OCT 17 1945

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 91—PART 8

OCTOBER 19, 1945, TO NOVEMBER 28, 1945
(PAGES 9823 TO 11156)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1945

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

To the living, loving, and eternal Father we offer our tribute of praise: Thou art the source of courage, the replenishment of strength, and the inspiration of the common order. Impress us that the devotion of a servant, the zeal of a prophet, and the love of an angel can be expressed in the humblest life; the equal eye of Thy glory knows neither great nor small, bond nor free. O let this be the litany of our lives and the outpouring of our hearts, that Thy transforming spirit can redeem broken humanity the world over. While there are sorrows left, while there are yearnings unrealized, Thou art our full assurance, our quiet hope, and our brave endurance. O Thou who didst consecrate the workshop by Thy presence and glorified labor by Thy example, hasten the dawn when man to man shall brother be and all the world be one. In the name of Christ, our Elder Brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1414. An act to assist in soil-conservation and water-conservation work, forest-fire prevention and suppression, and forest improvement by making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for such work, and for other purposes; and

S. 1423. An act to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of slum, blighted, and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such area in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes.

A NEW KIND OF STRIKE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some newspaper excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ABANDONMENT OF FORT BRADY

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes: and I ask unanimous consent to vacate the order which I have to address the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one on the freedom of speech in the Army, and in the second on the subject of the draft, and to include a letter which he sent to General Hershey.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, heretofore I have spoken before the House upon the subject of returning our veterans from foreign soil to our own country. Our boys who have 85 or more points are apparently stranded in England all because they have no available transportation. I have just received a cablegram from 119 Indiana boys, now in England, who left France on September 20, and they have been pushed through three casual camps in England, and they have no sailing date. They are stranded there. They want to come home. The Navy is not bringing these boys home—and with transport ships tied up in many ports, and with the Navy Day celebration in the offing, our boys simply have to sit by and await the time when the Navy decides to bring a few more boys back.

Mr. Speaker, I read the cablegram from these boys, which is as follows:

On September 20 we 1,200 casual 85-pointers, and over, left France for home. To date we have been pushed through three casual camps in England and still have no sailing date. This wasteful Army inactivity and apparent military inefficiency in not supplying at least one Liberty ship from our vast fleet has brought extreme discouragement and ebbing morale to a large bunch of eligible dischargees. Please bring our plight to the attention of the proper authorities.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETEEN INDIANA TROOPS.

Mr. Speaker, it is time our Army and Navy awaken and return these boys home. These troops have done their job; now let the Army and the Navy do its job by promptly returning these eligible dischargees to this country and to their homes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

FREE SPEECH IN PEACETIME

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an Army release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a military release taken from an Army bulletin board at Drew Field. Despite its apparently innocent phrasing, the meaning of this instruction is plain. It is to prevent soldiers at this field from exercising the traditional American right of free speech in peacetime.

Mr. Speaker, military suppression of free speech in peacetime was one of the ugly evils by which Hitler marched Germany to its doom. This militaristic tactic has no place in America. Incidents of this kind indicate the drive in America toward the military state in which the freedom and liberty of the people is replaced by despotism.

It is time for Congress to restore to the people of America the freedoms that America stands for, and to stop the onslaught of a totalitarianism clothed in glittering gold braid and brass buttons.

The text of this bulletin reads as follows:

HEADQUARTERS AAF REGIONAL
STATION HOSPITAL, DREW FIELD,
OFFICE OF THE BASE SURGEON,
Tampa, Fla., October 9, 1945.

Memorandum: All concerned:

1. No officer, enlisted man, or civilian employee of this hospital will release any information or answer any queries from representatives of newspapers, radio, or magazines in reference to any military activity at this hospital unless specifically authorized to do so by the base public relations officer.

2. It is incumbent upon all personnel to bear in mind at all times the importance of maintaining security of classified military information. The release of military information is a public-relations function, and only through the cooperation of all concerned can factual news be assembled correctly, quickly, and completely for public consumption.

3. Your attention is invited to Base Regulation 47-1; WD Circular 59, 1942; AAF Ltr. 47-8, 8 March 1945; and Hospital Regulation 47-2, 26 June 1945.

By order of Colonel Porter:

FRANK E. BRUNNER,
Major, M. A. C., Adjutant.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the atomic bomb and the release of atomic energy is not just another weapon. It is the release of the cosmic force of this universe. Anyone with even a fragment of religious sense will recognize that mankind cannot do that, unless his moral progress keeps pace with that scientific progress, without meeting head on the inexorable laws of God. Scientists who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee on yesterday and at other times and places have told us that the only defense against these weapons is an international order where their use would be impossible. If there ever was a time which called for statesmanship, that time is now, and that statesmanship has got to be more far-sighted and courageous than so far we have shown. I appeal to the membership to read the testimony given before the Military Affairs Committee on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made before the Polish-American Congress at Detroit, commemorating the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extracts from letters received from Elliott Goodman, an Indianapolis serviceman.

THE ECONOMY BLOC

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I hope no one will overlook the list of 82 men on page 9308 of yesterday's RECORD. It is a notable list of notable men. They not only preach economy, but, extraordinary as it may seem, they actually vote for economy.

Mr. Speaker, that list of names ought to be printed in every newspaper in the country. I do not know just how interested in economy the newspapers are, but there have been so few votes for economy lately that it ought to be in the same class with the story of "Man bites dog."

We have all kinds of blocs here—the farm bloc, the labor bloc, the railroad bloc; now at last we have an economy bloc.

May I suggest that formal meetings of the bloc be convened here on the floor of the House every time a bill is up to spend money we do not have for something we do not need.

You will recognize a brother of the bloc when he gives the password. The password is the word "No," spoken clearly and distinctly when the Member's name is called on a vote to appropriate borrowed money for something we can get along without. The uninitiated are earnestly invited to affiliate at any regular meeting of the bloc.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to assure the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that if he really means business we on the Republican side will be glad to give him thorough cooperation. We have been waging a lonely fight for some time and are delighted at the words of the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Talk does not do anything; it is the vote that counts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I repeat, if the gentleman from Missouri means what he says, we on the Republican side will be glad to give him thorough cooperation from now on by the vote. We will see who is for economy.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will help me secure Members to join the bloc.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed glad to know that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has headed a bloc at last to fight for economy. I recall not so long ago when the gentleman who is now addressing you made a rather militant fight on the floor to stop the expenditure of $15,000,000 to take a farm census. I could recall a lot of other similar fights that were made to stop the useless and senseless expenditure of money for things we did not need to be paid for out of the Treasury that does not have any money. The record will indicate that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri led the fight to spend that money for a thing which proved to be absolutely worthless and senseless.

THE PALESTINE QUESTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN adressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ECONOMY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a hasty count of those 82 immortals who voted "no" yesterday upon a bill to spend $650,000,000 to $700,000,000 that we do not have, have not got, and create inflation, reveals 12 members of the Democratic Party and 70 members of the Republican Party voting to save the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORRELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

REDUCING CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS AVAILABLE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4407, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, general debate is limited to 3 hours, to

be confined to the bill, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. How much time is left?

The CHAIRMAN. Three hours. None of the time has been used in general debate.

Mr. RANKIN. It is all general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, general debate will extend for 3 hours.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, is it the intention to read the bill after general debate is concluded?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair. General debate is to be confined to the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we report this morning one of the notable bills in the annals of the committee and the Congress. A hundred years from now it will be looked back upon as one of the landmarks in fiscal legislation.

It is extraordinary both in purpose and dimensions.

It reverses the usual functions of the committee and its bills and, instead of providing for expenditure, precludes expenditure. And it deals with amounts of a magnitude unprecedented in any bill in any legislative body in any country in any period of the world's history—considerably over $50,000,000,000, a sum so stupendous as to be incomprehensible to the finite mind of man.

When appropriations were provided for the fiscal year, 1946, the period beginning July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946, we provided for the full 12 months of the fiscal year. As a matter of fact the war lasted only about a month and a half of the fiscal year. The proposal now before us is to recover the unexpended portions of these funds which would have been used for war purposes had the war continued.

Of course, we cannot, as might be imagined at first blush, reclaim all of this money remaining unexpended at the close of hostilities. Although the war is over so far as the fighting is concerned, the war is not over so far as expenses are concerned. It requires vast sums to liquidate war activities and get back to a peacetime status. For example, although we are demobilizing our armed forces at a more rapid rate than any victorious army has ever been discharged, there are still millions of men who must be fed, clothed, housed, hospitalized, transported, and cared for until we can return them to their homes and muster them back into civilian life.

The committee took unprecedented action in contemplation of this emergency more than 2 years ago. We included in our deficiency bill at that time a provision under which the Bureau of the Budget was instructed to maintain a continuing study of all war appropriations and to report periodically to the Congress the status of the appropriations, the amount expended, the amount remaining uncommitted, and any surplus to be reclaimed. So when the end came, rather unexpectedly, with the surrender of the Japanese Empire to the American armies, we were ready to take immediate action. We had the essential data at hand. The day following the surrender of the Japanese Army we made arrangements to begin hearings. Through the Bureau of the Budget we notified the war agencies and departments to prepare to come in and give an accounting. Hearings started the day Congress convened, and continued, without interruption, from that day until the bill was reported, every day in the week, sometimes beginning as early as 9:30 and running as late as 7 o'clock at night.

Most of the agencies cooperated loyally with the committee. Others were reluctant to disgorge. Some started a race to commit everything they could before their funds were frozen. That is why we had to move with such celerity. We had to get the money before it could be spent.

The original estimates for rescission aggregated $49,068,021,928. Following searching recapitulations by the committee, many agencies which were requested to resurvey their fiscal programs, submitted revised estimates yielding an additional $951,045,583. In addition, the committee, acting on its own judgment, after a careful study of the situation, proposes a further cut of $2,443,270,277. So that the bill submitted today carries a total rescission of $52,453,535,278. In connection with the two bills of this character passed since the surrender of Germany, this bill presents a combined rescission of $56,810,654,278, approximately one-fifth of the national debt, which it is now proposed to return to the Treasury. The effect upon future taxation and on the credit of the United States of thus reducing the ultimate amount of the public debt is beyond calculation.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Has the gentleman investigated to ascertain what the national debt will be after this total credit has been made?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is impossible to say at this time. War expenditures are continuing and will continue for some time to come. For that reason we have not included in this bill, as huge a bill as it is, the full amount we expect to be able to eventually salvage. The bill reserves such amounts as can be impounded without interfering with demobilization or reconversion. We expect to make further rescissions when the committees take up the 1947 Budget.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not true that an appropriation of money is merely an authority for the agency for which it is appropriated to spend the amount appropriated? Is it not a fact that by the rescission of these appropriations as contemplated and embodied in this bill you are simply denying to the agency the right to spend a portion of the appropriation which is rescinded and that it will in no way cut down the public debt? The public debt is represented by money that has been spent which they did not have in the Treasury. And that amount of money is not transferred to the public debt until it is actually spent. Therefore, the rescission itself cannot affect the the present public debt but may have some effect in curtailing a rise in the public debt. Is that not true?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In this bill we deal with the two methods providing for expenditure—the appropriation of actual cash, under which the department is authorized to draw upon the Treasury, and contractual authorization, under which the department contracts indebtedness for which cash must later be appropriated. Appropriation does not necessarily involve debt. It is only when the funds in the Treasury have been exhausted, and it is necessary to issue bonds, Treasury certificates, or unsupported currency that debt is created. But, of course, deficit spending—the appropriation of funds in excess of the public revenues—can be continued only through increases in the public debt sufficient to make up the deficit. So a rescission of appropriations or cancellation of contractual authorizations rendering it unnecessary to sell Government bonds or otherwise float Government loans means a reduction in the cost of the war, in deficit spending, and eventually in the national debt. The rescissions in this bill have no immediate effect on the $270,000,000,000 of national debt now outstanding; they prevent the debt from being increased by these items to a total of $326,000,000,000 and to that extent reduce the national debt.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. On the occasion when the committee reported out the other bill recapturing for the Treasury certain no longer needed war appropriations, I congratulated the gentleman in bringing in a unique bill returning to the Treasury money which was not needed to be spent now in the interest of the public safety. I want again to congratulate the gentleman in today bringing in a bill providing for the return of a much larger amount. Congress was generous, as it should be, in appropriating to carry on the war successfully. Let us not spend a dollar on the war unnecessarily.

I am glad to hear the gentleman say that after carefully weighing these items, the committee tried, in recapturing this vast sum, not to interfere at all with the problem of demobilization or reconversion. I trust the gentleman has

studied all such items carefully, including combination items both for war and peace, because there is danger now that in our economy-mindedness we may cut too deeply and thereby interfere with demobilization or total reconversion. I would like the committee in its program to be as wise and generous in furnishing funds for victory, in peace as it was in furnishing funds for victory in war. I think the committee has been careful in this measure and I urge the committee to be careful not to cut so deeply anywhere that it will interfere with demobilization, reconversion or the proper postwar expansion of our economy in furnishing jobs.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are glad to have the approval of the gentleman who has always cooperated with the committee in its efforts to save money. I fully agree with him that we should be careful here not to interfere with reconversion or demobilization.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think at this point it would be right and proper to inform the Congress and the country that after this $52,453,535,278 is recaptured there still remains a balance which can be spent in the amount of $94,040,866,499 during this fiscal year.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does the gentleman want to include that in the bill also? If it is included, there will not be a man able to get home.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is not fair in that statement. Of course, he knows we cannot take it all away.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What does the gentleman want to do? He called attention to it.

Mr. JENSEN. I want the American taxpayers to know that the great New Deal spenders still have got this great sum of over $94,000,000,000 to play with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If it is to play with why not take it away? The gentleman knows it is for demobilization and liquidation of war activities. And it might be added that the gentleman himself voted to put every dollar of it there.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not. The gentleman knows I did not.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman voted for these appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman is very unfair when he makes that statement, because he knows it is not a fact.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Every time an appropriation came up here for prosecuting the war the gentleman voted for it. That is what this is. Every dollar of it is from the war appropriations and the gentleman voted for every one of them.

Mr. JENSEN. Sure; I voted for the war appropriations. I voted for everything for war. I did not vote for a lot of these "pork-barrel" measures.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no "pork" here. All we have left is for demobilization and liquidation. But there was a "fat pork" bill on the floor yesterday. How did the gentleman vote on that?

Mr. JENSEN. I voted against it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I congratulate the gentleman. All who voted for the airport bill voted to increase the national debt. It is deficit spending. The amount for the airports will have to be added to the amounts for the war and that means added to the national debt. And they voted to decrease the national revenue by $7,000,000,000 so it will be that much harder to pay the national debt.

Mr. JENSEN. Did the gentleman from Missouri vote against it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I certainly did.

Mr. JENSEN. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

We work together. I hope we can continue to stay together on this bill.

The preparation of the bill has been a tedious and laborious task. We have been on it since the 5th of September and I want to take advantage of this opportunity to express appreciation of the work of the minority on the subcommittee. We have had earnest and conscientious cooperation from the four members of the subcommittee on the minority side of the table.

Of course, the real credit for this bill goes to the clerk of the committee, John Pugh. I really do not know whether he has eaten or slept since this bill has been under consideration. There has never been a time when I called him, even on Sunday, from early morning until midnight, but what he was at the telephone in his office at the Capitol, ready to look up any data, ready to give any information needed in the work on the bill, and ready to take up the preparation of the next day's program. In my opinion, he knows more about the Military Establishment and the Naval Establishment than any man living today. He has rendered incalculable aid in the retrenchment of these vast appropriations. If the money John Pugh has saved the United States Government could be segregated, it would pay his salary through eternity. I want to express to him, for the committee, for the House, and for the country, our great appreciation of his indefatigable labor on this bill and his wise and experienced counsel in its preparation.

And that brings to mind the fact that the Members of this House, individually, are also entitled to credit for services performed.

We have had the privilege of entertaining on this floor the great war leaders as they came back from the scene of action in Europe and in Asia. We have acclaimed their deeds and expressed our appreciation. So I may be pardoned if I call attention at this time to the service that the Members of the House have rendered in the war program and the war effort.

The war could not have been won without the heroic sacrifices of the men at the front. It could not have been won without the arms and munitions which poured from the factories at home, or without the workmen who fashioned them. And it could not have been won without the men on the legislative and appropriating committees here who have been in practically continuous session since the war began. It was in these committees and then on this floor that these armies and factories and supplies had their beginning and their continuing support. These men, carrying the heavy burdens of a war Congress, have served in the war as truly as any man who guided a ship, or led a regiment, or charged the machine guns of the enemy. To fully appraise the work of the Congress it is only necessary to compare the work of former Congresses under similar circumstances.

Contrast the congressional management of this war with that of the Civil War. Here is a brief excerpt from a history of the times:

> Belief in McClellan was slipping away. A congressional committee had blazoned the War Department's mismanagement of contracts. The capital presented the spectacle of waste on an imperial scale. The peculations of the contractors and the frauds and thievery in the commissary department vied with the grotesque shiftlessness of foundered horses and spoiled rations. In ragged uniforms and blankets, the soldiers were bearing the exposure and the inactivity with spirit.
>
> Mr. Lincoln said, "General, what shall I do? The people are impatient; Chase has no money and he tells me he can raise no more. The bottom is out of the tub. What shall I do?"

Take a look at the Spanish-American War. Many of you will remember the embalmed beef scandals, and men dying like flies because of improper food in makeshift camps. One of the characteristic errors of the war was sending troops to Cuba to fight a tropical campaign, wearing woolen winter clothing. These were only the high lights of the mismanagement that characterized the entire Spanish-American campaign.

Even in the last war you will recall the great contagions which swept the armed camps throughout the country. Men died in camp by the thousands, 3,000 miles away from the battle front. I visited one camp at Chillicothe, Ohio, where they could not get coffins fast enough to bury them.

What a contrast with the adequacy and efficiency of this war.

No army has ever been so well fed, well clothed, well housed, well equipped, well hospitalized, and well paid. There has not been a single contagion or epidemic in any camp in the 4 years of warfare. And the losses on the field have been proportionately less than in any previous war.

Only one-quarter of the number of men we expected to lose have been lost in battle. At the beginning of this war the Army statisticians got together and estimated how many men we would have to lose to win the war, how many men we might expect to lose to invade Africa, to drive into Germany, to take Japan. The number they estimated was four times the number we actually lost; and back home—when demobilization is completed—for every boy that does not come back there will be three walking the streets whom we did not expect to re-

turn—due to the remarkable efficiency in the management of this war. In cooperation with the legislative committees of the House, the Committee on Appropriations took every precaution to see that ample supplies were provided. Invariably, after we had completed the examination of the estimates with an admiral of the Navy or a general of the Army—after we had completed the hearings—we inquired: "Well, Admiral," "now, General," "are you certain you have enough money for this program?" "Look this over again." "Is there anything you think should be added, or anything for which we have not made provision?" And in every instance they said: "No; you have made ample provision." Everything was done that could be done to make the war effort successful, to contribute to its early conclusion of the war, and to the lowered casualty lists. The achievements of the Congress in that respect are persuasively indicated by a review of the work of the agencies supplied by Congress, and for the work of which Congress itself was primarily responsible. The heroism of the men on the battle front, the vast resources poured into the conflict, the sacrifices on the home front, would all have been without avail but for the miracle-working accessories supplied by our research laboratories.

For example, we could not have won the war without radar. Without radar, which we supplied, England could not have survived. Without radar, she would have been enveloped and overwhelmed by the sheer numbers of the planes Hitler sent against her. And without England and the European base which she supplied, our cause would have been hopeless.

Again, there was no other answer to kamikaze—to the suicide attacks of the Japs against our Navy. We shot down planes 4,600 yards away which were never seen until they exploded after our radar-directed fire hit them. With radar we aimed automatically and we hit them before they got in view. But for radar, they would have sunk every vessel we had; our troops ashore would have been stranded without supplies, and we would have suffered one of the greatest catastrophes in the history of American arms.

Likewise, the proximity fuze, the antisubmarine devices, the atomic bomb, and other scientific equipment developed in direct response to funds and oversight provided by the House and its committees, contributed materially to the successful conclusion of the war and were determining factors without which victory would not have been achieved. It was testified by the highest authorities of both the Army and the Navy in our last hearing that without radar and the proximity fuse alone the war would still be going on and we would today be suffering appalling losses.

In other words, this Congress met and solved every problem raised by the unprovoked and unexpected attack of the two greatest military machines, operated by the two most powerful autocracies the world has ever seen. Never in any previous national crisis has the Congress and its committees operated so efficiently, so faultlessly, and so successfully.

And yet there have been Members of Congress who spent a large part of their time while the war was at its height disseminating the idea over the country that Congress is so deficient in facilities for transacting business, and so delinquent and incompetent in providing them, that the Nation is on the verge of a great catastrophe. In the last few days Members of the House, through the columns of a national magazine, branded their colleagues on this floor as clowns and dotards, and I quote their exact words as printed in a recent issue of a national magazine.

Never before has any legislative body been confronted with such crucial tests. Never before has any system of government or legislative procedure acquitted itself so successfully and so victoriously. The Nation may well take pride in its Congress, and in the integrity and competence of every member of its war committees. But these gentlemen are rushing into print at every opportunity and devoting a large part of their time to an effort to make the country believe that the contrary is true.

By these unwarranted attacks they are bringing our form of government, and especially their colleagues who are responsible for its procedure, into general disrepute. They are undermining the confidence of the people in their Congress, and anything that brings the Congress—the representatives of the people—into disrepute weakens the fabric of American democracy. That is the program of fascism and nazism. The first step taken in the exploitation of Germany and Italy was to discredit and destroy the national legislatures. However unjustified, it creates distrust and unrest. And so far as the American Congress is concerned it is wholly unjustified.

In criticizing the Congress they do not even take the trouble to adhere to the facts. For example, they have made the statement here on the floor—and a newspaper in my State has carried it in a box day after day on its editorial page—that the procedure of the House has not been overhauled since 1893. Anyone who has paid any attention at all to House procedure knows that the most sweeping revision of all time was made in 1911. The procedure of the House was more completely revamped in the revision of 1911 than in any revision since our legislative system was first codified by Jefferson in 1799. In that revision we eliminated old committees and created new committees and completely changed the method of their appointment. We democratize the House.

Frequent changes have been made since that date. And further changes can be made at any time. If any Member thinks something should be revised, all that is necessary in order to get consideration is to drop a resolution in the basket there on the Clerk's table and the Committee on Rules will give it prompt attention.

Our Committee on Rules is made up of able and experienced men and they are ready at any time to consider any reasonable suggestion. If anyone here feels that there is anything wrong with the procedure of the House, all you have to do is to send a resolution up to the Committee on Rules. They will give you a hearing. They are fair-minded men, and if there is anything wrong, they will bring a rule on the floor to make it right.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here, in one capacity or another for more than 30 years, and I trust I will not be charged with fulsomeness, when I say I do not believe there has been a body of abler, more conscientious, more sincere, and efficient men in this House, in all those 30 years, than serve here here today. They have acquitted themselves well and faithfully in this great hour. And there is not a clown or a dotard among them.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I would like to make a brief statement. I share with the gentleman from Missouri the feeling of admiration and respect for the attitude and the services rendered by the minority members of this committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and others who sat with us. I also feel that there is a tremendous amount of appreciation due the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

It appears that when any emergency arises in America that we have someone, or more than one who rises to meet the emergency. We have it in the case of General Marshall. Though the job he did was not so dramatic as that performed by those who were at the battle fronts, sufficient cannot be said as to the quality of his leadership. The same is true of General Somervell, in managing perhaps the greatest business ever conducted in the history of the world, in having the material contracted for on time, in having it produced on time, and in having it at the right spot at the right time. I would like to interpolate here that I think we have given far too little praise to men like General Marshall and General Somervell.

The period is now at hand when the important job is to save the taxpayers any unnecessary expense. I rise at this time primarily to pay tribute to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON]. He is being called to that job just as General Marshall and General Somervell were to the jobs they have done so remarkably. The way he has attacked the problems presented by this bill, and his sincere devotion to economy and the best interests of this country, prophesy a leadership that is now most needed in this country; and his actions as chairman are certainly an example of the finest type of sound, strong, intelligent leadership in Congress. He has done a magnificent job. He has done a job for which this House and his country should feel a deep debt of gratitude. I rise at this time to say that I agree that in the chairman of the Appropriations Committee we have

leadership for economy which is of a very high order, indeed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The bill before us is a rather simple proposition. It proposes to rescind available appropriations, cancel existing and uncommitted contractual authorizations and recover certain corporate funds. The provisions of the bill on the various rescissions are largely self-explanatory and I shall not take them up seriatim.

But there are three items in which more than passing interest has been expressed by members and by the country.

I will refer to these briefly.

One deals with the continuance of the nurses' training program. I think perhaps more telegrams came in on that item than on any other in the bill. Largely in response to the message of the President on the subject, the committee recommends retention of funds for continuance of the program to admit applicants until October 15, 1945, although we are separating nurses from the service every day and nurses now entering training will not graduate for more than 2½ years after the close of the war.

Another question of general interest relates to the child-care centers. In order to increase production in munition factories, Congress provided for the establishment of child-care centers in the great industrial areas. The Bureau of the Budget, in view of the fact that this was purely a war activity, to increase war production, recommended that it be eliminated when the war factories were eliminated. However, in view of the widespread interest and urgent requests in behalf of children whose fathers were in the service the committee recommends a continuance of the present policy until March 1, 1946.

The third item related to the Bureau of Mines and a number of its activities. The importunities received by the committee seemed to be due to a misapprehension which had gained currency to the effect that the Budget cuts were to be doubled.

Of course we never at any time entertained any such intention. Accordingly, the rescissions recommended are in exact accord with the Budget estimates.

Perhaps the most notable provision in the bill, one which will be of more general interest back home than any other, is that incorporated in the bill for the purpose of speeding up demobilization. It took years to mobilize the Army and, naturally, it cannot be sent home in a night. At the same time, when the more we study the situation, the more evident it becomes that all branches of the service have been unnecessarily slow in releasing men and that the original program for demobilization involves too long a delay in getting the men back home.

In corroboration of this view, I am including a letter from one of the eminent men of the Nation—a former Member of this House and this committee:

OCTOBER 15, 1945.

DEAR CLARENCE: I am sitting out here watching what's going on and notice that, so far, no one has advanced the idea that the Government could save a tremendous amount of money if discharges were expedited.

For instance, we have here an air base with perhaps 20,000 men. I am guessing that better than half of them are flight officers or officers. Many of them have not the points for a discharge; the only activity that I can find out the great majority of them are doing is going out to the base and reporting, and trying to get a chance, and some of them succeeding, to fly. If they are off the ground 4 times per month and in the air for a total of four hours, they get their flying pay, so here they are, doing nothing except to fly so as to get an increase in pay. Many of them will frankly tell you that. Many of them want to get out and can't get out.

In connection with that, Congress is proposing to reduce taxes which, of course, means more deficit spending and borrowing. Then they are going to try to get the American people to buy bonds at a time when many folks are facing a reduction in pay and loss of jobs.

It doesn't add up to sense, Clarence, and there are a lot of us out here in the hinterland who feel that a speedier demobilization of the armed forces will result in less deficit spending and less need for bond sales. Incidentally, the maintenance of a sound tax structure will do both.

I have been told also of Government new construction just to get the money spent before the appropriation lapses. These stories make an old penny pincher of appropriations want to go to the races and see who can win—the savers or spenders.

Here is another letter from a slightly different point of view, which speaks for itself. It is only one of many:

The time has come when, regardless of points, the men who have fought this war should be relieved. The suggestion that any revision in the demobilization program be promptly publicized will be greatly appreciated by all of us who have waited and wondered how to plan.

One of the groups hardest hit by this uncertainty is the group of married men and women who are over 30, and who will have to start all over again when they do have a chance to resume normal living. Possessing more knowledge on what to expect will enable many of us to make arrangements for living quarters, and will give our fighting men a chance to take advantage of any business opportunities which could not be accepted as long as we did not know what would happen next.

I hope our fighting men will be able to return very soon to the lives they have had to give up for so long.

A SOLDIER'S WIFE.

By cutting the amount allowed in this bill for pay and subsistence, and by our admonition direct to the departments and in the report we have already speeded up demobilization more than 100 percent. As will be noted, we got results even before the bill was brought to the floor. Last Monday, the Army decreased its requirement in points for discharge, and the Navy has this morning released an announcement of a decrease in its point requirements. These reductions, and the consequent acceleration of the discharge of men from both branches, are in direct response to provisions of the pending bill. As a consequence of this enactment, the boys will be home months before they otherwise would have been returned, the period of reconversion will be speeded up, shortened, and the business of the country should be back to normal that much sooner. The Navy now is releasing an average of 11,791 men a day, or at the rate of 135,000 a month. The Army is discharging men on an average of 43,000 a day and will release men at the rate of over 1,200,000 per month. Incidentally, we are not only getting the boys back home sooner, hurrying up the period of reconversion, but we are also saving for the United States Treasury money which otherwise would be spent in holding and maintaining these men idle in military camps and naval stations.

To those who may still entertain any misgivings on the score of these reductions, I submit that the unobligated availability of funds for the armed services is undoubtedly too large.

The amount remaining to the Army is $16,226,514,937.

The amount remaining to the Navy is $11,945,257,515.

The slack, in my judgment, is in the figures reported as expended and obligated before we undertook our inquiry.

As to the Army, such amount has been reported to be $33,626,678,872.

As to the Navy, the amount has been reported to be $51,671,930,782.

Each of those amounts is as of July 31, 1945.

It is my judgment that further experience, further examination, and more recently prepared reports, compiled with greater care and thoroughness, will disclose that such amounts are too large; that there will be additional availability for recovery running into appreciable sums.

We have heard complaints that the rescissions proposed in the funds for the armed services will necessitate the termination of this activity or that activity, or will cause this activity or that activity to be too greatly contracted, or will necessitate the abandonment of some project which the war's end has rendered unnecessary. That is the purpose of this measure. War procedures and practices and dictated needs are in the discard. We must set our sights for the pursuits of peace, and, as to the armed services, for levels commensurate with the maintenance of peace. No other course could or would be justified.

In this connection, I might observe that we may make or pass all kinds of resolutions to the effect that we propose to maintain armed services of this or that size. The size of the armed establishments is to be determined by the amount of taxes the American people are willing to pay. National income will control budgets, assuming we are sufficiently impressed by the size of the public debt to live in the future within our income and devote a reasonable amount of it to debt retirement.

To those concerned about our state of preparedness, I reiterate what I said on September 5, namely, that in planning a fiscal course for the future we should determine upon and aim to provide annually a floor amount for debt retirement, and should definitely determine upon a floor amount for preparedness. That is the sure way of maintaining a proper measure of preparedness.

Another way is to channel expenditures into essentials; to eliminate activities not in essential categories, the support of which, with limited budgets, would take funds from real essentials.

The war has built up a spending psychology which reaches into all branches of the Federal service, including the armed services. Money has been free and has been used freely. That psychology must be dissipated. As the Secretary of the Navy tersely and aptly expressed it, we must "recapture economy."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. On page 15 of the bill under the subheading "United States Employment Service," there is the following:

Employment office facilities and services: The unexpended and unobligated balances, on the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this act, of appropriations made in the first paragraph under the heading "Employment Office Facilities and Services" in title VII of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1946, shall, on such thirtieth day, be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

I expect to offer an amendment as follows:

After the word "appropriations" insert "excluding the appropriation of $7,791,134 to carry into effect the provisions of section 602 of title 4 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress."

I am afraid unless an amendment of this kind is adopted we are going to greatly interfere with the present program of getting these returning servicemen readjusted and back into their usual avocations and bring in a State agency that will probably complicate the matter still further. I am just wondering if the gentleman from Missouri has studied that proposition and, if so, would he be willing to accept such an amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unfortunately, I have had no opportunity to study the amendment. As the gentleman will observe, there is nothing in the hearings about it as this amendment was brought up rather unexpectedly, just before we reported the bill. I think perhaps some of the subcommittees have from time to time made a study of it, perhaps a year ago, but nothing has been reported to the committee en banc.

Mr. RANKIN. This would be in accord with the GI bill which the Congress passed last year, and I just wonder if the gentleman from Missouri would like to discuss it at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am not familiar with it as we had no hearings on it. I think some of the subcommittees had hearings on it but took no action on it, perhaps a year ago. The amendment seems to speak for itself. It is apparently merely a matter of returning this activity to the States.

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask the gentleman another question on the proposition that he was discussing a moment ago, and that is with reference to expediting demobilization. The gentleman seems to think that cutting down the appropriations will expedite the demobilization of the men in the armed forces at the present time. As a matter of fact, it seems to me we are going to have to have more drastic legislation; Congress is going to have to express itself and provide that these men, under certain conditions, may be discharged on their own application, if we are going to have men returned to their homes who are needed there, who have dependents to look after, or young men who want to go back to school.

When we urge the discharge of a man, they come back at us with this point system that is holding hundreds of thousands of men in the armed forces who should be at home looking after their families, or young men who should be permitted to return to school. I am wondering if cutting down this appropriation will have the effect of speeding up these discharges.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that I would heartily approve the legislation to which he refers. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations is not a legislative committee and has no jurisdiction. However, when you cut off the money you cut off the activity. This reduction in appropriations, in connection with our instructions to the representatives of the departments who appeared before us, and their assurance of cooperation, insures expedition by 100 percent of the return of these men to civil life.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me ask the gentleman a further question. The House, by adopting this rule, has waived all points of order against this bill. The gentleman from Missouri being the outstanding parliamentarian, not only in this country but of the world, I want to ask him this question——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. "A Daniel come to judgment."

Mr. RANKIN. I hope the gentleman will express his judgment rather freely at this time. Would an amendment be in order to require the Army to release men who had been in the service a certain length of time, or who have dependents at home to look after, or young men who want to return and continue their schooling?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, the gentleman understands that the rule merely makes in order the provisions of the bill. It does not make in order any amendment which would not be in order under the general rules of the House. If the amendment is germane, it would be admissible.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, would it be germane?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would be necessary to study the text of the amendment in connection with the bill. The gentleman mentions my interest in parliamentary law. All that I learned I learned from the gentleman from Mississippi. He is one of the ablest parliamentarians who has ever served in this House. I am sure he is merely asking me a rhetorical question in order to impress upon the House the importance of the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. No, sir. I am asking my mentor. I still contend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is the ablest parliamentarian in the world. But if he desires me to take the lead and attempt to give him another lesson in parliamentary procedure, I will make a stab at it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In parliamentary matters I have always sat at the feet of the gentleman from Mississippi, as Paul sat at the feet of Gamaliel.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The Appropriations Committee is to be congratulated on having reported a bill to cut down appropriations. On the other hand, I do not want anybody to feel, either in the House or on the committee or outside in the country, that the job is anywhere near done. If anyone has in front of him page 2 of the committee report, I can demonstrate that in a moment.

The total funds available for different war activities at the time this set-up was considered, as of July 1, 1945, was $146,427,000,000. This cut involves $52,435,000,000, leaving a balance of funds available for expenditure or contract authorization or anything of that character of $94,000,000,000. The Budget estimates, and they are not very far from the mark, that the expenditures of the Government for the particular purposes specified in the bill in the fiscal year 1946 in which we now are, that is, the year ending June 30, 1946, will be $50,000,000,000. This means there is still $44,000,000,000 of velvet kicking around that we need to dig up and recover for the Treasury. I am in hopes we shall be able to find a way of salvaging that velvet before the departments of the Government get the idea that they can run wild and spend it.

Possibly some of the cuts have not been as deep as they should be, perhaps because we did not have information enough to offer the amendments that ought to be offered.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Does the gentleman feel it is good economy for the Federal Government to appropriate $30,000,000 and turn it over to the States to be administered?

Mr. TABER. The bill contains no such proposal. It does contain a proposal to turn $30,000,000 over to the States for the administration of the Wagner-Peyser Act. The reason for that is that we can undoubtedly secure some efficient administration that is now being denied the workers of America and the returning veterans if we return that money to the States for administration. I want to protect the workers and the returning veterans instead of having continued inefficiency.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman will admit that this $30,000,000 was appropriated and is Federal funds.

Mr. TABER. It was not appropriated, but it is Federal funds. The statute presently requires an allotment to the States for administration, and that is what we propose, to go back to operating under the statute and cease operating

under an Executive order for which there was no basis in law.

Mr. HOOK. In other words, the gentleman believes that it is good policy for the Federal Government to give the funds to the States without the States putting up any matching funds whatsoever.

Mr. TABER. I believe it is good policy for the States in accordance with the law to continue the practice that has been denied for a great many years in providing for these employment agencies; and I believe that if we do it even the gentleman will realize that we have been the friend of the workingman and the returning soldier.

Mr. HOOK. I do not think so.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I believe it should be stated that we are recapturing $52,000,000 in this bill pertaining to the Employment Service and are expending only $30,000,000.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe we are recapturing quite as much as that, because there has been a considerable expenditure out of that figure; but we are recapturing a considerable amount.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. It is true, is it not, that in 1933 the Congress of the United States declared a national policy by adopting the Wagner-Peyser Act and that that is the only law on the statute books at the present time with reference to the operation of employment office facilities; and all that it is proposed to do here is to return to the declared national policy and operations under that policy as prescribed by the law adopted by a Democratic Congress at the instigation of President Roosevelt in 1933?

Mr. TABER. That is all it is proposed to do. The only authority that there was in law for any operations otherwise was an appropriation that was brought in here by the Appropriations Committee to carry on that Federal set-up. The Federal set-up is not doing the job; therefore we should get back to the States and have it done the way it used to be done, effectively and efficiently, rather than to play false to the workingmen and the returning veterans by trying to carry it on as it is.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time. I think I have covered that particular situation.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventeen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. With regard to this Dirksen amendment in connection with the transfer of the funds at this time, the only reason I would take exception is because of the tremendous load that the agency has at the present time. With the returning veterans and with the reconversion program going on, so many people using the facilities of the office at a time like this, it seems this is a most inappropriate time to do it. I think some sort of a date set in the future for return of this agency to the States would not be objected to by the House and would not cause the confusion that the proposal before us is going to cause.

Mr. TABER. The reason I would like to see it done right away is that we are faced with a terrific confusion as a result of a failure of a lot of these people, who are let out of employment in places, to be placed properly, effectively, and efficiently by the service at this time. I believe the return to the States would get rid of the confusion and uncertainty, and that is why I feel this is the time to do it. That is the reason I am for it at this time. I would be willing to accept the amendment that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] proposed, but I feel that we ought to go along and clean up this picture so that the folks can come back and go to work and so that the reconversion program can be accomplished and our people may have the opportunity to earn their daily bread.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I was just going to ask if it is not a fact that practically every governor in the United States has requested that this change be made and that it be made immediately.

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. From California we get no report of confusion or lack of efficiency on the part of the present Administration. In view of the gentleman's statement that there is inefficiency and confusion, will he please tell us what evidence he has to support that statement? If it is a fact I would like to know.

Mr. TABER. I live in the United States and they have those offices up in my territory, and I know something about what is going on.

Mr. DOYLE. What is the fact?

Mr. TABER. And I hear from other places to the same effect, and I do read the newspapers. That is the basis of my information.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has to say. There has been a mass of evidence brought in here of a documentary character in reference to the boys who are coming back now, how they are simply being brushed aside by these agencies that are supposed to give them preference, both in civil service and the Government agencies. They do not have a chance to break in under the present set-up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In response to the inquiry raised by the gentleman from California, on September 20 the chairman of the Employment Stabilization Commission of the State of California in a telegram says as follows:

> Need for prompt return of employment service to States continues imperative to enable proper coordinated administration of joint program to meet local employment and unemployment compensation problems.

Mr. TABER. I think that that is the general picture all over the United States.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. May I say that that was profoundly brought out in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, that practically every State agrees that this ought to be done. The people quite generally feel that this ought to be done and there is no question that it ought to be done. There might be some question as to the right method of doing it, and whether this is the right method, but there cannot be any question but what it ought to be done.

Mr. TABER. May I say that the law presently provides for its being done, but the funds are not available to do it in the way that the law provides that it be done. In this amendment, carrying out existing law, which was adopted by the committee and is now before the House, we are just cutting an appropriation for something that was not authorized by law and providing the funds for the method that is authorized by law to handle the picture.

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman will yield further, if we are going to give consideration to finances, there is no question but what this is financially the best way to do it.

Mr. TABER. It does not cost as much money and it does a better job.

I just want to call attention to two or three things in this bill as I go along that I do not believe have been cut as deeply as they ought to be. As to most of them I am not going to offer an amendment at this time, because we do not have sufficient data yet to justify the kind of a cut that ought to be made. There will still be available $1,200,000,000 to be obligated after the middle of August by lend-lease. That, to my mind, is too much. To my mind they have not canceled outstanding contracts the way they should, and reported the salvage, so that we could take advantage of it. In our hearings we were unable to find a satisfactory point from which we could properly and intelligently operate. I do believe that the situation requires further action and prompt action in connection with that item.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I desire to compliment the gentleman from New York, the ranking Republican on our Appropriations Committee, on his efforts during the hearings to ascertain factual data concerning the operations of the lend-lease program. I have studied the hearings on that subject and am amazed at the amount of confusion and the lack of definite information that was made available to the committee at that time. It is very obvious that the gentleman from New York is not satisfied with the representations made by the officials of FEA on lend-lease, and I believe that he should make an effort to present additional information. I think the gentleman has done a splendid job in that regard and should continue his efforts so that the House may have some definite understanding as to the implications and the scope of lend-lease now that the war has ended and the President has terminated lend-lease, on August 17.

Mr. TABER. I believe we could add a billion dollars to that cut without hurting it. On the other hand, I do not have the data I would like to have when I come here in the well to talk.

Now, the State Department. We have this OWI proposition transferred to the State Department with an enormous personnel. They are operating a short-wave propaganda broadcasting set-up in New York City with a present personnel of about 2,000. They have another outfit in San Francisco with a very large personnel. How is it possible for any self-respecting man or any man of capacity to act effectively as Ambassador from this country to any other country and have somebody in an independent status from New York City or San Francisco broadcasting American views in there without any control from that Ambassador? I frankly do not see how there can be anything resulting from that except utter and complete confusion. It is a set-up that must have further attention and must be coordinated. If the State Department does not do it awfully fast, the Congress ought to do it and do it quickly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman say that all of the personnel of OWI is being transferred to the State Department without any reduction?

Mr. TABER. Not quite all. Some of it is going other places, but the bulk of it goes there. Some of it has been cut off, but not enough.

Mr. SPRINGER. How much has the reduction been in the personnel?

Mr. TABER. It is hard to tell. There has probably been a reduction of a couple of thousand, or it may be a little more, including the overseas personnel. I do not have that figure in my head. But it should go a great deal further.

Mr. SPRINGER. That reduction of approximately 2,000 is out of how many employees?

Mr. TABER. Probably 8,000 or 10,000.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that there are probably 6,000 of those dead beats on the pay roll at this time, in a country where we have a free press, where we are covered up with papers and with pamphlets, and where there is no end to the publishing of books? Does the gentleman mean to say that when the country is broke we are still paying those parasites?

Mr. TABER. There are plenty on the pay roll yet. It might not run 6,000 today, but it would run a very considerable number—very close to it.

Mr. JENNINGS. If there is a baker's dozen of them, it is too much, unless they are paying their own expenses and working for nothing.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman ever hear of anybody of that type working for nothing?

Mr. JENNINGS. Of course not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

Now, I want to get into another situation, and that is the War Department and the Navy Department situation. I call attention to the fact that when the 15th of August arrived we had about 8,000,000 officers and men in the Army and we had about 3,400,000 officers and men in the Navy.

At the present time there has been a considerable reduction in it. But let me call your attention to this fact: When we started hearings, the rate of discharge out of the Army was approximately 15,000 a day. Today I am advised that the rate of discharge is 48,000 a day and that it probably will go higher. In the Navy the rate of discharge was about 5,000 a day and today it is approximately 10,000 a day.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. This morning's press says that the rate of discharge from the Navy is above 11,000 a day.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

The Marine Corps discharge rate has gone up. I am satisfied that the things we said in the Appropriations Committee to the representatives of the armed forces has had a very salutary effect upon the increase in the number that were discharged. That is not a partisan statement. I will hand just as much credit to the majority side on that proposition as to the minority side. But the Congress of the United States is entitled to some of the credit for the stepping up of that discharge rate. I want to see that understood by the people back home.

We have made a revision of the money that we would allow the Army and Navy for pay and that sort of thing with the idea of getting them to step up these discharge rates just as much as we could and still not upset the needs of the Army. That they could do it is evidenced by the results that have been achieved since we began to operate. For instance, on the first day of October, there were 2,875,000 enlisted men in the Army in the continental United States. On top of that, there were 500,000 officers, about 18 percent of the strength of the enlisted personnel. Anybody who thinks at all realizes that that is a ridiculous situation, and that they have too many Reserve officers on active duty. They have to have a lot of enlisted men lolling around in front of them to keep them busy. Now those things have got to come down and I think the Army has begun to realize it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I think the gentleman's comment on the officer situation in the War Department is a very timely one. But the gentleman surely realizes that part of the reason for the slow demobilization is that in the case of some of these officers, in order to justify keeping their rank and keeping them on the pay roll, they must have a lot of enlisted men around them.

Mr. TABER. That is just the picture that I have tried to present. It is because we have allowed so many of them to hang on that we have so few discharges as of this date although the picture is improving.

Now, let me give you the Navy picture: In the United States today there are 51,000 Reserve officers on active duty in the Navy in the continental United States who are really not fit for sea duty.

Just think of it. You and I, when we provide an Army and Navy, want a fighting Army and a fighting Navy. That applies just as much to the majority as it does to the minority. We do not want overage officers, overage enlisted men. We do not want to allow that situation to arise which came to us after the last war, where we had second lieutenants over 60 years of age in the service. And let me say to you, it took over 15 years after the last war before we got rid of a lot of those people who were so far over age or were so unable to do the job they ought to do.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. In connection with the gentleman's remarks, I would like to say that we had legislation after I came here in 1930 dealing with what we called the hump in the Army.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. MAY. There were more than 10,000 unnecessary officers in the service.

Mr. TABER. And they were not any good to the Army. We had to do the same thing and had the same kind of legislation with the Navy. I do not want that situation to exist in the days to come.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I think this is a good place to call attention to page 802 of the hearings, in which General Robins, at my request, placed in the record a statement of the enlisted troop strength in the continental United States during the fiscal year 1946.

That record shows that in July they had 3,264,000; August, 3,402,000; September, 3,370,000; October, 3,310,000;

November, 3,250,000—only 14,000 less in November than in last July; December, 3,140,000. January 1946, 2,935,000; February, 2,740,000, and so on down. Not until May are they getting down below 2,200,000. All of those men are drawing pay, are being kept in the United States.

Mr. TABER. And that is the reason the committee made a cut, so that we would be rid of that situation. That is how the War Department was able to step up its discharge program and get rid of 4,000,000 men by Christmas.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. They would not discharge men in this country because they did not have 70 points. They would not send them across, because they had more than 45 points. They were frozen right here. In the meantime, we were paying their pay.

Mr. TABER. And they had nothing to do.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me how many hundred thousand officers there are in the Pentagon Building.

Mr. TABER. I do not have that figure. I think perhaps the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may have it.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We do not have any figures on that.

Mr. TABER. All it will hold. I think that is the best answer; and it is the most enormous building in the world.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. And they are not all in the Pentagon Building, either. Some of them are in other buildings in rented space.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I would like to call attention to the language on page 17 of the report.

Mr. TABER. I think that should be in the RECORD.

Mr. RABAUT. It is just a short sentence.

Both—

That is the Army and the Navy—

Both should immediately adopt the policy of releasing any officer or enlisted person as and when they become surplus, points or no points.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I think he has done a splendid job.

It seems rather strange to me, as a Member of this body, that in order to reduce the number of the members of the armed forces it becomes necessary for the Appropriations Committee to take the money away from the War Department and the Navy Department to get it done.

Mr. TABER. There has never been any other way in the history of this Congress way back to the beginning that that could be done; that is the situation. I hope as a result of this last operation of the Navy in announcing cuts in personnel that we shall be able on the floor as a result of a committee amendment, in which I hope all of us will join, to make a little further saving in connection with this personnel picture; and I am sure it will expedite discharges if we do it. I am not going to get into a detailed discussion of that, because it is a matter that is being worked out, and I hope we shall have something to present to you with a united front a little later.

There have been some things in this war that have been disturbing. We started off with the Pearl Harbor situation and the participation there of Hans Wilhelm Rohl, a German subject, and his partner, Colonel Wyman. We followed that with the Alcan Highway and the Central American Highway. Those things have not made a very satisfactory impression upon the public. I hope the thing will clear up some time and that we shall know in detail just what has happened.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], a member of the House Military Affairs Committee, conducted the hearings as chairman of the subcommittee that led to the revelation of the Theodore Wyman situation. We filed a written report at the time disclosing it all in this House. Neither the press, radio commentators, nor anybody else said a word about it. They waited until something further happened and then began to discuss it, when, as a matter of fact, it was revealed from the very beginning.

Mr. TABER. I believe that is true, but everybody was so tied up in this war picture that we could not do justice to a lot of those things. But I do want to say one word about the postwar Navy picture. I think I understand that somewhat for I served for 10 years on the Naval Subcommittee. The plan that I understand is pending before the Naval Affairs Committee on the postwar Navy—a tentative plan, of course, for we cannot tell the kind of postwar Navy we are going to need right now, but the thing in that picture that struck me and struck me hard was that they propose a large number of combatant ships with a complement of 120,000 men. I would not quarrel so much with that, but they then proposed a large number of auxiliary ships to be kept in active commission and propose a complement for the auxiliary ships of 137,000, or 17,000 more than they were going to put on the combatant ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. What kind of Navy do we want? Do we want an ornamental Navy that takes a lot of waiting on or do we want a fighting Navy? The matter of auxiliary ships can be stepped up and taken care of when we get to the point where war is approaching. The combatant ships we have to have in training with the far-flung bases that we are going to have following this war, but we do not need half of such an auxiliary set-up and we ought to figure our situation along some such lines as that. We should bear these things in mind when we come to think about a postwar Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an item appearing in Jim Brady's column, Inside Washington.

The great task of administration accomplished by our military leaders in World War II merits the praise of every American. Without the leadership ability, organizational qualities, and character of the men mentioned in Mr. Brady's column, victory could not have been won so soon and the lives of many more citizens would have been taken to crush our enemies.

The column follows:

INSIDE WASHINGTON

(By Jim H. Brady)

BEHIND THE SCENES OF WORLD WAR II—THE BIG FIVE OF AMERICAN MILITARY ADMINISTRATION

Bashful, hard working and efficient in their jobs have been five great Americans. Their contribution to the victory that has been won shall never be forgotten. Late Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox; retired War Secretary Henry L. Stimson; Secretary of the Navy Jimmy Forrestal; General of the Army George Marshall; and Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King formed the greatest administrative combat team in world's history.

Frank Knox

A Chicago newspaper publisher, Frank Knox came to Washington with an ambition of building the greatest two-ocean navy in the world. Until December 7, 1941, some Congressmen and quite a few Government experts couldn't agree with Knox. However, after the Jap attack the late Navy Secretary was given the proper credit for his effort to build a navy.

Carrying on the tradition laid down by Teddy Roosevelt many years before, Frank Knox worked day and night for a mighty navy which he termed the "most important security measure we could take." He didn't live to see his navy steam into Tokyo Bay. But when Frank Knox died of heart failure caused from overwork, he had a confident feeling about the Navy and the ultimate fate of the Japanese. Few men in history have made the record of our late Navy Secretary. As present Secretary Forrestal says, "The work of Frank Knox will go down alongside the accomplishments of Teddy Roosevelt."

Henry L. Stimson

Twice Secretary of War and once Secretary of State, all in time of crisis. That is the record of Henry L. Stimson, who retired a few weeks ago on his seventy-eighth birthday. Stimson was a colonel in World War I. He was one of the first to advocate a strong Army, compulsory military training, and international cooperation.

When he first came to Washington he was branded a warmonger by his enemies. Many feared his internationalistic ideas. President Roosevelt saw war coming and immediately sent for Stimson. He continued his job throughout the war in spite of failing health and age.

As Stimson left Washington last week there was a confident smile on his face at the airport. The soldier-statesman knew America had learned her lesson. Yes; we will keep an Army, Navy, and the atomic bomb. We will train men and remain secure. And, the next time Stimson says "remain prepared," we will respect his warning.

James Forrestal

James Forrestal, a regular fellow, has been referred to as the "wonder boy of Wall Street." He loves the Navy and wants to fight for it. Nobody is going to junk our Navy this time. If somebody has the bright idea, they will have to buck Forrestal and I doubt if that would be fun.

He follows the footsteps of the late Secretary Knox. Forrestal believes that our Navy is our first line of defense. He is a strong supporter of compulsory military training.

There isn't an admiral in the Navy who doesn't admire and respect Forrestal. In spite of being many years their junior, they see him as a great fighter and diplomat.

Forrestal is a good mixer. He isn't afraid of bullets, either. Wearing the uniform of a marine enlisted man with a civilian tie, Forrestal has been in several of the Navy's toughest invasions. He has a lot of fun visiting the fellows in their fox holes and talking over the Navy's problems with ordinary seamen and Marine Corps privates.

It meant plenty to the boys fighting at the fronts for the Secretary of Navy to drop by for a friendly chat. It would have been easy for Forrestal to stay in Washington, because his official duties never required him to personally appear in naval operations. However, he wanted to be one of the boys.

General Marshall

General of the Army George C. Marshall is probably the most bashful official in Washington. Since 1941 he has held only two press conferences and one of them was off the record. General Marshall never wanted credit, he just wanted to see the job done.

A graduate of VMI, where he was an honor student, Marshall is already past retirement age. He has served the longest wartime tour as Chief of Staff.

He made many visits to the combat zones. He kept personal tab on the progress of the atomic bomb development. It was General Marshall who discovered the leadership qualities of Eisenhower and elevated him to a rank equivalent to his own.

Since he was old enough to walk, General Marshall has always wanted to do a job perfectly. His first week in VMI his shoes were not quite shiny enough to pass inspection. However, they were cleaned perfectly and had a dull finish.

The cadet officer told Marshall that his shoes ruined the looks of the entire platoon. Next day Marshall was called out of ranks to explain why he had worn patent leather shoes to drill. There were strict regulations against "nonreg" shoes.

"But, sir," said Cadet Marshall, "these shoes aren't patent leather." The cadet officer grinned and so did Marshall. Those shoes had the best shine VMI had seen for a long, long time.

Admiral King

On the third floor of the Navy Building on Constitution Avenue sits one of the busiest and most efficient sailors of American history. Admiral E. J. King, Commander of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations, accomplished what was termed the impossible in World War II.

His was the idea of mobility and rapid-fire administration. No red tape for Admiral King and his slogan was "Get the ships, guns, and men to the front."

Admiral King issued orders daily from his headquarters to the Navy fleets. He kept close track of naval movements and knew where every ship was at any given time.

An honor graduate of the Naval Academy, Admiral King fought for efficiency. At any time during the war when Admiral King asked Congress for something it was delivered. Few men in Washington have commanded the respect of both political parties, business and labor interests, and the American people, as Admiral King during the past 4 years of conflict.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

RECAPTURE OF AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF WAR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today is the first great retrenchment measure following World War II.

It reaches out and recaptures the astronomical sum of $52,453,535,278 in appropriations and contract authorizations. It recovers and returns to the United States Treasury $48,264,441,439 that had been appropriated in cash, and it cancels $4,187,903,339 of contract authorizations.

This is a historic measure and, in my opinion is one of the finest pieces of legislation—if not the finest—that ever emanated from the Appropriations Committee. It is bound to have a far-reaching effect as an incentive to recovery. It will thrill the country and will encourage and reactivate businessmen and employers and the people generally, who will hail it as the first long approach to the planned economy and normalcy which America so much craves.

This bill adds laurels to the brow of Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of our Appropriations Committee, whose genius and driving power contributed largely to bring out the facts that made such enormous recoveries possible. Never did Mr. CANNON'S rare ability as an examiner of witnesses shine more brightly than it did during the hearings on this bill. The close of each one of the World Wars has brought into play the highest qualities of a great chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It was Representative Swagar Sherley, of Kentucky, who, as chairman of the then-existing Appropriations Committee, directed the recoveries after the First World War when the recaptures amounted to $15,411,226,286.38 in appropriations and contract authorizations. The bill presently before us recaptures more than three times that amount, and other rescission bills are to follow.

In his relentless pursuit of dollars available for recapture, Chairman CANNON has had the loyal support of able members of the Deficiencies Subcommittee, regardless of politics. Judge WOODRUM, during the hearings and the framing of this bill, was a tower of strength, as he always is. It is a matter of profound regret to the Appropriations Committee that the committee will soon be deprived of his sound counsel and superlative ability. EMMET O'NEAL'S great wisdom and far-seeing vision were in evidence all of the way and again it was demonstrated that there is no abler Member of either branch of Congress than Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. SNYDER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. RABAUT, of Michigan; and Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, all made major contributions toward the perfection of this legislation. Much credit is due to the ranking minority member, Mr. TABER, and his associates, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL, for the thoroughness with which they delved into the intricacies of the problems presented and their patience in examining witnesses. Many bureau chiefs, as can easily be imagined, were tight-fisted in holding on to the dollars that Congress had voted them. It is characteristic of a bureau chief that he regards his own particular activity as the greatest on earth and that he wants to see it continued regardless of rhyme or reason. Many of these department and bureau spenders had to be brought into line by drastic means and the committee's forceps were freely used under Chairman CANNON'S direction to extract from them the funds that rightfully belong in the United States Treasury, now that the war is over. Time after time the chairman would say to a witness:

> We expect you to re-review your needs and to give us a revised estimate showing additional amounts that you can return to the Treasury.

This vigorous handling of the situation by the subcommittee brought an additional harvest of rescissions. The amount originally recommended by the Budget for rescission was $49,068,016,928. The additional rescissions that were recommended by the Budget largely through the subcommittee's insistence amounted to $951,045,583. Our subcommittee then on its own initiative made further cuts totaling $2,433,270,277.

I think the public will find much to commend in the subcommittee's action by which it added such large amounts to the recaptures originally proposed by the Budget.

The hearings on the pending bill were long and grueling, starting on September 5 and ending on October 11. The daily sessions sometimes began as early as 9:30 a. m., and never later than 10, and often ran as late as 7 p. m. The testimony taken fills two large volumes, one of 838 pages and the other of 964 pages; total, 1,802 pages.

The amount of $52,453,535,278, which this bill recaptures to the United States Treasury, is almost beyond the comprehension of finite minds. One way of looking at it is that it is the equivalent of $26,868,348 for every year since the birth of Christ and $73,886 for every day since Christ was born.

Another way to measure the magnitude of the recaptures carried in this bill is to compare them with the statistics of national wealth. The latest census of national wealth, found on page 293 of the Economic Almanac for 1940, estimates the total wealth of the United States to be $300,750,000,000. The total wealth of 26 States, including all resources and

property of all descriptions, is estimated as follows:

Maine	$2,001,000,000
New Hampshire	1,218,000,000
Rhode Island	2,084,000,000
West Virginia	2,934,000,000
South Carolina	2,236,000,000
Georgia	3,300,000,000
Florida	2,389,000,000
Alabama	2,932,000,000
Mississippi	1,553,000,000
Louisiana	2,790,000,000
North Carolina	4,641,000,000
Minnesota	5,178,000,000
New Mexico	774,000,000
Nevada	647,000,000
Utah	1,231,000,000
Colorado	744,000,000
Arizona	1,058,000,000
Wyoming	882,000,000
Idaho	1,359,000,000
Montana	2,076,000,000
Delaware	778,000,000
Arkansas	1,542,000,000
Oregon	2,738,000,000
North Dakota	1,589,000,000
South Dakota	1,682,000,000
Vermont	900,000,000
Total	51,166,000,000

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. If I am not mistaken, the amount recaptured in this bill exceeds by far the total cost to the United States of World War I.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is true. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I was coming to that a little later with the exact figures.

So it will be seen that the amount recaptured in this bill is $1,287,535,278 more than the estimated total wealth of these 26 States, as shown by the last census of national wealth. The estimated total wealth of the wealthiest State of the Union—New York—is shown to be $51,439,000,000 by the last census, or less than the amount of the rescissions carried in this bill. All of the wealth of the State of Pennsylvania is only about half the amount of these rescissions. California's wealth is only about one-third of the amount of cash this bill returns to the Federal Treasury.

The magnitude of the rescissions carried in this bill may be further realized when we contemplate the fact that the amount recaptured is more than twice the total amount appropriated to run the Government during 43 years of our national existence beginning in 1873 and ending in 1916. During those 43 years the combined total of all of the annual appropriations was about $26,170,000,000. Comparing that amount with the $52,453,535,278 of rescissions carried in this bill reveals convincing evidence, I think, that the members of our subcommittee in framing this bill acted with sincere regard for the interest of the taxpayers.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I want to express the point of view of some of us back here. It seems to us that for years and years we have had nothing but bills that were taking us into war or bankruptcy or communism. It gives us great pleasure and a sense of deep gratitude to the committee that it should bring in here a bill for which we can delightedly vote.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentlewoman very much. I think the pleasure is mutual.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The bills we have had heretofore took us to victory, too.

Pursuing the comparison a little further I cite the appropriation figures for the First World War. The annual appropriations covering that period were:

1917	$1,628,411,644.81
1918	18,881,940,243.79
1919	27,065,148,933.02
Total	47,575,500,821.62

Subtracting that amount from the cut-back of $52,453,535,278 carried in this bill we find the recaptures in this measure exceed the cost of World War I by $4,878,034,456.38.

The rescissions carried in this bill, monumental in size as they are, do not cover all of the recaptures of war appropriations that have been made. The grand total, including this bill, is $56,810,654,278. Last May, when it appeared that the war was nearing its end, there was a cut-back of $4,265,000,000 in the Maritime Commission's funds, covering its shipbuilding program.

Furthermore it should be understood that the amounts carried in this bill do not comprise the last word in the liquidation of the war bills. As matters develop the outstanding appropriations will be constantly under the watchful eye of the Appropriations Committee and will be reviewed from time to time to determine where additional cuts can be made. That there will be further rescissions during the current fiscal year running into millions—perhaps billions—of dollars is certain.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand it, our national debt at the present moment is approximately $260,000,000,000. Is that about correct?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think that is about correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There seems to be an impression that since we have before us today a rescission of fifty-two billion four hundred and fifty-three million-odd dollars that the national debt will be reduced by that amount. How does the gentleman explain that?

Mr. LUDLOW. I will say to the gentleman this bill carries no reduction whatever in the national debt.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In other words, we are not reducing the national debt under this legislation?

Mr. LUDLOW. No; we are not. We are recapturing appropriations that have been made which ultimately would be fused into the national debt, but so far have not been fused into the national debt.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And which do not appear as items in the national debt at the present time?

Mr. LUDLOW. That is correct. None of these items so far has been fused into the national debt.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct since an appropriation does not amount to a national debt until the money is spent. Is that not correct?

Mr. LUDLOW. Absolutely; the gentleman is right.

Mr. RABAUT. This bill provides for the recapture of appropriated funds.

Mr. LUDLOW. Both gentlemen are eminently correct.

Before long the regular subcommittees will begin work on the 10 annual regular supply bills for the fiscal year 1947 and the remnants of the war appropriations will come before them for review. It is possible, if not probable, that each annual bill will carry two titles, title I covering the appropriations needed for normal operations in the fiscal year 1947, and title II to cover rescissions of remaining war appropriation balances not needed in the fiscal year 1946.

The liquidation of the vast Military Establishment has been facilitated by wise foresight that was exercised at the beginning of the war which caused the insertion of a cancellation clause in practically every one of the many thousands of war contracts and most of these contracts were stopped dead in their tracks, so to speak, on VJ-day, or immediately thereafter. However, there were some exceptions to these cancellations which I think may properly be noted in explaining the pending bill. The testimony of competent witnesses who appeared before our committee focused largely on two objectives as being worthy of continuing and expanding operations—the air service and research, pure and applied.

Our subcommittee was tremendously interested in the testimony of Gen. Henry H. Arnold, commanding general of the Army Air Forces, which was a revelation as to the importance of air power as an arm of national defense and as a means of protecting the future peace of the world. We were especially impressed when he said—page 585 of the hearings:

> With the program that I hope to get from the scientists and with the aid of the experimental research and development facilities that we have in the United States, if I get the money that I ask for, we will always lead the world in aviation, because there is nobody that has the ability that we have to produce new or better equipment.

This bill carries $395,000,000 for procurement of Army airplanes during the fiscal year 1946 and $75,384,200 for procurement of Navy airplanes. The future airplane contracts will be for new types of planes for the Army and Navy to insure that there will be no retrogression in this vitally important field of progress.

Between October and June 30, next, the end of the fiscal year, 809 new planes will be delivered, including 69 very heavy bombers, 634 fighters, 88 transports, and 18 communication planes.

Members of Congress returning from trips around the world have reported that they were amazed by the vast as-

semblies of airplanes which they saw occupying acres upon acres of space here, there, and seemingly everywhere and the question naturally arose, Why should any more planes be built now that the war is over?

The answer, which seemed to be well-grounded, was that air power appears destined to be the backbone of our future defense and that we cannot afford to lag for a moment in creating and perfecting new and better types of airplanes.

Some philosophers have expressed the opinion that the wars of the future will be won in the laboratory and not on the battlefield and our subcommittee gave some credence to this prophecy by inserting in this bill research items amounting to $385,000,000. This does not include atomic research, which will await the action of Congress and the President.

In January we shall get the regular Budget from the executive department, and it will clarify and assist in charting the course of appropriation operations during the remainder of the fiscal year. At present we are passing through a transitional period and there are many imponderables which make it impossible now to set firm recapture and reconversion figures. The situation necessarily will remain in course of study, and additional rescissions will be effectuated as time and developments will permit. I would like to say in conclusion that the Appropriations Committee is economy conscious; that in my opinion it has made a magnificent start in meeting this delicate and difficult problem. I am sure that in its further efforts to recapture and restore to the people every dollar that can be saved from national emergency appropriations it will carry on in a way that will merit the confidence of the Congress and the country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Again, I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid informative address on the pending legislation and the subject matter related thereto. The gentleman from Indiana is earnest and diligent and always has present a fund of information on the subject he presents. Let me say further I am impressed with the gentleman's statement to the effect that the Appropriations Committee has become economy conscious. I commend the gentleman from Indiana, who has at all times been economy conscious. There have been many times when, in my judgment, too many Members of this body, including some of the members of the gentleman's committee, were not as economy-minded and considerate of the taxpayers of this country as they should be. The distinguished gentleman who now has the floor is not in that category. It is high time that this Congress really become economy-minded. It would have been better if the Congress had been thinking about that a long time ago.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for his statement and for his kind personal reference. I am confident that he may expect much from the Appropriations Committee in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, probably the greatest danger confronting the American Nation at this time is the danger of savage inflation, with Nation-wide suffering for all. In my opinion, we have been moving in this direction steadily for years. It is difficult now to see how in the long run the Nation is to escape devaluation, repudiation, or some form of severe inflation. Attempts to stop waste and extravagance in recent years have been a good deal like trying to hold back Niagara Falls.

We have today a so-called national debt approaching $300,000,000,000. We have in addition to that a contingent national debt composed of guaranteed obligations, insurance, and other secondary liabilities amounting to more than $300,000,000,000. We have an expenditure estimated for the present fiscal year by the Secretary of the Treasury of around $66,000,000,000 with a deficit of some $30,000,000,000, a deficit equivalent to about $82,000,000 per day, although for 10½ of the 12 months of this fiscal year this country will have been at peace.

We have on the Federal pay roll, still, over 2,900,000 persons.

We have a postwar Navy now under consideration which will probably cost, if approved, on the present basis, between $2,600,000,000 and $3,000,000,000 a year. We have a postwar Army under consideration which may well cost an equivalent sum.

There are enormous demands made upon us both at home and abroad.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is a source of especial satisfaction to be able to stand on this floor today and sponsor the bill which is now before us providing as it does for a rescission of appropriations and of contract authorizations to the extent of $52,400,000,000, about $3,400,000,000 in excess of the Budget recommendations.

I believe this bill constitutes a real step in the right direction. I hope it will receive the unanimous support of this House.

I want to emphasize, however, that in my judgment this bill does not begin to do a thorough job.

According to the Budget figures, there were available at the beginning of this fiscal year, in terms of appropriations and contract authorizations, no less than $146,467,000,000. Subtracting from that figure the $52,400,000,000 rescinded in this bill, we have a balance of $94,000,000,000 available for expenditure in this fiscal year in respect to items considered in this bill and these items only.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Can the gentleman tell the Members of the House why if this stops short by $94,000,000,000 we could not go further at this time in recapturing a greater sum?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that I do not say that this bill stops $94,000,000,000 short of where it ought to. I think it is obvious however that it stops far short of a thorough job.

The $94,000,000,000 may be roughly divided into three parts: First, expenditures up to the end of July 1945 which were very large; second, estimated expenditures for the last 11 months of the present fiscal year which are subject to revision in terms of the rate of demobilization and other unknown factors; and third, obligations outstanding as of July 31, last, subject to cancellation in many cases to an extent which has not been determined by the agencies concerned.

In other words, up to the present time we have not got the necessary information from the agencies concerned to do an intelligent and thorough job of rescission.

Many figures were admittedly hastily prepared. Further cancellations of outstanding obligations are certain. Further reduction in estimated expenditures for the balance of the year is imperative. We should have further and very large rescissions. It is a job which will primarily fall upon the shoulders of each and every one of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee as those committees consider appropriations submitted for the fiscal year 1947.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. Chairman, the largest item of rescission, of course, is in respect to the War Department, where there is a rescission of $30,900,000,000, or about $2,200,000,000 above the Budget recommendation.

The Budget figure indicates a total of $63,800,000,000 available at the start of this fiscal year. If we deduct the $30,900,000,000 that it is proposed to rescind in this bill, there will be a balance of $33,000,000,000, of which roughly $13,000,000,000 is carried against outstanding obligations and liquidation and termination costs, leaving about $20,000,000,000 for other expenditures during the current fiscal year.

The principal items of rescission are indicated in the report.

As has been pointed out, the Army, from an over-all peak of 8,291,000 men, with some 5,455,000 overseas, has been reduced to about 8,000,000. It is anticipated that this number will be further reduced by 6,000,000, or to about 1,950,000 as of the end of the fiscal year, 320,000 of this total being in the pipe line on the way to discharge.

The committee has laid great stress on the vital importance of speeding up demobilization not only by the Army but by the Navy, the Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—by all the armed forces. It is encouraging to see the increased speed in demobilization which has developed since the start of these hearings, an increase insofar as the Army is concerned which is reflected in a figure of 48,000 understood to have been demobilized recently in a single day.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

The next largest item of rescission is, of course, in respect to the Navy Department, where there is a rescission of $17,600,000,000, or about $800,000,000 above the Budget recommendation.

In this instance the Budget figures indicate about $75,000,000,000 available

at the start of the fiscal year. Deducting $17,600,000,000 leaves a balance of $57,400,000,000, which is broken down according to the Budget in three parts: $37,000,000,000 spent up to July 31, 1945; about $9,000,000,000 for outstanding obligations, liquidation, and termination costs; and a balance of something under $12,000,000,000 for operation during the balance of the fiscal year.

The principal rescissions are indicated in the report.

The Navy personnel has dropped from about 4,000,000 to around 3,000,000 at the present time. The Navy expects to reach a figure of 1,077,000 by the end of the fiscal year and to go down as of September 1, 1946, a little less than a year hence, to 500,000 enlisted men and 58,000 officers.

The postwar Navy contemplated in terms of ships amounts to 1,079 in number; 30 percent active, 10 percent in a so-called ready reserve, and 60 percent which would not be in commission.

The rate of demobilization by the Navy has also been increased of late and is understood to have been as high as 9,800 in a single day.

OTHER AGENCIES

Insofar as title I is concerned, referring to the other agencies in this bill, there is proposed a rescission of $3,800,000,000, about $328,000,000 more than the Budget recommendation.

Subtracting this sum from $16,600,000,000 available at the start of the year leaves about $12,800,000,000 for operations during the year, about $1,100,000,000 having been spent up to July 31, 1945, about $6,900,000,000 being reserved for outstanding obligations, and about $4,800,000,000 being left for expenditures during the year.

The various items of rescission appear in tabular form in the report.

The largest item has already been referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I refer to the item in respect to lend-lease where rescission of $1,739,000,000 is proposed, leaving, apparently, a balance available for the year of about $7,383,000,000. Of this balance, about $399,000,000 was spent through July 1945, about $5,104,000,000 is reserved for outstanding obligations, and about $1,879,000,000 is held mainly for supplies in the so-called pipe line. No satisfactory information is available as to how much of the $5,104,000,000 can be canceled. No definite word has been received as to how much of the $1,879,000,000 will be canceled and how much will be acquired by foreign governments for cash or for credit on a basis of repayment over a period of 30 years with annual interest at the rate of 2⅜ percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to various transfers of war agencies referred to in this bill.

The Foreign Economic Administration is to be divided between the State Department, the Commerce Department, and the RFC. The Office of Economic Stabilization is to be transferred to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The Office of Strategic Services is to go about one-eighth to the State Department and about seven-eighths to the War Department. The Office of Inter-American Affairs is to go about two-thirds to the State Department, about one-third of its funds being retained to carry out existing programs in other American countries. The OWI is to go to the extent of about $24,000,000 to the State Department, and to the extent of $343,000 to the Bureau of the Budget.

The saving, if any, from these transfers remains to be seen.

The OES transfer to OWMR is in accordance with a recommendation which I personally made on the floor of this House last June. It is to be hoped that the transfer of the functions will not involve any increase in the personnel of OWMR.

The transfers of OIAA and OWI to the State Department are also in accordance with recommendations which I made on the floor of the House last June.

Attention is invited to the fact that no less than $53,000,000 was provided this year for OIAA, OWI, and Cultural Relations under the State Department. It is to be hoped, now that the war is over, that we shall have a compact, efficient, economical unit in the State Department rather than what we have heretofore had under war conditions.

It is further to be hoped that the most careful screening policy will be pursued by the Department in respect to the personnel of OWI which is to be taken over by the Department. It would be most unfortunate if some of the personnel whose loyalty has been subject to challenge should be included at this time on the rolls of the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, no rescission bill can eliminate waste of the people's money in the past. It is to be hoped, however, that the attitude of the Congress in respect to this bill may have its effect in the future.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has referred to some outstanding examples of waste—other examples of waste under the Navy Department are referred to in these hearings.

First. I have in mind particularly the contract with the Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp. plant at Allentown, Pa., understood to be largely owned by Victor Emanuel interests. The situation is presented by the following figures:

Planes and spare parts ordered in 1943: 1,100 at $170,000,000; in 1945, 600 at $73,000,000, making a total of 1,700 at $243,000,000, or $143,000 per plane.

Planes delivered to September 1945—a year or more behind schedule: 180 at $90,000,000, or $500,000 per plane.

Facilities: $5,300,000, or $526,000 per plane if included.

No plane delivered was used overseas.

Contract termination fee of $10,000,000 said to be under reconsideration.

Second. I have in mind also a contract with the Brewster Aeronautical Corp., previously considered by the Naval Affairs Committee and the Truman committee in respect to which the following figures are applicable:

Planes and spare parts ordered in 1940: 203 at $15,158,000, or $74,660 per plane.

Planes delivered—1 year behind schedule: 140 at $30,000,000, or $214,200 per plane.

Double the money for 70 percent of the planes.

Third. I have in mind also a second contract with the Brewster Aeronautical Corp., and the following figures:

Planes and spare parts ordered 1941–43: 1,508 at $148,623,000, or $98,500 per plane.

Planes delivered about a year behind schedule: 860 at $96,500,000, or $112,000 per plane.

Facilities: $9,500,000, or $123,000 per plane, if included.

Fourth, I have in mind also, a contract with the Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co., also previously considered by the Naval Affairs Committee, and the following figures:

Planes and spare parts ordered 1942: 800 at $113,229,000, or $141,600 per plane.

Planes delivered—1 year behind schedule: 17 at $59,000,000, or $3,470,000 per plane.

Facilities: $20,997,000, or approximately $4,706,000 per plane, if included.

As a further indication of waste I include at this point in the RECORD an additional table in the merchant marine field. I do so because the appropriations of both the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration are subject to rescission in this bill. The table has been prepared from figures all of which have been supplied by the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, or the General Accounting Office.

Name of vessel	Year built	Year acquired by owner	Total cost to owner	Book value as provided by G. O. No. 24 of Maritime Commission—investment value prior to enhancement caused by war	Admiral Land's estimated value as of Dec. 31, 1938, being world market value prior to enhancement caused by war	Amount of insurance carried on vessel by War Shipping Administration with Government funds	Net profits, Red Sea voyage	Remarks
Arizpa	1920 [1]	1931	$118,401	$38,230	$91,168	$704,320	----------	
Gateway City	1920 [1]	1931	112,[illegible]59	35,715	91,084	115,111	$194,833	Maritime Commission under sec. 510 via trade-in has allowed owners $686,900 for this vessel.
West Kyska	1918 [1]	1931	108,329	50,170	93,096	636,000	351,339	
Sun Dance	1919	1929	27,314	33,548	84,427	600,000	----------	

[1] Constructed by the Government.

Name of vessel	Year built	Year acquired by owner	Total cost to owner	Book value as provided by G. O. No. 24 of Maritime Commission—investment value prior to enhancement caused by war	Admiral Land's estimated value as of Dec. 31, 1938, being world market value prior to enhancement caused by war	Amount of insurance carried on vessel by War Shipping Administration with Government funds	Net profits, Red Sea voyage	Remarks
West Ira	1919 [1]	1940	$143,699	$48,560	$95,259	$675,356	$283,362	
Emergency Aid	1920 [1]	1940	119,289	35,910	89,424	660,300		
West Camorga	1920 [1]	1940	59,693	45,682	97,321	653,194		
Cranford	1920 [1]	1933	54,944	50,229	102,218	738,075	387,342	
City of Baltimore	1918 [1]	1930		52,658	137,960			Navy 1940 paid $1,420,000.
Tulsa	1919 [1]	1929	95,687	38,085	85,232	703,575		
City of Alma	1920 [1]	1935	81,570	42,683	91,319			Maritime Commission under sec. 510 via trade-in has allowed owners $686,900 for this vessel.
Liberty Glo	1919 [1]	1928	26,244	42,204	83,488	600,000	217,708	
Point Bonita	1919	1931	85,750	26,266	80,185	405,000	241,378	
President Van Buren	1921 [1]	1924	577,279	102,937	172,499	1,263,960		
American Robin	1919 [1]	1928	27,998	34,715	86,724	600,000	228,414	
Wildwood	1919 [1]	1928	26,314	35,864	84,561	600,000		
City of Joliet	1920 [1]	1933	56,072	50,835	103,408	267,000		
Cardonia	1920 [1]	1933	70,609	34,624	85,584	495,000		
Aquarius	1920 [1]	1933	49,182	40,778	102,184	767,920	379,439	
City of Omaha	1920 [1]	1933	54,949	50,496	102,687	238,075		
West Irmo	1919 [1]	1928		47,305	96,835	700,000		
Liberator	1918	1933	66,261	52,221	129,449	878,475		
West Quechee	1919 [1]	1933	53,662	48,195	95,762			
Stella Lykes	1919	1926	57,736	22,463	43,748	300,000		
Ruth Lykes	1919	1927	98,605	19,607	43,798	303,750		
Nishmaha	1919 [1]	1933	53,483	48,522	101,882	705,900		
Effingham	1919 [1]	1933	49,633	49,171	107,667	727,050	331,611	
Tillie Lykes	1920	1922	94,668	22,456	43,128	310,875		
Hybert	1920 [1]	1933	55,020	50,133	102,620	279,075		
Edge Hill	1919 [1]	1933	66,642	50,953	115,163	522,875		
West Madaket	1918 [1]	1931	84,461	47,591	93,314	685,840		
President Monroe	1920 [1]	1924	621,634	102,937	172,499	1,263,960		
President Hayes	1920 [1]	1924	576,274	102,937	172,499	1,263,960		
Delmundo	1919 [1]	1929		35,870	82,409	684,900		
Delnorte	1919 [1]	1929		45,909	81,590	684,900		
Delsud	1919 [1]	1929		39,582	81,590	684,900		
American Banker	1920 [1]	1931	120,700	60,000	121,681	275,386		
American Trader	1920 [1]	1931	120,700	62,150	121,681	363,410		
Scan York	1919 [1]	1928		45,834	84,554	464,100		
Scan States	1919 [1]	1928		48,491	84,554	405,000		
Scan Penn	1919 [1]	1927		48,535	84,375	405,000		
City of Newport News	1918 [1]	1930		67,266	137,960			Navy 1940 paid $1,420,000.[1]
City of Norfolk	1918 [1]	1930		67,266	137,960			Do.[1]
Schoharie	1919 [1]	1928	26,265	40,934	83,354	680,000		
Fluor Spar	1919 [1]	1928	26,226	40,934	84,762	640,000		
Lafayette, ex *Dryden*	1919	1932	59,597	44,204	103,324	843,000	296,705	Maritime Commission under sec. 510 via trade-in has allowed owners $676,000 for this vessel.
Cripple Creek	1919 [1]	1933	49,232	48,543	105,974	776,800		
Nemaha	1920 [1]	1933	55,695	50,238	109,009	738,075		
Delralle	1919 [1]	1929		35,094	82,409	555,000		
Schickshinny	1919 [1]	1928	97,005	45,418	85,567	703,575		
Chester Valley	1919 [1]	1933	41,924	37,518	85,148	601,025		
Syros	1920 [1]		61,312	50,028	103,811	398,075		
Zarembo	1919 [1]	1928		46,486	83,118	572,400		
Cathlamet	1919 [1]	1928		46,963	98,411	663,900		
West Kebar	1920 [1]	1928		46,161	94,236	644,325		
Point Judith	1919	1934	120,541	26,114	80,654	810,000		
Maiden Creek	1919 [1]	1931		47,040	84,360	817,688		
Hastings	1920 [1]	1931		42,205	90,564	821,793		
Afoundria	1919 [1]	1931		35,374	84,008	599,925		
Pankraft	1920 [1]	1928	101,175	47,491	94,639	603,750	350,111	
Mary Luckenbach, ex *Black Falcon*	1919 [1]	1931		52,870	84,662	679,745	197,111	
Everett, now *Jean LaFitte*	1919 [1]	1928	93,660	47,375		535,600	378,230	
Grays Harbor	1919 [1]	1928	106,862	51,520		757,500	306,529	
Kahuku, ex *Shelton*	1920 [1]	1928	103,015	49,954		685,500		
Bellingham	1920 [1]	1928	103,370	48,970	89,625	156,394		
Pennsylvania	1920 [1]	1928	101,175	47,003	93,817	660,000		
Tacoma	1919 [1]	1928	107,374	49,413		761,250		
Seattle	1919 [1]	1928	103,015	49,954		685,500		
Winoa ex *Exarch*	1920 [1]	1928	72,800	46,052	103,911	727,500		
Agwidale	1918			33,900	79,886	694,744		
Hollywood	1920 [1]	1926	94,632	47,713	92,190	652,751		
Lafcomo	1919 [1]	1930	111,592	39,021	84,310			
Topa Topa	1920 [1]	1931		48,389	89,809	840,866		
Antinous	1920 [1]	1931		40,775	54,999	318,500	542,618	
Wester Queen	1918 [1]	1933	50,325	76,174	98,143	646,050		
Sahale	1919 [1]	1930	111,625	49,437	84,310	140,925		
Carlton	1920 [1]	1930	112,158	34,625	85,970	120,000		
Kenowis	1920 [1]	1931		35,492	82,733	235,663		Maritime Commission under sec. 510 via trade-in has allowed owners $686,700 for this vessel.
Ex *Brook*, now *Panama City*	1920 [1]	1925	57,502	41,519	81,258	575,025		Maritime Commission under sec. 510 via trade-in has allowed owners $548,000 for this vessel.
Yaka	1920 [1]	1931	108,798	36,834	91,084	660,300		
Black Eagle	1920 [1]	1931		34,968	84,846	715,500		
Black Gull	1919 [1]	1931		37,050	84,326	653,140		
Black Hawk	1919 [1]	1931		48,096	83,639	719,730		
West Nilus	1920 [1]	1926	54,172	47,048	92,123	642,975		
Alabaman	1921	1936	291,873	139,442	117,443	830,400	387,567	
Alaskan	1918	1928	525,707	71,281	89,943	879,750	319,027	
Arizonian	1920	1929	317,119	93,820	97,506	870,000		
Carolinian	1921	1936	313,661	146,486	117,326	830,400		
Coloradan	1920	1936	446,430	93,462	109,948	802,500		
Floridian	1921	1936	327,079	142,669	117,342	830,400		
Georgian	1920	1936	528,874	101,180	97,674	870,000		
Hawaiian	1919	1925	416,056	47,408	81,627	807,500	331,631	
Honolulan	1921	1937	84,893	45,236	125,643	877,600		
Illinoian	1918	1936	447,055	54,586	108,539	802,500		
Kansan	1918	1928	420,018	37,022	81,660	807,500	291,676	
Nebraskan	1912	1928	391,670	17,825	110,199	1,019,320		
Nevadan	1912	1927	325,993	15,400	79,380	806,800		
Puerto Rican	1919	1937	60,662	26,307	101,882	753,600		
Utahan	1919	1937	73,877	32,382	117,898	824,000		

[1] Constructed by the Government.

I might add in this connection that the figures submitted also indicate that the vessel *City of Alma*, valued by Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, on December 31, 1938, at $91,319, was purchased by the Maritime Commission on December 6, 1942, for $60,300; that the vessel *Malany*, similarly valued on the same date at $66,612, was subsequently purchased by the Maritime Commission on February 26, 1942, for $400,000; that the vessel *Nana*, similarly valued on the same date at $55,049, was purchased by the Maritime Commission on December 31, 1941, for $352,669; and that the vessel *El Capitan*, similarly valued on the same date at $87,462, was purchased by the Maritime Commission on June 26, 1941, for $486,595—a total purchase price of $1,899,564, as compared with valuations on December 31, 1938, supplied by Admiral Land, of $300,442.

I invite particular attention to the table which I have just inserted as a part of my remarks and to the wide discrepancies between insurance valuations and purchase prices as compared with valuations placed on the same vessels by the Commission itself. No one can deny that the delegation by the Congress of broad discretionary power is susceptible of abuse.

Attention is also invited to the fact that as of July 1, 1945, the Maritime Commission had recovered by renegotiation only $75,554,692; that profits allowed on sales after renegotiation have run from 5.35 percent to 10.48 percent; and that all bare-boat charters, the bare-boat element in all time charters, and all purchases of vessels, whether voluntary or by requisition, have been exempted entirely from renegotiation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will be passed unanimously. I hope it will prove to be the first in a series of rescissions. I am confident that its adoption will be heartening to the Nation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman referred to the exemptions which the War Shipping Administration or Maritime Commission had obtained for certain of their contracts. The gentleman will recall that during the hearings on the appropriation bill for war agencies last spring there was considerable criticism of that and there was a suggestion that possibly they were not going to take a great deal of advantage of the exemption and might even modify that regulation. Was any testimony given during the hearings on this bill in connection with that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think that any added light was thrown on the picture. It was simply reemphasized that the exemption had been permitted by the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On which the War Shipping Administration itself was represented through a member from the Maritime Commission?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I desire.

Mr. Chairman, to return USES at this time is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I am very greatly disturbed by the manner in which we are handling an issue as important as this. I know that it is a matter of record that this House has expressed itself in favor of a return of the United States Employment Service to the States shortly after the end of the emergency. I wonder whether anybody is willing to state publicly at this time that the emergency is at an end, that two to three million workers laid off from war industries represent no problem, that the 6,000,000 veterans who will be arriving at east and west coast ports during the next 8 months present no emergency situation—that all these citizens will shift smoothly from wartime activity to peacetime activity. I, for one, am not prepared to make any such ridiculous assertions. I believe this problem is the gravest one that this body will have to face and resolve.

It is, therefore, totally inconceivable to me that we are willing to settle an issue such as the return of the United States Employment Service to State hands with such dispatch and without the fullest consideration of the implications of that move. The President of the United States, whose judgment and integrity is held in the highest esteem, has specifically requested Congress to make no such move until at least June 30, 1947. Yet, because of the selfish interests of a small group of State unemployment-compensation administrators we are willing to throw over and totally disregard the advice and counsel and this specific request of the President.

If any of you have been back in your districts lately, you must have been told by your constituents of the manner in which claimants for unemployment benefits are being bludgeoned into accepting jobs far beneath their present skills and their previous earnings. Here we have a situation in which workers were encouraged to leave their peacetime jobs and their peacetime security for war work. They were willing to gamble on their future security by assurances that the Government would see to it that they would be given the best opportunities to reestablish themselves in peacetime work. They took training for work for which they were unskilled and developed new skills. Yet at the conclusion of their wartime work they are now told that State unemployment compensation laws require that they forget their wartime skills, that they go back to their old work, and regardless of their cost of living and the debts they may have acquired, must accept the jobs offered by employers who during the war years made no effort to increase their wages or improve their working conditions. Go into any public employment office today and you will find that the jobs offered for the most part come from those employers and those industries which offer the lowest wages. They were the industries which lost workers because of their unwillingness to meet prevailing conditions. And now we are willing to further subsidize these industries by putting a premium on their jobs and denying unemployment benefits to workers who refuse to accept these jobs.

This, gentlemen, is the basic issue and explains completely the motive underlying this organized drive to return the Employment Service to the States at this time. Let us make no bones about it. We are witnessing today an effort which will divide job seekers into three groups. One group will consist of job seekers who are claimants for unemployment compensation. For that group you will have one set of standards as to what is a suitable job as the State unemployment compensation administrators choose to define a suitable job. Since their interests lie primarily in preserving unemployment compensation funds, you can expect nothing but a very restrictive definition which tells a man to go hungry if he does not take a job which happens to be on file with the United States Employment Service. The second group will consist of the job seeker who is not a claimant for benefits. This group will be made up of the new entrants into the labor market—young men and young women, wives of servicemen. Since this group is not claiming unemployment benefits, even the State unemployment compensation people are willing to admit that their refusal to take the jobs offered are perfectly reasonable—that nobody else in the same situation would want these jobs until he had looked around, offered his services to the employers who offer work opportunities more comparable to their skills and ambitions. This is the privilege of any American citizen. Why, then, must we have one set of standards for a decent, suitable job for an unemployed worker who happens to be claimant for unemployment benefits and another standard for the individual who is claiming benefits? Are we willing to admit that the American worker prefers idleness to decent work at decent wages? Whether we realize it or not, that is exactly what we are saying when we support this move to return the United States Employment Service to the States. Furthermore, if you do make this admission, then you are admitting that the payment of benefits or the nonpayment of benefits is more important than an efficient and effective job-placement agency.

Recall the prewar experience when the Employment Service operated under the Social Security Board and when the Employment Service was put under the State unemployment compensation administrators. From the first day this plan went into effect you had a complete subordination of job finding and job placement and job counseling to the work involved in the collection of unemployment compensation taxes and the payment of unemployment benefits. It is inevitable that it will occur again—and this at the very time when the placement of workers in jobs is without doubt the most important problem facing this country. I want to add a third group

which is being set apart from the rest of the citizens of this country by this action and that is the veterans' group. The Congress, in deep appreciation of the sacrifices of the veteran and in recognition of his status when he returns to civilian life, enacted the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. We provided liberal allowances and established standards for the placement of veterans and payment of allowances. We guaranteed fair treatment by making the United States Employment Service responsible for registering, advising, counseling, and placement of veterans. All that we ask of the veteran is that he continue to report to a public employment office and that he be ready to work and available for suitable work. We did not say that the veteran should be compelled to take any job that pays as much as his allowance as do so many State unemployment compensation laws. The veteran is being treated with decency and with respect. He is being offered work at his highest skill and is not being told that even though he came out of the Army or the Navy or the Marine Corps a first-class machinist he must take a job as a mechanic's helper in an alley garage simply because he is qualified to do that kind of work. I think the United States Employment Service knows when a job is suitable and it will make referrals to that job when a worker is qualified. I cannot accept a situation in which we have one set of standards for the unemployed veteran, one for the unemployed job seeker, and one for the unemployed job seeker who is claiming unemployment benefits.

This issue is of such tremendous importance that I strongly object to dispatching it by the amendment to H. R. 4407. I think that in the interests of fairness and decency and out of respect to the millions of men and women who served in our armed forces and in our war industries, this House should entertain proper legislation which would establish appropriate standards for administration of an employment service. That legislation should be given appropriate hearings and the testimony of the witnesses should be used in guiding this body. I am utterly opposed to the return of the United States Employment Service without the necessary legislation. I hope that most of my colleagues will share my views.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in view of what appears to be some misunderstanding about the provision of this bill relative to the transfer of the Employment Service to the States, it has been suggested as chairman of the subcommittee handling the appropriations for this agency I should make some statement showing what has been the history of the agency since its transfer from the States to the Federal Government. We all understand that on December 19, 1941, the President of the United States addressed a communication to the Governors of the several States suggesting that under the powers vested in him by the declaration of war and the Manpower Act, the Employment Service could be more efficient in securing increased production for the war, particularly war materials, if they would agree to the transfer of this agency to the Federal Government during the war. On December 23, 1941, an Executive order was issued providing for the transfer, and on January 1, 1942, the transfer was effected. The Federal Government then began the administration of the Employment Service.

In the late spring of 1942, many of the State directors of the unemployment compensation activities in the several States expressed apprehension that the United States Employment Service was endeavoring to appropriate the functions of the unemployment compensation agencies, and should it succeed, then the administration of the Unemployment Compensation Commission, as well as the United States Employment Service, would all become an agency of the Federal Government. Many such complaints were submitted to the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

The committee decided to hold hearings. Those hearings were conducted, and were quite voluminous. The records show there were approximately 100 pages of printed matter. We had representatives of the States, from Texas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, and a number of other States. Some of the Governors sent letters complaining about the encroachment. The testimony was gone into at length. The Chairman of the Federal Security Agency and the Chairman of the Social Security Board were asked to come in and testify. According to the evidence, it was definitely declared, definitely decided, there was no intention on the part of anyone to appropriate the functions of the Unemployment Compensation Commission, and that the Federal Employment Service would be returned to the States immediately after the war.

This is a matter of record. If you will turn to pages 809, 810, 811, and 812 of the hearings on the appropriations for 1943, you will find it was the understanding of the Chairman of the Social Security Board that immediately upon the termination of the war this agency would be returned to the States. In fact, it was suggested that it would automatically go back to the States if funds were not appropriated to continue the work as a Federal agency.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman tell me whether or not this Congress has declared the termination of the war?

Mr. HARE. I think this bill itself is evidence that the Congress feels that the war is over, because the bill now before us undertakes to recapture $52,000,000,000 formerly appropriated for the prosecution of the war. The recapture is upon the theory the war is over. The telegram of the President to the Governors did not contemplate the period of time to elapse following the war before the agency would be returned to the States. In fact, he asked to have this agency transferred to the Federal Government solely to increase the production of materials for the prosecution of the war. Then when the agency was no longer needed to assist in the production of materials for the prosecution of the war, I think, under the wording of the telegram addressed to the Governors, the agency would revert immediately to the States, unless the Congress should in the meantime enact legislation to the contrary.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. The act was passed in June 1933, known as the Wagner-Peyser Act. If I am not mistaken, section 5 (a) of that act provides that the States shall not be allowed to function or operate until they match the funds of the Federal Government; in other words, that no funds of the Federal Government can be apportioned to any State until the State puts up a like fund; yet here we propose to turn back $30,000,000 without the States putting up one dime. Does the gentleman believe that is in accordance with the act or that it is proper?

Mr. HARE. I assume that if it is returned to the States and the States undertake to administer the law they will administer it in the same way they were administering the law at the time they transferred the agency over to the Federal Government. However, I did not rise to discuss the wisdom of the establishment of the Employment Service or the Unemployment Compensation Service or whether it should be placed with the States or left with the Federal Government. I am undertaking only to show the action of the committee in handling the appropriations for these agencies for the last 4 or 5 years. It has been the definite understanding of the committee that when the war was over, when hostilities ceased, when it was no longer necessary to manufacture materials of war, this USES would go back to the States, and the committee incorporated this understanding in its report accompanying the appropriation bill of 1943, and the Congress formally adopted that report and thereby ratified the understanding. In fact, we not only inserted this understanding in the report, but we incorporated it in the bill making appropriations for the Unemployment Service for 1943, and have been incorporating it in appropriation bills from that day to this. Congress has formally approved the action of this committee several times. I am not here to say whether the committee acted wisely or not but I am here to say what the committee did; and I am here to say that the House by formal action approved the action of the subcommittee, approved the action of the full Committee on Appropriations, not once, not twice, but three times within the past 3 years. There should, therefore, be no misunderstanding, misapprehension, or confusion on the part of any Member about the transfer of this agency back to the States.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOOK. I appreciate that explanation. Could the gentleman inform me as to whether it was the intention of the subcommittee that when it was transferred back to the States it should

be transferred in accordance with the Wagner-Peyser Act?

Mr. HARE. Certainly, it was to be transferred back to where it came from; and I believe that is exactly what the President meant when he indicated the agency would be returned following the then emergency.

Mr. HOOK. And in accordance with the provisions of the act.

Mr. HARE. Yes, and the policy prevailing at the time the transfer was made.

Mr. HOOK. Including a matching of the funds.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. In response to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan, it is apparent he is laboring under some misapprehension as to the operation of this program.

It should be borne in mind, it seems to me, that in 1935, effective in 1936, the Congress passed the Social Security Act. The Wagner-Peyser Act was passed in 1933. Under title III of the Social Security Act we provided for a system of unemployment compensation and if the gentleman will look back into the RECORD he will find that the Comptroller General of the United States held that the relationship between unemployment compensation and the administration of the Employment Service was so integrate that from that time on practically all the funds to provide for the administration of the unemployment compensation and the Employment Service were derived from title III funds which were earmarked funds for the administration of unemployment compensation. So this talk about the original enactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act, which provided authority originally for $4,000,000 of matching funds, has been out of the picture ever since 1936. It has never operated in that way, and if the gentleman will look further he will see that under the provisions of the First Reorganization Act the President brought these two agencies together as Congress intended and put the administration of the Wagner-Peyser Act, which was then in the Labor Department, in the Federal Security Agency, and brought the Social Security Agency in under one tent, so to speak, under the direction of the Director of the Social Security Agency. There should not be a lot of confusion about this proposition. I do not want to take the gentleman's time, but that is a complete answer to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin because it happens that he is a member of the subcommittee and is thoroughly familiar with the actions of the committee for the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to make clear to the Congress what the history of this agency has been for the past few years so there may be no misunderstanding or confusion in the matter. I am not here to argue whether it should be turned back today, tomorrow, next week, next month, or even next year, but I want to make it clear that, according to the evidence submitted to our committee every year for the past 3 years, it was the original intention of the President and the expressed intention of the Congress when it adopted the report of the committee and passed the bill in 1943 indicating when the Employment Service should go back to the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, as one labors with Members and with clerks on the Committee on Appropriations one develops an appreciation for their diligence and for their labor such as you get in no other way. First, I pay testimony to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. It is really something to be on time every morning at 10 o'clock week after week for a hearing in this committee, and to be on time every day, week after week, at 2 o'clock and to run on hour after hour, sometimes examining witnesses at 7 and 7:30 at night. One night recently we had J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, before the committee, and if I remember correctly, we did not finish with him until 7:30 in the evening. The chairman has always been there. The ranking Republican member [Mr. TABER] has always been there. Other members have been equally diligent. I pay testimony here and now to their diligence and to their devotion to work that is genuinely laborious.

But I would feel a little remiss if I did not give especial testimony to John Pugh, the clerk of this committee. I doubt whether in the history of this Congress or in the history of the country we have loaded such a multiplicity of detail upon any one individual. Here is a bill involving substantially $55,000,000,000 of cash and contract authority that has been rescinded in behalf of the taxpayers of the country. In point of savings for the people it is infinitely more important than the tax bill that went across this floor a few weeks ago. There is in behalf of the taxpayers here a rescission of funds ten times as great as the amount that is saved in the tax bill. It is more important than the tax bill, in a sense, for in proportion as this money goes back into the Treasury it diminishes the inflationary pressure that has been developed in the country and will redound in terms of diminished price levels. All these details of a huge Army and Navy Establishment, and independent agencies of Government, have been loaded upon the clerk of the committee, John Pugh, to examine, to explore, to advise, and out of his memory and out of his splendid background to constantly consult with the committee on many points. So here and now, to the country and to the Congress I want to say that we never had a more faithful servant than John Pugh, the clerk of this committee.

As for the diligence of the committee members, all of them—perhaps I ought exclude myself with proper modesty—it has been a real painstaking effort for weeks and weeks, and I do believe that it will call for the gratitude of the people of this country.

This bill is a weapon. It is a weapon in this whole reconversion program which presently faces the country. The first weapon, of course, was the tax bill. The second weapon is the rescission of funds that go back into the people's Treasury. It is for the purpose of conforming to a pattern of reconversion which, of course, is the hope of America. The objective, after all, is what? It is reasonably full employment. I use the word "reasonably" because there has to be a goal that we can attain.

In dealing with reconversion and employment, due allowance must be made for human error in calculating the number of jobs which must be provided; allowance must be made for the lags that develop; allowance must be made for transient and seasonal labor. So it seems to me that the word "reasonably" ought to be used in connection with an objective that we can attain. We are going to attain it like we always attained it. First, through an American system of free enterprise. That sounds so awfully academic.

On occasion I have observed comment in certain segments of the press and magazines that this talk of free enterprise is old stuff.

It is old stuff. It is old-fashioned stuff. But there is no other stuff I know of if we are going to attain for our country the standard of living that we hope it can attain not only for those here but for the youngsters who will come back after heroic and gallant service on every war front from one end of the world to the other.

I believe that technically the situation is very sound in this country. There is going to be a great need for goods. The production of goods is the thing that must have accent. We talk so freely, you know, about jobs. It is production that must have the accent, because jobs spring out of production and in proportion as we can develop the incentive for production the job problem will be solved. That is typically American and that is a typical approach on the part of us who have been steeped in and brought up on the philosophy of the free private enterprise system of the country.

I say technically it is sound. Look at the need there is today. We have the manpower. It is not too badly dislocated. I think Dr. Sumner, of Harvard, made the best analysis I have seen in a long time. He estimated that only 7,000,000 out of our 51,000,000 productive workers in industry would be badly dislocated because of war cut-backs because there was a concentration of war industries in certain areas of the country. He estimated that most of the plants would not require over 4 months for reconversion, many of them less than that and some of them a little more. There is a great backlog of need in the country. The number of marriages in the country in the last 4 years of the war was 1,100,000 more than normal. That is 1,100,000

families of fine young Americans who want to establish a family life. They must have homes, they must have furniture, they must have food. Wives will want nylon hose; young men will want clothes; families will require supplies; there must be housing. We are far behind on modernization of homes. For a period of 3 years no radios were produced for civilian use. Motorcars have been wearing out and only a limited number of new cars were available. Machine tools have been wearing out and must be replaced. In the whole field of supply, equipment, and service, there is a basic need which calls for the production of such goods and services. What then is our approach to this whole problem?

I have thought in terms of four approaches. The first one is a moral approach. You have heard said now in the last few weeks in the well of this House something about the days of the apple sellers. It always reminds me of the story of the man who went into a restaurant, got the napkin up around his neck, and when the waiter came said, "What kind of soup have you?" He said, "Ox tail." The man said, "Oh, why go back that far?"

I ask, why go back that far? It is a moral problem, of putting aside despair, desperation, and defeatism and the development of a resolute confidence that we can do the job of restoring economic health to the Nation.

When this session of Congress began and I came down to my desk, on top of the desk was a magazine. It had a huge headline about 2 inches high. I suppose you read it. I clipped it out and put it in my files, because I want to save it for posterity. It said, "Gloom grips Capitol as depression follows war." Fine spirit for a great country like this, which has written the V of victory in the sky; is it not?

The first thing to do is to sweep away the cobwebs of defeatism. I told this story a time or two about Houdini when he was first starting out as a magician. He was in a little town in Scotland, and they bet him 100 pounds—oddly enough, in Scotland—that they could put him in a strait-jacket and put him in jail and he could not get out. He labored earnestly. He got out of the strait-jacket all right, and then he undertook to pick the lock on the jail door. He labored at the lock for about an hour and a half, and in a state of semiexhaustion he fell against the door and it opened. They had not locked it.

We have been locking the door by this talk of defeatism. First, we must build the determination that the job can be done. If we confess defeat at the very outset and embrace the belief that it cannot be done, we are half licked before we start. I do not believe it. We can surmount every obstacle and do the job if we will. That is our first problem. And that is the moral approach.

Then the second approach is the American approach of free enterprise. Of course, you have to develop some incentive. You have to stimulate pioneering and risk taking. There are lots of people in this country who ought to be ashamed of themselves every time they look the pilot of a B–29 in the face.

Think of a youngster, probably 20, 21, or 22 years old, taking off from a field in Okinawa with a load of those destructive eggs with which to bomb the Japs and hasten the day of victory. With him is a copilot, a navigator, a weatherman, and a few others in the crew aboard, starting out over an endless expanse of water in the direction of Tokyo, dropping the eggs in the interest of victory, and then coming back. You talk about pioneering and you talk about courage. You talk about risk. You talk about hazard. You talk about venture. That is the kind of mettle we need in this country today if we are to solve this reconversion problem. Let us take a lesson out of their book.

In order to develop that kind of pioneering, there have to be incentives. The taxman has to permit a person after he has worked diligently to keep some little of what he has made. We made a start by modifying the tax structure. The incentive of a modest profit must be kept alive. It is an essential part of the free private enterprise system.

There must be further encouragement. This bill today, taking billions of dollars and putting it back in the people's Treasury, is a great encouragement to industry, business, and to private enterprise. That is the second approach.

The third approach is a human approach. I am for expanding the social-security system. I am for liberalization of benefits. I believe the country can stand it. Do you know why? If we can afford to spend $350,000,000,000 to destroy some of the finest cities in all civilization and to kill millions of people, surely there are in our Treasury a few dollars for our own people. That is the human approach.

Then there is a fourth approach. If private enterprise fails, then, of course, we have to shore up that effort with a program of justifiable public works, works that are economically justifiable. We have done it before.

That is a sort of fourfold program and in that program there is an item that I think is encouraging to industry and to enterprise in this country. It is the amendment that I sponsored in the full committee which was adopted by a vote of 23 to 12 to hand back the United States Employment Service to the States where it belongs. It is something more than a matter of economics. There is a moral obligation involved. Therefore, I want to set forth the essential details of this matter. I say to you here and now that if this division between the employment services and unemployment compensation in the States should persist for long, it will frustrate the reconversion effort. It will loom up as a positive and confusing danger. That is why the thing cannot wait. That is why this House must take action today. Now, then, why is it that after all the years that these two agencies, one for the payment of unemployment compensation to the jobless and the other an employment service to find a job for the jobless, have been together for so long?

It started out in the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933. To be sure, there was matching of funds. But as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] so well pointed out—and he is one of the best-informed men in this House on that subject—we started out with $4,000,000. After a while we discovered that you could not operate these two agencies separately and since the Congress has by solemn enactment imposed a tax whereby unemployment compensation was to be paid by the States, naturally those two had to be coordinated, and they have been integrated ever since. When we passed the Social Security Act of 1935, we made it specific. Here is what we said in that act, in section 303a, paragraph 2. In effect we said, "The Social Security Board shall certify no payments to any State unless the State law has a provision that the payment of unemployment compensation is made solely through public employment offices or such other agencies as the Board may approve."

We said that in the act. Congress said, "You must pay these compensation payments through the employment facilities of the State or such other facilities as the Board approves." Then we reaffirmed it in 1939 when we passed a whole sheaf of amendments to the Social Security Act. We said, "Payments must be made through the so-called employment facilities." It worked splendidly all the time.

Then we came up to the war period, and what happened? By a very peculiar action those offices were returned to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. You may remember that the President sent a telegram to the governors. That telegram went out from Washington 12 days after Pearl Harbor. It was the 19th of December 1941. He suggested that those offices be handed back to the Federal Government. Why? Because we had a manpower problem. He thought recruiting could be done more expeditiously and more efficiently. The governors did not quarrel. It took only 11 days to make the transfer. They said, "Why, certainly, Mr. President. We are patriotic. We will be glad to hand these offices over." So they did it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When they were handed back, at the request of the President of the United States—not by any legislation that the Congress passed, but at the request of the President in a telegram to the governors—they were operated by the Social Security Board. Then they were handed over for administration to the War Manpower Commission, and then transferred to the Labor Department. Now, that transfer happened only a short time ago. To be exact, it was the 17th of last month that President Truman issued that Executive order. I have a copy of that order here. It says:

> In order to maintain essential coordination of public employment service and unemployment compensation.

He recognized the fact that those two have to walk in tandem if you are going to get efficiency and proper operation of this function.

We recognized that those offices were loaned to the United States. They were loaned by the governors. Let me prove it. There have been some statements made here today that are not founded in fact. But here is the fact: In the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1946, when it left this House and went to the Senate, the very distinguished former Governor of Massachusetts, Senator SALTONSTALL, offered an amendment which read as follows:

That the employment service facilities, property, and personnel, loaned by the States—

And so forth. That is the language of the Appropriation Act. Those were loaned by the governors. So, what is the matter now with giving them back? The governors want them. I have telegrams from all directors of employment security that they want them. Then when the governors, Democratic and Republican alike, met at Mackinac for their annual conference this year, they authorized a statement to the effect that they wanted these offices back. Later they authorized Governor Martin, of Pennsylvania, who was chairman of the conference, to send a telegram to Senator GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee, and to our distinguished and beloved colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in which they said, "We wish to urge with all possible emphasis the necessity of returning the employment services to the States immediately, if we expect our employment and unemployment compensation systems to operate efficiently."

Every governor has said that. They have said, "We can handle it. We can take it over in 30 days."

That is what this amendment now in the bill provides. It simply slices off the appropriation for Federal operation in 30 days. Then it appropriates money to the Social Security Board to allocate to the States, just as they have done under the basic law, for the purpose of providing administrative funds so that the States can operate employment facilities and unemployment compensation functions as an integrated operation.

That is the whole story. But, if we continue with this separation, what will happen? Perhaps it can be illustrated by what happens to a jobless person who enters such an office to apply for a job and for benefits. Here is an employment office. Right down the middle you can draw a chalk line. On that side we have the Unemployment Compensation Office. It is manned by State personnel. On this side are clerks who are on the Federal pay roll. They run the Employment Service. A jobless person goes first to the Federal side and registers. Then he goes over on the State side and there he makes out an application for unemployment compensation. Then he goes back to the Federal side to the referral clerk to find out whether there is suitable employment. If there is no suitable employment, then the State has no choice except to pay him. Well, this Federal employee, thinking not always too much of State funds, taxed out of the people, says, "Well, perhaps there is no suitable job, so go ahead and get your unemployment compensation anyway."

Is it fair to let that kind of situation persist? The ultimate end can be the complete dissipation of all the unemployment reserves in the country that are in the treasuries of the States today. It is not fair to them; and so they are saying to us: "Now, we want you to repay the loan. We lent these offices to you and we said so in a solemn act. Give them back, because the war is over." How much compensation shall be paid or for how many weeks it shall be paid is not involved here. That's the wholly different matter. Our problem at the moment relates only to the coordination of the two functions of providing job placement facilities and the payment of jobless benefits. This integrated system operated successfully for 5 years. The need for coordination has been recognized time and time again by various enactments of the Congress. It has been recognized in various directives of the Social Security Board. It is recognized by the various governors and by those who directed this operation in the various States. So why shouldn't it be done now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So, that is the story. There was one inadvertence. I labored with some members of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], with Mr. Morgan of the legislative counsel, and others to perfect the language adopted by the full Committee on Appropriations. There was one inadvertence. Maybe it was not inadvertence after all, because I sort of went on the theory that the Veterans' Placement Board would be taken care of anyway because we set up a special fund for that Board in the GI Act. So this morning I talked to several persons about it, including the chairman of the World War Veterans' Legislative Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], whose devotion and loyalty to the cause of the veterans has been unquestioned, and who has given so unselfishly to that cause. I said, "What do you think?" He suggested that he could offer an amendment. I said, "Fine." So that amendment was suggested and it will be offered. There will therefore be no question as to whether the veterans will be taken care of.

A little while ago, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Lavery, both of the legislative service of the American Legion, were here at the door, and I read them the language and asked if it was agreeable to them. And it was, since it is simply the language of the regular appropriation act of 1936. So the Veterans' Placement Service Board will be amply provided for and by this act making the money available these offices can be coordinated with State operation.

What did the Senate do? When the unemployment compensation bill was considered in that body, they approved an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], by a vote of 56 to 23, to put these offices back under the control of the States in 90 days, notwithstanding the fact that there has been no proclamation of the end of the emergency. The Senate has spoken on this matter by more than 2-to-1 vote. That bill went to the Ways and Means Committee, where it was tabled. No petition has been filed to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill, so we continue a state of confusion in which the Federal Government operates the employment facilities and the States operate the unemployment-compensation function. This is a golden opportunity for this House to do a historic piece of work by putting these offices back where they were and repaying the loan that the States made as a patriotic gesture in response to a telegram from the President of the United States. Let me reaffirm what I said before. How much compensation shall be paid to the jobless is not involved. For how many weeks such compensation shall be paid is not involved. It is merely a problem of carrying out the oft-expressed intent of Congress that the function of finding suitable jobs and paying benefits be operated under coordinated direction.

It has been said that this whole operation should be federalized. That question is not involved either. The States pay the jobless benefits. It is pretty generally recognized that that system will remain in the hands of the States. It is for us to make it all one or the other—make it completely Federal or completely State. But continuing divided authority can only result in harm, confusion, and an obstruction of the reconversion effort. Therefore, the logical and rational thing for us to do is to return these employment facilities to the States and to do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 4407, has for its purpose reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations which were made available for the fiscal year 1946. As shown by the report, these reductions, covering rescission of appropriations, cancellation of contractual authorizations and the recovery of corporate funds, will aggregate $52,453,535,278. This, of course, is a staggering sum of money. It does not mean, however, that we are making savings of that amount but that we are laying the foundation for curtailing war expenditures heretofore authorized which would have aggregated that sum if the war had continued and the expenditures made. It does not mean a reduction of the existing national debt.

I call attention to the following excerpt from the committee report on this bill showing the items reduced and the amounts still available for expenditure in the present fiscal year:

There follows a recapitulation of rescissions thus far effected and of those proposed in the instant measure:

Public Law 68, approved May 29, 1945: Cash and contractual authorization, U. S. Maritime Commission	$4,265,000,000
Public Law 127, approved July 3, 1945, applying to various appropriations	92,119,000
Accompanying measure	52,453,535,278
Total	56,810,654,278

The amount above relating to the accompanying bill applies to a total availability on July 1, 1945, of appropriations and contractual authorizations of $146,467,211,277. Subsequent accretions from reimbursements and cancellations would raise the figure roundly to $170,000,000,000. However, at the time the committee commenced its hearings (September 5, 1945), commitments had been incurred exceeding eighty-two billions. Of the remaining amount, therefore, the rescission is approximately 64 percent.

Details are contained in the table commencing on page 24 hereof. As to each item affected by the bill, except prior year funds, the table shows—

(1) Appropriation or contractual authorization availability, July 1, 1945.

(2) Rescissions formally recommended.

(3) Rescissions in consequence of supplemental recommendations, by memorandum or otherwise.

(4) Additional rescissions proposed by the committee.

(5) Total rescissions proposed in bill.

(6) Availability for whole fiscal year period after deducting rescissions proposed.

The following is a summation of such table, by titles:

	Appropriation or contractual authorization availability, July 1, 1945	Total of rescissions proposed	Balance available for whole of fiscal year
Title I—Various executive agencies:			
Cash	$15,344,474,093	$2,956,620,045	$12,387,845,048
Contractual authorization	1,283,691,210	930,461,208	353,230,002
Total	16,628,165,303	3,887,090,253	[1] 12,741,075,050
Title II—Military Establishment	54,787,783,930	30,903,090,564	[1] 23,884,693,366
Title III—Naval Establishment:			
Cash	71,346,581,814	14,404,721,830	56,941,859,984
Contractual authorization	3,704,680,230	3,257,442,131	447,238,099
Total	75,051,262,044	17,662,163,961	[1] 57,389,098,083
Grand total	146,467,211,277	[2] 52,453,535,278	[1] 94,014,866,499

[1] Excludes obligations incurred subsequent to July 1, and estimated accretions during year.
[2] Excludes $1,190,500 of corporate funds included in earlier totals.

The table, of which a summation is given above, should suffice as a report as to the great bulk of the items affected by the bill. The idea of recovering obligational availability previously voted for or incident to the prosecution of the war should have a generally strong appeal. If there be any question at all, it would seem that it would be, Why not larger rescissions?

For over a decade the costs of government have continued to rise each year, until today the aggregate cost for all governmental services is so large that it is threatening to undermine the financial structure of our Government. The overburdened taxpayers are demanding reduction of taxes, and the Congress has evidenced its intention to reduce taxes materially as shown by the bill recently passed by the House reducing taxes by some $5,000,000,000. One of the main opportunities for reduction of taxes is reducing Federal expenditures. While it is true that during the prosecution of the war it was necessary to authorize enormous expenditures in order to bring the war to an early successful conclusion, now that the war is over there is no just reason why these wartime expenditures should not be drastically curtailed. It is the purpose of this bill to make a start in that direction, and I am happy to give the bill my support.

Up to July of this year, World War II had cost the United States $259,000,000,000. However, there is still available appropriations for the present fiscal year $94,014,866,499. We have a debt in excess of $262,000,000,000. It will soon exceed $300,000,000,000, more than the assessed value of all property in the United States. While the Congress has imposed upon the people the heaviest tax burden in all history during the war period, nevertheless we owe more than the total cost of the war. It is true we started the war with a heavy public debt, due to the orgy of New Deal spending which had continued for 10 years. It is interesting to note the cost of modern wars compared with those of ancient times. I have seen the statement that in the war of the Caesars the cost per man killed was $0.75. In the Napoleonic wars it rose to $3,000. In our own War Between the States, it was approximately $5,000, and in World War I the estimated cost was $21,000 to $25,000, whereas in the war just closed, the expense rose to the enormous sum of $50,000.

While the fighting war is over and the debt has been incurred and put on ice for future generations to pay, including those of the present generation and the GI's who are just coming home, nevertheless, we are still faced with the enormous problem of meeting the obligations which are the result of the war. We have been confronted with a Budget of eighty to one hundred billion dollars a year. With the war over, this will be materially reduced, but we will still have a deficit in the current year estimated to be $34,000,000,000. The deficit for the succeeding year will be substantially less. It will cost, according to the best estimates, $25,000,000,000 a year to run the Government on a peacetime basis. When all accounts are balanced and the war is behind us and our war commitments met, we will owe in excess of $300,000,000,000. It will require $5,000,000,000 per year to service this debt without amortization. Before the war the total expenditures of the Government did not equal this sum. This means that the Congress is faced with the heavy burden of keeping the national income at a high level. It must be kept in the neighborhood of $140,000,000,000 a year in order to keep off the rocks of bankruptcy and meet our obligations. That means that our people must be able to secure purchasing power in order to maintain a high standard of living and keep the wheels of industry moving in order to maintain this high national income. It means high wages and prices commensurate therewith in order to enable the manufacturer and the farmer to produce and dispose of his products at a price that will enable him to meet overhead and make a modest profit.

We frequently hear the question, Where does Uncle Sam get the money to meet these enormous war expenditures? It must be answered that there are only two ways for him to secure the sinews of war and pay these enormous debts, namely, by taxing the American people and by borrowing from them. Both of these methods have been followed almost to the breaking point. The taxes imposed have been so heavy that in many instances they have forced industries to the wall and dried up the sources of incentive capital so that new industries, aside from war activities, have become almost nonexistent. Under the American system of private enterprise, if the incentive for gain is removed, industry dries up. There is no urge for one with idle capital to invest it in an industry which will provide jobs for the workers if the Government seizes all profits and leaves the investor to worry with the losses. By reason of this the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress, in addition to relieving low-income taxpayers, desires to reduce the burden of taxes on industry so as to enable incentive capital to be put to work. The big problem facing us here in America is to provide jobs in private enterprise for the GI's returning to civilian life and for the workers released from war industries. Unless we are going to adopt a socialistic program and resort again to WPA spending, opportunity must be given to private capital to be put to work without seizing all profits resulting therefrom in order to provide full employment with American standards of wages. During the war it is conceded that it was necessary to tax to the limit, which was done. With the war over, the program should now be to require every man in every enterprise to carry his full share of taxation, but not to be taxed out of existence.

In addition to the problems facing the Congress in converting our Nation from war to peace and keeping America at work, cutting down the tax burden and keeping purchasing power in the hands of the buying public, we are confronted with international problems which also impose heavy financial burdens.

We have joined with our allies in attempting to provide a stable world where free, unhampered trade may prevail so that our own country, in common with others, may find markets for excess production. To accomplish this we have joined with other nations in establishing the UNRRA program, have joined in the Bretton Woods agreement and the Export-Import Bank, and have now been importuned by many of our allies to give them credits or make them loans running into many billions of dollars. Representatives of the British Government are here in Washington seeking to secure credits reported to be in the neighborhood of $5,000,000,000, and the Russian Government heretofore has made it known that she would like credits or loans of some $6,000,000,000 to enable her to rehabilitate her industries. The

United States with its huge war debt does not have the money with which to make these loans or advance credits. If they are made, they can only be financed by further borrowings from the American people. Many Members of the Congress believe that America has been more than generous in providing funds through the lend-lease, UNRRA, and other agencies, in financing the war, and in helping to restore stable conditions behind battle lines in the liberated countries. With the war over they feel that we should now tighten our belts and endeavor to get our own country on a sound financial basis so that we may meet our outstanding bond issues and keep faith with the American people who have so generously provided the funds to float the bonds. They also feel that whatever assistance can be given foreign nations in order to help them restore their own financial equilibrium should be given but that it should be on a sound basis with some protection to the American taxpayer who ultimately must pay the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Congress, with the passage of this bill, is embarking on a program of drastic reductions in all Federal expenditures where savings can be made in order to protect the American taxpayer and in order to provide the incentive for capital to seek investment in private enterprise which will provide full employment for our people. Idle dollars mean idle men. Let us, therefore, Mr. Chairman, reduce expenditures, increase private enterprise with full employment, and insure a prosperous America.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to give my support to the item in this bill which carries funds to continue the child-care centers until March 1, 1946. These centers were instituted purely as a war activity and it was agreed they would be discontinued when the war closed. They are now scheduled to be closed out October 31 unless this appropriation is provided for their temporary continuance until March 1. During the recess of Congress, while I was in my district, I took the occasion to inspect a number of these centers and also to meet with the Portland Council of Social Agencies which is deeply interested in this program. I ascertained at first hand the excellent work that has been done in my district in taking care of these young children of mothers employed in the war industries. Many of these mothers are wives of servicemen and there is a large number of fathers in the service who have not yet been discharged. If these child-care centers are abruptly discontinued at this time it will result in great hardship to these mothers and to their small children receiving this care.

These child-care centers were authorized for the purpose of securing much needed labor in war industries at a time when the young men carrying on industrial activities were called to the service, and as a result of which thousands of American women gladly left their homes and took up employment in war industries in order to help win the war. They have done an outstanding job and are entitled to the grateful thanks of our Nation. They contributed materially to the victory. Many of them were mothers of young children and, in order that these children should not be neglected and should have the proper daytime care while their mothers were at work, these child-care centers were instituted. We have a large number of them in my congressional district where over 100,000 war workers were brought from other localities to work in the shipyards and other war activities in the district and immediately adjacent thereto in the Portland trade area. I included as a part of my remarks a letter I recently received from Saidie Orr Dunbar, of my district, who is director of the State advisory committee on child care, health, and welfare. Mrs. Dunbar sets forth in this letter factual information which I am sure will be of interest to you:

We thank you for your encouraging reply to our telegram of September 19, 1945, requesting your consideration of immediate measures to extend assistance to continue child-welfare facilities which have been supported by funds allocated through the Lanham Act.

The day-care committee of the Portland Council of Social Agencies advises us that on August 18, 1945, 2,500 children were enrolled in the day-care program in the Portland and Vanport areas. Of these, 1,850 attended the Lanham-operated centers, 455 the Kaiser child service centers, and 195 the four private nurseries, three of which are supported by the Community Chest. The Kaiser centers have since closed. When the Lanham centers also close, this total load will fall on the private agencies which have a capacity of 205. This is obviously impossible and it is the hope that during the next 6 months a readjustment of the situation can be accomplished.

The Council of Social Agencies also states that the nursery schools provide care for children 2 to 6 years of age; extended day care provides vacation supervision for school-age children. During the school year, this care has been for hours before and after school. In the Portland public-school centers, 347 fathers of children enrolled are in military service. Wives of servicemen are employed to supplement their husband's allotments.

With respect to recreation, the city of Portland Recreation Department has been operating 63 recreation centers, 30 of which have been financed entirely or partially by Lanham funds. The average daily attendance for all ages during July 1945 was 35,529, 75 percent of whom were under 18 years of age. The cost is borne jointly by the city of Portland and by Federal funds. The county is not authorized by law to support recreation. For the year 1944–45, the city supplied $144,514 and Lanham Act provided $197,550. The city has allocated $180,000 for the 1945–46 period.

In other portions of the State the report is much the same. The total enrollment for August in nursery schools and extended day-care centers supported by Lanham funds was 2,169 children with an average daily attendance of 1,676. Of the 1,932 mothers whose children were under care, 657 were servicemen's wives. The following communities maintained centers in which more than 20 servicemen's wives had children under care: The Dalles, Toledo, Newport, Corvallis, McMinnville, Eugene, Medford, Portland, and Vanport City.

We shall appreciate your continued efforts to avoid the termination of Lanham Act activities until local or State provisions may be made should the need continue.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the funds, recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the continuance of these child-care centers until March 1 will receive the full approval of the Congress so that the work may not be interrupted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, representing a great industrial State, I am profoundly interested in this legislation. I am going to vote for it and in doing so I gladly recognize the magnificent service the committee members have performed in preparing it for our consideration. I am especially interested in what is known as the Dirksen amendment which in my judgment is the keystone in the arch.

For more than 20 years I was associated with one of the greatest industries in this country, representing the employees as industrial relations counsel. During that long period I had to deal at first hand with the problems of employment and unemployment and of cooperation between management and men. So I am profoundly interested in the continuous expansion and successful, unified working of our social security and our unemployment agencies. I hope that this House will vote with great unanimity for this legislation today, including the Dirksen amendment.

Now I want to say a word or two about one aspect of this matter which may seem to be of minor importance, perhaps, but which contains within itself the principle involved in this proposed legislation. I have in my district Picatinny Arsenal, one of the group of old-line arsenals that has stood for generations behind our safety in this Nation. One of those arsenals situated at Watertown near Boston I have known for 50 years. Another one is at Springfield, Mass. Our Picatinny Arsenal is situated in a beautiful Morris County valley with high mountains on either side. It covers a territory of 9½ square miles, twice the territory of the town of Dover. There is an investment in buildings and equipment of $40,000,000. During this war at the peak Picatinny employed around 18,000 people. For 65 continuous years since 1880 it has been outstanding as a center of scientific and experimental arsenal work in this country of ours.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if the proposed allotment to the Ordnance Department is sufficient, in his judgment, to keep these old-line arsenals in working order, equipped with a proper force of employees and experts, to stand behind the continued safety of this Nation and, especially, if Picatinny Arsenal is going to be continued as a going concern or be wiped out?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman, in response to his inquiry, that we are very glad to cooperate with him in retaining this arsenal. The appropriation for ordnance, naturally, was among the largest of the appropriations to come before the committee. We eliminated $8,000,000,000, but we left more than $3,000,000,000 to continue the program. Of course, as has been stated,

this money may be allocated by the department as it chooses, but it is my understanding they intend not only to maintain the arsenal but to increase the amount of the allotment while operations at the Picatinny Arsenal were temporarily suspended at the close of the war, pending readjustments and a determination as to what would be done with it in the post-war era. I am glad to assure the gentleman from New Jersey that it will be continued, and on a larger scale than that on which it was operated prior to the war. It will be a permanent installation and some of the activities now handled elsewhere that will be permanent in nature will be transferred to Picatinny. Of course, it will be some time before the amount of appropriation is determined, but the activities can be supported from funds made available until full operation is resumed It is expected all the old personnel which may have been laid off temporarily will be reemployed.

Mr. EATON. Does the gentleman mean the administration of the allotted funds by the Army and Navy for the support of these arsenals will insure their continuance on a peacetime basis?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly. We have in Picatinny three generations of workers. We have over a thousand men and women who have worked there for more than 20 years. We have 140 who have worked there for more than 25 years. In one neighboring town 25 percent of the population have derived their livelihood for two generations from working in this arsenal and if it were to be shut down, or as is now proposed reduced to around a thousand employees, it would create a financial and an unemployment situation of terrific force, and destroy the well-being of several surrounding communities.

In reference to the Watertown Arsenal, near the home of the distinguished majority leader of the Democratic Party, it is surrounded by a great industrial community of 2,000,000 population. They could easily absorb into the industrial life of that community a few hundred unemployed arsenal workers. But Picatinny Arsenal is surrounded by communities of limited industrial capacity and we cannot absorb a large number of unemployed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish the best of luck to my friend's arsenal, but as between Watertown and my friend's arsenal he does not mind if I fight for Watertown first?

Mr. EATON. I would be ashamed of the gentleman if he did not fight for his own and it would be the first time that I ever failed to be proud of his loyalty and honor.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Would not the gentleman wish that the time had come when he could take the well of the House and plead for the closing of these arsenals so that we would no longer have to keep them open to make material to destroy mankind?

Mr. EATON. I wish that with all my heart now, but I do not see any present prospect that it will happen soon.

Let me say a word about full employment in this connection. If we are going to have full employment in this country, what do we mean by it when the Federal Government begins by driving its own employees into the streets, without a job, and leaving only a handful, where our national safety requires that they continue on the job?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I make an observation on the gentleman's colloquy with the gentleman from New Jersey? The power that we have should be preserved and maintained. After this war is over the United States will be possessed of great power, and power is perfectly proper. It is a very useful and legitimate possession if used for good and not for evil. I think the real answer to the statement made by our colleague is that we should have a strong Navy and a strong Army and that our arsenals and our navy yards, all of them necessary to keep the United States a powerful nation in the future, should be maintained in order that our power be preserved to be used for good and not for evil.

Mr. EATON. To that I say "amen." I have no illusions as to the future. The United States is the fattest goose that is left unplucked, and we certainly will be plucked bare unless we have the backbone and the courage and the intelligence to take care of ourselves and continue to be strong. Unless we are healthy ourselves here at home, we cannot retain our place in a sick world sucking the life out of us on every side. I am strong for a big navy, strong for a big air force, strong for all necessary armed preparation, and for that reason I am especially strong to keep Picatinny Arsenal going.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, this rescission bill, or bill to recover to the Treasury certain sums of money that have been appropriated to the Administration for war purposes, is a step in the right direction. The Congress should recover this money, the only objection to this measure is that it does not recover a sufficient amount.

Throughout the period of this war, the Congress has made an honest attempt to prevent waste of the public money. The administration of these laws that the Congress has enacted, and the spending of the money that Congress has appropriated, are the responsibilities of the administration. In several glaring instances the administrative agencies have failed to carry out the intent of the Congress.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, which committee must recommend the taxes to be imposed on the American people, I shared the view of the minority members that we should cut the taxes at least 20 percent. The reason that this was not done was because some administration leaders realized that a 20-percent cut would eliminate much waste. We cannot waste the public money and at the same time lower taxes for the American people.

Illustrative of the waste that I have mentioned, I have noticed from time to time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, facts and figures which indicate that the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration are guilty of misuse of the public funds to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Congress enacted a Renegotiation Act for the purpose of eliminating war profits. It was not the intention of Congress that this be applied only to the little war contractor at the crossroads or some subcontractor. We did not intend that the little fellow be put through the mill and that certain items representing hundreds of millions of dollars be winked at. When the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, who is also Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, as disclosed by the hearings, he gave us to understand that all war contracts under his agency were subject to the renegotiation law. Some time ago, I addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, inquiring about the war contracts and how many of them had been renegotiated. To my surprise I found that out of some $21,000,000,000 of war contracts, less than 60 percent had been renegotiated. Upon investigation, I find that the same gentleman appearing before the Appropriations Committee about a week after his appearance before the Ways and Means Committee, furnished a written statement that showed that under the discretionary power he had exempted from the Renegotiation Act and I quote, "Contracts and subcontracts for the sale or lease of any interest in real estate," and "Contracts for the sale of vessels and their equipment, other than contracts for the construction of vessels." Also other categories of contracts incident to our war program and involving millions and millions of dollars.

I note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 1, 1945, a statement by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL], to the effect that from a contract involving $32,000,000 there was an admitted profit of $27,000,000 and no part of that contract has been renegotiated. In that same statement is shown that a vessel with a depreciated value of $3,000 shows a profit of $338,000. This item was not renegotiated. How can the Congress cut taxes and save money when these administrative agencies refuse to obey the mandate of the Congress?

In addition, the gentleman from Ohio on the same day brought forth the fact that this agency has permitted a certain few to accumulate tax-exempt profits and gains of some $329,000,000, few of any of which have been renegotiated.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the same date, the statement of a gentleman

from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], shows that 758 ships, 20 years or more of age, with a book value of $37,900,000, earning under charter $199,700,000 in 18 months. And that, 690 vessels, 20 years or more of age, with a book value of $34,500,000 and insurance allowed to the extent of $477,300,000 or 1,400 percent of the book value. Bear in mind that this insurance was all with the taxpayers' money. The taxpayers paid the losses.

The Congress not only passed the Renegotiations Act, but they have a committee on expenditures in the Executive Department, which apparently the administration has been able to prevent from functioning. In addition to this, the Congress created the Office of the Comptroller General, the function of which is to call attention to the Congress of excessive and unlawful expenditures.

Recently I wrote the Comptroller General in reference to one of these items and he sent me a copy of a letter he wrote to the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, in which he said:

> Obviously it was not intended that the Government might assume insurance risks, under any circumstances, in excess of the value of the vessels in the event of their total loss or destruction.

The ship in question was the *Santa Lucia*. The book value placed on a vessel is made by the Maritime Commission and under the law the Government would have a right in wartime or in time of emergency to acquire the vessel for that amount. According to the letter of the Comptroller General this vessel was constructed originally with the aid of a construction differential subsidy under the Merchant Marine Act. The letter of the Comptroller General shows that the Maritime Commission allowed an insurance payment in excess of the book value of the vessel to the extent of $2,252,615.21. This is in excess of what the vessel could have been taken over for by the Government. The Comptroller General, in his letter referred to, is clear that such an allowance of insurance could not and should not be made. Yet I find that on a later date the Comptroller General retracted from his position without any statement as to why he did it.

Mr. Chairman, the administrative agencies have failed the Congress under the Renegotiation Act, administrative forces have been successful in preventing our own Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments from doing all that should have been done, and the Congress has been failed by the Comptroller General in that he has not called to our attention such facts as shown by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] to which I have referred.

Mr. Chairman, we can reduce taxes if we eliminate waste, but we cannot reduce taxes if the administration is going to continue to permit a favored few to reap vast fortunes at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the appropriations and contractual authorizations of the departments and agencies available in the fiscal year 1946, and prior year unreverted appropriations, are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. As I understand, the rules provide that the bill shall be read by appropriation titles. My understanding of that is that as each short subject is read amendments will then be in order. For instance, on page 2, Foreign Economics Administration, the Clerk would read down to the next item, National War Labor Board, and then amendments might be in order for that particular unit read.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair, and I think that is what is intended under the rule.

Mr. TABER. I wanted the membership to know that so that there would be no confusion as we went along.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENT OFFICES, AND EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office for Emergency Management

Foreign Economic Administration:

Salaries and expenses, $5,226,461, and limitations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Travel within continental United States from "$234,000" to "$150,000," (2) reimbursement to employees for emergency or extraordinary expenses from "$75,000" to "$40,000," and (3) expenses of a confidential character from "$1,200,000" to "$25,000."

Penalty mail costs, $12,440.

National War Labor Board:

Salaries and expenses, $1,563,500.

Office of Defense Transportation:

Salaries and expenses, $3,075,000, and limitations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Traveling expenses from "$452,500" to "$150,000," (2) printing and binding from "$47,500" to "$14,000" (of which the amount available outside continental United States is decreased from "$1,800" to "$500"), and (3) penalty mail costs from "$118,900" to "$53,000."

Office of Economic Stabilization:

Salaries and expenses, $53,780, and limitations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Penalty mail costs from "$2,250" to "$1,500," (2) traveling expenses from "$4,500" to "$4,000," and (3) printing and binding from "$2,000" to "$1,600."

Office of Inter-American Affairs:

Salaries and expenses, $1,500,000.

Office of Scientific Research and Development:

Salaries and expenses, $56,101,792.

Office of War Information:

Salaries and expenses, $10,662,558, and limitations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Temporary employment in the United States by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws from "$45,800" to "$25,000," (2) travel within continental United States from $267,500" to "$230,000," (3) printing and binding within continental United States from "$1,000,000" to "$550,000," and (4) to meet emergencies of a confidential character from "$250,000" to "$40,000."

War Manpower Commission:

General administration, $71,194.

Apprentice training service (national defense), $131,500, and the balance to remain available until December 31, 1945.

Training Within Industry Service (national defense), $125,000, and the balance to remain available until December 31, 1945.

Migration of workers, $479,000.

War Production Board:

Salaries and expenses, $10,000,000, and limitations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Travel expenses from "$1,944,000" to "$954,000," (2) penalty mail costs from "$210,000" to "$105,000," (3) printing and binding from "$648,000" to "$346,000," and (4) salary of the head of the agency from "$15,000" to "$12,000," except that so long as the position is held by the present incumbent the salary shall remain at $15,000.

War Shipping Administration:

Revolving fund, $195,452,000.

Maritime training fund, $25,000,000.

Marine and war risk insurance fund, revolving fund, $91,000,000.

Office of Censorship: Salaries and expenses, $8,200,000.

Office of Price Administration:

Salaries and expenses, $25,929,000, and limitations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Printing and binding from "$1,470,000" to "$961,064," (2) traveling expenses from "$7,949,700" to "$6,780,000," and (3) penalty mail costs from "$5,210,550" to "$3,085,000."

Office of Strategic Services:

Salaries and expenses, $11,500,000, and limitations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Expenditures without regard to provisions of law and regulations from "$10,500,000" to "$2,000,000," and (2) expenditures for objects of a confidential nature from "$10,000,000" to "$1,750,000."

Petroleum Administration for War:

Salaries and expenses, $1,800,000, and limitations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Personal services without regard to civil-service and classification laws from "$250,000" to "$125,000," and (2) travel expenses from "$263,700" to "$100,000."

In all, Office for Emergency Management, $447,886,225.

EMERGENCY FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Emergency fund for the President, national defense, $45,000,000.

Defense aid—lend-lease:

(1) Ordnance and ordnance stores, supplies, spare parts, and materials, $57,990,000.

(2) Aircraft and aeronautical material, $85,705,000.

(3) Tanks, armored cars, automobiles, trucks, and other automotive vehicles, spare parts, and accessories, $24,461,000.

(4) Vessels, ships, boats, and other watercraft, $76,080,000.

(5) Miscellaneous military equipment, supplies and materials, $8,963,000.

(6) Facilities and equipment for the manufacture or production of defense articles, by construction or acquisition, $17,937,000.

(7) Agricultural, industrial, and other commodities and articles, $1,351,216,000, and the $500,000,000 made available by title II of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945, as a reserve for expenditure for postwar price support of agriculture shall be paid to the Commodity Credit Corporation and continued as a reserve fund for expenditure, as and when necessary, for the postwar price support of agriculture.

(7b) For testing, inspecting, proving, repairing, outfitting, reconditioning, or otherwise placing in good working order any defense articles for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, $73,266,000.

(7d) For necessary services and expenses for carrying out the purposes of such act not specified or included in the foregoing, $43,943,000.

In all, emergency funds appropriated to the President, $1,784,561,000.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DWORSHAK: On page 6, line 16, after "articles", strike out "$1,351,2'6,000" and insert "$1,851,216,000."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, on August 17 President Truman issued an Executive order terminating lend-lease operations. That action was acclaimed throughout the country because, with the end of hostilities, the American taxpayers realized there was no justification for continuing the hugh expenditures under the lend-lease program. If the Members read the hearings on this bill, they will find nothing but conflicting testimony on the part of the officials of the FEA in regard to this item. It is true the committee is bringing in a recommended rescission of $1,739,561,000, which is only $10,000,000 in addition to the voluntary rescission of funds offered by the Lend-Lease Administration. On July 1, 1945, lend-lease had available $9,122,828,000. The 1946 appropriation amounted to $2,475,000,000. There were also approximately $2,000,000,000 of free funds carried over from the preceding year. There were also about $4,000,000,000 which had been obligated on contracts and commitments, but which actually had not been paid out of the Federal Treasury. All of these amounts total $9,122,828,000.

The hearings will indicate that outstanding obligations on August 11, 1945, a few days prior to VJ-day, were a little in excess of $5,000,000,000. Now, you probably read in the press recently that Russia completed negotiations to take over accumulated lend-lease supplies in that country to the amount of approximately $400,000,000, to be paid for over a period of 30 years at a small rate of interest.

It is also reported that Great Britain is negotiating the purchase of a similar amount, approximately $400,000,000. So that, even in consideration of the purchase of accumulated lend-lease supplies in all of the United Nations, there will probably be a sum of about $1,000,000,000. Now, keep this in mind: On August 11 there were outstanding obligations in excess of $5,000,000,000, but, according to the testimony submitted at the hearings, there is only a possibility of recapturing less than one-fifth of that from our various allies in the purchase and payment of accumulated supplies.

On page 919 of the hearings you will find lend-lease materials contracted for but not delivered on VJ-day were $533,000,000, which is in excess of half a billion dollars. You will also find on the following page a table showing that the storage and warehouse inventory of lend-lease materials on VJ-day amounted to $858,000,000. Then you will find that Mr. Parleman, of the FEA, testified on page 924 of the hearings that there were $685,000,000 available to be obligated after the end of the war. Now, the point I want to stress is this—the more you study these figures, the more confused you will become, just as were members of this Appropriation Subcommittee, and as was indicated by our ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York. You will find there remain outstanding obligations at the end of hostilities in Japan in excess of $5,000,000,000.

In the short time remaining, I simply want to stress this point. You probably are aware that Congress has appropriated approximately $66,000,000,000 for lend-lease. The President reported recently approximately $41,000,000,000 have been accounted for, which leaves a difference of about $25,000,000,000. We all know that the War Department and Navy Department have diligently canceled outstanding contracts because they saw no continuing necessity for the further expenditure of the funds which have been made available by this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The fact remains, if these other war agencies can cancel contracts and recapture funds, I challenge anyone on this floor to justify the failure of the FEA to cancel contracts and to recapture some of these funds, the difference between $41,000,000,000 and $66,000,000,000. There are many supporters of lend-lease, and undoubtedly that program did accomplish some worth-while purposes. But the war has ended. Five months after VE-day lend-lease officials testified at a hearing that they had not yet ascertained what contracts had been canceled or would be canceled. Is there any reason why, 5 months after the end of hostilities in Europe, public officials should come up here and seek to justify their culpability in permitting $25,000,000,000 to remain uncaptured? It is time that we recaptured at least another half billion dollars with this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] for offering this amendment. But I am wondering why he did not increase it to four or five or six or seven or ten billion dollars. When I heard the Clerk read this bill and the amount you are trying to recapture, it is about the best reading I have heard in a long time in this House. A bill to cut down appropriations already made. It is about the best reading some of you will hear for some time. Anything that spells economy, I am for. Now, let us make it read right. Let us pass this amendment to the bill and increase it in many other instances. Cut down all you possibly can. If it is a fact that the information which the Appropriations Committee gets from public officials of the Government is so vague, then the thing for Congress to do is to get out the ax and chop off extravagance just as much as you can, so that the bureaucrats will have to quit spending. You know as long as a squanderer has money in his pocket he spends and spends and spends, but when he does not have any money he cannot spend. That is the only way you can regulate some Government officials. Take it away from them so that they will have to come to you, if they want more money, and then they will know the value of a dollar, or at least they will know you are at least looking after the taxpayer and the welfare of the country.

I know you all keep posted on the Treasury statements; if not, you should. On October 16 the national debt was $262,154,526,718.88. I do not know how they got the 88 cents, but I do know how they got the $262,000,000,000. The New Deal is most responsible for inefficiency. Now, let us watch every penny. If the members of the Committee on Appropriations can offer some further amendments increasing the savings above this amount so that this will read right, by saving down to the very last nickel or penny that we can cut from these appropriations, then I think that committee will do the best job that is possible for the welfare of this country. Let us be frugal.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we can add many more amendments that will eliminate additional funds. If, as was said, they have $66,000,000,000 for lend-lease, and lend-lease has been terminated, why do we not cut more than $40,000,000,000? If they still have $25,000,000,000, that is $24,999,999,999.99 too much for lease-lend. Let us cut it out.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. If you have bought something and have not paid for it, do you think you ought to pay for it or just drop it?

Mr. RICH. I have always tried to pay my bills, and I believe everyone should pay his obligations, but it does not seem as if Uncle Sam is able to pay his. It will be a long time before he will be able to pay the bills created by the New Deal. Where are you going to get this money? You remember you borrowed money from 88,000,000 bondholders in this country. You have got to pay it back. The best way to pay it is to cancel a lot of these obligations, by saving, by efficiency, by economy, by good business methods.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the most distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I would like to tell the gentleman that what he is asking us to do here is simply to repudiate this obligation.

Mr. RICH. No; I am not. The confusion and Government inefficiency is the reason.

Mr. O'NEAL. Repudiate payment for goods which we have already bought.

The gentleman says, "Do not appropriate the money." Is the gentleman going to repudiate the purchase?

Mr. RICH. I want to stop lease-lend; I want to cut it off now. It never was a

good way to assist our allies. It was the poorest piece of legislation ever enacted. We should have dealt with our allies on a good, sound, sensible business basis. The American people have got to pay for every dollar of lease-lend, because they are not going to get it back, the way it looks to me. Who ever heard of such a procedure involving over $40,000,000,000? Nothing ever like it before in history by any people. I thought when the legislation was first enacted that the President had in mind giving America away on a platter, and he did a good job for the other fellow. He forgot America. If these foreign countries want to get more merchandise, let them make arrangements to pay for that merchandise in the good, sound, old-fashioned, American business way. Let us be men, sound and sensible, if that is possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether he means by his statement to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that we had bought and agreed to pay for these various items up to the full amount that has been appropriated to lend-lease? Is that it?

Mr. O'NEAL. I may say to the gentlemen from Michigan that I believe the people handling lend-lease are very competent men of great business experience who are as good American public servants as will be found anywhere. They will pay what they are obligated to pay and make the best deal they can on anything that is subject to negotiation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That was not the point I was asking about. Am I correct in understanding that in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania the gentleman from Kentucky said that the United States Government had obligated itself to make payments up to the full amount that had been appropriated for lend-lease? Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. O'NEAL. According to the testimony we have, of the amount which is left to lend-lease substantially all is obligated except $500,000,000. If the gentleman will turn to page 13 of the report he will see the item:

> Liquidation of commitments for goods and services, and incidental administrative expenses, $1,279,183,000—

Which is the major part of the $1,879,000,000—commitments for things, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, which we have bought in the way of goods and services.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then under the gentleman's statement there is $500,000,000 on hand, which has not been spent, to spend on which no contracts have been made. Is it not true we have incorporated in all of the contracts we have on lend-lease the same provision for cancellation that we have in contracts with our own people for war production under which we have the right to cancel at any time?

Mr. O'NEAL. No doubt there have been and will continue to be cancellations beyond what was anticipated, but these are obligations already incurred.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I know, but not for the $500,000,000. When the Federal Government has contracts with our own people who have been manufacturing munitions of war and other things and those contracts contain cancellation clauses in the event of the cessation of hostilities, have we failed to put such cancellation provisions in the lend-lease contracts? Are those contractors to be put in a favored class over our own local people?

Mr. O'NEAL. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that there is no difference at all. It is just a question of whether a contract has been performed or not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means whether the goods are ready for delivery?

Mr. O'NEAL. Whether the goods or services have been furnished or rendered. Where they have been we feel the contract obligation should be fulfilled.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is true but we have not agreed to pay anyone any part of this five hundred million. This is a move to prevent the spending of an additional sum. The people of the country are beginning to wonder whether we are going to continue to send everything abroad under lend-lease, UNRRA, and by way of gifts to other nations until we are bankrupt. Within the past week there appeared before one of the standing committees of the House a number of witnesses and to Washington came a thousand representative citizens insisting that we provide jobs for all. One of the witnesses before that committee testified that we would have not less than 8,000,000 unemployed in the next year. He also testified that there must be an adequate wage or income of not less than $3,000 annually. That is $24,000,000,000. Then there is another bill that calls for the expenditure of $52,000,000,000; this makes $76,000,000,000 for which they are asking. The President said that lend-lease was at an end, and the Army and the Navy are feeding and clothing the people in the occupied areas. If there is one single word or thought that is worth anything in the statement made late yesterday afternoon by the gentleman from Georgia that we are in danger because of the policy adopted and followed by Russia, then does it not occur to the gentleman that it is about time we cut off this lend-lease entirely and that we quit giving aid to a nation which has a theory in conflict with our political principles. We have no right to tell other nations how they shall conduct their domestic affairs but we have the right to say how our money shall be spent. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman add 5 minutes because I would like to have 5 minutes on this matter?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time only because of some of the things that have been said within the last minute or two about lend-lease and our relationship to certain foreign countries. I want my own position on this matter to be very plain. It is my earnest belief that if the degree of hunger and want which I understand will prevail in the western European democracies goes unchecked in the coming winter the consequences from the point of view of everything America holds dear may be serious indeed.

Meanwhile we shall have a huge surplus of eggs, citrus fruits, and some other commodities in this country. I would like to see food get to those hungry people and if we cannot do it by lend-lease, and I would be glad to see lend-lease resumed as to those nations just for food, but if we cannot do it that way I am for amending the Commodity Credit Act so that it can be done in that way. I just could not let some of the remarks that have been made go without making it plain that, popular or unpopular, I care not which, in the long run unless there is a minimum of food gotten to those people we are going to have serious conditions indeed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman I am sure realizes that UNRRA is the organization set up to provide the very things that the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is mistaken. UNRRA does not go into France, Holland, Norway, or Belgium, any of those four countries, and only goes to a very limited extent into Italy. UNRRA only operates in the countries farther east. The countries I am talking about are the so-called paying countries which up to date have paid cash for every single thing they have received.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They still have the cash and they want to buy for cash right now?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think they do, but they are also up against the problem of rehabilitating their own economies. In some instances I think there will be a tendency to buy machinery and long-term things like that rather than food. I could not in 5 minutes tell the gentleman how this problem can be solved. I do know that the food is needed. To the extent that it can be paid for, of course, I am for having it paid for, but to the extent it cannot be paid for I am in favor of sending it over there anyway.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know that the Department of Agriculture states that the potato-growing industry in this country is confronted with a surplus of 68,000,000 bushels of potatoes?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Those potatoes were prepared for dehydration. They were dehydrated and sent over to Europe but the people over there said they did not want them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know that.

Mr. WHITE. There have been four shiploads of canned peas also sent over there and they are lying over there because the people do not want to eat canned peas.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I do not know that.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman should consult the Department of Agriculture and he will find out something.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have consulted the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I want to say, apropos of what the gentleman from Idaho stated, that I recently was in Europe as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. In the countries we were in, particularly France, Belgium, and Italy, they would eat anything. That is how bad off they were.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the gentleman aware that the War Department has had about a billion dollars during the past fiscal year and in the current fiscal year to relieve the distressed and hungry in the liberated areas, and that we have UNRRA and other agencies to relieve the distressed to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Just a moment; all of which money, so far as the War Department is concerned, will be spent from now on in the conquered countries and not the liberated countries. I repeat that UNRRA does not operate in any of the western democracies I have mentioned, France, Belgium, or Norway, and only to a limited extent in Italy. I have not presumed here to tell the House just how this problem ought to be solved. I have taken exception to a point of view which indicates that this great Nation can afford to see people in Europe starve this winter or go seriously hungry so that their children will grow up deformed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is no issue before us now as to whether we are for or against having people starve. I think the heart of America has always responded to relief needs, and always will.

This is a matter of honest accounting for Federal funds. When we passed the lend-lease extension this spring, this House wrote into it a provision that lend-lease should end with the end of the war, except for articles that were already contracted for and for which cash would be paid. Those particular contracts can be carried out after VJ-day. Otherwise lend-lease ends.

Now, I cannot make these figures parse out. You will find here on page 13 of the report $1,279,183,000 liquidation of commitments for goods and services, and the report says that recovery is anticipated of "the greater part of the funds." What part will not be recovered? Under the lend-lease law recovery should be had of every dollar of lend-lease furnished after the war, and the proceeds of that recovery will go into a rotary fund that the Lend-Lease Administration can again spend. I understand that there is over five billions in lend-lease that is supposed to be obligated, but not spent. I cannot imagine how this vast amount could be legally under obligation, under the lend-lease law. Instead of the cut being $500,000,000 more, under the present amendment, it might conceivably be almost 10 times that amount. But I confess that I cannot make the figures parse out, and I ask the gentleman from New York if he can explain the discrepancy.

Mr. TABER. I am unable to explain it. But as I said when I was on the floor we could not get any satisfactory statement out of the lend-lease outfit. It is my purpose—I do not know whether I will be successful or not—immediately after this bill is disposed of to ask the Committee on Appropriations to order a complete investigation of this whole lend-lease picture by our investigators, with auditors, so that we will have something to operate on. We have nothing to operate on and know nothing about it. There are $5,000,000,000 worth of contracts hanging fire. For what, nobody knows. Nobody knows how much we can salvage. My own opinion is that we ought to be able to save a great deal more than $500,000,000 out of this; but I do not know, and I want to find out that which we were unable to get in the hearings.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If there are limitations imposed by law on expenditures for postwar lend-lease, should there not be substantial salvage out of that $5,104,000,000, that is at present supposed to be obligated? How can that possibly be for obligations incurred before the war's end for which cash is to be paid?

Mr. TABER. I cannot see why there should not be very much salvage out of that $5,000,000,000.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it any more unreasonable to demand that the Lend-Lease Administrator cancel some of his contracts that are not necessary now for the attainment of his program than it is to expect the War Department or the Navy Department to cancel many billions of dollars of their contracts?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. No. It seems to me it is quite reasonable. I think this problem is not whether we are in favor of having America participate in postwar relief or whether we are in favor of postwar participation by America in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of these devastated countries. I for one, expect my country to do its part, but we want to have that participation presented as a postwar program to the Congress so that we can judge it by its four corners and on its own merits. We want to prevent the misuse or abuse of lend-lease, which Congress and the President all decided should end with the war. We want to prevent the use in any way of lend-lease, or any loopholes in it, as a device for carrying on unauthorized postwar relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction. When we take that position, it is not that we are opposed to international cooperation in aiding where we are needed; it is merely that Congress wants to know what the plans are, and we want to approve them before we launch into them.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. When we were in India recently we were told that America had furnished India $2,000,000,000 lend-lease, with $500,000,000 reverse lend-lease. Despite the fact that India had received lend-lease for one and a half years before we received any reverse lend-lease, the moment lend-lease was terminated India stopped reverse lend-lease, and we had to pay in dollars for all food, services, and supplies furnished our Army by India. This in the face of the fact that India owed us one and a half billion dollars balance under the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

INFLATION AND RETURNING VETERANS

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hear statements practically every day on the floor to the effect that there is danger of repudiation of our Government bonds, that the country is going into bankruptcy. I can speak only for one Member of this great body, but I want to say that I do not agree with that statement at all. I do not think there is any danger of our Government repudiating our bonds, not the slightest chance on earth of that happening. Our country is not

going into bankruptcy. Nations cannot go into bankruptcy. It is not possible to go into bankruptcy. There is only one way that we can destroy our country and that is by printing so much money or by creating so much credit through commercial banks that the money and checks will become worthless. But we will pay our bonds and we will pay our debts. But that is the only way we can do it, with worthless money.

We want to pay this national debt with honest dollars. There will be no repudiation, there will be nothing in the form of bankruptcy, but there will be a sincere effort made by Congress and the people to pay our large national debt 100 cents on the dollar with honest dollars, and we will be successful. That is what we want to do. I do not think there is any doubt in the world about it.

Our debt is very high, that is true, $261,000,000,000, the highest debt any country ever had in the history of the world. Notwithstanding that, this enormous debt, about 10 times as much as it has ever been before, the war has been financed with the lowest interest rate in the history of the world. During the First World War we paid over 4 percent interest. During this war the interest rate has been and is now below 2 percent. Does not that indicate solvency, does not that indicate security, does not that indicate confidence on the part of the people? They would not buy these bonds that are drawing less than 2-percent interest if they did not have complete confidence in their country. Let us hope that they will continue to maintain that confidence. Let us say just as little as possible about debt repudiation or bankruptcy, because there is just not one chance in a million of that happening without inflation. It just will not happen, that is all, except, of course, to the extent that our dollars are made less valuable through inflation.

That is one thing that can happen in this country that will be disastrous, that will be just about as costly in dollars as losing the war, and that is inflation.

I invite your attention again to a serious problem regarding housing. In every boat load of returning servicemen you will find hundreds of men who have been away from their families 2 or 3 years. Their families have been residing back home with their parents, their fathers and their mothers, or other relatives. They want homes for themselves to live in.

They have a right to expect these homes at reasonable prices. I do not care how many builders we have, it will be impossible to build enough houses to house all these returning veterans in another 2 years. During the next year 1,500,000 returning servicemen, married, will be unable to buy a home or rent a home. They will just have to double up with other people. Today, the most serious break in our dam that has been holding back inflation has been the removal of L–41, which was holding down the price of building construction and the price of the finished house. Now, the sky is the limit, and these boys who have been earning $50, $60, and $75 a month are coming back home and they have to pay $8,000 for a $4,000 house or even pay $10,000 or $12,000. You say they will not pay it. Well, somebody will have to pay it for them if they are to have a place to live. That is one of the most serious problems that we have facing our country today. So let us work to the end that something will be done to patch up the break in our inflation dam and prevent this great wrong and injustice from being perpetrated on our returning servicemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, returning to the amendment pending in the Committee, there was no item in the bill which was more carefully canvassed and more exhaustively considered in the committee. It is a very simple proposition. There is no occasion for any concern about it. The unobligated balance under the project to which the amendment applies was $2,636,216,000. Now we take from that the committee rescission of $1,351,216,000, leaving $1,285,000,000. From this, the gentleman proposes to deduct an additional half billion dollars. That will leave $685,000,000 in this project. But there already will have been transferred $100,000,000 to UNRRA and $500,000,000 is earmarked for Agriculture for support of the parity agriculture program plan with which you are familiar. That would leave only $185,000,000 in this project. We have entered into contracts which are so nearly complete that it would be disastrous to take this step at this late date.

It is true the War Department and the Navy Department have canceled many contracts, but they canceled none on which they lost more than they made by the cancellation. That would be the situation here. This money is in goods that have been largely processed. We are obligated. We cannot refuse to take them. But we already have agreements with the foreign nations to which they have been assigned under which they will pay for them dollar for dollar in cash or approved credits. In other words, we have just had a conversation this morning with the Administrators of this activity and were assured that there was positively no doubt that we would get back every dollar of this money. On the contrary, if this amendment were adopted we would lose money. Repudiation of these contracts now, would cost us heavily in cancellation expenses and fees. But if we go ahead and take the goods, we sell them for 100 cents on the dollar. If canceled we lose the cost of cancellation and are involved in unpleasant negotiations with the nations to whom we have agreed to sell them and who will not understand why we have welched on our agreement.

Furthermore, we get another opportunity to retrieve any possible surplus remaining after liquidation of this project. Lend-lease is through. It is being liquidated. They make their final report in January, and we can then recover any funds not required for liquidation. We have positive assurance that our losses will be relatively nil if the committee's proposal is followed. If we agree to the amendment we may lose a substantial amount in the resulting costs and we would be involved in controversies with the nations for whom we have agreed to provide these goods, not to mention the readjustments with the contractors.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will get me one additional minute to answer his question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for one additional minute so that he may answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman has referred to expenditures under the lend-lease program on the basis of creating a lot of surplus property. Would the gentleman have this House believe that it is possible to sell that surplus property and collect 100 cents for every dollar invested, as he said a moment ago?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Practically so, yes. The contracts have been so nearly perfected that we cannot cancel them without loss and the incidental expense to the Government. We already have an understanding with the nations which are to get the commodities that they will pay us a hundred cents on the dollar for them. Part of them to pay in cash and part on approved loans.

Mr. DWORSHAK. For all this surplus property that is available under lend-lease?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All that is provided for in this item of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division, there were—ayes 90, noes 99.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. DWORSHAK to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 114, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission (national defense), $2,032,000.

Employees' Compensation Commission: Employees' compensation fund, $1,761,644.

Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses, Federal Communications Commission (national defense), $930,000.

Federal Power Commission: National defense activities, $17,628.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, $2,000,000.

Selective Service System: Salaries and expenses, $2,957,500.

United States Maritime Commission: Construction fund, act June 29, 1936, revolving fund, $496,500,000.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Public Health Service:

Health and sanitation activities, war and defense areas (national defense), $392,568.

Malaria and diseases of tropical origin (national defense), $1,862,501.

Training for nurses (national defense), $15,557,000, and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for administrative expenses is hereby decreased from "$788,255," to "$611,322."

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for grants to States for administration of unemployment compensation and employment service facilities operated in conjunction therewith, as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935, as amended, $30,000,000, which shall be in addition to the amounts appropriated for such purposes in title II of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1946.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: On page 8, line 10, after the period, strike out lines 11 through 20 and insert the following:

"On July 1, 1946, any unobligated balance of the appropriation made in the first paragraph under the heading 'Employment Office Facilities and Services' in title VII of the Labor-Federal Appropriation Act, 1946, shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury, and after June 30, 1946, appropriations shall be made only for grants to States for administration of unemployment compensation and employment service facilities as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, approved August 11, 1935, as amended, and in the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, known as the Wagner-Peyser Act."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, that it is legislative in character.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is obviously germane. It relates to the same subject as specified in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make an additional point of order. If I understood the amendment correctly, it makes an appropriation. Has this bill not been regarded as a legislative bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph under consideration makes an appropriation of $30,000,000

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this, to my mind, is the situation: The amendment is a rescission. The paragraph which is made in order under the rule is an appropriation; therefore the amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered is germane to the paragraph which deals with appropriations for this purpose. The amendment offered also deals with appropriations for the same purpose. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is clearly germane and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the Chair ruled at any time whether this is an appropriation bill or a legislative bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not have to rule upon that question. This is a question with reference to rescission of funds and incidentally involves appropriations, as does this particular paragraph. The Chair, in a bill of this character, which is not a general appropriation bill, is simply called upon to pass upon the question of germaneness. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is clearly germane.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not question the germaneness, but I heard the bill referred to as a legislative bill, and if it is interpreted as a legislative bill, the amendment making an appropriation, of course, would not be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. This certainly is not a general appropriation bill but a bill with reference to rescission of appropriations. The only question which could occur from a parliamentary standpoint would be the question of germaneness. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is clearly germane. The Chair overruled the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, the rule waiving points of order would apply to any point of order that an amendment was legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not at all passing upon that question. In the opinion of the Chair, the only parliamentary point upon which the Chair is required to pass is the question of germaneness.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, since that question has been raised, may we have a ruling on the question whether or not the rule waives points of order as against amendments or merely waives points of order against the contents of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is called upon to rule only upon the point of order made and cannot rule upon other points of order not pertinent to the pending amendment. The Chair has overruled the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. I object.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do you not think 30 minutes is unfair when the proponents have 10 minutes to start with?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to let the thing run along for about two or three speeches, and then have a limitation fixed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request and make it 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri modifies his request that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I shall not offer in case the pending amendment is adopted but which I shall want to offer if it is not adopted. I wonder if I will have 5 minutes to discuss my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think at least one member of the opposition should have as long as the proponent has, and I shall have to object at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is a decided advantage to the House to know what we can depend on, so I modify my request to include the time asked by the gentleman from New York so that any speaker selected on that side may be allowed 10 minutes, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes.

Mr. TABER. I shall still have to object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked for five additional minutes was that due to the fact that all time was taken up in general debate by members of the committee, and properly so. It was impossible for me to obtain time during general debate. I know the Members in charge on either side would have given me the time if I had asked for it, but I knew it would embarrass them, so rather than embarrass them by taking the time away from somebody else I decided to wait until the bill was considered under the 5-minute rule and then ask for five additional minutes.

The amendment I have offered aims to bring back to the States on June 30, 1946, the employment services which are functioning now. We all know the history of the United States Employment Service, that during the war it was necessary in the national interest for the Federal Government to administer them temporarily and, so to speak, take them over. We have made a clear promise to return them, and that promise every one of us from the President down recognizes should be carried out at the right time. The question is, When is the right time in the light of the reconversion program and in the light of the demobilization of those who are in our armed forces?

As far as I can find out, the Dirksen amendment was not considered in the subcommittee that considered the bill

before us. If I am mistaken in that respect, I welcome correction by any member of the Committee on Appropriations. As far as I am able to ascertain, the subcommittee reported this bill to the full committee and then, just prior to its being reported out, the gentleman from Illinois offered his amendment, which was adopted. But the fact remains that the matter was not considered by the subcommittee. This is rather unusual, because a subcommittee contemplating any action always gives an opportunity, if it is feasible to do so, to the agencies affected to get the information and incorporate it in the hearings upon which the subcommittee, and later the full committee, and still later the House, when the bill is reported out, have to act.

It is very apparent from the Dirksen amendment that the gentleman from Illinois does not accomplish what he has in mind. If my amendment is adopted, I shall move to strike out the other portion of the bill relating to this subject, which appears on page 15. If you will read the Dirksen amendment, it is as follows:

> There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for grants to States for administration of unemployment compensation—

Get that—

> for grants to States for administration of unemployment compensation and employment service facilities operated in conjunction therewith.

It does not say "and employment facilities." Remember that the grants we have made before were for unemployment compensation and also to carry out the Wagner-Peyser Act. It is true, as the gentleman from Illinois said, they are more or less lumped together for administrative purposes, but they are two separate and distinct functions. We appropriate the total amount for the activities in connection with the unemployment compensation but in connection with the Employment Service offices under the Wagner-Peyser Act, we appropriate and the States are supposed to appropriate dollar for dollar. Under this amendment, and I am sure the gentleman who drafted it and proposed it failed to recognize the implications, 30 days after it becomes law, if this amendment is adopted, the only one who can go in any get any unemployment service from these agencies in these offices in the States are those who go in for unemployment compensation because the wording says, "unemployment service facilities operated in conjunction therewith." In conjunction therewith—with what? With the administration of unemployment compensation. My amendment corrects that because it strikes out the words "operated in conjunction therewith." Furthermore, the Dirksen amendment might repeal for all practical purposes the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act and I specifically protect that in my amendment. What is the difference between the Dirksen amendment and the McCormack amendment? The difference is only a matter of several months. The Dirksen amendment provides 30 days after this bill becomes a law. My amendment provides June 30, 1946. I had convincing reasons which prompted me to offer this amendment. I do not want to see the millions of veterans interfered with in receiving valuable advice in relation to employment in their States. The greater part of demobilization will have taken place by June 30. Therefore, it is a good date from that angle. From the angle of the millions of workers who have gone out of their States to other States and returned, it ought to take care of that situation since a great part of that reconversion of labor ought to be over by June 30. So I have logical reasons for setting June 30 as the date, reasons consistent with the best interests of the States and consistent with the best interests of the Federal Government.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. May I call to the gentleman's attention that we have testimony from State directors before the Committee on Ways and Means who said that this was urgent and should take place immediately?

Mr. McCORMACK. The amendment before the Committee on Ways and Means provides 90 days. Is that not correct?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; that is the Lucas amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Dirksen amendment provides that this will go into effect in about 30 days. This bill will probably become a law around November 1 and it will be operating December 1, roughly speaking. So the only difference is 6 months between the operation of this amendment and the operation of my amendment. President Truman thought well enough of this subject to incorporate it as item 8 in his message to the Congress of the United States on September 6, and he advocated 1947. That probably might be a little too long, but I cannot take issue with the judgment of the President. However, in the light of the honest state of mind entertained by Members who might disagree as to when it should be returned, and of course all agree that some day it should be, June 30, 1946, tied up with reconversion so far as labor is concerned, and demobilization so far as the veterans are concerned, would be an excellent date. The President was very emphatic. He said:

> Hundreds of thousands of men and women will want to seek jobs in towns and cities other than those in which they worked during the war. They may want to return home, or they may want to strike out in search of new opportunities in new surroundings. Millions of veterans also will be coming back in search of peacetime jobs. They will want to know where such jobs can be found, not only in their own areas, but also in other parts of the land.

Then he says:

> I urgently recommend that the Congress do not yet return the Employment Service to the States. Ultimately it should be so returned. However, it should be continued under Federal control at least until the expiration of the War Mobilization Act, June 30, 1947.

But the basic thing, he urgently recommends the Congress that it be not returned now. The Dirksen amendment is 30 days. The Lucas amendment in the Senate was 90 days. I honestly believe that June 30, 1946, is a fair and reasonable date. We can then look ahead. We can then, in an orderly way, take care of the return of these services to the several States. I believe it should be returned, but 30 days would result in harm. Our veterans receive employment advice as to the opportunities, when they are at separation centers in the process of being discharged. This would cause harm to them in receiving proper advice. We want to give them the best advice we can.

My amendment is not hostile to the objectives of the Dirksen amendment. There is a disagreement as to time. I submit that the facts support my amendment and justify the Members in adopting it. It is in no way hostile to the Dirksen amendment, and to vote for it would not be considered hostile to the views of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. We have got to consider demobilization. We have got to consider reconversion. I think the merits in support of my amendment, having in mind the present situation, warrant the House today in adopting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the distinguished majority leader admits there is an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to return the Employment Service to the States. I am also glad to note that he has assumed his responsibilities as leader in this matter, because yesterday it looked as though the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] was handling the opposition.

Now, let us see what the facts are. I do not pretend to know everything about this, but this particular field is one to which I have devoted myself since I have been in the Congress. I happen to have served the last 6 years upon the Labor Federal Security Subcommittee on Appropriations that has dealt with this subject for four successive years. So that it does not well become any Member to stand in the well of this House and say this matter has not been considered by an appropriate committee of the Congress. We have had hearing after hearing, as the chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], so well stated to the Members this afternoon.

Now, who is in the best position to determine when this transfer should take place? It is admitted by all hands that the transfer should be made. Who is in the best position to know the needs of the States? I have before me telegrams from 47 State agencies. I have the report from 48 State governors. It is not a political question. Democrats and Republicans alike are charged with the responsibility of handling this problem of

employment and unemployment compensation.

Almost without exception, every single State agency charged with the responsibility of administering this program, including the Governors of all the States of this Union, have petitioned and asked and demanded that these employment services be returned to the States not 60 days from now, not 6 months from now, but immediately. I have here telegrams from every one of these State agencies. If you would take time to read them, you would readily understand why they ask that it be done.

Mr. Chairman, you must understand the functioning or the relationship between the Employment Service and the unemployment compensation service in this country. Congress itself set up the pattern in the Wagner-Peyser Act, establishing the national policy.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman agree with me that members of the Labor-Federal Security Agency Subcommittee, both Democrats and Republicans, with one possible exception, after all the hearings they have had concerning the subject matter, favor the immediate return of the employment services to the States?

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. TARVER. And that the full Appropriations Committee by a vote of approximately 2 to 1 approved this proposition when it was submitted to them?

Mr. KEEFE. That is correct; the vote was 23 to 12, and it was taken in the full Appropriations Committee after a long and considered debate. Let it not be understood that there is any attempt to slip something over on somebody in this matter. We operate the Employment Service. You have the Wagner-Peyser Act setting up the general policy in 1933. What happened? It was a State-operated program under the direction of the Federal Government, and every State could participate, but before they could participate under that program they had to adopt a State system and have it approved by the Federal Government.

In 1935 you passed the Social Security Act and in title 3 of that act you set up a system of unemployment compensation. The two worked hand in hand; they matched together to provide a well-rounded program, first, of employment facilities, and, second, of unemployment compensation. It is true that the Wagner-Peyser act provided for the matching of funds and provided for a total authorization of $4,000,000. When the thing first started the States matched those funds dollar for dollar, but $4,000,000 was soon found to be a ridiculously small sum to run a national system of employment services. What did they do? They went to the Comptroller General of the United States and he rendered an opinion to the Social Security Board that due to the integration of the Social Security Act providing for unemployment compensation and the employment services of the country they could use title 3 funds—funds raised by the tax provided for in title 3 of the Social Security Act. Since that time—1936, if you please—both the employment services and the unemployment-compensation program of this Nation have been financed out of funds paid by the employers of this Nation under the tax imposed by title 3 of the Social Security Act. Those funds ran up to the point that last year we appropriated $54,000,000 to take care of the employment offices of this country. So it is entirely beside the question to talk about the funds being matched under the Wagner-Peyser Act. They have not been doing that since 1936.

The fact of the matter is there are two schools of thought on this proposition. The State agencies that are at the grass roots, that have to find the jobs and know where the jobs are to be found in the local communities, are the ones who ought to administer these employment facilities. Everybody admits that. You say, "Postpone it until next June 30." We say, in accordance with the request of every State governor who is familiar with the situation and in accordance with the request of 47 State administrators, that it should be done now, and there is no reason why it cannot be done now.

Let us see what happens and let us note the confusion that has arisen in this country. A person is out of employment. He may be a soldier or civilian. These two functions are housed in the same office. He goes to that office to apply for a job and he is told to register. He does register. He then goes over to the unemployment compensation group to file his claim for compensation. After that he goes back to a job interviewer on the other side of the same office where he is exposed to a job opportunity. He then says, "Yes, you are offering me a job but it is not a suitable job." It may be a suitable job under the State law, but the Federal Government steps in through its officials in that office and says, "The job that we have is not a suitable job for this man." Therefore it tells the State to pay out of its funds unemployment compensation. As a result confusion is rampant throughout the land and all we are trying to do is to resolve that confusion and provide jobs now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, there is considerable confusion regarding this employment-service question at the present time, and for the information of the members of the committee I would like to read a letter sent to me by the Governor of my State, Dwight Griswold. He writes as follows:

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lincoln, October 16, 1945.

HON. KARL STEFAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: I understand that your committee is soon to consider an amendment to an appropriations bill which will provide for the return of the employment service to State administration.

You might be interested to know that at the present time some confusion is arising. The men and women now in the employment service seemingly desire to remain with the Federal Government and in case there is any discussion with an employer as to why men are not available for jobs, the employment-service people seemingly are following the policy of saying that the fault lies with the unemployment-compensation division, which is under State administration. Some of the fault may be on the part of the State employees who perhaps are inclined to say to people that the trouble with the present set-up is that the employment service is a Federal agency and they are not properly coordinating.

I am not trying to put blame on anyone but I do desire to point out as has been done many times previously that the two agencies must work together. The facts are that in 1941 at the request of representatives of the Social Security Board the Nebraska Legislature amended the State law so that there would be full and complete integration of the unemployment compensation and employment services. At that time it was argued by everyone interested that the two must be administered together. The interested parties were right then and certainly the people are right today who insist that the two agencies be combined. There is bound to be confusion, there are bound to be charges back and forth as long as they function as they are today.

Congress has several times shown by its votes that they are not going to federalize unemployment compensation. The only practical means then to get the two agencies together is to provide for an immediate return to the States of the employment service.

You may use this letter as you see fit, but I thought you would be interested in this information.

With kind regards and best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT GRISWOLD.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McCormack amendment, because I believe that it is a fair compromise of the difference between the Dirksen amendment, which is entirely too short in the term, and the recommendation of the President, which probably is too long to suit most of the people. There is one phase of the situation that I would particularly like to call to your attention, and that is this: We have approximately 23,000 employees now in the employment services, of which I am informed 14,000 are new people who were not employed by the States when the agencies were transferred to the Federal Government. No one knows, as far as I have been able to find out, whether those 14,000, if the services go back to the States in 30 days could be employed by the States under the merit-system requirements imposed under the Social Security Act. It might create very considerable confusion. It might result in the elimination of a number of trained employees in the various State services, thus decreasing the possibility of service to those who are unemployed and to the veterans who are coming back seeking assistance of the employment services. We have heard about the requests of the Governors, and it is perfectly natural

that the Governors and the State officials who operate these agencies would be glad to get back under their wing 23,000 employees who are now in the Federal services. I do not think I have to explain to any Member of Congress why they want the services back. We all understand that. The Federal Government pays the bill, 95 percent. They get the employees. But I prefer to listen to the business interests of the country. I hold in my hand a report from the Committee on Economic Development, made in August of this year, the chairman of which is Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation. I wish I had time to read the list of outstanding businessmen on this committee. They say this:

Primary public responsibility for assisting the transfer of soldiers and war workers to peacetime jobs should rest on the public employment services. The services must be markedly improved. There is a growing demand that the employment services, transferred to Federal operation shortly after the United States entered the war, now be returned to State operation. This committee believes that the services eventually should again be operated by the States. In the committee's view, this activity should be retained by the Federal Government so long as the interstate movement of labor in the transition period constitutes an important element in the problem.

Thirty days certainly would not comply with their recommendation. I hold in my hand a telegram from San Francisco, signed by representatives of labor, and of management, and of agriculture, members of a management-labor committee of the Manpower Commission, region 3, held at San Francisco October 4, in which they make much the same recommendation. The facts are that the people who have to use these services, the management and the labor people, do not want these agencies returned at this time. I should like to see them go back to the States at the proper time and I expect to vote for it when that time comes, but I do hope that we will not take the precipitate action called for by the Dirksen amendment, which would cause confusion and delay in the handling of the employment problem, which is growing larger day by day in the transition from wartime operation to peacetime production. We cannot afford to take the chance of having a million men discharged from our Army and Navy every month with no well-functioning employment service available to give them the service which we have promised them and to which they are entitled.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 19, 1945.*

Urgently request the deletion of United States Employment Service amendment to H. R. 4407 because it is most untimely. It affects the whole reconversion effort, touches the lives of millions of people, including several million veterans. Any action affecting a problem as important as this should be handled through normal legislative processes with full opportunity for hearings and discussion. If enacted as part of H. R. 4407, it will create a confusing administrative set-up at the national level because funds are appropriated to the Social Security Board for the operation of the Employment Service whereas responsibility for its administration is now vested and is proposed to remain in the Department of Labor. It ignores the Wagner-Peyser Act which vests Secretary of Labor with responsibility of developing a national system of employment services which sets pattern for Federal-State operation. It would prevent continued effective and uninterrupted operation of the Employment Service and result in inadequate Employment Service facilities which are operating at this time with the responsibility for veterans' placement under the provisions of title 4 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. It would do a gross injustice to the personnel who have been engaged in Employment Service activities during the war period. It would disrupt service to thousands of war workers now seeking employment in peacetime activities, as well as millions of veterans who are returning to the labor market. Please do your utmost to secure the deletion of this amendment which is enacted, will throw the entire Service into complete chaos at this extremely critical time.

JAMES B. BURNS,
National President, American Federation of Government Employees.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *October 9, 1945.*
Hon. LEWIS SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.:

At a regularly scheduled meeting of the regional management-labor committee of the War Manpower Commission for region XII held at San Francisco, Calif., on October 4, 1945, and attended by all of the undersigned. It was unanimously resolved that the committee go on record as urging the retention of the United States Employment Service as a Federal function at least until the national problems of reconversion have been solved. This resolution was prompted by the experience gained by the committee in its dealings with the problems faced by the War Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service during the period of hostilities. The committee respectfully requests that you be guided by this resolution in considering pending legislation designed to effect the immediate return of the United States Employment Service to the several States.

Philip M. Connelly, president, California State CIO, Los Angeles, Calif.; Daniel F. Del Carlo, Building and Construction Trades Council, San Francisco, Calif.; Alfred E. Hurtung, Regional Director, CIO, Portland, Oreg.; O. B. Dailey, general chairman, Brotherhood of Blacksmith Forgers, San Francisco, Calif., representing labor. Dean Ballard, Distributors Association of Seattle, Seattle, Wash.; P. A. Coxon, Moore Drydock Corp., Oakland, Calif.; William K. Hopkins, Columbia Pictures Corp., Hollywood, Calif.; G. C. Patterson, Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif., representing management; William Darise, Walnut Grove, Calif., representing agriculture.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that I am justified in pointing out to the members of the Committee of the Whole the position of the Subcommittee on Labor-Federal Security Agency Appropriations, not that the members of our subcommittee claim any greater wisdom than appertains to other Members of the House but because we for several years have had every year a great deal of testimony concerning this particular problem. I hope you will feel that we are in good conscience aiming toward the same objectives in connection with this matter which should be your aim, and that there ought to be some significance in the fact that with the possible exception of one member of the subcommittee who have heard this evidence we are all of the opinion that the employment services should be immediately returned to the States. When I say "immediately" I do not necessarily mean within 30 days. It might be possible that the return could be made effective January 1, 1946, and be accomplished in a more orderly way. If that should be true, then an amendment should be proposed not to this portion of the bill but to the portion carried on page 15, which undertakes to fix the date of the transfer. In that paragraph, instead of providing for transfer on the thirtieth day after the enactment of this law, provision might be made for transfer on January 1, 1946. I think such an amendment would not defeat the objectives which the Committee on Appropriations had in mind in incorporating this language in the bill and, as far as I am concerned, I should be glad to support such an amendment if offered.

The carrying out of the Dirksen provisions, as they have been referred to, but which are the provisions which have been adopted by the full committee by a vote of approximately 2 to 1, will merely mean the carrying out of a promise made in effect by the President of the United States at the time that he took these agencies over, a promise reiterated by the Congress of the United States in connection with the approval of various Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bills which have been enacted since that time.

The trouble is that while some of those who are advocating postponing this transfer until July 1, 1946, are in good faith, I am very strongly of the opinion that there are others who never want the transfer to be effected at all. I heard the testimony of Governor McNutt and of Mr. Altmeyer, the Chairman of the Social Security Board, before our subcommittee time after time. They do not believe that the services ought ever to be transferred back to the States. If you give until next July, you give that much more time in which activities can be indulged in which will have a tendency to bring about the enactment of legislation keeping these employment services under the control of the Federal Government permanently. There is no reason why if you desire to keep the promise which has been made to the States you should not do so within the immediate future, certainly not later than January 1, 1946.

I see the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means present. I know that his committee had some hearings in regard to this matter as to the possibility of effecting immediate transfer of the employment services to the States without injury to the services. I desire to inquire of him, for the information of members of the Committee, whether or not the Committee on Ways and Means was advised that this transfer could be effected immediately without impairing

the effectiveness of the employment services.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. As I recall, our Committee on Ways and Means conducted extensive hearings on this subject. If anything was demonstrated at all, it was clearly shown to our committee, as I understood it, that the administration of the Unemployment Compensation Act was being considerably handicapped on account of the two authorities. The State unemployment compensation office and the United States Unemployment Compensation Authority were in the same building, and they kept separate hours. There was constant confusion there, and the results were that the State unemployment compensation administrators were very greatly handicapped in their work on account of the two administrators.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman believe from the evidence adduced by his committee that the immediate transfer of the employment services to the States should be brought about?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I would not say that the word "immediately" was used.

Mr. TARVER. I mean within a reasonable period.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The testimony before our committee, according to my understanding, was that they ought to be returned as early as is reasonably possible.

Mr. TARVER. Did that testimony indicate that the return could be made within the very near future without inconvenience?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It seems to me the testimony before our committee was that the State authority, the Governors, administrators of unemployment compensation, all being in one accord, thought it should be returned.

Mr. TARVER. May I repeat what I have already said in effect, that if you want to consider postponing the date of the transfer you ought not to do it by adopting the McCormack amendment but you ought to wait until you get to page 15 of the bill where the date of the transfer is proposed to be fixed. You ought, in my judgment, to reject this amendment and adopt the language which has been written by the committee, and when you reach page 15 give consideration to whether or not you will fix a different date for the transfer other than that which was fixed in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to review the history of these acts, but I just want to call to the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin that he was only partially correct when he stated that there was no matching of funds, that after the opinion from the Comptroller General and the Attorney General in regard to it there was an appropriation of $3,000,000, and from that time on up until the time that the Federal Government stepped in and took it over, there was matching of funds on the part of the States of at least $3,000,000.

It is true that the balance, amounting to about $48,000,000, was paid out of the Social Security Fund for the administration of this agency. The question of whether or not it shall be postponed or whether or not this is the proper place for the McCormack amendment in the bill I think was very ably answered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] when he explained that unless his amendment is adopted there is a serious question as to whether or not this provision will repeal the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act. That must be seriously considered.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. Pardon me. I have only 5 minutes.

Let me call your attention to the fact that there is confusion throughout the country. I am just wondering whether or not it is a matter of economy to the Federal and State Governments and whether or not it is in the interest of good government to continue the operation within the States, for this reason: If a man goes in looking for a job and he is told that there is a job within the State comparable to the work he has been following, he must accept that job or he is not entitled to unemployment compensation. However, there are hundreds of thousands of migratory workers who went from one State to another during this wartime period. Witness my own State of Michigan. As a matter of comparison, many people came from the State of Kentucky, for instance. They have worked in Michigan during the war period. They want to return to a job in the State of Kentucky, the kind of work they were doing before they left that State. I understand they are needed in Kentucky, also. If they left the State of Michigan and went down to Kentucky they would not be entitled to unemployment compensation. The result is that they remain in Michigan and accept the unemployment compensation. Let us arrange it so that they will be able to take jobs any place in the United States, and not be supported by the State of Michigan or any other State. This is nothing but a bull whip against labor, to force them to accept substandard wages.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss this with reference to the time when the Employment Service should be returned to the States. I am glad to get the reaction of this committee, which is that we do intend to return it to the States. Then there is just one question: When should we do it?

We had some very extensive hearings in the Ways and Means Committee, as the chairman of our committee stated a moment ago, on this very important subject. Evidence was presented to the committee that immediate return to the States was essential. What is the testimony of those individuals who have to administer this act? I am going to quote only sentence statements from two of them as they appear in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 3736. First, from Claude A. Williams, who is of the Texas Unemployment Compensation Board. What does he say about returning this Employment Service to the States?

> I do not believe there is one thing in the world that this Congress could do that would help more to bring about reconversion to peacetime economy than to return the Employment Services to the States—not tomorrow, but, if you could do it, do it today. It would be the greatest single contribution to reconversion that this Congress could do.

It is most important that this House give consideration to these men who have to operate these agencies back in the States. Here is Mr. Williams who says: "Not tomorrow, but return it today."

There were other witnesses, but I shall refer to only one more, and I am going to read a sentence from his statement. He comes from the home State of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and is Col. A. L. Fletcher, chairman of the Unemployment Compensation Commission of North Carolina. Listen to what he says:

> Under the present system, with little control over claims taking and with no control whatsoever over funds and job placement we will do the best we can because that is the kind of people we are; but if you want a good job done and unemployment kept as low as possible, I beg that you will see to it that the employment service is returned to the States immediately.

That is when he wants it back, and he is the man who is working with it. Colonel Fletcher stated further: "We want it now, and we are ready to take it back and put it to work on the problem you are so deeply concerned about."

Mr. Chairman, you just cannot sit in a committee and hear these statements from the men who come in from the States out in the field working on these problems without being convinced this agency ought to be returned to the States as soon as possible.

There may be merit in the statement that 30 days is not a long enough time, but the Senate passed the bill which provided for 90 days. Certainly we can agree on a compromise between the 30 days and the 90 days. Let us aid reconversion by immediate action on this important bill. I sincerely hope that the McCormack amendment will be voted down, and that we can enact the legislation contained in the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall reading in history that Napoleon always reserved the old guard for emergencies. Whenever the Speaker and the majority leader take the floor I recognize the existence of an emergency. I know of no man in the House I would rather have in my corner if I were in a tight situation and in a hard fight than my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts

[Mr. McCORMACK]. He is not only plausible, but he is convincing—and he is a magnificent fighter.

Mr. Chairman, this involves something that has nothing to do with partisanship. Those of us who come from the rural sections north and south recognize the fact that so long as the Federal Government continues to control the employment agencies we are not going to get labor for our farms. Why do I say this? Because as the law is now operated an unemployed individual can file for unemployment compensation and draw pay for the full time without complying with the provisions of the law, which contemplates that he shall constantly make every effort to obtain a new job. We had Mr. R. J. Thomas, president of the National Automobile Workers' Union, before the Ways and Means Committee when the unemployment bill was being considered. Our distinguished chairman asked him what the top wage was in the automobile industry, to which he replied that it was something like $1.95 an hour. Said our chairman: "If a man who becomes idle after the war finds that he cannot get more than $1 an hour would you advise him to take the job?" Mr. Thomas replied: "Most assuredly not." Mr. Thomas, of course, is against turning these agencies back to the States because he knows that when they are turned back the man who got $1.95 an hour during the war will have to take a job at peacetime wages, or else he may have to pull up his belt. We want to see the highest possible wages and we should also have proportionately high price levels to maintain the national income at the highest possible levels. However, we must not overlook certain fundamental aspects that have an important bearing on the whole problem. I submit there is something wrong when a farmer cannot hire help, even though he offers as high as $125 per month plus board, room, and laundry. If that situation is not corrected all may go hungry next year.

Of course, I realize that the forces seeking to put the McCormack amendment over are formidable. There is my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who on yesterday led his group in several skirmishes; then there is the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] who is also active in putting over the McCormack amendment.

Why are these gentlemen so intensely interested in having the McCormack amendment adopted? Because the CIO wants it. When you vote for the McCormack amendment you are voting the way that the CIO wants you to vote and the way many have been ordered to vote.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of talk about returning the Employment Service to the States, and I have no objection to that if the States are prepared to take over the matter. But you should remember, Mr. Chairman, that there are a lot of soldiers coming out of the Army. These men want jobs, they want to be taken care of, and they are entitled to be taken care of.

I have no objection to returning this to the States when the States are prepared to take it over. How much money have the 48 States appropriated for such purposes?

Are we going to let down the soldiers? Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the McCormack amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McCormack amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting throughout this debate to have someone give away the real reason why this effort is being made to return the Employment Service back to the States. We finally at long last have the motive. It is found in the frank confession made by the gentleman from Minnesota. He told us that the return of this Service to the States is the best guaranty to force workers to accept employment at wages considerably lower than they have been receiving during the war. In other words, his complaint against the USES is the fact that the USES has made efforts to protect the wage standards of American workers.

The gentleman from Minnesota whose attitude toward labor was very aptly described by himself at a Ways and Means Committee meeting when he advanced the bull whip as a solution of labor problems, wants this Service returned to the States so that when an unemployed worker insists on American standards and American wages he will be denied unemployment compensation if he refuses un-American and substandard wages. This Dirksen provision in the bill is part of the entire antilabor drive that is going on in this Congress. Labor exploiters want this provision. They want the Employment Service returned to the States now. Why? So that during this period of reconversion workers who have been laid off will either have to accept low wages or be denied unemployment benefits. This plan is an appendage to the antilabor vehicle that has been let loose in this Congress on the working people of this country and you are not fooling anybody by talking about efficiency in administration as an excuse for transfer of this Service to the States.

Labor knows what the scheme is. It was revealed just now. It was given away by the gentleman from Minnesota who said that if workers do not take the jobs that are offered at the wages offered, they had better tighten their belts. This is a device to exploit American workers. It is part of the plan to use reconversion as an instrument to cut wages.

In other words, unless American workers accept reduced wages they have to starve. That is the game. The working people know it. Talk not about free enterprise when you resort to this ill-concealed scheme to bring about a reduction in the wage levels of the working people of these United States. Do not talk about efficient administration, you are just not kidding anybody.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the majority leader has indicated that the only difference between his proposal and mine is one of time. Shall it be done in 30 days or shall it dribble along until the 30th day of June 1946? In support of the contention that it ought to be permitted to run until June 30 it is said, for instance, that it is about coterminous with demobilization. When is the need for this service if it is not now, when the soldiers are being demobilized? General Marshall appeared before our subcommittee and gave us figures on demobilization. Secretary Forrestal appeared. I can say to you now that as an average for the first 10 days in October the Navy demobilized at the rate of 9,800 a day and it is now up to 11,000. The Army averaged 38,000 per day, and in one day they hit 43,000. So, when you lump the services together, 1,500,000 young men in uniform are moving out of the service every 30 days; they are moving home to the States where the jobs are. That is the essential thing and that is why this ought to go back to the States. That is where the job is and that is where the referral is going to be made, and it is there where the compensation must come from.

Item No. 2: The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] indicates the difficulty of transferring the personnel. Why, bless you all, when the President sent out his wire on the 19th of December 1941, the whole transfer had been completed by the 48 governors and their subordinates in exactly 11 days. Now, are we going to confess that the States can transfer to the Federal Government in 11 days, but that it will take the Federal Government, 7 months to do the job? Shame on that kind of confession. This is the time. Time is of the essence of this thing now, and it can be done.

What about the absorptive capacities of the States to accept this job? There are so many telegrams here from Alabama, from Arizona, from Arkansas, from California, from Connecticut. What do they say? "We can do the job in 30 days or less." They can do it. So where is the argument for waiting until June 30, 1946, in order to complete it?

It was said that over on the Senate side the distinguished Senator from Illinois offered an amendment to transfer in 90 days. Let me refresh you on the fact that the Senator from Illinois when he first prepared that amendment made it 30 days and not 90 days. These youngsters are moving back home. That is where the jobs are. Time is of the essence of this thing. Let us not delay one moment longer because we are moving headlong into confusion and the dissipation of the funds of the States. Finally, I am a little astonished at my friend from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] who asked for a longer period of time. If these people to whom he referred are up there in Michigan now their contributions are going into the Michigan treasury or into the Michigan trust fund. The sooner you get them back down to North Carolina, as he says, or down to Kentucky, the better off they will be and the easier the ultimate load will be. So time is of the essence all the way through. Do not be deluded that this job is going to be easier 7 months from now. This is the

occasion to do it. I suggest to you most respectfully to vote down the amendment offered by my esteemed friend, for whom I have a deep affection, the majority leader. Let us go into action now. This is the time.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate here, and I know that when you cry out "Vote" you are all getting tired and high-strung. The latter part of the day is always a bad time to legislate. But this is a vital problem. I give everybody on both sides who have spoken for their favorite amendment due credit for absolute sincerity.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means I have heard the testimony. There is no question among the men who have to administer the State act. They are in favor of the immediate elimination of the Federal branch of this service and its return to the States.

The longer you delay this matter the more you are going to make the service inefficient under the Federal dual system. There is going to be uncertainty in the minds of the employees of the service, both Federal and State. They are not going to do their best work for those who need their services. There is going to be pulling and hauling; they are going to start propaganda, they are going to put the heat on the Members of Congress to Federalize the employment system.

We need the State service and we need it now. It will be less painful to do it now than it will be later. I stand for the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are not considering today the report of the Committee on Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriations. Of all the statements to make to the Members, who are educated upon the procedures of the House, I think one of the outstanding was made today, when they told us they have been considering this legislation and considering these problems in 1943 and in 1944 and other years. What committee does not consider its problems every year? This matter has not been considered by any committee this year.

Downstairs in the full Appropriations Committee when this matter came up the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] just took the figure right clear out of the sky. He started off with $48,000,000. Here we were with the rescission bill, and he walked into the room and read this amendment and said, "And we will give $48,000,000." Somebody started to scratch his head, and he thought it was $56,000,000. Then finally they began to look at each other and everybody wanted to compromise, because the grab-bag was on, the holy alliance was reigning, and they settled for $30,000,000. They do not know where they got that, not one of them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. No; I will not yield, because I asked the gentleman the same question downstairs and he could not answer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is quite unfair.

Mr. RABAUT. I am not going to say anything about it. I have made my statement, and it is a fact.

You cry "vote!" No; we will not vote yet. You do not like your own logic. It does not make sense; that is why you do not like it. It hurts.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. No.

Mr. KEEFE. I will give the gentleman the facts.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not want them from the gentleman, because I think he is misinformed. You have facts that are 3 years old. You have no facts from the hearings on this bill at this time. You have not had any and no one else in your committee has had any. What you want to do is exactly what the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] said you want to do. You want to take it out of the war worker. You want to take it out of the man who went to the machine and worked and say to him, "If you went to the heights during the war when you worked by the sweat of your brow and with your brain at your job, now you must return to the old level." You want to return him now to the wages of the low level you hoped you could keep him on. The exposé of it you do not like. That is what you are hiding behind. You are hiding behind a camouflage. I have here testimony from Governor McNutt's office in which he says this is a problem. This is a national problem, just as national now so far as the workers of this Nation are concerned as it was national when you called for the workers of this Nation and when a great President saw the emergency and said, "For heaven's sake, put them together," and no one said a word—not a word. "Then we decided we will join them now for national unity." Of all the things that surprised me today, one of the most surprising was to see the great chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who had the bill in his own committee, get up and testify that it ought to be done as soon as possible. Walk out on them, boys—walk out on the workers now and they will take their walk in due time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the committee did not reach out in thin air and grab the $30,000,000 figure. As a matter of fact, the basic authorization for this program amounts to $80,000,000. Under the way in which it has been operated as a Federal agency there is some question as to whether even that much would be enough, but under the rescinding portions of the bill $32,000,000 were being rescinded, so consequently the gentleman from Illinois, when he made his amendment and it was discussed in the committee, first suggested $48,000,000. That was the balance that was not being rescinded. He did not reach out and grab it out of thin air. It was a matter of simple subtraction of the authorization that was not being rescinded.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was not any magic or mystery about the $30,000,000 figure because in the committee there was the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] all of whom have served for years on the Labor and Social Security Appropriations Subcommittee, and out of their own background and experience they thought perhaps that amount of money would be enough, at least for the time being, and if further funds were necessary they could come back for a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. This amount received a good deal of deliberation. In fact, I do not remember any amendment which has been considered in the full Committee on Appropriations which received longer or more deliberate consideration than this particular amendment when it was considered. During that deliberation it was brought out that under operation by the States it did not cost as much to operate this system as it does under the Federal Government. In my own State of South Dakota, it cost the Federal Government $334,000 to operate last year while the last year it was operated by the State the cost was only $90,000. As a result of similar experience in other States and exchange of information thereon in the Committee on Appropriations, the figure of $30,000,000 was suggested. That is why it was made $30,000,000. It was not a matter of guesswork. It was not a matter of magic. It was a matter of deliberative consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] practically confessed that he thought the 30 days was too short, did he not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. He suggested that an even-end month might be better.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Kansas also said the same, did he not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] suggested that possibly 30 days might be an awkward date and that the end of the month might be better. We can consider that when we come to the other portion of the Dirksen amendment if the committee should feel that way about it. But as for the question involved here as to whether or not the amount of money was grabbed out of thin air or whether this was not a deliberative proposition, I can give you my word that in the Appropriations Committee it was deliberatively considered. The $30,000,000 was agreed upon as a safe figure at the present time and that is why it is proposed in the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. May I point out that the State authorities in my State

of Ohio say that they can take this thing back in 30 days very easily.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; and the testimony offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] repeated statements made before the Ways and Means Committee to that effect.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Just commenting on the statement of the gentleman from Michigan that the laboring men are being let down, according to that line of reasoning, they are being let down by the governor of every State in the Union as well as by the directors of the unemployment services in practically every State in the Union, and everyone knows that this is not true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, the truth is, the real protection of the laboring man calls for the return of this agency to the States, so that the reserves built up by the experience records of the industries in which they have had employment shall not be destroyed and dissipated.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is not the gentleman of the same opinion that I am—after hearing the distinguished gentleman from New York—that those who follow his argument are in favor of complete federalization of this program?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think so.

Mr. KEEFE. And have no intention of ever returning it to the States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And would accomplish the destruction of the compensation fund that has been built up in the States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, the Employment Service will be returned to the States eventually. Continued Federal support will be given to maintain it. Necessary as a vital arm of defense and necessary as an aid to reconversion and peace, this Congress must assure itself that a strong, well-administered, properly staffed Employment Service continues.

Have we obtained that assurance? Surely the present measure—H. R. 4407—does not offer these guaranties. It contains no provision to maintain standards of operation. It does not even consider the status of thousands of workers who saw through the job of mobilizing American manpower successfully in World War II. It would subordinate the job of placement to that of administering unemployment-compensation funds. By taking this precipitous and ill-thought action, it would place back on the State administration an agency which comes closer to the lives of our citizens than perhaps any other without even setting up standards of performance, despite the continued expenditure of Federal funds.

Although we have won the war on the world battlefields, the problems of dislocation created by our production effort are just now being attacked. Through the employment service millions of returning servicemen will seek to make their job adjustments to civilian life. No one really knows what the magnitude of the problem will be, how persistent the resultant unemployment may be, and the extent to which we can provide full employment for our people. While it is true that an employment service cannot create jobs, it can greatly mitigate unemployment by bringing job seekers and jobs together. It can avoid much useless and ill-directed job seeking, and it can provide to servicemen and former war workers tangible assurance that the Government of this Nation is not indifferent to the problems of millions of job seekers.

This problem can be solved by an intelligent and well-conceived measure which will deal directly with the problems of returning the Employment Service to the States. Responsible Government officials and representatives of labor and management should be called in public hearings. Provision must be made to allocate fairly personnel and property now attached to the existing Employment Service. We must not be stampeded into action in a quest for a return to normalcy and subsequently regret that action. The jobs and lives of too many millions of our people are at stake.

To return the Employment Service to the States immediately would be out of line with much of our other demobilization machinery. The President of the United States has requested us to not return the service to the States for some time yet. It is the desire of the President that the Employment Service be of the greatest possible service to the returning servicemen. We still have thousands of war workers to transport from one State to another, obviously an interstate problem.

The charges are made that under Federal control workers are not required to accept any job except as they choose. That certainly does not apply in my State, because the USES has insisted that each worker accept some job in which he could make a contribution to the war effort.

I am very anxious to see the McCormack amendment adopted.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is some evidence on this question that should be presented before the House votes.

I have a telegram that was received from the Labor-Management Committee for region 12, composed of representatives of labor, industry, and agriculture for the western region. I would like to read it to the House. The telegram reads:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *October 8, 1945.*

At a regularly scheduled meeting of the Regional Management-Labor Committee of the War Manpower Commission for region XII held at San Francisco, Calif., on October 4, 1945, and attended by all of the undersigned, it was unanimously resolved that the committee go on record as urging the retention of the United States Employment Service as a Federal function at least until the national problems of reconversion have been solved. This resolution was prompted by the experience gained by the committee in its dealings with the problems faced by the War Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service during the period of hostilities. The committee respectfully requests that you be guided by this resolution in considering pending legislation designed to effect the immediate return of the United States Employment Service to the several States.

The Labor-Management Committee for Region XII War Manpower Commission:

Philip M. Connelly, President, California State CIO, Los Angeles, Calif.; Daniel F. Del Carlo, Building and Construction Trades Council, San Francisco, Calif.; Alfred E. Hartung, Regional Director, CIO, Portland, Oreg.; O. B. Dailey, General Chairman Brotherhood of Blacksmith Forgers, San Francisco, Calif., representing labor; William Darsie, Walnut Grove, Calif., representing agriculture; Dean Ballard, Distributors' Association of Seattle, Inc., Seattle, Wash.; T. A. Coxon, Moore Drydock Corp., Oakland, Calif.; William K. Hopkins, Columbia Pictures Corp., Hollywood, Calif.; G. C. Paterson, Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif., representing management.

That is the opinion of people who have been in the very middle of this problem all during the period of the war.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hold in my hand a telegram from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, showing his position and that of his association against the Dirksen amendment. The Dirksen amendment is not specifically mentioned, but it is opposed to what the Dirksen amendment would do. In part he says:

Congress surely does not want to interfere with labor mobility and hold down national income, restricting employment opportunities and earning ability for workers.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am very much obliged to the majority leader.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have the same correspondence that the gentleman has just indicated, from experienced people in the State of Arizona.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am obliged to the gentleman from Arizona. Now, it has been contended this afternoon that one of the troubles with the administration of unemployment compensation is because the Employment Service has been federally operated. Personally, I do not believe that is true. Indeed, I believe quite the opposite. I took the trouble while at home to talk to many people in the Employment Service and to go into the figures as to how the unemployment compensation was operating. This was right at the time of VJ-day and when lay-offs were beginning. I found that the people in the Employment Service were trying to do the best job they could, and that what-

ever criticism might be leveled because somebody collected unemployment insurance when perhaps he should have taken a job that was available, was criticism that properly should be directed not against the Federal policy but against administration in the States themselves.

So it is difficult for me to understand the arguments that are advanced against legislation in this field which would help to maintain the basic buying power for consumer goods of the poorer people of this country in this period of dislocation and it is hard for me to understand why this argument should be employed by the very same people who insist upon a return of the Employment Service to the States in precipitous fashion at the present time. For by such action they are rendering it even more impossible for this body to set any standards for the administration of these laws. Unemployment resulting from the dislocations caused by the war and because of the return of servicemen is a national problem. It seems to me the people who sent me this telegram and who have been dealing with this problem all the time are correct, that the McCormack amendment ought to pass and that we ought not to give back this Employment Service to the States at least at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree to close debate now.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have made certain commitments on this side; we cannot close debate now.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STARKEY] is recognized.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out a situation that exists in my State that has not yet been touched on. It is my information that the employees of the USES when they were employees of the State were under civil service. By virtue of the fact that they have been off the State pay roll for more than a year they are no longer entitled to their positions on the State pay roll. Therefore, if you pass this bill returning the service to the States within a 30-day period you may find yourself at least in the State of Minnesota facing the situation where the present employees would have to be replaced by inexperienced employees who might be on the civil-service lists in Minnesota. I do not believe this is the time to gamble with any such conditions. It seems to me this is far too important a question to bring in one day and on the same day ask Congress to vote before they have an opportunity to make a thorough check to see what the outcome would be back home.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conclude without making the observation that the dean of the Minnesota delegation yesterday marveled at and praised the committee for bringing in a gag rule on a question as important as this. He went on further to say—quoting from the records:

> As the law now operates, all one has to do is go to the USES office and declare himself without employment and then he immediately begins drawing what might be called rocking-chair compensation.

Everybody knows that is not a fact; everybody knows that the person must be available for employment and must accept that employment if it is offered, and everyone knows that he is not being paid rocking-chair pay; he is being paid because society does not afford him an opportunity to earn a living.

The gentleman also states in his remarks:

> As now operated, unemployment insurance tends to keep unemployed people from seeking work so long as they will be paid for not working. We must break that up before it gets to be a fixed habit.

If the gentleman is against part of it, is he against all of it? Why do we not take a stand here? We are either for unemployment insurance or we are against it. I have reached a conclusion, and I say that we should take at least these 6 months to study the whole situation. Certainly, the country is not going to the bow-wows in the meantime.

If it was necessary to federalize the service in order to get the job done for the war, it seems reasonable to assume that no great harm will be done if we continue that operation and help find employment for the people who have been displaced and for the servicemen who are returning from overseas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division of the question. The amendment is to strike out and insert and I ask that the question be divided so that the Committee may first vote on the part of the amendment which provides for striking out the language included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair recalls the rule, a motion to strike out is not divisible. Clause 7 of rule XVI reads as follows:

> A motion to strike out and insert is indivisible.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Chair finally clarify to the Committee what the situation is and what we are voting on?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MCCORMACK) there were—ayes 85 and noes 135.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MCCORMACK and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Office of the Administrator: War public works (community facilities), $13,700,000.

Public Buildings Administration:

Emergency safeguarding of public buildings and property, $750,000.

Construction of temporary office buildings, Washington, D. C., unobligated balance.

Public Roads Administration: flight strips (national defense), $318,008.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Office of the Administrator:

War housing, $74,355,000.

War housing in and near the District of Columbia, $3,372,000.

Reserves: From the reserve account established by the National Housing Administrator in the Treasury pursuant to section 303 of Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 14, 1940, as amended, $50,000,000.

Section 303 of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1521), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after the figures "303", and adding the following new subsections:

"(b) Moneys derived by the National Housing Administrator from the disposition of property, or from the removal of temporary housing, acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Nos. 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of disposition and removal, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That moneys derived by said Administrator from the disposition of any such property or the removal of any such temporary housing may be deposited in a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the disposition of any such property or the removal of any such temporary housing shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts.

"(c) Moneys in the reserve account established by the National Housing Administrator pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section 303 shall not exceed $25,000,000 at any time: *Provided*, That all moneys in said account shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts not later than 2 years after the President shall have declared that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist."

In all, independent offices, $666,505,849.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON: On page 9, line 16, after the comma following the word "amended", strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000."

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of recovering $10,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. The Administrator appeared before our committee and admitted that the Budget had recommended that $75,000,000 which they had on hand be returned and that he had suggested to the Committee on Appropriations that a reserve of $25,000,000 be kept. There was no justification whatsoever for that figure of $25,000,000. In my opinion,

fifteen million is too much. If the Public Housing Agency cannot dispose of these war houses by giving them away, but must have some $50,000,000 in addition to raze and dispose of them, then we had better turn the liquidation of the National Housing Agency over to some other agency, perhaps the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and let them handle it. For the life of me, I cannot see why we cannot dispose of these houses at a profit. At least, if we cannot, we can burn them down for much less than $250 per unit, which figure Mr. Blandford, the Director, says it may take.

Let us adopt this amendment and limit them to a $15,000,000 surplus and recover $60,000,000 back into the Federal Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I think I state what will be confirmed by other members of that committee when I say that without reference to party affiliation this amendment represents solely the views of the member of the committee who offered it. As a matter of fact, in the disposition of this temporary housing, it would have cost, but for plans that are being placed in operation, between $50,000,000 and $60,000,000. The salvage would be of no value whatever, inasmuch as it would cost from $250 to $300 per unit to have this property removed.

The act provided for reserves to take care of such disposition, and $75,000,000 had been reserved for this and other purposes. Fifty million of that $75,000,000 of reserves are being turned back. Why? Because a plan has been devised, of which the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds are fully aware, by which we hope, instead of subjecting the Government to a loss of fifty to sixty million dollars, to recoup some money for the Treasury and dispose of this property at a profit rather than at a loss. It is for that reason they are willing to turn back $50,000,000 of the $75,000,000 reserves, and to keep for whatever contingencies may arise merely one-third of that amount, all of which we hope will be returned to the Treasury when this matter is finally disposed of.

I wish to bring it to your attention, and the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will bear me out, that we gave very careful and deliberate attention to this matter and that the views which I am voicing here are the views of that committee, with the exception of the member who has offered this amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to concur in the statement made by our distinguished chairman. This amendment was given consideration, not only as an amendment but the figure of $50,000,000. It was O. K.'d by the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, with the exception of the distinguished gentleman who offered the amendment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. I am sure that both my distinguished chairman and my colleague on the committee the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], do not want to leave that impression with the committee. The entire committee, except myself, was not for the proposition. There were only five members present at the time, and I have talked with two or three members and they are with me on it. So, do not leave the impression that the entire committee was back of your position.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman's memory is at fault when he says there were only five members present. We had quite a good attendance of the committee, and no objection was voiced except by the gentleman from Indiana. Here we are turning back $50,000,000 of reserves where it had been supposed that $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 would have been expended in the disposition of this temporary construction. We are reserving only $25,000,000, all of which, through a plan with which the members of the committee are familiar, we hope will be returned to the Treasury eventually. We will turn this whole proposition into a profit instead of a loss and we will turn back the $25,000,000. But there must be some reserves for contingencies that will arise under this temporary war act in disposing of this property.

I certainly think that the amendment should be overwhelmingly rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILSON) there were—ayes 21, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

[Non-War]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Emergency rubber project, $1,649,790, and the balance remaining shall be used to liquidate such project, including the elimination of the remaining plantations, the rehabilitation and return of leased lands to the owners and the disposal of other property according to law, and for the continuation of the production, breeding, and disease phases of guayule research on indicator plots and experimental areas until June 30, 1946.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of California: Page 11, line 4, after the figures "$1,649,790", strike out the comma, insert a period and strike out the balance of the paragraph.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment so that the House may know exactly what is occurring in the provision that is contained in the bill on page 11. After full consideration by the subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations last year the House indicated that it wished to liquidate the emergency guayule rubber project but to liquidate it in an orderly manner. If this bill passes containing the provision on page 11 as it stands now and without my amendment it means that approximately 30,000 acres of growing guayule shrub with a potential yield of 17,000 tons of rubber will either be plowed under or piled up in windrows and burned. I should like to have you consider this amendment from a common-sense, dollars-and-cents point of view. In order to obtain the most return from the money that has been invested by the Government in this project, my amendment should be adopted and the entire project liquidated in an orderly manner. If that is not done, it is going to cost the Government more to liquidate the project between now and the 30th of June of next year than it will to carry forward the project as originally planned. On page 747 of the hearings the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Deficiency Subcommittee, made this statement, and received this reply:

Sometimes it seems it is more expensive to liquidate these projects than it is to initiate them.

Mr. GRANGER. I believe that is true as to this project.

I want the House to consider this amendment fully and if they desire to liquidate this between now and the 30th of June of the coming year, then vote my amendment down. If, however, they desire to obtain the highest amount of rubber that is available, then support my amendment.

I have read the hearings carefully and I must say that the Forest Service does not make a good case for Government management of a project of this kind. I do feel, however, that there is a future in the production of guayule in this country but I believe it should be carried on under a system of private enterprise and not under Government management.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman realizes that the hearings disclose it would require $688,000 under the gentleman's plan to recover $168,000 worth of rubber.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is only if the project is liquidated between now and the 30th of June. The gentleman's charge will not be substantiated by the hearings, for if he will read them, he will find testimony to the effect that if this project is liquidated in an orderly manner as recommended by the gentleman's subcommittee last year we shall recover in the neighborhood of 17,000 tons of rubber from the presently growing 28,000 acres.

Mr. TARVER. That would depend upon what the gentleman might consider "an orderly manner." If it is liquidated in the manner designated in this bill, the Government will save more money than it will if the Congress adopts the gentleman's plan.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That may be the gentleman's attitude but it is not my attitude. A careful and earnest reading of the hearings will convince

the membership that my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that since the deficiency subcommittee put this particular liquidation provision in this paragraph it takes away from the regular subcommittee on agriculture appropriations the opportunity of fighting against such liquidation?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is true and if the gentleman's subcommittee which is headed by the able gentleman from Georgia had made an adequate study of this subject I believe they would not favor liquidation by June 30.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that if the bill is passed with this paragraph containing provision for liquidation, it simply means we are turning over to the British and the Dutch the right forevermore to set the price for all the rubber consumed in this country?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes. We will be plowing under and burning up any insurance we might now have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, this has turned out to be one of the most ill-considered projects of the entire war. Of the few mistakes the committee made, this was our greatest.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Has not the gentleman always been at variance with the rest of the subcommittee relative to this particular project?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; on the contrary, two subcommittees, the Agricultural Subcommittee and the deficiency subcommittee, have repeatedly indicated their opposition to the public expenditure of money for this purpose.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will recall that our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in connection with the 1945 bill attempted to bring about liquidation of this project, and was reversed by action of the House?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The Agricultural Subcommittee considered the project at length and decided it was a mistake to waste any more money on it. The Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations also decided unanimously, after a separate investigation, that further expenditure for this purpose was a waste of money. The Committee on Appropriations, to which the subcommittee reported, decided it was a waste of money. We brought out the bill, and the House, unfortunately overpersuaded by the rubber advocates for that section, overruled the Appropriations Committee, with the result that the loss is now approaching $40,000,000 and increasing every day the project continues to operate.

It was testified before our committee that in order to secure rubber worth $168,000 they were planning to spend $688,000. Recent reports from the rubber areas in Java and Borneo show that the rubber facilities over there have been little injured, if at all. They have large quantities of raw rubber on hand. Their groves are in good condition.

The small amount of guayule rubber produced has cost something over $1.50 a pound. It was testified that it is deficient in every respect except one to natural rubber which can be bought in normal times for 7 or 8 cents a pound.

This language is incorporated in response to a suggestion from the Department of Agriculture that it required a definite indication of congressional intent. I hope the Members will read the hearings on this item. They will convince anybody that this ought to be stopped at once, and that the sooner we stop it the sooner we will stop wasting money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 76, noes 78.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ANDERSON of California and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 77, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 11, line 10, after "areas", strike out "until June 30, 1946."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are discussing one of the most misunderstood problems that has come before this Congress in a long time. I know statements have recently been made by gentlemen which clearly indicate that those who made them do not understand the purpose of the guayule program. This program was not instituted as a program to make money for the United States Government. No one proposing this program thought the Government should go into the business of producing rubber just to see what profit we could make off it. Rather, we felt that we should invest public funds in this program to provide for the defense of America, just as some 6 years ago there were those of us who voted to fortify the island of Guam when there were others on this floor who said that there would be no monetary return therefrom, and, therefore, they would vote against it. There is no more reason to expect a profit from this project than there was to expect a profit from preparing for national defense, for this was, and is, a part of the national-defense program.

The purpose of providing guayule rubber was to make possible a supply of natural rubber in the United States in time of war. We have done well with our synthetic program. It has rendered a great service at a cost of almost a billion dollars to the United States. But we have not devised a synthetic rubber yet that will make a suitable substitute for natural rubber in the fabrication of the larger tires. It is still necessary that we have some natural rubber with our synthetic if we are to put our military vehicles on wheels and carry on a war. Maybe we will not have another war. I hope not, but we are going to continue to spend billions for an army and navy because we fear that there will be another war. We agree that if needed for defense we must even draft our sons. Yet we hesitate to leave the door open for further consideration of this project. That is all this amendment asks. It simply allows the Appropriations Committee to continue the experimental work.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has said that we can get unlimited supplies of rubber from the Dutch East Indies. That may be true, when and if we get in there. The Dutch East Indies are still in the control of hostile bands, and nobody knows when we are going to get there. I assume sooner or later we will get there, and that we will get some rubber from them. But I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who told us 18 months ago that within 6 months from that date we would not need any natural rubber, can give us any guaranty that in the years to come we will not face the same situation we faced during this last war. All of our military leaders have told us that we should prepare for the same eventuality, and long ago General Eisenhower suggested that we needed a natural rubber program in the United States. Guayule is the only program that so far has offered any hopes of providing natural rubber in the United States.

The amendment I am offering does not do anything except say, "Go ahead and liquidate it, but leave the door open for further consideration of the research program." I think that we made a mistake when we defeated the Anderson amendment, but the House voted otherwise. My amendment says, "Go ahead and liquidate the program, but keep the experimental work so that the Committee on Appropriations can, if it sees fit, next year continue the experimental work." That is all we are asking, simply that you let Judge TARVER's committee—and I do not think anybody here would say that that would mean wild extravagance of money for experimental work—have the opportunity to continue experimental work. If you do not adopt this amendment, then we will have written into law a prohibition against the continuation of any experimental work on this crop after the last of next June. Does anyone believe that we can learn all there is to be learned in that time? This very bill carries vast sums for further experiments on atomic bombs. Are we to develop a bomb and then find we have no tires for our planes to carry the bombs?

Yet, you can't make large airplane tires out of synthetic rubber, and guayule

rubber is the only natural rubber you can grow in the United States.

You say you want this industry in private hands. So do I, but how can you expect to get it into private hands if you simply plow it up and stop all research? The Poage bill was intended to put it in private hands. I would not contend for one minute that the Department of Agriculture is running this thing efficiently. Unfortunately the Government generally does things the expensive way and apparently the Forestry Service has presented an even worse case than actually confronts us. I know that those costs which they presented were discouraging to the Committee on Appropriations. Their costs were too high. Their costs were many times the cost of private industry. But are we going to let the extravagance of a Government department prevent us from carrying on a program of research on which our very national security may depend? Let us make it possible for our people to show what we can do. We are growing the one crop that we have found it possible to grow in the United States to provide natural rubber. Let us not close the door on all further knowledge about this crop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will bear with me just one moment. I am sure you will recall in connection with the 1945 agricultural appropriation bill our subcommittee brought before you a proposal to abandon the guayule rubber project, which proposal you rejected, deciding that it should be continued under the then existing conditions. Thereafter, the Bureau of the Budget proposed in connection with the 1946 bill to begin the liquidation of the project. Our subcommittee decided against it, feeling it was bound by the action which had been taken by the Congress on the 1945 bill and that until Congress decided it should be liquidated it was our duty to provide for it, so we did provide for it in connection with the 1946 bill.

If you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], I think it will be the viewpoint of our subcommittee that it should make provision in future agricultural appropriation bills for the continuation of the project. The question is, of course, one for you to determine. I think you ought to examine the facts as to the history of this unfortunate project before you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. Look at the hearings on pages 752 and 753 and subsequent pages. There you will find you have already spent approximately $40,000,000—$40,000,000, gentlemen, on this guayule project in California. How much rubber have you recovered? Eleven hundred tons. What is the value of the rubber you have recovered? $650,000 or $700,000. That is the return in rubber from the expenditure of $40,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. It is a question for you to determine. If you want continuation of the expenditure of the people's money in a project of this sort, when there is no necessity for it and no possible chance of your building up a guayule rubber industry in this country, then adopt the Poage amendment and our subcommittee, of course, will consider that as instruction from you and we shall continue to make appropriations for this project in connection with future bills. But in my judgment you will not be doing a wise thing in doing so. I certainly feel that the decision should be to immediately liquidate the project instead of to continue it for a while in order to produce a little bit of rubber at very exorbitant cost. And I hope that you will not decide to continue it. I trust that the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly think that certain corrections should be made in some of the things which have been said. I have no means of saying what the Committee on Appropriations would do or what instructions they would take from a vote on this amendment. But this House should vote on whether or not they wish to continue a program to the point intended when it started. It was well known to all Members of this House that it was impossible to get rubber out of this program until the guayule shrubs had grown to the point where they produced rubber. They are just beginning to come to that point now.

We have 43,000 acres of guayule planted in the United States. It would be a matter of absurdity to say today that we should scrap that entire amount. The United States entered the war without an adequate supply of live rubber. We are talking about live rubber—not synthetic rubber. I think the records in the postwar period will show that we were so near the vanishing point on live rubber that it was a very serious matter. General Eisenhower, when he was Major Eisenhower, long before the war, recommended a project of this kind. All that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] asks, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, given the job of finding out about this program, is that you should not say that this program shall be liquidated by June 30, which would immediately say to the Forestry Service that they have to tear up these fields and burn the shrubs. All the gentleman asks is that you shall not say it be liquidated by June 30, but be permitted to be liquidated in an orderly, economical fashion.

I ask for a favorable vote on the amendment.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, a number of years ago the guayule rubber project came before the Committee on Agriculture when I was a member of that committee. This guayule project dates back to the last World War. It was a failure then. While we were studying this program there was a committee sent down to Mexico to study the guayule program. It came back with an adverse report. Guayule rubber plants grow wild in Mexico.

Then this program came up. At the time the guayule program was being considered while I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I voted against it. I could not see it. But I had no idea we were going to spend $40,000,000 and only get back $650,000 worth of rubber. I knew it was bad but I did not think it was quite that bad.

So, if it is a matter of economy that we want, here is one place where we can certainly economize. I understand that after 2 years they can get some rubber out of a guayule plant but not very much. It takes about 6 years to get rubber at all out of it. Now this program has been going on for some time and they have received but very little rubber so far. I think it is about time we liquidated this thing and got it off the books.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was said by one of the previous speakers that there has been much misinformation given on the floor on this rubber subject. I second that statement. Much misinformation has been given.

I have followed this very carefully for the past 5 years. I have made trips. The only committees I ever heard of that ever made any report on this matter to the Congress was when General Eisenhower, then Major Eisenhower, recommended, 14 years ago, that we plant and keep as insurance at least 400,000 acres of guayule rubber plants against the day when the Far East might take away our supply. We did not follow the advice of Major Eisenhower at that time.

The only other committee I ever knew of going to Mexico was a committee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], including the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] and myself. We went to Mexico less than a year ago, and there we viewed not only the wild shrub but shrubs grown with American capital by men who had followed this in California. We saw a plantation of 20,000 acres domesticated in Mexico, and cultivated for the first time, out on a desert where there is less than 1 inch of rainfall. We have a great deal of country in the South that is comparable to that land. I have no interest in rubber up in my district, because we cannot raise it. But there are great sections in this country that can raise it very profitably. We have the information that they expect to produce guayule rubber down there through the use of private capital and that they can produce it at a price of 10 cents a pound. Natural rubber was processed from the wild shrub at Salinas, Calif. I have heard a lot about the cost of this rubber being a dollar and a half a pound. When this experiment was set up we were in dire need of rubber and the supply situation looked terribly black. We did not know whether we were going to get synthetic rubber or not. So the Department of Agriculture, through the Forestry Division, was instructed to plant 200,000 acres of this guayule shrub. Then they were cut down to less than 40,000. They had already built housing because they had to have a lot of hand labor and they had to have houses to take care of the Mexican nationals who were brought in. Then they were cut back to 32,000 acres, but all the cost was charged to the guayule experiment car-

ried out as a national defense measure.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Would it not be possible for private enterprise to take over the existing plantations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Yes; and we have a bill pending now looking to that very end.

Mr. BREHM. Would it not be possible to have this turned over to private enterprise rather than to be liquidated as provided in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Absolutely.

Mr. BREHM. What does the gentleman mean, then, by saying that this would all have to be destroyed or plowed under?

Mr. POAGE. It would have to be destroyed if they carried out the requirement to finish the liquidation in this fiscal year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman's statements impress me very much that we have had a great deal of misinformation. What is the source of the misinformation? Whence does it come?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I have my own ideas about that but I had better not state them here.

We have been told that we are getting rubber from the East Indies, but I read in the paper the other day where they found they had destroyed 25,000 hevea rubber trees because they needed the ground to grow food for the people.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And it was furthermore testified before our subcommittee that it would be approximately 18 months before any appreciable amount of rubber could be obtained from the former sources.

Mr. JOHNSON. Absolutely.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. For a brief question, but my time is nearly up.

Mr. HOOK. Does the gentleman know who owns the process for making this rubber?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Yes; the United States.

Mr. HOOK. When did they take it over?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. A little over 3 years ago, when we bought out the Inter-Continental Rubber Co.; and that is the same American capital that went into Mexico and are successfully growing the shrub down there and selling the rubber to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it is certainly time that Congress and the American people should begin to face facts, and to decide what they are going to spend or how they are going to spend it.

I congratulate the gentlemen who have promoted the guayule program from the beginning. They are men who stand so high in the estimation of this Congress, such as the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] that it is very difficult for Congress to say "No" to those gentlemen and I regret very much that I must stand here opposing them; but there is less sound business and less logic for doing what is requested by the amendment than probably there is in anything else that has been suggested today. I do remember that the guayule project was started with much skepticism on the part of everybody but we thought we should try to do something in the war emergency in order to provide a natural supply of rubber.

Mr. Chairman, since that time we have poured out millions and millions of dollars for synthetic rubber. Also we have synthetic-rubber production today running into such large quantities that we cannot utilize what we make. It is of very good quality, too.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read a letter dated September 5, 1945, addressed to the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, and signed by Mr. R. S. Wilson, Director, Rubber Programs. This letter reads as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., September 5, 1945.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will acknowledge receipt of Mr. Brannon's letter dated August 29, in which a request is made for an expression of opinion by the War Production Board concerning the emergency rubber project in its relation to the over-all rubber situation.

It is understood that the emergency rubber project was authorized by the Congress in order to make available to the Nation natural rubber from within our continental limits or from within the Western Hemisphere during the period of national emergency which appears to be approaching an end due to our victories in Europe and the unconditional surrender of Japan. All recent Government actions are based on the premise that the fighting is over. Therefore, natural rubber from the Far East will be available as rapidly as shipping space is provided for any accumulations that may be found or from tapping operations for which plans have been made to provide natural rubber as quickly as possible.

I consider that the emergency rubber project was valuable insurance, but that, fortunately, through the earlier termination of the war, we did not have to avail ourselves of the insurance. Therefore, insofar as the project is concerned at this time, it is my opinion that the insurance is no longer needed and that the taxpayer should be relieved of paying any further premiums. In other words, I recommend that the project be liquidated as rapidly as possible and with the least expenditure of additional funds.

However, the future national defense of this Nation should not be overlooked. Therefore, until the day arrives when no natural rubber is required for the manufacture of any rubber product of adequate quality, I recommend that there be continued research and development on a moderate scale of plants, vines, shrubs, and trees possessing natural rubber and capable of being grown within the continental limits of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

R. S. WILSON,
Director, Rubber Programs.

We have left here $4,429,000 and if you will turn to page 11 of the bill, you will find the following language:

And for the continuation of the production, breeding, and disease phases of guayule research on indicator plots and experimental areas until June 30, 1946.

The amount of $4,429,000 is left to continue experimentation. With Congress in session to consider from a legislative standpoint what it wants to do in the future certainly it is proper at this time to continue appropriation which was made as an insurance proposition with reference to the subject of rubber and stop the expenditure of part of it; then if some legislative committee wants to go into the question of future experimentation for future necessities, we can do that. There is no logic in continuing this appropriation, especially when the Director of the whole rubber program recommends that it be discontinued at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'NEAL) there were—ayes 60 and noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 46, noes 156.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

War Food Administration: Salaries and expenses, $3,116,894.

Emergency supplies for Territories and possessions, $25,000,000.

The following appropriations shall be so administered as to avoid the incurrence of deficiencies therein except for such added expense occasioned by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 as it may not be practicable to absorb, namely:

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, salaries and expenses (crop and livestock estimates).

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, salaries and expenses.

Agricultural Research Administration:

Bureau of Animal Industry, salaries and expenses (meat inspection);

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, salaries and expenses (fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops);

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, salaries and expenses (foreign plant quarantine).

Forest Service:

Salaries and expenses (national forest protection and management);

Forest-fire cooperation.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, National Inventors Council Service Staff, $11,000.

Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics: Development of landing areas, $5,000,000.

The following appropriations shall be so administered as to avoid the incurrence of deficiencies therein except for such added expense occasioned by the Federal Employees'

Pay Act of 1945 as it may not be practicable to absorb, namely:

Coast and Geodetic Survey, salaries and expenses, departmental;

Patent Office, salaries;

Weather Bureau, salaries and expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, Division of Geography, $20,000.

War Relocation Authority: Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority, Department of the Interior, $5,000,000.

Office of Fishery Coordination: Salaries and expenses, $57,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 13, line 8, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I can explain this amendment very briefly. The committee has recommended a reduction in the appropriation for the War Relocation Authority of $5,000,000. My amendment would bring about a reduction of $2,000,000 instead of $5,000 000. The $2,000,000 is the amount of saving which at the very outside the Administrator of the War Relocation Authority estimated could be made if all the Japanese now held at Tule Lake who are subject to deportation to Japan because they did not profess loyalty to the United States could be promptly sent out of the country and back to Japan, as they will be sent.

The purpose of my amendment is briefly this: The job of this agency at the present time is the job of closing out the relocation centers by the process of moving the Japanese-Americans who have been held there out of the relocation centers and into some place where they are going to go to live. I have heard from some of the people in various parts of the country, notably in my own State, who have been trying to do a job of helping meet the problem that is created when a number of the Japanese-Americans come back into a community, to the effect that they are doing everything they can to meet that problem, but if the flow of these people back to those communities is increased over what it is at present serious conditions might result. They just don't know how they can possibly handle more than they are now doing.

We must remember that we have a whole lot of returning veterans coming into those communities who must have first call on everything, and we must remember that there are difficult social and economic problems created when these people who have been held in these centers all during the period of the war are released to go back into communities where they were before or into some other community.

All my amendment does is enable the War Relocation Authority to carry out this process of getting the people out of the relocation centers and back to some other normal place where they may live, at the rate of speed which was originally planned.

In the hearings I have noticed that in answer to a question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] Mr. Myer, the Administrator of this agency, said that if he moved everybody out of these centers by December 15 the amount of money that would be spent before that time would be some $5,000,000 less than the amount originally appropriated. But this could only be done at the cost of severe social consequences, and the question is whether it is wise policy to force the War Relocation Authority to do this job too fast, creating the problems that will result, or whether it would not be wiser to do it in the manner originally planned so that centers will all be closed out by next March. I believe most earnnestly that the latter is the wiser policy, and that the amendment I have offered will afford all the savings that can safely be made under the circumstances. I appeal to the House for its adoption.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the handling of these interned Japanese has been a difficult problem from the beginning. There were many complications, some of which have been dissipated and some of which have been aggravated. We have been liquidating the agency as rapidly as possible, and we have returned home or located in other parts of the country most of the Japanese of American citizenship who are to remain in the United States. The recalcitrant and the irreconcilables are to be returned to Japan.

This part of the appropriation to which the gentleman's amendment has no relation to the care of those Japanese who remain in the United States, is being used exclusively for the maintenance and repatriation of the Japanese we are sending back to Japan. The purpose in making this cut is to expedite their return.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think my amendment is the one that will do that, may I say to the gentleman with all due respect, because I understood the testimony in the hearings, which I have read by the way, was to the effect that if those people who are being sent back to Japan were sent there immediately or in the very immediate future, $2,000,000 savings could be made, but the committee has cut $5,000,000. That is why I asked that it be $3,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the report indicates this cut was made solely in the funds to send Japanese back to Asia. We are following here the same plan we are using to expedite demobilization. We are speeding up demobilization by reducing the amount of money available for maintenance and pay of the armed forces and speeding up the return of the incorrigible Japanese to their own country in the same way. We are already getting results. The representatives of the project when they returned to their departments telephoned to us that they were arranging for an earlier return of these Japanese to Japan. The bill as here written is already getting results. I trust that the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to several speeches advocating economy made this week by the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. I am particularly gratified to observe his support of this provision to recapture $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the use of the War Relocation Authority. On June 8, 1945, when the national war agencies bill was under consideration, I offered an amendment to reduce the appropriation of WRA by $5,000,000. However, at that time the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] opposed my amendment, and declared:

> The committee, after careful consideration, is convinced that the amount proposed is the irreducible minimum with which it [relocation] can be done. Liquidation is proceeding with efficiency and dispatch. The program should not be interrupted or disorganized. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

It was defeated by a vote of 113 to 95.

Mr. Chairman, it is timely to note, in the report of the Deficiency Subcommittee on this bill this comment on the War Relocation Authority:

> The committee feels that liquidation should proceed more rapidly and that those responsible therefor are not proceeding to liquidate as speedily as they should; that there is too much of a disposition to confer and dilly-dally. Thus convinced, the committee is recommending a rescission of $5,000,000 of the funds available to the War Relocation Authority.

The ending of hostilities caused no particular change in the WRA program, because Major General Pratt, on December 17, 1944, revoked the exclusion order involving Japanese on the west coast. It is obvious that my former amendment is now approved by the chairman and his Deficiency Subcommittee, and I commend him for his belated conversion to the cause of economy in this particular instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Solid Fuels Administration for War:

Salaries and expenses, $275,000, and on April 1, 1946, the sum of $150,000 of said appropriation shall be transferred to the appropriation "Economics of mineral industries," Bureau of Mines, and the limitation in said latter appropriation for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased from "$397,500" to "$529,000."

BUREAU OF MINES

Enforcement of Federal Explosives Act, $27,900.

Investigation of raw-material resources for steel production (national defense), $180,000.

Construction and equipment of helium plants, $260,000.

Manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research (national defense), $50,000.

Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays and alunite (national defense), $200,000.

Investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits (national defense), $350,000.

Magnesium pilot plants and research (national defense), $150,000.

Investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals in the United States and its possessions (national defense), $420,000.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing here with one of the important policies of our Government, a program that affects industry, reconversion, and the tax income of the Treasury.

When the public lands, comprising the national forest and grazing districts, were withdrawn from settlement many of the mineralized areas in the Rocky Mountain States were left inaccessible and undeveloped.

For years the Members of Congress representing the Western States have been trying to get the departments of the Federal Government to assist in opening our undeveloped mining resources by the construction of the necessary mining roads. Little attention has been paid to the efforts of the western Congressmen and many of the undeveloped mineral deposits have been left neglected and unutilized with the result that the war found this country short of the strategic minerals—copper, zinc, lead, and tungsten. The Government has, through the Metal Reserves Corporation, gone into foreign countries and purchased over a billion dollars in strategic metals, money spent in foreign countries to purchase ore and metals with taxable income flowing into the treasuries of foreign governments.

We are informed that the foreign purchase of zinc totaled $221,000,000, copper totaled $663,410,000, lead totaled $145,000,000, while the departments were making a belated attempt to uncover and utilize isolated deposits of the metals in the Western States.

These belated efforts of the Federal Government departments opened up and brought into production large amounts of vitally needed strategic metals. Precious tungsten, which previous to the war had come largely from China at around $2 per pound, was found by the diamond drill exploration of the Bureau of Mines in the famous Yellow Pine district in Idaho. Important lead and zinc deposits were also discovered.

If there is any program of the Government that should be continued as a means of building up new industries, providing work for returning veterans and opening up new sources of tax revenue, it is the program of uncovering our western mineral resources and making them accessible for development by the construction of the necessary mine access roads in mountainous sections of the Government lands of our Western States.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 14, after line 9, insert the following:

"Government in the Territories:

"Emergency funds, Territories and island possessions (national defense), $332,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this item is in process of liquidation. We have had the matter up with the Bureau of the Budget and they agreed on a rescission of $322,000. This cut will not interfere with the program. No question is involved here except the question of returning additional money to the Treasury beyond that originally estimated, and I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. May we have the amendment again read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I may say that we expect eventually to have an additional rescission from this source of $490,363, but at this time we feel justified in confining the rescission to $332,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration: Salaries and expenses, War Division, $100,000.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses, detection and prosecution of crimes (emergency), $2,480,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary:

Salaries and expenses (national defense), $1,388.

Salaries and expenses, safety and health program (national defense), $60,000.

Children's Bureau:

Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care (national defense), $8,113,600: *Provided*, That such reduced amount shall not affect the amount to be allotted to the States for administrative expenses as authorized in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1946.

United States Employment Service:

Employment office facilities and services: The unexpended and unobligated balances, on the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this act, of appropriations made in the first paragraph under the heading "Employment Office Facilities and Services" in title VII of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1946, shall, on such thirtieth day, be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 15, in line 7, after the word "appropriations", insert the following language: "excluding the appropriation of $7,791,134 to carry into effect the provisions of section 602 of title 4 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public Law 346, Seventy-Eighth Congress."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is quite agreeable. It was omitted by inadvertence.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to submit the amendment without argument, but I would offer the following explanations of the amendment:

No. 1: The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 which established a system of employment offices also provided for the creation of a veterans' service. The language is found in section 3 (a) of that bill which provides for maintaining "a veterans' service to be devoted to securing employment for veterans."

No. 2: The GI bill of rights—section 6 (a)—also creates a Veterans' Placement Service Board with the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration as the chairman.

No. 3: The GI bill of rights contemplates coordination between the Veterans' Placement Service Board and State operation of United States employment offices as indicated by the language in section 601 which provides that—

The United States Employment Service shall assign to each of the States a veterans' employment representative * * * each such veterans' employment representative shall be attached to the staff of the public employment service in the State to which he is assigned.

It is abundantly clear that the Veterans' Placement Service Board and its operations were geared to State operation of USES.

No. 4: The Veterans' Placement Service Board was given an independent status as evidenced by section 600 (a) of the GI bill which provides that the Board was created to cooperate with and assist the United States Employment Service as established by the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933. This, the Wagner-Peyser Act, which created employment offices to be administered by the States.

No. 5: Further evidence of the independent character of the Veterans' Placement Service Board is found in the fact that in section 605–A of the GI bill it is provided that—

The Board through its executive secretary shall estimate the funds necessary for the proper and efficient administration of this title * * * sums thus estimated shall be included as a special item in the annual budget of the United States Employment Service * * * the War Manpower Commission shall from its current appropriation allocate and make available such funds to carry out the provisions of this title during the current fiscal year.

No. 6: The Labor Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1946 approved July 3, 1945, Public Law 124, Seventy-ninth Congress, page 23 carried language which provided that out of the funds made available for employment office facilities and services "$7,791,134 shall be for use in carrying into effect the provisions of title IV, section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

No. 7: The language which I am offering merely restores to the present bill the same language carried in the 1946 regular appropriation act for this purpose and therefore safeguards placement of veterans in the same manner and to the same degree that Congress provided in the regular appropriation act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wonder if we cannot expedite action on this bill. I am wondering if a unanimous-consent request to dispense with further reading of the bill might be agreeable.

Mr. TABER. And that amendments may be in order to any part from this point on?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I would agree to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, after conferring with the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be in order for amendments to be offered to any part of the bill from this point on.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT

The Panama Canal: Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, $5,000,000.

In all, executive departments, $49,408,972.

In all, title I, $2,956,629,045.

Miscellaneous provisions, title I

REDUCTIONS IN CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Contract authorizations of the departments and agencies available in the fiscal year 1946 are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Emergency funds appropriated to the President: Defense aid—lend-lease, $600,000,000.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

United States Maritime Commission: Construction fund, act June 29, 1936, revolving fund, $325,900,000.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Public Roads Administration:

Strategic highway network, $1,484,363.

Access roads, $3,076,845.

REDUCTIONS IN LIMITATIONS ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitations on amounts from funds of corporations and other agencies for administrative expenses are hereby reduced in the following sums:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office for Emergency Management: Foreign Economic Administration, Rubber Development Corporation, $249,500.

Alien Property Custodian, $500,000.

War Shipping Administration:

Revolving fund, $4,312,000.

Maritime training fund, $519,357.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Smaller War Plants Corporation:

Administrative expenses, $1,550,000, and the limitation under this head on the amount for penalty-mail costs is hereby decreased from "$50,000" to "$40,000."

United States Maritime Commission:

Construction fund, act June 29, 1936, revolving fund, $2,687,450.

EXTENDING AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

The following appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 are hereby continued available until June 30, 1946, except as modified in this title:

Executive Office of the President:

Bureau of the Budget, national defense activities, independent offices:

Civil Service Commission, salaries and expenses (national defense).

Federal Communications Commission, salaries and expenses (national defense).

Federal Power Commission: National defense activities.

Federal Security Agency:

Office of the Administrator:

Salaries and expenses, Office of Community War Services.

Expenses, temporary aid to enemy aliens and other restricted persons.

Department of the Interior:

Office of the Secretary:

Salaries and expenses, Division of Geography, Department of the Interior.

CORPORATE FUNDS TO BE TRANSFERRED TO THE TREASURY

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office for Emergency Management:

Office of Inter-American Affairs: The Director of the Office of Inter-American Affairs is hereby directed to deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts the following sums representing excess funds of corporations created by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs under authority of law:

Institute of Inter-American Transportation, $315,500.

Prencinradio, Incorporated, $875,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

In order to accomplish the liquidation of any temporary agency of the Government created to perform functions in connection with the national security and defense, there may be transferred to such liquidating agency as the President may designate, such amount from the funds of the agency to be liquidated as the Bureau of the Budget shall determine is necessary therefor.

TITLE II—MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Office of Secretary of War:

Contingencies of the Army, 1942–46, $12,829,151.

Expediting production and equipment and supplies for national defense, 1940–46, $282,892,000

General Staff Corps:

Contingent fund, Chief of Staff, 1942–46, $124,335,489.

Special field exercises, Army, 1942–46, $51,246,874.

Finance Department:

Finance Service, Army, 1942–46, $207,000, and subappropriations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Expenses of courts martial, $36,000; and (2) Apprehension of deserters, $171,000.

Quartermaster Corps:

Quartermaster Service, Army, 1942–46, $3,944,994,479, and subappropriations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Welfare of enlisted men, $10,000,000; (2) subsistence of the Army, $1,762,081,479; (3) regular supplies of the Army, $561,018,000; (4) clothing and equipage, $1,563,225,000; (5) horses, draft and pack animals, $1,670,000; and (6) Army transportation, $47,000,000.

Transportation Corps:

Transportation Service, Army, 1945–46, $704,263,000.

Signal Corps:

Signal Service of the Army, 1942–46, $1,679,434,000.

Air Corps:

Air Corps, Army, 1942–46, $12,166,313,000.

Medical Department:

Medical and Hospital Department, Army, 1942–46, $268,039,000.

Corps of Engineers:

Engineer Service, Army, 1942–46, $2,349,523,571, and subappropriations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Engineer Service, $2,054,408,571; (2) military posts, $148,255,000; and (3) barracks and quarters, Army, $146,860,000.

Ordnance Department:

Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army, 1942–46, $8,300,000,000.

Chemical Warfare Service:

Chemical Warfare Service, Army, 1942–46, $997,870,000.

Special service schools:

Special service schols, Army, 1942–46, $178,000, and subappropriations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Infantry school, $81,000; (2) Cavalry activities, $22,700; and (3) Field Artillery activities, $74,300.

Seacoast defenses:

Seacoast defenses, general, 1942–46, $1,664,000.

United States Military Academy: Pay of Military Academy, 1942–46, $21,000.

Inter-American Relations, War Department: Inter-American Relations, War Department, 1943–46, $75,000.

Office of the Secretary:

Contingent expenses, War Department, 1942–46, $1,200,000.

Printing and binding, War Department, 1942–46, $18,000,000.

TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS

In addition to the transfers authorized by section 3 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1946, transfers of not to exceed the amounts hereinafter set forth may be made, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, from the appropriation "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army," to the following appropriations:

Army War College, $23,819;

Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., $30,189;

Quartermaster Service, Army, $7,881,967;

Rock Island Bridge, Rock Island, Ill., $5,719;

Instruction in armored force activities, $339,756; and

Maintenance and Operation, United States Military Academy, $1,323,884

GENERAL PROVISION

Appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1946 available for expenses of travel may be used under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, for the payment, in lieu of transportation in kind or movement at Government expense authorized by law for dependents, of 4 cents per mile for dependents 12 years of age or over and of 2 cents per mile for dependents between 5 and 12 years of age, in advance or otherwise, in accordance with distances established for payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 12, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 246; 10 U. S. C. 870).

In all, title II, $30,903,090,564.

TITLE III—NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT

Office of the Secretary:

Miscellaneous expenses, Navy:

Fiscal year 1944, $2,323,605.

Fiscal year 1945, $671,805.

Fiscal year 1946, $13,000,000.

Contingent, Navy:

Fiscal year 1944, $74,000.

Fiscal year 1945, $49,000.

Fiscal year 1946, $20,000.

Naval emergency fund:

Fiscal year 1945, $25,477.

Fiscal year 1946, $3,000,000.

Naval Research Laboratory:

Fiscal year 1944, $5,185.

Fiscal year 1945, $3,002.

Fiscal year 1946, $90,000.

Operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserves:

Fiscal year 1944, $6,926.

Fiscal year 1945, $6,353.

Fiscal year 1946, $18,000.

Ocean and lake surveys, Navy:

Fiscal year 1944, $6,677.

Fiscal year 1945, $21,298.

Bureau of Naval Personnel:

Naval War College:

Fiscal year 1944, $4,521.

Fiscal year 1945, $2,886.

Naval Training Station, San Diego, Calif.:

Fiscal year 1944, $232,338.

Fiscal year 1945, $327,515.

Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I.:

Fiscal year 1944, $823.

Fiscal year 1945, $256.

Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.:

Fiscal year 1944, $459,244.

Fiscal year 1945, $29,510.

Fiscal year 1946, $700,000.

Naval Training Station, Norfolk, Va.:
Fiscal year 1944, $4,488.
Fiscal year 1945, $14,879.
Naval Training Station, Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho:
Fiscal year 1944, $54,790.
Fiscal year 1945, $604,708.
Naval Training Station, Lake Seneca, N. Y.:
Fiscal year 1944, $38,894.
Fiscal year 1945, $3,209.
Naval training station, Port Deposit, Md.:
Fiscal year 1945, $2,794.
Fiscal year 1946, $500,000.
Fleet training, Navy:
Fiscal year 1944, $11,108.
Fiscal year 1945, $164,695.
Fiscal year 1946, $78,000.
Instruction, Navy:
Fiscal year 1944, $2,151,364.
Fiscal year 1945, $120,000.
Fiscal year 1946, $9,000,000.
Libraries, Navy:
Fiscal year 1944, $145,920.
Fiscal year 1945, $1,693.
Fiscal year 1946, $1,252,935.
Welfare and recreation, Navy:
Fiscal year 1944, $903,681.
Fiscal year 1946, $4,124,000.
Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps:
Fiscal year 1944, $237,300.
Fiscal year 1945, $88,337.
Miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Naval Personnel:
Fiscal year 1944, $3,009.
Fiscal year 1945, $124.
Fiscal year 1946, $20,000.
Naval Reserve:
Fiscal year 1944, $54,961,800.
Fiscal year 1945, $24,511,154.
Fiscal year 1946, $50,000,000.
Pay, Naval Academy:
Fiscal year 1944, $88,394.
Fiscal year 1945, $93,796.
Maintenance, Naval Academy:
Fiscal year 1944, $6,877.
Fiscal year 1945, $2,529.
Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa.:
Fiscal year 1944, $610.
Fiscal year 1945, $1,250.
Naval prison farms and prison personnel:
Fiscal year 1944, $10.
Fiscal year 1945, $5,100.
Bureau of Ships:
Maintenance, Bureau of Ships:
Fiscal year 1942, $43,907,135.
Fiscal year 1942–43, $51,956,375.
Fiscal year 1943, $64,050,351.
Fiscal year 1944, $52,247,000.
Fiscal year 1945, $118,474,000.
Fiscal year 1946, $1,468,000,000.
Defense installations on merchant vessels, Navy, $13,658,123.
Bureau of Ordnance:
Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy:
Fiscal year 1944, $551,226,542.
Fiscal year 1945, $1,208,752,767.
Fiscal year 1946, $2,600,000,000.
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:
Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, 1944, $128,214,285.
Pay and subsistence of naval personnel, 1946, $1,117,369,200.
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1946, $81,314,000.
Transportation of things, Navy, 1946, $140,036,282.
Fuel, Navy, 1946, $100,000,000.
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery:
Medical Department, Navy:
Fiscal year 1944, $14,017,195.
Fiscal year 1945, $12,238,592.
Fiscal year 1946, $30,000,000.
Bureau of Yards and Docks:
Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks:
Fiscal year 1944, $2,431,496.
Fiscal year 1945, $2,139,211.
Fiscal year 1946, $15,000,000.
Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, $400,000,000, and the contract authorization for "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," available in the fiscal year 1946 is hereby reduced in the sum of $1,229,880,000: *Provided*, That of this amount $946,000,000 shall apply against advance base construction, material, and equipment.
Bureau of Aeronautics:
Aviation, Navy:
Fiscal year 1943, $256,482,489.
Fiscal year 1943–44, $193,929,557.
Fiscal year 1944, $811,987,405.
Fiscal year 1945, $1,468,753,102.
Fiscal year 1946, $1,481,300,000, and subappropriations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) New construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts, etc., from "$799,128,500" to "$135,765,200"; (2) replacement of navigational and radio equipment for aircraft in service, etc., from "$168,808,200" to "$44,934,000"; (3) maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, air stations, etc., from "$1,431,840,800" to "$758,050,800"; and (4) continuing experiments and developmental work, etc., from "$81,272,500" to "$61,000,000"; and the unobligated portion of the contract authorization provided under this head is hereby repealed.
Marine Corps:
Pay, Marine Corps:
Fiscal year 1944, $41,321,480.
Fiscal year 1945, $10,000,000.
Fiscal year 1946, $69,913,260.
Pay of civil force, offices of Commandant of Marine Corps and director of personnel:
Fiscal year 1944, $358.
Fiscal year 1945, $174.
Pay of civil force, office of paymaster general, Marine Corps:
Fiscal year 1944, $330.
Fiscal year 1945, $118.
Pay of civil force, office of quartermaster general, Marine Corps:
Fiscal year 1944, $844.
Fiscal year 1945, $1,059.
General expenses, Marine Corps:
Fiscal year 1944, $79,787,482.
Fiscal year 1945, $56,737,554.
Fiscal year 1946, $310,000,000.
Increase and replacement of naval vessels:
Increase and replacement of naval vessels, construction and machinery, $732,104,151.
Increase and replacement of naval vessels, armor, armament, and ammunition, $276,876,967.
Increase and replacement of naval vessels, emergency construction, $38,385,489: *Provided*, That the balances remaining of appropriations under "Increase and replacement of naval vessels" shall not be available for the period of the fiscal year 1946 subsequent to October 16, 1945, for beginning the construction of any new vessels.
Repair facilities, Navy:
Repair facilities, Navy, $38,266,050, and the contract authorization for "Repair facilities, Navy," available in the fiscal year 1946 is hereby reduced in the sum of $27,562,131.
Coast Guard:
Salaries, office of Commandant, United States Coast Guard:
Fiscal year 1944, $219.
Fiscal year 1945, $133,293.
Pay and allowances, Coast Guard:
Fiscal year 1944, $35,006,326.
Fiscal year 1945, $8,658,922.
Fiscal year 1946, $80,000,000.
General expenses, Coast Guard:
Fiscal year 1944, $631,865.
Fiscal year 1945, $1,289,896.
Fiscal year 1946, $20,000,000.
Civilian employees, Coast Guard:
Fiscal year 1944, $109,654.
Fiscal year 1945, $200,633.
Establishing and improving aids to navigation, Coast Guard, $346,000.
Acquisition of vessels and shore facilities, Coast Guard, $2,741,000.
Retired pay, former Lighthouse Service, Coast Guard:
Fiscal year 1944, $73,320.
Fiscal year 1945, $48,109.
Salaries, Merchant Marine Inspection, Coast Guard, 1945, $25,536.
Salaries and expenses, Merchant Marine Inspection, Coast Guard:
Fiscal year 1944, $899,401.
Fiscal year 1945, $373,270.
Emergency construction, vessels and shore facilities, Coast Guard (Navy), $231,000.
Special projects, vessels, Coast Guard (Navy), $127,000.
Special projects, aids to navigation, Lighthouse Service, Coast Guard (Navy), $28,699.
Special projects, aids to navigation, Coast Guard (Navy), $556,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Salaries, Office of Secretary of the Navy:
Fiscal year 1944, $78.
Fiscal year 1945, $5,330.
Salaries, General Board, Navy Department:
Fiscal year 1944, $3,826.
Fiscal year 1945, $8,775.
Salaries, Naval Examining and Retiring Boards:
Fiscal year 1944, $1,536.
Fiscal year 1945, $5,662.
Salaries, Office of Naval Records and Library:
Fiscal year 1944, $879.
Fiscal year 1945, $7,035.
Salaries, Office of Judge Advocate General, Navy:
Fiscal year 1944, $5,312.
Fiscal year 1945, $36.
Salaries, Office of Chief of Naval Operations:
Fiscal year 1944, $787.
Fiscal year 1945, $731.
Salaries, Board of Inspection and Survey, Navy Department:
Fiscal year 1944, $3,452.
Fiscal year 1945, $2,893.
Salaries, Office of Director of Naval Communications:
Fiscal year 1944, $125.
Fiscal year 1945, $18,647.
Salaries, Office of Naval Intelligence:
Fiscal year 1944, $2,932.
Fiscal year 1945, $923.
Salaries, Hydrographic Office:
Fiscal year 1944, $176,696.
Fiscal year 1945, $16,357.
Salaries, Naval Observatory:
Fiscal year 1944, $38.
Fiscal year 1945, $1,117.
Salaries, Bureau of Ships:
Fiscal year 1944, $2.
Salaries, Bureau of Ordnance:
Fiscal year 1944, $322.
Fiscal year 1945, $151.
Salaries, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:
Fiscal year 1944, $2,992.
Fiscal year 1945, $2,414.
Salaries, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery:
Fiscal year 1944, $4,578.
Fiscal year 1945, $2,854.
Salaries, Bureau of Yards and Docks:
Fiscal year 1944, $94.
Salaries, Bureau of Aeronautics:
Fiscal year 1944, $46.
Contingent expenses:
Contingent expenses, Navy Department, 1944, $10,322.
Contingent expenses, Navy Department, 1946:
The amount which may be transferred to this appropriation from other appropriations contained in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1946, is hereby decreased from "5,500,000" to "$4,500,000."
Printing and binding, Navy Department, 1946:
The amount which may be transferred to this appropriation from other appropriations contained in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1946, is hereby decreased from "$18,500,000" to "$10,500,000."
Contingent and miscellaneous expenses, Hydrographic Office:
Fiscal year 1944, $289,839.
Fiscal year 1945, $94,942.
Fiscal year 1946, $413,000.

Contingent and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Observatory:
Fiscal year 1944, $572.
Fiscal year 1945, $40.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel under the Naval Establishment during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 364), the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to issue in kind during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, one service blue uniform and overcoat to each enlisted man in the naval service upon return to the United States from sea and foreign shore duty upon the sworn statement of such enlisted man that he was prevented, by competent naval authority, from taking such articles of clothing with his person at the time of his assignment to sea and foreign shore duty: *Provided*, That the value of such articles of clothing shall be charged to the clothing and small-stores fund.

In all, title III, $14,404,721,830.

GENERAL PROVISION

The officer and enlisted personnel strengths of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be demobilized at a rate not less than would be necessary to keep within the amounts available for their pay in consequence of the provisions of this act, unless the President otherwise shall direct.

SEC. 301. This act may be cited as the "First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, to further expedite demobilization, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 27, line 12, strike out "$1,117,369,200" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,317,369,200."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this subtracts an additional $200,000,000 from the appropriation and is a further step in our program of expediting demobilization. We cut pay and the subsistence allowance for both the Army and the Navy. The cut was productive of immediate results. Even before the bill was reported, the Navy thereafter announced a reduction in point requirements which made it possible to separate men from the service at a rate that obviated the need for this amount for pay and subsistence. Figures were not available at the time the bill was reported to the House, but in the meantime we have an estimate of a definite figure of $1,317,365,200. This amendment will bring the men home that much sooner.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no one is better aware than I of the futility of attempting to get any consideration for a motion to modify the rescission bill at this stage of proceedings, if, indeed, much attention for remarks at this time of the day, and I shall not use the 5 minutes. I do, however, wish to call attention to the action of the committee with relation to appropriations for the War Department.

First, relative to the cuts made in the annual appropriations and those made in the military appropriations, and, second, with the reductions proposed for the research and development funds of the Air Forces.

Let me call the attention of the Members to this fact, however, that the funds for the Navy are being reduced from seventy-five billions to fifty-seven billions, or about 23 percent; whereas the funds of the War Department are being cut from $54,000,000,000 to $23,000,000,000, which is a reduction of 56 percent.

To state it another way, this bill rescinds 56 percent of the Military Establishment's appropriation of a much smaller amount and only 23 percent of the naval appropriations which are much larger.

Those of you who are concerned with the military policy of the country following the war should give some consideration to the fact that the war has proven that old concepts of perimeter defense no longer hold, and I hope you will ask yourselves, Why do we cut the Navy less than the Army?

Second, I wish to call attention to the fact that by this bill as written, the research and development funds for the Air Forces are cut from $245,000,000, in round figures, to $115,000,000. Those funds are what I would personally regard as the most important of all forms of military expenditures in the next few years.

Let me repeat that: Research and development are cut more than 53 percent; cut from $245,000,000 to $115,000,000. Those are the figures that were placed in the printed hearings by General Arnold, in response to a question which I suggested to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

My concern on this matter had led me to ask the Under Secretary of War for Air about the air program and I have a letter in response which goes into it in detail.

Perhaps I should take another minute or two in view of the interest that is being shown to give a few figures to show the effect of the action on these research funds. The Air Forces proposed to spend $2,627,000 for research in rocket and atomic energy engines. The budget estimate as submitted to the committee, and approved by this action, will eliminate that item entirely in the program this year.

The request of the Army Air Forces to the Budget for research in radio and radar, navigation, communications, radar bombing, rocket bombing, fire control and things of that sort was $26,000,000. The Budget Bureau's figure will cut that program to $12,100,000.

Congress is doing a proper thing in reviewing and rescinding certain war appropriations now that the fighting is over, but in determining what funds should be cut we should be concerned with whether or not we are leaving the money that is needed for proper research in the fields of atomic power and jet propulsion, rocket projectiles, radar, and things of that sort.

I am not finding fault with the action of the Deficiency Subcommittee in writing the bill as they did on this point; they took the Budget figure and there was no showing of the Air Forces' request and no testimony on the effect of the cut.

In the hearings on their original appropriation for fiscal 1946, the Air Forces had indicated they would use about one hundred and sixty million on research, and a cut to one hundred and fifteen million was in line with other cuts that were being made with the completion of the war; however, it was not brought out before the committee that the Air Forces originally expected to get a great deal of research and development work done by the manufacturers in connection with their procurement program. With the buying stopped, naturally that research work would go undone unless the Air Forces did it themselves.

And right now there is need for doing even more because of the captured equipment and research records of the Germans and Japanese. The Air Forces should have funds to examine, test, and explore all the information they now have on the enemy's research. That is why they proposed to use two hundred and forty-five million in their program for research and development under the rescission budget. And a cut to one hundred and fifteen million is far too severe, in my opinion.

I recognize that at this late hour, and under the procedure of the House, it would be impossible to give a proper consideration to the details that are involved in the issues I have raised so I am offering no amendment to the bill at this time. I sincerely hope, however, that these questions will be taken up in the other body, and the full effect of this cut determined in order that appropriate action may be taken and considered by the representatives of the House when the bill goes to conference.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 36, line 7, after the word "direct", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That (a) there shall be discharged from, or released from active duty in, the military or naval forces of the United States without delay, any person who requests such discharge or release and who—

"(1) has served on active duty 18 months or more since September 16, 1940; or

"(2) has, at the time of making such request, a wife or a child or children with whom he maintains (or would but for his service maintain) a bona fide family relationship in his home; or

"(3) has, at the time of making such request, a mother or father dependent upon him for chief support; or

"(4) desires to resume his education or training by enrolling in an educational or training institution, if his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service. Any such person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. I shall not make the point of order, but reserve it in order to permit

the gentleman to discuss the amendment on its merits.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is adopted. It is an exact duplicate of a bill which I introduced on the 19th of September and which I expect to bring to the floor of the House for vote unless this amendment is agreed to at this time.

General MacArthur tells us that he will not need more than 200,000 men in Japan, and I saw the other day where it was intimated, if he did not say it, that he could get along with 60,000 in a few months. If General MacArthur can control the entire Japanese Empire with 200,000 men, surely we can get along in Europe with a similar number, when we have France, England, Russia, and our other allies helping to police Germany.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I may say that I am very much in favor of the gentleman's amendment because I introduced a bill to do a similar thing in September. General Barry testified before a Senate committee yesterday that there were 1,960,000 men in the Army with 60 or more points.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not surprised.

We will not need more than a million and a half men, and I doubt if we will need more than a million from now on. As a matter of fact I do not think we will need more than a million. Why keep them standing around in uniformed idleness when they are anxious to get out and their people at home are begging for them to come home and take care of their families? Why keep them standing around in uniformed idleness when they have business at home to look after, such as crops to gather, stores to operate, or professions to rebuild?

Why keep young boys standing around in uniformed idleness who want to go back home, return to school and complete their education?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I wonder if the gentleman has read in the press where the War Department has announced that very soon it is letting out all conscientious objectors over 38 years of age, yet combat soldiers with 18 months' experience are being held with nothing to do.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and it is wrong. These young men who have done their duty in this war should have first consideration.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. May I say to the gentleman that I am in accord with his views on this proposition. I introduced a bill to do the same thing on the 12th of September. I have letters from all over the world from thousands of these men who say they are not doing anything.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me give you one illustration. The doctors in my State, especially in my section of the State, publish a magazine. The man who publishes that magazine is in the Army, not doing a thing in the world but begging to get home and resume the publication of one of the most necessary magazines in the State, and they cannot get him out because he does not have the required number of points. The point system is a miserable failure and ought to be abolished, and that is what I am trying to do. I know a young man who wants to come back to take a position as assistant professor of music in the University of Mississippi. The head of that department tells me that she cannot carry on the work successfully without him, yet he is being held in the Army in the State of Mississippi, and I cannot even get him considered for a discharge.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I do not know whether the gentleman's amendment will go out on a point of order, but I hope some way will be devised to make the Army and the Navy release some of these men. The amendment should certainly pass.

Mr. RANKIN. I will argue the point of order, if one is made.

There are hundreds of thousands of hard cases of young men who should be discharged now.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I just want to say that I hope it will not go out on a point of order, because it is a good amendment and ought to prevail.

Mr. RANKIN. We might just as well pass it now, because we will pass it sooner or later. The American people are going to demand it.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. According to health standards it requires 3,000 freshmen dentists to enter the dental colleges every year, and we have only 950 in the dental colleges this year.

Mr. RANKIN. That is true. Many of these young men want to get back to dental schools, as well as to other studies.

You all have correspondence piling up on your desks every day from boys who entered the service because the country needed them, and now when their country does not need them any longer, and they are needed at home, they come along with this point system as complicated as some of the point systems we had during the war itself, and the boys are frozen in the service.

I say that this amendment should be adopted and these boys be permitted to come home now.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is going to make a point of order, but I feel it is my duty to make it.

I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is not germane to the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Let me read to the Chair the provision of the bill that it would amend.

As the chairman knows, the question of germaneness is one of procedure. It is whether or not the amendment offered injects new or extraneous matter. It is whether or not the amendment proposed injects new or extraneous matter into the bill or the provision to which it is offered. Here is the provision to which the amendment is offered:

GENERAL PROVISION

The officer and enlisted personnel strengths of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be demobilized at a rate not less than would be necessary to keep within the amounts available for their pay in consequence of the provisions of this act, unless the President otherwise shall direct.

This section is on the question of demobilization, because it says "they shall be demobilized at a rate not less than would be necessary to keep within the amounts available for their pay in consequence of the provisions of this act, unless the President otherwise shall direct."

Mr. Chairman, they try by indirection, by cutting down appropriations to force the discharge of these men. That is a boot-strap method of getting these men discharged. It virtually says, "Well, we will starve them into it." How will the men in the service feel about that, when we cut off their supplies and still leave them in the service? But here I offer this amendment which I feel is entirely germane to this provision of the bill.

I submit that this point of order should be overruled, and the Members given an opportunity to vote on my amendment. If that is done, it will pass by a landslide. If that is not done I will get it put on in the Senate.

Mr. BREHM. If the gentleman will yield, it is at least germane to the morale of the country, is it not? It is germane to the bill, too.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, but it is germane to this provision of the bill.

Suppose I had added some other provision there for additional money, or to take away a part of the appropriation, you would have said it was germane. In other words, it would be germane for me to cut off the soldier's supply of food, according to the argument of the opposition, but not germane for me to ask for his discharge.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this provision here is on this identical subject, that my amendment is entirely germane, and that the point of order should be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, my only purpose in making this point of order is that I have long believed that this is really the greatest legislative body in the world, and that I believe that when legislation of this character, reaching far beyond anything contemplated in the bill,

is brought in here at this time of the night, somebody should stand up here and make a point of order, no matter how worthy the ends to be obtained may be.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman keeps bearing down on "this time of the night." It is the same "time of the night" here that it is in the Army, where these boys are begging to get out.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is right. Possibly some of us ought to be in the Army; I do not know.

If you will read the gentleman's amendment offered to this paragraph, you will find that he goes into the question of defining the various classes of men in the Army, and writes a ticket going way beyond anything in the bill. This is a rescission bill cutting off money from all the departments of the Government, the Army included. The amendment attempts to define how demobilization shall take place, how people shall be judged, according to their families and how many children they have, and whether the children are going to school or not. This is writing a legislative bill in here. It is so far beyond anything in this bill that I do not believe there is any question but that the Chair will have to declare it not germane, and therefore not in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair is ready to rule.

The question before the Chair does not concern the merits of the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. It is the duty of the Chair simply to pass upon the point of order from a parliamentary standpoint, as to whether or not the amendment is germane.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is clearly a general legislative expression and proposes substantive law, whereas the provision in the bill to which the amendment is offered is merely the expression of a hope that within the amounts available for their pay and in consequence of the provisions of this act demobilization will be carried on as rapidly as possible.

In the opinion of the Chair, clearly, under the limitations of the general provision on page 36, this amendment, being a general legislative provision with reference to demobilization and having the effect of substantive law, and not being restrictive is not germane. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, with all the deference in the world for the distinguished Chairman, whom we all love, I respectfully appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the appeal cannot be laid on the table. The Committee has a right to vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion to lay on the table is not in order in the Committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it in order to demand a consideration of the motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The question at issue is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on my appeal if it is debatable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes on the appeal.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say, with all deference to the Chairman who labored considerably with this proposition, that I think the amendment is clearly germane. I have taken this appeal because it is our chance to get these boys out of the service. It is no reflection on the Chair to overrule the decision of the Chair. I trust the decision of the Chair will be overruled. If it is overruled, that will give us a chance to vote on my amendment, which you can see the Members are anxious to support.

If we are denied the right to adopt the amendment here, I feel confident we can get it put on in the Senate.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard in opposition to the appeal?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] is recognized.

Mr. O'NEAL. The only question before the Committee as a legislative body is to do its duty and decide whether or not the Chair was wrong in its decision. It is not a question of the merits of the amendment. The only question that the gentleman from Mississippi is raising in appealing from the decision of the Chair is: Is the Chair correct or is he incorrect? That is what the gentleman from Mississippi is asking and that is all you are going to answer when you decide this appeal.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. What I am asking for is that we be permitted to vote on this proposition now. The Members of the House want to vote on it. They have a right to vote on it. As I said, if I fail to get a vote on it here I'm going to do my best to get this provision adopted in the Senate.

Mr. O'NEAL. I beg to differ with the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi. The Chair has made a decision and ruled on a point of order. This appeal is not on the merits of the amendment. The gentleman from Mississippi has appealed to you that the Chair has decided wrongly. Your decision, just as though you were a judge on the bench, is to decide whether or not the Chair was in error when he ruled that the point of order was well taken.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The question is: Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee of the Whole?

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the "ayes" had it.

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee followed the exact recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. At the time the item was under consideration we went into the question as to whether the Navy had been cut deep enough and whether the cut was proportionate. It was explained that the problems before the Navy at this time are more serious than those of any other service, for the reason that it is engaged in research on jet propulsion, which promises to revolutionize the entire system of aviation.

I think, however, the most significant statement made on the subject in the entire hearing was the statement to the committee by Dr. Vannevar Bush, perhaps the most eminent authority on the subject today, that advantages accruing from research could not be measured by the amount of money expended; that there was no fixed relation between the amount of money provided for research and the results secured.

The amounts and the proportionate relation suggested by the committee are amply justified by the testimony before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and pursuant to House Resolution 375 he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DWORSHAK. In its present incomplete form I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DWORSHAK moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with an increase of $500,000,000 in the recapture of lend-lease funds.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO CHANGE TOTALS IN BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make the necessary changes in the totals in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken today on the bill may have five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial on atomic energy.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three articles from today's Washington Post.

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address he made before the Junior Board of Commerce in Washington, D. C., on October 18.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address of His Holiness Pope Pius XII to his committee on the occasion of their visit to the Vatican.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters and a petition.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 30 minutes following the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF OCTOBER 22

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do this in order to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to announce the program for next week.

Monday: There are five bills out of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I understand they are noncontroversial.

Tuesday: On Tuesday there will be a joint session of the House and the Senate to receive a message from the President. There will be no other business that day.

Wednesday: We will take up for consideration the bill (H. R. 4160) amending the bankruptcy laws relating to commissioners.

Thursday: We will take up the bill (S. 805) relating to the protection of military secrets. That bill was originally scheduled for this week, but we were not able to reach it. I am, therefore, setting it down for consideration the latter part of next week.

So, next week, outside of those two bills and District of Columbia business on Monday and the President's address, nothing is scheduled.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And if we complete the military secrets bill on Thursday, that will probably conclude the business of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. If we do, that will conclude the work of the week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in committee today and to include certain excerpts and correspondence.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copies of correspondence.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a newspaper in his home county.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. RAMSPECK asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in committee today and include several telegrams.

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. RAMSPECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorials.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. DOUGLAS of California, for 1 week, on account of important official business.

To Mr. ROGERS of New York, indefinitely, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1426. An act to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of slum, blighted, and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such area in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to extend in the case of aluminum plants and facilities the time during which disposition of such plants and facilities is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), according to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will meet at 10 a. m., Monday, October 22, to continue hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill. The Army, Navy, and ODT witnesses are expected to be heard Monday, October 22, 1945.

There will be a meeting of the Special Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Monday, October 22, 1945.

Business to be considered: Resumption of hearing on study of operations under the Public Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing to consider the bill

(H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on Friday, October 26, 1945, on the following: House Concurrent Resolution 85, House Concurrent Resolution 86, House Concurrent Resolution 91, and House Joint Resolution 245, declaring the date of termination of hostilities in the present war. The hearing will begin at 10:30 a. m., and will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

768. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945; to the Committee on Claims.

769. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $1,031,100, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service (H. Doc. No. 340); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

770. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting the twentieth report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

771. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $194,000 for the Export-Import Bank of Washington (H. Doc. No. 336); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

772. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, together with supplemental estimates of appropriation for said fiscal year in the amount of $159,680,000 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

773. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $431,500 for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 337); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

774. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $565,000, for the Interstate Commerce Commission (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

775. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $785,000, for the Federal Communications Commission (H. Doc. No. 339); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

776. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $50,000,000, for the fiscal year 1946, and in addition, contract authority in the amount of $57,500,000, for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

777. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $18,276,500, and an authorization to expend additional funds (H. Doc. No. 342); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

778. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 in the amount of $595,000, and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $1,320,200 in all, $1,915,200; together with a draft of a proposed provision affecting an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 344); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

779. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $27,468,350, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 341); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

780. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation amounting to $3,183,850.44, to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (H. Doc. No. 353); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

781. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation amounting to $1,730.63, under the Treasury Department for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 348); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

782. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of $118,144.91 (H. Doc. No. 349); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

783. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $18,540.92, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 356); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

784. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts (H. Doc. No. 355); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

785. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $69,033.16 (H. Doc. No. 350); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

786. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of $296,867.45 (H. Doc. No. 354); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

787. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $191,000,000, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, for the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

788. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment, amounting to $159,752.23 (H. Doc. No. 357); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

789. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $39.21, as covered by certificate of settlement (H. Doc. No. 351); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

790. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay a claim resulting from real and personal property damage occasioned by United States naval personnel in a foreign country, in the amount of $11,132.56 (H. Doc. No. 352); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

791. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $4,466,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1139. An act for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4428. A bill to adjust the rate of dividends paid by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation on its capital stock and to decrease the premium charge for its insurance; without amendment (Rept.

No. 1137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1383. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia, approved April 8, 1864; without amendment (Rept. No. 1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 255. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Women's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election; with amendment (Rept. No. 1139). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CURTIS: Committee on Ways and Means. Senate Joint Resolution 100. Joint resolution permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4449. A bill to prevent the lapse of reemployment rights of veterans when the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, becomes inoperative; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4450. A bill to provide for payment of travel allowance and transportation to their homes and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. R. 4451. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Sagining River and its tributaries, Michigan, for flood control, for run-off, and water-flow retardation; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4452. A bill to establish a temporary agency to be known as the Commission on Emergency Federal Aid to Higher Educational Institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 4453. A bill to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia before the expiration of such leave; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 4454. A bill to promote the progress of science; to secure the national defense; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4455. A bill to establish import quotas with respect to cheese of various types or kinds and grades; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 4456. A bill to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Res. 376. Resolution making House Resolution 58 a special order; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 4457. A bill for the relief of Larren N. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Rosella J. Masters; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4459. A bill for the relief of Pavlos G. C. Yovis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 4460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Maurice; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1261. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution unanimously adopted by a joint mass demonstration of the American Christian Palestine Committee and American Zionist Emergency Council, Paterson (N. J.) district, on October 11, 1945, calling for immediate opening of the gates of Palestine to Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1262. Also, petition from Textile Workers Union of America, Local 156, Paterson, N. J., favoring H. R. 2202 and H. R. 3841; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1263. By Mr. RICH: Resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars, that full employment should be attempted through the use of private spending and the free-enterprise system before attempting to obtain full employment through Government spending and Government guaranty of jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1264. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of the Virginia Peninsula Association of Commerce, Newport News, Va.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1265. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Peace Campaign, Mt. Vernon, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement for a Christian peace in a Christian Europe and a curb on rampant tyranny; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all that is fair and free, we are gratefully glad that the thunder of guns is silenced and that the speeding forts of the air no longer rain destruction on defenseless cities, that multitudes are being brought back by Christlike pity from the gates of death, and that united nations are taking their first fumbling and faltering steps in cooperation. Yet we are solemnly conscious that the battle for the peace of the world is not won. Not content with the victories of war, may we commit our highest powers anew to those ideals that must win in all our strife if the world is to be remade. So may we ever march in the proud company of our own self-respect, with the banners of freedom and justice going on before. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 18, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 109) to extend in the case of aluminum plants and facilities the time during which disposition of such plants and facilities is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to extend in the case of aluminum plants and facilities the time during which disposition of such plants and facilities is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR TAYLOR FROM COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that he has a communication from the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] submitting his resignation as a member of the Committee on Claims, which will lie on the table.

ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS—RESOLUTION OF CUBAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the House of Representatives of Cuba, transmitting copy of a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of Cuba, which, with the accompanying

resolution, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation]

LAHABANA, *September 18, 1945.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The House of Representatives at its session of this date, adopted a resolution approving the motion, a literal copy of which is enclosed, to the effect that on each anniversary of the independence of the American Republics, the flag of the respective nation should be flown at the palace at the capital, to the right of the national colors, as a tribute of sympathy and compenetration of ideals by the people of Cuba to a brother people.

I have the honor to transmit the said resolution accordingly.

Respectfully,

DR. MIGUEL A. DE LEON FUENTES,
President.

[Translation]

THE HOUSE

The spirit of continental solidarity, arising from the similarity of ideals, sentiments and historical events, is daily growing and strengthening, as a result of the constant and intensive intercourse, now going beyond the official sphere in which up to now it has taken place, to popular manifestations, in which it acquires the true feeling of compenetration and unity.

In view of the world-wide orientation of the moment and the putting into effect of a new political-economic-social order, the continent needs more than ever this bond of moral and material values to sustain its common interests, and all that tends to sustain and strengthen it is a work of positive American greatness.

Many of our nations, to emphasize this desire for unity, are bringing out the significance of certain of the most relevant facts in the history of the other republics. Chile, for example, on the initiative of its House of Deputies, has just agreed that "the national colors may be flown in its hall, on the dates of the independence of each of the American nations," and the President of the same House of Deputies has just communicated this to this body.

We therefore propose to the House of Representatives the approval of the following:

MOTION

The House of Representatives of Cuba, giving voice to the sentiments of its people and in their name, agrees—

That upon each anniversary of the independence of the American Republics, the flag of the corresponding nations be flown at the palace at the capital, to the right of the national colors, as a tribute of sympathy and compenetration of ideals by the people of Cuba to a brother people.

That this agreement be communicated by the President of this legislative body to the executive branch of each nation on the continent.

That it also be communicated to the Senate and the President of the Republic.

The hall of the House of Representatives, September 18, 1945.

PASTOR DEL RIO.
MIGUEL A. DE LEON FUENTES.
ARMANDO CAINAS MILANES.
CAROLS FRAILE GOLDARDS.
RADIO CREMATA VALDES.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROGRESS REPORT OF LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL RURAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, three statements constituting a report with respect to the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend title V thereof to the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION OF KEARNEY (NEBR.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ENDORSING THE MID-STATE POWER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Kearney (Nebr.) Chamber of Commerce endorsing the Mid-State Public Power Irrigation District.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Kearney and its entire trade territory is fundamentally and principally an agricultural area; and

Whereas the entire agricultural area of central Nebraska is particularly adapted to irrigation and the specialized farming most advantageously conducted under irrigation; and

Whereas the Mid-State Public Power and Irrigation District has been created and organized, having determined that there is a large acreage within its borders located in Buffalo, Hall, and Merrick Counties, it being determined by the plans and specifications of said district that this acreage may be provided with irrigation by constructing said irrigation district which will result in specialized farming, providing an increase in agricultural products for this area and the State of Nebraska, providing increased wealth for the entire State of Nebraska, providing employment both in the construction of the project and in the business of farming, as well as related businesses and industries; and

Whereas the construction of this facility would afford recreation facilities and wildlife conservation, both of which are greatly needed in this area and in which the peoples of this area are vitally interested; and

Whereas the construction of the district will provide increased power for this area in particular and the entire State in general, adding to the wealth of the State directly and indirectly and the inducement to business and industrial development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kearney Chamber of Commerce endorse the Mid-State Power and Irrigation District and request the counsel, advice and assistance of the Honorable Dwight Griswold, Governor of the State of Nebraska, the Nebraska Legislature, the Nebraska Congressmen, and the Nebraska Senators and urge that they use their efforts and influence in assisting the Mid-State Public Power and Irrigation District in securing approval of the project, financing for its construction and the ultimate completion of said project. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Dwight Griswold, Governor of the State of Nebraska, the Nebraska State Legislature, the Congressmen from Nebraska, and the Senators from Nebraska.

Signed by executive committee.

HERBERT CUSHING, *Chairman.*
JOHN M. SPEAR, *Vice Chairman.*
IVAN MATTSON, *President.*
ROLLIN G. DOWNING, *Member.*
JOHN HENRY, *Member.*
A. C. LANTZ, *Member.*
C. S. MORROW, *Member.*

Attest:

WALLACE THORNTON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF SHANKLIN-ATTAWAY AMERICAN LEGION POST, ROME, GA.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Shanklin-Attaway Post, No. 5, American Legion, of Rome, Ga., requesting the President of the United States and the Congress to declare the end of World War II as of November 11.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas November 11 has been a day enshrined in the hearts of millions of American people in commemoration of the cessation of hostilities in World War I, and as such has become a national holiday; and

Whereas World World II was but a continuation of World War I for the same principles and against the same forces; and

Whereas the armistice of 1918 and the victory of 1945 were won by the blood of Americans and their allies, fighting for the cause of freedom; and

Whereas the members of the Shanklin-Attaway Post, No. 5, of the American Legion believe that it would be both fitting and appropriate that November 11 be perpetuated as a memorial day for all those who have died in our wars for liberty and freedom and as a day of dedication to principles for which they gave their lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Shanklin-Attaway Post of the American Legion, That they request the President of the United States, and/or the Congress to declare the end of World War II as of November 11, and so designate that date as such that November 11 be not only a day of armistice, but a day of victory and peace, on which the American people can memorialize the sacrifice and death of her heroes, and celebrate their victory; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, our Senators and our Congressmen, to the Georgia Department of the American Legion and to the national office of the American Legion in the hope that they will join in the effort to perpetuate November 11 as the day set aside in commemoration of victory and peace.

DISPOSITION TO SCHOOLS OF SURPLUS MATERIALS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received a letter today from Mr. H. L. Sherman, secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin Association of Directors of Vocational and Adult Education, enclosing a letter from the directors' association referring to the disposition of surplus materials for schools. I ask that both letters be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Mili-

tary Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
October 18, 1945.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A motion was made and seconded and unanimously passed by the executive committee of the Wisconsin Directors of Vocational and Adult Education at Madison on October 15, 1945.

In this motion it was agreed that a copy of the enclosed letter be sent to the 2 Senators and the 10 Members of the House of Representatives of our State of Wisconsin asking for the support in obtaining surplus property and supplies for use in Wisconsin vocational schools.

Yours truly,

H. L. SHERMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

OCTOBER 11, 1945.

HONORABLE SIR: It has come to the attention of this group that there has been some discussion in Congress on section 13 of Public Law 457, which provides for donation of equipment and materials from excess and surplus equipment to the school. This matter was considered of such grave importance that a special meeting of the executive committee of the Wisconsin directors of vocational and adult education was called for the purpose of discussing the matter. As a result of this meeting, it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that Senators and Congressmen from Wisconsin should receive a report of the reactions of the committee. These reactions are summed up as follows:

1. During the period of the emergency the schools of the Nation, and particularly the schools of vocational and adult education, were called upon for superhuman efforts in meeting the preinduction training needs of those about to enter the armed services, as well as those who needed training to meet the production tasks and assignments of a war-mobilized industry. In meeting this need the vocational schools particularly conducted 24-hour service 7 days a week for the major portion of the 5-year emergency. It can readily be seen that in peforming this task that equipment which would normally have a life span of 25 years under the schools' normal program received wear and tear four times as fast, or the equivalent of 20 years out in the 5-year period.

2. While it is recognized that the Federal Government supposedly was supporting this program 100 percent from Federal funds, it must be realized that this was not true in actuality. The reasons for this are as follows:

A. The statement mentioned above of the equipment wear and tear.

B. Overhead operating and maintenance expenses that could not be accurately measured, separated, and charged to the defense-training program.

C. Equipment replacements that were available under the law were not adequately met because, while the funds were provided, it was impossible to receive adequate priorities in order to secure delivery of the equipment.

3. During the emergency, Congress did try conscientiously to meet the added cost of defense training, but from present indications there apparently has been no attempt to adequately meet the new problems that will be facing the schools of the Nation during the reconversion period. Again speaking for those engaged in vocational and adult education, this period must of necessity confront us with the new challenges, new problems, and increased expenditures. These may be listed as follows:

A. The provisions of Public Law No. 16 and Public Law No. 346 for training for veterans will place an additional burden of expense on the part of the vocational schools meeting their training needs.

B. The present trend indicates that an increasing demand on the part of those employed in war industries for retraining and supplementary training in preparation for and in maintaining civilian employment.

4. Finally, but by no means the least of the problems of the school, comes from the fact that they are largely dependent upon local financial support for the conduct of their program. Already there is evidence on the part of the city administrations of retrenchments in city budgets and appropriations. Mainly the reasons for this are the—

A. Backlog of public works that must be met.

B. There is a tendency to reduce taxes.

C. Normal procedures on equipment replacements do not permit appropriations in line with the immediate needs of the schools. Thus if equipment is to be made available to the schools at even a nominal charge a great many of the schools will be prevented from securing this equipment because of budgetary limitations.

In the light of these facts, it is a feeling of this committee representing directors of the Wisconsin vocational schools that the provisions for donation of equipment for schools ought to be maintained and, if at all possible, liberalized to the end that they may receive much-needed equipment and continue to be able to serve veterans and civilians with vocational objectives effectively, efficiently without undue burdens being placed on the local communities.

Rest assured that we would appreciate your earnest consideration of the facts submitted and any support you can give by way of protecting the rights of schools under the present provisions of this law or the liberalizing of those provisions to the end that the schools may be fairly treated in securing such equipment.

Very respectfully submitted.

WISCONSIN VOCATIONAL AND ADULT SCHOOL DIRECTORS' ASSOCIATION.

COMMISSION ON PERMANENT FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I received from R. E. Arnold, chairman of the Kansas-Missouri Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, Kansas City, copy of resolutions adopted on October 14 at a meeting of that organization which was attended by 6,000 people. I am in hearty accord with the sentiments expressed in these resolutions and ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we are gathered here today in mass meeting assembled for the purpose of intensifying our conviction that there is urgent and full need for the existence of a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee; and

Whereas it is the sense of the approximately 6,000 people present that nothing should be left undone in order to arouse favorable reaction from the heads of our Government as well as from Representatives in Congress in support of the creation and establishment of a permanent committee or commission charged with the responsibility of preserving for all groups or individuals their right to work without limitations or discrimination based upon race, creed, or religion, or national origin. No group is more conscious and aware than we of the evils of unfair color and employment practices. We urge full and complete elimination of discrimination in the matter of employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, creed, color, or national origin. We condemn the practice whether in public or private employment as violative of every concept of true democracy. It is our belief that just as the first basic step in preparedness for war was free use of working and military manpower, it is equally urgent that discrimination be removed in the eras of reconversion and peace; and

Whereas we appeal to our Government because it must know that discrimination in employment will ultimately bring strife, unrest, and all kindred evils, it therefore becomes its duty to remove by appropriate legislation every possible inducement, destructive of the freedom for which our Nation fought: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, in public mass meeting assembled expressing our belief in the virtues of democratic forms of government appeal to the President of the United States of America and to the Congress thereof for the immediate creation and establishment of a Commission on Permanent Fair Employment Practice charged with giving employment to citizens of the United States without discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
National Co-chairman, National Council for a Permanent FEPC.
Miss R. E. ARNOLD,
Chairman, Kansas-Missouri Council for a Permanent FEPC.
W. R. TILLMON,
Chairman, Executive Committee, Kansas-Missouri Council for a Permanent FEPC.
MARY G. SIRLS,
Secretary, Kansas-Missouri Council for a Permanent FEPC.
RAYMOND E. BURGIN,
Chairman of Mass Meeting.
CARL R. JOHNSON,
Attorney.
L. AMASA KNOX,
Attorney.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *October 14, 1945.*

REPORTS OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 2668. A bill to transfer Ben Hill County, Ga., from the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia to the Americus division of the middle judicial district of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 653);

H. R. 3281. A bill to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June; without amendment (Rept. No. 654);

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election; without amendment; and

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; without amendment (Rept. No. 652).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1505. A bill to amend the act of February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19, ch. 10), in relation to

disaster loans to States or political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 1506. A bill to provide for maintaining the principal office of the Tennessee Valley Authority at Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WAGNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 182), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, authorized by Senate Resolution 9, agreed to January 6, 1945, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the same purposes, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount of $5,000 heretofore authorized.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945—AMENDMENT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, now being considered by the Finance Committee. I realize the committee has completed its hearings, but should it have another meeting before the tax bill comes before the Senate, I should like to have the proposed amendment considered, if possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

Mr. MCCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GUFFEY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 511) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed.

CONFUSION AT ARMY SEPARATION CENTERS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from an officer. As he is now discharged from the service his name may be printed with the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOUNT SIDNEY, VA., *October 11, 1945.*

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: You may recall that I was in your office last Saturday morning with a mutual friend, Mr. J. C. Dell, Jr., formerly of Nebraska. At that time I made some statement regarding the confusion at the separation centers where our servicemen are being given their discharges. You suggested that I write you outlining some of my criticisms and suggestions.

I passed through Fort Meade and received my honorable discharge there on July 1. It took me 8 days to get through and I was moved to three different barracks with all my luggage during my stay. They were separating between 200 and 250 men per day at that time—more than 3 months ago. On my way home I read in a newspaper where they said they were discharging 1,000 men per day at that time. I am enclosing herewith a clipping from a Washington paper dated October 7 which shows that the confusion there is still rampant.

I never observed such inefficiency and confusion in all my life. Papers and records were lost, roll calls were confused, about 25 percent of the men were a. w. o. l., and many discharge papers were made out which contained mistakes that were never corrected. There were two or three mistakes on my discharge papers. I insisted that they be corrected and the result was that my whole group was held up about 2 hours, so I was told. At that time they would not give the men furloughs. Most of the men just took off for Washington or Baltimore or their nearby homes (some had been overseas for 2 or 3 years). Some came back the next morning, but many stayed away for a day, or several days, and missed their calls for processing which screwed up all the rolls. To the best of my knowledge no disciplinary action was taken to enforce compliance with military regulations. I started through with a group of 60 men in the actual processing procedure, and 16 men out of the 60 were missing. One seldom saw an officer around, and the noncoms who were doing the processing said that they knew nothing about the work. In fact most of the men who were doing the actual processing were privates, privates (first class), and Wacs, and they said that they had been suddenly pulled out of different units scattered about the post which had nothing to do with the separation center. They said that they had had no training for this work and did not know what they were doing. I also found out that they were pulling out high point men who had been overseas many months and were making them work on the post. I met up with a friend of mine from my home town who had shipped up from Florida for separation at Meade. He had around 100 points, had been through the north African and Sicilian campaigns and had then been sent to Europe. He had been in the service more than 3 years. I ran across him working in a supply building handing out pants and shirts. They had denied him separation by saying that he was essential. He came home recently with a discharge. I asked him how he got out. He said that the inspector general had paid the post a visit and had ordered the authorities there to discharge these men of his type. I was told that a person with 138 points was still doing menial tasks in another camp.

I have talked with a great number of men who have returned home with their discharges. They all have the same story to tell about the confusion and inefficiency at the separations centers. I could go on and on with individual cases and complaints. I think that it is high time that Congress take over and tell the Army (and Navy) just how to run things now that the war is over. The military organization is a good thing to win a war with, but a very extravagant, inefficient, and wasteful thing to conduct a business in peacetime. Many of those in charge of operations in wartime covered up their wastefulness, inefficiency, and extravagance under the guise of secrecy or military expediency, and Congress and the people just had to take it.

I think that there are two things which Congress can do to improve the situation. The most practical thing to do would be to employ some civilian personnel experts from most any of our many well-managed industries and corporations and put them in charge in these separation centers. The War Department has never hesitated to hire civilian experts to work with the Army even in wartime. I saw a great many of them overseas, attached to the Army and Navy. Another suggestion would be to require the commanding officers of the separation centers to use military personnel who meet certain educational requirements, and to give them specialized training. There are still plenty to select from yet in the States who have not seen overseas service, including the limited-service category. The men who are coming home not only deserve speedy processing, but it is due them that it is properly done. A person's discharge and related papers are among his most valuable possessions and if they are not properly drawn they can cause the owner any amount of trouble in future years. Many soldiers will not go to the trouble of having mistakes corrected in their haste to get out and get home.

Congress cannot rely too much on the reports and promises of Secretary Patterson and Chief of Staff Marshall. Their reports are based upon what their subordinates pass along to them. I have been reading about their testimony before congressional committees, but the information and promises they are giving is just not panning out if what one hears from the returning veterans is true regarding their experiences in these separation centers. And this thing has been going on for months and we have hardly scratched the surface as yet in the matter of discharges. The peak load is yet to come. Congress should either investigate conditions personally, or else send some impartial, nonmilitary, expert investigators into these separation centers to get the fac Under-cover investigation would probably yield the best results.

Another thing I would like to mention in passing. I saw more bedbugs and diseased men running loose in barracks in the States upon my return here than I saw under all types of conditions during my 18 months overseas.

Pardon the length of this letter. I have only hit the high spots. It would give me pleasure to give more details to any Congressman or committee if I thought I could help to improve what I think is a critical problem relating to this separation business.

I served in the Army as a special agent, Military Intelligence Service, Counter Intelligence Corps. I have no objection to the use of my name in connection with the above information. I should have written my own Senator, HARRY F. BYRD, who is a very good friend of mine, but since you asked for it you are welcome to it.

Very respectfully,

FRANK S. DRIVER.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES PUBLISHED BY THE GREATER CLEVELAND COUNCIL, SMALLER BUSINESS OF AMERICA, INC.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the Program of Objectives recently published by the Greater Cleveland Council, Smaller Business of America, Inc., and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM OF OBJECTIVES

1. To preserve the incentive system of the American economy—the rock which has sustained all business, especially small business.

2. To champion the right of veterans and all other Americans to engage in any lawful business pursuit.

3. Cooperation and cohesion of all small business the country over through a united voice and united action.

4. Stimulation and encouragement of sounder and friendlier human relations in industry and commerce.

5. Foster and promote tax reform from the viewpoint of the taxpayer.

6. Broaden the markets of small business by stimulation of study and research in schools of economics, business administration, and technical laboratories.

7. To study the evils of and encourage action in the regulation and control of piracy on the "dry seas" as well as the "high seas" of commerce—originality of design, packaging, as well as patents.

8. To urge Congress to study why, in spite of the Sherman antitrust law, monopolies and cartels continue to develop and grow, and to provide the proper remedy therefor.

9. To stimulate the interest of the departments of Government in the activities of the 92.5 percent of business establishments and the annual national business turn-over handled by all small business.

10. To stimulate the consciousness of 2,750,000 small businessmen in America of their importance to and in the American economy.

INVITATION OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII TO BE SELECTED AS THE SITE OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. McMAHON, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. It is impossible to recognize all Senators at the same time. To do so would result in too much confusion. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is recognized. He was the first to be on his feet.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Territory of Hawaii has played a very significant part in world affairs during the past 4 or 5 years. Those of us who have had the good fortune to visit Hawaii have been impressed with its culture, its civilization, its lovely climate, and the delightful manners of its people, as well as its intrinsic beauty.

The Territory of Hawaii has extended a very serious and well-considered invitation to the Council of the United Nations to locate the site of the Council in Hawaii. Merely because the Territory of Hawaii is small, in comparison with the main lands, many of us are likely to think that this is not a well-considered invitation. However, I can assure those who would assume such a viewpoint and write down the invitation as being unworthy of consideration, that were they in possession of all the facts they would readjust their conclusions.

The book which I hold in my hand is the formal invitation from the people and the Government of Hawaii to the Council of the United Nations to consider Hawaii as the site for the United Nations Organization. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to send the book forward to the desk, and I ask that it be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Other copies will be sent to the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the United Nations Preparatory Commission, London, England:

The people of Hawaii, whom I have the honor to represent, respectfully invite consideration of these islands as a suitable location for permanent headquarters of the United Nations Organization, and hereby tender a site of such dimensions as may be deemed requisite.

Outlined in the following pages are the facilities and special advantages afforded here, and the reasons why, from the standpoint of both geography and environment, Hawaii is in an unexcelled position to meet your requirements.

INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

Hawaii as the location of headquarters for the United Nations Organization would be uniquely appropriate. These islands are the home of a people of varied racial lineage, long and widely known for the friendliness with which they live together. And here also is situated—Pearl Harbor. Therein would perpetually lie a dual reminder, first, of what mankind can achieve in amity between different races and nations and, second, what can befall without a check on ruthless power.

The geographical advantage offered by Hawaii is implicit in the fact that these islands lie farther from any continent than any other body of land. Although an integral part of the United States, they are noncontiguous territory. They are located in the Pacific, theater of the most important international developments of the future, yet they are far enough from any nation on its rim to facilitate materially a detached point of view.

Hawaii is several thousand miles from the nearest national capital. It is removed from any of the potentially explosive situations of the world, thus promoting an objective view of them. It is equally distant from large concentrations of industrial and financial power. Isolated from pressures, both political and economic, Hawaii fits the role of a neutral, centrally located, international capital more perfectly than any other place in the world.

Hawaii's equable climate varies less than 10° between winter and summer and between noon and midnight. It has no extremes of heat or cold, rain or dryness. It uniformly provides a mildness particularly welcome to elderly persons and suitable for outdoor recreation the year around. Members of the United Nations Organization will find here a climate conducive to comfort in both work and relaxation.

Hawaii has the largest airport in the world. It is only 9 hours' flying time from the United States west coast and 22 hours from Hong Kong. Honolulu is a port of call for steamship lines of many nations on routes which radiate directly to mainland United States, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South America, China, the Philippines, Russian and British Asiatic ports, and the Netherlands East Indies. Travel facilities to, from, and within Hawaii will be found adequate in speed, capacity, and luxury to meet the needs which a world capital will create.

Honolulu has complete cable, radio, radiotelephone, and telephoto facilities capable of expansion to meet all requirements. It has two large daily newspapers served by all the major press associations. In provisions for information and communications, therefore, it is well prepared; and it has had a long experience in receiving and accommodating international assemblies. Yet, with its predominantly agricultural economy, it is remote from the congestion and turbulence of thickly populated industrial areas. It affords metropolitan advantages in a setting as tranquil as it is scenically superb.

Hawaii is internationally minded. The inception here of the Institute of Pacific Relations, the activities of the Bishop Museum, and of the School of Pacific and Asiatic Studies at the University of Hawaii, the cosmopolitan character of the constant flow of travelers, all bear testimony to this fact. Strongest factor of all has been the far-flung origins of her diversified population in developing a global consciousness.

It is easy for people of all countries to feel at home in Hawaii—its wide diversity of races and nationalities tends to make this true. No community has a richer tradition of racial tolerance, and none has provided a more nearly perfect laboratory for the study of ethnology and inter-racial sociology, or used it to better effect. Here, then, is a community charged to a high degree with the spirit that must guide the world into permanent ways of peace.

Typical of the sites Hawaii is prepared to offer for the United Nations capitol is one near Waimanalo, on Oahu Island, 18 miles from Honolulu. It is near the eastern end of the Koolau Mountain range and commands a view of the Pacific Ocean. An airport large enough to accommodate trans-Pacific planes is within 3 miles of the site. Six miles of curving, surf-washed beach are just below the site. Back from the ocean at distances varying from one-half to 3 miles the majestic Koolaus rise almost perpendicularly. Between ocean and mountains the land rises gradually in level, green stretches. The capitol and auxiliary buildings would stand at the foot of the mountains, well above ocean's level and would afford an unobstructed view of sea, sweeping land, and other parts of the Koolau range. The dignity and majesty of the site would be difficult to match.

HISTORY

1778: Islands discovered by Captain Cook, R. N.

1795: Kamehameha unites the islands under one rule.

1815: Russia voyagers land in Hawaii.

1820: First American missionaries arrive.

1843: British flag flies over the islands.

1843: England and France recognize Hawaii's independence.

1846: Treaties with various European nations mark the emergence of Hawaii as an international factor.

1874–91: Reign of Kalakaua.

1891–93: Reign of Queen Liliuokalani.

1893: Provisional government established.

1894: Republic of Hawaii established.

1898: Hawaii, at her own request, annexed to United States of America.

1920: First international Pan-Pacific Conference held in Honolulu.

1925: First international conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations held in Honolulu.

1926: First international Pacific Rotary Conference held in Honolulu.

1927: First airplane flight, North America to Hawaii.

1929: First international Pan-Pacific Surgical Conference held in Honolulu.

December 7, 1941: Pearl Harbor attack.

CULTURAL FACILITIES

Central Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations.

Headquarters, Pan-Pacific Union.

Academy of Arts.

Honolulu Symphony Orchestra.

Community Theater.

Bishop Museum.

Honolulu Aquarium.

Library of Hawaii and 117 other public libraries, branches, or stations.

Queen's Hospital Medical Library and numerous other technical libraries.

Agricultural experimental and research agencies.

Outdoor circle.

Hui Manu (bird society).

Garden Club of America chapters.

RACIAL

Most of the races and nationalities of the world are represented in Hawaii's cosmopolitan, melting-pot population.

Eight different racial classifications are represented among the residents of Hawaii in sufficient numbers to each account for more than 5 percent of the islands' total population.

Census

Year:	Population
1900	154,001
1910	191,909
1920	255,912
1930	368,336
1940	422,969
1945 [1]	502,000

[1] Estimated, Bureau of Vital Statistics.

HOMES

There were 53,502 dwelling units in Honolulu at the time of the last United States census in 1940. Since then, residential housing facilities have been greatly expanded.

Ranging in size from small bungalows to elaborate estates, homes in Hawaii have been built to embrace all modern conveniences, and with architectural concepts which have captured the distinctive atmosphere of the islands. Most of the residential districts are situated on the hillsides, in the valleys, and along the beaches of Oahu—settings that are beautiful and serene; and are handily accessible to business areas and to the proposed United Nations capitol site.

GAS AND ELECTRICITY

Hawaii is equipped with up-to-date, economical public utilities.

There are more than 50,000 consumers of electricity in the city of Honolulu.

Gas meters in Honolulu total more than 30,000.

BUSSES

There are over 2,000 miles of highways in Hawaii. On the island of Oahu, alone, there are 752 miles of paved highways. Honolulu's rapid transit system, with a fleet of 360 comfortable, modern busses, carried a total of 9,606,916 passengers during the 1 month of August 1945.

WATER

Pure artesian springs are the source of Hawaii's water supply. "An island paradise * * * with modern plumbing," is the way one writer described Hawaii.

HOTELS

In addition to apartment and rooming houses, there are 94 modern hotels (European and American plan) in Hawaii. Seventy of these are situated in Honolulu and on the main island of Oahu:

Island of Oahu	70
Island of Hawaii	8
Island of Kauai	3
Island of Maui	13

WEATHER

It has never been colder than 52°, nor hotter than 90° in the history of the United States Weather Bureau in Honolulu.

"There were only 3 days during the entire year when it failed to shine on Honolulu."

Cool northeast trade winds.

Honolulu's average relative humidity is 69½ percent.

STORES

Number on Oahu

Activity:	
Antique and art	10
Auto dealers	22
Books and stationery	28
Bar and cocktail lounges	251
Curios and novelties	192
Department stores	12
Drugs	93
Dry goods	113
Florists	82
Furniture	57
General merchandise	451
Grocery	507
Jewelers	112
Meat dealers and meat markets	148
Music stores and composers	19
Office equipment and supplies	22
Restaurants	558
Activity—Continued	
Service stations	182
Sporting goods	10
Toilet articles, cosmetics	31
Wearing apparel	112

(And 50 additional categories of retail establishments.)

SCHOOLS

In addition to the University of Hawaii, there are 196 public schools and 121 private schools and colleges in the islands.

Public schools:	Number
High schools	12
Intermediate schools	17
Elementary schools	145
Vocational and miscellaneous	22
Private schools:	
Educational institutions of all grades (elementary through college)	121

RELIGION

Christian, oriental, and other religions have contributed to the spiritual development of Hawaii.

In Honolulu there are 150 religious centers, churches of every denomination, temples, and shrines.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Number on Oahu

Activity:	
Architects	29
Attorneys	99
Certified public accountants	15
Chiropodists	12
Clinics	10
Dentists	141
Engineers	28
Optometrists	11
Osteopaths	5
Physicians and surgeons	189
Registered nurses	75
Surveyors	8
Theologians	20
Veterinarians	7

OTHER SERVICES

Number on Oahu

Activity:	
Artists	23
Auto repair garages	185
Barber shops	347
Beauticians and hairdressers	188
Caterers	21
Dressmakers	748
Dry cleaners, hat and carpet, etc	191
Engravers	13
Interior decorators	12
Laundries	542
Photography shops	289
Tailor shops	172
Taxis	607
Watch repairers	80

TO DO TODAY

Surfboard riding—Waikiki Beach.
Ski trip—slopes of Mauna Loa.
Interisland golf tournament.
Hukilau fishing festival.
Polo championships—Maui Isle.
Glider meet—Nuuanu Pali.
Baseball, 2 p. m.—Football, 7 p. m.
Ti-leaf sliding—Kauai Isle.
Mid-Pacific tennis matches.
Luau, Hawaiian native feast.
Hunting expedition to Molokai.
Moonlight swimming—Lanikai.
Dancing under the stars—Waikiki.

TRIPS IN HAWAII

Miles from Honolulu

Hawaii, the "Big Island"	194
Maui, the "Valley Isle"	74
Kauai, the "Garden Isle"	96
Molokai, the "Friendly Isle"	52
Hawaii National Park (Kilauea Volcano)	224
Hawaii National Park, Maui	110
Kilauea Volcano	224
Haleakala, the "House of the Sun"	120
Kona Coast, "Old Hawaii"	147
Waimea Canyon	140
Maui's "Amalfi Drive"	84
Kauai's "Barking" Sands	137
The Black Sands Beach of Puna	124
Nuuanu Pali	7
Tantalus-Makiki Circle	5
Pearl Harbor	7
Schofield Barracks	20
Hamakua, the sugar coast	219
World-famed pineapple canneries	1
Upside-down waterfalls	3

WIRELESS AND CABLE

Instantaneous communication to all parts of the world is possible in Hawaii through the services of three wireless-telegraph companies, one cable company, and transocean radio-telephone service.

Trans-Pacific radio telephone

Year:	Number of paid messages
1938	4,150
1939	5,175
1940	9,686
1941	20,109
1942	55,852
1943	62,363

TELEPHONES

For communication between the various islands of the Hawaiian group there are an interisland wireless-telegraph system and an interisland radio-telephone service. There are more than half a hundred thousand telephones in service in Hawaii today.

PUBLISHING

There are 12 newspapers published in Honolulu; and 4 radio broadcasting stations in the Territory of Hawaii. Honolulu has many modern lithography plants and printing establishments, along with all the commercial and fine art facilities to meet every publishing requirement.

THEATERS

Number on Oahu

Theaters	61
Other amusement centers	152

Interisland steamship traffic

	Number of round trips	Number of passengers
1933	450	97,601
1934	468	109,064
1935	468	118,614
1936	468	130,756
1937	468	146,319
1938	468	132,510
1939	482	158,601
1940	482	158,328
1941 to Dec. 7	455	162,665

Interisland airplane traffic

	Number of flights	Number of passengers
1933	1,260	6,868
1934	1,313	10,373
1935	2,096	13,551
1936	2,014	18,080
1937	2,406	21,725
1938	3,858	28,917
1939	2,730	22,138
1940	2,799	28,337
1941	4,299	49,039
1942	4,031	82,501
1943	4,401	108,114
1944	4,526	110,618

Steamships calling at Hawaii

1933	1,096
1934	1,151
1935	1,208
1936	1,224
1937	1,261
1938	1,422
1939	1,279
1940	1,420
1941	1,667

AVIATION

Prior to the last war Hawaii was served by an average of three passenger flights every week on the trans-Pacific air routes to and

from North America, New Zealand, and the Orient Indicative of the extent of future air service (now being authorized by Civil Aeronautics Board) to the Hawaiian Islands are the following facts:

Recent monthly averages of passengers carried by United States Army and Navy planes between Honolulu and North America: 35,500 passengers.

Recent monthly average number of flights between Honolulu and North America: 2,340.

Resolution by the Hawaii United Nations Capital Committee, adopted at a meeting in the senate chamber of the capital of the Territory of Hawaii, September 26, 1945

Whereas the selection of a place for permament headquarters of the United Nations Organization—the United Nations capital—will be under consideration by the Preparatory Commission at an early date; and

Whereas the interests of the United Nations Organization will best be served by a location within the confines of the United States of America and one which, from a world standpoint, is central and neutral in its geographical position and character; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, United States of America, is noncontiguous to continental United States, remote from any national capital and therefore removed from concentrations of political and economic pressure; it has an equable climate and natural scenic beauty which makes it an inviting and physically suitable setting; and, by reason of the diversified racial origins of its population and its record of success in achieving racial harmony, it provides a uniquely appropriate environment for an organization dedicated to world amity; and

Whereas the Hawaii United Nations Capital Committee is truly representative of the people of Hawaii and qualified to speak in its behalf: Therefore be it

Resolved—

That the Honorable Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, be and is hereby empowered, in behalf of the people of Hawaii, as represented by this committee, to invite consideration of Hawaii as a location for the permanent headquarters of the United Nations Organization; and

That he be further empowered to tender a site within the Territory of such dimensions as are deemed requisite for a world capitol and its auxiliary units; and

That he pledge that whatever hotel, transportation, residential, and other facilities may be required to serve the needs and convenience of the members of the United Nations Organization wil be offered by citizens of Hawaii; and

That he convey assurance that the people of Hawaii deeply appreciate the honor that would attend the selection of these islands as the location of the world capital and that they pledge their cooperation to the utmost in meeting the responsibilities entailed by this high distinction; and

That, as Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, he transmit this resolution to his excellency, Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State.

Hawaii United Nations Capital Committee; Daniel K. Aimoa, President, Hawaiian Government Employees' Association; Thelma V. Ikana, Senator, Territorial Legislature; Doyle C. Alexander, President, Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce; Riley H. Allen, Editor, Honolulu Star-Bulletin; Paul S. Bachman, Dean of Faculties, University of Hawaii; F. F. Baldwin, President, Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co.; Leonora Neuffer Bilger, President, AAUW, Honolulu Branch; E. E. Mercer, Chairman, Available Sites, UNC, Raymond Capp, Editor, Honolulu Advertiser; E. S. Capellas, President, Territorial Senate; Cyril F. Damon, President, Bishop Trust Co., Ltd.; Walter F. Dessingham, President, Oahu Railway & Land Co.; Joseph R. Farrington, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; H. P. Gay, President, Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu; Catharine P. Field; John F. Fox, President, Punhou School; Robert M. Gordon, Manager, Kodak Hawaii, Ltd.; Allen Hackett, Pastor, Central Union Church; John A. Hamilton, Manager, Honolulu Chamber of Commerce; F. M. Cleary, Senator, Territorial Legislature; C. J. Henderson, President, Honolulu Community Chest; M. O. Holst, President, Halst & Edwards, Ltd.; Henry Clium Hoon, Board of Governors, American Chinese Club; Ernest K. Koi, Hawaiian Civic Association; Harry S. Kennedy, Bishop of Honolulu; R. C. Kesner, President, Honolulu Retail Board; Katsumi Kometani, M. C. Lashlico, Supervisor, City and County, Honolulu; Herbert K. H. Lee, Legislator and Attorney; Charles F. Loomis, Secretary, Institute of Pacific Relations; Oren E. Long, Superintendent, Public Instruction; Nicholas George Lycugis, Manager, Volcano House; J. Frank McLaughlin, President, Council of Social Agencies; Robert K. Mulodami, Attorney; Vladimir Oriskoff, Secretary, Hawaiian-American Institute of Architects; M. G. Paschbal, Speaker, House of Representatives; F. J. Pinkerton; Martin Pease, Judge, Circuit Court of Hawaii; Lester Peters, Mayor, City and County of Honolulu; Harold W. Rice, Senator, Territorial Legislature; Kenneth W. Roehing, President, Hawaii-American Institute of Architects; P. E. Spalding, President, Hawaii Sugar Planters Association; C. W. Turner, District Manager, Standard Oil Co. of California; Juan A. Vernon, Interpreter, HSPA; John H. Williams, Insular Life Assurance Co., Ltd.; G. F. Laterhouse, President, Bishop National Bank; Henry A. White, President, Hawaiian Pineapple Co.; Heaton L. Wrenn, President, Bar Association of Hawaii; G. C. Young, M. D.; A. G. Budge, Chairman.

A REPUBLICAN PROGRAM FOR CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Republican Program for Congress," delivered by him in Columbus, Ohio, on October 19, 1945, at the sixth annual fall convention of the Ohio Federation of Republican Womens Organizations, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHEESE INDUSTRY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the cheese industry issued by him on October 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR ACTIVITIES OF AMERICAN RED CROSS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him and entitled "War Activities of American Red Cross," which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITICISM OF MRS. TRUMAN BY REPRESENTATIVE ADAM C. POWELL—ARTICLE BY HERB GRAFFIS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article by Herb Graffis relative to criticism of Mrs. Truman by Representative ADAM C. POWELL, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOMES FOR RETURNING SERVICEMEN—EDITORIAL FROM THE UNION CITY DAILY MESSENGER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding homes for returning servicemen, from the Union City (Tenn.) Daily Messenger, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN OFFER TO TRADE PLACES—EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBUS (NEBR.) DAILY TELEGRAM

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Offer To Trade Places," written by Edgar Howard, editor of the Columbus Daily Telegram, from the issue of October 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH—REPORT OF PRESIDENT HAROLD W. DODDS, OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report of President Harold W. Dodds, of Princeton University, to the board of trustee, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECONVERSION OF HUDSON MOTOR CAR CO.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by A. E. Barit, president of the Hudson Motor Car Co., on the occasion of the production of the first postwar Hudson automobile, a newspaper article written by Mr. Barit, and remarks of Richard Harfst, general manager of the Automobile Club of Michigan, which appear in the Appendix.]

CLEAVAGE OF THE GIANTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by John W. Owens entitled "Cleavage of the Giants," published in the Baltimore Sun of October 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 630, where the last call of the calendar ended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Connally	Hoey
Austin	Cordon	Huffman
Bailey	Donnell	Johnson, Colo.
Ball	Downey	Johnston, S. C.
Bankhead	Eastland	Knowland
Barkley	Ellender	La Follette
Bilbo	Ferguson	Lucas
Brewster	Fulbright	McCarran
Briggs	George	McClellan
Brooks	Gerry	McKellar
Buck	Green	McMahon
Butler	Guffey	Magnuson
Byrd	Gurney	Maybank
Capehart	Hart	Mead
Capper	Hawkes	Millikin
Carville	Hayden	Moore
Chandler	Hickenlooper	Morse
Chavez	Hill	Murdock

Murray	Saltonstall	Wagner
O'Daniel	Shipstead	Wheeler
O'Mahoney	Smith	Wherry
Overton	Stewart	White
Radcliffe	Taft	Wiley
Reed	Taylor	Wilson
Revercomb	Tunnell	Young
Robertson	Tydings	
Russell	Vandenberg	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent attending the Food and Agriculture Conference in Quebec.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who is one of the members of the Senate delegation to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Conference at Quebec, has been excused to attend its sessions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no objection, of course, to that portion of the motion requesting a conference being agreed to; but at the moment I shall have to object to the portion of the motion which has to do with the appointment of the conferees. Unhappily, there seems to be somewhat of a controversy as to the Senators who are to represent the Senate on this conference. I must object to that part of the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to have the question divided if he so desires.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I regret that this issue has arisen at this time, and I hope the matter may be laid aside temporarily, with the hope that there may be appropriate adjustment of the situation. I would appreciate having it laid aside, if that be possible.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the suggestion just made by my colleague. I think it very possible that an adjustment may be made in this matter, and that a controversy over the naming of conferees, which, I realize, is a most unusual thing, may be avoided. I hope the matter may be temporarily laid aside, or that the motion be withheld temporarily, so that some adjustment may be worked out. I cannot at this time agree that the Chair shall appoint the conferees.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Maine that, as I understand, the conferees are divided proportionately between the majority and the minority, and it is only a question of the minority selecting the minority membership. There are to be three members of the conference from the majority and two from the minority, in a committee of five conferees. If the objection of the Senator from Maine is to the personnel of the conference committee, that is a matter to be settled on the other side of the aisle. If the objection is on this side, I think this side can settle it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, without going into too much detail, the situation was that the majority of the Senate, in the consideration of Senate bill 2, in a matter which involved I would say 90 percent of the disagreement, a matter of very profound principle, represented a certain point of view which apparently is not reflected in the conferees who are suggested. So I would hope that the Senate itself might at least consider whether or not in the point of view of the majority of the Senate, as the Senator from Nevada points out, should not be reflected. That is the question which arises. I hope there may be some adjustment, if the matter may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to disagree to the amendments of the House and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been customary for the Chair to name conferees, but of course under the rule the Senate has the right to elect its conferees, and in the absence of a unanimous-consent agreement that the Chair name them, I suppose the next step would be to move that certain conferees be elected. I hope we will not have to come to that, but that is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that to be the rule of the Senate, but I hope that is not going to be an issue immediately presented to us.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I was simply trying to clear the parliamentary situation in view of the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is correct in his statement. Either the chairman of the committee or the member of the committee having the bill in charge would have the right to make a motion respecting the appointment of conferees.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Would such a motion be debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion would be debatable and amendable.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should not resist a request on the part of the Senator from Maine for a reasonable delay. I could make the motion and acquiesce in his request. So I will enter the motion that conferees be appointed. That motion is debatable, I take it. Certainly I should not resist any reasonable delay.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The proper motion is not that conferees be appointed. The proper motion is to name the conferees in the motion and move that they be elected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the correct procedure. If the Senator from North Carolina desires to make a motion to that effect he will be recognized for that purpose.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement. I filed with the President of the Senate just now a list of five names. Mine is not on the list, so I am not embarrassed. That is the custom which I have always followed in the Senate, and according to my recollection that is the universal custom. But let no Senator for 1 minute get the impression that I am insisting on any right to name conferees. They are named by the Chair, and I take it if the Chair does not satisfy the Senate, the Senate may name them.

I have no favorites in the matter. I named the two ranking Republicans. I left out the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] because the Senator from Maine informed me that the Senator from Michigan desired his name to be omitted. I named the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. They rank next to the Senator from Michigan. Then in order to accommodate myself to the peculiar situation in the committee, I left out my own self, and I like that. That does not trouble me. I shall not be here the latter part of this week. I have got to go home, and I may be gone for some days. I think the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the author of the bill which the Senate approved, who was chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the bill through the Senate, ought to be made chairman. So I named him.

As for the others, I named the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. I do not know how he stands concerning the subject, but I think he is a very level-headed, high-minded, reliable Senator. Who is the other one I named?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. I named the Senator from Washington only because of his unusual interest in aviation, and because of his usefulness on the committee. But I have no idea of how the several Senators voted in the Senate. I was simply trying to do the fair thing and obtain good men. I am not insisting upon anyone being on the committee. If I were to insist on any one, I would insist that the Senator from Nevada be made chairman. That is all I have to say.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has indicated that the senior Senator from Michigan asked to be not appointed as a conferee. I should like to have the record clear on that subject. I made the request because it is my view that one who has lost a battle in the Senate and has been overruled should not be a conferee on the issue thus involved.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well. We have that straight. I do not quite understand the significance of the remark. I was not appointing anyone on the ground of winning or losing battles. With respect to the Republican side I was following the rule that was given me by the late Senator McNary. He was the minority leader. I used to ask him about matters of this sort and he would invariably say, "Follow the rule of seniority and no one can complain." So that is what I was doing.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know nothing about the particulars——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Maine suspend a moment so the clerk may state the motion of the Senator from North Carolina?

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. BAILEY moves the election as conferees on the part of the Senate on Senate bill 2 of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know nothing about the views on this matter of any of the Senators whose names are upon that list. But I think it is not unreasonable when a controversy has arisen as to those who shall serve as conferees that the matter not be forced to an immediate decision. I think it is entirely reasonable to ask that the entire matter may stand over. This subject matter has been before the House and the Senate for long weeks, and it is not a matter which is now imminent. Nothing is going to happen to this country if we have a day in which to consider this problem. I still indulge the hope that if time is given to us and we approach the subject in the right spirit, conferees may be selected who will be satisfactory to both sides of the Chamber and to both points of view in the Chamber. I am making the request that the matter go over today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I have the right to object, let me say that it seems to me the bill should be taken up by a conference committee with a reasonable degree of promptness. It has just come over from the House. If I were to express my personal desire in the matter, I should like to have the measure taken up in conference at once. I so expressed myself to the able Representative who had charge of the bill in the House. I have a personal reason for that, in that next Sunday I wish to leave for the West. That does not need to enter into the question at all. But it seems to me that the chairman of the committee has followed an unbroken rule or precedent in naming as members of the conference committee the Senators he has named, together with the Senator who had charge of the bill all the way through. In the case of bills which have been subject to much more contention on the floor of the Senate than the bill in question, I have known of instances of Senators who were actively interested and were even on the winning side being left off the conference.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have heard statements with respect to the desirability of speed in the disposition of this matter, but I remind the Senator that this proposed legislation has been before the committee of the Senate and before the Senate week after week and month after month, and it has taken a reasonable length of time for its disposition in the other branch of the Congress. I cannot see any harm in at least giving us until tomorrow to consider the problem which has been presented. It is somewhat unusual for the Senate to elect its conferees.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to assure the Senator that I have no objection whatever to such delay as the Senator may think proper. I wish to make that clear. I would not resist the Senator's suggestion for one moment.

Mr. WHITE. So far as I am concerned, if the matter can go over today and until the next session of the Senate, I will have said all I care to say about delay. I might wish to discuss other features of the subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might say in that connection, Mr. President, that the chances are that we will not consider any business at the session on tomorrow, so that if the matter goes over today it goes over until Wednesday. Personally, I see no great harm to come from that course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Objection to what—to my request that the motion go over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine that the motion go over? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar, under rule VIII, is now in order. In accordance with the order previously entered, the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 630.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 914) to amend the Tariff Act, as amended, was announced as first in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill from some member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It seems to be rather far reaching.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was reported by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who is not now present. Will the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] give his attention to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. JOHNSON subsequently said: Mr. President, during the consideration of the calendar, Calendar No. 630, Senate bill 914 was temporarily passed over. I desire to have it considered before we proceed to other matters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 914) to amend the Tariff Act, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, I understand that it merely authorizes freight forwarders to transport bonded merchandise, just as is generally done by common carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and consideration of the bill is necessary because Congress has said that freight forwarders are not common carriers.

Mr. WHITE. And it puts freight forwarders, with respect to this character of business, in precisely the same category with common carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. The bill would not determine the question which has been in controvery in Congress, namely, whether a freight forwarder is a common carrier. Leaving that question entirely out of the picture, the Secretary of the Treasury may now permit common carriers to transport bonded merchandise.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, when the bill was first called on the calendar I asked for an explanation of it, and the bill was temporarily put over at the request of the Senator from Colorado.

As I understand the bill, it does not create any new powers in the Secretary

of the Treasury, but it does include forwarding carriers only under the powers already existing in the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. The Secretary of the Treasury has general power, under the Common Carrier Act, to do what it is intended to be done under this bill. The Secretary of the Treasury has already exercised that power over freight forwarders, but the Congress in the meantime had ruled that freight forwarders were not common carriers. The time has come when it is necessary to have a clarification so that freight forwarders may come under the Treasury supervision.

The bill has been considered by the officials of the Treasury Department, and their suggestions have been incorporated in amendments to the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the Senator from Colorado has said. Back in 1930, when section 551 of the Tariff Act was enacted, it was provided that railroads, steamships, or any other common carrier should be permitted to carry bonded merchandise under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. At that time freight forwarders were generally regarded as common carriers. About 1938 the Interstate Commerce Commission ruled that they were not carriers, but shippers. Since then the Congress enacted legislation carrying out the findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission that freight forwarders were not common carriers.

The Secretary of the Treasury wants to use freight forwarders. They want to be used. So, as the Senator from Colorado has already said, the proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use the carriers to whom I have referred in the way that he has been using them up to the present time. However, in the light of the findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission the Secretary of the Treasury finds it necessary to have some specific authority furnished him, and this bill supplies that authority. I assure the Senate there is nothing objectionable in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 914) to amend the Tariff Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, sec. 1551) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 551. Bonding of carriers: Under such regulations and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, any common carrier of merchandise owning or operating a railroad, steamship, or other transportation line or route for the transportation of merchandise in the United States, or any freight forwarder, as defined in section 402 of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, title 49, sec. 1002 (5)), upon application, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be designated as a carrier of bonded merchandise for the final release of which from customs custody a permit has not been issued."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise."

PERIOD OF LIMITATION ON CERTAIN ACTIONS BY OR AGAINST MOTOR CARRIERS AND FREIGHT FORWARDERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 356) to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide a limitation on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Interstate Commerce was, in section 1, on page 2, line 1, after the word "within", to strike out "two" and insert "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "two" and insert "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the words "within the", to strike out "two-year" and insert "three-year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 13, after the words "expiration of the", to strike out "two-year" and insert "three-year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 2. Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 414 the following new section:

"LIMITATION ON ACTIONS

"SEC. 414a. (a) All actions at law by freight forwarders for recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 3 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(b) For recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun against freight forwarders within 3 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (c) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the freight forwarder within the 3-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the freight forwarder to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(c) If on or before expiration of the 3-year period of limitation in paragraph (b) of this section a freight forwarder begins action under paragraph (a) of this section for recovery of charges in respect of the same service, or without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the freight forwarder.

"(d) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the freight forwarder, and not after.

"(e) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(f) The provisions of this section shall extend to and embrace only cases in which the cause of action may accrue on and after the date of enactment of this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 223 the following new section:

"LIMITATION ON ACTIONS

"SEC. 223a. (a) All actions at law by common carriers subject to this part for recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 3 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(b) For recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun against common carriers subject to this part within 3 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (c) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the 3-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(c) If on or before expiration of the 3-year period of limitation in paragraph (b) of this section a common carrier subject to this part begins action under paragraph (a) of this section for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the carrier.

"(d) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the carrier, and not after.

"(e) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for transportation services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(f) The provisions of this section shall extend to and embrace only cases in which the cause of action may accrue on and after the date of the enactment of this section."

SEC. 2. Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 414 the following new section:

"LIMITATION ON ACTIONS

"SEC. 414a. (a) All actions at law by freight forwarders for recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 3 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(b) For recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun against freight forwarders within 3 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (c) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the freight forwarder within the 3-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the freight forwarder to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(c) If on or before expiration of the 3-year period of limitation in paragraph (b) of this section a freight forwarder begins action under paragraph (a) of this section for recovery of charges in respect of the same service, or without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the freight forwarder.

"(d) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the freight forwarder, and not after.

"(e) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(f) The provisions of this section shall extend to and embrace only cases in which the cause of action may accrue on and after the date of enactment of this section."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders."

PERIOD OF LIMITATION ON CERTAIN ACTIONS BY OR AGAINST RAILROAD CARRIERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 432), to increase the period of limitation on actions against railroad carriers for recovery of overcharges from 2 to 4 years, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Interstate Commerce was, on page 1, line 4, after the figure "(1)", to insert "by striking out in paragraph (3) (a) thereof the words 'two years' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'three years'; (2)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "words", to strike out "four years" and insert "three years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 1, after the word "word", to strike out "four-year", and insert "three-year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 2, after the word "and", to strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "four-year", and insert "three-year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out in paragraph (3) (a) thereof the words "two years" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "three years"; (2) by striking out in paragraph (3) (c) thereof the words "two years" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "three years", and by striking out in such paragraph the word "two-year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "three-year"; and (3) by striking out in paragraph 3 (d) thereof the words "two-year period of limitation in subdivision (c) of this paragraph" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "three-year period of limitation in subdivision (c) of this paragraph."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase from 2 to 3 years the period of limitation on actions for undercharges and overcharges by or against railroad carriers."

MARGERY ANDERSON BRIDGES

The bill (S. 203) for the relief of Margery Anderson Bridges, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws the temporary admission to the United States of Margery Anderson Bridges, the wife of Robert E. Bridges, a native-born citizen of the State of Georgia, is hereby declared a record of permanent admission as of the date she last temporarily entered continental United States, to wit, January 25, 1940.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT

The bill (H. R. 1104) to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

AUTHORITY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE TO MAKE ARRESTS

The bill (H. R. 386) to amend the law relating to the authority of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant in certain cases and to search vehicles within certain areas, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the bill would give representatives of the Immigration and Naturalization Service authority to make arrests in certain cases. It has been requested by the Attorney General in order to facilitate the operations of that service. The letter of the Attorney General states, in a paragraph, the necessity for the bill. He says:

Under existing law arrests of aliens may be made without warrant only if the alien is entering or attempting to enter the United States in the presence or view of the arresting officer (43 Stat. 1049; 8 U. S. C. 110). Aliens illegally in the United States may be arrested only pursuant to a warrant issued by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

It is said that this limitation makes the operation cumbersome, and that frequently persons escape before they can be arrested. The bill would permit representatives of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant whenever the evidence was sufficient to justify an arrest. I do not believe that it would encroach upon the rights of any individual. He would be fully protected. He would be taken immediately before an officer who could issue a warrant. The bill would permit the detention of such an individual for the time being. The Attorney General feels that the bill is necessary in order to prevent the escape of persons sought to be arrested while the officer is undertaking to obtain papers. If a person can be detained in the meantime, a warrant can be procured and served without letting the person get away. It seems to me to be a proper measure. The committee considered it and heard the testimony of officials of both the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the State Department. We also have a letter from the Attorney General.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very clear explanation dealing with the first part of the bill. However, I am interested in the part under subdivision (2), which provides that agents and officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service may board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States, railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle, within a reasonable distance of any external boundary of the United States. It seems to me that that language would allow a pretty broad search.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that language is in the existing law. It has been in the law for a number of years. The only change in existing law is that referred to by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. The language just read by the Senator from West Virginia is in the law at the present time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I read the report on the bill, under existing law an immigration officer may arrest an alien only if he sees him either entering or trying to enter this country unlawfully. The bill would enlarge his authority so that he could arrest a person even though he did not see him entering. Also it would permit him to go aboard any vessel in our territorial waters, or enter any automobile or railroad carriage, without a warrant, and arrest such a person. In other words, if one were driving his car along the highway, he could be stopped by an immigration officer who might say, "I want to look through your car. I believe you have an alien in there." It seems to me that that is going pretty far.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Massachusetts is correct, my recollection is in error. I do not have the hearings before me, but I listened very attentively to the explanation of the bill. I understood the representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to say that such authority was contained in existing law. It is entirely possible that my memory is in error.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The only new feature in subdivision (2), which the Senator read, is the right to search aircraft. The remainder of the language is in existing law. The new language, in which the Department is most interested, is subdivision (3), which reads as follows:

(3) to make arrests for felonies which have been committed and which are cognizable under any law of the United States regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, if the person making the arrest

has reason to believe that the person so arrested is guilty of such felony and if there is likelihood of the person escaping before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest, but the person arrested shall be taken without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States; and such employee shall have power to execute any warrant or other process issued by any officer under any law regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens.

That is the new part. The only new language in subdivision (2) deals with the right to search aircraft.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, there seems to be some difference of view as to the existing law and the proposed change. I do not wish to cause undue delay in the consideration of the bill. However, in view of the situation to which I have referred, I feel that the bill ought to be passed over temporarily and called up later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CITIZENSHIP

The bill (H. R. 390) to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. REVERCOMB subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that the vote by which House bill 390, Calendar No. 636, was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the vote by which the bill was passed is reconsidered, and the bill is now before the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I request an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this bill would simply change the definition of persons ineligible to citizenship so as to bring it up to date. It now includes, although perhaps it has no effect, persons of the Chinese race. As we know, the law was amended in 1943 so as to make persons of the Chinese race eligible for citizenship under certain conditions. The bill would make neutral aliens who refuse service under the Selective Service Act ineligible for citizenship. That was the intent of the Selective Service Act, and the bill simply would make this particular section of the Immigration Act consistent with that intention.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether the amendment with respect to permitting Chinese to apply for citizenship in any way affects the quota for entrance or attempts to affect it.

Mr. BALL. No; not at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 390) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATURALIZATION DOCUMENT FEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 391) to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment, on page 2, in line 9, after the figure "1940", to strike out "and before the termination of hostilities in the present war."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill from the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to waive certain nominal fees which are charged for various documents issued in the naturalization process. It is desired to waive the fees in behalf of veterans and members of our armed forces. Normally such fees are required of persons desiring the duplication of certain documents issued in the naturalization process.

It is my understanding that in 1934 this waiver was granted on behalf of certain veterans, namely, those who served between April 5, 1917, and November 12, 1918. The waiver was repealed in 1940.

The purpose of the bill now under discussion is to reinstate the waiver of such fees in the cases of two types of documents, namely, applications for declarations of intention to become a citizen, in lieu of declarations alleged to have been lost, mutilated, or destroyed; and, in the second place, applications for certificates of naturalization, in lieu of certificates alleged to have been lost, mutilated, or destroyed.

This bill undertakes not only to reinstate the waiver but to extend it so as to cover veterans of the war just ended, veterans of the Spanish-American War, veterans of the Philippine Insurrection, veterans of the campaign on the Mexican border, and also members of the armed forces who are still in the service or who will enter the service in the future. The theory of the bill is that because of the itinerant life of a soldier he is very likely to lose such documents.

The fees in question are very small—only $1 each for the declarations to which I have referred. It is deemed by the committee advisable to grant this waiver.

In conclusion, I may say that the bill is recommended by the Attorney General, although since the Attorney General's recommendation there has been a further extension of the bill by means of an amendment noted on the second page, in line 9, so as to strike out the words "and before the termination of hostilities in the present war." The effect of the amendment is to make the bill applicable to members of the armed forces who are still in the service or those who will enter the armed forces in the future.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection to the bill, so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment on page 2 has already been agreed to.

The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DR. ERNEST H. STARK

The bill (H. R. 239) for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. JAMES M. HOOKS

The bill (H. R. 240) for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OSCAR R. STEINERT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, in line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

JOHN C. MAY AND EVA JENKINS MAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1084) for the relief of John C. May and Eva Jenkins May, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,650" and insert "$3,652.25."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John C. May and Eva Jenkins May, of New Orleans, La., the sum of $3,652.25, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their son, Charles Kenneth May, age six years, resulting from fatal personal injuries received when he was struck and run over by a United States Army truck on Gentilly Highway at or near the intersection of Piety Street, New Orleans, La., on January 24, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JESS HUDSON

The bill (S. 1131) for the relief of Jess Hudson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jess Hudson, of Birmingham, Ala., the sum of $255.26, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred on January 15, 1944, when the automobile which he was driving was struck by a United States Army vehicle on Fiftieth Street North, in Birmingham, Ala.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

N. OWEN OXLEY, ETC.

The bill (H. R. 1563) for the relief of N. Owen Oxley and the legal guardian of Lamar Oxley, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENCE BARROWS

The bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Florence Barrows was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Florence Barrows, of the town of Exeter, county of Kent, State of Rhode Island, the sum of $2,500, in full settlement for personal injuries sustained by her on December 18, 1943, when she was injured by an Army truck, W-422452, operated by an enlisted man of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CHARLES BRYAN

The bill (S. 1122) for the relief of Charles Bryan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Bryan, of Lincoln, Nebr., the sum of $5,881.40, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle while directing traffic, in Lincoln, Nebr., on August 24, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JOHN A. HATCHER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1296) for the relief of John A. Hatcher, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$650."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $650, to John A. Hatcher, of Teays, W. Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Navy vehicle, near Saint Albans, W. Va., on December 5, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

RELIEF OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 1465) for the relief of the State of California was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF PETER G. FABIAN, DECEASED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, in line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,423.75" and insert "$5,423.75."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 473) relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Request is made that the bill be passed over, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the bill. I invite the attention of the Senate again to Calendar No. 651, Senate bill 1120, now on the calendar. I would not expect the bill to be passed during the call of the consent calendar, but I express the hope each Member of the Senate will give the bill special consideration and special study because it involves reorganization of the departments of Government, giving the President of the United States the right to reorganize, under certain limitations and certain conditions. The bill will be called up in the not-far-distant future, and it is highly important that every Member of the Senate have quite an intimate knowledge of what is contained in the bill.

INDUCEMENTS TO CITIZENS TO MAKE THE NAVY A CAREER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1438) to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States Navy a career, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in addition to persons to whom the provisions of section 203 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1178) now apply the provisions of that section shall also apply to men who have been transferred to the Fleet Reserve subsequent to June 30, 1945, and to men who enlisted or enlist in the Regular Navy after July 1, 1925, and prior to a date 121 days after the date of approval of this act, and to men who, having been discharged from the Regular Navy after July 1, 1925, and prior to a date 121 days after the date of approval of this act, reenlisted or reenlist in the Regular Navy within 3 months from the date of their discharge.

(b) Section 203 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1178) is hereby further amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding thereto the following proviso: "*And provided further*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year for purposes of this section in computing years of naval service and base pay, plus all permanent additions thereto."

SEC. 2. Section 204 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1179) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Men serving in the Regular Navy on June 25, 1938, who first enlisted in the Navy after July 1, 1925, or who reenlisted therein after July 1, 1925, having been out of the Regular Navy for more than 3 months, and men who first enlist in the Regular Navy after June 25, 1938, may upon their own request be transferred to the Fleet Reserve upon the completion of at least 20 years' naval service. After such transfer, except when on active duty, they shall be paid at the rate of 2½ per cent of the base pay they are receiving at the time of transfer multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, plus all permanent additions thereto: *Provided*, That the pay authorized in this section shall be increased 10 percent for all men who may be credited with extraordinary heroism in the line of duty or whose average marks in conduct for 20 years or more shall not be less than 95 percent of the maximum: *Provided further*, That the determination of the Secretary of the Navy as to the definition of extraordinary heroism shall be final and conclusive for all purposes: *Provided further*, That the pay authorized in this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay they were receiving at the time of transfer: *Provided further*, That all enlisted men transferred to the Fleet Reserve in accordance with the provisions of sections 1 and 203 of this act, as amended, shall, upon completion of 30 years' service, be transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy, with the pay they were then legally entitled to receive: *Provided further*, That all enlisted men transferred to the Fleet Reserve in accordance with the provisions of this section shall, upon completion of 30 years' service, be transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy with

the pay they were then legally entitled to receive: *Provided further*, That nothing contained within this section shall be construed to prevent persons who qualify for transfer to the Fleet Reserve under the provisions of section 203 of this act, as amended, from being transferred in accordance with the provisions of this section if they so elect: *And provided further*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year for purposes of this section in computing years of naval service and base pay, plus all permanent additions thereto."

SEC. 3. Title II of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1178), is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section numbered 208, to read as follows:

"SEC. 208. Whenever enlisted men of the Fleet Reserve, transferred thereto after more than 16 years' service, or enlisted men transferred from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the Regular Navy, perform active duty, such active duty, except that which they are required to perform in time of peace under section 206 of this title, shall be included in the computation of their total service for the purpose of computing their retainer or retired pay when in an inactive-duty status, and in the computation of their retainer or retired pay all active duty so performed subsequent to the effective date of transfer to the Fleet Reserve or to the retired list shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retainer or retired pay and shall be based on the pay received by them at the time they resume an inactive-duty status, including increases in consequence of promotion, longevity, and conduct or extraordinary heroism, and if they shall have completed a total of 20 years' or more of active service their pay shall be computed in the manner prescribed in section 204 of this act as amended: *Provided*, That active duty performed during any period of national emergency declared by the President shall be considered for the purpose of this section as not being active duty in time of peace required by section 206: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Marine Corps, shall apply to enlisted men of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve and to enlisted men transferred from such Reserve to the retired list: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall operate to reduce the retainer or retired pay and allowances to which any enlisted man would otherwise have been entitled: *And provided further*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year for purposes of this section in computing years of naval service and base pay, plus all permanent additions thereto."

SEC. 4. The provision contained in section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 364) which reads as follows: "*Provided further*, That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter the provisions of section 2 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, 77th Cong.), are hereby suspended," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. (a) The authority conferred upon the President by the act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), as amended, to appoint commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy to commissioned grades or ranks is hereby extended to include authority to appoint chief petty officers of the Regular Navy who have completed not less than 3 years of service as chief petty officers to commissioned grades or ranks in like manner and under the same conditions and circumstances, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, as is provided in that act, as amended, for the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned grades or ranks.

(b) The authority conferred upon the President by the act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), as amended, to appoint commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy to commissioned grades or ranks is hereby extended to include authority to appoint any enlisted man of the Regular Navy who has not, on the date of such appointment, attained his thirty-third birthday and who has served continuously and immediately prior to such appointment in the Regular Navy for a period of not less than 4 years to the commissioned grade or rank of ensign in the line or staff corps of the Regular Navy in like manner and under the same conditions and circumstances, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, as is provided in that act, as amended, for the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned grades or ranks: *Provided*, That the authorized number of commissioned officers of the line and of each staff corps to which appointments pursuant to this subsection may be made will not be increased according to the number of appointments made, and officers appointed pursuant to this subsection shall not be carried as extra numbers in the grades or ranks in which appointed.

(c) In computing the years of service necessary for appointment to commissioned grade or rank pursuant to the act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), and pursuant to this section, at least 1 year of such service shall have been in the Regular Navy. The remaining portion of such service may have been active duty in a reserve component of the Navy after September 8, 1939, and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President or established by act or resolution of the Congress.

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection 8 (c) of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) An officer or enlisted man on the retired list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps who was placed thereon by reason of physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher rank, subject to the provisions of subsection (e) hereof, be advanced on the retired list to such higher rank with retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in that rank."

(b) Subsection 8 (e) of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) The benefits of this section shall apply only to an individual who incurs physical disability in line of duty in time of war or national emergency. In the case of those officers and enlisted men to whom subsection (c) hereof is applicable, retirement in the next higher rank shall be effected upon a finding by a naval retiring board that the disability was incident to the service while on active duty in the higher rank and upon a rating by such board, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, at not less than 30 percent permanent disability. In all other cases officers and enlisted men shall be retired in accordance with existing law providing for the retirement of officers or enlisted men."

(c) Subsection 8 (g) of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), is hereby amended ab initio to read as follows:

"(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply in any case if the proceedings of the naval retiring board be commenced subsequent to a date 6 months after the termination of the temporary appointment or release from active duty of the individual concerned whichever may occur later, except in the case of any individual whose temporary appointment shall have been terminated prior to the date of this amendment, or who, prior to such date, shall have been released from active duty."

SEC. 7. Enlisted men of any component of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard discharged on or after February 1, 1945, for the purpose of enlisting in the Regular Establishment of any of the armed forces shall be entitled to the travel allowance as authorized in the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895).

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is not present at the moment. However, I can give the Senator from Oregon a general picture of the bill.

The philosophy of the bill is to encourage enlistments in the United States Navy. Prior to the war, men who served 16 or 20 years were given certain retirement rights as an inducement to keep them in the service. After examination, the Committee on Naval Affairs desired to have that policy reinstated, with a few additional advantages. But, basically, the same pattern as that which prevailed before the outbreak of the war was voted by the committee to be adopted for the postwar period. However, the committee decided as an inducement that the enlistment period should be shortened, so that a man could enlist for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, or 4 years, in the expectation that men who were drafted into the Navy and who wished to go home might be discharged and might be replaced by volunteers. That is the philosophy and purpose of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1438) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States naval service a career, and for other purposes."

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the committee report on S. 1438 (Rept. No. 641) be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1438) to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States Navy a career, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to provide additional inducements, (1) to those enlisted personnel now in the regular naval service to reenlist, (2) to those enlisted personnel now in the Reserve to transfer to the Regular Establishment, (3) to those inductees now in the service to reenlist, and (4) to provide added inducement to persons who consider enlisting in the naval service.

The bill will do much to assist the Navy Department in its determined effort to recruit volunteers for the postwar Navy. The bill is intended to provide more incentives for men to make the Navy a career for 16 or 20 years and thereafter transfer to the Fleet Reserve. The Navy has had a reserve force ever since 1916. In both World War I and World War II the men of the Fleet Reserve, i. e., men transferred to the Reserve after 16 or 20 years' service, have been of great value to the Navy as they provided a large reservoir

of trained men who were immediately available for active service with the fleet, and who were available to train the additional personnel needed as the numbers of naval vessels continued to increase.

The Naval Reserve occupies an important place in our plans for the future security of our Nation, and officers and men of the Reserve are needed to augment the Regular Navy immediately on the outbreak of war, and with the Regular Navy, to bear the first shock of battle in meeting an enemy attack.

The bill would amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, the Temporary Promotion Act of July 24, 1941, and the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. The Naval Reserve Act of 1938 discontinued the 16-year Fleet Reserve for those who first enlisted after July 1, 1925 and curtailed some of the benefits for the 20-year Reserve as to those persons who were not in the service on July 1, 1925, those who first enlisted after that date, and those who did not reenlist within 3 months from date of discharge. The law with respect to the Fleet Reserve, as it existed before the 1938 act, permitted men who had served in the regular service for 16 years to transfer to the Fleet Reserve with one-third pay, plus all permanent additions, and those who served 20 years in the regular service to transfer to the Fleet Reserve with one-half of their pay, plus all permanent additions.

The present bill would restore these benefits and in addition would grant additional benefits to persons transferring to the Fleet Reserve after 16 or 20 years' service.

Provision is made for a new section 208 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, which would permit enlisted men of the Fleet Reserve who perform active duty thereafter to have such active duty counted in the computation of percentage rates and increases with respect to their retainer or retired pay, including increases in consequence of promotion.

The act of August 18, 1941, provided an enlistment allowance equal to that provided in the act of June 10, 1922, for enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, who were enlisted within 24 hours following honorable discharge. This additional allowance is payable during war or national emergency but section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 suspended the additional allowance authorized by the act of August 18, 1941. The present bill would remove the suspension. Payment of this additional allowance will furnish a strong incentive for men to reenlist.

The act of July 24, 1941, would be amended to provide that retired enlisted men and Fleet Reservists who performed active duty during the present war and served in higher temporary or commissioned ranks, if they incurred physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher rank, would, when returning to inactive, retired, or Fleet Reserve status, be advanced on the retired list or in the Fleet Reserve to the highest rank held while on active duty provided their service was satisfactory.

A further important change recommended by the committee would permit chief petty officers of the Regular Navy to be commissioned in the grade or rank for which they make application and for which they are found qualified, not above that of lieutenant in the line and Staff Corps of the Navy.

Candidates shall have completed not less than 3 years of service as a chief petty officer and to be eligible for appointment in the rank of lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade), or ensign be not more than 40, 35, or 32 years of age, respectively.

A candidate will have to be recommended by his commanding officer under whom he has served as a chief petty officer and will have to establish his mental, moral, physical, and professional qualifications, in accordance with standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

The committee has also recommended a new policy which will permit any enlisted men under 33 years of age, who has served in the Regular Navy for 3 years and whose record has ben satisfactory, upon the recommendation of his commanding officer, to take a competitive examination for promotion to the rank of ensign.

The candidate will have to establish his mental, moral, physical, and professional qualifications in accordance with standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

The present bill (S. 1438) provides a basis for computing the retired and retainer pay of Fleet Reservists with more than 20 years of service and of retired enlisted men similar to that provided for men of the Army by the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, in that it provides for such computations on the basis of 2½ percent per year of active service.

It is the considered opinion of the committee that enactment of the bill (S. 1438), which makes provision for capable and ambitious enlisted men to attain higher rank in the Navy and which increases the benefits to be derived from a transfer to the Fleet Reserve of those who complete 16 or 20 years as enlisted men, will do much to make the Navy an entirely volunteer organization as it was before the war and remove any necessity for the Navy to rely upon Selective Service in building up to postwar strength.

A section-by-section explanation of the bill is as follows:

SECTION 1

Under existing law enlisted men of the Regular Navy who enlisted on or before July 1, 1925, are entitled to be transferred to the Fleet Reserve after 16 or more years of naval service (sec. 203 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, 52 Stat. 1178). If they have served 16 years but less than 20 years, they receive after transfer as retainer pay one-third of the base pay they were receiving at the time of transfer. If they have served 20 years or more, their retainer pay is one-half of their base pay. To this retainer pay is added the permanent additions to pay (longevity increases) to which the men were entitled at the time of transfer. The pay of these Fleet Reservists is further increased by 10 percent in the cases of such men as are credited with extraordinary heroism in the line of duty or whose average marks in conduct for 20 years or more are not less than 95 percent of the maximum.

Section 1 of the bill, S. 1438, would offer to men who enlisted or enlist after July 1, 1925, and before a date 121 days after the enactment of the bill, the privilege of being transferred to the Fleet Reserve after 16 or more years of naval service with the same retainer pay as is now provided for men who enlisted on or before July 1, 1925. It is also provided in section 1 that a fractional year of 6 months or more would count as a full year in computing length of service and pay for all men who have become or who become entitled to transfer to the Fleet Reserve after 16 or more years of naval service.

It will be noted that any man now in the Regular Navy who reenlists at any time hereafter within 3 months from the date of his discharge will preserve for himself the privilege of going into the Fleet Reserve after 16 years' service. A man who first enlists in the Regular Navy within 121 days after the bill is enacted will enjoy the same privilege. Those who fail to reenlist within 121 days and those who first enlist in the Regular Navy 121 days after the enactment of the bill will have to remain in the Navy for a period of 20 years before being eligible to transfer to the Fleet Reserve.

SECTION 2

The privilege of transfer to the Fleet Reserve after 16 years of naval service is of limited duration both under existing law and under the proposal contained in section 1 of this bill as explained above.

The permanent, or continuing, provision for transfer to the Fleet Reserve is contained in section 204 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1179). Under section 204 men who enlisted after July 1, 1925, are entitled to transfer after at least 20 years' naval service provided they are physically and otherwise qualified to perform duty in time of war. Their retainer pay after transfer is one-half of the base pay they were receiving at the time of transfer. They do not receive permanent additions to pay (longevity increases) nor do they receive additions for heroism or good conduct. Section 204 also provides that Fleet Reservists after 30 years' service shall be transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy with the pay they were receiving as Fleet Reservists except that men who enlisted after July 1, 1925, and who, therefore, did not receive longevity increases as part of their retainer pay in the Fleet Reserve, should receive these longevity increases when transferred to the retired list. Section 204 provides that the retired Fleet Reservists should receive the allowances to which enlisted men of the Regular Navy are entitled on retirement after 30 years' service; however, the receipt of allowances by enlisted men after retirement was discontinued by section 19 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 369).

Section 2 of the present bill (S. 1438) would provide without limit as to duration, for the transfer of enlisted men of the Regular Navy to the Fleet Reserve after 20 or more years of naval service. Their retainer pay would be computed at the rate of 2½ percent of the base pay they were receiving at the time of transfer multiplied by the number of years of their service plus all permanent additions thereto. The pay of each man so transferred who is credited with extraordinary heroism in the line of duty or whose average marks in conduct for 20 years or more is not less than 95 percent of the maximum would be increased by 10 percent. However, the total retainer pay received by a Fleet Reservist could not exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay the man was receiving at the time. A fractional year of 6 months or more would count as a full year in computing years of naval service and retainer pay. Section 2 of the present bill also provides for an ultimate transfer of all Fleet Reservists to the retired list after 30 years' service with retired pay equal to the pay the Reservist was entitled to receive at the time of his transfer to the retired list. The provision contained in the language of the old law for the payment of allowances to retired enlisted men is omitted, as the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 discontinued the payment of allowances to retired enlisted men.

In order to preserve equities in Fleet Reserve retainer pay which men may build up through years of service and yet lose by reason of a disability incurred just prior to qualifying for transfer, the language contained in the old law which requires that reservists at the time of transfer must be physically and otherwise qualified for duty in time of war is omitted from the language of the present bill.

SECTION 3

Under existing law a Fleet Reservist once he has been transferred to the Fleet Reserve cannot enjoy an increase in his pay as a reservist when on an inactive-duty status even though he should return to active duty and serve during war or emergency. Once his duty subsequent to transfer to the Fleet Reserve is complete and he is returned to an inactive status, he receives the same retainer pay that was fixed in his case upon his original transfer to the Fleet Reserve.

Section 3 of the present bill (S. 1438) would allow active service of a Fleet Reservist

or retired enlisted man during war or national emergency to be counted for purposes of increasing his retainer or retired pay when the man concerned has returned to an inactive-duty status.

SECTION 4

Section 2 of the act approved August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, 77th Cong., 55 Stat. 629), provided for the payment of a double enlistment allowance to honorably discharged enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who reenlisted during war or national emergency within 24 hours on board the ship or at the station from which last discharged. This served as a stimulus to immediate voluntary reenlistments.

Section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 364), suspended the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress during the present war and for 6 months thereafter. Personnel for the services were available under selective service at that time so that the stimulus of double enlistment allowances was unnecessary.

At the present time, however, inducements to voluntary reenlistments are highly desirable in building up a volunteer poswar Navy. To this end section 4 of the present bill (S. 1438) would restore the double enlistment allowance to be payable only during war or national emergency.

SECTION 5

The act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), authorizes the appointment of qualified commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy to commissioned grades or ranks not above that of lieutenant in the line and staff corps of the Regular Navy. These officers on June 30 of the calendar year in which appointed must have completed not less than 3 years of service as a warrant officer. The age limitations on the appointment to the grades or ranks of lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade), and ensign are 40, 35, and 32 years, respectively.

Section 5 (a) of the present bill (S. 1438) would extend this authority to allow the appointment of chief petty officers who have served three or more years as such to the same ranks and under the same conditions as now provided by the act of June 27, 1942, for the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to the commissioned grades or ranks of lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade), and ensign. Commissioned warrant officers, warrant officers, and chief petty officers appointed to commissioned ranks become additional numbers in the grade or rank to which appointed and may be appointed to these ranks whether or not there are vacancies in these ranks. In other words persons in the above categories are sure of an appointment to a commissioned rank in the Regular Navy if they meet all the necessary requirements.

Section 5 (b) of the bill would further extend the authority now contained in the act of June 27, 1942, by authorizing the appointment to the grade or rank of ensign of any enlisted man who has served continuously 4 years or more immediately prior to appointment in the Regular Navy. Enlisted men who have served in the Regular Navy for a period of 4 years and who are found qualified for promotion to the rank of ensign would not become additional numbers in grade but would fill an authorized vacancy. In other words they are not guaranteed a commission in the Regular Navy but may be given a commission if there are vacancies in the regular service. Section 5 (c) requires that an eligible candidate shall have served in the Regular Navy for at least 1 year, but that the other 3 years of his service may have been obtained by active duty in a reserve component of the Navy after September 8, 1939, and before the termination of the present war.

SECTION 6

Section 8 of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604), provides, among other things, that an officer of the retired list of the Regular Navy who was retired by reason of physical disability, and who incurs further physical disability while serving on active duty in a temporary rank higher than the rank in which retired, shall be advanced to such higher rank on the retired list with retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in such higher rank.

Section 6 of the present bill (S. 1438) would provide the same privilege and treatment for retired enlisted men of the Regular Navy.

SECTION 7

Enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard are entitled to receive a travel allowance upon discharge at the rate of 5 cents a mile from the place of discharge to the place where they were accepted for enlistment (act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895)).

The Comptroller General has recently held that enlisted men of the Naval Reserve who are discharged for the purpose of immediate enlistment in the Regular Navy are not entitled to this travel allowance.

Section 7 of the present bill (S. 1438) would permit the payment of the travel allowance to such men.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 179) creating a special committee to investigate problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I move the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, my motion is not debatable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion of the Senator from Connecticut cannot be entertained at this time, because the Senate is proceeding with the Consent Calendar.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, under the rule, as I understand it, the resolution is subject to a motion for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it is not. Under rule VIII, such a motion cannot be entertained at this time.

The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

J. CLYDE MARQUIS

The bill (H. R. 2172) for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the calendar.

TRANSFER OF BEN HILL COUNTY, GA., TO MIDDLE JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2668, which was reported earlier in the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by its title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2668) to transfer Ben Hill County, Ga., from the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia to the Americus division of the middle judicial district of Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, I understand that the bill is purely local in its application.

Mr. GEORGE. It would transfer a certain county from the southern judicial district of Georgia to the middle judicial district of Georgia. It is necessary to secure immediate consideration of the bill so that litigants may be advised.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2668) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, has the calendar been completed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been completed.

Mr. McCARRAN. What, if anything, was done with reference to Calendar No. 628, House bill 7?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Consideration of the calendar began with Calendar No. 630, Senate bill 914.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 628, House bill 7, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McMAHON. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 179.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 179) creating a special committee to investigate problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy, which had been reported by the Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments, and by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate without additional amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the resolution

When the bomb-bay doors of the B-29 opened over Hiroshima and the first atomic bomb exploded almost 90 days

ago, in my opinion there occurred, as I said the other day, the most momentous development in the 2,000 years of the world's history since the birth of Jesus Christ.

Eve tempted Adam, and Adam succumbed and partook of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, and as a result Adam and Eve were banished from Paradise.

Man today has tasted the fruit of the secret of energy; he has finally discovered the secret of matter, and I say that unless this momentous development is handled wisely and judiciously, unless it leads to peace and righteousness among men and among nations, all mankind will be banished from the face of the earth.

Our people are rapidly becoming aware of the magnitude of this great problem. It is being discussed in the newspapers and over the radio, and it is well that this is so; but the great need that exists today is for deep and careful consideration by the Senate and by the Congress so that we may, in our country's interest, plot a wise and safe course.

It is because that I was so thoroughly convinced not only of the magnitude of the problem but of the intricacies that surround it that I dared to bring it to the attention of the Senate on the day Congress reconvened last September.

The problems which are involved, Mr. President, will not wait, and that is why I proposed that a committee of this body be formed to handle all aspects of this overwhelming development.

Under the terms of the resolution as reported by the committee the special committee would be equipped to delve into all facets of the situation and the problem which the late President's gamble with fate has brought into being.

I apprehend, Mr. President, that there are at least 12 standing committees of the Senate that could make out a good case for a claim to jurisdiction over various aspects of the matter. In the interest of orderly progress, in the interest of a wise solution of the gigantic problem with which we are faced, I urge my colleagues to vote affirmatively on the resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I totally agree with the observations of the able Senator from Connecticut. As the Senator knows, I was the author of a resolution seeking to follow the Senator's philosophy even further, to the extent of a joint effort by a House and Senate committee on this superlatively important subject. Evidently it is impossible to obtain the consent of the House to the program which the Senate itself endorsed. So it seems very clear to me that the second best procedure is the one suggested by the able Senator from Connecticut, and I hope that without further delay the resolution may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Interstate Commerce was on page 1, line 3, after the name "Senate", to insert "of whom one shall be designated as chairman by the President pro tempore."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, by the amendment authority is given to the President of the Senate to make the appointment of the chairman. What I am interested in is that the appointment shall be made on a seniority basis, that is, that the member of the committee on the majority side having the greatest seniority shall be made chairman. Of course, I know the amendment leaves it entirely open to the President pro tempore of the Senate, and that is perfectly agreeable to me because I have full confidence in his fairness and in his judgment, and whatever decision he may make will, of course, be satisfactory to me; but I most earnestly urge that the President of the Senate name as chairman of this committee the member of the committee on the majority side having the greatest seniority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to say to the Senator from Colorado that if the resolution could be amended so that the chairman of the committee would be selected by the Senate, it would suit the President of the Senate very much better. I should like very much to let that question be decided by the Senate rather than by myself. I merely want to say that if the Senator shall offer an amendment to that effect I hope the Senate will agree to it, and select the chairman of the committee itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What would the Senator think of leaving the selection of the chairman to the committee itself? Would he prefer that?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would be better for the Senate to select the chairman of the committee. I think that would be entirely fair, and it would certainly relieve the President of the Senate very much if that were done. I hope the Senator will offer an amendment to that effect, and I hope the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee that his suggestion, of course, is along the line of democratic procedure, and no one can object to that. However, we have a rule in the Senate whereby chairmen of committees are determined by seniority. That is the rule we have followed for a great many years. Under the pending resolution we are establishing a legislative committee. It is not a committee merely to hold hearings, but it is a legislative committee, with as much power and as much authority as any standing committee of the Senate. I do not know why we should abrogate the rule which has worked so harmoniously and so well in the appointment of committees and in the appointment of chairmen of committees.

Every Senator knows exactly what will happen, of course, if we do not follow the seniority rule. There will be little cliques and groups in the Senate getting together and working together for the appointment of a chairman who is to their particular liking. In order to get away from all such controversy and difficulty, the plan has been accepted by the Senate of appointing the senior members of committees as chairmen. I think that plan should be followed in this instance. Unless it is followed, we are bound to be starting something which will react against the harmonious operation of the Senate in the appointment of its committees.

I do not care to offer an amendment providing that the Senate itself shall select the chairman. I am sure that if the Senate should act it would suggest that the senior member on the majority side of the committee be made chairman, as he should be. Otherwise the Senate would certainly be adopting a practice inconsistent with its other rules. If we wish to change the rules of the Senate and select committees by popular vote, let us do it all down the line. Let us not start by chiseling in this one small instance.

Mr. President, this is an important matter. I know there are advocates of both sides of the question. There are many who think that there should be an election and, through a popularity contest, chairmen of committees should be selected, but, as I have already stated, that would develop into all sorts of factional difficulties and fights and quarrels, the formation of group against group in the Senate itself, until we would not be able to proceed in an orderly way. The orderly way to proceed and the easy way to proceed is to appoint the senior member on the majority side chairman of the committee, and have done with it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Colorado places me in a somewhat embarrassing position; yet I do not see how I can fail to meet the challenge which is implicit in his remarks.

I have the greatest and deepest respect for the traditions of the Senate. During my membership in the Senate, since the 3d of January last, I think I have demonstrated by my conduct my deep respect for the traditions of the Senate. I fully realize the necessity, in the case of a standing committee, of following the rule of seniority, although I appreciate that there have been cogent arguments made against it.

The committee proposed to be created will not be a standing or permanent committee of the Senate, since the resolution provides by its very terms that its life shall expire and terminate at the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator from Colorado speaks, the Chair would like to suggest to him that prior to the time he took the floor the Chair had declared the amendment agreed to. The Chair did not know whether the Senator from Colorado was aware of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I did not understand that the Chair had declared the amendment agreed to, because

the Senator from Colorado was on his feet trying to get recognition from the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, then, the amendment will still be considered pending.

Mr. McMAHON. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not object to the amendment. I wish to discuss it, and I rose for that purpose. I am not objecting to the amendment, whether it has been adopted or not. It is very satisfactory to me, because, as I said a few moments ago, I have complete confidence in the judgment of the President pro tempore and in his doing the right thing. As I said before, and as I repeat, whatever decision he reaches will, of course, be satisfactory to me.

I interrupted the Senator from Connecticut merely to ask him if the committee to be set up is not to be a legislative committee, if it will not have all the power and all the authority, on the particular question referred to it, any other committee of the Senate has in regard to matters referred to it.

Mr. McMAHON. For a very limited period of time, for a year and 3 months; and that, as I understand, follows the precedent of at least two other so-called special committees which are now in existence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Were they legislative committees?

Mr. McMAHON. They carry legislative power, and I should like to call on the senior Senator from Maine, who, I am sure, quoted a precedent in the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to inform the Senator from Colorado and myself if what I have stated is not a fact.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think perhaps I should say that I offered this amendment in the committee, and I did so because without some designation as to the appointment of the chairman, so far as I knew, there would be no rule of the Senate determining who should be the chairman of the special or select committee. The rule in the book applies only to standing committees, and the chairmen of standing committees shall be elected by the Senate, but the rule is wholly silent as to the selection of chairmen of select or special committees. Unless we determine the matter in some way in connection with the resolution creating the committee, the question will arise as to whether the chairman is to be appointed by the committee itself, whether he is to be appointed by the Senate as a whole, or whether he is to be designated by the President of the Senate, or chosen in some other way. It seemed to me wise, although perhaps not terrifically important, that the resolution itself should point the course of procedure.

Mr. McMAHON. It was after the Senator from Maine had pointed out that he has just stated that I, as the sponsor of the resolution, acquiesced willingly in the amendment which was offered.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Colorado—and, as I have said, this is a most embarassing experience for me—to the fact that in connection with the last 17 special committees which were created by the Senate the sponsor of the resolution was named chairman thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. None of those committees were legislative committees; they did not have the power and authority of standing committees. That is the basis for my objection. If the proposed committee were merely to hold hearings and to submit a report to a legislative committee, I should not be on my feet trying to clarify this point. Of course, the point I raise is not before the Senate at this time. The resolution does not say anything about the basis on which the appointment of a chairman shall be made. I am merely calling the attention of the Senate and of the President of the Senate to the fact that in the selection of a chairman it is my sincere hope the President pro tempore will act in accordance with the long-established traditions and rules of the Senate, and appoint the chairman of this temporary standing legislative committee on the basis of seniority.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to reply to the Senator from Colorado by stating that I hope the President pro tempore will follow the precedents as established in this body in connection with special committees, because the committee here proposed is not to be a standing committee of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the second committee amendment.

The amendment was, on page 2, after the words "Senate at", to strike out "any time" and insert "the earliest practicable date."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 4, after the word "resolution" and the period, to insert "The existence of this committee shall terminate at the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move to amend the pending resolution by striking out the word "nine", in line 2, on page 1, and inserting the word "eighteen."

I think we are all convinced, Mr. President, that what we shall decide to do about the question of atomic energy and its peaceful as well as destructive potentials is tremendously important. The legislation dealing with this question on which we shall pass in the next year, during the life of the proposed committee, will probably be the most important legislation that Congress will consider for many decades. Most of our standing committees which consider legislation consist of at least 15 members, and usually of from 18 to 20 or 21 members. It seems to me unwise to confine the study and consideration of this vastly important subject to less than one-tenth of the membership of the Senate. I think we all recognize that the members of this committee may receive confidential information which they will not be able to reveal on the floor of the Senate. That makes it all the more important that the committee be very broadly representative of the whole Senate, and I do not think that will be possible with its membership restricted to nine Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am in complete accord with the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota. If we are going to do a job let us do it properly. If the job is worth doing, let us do the right way. What the Senator has just said is directly to the point. We are dealing with a subject of such tremendous importance that we can hardly realize how important it is. It completely revolutionizes military procedures, both in the Army and the Navy. It may even go so far as to revolutionize all sources of power. Atomic energy carries such far-reaching implications that the Senate ought to proceed in the right way, if it is going to proceed at all. So I hope the Senator's amendment to increase the membership from 9 to 18 will prevail so we may have a representative committee to handle this matter.

I think the Military Affairs Committee, one of the standing committees of the Senate, could have held hearings on this subject and dealt with the proposed legislation; I think the Interstate Commerce Committee could very well have done so; but that does not seem to be the opinion of the majority of the Senate. Now it is proposed to set up a special committee. If we are to set up a special committee, let us do it in the right way, and not in a half-hearted manner. Let us follow the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota and provide that the membership on the committee shall be at least 18, perhaps 21.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I have discussed the question of what we shall do with the atomic bomb with various individuals, and I find all of them to be exceedingly fearful. They do not know what its possibilities are. They do not know how best we can control atomic energy. This lack of knowledge, this lack of information, is the greatest incentive to fear, and the more we tend to concentrate in fewer and fewer hands not only the knowledge of what atomic energy is all about but the consideration and the decision as to what we shall do with it, it seems to me the more we are feeding that fear not only in this country but all over the world.

It is simply too vast a subject, too important a subject for the future of the whole country, not to have consideration of it on the broadest basis we can provide.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement on the whole subject with regard to the setting up of a special committee. I was one of the Senators who felt that a special committee was unnecessary under the circumstances, notwithstanding the importance of the subject. Legislation concerning many important discoveries and inventions has been handled by standing committees. Probably none of them were quite so important as the discovery

of atomic energy, although I think that almost any one of a half dozen or more standing committees of the Senate would have been just as able to deal with this subject as any special committee the Chair might appoint.

The Senate adopted a measure creating a joint committee of 12 members, as I recall, to study the subject. That measure went to the House of Representatives. In the meantime, the President sent his message recommending the appointment of a commission of nine. The House has been acting upon that basis, the bill having been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House.

With the hope, I have no doubt, that the House would pass the measure creating the joint committee, the bill introduced here was laid on the table pending the outcome in the House. The House rather took the view, as I understand from the author of the companion measure in the House, that after the President's message was received it changed the situation somewhat, so the author of the House measure did not urge that the House act upon his measure creating a joint committee.

In the meantime, the Senator from Connecticut submitted the pending resolution. The measure introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] went to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut went to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Of course, if the Interstate Commerce Committee had jurisdiction of a resolution of this kind it has jurisdiction of legislation dealing with the subject. So that any one of half a dozen committees might claim, with some degree of justice, jurisdiction over such legislation—the Committee on Military Affairs, the Interstate Commerce Committee, and other committees I need not mention.

In the inception of this matter I felt that any standing committee of the Senate to which the bill or any legislation dealing with it might be sent was capable of handling the legislation without the necessity for creation of a special committee. However, in the Committee on Interstate Commerce, of which I am a member, I participated in the consideration of the resolution and suggested an amendment or two which made it more satisfactory, especially that part of it which makes its life only for the duration of the present Congress, because I felt that we ought not to create special committees which never end. And that is the history of most of the special committees we create; they never end; they never finish their business. They come to the Senate from time to time asking for extension of their life. I do not want that to happen in regard to this committee, and I see no reason for it, because if this committee cannot do anything about atomic energy in another year and a quarter, then if all the predictions made about atomic energy come true it will not be worth while doing anything. None of us will be here to see what is done. But I am not uneasy about that. I do not think the world is coming to an end day after tomorrow notwithstanding the predictions of a certain religious cult in the State of the distinguished Senator who now presides over this body.

I came to the conclusion, however, that in view of the situation in which this legislation is snarled up in the Senate probably the best thing to do was to create a special committee after all, and therefore I voted to report the resolution favorably.

The question arose in the committee whether the size of the committee should be increased from nine to some other number, and the point was urged that a small committee of nine might be more efficient because the responsibility would be concentrated in a fewer number of members. It was contended that if the committee were to have a membership of 18 or 21, we might as well let one of the standing committees do the job from the beginning, and not create a special committee.

I believe that argument has some force. If we are to have a committee of 18 or 21, we might as well refer the bill to a standing committee which has that many members. I believe that the standing committees, any one of which might claim jurisdiction over this question, are just as able as a special committee would be, because the membership of every committee must be taken from the membership of standing committees.

Personally I feel that, regardless of the size of the committee, if the Chair should consult me about its personnel, I should suggest that membership on the special committee come from the standing committees which might claim jurisdiction. I believe that the Committee on Military Affairs should be represented, as well as the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, and probably the Committee on Appropriations. If the membership of the special committee is to be as large as the Senator from Minnesota is seeking to make it, I believe that its members should be chosen from committees which might otherwise have jurisdiction.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. If the committee were to consist of only nine members, as the Senator suggests, and all the committees which the Senator mentions were to be represented, practically the only Senators who would be members of the special committee would be chairmen of standing committees, with perhaps one or two ranking members on the minority side.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe that the chairman of a standing committee has any priority over any other member of the committee in the matter of appointment. I do not believe it is contemplated that the appointments shall be limited to chairmen of standing committees. Some Republicans—at least four—will be appointed. They are not chairmen of committees. Only Democrats are chairmen. So the Senator's apprehension could not be realized. It does not make any difference whether a member of the special committee, who is also a member of some other committee, is a Democrat or a Republican. If the membership of the special committee is to be left at nine, that number is certainly sufficiently large to take one member from each of the important committees which has any right to claim jurisdiction over legislation on the subject. I am somewhat impressed with the argument that if there is to be a special committee at all, it should be a small committee and not a large one.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is very difficult to resist a suggestion such as that made by the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. Neither the Senator from Kentucky nor I would wish to seem to foreclose the widest possible Senate participation in any enterprise of this nature. However, I cannot resist saying that I totally share the viewpoint now expressed by the Senator from Kentucky. What is everybody's business is nobody's business. A special committee is created because of the fact that there is a special job to be done. It must be done in a concentrated way, as rapidly as it can be done with full justice to the subject. I feel that if there were to be a committee of 18, there would be a scattering of responsibility, and the result we desire would not be achieved. We all know what the experience is with large committees.

Furthermore, we are dealing with a subject which unavoidably involves a certain element of secrecy. I very much doubt whether a committee of 18 would wind up with half as much information as could be entrusted to a committee of 9.

So far as I am concerned, I concur in the conclusion reached by the Senator from Kentucky. I do not wish to resist any desire of the Senate, if it sees fit to do so, to enlarge the membership of the committee to 18. However, speaking for myself, I shall vote for the smaller number, from much the same point of view as that indicated by the able majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Michigan. I might add that we now have so many special committees in the Senate that it would be difficult to choose 18 Senators none of whom are not already on a special committee of some kind. For that reason, and the other reasons expressed by the Senator from Michigan and myself, I believe that a better job could be done if we were to limit the size of the committee to nine, distributing the appointments among the important committees, any one of which might claim jurisdiction over legislation affecting the subject matter.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Like the Senator from Michigan, I am in complete concurrence with what the Senator from Kentucky has said about the size of the special committee. I believe that to increase the membership to 18 would be to destroy the effectiveness and usefulness of the committee. I think we all appreciate what happens at meetings of committees of large membership. Quorums are

made up by proxies; hearings are held with proxies largely present, and bills are even reported to the Senate by proxy votes. That practice has always been a cross to me; and yet it arises somewhat from the necessities of the case and from the demands upon the time of Senators.

The resolution contemplates the ending of the committee at a definite time stated in the resolution, all for the purpose of forcing a speedy study and a speedy determination as to what shall be done. I believe that we would make better progress and have a much more thorough and intelligent investigation of the whole question if the membership of the committee were limited to nine, as the resolution provides. I am in agreement with the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. To follow the argument of the Senator from Kentucky to its logical conclusion, it might be contended that in order to save time we should have a committee of one. But the very reason we have encountered difficulties in referring the bill is that so many committees are intensely interested in the subject. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has every right in the world to be intensely interested in the bill, as has the Committee on Interstate Commerce. As we know, the Committee on Interstate Commerce has to do with recommending confirmation of the appointments of personnel of the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and many other commissions. If any committee of the Senate should have consideration of this matter it seems to me that it is the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The Committee on Military Affairs is also interested. No military plans can be made in this country, or, for that matter, in the world, until something is determined with respect to the atomic bomb. All the plans of the Navy are tied up in this question.

The Committee on Commerce might very well claim jurisdiction, and so might the Committee on Foreign Relations. Certainly this question has far-reaching implications in international affairs. Because of the widespread interest in the Senate we were unable to decide to send the bill to a regular standing committee, and it is now proposed to appoint a special legislative committee. I wish to emphasize the fact we are appointing a legislative committee, and not the ordinary special committee. For a limited period of time that special legislative committee will have all the power and authority possessed by any of the standing committees so far as legislation on this subject is concerned.

If this job is as tremendous as it seems to be, and if it is as important as the Senator from Michigan has suggested, then certainly the membership of the committee should be as broad as the Senate, so that when the committee reaches a conclusion and recommends legislation to the Senate, it will be founded upon a broad base, and not a small committee which would not be representative of the entire Senate. If it is efficiency that we want, let us appoint a committee of one, and then we can obtain quick action.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as between two extremes there is always a reasonable point at which men usually arrive. The two extremes in this case are a one-man committee and a committee of the whole Senate. It seems to me that we must arrive at some reasonable point between those two extremes in deciding upon the size of the special committee. I respectfully reiterate that in my judgment, in view of the number of standing committees of the Senate and the number of special committees, it would be a serious mistake to enlarge the membership of this committee to 18. I believe that it would be unnecessary to enlarge it beyond a membership of 9, as provided in the resolution.

Now let me make a statement in regard to the chairmanship of the committee. The Senator from Colorado knows that I tried to steer the proposed legislation on this subject to his committee, namely, the Committee on Military Affairs. I thought that was where it should go when it was introduced by him. But it did not go there, and now we have reached the situation that a special committee is proposed.

The rule of the Senate provides that all standing committees shall be elected by the Senate, and under that rule the chairman of each standing committee is elected by the Senate. But it has never been the practice of the Senate to elect members of special committees or to elect the chairmen of such committees. Various methods have been adopted in such cases. Sometimes the resolution provides that the special committee itself shall select its own chairman. Frequently that is done. The only other way, except to authorize the Chair to designate the chairman, would be to have the Senate itself elect the chairman or to have the committee, after it is set up, choose its own chairman.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce, after considering these various methods, felt that the proper method was to authorize the Chair himself to designate as the chairman of the special committee one of the Senators he appoints to that committee.

In connection with the selection of chairmen of standing committees and members of standing committees, the representative steering committees of the two sides—Republican and Democratic—meet and consider all applicants for membership. The rule of seniority has great weight. It is not an irrevocable rule; sometimes it is deviated from, depending on circumstances. The chairman is usually, if not always, the ranking member of the majority, unless there is a choice between two chairmanships, so that he may have the right to pick one or the other.

But the rule of seniority which has been adopted by the steering committees and is usually applied in the Senate has not been the regular practice of the Senate or of the Chair in connection with the appointment of special committees. I mention that, not because I have anything to do with the selection of chairmen, for that is the task of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, but because in considering the membership and the chairmanship of special committees, the Chair, in cases in which he has been authorized to appoint the members of special committees, has not been required to follow the rule of seniority, and has not followed it.

It has not been usual, I will say, for the Chair to be authorized to designate the chairman of a special committee. I think it is probable that in most cases the committee itself has made its own choice. But in any event, there is ample precedent for selection as chairman, either by appointment by the Chair or by election on the part of the committee itself, of the author of a resolution providing for the creation of a special committee. That, however, is a problem with which I do not have to deal. That is a problem confronting the Chair. But I think the RECORD should show that we have not adopted the seniority rule always or in the majority of cases in connection with the appointment of members of special committees or the selection of their chairmen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I simply wish to suggest to the Senator, inasmuch as he has complained about the number of special committees, that perhaps the reason why we have so many of them is that whenever a Senator wishes to be chairman of a special committee, he draws up a resolution, submits it to the Senate, and when it is adopted, has himself appointed on the special committee, as its chairman. Perhaps if there were a rule regarding the appointment of chairmen and members of special committees, we might not be troubled with so many special committees. It is a very serious problem, and it handicaps our work.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator about that. There are too many special committees, and most of them last too long. Right now I know of some which could well be dispensed with. I know of one recent case in which a Senator who sponsored a resolution did not wish to be chairman of the special committee appointed under it, but he had the chairmanship of the committee wished on him, very much to his regret. So, at least, there is one precedent of a Senator submitting a resolution calling for the appointment of a special committee who did not do so merely in order to get himself named as chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota because I think that on the committee we should have the widest possible basis of representation of views within the Senate, so as to make it perfectly certain that all points of view with regard to the atomic energy policy of this Government shall be represented on the committee.

I do not think it should take very much argument to convince the Senate of the United States that we are deal-

ing in this resolution with the most important problem which will face this country in the next century. I think we should recognize, and I am sure we do, that the whole destiny of this country no longer rests with the Congress of the United States, except to the extent that we in the Congress carry out wisely the teachings of the scientists of America in respect to the use and control of atomic energy. The real destiny of this country rests with our scientists and I think we should recognize that fact and heed their advice much more than we seem to be doing.

I spent an hour this morning with one of the great war correspondents of America, a man who has just returned from Japan. He was among the first to visit the scenes of the use of the atomic bomb. He told me that he wishes every Member of the Congress of the United States could see with his own eyes the devastating effects of the use of atomic energy.

I happen to be one of those who believe that the atomic bomb should have been used, because I think it is perfectly clear that in its use we saved thousands and thousands of American lives. We used it to defeat a ruthless and brutal enemy which would have killed great numbers of our men had we tried an invasion of Japan proper. But the use of the bomb has placed a great responsibility on the shoulders of the people of this country, too. By use of the bomb we ended the war quickly and we saved many American boys who otherwise would have been sacrificed in a bloody invasion. Incidentally we saved many more Japanese lives and much more property by the use of the bomb than would have been saved if we had won the final victory by a costly and bloody invasion.

However, Mr. President, I fear that our people are not aware to any great degree whatsoever insofar as the true implications of the atomic bomb are concerned. The bomb has produced a revolution in the history of mankind, and that revolution has come upon us practically overnight as far as the time factor in the history of its development is concerned. Its implications to the future of the human race are so tremendous that no words of mine nor, for that matter, of the scientists themselves who know something about atomic energy, can describe or explain with human understanding what actually has occurred.

I think that as future events unfold themselves in the pages of history in the immediate future we will discover that the release of the first atomic bomb started a chain of events in the history of man which will be recorded in the textbooks a century from now as marking the beginning of the era of the atomic revolution. The atomic era into which we have been catapulted, I think, differs more in contrast with the world prior to August 6, 1945, than did the depth of the Dark Ages differ in contrast with the world and human affairs at the height of the industrial age.

I think that the nations of the world have but one choice now if they wish to survive as nations, and that includes the United States. The choice is not an easy one for some people to reconcile themselves to, but we of the Congress must not evade it. The nations of the world must live in one world from now on or we will be confronted in the not too distant future with atomic warfare the results of which may produce a great historical paradox, namely, a new dark ages for the human race, resulting from our failure to follow the constructive leadership of men of science. It is my plea that we listen to the men of science rather than to those who are appealing to the fears of our people in an endeavor to persuade them to adopt a narrow nationalistic program for the control of the atomic bomb. Hence, I think the committee should be so enlarged in its membership that every major point of view in regard to national policy in relation to the atomic bomb will be represented on that committee, which I am sure will not be the case if its membership is left at nine.

It is certainly important that we try to get the people of this country to recognize, in spite of propaganda which is abroad today, that we cannot nationalize science, and we cannot nationalize unto ourselves alone the know-how for the production of atomic bombs. I have talked to some of the great scientists in America in the last 30 days, and they tell me confidentially that neither the secret of the atomic bomb nor the know-how of its production can be kept from other powers of this world for very long if at present they are secrets.

So Mr. President, I say that when we come to deal with legislation which probably will have more to do in the determination of the future of this country than any other legislation which this Congress will consider, I think it is our solemn obligation to see to it that all points of view in the Senate of the United States are represented on the committee which is going to be charged with that obligation. Let us be a little realistic about alinements within the Senate, because we had better be practical politicians here as well as out on the campaign platforms. If membership on a committee of nine is broken up among the two parties in the Senate, I am willing to take judicial notice of the fact that we will not have on that committee of nine representation of all points of view, because I think that is mathematically impossible. I think the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota for a committee of 18 at least gives reasonable assurance that all points of view in regard to policy concerning the atomic bomb and the international policies of this Government flowing from it will be more likely to be represented on such a committee than if we give to the leadership of the Senate the authority to appoint a committee of nine. Already we have noted that there is concern over who shall be chairman of the committee. My party is certainly not of one mind in the Senate as to the policy which should be followed in connection with the atomic bomb. A committee with just four Republicans on it will most likely fail to represent the point of view of a considerable number of Republicans in the Senate and it is my guess it will fail to represent adequately the liberal forces within the party. However, a larger committee would, in the ordinary course of events provide the appointing authorities in the two parties in the Senate with a compelling justification for appointing representatives of various schools of thought on both sides of the aisle to this very important committee.

I believe, Mr. President, that one of the reasons we are today in somewhat of a stalemate so far as international policies are concerned—and we must agree that we are in such a stalemate unless we want to deny the reality of the situation—is the use of the atomic bomb by the United States and our announced intention to hold its secrets as a check upon other nations. Our present program as we have announced it to the world concerning our plans for the atomic bomb has stirred up world-wide suspicion in regard to the international policies of this country.

I do not believe that those suspicions are well-founded, because I am satisfied, as I am sure every Member of this body is satisfied, that this country will not only stand for the ideals of internationalism as expressed in the San Francisco Charter, but that we will practice those ideals by implementing the Charter. But we must demonstrate quickly that we intend to implement those ideals. I happen to be one who believes that we will not get very far in working out a peace program, or in lowering the suspicious fingers which are now being pointed toward America by other nations of the world, until we recognize that, after all, the secret of atomic energy does not belong to America, but that, instead, it belongs to all mankind.

Therefore, I think we need to make haste in establishing a committee such as the one which has been recommended. It should be established on a very broad base in order that we may ascertain what are the facts which are available to this Government concerning atomic energy. I understand that if we proceed to make the necessary investigations we will find existing today in black and white reports of some of our great scientists quite at variance with policies which have thus far been promulgated by our Government concerning the use of the atomic bomb and the future of atomic energy.

Mr. President, I feel so deeply with regard to this matter so far as the future welfare of my country is concerned that I cannot let this occasion go by without putting into the RECORD the warning that unless the Congress of the United States, unless the administration of this Government, unless all of us in the Nation proceed with dispatch in developing a national and international policy in regard to the use of atomic energy we ourselves as a nation may be recorded in history as one of the nations which failed in 1945 and in 1946 when the world was ready for an international organization for the promotion of peace to make possible the accomplishment of that end. We will be so recorded as having failed mankind if we continue to labor under the delusion that we can nationalize science, and can keep unto ourselves as a club over the remainder of the world the so-called secret of atomic energy.

God forbid that such shortsightedness on our part shall ever take place. It

would rise to destroy our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren as well.

We all know that many variances in viewpoints exist among us as to the best policy to follow in regard to the use of atomic energy. We know it to be true because when we discuss the matter during the lunch periods and in the cloak rooms we hear variances of opinions expressed. Therefore, it is important that the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to enlarge the committee membership from 9 to 18 be agreed to so that there may be assurances that the committee will represent a cross section point of view of this body. Out of the information which will be channeled through that committee there should result a national program regarding the use of atomic energy plus recommendations as to our international position on the problem. Scientific truth cannot for long be stifled, censored, or concealed. We must use this truth in developing world peace instead of developing a nationalistic policy which will lead us only to another war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreement to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on page 1, line 2, after the words "composed of", to strike out "nine" and insert "eighteen." In effect, the amendment would increase the proposed membership of the committee from 9 to 18. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think a quorum should be present before voting on this amendment, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gerry	Murray
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hart	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hawkes	Reed
Bilbo	Hayden	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Briggs	Hill	Russell
Brooks	Hoey	Saltonstall
Buck	Huffman	Shipstead
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capehart	Knowland	Taft
Capper	La Follette	Taylor
Carville	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Wheeler
Donnell	Magnuson	Wherry
Downey	Maybank	White
Eastland	Mead	Wiley
Ellender	Millikin	Wilson
Ferguson	Moore	Young
Fulbright	Morse	
George	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 107, which was reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary today, and concerning which I think there will be no contest at all, be read by the clerk, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate what it is?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to do so. It reads:

That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day and calling upon the people throughout the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the day on which women throughout the United States first cast their votes in a Presidential election.

Mr. President, I may in a word indicate to the Senate why I am interested in this matter.

Twenty-five years ago I attended the Democratic National Convention in San Francisco, and after the convention was over my friend, Senator James D. Phelan, at that time a Senator from the State of California, and one of the grandest men I have ever known, took me to his country place. As I discovered when I went to San Francisco, he was an exceedingly wealthy man. He had a very large town house and several country estates. He took us to one of his country places about 52 miles south of San Francisco. There was a main house of some 40 rooms, and he had beautiful bachelor apartments on the side of a mountain rising immediately to the rear of the main house which would accommodate 48 men. There was also a large and beautiful ballroom.

I was somewhat younger then than I am now. Senator Phelan was also a bachelor and was very popular, and he had many young people at his country home, where he entertained most lavishly, and I never had a better time in all my life. The California girls gathered there were most attractive and beautiful. I have never seen such elegance, such a beautiful home, such attractive quarters as those where we stayed. I think the Senator had more than a hundred guests over the week end, largely residents of San Francisco.

While having this delightful time I received a telegram from the then President of the United States, the late honored and respected Woodrow Wilson, who urged me to leave and go at once to Nashville, Tenn., where the Tennessee Legislature was in session, having been called into session for the express purpose of passing on the amendment proposed to the Constitution of the United States granting suffrage to women. If the resolution of ratification should pass the legislature, Tennessee would be the thirty-sixth State to ratify the amendment, and it would become the law of the land, a part of the Constitution of the United States.

I went to Nashville and had difficulty in finding a place to sleep. The only place I could find was in the room of a good friend, one of the finest men I ever knew in my life, Mr. T. K. Riddick, of Memphis, a distinguished lawyer, who, so far as I recollect, never ran for office and never held an office, except on this occasion. There was a vacancy in the Shelby County delegation, and Mr. Riddick was elected to go to Nashville to lead the fight for suffrage, and he certainly made a great leader. He was about a foot or a foot and a half taller than I was, and in the double bed which I had to share with him the only way I could be comfortable was by arranging a little table at the foot of the bed for Mr. Riddick's feet. [Laughter.] No man ever did more for women's suffrage than did T. K. Riddick in that memorable session. There never was a finer man.

We were in Nashville a little less than 5 weeks, and at the end of that time the legislature voted, and by a change of one single vote it ratified the woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, I imagine that probably growing out of that circumstance some ladies asked me to introduce the joint resolution I am asking the Senate to pass. The joint resolution brought back to me a flood of very beautiful memories of the wonderful time I had at the city home of James D. Phelan and at his beautiful California country home which we visited. I never had a more pleasant time in my life.

It also brought back to my memory the difficulty we encountered in trying to have the suffrage amendment ratified by the Tennessee Legislature. I do not recall ever having seen a legislature in session except on that occasion. That is true notwithstanding the fact that 6 years before, when I was elected to the Senate, I was voted on for United States Senator on a great number of ballots, but I was not in the city at the time, and, of course, did not see the legislature in session.

As I offer the joint resolution it brings back a flood of memories. I shall ask my colleagues if they will permit the joint resolution to be acted upon and passed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator said he did not go near the legislature. I wonder if he would tell us how this tall friend of his obtained the one vote that was necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not mind telling that at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I object, Mr. President. I object.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Michigan objects, but I still think I will tell it. I am very happy to say it was a Republican vote.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the reason I objected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does that help?

Mr. WHITE. I knew it was an intelligent vote, and I assumed it was a Republican vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, it was an intelligent vote. The one who cast that vote is one of the finest young men in my State. He still lives there. I had a letter and a visit from him a little while ago. He is a perfectly delightful gentleman, Mr. Harry Burn, of Bradley.

I will tell how that vote came to be cast. This young man had been voting against us all along, but it seemed—I am telling the inside history—he had promised former Senator Newell Sanders, who was very much interested in woman suffrage, that if his vote would pass the measure he would vote for it. The previous vote had resulted in a tie. On that vote this young man, Mr. Burn, had voted against the amendment. Senator San-

ders was in Chattanooga. I immediately called him over the telephone and told him what the situation was. He talked to this member of the legislature over the telephone, and the deed was done.

I know both Senator Sanders and Mr. Burn acted in the highest good faith and performed a great service to their country. There was nothing but the best of good faith about the ratification of the amendment. I am sure Mr. Burn voted his conscientious convictions. He was really and truly for woman suffrage, but for some reason with which I am not familiar he had been voting the other way.

I am giving the Senate the inside secret concerning the only time I ever lobbied knowingly in my life. I am sure the end had fully justified my lobbying on this occasion. As we all know, woman suffrage has been a great success. The way women have used their ballots has been fine for the country. They have voted intelligently at all times, and have stood for the highest and best in American citizenship.

Mr. WHITE. Then, as a result of what took place really the Republicans gave suffrage to the women of Tennessee and the Nation; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that is not exactly correct. It is true that a Republican broke a tie in favor of woman suffrage. But I cannot say that it would make the measure a Republican measure, because the Democrats had entire control of the legislature in every sense of the word, and it was a Democratic legislature that put the measure through. I am not claiming anything for the Democrats, however, in that respect. Without regard to party, I have always been strongly in favor of woman suffrage. I do not know that I ought to be, but I am. As Senators know, I have never been able to induce a woman to marry me, but notwithstanding that I have always been for them, and I am still for them, and I hope that they may have nothing but happiness and prosperity in their lives, and receive the fullest enjoyment as the result of the passage of this joint resolution.

Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of Senate joint resolution 107?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. J. Res. 107) authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day, in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 179) creating a special committee to investigate problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on page 1, line 2, to strike out "nine" and insert "eighteen."

Mr. BALL. On the pending question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have the question again stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has moved to amend the resolution on page 1, line 2, to strike out "nine" and insert "eighteen." That would increase the number of Senators on the proposed special committee from 9 to 18.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, a number of Senators were not present during the discussion of my amendment but have come in since. My amendment is offered for the reason that a committee which deals with so tremendously important a subject as this, and legislation dealing with that subject, should be at least as large in membership as our regular standing legislative committees and therefore broadly representative of the whole Senate.

Mr. President, I dislike very much to disagree with my good friends the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], but it seems to me that every argument they have made about restricting the membership of the special committee to nine members, because it would be more efficient, and the attendance would be better, and there would be less delay, would apply with just as much force to every standing committee of the Senate and to the Senate itself.

I realize that, insofar as legislating is concerned, the Senate, when compared to a dictator who can legislate by decree, is relatively a bungling, inefficient, and slow-acting body. That is the price we pay for democracy. I would say to the distinguished majority leader that every Senator should be tremendously interested in legislation dealing with this subject, which may hold the balance between whether civilization is to be blown up and destroyed in the next war, or whether a way is to be found which will prevent such a catastrophe and at the same time hold out a possibility for great abundance in this country. Every Senator must of necessity be vitally concerned with the policy the Congress may adopt. I believe we will make more haste if the committee which undertakes the initial consideration of this subject is broadly representative of the Senate.

Mr. President, just a final word. I for one have been very seriously concerned with the attitude which seems to permeate many of the official statements regarding this great discovery, namely, that anly a handful of individuals in the United States can be trusted, not only with the secret as to how to release atomic energy, how to put it into a bomb and all the rest, but to make the decision as to what we shall do with the secret in the interest of the American people.

I grant that it would be much easier and more speedy and more efficient if we simply adopted a resolution providing that the President could do whatever he wanted to do with this subject and should have complete authority over it. But, Mr. President, it would not be democracy. It would not solve the problem. I think we might as well face now the question whether we are going to make public at least sufficient information about the whole question of atomic energy so that we as a democratic people can make an intelligent decision as to what we want to do with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The other evening I heard Raymond Gram Swing analyze a bill I introduced in the Senate providing for a commission to control atomic energy. He called the bill I introduced a Fascist proposal. Of course, I am not a Fascist and I do not propose Fascist measures, but after I listened to Mr. Swing's analysis I could very well see that there are tremendous matters involved in the setting up of a commission or in the setting up of the controls over atomic energy.

Here we have a proposal before us. Are we going to proceed on a narrow basis? Raymond Gram Swing spoke against close corporation control of this thing. He said that instead of having a widespread and a large base, we were proposing to have a very narrow control. I believe he is correct insofar as that point is concerned, that we must proceed to handle this matter on an extremely broad, democratic basis. As I see it, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota raises the question whether we are going to proceed to consider this subject on a democratic basis or whether we are to proceed on the basis of a small inner group of inner controls.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Colorado. Mr. President, that is exactly the question. I think we shall make greater speed in reaching a sound democratic decision on this issue if we are not told that the decision must be made and bottled up in a small committee, and handed down, to be followed "or else." We will not get a decision in the Senate by that method. We might as well broaden the base now, so as to make better speed in the long run.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The other day the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced a bill which provided for a commission of nine to be appointed by the President. Presumably there would be no Senators on that commission. The resolution now before the Senate fixes the same number as that provided for in the Senator's bill. The commission contemplated in the Senator's bill would no doubt be composed of scientists. That may be the best thing. I was for the bill. I wanted it given consideration. But up to the present time no effort has been made to increase the number of members on the commission provided for in the bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado. In that case the number was nine.

Mr. BALL. The bill is still on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is still on the table. I suppose that when the Senate special committee is established the bill will be taken from the table and referred to the committee.

Mr. BALL. A commission to administer a policy laid down by Congress is a

very different thing from a committee to adopt a policy in the first instance.

Mr. BARKLEY. The commission provided for in that bill was not to administer a policy. It was to make an investigation. There was no statement of law or policy in the bill, beyond the preliminary stages.

Mr. BALL. Is the Senator referring to the Johnson bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. It also provided that if there were any international repercussions, the President should refer the question back to Congress for further consideration.

Mr. BALL. Any international agreements would come back to Congress. The Johnson bill is definitely basic legislation on this subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point made by Raymond Gram Swing—and I am not in accord with his statement, because I think it is exaggerated in the extreme—is that under the terms of the bill which I introduced, which provided for a commission of nine members, the nine members could be appointed from industry, each one representing some particular branch of industry, and in that way the whole future of atomic energy, its use, and application, might very well be completely controlled by nine representatives of industry.

The point I am making is this: We are creating a special legislative committee to go into all the ramifications, details, and proposals within the scope of the legislation which has been introduced in the Senate. Certainly when the bill comes back from the committee it will not look like the bill which went to the committee. I hope, as a result of hearings, it will be changed in many respects. Any bill which is introduced is simply for the purpose of bringing the subject up for consideration. The committee considers the bill in that light, recommends certain amendments or additional provisions, and reports a bill which it can defend on the floor of the Senate. That is the sort of proposal which we have before us. We are going to ask the special committee to consider the proposed legislation, recommend any amendments which it deems proper, and report a measure to the Senate which it can defend and support, and which it will try to have the Congress adopt. That is the function of the committee which we are creating. It is not a committee merely to hold hearings. It is a committee to consider legislation, and recommend whatever amendments it deems proper. Therefore it seems to me that we should have a full-sized committee to handle such a tremendously important subject as this, unless we wish to have the charge made that the committee is a closed corporation, with only a few members, that the bill is a Fascist measure, and that industry is to control the use and application of atomic energy, or that some one other than the American people, whom we represent, is going to control it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

Mr. BALL. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If I correctly understood the Senator from Minnesota a few minutes ago, he stated that he felt that the public should be informed with respect to atomic energy. I take it that the committee, the creation of which is under discussion, whether it were composed of 9 or 18 members, would not be authorized to disclose to the public any information with respect to atomic energy. It would be a committee to receive and consider numerous bills dealing with the subject. I have felt, and still feel, that any information within the knowledge of this country dealing with atomic energy for destructive purposes ought to be held, and not divulged to the rest of the world. It certainly ought to be held until the destructive force of atomic energy can be met and counteracted, if means for doing so are ever found. I do not for a moment subscribe to the idea that we should disclose to the other nations of the world information with respect to the destructive forces of atomic energy. Such information should be kept for this country, just as long as we can keep it. Doubtless other countries will find a way to use atomic energy in time. But so far as we may do do—certainly for the present—the secret of atomic energy should be held in this country.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I did not say anything about disclosing to the people the secret of how the atomic bomb is made. What I was objecting to was the attitude which seems to permeate many statements on the subject, that only a few men can make the decisions, that we must accept them, and that we cannot be trusted with the basic information as to the possibilities of atomic energy, on which such decisions are made.

I do not believe that we can proceed on that basis. So far as the secret of the bomb is concerned, I do not believe that we can keep it secret for very long. I do not believe that any scientist would claim that we could.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have no intention of repealing the views which I have already expressed in this debate prior to the quorum call. However, I should like to make a few brief observations.

First, I am somewhat at a loss to understand why the sponsors of the resolution have not voluntarily accepted the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. It seems to me that the very fears which have been expressed by the Senator from Minnesota and others of us who share those fears should be sufficient to convince the sponsors of the resolution that if we are to have the maximum of unity and cooperation within the Senate on this vital subject of atomic energy which I think we must have in the interest of the welfare of this country, we certainly should not be in dispute at the very beginning of our deliberations as to the size of the committee which is to consider this very vital problem. The very fact that there are fears—and let us be frank about it—that if the membership on the committee is to be kept at 9 it will not represent a true cross section of the Senate, ought to be enough, in and of itself, to cause the sponsors of the resolution to agree to enlargement of the membership to 18, so that those of us who fear that a committee of less than 18 would not represent a cross-sectional point of view would be satisfied. I believe that such consideration is due those who have such fears, almost as a matter of parliamentary courtesy.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. The second point I wish to make is that the point made by my good friend from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] represents a point of view in the Senate, namely, that we must do everything we can to keep to ourselves the secret of atomic energy. Others have quite a contrary point of view. They are just as sincere as is the Senator from West Virginia. They are convinced that if we follow the course of action which he suggests America will soon find herself in a situation in which the rest of the world will be arrayed against her.

As I stated earlier in the day, I think we might well recognize the fact that we shall not get very far with a program of international cooperation so long as other great powers of the world feel that we are going to use the atomic bomb and atomic energy as a weapon against them to force them to abide by our wishes. International cooperation does not work that way. It must work both ways. I repeat that atomic energy does not belong to the people of this country. It happens to be a great prize of mankind. The scientists of other nations are going to make it known to their peoples in the very near future. I should like to see my country, at the very beginning of this new era of history in the position of being willing to sit down at a council table of nations and devise a cooperative international program in regard to atomic energy. Because so many of us hold that point of view, I think it highly desirable that the membership of the committee be enlarged to 18.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, one reason why we are creating this joint committee is that at least four committees, with memberships between 18 and 21, claim jurisdiction of the subject-matter. I cannot see how we can make haste with a committee of 9, or how it makes any sense, as parliamentary procedure, to establish a committee of 9 to take the place of four committees each with a membership of 18 to 21.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to observe that I do not believe that any Senator can say whether a membership of 9 or 18 would be a cross-section of the Senate, so far as the attitude toward atomic energy is concerned. There may be some among us who would attempt to say, but I do not think anyone could say.

Two or three weeks ago the Senate passed a joint resolution providing for the establishment of a joint committee of 12, only 6 of whom were to come from the Senate and 6 from the House. That joint resolution did not receive a dissenting vote in the Senate or in the committee.

It seems to me that after we have passed a resolution saying that 12 Members are sufficient for a joint committee, we shall not be very much out of line now if we say that the Senate committee shall be composed of 9 Members.

I am willing to agree to a membership of 11 on the committee, but I think 18 Members would be entirely too many. I am not responsible for the resolution, and I came to support it somewhat hesitatingly. But I think 11 would certainly be a better number than 18. Anything beyond 11, it seems to me, would be cumbersome, in view of the fact that we have the regular standing committees and other special committees, and in view of the fact that the larger we make a special committee the fewer will be the number of Members, proportionately, who will do the work. We all know that to be so.

If the Senator from Minnesota would accept it, I should be perfectly willing to offer to his amendment an amendment making the number 11, rather than 18 or 9. It seems to me that would be sufficiently large, and would not make it so cumbersome that it could not operate efficiently.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I merely wish to make a comment on the observation just made by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. First, let me say that a joint committee is purely an investigatory committee, and it cannot report legislation to the Senate, which is an entirely different thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think that makes any difference at all.

Mr. BALL. Customarily our investigating committees are relatively small. The largest one I know of has 10 Members.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not always the case. No matter whether a committee is a joint committee or simply a committee constituted by one of the two branches of Congress, and no matter what the size of the committee may be, finally the matter must be passed on by the Congress.

Mr. BALL. I think this very debate shows that the Senate will make greater progress if the committee is a little more representative of all views in the Senate than would be possible with a smaller committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what all views in the Senate are, and I do not think any one of us is prepared to say what all views in the Senate are on this matter. If there are 18 different views regarding what should be done by the Senate with atomic energy, I am not so sure but that we shall find ourselves in the woods before we get through.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, has suggested that he would like to propose an amendment to make the committee 11 instead of 9, as now provided. I shall welcome such a proposal by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would it be in order to offer such an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky refer to an amendment proposing to strike out the numeral 18 and insert the numeral 11?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such an amendment would be in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer that amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator's amendment provides for a membership of 18. I move that the numeral 18 be stricken out and that the numeral 11 be inserted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think the amendment suggested by the Senator from Kentucky to my amendment is a compromise which does not meet the issue in any way whatever. I told the distinguished majority leader, when he came over a moment ago to talk to me, that in the interest of harmony, a committee of 15 would meet our major objection. But I think just to add 2 members to the 9, so as to provide for a membership of 11, would not do anything in that connection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, namely, to strike out the numeral 18 and insert the numeral 11.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand that after a yea-and-nay vote has been ordered on an amendment, an amendment to that amendment can be entertained only by unanimous consent. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; that is not correct. Such an amendment can be amended after the yeas and nays have been ordered on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. When the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota is before the Senate and after the Senate has decided that it wishes to vote on it by a yea-and-nay vote, can an amendment be proposed to it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that that is the parliamentary situation. After the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Ball amendment, if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky to that amendment is agreed to, the question then will be on the Ball amendment as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered in this case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Ball amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, Mr. President, if the amendment which I offered to the Ball amendment is adopted, so that the number of members on the committee would be reduced to 11, then the yea-and-nay vote which has been ordered would be on the Ball amendment as amended; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; it would then be on that amendment as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if we are going to vote to change the number of members on the committee from 18 to 11, then I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote on that proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can be done, if a sufficient number of Senators so request. Is there a sufficient number?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Do I correctly understand that a vote of "yea" will be for a membership of 11, and that a vote of "nay" will be for a membership of 18?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. On this vote the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. LANGER's name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] because of illness.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the

International Labor Conference in Paris, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent attending the Food and Agriculture Conference in Quebec, Canada.

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained in committee meeting.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent. His pair has been announced heretofore.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who is one of the members of the Senate delegation to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Conference at Quebec, has been excused to attend its sessions. He has a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—45

Andrews	George	Maybank
Austin	Gerry	Millikin
Bailey	Green	Murdock
Barkley	Guffey	Murray
Bilbo	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Briggs	Hart	Overton
Brooks	Hayden	Radcliffe
Byrd	Hill	Russell
Capper	Hoey	Saltonstall
Carville	Huffman	Stewart
Chandler	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Tydings
Downey	McClellan	Vandenberg
Eastland	McKellar	Wagner
Ferguson	McMahon	White

NAYS—27

Ball	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Chavez	La Follette	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Tunnell
Donnell	Mead	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Revercomb	Young

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Kilgore	Reed
Bankhead	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Mitchell	Tobey
Butler	Myers	Walsh
Gibbs	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Hatch	Pepper	Willis

So Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to Mr. BALL's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] as amended.

Mr. BALL. The yeas and nays were ordered on my amendment, but the yea-and-nay vote was actually on the Barkley amendment to my amendment. I ask that the order for the yeas and nays on my amendment, as amended, be rescinded and that the result be ascertained by a voice vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is before the Senate, and open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 179 as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be allowed to absent himself from the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate for a period of 10 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR NAVY AND COAST GUARD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 650, Senate bill 473.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 473) relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine explain the bill?

Mr. BREWSTER. The purpose of the bill is to take care of two officers in the Navy. Under the rule provided in the bill there are only two officers who have served much longer than the time necessary for them to become rear admirals of the upper half. However, as the result of current regulations it is impossible to consider them for such rank. It was believed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and by officials of the Navy Department, that legislation of this character was appropriate. We have been definitely advised that there are only two cases which will be affected, and that they are most meritorious. One of the men involved has been serving overseas for 5 years, and is now rather seriously affected. It is believed that the bill is a proper one and that it should be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each officer of the retired list of the Regular Navy or Regular Coast Guard recalled to active duty in the rank of rear admiral, now or hereafter performing active duty in such rank, shall be paired with an officer of the active list in the manner hereinafter prescribed, when such duty is, or any other prior active duty in such rank performed after recall to active duty, shall have been performed outside the United States in time of war or national emergency. If the officer with whom such retired officer is so paired is, or shall become, entitled to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half other than solely by virtue of the duty to which assigned, such retired officer shall likewise be entitled to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half whenever performing active duty after (a) the date of this act or (b) the date he became eligible for pairing or (c) the date the officer with whom he is paired becomes entitled to such pay and allowances, whichever date is latest. Any retired officer after becoming entitled to such pay and allowances shall thereafter be entitled to retired pay when not in an active-duty status, equal to 75 percent of such active duty pay.

SEC. 2. The officer with whom the retired officer is paired under section 1 hereof shall be a line officer of the Regular Navy or Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be, of the rank of rear admiral, other than an officer who holds such rank solely by virtue of the duty to which assigned, and shall be the officer whose date of rank is nearest to the date such retired officer would have commenced active service in such rank if all his active service therein, including any such service prior to retirement, had been performed continuously in the period immediately preceding the date of such pairing.

ELECTRIC POWER BOARD OF CHATTANOOGA

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate for a few minutes about the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, which recently issued its sixth annual report. The Electric Power Board of Chattanooga is a user of TVA power and its sixth annual report shows a most interesting situation.

The board is composed of Mr. L. J. Wilhoite, chairman; J. Courtenay Twinam, vice chairman; Roy E. McKenzie, T. R. Cuthbert, and B. H. Odom, members; William F. Chamlee, legal counsel; N. J. Simmons, secretary; and Ken Whitaker, administrative assistant to the board.

The report was filed on the 6th of October 1945, but it includes figures showing operative costs and financial conditions up to the 30th of June 1945. Because of its unusual character and because of the cheapness of power which we in Tennessee are permitted to enjoy, I should like to read a letter written by the chairman of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga to the board of mayor and commissioners, city of Chattanooga. It is dated October 6, 1945, and reads as follows:

GENTLEMEN: In accordance with the requirements of chapter 455, section 12, Private Acts of 1935, amending the charter of the city of Chattanooga, the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga is submitting herewith a statement showing the operations and financial conditions of the electric distribution system for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945. This statement has been prepared by Ar-

thur Andersen & Co., a nationally recognized auditing firm.

At the end of the fiscal year the board was serving 47,528 customers, an increase of 1,645 over the same period last year. Sales of electricity during the fiscal year totaled 527,194,000 kilowatt-hours, a decrease of approximately 19,000,000 kilowatt-hours over the previous year.

I digress to observe that the decrease over the previous year was no doubt due to the fact that the war had ended, and many of the concerns which had been using electrical energy for the manufacture of war munitions had closed down.

I continue reading:

Residential kilowatt-hour sales showed an increase of 6 percent; commercial and small power sales an increase of 8 percent; industrial and large power sales a decrease of 7 percent. The basic TVA rates, without surcharge, were in effect during the year. The average income of 0.9 cent per kilowatt-hour sold is in contrast to the average cost of 1.7 cents per kilowatt-hour for all sales in 1938, the last full year of private ownership of the electric distribution system which the board purchased.

During the year $280,000 of the revenue bonds bearing 2¾ percent interest came due and were retired. Payments in lieu of taxes to the city, county, and other taxing units totaled $361,800.

With the approaching availability of materials and manpower, much needed renewals and replacements of depreciated lines and equipment, for which funds have been accumulated, can be begun. Also, many extensions of the board's lines within its service area to serve approximately 3,000 unserved residents can, likewise, be constructed from funds which the board has accumulated for this purpose.

Savings in electricity costs to the Chattanooga area, based on the average rate charged in 1938, amounted during the last fiscal year to $3,025,763. This makes total savings to electricity users in the board's 6 years of operation of $16,170,045, greatly exceeding the $10,850,000 paid for the system by the board.

That concludes the letter, which is signed by the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, L. J. Wilhoite, chairman.

Mr. President, this electrical system, which was purchased from the Tennessee Electric Power Co., a company that was owned by the Southern Cities Co., I believe, was brought by the electric power board and the city of Chattanooga in the year 1938, probably the latter part of 1938, but the first full year's operation, as I recall, was 1939. The amazing and interesting feature about it is that in this period of time the revenue from the operation of this plant by the city of Chattanooga, or the power board, has paid for the system in its entirety, and has left a total to the board of over $6,000,000. To electrical users—commercial, domestic, and otherwise—in the city of Chattanooga they have sold electricity at less than half what they had been paying when public power first began to operate in the city of Chattanooga. In addition to that, as I have called to the attention of the Senate, they have paid in excess of $300,000 a year in taxes.

To refer briefly to a break-down of this report, the figures as to operating revenues show that sales of electrical energy to owners of residences total more than one and three-quarter million dollars; that commercial income is more than $600,000, industrial energy two and a quarter million dollars, and street lighting about $72,000.

The total operating costs, which include paying to the TVA for the use of the current which is purchased by the electric power board, are $2,870,000. The maintenance cost runs about $160,000.

It is pointed out in this letter, Mr. President, that since the war has ended and manpower and materials are available for expansion and extension of the services, more than 3,000 unserved residents in that immediate vicinity can be added to the already more than 47,000 domestic users, making, therefore, within the city of Chattanooga more than 50,000 customers, which figure includes residential owners and commercial users.

A while ago, I tried to find the figures, but was unable to locate them, but about 6 months ago Hon. JOHN RANKIN, one of the Representatives from Mississippi, placed in the RECORD some very interesting statistics showing comparative costs of electrical energy in Tennessee, which is served by the TVA, and other States where private power companies operate. The difference is amazing.

The report which is filed by the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga is one of the strongest arguments which could be made in behalf of public power. A system purchased at a cost in excess of $10,000,000, serving some 50,000 people—and, of course, with improvements, it would now probably cost more than ten million—is paid for in a period of about 6 years' operation, during which time the power board, continuing its operation, pays some three or four hundred thousand dollars each year in taxes to the city and to the county it serves.

The entire system is paid for and a total of more than $6,000,000 in addition thereto is collected, so that in a period of 6 years, to put it on a percentage basis, $10,000,000 is paid back and $6,000,000 in addition is collected, making the earnings of this company run considerably in excess of 150 percent in that period of time, figured on the cost of the original purchase.

Mr. President, this is an illuminating and intriguing statement. Those who may be interested in the practical side of the public-power question might be interested in seeing this annual report from the city of Chattanooga, and the annual reports made by other cities in Tennessee, such as Memphis, Chattanooga, Nashville, Knoxville, and, indeed, all the cities in Tennessee which are served by power from the Tennessee Valley operations.

This statement is interesting because at this time the extension of public power in other sections of the country is being given consideration. When it is possible to serve the people of a community by the use of public power at less than half what it costs them to be served by private power companies, certainly they are rendered a service when they are afforded the opportunity to purchase power as cheaply as it is being purchased at Chattanooga, at the same time, as I have said, paying back a substantial amount by way of tax replacements.

The story of the operation of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, and of other cities in Tennessee, is one in which the Members of the Senate, I am sure, are interested. The story of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga and its operations is that of a well-operated, businesslike organization, which has rendered to the people of the community a service for which they have paid, and a service which they deeply appreciate.

Mr. President, I wish to say, with particular emphasis on the report from the Power Board of Chattanooga, that it represents to my mind a most excellent account of stewardship.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Thomas M. Madden, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice John Boyd Avis, deceased.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Viena P. Johnson, of St. Paul, Minn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 35, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minn., to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Spruille Braden, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. LA FOLLETTE addressed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I cannot let this nomination be acted upon without rising on the Senate floor to ask a few questions. The man whose nomination as an Assistant Secretary of State is about to be confirmed will help form policies which I hope will work for the peace of the world. I endeavored to obtain copies of any printed reports on the subject which may have been made. I understand it is not customary to print reports respecting nominations. This nomination has been before the Foreign Relations Committee for more than 3 weeks, and during that time newspapers throughout the land have made public some of the activities in which Mr. Braden has been engaged relative to the uprising in the Argentine. I am not here

condemning or condoning what Mr. Braden has done. Neither am I condemning or condoning the action of the Foreign Relations Committee in reporting the nomination unanimously. But I should like to ask a question or two in view of the fact that we have no printed report on the nomination, and that the activities of this man in the Argentine are more or less of a confidential nature.

Mr. President, I should like to ask first: Are the policies which Mr. Braden advanced in the Argentine in keeping with the provisions set forth in the treaty of Chapultepec?

I should like to have the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee answer that question, if he will. I ask it in all sincerity, because it is my understanding, as I read the treaty, that under it the sister republics have joined together in trying to maintain peace in this hemisphere. I want to know if Mr. Braden has done anything which would be in violation of that treaty. It seems to me we are going pretty far if we are attempting to force a country to do something that might not be in accordance with the provisions of that treaty.

I should like the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to answer that question because I feel the people of the United States should know whether the policies advanced by Mr. Braden are in keeping with the provisions of that treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator desire that I interrupt him now?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, like many questions which are propounded, the question is of such a general and nebulous character that I do not feel that there is anything proper I can say without making an explanation. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that with a rather large attendance the Committee on Foreign Relations considered this nomination for about 3 weeks, and at the end of that time the nominee received the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, but still that does not answer the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say to the Senator that I do not agree that an assistant secretary is a policy-making official. The policy of the State Department is the responsibility of the Secretary of State and the President, and even the Secretary of State has no right to make foreign policy unless it is approved by the President of the United States. So I do not agree that these assistant secretaries have the power to make policy for anybody. They do not for the Foreign Relations Committee, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman——

Mr. CONNALLY Having answered that question satisfactorily I will now yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator is begging the question when he says he has answered my question satisfactorily.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator's question was of such a general nature that it would take me all afternoon to discuss all the matters involved.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask this question then: After Mr. Braden's activities in the Argentine and the policies advanced by him were explained to the Foreign Relations Committee did the committee come to the conclusion that they were within the provisions of the treaty of Chapultepec?

Mr. CONNALLY. It was not so much a question respecting the actual provisions of the treaty except as to the particular clause which required consultation among the other Latin-American countries. Some members of the committee thought Mr. Braden had not observed that requirement in some of his recommendations. But, after all, they were only his recommendations, and they were adopted by the Acting Secretary of State. So that the responsibility finally was that of the Acting Secretary of State. Mr. Byrnes was out of the country.

The consensus of opinion of the committee was, if the Senator wants a very concise and, I hope, informative, reply—

Mr. WHERRY. I should like very much to have it; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. The act of Chapultepec, as Senators know, is an agreement between the 21 Republics of the Western Hemisphere, providing for a unified defense against an attack by other nations against any nation in South or Central America. That agreement made at Mexico City, which we intend to have implemented by a treaty which will come along in due time, provides that an armed attack on any nation by another nation shall be regarded by each of the other 21 Republics as an attack upon itself. That must be distinguished from a threat; it refers to an armed attack. There is no requirement that there shall be necessarily any other action than to resist it, and to act together in resisting it.

Now when it comes to the threat of an armed attack the requirement is clear that the nations should consult together and so forth and so on. So there were some members of the committee who felt that Mr. Braden in recommending to the Secretary of State that he take the lead in calling off the conference which was scheduled to meet at Rio de Janerio on the 20th of October, went beyond his duty and did not first consult the other American Republics. The State Department and Mr. Braden took the position that their first duty was to consult Brazil, because Brazil was the host government, and that they did consult Brazil, and that thereafter the matter was taken up with other Latin-American countries. In that respect a good many members of the committee thought that Mr. Braden went beyond his proper duties.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. That matter, as I understand it, revolving around the duty of our State Department to consult all of the 21 nations, was not in the same category as the type of consultation which would be expected in the case of an attack or a threatened attack. The conference at Rio was for the purpose of implementing the agreement made at Chapultepec.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And there was no attack or threat of attack involved there, but it was a matter of postponing or calling off for the time being the conference to be held in Brazil revolving around the Act of Chapultepec.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wanted to ask whether there was was not in the committee a substantial sentiment that whatever was done with respect to the postponement of the Rio conference was after all the responsibility of the State Department rather than the ultimate responsibility of Mr. Braden. I take it it had the approval of Mr. Braden, but the decision as to the request for a postponement was a State Department decision.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator, and I tried to indicate a while ago that the real policy, after all, is the responsibility of the Secretary of State. Mr. Braden had recommended it, but it was adopted by the Acting Secretary of State, and he acted upon it, so it was as a matter of fact a responsibility of the Department of State.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator one more question. That brings up the fact that as a reader of the newspapers I have no way of knowing what happened in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the Foreign Relations Committee does not try to withhold any information. At my especial initiative every word of Mr. Braden's testimony was taken down by a stenographer. It has been made available to all the members of the committee, but since it was an executive session I have not divulged it to anyone except members of the committee. There are a number of distinguished members of the committee who sit right by the side of the Senator from Nebraska and he can find out anything he wants to know about it from them. I shall be glad to ask the committee to release it for the Senator from Nebraska so that he may read every line of it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas whether the committee approved all the actions of Mr. Braden in the Argentine, or whether the committee voted favorably to report the nomination in spite of the fact that the committee did not approve?

Mr. CONNALLY. That, Mr. President, is a question which, like the question of the Senator from Nebraska, calls upon me to interpret the motives, and what is operating in the minds of every member of the committee. That is a little difficult to do. I often have difficulty in arriving at a conclusion respecting such matters concerning Senators on the floor. I will say that so far as the debate was concerned there was consider-

able opposition to the views of Mr. Braden in that respect.

There is one other matter which I think is really more important than that. Many of the members of the committee, including myself, took the view that the less interference in the domestic affairs of any Latin-American country the United States could indulge in would be best not only for our own welfare but for the welfare of all the other 21 American nations and for their cooperation among themselves. We do not want to create any impression that by the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Braden we are reverting to the old type of diplomacy of the years gone by when we had the reputation, whether deservedly or not, of having wielded the big stick and using a strong arm diplomacy. We do not want that. We want the other countries to feel that we are showing consideration for their sovereignty and their independence, and that we do not expect to interfere in any wise in any of their domestic affairs unless it is in the interest of some American citizen or some American properties that are involved.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asked the third question which I had in mind, and the Senator from Texas volunteered the answer to the fourth.

Was any testimony taken as to how the other countries in South America felt about Mr. Braden's activities in Argentina?

Mr. CONNALLY. The committee did not go into that question, because naturally ambassadors would be reluctant to appear before a committee and give testimony. They must live on good terms with the State Department. The Senator can readily understand that we would not call them before the committee and ask them how they felt about it.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the distinguished Senator to know that I did not in any way desire to infer that he would not have revealed the minutes of the committee to a Member of the Senate. I did not mean that. I wished to have the distinguished chairman of the committee understand that as a result of what I had read in the newspapers I called the committee to see if the minutes were available. I was told that they were confidential. I did not wish to ask for any favors to be extended to me, or for a breach of confidence. However, I was intensely interested in knowing whether the committee knew of the actions of Mr. Braden prior to the time of the uprising in Argentina, or whether, after they had been thoroughly explained, the members of the committee were unanimous in approving what Mr. Braden had done. I wished to know what the effect had been upon the other signers of the treaty of Chapultepec. I feel that such information is very vital to the success of the San Francisco Charter, as well as the treaty.

I have risen only to obtain answers to the questions which I have asked. I still feel that we have gone a long way, through an Under Secretary, toward adopting a policy of intervention in Argentina. I hope the hearings will have produced the effect that there will be consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations all along the line, so that our policy in South America will not be misunderstood by those countries, and especially will not be misunderstood by the people at home.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very much. However, I do not regard a vote for confirmation of a nomination as being tantamount to approving everything an appointee has done or will do. If that were true, I should be in a rather unfortunate situation, because I have voted for the confirmation of many nominations of appointees whose actions I have not approved in every particular, and do not expect to approve. A number of considerations must be borne in mind in connection with the confirmation of a nomination. The President makes the appointment. If a man is honest and capable, we usually confirm his nomination as a matter of course; yet we do not agree, of course, with everything he does. That is also true in the case of Senators. Senators for whom I have the greatest possible personal affection do not agree with me on many matters, and it is probably wise that they do not, because they might be wrong at times—rarely, but sometimes.

Furthermore, let me say that Mr. Braden appeared before the committee, and most of the members of the committee made known to him the views of the committee as to these policies. He assured us that he had not intended in the past, and that he did not intend in the future, to do anything in the way of intervention in the internal affairs of any Latin-American country. He assured us that in connection with his recommendation with respect to postponing the conference at Brazil he had acted as he thought was proper, first by taking the question up with Brazil, and then letting Brazil take it up with the other powers which were invited to be present.

So, Mr. Braden, as Assistant Secretary, will be very well acquainted with the views of most of the members of the committee; and I do not believe he will be worse off for giving consideration to those views.

I thank the Senator for suggesting that consultation be had with the Committee on Foreign Relations. I take that as a compliment. I believe that in the conduct of our foreign relations it is best to talk about these things in advance rather than to wait until the event occurs and then try to pick up the pieces.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I merely wish to say in conclusion that, so far as I am concerned, I know nothing personally about Mr. Braden. So long as the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously asks that the nomination be confirmed, I think we should be guided by the vote of the committee. But I also wish to have it understood that in voting to confirm his nomination I am not condoning what he has done in Argentina relative to what I call the intervention policy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I voted to report favorably Mr. Braden's nomination as an Assistant Secretary of State, and I shall vote to confirm the nomination, because I think he has a very broad experience and a rather fine capacity for public work. But I am unable to permit this occasion to pass without making a very definite statement concerning the policies which have been involved in the discussion of the Braden case. I intend to discuss the subject for not more than 5 or 10 minutes, but not in connection with Mr. Braden himself. I consider him but an incident. I desire to discuss the question in connection with what I believe to be the indispensably vital need for retaining the inter-American system in all its most sympathetic relationships, for the sake of the welfare not only of the western world, but of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to comment upon what I believe to be the imperative need that we shall do everything within our power to maintain healthy, wholesome relationships and to scrupulously observe all of our mutual engagements with the 20 Latin-American Republics which constitute, with us, the great inter-American system of hemispherical peace, security, and good will. This inter-American system is not the sudden improvisation of an expedient hour. It is not born of the transient exigencies of a war. It dates back to the days of President James Monroe in respect to its roots. It is the evolution of many decades of neighborly contacts. It is the natural outgrowth of common interests in the protection and development of our common heritage in this New World. Its credentials are as long as they are honorable. It enjoys attachments of deep affection throughout the two Americas. It has been solemnly stabilized by repeated treaties for mutual consultation and mutual support. It is not a perquisite of the United States alone. It is the common property of our inter-American partnership, and the statecraft of the United States must never for an instant neglect, ignore, or violate this fundamental fact.

What happens in the midst of the swift pressures of a World War can always be an exception to all rules. But exceptions only emphasize the importance of general fidelity to the rules themselves. In anything like normal times what happens internally in any one of these American Republics is not entitled to be a matter of external intervention or of external disciplines unless it is a threat to the peace, safety, and welfare of the others. In the latter event, it becomes, by our inter-American agreements, a threat to all the others, and, under the terms of our numerous agreements, all the others must consult together—in the hope that they may act together—to determine a common course of action. This procedure is recommended not only by the letter and the spirit of our inter-American engagements, but also by the obvious fact that multilateral action—the voice of two continents—will be infinitely more persuasive and far better calculated to produce desired results than anything that

can be done unilaterally, upon our own American responsibility, by itself. We do not abstain from condemning dangerous situations which violate our sense of essential democracy when we substitute multilateral action for unilateral action. We powerfully multiply our unilateral action by 21, and we proportionately multiply the irresistible effectiveness of our challenge. Meanwhile, we thus avoid unfortunate and unfounded suspicions that the oft-called Colossus of the North is again reverting to a one-sided imperialism, which would make a cooperative inter-American system impossible. I am sure there is no such conscious purpose anywhere in our Government.

Let there be no doubt about our commitments in this respect. I refer briefly to a few excerpts from our existing American treaties. At Buenos Aires in 1936 an inter-American Conference signed the famous "convention for the maintenance, preservation, and reestablishment of peace." I quote one pregnant sentence:

Every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and every one of them—the 21 American Republics—and justifies the initiation of the procedure of consultation, etc.

Then this:

ART. 2. The high contracting parties, convinced of the necessity for the cooperation and consultation provided for in the convention for the maintenance, preservation, and reestablishment of peace signed by them on this same day, agree that in all matters which affect peace on the continent, such consultation and cooperation shall have as their object to assist, through the tender of friendly good offices and of mediation, the fulfillment by the American Republics of existing obligations for pacific settlement, and to take counsel together—

I emphasize the phrase "to take counsel together"—

with full recognition of their juridical equality, as sovereign and independent states, and of their general right to individual liberty of action, when an emergency arises which affects their common interest in the maintenance of peace.

Two years later, at Lima, this dedication was renewed. I quote again one paragraph from the Lima declaration:

Third. And in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American Republic is thus threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coordinating their respective sovereign wills by means of the procedure of consultation—

Always and forever the identification of this procedure of consultation—

established by conventions in force and by declarations of the Inter-American conferences, using the measures which in each case the circumstances may make advisable.

One year later, Mr. President, came the first meeting of Inter-American Foreign Ministers at Panama. Here is the resultant general declaration:

The governments of the American Republics further declare that whenever they consider it necessary they will—

What?—

consult together to determine upon the measures which they may individually or collectively undertake in order to secure the observance of the provisions of this declaration.

At Habana in 1940, at Rio de Janeiro in 1942, at Mexico City in 1945, these mutual consultative obligations were renewed. In the latter instance the preliminary act of Chapultepec asserts that the American Republics "will consult"—not "may" or "should"—"among themselves in order to agree upon the measures it may be advisable to take." It is this act which we shall shortly implement by another treaty.

Mr. President, I purposely refrain from any analysis of current events in this discussion. There is a wide divergence of controversial argument upon the subject. Yes; and it is so easy to confuse the issues prejudicially. This is less a criticism than it is an admonition. To make quite sure that no one can misunderstand my own personal attitude toward fascism, I hasten to state that I would have all the American republics join in striving to stamp it—or organized communism—out wherever they rear their ugly heads in a threat to common democratic interests in the Western Hemisphere. But I am speaking generally today. I am speaking of the desperate, fundamental importance of scrupulously maintaining the process of mutual consultation and mutual action in our inter-American system regardless of what problem confronts us in our western world. I regret to say that I think we have not fully abided by that process in recent months. I am speaking of the necessity for making sure that none of our Latin-American good neighbors shall have any legitimate right to suspect us of any purpose to intervene unilaterally in their internal affairs; but, on the contrary, shall always be reassured that when we find any cause for inter-American action we shall faithfully observe our pledge to ask for multilateral consultation. We need the confidence of our neighbors and they need ours.

Mr. President, it should be clearly understood that it is no desertion of the over-all authority of the United Nations Organization to maintain and strengthen the strongest possible ties of mutual sympathy, mutual understanding, and mutual cooperation in this age-old Pan American Union which is the shield of this Western Hemisphere. All of these 21 American Republics are members of the UNO. No matter how difficult or how discouraging the world's international relationships may become, it is all the more necessary that the United Nations Organization should persist, because it is our only available hope for the pacific stabilities for which the people pray at their hearthstones all around the globe.

The San Francisco Charter not only invites but encourages regional arrangements in the development of this precious aspiration. The Charter repeatedly invites "regional cooperation consistent with the principles and purposes of the United Nations"—article 52, section 2. Nothing could be more consistent, Mr. President, than the Pan American Union. Indeed, regional agencies are committed "to make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or agencies before referring them to the Security Council"—article 52, section 2. The Security Council is enjoined to "encourage pacific settlements through regional arrangements either on the initiative of the States concerned or by reference from the Security Council"—article 52, section 3. Regional arrangements are also specifically recognized—article 51—in the provision for "collective self-defense if any armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security." Regional military staff committees are provided in article 47, section 4.

The greatest and the noblest regional arrangement on earth, Mr. President, is the Pan American Union in this western world. Its record and its objectives are totally within the purposes, the concept, and the structure of the UNO. The maintenance of a vigorous, healthy, confident Pan American Union—subordinate in all its final aspects to the UNO—will be a tower of strength to the UNO. There is no conflict between the two. Indeed, the disintegration of the true solidarity of the inter-American system would be a blow to the UNO, as it would be a bitter blow to the intelligent self-interest of the United States and every Latin-American Republic.

Mr. President, my plea, therefore, is that we shall scrupulously maintain this inter-American institution on the basis of its mutual commitments and with constant fidelity to its mutual obligations.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a discussion of the postponement of the Rio Conference, by Hon. Sumner Welles, previously Under Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR ILL-ADVISED ACT

(By Sumner Welles)

POSTPONEMENT OF RIO CONFERENCE

Upon the demand of the United States, the American republics have postponed the meeting of their Foreign Ministers set for October 20. This meeting had been called to negotiate in treaty form the reciprocal obligations for the maintenance of regional security into which the American governments entered, as a temporary war measure, at Mexico City last winter.

The Department of State initiated this postponement without formal consultation with the other American governments. It announced that it took this action because of the unwillingness of the Government of the United States to enter into treaty relations with the Argentine dictatorship.

It seems to be difficult for those who are presently charged with the conduct of our inter-American relations to remember that there are 19 other American governments equally concerned in what goes on in Argentina. They seem to be even more oblivious of the strength of public opinion as a support for democracy within the Western Hemisphere.

Public opinion within Argentina is making itself increasingly felt. The overwhelming majority of the Argentine people are demanding the overthrow of the dictatorship

which has maneuvered its way to power. The force which public opinion represents has already brought about Perón's elimination from the government.

On September 20, after half a million Argentine citizens had demonstrated in Buenos Aires against the regime, the great Argentine newspaper, La Prenza, said: "We need neither mentors, nor tutors, nor prophets, nor redeemers, nor protectors, nor saviors." While that admonition was primarily addressed to Perón and his henchmen, it likewise referred to those well-intentioned, but wholly ill-advised, spokesmen for foreign governments who have assumed the role of saviors of the Argentine people. For the Argentine people long ago showed the rest of the world that they can achieve democracy by their own efforts, and that they will not long submit to any form of tutelage, whether domestic or foreign.

A clear distinction must be drawn between official interference by other American governments in Argentina's internal concerns and condemnation of the Argentine dictatorship by public opinion in the other American Republics. In their struggle for freedom the Argentine people are receiving the unanimous support of public opinion throughout the New World. Such support is of the utmost value to them in their fight for constitutional and democratic government. Both the press and the radio in the United States have rendered invaluable help. But the moment the United States Government, or the government of any other American Republic, undertakes to project itself through official channels into the internal affairs of the Argentine people the beneficial results of freely expressed public opinion are correspondingly weakened.

Neither the individual interests of the United States nor the cause of inter-American unity is served when the United States Government or its representatives take action which is regarded by the peoples of the Latin-American nations as derogatory to their national sovereignty.

Ambassador Braden in Argentina and Ambassador Berle in Brazil have been stanch and eloquent defenders of the democratic faith. Yet, after the present Argentine dictatorship has been overthrown, the Argentine people will lastingly resent the fact that a United States Ambassador harangued Argentine audiences on the iniquities of their own government. And in Brazil, Ambassador Berle's recent injection of his own views into the electoral campaign of that country has very naturally aroused a storm of protest. It will not soon be forgotten.

It is encouraging that leading members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate have condemned the action of the Department of State in bringing about the cancellation of the conference at Rio de Janeiro without prior consultation with the other American Republics. These Senators are stanch advocates of the inter-American regional system and have individually contributed to its successful growth. They evidently see more clearly than our Department of State that the inter-American system cannot become a strong and lasting force for the defense and progress of the Americas and for the safety of our own country unless the Government of the United States scrupulously respects the sovereign equality of the other American nations. That principle is one which the officials of the Department of State generally uphold in their official pronouncements. What is required is its observance in practice.

The postponement of the Rio conference is unfortunate. The meeting would have offered the American governments the best chance of expediting the negotiation of a treaty which would constitute a pillar of the United Nations Organization, and which would render a large measure of security to all the peoples of the New World.

Certainly, so long as the present Argentine dictatorship remains in power, the Argentine Republic should not be permitted to become a party to the contemplated treaty. But the proposed treaty could readily be drafted in such a form as to provide for the inclusion of the Argentine Republic, after constitutional and democratic government has been restored to the people of that country. The conference would also have afforded an admirable opportunity for the foreign ministers of the American nations to consult together concerning Argentina's internal situation and the failure of the Argentine dictatorship to comply with its internal obligations, and to consider joint measures of precaution.

The governing board of the Pan American Union should fix an early date for the Rio meeting so that the harm done by the ill-advised action of the Department of State may, insofar as may yet be possible, now be repaired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Michigan for the very excellent statement he has made reviewing the obligation for mutual consultation which we have entered into with the Latin-American countries. As one member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I should like to say that I think the events preceding Mr. Braden's nomination and the circumstances under which the Rio de Janeiro Conference, which was scheduled to be held on October 20 last, was postponed, are most unfortunate in so far as our strengthening hemispheric solidarity is concerned.

In the first place, Mr. President, the removal of Nelson Rockefeller from the position which he held and the appointment of Mr. Braden in his place should cause us, I think, without any reflection upon Mr. Braden and without passing judgment upon the policies of Mr. Rockefeller, to take judicial notice of the fact that that action raised in every Latin-American nation the question whether the so-called good neighbor policy was about to be revised or altered.

The further fact that Mr. Warren was simultaneously given an assignment in the diplomatic corps added to the apprehensions which were felt south of the Rio Grande.

When Mr. Braden left his post and came to Washington, very precipitant action was taken by the State Department following his arrival in this country, looking to the cancellation or the postponement of the Rio de Janeiro Conference which, as I have already said, had been scheduled to meet on October 20. The fact that the news that the United States had determined upon a policy of a postponement became public prior to the time the State Department consulted any other Latin-American governments, or their representatives in Washington, added to the apprehension that we were deviating from our commitments and our policy to consult with the other Latin-American nations in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, it was not until after the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and Mr. Braden had come to the office of the Senator from Texas on Tuesday, October 2, to discuss with the Senator from Texas and other Senators who had been approached concerning the possibility of their becoming members of the American delegation to the Rio Conference, that the State Department took action by calling together the Board of Governors of the Pan American Union to discuss this question. The record shows that such action was taken on October 3, the day on which the Foreign Relations Committee first met to hear Mr. Braden and Acting Secretary of State Acheson. I wish to say that so far as I am concerned I am not at all convinced in my own mind that prior to the time Acting Secretary of State Acheson and Mr. Braden came to the office of the Foreign Relations Committee on Tuesday, October 2, and there learned the unvarnished views of the Senators who were present, they ever intended to consult with any of the other nations or to utilize the Pan American Union as the vehicle for consultation on this very important decision.

The record is open to doubt, Mr. President. In the first place, the dispatches which I requested and which the chairman and the remaining members of the committee were kind enough to request the Department of State to furnish in connection with this matter, are all paraphrased so that in reading a paraphrased dispatch it is impossible to determine whether one obtains the actual meaning which was conveyed in the original text.

I should also like to say, Mr. President—and I do so without any reflection upon Mr. Braden—that the general comment which was current in the press, not only in the United States and in Latin-American countries concerning the conduct of Mr. Braden's mission in Argentina, create the impression—and I say again that a man cannot be held responsible, as I know so well, for what the press says about him—that Mr. Braden might have had in mind policies of a more vigorous and more unilateral character, so far as the United States was concerned than had prevailed in the past.

In that connection, I should like to say that I think the information which we have received both from the press and from Mr. Braden, through his statement made before the Foreign Relations Committee has been very lacking in some essential facts. I make that statement without any sympathy whatever for the Perón government in Argentina. But I have followed the press dispatches with reasonable care. I listened very attentively to every word which Mr. Braden said before the Foreign Relations Committee in explaining to the committee the situation which existed in the Argentine, and it came as a great surprise to me to read in the New York Times of October 19 a dispatch from Buenos Aires dated October 18, by Arnaldo Cortesi, the New York Times correspondent. I shall not burden the RECORD by reading very much of the article, but I wish to read a few paragraphs from it:

> While a general strike declared by the General Confederation of Labor brought about a complete stoppage of all activities throughout Argentina, Buenos Aires lived through another day of mob rule today.

After describing what took place there, the correspondent continued as follows:

> Even allowing for the unusual circumstances under which yesterday's events occurred, it seems clear that Colonel Perón has more support among the working classes

than most people believe. The crowd that gathered in the Plaza de Mayo yesterday did not number 500,000 persons, as Colonel Perón claimed, but possibly it did number as much as 80,000 or 100,000.

They were mostly very young, many mere boys, but they were undoubtedly for most part recruited from the working classes. Indeed, from their looks it would appear that Colonel Perón's appeal is mostly to the very poorest among the population. This is confirmed by the fact that the first strikes in protest against Colonel Perón's removal from the government occurred in such provinces as Salta and Tucuman, which are economically the most backward.

It is equally clear, however, that Colonel Perón is far from having the whole, or even the greater part, of labor on his side. Both the Socialist and Communist Parties, which still have a considerable following among the workers, are his declared enemies. All the independent unions, of which there are still some despite the harsh treatment their leaders and the members have received, are equally against him. And one cannot forget that only 2 months ago the crowds that shouted against the government while celebrating the victory of the United Nations were largely composed of workers.

It must be admitted that the general Confederation of Labor, which is controlled by Colonel Perón through the Secretariat of Labor and Social Welfare, succeeded in paralyzing all activities in Argentina today. This afternoon it would have been difficult to obtain even a flask of water in Buenos Aires. Intimidation and actual violence play a part in bringing about this result, but it is evident that the controls of the leading labor organizations are in Colonel Perón's hands and that he has enough support among the roudiest and toughest of the rank and file to impose his will upon the rest.

This is a fact that cannot be overlooked in appraising the Argentine situation and that undoubtedly will play an important part in full developments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On October 20, 1945, the next day following the day to which I have referred, the same correspondent, Arnaldo Cortesi, sent a dispatch dated October 19. I shall read only one paragraph of it, but I ask that the remainder of the dispatch be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The paragraph which I desire to read is as follows:

It was confirmed that in all cases the forces mobilized in Colonel Perón's favor belonged to the labor unions that he had either created or controlled. It is still a moot point how much labor support he enjoys, but it is clear that whatever support he has, whether it is great or small, comes from the working class and in general from elements in it.

I have cited these dispatches, Mr. President, only to show that they were the first indication I had, either as a result of reading newspapers or as a result of listening to Mr. Braden on two separate occasions when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, that the much detested government of Colonel Perón has support among the rank and file of the people of Argentina, and that it also has support among organized labor in that country.

Mr. President, I am not saying that that serves as any justification or excuse for the policies of the Perón government. What I am saying is that such faulty reporting, such faulty exposition of the actual facts in a nation which is in a state of crisis, can lead only to disaster if our policy is to be predicated upon such reports, which are so inadequate and which so utterly fail to describe the actual factual situation.

I am informed that the State Department is not the only department of Government which failed to receive the information which is now contained in these two dispatches, which, so far as I have seen, have not been denied.

Mr. President, so far as I was concerned in the case of Mr. Braden's nomination, I wish to be entirely frank with my colleagues. I was caught on the horns of a very difficult dilemma. If I voted against Mr. Braden, if the committee voted against him, and if the Senate voted against him, in view of all the publicity which he had obtained, or which had been accorded to him, it could not have been taken in any other fashion than as an indication that the committee and the Senate was repudiating the Ambassador who had so lately returned from the difficult and complex situation in Argentina. If I voted for Mr. Braden, if the committee voted for him, and if the Senate voted for him, as they intend to do, I have the distinct feeling that we are not advancing the cause of cooperation, consultation, and united action so far as the Latin-American nations are concerned.

Mr. President, I weighed that dilemma carefully, and I finally came to the conclusion that under all the circumstances perhaps the best thing we could do would be to vote for Mr. Braden's confirmation, and I intend to do so. But I want it clearly understood that in so doing I am not in any wise indicating that I am in favor of any weakening or any alteration of our policy so far as the Latin-American countries are concerned. On the contrary, Mr. President, I take this occasion, in the light of what we are about to do, to place myself on record as in favor of a more enthusiastic, a more sympathetic discharge of our written and solemn obligation so far as those nations are concerned.

I wish to express here and now my own conviction that the security of the United States requires the speedy implementation of the act of Chapultepec, and I do not want any vote which I may cast for Mr. Braden to be interpreted as approving delay in the implementation of that act.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I call upon the State Department and upon any of the persons attached to our missions, military or otherwise, to do a better job of reporting on conditions in these delicate and complicated situations, than they have been doing up to now.

I wish to say further, Mr. President, as one member of the committee and one Member of the Senate, that I believe that in the light of all that has developed we should consult with the other nations in this hemisphere on the Argentine problem, and if possible, we should secure unanimity and mutilateral action in respect to it.

I desire to put myself on record as being opposed to implementing the Act of Chapultepec by the exchange of drafts of treaties by correspondence which is only a means of avoiding consultation with the other nations as to what should be done so far as the Argentine is concerned.

Mr. President, I believe there should be a meeting of the Latin-American Nations in this hemisphere, that there should be a full, free, and honest discussion of this whole question, and then united action, so far as the complicated and complex situation in the Argentine is concerned, should be determined upon.

If we proceed on a unilateral basis much longer it can result only in wrecking what I think, so far as our relations with Latin America are concerned, has been one of real achievements of the last decade or so. To proceed further on a unilateral basis or in a unilateral spirit in order to avoid embarrassing and complicated problems, which may arise from multilateral action and discussion, I say in the long run hazards the destruction of the good-neighbor policy, which, as I have heretofore stated, I believe to be one of the great achievements in international cooperation in the last decade.

EXHIBIT A

ARGENTINE STRIKE BACKS PERÓN COUP—NATION PARALYZED BY GENERAL STOPPAGE AS BUENOS AIRES SEETHES IN MOB'S GRIP

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

BUENOS AIRES, October 18.—While a general strike declared by the General Confederation of Labor brought about a complete stoppage of all artivities throughout Argentina, Buenos Aires lived through another day of mob rule today.

Groups of irresponsible and rowdy young men, most of whom came in from the industrial city of Avellaneda and other points, were in possession of the streets from the earliest hours of the morning and never seemed to tire of marching through the main thoroughfares shouting the name of Col. Juan Perón.

Apart from these demonstrators, the streets were virtually deserted, most people preferring to remain indoors.

Despite the strike, La Nacion, La Prensa, and other morning papers appeared as usual, but there were no afternoon papers except the pro-Perón La Epoca. Among the afternoon papers that did not appear is Critica, which was occupied by the police after it had been attacked by a mob late last night.

Details of this affair are still confused and each side accuses the other of starting to shoot. Whoever started it, it is certain there was much shooting also from inside the Critica Building. It is certain also that high-explosive bombs and machine guns were used, but it is uncertain by whom.

The police arrived on the scene when the fighting had been in progress for more than an hour and finally occupied the Critica Building with the help of two truckloads of soldiers. The police say the casualties number 2 dead and 24 wounded, including 2 boys. Sixty members of Critica's staff were taken to the Villa Devoto prison, together with six employees of the Nacional, which is printed in the same premises.

Three cabinet ministers were appointed today and they took the oath. They are the

War Minister, Gen. Humberto Sosa Molina; the Navy Minister, Rear Admiral Abelardo Pantin, and the Foreign Minister, Juan Isaac Cooke. A cabinet post was offered to former Minister of the Interior Hortensio Quijano but he refused it because he proposes to run as Vice President on Colonel Perón's ticket.

Col. J. Filomeno Velazzo and Col. José Domingo Molina, chief and subchief of the Federal police for many months before Colonel Perón's fall, were reinstated in their posts today.

INSURGENT ADMIRAL SEIZED

Vice Adm. Hector Vernengo Lima, who took over half of the Cabinet after Colonel Perón's fall, fled last night with three units of the river squadron. He was threatened with several measures, including the bombing of his ships from the air, if he did not return. This he finally decided to do, and he reached Buenos Aires today and immediately was placed under arrest.

Gen. Eduardo Avalos, the other half of the Cabinet after Colonel Perón's fall, spent the night at the military base of Campo de Mayo as usual and today resigned his commission.

There is no truth in reports that the navy or part of the navy rose against the Government last night. According to these rumors, the naval school in Rio Santiago began a march on Buenos Aires, headed by its commander, Rear Adm. Leonardo MacLean, until turned back by the Seventh Infantry Regiment. So far as can be learned today, no naval forces left Rio Santiago, though it is possible that they would have done so if they had been joined by Vice Adm. Vernengo Lima, who was on his way there when he left Buenos Aires.

Colonel Perón's whereabouts is unknown. He has not been seen since yesterday's events. He is not in his home and it is presumed therefore that he is on his way to the Territory of Chubut, where he intends to spend 2 weeks to rest and recuperate, according to an announcement he made yesterday.

POLICE DETERMINE EVENTS

The sensation comback that Colonel Perón staged yesterday must be attributed mainly to the fact that Argentine was, for all intents and purposes, with a government for a week. It was the police, in both Buenos Aires and the provinces, who determined the course of events by severely crushing all demonstrations against Colonel Perón and by favoring those in his support.

Colonel Perón's forces also obviously were much better organized than those of his rivals. They began moving on Buenos Aires from the nearby city of Avelaneda early in the morning and by the time most citizens woke up they were already in full possession of the capital. From that moment they were undisputed masters of the situation.

The Buenos Aires Police Department is one of Colonel Perón's great strongholds. The police force was considerably increased in numbers recently by its chief, Col. J. Filomeno Velanzgo, who is one of Colonel Perón's stanchest supporters, and he made of it a valuable instrument of Colonel Perón's political ambitions.

It so happened, moreover, that just yesterday a federal judge ordered the arrest of three leading police officers, considering them responsible for the shooting that occurred in the Plaza San Martin last week. This untimely step must have convinced many other police officers that their only salvation lay in Colonel Perón's speedy return to power.

THE DEMOCRATS' MISTAKE

Looking back on it now, one realizes that the Argentine democrats made a terrible mistake by insisting on the delivery of the government's powers to the supreme court after Colonel Perón's fall. If they had immediately organized a government of their own, even accepting Edelmiro Farrell's presidency if necessary, they would have been in a position to influence events and gradually dismantle the powerful organization that Colonel Perón had created within the government itself to further his plans.

What happened is that they refused to have anything to do with the government and they themselves thus helped create the chaos from which Colonel Perón ultimately benefited.

Even allowing for the unusual circumstances under which yesterday's events occurred, it seems clear that Colonel Perón has more support among the working classes than most people believed. The crowd that gathered in the Plaza de Mayo yesterday did not number 500,000 persons, as Colonel Perón claimed, but possibly it did number as much as 80,000 or 100,000.

They were mostly very young, many mere boys, but they were undoubtedly for most part recruited from the working classes. Indeed, from their looks it would appear that Colonel Perón's appeal is mostly to the very poorest among the population. This is confirmed by the fact that the first strikes in protest against Colonel Perón's removal from the government occurred in such provinces as Salta and Tucuman, which are economically the most backward.

It is equally clear, however, that Colonel Perón is far from having the whole, or even the greater part, of labor on his side. Both the Socialist and Communist Parties, which still have a considerable following among the workers, are his declared enemies. All the independent unions, of which there are still some despite the harsh treatment their leaders and members have received, are equally against him. And one cannot forget that only 2 months ago the crowds that shouted against the government while celebrating the victory of the United Nations were largely composed of workers.

It must be admitted that the General Confederation of Labor, which is controlled by Colonel Perón through the Secretariate of Labor and Social Welfare, succeeded in paralyzing all activities in Argentina today. This afternoon it would have been difficult to obtain even a flask of water in Buenos Aires. Intimidation and actual violence play a part in bringing about this result, but it is evident that the controls of the leading labor organizations are in Colonel Perón's hands and that he has enough support among the roudiest and toughest of the rank and file to impose his will upon the rest.

This is a fact that cannot be overlooked in appraising the Argentine situation and that undoubtedly will play an important part in future developments.

EXHIBIT B

PERÓN OPPONENTS IN ARGENTINA HIDE—CAPITAL APPEARS TO BE QUIET BUT ARMED POLICE TAKE UNUSUAL PRECAUTIONS—NEW ARRESTS REPORTED—LATE NEWS FROM PROVINCES INDICATES MUCH VIOLENCE BY DICTATORIAL FACTION

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

BUENOS AIRES, October 19.—The general strike ended at midnight and Argentina, after a week of turmoil, chaos and unexpected events, was rapidly returning today to what for many months past it had been obliged to regard as a normal condition. The sun was shining brightly with the first heat of summer in the air and the people were going about their business as usual, apparently forgetful that since August 9 their country had been through a true revolution and counterrevolution.

The only particular in which the present situation differs from that existing before Col. Juan D. Perón's momentary eclipse is that the opposition to the military regime seems completely disorganized and is lying very low. Some universities, including the University of Buenos Aires, have shown their disapproval of the turn that events have taken, however, by declaring the scholastic year ended.

Despite the surface calm there are many indications that the Argentine political pot is still boiling. Most unusual police precautions were taken this afternoon. In some central streets mounted police were actually sitting on their horses with carbines in their hands.

MANY GO INTO HIDING

It also is reported that the police again are arresting numerous persons, including some of the students who were released little more than a week ago. Whether this report is true or false what is certain is that many student leaders and other persons in the Government's bad books have thought it prudent to go into hiding.

Argentina, moreover, again is witnessing the shameful spectacle of citizens being obliged to find protection against their own Government in foreign embassies. The Peruvian Embassy, for instance, has taken in several persons, including former Federal Judge Ramon S. Vasques, who filed a complaint in courts against the police for having tortured political prisoners.

In the Uruguayan Embassy, along with others, are former Foreign Minister José Maria Cantilo and the family of Rear Adm. Leonardo MacLean, who played an important part in the recent events.

As news comes from the provinces, it is clear that the violence was not confined to Buenos Aires in the last few days. Many competent observers, indeed, attribute the success of yesterday's general strike to the atmosphere of violence that hung over the whole country.

VIOLENCE HIT PROVINCES

Several newspapers were attacked in various parts of Argentina, as were also some private homes, such as that of Dr. Alfredo Calcagno, rector of La Plata University. In some industrial districts of Avellaneda anyone who appeared in the streets wearing a tie was subject to assault.

In Cordoba the offices of the Argentine North American Cultural Institute were stoned while police looked on without interfering.

The reaction of the military dictatorship's adversaries everywhere was feeble. The adversaries apparently were caught off their guard and were not able to organize any effective countermovement. Incidents were therefore comparatively few, though a dozen or so shooting affrays were reported in which some people were wounded.

It was confirmed that in all cases the forces mobilized in Colonel Perón's favor belonged to the labor unions that he had either created or controlled. It is still a moot point how much labor support he enjoys, but it is clear that whatever support he has, whether it is great or small, comes from the working class and in general from elements in it.

OFFICERS BARRED FROM POLITICS

One of the War Minister's first actions today was to issue a general order forbidding all officers to participate in political meetings or even to call on the President except by special permission. This obviously is intended to prevent further interference by the army in the development of political events.

Colonel Perón's fall was in fact brought about exclusively by the army and his arrest, it is understood, was demanded by a committee of generals and admirals who forced their way into the Presidential offices threatening sentries with their revolvers. The army, moreover, early yesterday morning had a voice in picking the new cabinet, for it vetoed the inclusion in it of Dr. Hortensio Quijano, former Minister of the Interior.

Colonel Perón is out of the Government but he continues to dominate it. The cabinet, which at the moment of writing is still incomplete, is composed almost exclusively

of Colonel Perón's friends who are completely loyal to him.

The final proof of how thoroughly Colonel Perón is back in the saddle was afforded when one of his chief henchmen, Col. J. Filomeno Velazco, was reinstated as chief of police yesterday. This man, to whom direct responsibility is attributed for all excesses of which the police have been guilty in recent times, is the symbol of everything that the Argentine democratic forces have been fighting against.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not expect to take much of the time of the Senate. I do not care to enter into any debate with the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Wisconsin, because no one questions the statements of fact which they have made, and since they are apparently going to vote for the confirmation of the nominee, I do not care to say anything contrary to what they have said.

I will state, however, that the State Department assures us that it does believe in consultation with the Latin-American countries. We are under obligation to consult with them. Together with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] I was an observer at the time the Act of Chapultepec was agreed upon, and as observers we took part in the formulation of the act. I think the formulation of that act was a distinct advance in Latin-American relations, and I have great hope that its final implementation in the form of a treaty will still further advance that cause.

We are going to have consultation with regard to the Act of Chapultepec. The State Department assures me that while it will consult, it will submit to the other nations involved proposed drafts of a treaty which this country regards as proper, and that it will receive from other countries their drafts as to the proposed treaty, and that after the exchange of these documents there will be called a conference for the writing and the execution of such a treaty. So that will comply with our obligations of consultation with the Latin-American nations.

Mr. President, I think we will have still greater opportunities in the future with regard to the Latin-American nations than we probably realize at the moment. Occurrences in Latin America must always be of grave concern to the United States. We want those nations to maintain their own independence, we want their own internal affairs to be under their governments, but the only kind of free government, the only kind of constitutional government of any value to a people is that which they themselves work out and adopt and maintain. Such a government cannot be superimposed by an outside influence.

One of the great opportunities of the future will be to set an example to the Latin-American countries that the way to attain their objectives and their final independence and the development of a constitutional system is to follow the pattern set before them and do it themselves and do it properly.

Mr. President, unless there are further questions, I have no other comments to make and I should like to have a vote on the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mr. Spruille Braden to be an Assistant Secretary of State?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on the assumption that there is to be no record vote I desire to say for the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] that if he were present he would vote in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Braden.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mr. Braden? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nomination of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to announce before Senators depart that the Senate will meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon for the purpose of going to the House Chamber to attend the joint session of the two Houses to hear a message from the President. There will be no other business transacted tomorrow. The Senate will meet at 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, for the purpose, I hope, of taking up the tax bill.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS OF LAW UPON COUNSEL FOR THE PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on last Thursday I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 110 which would relieve the counsel of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee from certain restrictions of the law with reference to transacting business with the Government. We authorized our general counsel, Mr. Mitchell, to select his assistants, and he has done a very fine job. They are working day and night and Sundays on the record and reading the testimony in order to get some matters ready for public hearings.

In order to obtain efficient counsel we know that it is necessary to engage attorneys here who are members of firms which in the nature of their business appear before departments and agencies of the Government. The Committee on the Judiciary today unanimously reported the joint resolution. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in sections 361, 365, or 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel serving under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, passed by the Senate on September 6, 1945, and passed by the House of Representatives on September 11, 1945.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. There being nothing further to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 23, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 22, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, now a foreign-service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Hon. Jorge Luis Cordova Diaz, of Puerto Rico, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, vice Hon. Martin Travieso, elevated.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William McClanahan, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee. (Mr. McClanahan is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired August 11, 1945.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John P. Logan, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires October 30, 1945.)

Edward L. Burke, of Vermont, to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont. (Mr. Burke is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 14, 1943.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Clara M. Ketchum, Bonnerdale, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dixon G. Baker, Humnoke, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Richmond A. Waller, Keo, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Claude Spore, St. Charles, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Dewitt E. Tucker, Tucker, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Mabel L. Hulsey, McArthur, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

HAWAII

Meice W. Hua, Honaunau, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ILLINOIS

Blanche H. Davis, Buncombe, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Claude M. Jordan, Enfield, Ill., in place of Ben Bramlett, resigned.

INDIANA

Leone P. Erick, Keystone, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John G. Fahey, Notre Dame, Ind., in place of F. J. Merline, resigned.
Jess Harlan Nunn, Richland, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KANSAS

Raymond J. Renner, Andale, Kans., in place of Frank Batka, retired.
Eugene R. Jones, Liberal, Kans., in place of R. O. Tobias, removed.
Claude F. Averill, Rantoul, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Leo Thom, Hayes, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Bess L. Cook, Loranger, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MAINE

Ida M. Pitts, Harrison, Maine, in place of C. H. Pitts, deceased.

MARYLAND

Mahlon McKinley Poe, Texas, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Lulu M. Pyykkonen, Atlantic Mine, Mich., in place of A. E. Rova, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Selmer Oliver Lundeen, Alvarado, Minn., in place of M. H. Sands, resigned.
Olive M. Stromgren, Constance, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSISSIPPI

Robert W. Bounds, Lawrence, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John D. Pickens, Toccopola, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MONTANA

Harry Kennedy, Rosebud, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW JERSEY

Eleanor M. Busch, Almonesson, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Pearl S. Richman, Malaga, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Christina V. Richardson, Port Reading, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

John L. Stecz, Haverstraw, N. Y., in place of M. F. Maloney, deceased.
Katherine B. Kinne, Memphis, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
M. Louise Soule, Minoa, N. Y., in place of W. A. Soule, deceased.
Matilda B. Engelmann, Mount Vision, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Elva G. Commerdinger, Nesconset, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OHIO

Stella E. Dickerson, Glencoe, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Lester A. Clay, Lewistown, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

Pearl M. Alder, Burlington, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joseph Charles Taylor, Kingfisher, Okla., in place of E. J. Solomon, deceased.
Daisy A. Stilley, Mannsville, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OREGON

Edgar W. Peterson, Powell Butte, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marie M. Bassler, Brockton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John W. Wasil, Calumet, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Margaret M. Reddy, Connerton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
I. Elizabeth Clark, Graterford, Pa., in place of P. V. Abel, deceased.
Mayme S. Porter, Hokendauqua, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Rocco Moff, Weston, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Francis T. McMahon, Wyncote, Pa., in place of M. E. Cascetti, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Ila V. Brock, McDonald, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James A. Green, Pelham, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Errie E. Morgan, Arcadia, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Doris Johnson, Comstock, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VERMONT

Ruth E. Curtiss, Williamstown, Vt., in place of N. B. Smith, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Nell P. McMullin, The Plains, Va., in place of T. B. Cochran, transferred.

WASHINGTON

Frank O. Keith, Battle Ground, Wash., in place of F. O. Keith. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Walter E. Holliday, Caldwell, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Lawrence O. Hunt, Cottageville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harvey N. Sanford, Leslie, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Winfred J. Hicks, Rockland, Wis., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lillian M. Bionien, Rudolph, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 22, 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Spruille Braden to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Pearl G. Hill, Badger.
Katherine W. Baxter, Burlington.
Mark J. Torrence, Kamrar.
Henry J. Johnson, Kanawha.
Emma A. Cullin, Percival.
Dorothy E. Peterson, Pilot Mound.
Harry G. Liddle, Wever.

TENNESSEE

Mary E. Leedy, Bean Station.
Joseph B. Campbell, Blaine.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the great mysterious adventure of life, we pray Thee to give us minds to make a new covenant for more noble service, true to duty and to Thee. Forgive our feverish and faltering ways and lead us with calm faith, that our understanding may be clarified with statesmanlike wisdom. Bless us with the pardon of our sins, with consciences that are sensitive to all wrong, and with courage to carry forward every good purpose.

We pray that our truest values of men may be of those who give loyal service to their communities and lead exemplary careers, whose thought of life is not just to succeed, but to be content with Thy commendation: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." Here, in the Master's loving words, is set forth the grandeur of a truly great life. With heaven's hope for every hopeless man, with purity for every stained life, with living water for every parched lip, let the spirit of God whisper its glory into the souls of men. At the close of this day, give us the sweet consciousness that we have been a little closer to the Heart Eternal. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 19, 1945, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and include with each a newspaper article.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a poem.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter and photograph from a naval officer with whom it was my privilege to serve during this war. In his letter he says:

We went out to Samar, in the Philippines, and picked up our first load before we had a chance to get special accommodations built in or any other preparations made—speed is the word. It rather annoys me to hear that Congressman so-and-so has suggested that Navy combat ships should bring back high-point personnel, when already, months ago, they were ordered to bring every man they could cram in, and there have been assigned specially to that one job seven CV's, 35 CVE's and at least 110 other large ships to shuttle back and forth doing nothing else. We get into San Diego with this load in 3 days and as soon as we can clean boilers start right out on another trip.

The picture—

A very interesting picture because it shows that all the planes are removed from the hangar deck and the space thus made available is covered entirely with cots—

is our hangar deck—with some of our passengers. We have cut out over 200 of our crew so as to carry more, so lots of passengers are bunked in their spaces below besides the ones you see in the picture. The chief problem, of course, is fresh water.

I do not presume to speak for the servicemen, but I venture the guess that they are well aware of how enormous the job is and appreciate fully that everything possible is being done to get them home quickly. Recently I talked with an officer friend of mine who served on a battleship in the Pacific. He told me that every effort was made to provide space on all of the ships returning to this country for eligible servicemen. The charge that the Navy is not making every effort to bring our boys home as quickly as possible is entirely without basis in fact and is not fair. Of course it would be nice if every veteran could take his uniform off and resume his normal and usual vocation as soon as the war ended, but even the cronic gripers in the services realize that this is impossible.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when the special orders are called an address on the one problem that overshadows by far any problems mankind has ever faced in thousands of years, namely, the problem of the control of atomic energy, will be made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. He has not asked me to do this, but I am urging Members of the House who can possibly be here, to be here to hear that address.

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BILLS

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a very short letter sent me by a representative of a Minneapolis labor union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have filed petitions signed by 1,079 names collected by the labor unions in favor of the full-employment bill and the Kilgore-Warren bill regarding unemployment compensation. The letter accompanying these petitions is as follows:

UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., October 20, 1945.

The Honorable WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GALLAGHER: At the request of our people in Minneapolis we are sending you 66 petitions containing 1079 signatures collected in the local union shops and throughout the city. We would like to request that these petitions be filed with the Speaker of the House.

In view of the fact that you support the measures called for in the petitions, we would also like to request that you make brief mention on the floor of having received these petitions. As you know, much time and effort goes into the collection of these signatures.

If you are able to do this, please let us know so that we can advise the editor of our local union paper in Minneapolis.

Thank you very much for whatever consideration you feel you can give our request.

Respectfully yours,
CLIFFORD T. MCAVOY,
Washington Representative.

ATOMIC ENERGY MOST IMPORTANT SUBJECT BEFORE CONGRESS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MCDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the St. Joseph Union Observer entitled "A. F. of L. Wage Policy as Set Forth by the Executive Council."

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want once again to call to the attention of the House that Congress should take action to supervise the discharge process. I have a letter this morning from Japan dealing with this matter which sets forth in detail some of the things that are interfering with the separation of men from the armed forces who should long ago have been home.

The letter is as follows:

OSAKA, JAPAN, *October 10, 1945.*

SIR: There are facts, not opinions, or surmises. They exist now—today. I wish you'd read them and then question the validity of the War Department's programs and promises.

The Sixth Army as of today has not allowed men eligible for discharge to initiate a request for discharge. Men eligible for separation from the service in my unit in the Philippines, 1½ months ago, are with us now in Japan. These men have not been allowed to begin the first step in the discharge process—that of writing a request for discharge.

This is not my unit C. O.'s fault—he has tried to get authority from Sixth Army headquarters to release these men—such authority has not been forthcoming. All we get are evasive answers—no results. Small "defeat the incumbents" groups are forming to oust Congressmen who are not helping us get released from the Army. If our present Representatives can't get us out of the Army, we'll try to get them out of office.

We want immediate congressional action and supervision of the discharge process. We want all men with 3 (not 2) years' service, not otherwise qualified, released from the Army. We look to Congress for aid.

Sincerely.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of socialized medicine and include therein a short editorial on the same subject.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution which he introduced last March and also an editorial from the Washington Post.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of legislative business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the address by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] on Wednesday afternoon, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on why should not the OPA quit?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

TRUCK CARRIERS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from the head of a large trucking company or forwarding company in my State which says that he needs 50 new trucks. He made a canvass of the truck dealers in Sioux Falls, and received these replies:

International Harvester: No trucks. Factory closed on strike.

Studebaker: No trucks. Factory on strike.

Diamond T: No trucks. Factory on strike.

Reo: No trucks. Factory on strike.

Dodge: No trucks; possibly can furnish five or six units within the next 30 or 60 days.

Chevrolet: No trucks; hope to furnish a few units within 60 days.

Ford: No trucks; expect to get into production soon.

General Motors: No trucks; expect to be able to furnish some tractors, but nothing on straight trucks for some time.

Mr. Speaker, That is your American picture today. I stand with every Member here who is interested in reconversion and providing jobs in urging that the administration promptly announce a postwar wage policy that will permit the settlement of these strikes. If that action is to be delayed, Congress should declare itself in a law establishing mutual responsibility for labor and management so that reconversion may go ahead and returning servicemen be employed. The public has a stake in these matters and deserves consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances with respect to two separate subjects, and include a newspaper item in connection with each extension.

THE END OF THE WAR

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we all know the war is over but there has been no declaration to that effect. I think it high time that the administration leaders take notice of that and either the President or the Congress officially declare the war at an end. I say this because the newspapers recently carried the story that the President had submitted to the Appropriations Committee a request for something like $132,000,000 for river and harbor projects in this country. When I checked up on that I found that that included no items that were in the bill passed by this Congress sometime last January or February. The reason there was no item included in that request was just this: that there is a provision in the existing law that no appropriation can be made for any projects for rivers and harbors until 6 months after the termination of the war. We must terminate the war, or else no appropriations can be made for new projects.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of other special orders today I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Gen. R. W. Berry, the Deputy Personnel Chief of the Army, testified before the Senate Military Affairs Committee last week that the Army had 6,990,000 men in service as of October 15. He further stated that of these men there were 1,985,000 men with more than 60 points who would now be eligible for discharge. General Berry also gave this committee the information that there were 410,000 men with more than 85 points still in the Army and of this number 200,000 were in the United States.

Of the 6,990,000 men still in the Army, 1,930,000 men are in the Atlantic area, 2,100,000 in all Pacific areas, and 3,500,000 in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, unless it is the intention of the armed forces to have some five million men in the Army at Christmas time, it will be necessary to give every man in the United States who is not usefully employed in the Army an indefinite furlough at home. He should be left there with his family and his business until the Army is ready to complete his discharge.

General Berry also gave the information that more than 30,000 men were voluntarily enlisting in the Army each month. There is an additional 17,000 men monthly enlisting in the Navy. If the Selective Service continues their call of 30,000 a month, it would seem that we would be getting more than 1,000,000 men a year in the armed forces, either by voluntary methods or by drafting them.

It would seem to me that it is time for the Selective Service to make a drastic reduction in the number of men they are sending into the Army. It is quite evident that the voluntary recruitment of men will be sufficient to meet all the needs of the armed forces. If this is true, why is it necessary to keep on drafting men into the armed forces?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, at the close of business and following any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, immediately after the special order of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], I may address the House for 30 minutes on Americanism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times on the subject of clothing restrictions.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from the letter of a serviceman.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of October 18.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Shreveport Times entitled "Peacetime Air Forces."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered in New York before the Propeller Club a few days ago by Mr. Roy Miller.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an appeal sent to President Truman.

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Morning News of Wilmington, Del.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a sailor.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a soldier.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two statements of his own.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today, I may adress the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend by remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOFFMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CAPITAL AND LABOR MUST RECONCILE THEIR DIFFERENCES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, nothing would do more in our reconversion effort than for the President immediately, not next month, but immediately, to call his conference of businessmen and labor leaders and anyone who can in any manner soften the differences between capital and labor. Certainly it is the greatest thing, the most important thing, that should be done and he should not permit anything else to interfere with it. The only way we will get together in this country in peace and harmony is for men to have an understanding, every man to try to see the viewpoint of others and try to compromise the differences. With a spirit of cooperation we can win. A spirit of dog eat dog—or to get everything you want and no thought of the other fellow—breeds discontent and later hardship to you and your fellow men. Remember the Golden Rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS—VIRGINIA-DISTRICT BOUNDARY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3220, an act to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 5, lines 7 and 8, strike out "for use in the exercise of essentially governmental functions."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1383) amending an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the chairman of the committee would make a brief statement as to the purpose of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this would give to the hospital in question certain rights, namely, to change the corporate name, to conduct a school for the education and training of nurses, and also to issue suitable certificates upon completion of the course, and also would repeal the present limitation as to the amount of real estate the institution may hold.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia approve the bill. It is just a step in a forward policy of this hospital to meet the needs of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporation of Providence Hospital, of Washington, D. C., under an act of Congress approved April 8, 1864, be, and the same hereby is, approved and continued in force except as herein specifically altered:

The corporate name of the said corporation shall be "Providence Hospital" instead of "The Directors of Providence Hospital."

SEC. 2. The corporation is authorized to conduct not only a hospital, clinic, and all the departments, staffs, and services usually connected therewith, but also a school for the education and training of nurses and interns with full power to examine the said nurses and interns and to issue suitable certificates evidencing the completion of their courses of training.

SEC. 3. The provision contained in the act incorporating Providence Hospital approved April 8, 1864, limiting the value of the real estate which may be held by the corporation is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARKING FACILITIES FOR PERSONS EMPLOYED IN FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDINGS (D. C.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4283) to require parking facilities for persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any office building is hereafter erected in the District of Columbia by the United States Government, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, or any corporation, all of the stock of which is owned or controlled by the United States Government, space readily accessible to such building shall be provided and maintained for the parking of automobiles and motor vehicles of not less than 10 percent or more than 20 percent of the persons employed in such building.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this legislation are to at least partially relieve the traffic congestion which continues to exist within the District of Columbia. We are providing that when new buildings are erected in the District a certain percentage of parking space will be provided. As I stated heretofore, this is just a step in what we trust will be toward further solution of the traffic congestion.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman tell us what they are going to do to help relieve the traffic situation? Of course, I think it is something that ought to be done.

Mr. RANDOLPH. When a Federal building is constructed within the District of Columbia in the future we will require in connection with that building that there shall be provided and maintained for the parking of automobiles and motor vehicles a space for not less than 10 percent of the employees who may work in that building. We realize there are employees who come to work by street car, by bus and by other means of conveyance. We believe this is a fair percentage because it will redound to the advantage of the people who drive their own automobiles.

Mr. RICH. I notice that on very wide streets in the city before 9:30 they do not permit parking on some of them. Take New York Avenue, for example, which is a wide street. They could utilize that and I think it would aid and assist. I took this up with Mr. Van Duzer and he permitted parking from Fourteenth to Thirteenth and I think that was a fine change. However, they could go a little farther on Fourteenth Street, in my opinion; and if he would do that he would do the city a very great good so far as traffic is concerned. Maybe a word to him from the gentleman on that might aid and assist because the traffic situation is rather desperate here. On these wide streets where they can permit cars to be parked at certain times, not all day parking but for 10, 15, or 20 minutes while people run errands, it would aid and assist the situation, it seems to me.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes an appropriate comment and I may say that our Subcommittee on Traffic has made certain recommendations. We are going to continue the study in order to be helpful in this problem.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no opinion on the New York Avenue situation to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred, but I do want to make one observation. One of the great problems in all large cities is the traffic situation. Another important matter is the business houses located in these cities. They have their money invested. I refer to those particularly located in the center of a city. Unless something is done to enable people who might shop there through the use of the automobile to have the opportunity to go in and shop

in these stores and businesses, these business houses might be compelled to move to another section of the city. We have that situation in Boston. In my opinion, there is a great deal to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said from the standpoint of helping business, not only here but in every other city in the United States.

As this bill relates to the District of Columbia, without making any observation about any streets here, particular attention might be paid, in my opinion, to the interests and the invested capital therein, which to me is a very important matter.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts also for his contribution, and again I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I was not thinking of permanent parking for long hours, but if they could allow a half-hour parking on some of the wide streets it would help possibly. It would assist the individual and would result in a better situation, so far as traffic is concerned, for the city.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assumed that is what the gentleman had in mind and I wanted to make the observation because I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania made a very constructive suggestion.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CODE OF LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2938) to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. This legislation was recommended to the House District Committee for passage by the District of Columbia Bar Association. It was felt that reimbursement of reasonable expenses incurred by property owners in condemnation proceedings which have been abandoned should be paid. The testimony brought out that there were only two such proceedings over a period of 4 years. It would therefore be a relatively small cost to the District. Specifically, the provision is that if condemnation proceedings shall be abandoned, the court shall award to the owner or owners of property involved sufficient funds to reimburse such owner or owners for all reasonable costs and expenses, including reasonable counsel fees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 490 of chapter XV of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 16–610), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 490. It shall be optional with the Commissioners to abide by the verdict of the jury and occupy the land appraised by them, or, within a reasonable time to be fixed by the court in its order confirming the verdict, to abandon the same: *Provided, however*, That if such condemnation proceeding shall be abandoned, the court shall award to the owner or owners of the property involved therein such sum or sums as will in the opinion of the court reimburse such owner or owners for all reasonable costs and expenses, including reasonable counsel fees, incurred by him or them in such proceeding; and the sum or sums so awarded shall constitute a judgment or judgments against the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall be held and considered to have become effective as of January 1, 1941. The owner or owners of property involved in any condemnation proceeding which was abandoned by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on or after such date and prior to the enactment of this act may apply to the court for a reopening of the case, and upon reopening of the case the court shall award to such owner or owners such sums or sums as will in the opinion of the court reimburse such owner or owners for all reasonable costs and expenses, including reasonable counsel fees, incurred by him or them in such proceeding; and the sum or sums so awarded shall constitute a judgment or judgments against the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTING CERTAIN PROPERTY FROM TAXATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 236) providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas certain real property in the District of Columbia, including property belonging to the United States of America and other property belonging to various institutions, associations, societies, and so forth, is exempt from real-estate taxation; and

Whereas in times of national stress it is necessary for the United States of America and its various instrumentalities to use and occupy additional space necessary for the proper execution of their enlarged functions: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the use and occupancy of real property in the District of Columbia by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America, or by the American Red Cross, on a basis which does not result in the receipt of rent or income to the owner thereof within the meaning of section 2 of the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1089), shall not operate to terminate the tax-exempt status of such property if exempted from taxation prior to such use and occupancy; and, further, that any taxes, penalties, or interest which may be due by reason of such change in the use and occupancy of such property and unpaid when this joint resolution shall be approved by the President shall be abated: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing any refund of any taxes, penalties, or interest heretofore paid.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross.

This is merely to correct a technicality. Although the District of Columbia Code exempts property belonging to the United States and also exempts other property belonging to various institutions, associations, societies, etc., when the latter use and occupy their respective properties, the Commissioners of the District have held that when such institutions furnish space to the Government gratuitously the exemption ceases since such property is not then "used and occupied" by the owner to whom the exemption is granted.

Such a position naturally operates as a substantial deterrent to a practice which it is believed should receive encouragement.

We know that during the housing emergency in the District of Columbia the Red Cross performed certain services for which the Distric tof Columbia believes this organization could be taxed, but we feel that the Red Cross fits itself into the structure of tax-exempt organizations, and for that reason we attempt to take care of his particular case.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman assures the House that this bill does not contain exemptions for any other property except that of the Red Cross?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true. I shall say to the gentleman from Nebraska that in prior years the Red Cross has been exempted, but during this war emergency they took on certain housing prerogatives to which the District Commissioners, though technically they want to tax them, have no objection, and they have agreed to this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there any additional property owned by the Red Cross or controlled by them that is being taken out of taxation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No. It does not go to the amount of the property. It is simply to take care of a situation whereby they carried on certain activities during the war which were not just what a Red Cross organization might carry forward in peacetime.

Mr. STEFAN. I am not opposing this bill, but I call attention to the chairman of the District of Columbia Legislative Committee the fact that in Washington there are literally millions of dollars worth of property that has been taken out of taxation resulting in tremendous losses to the taxpayers of the District.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman's observation certainly is pertinent. What

we do here is merely to recognize that the Red Cross ordinarily has a tax-exempt status, because its property is actually occupied and used by that organization. But during the period of the emergency it was used perhaps for other purposes, but will now revert in peacetime to Red Cross use.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. In the consideration of this bill did the gentleman's committee go into the matter of the large amount of property in the District that is not taxed, some of which should be taxed?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. I will say perhaps not so much in connection with this particular organization did we discuss that matter, but we, as a legislative committee, as well as the gentleman's subcommittee on District appropriations, have from time to time attempted to survey that problem, because it appears to be a growing one. We will want to join with you in doing what we can to see that there is equitable taxation of such property.

Mr. STEFAN. May I call the gentleman's attention further to the fact that the expenditures of the District far exceed the receipts, and that the District will soon be out of funds and we shall be called upon perhaps for deficiencies. I think in the next appropriation bill for the District of Columbia the entire tax situation should be surveyed with the objective of bringing back into taxation property in the District that should be taxed in order to give some protection to the taxpayers of the District.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman is correct. This situation has been brought to our attention through the use of the Red Cross facilities by the Navy in time of war.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BIEMILLER: On page 2, following line 17, add a new section as follows:

"That the property situated in square one hundred and seventy-three in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, described as lots four, five, six, seven, and eleven, inclusive, occupied by the Daughters of the American Revolution, shall no longer be exempt from taxation, as heretofore provided in the third paragraph under the heading 'Contingent and miscellaneous expenses' of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes'; and that the said exemption shall be, and is hereby, repealed."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order so that I may make a point of order against the amendment?

Mr. BROOKS. I will withhold the point of order for that purpose, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia will state his point of order.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this legislation. We are only concerned in providing for the Red Cross in connection with conditions that arose during the war while a Government agency used the facilities rent free. Frankly, the gentleman from West Virginia will not allow this District of Columbia legislation to become involved in the subject matter of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin, for whom I have very high regard, has not spoken to me about offering this amendment. I do not feel that District of Columbia legislation in connection with a bill of this type is the place to consider such a proposal. I am going to withdraw the bill if the point of order is not sustained.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order, not on the merits of the amendment?

Mr. BIEMILLER. On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the bill deals with the question of tax-exempt property in the District of Columbia and furthermore deals with an organization which has been chartered by the Congress, the American Red Cross. My amendment deals with those same categories, tax-exempt property and an organization that has been chartered by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard further on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

This bill provides only for Government-chartered organizations that have given their facilities to the Government of the United States during the war period. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin would make an absolute repeal of law on the statute books and therefore is not germane. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT CONTROL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3979) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended, is further amended by striking in section 1 (b) thereof the figure "1945" and inserting in lieu thereof "1946."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the bills from the District of Columbia Committee for today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two newspaper articles.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Hon. FRANK BOYKIN, be permitted to extend his remarks and include a letter received by him from the sheriff of Mobile County.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed over a case in which I am deeply interested from two aspects. The young man in question is a former employee of a firm that has done an outstanding piece of work under most difficult circumstances because of the shortage of labor, resulting at last in the break-down of the general manager and senior partner of the company. The young man in whom I am interested is familiar with the direction of certain activities in this war plant, and is sorely needed to carry on a part of the work heretofore performed by the general manager.

The second aspect of the case is that this young man has only one eye, and was recently assigned to work which could not help but weaken the other eye. I know from experience what blindness in a family means, and God forbid that any young man be assigned to work which might result in blindness.

He is on a limited-service status because he has but one eye. He has been in the service since February of 1943, part of that time being spent overseas. Due to an infection caused by unsanitary conditions while he was in Africa, and lack of proper facilities to care for his artificial eye, he has spent quite a bit of time in Army hospitals, as his record will show. He is married.

After personally investigating all of the facts in this case while at home this past summer, I wrote to his commanding officer on August 13, 1945, placing these facts before him. I received no reply from him, so wrote again on September 11, 1945. Under date of September 15, I was advised as follows:

It is our desire to release every man from the service who may be entitled to such action under existing regulations. However, the case of this young man does not come within the purview of existing regulations.

In view of certain information which had come to my notice, I arranged to see this young man, and am convinced that he has been denied a discharge be-

cause of the prejudice of one man somewhere along the line.

I discussed this case with a War Department official on September 20, who requested that an investigation be made of this case. On October 18 I received an undated letter from the War Department, from which I quote:

Corporal ——— has twice previously applied for discharge and the request was unfavorably considered. Recently he again submitted an application, and after careful consideration the board of officers at Fort ——— again recommended a disapproval because of the fact that his discharge was not considered imperative in the interests of national health and safety. In view of his induction in February 1943, he will automatically become eligible for release on March 20, 1946, when the Army policy of discharge for men with 2 or more years' service goes into effect.

Now, I want to call particular attention to the last paragraph of the general's letter:

I regret that a more favorable action could not be taken in this case, but the high rate of discharge from the Army necessitates very strong reasons for the discharge of men who apply for release under the provisions of national health, safety, and interest.

This young man from my district, forced to remain in the service after hostilities have ceased, doing work that is endangering the sight of his one good eye, comments as follows:

I am at a loss to understand the attitude of the War Department in a situation of this type, especially when one considers the discharge of Charles Trippi from an AAF base in Florida to enable his return to play football for the University of Georgia after 2½ years of service within this country and a total of 41 points for discharge. It is rather difficult to retain the proper attitude of a soldier toward his duties and his country when the Army ignores a justified and reasonable plea of industry, reconversion problems affecting the very future of this country, and then lends a helping hand to college football so that it can return again to its prewar prominence.

Incidentally, this item in the column of a sports writer this morning is pertinent:

L. S. U., 32; Georgia, 0: Charley Trippi is probably on his way back to the Army today.

While the War Department advises that my constituent will be eligible for discharge as of March 20, 1946, we all know that this does not mean that he will be discharged on that date, even if he is eligible.

Senators GEORGE and RUSSELL both worked on Trippi case. This lad got out on a hardship case—his wife, child, and father to support. He was supposed to be doing that when he was attending college before his induction. How can he attend college and support three people?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan. Before I yield, let me say, if there is any man in this House of Representatives who is sympathetic with football, I think I should be the one. I had the experience of coaching football for practically 12 years. I know the extent to which the American boy will sacrifice for his alma mater. We all know the extent to which they will sacrifice for their country. So, I am not speaking in any criticism of this young man, but I am simply drawing a comparison as between this boy with a glass eye who served overseas, and now is put in a position, I think deliberately, in order to just hound him and destroy the vision in his other eye. Somebody along the line is sore. He has been recommended for discharge, but somebody, out of pure cussedness, is keeping him in the Army. It is not accidental. He is simply doing clerk work which requires him to use this one eye.

Mr. SHAFER. I know the gentleman has been very greatly interested in obtaining the release of boys who have seen long service in the Army. As the gentleman knows, I have the same attitude. It was called to my attention this morning that the War Department has placed its O. K. on a plan now being used to keep our boys in service overseas, by approaching those homesick boys who have served a long time overseas with the proposition that if they would like to reenlist for 3 years they will be given 90-day furloughs.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I am familiar with that.

Mr. SHAFER. I think the gentleman from New York, along with many others of us who would like to obtain the early release of these boys, should make that quite clear to the boys in the service, that because of their homesickness they should not accept this reenlistment.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I would like to yield to some of the other Members, but I would like to proceed now for a few minutes.

In connection with this football situation, I have here the headlines from the various papers. This is the New York Times:

GI WHO DEFIED GENERAL DUBICUS

NEW YORK, October 20.—Sgt. Bernard B. Spindel, the GI who scored off a general at a Senate Military Affairs Committee hearing, vowed today to continue his campaign to get out of the Army despite a suspicion that he had been caught in "the old army game."

At the hearing last Wednesday, Spindel, 26, questioned Brig. Gen. Robert W. Berry, the War Department's Assistant Personnel Chief, about demobilization in general and his own case in particular. Berry was somewhat disconcerted when the sergeant caught him in a trap devised from the War Department's own mimeographs.

Aided by Senators JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado, chairman, and REVERCOMB, Republican, of West Virginia, the sergeant got the general to list discharge qualifications for surplus men, then proceeded to quote chapter and verse of a War Department memo which practically nullified the list; he got the general to admit that a 35-pointer could be discharged now, and quoted a subordinate of the general's who had denied it.

His hour of glory a matter of congressional record, the sergeant trekked back to his post at Fort Monmouth, N. J., to await his discharge.

I want to say here that it is a pity that under the Constitution of the United States it is not possible to impeach Army officers. They can only be handled by court martial. Of course, they are a clique all by themselves. There is one thing we can do and ought to do, we ought to have a thorough congressional investigation as soon as possible to clean out a bunch of these men who are the so-called old-type militarists who at any time and on all occasions thwart the wishes and the will of the sovereign people of the United States. God forbid that we ever have militarism in this country, because that is what has caused most of the wars in history.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I wonder if the gentleman has had the experience I have since the very beginning of having privates and other enlisted men writing to their Congressmen and being suddenly sat upon by some officer who happened to be in charge? This, of course, is probably out of the ordinary; nevertheless it has happened.

Mr. REED of New York. I disagree with the gentleman; it is not out of the ordinary. I receive many every day, and I believe every Member of the House practically has had this experience. A good citizen and a patriotic citizen, a veteran of World War I, and who had a grievance arising in this war, went down to get some relief from a group in the War Department. He was told he could not get the relief, and what is more he was told it would not be well for him to try to contact his Representative. This man was a good fighter. He said: "Do you mean to tell me that a citizen of the United States who is aggrieved because of some action of the Government cannot go to his Representative in Congress?" The officer backed water a little, but it did not change the result.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I wish to say that such action on the officer's part is an effort to defeat constitutional government in the United States.

Mr. REED of New York. We all agree to that.

Mr. SHAFER. I may interject that I have had one instance where my mail to a soldier was opened by his own officer, and he was then jacked up on the carpet.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; and the question resolves itself to this: Whether or not this Congress, representing the sovereign people and the sovereign will of the Nation, is just going to sit back and take this in times of peace. If you are, I will tell you one thing; you are creating a situation of low morale in this country that is very dangerous to this Government and is just what the subversive interests are trying to foster, and I do not like the Communist influence that is working in the Army, for it is by just such methods, getting control of the military, that they overturn governments. What is more, do not forget that promoting an autocratic military system in peacetime is recognized as being very dangerous to the morale of both of the Army and the people of the country. That could happen unless Congress asserts itself in the interests of the people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No doubt the gentleman from New York recalls how the Congress attempted to have the drafting authorities, General Hershey in particular, enforce the Tydings amendment. He told us to go plumb to ——.

Mr. REED of New York. I remember it well, and we have come to the turning point now where this Congress is permitting these subversive organizations practically to run the Government, to say nothing about all that this militarism is attempting to do now that we are at peace.

I wish to proceed for a few minutes, for I have several long letters from soldiers which I wish to read. I wish to call the attention of the membership to the case of a young physician with whom I am well acquainted; I have known him since he was born, 31 years ago.

He is married, has a son 3 years of age and another child is expected in December. In July 1941, he joined the Army Medical Corps, was commissioned a first lieutenant and is now a captain. He contracted asthma while in the service and was disqualified for foreign service. He applied several times for reexamination as he was anxious to get across but was rejected each time. He was given no medical work of any importance. Most of the time he was performing administrative duties and undergoing the ordinary training of field forces. In September of 1944 he was engaged in examining boys for overseas duties, the first work he had where he felt that he was actually doing something for which he was trained. During the past summer he was given a 3-months' course in military psychiatry and is now considered indispensable. He maintains that this position is arbitrary and not supported by the facts at all, but he is classified as D–3130 and falls into a "critical" category.

Because of this 3-month course in military psychiatry which was ordered by the War Department, this young man, who has received an offer of assistant residency in medicine at a New York hospital, must remain in the service indefinitely. As he puts it, he is "seeing on an average half of a patient a day." He is to be sent to another camp shortly, where he is told that his work will be doubled so that he will soon be seeing at least one patient a day. His father's comments are interesting:

We note that Roosevelt's sons are not indispensable, as they have been discharged to take over lucrative positions. The same observation applies to Georgia football players. Some time we hope that we can get rid of the Washington scourge that has existed since 1933.

A Navy lieutenant, junior grade, writes to me, as follows:

DEAR SIR: May I congratulate you on your proposal for the immediate discharge of all veterans for over 2 years' service. If everyone knew the bitterness and discontent among the veterans out here in the Pacific area over the apparent inability of the Army and Navy to return unneeded personnel home within a decent period, I am sure more public-spirited Congressmen like yourself would make an effort toward untangling the situation and getting us back home.

Hostilities have ceased for approximately a month and a half and in view of the handful of personnel out here that has been sent home for discharge, the rest of us see little hope, or have much faith in the point system. Surely, a person, after over 2 years' service, including a year in the Tropics now has the right to enjoy the benefits of peace. Too many out here are doing needless, inconsequential jobs that could be dispensed with immediately.

Again, sir, may I say that we look to you and the rest of Congress to help us.

Sincerely yours.

As a matter of fact, he does not realize it, but I have a bill pending before the Congress which provides that after 18 months' service these men shall be discharged.

A staff sergeant writes me from the Pacific:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: We read with great tribulation your article on if something isn't done about releasing GI's soon that you will propose a bill to force the Army to release men after 2 years of service. After over 4 years of service for my country I sit with thousands of others just waiting, waiting now that the war is over while the Army fingers through its cumbersome mathematical point system and telling us in the same breath there is a lack of shipping, which I consider not true. If so why did we cease making ships and transports and revert other boats back to their former steamship companies before the job is finished? I consider the job not finished until we can get home and see things more nearly normal.

I went from the States to the European theater of operations to the Pacific theater of operations in nothing flat, now I'm stumped.

A staff sergeant in the Tokyo Bay area writes the next letter:

Representative REED of New York.

DEAR SIR: We read your statement over here with enthusiasm about forcing faster discharges from the service. And if necessary you would put a bill before the House for those that have served honorably for 2 or 3 years, to be discharged.

I take it that will include those that are on their fifth year of that so-called 1 year's service that took place so darn long ago.

We need more men like you, sir.

Yours,

FROM A VERY TIRED SERVICEMAN.

A serviceman writes from Berlin, Germany:

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is not a letter of protest, dissatisfaction, or condemnation on my part at all, but just a note of congratulations for the support you have given concerning the demobilization of all men with two or more years of active service in the armed forces.

I am very much in favor of your proposed plan for releasing all men with more than 2 years of service. I have been in the Army well over 2½ years, including 15 months overseas service, and feel that additional consideration should be given to those with overseas service.

A sergeant wrote this next letter from the Marianas Islands:

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your proposal to introduce legislation asking for discharge of men with more than 2 years' service was enthusiastically received by many men in my organization. It comes as almost the first concrete step toward recognizing length of service as a discharge factor. Many 5-, 4-, and 3-year selectees in my unit, still far short of the required 80, were getting plenty discouraged at the sudden flurry over age and dependency.

More men than you perhaps realize, sir, look to Congress for speedy and intelligent action on returning them to civilian life. We have more faith in you than we do in some of the other agencies in whose jurisdiction we as soldiers fall.

I have more than 4 years' honorable service as do others in my unit and we have been out here since July awaiting the next move. We are convinced that if these islands and Japan itself must be policed there are new men, with only a few months in service, who should do it. It just is not American that men with long service should be stuck. Dissatisfaction is growing among these men and we appeal to you Members of Congress to speak out on our behalf.

As a suggestion, some of us would set 3 years as a minimum for immediate discharge, inasmuch as that is a normal enlistment in the Army. You will find it axiomatic in the Army that no man ever quarrels with another if he is outranked in point of service. Therefore, a discharge system based partially on this factor will, I assure you, meet with widespread approval and very little censure.

We have won the war, sir, and we ask only a speedy restoration of our civilian status and a chance to return to our families, for whom the war is not over until we have returned, every last man of us.

Your efforts are keenly appreciated and we trust you will push them to the utmost.

A New York businessman writes as follows:

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I take this opportunity of congratulating you on your proposal to expedite the demobilization of our Nation's armed forces, by the discharge of men and women in uniform who have been in the service for 18 months or more.

To those of us whose children have been in uniform for two, three, or more years but who cannot be released under existing War Department regulations, it is gratifying to know that among our representatives in Washington are some like yourself enthusiastically devoted to the cause of returning our country to a peacetime basis now that the war is over on all fronts.

We, your constituents, are far too removed from the seat of our government at Washington, D. C., to ascertain why the discharge system has bogged down so completely. Whether it's administration policy to keep the soldiers and sailors out of the labor market so that unemployment problems may thus be fraudulently solved, whether it's big brass hats desire to maintain a large Army and Navy so that ranking officers may thus prolong their hold on well-paying jobs, or whether it's just plain bungling on the part of incompetent officials charged with the responsibility of returning our men and women to civilian life, I am in no position to state. However, I emphatically believe that every effort must be made to cut the red tape hindering demobilization plans, so that American youth that has already spent so many years in uniform and that is growing old in the service will be permitted to enjoy the freedom for which it fought.

A case in point is that of my son, Pfc Louis Morgenbesser, 32312157, Second Signal Service Battalion, Washington 25, D. C. A Government law enforcement officer in civilian life, of fine cultural background, he is now 33 years of age, with over 3½ years of faithful service in the Army. Through no fault of his own, he has been in continental United States since his induction, working

in a specialist capacity, and for the last year in top secret work at the Capitol. Unable to acquire enough points for discharge because he has not been overseas, he now faces the prospect of serving 2 more years in occupation work, making a total of 5½ years in uniform before he'll be eligible for release. Meanwhile, those entering the armed forces now will only be in for about 2 years, while men his age and younger than him are no longer being inducted. At the present moment, he has been declared "surplus" personnel, available for reassignment anywhere from scratch just as if he entered the Army today. Is this American justice for one who has unselfishly devoted his gifted capacities toward the successful prosecution of the war effort?

It is particularly gratifying to learn, Congressman REED, that when others are silent as to the return of our children to us, you have placed yourself on record as to your liberal viewpoints so that all who desire may examine them in years to come. Be it yours to succeed in your tireless efforts to demobilize our boys and girls in uniform without further delay.

A former chief yeoman in the Navy writes me, as follows:

DEAR MR. DANIEL REED: Approximately 2 months ago, I was honorably discharged from the service with the hopes of getting a fairly decent job with the Government after spending 7 years in the Navy of the United States.

From all appearances thus far it would have been far more profitable for me to have remained a civilian than to have served the Nation—as many persons capable of bearing arms have done and are gainfully employed by the Government. It seems that most Government jobs which would enable me to care for my family—wife and child—are taken either by friends of departmental heads or men with temporary appointments.

At each Government office that I have approached for a job, I have received the same answer—no experience in civil service, or words to that effect. I had 5½ years clerical work in the Navy. I was a chief yeoman for the last year and one-half of my naval career—yet I was only offered a CAF-2 ($1,706 per year). Anyone without office experience receives that grade in civil service. As for the qualifications of a chief yeoman, I believe you know what they are and the responsibilities entrusted him.

As for references to my capabilities, I refer you to the following naval officers under whom I have recently served:

1. Rear Adm. A. R. McCann.
2. Capt. W. R. Smedberg III.
3. Commander K. A. Knowles.
4. Commander W. Seybold.

All the above officers were attached to the headquarters of the Commander in Chief, United States Fleet.

I have a 101 rating on a civil-service examination for border patrolmen which I took in 1942 while in the service. I was informed that there were no vacancies at present but the outlook was favorable. How long does a person have to wait to be employed when "conditions are favorable"?

I have come to the conclusion, along with many other veterans who are experiencing the same difficulties, that the veterans of this war will bear the same fruit as the veterans of the last war—selling apples, or a similar vocation.

At present I am employed at a Veterans' Administration as a CAF-2, therefore necessitating week-end bus rides to be with my family. After 7 long years of looking forward to living at home, in a place of my own, the turn of events are certainly ironical—maybe, perhaps, there is no place for the wicked if we veterans are such. All I ask is information or aid in securing the border-patrolman post which I am most anxious to receive.

Hoping to find some solution to my present problem, which seems to be as great as those endured by us during the war, I am anxiously awaiting a reply.

I remain, respectfully.

A Marine on Saipan writes as follows:

DEAR MR. REED: My subject in this letter is demobilization. I've heard about your demobilization plan over the Army news broadcasts and I fully agree with your bill, but the Army and Navy are getting all the good breaks. The marines are starting their point system at 85 points and the point system ends on September 1 for us marines. I am going into my fourth year in the Marine Corps and I'm now overseas for the second time. I have 60 points up to September 1 and if this goes on any longer I'll have to stay in for another year and a half in order to go over 85 points. Now I have three dependents, my father, mother, and brother who is disabled for life. I have a dependency allotment out for them but they won't let me count them on my points.

I am 26 years old and I'm pretty well known in the newspaper and publishing business. Now the marines are sending back some men with 2 years of service and they have 85 points because of the campaigns they have been in. I'm on my fourth year now and I haven't seen any combat, but I have enough of time in, and my family allotment was cut from $52 to $37 without even a decent warning or notice in May 1944. Since I came into this outfit I've had bad luck with my family at home—sickness all the time. At the present time I'm in an MP outfit and I haven't done a thing worthwhile. When I get out of the Marine Corps, I'll write the biggest story about the raw deals that we are getting.

When you are in session, can you make the big shots of Washington listen to you and tell them that the marines have done the biggest part of the fighting and they made more beachheads than the Army will ever make. Now the marines have to do all the police work out here. Where is the Army, anyway?

The trouble is that the American people don't realize what a marine has to go through to get a discharge. The points should be lowered to 60 because if the marines get discharged a year from now the ones that are being discharged now will have all the good jobs taken.

Let's hope that you can do something for the marines.

A chaplain writes to me as follows:

The Honorable DANIEL REED,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: Your courageous stand in behalf of the enlisted men is very commendable. It takes real courage to oppose the new class of military politicians whose only concern is to perpetuate themselves in good paying jobs. I know you will be interested in a letter I received from a soldier stationed in Camp Campbell, Ky. He is 21 years old and in the Army over 2 years. He spent about 2 years and 4 months overseas and was in five major engagements. Last month he returned home, the first furlough since his induction into the Army. He had 30 days at home and returned to camp. He has 79 points, although he was sure that he has earned more or at least enough for discharge. He was denied one point because he was inducted a week later than the date set for computing points. Here is his reflections on the Army methods:

"I went through a lot, but I would rather face combat than this disappointment. We veterans have to take the same instructions as we had in our basic training. It is very unpleasant. It drives us crazy. After going through combat for over 2 years, now they teach us how to fire a carbine. Every one of us is fed up with this nonsense.

"The German prisoners of war here, walk around without guards. But the American soldiers who came late from furloughs are under guard. That is the way they treat a veteran just because he was late in reporting to camp. That is the way they repay him for fighting for his country.

"And the Italian prisoners get passes to town and are free to associate with American girls. They have no guards. It makes me angry to see all this. Why should the prisoners of war be allowed to go freely to town? Only a few months ago they were killing our men and now they are our guests. What we need is real men to run America."

This letter is but a reflection of the sentiment that must be in the minds of our men. What this soldier tells is not imaginary but real. It is time for us to become realists and make some plans to help our soldiers.

They cannot be good and useful citizens if their minds are prejudiced by what they see and are forced to endure under Army discipline. I have been associated with Army camps and prisoner-of-war camps since 1943, as auxiliary chaplain. I had both Italians and Germans. I know the reactions of our American soldiers. I can understand the feelings of the soldier I am quoting in this letter. In my position, I cannot take an open stand in behalf of our men and for that reason I ask you to keep my name in confidence. I am sure you understand.

With best wishes for the success of your service for the good of our people, I am,

Respectfully yours.

Nine men sign the letter from Tehran, Iran, which follows:

TEHRAN, IRAN, *September 13, 1945.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: It gives one a good feeling inside to know that there are some people back home who know what the score is. Your suggestion of releasing all men with two or more years of service is the most sensible idea we have heard in a long time.

Since this is my first attempt at writing a letter of this sort, I am somewhat at a loss for the most fitting words to give credit where it is due and to express the sentiments of the average soldier serving overseas. We heartily agree with your statement that the Army and Navy are bungling demobilization.

The responsibility for this bungling can be blamed on the "big brass" who are on top and want to stay there. We can easily see their motive for delaying the discharge of the enlisted men as long as possible and trying to keep the size of the armed forces under them as large as is their power. They know that in order for them to keep on living and ruling like they have been, it is necessary for them to hold their position over a large number of troops. Where else could they live in such comparative luxury and comfort while those serving under them have to be contented with the barest necessities regardless of their previous standards of living? The irony of it all is that not only are they trying to keep from losing any men from their command, but they are constantly striving to increase their personnel so as to give room for further advancements of already too high rank and position. It seems that one of their greatest fears is the loss of rank and position they now hold.

Why are there such large numbers of armed forces personnel in overseas and domestic theaters each dependent on the other for his presence? In a very great number of cases, unheard of duties are created for the only purpose of giving someone something to do. A thorough investigation of the situation that is present all over the world by some responsible person not connected in any

manner with the military would result in the desperately needed housecleaning of our Army and Navy. During the time of war, it was excusable to have a large number of idle personnel but at present, it would be very difficult to offer a logical explanation for the presence of so many men who rightfully should be back home with their families.

We trust that our Congressmen will do their utmost in returning us to civilian life. If it is left up to the Army and Navy, the best years of our lives will be wasted just waiting and wondering what have we really been fighting for, certainly not a military career. Most of us gladly gave up to defend our country and rights. Now we want to get home to enjoy those privileges we fought for.

The point system used at the present is not the fairest way of releasing them. Length of service and parenthood should receive a good deal more consideration than it now does. Anyone who has been in service longer than 3 years deserves to get out if he wishes, especially fathers, many of whom have never seen their offspring. A revision in the method of discharge is the only solution which will hasten and simplify demobilization.

Your consideration of any system which will cut out the red tape and get us back into civilian clothes will humbly be appreciated not only by ourselves, but also millions of others who have made up our team.

Respectfully yours.

An Army sergeant at Ie Shima writes as follows:

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this letter congratulating you on your efforts for a faster discharge of war veterans. Please accept my wishes as those representative of thousands of GI's who have been stuck in the remote islands of the Pacific for from 24 to 26 months with no hope of an early return home except for the defeat of Japan.

But now that the war is over, we are tired. We have been patient, we have worked hard, we have listened to false promises and statements by both Congressmen and War Department members until we are sick of their stuff.

I speak with reference to the last sentence in the news paragraph of this paper. Believe me when I tell you that we can sit here in our tents and look out over the harbor and see not less than 100 ships of all types laying idle. The majority of them have not moved in days. The boat crews swear they are empty.

We can walk to the airstrip and count 110 aircraft troop carriers that were supposed to be used in the landings on Japan. These planes were brought in 3 days prior to Japan's formal surrender to MacArthur and have not left the ground since then.

While these conditions exist hundreds of men lie around in their camps, all with 24 or more months overseas duty and with accumulated point scores of 80 to 92.

I am not gifted with words by which I can describe our disgust at the methods employed to get us back home. All we can say and hope for is that you and your colleagues are successful.

Yes, Mr. REED, we are praying for your success. God speed your efforts.

Yours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute, and I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. I just want to say this: If I am still in Congress during the years to come, these men who have been arbitrary and unjust to our boys are going to hear from Congress through a congressional investigating committee. They are going to be singled out and they are going to get some of the treatment that they have meted out to others.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think that Congress ought to start gathering such information now?

Mr. REED of New York. I am for it now, but I have little hope that we can get it. But it ought to be started now and the individuals in our files should be brought in here and put to the test.

Mr. RANKIN. It is absolute nonsense to keep men in the service who are not needed there but who want to go home and take care of their families or return to school.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee on War Appropriations will meet Wednesday morning to hear requests for appropriations for civil functions. This involves 120 flood-control projects, 23 maintenance and improvement projects, and 23 defense planning projects. I am placing in the RECORD a list of these projects in order that the membership may be aware of them and understand what projects will be brought before the committee:

TABLE I.—*Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works—Deficiency estimate for fiscal year 1946*

NEW WORK

Project:	Amount
Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn	$75,000
Hudson River, N. Y.	515,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	2,000,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea	743,700
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal	645,000
Potomac River water front, District of Columbia	413,000
James River, Va.	652,000
Charleston Harbor, S. C.	155,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La.	1,573,500
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.	3,429,500
Missouri River at Fort Peck, Mont.	1,185,000
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.	2,700,000
Keweenaw waterway, Michigan	548,000
Racine Harbor, Wis.	72,600
Lorain Harbor, Ohio	131,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.	967,000
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.	571,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor, Calif.	7,100,000
Suisun Channel, Calif.	160,000
Sacramento River, Calif.	$390,000
San Joaquin River, Calif.	150,000
Columbia River and tributaries, Celilo Falls to Snake River	100,000
Total, new work	24,316,300

MAINTENANCE

Chesapeake & Delaware Canal	1,200,000
Total	25,516,300

TABLE II.—*Flood control, general—Deficiency estimate for fiscal year 1946*

Project:	Amount
Franklin Falls Reservoir, N. H.	$60,600
Mountain Brook Reservoir, N. H.	521,500
Nashua, N. H.	195,000
Mansfield Hollow Reservoir, Conn	1,500,000
Norwich, Conn.	632,000
Union Village Reservoir, Vt.	1,000,000
Surry Mountain Reservoir, N. H.	17,000
Knightville Reservoir, Mass.	14,000
Hartford, Conn.	255,000
Winsted, Conn.	132,500
Springfield, Mass. (Mill River)	42,000
West Springfield, Mass. (Agawam)	333,000
Riverdale, Mass.	403,000
Chicopee, Mass.	170,000
Holyoke, Mass.	500,000
Syracuse, N. Y.	500,000
East Disney Reservoir, N. Y.	700,000
Whitney Point, N. Y.	243,000
Elmira, N. Y.	1,000,000
Lisle, N. Y.	240,500
Bath, N. Y.	295,500
Addison, N. Y.	331,100
Almond Reservoir, N. Y.	1,000,000
Canisteo, N. Y.	250,700
Almond, N. Y.	30,500
Sunbury, Pa.	500,000
Williamsport, Pa.	1,000,000
Wilkes-Barre, Hanover Township, Pa.	135,000
Plymouth, Pa.	400,000
York, Pa.	218,200
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	1,000,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	1,000,000
Allatoona Reservoir, Ga.	3,000,000
Homochitto River, Miss.	15,000
Wallace Lake Reservoir, La.	193,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Terre Noire Creek, Ark.	100,300
Bayou Bodeau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou, La.	65,000
Bayou Bodeau Reservoir, La.	1,000,000
Shreveport, La.	500,000
Balkely Mountain Reservoir, Ark.	500,000
Memphis, Tenn.	1,000,000
Buffalo Bayou, Tex.	1,500,000
Columbus, Tex.	212,300
John Martin Reservoir, Ark.	500,000
Blue Mountain Reservoir, Ark.	1,000,000
Nimrod Reservoir, Ark.	192,500
Clearwater Reservoir, Mo.	1,000,000
Norfolk Reservoir, Ark.	1,000,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark.	3,000,000
Fort Smith, Ark.	863,600
Little Rock, Ark.	548,400
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla.	1,500,000
Canton Reservoir, Okla.	2,000,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Akla.	2,000,000
Fall River Reservoir, Kans.	1,000,000
Wilster Reservoir, Okla.	1,000,000
Hutchinson, Kans.	500,000
Union Township drainage district levee, Missouri	47,000
Green Bay levee and drainage district No. 2, Iowa	49,300
Dry Run, Iowa	382,500
Lake Traverse and Bois de Sioux River, S. Dak. and Minn.	45,800

Project—Continued	Amount
Lac Qui Parle Reservoir, Minn.	$30,900
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans.	2,000,000
Kanopolis Reservoir, Kans.	1,000,000
Osceola Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Mo.	1,000,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.	2,000,000
Council Bluffs, Iowa	500,000
Omaha, Nebr.	500,000
Hamburg, Iowa	236,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr., and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa	500,000
Schuyler, Nebr.	64,000
Hot Springs, S. Dak.	154,000
Cotton Wood Springs Reservoir, S. Dak.	510,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky.	4,000,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky.	1,500,000
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn.	3,000,000
Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga.	200,000
Brevoort levee, Indiana	30,000
Muncie, Ind.	70,000
Harrisburg, Ill.	24,500
Golconda, Ill.	29,200
Brockport, Ill.	28,500
Mounds and Mound City, Ill.	500,000
Newport, Ky.	500,000
Delaware Reservoir, Ohio	1,000,000
Muskingum River Reservoirs, Ohio	1,500,000
Bluestone Reservoir, W. Va.	3,000,000
Massillon, Ohio	500,000
Parkersburg, W. Va.	500,000
Dewey Reservoir, Ky.	1,000,000
Dillon Reservoir, Ohio	1,000,000
Tionesta Reservoir, Pa.	277,600
Mahoning Creek Reservoir, Pa.	360,000
Loyalhanna Reservoir, Pa.	494,000
Youghiogheny River Reservoir, Pa.	573,000
Crooked Creek Reservoir, Pa.	3,000
Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa.	3,000,000
Punxsutawney, Pa.	500,000
Elkins, W. Va.	500,000
Coal Creek drainage and levee district, Illinois	500,000
Kelly Lake drainage and levee district, Illinois	97,900
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas, and Kerton Valley drainage and levee district, Illinois	172,900
Sebewaing, Mich.	241,800
Lancaster, N. Y.	570,400
Mount Morris Reservoir, N. Y.	500,000
Santa Fe Reservoir, Calif.	900,500
Los Angeles River, Calif.	2,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif.	2,000,000
Big Dry Creek Reservoir and Diversion, Calif.	435,000
McKenzie River, Oreg.	62,000
Cottage Grove Reservoir, Oreg.	11,500
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg.	2,000,000
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg.	1,000,000
Mill Creek, Wash.	125,600
Mud Mountain Reservoir, Wash.	257,000
Tacoma, Wash.	700,000
Yakima, Wash.	134,000
Snagging	500,000
Round-off	−100
Total	65,159,000

TABLE III.—*Projects requiring additional funds for advance planning in fiscal year 1946*

Project:	Amount
Bennington Reservoir, N. H.	$30,000
Nashua, N. H.	7,000
West Peterboro, N. H.	8,000
North Andover and Lawrence, Mass.	9,000
North Plymouth Reservoir, N. Y.	100,000
Genegantalet Reservoir, N. Y.	$60,000
Philpott Reservoir, Va.	150,000
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Ark. and La.	150,000
Big and Little Sunflower Rivers, etc	150,000
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff, Mo.	15,000
Black River, Poplar Bluff, Mo., to Knobel, Ark.	10,000
Creede, Colo.	5,000
Louisville, Ky.	100,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek Levee, Ind.	8,000
Indianapolis, Warfleigh Section, Ind.	8,000
Bald Hill Reservoir, N. Dak.	35,000
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers, Minn.	30,000
Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin, Ind.; Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif.	
Folsom Reservoir, Calif.	
Table Mountain Reservoir, Iron Canyon site, Calif.	600,000
Terminus Reservoir, Calif.	
Isabella Reservoir, Calif.	
Harlan County Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Nebr.	300,000
Panther Mountain Reservoir, N. Y.	50,000
Cahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	200,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak.	100,000
Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans.	200,000
Success Reservoir, Calif.	50,000
New Kelones Reservoir, Calif.	125,000
Lookout Point Reservoir, Oreg.	100,000
Quartz Creek Reservoir, Oreg.	150,000
Recreational investigations and plans	50,000
Total	2,800,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION PROBLEMS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, there are at least three large unsolved problems at present in the demobilization program. First, there is the transportation bottleneck delaying the return of men from both the European and Pacific theaters, more particularly the latter. In this connection, those men stationed at isolated points such as Iceland, Brazil, the Aleutians, and other forsaken areas must not be overlooked. Thousands upon thousands of men now eligible for discharge are not being returned. Undoubtedly there are difficulties in the way, but they must be overcome. If we could ship men, food, munitions and all kinds of heavy equipment to all four corners of the world while the war was in progress, certainly sufficient transportation can be supplied shortly to provide space for these soldiers and sailors who have fought so valiantly. The volume of tonnage is certainly less than in wartime. Therefore, there should be more room for men. I contend this is just as important today as shipping war equipment was during the war. Consequently, the tie-ups must be overcome.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to stress the effect this delay has on morale. Also, it stirs up feeling between troops in the continental United States, the ETO, and Pacific. Let me quote from a letter from a young man who has been in the Pacific for 3 years and is now in Manila:

> It is bad enough to be over here but when we hear and read that men with lower points than ours are being returned from Europe and being discharged, it is hard to take and is certainly developing a bunch of radicals. Also, when they announce they are moving 17 or 18 carriers from the Pacific to the Atlantic to help move troops from Europe, it dosn't help our morale. Then they turn around and announce that they intend to double the returns from the Pacific and that reflects on our intelligence. Twice nothing is nothing.

Time is relative. Two or three weeks in the Pacific or in Europe may easily seem as long as 2 or 3 years of the more abundant life back home. Let me quote from a letter received from a young man in the Admiralty Islands:

> Now, 2 or 3 weeks may not seem long to you, but when one is back here sweating it out for 16 months without a leave, 2 weeks is one hell of a long time. Even at that, I am not half so bad off as some mates of mine who spent 7 weeks at one receiving station awaiting transportation. Now my contention is that if the country has all the ships that they say they have, I see no reason why they can't put regular bunks on them like they use in our tents and get us home.

And neither can I. Just a few days ago, we passed the ship surplus bill, at which time the tremendous size of our merchant marine was stressed and emphasized. I cannot understand why more of these ships are not being used for this essential purpose. The Navy is filling its boats to capacity, why aren't there more boats to use?

I want to pay the greatest tribute to the Navy on Navy Day. We all wish to join in tribute to the greatest Navy of all time. It is magnificent. But I cannot help but wonder how much these celebrations at the various ports in the United States and in our island possessions will slow up the return of our soldiers and sailors. Secretary Forrestal has publicly stated that it will not cause any delay at all. But when you think of the number of ships being sent to various ports, it seems inconceivable to a layman like me that it will not cause at least 2 or 3 weeks' delay, to put it mildly, for a great many of our men. I noticed in the newspapers that a number of aircraft carriers which have been and will be converted for transportation purposes will not leave the States until after the Navy Day celebrations. Also, friends of mine recently returned from Pearl Harbor tell me ship movements there are pretty well stalled until after Navy Day. I keep as good track as I can of these matters affecting so many. Personally, I

believe the finest Navy Day celebration this country could have in this year of our Lord 1945 would be to have vast numbers of ships steam into our harbors, loaded with men and women of our armed services returning to their homes and families.

Transportation is an administrative problem. It rests entirely with the Army, the Navy, and the War Shipping Administration. These organizations won the war in considerable measure by establishing the finest and fastest system of supply in the world. They can and must solve this equally important peace problem also. If they could do the one, they can do the other, if they will realize the same urgency exists—war does not end when the last shot is fired.

A few days ago Secretary Forrestal declared, "There is no better way to start a third world war than to demobilize too rapidly." Our primary concern today is to fill the needs of occupation adequately and to make sure we will retain the fruits of victory for which the young men and women of America have fought and died. We must also lay the foundation for a lasting peace. But the Navy Department has stated that the peacetime Navy will be adequate at 500,000 men and 58,000 officers. General Marshall told all of us that the rate of demobilization did not depend upon the size of the Army and would not have any relation to it until some time next spring. Therefore, I cannot see why a rapid release of those men admittedly unneeded now can in any way jeopardize either the needs of occupation or the preservation of the fruits of victory, or the establishment of peace. If secret commitments concerning foreign policy requiring large armies and navies have been made, then the Congress should be so informed; then the Congress can ratify or reject such commitments and can take them into account, if ratified, in determining the size of the armed forces.

Secondly, more separation centers and separation points must be established and more personnel must be placed in existing separation centers. I can see no reason why civilians cannot be used in some of these positions at separation centers. A great deal of the work is filing and book work. We must remember that the men at the separation centers, many of them, want to go home also. It may take 30 days or more to establish a new separation center or point. Its usefulness may be ended early next spring when most of the men now eligible for release at long last receive their final papers. In the meantime—and this is the all-important point—thousands and even millions can get back home in 2 weeks, a month or even 2 or 3 months sooner than would otherwise be the case. This may seem a great deal of effort and expense for such a minor gain. The answer is—the gain is not minor because 1 or 2 weeks or 1 or 2 months means so much to these men and women who have been away from home so long and to their wives, husbands, parents, sisters, brothers, and friends awaiting their return.

Thirdly, the Army should establish a definite time limit for the return of troops from overseas. Then the troops will know when they can expect to return and their families can know how to plan for their return. Of course, this cannot be done too accurately, but a margin of safety can be allowed to cover unexpected delays. If the return is before the scheduled time, there will be little complaint about it. Undoubtedly, this policy cannot be carried out completely for all men in all areas, but I feel certain it can be established for the vast majority of the men and women in most areas.

Let me give you the history starting at VE-day of one young man who wrote to me. He was in France and Germany. His company was broken up and he was assigned to the casual pool. He was then assigned to an outfit scheduled for "direct shipment to the Pacific." That was satisfactory to him. They got as far as Camp Chicago in the assembly area. Then VJ-day was declared and, as he says, "You know how happy that made us." They stayed 7 weeks at Camp Chicago while the men below 60 points were weeded out. He had more than 60 points.

On September 15 they started for the staging area near Marseilles. Let me quote again:

On the way down from Reims we passed trainloads of GI's going back to Germany who had 70 to 75 points. They had been literally taken off the boats and sent back to Germany. Our trip took us 2 days to go about 600 miles—and no sleepers either—but in broken-down passenger coaches and 40 and 8's (boxcars). We didn't gripe because we thought we were on our way home and we were willing to ride on an oxcart if it would get us home any quicker.

But listen to what happened later on:

On September 18 disaster struck. We were told that the men had to have 72 points on VE-day in order to be eligible to go home. What a blow that was! * * * Now imagine the heartbreaks this has caused bringing us through all that rigmarole and right down to the boat practically and then being told "Go back boys." Well, this would affect about one-third of our squadron. Sir, let me tell you if you want to see a sad bunch of boys, you just come down here and see the faces of us boys who are told "Not yet," after all the processing and reprocessing and red tape we had been through. Sir, this is a war of nerves here that Hitler would have been proud of, and I can't see why there haven't been more section 8's or suicides. Fellows who have had some pretty rough times over here and have gone through it okay are definitely showing signs of having their faith and morale cracked at the very last by something so incalculably cruel as giving them the impression they are going home to their loved ones, their jobs later on, and all they hold dear and fought for all these years, and then have it pulled away from them for another long and tantalizing period of time. Again, I repeat, sir, it is enough to break a fellow's heart and it sure does come close to it. * * *

The least they could do is to make their system known beforehand so a fellow could know what to expect and avoid all that useless travel back and forth of these downtrodden vets. * * * Mr. KUNKEL, please try to get the Army to set a time schedule of points far enough in advance so it doesn't catch a group of soldiers already on their way home and then pull them back. I know you are 100 percent for the vets. I think that a set system, completely made out to the last detail, should be made public as to when a person should expect to get home to the States. Something figured right down to the last man, occupation included. Make the War Department come out with a definite statement as to when the last man can expect to get to the States at least, if not home. The soldiers have a right to know and something should be done about it. * * *

I don't begrudge the shipping of men home first with higher points than I have and I know there are many, but I do object to this bringing a person down, building his hopes up, and then saying "Go on back." It is cruelty in a mean form. * * *

If we would be told at a certain point the group would be shipped to the States—say October or November or December—a person would know just where he stood and when he could be expected home. Now the way it looks, I have been told to write home I am coming, don't send packages, my mail is already being forwarded to my home address in anticipation of the 30-day furlough I would have gotten, my furlough data has been taken, I have been processed and reprocessed, first for the Pacific and then for home, and I don't know where the devil I stand, and I am one highly browned-off person, GI or otherwise. Right now my morale is at the lowest point of the war. My faith in all that is good is shattered. In fact, I am so darned mad I could break out in tears (imagine a vet talking like that). I am so darned mad, Sir, that it isn't funny and it sure sounds like a child's voice in a roaring crowd, but I demand action on the home front. The only way I can speak is through you, so speak good and loud. * * *

Mr. KUNKEL, I beseech you to get up and make your voice ring out clear and loud for a more humane method of getting us home.

I know perfectly well that I could never make as effective a statement as this young man has made in his letter. While probably it would not be possible to do it completely, I do think that a method could be worked out whereby these men could be advised with reasonable certainty as to when they would be returned to the States. Further, that program could be extended so that the men here in the United States would know fairly exactly a time limit beyond which they would not be retained.

The father of a serviceman called me on the telephone the other day, gave me some data, and I told him his son was "eligible for discharge." He said, "I wish they would discard those three words and never use them again, because nobody knows just what they mean." Unfortunately that is all too true.

In any event, I certainly agree with what this young man said, and I firmly believe that a policy can be worked out whereby these men and women will know what to expect. It will make them easier in their minds and more contented under trying circumstances.

Do not forget, in addition to the young men themselves, to think of the wives, parents, and relatives.

He adds a postscript to that effect:

What browns us up the most is how our folks are going to take all this—our wives, mothers, sisters, and fathers. It is a real blow to them, too, a real disappointment.

A copy of the Stars and Stripes is enclosed with this letter, relative to this same problem.

I go back home nearly every week end in order to keep in touch with my friends back home. For a good many weeks past, particularly since the mail on demobilization has been so heavy, I have been calling on the telephone a number of

friends who have written me and have talked to a great many others. This feature of a definite date is a morale builder. There is no question at all about that. After General Marshall told us that all men with two or more years' active service would be demobilized by July 1, 1946, or shortly thereafter, I could notice the tremendous relief and the fine reaction of those with whom I talked and to whom I gave this information. July 1, 1946, is a long way off. It is a long time to wait for one of your loved ones to come home, but the fact that it was a definite, fixed, and certain time instead of a mere mirage or vanishing point was a tremendous morale builder. A large percentage of the men about whom friends and constituents have written are located in this country. A definite time helps their spirits and morale. I know a really definite program would be a far greater morale builder among the men overseas. Furthermore, it is only fair and just to do this. There is no earthly reason nor need to keep the date of return a vanishing point. The "duration and 6 months thereafter" becomes a hazier and more distant horizon each day. The President opposes any official termination date now, and gives no clue as to when that time will arrive. Hence the only hope for definiteness of time of relief rests with the Army and Navy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, to make sure that my request to extend my remarks was broad enough to cover some letters, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper articles as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made a short time ago and to include some excerpts from the hearings before various committees on un-American activities; also, excerpts from a volume called Syndicalism, written by the present head of the Communist Party of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Mrs. R. C. Matson, of Worthington, Minn., asking consideration for the retailers of this country.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the historian of the future will record the invention and use of atomic energy as the most important development of the twentieth century. The Global War, just concluded with victory for the United Nations, was the outstanding historical event until August 6, 1945. On that tragic day the world read with incredulity, amazement, and awe of the destruction of Hiroshima, a city of 300,000 by atomic bomb No. 1.

As the eyewitness accounts and aerial photographs became available to the general public, the incredulity turned to relief, the amazement changed to consternation, and the awe of this latest and most terrifying discovery of the scientist changed to fear—yes; stark, soul-shaking fear for a civilization not yet ready in a moral and spiritual way to cope with this Frankenstein force.

Three days later a second and more powerful atomic bomb was dropped from a B-29 on one of Japan's most powerful industrial cities, Nagasaki. Here the Japanese war lords had located the great Mitsubishi steel and iron works, with its sprawling armament factories. The Army reported "good results," meaning that the city of Nagasaki, with its factories and civilian population, was destroyed and would no longer be a factor in Japan's war arsenal.

How many more atomic bombs would be available for the other cities of Japan? We can be sure this question was a determining factor in the immediate acceptance by the Japanese Emperor and his war lords of the Potsdam ultimatum which had been issued on July 26 by the United Nations, and which these same Japanese war lords had rejected.

The Global War ceased on August 12, just 6 days after the destruction of Hiroshima, the Japanese military base, by atomic bomb No. 1.

But a potential danger to civilization, more terrible in effect and more far reaching in its implications than ever known before, had been conceived in the laboratory of the scientist and born in the bloody crucible of war.

I shall therefore talk to you today about the most important subject that may ever come before the Congress of the United States—atomic energy.

I am not a scientist, I cannot qualify as a technical expert on nuclear fission, but I have studied carefully the testimony offered by the most famous scientists in America before the Senate War Mobilizaion Committee. I have also heard the testimony given to date before the House Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member.

I have also studied such available data as I could find, including the official War Department report to the President, known as the Smyth report. This is a public document and should be read by every Member of Congress. As one scientist, Dr. Leo Szillard, testified, "It is a scientific textbook on how to make an atomic bomb."

I expect to prove certain facts by use of the expert testimony given before congressional committees by competent and world-famous scientists.

First. A policy of secrecy is impossible, as well as dangerous to our Nation.

Second. There is no defense or countermeasure against the atomic bomb.

Third. Civilization cannot exist in the future under the impact of atomic warfare.

Fourth. Congress and the President are responsible to the people of the United States for the proper disposal of this grave matter.

Our first reaction, when we realized for the first time the devastating effects of an atomic bomb, was that we should guard the secrets of production and use of atomic energy so that no foreign nation shall discover them and use atomic bombs on us.

Before we imitate the ostrich who buries his head in the sand while leaving prominent parts of his anatomy exposed, let us ask ourselves: Is the policy of secrecy possible? The truths of science cannot be limited by national boundaries. Scientific knowledge is international. It is a compilation of basic facts and discoveries by the great scientists of every nation. Interchange of knowledge, comparison or experimental notes, debates on scientific theories are and have been the life blood of scientific progress. The structure of science is never finished, it is constantly changing, new additions are added as each discovery is made. Science can also be compared to a chain, each new link is interlocking and dependent on the other links for strength and continuity.

Every great scientist connected with the development of atomic energy has testified that it is impossible to keep the secret of atomic energy or atomic bombs from other nations, except for a short period of time. Dr. Vannevar Bush and Dr. Conant made these statements before congressional committees. They were the scientists in charge of the Manhattan project. Their testimony was corroborated by outstanding physicists from every atomic laboratory: Dor Oppenheimer, the director of the New Mexico laboratories; Dr. Robert Wilson, representing the Association of Los Alamos Scientists; and Dr. H. J. Curtis, speaking for the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place extracts from their testimony and that of other scientists before congressional committees at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SENATE HEARINGS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Dr. Oppenheimer, page 894:

It is most essential that the administration of the atomic energy project be so conducted that there be a free interchange of scientific information on the fundamentals of physics and chemistry involved; I would say a free interchange which should not and cannot be restricted to the boundaries of this country, which cannot and should not be restricted to Government owned and operated laboratories, and the reasons for this are

that without it there simply won't be any fundamental physics.

Page 896:

Science has been almost unique among human activities in the role which has been played by the collaboration between workers of the various nations. It is probably true that today America has the greatest concentration of scientists and scientific facilities, and in many fields it is preeminent. Nevertheless, we have everything to gain and nothing to lose from the cultivation of science in other countries and from those cordial, competitive, and fraternal relations which have existed in the past among the scientists of the world.

Page 899: When questioned by the chairman of the Senate committee on whether fundamental research was of high military importance, Dr. Oppenheimer replied:

I don't think it is. I think that the main reason is because it is not possible. I think it is very largely an academic discussion of whether to keep the nature of the world secret. The nature of the world isn't secret, and what you may keep secret is matters of policy, which of a number of programs it looks to a given government profitable to pursue, but you can't keep the atoms secret. They exist in every country.

Dr. Fermi, page 898:

The question of secrecy is particularly vital in my field of research due to its recognized tremendous military implications. I believe, however, that what I am going to say applies just as well to any other field. It is the opinion of many that since the potential military value of science has been so clearly demonstrated during the war, the security of the Nation will require that scientific results which may conceivably have a bearing on military developments should henceforth be kept secret. This argument, I believe, is based on the presumption that with respect to physical sciences this country is so far ahead of potentially competing countries that we could afford to cut ourselves off from the scientific intercourse with the rest of the world and still have a high probability to keep ahead of everybody else. I believe this argument to be erroneous for two reasons. It is true that at the present moment we have an undisputed lead in the field of physics. It is also undeniable that this lead has been acquired by American science only relatively recently and that the experience of the past has shown that nations alternate in the leadership of scientific fields.

There follows an example which I hope is not meant as a warning:

The most striking example in the recent past is perhaps that of Germany which enjoyed a dominant position in physics in the 10 or 15 years after the end of the First World War and lost it very abruptly in the early thirties. A second fallacy of the argument about secrecy is that it neglects the unfavorable reaction that an extensive limitation of the freedom of scientific intercourse would have on the development itself. I do not believe that such unfavorable influence would be due to a major extent to a conscious rebellion of the scientists to work under conditions so different from their tradition. I rather expect that the greatest loss would be due to the discouragement and the difficulty of working without the stimulus of the interaction of ideas with colleagues representing a different background and a different point of view.

It is my belief that the industrial capacity of this Nation will insure that the practical application of fundamental scientific results will be exploited here more rapidly than elsewhere. For this reason it is in our interest to make all possible efforts to promote international exchanges on the scientific level. This will offer us the best guaranty against surprising and dangerous development of some discovery made in a foreign nation and of which we would not be aware. It will also be our best hope to maintain in this country favorable conditions for our own scientific progress.

Dr. H. J. Curtis, page 910–D:

After careful consideration we have concluded that the best interests of this country will be served by turning over the control of atomic energy to an international authority whose function it will be to so regulate the development of atomic energy that the atomic bomb will be used only by a world authority if necessary for the enforcement of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore conclude, on the basis of this testimony from expert scientists, who directed or participated in the development of atomic energy and atomic bombs, that the secrecy policy is impossible. It is of a temporary value only, and those who advocate it as a permanent policy are imitating the ostrich and are blind to the consequences of such a policy. Not only are they blind leaders of the blind, but they are dangerous advocates of a new form of isolationism.

IS DEFENSE POSSIBLE?

True, we have a short period of 2 to 5 years' advantage over the rest of the world in methods and application. True, we may be able to keep a year or two ahead in the atomic rearmament race, which is inevitable under the secret policy procedure. But, a surprise attack by any nation with Hiroshima-Nagasaki type of atomic bombs would wipe out 40,000,000 people in our 20 most populous centers overnight. And the scientists tell us that we are the most vulnerable of any nation due to our concentrated industry and population.

The possession on our part of a superatomic bomb would be no protection against such an attack. Along with the development of a superatomic bomb on our part, would of necessity go the determination to use it immediately in a surprise attack on a potential enemy, or it would be a futile accomplishment. But some skeptic may arise and declare: "For every offense there is a defense," or if we cannot find a countermeasure we will go underground. What do these same scientific experts I have quoted say about a defense against the atomic bomb? What is the testimony of Admiral Purnell of the Navy and General Groves, who had charge of the atomic development for the Army on this important matter of defense?

Again, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place their testimony in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SENATE HEARINGS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Dr. Oppenheimer, page 903:

There are no specific countermeasures for atomic bombs. This is nonsense. There never will be. I don't know what the other manufacturers of atomic bombs do, but ours cannot be exploded before they reach their destination by any means.

Dr. Curtis, page 912:

In spite of the adage "to each offensive weapon there has been a defense," we scientists can offer no hope of a specific defense against the atomic bomb. The only immediate defensive measures are retaliation, counteroffensive, or preventive warfare, but these will not restore the ruins of our cities nor revive the millions of our dead. If this happens, we will find small comfort in the possible knowledge that our atomic bombs, if they could have been used, would have been somewhat more efficient than those of our enemy. The ruined cities of Europe bear mute testimony to the fact that no adequate specific defense has been developed against heavy bombers, although the problem has received considerable attention. In the same sense it is very difficult for us to visualize a specific defense against atomic bombs. After a country acquires a certain number of atomic bombs there will hardly be any point in acquiring any more or in increasing their efficiency.

Testimony of Rear Adm. W. R. Purnell, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, on hearings on science legislation, page 259:

Senator FULBRIGHT. I should like to know; do you feel that you have a defense to the use of the atomic bomb?

Admiral PURNELL. I do not know of it; no, sir.

* * * * *

If I may express my own opinion on countermeasures, particularly in their relation to the atomic bomb, the first thing when you get a countermeasure is that the people who made the bomb would probably have the best knowledge of meeting that countermeasure and could probably evade it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that the country would be destroyed no less effectively by second-rate atomic bombs than by first-rate atomic bombs?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I conclude from this competent testimony that there is no permanent defense against surprise attack with atomic bombs. There is no competent testimony to prove the defense theory correct.

CIVILIZATION CANNOT EXIST UNDER THE IMPACT OF ATOMIC WARFARE

If secrecy is impossible and the probability of other nations obtaining and using atomic bombs within 2 to 5 years, and if a defense is unlikely and unknown, it is pertinent to inquire: Are our people in danger?

Certainly not today or for a year or two, but every scientist, who has testified on this point, has been careful to state that foreign development of atomic bombs will be possible within 2 to 5 years. So, my friends, we have an undetermined but short time as history evaluates time, to put our national and international house in order. Unless we move quickly and surely, long-range bombers with twice the carrying capacity of the B–29 may come unannounced out of the night. I speak of the B–36 which is now in pro-

duction and will be delivered in 1946. Five hundred or one thousand bombers may start for our metropolitan centers. If 20 of these large bombers loaded with Hiroshima-Nagasaki type of atomic bombs get through our interceptors and drop their terrible cargoes on 20 of our great metropolitan centers of population, chaos will result. Forty million lives will be endangered and the industrial life of our Nation will be paralyzed.

But our danger lies not alone in the cargoes of man-operated bombers. The people of London can vouch for that. I was in London in September of 1944 when V–1 and V–2 bombs from the stratosphere were falling on the defenseless people of England. I heard the infernal clatter of the V–1, and the explosions of the V–2's, when they hit. I saw the craters and the smoking ruins caused by these diabolic missiles. The defense was unsuccessful against this attack. Our great Army Air Force has just concluded a 2-week demonstration of the implements of air warfare at Wright Field. I visited this display Sunday, October 21. Every Member of Congress should have been there. We are a clever people, our scientists have not been asleep on the jet-propelled and V–2 rocket type of missiles. We have them, too, now. The rocket missile of the Germans is obsolete. We can launch them better, they will travel much farther, and we can guide them accurately by remote control through improved radar. We can also put atomic war heads on these missiles now.

Allow me to show you some pictures and a model of projected missiles which were displayed there. These pictures look fantastic, do they not? Something out of a Superman or Buck Rogers adventure strip. This model looks like a little boy's toy but its meaning is more sinister, I assure you. It is in two parts, the rear part represents the rocket-propulsion engine, and the fore part could represent the atomic war head equipped with gliding wings to wipe out a city the size of Washington.

Are these in existence today? Will they be in existence 2 years from today? Will our country be the only nation to have them? Will a thousand radar-guided, rocket-type atomic V-bombs be launched from carriers a thousand miles offshore?

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the answers to these questions. The scientists and diplomats here and abroad are busy. The lights burn in their laboratories and offices, while you and I sleep. Some of them know the answers to the questions I have asked. I know enough about current accomplishments and near future possibilities along this line to cause me sleepless nights. Better informed men tell me that civilization cannot stand the devastation now possible through atomic-bomb warfare.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

What are we going to do about this great question in view of the foregoing facts? First, I believe the President of the United States, his Cabinet, and the elected representatives of the people have the obligation and duty to study this subject carefully, obtain all the information available through printed word and extensive public hearings on this subject. We should not be stampeded by "hush! hush! hurry! hurry!" pressure, regardless of the scourge.

Congress must accept the responsibility of this great decision. The economic future as well as the national security will depend on the proper discharge of our duty. Improper or poorly drawn legislation will be the result of haste, or a refusal to accept the responsibility suddenly thrust upon us.

Second, I believe there are two divisions of responsibility: The national and international.

In the national field the responsibility rests first on the House of Representatives to carefully consider and pass legislation which will provide an organizational framework capable of protecting all of the American people's rights in the coming atomic age. This organization created by Congress may take any one of several forms, but it must accomplish certain basic results.

I offer the following principles for consideration:

CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS

First. Scientific research and development in the field of nuclear fission should continue under Federal supervision, with liberal allocation of Federal funds. The traditional freedom of the scientist in the exercise of his profession must be guaranteed.

Second. The continued Federal control of the production of atomic energy shall be established as a permanent policy. The present accomplishment is the result of the expenditure of $2,000,000,000 of the people's money. The future development in the atomic field should be at Federal expense and the basic rights should belong to the people.

Third. Domestic application of atomic energy should be furthered through encouragement of research in the domestic field, the provision of atomic energy to private enterprise and political subdivisions, for research or use, at the lowest possible cost consistent with sound financial practice.

Fourth. Military application of atomic energy should be provided for through encouragement of research in the military field and the provision of such atomic energy as necessary for the protection of the national interest.

Fifth. Such security regulations as necessary to protect national security in the field of military or commercial adaptation of atomic energy should be enacted.

Sixth. All research or use of atomic energy should be with the knowledge and consent of the Federal organization set up by Congress.

Seventh. Provisions for control or use of atomic energy in the United States should conform to any international agreements in this field.

Eighth. Other purposes and more detailed treatment should be considered and legislation enacted from time to time as atomic knowledge increases.

Now I wish to offer constructive suggestions in the international field:

First. The President of the United States should immediately initiate a world conference of delegates from all the nations for the purpose of forming an international body to guarantee the peace of the world because of the danger to mankind inherent in atomic energy. Methods of control of production and use of atomic energy for the benefit of mankind should be studied. International control based on complete knowledge of research, development, and use of atomic energy in every nation is the only defense against a mad race in atomic armament. Such a race caused by distrust, suspicion, and fear of our present advantage in this field, will lead inevitably to atomic warfare and the destruction of civilization.

Second. The Senate of the United States, as the constitutional treaty-approving body of Congress, should accept their responsibility and cooperate with the President in counsel, guidance, and support of such a policy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have proved by expert scientific testimony that—

First. Secrecy is impossible and dangerous.

Second. There is no defense against surprise atomic attack.

Third. Civilization cannot exist under the impact of atomic warfare.

Fourth. The grave responsibility to prevent the destruction of mankind rests upon the Congress and the President of the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, atomic energy can be the greatest force for good that the world has ever known. It can lift the burden of labor from the shoulders of mankind. Its possibilities for industrial and medical use are phenomenal. The field is as yet unexplored.

Its capacity for destruction, if misused, is greater than any force heretofore known. In view of these facts, I assert with all the emphasis at my command, Congress should not be rushed into hasty or ill-advised legislative action on this great subject regardless of pressure from either the executive or any other departmental division of government.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. First of all, may I thank the gentleman for the speech he has made. Over a month ago I tried to do the job that he has done today but in the nature of the case without as much knowledge as he has brought to it. I think the gentleman has done a fine piece of work here today. I want to thank him very much, not only for myself, but for the service I believe he has performed for the American Nation. It seems to me the gentleman has demonstrated, as I have attempted to do on numerous occasions, that there is only one safe course for the world to follow today. The only possible safety lies in the prevention of atomic warfare. In the second place, he has shown that we can not expect to prevent that atomic war as long as an atomic armament race is permitted to take place. That atomic armament race is inevitable in the absence of a means whereby the nations

of the world would have complete knowledge of what was going on in all the other nations.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with the gentleman absolutely on that point. I want to point out that knowledge on this subject is extensive and international in scope. The majority of the scientists who developed this atomic energy came from foreign countries and in some instances are still citizens of foreign countries.

The greatest German scientist, Dr. Otto Hahn, is now in another nation in Europe, no doubt working upon atomic research.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman permit me to continue for a moment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wanted to say to the gentleman that I have introduced two bills on this subject, one of which is a companion bill to one in the Senate, introduced by Senator MCMAHON, which would carry out the policy the gentleman has suggested. I just want to say it is not a proposition for the United States to give something away. It is a proposition for this Nation to employ genuine fearless world leadership, in the few years we may have of supremacy, to bring the nations together in a situation whereby it will be possible for the nations internationally to control their own action. Once there is established the right of inspection in every nation by an international board of scientists and others, once there is universal knowledge in such an international body of what is going on, then for the first time we shall have a chance to enforce an agreement not to use such an implement of war and to establish unified control over these atomic weapons, which can otherwise destroy civilization and even threaten the existence of human life upon it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As I said in the course of my remarks, it is the only defense against a surprise attack by atomic warfare. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. When I went to high school some 51 years ago, I was taught the principle of the split atom, which is the basis of the atomic bomb.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I say to the gentleman on that point that Dr. Einstein wrote the scientific formula for the atomic bomb in 1905.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It has just now been put into practice.

Mr. GALLAGHER. At the expense of $2,000,000,000, the United States had to have the equipment and the know-how. Experience has shown that attack and defense go together. Sometimes the attack is ahead and sometimes the defense is ahead. I am absolutely opposed to the United States giving up its leadership in this affair until we have discovered the real defense against it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman spoke of the $2,000,000,000 which the United States has spent in the research and development of this atomic energy. Dr. Leo Zillard testified that it is possible at this time to build an atomic energy-producing plant for $100,000,000. Remember this, we were searching out a way to find atomic energy. We explored different streets. We went down many highways looking for a way to make it. We found it—I do not know in how many highways, but expert testimony says that a foreign nation does not have to spend $2,000,000,000. They can take the proven scientific facts that are revealed in the Smyth report with other knowledge and they can organize their development of machinery along that line and produce atomic energy-producing machinery for $100,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wanted to ask whether you or the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] think that Russia, or any other country for that matter, will give to us the information they get, pool it into a world organization?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I answer the gentleman?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know for certain what other nations might do, but as their people begin to realize even slightly what this thing is and what an atomic war would do to them I believe they would force agreement. Naturally, I have thought about that a great deal.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then would you have us give it to them before we know?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I certainly would not. I have made that very clear in my remarks every time I have spoken on this subject.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I should like to answer the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I just finish?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am very grateful to my colleague. I am not for the United States giving anything away except on the condition which I laid down, namely, that the nations open up every nook and cranny of their borders to international inspection of what is going on. I do not know what Russia or other specific nations would do, but I do believe that if America made such a forthright proposition to the nations of the world, and if some of the nations agreed to it, the time would come when every nation would have to. In any case an attempt to save humanity from something approaching race suicide is certainly worth the attempt.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have no alternative on this. The gentleman brought in the subject of revealing the secret to Russia. Dr. Otto Hahn, the great German scientist, is in Russia today. Russia may have that secret today. She may not have it for 2 years. It may take her 5 years. Eventually the scientists of all nations having modern facilities will know what we now know. The facts relating to nuclear fission are scientific facts, they can be discovered through study and experiment by any nation's scientists.

You can no more hide or patent them than you can patent gravity or hide the forces of gravity from mankind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Under a special order previously agreed to, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INSURANCE IN WARTIME — GUARDIAN LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr Speaker, on May 17, 1943, I addressed the House on the general subject of life insurance on the lives of men in the military service of the United States. The burden of my talk dealt with the question of the position taken by the private life-insurance companies in excluding the hazards of war from policies written after this Nation went to war. In the course of my remarks I quoted a president of one of our principal private life-insurance companies whose views coincided with my own in this matter. In substance, he stated on two occasions, once in March 1942 and again in March 1943, that he saw no reason for war-exclusion riders in life-insurance policies. I, too, saw no reason for life-insurance companies to exclude men either in the military service or those within the age brackets of the selective service from the protective benefits of life insurance.

The war has been fought and won. We are no longer fighting one single enemy on any front. Experience, reflecting the effect of war on the mortality of life-insurance companies, is practically all in. The records are near enough complete to afford some interesting observations, in the light of my own remarks in May 1943 and the statements made prior to that time, and quoted by me, by a prominent life-insurance-company executive.

What does the mortality experience of the life-insurance companies show now?

It must be remembered first that companies active in the writing of life insurance over many years had policies in force on the lives of a substantial percentage of the men who went to war, written in times of peace, and with no war restrictions embodied in the policy contracts. The risk, which already was assumed by the companies, affords the first basis of my presentation here of the mortality experience resulting from the war.

Statistics prepared by organizations that have been for more than 40 years recognized by the institution of life insurance as thoroughly reliable indicate that the actual mortality of the life-insurance companies in the United States has increased less than five points for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944, and that the actual mortality is still substantially under the expected mortality for those years.

This means that the life-insurance companies have paid out a little more on death claims during the war years, but that they still have been prepared to pay out, under the mortality tables under which they operate, a great deal more than they have been called upon to pay, and that the difference has been placed partly in the surplus funds of the

companies, and has been returned, in part, to the policyholders in the way of premium dividends.

Since the cessation of hostilities, the life-insurance companies have been quick to announce removal of all war restrictions on their policies, and one company has already announced that its removal of these restrictions would be made retroactive, and that claims scaled down in payment by reason of the war-exclusion rider would be reopened and paid in full, just as though there had been no restriction. This particular company, with more than $8,000,000,000 of life insurance in force, recognizes belatedly that the war-exclusion rider was not necessary, a fact pointed out clearly in my address of May 17, 1943.

A few calculations afford statistical justification of both my remarks and the position taken by the company above referred to. In 1944 this company paid out, in death claims and matured endowments, the sum of $95,306,357. In its announcement that removal of the war-exclusion rider would be made retroactive, in the National Underwriter, an insurance trade journal, under the published date of September 14, 1945, this company was quoted as having indicated that the additional payments on scaled-down claims for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944 would total $900,000. I quote from the article:

> It is understood that this action will result in the payment of approximately $900,000 more than was required under these policies.

A little mathematics develops the interesting fact that the additional payments are less than 1 percent of the total death claims and matured endowments paid for 1 year by this same company. Nine hundred thousand dollars is 0.94 percent plus of $95,306,357.

And yet war-risk claims for 3 years are herein calculated against the normal claims for 1 year. Normal? Not quite, for this same company, it must be remembered, had policyholders who had taken out insurance before the war, on whose claims the company made payment in full.

This same company, it might be added, gained in surplus in 1944 the sum of $28,078,409 after paying policyholder dividends of $49,096,163. Its total surplus at the close of 1944 stood at $186,349,661. This surplus, is, of course, in addition to the full legal reserves set aside by the company for the protection of its contract obligations.

Statistics are, I quite realize, extremely dry, but I am coming to my point rapidly now. I have shown that, without the war-exclusion rider, this one company, reasonably typical of the institution of legal reserve life insurance, would scarcely have felt the impact of war on its mortality experience. That after paying its war claims in full for the three war years it will have increased its actual mortality by less than 1 percent of its 1944 experience alone. From surplus it takes less than one-half of 1 percent, and from the increase in surplus for the 1 year 1944 it takes slightly over 3 percent, without affecting dividends to policyholders in the slightest.

Surplus is a fund accumulated by the life-insurance companies to use in emergency. Here is one company using just a little under one-half of 1 percent of its surplus for the war emergency through which the Nation has just passed, and from which it is only now emerging. Extremely commendable.

It is to be hoped that other companies can find in their management sufficiently generous impulses to do likewise. If they do, then it is reasonable to assume that the faith citizens of this great country of ours have had in their life-insurance companies will not be too badly impaired. It must be said that when the companies, almost to the very last one, deserted the young men of this country in their hour of need for the very protection urged upon them when their needs were less, or to speak frankly, normal, and therefore assuredly below a figure the companies were prepared to pay, a question was established as to just how much faith could be placed in the institution of life insurance.

I am proud to be able to say here that one company, domiciled in my home State of Texas, not only did not break faith, but concentrated its efforts on making certain that men in the armed services of our country had insurance in a privately owned and operated company, payable in cash at death, with no extra premium charge, and with no war restrictions of any sort, and that this company, the Guardian Life Insurance Co. of Texas, has paid every claim promptly and in full, thereby alone and unaided, upholding the faith and justifying the confidence of our more than 12,000,000 fighting men.

What the Guardian Life of Texas did as a matter of good business foresight, other companies will now do as a matter of hindsight. What the experience proves is that there is not now, and there has not been at any time, any actual need for government life insurance of any kind to supplant the service of the private companies, if the private companies will, by sound management, assume the obligations they are set up to assume, and fulfill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

GOVERNMENT BUREAUS MUST FOLLOW THE LAW

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the question I want answered today is: Do you want the bureaus to follow the law of the land or not?

The most important action Congress could take after promoting demobilization of the armed forces is to demobilize the unnecessary bureaucrats. Many of them were actually harmful to maximum food production during the war and are now harmful to reconversion.

A good place to begin is to demobilize the OPA employees that do not follow the law themselves and are trying to continue this country as one of men instead of a country of laws.

For example, in the April 2, 1945, amendment to RMPR 289 is found the following:

RMPR 289
Amdt. 23
Apr. 2, 1945

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION
(Document No. 45004)

PART 1351—FOOD AND FOOD PRODUCTS

[RMPR 289,[1] Amdt. 23]

DAIRY PRODUCTS

A statement of the considerations involved in the issuance of this amendment, issued simultaneously herewith, has been filed with the Division of the Federal Register.

Revised Maximum Price Regulation 289 is amended in the following respects:

1. Section 27 (e) is added to read as follows:

(e) Maximum prices for "Switzerland Swiss cheese"—(1) Sales by exporters, primary wholesalers, secondary wholesalers, and service wholesalers—(i) In New York City: The maximum price for the sale of "Switzerland Swiss cheese" delivered at any place in New York City shall be the appropriate price set forth in Table E below:

TABLE E

Sales and deliveries by:	
Exporters	$0.48¼.
Primary wholesalers	$0.49¼ per lb. for sales of more than 1 tub or 1 box.
	$0.49¾ per lb. for sales of 1 tub or less, or 1 box or less.
	$0.50¼ per lb. for sales of one wheel or block.
	$0.50¾ per lb. for sales of 100 lbs. or less.
Secondary wholesalers	$0.49¼ per lb. for sales of more than 1 tub or 1 box.
	$0.50¾ per lb. for sales of 1 tub or less or 1 box or less.
	$0.51¼ per lb. for sales of one wheel or block.
	$0.51¾ per lb. for sales of 100 lbs. or less.
Service wholesalers	$0.57¾.

(ii) Outside New York City: The maximum price for the sale of "Switzerland Swiss cheese" delivered at any place outside New York City shall be the appropriate price set forth in table E above, plus a "transportation factor." A "transportation factor" means the lowest published railroad carlot freight rate per pound, gross weight, from New York City to the place of delivery multiplied by 1.15. In calculating the "transportation factor" the 3 percent transportation tax imposed by section 20 of the Revenue Act of 1942 shall be included.

(2) General provisions: (i) The provisions of paragraphs (b) (2), (b) (3), (b) (5), (b) (8), (c) (2), (c) (3), (c) (4), (c) (5), (c) (6), (c) (7), (c) (8) (iii) and (d) of this section 27 shall apply to this paragraph (e)

[1] 9 F.R. 5140, 5427, 5429, 5538, 5917, 5919, 5921, 6105, 7699, 10090, 10579, 10871, 11171, 13057, 13630, 14288, 14292, 14339; 10 F.R. 250.

establishing maximum prices for sales of "Switzerland Swiss cheese."

(ii) The provisions of paragraph (c) (1) of this section 27 shall apply to this paragraph (e) except that a "primary wholesaler" is defined as a person who purchases cheese from an exporter.

(iii) The maximum prices established for exporters are for cheese, duty paid, and delivered to the United States at the seller's expense.

(iv) "Switzerland Swiss cheese" is Swiss cheese meeting the requirements of paragraph (c) (8) (iii) of this section which has been imported from Switzerland and which is marked in the following manner: On both flat sides of each wheel is stamped in the middle with vegetable dye the designations "Made in Switzerland" and "Switzerland cheese." The entire surfaces of each flat side shall be imprinted with the designation "Switzerland" approximately 3¼ inches long and consisting of letters ranging in heights from about ⅛ inch in the center of the wheel to about ½ inch at the outer edge of the wheel. The designation "Switzerland" shall be imprinted in radial form in a series of concentric circles. The rim of each wheel shall be burned twice with the designation "Switzerland."

This amendment shall become effective April 7, 1945.

Issued this 2d day of April 1945.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

STATEMENT OF CONSIDERATIONS INVOLVED IN THE ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 23 TO REVISED MAXIMUM PRICE REGULATION 289

This amendment establishes specific maximum prices for sales of Swiss cheese imported from Switzerland. Such cheese has traditionally in prewar times enjoyed a price premium over Swiss cheese produced in this country. Prior to this amendment imported Swiss cheese under Revised Maximum Price Regulation 289 had the same maximum price as Swiss cheese produced domestically. Because of war conditions practically no Swiss cheese has been exported from Switzerland to this country in recent years.

The maximum prices established by this amendment for Swiss cheese imported from Switzerland are 12¾ cents per pound higher in New York City than for Swiss cheese produced in this country. This price differential is the same as has existed between the two commodities during the period from 1936 to 1939. Studies of the price relationship during this period between fancy domestic Swiss cheese and Swiss cheese imported from Europe disclose that the latter prices were 12.7 cents per pound higher than the former in the New York market. The New York market, which is the principal market in the United States for fancy domestic Swiss and imported Swiss, is regarded as typical, and the prices prevailing in that market are regarded as a proper basis of comparison for purposes of establishing maximum prices. The period from 1936 to 1939 is regarded as a representative base period during which price relationships between imported and domestic products are most typical. Therefore, the price differential of 12¾ cents per pound established in favor of the imported product in New York City is regarded as one placing the imported and domestic products in their customary relationship with each other.

This amendment establishes maximum prices for imported Swiss cheese according to a different price pattern than that which characterizes maximum prices for domestically produced Swiss cheese. Whereas prices for the domestic product are established with a Wisconsin basing point plus a transportation factor measured by the freight rate between Wisconsin and the place where the cheese is delivered to the buyer, this amendment establishes maximum prices for imported Swiss cheese on a New York City basing point basis. Maximum prices in other parts of the country are determined by adding a transportation factor to the established New York City prices. This transportation factor is the lowest published carlot freight rate per pound, gross weight, from New York City to the place of delivery multiplied by 1.15. It is similar to the transportation factor employed on a Wisconsin basing point system for domestically produced Swiss cheese. In establishing maximum prices for imported Swiss cheese on a New York basing point system, this amendment sets up a price formula which will permit imported Swiss cheese to flow unimpeded by price restrictions to all parts of the United States after it has been shipped to New York City. New York City has been, and in all likelihood will continue to be, the major import center for Swiss cheese from Switzerland and for this reason has been selected as the basing point city.

This amendment establishes no prices for imported Swiss cheese sold by cheese factories. It is recognized that prior to delivery of the cheese at the dock, the function of assembling has been performed and that the seller exporting to this country fits the role of an assembler more than that of a cheese factory. Therefore, maximum prices are established for imported Swiss cheese in the first instance at the assembler or exporter level. The assembling allowance permitted by this amendment is the same allowance which is permitted for assembling domestic Swiss cheese, although the regulation with respect to the latter establishes no maximum prices for an assembler as such, but includes the assembling allowance in the primary wholesaler's maximum price. This amendment recognizes that in the case of imported Swiss cheese the assembling and primary wholesale functions are performed by different persons. The exporter performs the assembling function. The importer performs the primary wholesale function. The maximum prices established for assemblers (exporters) and for primary wholesalers (importers) are thus based upon a recognition of the functions that each performs.

This means that the mark-up received by primary wholesalers over the maximum price which they pay to secure supplies is greater in the case of domestic Swiss cheese than in the case of imported Swiss cheese. However, in the latter case they are not performing the function of assembling, and, therefore, should not be compensated for a function performed by the exporter. The maximum prices established for primary wholesalers, secondary wholesalers, and service wholesalers of imported Swiss cheese are all 12¾ cents per pound higher in New York City than for similar sales of domestic Swiss cheese. The cost of wholesaling or handling imported Swiss cheese does not vary from the cost of wholesaling or handling domestic Swiss cheese. Therefore, the same allowances are given for the imported product as have been established for the domestic product.

In order to avoid evasion and violation of the maximum prices established by Revised Maximum Price Regulation 289 for sales of domestically produced Swiss cheese, it is provided that the maximum prices established by this amendment for Swiss cheese imported from Switzerland may be charged only for sales of imported Swiss cheese which has been stamped in an unmistakable and conclusive way as an imported product. No cheese, whether imported or domestic, may secure the maximum prices established for imported cheese unless each wheel of Swiss cheese is identified with peculiar markings in the manner designated by this amendment. To secure the price premium each wheel of imported Swiss cheese must be stamped with vegetable dye on both of its flat sides in the middle with the designations "made in Switzerland" and "Switzerland cheese." In addition, the entire surfaces of each flat side must be imprinted with the designation of "Switzerland" approximately 3¾ inches long and consisting of letters ranging in height from about ⅛ inch at the center of the wheel to about ½ inch at the outer edge of the wheel. This designation of "Switzerland" must be imprinted in radial form in a series of concentric circles. In addition, the rim of each wheel must be burnt twice with the designation "Switzerland." In requiring these special markings of identification in order to secure the premium established for imported Swiss cheese, this regulation does not require anything new or unusual. It has been customary to brand and stamp each wheel of Swiss cheese imported from Switzerland in the manner set forth in this amendment and the Swiss cheese exporters have requested that the special maximum price established by this amendment for imported Swiss cheese be limited to the cheese marked in the manner described in this amendment.

It is the opinion of the Administrator that the maximum prices established for imported Swiss cheese by this amendment at all levels of distribution are generally fair and equitable. The prices established are based upon consultations with members of the industry affected and upon data and factual information submitted by the industry. In the opinion of the Administrator the provisions of this amendment are consistent with the aims and purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, and with Executive Orders Nos. 9250 and 9328.

Issued this 2d day of April 1945

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

On April 14, I wrote Mr. Bowles and asked about this situation, and on April 28, I received the following reply:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1945.

The Honorable REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This acknowledges your letter of April 14, referring to specific ceiling prices established for Switzerland swiss cheese.

Prior to the issuance of amendment 10 to RMPR 289, token shipments of Switzerland swiss cheese periodically were imported into this country. However, the above amendment provided no price differential between imported and domestic swiss, which indirectly resulted in an embargo being placed on Switzerland swiss.

Shortly after the issuance of the regulation, the Switzerland Cheese Association, Inc., of New York City, representing the Switzerland swiss cheese exporters, filed a protest, claiming that the amendment violated the Tariff Act, the Antidumping Act, and the reciprocal trade agreements in effect between the United States and Switzerland.

In answer to the protest, amendment 23 to RMPR 289 was issued, affording Switzerland swiss cheese exporters the opportunity to export this commodity on the same price differential basis as existed between imported and domestic swiss during the base period from 1936 to 1939.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement about this procedure. I will yield at this point to any OPA apologist or any Member of Congress that can point to any part of the Price Control Act which gives Chester Bowles the authority to put a ceiling on imported Swiss cheese that is 12¾ cents per pound more than the ceiling on domestically produced Swiss cheese.

Amendment 23 to RMPR 289 is not made according to the law of the land and should be immediately repealed or withdrawn.

Before anyone attempts to answer this I would like to call their attention to the fact that this session of Congress spent 10 days in deciding whether or not President Truman was to be delegated the authority to reduce the duties by 50 percent. The new so-called reciprocal trade set-up was passed and President Truman has now been delegated the authority to reduce the duty on cheese imports from 5 cents per pound, the present rate, to a duty of 2½ cents per pound.

When you answer the statement also include your opinion as to why President Truman was given the power to reduce the duty by 2½ cents per pound if Chester Bowles already had the power to remove the duty altogether. Twelve and three-fourths cents per pound removes the duty and gives 7¾ cents per pound for expense and profit.

The OPA, according to the Price Control Act, has not had the authority to fix the price on any agricultural product. Section 3, subsection e provides:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, no action shall be taken under this act by the Administrator or any other person with respect to any agricultural commodity without the prior approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Neither Mr. Wickard nor Mr. Jones insisted on the OPA's following this part of the law. The OPA claimed that agricultural products were not agricultural commodities, it appears, and got away with the contention. The following letter shows that the USDA had nothing to say about the prices even if the law did so state:

> UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
> OFFICE OF PRICE,
> *Washington, D. C., July 17, 1945.*
>
> Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
> *House of Representatives.*
>
> DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of July 11, 1945, addressed to Judge Marvin Jones regarding the price established by the Office of Price Administration for imported Swiss cheese.
>
> Prior to the recent amendment to the Price Control Act, only regulations relating to maximum prices for raw unprocessed agricultural commodities were submitted to the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration for approval. Under this procedure, the price action with respect to imported Swiss cheese, to which you refer, was not submitted to this agency for approval.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> H. B. BOYD,
> *Director of Price.*

All the suits in Wisconsin where the OPA sued, persecuted, prosecuted, and fined the dairy people for an alleged overcharge of ½ cent on a quart of skim milk were not legal. The War Food Administration had not approved the price ceiling and any judge except a New Deal appointee would have thrown them out of court.

The war is over. The time has come to insist that each and every bureau and agency, and every official of every bureau and agency, follow the law of the land. We have seen altogether too much of the pushing around attitude and the time to stop is right now.

If this administration wishes to keep order 289 as amended in operation, it must assume the responsibility for so doing.

I call this to your attention because H. R. 1955 will soon be up for consideration. H. R. 1955 will give the Revere Sugar Refinery, of Charlestown, Mass., a $115,882.73 settlement on a sugar price differential deal. If claims are to be presented to make good on all the OPA's rulings, they can be expected to be presented by the thousands.

In the meantime try to figure out why it would cause inflation to have domestically produced Swiss cheese advance a fraction of a cent a pound while imported Swiss cheese can be sold in the United States for 12¾ cents per pound more than the domestically produced Swiss cheese and not cause inflation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include letters.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

BENJAMIN HARRISON MEMORIAL

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, before many days I anticipate that this Congress will have before it the Ludlow bill authorizing the creation of a Benjamin Harrison Memorial in the nature of a national forest in southern Indiana. At the outset I want to say that I have never expressed myself as being either for or against this resolution. I have remarked that, "I have not yet seen fit to support it." This comment was made because my only desire is to represent the wishes of the people of the counties affected. The reasons why I have not yet seen fit to support this bill have been stated privately and publicly from time to time, and I might add some new thoughts which are developing, though I reiterate that my attitude toward the eventual initiation of this program is still indifferent.

To date, only civic organizations, such as chambers of commerce, Kiwanians, Rotarians, and so forth, have expressed their urgent support. These people are, largely speaking, representatives of business and industry. Little if anything has been said by the farmers who are going to be most vitally affected, at least in the beginning. Therefore, before I voice my sentiments in favor of this program, I would like to hear from representatives of the farm groups, if they care to be heard.

As I understand it, if this program is initiated, some 700,000 acres of farm land will eventually be purchased by the Federal Government. It will not be taken from the farmers by condemnation proceedings of the Federal Government. The farmers must be willing to sell their land or bargain with the Federal Government much as they would with any private buyer. Therefore, the farmers who wish to sell to the Government will not be adversely affected. My concern is for those farmers who are managing to make a living from their farms and who wish to remain on them.

Let us look, for a moment, at what might happen to them. Should the Shoals Dam be built, which is an ever-present threat to the people in the river bottoms of the east fork of the White River, above Shoals, Ind., the Government would take all of the fertile bottom land out of cultivation and with the initiation of the Harrison Memorial Forest 700,000 acres of marginal land would be acquired. Many farm folk who are wholly or partially earning their livelihood from their farms would be removed to other localities. Some, namely, those affected by the construction of the dam, would be unwillingly removed. Hundreds of families have already been removed by the acquisition of land for various wartime projects. All this leaves an increased tax burden on those remaining in order to carry on the expenses of their local governments; also, to the thousands of farmers who are just earning a living and who will have to bear the increased cost of all marginal fencing instead of 50 percent of it, which additional load will be more than they can possibly stand, and, therefore, they will be squeezed out; also, how about a farmer getting his children to school and getting his roads cared for once a major portion of his neighbors have moved on? This squeeze will, in my opinion, eventually get 25 percent of the remaining farmers in the areas involved.

Will this be a boon to the businessmen of the area? Will it help such towns as Nashville, Seymour, Paoli, Salem, and Bedford to have 25 to 50 percent of their farmers absent from their town with their cream and egg money on Saturday afternoons? I might add that, while I am in favor of spending Government money when and only when a dollar's worth of good is done with every dollar spent, I am not sure that a program of nationalization is the best way to do this job. Everyone knows that our Federal Treasury is in a deplorable condition, while our State treasury is fat with funds. The question is, How far are we going in the nationalization of our country? Are these civic organizations in favor of putting the squeeze on the border-line farmers, who are just able to meet their economic needs now, and who will not be able to do it once their neighbors are removed?

I am wondering about the thousands of farmers set up in business on the marginal land and financed by the FSA. The Federal Government has encouraged individuals to buy small, inexpensive farms and to move onto the land and improve their farms so that they—the people—can be self-supporting. In my opinion, these folks will all be caught in the squeeze by this, another Government program, reacting against the original Government program.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I say that it does not make 1 cent of difference to me, personally. I only want my farmers to know what is happening, to consider the consequences from all angles, have their day in court, and then I am ready to act on their decision. No pancake is so flat

but that it still has two sides, and I am anxious that both sides of this matter be publicized before the die is cast.

Unless more interest is shown by the opposition, this is my last and final effort to call the people's attention to the dangers involved, and I want to warn all who are interested in the long-time results of this grave wave of nationalization that this is but a step toward things to come in following generations.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RECONVERSION PROBLEMS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some of the folks back home get the idea that a Congressman's work is done on the floor. Some of the folks who come to visit the House when they are in Washington express the thought that because there are so few Members on the floor that the Congressmen are loafing; that they are off fishing or playing golf or something else. I wish there was some way of assuring the people throughout the country that nine-tenths of our work is performed in the offices or in committee; that sometimes we have two or three committee meetings on the same day; that many times we must answer our correspondence at night; that only a very small part of our work—and the value of that is sometimes difficult to ascertain—is done here on the floor except when we are considering legislation, which, of course, is always important. But many of the things we say here are printed in the RECORD and read by the folks at home, the purpose, of course, being so that they may know the views of Members, then write to us and correct us when we are wrong.

IS IT JUST ANOTHER SORDID NEW DEAL?

To a people suffering grievously from the aftermath of World War I, the Democratic party offered the only effective remedy for the depression. It was hard work, economy, and a drastic reduction in Government expenditures, in the number of Federal jobholders. Thoughtful, sensible people knew that to be the only sure remedy.

The late President, although he recognized the efficacy of the remedy, realized it would be a bitter dose to the thoughtless; to those eager for an immediate return to prosperity. So Charlie Michaelson and the smear artists were put to work on President Hoover, and they did a thorough job. The people, always eager for a scapegoat for their own shortcomings, were led to believe that their troubles were created and continued by President Hoover and that, if they would just accept the New Deal and its prophet, everything would be lovely.

Mr. Roosevelt, thus welding together the practical, hard-headed people, with his program of economy and efficiency, and the dreamers and the money-changers, whom he had promised to throw out of the Capitol, with his denunciation of the current administration and its head and his promises of a rosy future, attained his goal—Chief Executive of the United States.

In the first 6 months of his administration, he started on the road toward economy and efficiency. Unfortunately, the veterans of the First World War were the principal—perhaps the only—victims of his economy program. Some Federal employees were discharged, but where one conservative Republican was fired, two New Deal disciples were hired.

The New Deal's program of deception and of promises impossible of fulfillment continued until that lifetime Democrat, who had served with such distinction and so long in the United States Senate, CARTER GLASS, was moved to remark:

> The New Deal, taken all in all, is not only a mistake, it is a disgrace to the Nation, and the time is not far distant when we shall be ashamed of having wandered so far from the dictates of common sense and common honesty.
>
> The last election was carried by people who were getting favors from the Government, people who were subsidized by the Government, people who were on relief rolls, and people who were sanctioning the invasion of private property and its occupation, as is being done now. We have got no government in Washington and we have got no government in some of the States, because Government has surrendered to mob violence.

An ardent New Deal supporter, Harry Hopkins, put the administration's opinion of the average voter into expressive terms when, as the record shows, he said:

> The people were too damned dumb to appreciate the finer things of life.

The last administration not only spent public funds appropriated to help the unfortunate for the purchase of votes; it not only entered into a corrupt political alliance with labor politicians for the delivery of votes in exchange for special favors, but it consistently followed a course designed to create public ill will against businessmen, industrialists and Members of Congress.

The New Dealers succeeded in their purpose. Mr. Roosevelt held the Executive Mansion and exercised many of the powers of a dictator. He was elected for a fourth term.

If memory serves correctly, this is the first time since his passing that his name has been mentioned by me. On the 14th of April 1945, to my constituents and in the RECORD—Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1733—the following statement was made:

THE FORMER PRESIDENT

> The forceful, dynamic Franklin Delano Roosevelt has gone to the end of the road we are all traveling, and only the coming years will disclose the effect which his policies, his life, have had upon the lives of our people, the future of our Nation.
>
> Some hailed him as the champion of the common man; others, equally sincere, considered his policies as destructive of all they hold dear and sacred.
>
> The book has been closed, and neither the most extravagant praise nor the bitterest condemnation can change the record which has been written. Only the future will disclose whether the ultimate result of those policies, those acts, will, to our people, our Nation, be beneficial or otherwise.

THE PRESIDENT

> In his place, a position from which, perhaps with one exception, can be exerted the most powerful influence upon world events for the next 100 years, we have Harry S. Truman.
>
> President Truman, unlike former President Roosevelt, was not born of wealthy, socially prominent parents. Unlike former President Roosevelt, he was not born an aristocrat. He did not live among, and his early associates were not, those who fairly or unfairly considered themselves a little above, in worldly possessions and educational attainments, the average American. President Truman was born, lived with, and grew up among and associated with, people who were just average Americans.
>
> Born on the farm, a small-town, country lawyer, rising to political power and position, becoming a United States Senator, there has been nothing spectacular or out of the ordinary in his life and career. The only thing his political enemies have said against him is that his rise to power was aided by corrupt political machines. But who has not, at times, received the aid of those with whose policies and principles he had nothing in common?
>
> President Truman belongs to that great number of people—the common people—of whom Lincoln is reported to have said, in substance, "The Lord must love common people because he made so many of them."
>
> President Truman is an average American, possessing the good sense, the honesty and, we believe, the faith and confidence in American institutions, which is the heritage and security of the average American.
>
> As a United States Senator, he has been faithful to the trust reposed in him and, while he has been a loyal party man, there is no reason to believe that he ever has, or ever will, let party or political advantage work to the detriment of the welfare of our people as a whole, of our national stability and security.
>
> President Truman has, and until there is some overwhelming reason to believe otherwise, will continue to have, as President, the confidence and the support of all our political parties, of the people as a whole.
>
> We all ask for him divine guidance and the strength to perform the enormous tasks which confront him.

In my judgment, the foregoing and a statement sent to my people on April 21, 1945, and inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1841, expressed the opinion and the good will of the overwhelming majority of our people. The latter statement read as follows:

WILL HE DO IT?

> Other than the news from the battle fronts, uppermost in the minds of most Americans, is the question as to the course which President Truman will follow.
>
> Senators and Representatives who know him are convinced that he believes in and, if left to his own inclination, will, as President, follow a course which will restore constitutional government to the people.
>
> President Truman is not, in the ordinary meaning of the term, a great man, for which many are thankful. Alexander, Nero, Napoleon, many others were great men, but millions of people died because of their ambitions and none, so far as we know, added to either the welfare or happiness of his people. Washington and Lincoln were truly great men but they had an understanding of the needs and desires of the common man in addition to their other virtues. They were exceptions to the rule that so-called great men bring little of good to their country.
>
> The President's parents were average Americans. Born on a farm, growing to manhood in a small community, without a university

education, with the experiences which come to the average farmer and small-town dweller, he is just an ordinary man with the background of a Lincoln. That is why so many of his associates have faith in him. That is why so many believe he may prove to be in some respects another Calvin Coolidge.

President Truman is a Democrat, a loyal party man. In the Senate he gave ample evidence that he was honest, efficient, and had first in his mind the welfare of our people. He has never shown any indication of being a New Dealer, of harboring ideas looking toward the remaking of America, the destruction of constitutional government. His whole life, private, business, and political, indicates that he believes the laws should be made in Congress, interpreted by the courts, and enforced by the executive department; that the people, through their chosen representatives, should determine the Nation's policy, its future course.

Though the Pendergast machine in St. Louis and Missouri gave him material aid; though, after Pendergast served a term in the penitentiary, Harry S. Truman attended his funeral, there is nothing in his record to indicate that he ever believed in, or will support, corrupt city machine policies.

The only question which, in the mind of his former associates, throws any doubt upon the course which he will follow is the realization of the great pressure to which he will be subjected as President.

There is in Washington a powerful, well-financed group of individuals, a number of organizations, intent upon substituting for government by law through constitutional process, government by men, headed by a dictator. These individuals and groups were all-powerful in the late administration; in many things dictated its policy. They are still in Washington, firmly entrenched in policy-making positions. They can make life miserable, almost unbearable, for anyone who opposes them.

When they take Harry S. Truman to the top of the mountain and tempt him by painting a pleasing, alluring picture of the false goals which they seek; describe the disagreeable situation which may arise if he opposes their wishes, will his good sense, his courage and his determination, be sufficient to foresee and spurn their aid? In short, will he fulfill the promise made by a former President to drive the money changers out of Washington?

It will require all of President Truman's courage, determination, and ability to either circumvent or overcome their plans, defeat the accomplishment of their purpose.

Republicans, as well as a majority of the Democratic representation in Congress, will stand squarely behind and give every possible aid to the President in any and all efforts to restore our Government to the people.

The record will show that for months after he took office Harry S. Truman had the wholehearted support of the American people and of the Members of the Congress. We all wished him well. We hailed him as the man who would lead us into a safe harbor.

Many of us still believe in him. We believe he wants to do the right thing. But his acts, his messages, and things he is publicly reported to have said are beginning to raise questions in our minds.

It is for the purpose of calling to his attention, to the attention of his advisers, and of the leaders of the Democratic Party here in the House and throughout the Nation, some of these purported acts, statements claimed to have been uttered by him, that these remarks are made.

It is my hope that, when the truth is known, the policies of this administration will be found to be in accord with those of our Constitution; its principles the same as the principles which made us great as a nation.

It is my hope, as I am sure it is the hope of millions of our citizens, that we will learn, when the truth is known, that some of the statements attributed to the President were never made by him.

Some of our confidence in the President, some of our hope that his small-town training, his belief in equality and justice, in the necessity of work and thrift, sobriety, right living, were foundation stones upon which we should build, was shaken by his message to Congress outlining some 21 points of procedure.

When the President, after having told the Congress that it was its duty to initiate and adopt a legislative program, sent down a list of "must" legislation, some thoughtful individuals began to speculate as to whether he meant what he said.

When he came out flatfooted and told the Nation that Congress must adopt legislation which would give certain employees benefit payments of $25 a week for 26 weeks some of us wondered if he had given any consideration to the question of where the money was to come from.

When he sponsored the passage of a bill giving useful, regular, remunerative full-time jobs to every unemployed individual who wanted to work—a bill which apparently pledged the Federal Government to make good such opportunity in case private enterprise failed to do so, there was speculation as to whether Harry S. Truman favored state socialism.

When strikes threatened the reconversion program which was well on its way toward completion and he failed to adopt a clear, straightforward labor policy but, emulating the late First Lady, began to travel, visiting here, there, and the other place, some folks unkindly hinted that he had no labor policy and was dodging the issue.

The people do know that while the President was letting matters drift Governor Dewey finally settled the New York elevator strikes. They recall that while the President was visiting county fairs and acting as best man at Senator Clark's wedding, Governor Kelly, of Michigan, a veteran of the First World War—and he left a leg in France—when the strike threatened to shut off public-utility service in Michigan, called the labor leaders in and told them in no uncertain terms that if they did not go to work the State of Michigan would see to it that the utilities were operated. That settled that strike.

The courage of the Governor and a few plain words brought home once more to the people of the Nation the principle acted upon years ago by Grover Cleveland in the Pullman strikes; the statements of Calvin Coolidge when he told the Boston police that public servants engaged in necessary public services had no right to strike against their government.

Some were so unkind as to suggest that instead of acting as best man at Senator Clark's wedding the President devote his time to being best man for the American public.

It is not my purpose to criticize the President for his lack of action in the strike situation. He inherited that problem. It is a most difficult one. Its solution is not easy. The problem can only be solved with the aid of the law-enforcing officials, the executive officers of all of the States, of the law-enforcement officers of the larger cities.

It might also be solved by courageous, impartial action of a Congress determined to protect the interests of all citizens.

Whether the President was correctly quoted when it was alleged that he said that the defeat at Pearl Harbor was the fault of the American people, or whether he meant what his words—if he uttered them—imply, is an open question.

Whether he or some subordinate made the statement that the Yanks in Germany were treating the Jews as badly as did the Nazis except that they were not exterminating them, many do not know.

The wife of every Yank, the mother of every Yank, knows that such a statement was absurd and untrue, and it is difficult to believe that any public official did deliberately make it.

Whether the President was accurately quoted by that chronic liar, Drew Pearson, in his column in the Spokane Daily Chronicle—and probably other papers—on September 27, 1945, page 2, I have no way of knowing.

I would make no reference to this statement, for I do not believe in using known falsifiers as witnesses, were it not for the fact that the statement was given publicity throughout the country by Drew Pearson.

It attributes to the President words and conduct which are not only entirely out of place in the White House, but which should not dirty the mouth of any decent American citizen.

Pearson's statement attributing words to the President and which refers to a Wisconsin politician named Polland, is as follows:

"Mr. President," Polland opened up, "you've seen Dewey, Hoover, and Landon, but I guess I'm the first Willkie Republican to drop in and pay my respects."

Truman said he was delighted to see Polland and confided that he had a lot of respect for the late Wendell Willkie.

"I remember just how Willkie always used to refer to Tom Dewey," Polland continued. "He used to call him that little mustached son of a ———."

"Well, that about describes him," replied Truman, grinning broadly.

Polland told Truman how he and a few other Willkie Republicans are determined to make a fight for liberalism in GOP ranks.

"We're especially anxious to see that men like Nye and Ham Fish never get back in Congress," Polland said. "We're also after guys like Shipstead's scalps."

"That's swell," replied Truman. "I hope you continue to fight them. They deserve to be licked again and again."

These alleged statements of the President of the United States, if they were made by him, reflect upon his character as an individual; and, if true, they show him unfit to hold the high executive office which he now occupies.

It is my hope that, at some convenient time, he will take occasion to deny them

and that the House will pass a resolution calling upon the Speaker to appoint a committee of three to inquire into the truth of the statements above referred to and to suggest what action may be taken by the House in an effort to make more truthful, less obnoxious, future releases by Pearson.

While freedom of speech should be preserved, the constitutional guaranty is no shield behind which chronic liars, sowers of discord, and smearers of loyal citizens, should be permitted to hide.

THE JEFFERSON ISLAND PARTY

It is somewhat difficult to understand the President's attitude in accepting the hospitality of one Russell M. Arundel, who, some said, picked up the $75,000 check—I would say $750 would be nearer the mark—which paid for the festivities held at Jefferson Island in Chesapeake Bay, on September 22 and 23, 1945.

Some of the activities of Mr. Arundel are given in his own testimony when he appeared before the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission on September 14, 1944.

A signed article appearing on the editorial page of the Boston Herald, October 3, 1945, under the title of "Truman Merely Another Guest," in part reads as follows:

TRUMAN MERELY ANOTHER GUEST

If you are at all interested in politics you should familiarize yourself with Russell M. Arundel because, unless the Republican high command in Washington has been slumbering, you'll surely read a lot about him presently.

About 10 days ago President Truman and 200 of the starchiest Democrats in Washington, including Cabinet members, went gamboling at the Jefferson Island Club in Chesapeake Bay. This is an elegant joint, and expensive. There they participated in a 2-day frolic which made the biblical feast of Belshazzar look like a White Tower feed.

GENIAL HOST

The current issue of Time described the scene of the sumptuous stag party as a delightful retreat and also explained that "the President was merely another guest of Russell M. Arundel, Washington attorney, who signed the check at the club.

Undeniably, Mr. Arundel can well afford to throw a party as gorgeous as Mr. Truman's but he is not an attorney and he is one of the toplofty lobbyists in the country. Some of the background of this genial host to the Democrats may be obtained from his own sworn testimony given only 1 year ago before a congressional committee of investigation.

Here are some excerpts:

On March 10, 1933, you were commissioned as lieutenant, senior grade, in naval intelligence?—Yes, sir.

You resigned your commission October 1, 1940?—About that time.

* * * * *

And it was accepted November 5, 1940?—Yes, sir.

When you registered for the draft you registered twice, didn't you?—Yes.

And in your questionnaire you said you are a farmer?—Yes.

Do you own a farm?—Yes.

* * * * *

You told the draft board you were negotiator for certain ordnance companies?—That I was employed by the Auto Ordnance Corp.; yes.

They were manufacturers of machine guns?—Yes.

What other company did you tell the draft board you were employed by?—I don't remember.

WATCH CASE

What about the Thompson Machine Gun Co.?—Yes.

And what about the National Brass & Copper Co.?—Yes.

And the Bulova Watch Co.?

You have been interested in obtaining passports for Mr. Bulova to go abroad, haven't you?—Yes; I think I have—expediting passports.

Let me refresh your memory with this question? In 1932 the Customs Bureau of the Treasury Department charged Mr. Bulova with smuggling 200,000 watches into the United States in violation of customs law?—I remember there was such a case. I think it was rather a well-known case in Washington.

The forfeiture value of these watches was $405,000?—I haven't any idea.

Don't you know that Mr. Bulova, on December 7, 1933, paid the Treasury of the United States $38,000 in settlement of that case?—No, sir; I didn't know that.

You didn't have anything to do with that?—No.

* * * * *

Let me read this and see if it refreshes your memory of your knowledge of this matter [reading]: "Mr. Arundel * * * called this morning to see you with reference to Mr. Adolph Bulova. I told him what we had in our files regarding the shady work of Mr. Bulova in smuggling watches into the United States. Mr. Arundel said he was aware of all of this." Does that refresh your recollection?—I don't know who wrote that. I may have said that.

* * * * *

Mr. Arundel, here is an adding machine slip made from the ledger sheets of your bank account at the Munsey Trust Co., after your resignation from the Navy as a naval intelligence officer. It shows that from January 1, 1940, to August 10, 1944, you deposited $524,416.46. Is that about right?—I don't know. It probably is.

Will you please tell the committee what corporations you represent and in what capacity?—You mean right today, or in the past few years?

Since 1940, in addition to the Bulova Watch Co. Well, the South Puerto Rican Sugar Co.; Camaguey Sugar Co.; Mexican-American Flavors Corp.; Southwestern Sugar & Molasses Corp.; about 35 corporations in Puerto Rico which have Spanish names and which I can't recall; the Island Bottling Corp., which I own myself; the National Brass & Copper Corp., the Longines Watch Corp.

Right there on the Longines Watch Corp., let me ask you if you know Mr. Ira Guilden?—Yes; very well.

Is he a former brother-in-law of Arde Bulova?—Yes.

And he is the owner of the Longines Watch Corp.?—I think so.

Do they have a subsidiary, the Select Watch Case Co.?—There is a Select Watch Co. I don't know that it is a subsidiary.

OTHER INTERESTS

You represent the Select Watch Co., do you?—Yes, sir.

Go right ahead.—The Pepsi-Cola Corp. of Long Island, which I own; the National Wool Felt Hat Manufacturers' Association; the Sucro Blanc Corp., of Cuba; the American Motorists' Association; there are probably a lot more, but I can't remember them.

* * * * *

When was the last time you saw Mr. Bulova?—I believe in Chicago at the Democratic National Convention.

* * * * *

Having accepted this lobbyist's lavish hospitality it is doubtful if these Democratic politicians, being human, will give his profusion of interests any the worst of things. If Hoover did such a stupid or insolent act the Democrats would have drummed him out of the White House.

Note the concluding statement in that editorial. Permit me to repeat:

Having accepted this lobbyist's lavish hospitality, it is doubtful if these Democratic politicians, being human, will give his profusion of interests any the worst of things. If Hoover did such a stupid or insolent act, the Democrats would have drummed him out of the White House.

The reference in this editorial was to Mr. Arundel. The host of this so-called frolic, which was a gathering of the leaders of the Truman administration, was Mr. Arundel, the lobbyist above referred to.

Before the committee, he testified among other things—page 4674 of the hearings—that he held a commission in the United States Naval Reserve as lieutenant, senior grade, from March 19, 1933, to November 5, 1940; that he resigned—when he was 37 years of age—some 14 months after the President had declared the existence of a national emergency.

Arundel had attended the University of Illinois, a college at Jacksonville, and the Lincoln College of Law, but never received a degree from any of them. Here in Washington, he was president of the Washington Civic Opera and the Washington Civic Opera Co.

He was the originator of National Radio Forum and spoke on that program for approximately 6 months over 39 stations, and introduced various Cabinet members and Members of the House and Senate.

He testified he did publicity work for some 15 or 20 Members of the House and Senate, both Democratic and Republican.

Mr. Arundel also testified that he had deposited in a Washington bank more than $500,000 in a period of 58 months. He admitted that he was not a lawyer although—page 4675—he testified that letters which he had written might be so interpreted.

A reading of the testimony taken at the hearing referred to shows this lobbyist's transactions with the largest American distributor of Swiss watches. He testified that he was a farmer, but the record shows—page 4675—that he was also a negotiator for war contracts, although whether he secured exemption from the draft as a farmer I do not know. He did state—page 4684—that he had an income of $60,000 a year from a farm.

He checked into a $1,000 per month suite at the Statler Hotel here at Washington, which was paid for by the Bulova Watch Co., an importer of Swiss watches.

He testified under oath that he represented other corporations; in fact, after naming—page 4678—several foreign corporations, said that he represented some 35 corporations in Puerto Rico which had Spanish names and which he couldn't recall.

He also said that a Treasury claim for some $405,000 against the Bulova Watch Co. for smuggling some 200,000 watches was settled for $38,000.

It has been reported that Bulova, during 1942 and 1943, did import through the Nazi-Mussolini military lines, from Switzerland some 10,000,000 watches and watch movements.

At that time, I think it will be admitted that there was no way of getting such watches and watch movements out

of Switzerland without the connivance of the Hitler-Mussolini underlings.

In a statement made by the former general counsel of the Federal Communications Commission—page 2706—appears the following:

Prior to the war, because of the type of controls which the Italian Government maintained over foreign trade, the Italo-American businessman, dependent as he was on Italian sources for his goods, was out of business if he fell out with the Italian consul. For example, he had to be in good standing with the consul in order to get the necessary permits for his dealings with Italy and in order to obtain the favorable exchange rates. Both the sponsor of foreign language radio programs and the time broker were therefore peculiarly susceptible to suggestions and demands as to the propaganda line to be followed. The files of several Government investigative agencies indicate that much of the purported advertising over these foreign language programs were simply a blind for unadulterated alien propaganda. It was reported, for example, that in the case of two well known Italian language programs the sum spent on radio advertising was in excess of the gross annual profits of the company sponsoring the programs.

The American people are deeply concerned whether the head of our Nation, the man chosen by them to lead them through these trying days, is the kind of a man who would use the words attributed to him by Drew Pearson. I, for one, cannot believe that he is. I cannot believe that he, as President, ever used that kind of language with reference to anyone. I cannot believe that he is the kind of a man who will permit—if the charge be untrue—such statements to stand unchallenged before millions of Americans.

There are millions of American mothers who believe in Christianity, in decency, in morality. They do not believe in name-calling; they do not believe in the use of vile language. They are deeply concerned whether their President—your President and my President—used such language; whether some columnist is bold enough to deliberately falsify and to place the President in an unfavorable, untrue position before the public.

They would like to know, too, whether the President is aware of the activities and the character of the gentleman who financed the party at Jefferson Island, where some 300 Democrats—no Republicans were invited nor expected, and none attended—gathered over a week end for a little recreation, a little peace and quiet.

Americans are not in the habit—even though they be public servants—of accepting hospitality from individuals who practice duplicity. Nor should a public official accept the hospitality of those who seek to use Government agencies and facilities for the financial advantage of their clients.

Mr. Arundel—according to his own statement—is not above holding himself out as something that he is not. For example, on page 4675 you will find where he was asked:

Mr. BARKER. Are you an attorney?

Mr. ARUNDEL. No, sir.

Mr. BARKER. Have you ever represented yourself to be an attorney?

Mr. ARUNDEL. Not intentionally.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Arundel, don't you know that it is generally believed here in the city of Washington that you are an attorney-at-law?

Mr. ARUNDEL. No, sir.

Mr. BARKER. You didn't know that?

Mr. ARUNDEL. No, sir.

Mr. BARKER. Have you ever written any letters purporting to be an attorney-at-law?

Mr. ARUNDEL. I may have written letters years ago which people could have interpreted as such.

So it appears that Mr. Arundel did represent himself to be an attorney when he was not. It is quite evident that the reporters in Washington have him listed as an attorney.

In the Times-Herald of Sunday, September 23, appears this little paragraph:

Russell M. Arundel, Washington attorney, will pick up the check for the week-end party.

In the Washington Star of the same date, on page A5, is this statement:

Russell Arundel, Washington attorney, is host at the outing.

Subsequently, if my memory serves me correctly, it appeared that Mr. Arundel was host and that he did pick up the check for the outing given Mr. Truman and some 300 Democrats.

In view of Mr. Arundel's apparent influence with Government agencies and the opportunity given him to sell his wares at the little frolic at Jefferson Island, the check for the outing may not have been money wasted.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Would that check for $75,000 or $750 for a jamboree of that kind be taxable?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know. The people would like to know if Arundel, following the policy of the Elliott Roosevelt-Hartford loan, might be able to charge off the check as a business expense item.

But the American people, still having faith—I believe—in Harry S. Truman, are wondering whether he is the kind of a man depicted by Drew Pearson; whether he is the kind of man who would associate socially with Arundel, whether he is the kind of a man who, having been taken up on the top of the mountain and shown a political future, would yield to the temptations put before him.

They do not think he is, but they want a flat-footed denial and proof of the falsity of some of these charges, and they want assurance that he is the kind of an American they believed him to be when he took office.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the proceedings on the occasion of the christening of the U. S. S. *Oriskany.*

Mr. CANNON of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by former Congressman Hon. William Nelson, of Liberty, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LCRA STRIKE—AN EXAMPLE OF A THREAT TO NATION'S RECONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a recent strike by a comparatively small number of workers against the Lower Colorado River Authority, a State agency in Texas, cut off the electric current that supplied 83 communities and 25,000 farms. You can easily imagine the danger of such action when you think of having electricity suddenly discontinued to hospitals, schools, army camps, municipal water supplies, frozen food locker plants, and a multitude of other essential services.

The strike was without warning and was accompanied, or immediately followed, by the cutting of some of the distribution lines that carried the current to those communities and towns. In order to restore service citizens volunteered to be deputized by local sheriffs to patrol the lines and protect them from further damage.

Incidents of this nature, accompanied by physical destruction to property, are indefensible. The question of the merits of any issue involved is beside the point when the health and safety of so many citizens are involved. In such cases the public interest so far transcends that of the parties immediately affected that a strike under such circumstances becomes hard to understand. It is reported the workers struck because they were not recognized as a bargaining group. That contention was made in the face of the knowledge that the Wagner Act does not apply to State agencies such as the LCRA, and the attorney general of Texas had previously ruled that the State agency had no authority to negotiate a contract with a labor union.

In view of those circumstances, it is easy to understand why the action of the LCRA in firing the strikers and inviting war veterans to come in and take the jobs was so universally acclaimed in the area affected by the strike.

This controversy entirely ignored the public interest and serves to illustrate how a small group of men, strategically located, may do serious damage to the economic life of communities and of the country at large. It is a case of private controversies interfering with public rights, where the rights of the public are certainly paramount.

NO PROTECTION TO PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. Speaker, what protection does the public have with regard to these private decisions of such broad consequences? What authority does the Government now have to step into industrial controversies and settle disputes, prevent and stop strikes? There is, in fact, no recognition in the law that the public has legal rights as respects strikes or lock-outs.

Aside from the Smith-Connally Act, known as the War Disputes Act, which automatically expires when the war is formally declared at an end, about all the Government can do in settling a strike controversy is through the conciliation service as it is now set up in the Department of Labor. We need only to look to events of recent weeks over the Nation to know that the service as it now exists and operates is ineffective to settle disputes and to prevent and stop

strikes. That deficiency was well demonstrated in the abortive effort to settle the oil strike. Production in the oil refineries was resumed but it would not have been had it not been for the Smith-Connally Act which the President was able to resort to in taking over the refineries.

SMITH-CONNALLY ACT WILL SOON EXPIRE

But the Smith-Connally Act was a wartime measure and it will by its own terms soon expire. It was devised to meet war conditions and the war is now at an end. By virtue of that act and the President's broad war powers, many sanctions could have been, and on occasions were, invoked against strikers. Rationing coupons could have been canceled or withheld. Strikers could, and on occasions were, denied the privilege of working in other factories having Government contracts or depending on WPB for priorities to operate. In addition, strikers could during wartime have unemployment benefits frozen, as was threatened in the Philadelphia Transit Co. strike, which by the application of sanctions was stopped in 48 hours. And during wartime there was the power to induct into the Army to serve in labor battalions or otherwise those who struck in war plants and thereby endangered the supply of essential materials to the men on the front lines. But with the war's end, many of those powers are ended.

RECONVERSION THREATENED BY STRIKES

Today, only a few weeks after the war's end, we find the reconversion program threatened by strikes and threats of strikes. Many of those strikes are of the so-called outlaw variety, where even the union leaders profess their inability to control the strikers. Consider the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. strike where 4,500 employees walked out and stayed out for more than 6 weeks in a dispute over the discharge of three minor union officials who bodily threw a shop foreman out of his place of business. There the higher-up union officials claimed they were wholly unable to get the strikers back to work. That strike caused 50,000 Ford employees to be laid off because the plants where they worked depended on the strike-bound Kelsey-Hayes plant for essential parts and materials.

Mr. Speaker, does the administration have a reconversion labor-management policy, and if so, what is it? It should be clear to everyone that unless something is done to keep the wheels of industry moving, the threat of widespread unemployment and of inflation are haunting and real. More than half a million have been out on strike, and many major industries are threatened with shut-downs unless they yield to CIO pressure for 52 hours of pay for 40 hours of work. That demand is being made in the face of the Government's announced policy of holding down consumer prices.

The time has come when the rights and duties of labor, as of management, should be clearly defined by law and laid down within the framework of collective bargaining. The time has come when legal responsibility should be attached to the consequences of the acts of organized labor just as it is and should be to a corporation. The time has come when, after management-labor rights and duties have been defined and cataloged and a formula for settlement of disputes laid down, in the public interest such rights and protections should be abrogated with respect to those who violate them. Indeed, the time has come when rights and privileges accorded any class where the public interest is involved must not be allowed to become a license.

NEW LAWS NEEDED

Mr. Speaker, this Congress was called back here last month to pass reconversion legislation—to remove impediments that lay in the path of all-out production of durable goods with the minimum of delay. That production was looked to as a means of providing millions of jobs for returning veterans and others. It was looked to as the most effective antidote to the forces of inflation. Lack of production goes hand in hand with inflation. From shortages of durable goods that are needed and are in demand by the public, inflationary spirals are spawned. Yet there is nothing in the reconversion program about legislation to settle industrial disputes and prevent and stop strikes and keep the wheels of industry moving.

TWENTY-FIVE-DOLLAR-A-WEEK LAW WOULD ENCOURAGE IDLENESS

The big reconversion news that has been going out of Washington in recent weeks has pertained to the demand for a law to guarantee up to $25 a week for 26 weeks in unemployment protection, the cost to be borne by the public. Yet at the same time those who are the loudest in those demands are striking for 52 hours of pay for 40 hours of work, and the strikes are planned in such a way as to do the most damage to the reconversion program. That $25 demand would, in fact, encourage idleness and would discourage people from getting jobs and going to work, and the agitation for it is coming at a time when there are thousands of jobs for which there are no takers.

In considering the need for reconversion labor legislation, it should be borne in mind that the Communist influence is very strong in the leadership of some of the labor unions. It is well known now that the settlement of the costly strike that caused the port tie-up in New York City and is retarding the return of troops from Europe was thwarted by Communists.

NEW LAW NEEDED

Mr. Speaker, it is not an easy matter to outline legislation that will meet every contingency that may arise. But duties and responsibilities should be defined by law and a definite stand taken by Government with regard to industrial disputes. The history of legislation on the subject reveals that efforts to prevent strikes by mediation have succeeded in the past. Consider the Railway Labor Act of 1926. There has not been a strike of any consequence among railway employees since that law was enacted, and that covers nearly 20 years. That act defined rights and responsibilities. It provided protection for the public interest. It set up machinery whereby issues that have arisen have been settled peaceably without being submitted to the arbitrament of industrial warfare. The act forces compulsory mediation by law. It has worked to the satisfaction of management and labor and thus far certainly to the best interest of the public.

A number of bills are now pending in Congress on the subject of settlement of industrial disputes. The Ball-Hatch bill has been pending for months. There is no claim that it is perfect, but it can be used as a pattern for legislation and can be improved by amendment. If jobs are to be provided for returning veterans and others, and if goods are to be made and inflation prevented, we must have unimpeded production. It is now evident that cannot be done without a strong and determined stand by the Government, supported by adequate laws.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

VETERAN'S PENSION, COMPENSATION, OR RETIREMENT PAY DURING HOSPITALIZATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the following bill:

A bill to provide that a veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of law or veterans' regulation, no reduction of the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay of any veteran shall be made during his hospital treatment or institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this bill because at the present time a single veteran, if hospitalized, does not receive more than $20 a month. He does not receive the compensation that he receives when he is not hospitalized or in a soldiers' home.

To my mind, it is a very cruel provision, because the veteran needs his money coming in just the same, whether he be hospitalized or not. Veterans who do not live at home, who have an apartment or a room somewhere, in order to keep their living quarters must pay the rental on those quarters all the time. And if they have homes their expenses continue. It is only fair that they should have the money which belongs to them during their time of hospitalization.

I remember just after the First World War a contrary regulation was issued which gave all of the veterans where hospitalized $80 a month, the total amount for total permanent disability compensation, while hospitalized whether the amount of compensation was so much as that or not.

That regulation was rescinded and it was not so many years ago that the Congress passed the unfortunate and, I think, unjust provision of cutting the veteran while hospitalized to $20 a month if he was a single veteran. I fought the provision and voted against it in committee.

I hope this bill I have introduced will pass the House very speedily and then

pass the Senate and become law. To my mind it will right a great injustice.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the activity that is being made in the development and attempted perfection of artificial arms and legs, artificial eyes, and so forth. Very little up to now has been accomplished, and the least we can do for these men who have given so much for us is to try to make them as nearly whole, as nearly normal, as possible. We spend billions on atomic bombs; we must spend billions if necessary to give them the necessary and satisfactory prosthesis. The lack of successful prosthesis in the past is shocking.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RAMEY, indefinitely, on account of serious illness.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 23, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, October 23, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in executive session, on Tuesday, October 23, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the committee room 256, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be an executive meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Tuesday, October 23, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the following bills: H. R. 1867 and H. R. 2593.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on Friday, October 26, 1945, on the following: House Concurrent Resolution 85, House Concurrent Resolution 86, House Concurrent Resolution 91, and House Joint Resolution 245, declaring the date of termination of hostilities in the present war. The hearing will begin at 10:30 a. m., and will be held in the Judiciary Committee room 346, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

792. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend title V thereof to the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

793. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 3, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination and survey of Point Remove Creek, Ark., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

794. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 2, 1945, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Barnegat Inlet, N. J., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 10, 1944; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2788. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code in regard to the limitations of certain actions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Special Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies submits its eighth intermediate report (Rept. No. 1142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4461. A bill providing for the creation of the Curtiss Memorial Commission; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4462. A bill relating to investment of trust funds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4463. A bill to amend the War Labor Disputes Act by prohibiting the organization of supervisory employees for purposes of collective bargaining; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4464. A bill to provide that a veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 4465. A bill for the relief of the bondholders of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank, of Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Francis T. Lillie and Lois E. Lillie; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1266. By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition signed by 1,079 names collected in the local union shops and throughout the city of Minneapolis, Minn., relative to jobs for the workingman and unemployment pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1267. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Somerville (Mass.) Board of Aldermen, favoring granting of terminal leave pay allowance to all members of armed forces of our various military branches; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1268. By Mr. RICH: Petition of S. H. Belford and other citizens of Renovo, Pa., urging passage of H. R. 4051, a bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 22, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou source of light that never fades, make sensitive our spirits

lest the high and holy knock at our heart's door in vain; open our eyes to see Thy exceeding glory mirrored in the flower that blooms for a brief day, in stricken leaves that whirl about mournful autumn paths, in the glory of trees that lift their leafy arms to pray. In the dimness of our souls, may we not miss the splendor of Thine infinite love incarnated in lowly human lives, smiling in the face of a little child, inspiring in the unforgettable devotion of a mother's brooding love and a father's selfless care.

Grant above all that we may see our tasks glorified in the radiance of that One whose revelation of life abundant is the sun of all our seeing and in whose face flames the light of the glory of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 22, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 22, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 109) to extend in the case of aluminum plants and facilities the time during which disposition of such plants and facilities is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 22, 1945, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 109) to extend in the case of aluminum plants and facilities the time during which disposition of such plants and facilities is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1333) to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3220) to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2938. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings;

H. R. 3979. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4283. An act to require parking facilities for the persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3440) authorizing appropriations for a permanent program of scientific research in the interest of national security, reported it without amendment, and, under the order of the Senate of June 20, 1945, the bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. BANKHEAD introduced a bill (S. 1507) to better adapt the loan programs authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the needs of veterans and low-income farmers, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2938. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings;

H. R. 3979. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4283. An act to require parking facilities for the persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO REPORT TAX BILL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be given until midnight tonight to report to the Senate the tax bill and file its report thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might also announce that it is contemplated that the tax bill will be taken up tomorrow.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD AT DEDICATION OF THE BOWNE HOUSE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on October 10, 1945, at the dedication of the Bowne House, Flushing, N. Y., as a national shrine to religious freedom and tolerance, together with an article entitled "Bowne House—A Shrine to Religious Freedom," and a copy of the program arranged for the dedication, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN SHIPPING INDUSTRY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relating to the shipping industry, delivered by him before the Propeller Club at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y., October 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWPOINT OF AN AMERICAN SOLDIER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by an American soldier serving abroad, which appears in the Appendix.]

MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE—EDITORIAL BY CLARA SAVAGE LITTLEDALE

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial written by Clara Savage Littledale and published in the Parents' Magazine, endorsing S. 1318 and H. R. 2922, dealing with maternal and child welfare, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the imminent joint session of the two Houses at this time, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and, as in executive session, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas M. Madden, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—VIENA P. JOHNSON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Viena P. Johnson, of St. Paul, Minn., to be collector of customs district No. 35, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I discovered after I came into the Chamber that certain confirmations had been made as in executive session, including the confirmation of the nomination of Mrs. Viena P. Johnson to be collector of customs for district No. 35, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minn. I do not wish to move reconsideration of the confirmation, but I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to the confirmation of Mrs. Johnson's nomination.

As a political reporter in Minnesota, I watched Mrs. Johnson's activities in the Farmer-Labor Party of that State, which since has merged with the Democratic Party, and during 1936, 1937, and 1938 the Communist Party took control of the Farmer-Labor Party. During that period Mrs. Johnson, knowingly or not, consistently lent herself to Communist infiltration into the Farmer-Labor Party. I am convinced that she is what

we called in newspaper parlance, a Communist "fellow traveler." That is not susceptible of proof, but watching the activities of persons in politics over a few years one becomes convinced of what their political philosophy is.

I merely want the RECORD to show that I do not approve of the appointment of individuals holding such views to important Federal posts.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Kenneth C. Royall, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of War, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Guffey	Murray
Austin	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hart	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Huffman	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Capehart	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chandler	Lucas	Taylor
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Connally	McClellan	Tunnell
Cordon	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Mead	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gerry	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murdock	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent because of deaths in their families.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent attending the Food and Agriculture Conference in Quebec.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who is one of the members of the Senate delegation to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Conference at Quebec, has been excused to attend its sessions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senator having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the time has arrived for the Senate to go to the Chamber of the House for the joint session of the two Houses. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate returns to the Senate Chamber following the joint session, it shall then stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the purpose of meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning is that it is hoped that the tax bill will be ready for consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have already obtained consent for the committee to report the tax bill today, and I have announced that it is our purpose to take it up tomorrow. It is also our hope that we can dispose of it tomorrow. In furtherance of that plan, I ask that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the Chamber of the House.

The motion was agreed to; and at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m. the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Leslie L. Biffle), the Sergeant at Arms (Wall Doxey), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address delivered by the President of the United States.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(The address by the President of the United States this day delivered at a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress appears on page 9934 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RECESS

The joint session being dissolved, the Senate (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) returned to its Chamber, and thereupon, pursuant to the order previously entered, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 24, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 23 (legislative day of October 22), 1945:

WAR DEPARTMENT

Kenneth C. Royall, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of War.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 23 (legislative day of October 22), 1945:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Thomas M. Madden to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Viena P. Johnson to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 35, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minn.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Sol Adler, Cobalt.
Charles T. Swanson, Cornwall.
Thomas L. Barry, Norfolk.
Charles J. Seiferman, Portland.

HAWAII

Robert Yutaka Hamamura, Anahola.
Julia K. L. Rodrigues, Hanalei.
James D. Lewis, Jr., Kaunakakai.
Joseph P. Dolim, Keahua.

KANSAS

Frank H. Steiger, El Dorado.

NEVADA

Evelyn Campbell, Mountain City.

NEW YORK

Ward A. Withey, Allentown.
Ida M. Negus, Alplaus.
Bernadette I. Coultry, Altona.
LaBelle F. Garland, Armonk.
Helen T. Quick, Athol Springs.
Helen T. Kane, Averill Park.
Theodore H. Kronke, Bardonia.
Charles J. Reilly, Bloomington.
Fred W. Thomson, Bovina Center.
Grace R. Lehley, Brant.
Stephen W. Schuster, Jr., Callicoon Center.
Burton Yates, Caroga Lake.
Margaret E. Bentley, Conewango Valley.
Myrtle M. Fingar, Coram.
Raymond O. Phelps, Cowlesville.
Morris A. Davis, Crompond.
Edith M. Ortner, Darien Center.
Helen R. Vail, East Marion.
Gladys M. Laing, East Otto.
Clara L. Walker, Farnham.
Mildred B. Albers, Fort Hunter.
E. Arthur Calkins, Glen Wild.
Jennie Young, Howes Cave.
Fred Churchill, Hughsonville.
Mary A. Russell, Keene.
Charlotte M. Fleischman, Laurel.
George B. Nivison, Lodi.

Alice M. Grace, Lowman.
Eileen B. Kennedy, Marietta.
Julian L. Peck, Masonville.
Robert W. Thomlinson, McLean.
Frank J. Donnelly, Mill Neck.
Muriel E. Raymond, Minerva.
Laura T. Le Duc, Mooers Forks.
Gilbert V. Horton, New Suffolk.
Amanda Stewart, North Branch.
Ella B. Kavanagh, North Java.
Alice M. Tobin, Old Chatham.
James A. Flynn, Point O'Woods.
Mary P. Van de Wal, Schodack Landing.
Freda C. Stearns, Smiths Basin.
G. Wilson Murdock, South Schroon.
Eckert A. Smith, Spring Glen.
J. Carl Blust, Stittville.
George W. Doremus, Tallman.
August P. Lenz, Thendara.
George E. Varley, Thomson.
Loretta H. Grover, Varysburg.
Howard D. Kellogg, West Falls.
Mildred W. Gimlich, West Lebanon.
Marie H. Bingham, Westernville.
Frances H. Courtney, Wilmington.
Beatrice M. Velsor, Woodbury.
Fred Hensel, Yulan.

NORTH DAKOTA

Warren W. Taylor, Dazey.
Viola Hazle Blocker, Elbowoods.

WASHINGTON

Louis Von Salzen, Ashford.
Ella M. Jasmer, Carbonado.
Hilborne W. Miller, Colbert.
Carl Arthur Appelo, Deep River.
Mattie Laugenour, Hunters.
Helen L. Gilbert, La Grande.
Benjamin B. McKenzie, Mead.
Andrew Alner, Moclips.
John Dean, Otis Orchards.
Austin J. Dickinson, Riverside.
Alfred H. Rodal, Rollingbay.
Harold A. Althof, Seabeck.
Elizabeth H. Harrow, Skamokawa.
Ruby D. Sooter, Underwood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.

We rejoice that back of all human transitions, back of the rise and fall of governments, and back of the fleeting centuries, is the loving, sheltering hand of our Heavenly Father. As we pass through life may our hands be outstretched and our hearts warm to succor those who need help and encouragement.

O harmonize us all with the universal law of Thy brotherhood, that Thy spirit may surge through our Republic like a golden river, flowing in triumph in street and marketplace, shop and home, clothed with love and sympathy as it touches the hearthstones of our land. Then—

Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree, and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off.

We pray in our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 239. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark;

H. R. 240. An act for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks;

H. R. 390. An act to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924;

H. R. 1104. An act to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 1465. An act for the relief of the State of California;

H. R. 1563. An act for the relief of N. Owen Oxley and the legal guardian of Lamar Oxley, a minor;

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis; and

H. R. 2668. An act to transfer Ben Hill County, Ga., from the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia to the Americus division of the middle judicial district of Georgia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert; and

H. R. 1890. An act for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 203. An act for the relief of Margery Anderson Bridges;

S. 356. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders;

S. 432. An act to increase from 2 to 3 years the period of limitation on actions for undercharges and overcharges by or against railroad carriers;

S. 473. An act relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral;

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise;

S. 1034. An act for the relief of John C. May and Eva Jenkins May;

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan;

S. 1131. An act for the relief of Jess Hudson;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Florence Barrows;

S. 1296. An act for the relief of John A. Hatcher;

S. 1438. An act to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States naval service a career, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election; and

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by its President pro tempore, Secretary, and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee on the part of the House to escort the President into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On the part of the Senate, the President pro tempore appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure and the high privilege of presenting to you the President of the United States.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress of the United States, in my message to the Congress of September 6, 1945, I stated that I would communicate further with respect to a long-range program of national military security for the United States. I now present to the Congress

my recommendations with respect to one essential part of this program—universal training.

The United States now has a fighting strength greater than at any other time in our history. It is greater than that of any other nation in the world.

We are strong because of many things: Our natural resources which we have so diligently developed; our great farms and mines, our factories, shipyards, and industries which we have so energetically created and operated. But above all else, we are strong because of the courage and vigor and skill of a liberty-loving people who are determined that this Nation shall remain forever free.

With that strength comes grave responsibility. With it must also come a continuing sense of leadership in the world for justice and peace.

For years to come the success of our efforts for a just and lasting peace will depend upon the strength of those who are determined to maintain the peace.

We intend to use all our moral influence and all our physical strength to work for that kind of peace. We can insure such a peace only so long as we remain strong. We must face the fact that peace must be built upon power, as well as upon good will and good deeds.

Our determination to remain powerful denotes no lack of faith in the United Nations Organization. On the contrary, with all the might we have, we intend to back our obligations and commitments under the United Nations Charter. Indeed, the sincerity of our intention to support the Organization will be judged partly by our willingness to maintain the power with which to assist other peace-loving nations to enforce its authority. It is only by strength that we can impress the fact upon possible future aggressors that we will tolerate no threat to peace or liberty.

To maintain that power we must act now. The latent strength of our untrained citizenry is no longer sufficient protection. If attack should come again, there would be no time under conditions of modern war to develop that latent strength into the necessary fighting force.

Never again can we count on the luxury of time with which to arm ourselves. In any future war, the heart of the United States would be the enemy's first target. Our geographical security is now gone—gone with the advent of the robot bomb, the rocket, aircraft carriers, and modern air-borne armies.

The surest guaranty that no nation will dare again to attack us is to remain strong in the only kind of strength an aggressor can understand—military power.

To preserve the strength of our Nation, the alternative before us is clear. We can maintain a large standing Army, Navy, and Air Force. Or we can rely upon a comparatively small Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force, supported by well-trained citizens, who in time of emergency could be quickly mobilized.

I recommend the second course—that we depend for our security upon comparatively small professional armed forces, reinforced by a well-trained and effectively organized citizen reserve. The backbone of our military force should be the trained citizen who is first and foremost a civilian, and who becomes a soldier or a sailor only in time of danger—and only when the Congress considers it necessary. This plan is obviously the more practical and economical. It conforms more closely to long-standing American tradition.

In such a system, however, the citizen reserve must be a trained reserve. We can meet the need for a trained reserve in only one way—by universal training.

Modern war is fought by experts—from the atomic scientist in his laboratory to the fighting man with his intricate modern weapons. The day of the minuteman who sprang to the flintlock hanging on his wall is over. Now it takes many months for men to become skilled in electronics, aeronautics, ballistics, meteorology, and all the other sciences of modern war. If another national emergency should come, there would be no time for this complicated training. Men must be trained in advance.

The sooner we can bring the maximum number of trained men into service, the sooner will be the victory and the less tragic the cost. Universal training is the only means by which we can be prepared right at the start to throw our great energy and our tremendous force into the battle. After two terrible experiences in one generation, we have learned that this is the way—the only way—to save human lives and material resources.

The importance of universal training has already been recognized by the Congress, and the Congress has wisely taken the initiative in this program.

The Select Committee of the House of Representatives on Postwar Military Policy has organized hearings and has heard extended testimony from representatives of churches and schools, labor unions, veterans organizations, the armed services, and many other groups. After careful consideration the committee has approved the broad policy of universal military training for the critical years ahead. I concur in that conclusion and strongly urge the Congress to adopt it.

In the present hour of triumph, we must not forget our anguish during the days of Bataan. We must not forget the anxiety of the days of Guadalcanal. In our desire to leave the tragedy of war behind us, we must not make the same mistake that we made after the First World War, when we quickly sank back into helplessness.

I recommend that we create a postwar military organization which will contain the following basic elements:

First. A comparatively small Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps;

Second. A greatly strengthened National Guard and Organized Reserve for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps;

Third. A General Reserve composed of all the male citizens of the United States who have received training.

The General Reserve would be available for rapid mobilization in time of emergency, but it would have no obligation to serve, either in this country or abroad, unless and until called to the service by an act of the Congress.

In order to provide this General Reserve, I recommend to the Congress the adoption of a plan for universal military training. Universal military training is not conscription. The opponents of training have labeled it "conscription," and by so doing have confused the minds of some of our citizens. Conscription is compulsory service in the Army or Navy in time of peace or war. Trainees under this proposed legislation, however, would not be enrolled in any of the armed services. They would be civilians in training. They would be no closer to membership in the armed forces than if they had no training. Special rules and regulations would have to be adopted for their organization, discipline, and welfare.

Universal training is not intended to take the place of the present Selective Service System. The Selective Service System is now being used to furnish replacements in the armed forces for veterans of this war who are being discharged.

Only the Congress could ever draw trainees under a universal training program into the Army and Navy. And if that time ever came, these trainees could be inducted only by selective process, as they were inducted for World War I and World War II. The great difference between having universal training and no training, however, is that, in time of emergency, those who would be selected for actual military service would already have been basically trained.

That difference may be as much as a year's time. That difference may be the margin between the survival and the destruction of this great Nation.

The emphasis in the training of our young men will not be on mere drilling. It will be on the use of all the instruments and weapons of modern warfare. The training will offer every qualified young man a chance to perfect himself for the service of his country in some military specialty.

Under the plan which I propose, provisions should be made within the armed services to help trainees improve their educational status. The year of universal training should provide ample opportunity for self-improvement.

Some part of the training could be used to develop skills which would be useful in future civilian life just as such skills have been developed during the present war.

The period of training could well be used to raise the physical standards of the Nation's manpower, to lower its illiteracy rate, and to develop in our young men the ideals of responsible American citizenship.

Medical examinations of the young trainees would do much toward removing some of the minor disabilities which caused the rejection of so many men during this war by the Selective Service System.

The moral and spiritual welfare of our young people should be a consideration of prime importance, and, of course, facilities for worship in every faith would be available.

But the basic reason for universal training is a very simple one—to guarantee the safety and freedom of the United States against any potential

aggressor. The other benefits are all byproducts—useful indeed, but still byproducts. The fundamental need is, and always will be, the national security of the United States, and the safety of our homes and our loved ones.

Since training alone is involved, and not actual military service, no exemptions should be allowed for occupation, dependency, or for any other reason except total physical disqualification.

All men should be included in the training, whether physically qualified for actual combat service or not. There should be a place into which every young American can fit in the service of our country. Some would be trained for combat, others would be trained for whatever war service they are physically and mentally qualified to perform.

I recommend that the training should be for 1 year. Each young man should enter training either at the age of 18 or upon his graduation from high school, whichever is later, but in any event before his twentieth birthday. A trainee who completes his high-school education in his seventeenth year should be eligible, with parental consent, to enter the course of training.

After the first few months of training selected trainees who are not physically qualified for military service could be trained in certain skills, so that if war came, they could take their places in shipyards, munitions factories, and similar industrial plants.

Upon completion of the full year's training, the trainee would become a member of the General Reserve for a period of 6 years. After that he should be placed in a secondary reserve status.

Present personnel in the Army and Navy Reserves would, of course, be retained, and the new trainees would provide the source from which the Reserves of the future would draw their personnel.

Commissions would be granted to qualified men who complete the course of training and who then take additional instruction in officer candidate schools, in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps. Outstanding trainees could be selected after an adequate period of training and sent to college with Government financial aid on condition that they return, after graduation and with ROTC training, as junior officers for a year or more of additional training or service.

Such a system as I have outlined would provide a democratic and efficient military force. It would be a constant bulwark in support of our ideals of government. It would constitute the backbone of defense against any possible future act of aggression.

It have been suggested in some quarters that there should be no universal training until the shape of the peace is better known and until the military needs of this country can be estimated and our commitments under the United Nations Organization can be determined. But it is impossible today to foresee the future. It is difficult at any time to know exactly what our responsibilities will require in the way of force. We do know that if we are to have available a force when needed the time to begin preparing is now.

The need exists today—and must be met today.

If, at some later time, conditions change, then the program can be reexamined and revalued.

At the present time we have the necessary organization, the required camp installations, and the essential equipment and training grounds immediately available for use in a training program. Once we disband and scatter this set-up, it will be much harder and more expensive to reestablish the necessary facilities.

The argument has been made that compulsory training violates traditional American concepts of liberty and democracy, and even that it would endanger our system of government by creating a powerful military caste. The purpose of the program, however, is just the contrary. And it will have just the contrary result. The objective is not to train professional soldiers. It is to train citizens, so that if and when the Congress should declare it necessary for them to become soldiers, they could do so more quickly and more efficiently.

A large trained reserve of peace-loving citizens would never go to war or encourage war, if it could be avoided.

It is no valid argument against adopting universal training at this time that there are now millions of trained veterans of this war. No fair-minded person would suggest that we continue to rely indefinitely upon these veterans. They have earned the heart-felt gratitude of all of us—and also they have earned the right to return promptly to civilian life. We must now look to our younger men to constitute the new reserve military strength of our Nation.

There are some who urge that the development of rocket weapons and atomic bombs and other new weapons indicates that scientific research, rather than universal training, is the best way to safeguard our security.

It is true that, if we are to keep ahead in military preparedness, continuous research in science and new weapons is essential. That is why in my message to the Congress of September 6 I urged that there be created a national research agency, one of whose major functions would be to carry on fundamental military research.

It is true that there must be continuous exploration into new fields of science in order to keep ahead in the discovery and manufacture of new weapons. No matter what the cost, we cannot afford to fall behind in any of the new techniques of war or in the development of new weapons of destruction.

Until we are sure that our peace machinery is functioning adequately, we must relentlessly preserve our superiority on land and sea and in the air. Until that time, we must also make sure that by planning—and by actual production—we have on hand at all times sufficient weapons of the latest nature and design with which to repel any sudden attack, and with which to launch an effective counterattack.

That is the only way we can be sure—until we are sure that there is another way.

But research, new materials, and new weapons will never, by themselves, be sufficient to withstand a powerful enemy. We must have men trained to use these weapons. As our armed forces become more and more mechanized, and as they use more and more complicated weapons, we must have an ever-increasing number of trained men. Technological advances do not eliminate the need for men. They increase the need.

General of the Army George C. Marshall, in his recent report to the Secretary of War, has made this very clear. I quote from his report:

> The number of men that were involved in the delivery of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima was tremendous. First we had to have the base in the Marianas from which the plane took off. This first required preliminary operations across the vast Pacific, thousands of ships, millions of tons of supply, the heroic efforts of hundreds of thousands of men. Further, we needed the B-29's and their fighter escort which gave us control of the air over Japan. This was the result of thousands of hours of training and preparation in the United States and the energies of hundreds of thousands of men.
>
> The effect of technology on the military structure is identical to its effect on national economy. Just as the automobile replaced the horse and made work for millions of Americans, the atomic explosives will require the services of millions of men if we are compelled to employ them in fighting our battles.
>
> This war has made it clear that the security of the Nation, when challenged by an armed enemy, requires the services of virtually all able-bodied male citizens within the effective military age group.

Even the atomic bomb would have been useless to us unless we had developed a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force with which to beat off the attacks of our foe, and then fight our way to points within striking distance of the heart of the enemy.

Assume that on December 7, 1941, the United States had had a supply of atomic bombs in New Mexico or Tennessee. What could we have done with them?

Assume that the United States and Japan both had had a supply of the bombs on December 7, 1941. Which would have survived?

Suppose that both England and Germany had had the atomic bomb in September of 1940 during the "blitz" over England. Which country would have been destroyed?

The answer is clear that the atomic bomb is of little value without an adequate Army, Air, and Naval Force. For that kind of force is necessary to protect our shores, to overcome any attack, and to enable us to move forward and direct the bomb against the enemy's own territory.

Every new weapon will eventually bring some counterdefense against it. Our ability to use either a new weapon or a counterweapon will ultimately depend upon a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force, with all the millions of men needed to supply them—all quickly mobilized and adequately equipped.

Any system which is intended to guarantee our national defense will, of course, cause some inconvenience—and perhaps even some hardship—to our people. But we must balance that against the danger which we face unless we are realistic and hard-headed enough to be prepared. Today universal training is the only ade-

quate answer we have to our problem in this troubled world.

There will be better answers, we hope, in the days to come. The United States will always strive for those better answers—for the kind of tried and tested world cooperation which will make for peace and harmony among all nations. It will continue to strive to reach that period quickly. But that time has not yet arrived.

Even from those who are loudest in their opposition to universal training, there has come no other suggestion to furnish the protection and security which we must have—nothing but pious hope and dangerous wishful thinking.

I urge that the Congress pass this legislation promptly—while the danger is still fresh in our minds—while we still remember how close we came to destruction 4 years ago—while we can vividly recall the horrors of invasion which our allies suffered—and while we can still see all the ravages and ruin of war.

Let us not by a short-sighted neglect of our national security betray those who come after us.

It is our solemn duty in this hour of victory to make sure that in the years to come no possible aggressor or group of aggressors can endanger the national security of the United States of America. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m. the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m. the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The message of the President will the referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a list of reclamation projects.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 24, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in executive session, on Wednesday, October 24, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. Wednesday, October 24, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full-employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing, to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on Friday, October 26, 1945, on the following: House Concurrent Resolution 85, House Concurrent Resolution 86, House Concurrent Resolution 91, and House Joint Resolution 245, declaring the date of termination of hostilities in the present war. The hearing will begin at 10:30 a. m. and will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Wednesday, October 24, at 10 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

795. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of June 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

796. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting three statements constituting a report with respect to the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

797. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McKENZIE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2543. A bill to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4467. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 4468. A bill to grant to veterans additional opportunities with respect to the purchase of surplus property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 4469. A bill to grant to veterans of the present war a temporary exclusion from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4470. A bill to amend the act authorizing the commencement and conduct of legal proceedings under the direction of the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 4471. A bill to provide for the discharge or release of certain persons from the military and naval forces and to postpone the induction of others; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of Cuba, agreeing to the motion that upon each anniversary of the independence of the American Republics, the flag of the corresponding nations be flown at the palace at the capital, to the right of the national colors, as a tribute of sympathy and compenetration of ideals of the people of Cuba to a brother people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4472. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Oscar A. Lawson; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4473. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Ed Gearhart; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4474. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Stanley Rensvold; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4475. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John Delbert Schneider; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4476. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to M. J. Schwinden; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4477. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in

the State of Montana to James A. Cody; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4478. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Leroy E. Cody; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. R. 4479. A bill for the relief of William E. Robertson and Estelle Robertson; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 22, 1945)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, who knowest our necessities before we ask and our ignorance in asking, have compassion, we beseech Thee, upon our infirmities; strengthen us in all noble impulses and daily increase in us the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and knowledge and true godliness. Dowered with privileges as no other nation, may our high estate be to us Thy call to protect the weak and exploited, that through the potent ministry of our dear land all peoples of the earth may be blessed. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 23, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1383. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864;

H. R. 239. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark;

H. R. 240. An act for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks;

H. R. 390. An act to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924;

H. R. 1104. An act to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 1465. An act for the relief of the State of California;

H. R. 1563. An act for the relief of N. Owen Oxley and the legal guardian of Lamar Oxley, a minor;

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis;

H. R. 2668. An act to transfer Ben Hill County, Ga., from the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia to the Americus division of the middle judicial district of Georgia; and

H. R. 3220. An act to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FILED DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 23d instant,

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, reported it on October 23, 1945, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 655) thereon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

JUNE 1945 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Corporation for the month of June 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LAND ACQUISITIONS FOR PARKS, PARKWAYS, AND PLAYGROUNDS, NATIONAL CAPITAL

A letter from the Acting Executive Officer of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with the accompanying list); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Forty-sixth National Encamptment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, assembled in Chicago, Ill., favoring preservation of American economy and national self interest; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Local Union No. 1587, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Hutchinson, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a Missouri Valley Authority; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 765. A bill concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States and on the international air-transport routes from the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 656).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1259. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 657);

S. 1425. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.," approved June 8, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 658); and

H. R. 4083. A bill authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 659).

By Mr. KNOWLAND, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 3870. A bill to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the Harry L. Englebright Dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 669).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Winfred Alexander; without amendment (Rept. No. 660);

H. R. 1630. A bill for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 661); and

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 662).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart; without amendment (Rept. No. 663).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1560. A bill for the relief of J. B. Grigsby; without amendment (Rept. No. 664); and

H. R. 3453. A bill for the relief of John W. Farrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 665).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Ida M. Raney; with an amendment (Rept. No. 666);

S. 815. A bill for the relief of Ogden and Dougherty, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 667); and

S. 1158. A bill for the relief of Winter Bros. Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 668).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1508. A bill to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1509. A bill relating to investment of trust funds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. MURRAY (by request) introduced Senate bill 1510, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1511. A bill for the relief of the Cox Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1512. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the U. S. S. *Mississippi* to the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1513. A bill to make the increase in base pay of enlisted men of the armed forces, provided by section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, retroactive to September 1, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1514. A bill for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1515. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maude L. Groner; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1516. A bill to amend section 12 of the Bonneville Project Act, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1517. A bill for the relief of Lofts & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1518. A bill relating to the taxation by State and local taxing units of certain real property sold by the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

RETURN OF OPERATION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO THE STATES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of Labor, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the return of public-employment offices to State operation.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1510) to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

JERUSALEM FOR THE JEWS—STATEMENT BY DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Jerusalem for the Jews," by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ATOMIC BOMB—BROADCAST BY TRISTRAM COFFIN

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by Tristram Coffin giving an account of a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce considering the question of the control of atomic energy, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM FOR MILITARY TRAINING—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post of October 24, 1945, dealing with the President's program for military training, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE NEGRO DISILLUSIONED—ARTICLE BY DEMPS ALEXANDER ODEN

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "The Negro Disillusioned," by Demps Alexander Oden, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF WAR—STATEMENT BY TOM BURNS

[Mr. CORDON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "To Prevent War," by Tom Burns, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the Senate during the luncheon hour because of a speaking engagement elsewhere in Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN GENERAL MOTORS AND THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to make a statement in connection with the strike situation.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it a brief statement?

Mr. MURRAY. It is.

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Montana for a brief statement.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram from Walter Reuther, vice president and director of the General Motors department, United Automobile Workers, CIO, briefly setting forth labor's side of the controversy between General Motors and the United Automobile Workers. This telegram carries its own important message to the Members of the Senate, and I ask permission to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appeal to you, as chairman of the Senate Education and Labor Committee, to bring immediately to the attention of the Senate the fact that President Charles E. Wilson, of General Motors, the largest corporation in the country, has formally given notice of a sit-down strike against the announced Government policy of raising wage rates to maintain take-home pay wherever such increases do not require price increases.

Mr. Wilson has delivered an "either or" ultimatum to the Government, the people of the United States, and the 350,000 General Motors workers, as proved by verbatim excerpts from the official General Motors transcript of his October 19 press conference here in Detroit following a flying trip to Washington for a conference with President Truman. Either, says Mr. Wilson, the Government will have to raise prices, labor will have to take the present 23-percent cut in take-home pay, or the Congress must amend the Wages and Hours Act to increase the normal workweek to 45 hours. If Congress will jump through the hoop at General Motors command, then, says Mr. Wilson, General Motors will increase hourly wage rates 5 to 8 percent and pay overtime above 45 hours. If none of these ultimatums is accepted, Mr. Wilson said General Motors will push out sample cars to dealers throughout the country and then go on a sit-down strike, relying on public opinion to force Congress to take the backward step of increasing the workweek to 45 hours at a time when 8,000,000 unemployed within the year are anticipated. General Motors wants a strike; that is plain. It is baiting labor; it is baiting the Government; it is planning to use its vast economic power and propaganda machine to coerce Congress. Before citing, with page numbers, the verbatim transcript of Mr. Wilson's October 19 disclosure of the General Motors plan to go on strike to enforce its own ideas of the shape of our postwar economy, may I remind you that this Mr. Wilson is the man and General Motors is the corporation that in 1941 went on a sit-down strike against conversion from peace to war production until it was able to write virtually its own terms. At that time Mr. Wilson told the National Defense Mediation Board: "A strike might be a bad thing for General Motors but a good thing for the Nation."

Here are Mr. Wilson's own words excerpted from the General Motors report of his press conference:

"Question. Mr. Wilson, in the event that labor does get its increase—15 percent, 20 percent, 25 percent, or 30 percent—and there is not a satisfactory increase in price, will General Motors close down or what will it do?

"Mr. WILSON. Well, of course it would gradually run out of soap and close down, or it could do it ahead of time. We actually have had suppliers now that said: 'No; we won't take the business.' The Government is having the textile manufacturers now who are being asked to make the cheaper grades of textiles at a very low price say: 'No; we will shut down.'

"Question. But you said you did not see much chance of getting the wage-price solution—the thing that we are up against now.

"Mr. WILSON. We have already made the decision. The answer is 'No.'

"Question. Mr. Wilson, will you qualify the statement that you made a little earlier to the effect that you did not think this wage-price problem will be solved in time?

"Mr. WILSON. To avoid serious strikes. I do not. I am afraid it cannot be.

"Question. Mr. Snyder has referred to 23 percent increase in the cost of living of the workers. Now if your production-standards efficiency were maintained as before the war and your volume were as good as you expect it to be after the war, all things being equal, could you grant the workers a 23 percent wage increase and stay in business?

"Mr. WILSON. You mean at the same prices?

"Question. Yes.

"Mr. WILSON. No; we could not.

"Question. I have a simple question, Mr. Wilson. All these divisions have reported their divisions in production, and these cars are accumulating. You have no price formula to sell them. I assume you are not going to keep them. You are going to send them out to the dealers. How are you going to sell them without a price program, without a price being set?

"Mr. WILSON. We usually get enough cars in the hands of dealers so that everybody was ready to do business before we said that is the price. We are hoping that by the time we get the cars in that shape we will have this problem solved. It is either going to be solved or our plants are all going to be shut down completely and we don't have any cars accumulating. So one of the two is going to happen.

"Question. Has General Motors given your final answer on this wage increase, and what is your real position on it?

"Mr. WILSON. Our real position on it and the answer has been given; is that there is no increase that we can or will give at this time under the present wage-price formulas of the country as we understand them. If they are changed, we will talk about another set of conditions. If they are not changed, I suppose we will have a strike unless the men get sensible about it."

Although General Motors refuses to negotiate, to discuss our demands, to try to disprove our contentions and our economic brief, and arrogantly declares that negotiations are none of the public's business unless and until they have been broken off and result in a strike, the UAW (CIO) will continue to present the proof of its demands to the corporation and simultaneously to the press, radio, and the American people. We have made a fair offer to the corporation and to the public. If our contentions can be disproved, we will compromise. Unless and until they are, we will not concede one red cent.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
Vice President and Director,
GM Department, UAW (CIO).

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the telegram from Mr. Reuther deals with such a vitally significant situation that I am prompted to make certain additional remarks at this time.

The struggle between labor and management in the General Motors industry involves directly the welfare of 350,000 workers and in numerous ways touches the lives of many thousands; yes, even millions of our citizens. The President of the United States has held conferences with the leading figures in this controversy. The Congress has had management's position presented to it in a document entitled "Danger on the Production Front." The daily press of the Nation has headlined this sharply drawn issue as the No. 1 labor-management controversy of the Nation. How thoroughly it is understood and what is done in settling it will establish a pattern which may well become the way of dealing with other labor-management problems now harassing our national life.

We have come through a long and hard-fought war in which management and labor have done their utmost to provide the sinews of strength which enabled our armed forces to press on to victory. Now, as we reconvert our vast wartime machinery to the pursuits of peace, what happens in the largest corporation in the Nation and in one of its greatest industries will influence all of us.

Labor has proposed to General Motors Corp. that an increase in pay to employed workers be made which will offset the 23-percent cut in take-home pay which has resulted since VJ-day. Labor has pointed out that the financial structure and earnings of the General Motors Corp. make such a wage adjustment possible without increasing the cost of automobiles to the buying public.

Mr. Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corp., has declared, following a conference with President Truman, that either the Government will have to raise prices, labor will have to take the present 23-percent cut in take-home pay, or the Congress must amend the Wages and Hours Act to increase the normal workweek to 45 hours. Were the Congress to legislate this longer workweek, the result would be, Mr. President, a substantial increase in the number of jobless workers throughout the Nation. In view of this disastrous prospect, the move suggested by the president of General Motors is unthinkable. There remains, then, a demand for increased prices of product or continuing the reduction in the size of pay envelopes which has already lowered the standard of living of automobile workers by one-fourth. Neither alternative offers any prospect of continuing high levels of production and employment.

In contrast with these, there is the proposal of the automobile workers themselves. It is in keeping with the position of the present administration to maintain the take-home pay of workers and at the same time to prevent sharp increases in the cost of goods to the consuming public. The United Automobile Workers have declared that such a proposal as contained in their brief to the General Motors Corp. is completely possible.

In summarizing their telegram to me, they say "We have made a fair offer to the corporation and to the public. If our contentions can be disproved, we will compromise. Unless and until they are, we will not concede one red cent."

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, the problems of which I have spoken, freighted so heavily with great concern to all American citizens, are to be solved in most particulars by the actions of the administrative branch of this Government. The issue is properly before the President and Secretary of Labor for solution. I know they have already taken necessary first steps to find an adequate solution. I am confident that they will do all that is necessary and in their power to prevent the catastrophe of a major strike affecting so many millions of our people.

Mr. President, it is vitally important that both sides to this controversy make clear to the American people without equivocation or deception the facts upon which they stand. They owe an obligation to the American people to prevent the dangerous consequences of a strike which will demoralize the country. Both sides must take the public into their full confidence and give a straightforward, honest statement of the facts so that the American people may know whether this demanded increase in wages may be made without an increase in prices.

On the part of labor, a clear-cut statement of the facts has been presented in a brief which I ask to be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Labor has stated it is willing to recede from its demand or adjust its proposal in view of any new facts developed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 1945.

PURCHASING POWER FOR PROSPERITY—IN THE MATTER OF INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (CIO) AND GENERAL MOTORS CORP.—THE CASE FOR MAINTAINING TAKE-HOME PAY WITHOUT INCREASING PRICES

ECONOMIC BRIEF—PART I

(Presented by Walter P. Reuther, vice president, director, General Motors Department, UAW-CIO)

Letter of transmittal

CHARLES E. WILSON,
President, General Motors Corp.,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. WILSON: This brief is presented to General Motors Corp. in support of the demand of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO) for a 30-percent increase in basic wage rates in order to maintain take-home pay without any increase in the prices of General Motors products, and for other amendments of the agreement between this union and the corporation.

The demands of the union covered by the attached part I of our brief are based upon these considerations:

The GM workers' annual earnings will fall disastrously if present wage rates are continued in effect. A 30-percent increase in rates is imperative to maintain take-home pay and to prevent disastrous retreat, all along the line, from the national objective of maintaining the peacetime economy.

This is the first step toward a standard of living that is 50 percent higher than we have ever known—the standard of living of full production and full employment proclaimed by the National Government and pledged by both Presidential candidates in 1944.

While GM wage rates must be raised, GM prices must not be increased. For General Motors workers to demand wages so high as to require higher prices of automobiles would be against the public interest and would provide only a temporary gain to the workers. In the long run, higher prices limit sales and jobs.

Manufacturers of automobiles and other durable goods have a major responsibility in building purchasing power for the products of the entire economy. Their products will be in great demand. They will produce at capacity.

Unless these industries begin now to lead the way toward a far larger spending power in the hands of the people than we have ever known, their brief boom will collapse and they will carry the Nation back to a depression with 19,000,000 unemployed.

Part II will present proof that the corporation can meet the need described in part I, that the corporation can meet the union's demands and still have higher profits than ever before in its rich history of war and peace production.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
Vice President, Director, General Motors Department, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO).

DETROIT, *October 19, 1945.*

A. Maintenance of GM workers' wartime level of real wages—equivalent to 30 percent increase in present wage rates without price increase—is an indispensable "must" in order to prevent disastrous retreat from the national objectives of adequate purchasing power in the peacetime economy.

1. A 30-percent rise in present wage rates is necessary to approximate prereconversion take-home pay.

As a result of reconversion and the restoration of the 40-hour week, in place of the wartime scheduled week of 48 hours with overtime for the last 8 hours, GM workers who remain in jobs at the same straight-time hourly pay have sustained weekly pay cuts of 23⅓ percent. To undo these pay cuts and restore their take-home, their rates must be raised by 30 percent.

Large numbers of workers reemployed on peacetime work are being downgraded, with a resulting reduction in their hourly rates of pay. For workers who have taken a loss of 8 hours in overtime and a loss in basic wage rate through downgrading, the 30 percent increase over present rates will not completely restore the drop in their take-home pay.

Even giving consideration to the fact that the average realized workweek in 1943 and 1944 was less than 48 hours, a 30-percent rise in wages over present average pay schedules (which reflect much downgrading) will not quite bring the weekly take-home of the employed worker to the level of the war years.

2. Maintenance of take-home pay is absolutely essential if we are to undertake the national task of achieving a standard of living 50 percent above prewar levels.

a. In its 1940 annual report, GM stated (p. 28):

"The corporation recognizes the importance of improving the economic position of its workers from the standpoint of both their progress and stability, hence advancing their status in a fundamental way. Such a policy is not only socially desirable but economically necessary because of the vital importance of the purchasing power of the factory worker."

Thus GM has approved the principle of maintaining purchasing power in line with productive capacity.

b. In their report to the President on February 12, 1945, the public members of the NWLB said:

"As to the maintenance of purchasing power in the period of reconversion, the rate increases proposed for that purpose are really put forward as a first step toward the higher level of national economy and of real wages that we are looking forward to in the postwar period. As we go forward to a time of full conversion to peacetime economy after the war, the goal is a level of production, distribution and consumption high enough to absorb into peacetime production all the enormous capacity for production we have demonstrated in war. This means a level of civilian demand and purchasing power high enough to substantially replace all the present wartime demands of the Government. Any such level of civilian consumption means a very great increase in our standards of living. As we move out of the wastage of total war back to peacetime and the promise of the future, we will no longer be thinking or speaking about maintaining prewar wage standards. The cost of living adjustment of the Little Steel formula will have to give way to wage and price adjustments which definitely raise the general level of real wages" (page 27)

c. OWMR Director (now Secretary of Treasury) Vinson has authoritatively determined what this means in the present situation.

"The American people," he stated (Third OWMR Report, p. 57), "are in the pleasant predicament of having to learn to live 50 percent better than they have ever lived before. Only the defeatist can scoff at this inescapable fact that we must build our economy on that basis."

Secretary Vinson went on to say in this same report, "American business is coming to realize that a high wage policy is in the long-run interest of everyone because it helps create the markets necessary to move goods from farm and factory—to store shelves—to the homes of America. And these high wages are necessary to achievement of the high standard of living which we can and must attain. Labor will continue to bargain for higher wages and management is recognizing the right of collective bargaining as a proper part of an economic democracy."

This means a 50-percent increase in the real standard of living over 1940—as applied to 1939 it means an increase of approximately 75 percent. In the light of Government-stated objectives for the economy, our UAW-CIO demand for maintenance of the wartime level of take-home pay—without deterioration through price increases—not only is not exorbitant, but is elementary common sense. UAW-CIO does not ask for immediate attainment of the full Vinson objective. It asks that we do not slide back from levels already achieved.

3. Acceptance of present reduced wage levels would mean disastrous economic retreat.

The pay roll of General Motors in 1944 (hourly workers alone) amounted to nearly a billion dollars ($995,000,000). For 1946, even with the corporation's optimistic estimates on employment (235,000 hourly-rate workers) and assuming that the realized working week will be 40 hours, the pay roll would fall to $660,000,000. At a time when we are depending on the automobile industry and other durable-goods industries to take the place of Government war spending and to provide employment for the returning veterans, General Motors would be slashing consumer purchasing power by $335,000,000.

From the point of view of the individual worker the retreat would spell disaster:

In 1940 the average annual earnings of GM workers were	$1,804
To achieve the Vinson objective of a 50-percent increase in the standard of living above prewar, it is necessary—	
To increase 1940 wages by 50 percent	$2,706
And to adjust this for the 30-percent increase in cost of living since 1940	3,516

The necessary annual earnings are thus over $3,500. In 1944 the GM workers' average earnings were $2,960.

In 1946 the GM workers' average earnings at present wages rates and at 40 hours of work a week will be reduced to	$2,300
Leaving a deficit of more than	1,200

It should be noted that the 1946 earnings, under existing living costs, will buy slightly less than the 1940 earnings of $1,804.

Thus, after 6 years of war expansion and war production, during which the economy has expanded to the extent that a 50-percent increase in consumption is necessary to keep it going, the worker is back where he started.

If this policy were applied to all the workers of the country—if all workers had wages which permitted them to buy only the same amount of goods and services which they bought and consumed in 1940—it would quickly spell disaster for the whole country. The Department of Commerce study, Markets After the War, which was prepared for and circulated by the committee for economic development, an organization of businessmen, says plainly that a postwar physical production at 1940 levels means 19,000,000 unemployed.[1]

To be sure, the prediction of 19,000,000 unemployed will not be realized immediately, for, while workers will be paid at 1940 wage levels (in terms of purchasing power), consumption demand—and therefore production and employment—probably will be temporarily sustained at higher levels because of temporary pent-up demand at home and abroad. But eventually the payment of 1940 wages will give us 1940 levels of consumption and production, and that means 19,000,000 unemployed.

The strength of even this temporary demand may prove disappointing. Much of the alleged $140,000,000,000 of personal savings undoubtedly is in the hands of well-to-do persons who are looking for investment opportunities for the bulk of their savings. The study on Providing for Unemployed Workers in the Transition made by Richard Lester for the Committee for Economic Development, reviewed all the evidence available by the end of 1944 and concluded that "the bulk of the wartime saving by workers has occurred in families with an income above $3,000 a year. * * * At least a quarter, and probably a third, of the wage earners' families in this country had, by 1944, accumulated little, if any, savings, in spendable form."

Alvin H. Hansen, special economic adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, had this to say on war bonds, in January 1999:

"Of the $165,000,000,000 of Government bonds now outstanding, $105,000,000,000 are in the hands of institutions. * * * None of these is a potential spender in the consumer's market. * * * Of the remaining amounts, which are in the hands of individuals, only $25,000,000,000 are War Savings bonds, of a sort that are widely held by the people, of which at least a third are held by well-to-do people. So that (source of consumer demand) has been very greatly exaggerated."

The moderate character of the UAW-CIO 30-percent-wage demand is revealed by the fact that it only partly counteracts the drop in GM's contribution to purchasing power. Even with the restoration of the $3,000 annual take-home pay of 1944, the GM pay roll would still decline by $150,000,000 in 1946—again based on GM's optimistic forecast of GM employment. Similarly, as regards the individual standard of living, the UAW-CIO wage demand falls short of bringing the worker immediately up to the $3,500 called for by our postwar productive capacity. It would merely keep the worker's wage at the standard reached in 1944 and prevent it from dropping back to the 1940 wage.

B. In demanding that GM meet its wage demands without price increases, UAW-CIO is giving proof of its recognition of the requirements of national policy. Wage policy for the Nation requires that reconversion wage adjustment be absorbed (except in isolated cases) out of industry's existing price levels.

1. UAW-CIO does not base its demands on short-run selfish considerations, but is basing them on enlightened long-run considerations which identify the true interest of the union with the general interests of the public.

The UAW-CIO demands not only do not conflict with the public interest, but actively promote the public interest. The easy way to get wage increases is to conspire with industry to get price increases from OPA, getting wage demands met out of prices at the expense of the general public.

This is the philosophy of "The public be damned!" It is the philosophy which GM, in its newspaper ads—paid for to the extent of 85½ percent by the United States Treasury—is accusing us of following, although it is precisely the policy we rejected.

We do not want our wage demands met out of price increases. Our letter of August 18 serving our demands on General Motors so stated. General Motors well knows this, but will do its best to deny it in its appeals to the public.

By refusing to discuss with UAW-CIO its ability to pay without price increases, and by refusing to discuss its profits, GM has adopted a "public be damned" attitude not only for itself but as a model for other corporations to follow. It has told our negotiators that profits were none of our business, and since our interest in profits is to protect the public from any increase of prices by General Motors, its refusal to talk prices or profits is the equivalent of stating that these subjects are none of the public's business.

2. The present economic situation requires industry as a whole to make a liberal contribution to wage rises without increasing prices.

With a drastic cut in Government war expenditures, which will fall from an annual rate of $92,000,000,000 in July 1945 to an annual rate of $44,000,000,000 in the second quarter of 1946, every group but big business faces a severe deflation of its income and purchasing power. Only big business is set for a phenomenal increase in its take-home profits.

According to the published estimate of national income used in congressional tax calculations, the Nation's income for 1946 will be $130,000,000,000—20 percent down from the war level.

That estimate of national income for 1946 implies unemployment of 8,000,000, and a drop in total wages and salaries by some $20,000,000,000, or nearly 25 percent from 1944 levels. The most severe drop will occur in manufacturing pay rolls. Here the indicated drop in take-home pay for the average employed worker—due to loss of overtime, downgrading, and to shift to lower-pay industries—is 29 percent. Including the effect of decreased employment,

[1] "It seems almost certain that postwar output must exceed the best prewar year. If it should be no more than in 1940 there would be the 9,000,000 who were unemployed in 1940 plus the 2,500,000 added to the civilian labor force between 1940 and 1946 plus 8,000,000 who would be displaced by improvements in efficiency over the 6 years—a total of over 19,000,000 unemployed." (Markets After the War, p. 3.) Note that the study makes no allowance for the abnormal entries into labor market during the war, some part of whom may be expected to remain and swell the ranks of the unemployed.

the drop in manufacturing pay rolls is estimated at 42 percent.

Agricultural income, which always follows closely the trend of urban wages and salaries, is expected to suffer a drop of 25 percent or $3,000,000,000 in 1946—going from $12,400,000,000 in 1944 to about $9,500,000,000 in 1946.

While retail sales and small business generally will for the moment maintain their wartime levels of prosperity, this will be due to a temporary factor—the spurt in durable-goods sales, representing a pent-up demand from the war, financed by wartime savings put aside for that purpose. For a time this will compensate for and cover up the serious decline in the market for nondurable goods due to declining levels of current income among workers and farmers.

Big business alone will be more prosperous than ever before. While corporation profits before taxes are expected to fall from the 1944 levels of $25,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000 in 1946, corporation take-home profits after taxes (thanks in part to the repeal of the excess-profits tax) will rise from $9,900,000,000 to $11,000,000,000. This estimate takes no account of the disguised profits through padded amortization allowances which the law permits, nor the generous refunds on both the excess-profits taxes and the ordinary corporation income taxes which will be given to individual corporations that fall below their base-period profits or sustain operating losses.

Nowhere will this unprecedented prosperity of business in the midst of general decline of national income be so marked as in the case of manufacturing. Profits of manufacturing corporations before taxes are estimated for 1946 at $11,000,000,000 as against $15,000,000,000 in 1944. But the profit take-home after taxes will rise from $5,000,000,000 in 1944 to $6,500,000,000 in 1946. The take-home profits of manufacturing corporations during the peacetime years 1936–39 averaged $2,100,000,000.

These estimates probably make insufficient allowance for the decline in manufacturing costs due to elimination of overtime and to downgrading, as well as to increased labor productivity. After the last war, labor productivity in manufacturing rose by 10 percent a year for 3 years straight. Since the technological progress in this war has been far greater than in World War I, the rise in labor productivity, when industry is fully converted, should be even more pronounced than in 1919, 1920, and 1921. United States Commissioner of Labor Statistics Ford Hinrichs recently testified before a Senate committee that this would probably prove to be the case.

3. To tolerate the existing wage-profit trends is to invite a crash in 1947 or 1948 which will make the great depression a minor recession by comparison.

Prosperity predicted for 1946 is a false prosperity—it is a prosperity for everybody but the people. It is built on the principle of paying business more for producing less and for employing fewer people. It is built on the shifting sands of pent-up demand instead of on the solid rock of giving the workers enough purchasing power to buy back the goods they currently produce.

Our economy could not tolerate in 1929 the high business profit and large savings of the wealthy of that year even though the economy was then operating at close to full employment and the national income as a whole was rising. How can it tolerate the even higher profit margins of 1946 at a time of mass unemployment and sharp drop in the national income?

If in 1929 we could not invest the business profits and the savings of the wealthy for expanding our productive capacity, because there wasn't enough purchasing power at the base to buy the products of expanded industry, how can we hope to do so in 1946 when the mass purchasing power is even smaller and when we have inherited a greatly expanded productive capacity from the war? Early in 1946 the necessary reconversion expenditures to adapt our war economy to peace will already have been made, and we shall face the impossible task of finding investment expansion outlets for thirty to thirty-five billion dollars a year at a time when our productive capacity already is far too big for the mass purchasing power that is available.

Only if business joins labor in immediate action to readjust the wage-price relationship can the Nation be put in a position to cope with the tremendous problems of managing our $200,000,000,000 economy without a disastrous tailspin and crash.

The demands of labor for wage adjustments without price increase are not intended to solve the whole economic problem overnight. Other measures on the part of business, labor, and Government will be necessary as the country gets its bearings. But we must begin now by maintaining take-home pay and remedying substandard and inequitable wages, or we shall be confessing defeat before we start. We shall be advertising to the world that American business is so greedy for immediate (but unstable) profits that it insists upon them even at the price of sentencing the whole economy and itself to disaster.

C. Manufacturers of durable goods, especially automobiles, have a major responsibility to promote full employment by raising wages without increasing prices.

1. Pent-up demand for their products will give them a ready market for capacity volume.

The effect of increasing volume on reducing unit costs and increasing profits is an old story, but never in peacetime have producers been presented with the bonanza of being able to plan in advance for capacity production for a guaranteed market. The profit prospects for durable goods industries, especially automobiles, are the brightest in history as a result of 4 years' interruption of production.

The profit potential of the durable-goods industries producing for this guaranteed market is revealed by their own reports to the War Production Board. Their reports show break-even points of 50.6 percent for the durable-goods manufacturers as a whole, exclusive of automobiles, and 55 percent for the automobile industry alone. These forecasts—made by industry—are forecasts of immense profits on production at capacity levels. In the nature of the case these estimates err on the conservative side, since a manufacturer is not likely to exaggerate in a report to the Government of his ability to draw a profit at a very low percentage of capacity. A realistic analysis of the break-even points of these industries undoubtedly would show them at much lower figures, possibly in the neighborhood of 30 percent.

Even if their peacetime profit margin were low, durable-goods manufacturers, presented with the bonanza of capacity production, would now be under the obligation to the public to renegotiate their profits with labor and with the consumer. The durable-goods producers did not by their own efforts create the present capacity markets for their products; that has been done for them by the war and by the sacrifices which the people had to make for the war, at a time when durable-goods manufacturers were being well paid indeed for producing war materials. The bonanza profits of pent-up demand—profits which are now to be relieved of excess-profits taxes—cannot be regarded as the producers' own business—they are in very large part the concern and business of the public and the concern and business of labor as well.

2. The peacetime profit position and the general financial situation of the durable-goods industries has been far more favorable than those of other industries.

OPA profits studies show that nondurable goods manufacturers' profits before taxes, expressed as a percentage of invested capital, was 8.8 a year for 1936–39 and rose to 16.1 for the boom year 1941. The same figures for durable-goods producers (excluding automobiles and equipment) were 9.7 for 1936–39, and 30.4 for 1941. For automobiles and equipment the 1936–39 average was 19.4, and the 1941 return was 42.5. When it is borne in mind that the durable-goods manufacturers, when converted to war production, operated in the excess-profits brackets and thus have substantial tax cushions in addition to the guaranteed markets on their production for pent-up demand, there is no financial excuse for their not taking the lead in a wage policy that is geared to the objective of sustained full purchasing power for the products of full employment.

3. The country looks to the durable-goods industries to provide a sound basis for postwar prosperity, and it is up to these industries—and particularly to the automobile industry—to convert the present pent-up demand into a large and permanent reservoir of demand through wider distribution of purchasing power.

The pent-up demand for durables, under conditions of declining national income, is too small and too slight a base upon which to build permanently either the prosperity of the durable-goods industries or the prosperity of the country. All postwar planning studies, including that of the Committee for Economic Development, indicate that to utilize our postwar productive capacity we shall all have to consume about 50 percent more goods and services than in 1940. But in many of the nondurable fields we are already close to the optimum limits of consumption—at least under present distribution of income. Therefore, the needed expansion of consumption will have to come to a very large extent in the durable-goods sectors. It is this potential increase of durable-goods consumption which the durable-goods industries can actively promote if they will adopt a wage policy that provides the necessary purchasing power, while holding prices down so that the wages may buy the total product.

By similar means, years ago, the automobile industry received its original burst of development—it set the style of high wages for the country as a whole, and the automobile industry thus benefited not only from the high purchasing power of its own workers but from the high purchasing power of workers generally.

As Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, vice president of the Brookings Institution, writes in his epoch-making book, Price Making in a Democracy (pp. 266–267):

"Henry Ford early came to the conclusion that even cheap automobiles could not be sold (in numbers needed for low-cost technique) in a society in which workingmen earned only two or three dollars a day. As early as 1914 he took the revolutionary step of adopting a $5-a-day minimum for his factory labor (then getting an average of $2.40) and raised it shortly to a $6 minimum. The results not only appeared to satisfy him but to impress other automobile companies so much that similar raises were made by them, and the practice spread to other lines of industry. Payment of high wages came to be regarded as an important factor in the industrial prosperity of the twenties and became the object of study even by industrial delegations from abroad. Undoubtedly the fact that practically every workman whose pay was raised by automobile and other manufacturers had an ambition to possess an automobile (even a Ford) led to a favorable sales response to his action."

The time has arrived for a repeat order on this policy, adapted to the wage-price-profit facts of life as they are today. Today's giant successors to the Ford of 1914 frequently recall with pride the courage of this bold initiative, but they have long since forgotten

to follow his example. By repeating the high-wage policy of its pioneers, the automobile industry, along with all durable-goods manufacturers, has the opportunity to open the door of America upon the glittering economic realities of our full production potential. They can phenomenally and permanently expand their own markets. At the same time they can help to build markets for other industries and for farmers and service industries and doctors and teachers and others. So doing, these industries will play the leading part that is theirs in insuring the general prosperity of the Nation.

D. The time to adjust wages (without increasing prices) is now.

1. The contention of business that it is necessary to wait for full production before adjusting wages means that the workers will bear the bulk of the costs of reconversion.

Workers are already bearing the unemployment cost of reconversion. They must not be required to bear the additional burden of reduced wage rates on the theory that large profits may not come for another 3 to 6 months. The developmental cost of any business operation is recognized as a charge on capital, not as a charge on labor.

2. Business is exceptionally well-heeled as a result of wartime operations and generous contract settlements and has been granted excess-profits tax carry-backs as an extra insurance to meet the developmental costs of reconversion.

General Motors alone is eligible to draw back as much as $160,000,000 from the United States Treasury in 1945 and in 1946 if profits during these 2 years fall below base-period earnings. This excess-profits tax carry-back privilege was granted to business to encourage it to use every effort to maintain employment, production, and purchasing power. If there is any risk in granting decent wages to workers, it has been specifically provided for by the excess-profits tax carry-back privilege.

3. Congress in drastically cutting business taxes now in order to stimulate business expansion has recognized that the time to stimulate the economy is now and that it is dangerous to procrastinate.

The whole style of the postwar economy is being set now. The action of business on wages is determining whether we intend to maintain permanent prosperity on a broad base of mass-purchasing power or whether we shall have a brief period of prosperity for the few followed by an economic collapse for all. In 1946, when the reconversion boom will be past its peak, and the cut in mass income will begin to show its permanent effects, a revision of wages from present levels will be insufficient to check the drift toward collapse. We shall then be hell-bent for depression, and the moderate remedies which can be applied now will be insufficient then.

4. A courageous stand on wages now will not destroy profits but will result in greater long-run profits for business.

Mass purchasing power is our new frontier, and only by developing this new frontier can business maintain the source of prosperity from which profits flow. This is not radical doctrine—this is conservative doctrine.

It has been emphasized by the Temporary National Economic Committee of the United States Congress. It has been endorsed by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations and their supporters in Congress. It is endorsed by such a body as the Brookings Institution:

"Inadequate buying power among the masses of people," it says, "appears to be fundamentally responsible for the persistent failure to call forth our productive powers. It has been shown that the standards of living desired for the American people as a whole can be atttained only if we somehow greatly increase the national output of goods and services. Our problem is to determine whether the flow of the income stream can be so modified as to expand progressively the effective demand for goods."

We repeat the statement of Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, reporting as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion to the President July 1, 1945:

"American business is coming to realize that a high-wage policy is in the long-run interest of everyone because it helps create the markets necessary to move goods from farm and factory—to store shelves—to the homes of America."

ECONOMIC BRIEF—PART II, SECTION 1

Letter of transmittal

CHARLES E. WILSON,
President, General Motors Corp.,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Herewith is presented part II, section 1 of the brief in support of the demand of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO) for a 30-percent increase in basic wage rates in order to maintain take-home pay without any increase in the price of General Motors products and for other amendments of the agreement between this union and the corporation.

Part I, presented to the Corporation on October 19, 1945, set forth the need of GM workers and the entire economy for such maintenance of take-home pay, if we are to make the transition and full employment for peace on a stable and lasting basis. We showed that failure of General Motors and other durable goods manufacturers to raise wages without increasing prices will create a false prosperity lasting only a year or two, followed by the worst depression in our history. We showed that the first step toward a full production and full employment economy in which Americans could have the purchasing power (the wages) to consume 50 percent more than ever before is the increase of wage rates to maintain take-home pay. We stressed the interest of farmers and businessmen in thus maintaining the market for their products.

Part II, section 1 of our brief proves that:

"General Motors can pay the increase in wage rates; it can do so without increasing the prices of its products; it can do it now.

"General Motors before the war could have paid substantially higher wages without increasing prices and still have had high profits—even at the relatively low levels of output then prevailing.

"General Motors in the prewar year, 1941, received more in profits (before taxes) for each man-hour worked by GM workers than it paid out in wages. The GM worker produced $1.07 for his family and $1.09 for GM stockholders every hour he worked in 1941."

Later sections of part II will show that increased volume of output, together with higher labor productivity in postwar production, will greatly increase GM profits on each hour worked by every GM worker, and therefore will reinforce its ability to pay the increased wage rates without any increase in the price of its products. We will show, finally, that because of its cash reserves, its new equipment furnished during the war at public expense and the many aids and insurances given by the tax laws, the corporation cannot lose. It can pay 30 percent higher wage rates without higher prices and still get into profitable production early in 1946, well before it reaches anticipated capacity production.

Its first full year of postwar production will be astonishingly profitable.

As a supplement to part I of our brief, which I presented October 19, I am presenting the New York Times October 18 report of certain statements on wages, prices, and the welfare of the Nation's economy made by Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion John W. Snyder. You will find that he confirms and supports the facts and logic upon which we base our demand for 30-percent increase of wage rates without increase of prices.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
Vice President, Director,
General Motors Department, UAW-CIO.
OCTOBER 23, 1945.

[From the New York Times of October 18, 1945]

SNYDER SAYS WAGES CAN BE RAISED BY INDUSTRY WITHOUT PRICE INCREASES—WITH OVERTIME GONE, COSTS ARE LOWER, HE TELLS CONNECTICUT MANUFACTURERS — EXCESS-PROFITS TAX WILL HELP

NEW HAVEN, CONN., October 17.—John W. Snyder, Reconversion Director, said today that because of decreased production costs "many industries should be able to grant wage increases that will not in turn mean price increases."

But, he added, a "sizable number" of others would have high production costs for some months yet.

Addressing the annual meeting and reconversion conference of the Connecticut Manufacturers Association, Mr. Snyder said the industries which ought to be able to grant wage increases were those now in production who were basing their prices "on the old cost of labor under the overtime conditions" which were done away with when the war ended.

"The proposed reduction of the wartime excess-profits tax, which took up to 85 percent of the higher wartime profits, will also assist industry to raise wages where necessary without raising prices," he asserted.

He conceded that for a sizable number of businesses the task of retooling, finding new markets, and evolving new patterns of distribution would keep unit costs of production relatively high for some months.

LABOR DEMANDS UNDERSTANDABLE

Declaring that with the end of overtime pay labor's demands for higher wages were understandable, Mr. Snyder said:

"The take-home price of the essentials of life remains high; the workers' take-home pay has fallen. Squeezed in that vise, the worker can do only two things—either he gets more money, or he has to reduce his standard of living. With a reduced standard of living, he will buy less, the purchasing power of the market will suffer, and manufacturers will feel it ultimately in reduced orders."

Whether wage increases could be granted, and to what extent, depended, Mr. Snyder said, on the answer to this "common-sense question":

"How much of an increase can the individual company afford to pay if it is left to meet its pay rolls and stay in business?"

He urged labor and management to work together to achieve cost reductions which could be passed on to workers in higher pay and to consumers in lower prices.

CALLS FOR EXPANDING OUTPUT

Mr. Snyder said "reconversion" was an unfortunate term to describe the phase through which industry was now going because it carried with it a sense of going back.

"We are going ahead," he said, to try to expand our output to 40 or 50 percent above anything we ever accomplished before.

"Increased employment will expand markets and in turn make it possible to expand our production. To maintain full employment and full production we need a steady consumer demand that increases year after year. In 1940 we had our greatest prewar production, a total of $97,000,000,000 in goods and services. During that year there were 47,000,000 men and women at work in the country, including the armed forces—and we had 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 unemployed.

"That was our greatest prewar year, but we cannot afford to go back to that. Increased efficiency and the growth of our work force would mean that instead of 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 unemployed, we would have millions more."

PART II

General Motors Corp. can pay a 30-percent increase in wage rates without increasing the prices of its products, and it can do it now.

A. General Motors is one of the most profitable of American corporations. Its profit-making capacity has been consistently demonstrated throughout the 28 years of its existence, and continues down to the present. The profits it earned before the war on production of peacetime products could have paid a substantial increase in wages without any increase in prices, leaving a high return on invested capital even at the relatively low levels of output that then prevailed.

Increased output and higher labor productivity on postwar production will even more readily permit of a 30-percent increase in wage rates. The rate of profit earned by General Motors undoubtedly will be large at this high volume of production. As its output approaches capacity, or 2,800,000 passenger cars a year, it will make profits far in excess of any year in its history, possibly reaching $600,000,000 a year, after taxes, due to the rapidity with which its profits rise when its production increases, as revealed by analysis of its past performance.

1. The automobile industry stands at the top of American industries in profitability.

A report on profits of 2,187 industrial corporations by the Office of Price Administration shows the high standing of the automobile industry as a profit maker in the prewar years, 1936 to 1939, inclusive, as follows:

Percent earned on investment

	Before income taxes	After income taxes
	Percent	*Percent*
Automobiles	20.6	16.7
Durable-goods manufacturing	10.2	8.3
All manufacturing	9.9	8.1
All companies	9.8	8.1

Profit per dollar of sales

	Cents	*Cents*
Automobiles	12.1	9.8
Durable-goods manufacturing	10.0	8.1
All manufacturing	9.1	7.5
All companies	8.4	6.9

2. General Motors stands at the top of the automobile industry and at the top of all corporations in the United States in sustained profit-making capacity.

(a) General Motors profits for the 1936–39 period compare with the foregoing data for the auto industry as follows:

	GM	Industry
	Percent	*Percent*
Percent earned on investment after taxes	17.7	16.7
Profit per dollar of sales:	*Cents*	*Cents*
Before taxes	16.1	12.1
After taxes	13.1	9.8

(b) In its report on the motor vehicle industry (1939), the Federal Trade Commission noted that General Motors' profits from 1927 to 1937, inclusive, averaged "no less than 35.5 percent." The Commission also reported—

"General Motors Corporation is often referred to as the world's most complicated and most profitable manufacturing enterprise" (p. 419).

"General Motors earned more profits for its stockholders during the 11-year period, 1927 to 1937, inclusive, than any other manufacturing corporation in the United States, but its total assets of $1,566,000,000 at the close of 1937 were slightly exceeded by a few other domestic corporations" (p. 1060).

General Motors is, and always has been, a prodigious money maker.

(c) One thousand dollars invested in 10 shares of General Motors Corp. at its inception in 1917 has earned the investor $930 a year in dividends and increase in value. This is a return of 93 percent per year on his original investment without 1 cent of additional outlay during the entire period.

(1) Increase of shares owned: In 1917, two shares of common stock of General Motors Co. could be bought for $1,000. These were exchangeable August 1, 1917, for 10 shares of General Motors Corp.

Since that date these original 10 shares have expanded through stock split-ups and stock dividends to 201$\frac{5}{16}$ shares of present General Motors common, without any additional investment by the shareholder, and without exercising the rights to subscribe offered in 1919 and 1920.

(2) Cash dividends: Cash dividends have been paid every year on General Motors Corp. common. The amount of these dividends, including the cash value of rights in 1919 and 1920, on the $1,000 investment in 1917 are tabulated below.

Twenty-eight years of earnings on 10 shares of General Motors Corp. common costing $1,000 in 1917

Period beginning	Period covered	Total earnings	Earnings per year
	Years		
1917	3½	$515.00	$147.10
1920	4	575.12	143.80
1924	2	557.66	278.80
1926	1	624.84	624.80
1927	1½	1,068.28	712.20
1929	16	8,788.13	549.30
Total	28	12,129.03	433.20

During the 16 years beginning with 1929, depression and recovery were reflected as follows:

Period beginning	Period covered	Total earnings	Earnings per year
	Years		
1929–31	3	$1,935.00	$645.00
1932–34	3	806.25	268.75
1935–38	4	2,418.75	604.69
1939–41	3	2,217.19	739.06
1942–44	3	1,410.94	470.31
1929–44	16	8,788.13	549.30

(3) Increase in value of holdings: In addition to cash dividends, the investor has shared in the increased value resulting from earnings retained by GM in its business. Present market value of the 201$\frac{5}{16}$ shares which the investor now holds is $14,915.62, an increase of $13,915.62 over the original investment.

(4) Total return on $1,000 in 28 years: The $1,000 invested in 1917 has received earnings, in cash and increased value, as follows:

Cash returns	$12,129.03
Increase in value	13,915.62
Total	26,044.65

The average annual rate of return is $930 or 93 percent of the original investment.

Even in 3 years of depression this investor's cash return averaged $268, or 26.8 percent of his investment.

In the war years 1942–44 he has averaged a cash return of 47 percent. With the 1944 dividend rate extending into 1945, and with the market price of the stock rising, his total return for 3½ years of war has amounted to $1,713.10 in cash and $745.78 increased value, a total of $2,458.88, or at a rate of $702.54 per year—better than 70 percent on his investment.

(d) The long profit record of General Motors continued down to the present and was strikingly demonstrated during the most recent period in which it was engaged in manufacturing automobiles.

Profits after taxes have yielded a high return on the net investment year after year:

Year	Annual rate of return on investment	3-year totals
	Percent	
1933	9.55	
1934	10.61	37.8 percent of investment recovered.
1935	17.51	
1936	24.04	
1937	19.29	53.3 percent of investment recovered.
1938	9.93	
1939	17.38	
1940	18.01	53.4 percent of investment recovered.
1941	17.99	
1942	13.75	
1943	11.80	38.7 percent of investment recovered.
1944	13.17	

In the last 9 years General Motors earnings have paid back the stockholders' investment in full and 45.4 percent in addition, a total return of 145.4 percent.

Even in the four depression years, 1930–34, when millions of workers were unemployed, GM earnings provided an average return of 7½ percent a year, or total earnings of 30 percent on the stockholders' investment.

3. Out of its huge profits on automobile production before the war, General Motors could have paid substantially higher wages than it did pay, without any increase in the prices of its products, and providing a high annual return to stockholders.

(a) In its last 6 years of automobile production (1936 to 1941, inclusive), General Motors earned almost as much in profits as it paid out in wages to GM workers.

Profits before taxes (with which wages properly are compared, since GM pays no income tax on what it pays to workers) from 1936 to 1941 totaled $1,745,518,000.

Wages paid to hourly rate workers totaled $1,927,331,000.

Thus for every dollar paid to GM workers from 1936 to 1941, inclusive, GM earned 91 cents in profits before taxes.

(b) General Motors could have paid 30 percent greater wages than it did pay from 1936 to 1941 and would have earned an average net income after taxes of $132,000,000 a year—more than 12 percent a year on its investment.

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Cost of a 30-percent increase to hourly workers	Profits before taxes	Profits after deducting 30-percent wage increase
1936	84,263	277,591	193,328
1937	100,809	245,130	144,321
1938	56,670	132,909	76,239
1939	79,155	242,597	163,442
1940	107,176	336,455	229,279
1941	150,127	510,836	360,709
	578,200	1,745,518	1,167,318

After paying estimated income taxes of $375,000,000 on these reduced profits before taxes, GM would have had net income after taxes of $792,318,000 for the 6 years.

This is an average net income (after taxes and after paying 30 percent more in wages) of $132,053,000 per year.

During that period the average investment (net worth) of the corporation (including contingency reserves) was $1,093,227,000.

Therefore, GM stockholders could have received an annual return of 12.8 percent on their investment during these 6 years, while GM workers would have been receiving 30 percent more in wages than they did receive.

All this could have been done in a period when GM was producing on the average only 1,500,000 passenger cars a year. Now we shall look at its best production year, and at the future.

(c) In its latest and greatest year of automobile production, 1941, General Motors Corp. actually received more in profits—before taxes—for each man-hour worked by GM workers than it paid out in wages.

(1) Total man-hours worked by hourly rate workers	469,225,000
(2) Total pay roll of hourly rate workers	$500,422,000
(3) Net sales	$2,436,801,000
(4) Operating profits, before taxes	$486,037,000
(5) Total profits, before taxes	$510,836,000

Each man-hour worked therefore produced—

Wages (2) divided by (1)	$1.066
Sales (3) divided by (1)	5.193
Operating profits, before taxes (4) divided by (1)	1.036
Total profits, before taxes (5) divided by (1)	1.089

The GM worker produced $1.07 for his family and $1.09 for GM every hour he worked in 1941.

(d) The profits made by General Motors Corp. in 1941 (its last and largest year of automobile production) prove that it can now pay the 30-percent increase in wage rates we demand and still make record breaking profits.

This can be shown by the following approximate calculation of adjusted costs and profits on the basis of 1941 output which makes no allowance for the economies of anticipated high volume of output or for increased labor productivity:

(1) To adjust for present wage demands as compared with 1941—

The 30-percent wage demand calls for an average hourly rate of approximately $1.45.

Average hourly wage paid in 1941 was $1.07.

The increase of 38 cents per hour, or 35.6 percent, would increase the $500,000,000 wage bill of 1941 by $178,000,000.

(2) To adjust for material cost increase since 1941—

Basic materials used in the manufacture of automobiles have increased in price since 1941 by less than 5 percent. But assuming an increase of twice that amount, 10 percent,

And assuming General Motors materials cost at the high estimate of 50 percent of net sales, according to automobile industry data, the material cost in 1941 would have been $1,200,000,000.

Resulting increase over 1941 in cost of materials would have been $120,000,000.

(3) To adjust for automobile price increases since 1941—

Prices of the 1942 models of General Motors automobiles exceeded average prices received in the year 1941 by approximately 9 percent.

Applying this increase to total 1941 sales of $2,437,000,000—

Increase over 1941 sales at 1941 rate of output amounts to $219,000,000.

(4) Effect on 1941 profits—

General Motors profits before taxes in 1941 were	$511,000,000
Adjusting these for—	
Increase in sales of	219,000,000
Less increase in wages	178,000,000
Less increase in materials	120,000,000
Total	298,000,000
Results in a reduction of 1941 profits by	79,000,000
Leaving profits before taxes of	432,000,000

This approximate adjustment to allow for a 30-percent increase in present wage rates, and increases of 9 percent in automobile prices and 10 percent in material costs over 1941, shows that even at the low production level of 1941 (1,860,000 passenger cars—two-thirds of capacity) GM could have profited as follows:

1. Profits before taxes of $432,000,000. These would be greater than the profits before taxes in any year of GM history except 1943 and 1944.

2. Profits after taxes amounting to $261,000,000. These would be the largest take-home profits in any year of GM history except 1928.

3. But, the anticipated increase of 50 percent in car and truck production should increase the foregoing profits by a minimum of 50 percent, so that profits before taxes are raised to $648,000,000, and profits after taxes become $400,000,000. Such take-home profits exceed by $150,000,000 the best previous profits in GM history and are more than double its average profits of the last 10 years.

4. Again it is emphasized that these results make no allowance whatever for—

(a) Increased economy and profitability resulting from increase in the volume of output from 1,860,000 cars in 1941 to 2,800,000 cars in the postwar years.

(b) Increased labor productivity resulting from technological improvement of plant facilities, tools, and processes.

This conservative estimate on the basis of 1941 performance proves that there can be no question of the ability of General Motors to pay 30 percent higher wage rates without raising prices on postwar high-volume production, and to earn very substantial profits while doing so.

ECONOMIC BRIEF—PART II, SECTION 2

Letter of transmittal

CHARLES E. WILSON,
President, General Motors Corp.,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Herewith is presented part II, section 2, of the brief in support of the demand of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America-CIO for a 30 percent increase in basic wage rates in order to maintain take-home pay without any increase in the price of General Motors products and for other amendments of the agreement between this union and the corporation.

In part I, presented October 19, 1945, we set forth the need of GM workers and the entire economy for such maintenance of take-home pay, if we are to make the transition from full production and employment for war to full production and employment for peace on a stable and lasting basis. We showed that the first step toward an economy of full employment based on purchasing power (wages) 50 percent higher than ever before is the maintenance of take-home pay. We stressed the interest of farmers and businessmen in thus maintaining the market for their products.

In part II, section 1, presented October 23, we presented proof that General Motors can pay the increase in wage rates which we demand; it can do so without increasing the prices of its products; it can do it now. We showed that General Motors before the war could have paid substantially higher wages without increasing prices and still have had high profits—even at the low levels of output then prevailing. Finally, we pointed out that, in the prewar year 1941, General Motors received more in profits (before taxes) for each man-hour worked by GM workers than it paid out in wages. The GM worker produced $1.07 for his family and $1.09 for GM stockholders every hour he worked in 1941.

Now, in part II, section 2, presented herewith, we show that in the postwar period, when capacity production is assured by the market for cars, the greatly increased volume of output will make it possible for General Motors to pay the increased wage rates and make such large profits as to permit a three-way profit split among workers, consumers, and investors, resulting in reduction in the price of cars, increased take-home profits for investors, and the increased wage rate we have requested.

In the final part II, section 3, we will show that, because of increased labor productivity, big cash reserves, new equipment furnished during the war at public expense, and the many aids and insurances given by the tax laws, the corporation can't lose. Its first full year of capacity production, after paying the increased wage rates and lowering car prices, will be astonishingly profitable.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
Vice President, Director,
General Motors Department, UAW-CIO.
OCTOBER 24, 1945.

B. What General Motors has done in prewar years it can, and will, do in postwar years. It will do even better. Its long-established capacity for making profit will be greatly enhanced by the large and virtually guaranteed markets that await its postwar production. This increased volume of output together with higher labor productivity in postwar production will greatly increase the profits which GM will earn on each hour worked by every GM worker, and therefore will reinforce its ability to pay 30 percent higher wage rates without any increase in the prices of its products.

1. The automobile industry predicts that it will operate at capacity (6,000,000 passenger cars and 1,500,000 trucks per year) for at least 3 years, and will be in capacity production by June 1946.

George Romney, general manager of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, speaking in New York on September 20, 1945, said:

"Several market surveys conducted independently by individual manufacturers indicate an immediate demand for about 18,000,000 passenger cars—exclusive of trucks and busses. Based on company production plans, this probably represents about 3 years' output, but during those 3 years approximately 12,000,000 cars will be scrapped. This will leave our national car inventory substantially below prewar levels.

"I estimate that the number of cars registered will rise to a 40,000,000 level by 1960. It does not appear likely that current and pent-up demands will be met before 1952."

Eleven manufacturers of automobiles reporting to the War Production Board in August 1945 estimated that their production in June 1946 would be 504,452 passenger automobiles. ("First report on progress of reconversion in 42 selected industries"—War Production Board, August 25, 1945).

In 1940 and 1941, approximately 45 percent of all new cars and trucks registered in the United States were manufactured by General Motors.

General Motors proportion of the anticipated capacity output will therefore be approximately: 2,800,000 passenger cars; 500,000 trucks.

C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors, stated in an article in Commercial and Financial Chronicle, December 14, 1944, that the postwar demand for automobiles may be 150 percent of the best prewar year. On this basis, General Motors should produce 2,796,000 passenger cars; 590,000 trucks.

2. High postwar output will prove even more profitable for General Motors. This is shown by the trends in General Motors wages, prices, and profits from 1936 to 1941. Even at the low levels of production then prevailing, a rise in cutput over the period revealed the ability of the corporation to increase wages as compared with prices and to realize a great increase in profits while doing so.

Figures published in General Motors annual reports show—

	1936	1941	Percent increase
Sales value per unit	$771	$900	16.6
Wages per man-hour	$0.777	$1.067	37.3
Operating profits per unit	$135	$179	32.3
Total profits, before taxes (millions)	$277	$426	61.0
Units produced (thousands)	1,867	2,257	21.4
Units per thousand man-hours	5.16	5.77	11.8

While General Motors wages increased more than twice as much as sales value per unit from 1936 to 1941, General Motors operating profits per unit increased 32 percent and total profits increased 61 percent. Why? Because total output increased 21 percent and output per man-hour increased 12 percent.

(NOTE.—Units are cars and trucks sold to dealers in United States. Sales are total net sales excluding sales of war materials in 1941. Operating profits are profits on sales as reported by General Motors. All 1941 data, except units sold, are reduced by one-sixth to adjust for sales of war materials which accounted for one-sixth of total sales in that year.)

3. When the full effect of the planned increase in output on General Motors profits is taken into account, it becomes evident that it will make tremendous profits in the first full year of postwar production, even after a 30 percent increase in wages and no increase in prices.

Analysis of past General Motors performance establishes, for an output of 2,800,000 passenger cars and 500,000 trucks in the first full year of postwar production, the following profit potentialities under various assumptions:

(1) Assuming 30-percent increase over present wage rates; 1942 model prices; 15-percent increase of 1941 material prices: Then General Motors profits before taxes will be $560,000,000.

(2) Assuming 30-percent increase over present wage rates; 1942 model price 5-percent increase over 1941 material prices: Then General Motors profits before taxes will be $728,000,000.

(3) Assuming present wage rates; 1942 model prices; 5-percent increase over 1941 material prices: Then General Motors profits before taxes will be $956,000,000.

Note that, when Congress cuts the tax rate to 36 percent, the foregoing profits before taxes will yield profits after taxes of $358,000,000, $466,000,000, and $605,000,000, respectively.

Such profits would greatly exceed General Motors highest profits after taxes in its four most profitable years: 1927, $235,000,000; 1928, $276,000,000; 1929, $248,000,000; 1936, $238,000,000.

4. In its postwar production General Motors can make as much profit before taxes, as in the best profit year of its history (1941) even though producing at less than capacity, and even though paying 30 percent higher wage rates than it now pays.

Analysis of General Motors operations in the past justifies the following expectations as to the ease with which General Motors can equal its record profits of 1941:

One hundred percent of General Motors capacity, 2,800,000 passenger cars.

Assuming present wage rates, 1942 model prices, 5 percent over 1941 material, then General Motors could make 1941 profits while producing only 1,800,000 cars or 64 percent.

If wage rates are increased 30 percent, General Motors can still equal its 1941 record profit producing 2,200,000 passenger cars or 80 percent.

This 1941 profit before taxes, after Congress reduces the corporation tax rate to 36 percent, as expected, will leave General Motors with the large profit, after taxes, of $327,000,000, which is 20 percent greater than the highest net income in its history (1928). This would provide a return of better than 30 percent on its net worth in a single year.

General Motors is therefore well protected as to profits. It can prosper even though production of cars to the public is curtailed and workers are laid off from General Motors plants. General Motors can't lose.

5. General Motors' profits on capacity production will so greatly exceed prewar profits as to justify a three-way split of the excess profits:

1. Thirty-percent increase in wage rates.

2. Reduction in the price of cars.

3. Increased take-home profits to the corporation.

This can be shown by the following estimates based upon 1941 performance. The estimates are extremely conservative because they make no allowance whatever for the higher rate of profit that results from the economies of high-volume production, nor for the savings that will result from increased labor productivity.

In part II, section A, subsection d.3 of this brief, it has been shown that the union's present wage demands and a 10-percent increase in material prices since 1941 would reduce the profits of that year to $432,000,000, before taxes.

Increase of output by 50 percent will increase these profits by a minimum of 50 percent, to a total of $648,000,000.

After paying United States income taxes at the new rate of 36 percent and foreign income taxes of approximately $15,000,000, General Motors would have profits after taxes of $393,000,000.

Setting aside the average annual take-home profits earned by General Motors before the war (1936–39), which amounted to $183,000,000, there could be split between stockholders and consumers a sum of $210,000,000, after taxes.

On a 50–50 split of this sum, stockholders would receive an additional $105,000,000 in profits after taxes. Added to the $183,000,000 already set aside, this will give them $288,000,000, which compares with $276,000,000 in the most profitable year of General Motors' history (1928), and with an average of $177,000,000 over the last 10 years.

The $105,000,000 allotted for reduction of prices to consumers would be available for that purpose on a pretax basis, since General Motors income taxes would be reduced by such action.

On a pretax basis the $105,000,000 is equivalent to $164,000,000.

Assuming, as General Motors predicts, that postwar sales will be 50 percent greater than the best prewar year, and that Chevrolet passenger cars account for 40 to 45 percent of General Motors total sales, the $164,000,000 available for price reduction would permit a cut of 12 to 13½ percent from the 1942 price of Chevrolets.

This would cut approximately $100 from the $800 price of Chevrolets in 1942, f. o. b. Detroit.

If General Motors salaries, as well as wages, were raised 30 percent, stockholders would share in a net profit, after taxes, amounting to $218,000,000, and the price of Chevrolets could be reduced approximately $65 f. o. b. Detroit.

A profit of $218,000,000, after taxes, is well above the average earned by General Motors during the last 10 years, and has been exceeded only in 1927, 1928, 1929, and 1936.

This is not an Alice in Wonderland theory, as an anonymous General Motors spokesman said in trying to brush off the proposal for a three-way split of profits. Rather, it is a glimpse of our industrial system's great potentialities for workers, consumers, and investors. This is the United States of America in the year 1945 and the outcome of these negotiations with the Nation's greatest corporation can mean a major defeat or victory here at home in the final winning of the people's peace and the "four freedoms," including freedom from want and fear, for which the war was fought and won.

Nevertheless, when the Red Queen said to Alice, "If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that"—she said a mouthful that General Motors and other employers would do well to ponder at this moment. They should piece it together with Secretary of the Treasury Vinson's statement, already cited, that "we are in the pleasant predicament of having to live 50 percent better than ever before." One way to begin is not to fall back, not to retreat. Once the line is held, we can start forward step by step to higher wages, increased purchasing power, larger production, lower prices, and maintenance of high and stable profits.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the consideration of House bill 4309, an act to reduce taxation and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. I now ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state the first committee amendment, which was

on page 1, line 7, after the word "amendment", to insert "or repeal."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think we should have a quorum present, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gurney	O'Daniel
Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Huffman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Knowland	Shipstead
Butler	La Follette	Smith
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Cordon	Magnuson	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Mitchell	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
George	Morse	Wilson
Gerry	Murdock	Young
Green	Murray	
Guffey	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent because of deaths in their families.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent attending the Food and Agricultural Conference in Quebec.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference, in Paris, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who is one of the members of the Senate delegation to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Conference at Quebec, has been excused to attend its sessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate has before it the revenue bill of 1945. The report is on the desk of each Senator, and I am sure each Senator will find it helpful, particularly the tables relating to the burdens.

This is the first tax bill since the end of the war. It is a pleasure to present a bill which will afford some relief to our taxpayers from the burdensome taxation made necessary by the war. However, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the financial needs of the Government, including expenditures for demobilization of the armed forces, military occupation, and the rehabilitation of our veterans are still very great. Therefore, we must proceed with caution and foresight in reducing our tax burdens commensurate with our needs. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, it is estimated that even under our present tax system, the Federal deficit will be around $30,000,000,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury has estimated that there will be a deficit ranging from five billion to eight billion dollars for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his appearance before our committee stated that it is his considered judgment that tax reductions for the year 1946 should not total more than $5,000,000,000. The Treasury suggestions resulted in a net decrease in 1946 tax liabilities of $5,335,000,000 for 1946 and $5,681,000,000 in 1947. A comparison of the revenue losses in tax liability under the House bill, the Finance Committee bill, and the Treasury suggestions is as follows:

1946:

House bill	$5,350,000,000
Senate Finance bill	5,633,000,000
Treasury suggestions	5,335,000,000

For 1947—and this year also must be taken into consideration to see the real effect of the tax changes which are proposed:

1947:

House bill	$7,252,000,000
Senate Finance bill	5,633,000,000
Treasury suggestions	5,681,000,000

It will be noted that the House bill results in a loss of revenue of only $15,000,000 more than the Treasury proposals for 1946, and $283,000,000 less than the Finance Committee bill for that year. However, there is a different picture for 1947. The House bill will reduce 1947 tax liabilities $7,252,000,000, while the Treasury proposals will reduce 1947 tax liabilities by $5,681,000,000. The Finance Committee bill will reduce 1947 tax liability by $5,633,000,000. Thus, for the 2-year period 1946–47, the total loss of revenue under each of the three proposals is as follows: House, $12,602,000,000; Treasury, $11,016,000,000; Senate Finance Committee, $11,266,000,000, or $1,336,000,000 less than under the House bill.

The main differences between the House bill and the Senate Finance Committee bill are as follows:

1. THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

The House continued the excess-profits tax throughout the calendar year 1946 at a reduced rate of 60 percent and repealed the tax as of January 1, 1947. The House bill resulted in a loss in revenue of $1,300,000,000 for 1946, and an additional loss in 1947 of $1,255,000,000. In repealing the tax as of January 1, 1946, your committee followed the suggestion of Secretary of the Treasury Vinson. The loss in revenue from this source amounted to $2,555,000,000 in 1946.

Secretary Vinson stated to our committee that the "basic objective of tax adjustments at this time is to put us on the high road of peacetime full employment and maximum production." In viewing our present tax structure with this objective in mind, the excess-profits tax, in my opinion, represents the greatest single obstacle to our peacetime recovery. This tax was adopted as a war measure designed to take profits out of war, and to discourage activities competing with the war effort. In order to prevent war millionaires, a tax of 95 percent gross—85½ percent net—was levied on excess profits. The excess profits were determined by comparing the current profits with those for the prewar years, 1936–39, or with a certain percentage of the invested capital. The tax had the tendency to freeze civilian production and income to the prewar level of 1936–39. New, growing, and small corporations are particularly hurt by the excess-profits tax. The old established concern has a large excess-profits credit, and, therefore, has a decided competitive advantage over new and growing companies. In appraising the tax as a part of our peacetime tax structure, it is helpful to recall the words of Secretary GLASS when he recommended its repeal at the close of the last war. He said:

> It encourages wasteful expenditure, puts a premium on overcapitalization, and a penalty on brains, energy, and enterprise, discourages new ventures, and confirms old ventures in their monopolies.

The competitive disadvantage of such a tax to a new and rising corporation is tremendous. The new and rising corporation, not having an adequate credit, pays a much heavier excess-profits tax on its current income than the old established concern. It is not the large and prosperous corporation which suffers from the tax but the new and growing one. The Treasury stated that for 1943 over 70 percent of the corporations subject to the excess-profits tax had net incomes of less than $100,000. Even with the $25,000 specific exemption, effective for 1946, it is estimated that at least one-half of the corporations subject to the excess-profits tax will have net incomes of less than $100,000. On the other hand, some of our very large corporations do not pay any excess-profits taxes. In 1943 it was estimated by the Treasury that one-third of the corporations with incomes of $1,000,000 and over did not have taxable excess profits.

The tax also discourages risk-taking, since many corporations can retain only

a small part of their profits. The continuance of the tax throughout the entire calendar year 1946 will discourage new investments in both 1945 and 1946. As a result, this tax will retard production, so that profits from expansion or increased production will not be realized until 1947. I have received a great many letters from businessmen pointing out the repressive effect of continuing the excess-profits tax through 1946. The following is typical of the letters I have received:

I have a client, a man who was president of a corporation which did a very substantial and very successful war business during the war period. It is now about to reconvert to peacetime. It happens, however, that other interests have gotten control of its stock and have discharged the president. This man, together with a nucleus of the personnel, is anxious to start out for himself in a new organization, and we have the capital to back him. He has the know-how, he has the ambition, and we could obtain factory space from any of the Government agencies that have the surplus factory space at their disposal. It is, however, quite impractical for us to organize the new venture if we are to be subject to the present excess-profits tax. We would have every possibility of losing money and practically no possibility of making any money while these taxes prevail.

However, our competitor, the corporation that got rid of my client, in 1930 made bad investments and lost $6,000,000 as a result of which it has an excellent tax base from a point of view of excess-profits taxes.

Accordingly, we are simply marking time, as we cannot ask venture capital to join us until a possible return on such investment can be indicated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish to say that I find this part of the committee's report the part which receives my highest endorsement, in spite of the fact that apparently, in some labor circles today, much propaganda is being issued urging Senators to keep the excess profits tax. I believe that if we are to have full employment, and if we are to operate the private enterprise system in the interest of increased production and higher standards of living, it is very important that we do away with the excess-profits tax. The tax I am convinced is serving as a great handicap to full employment during the reconversion period.

I have studied the report with some care, and I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I think it is somewhat unfortunate that the income to the Government through taxation is to be reduced by the bill which is now pending before the Senate. I recognize that it is supposed to be good politics to try to convince the people of the country that they can have their cake and eat it too. But I believe that if we are to keep the American dollar stable we must tell the American people that they must pay for the great benefits which they are insisting upon from the Federal Government. It seems to me that if there was ever a time in the fiscal history of this country when we ought to maintain high tax rates on the basis of the principle of ability to pay, now is that time. I think we truly would increase the wealth of this country during the next few years and assure a higher national standard of living if we as a people were willing to tighten our belts and proceed, through taxation, to pay for the great benefits of freedom which we enjoy in this country. If we are to keep the American dollar sound we must start to retire some of our debt.

I am greatly concerned about the value of the American dollar. I believe that one of the ways to deflate the value of the American dollar and cause a spiral inflation of prices is to adopt in the next few years a tax-lowering program. We must do more than raise the interest on our debt if we are to protect the value of the dollar. As I said the other day, I am perfectly willing to put my political head on the block in the interest of trying to get the American people to see that if we are to preserve our economy they must be willing to pay high taxes for the next few years. I wish this tax bill were so framed as to raise more income than I think will be raised under its present provisions.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator, and I agree with his entire philosophy; but I do not agree with his conclusions with respect to the tax bill. The rate of tax does not determine what comes into the Treasury. The bill, so far as it affects corporations, is properly a tax rate-reducing bill. It will not necessarily reduce the amount of revenue coming in. Indeed, if it has the effect which it is hoped it will have, it will so stimulate the expansion of business as to bring in a greater total revenue. I think if one will look back to World War I, he will understand precisely what I am now trying to say.

Mr. President, while it is somewhat aside, I shall pause in the presentation of my prepared statement to emphasize this fact: The Revenue Act of 1918 was approved February 24, 1919, some months after the actual cessation of hositilities. In a sense, that act was both a war-tax act and an immediate postwar tax rate-reduction act, since it provided one schedule of rates for 1918 and a somewhat lower schedule for 1919, 1920, and 1921. The act of November 23, 1921, made more substantial reductions in rates. The recovery of the country from a state of depression in 1920 and 1921 was rapid. The Revenue Acts of 1924 and 1926 made still further tax reductions, but the income from tax revenues of the Government increased through all of that period.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield, but of course I wish to proceed as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not care to take much time, but I wish to say that there is nothing more important for every Member of the Senate and every citizen of the United States to remember than what the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Finance Committee, has said, namely, that the rate of taxation in the bill does not determine the revenue. I might leave this thought with the Senate: The way to full production and a return to full employment is through proper tax reduction, and the way to further tax reduction is through full employment and full operation that yields revenue. It is revenue that we are after. Every member of the Finance Committee has the same feelings as those the Senator from Georgia has expressed. We all wish to find a happy medium, something that will start the production machine going and will yield the revenue which is necessary, and we want the people of the United States to know that the Government is headed back toward lower taxation at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his contribution.

I wish again to emphasize that the excess-profits tax is a major obstacle to the rapid reconversion and steady expansion of business enterprise; that it weakens materially the incentive for capital investment and the creation of employment; and that it admittedly promotes inefficiency in business and encourages wasteful expenditures.

2. LARGE CORPORATIONS

The Finance Committee bill also differs from the House bill in the treatment of the normal tax and the surtax applicable to large corporations. Under existing law, corporations with incomes of $50,000 or more are subject to a 40 percent rate, consisting of a normal tax of 24 percent and a surtax of 16 percent. The House bill reduced the turtax to 12 percent, making a combined corporate normal tax and surtax of 36 percent. Your committee bill continues the 40 percent rate with respect to corporations with incomes of $60,000 or more. Unlike the excess-profits tax which, in many cases, falls with unequal weight on corporations with the same earnings in the same taxable year, the corporate normal and surtax applies a uniform 40 percent rate to all corporations with incomes of $60,000 or more. It is not believed that this tax will constitute a serious obstacle to reconversion and expansion for 1946. The condition of the Federal Budget, the fact that the war and its aftermath will keep Federal expenditures high for some time, and the fact that the Federal debt is estimated to reach $273,000,000,000 by July 1 of next year, are, in the opinion of your committee, sufficient reasons for continuing the 40 percent rate for 1946. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that only about 22,000 corporations will have net incomes of $60,000 or more in 1946.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that statement, because it has a material bearing on the loose thinking of so many persons who have dealt with this subject: It should be borne in mind that only about 22,000 corporations will have net incomes of $60,000 or more in 1946, that many of these 22,000 corporations will be benefited through the repeal of

the excess-profits tax, and that all of them will be benefited through repeal of the capital-stock tax and its companion, the declared value excess-profits tax, which are to be repealed beginning with the capital-stock tax year ending June 30, 1946. The House bill and the Finance Committee bill are agreed upon this point.

3. SMALL CORPORATIONS

Now, Mr. President, let us take a look at small corporations.

Your committee bill provides relief for corporations with incomes of less than $60,000. It is important that small and growing corporations be encouraged to continue and expand in the latter part of 1945 and 1946, so that they will aid both production and employment. It is estimated that of the 260,000 corporations with net incomes for 1946, 238,000 will have incomes below $60,000. While some of these will be benefited through the repeal of the excess-profits tax and all will be benefited through repeal of the capital-stock tax, it is believed desirable to extend further relief through a reduction in the ordinary corporate rate.

The House bill reduced the surtax rate applicable to these small corporations by 4 percentage points. Your committee provided a special schedule which has the effect of reducing the combined normal and surtax rates on corporations with incomes up to $60,000.

To see the difference between the Senate plan and the House bill, as compared to existing law, I wish to invite attention to table 11 of the report. It will be seen that corporations with incomes of $5,000 or less pay a combined normal and surtax of 25 percent under existing law, or $1,250. Under the House bill a $5,000 corporation will pay a tax rate of 21 percent, or $1,050; and under the Finance Committee bill, such a corporation will pay a tax rate of 20 percent, or $1,000. Thus, the tax on a $5,000 corporation will be less under the Finance Committee bill that under the House bill, and $250 less than under existing law. A $10,000 corporation will also pay $200 less under the Finance Committee bill than under the House bill. A $15,000 corporation will pay the same tax under both House and Finance Committee bills. A $25,000 corporation will pay $400 more under the Finance Committee bill than under the House bill, and a $55,000 corporation will pay $1,650 more under the Finance Committee bill than under the House bill. The relief granted by the Finance Committee, affecting only the smaller corporations, will result in a tax reduction for 1946 of $63,000,000, while the House bill, which affects all corporations, will result in a loss of $405,000,000.

Since about 80 percent of all corporations with taxable incomes in 1946 are estimated to have net incomes under $15,000, the Finance Committee bill will give greater relief to 200,000 of the 260,000 corporations estimated to have net income for the calendar year 1946.

4. INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX RELIEF

Your committee adopted the provisions of the House bill allowing the same exemptions for normal tax purposes as are now allowed for surtax purposes. This has the effect of eliminating 12,000,000 taxpayers from the rolls who were placed thereon by the victory tax adopted in 1942. The taxpayers in question are married persons and persons with dependents. By express statutory provision the victory tax would have expired at the end of the war. However, in 1944 this tax was replaced by a new normal tax which continued the principle of a single exemption for each recipient, irrespective of his marital status or the number of his dependents, but did not contain the express provision covering repeal at the end of the war. Nevertheless, your committee deems it advisable to remove these 12,000,000 taxpayers from the rolls at the present time because they were brought in under a special war measure.

Mr. President, in order to keep my own record straight, I digress here to say that I do not believe that at this time anyone should be entirely removed from the tax rolls. I believe that the removal of more than 12,000,000 persons from the tax rolls is definitely inflationary, whatever are the arguments which may be made to the contrary. Moreover, I believe that such a drastic narrowing of the base of taxation is unwise. But my view represents the views of a decided minority upon the question, and I, of course, support the majority opinion. I would have cut the tax very deeply for all low income-tax earners, but would not have removed them from the rolls if I had been privileged to write a tax bill as I think it should be written at this time.

Mr. President, the House bill reduces the rate applicable to each surtax bracket by four percentage points and rearranges the surtax schedule so that each individual income taxpayer will have at least a 10-percent reduction in his total normal-tax and surtax liability. The Finance Committee bill reduces each surtax bracket by three percentage points, and this in effect reduces the combined normal-tax and surtax rates under the revised schedule by three percentage points. A further reduction of 5 percent of the combined taxes is then made. A comparison of the burden under the two plans will be found in tables 8, 9, and 10 of the report. In general, the burden under the Senate committee bill will be less on incomes up to $50,000, whereas on incomes above $50,000 the balance swings the other way, so that under the House bill incomes above $50,000 receive a larger reduction. In the case of incomes of $2,000 or less, the burden under both the House bill and the Senate Finance Committee bill will be the same.

A few examples will show the effect of these provisions. For example, a married person with no dependents and an income of $1,800 pays a tax of $199 under existing law. Under both the House bill and the Senate Finance Committee bill the tax will amount to $152. A married man without dependents and with a net income of $5,000 pays a tax of $975 under existing law, $800 under the House bill, and $798 under the Finance Committee bill. With a $10,000 income, he pays $2,585 under existing law, $2,210 under the House bill, and $2,185 under the Finance Committee bill. With an income of $100,000, he will pay $657.50 less under the House bill than under the Finance Committee bill.

5. RELIEF FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. President, I shall speak for a few minutes about the provisions in this bill relating to servicemen.

Your committee considered many problems of tax relief relating to members of the armed forces. Many of these problems could not be taken up in the pending tax bill, but the staffs were instructed to study them in connection with future tax legislation. There are three problems, however, which our committee believed could be taken care of without unduly delaying this bill.

First. Servicemen at the present time are allowed an exclusion of $1,500 with respect to service pay, in addition to their personal exemption. It appears that there are some enlisted men who may be required to pay income tax with respect to service pay. Your committee bill provides that compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, for active service as an enlisted member of the military or naval forces of the United States during such war, shall be excluded from gross income. This, in effect, exempts the service pay of the military or naval personnel, except commissioned officers, from any liability for Federal income taxes for the taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940, and before the termination of the war, with respect to taxes attributable to service pay. This will also relieve these men from any liability for filing returns.

Second. One of the chief complaints from commissioned officers, particularly those returning from overseas, is that they have a large tax liability which has accrued and which must, in general, be paid within 6 months after their return and discharge. While they have been able, in some cases, to work out arrangements with collectors of Internal Revenue, they are required to pay interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on payments beyond the 6-month period. Your committee bill permits payment of this tax, so far as it relates to service pay, over a 3-year period in 12 quarterly installments, without interest.

Third. A similar extension is granted with respect to the payment of any part of the tax attributable to earned income for the taxable years 1940 and 1941, if such tax became due and payable after the taxpayer entered into active service. To secure this relief, the tax must be for the years prior to entry into service.

Earned income for this purpose is the same as defined in the Internal Revenue Code. If the taxpayer's net income is not more than $3,000 his entire net income is regarded as earned income, and

if his net income is more than $3,000, his earned net income shall not be considered to be more than $3,000. In no case shall the earned net income be considered to be more than $14,000.

At this point I ask to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, without reading it, a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., to the War Department with respect to prisoners of war who were removed beyond the insular possessions of the United States to some foreign country. The ruling by the Commissioner obviated one of the difficulties to which the Senate Finance Committee gave some consideration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 14, 1945.

To the War Department:

Reference is made to your letter dated February 19, 1945, requesting advice as to the proper treatment, for Federal income-tax purposes, of pay credited to military personnel of the Army of the United States, who have postponed the filing of Federal income tax returns, on the basis of cash receipts and disbursements during a period in which they have been in a missing, missing in action, or prisoner of war status; and as to the proper application of the provisions of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code in specific circumstances.

You further request that if possible an immediate reply be made on the subject of constructive receipt, without waiting until the other questions in your inquiry have been decided.

Under the Missing Persons Act as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1001–1017), personnel of the armed forces in active service, and personnel of civilian departments serving abroad, who are missing, beleaguered or besieged, interned, or captured by an enemy, are entitled to receive or to have credited to their accounts the same pay and allowances to which they were entitled at the beginning of the absence or to which they may thereafter become entitled. They are also entitled to have their allotments paid currently from such accounts.

Your letter indicates that when an individual entitled to military pay in the War Department is missing under the Missing Persons Act, the Office of Special Settlement Accounts is notified by the Adjutant General of the Army. That office then prepares a master pay and allotment account record card for each person, to which is transferred, from the Office of Dependency Benefits, the allotment accounts and the family allowance accounts, if any, of the absentee.

The amount of pay and allowances which accrues to the absentee each month is entered in the account, together with the amount of allotments currently to be paid. Allotments chargeable against his account are not charged against any particular item or items of pay and allowances; they are merely charged against the entire amount due to him each month. The authorized allotments and the authorized family allowances are paid currently by the Office of Special Settlement Accounts, and the cumulative balance in the account to which the absentee is entitled is available to him at any time without any restriction except the fact of his absence. In general, these balances cover amounts earned and credited during the calendar years from and including 1941.

Your letter summarizes a number of problems that will arise under the provisions of sections 22 (b) (13), 107, 126, 251, and 421 of the Internal Revenue Code if pay that is not allotted is considered to be subject to Federal income tax in the year when the cumulative balance is actually paid to the individual taxpayer upon his return to active service, or to his beneficiaries after his death or after a finding of death. In addition, your Department is faced with the possible necessity of setting up machinery, with a consequent burden upon communications in war zones, for making payment outside the United States of accrued pay and allowances to those whose benefits under section 251 of the code might otherwise be jeopardized.

You inquire, therefore, whether the military pay of the absentee, subsequent to the last period for which he had received payment, may be regarded as constructively received by him as it accrues, and whether the portion constructively received in any taxable year involved should be included in the taxpayer's return for such year, if and when it is filed, and not in the return for the year of actual receipt of the cumulative balance by the taxpayer, or by his estate after his death.

It is the opinion of this Bureau that income which is credited to a taxpayer's account or set apart for him so that he may draw upon it at any time is subject to Federal income tax as constructively received for the taxable year in which it is so credited or set apart, even though he does not then actually receive it into his possession. To constitute constructive receipt, the income must be credited or set apart to the taxpayer without any substantial limitation or restriction as to the time or manner of payment or condition upon which payment is to be made. It must be made available to him so that he may receive it promptly at any time upon his request, and its receipt must thus, as between a payor and payee, be brought within the payee's own control and disposition (sec. 29. 42–2, regulations 111).

Your statement discloses that under the procedure authorized by the Missing Persons Act, supra, the military pay of an absentee is credited to him monthly as earned, without any restriction except the fact of his absence, and that the allotments and the family allowances which he has authorized or which are authorized by law are paid each month from the amounts so credited to him. Futhermore, the Missing Persons Act expressly provides, in effect, that his pay shall accrue during the period of his absence. He therefore has a statutory and unqualified right to the pay which became due him during his absence in one of the statutes referred to in that act.

It is accordingly concluded that the pay of the absentee accruing to him under the Missing Persons Act is constructively received by him as it accrues and is includible in his gross income for the taxable year in which it accrues. Pay due him or received by him for services rendered after his return to duty, when the Missing Persons Act is no longer applicable to him, is includible in his gross income for the taxable year in which it is received.

Your questions relating to the administration of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code will be made the subject of a separate communication.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH D. NUNAN, Jr.,
Commissioner.

Mr. GEORGE. Now, Mr. President, with respect to the excise taxes. There are certain excise rates increases which were imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943 but which are automatically reduced approximately 6 months after termination of hostilities in the present war. Under the existing law, the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war may be determined either by a proclamation of the President or by a concurrent resolution of the Congress. The taxes affected by the reduction include admissions, liquor, beer and wines, electric light bulbs, jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, telephones, transportation of persons, luggage, club dues, cabarets, billiard and pool tables. The Secretary of the Treasury recommended that July 1, 1946, be designated as the date these reductions should take effect. The House bill adopts the recommendation of the Treasury in this respect. Your committee makes no change in existing law, as it is believed that the entire question of excise tax increases and war excise taxes should be taken up as a whole in a later bill. There are many excise taxes which were adopted or increased during the war, and which will not be affected by this provision.

Your committee also extended to December 31, 1946, the benefits of sections 22 (b) (9) and 22 (b) (10) of the internal revenue code. Unless this action is taken, the benefits of these sections will expire on December 31, 1945. Section 22 (b) (9) provides for the exclusion from gross income of any income attributable to the discharge of indebtedness through the acquisition by a corporation of its own securities at less than par. This section is applicable to all corporations, including railroads. Section 22 (b) (10) relates only to railroad corporations, and provides for the exclusion from gross income of income attributable to the modification or cancellation of indebtedness as a consequence of a reorganization resulting from receivership or bankruptcy.

There is also another amendment dealing with the capital stock and declared value excess-profits tax for the year 1945. Some corporations which have recovered properties abroad which were seized by the enemy will have to pay a declared value excess-profits tax on the income resulting from the recovery of such properties, because they were unable to determine that they would recover these properties in sufficient time to declare them for capital-stock-tax purposes. Your committee has adopted an amendment which permits such corporations to pay a declared value excess-profits tax for 1945, equal to the capital-stock tax, of 1¼ percent of the amount of the war loss recoveries. This puts the corporation in the same position as if it had declared a value of capital stock proportionate to the income from such properties for capital-stock-tax purposes.

There are a few other technical amendments in the bill, which are explained in the committee report.

Mr. President, with respect to the revenues involved, I wish to present for the RECORD a table taken from the report summarizing the effect of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table from the committee report is as follows:

Estimated net reductions in tax liabilities under the House bill and under the Finance Committee bill as compared with tax liability under present law, calendar years 1946 and 1947

[In millions of dollars]

Source	Reduction in tax liabilities from present law			
	1946		1947 [1]	
	House bill	Finance Committee bill	House bill	Finance Committee bill
1. Internal revenue:				
(1) Income, excess profits and capital stock taxes:				
(a) Corporation taxes: [2]				
Excess-profits tax	1,200	2,555	2,555	2,555
Normal tax and surtax	405	63	646	63
Repeal of capital stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes	183	231	243	231
Total corporation taxes	1,888	2,849	3,444	2,849
(b) Individual income taxes: [3]				
Allow same exemption for normal tax as for surtax	782	782	782	782
Reduce surtax rates by 4 percentage points under House bill and by 3 percentage points under Finance Committee amended bill	1,738	1,303	1,738	1,303
Provision for reduction of tax by at least 10 percent under House bill	107		107	
Reduction of 5 percent in normal tax and surtax under Finance Committee bill		559		559
Total individual income taxes	2,627	2,644	2,627	2,644
Total: Income, excess-profits and capital stock taxes	4,515	5,493	6,071	5,493
(2) Miscellaneous internal revenue, excluding capital-stock tax:				
(a) Excises subject to war-tax rates:				
Liquor taxes:				
Distilled spirits	249		472	
Fermented malt liquors	32		63	
Wines	11		18	
Total liquor taxes	292		553	
Retailers' excise taxes:				
Jewelry, etc	48		99	
Furs	25		44	
Toilet preparations	18		39	
Luggage, etc	15		30	
Total retailers' excise taxes	106		212	
Telephone, telegraph, radio, and cable facilities, etc	15		29	
Local telephone service	21		41	
Transportation of persons	28		60	
Admissions	65		129	
Electric-light bulbs and tubes	4		10	
Club dues and initiation fees	2		5	
Bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables	2		2	
Total excises subject to war-tax rates	535		1,041	
(b) Use tax on motor vehicles and boats	140	140	140	140
(c) All other				
Total miscellaneous internal revenue excluding capital-stock tax	675	140	1,181	140
2. Employment taxes (net)				
3. Customs				
4. Miscellaneous receipts				
Net receipts, general and special accounts	5,190	5,633	7,252	5,633
Refunds on floor stocks [4]	160			
Net receipts less refunds on floor stocks	5,350	5,633	7,252	5,633

[1] Assumes, for comparative purposes, the same general conditions in 1947 as estimated for 1946.
[2] Takes into account the following sequence in tax reduction or repeal: First, action on the excess-profits tax; second, action on the corporation normal tax and surtax rates; and third, action on the capital stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes.
[3] Takes into account the following sequence in tax reduction: First, action on normal tax exemption; second, action reducing surtax rates by 3 or 4 percentage points; and third, action reducing tax by at least 10 percent from present law under the House bill, and by 5 percent (for all normal taxes and surtaxes) under the Finance Committee bill.
[4] Tax refunds are classified by the Federal Government as expenditures.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, one other tax should be mentioned, and that is the automobile- and boat-use tax. The House bill repeals the tax as of July 1, 1946. The Senate Finance Committee bill contains the same provision, repealing that tax outright as of next July.

I should also make the statement, Mr. President, that both the House bill and the Senate Finance Committee bill freeze the social-security tax for the old-age and survivors' insurance program at the present rate of 1 percent, and do not permit it to increase to 2½ percent on January 1 next, as it would under the present law.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wondered if the main reason for the repeal of the $5 use tax on automobiles was because of its nuisance character and difficulty in collecting it?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in answer to my distinguished friend, I will say that the automobile-use tax was definitely a war tax—that is, it was inserted in the act for the purpose of raising revenue when we approached preparations for war. It is not a sound tax because there is no graduation between the values of different cars, the size of the cars, or the weight of the cars, and we were of the opinion that it should be repealed beginning next July 1.

Furthermore, it has been a difficult tax to administer. It is easy where the tax is voluntarily paid, but there has always been at least a suspicion, if not more than a suspicion, that many people avoided payment of the use tax. At any rate, it was definitely a tax which was inserted in the law for the purpose of raising revenue, and it was not regarded as entirely a sound tax, except for the purpose of producing revenue, and, therefore, was not considered as a permanent tax in the first instance. Its repeal will result in the loss of $140,000,000 or more of revenue, depending, of course, on how many automobile owners and users would have paid the tax.

Mr. ANDREWS. I had gotten the idea that the theory of this tax had nothing to do with the size of a car,

but one car on a highway is just as dangerous as another and one car on a highway uses about as much space as any other car on a highway. It had seemed to me that it is a tax which is easy to collect, without fees or cost to the Government, involving merely the purchase of a stamp and putting it on the car, but if it is a war tax and was imposed for that purpose, under the theory of such taxes, perhaps it should now be dropped. I may say, however, that in the case of many people—and I should say millions of them—this is the only tax they ever pay into the Federal Government. There are millions of such people who use the highways and they ought to have some part in keeping them up and also in maintaining the Federal Government.

Mr. GEORGE. The statement of the Senator from Florida is probably correct, but the Senate Committee on Finance—and the House committee undoubtedly took the same view, as did the House of Representatives—that is, they thought it would be advisable to repeal the tax.

Mr. ANDREWS. I shall abide by that decision. I desire to ask the Senator one more question relative to the exemption of servicemen from the payment of certain income taxes for the past 2 or 3 years. Undoubtedly many of them have been overseas and when they return to the United States they find that they owe income taxes. As the Senator will remember, I introduced a bill at the last session of Congress to aid the small income group of servicemen in that situation.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Florida is correct. He did introduce such a bill. However, the bill now before the Senate excludes all service pay of all members of the armed forces of the United States in the computation of their income taxes if they are not commissioned officers. In other words, all the enlisted personnel under this bill would be in effect forgiven, during the entire war period, all their income taxes which would otherwise be imposed on account of their service pay. Of course, if they have independent outside income from investments, or something in the nature of investments, they are taxable upon such income; but no serviceman below the rank of a commissioned officer will be required to pay any tax upon his service pay, or upon any payments made by the United States Government to him on account of his service, nor will he be required to make a return for any one of the war years if he has no income except his service pay and allowances.

Mr. ANDREWS. I am very happy to hear the distinguished Senator give that assurance. That was the condition I especially wanted to make sure of.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have been approached on the subject of excise taxes and the black market, the statement being made that the high excise taxes led to black markets, particularly in relation to jewelry, and there is a considerable jewelry business in Massachusetts.

The bill as it passed the House reduced the tax as of June 30, 1946, and the Senate committee bill does not. I should like to ask the chairman if any evidence was presented to his committee on the subject of black markets and high excise taxes, particularly with relation to jewelry?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not recall such testimony, or any evidence on that point.

The committee recognized that there should be a reconsideration of certain excise taxes, but the House merely reduced those taxes which were increased by the act of 1943. There were many other burdensome taxes in the nature of excise taxes, or excise taxes, which were imposed or increased in 1941 and 1942. They were not affected by the bill as it passed the House. The Finance Committee was decidedly of the opinion that we should study the whole excise tax picture before we undertook to deal with the excise taxes.

Further, if the President should at any time between now and January 1 declare the war to be at an end, the present law would do as much as the House bill does, that is, it would reduce to their prior levels these taxes which were increased in 1943.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the position of the committee is that the whole subject of excise taxes should be considered together with a view to their ultimate reduction to peacetime levels, rather than do it piecemeal at the present moment?

Mr. GEORGE. That is exactly correct and I may say that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the other House assures me that a general tax revision study will be commenced very shortly after the turn of the year, and thus even before July 1 we will have time to look into this whole picture.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILEO. Not having had an opportunity to read the bill or the report, I hesitate to ask the question I have in mind, because it may be covered in the report on the bill, but I have received many requests from my constituents about the tax on toilet articles sold in drug stores. I have been in the drug business, and know something about it. Does the committee bill make provision for the imposition and collection of this tax at the source of supply of such articles, or will it still be up to the individual retailer to charge the tax and make reports?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senate Finance Committee bill did not make any change in the existing excise taxes, except the repeal of the auto use tax. The committee has of course considered the question whether or not the tax on toilet articles, the item to which the Senator refers, should not be imposed at the source, at the manufacturer's level. When we provided this tax originally, we reached the conclusion that it should be imposed at the retail level.

Mr. BILBO. Would the Senator be inclined to accept, for conference purposes if nothing else, an amendment to the pending bill imposing this tax at the base of supply of toilet articles? Having had practical experience in the drug business, I can readily envision the duties the retailer has to perform in keeping a record of so many small articles which are in his line of merchandise, when it could be done by the manufacturers at little cost.

Mr. GEORGE. I will say very frankly that I personally agree with the Senator from Mississippi; I think it would be wiser to impose this tax at the source. But we propose to look into the whole question of excise taxes, and what the Senator suggests is one of the very things we will consider. If this tax remains in the law, that question will be considered.

Mr. BILBO. In other words, the Senator gives us assurance——

Mr. GEORGE. If this tax is continued, when we come to the consideration of a comprehensive tax bill, which we will do within a very few weeks——

Mr. BILBO. A very few weeks?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, early next year; if we retain this tax, the question of whether it should be imposed at the manufacturer's level will be given consideration.

Mr. BILBO. With that assurance I shall not pursue the subject further, but I wish to ask about another tax concerning which I have received many letters. What has the committee done with the tax on tickets to picture shows?

Mr. GEORGE. We have not dealt with the admissions tax. That would be automatically reduced if the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, should declare hostilities to be at an end, that is, on the first day of the month occurring six months after such termination date; and under the bill as it passed the House, if that should prevail in conference, the tax would be reduced on July 1 next year.

Mr. BILBO. How much did the House reduce the tax?

Mr. GEORGE. The tax under the present law is 1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof. The House made the tax 1 cent for each 10 cents or major fraction thereof. In other words, that is one of the taxes which the House carried back to rates in effect prior to 1943.

Mr. BILBO. Would the Senator look with favor on an amendment to reduce the taxes on all amusement tickets costing below 40 cents? The picture show is the one great amusement source for millions of poor people, and the children of the Nation, and it seems to me there should be relief from the imposition of this tax on these people for this form of amusement, or recreation, or whatever we may call it. At best the picture shows are not making enormous profits in their line of business, I am informed. Would the Senator look with favor on an amendment to eliminate the tax on tickets for amusement where the charge is less than 40 cents?

Mr. GEORGE. I should be glad to give consideration to the suggestion, but I hope we may be able to have a reconsideration of all the excise taxes in the early months of next year.

Mr. BILBO. That would be included?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that would be included.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Finance Committee whether, from his point of view, it would not have been possible to include in the pending tax bill a provision dealing with Army enlisted personnel rather than to have to depend on another piece of legislation to take care of that matter. Is there any practical problem involved which would make it impossible to include such a provision in the pending tax bill?

Mr. GEORGE. The bill now before the Senate does exclude the service pay of all enlisted men, that is of all men in the armed forces or services below the commissioned ranks. Tax on enlisted men's pay is completely excluded, and the requirement for a return is likewise eliminated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understood the chairman of the Finance Committee to make some reference to another piece of legislation which would cover that subject.

Mr. GEORGE. There are other problems which will be studied. I had reference to certain other problems affecting the veterans. But so far as the entire enlisted personnel in the armed forces during the whole war period is concerned, all payments made by the Government of the United States for their services will be excluded in computing income taxes. They will receive refunds in those instances where they have actually paid the taxes, as some of them have.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wanted to inquire where in the bill there is provision for taxing refugees who came into the United States and who made, as I understand, a profit of $800,000,000?

Mr. GEORGE. Neither the bill as passed by the House nor the bill as it came from the Finance Committee deals with the capital-gains tax at all. It does not touch the capital-gains tax. The Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury and the joint committee staff are now studying the problem of which the Senator has spoken. If legislation is indicated, that is, if the taxes cannot be imposed and collected under existing law, certainly that will be one of the matters to be dealt with in a postwar tax bill.

Mr. LANGER. Some of the refugees will have gone back home before we get around to taxing them, will they not?

Mr. GEORGE. Efforts are now being made to collect the taxes, and they cannot return to their homes without paying all the taxes which are claimed against them. So the Treasury or the Bureau of Internal Revenue will not be prejudiced by passing this matter over until they have determined whether under existing law they can reach the situation indicated by the Senator's question, or whether additional legislation is necessary.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire if the Senator has any objection to giving me his opinion as to whether or not the Treasury Department has authority to collect taxes on the profits made by refugees?

Mr. GEORGE. The Treasury Department is of the opinion that it now has the authority and power to reach such cases, and I assume its opinion is quite well taken.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to make an inquiry relative to the cosmetics tax. The Senator will recollect that about a year ago the question arose concerning a provision in the law whereby those operating beauty parlors had to pay a tax, whereas those who were selling cosmetics otherwise, such as department stores, did not have to pay a tax. Is a change made in that situation under the pending bill?

Mr. GEORGE. It has not been dealt with by this bill.

Mr. LANGER. The 20-percent tax will apply?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it would be affected by the bill as it came from the House if the House bill should finally be approved, because it is my recollection that tax was increased in 1943. It would drop from 20 percent to 10 percent, under the House bill if it should be approved.

I may say to the Senator—repeating what I have already said—that many of the excise taxes would not be reduced under the bill as it came from the House, and it was the opinion of the committee that we should study the whole group of excise taxes very carefully before we undertook to legislate, and not deal piecemeal with the excise taxes. For instance, there is a tax on stoves, gas, and oil ranges, electric ranges—I believe it even extends to wood burners—which was not increased in 1943 at all, and certainly that tax is one of those for which very little justification can be found at this time. It also was put on during the war. Therefore we prefer to postpone the whole matter until we consider a tax bill when Congress returns after Christmas, when we can study all the excise taxes. But if we had dealt with some excise taxes in this bill, the House having dealt with some, we would have gone about it by a sort of piecemeal selection without a study of the whole picture. Many of them, of course, should come off entirely as soon as it is practical to do so. At the same time we will probably find it necessary to retain a rather wide base of real luxury excise taxes in order to remove from income taxpayers as much as possible of the burden now resting on them.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire how the farmers are affected? The farmer, as I understand, under the present tax law pays on his net profit. As the Senator very well knows—and I have heard him say it many times, and I know he is interested in farming—in some parts of this country, about the greatest gamble there is in the United States is for a man to put in a crop. The farmer pays a tax, as I understand, on his entire net. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. On his net income, but he is given now exemption for himself and all his dependents.

Mr. LANGER. Oh, yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Against both the normal and the surtax.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to make another inquiry of the Senator. If a man gambles on the grain market and buys wheat or cotton which does not exist, does he pay on his net profit or does he pay on only 25 percent of his profit?

Mr. GEORGE. I would not be able to answer the Senator. No universally applicable affirmative or negative answer can be made. It depends entirely on whether that is his business, or whether he is simply taking a flyer in the market, on how long he holds his grain contracts, and so forth.

Mr. LANGER. What I am trying to find out is whether an ordinary citizen making a living by gambling in grain pays on his net income or whether he does not.

Mr. GEORGE. He would pay if that is his regular busines. If that is what he is doing, then he would pay on his net income.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose it is not his regular business. Suppose he is a doctor, and he decides to buy a half million bushels of wheat, and holds the wheat 6 months and makes a profit of $10,000. Does he pay a tax on the $10,000, or does he pay a tax on $2,500?

Mr. GEORGE. If he holds it for more than 6 months it would become a capital gain and he would be entitled to pay a tax of not more than 25 percent of the gain. But if he does not hold it for 6 months he must account for it as a short term gain. And if he loses, he does not get very much advantage by way of a loss.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, if the Senator will yield at that point, if he happens to lose instead of gain, he does not get much credit by reason of the loss.

Mr. GEORGE. Very little.

Mr. LANGER. The farmer does not either if he puts in a crop and loses. That is true, is it not? The farmer cannot carry his loss from 1 year to the next?

Mr. GEORGE. If he is an income taxpayer at all and he has a loss or an entire failure of his crop, he can take his loss and can carry it over.

Mr. LANGER. What is that?

Mr. GEORGE. He can carry it over because it is a part of his trade or business loss.

Mr. LANGER. What I am trying to get at is whether the grain gambler is favored over the farmer who loses his crop?

Mr. GEORGE. I would not think so. We have a capital-gains tax in our revenue law, but the capital-gains tax is not dealt with in this bill at all. The income tax is dealt with, and those in the lower brackets whose net incomes is low will find that this bill gives them considerable relief. More than 12,000,000 persons are taken off the tax roll entirely.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that, and I am in favor of it.

Mr. GEORGE. That includes farmers as well as others.

Mr. LANGER. I am trying, if I can, to find out the comparison between the farmer who actually produces the crop and takes all the risk and the gambler.

Mr. GEORGE. The farmer who produces the crop is like the merchant or anyone else who buys a stock of goods and takes all the risk. If he engages in

capital transactions, he is treated just as every one else is treated. But there is no necessary relationship between his ordinary operations and capital-gains transactions. If he buys a farm and holds it for 6 months and then sells it, he pays a capital-gains tax if he realizes a capital gain.

Mr. LANGER. I am trying to obtain a comparison between the farmer who actually raises a crop of cotton or wheat and the man who gambles in it.

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to say that there is no comparison. In the first place, there is no comparison between the two men. The farmer is taxed on his income derived from his business, as is the merchant, the baker, the candlestick maker, the doctor, the lawyer, and everyone else, if he is operating as an individual. If he engages in capital transactions and has capital gains or capital losses, he has the same benefit as anyone else who engages in similar transactions.

Mr. LANGER. To repeat, if a doctor or anyone else buys half a million bushels of grain and holds it for more than 6 months and sells it at a profit of $10,000, say, is he taxed on the whole $10,000, or is he taxed on 25 percent of it?

Mr. GEORGE. If it is a capital gain—and I understand from the Senator's question that it would be a capital gain—if he buys land, wheat, stocks, or any other kind of property not connected with his ordinary business, and makes a capital gain, he is not taxed on the full gain if it is a long-term gain, that is, if he holds the property as a capital asset for 6 months or more.

Mr. LANGER. How much is he taxed?

Mr. GEORGE. At most, 25 percent of the gain.

Mr. LANGER. If a farmer raises a crop he is taxed on everything he makes, but if a gambler holds——

Mr. GEORGE. He might be taxed 3, 23, or even 50 percent on his net income. He pays a tax on his net income at the rate provided for the bracket in which his income falls.

Mr. LANGER. But if a gambler speculates and holds property for more than 6 months, he is taxed on only 25 percent of his net gain. Is not that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. The tax cannot exceed 25 percent of the gain, unless that is his regular business. If it is his regular business, he is taxed on his entire net income. I cannot make it any clearer to the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator think that is fair?

Mr. GEORGE. Of course it is fair. The law applies to all alike. It makes no difference whether I am a farmer or not. It so happens that I am a farmer, but it makes no difference. If I go into the market and buy something—lands, stocks, or anything else—and realize a capital gain upon the transaction, I am entitled, as is any other taxpayer, to take the benefit of the capital-gains tax. If I suffer a loss, I get very little benefit from a tax standpoint. In my case there would be practically no benefit. On my net income from the farm, to which, of course, is added my salary, because the farm is not incorporated, I pay my tax. I am operating as an individual. The income from the farm is added to my salary, and I pay at the rate which my net income indicates. That is, I pay the rate applicable to the bracket in which my net income happens to fall. I think it is entirely fair.

I believe that the British have a much sounder system. It is not necessary to discuss the philosophy of it at this time, but I believe that the British system is much sounder. As a general proposition they do not recognize ordinary gains and losses as true income, and therefore do not tax them at all. But we have a capital-gains tax. It is applicable to everyone who, outside his regular business, makes a capital investment on which he realizes a gain or a loss. We have broken it down into brackets. The capital-gains tax is perhaps based on the theory of discouraging speculation by requiring the holder of a security to keep it for 6 months or more before he can realize a capital gain upon it and get the benefit of the 25 percent rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator wish to ask a question?

Mr. BUCK. I do.

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BUCK. Does the Senator care to indicate why the committee felt it prudent to raise the tax rates on small corporations with incomes between $15,000 and $60,000, as compared with the rates which the House fixed?

Mr. GEORGE. Actually, the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee is more favorable to the corporation with a small income, a net taxable income of less than $15,000. Beyond that point, the relief afforded by the Senate bill is less than the relief given by the House. That results from the application of a principle which we were trying to apply in an effort to get away from the rather crude "notch" system which exists under the present law. It is true that the result is that the corporation with a net income between $15,000 and $60,000 would pay a somewhat greater tax than under the House bill, although it would be less than under existing law.

Mr. BUCK. The rates between $15,000 and $60,000 are somewhat higher. It seems to me that the smaller corporations are the very ones which we should help all we can in the reconversion period.

Mr. GEORGE. The committee agreed with the general philosophy of the Senator, and was making an effort to give as much relief as possible to corporations which may be described as small corporations. We therefore decided, first, that we would make special provision for all corporations with incomes of $60,000 or less. What the committee has done, of course, represents relief as compared with the present law; that is, it is a reduction as compared with the burden under the present law. As the Senator says, and as I pointed out in my statement to the Senate, the rates are somewhat higher than those in the House bill for corporations having incomes between $15,000 and $60,000. However, it should be pointed out that 200,000 of the 260,000 corporations estimated to have incomes in 1946, are expected to have incomes of less than $15,000.

Mr. BUCK. Is it not true that the savings which the Government would make by reason of the Senate committee rates for small corporations, as compared with those of the House, are offset by the reductions in rates recommended by the committee in the case of individual income taxes?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that is true. However, the reduction in revenue to the Government under the terms of the bill as it came from the House would be about as great as that under the measure recommended by the Senate committee. The arrangement of the individual income-tax rates in the bill as it came from the House would represent about as large a reduction in revenue to the Government as would be the case under the bill reported from the Senate committee. On page 20 of the report the Senator will find a table showing the effective rates on incomes of so-called small corporations, that is, corporations with incomes not exceeding $60,000.

Mr. BUCK. I have that table before me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I desire to address one or two questions to him, if he will be good enough to indulge me.

Mr. GEORGE. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

ABUSES OF CARRY-BACK PROVISIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say in the first place that, in common with all other Members of the Senate, I appreciate the complexity of the task which the Finance Committee has been called upon to perform. The chairman of the Finance Committee will, however, I am sure, recognize that those of us who have not had the advantage of serving upon the committee, and now for the first time have the opportunity of examining the bill and the report, may find it just a little difficult to understand precisely what has been done and what the general effect will be.

In glancing over the report, on page 19 I find this paragraph to which I should like to draw the attention of the Senator:

> The 2-year carry-back of unused excess-profits credits is retained for 1 year beyond the repeal of the excess-profits tax. Thus it will be possible to carry back unused excess-profits credits arising in 1946 to 1944 and 1945 and reduce the excess-profits tax paid in these years.

Do I correctly understand that to mean that under this bill, which undertakes to repeal the excess-profits tax, there nevertheless will be a continuation of the carry-back provisions, which in some cases—perhaps in many—will result in reducing the excess-profits tax already accrued for 1944 and 1945?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, let me say that the loss carry-back provision applicable to the excess-profits tax does permit a carry-back of a loss against the taxes

actually paid during a profit year. The theory of the loss carry-back is simply that in a war period, with rapidly fluctuating prices and with rapidly fluctuating inventories, it is not quite possible for any taxpayer to be said to have made a profit unless more than 1 year is considered. In an ordinary, normal period in many cases it is difficult enough to determine whether profits have actually been made. But particularly is that true in a war period. So there are two types of loss carry-back. One is the loss carry-back of losses sustained. That is not affected by this bill, and of course that continues. Then there is the loss carry-back of the unused excess-profits credit. If a corporation has an unused excess-profits credit in any year, it may carry it back as against taxes actually paid in the two preceding years. That is the general or ordinary principle.

The Secretary of the Treasury recognized that it would not be equitable or fair to cut off the excess-profits taxpayers without some advantage accruing from the unused excess-profits credit available to them. But he did say that he did not think the unused excess-profits credit should be continued for more than 1 year after the repeal of the tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, will this credit which may be carried back against the accrued taxes of previous years be a credit accruing under this bill, that is to say, a credit which accrues in the future?

Mr. GEORGE. If the taxpayer has an unused excess-profits credit arising in 1946, it may be carried back to 1945 or 1944.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, we are now in 1945.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Therefore, it would seem to me that this proposal has the effect of making it possible for a corporation which has made an excess profit and has become liable for an excess-profits tax during the war years to apply against that war tax a credit which will be earned in a peace year.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. That is what the provision is intended to do. Let me to say to the Senator that in trying to devise an equitable excess-profits tax we were confronted with innumerable problems: First, what credit were we going to fix? Everything a corporation makes is not excess profits.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. GEORGE. It might be only $1. Therefore, we had to fix a measure for determining excess profits. We had to determine how we should deal with declining inventories and undermaintenance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I realize that it is a problem of great complexity.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me finish, please; I shall be very brief.

There was suggested on the part of the railroads and various other corporations that they be allowed to set up a deferred maintenance reserve. They could not make the improvements during the war. They said, "Therefore, let us have a reserve which we can now set up, which we can use after the war to do the things we should have been doing during the war." Then there was a larger group of corporations which said, "We want and we must have, if we are to be saved from bankruptcy, a depreciation reserve or an inventory reserve to meet our problems."

What happened was that we did not grant the relief which either group asked for, or even the relief which other types asked for. We provided for a carry-back provision. Subsequently, because of great inequities which we found developing, we provided for an unused excess-profits credit carry-back.

I should like to say further to the Senator that we recognized that there were some corporations which were in a position to take advantage and which might take great advantage of even this 1-year carry-back of unused excess-profits credit.

In the part of the report which appears on page 30, the following is pointed out:

> There is danger that the operation of the unused excess-profits credit carry-back provision, particularly in 1946, may make possible certain abuses. These potential abuses might arise through various devices or transactions entered into wholly or in large part for the purpose of obtaining refunds of wartime excess-profits taxes through unused credit carry-backs, or through transactions having the apparent effect of creating carry-back refunds in situations unrelated to the purpose and intent of the provisions allowing carry-backs. While various tax-avoidance schemes are already dealt with either by express provision in the internal-revenue laws or through court decisions, your committee will give further consideration to the necessity or desirability of retroactive legislation in this connection.

I think a typical example would be in the case of a corporation which, through 1946, had merely maintained a skeleton organization, very largely hoping to realize profits out of the application of this very principle, and therefore the necessity of a further study and further legislation in order to meet the abuses if, as, and when they may arise.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the Senator's reference to that aspect of the situation, because I was about to raise that question, having read the sentence from the report on page 19. However, it is recognized in the report that this carry-back is subject to abuse. The recognition by the committee of the fact that it is subject to abuse and inequities, and the declaration which the Senator just read from page 30 of the report, constitute, in the Senator's opinion, I take it, as well as in the opinion of other members of his committee, sufficient notice to taxpayers that abuses will not be tolerated.

Mr. GEORGE. They will not be tolerated. The Senator is entirely correct. That fact undoubtedly was in the mind of the Secretary of the Treasury when he asked for a reduction of the period from 2 years to 1 year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, we are all familiar with the fact that advantage is always taken of the letter of any tax law in order to create losses which may be deducted from taxes due. That, of course, is something which should be avoided, particularly when having emerged from the war we create a system by which, apparently, losses which might be voluntarily incurred during peacetime could be set aside as deductions against profits which had been properly a subject of high taxation during the war.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is quite correct. We incorporated this provision at two places in the bill in order to serve as a warning. We have the happy advantage of being able to enact retroactive legislation in order to meet any situation of the kind which the Senator apprehends will arise and, frankly, I think it will arise in some cases.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It occurs to me as being appropriate to suggest that it might be of information to the Senate if the chairman would request the staff of the Finance Committee to prepare a memorandum to be inserted in the RECORD, setting forth in a little more detail the character of the abuses and inequities to which reference has been made. I believe that in passing upon the bill we should know just what kind of abuses are likely to occur.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that the staff is at work on the problem, and we do not want to become committed or frozen to any enumeration of circumstances which we might wish to upset by subsequent legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be possible to disavow any purpose of becoming committed.

Mr. GEORGE. It is sufficient to say that if any abuse occurs we will have the power and right to correct it by retroactive legislation. That is why we were at great pains to emphasize at two places in the report not only the possibility but the certainty that further steps will be taken if those abuses actually occur.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I compliment the chairman of the committee for taking that position.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that in 90 percent of the cases no abuse will occur.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I still believe that it would be of great benefit to the Members of the Congress, and to the public as well, to know the type of abuse and inequity of which the committee has already apparently taken cognizance.

Mr. President, there is another question which I wish to propound to the Senator from Georgia. Unfortunately I was not able to be on the floor of the Senate, because of a meeting of the Appropriations Committee, when the Senator began his exposition of the bill at approximately 11 o'clock this morning. I do not find, in running hastily through the report, an estimate of the revnue from corporations which is likely to be received under the bill as revised by the Senate committee, and an estimate of the revenue likely to be received from individuals. Has such a table been prepared?

Mr. GEORGE. The tables on pages 4 and 5 of the report supply the information. They show the estimated tax liabilities under present law, under the House bill and under the Finance Committee bill. Estimated net reductions in tax liabilities under both the House and Senate bills appear on page 5 of the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I shall be very glad to examine

the tables to which the Senator has referred.

I notice on page 6 of the report, under the heading "General discussion of recommended individual income-tax reductions," in the second paragraph, the following statement:

The revenue loss from this provision is estimated at $782,000,000.

I accept that as being a statement that the committee is of the opinion that the revenue loss, by reason of concessions granted to individual income taxpayers, will be only $782,000,000, while on page 19 of the report——

Mr. GEORGE. No: the Senator is incorrect. The reference is only to one provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. What is the total?

Mr. GEORGE. The total is $2,644,000,000. That figure appears in the table on page 5 of the report. It applies only to individuals. The loss to which the Senator first called attention results from the application of the surtax exemptions to the normal tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. That is only one item.

Mr. GEORGE. It is only one item.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are several items, and the total, as I understand the Senator, of reductions on individuals will be greater than two and one-half billion dollars.

Mr. GEORGE. It will be $2,644,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How does that figure compare with the reduction which will be granted to corporations?

Mr. GEORGE. The estimated reduction in the case of corporations is $2,849,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reduction for corporations is slightly more, therefore, than is the reduction for individuals?

Mr. GEORGE. It is slightly more, but there is an automobile use tax involved, the removal of which will actually benefit individuals, and the loss there is estimated to be $140,000,000. There is not a large difference between the two figures.

INDIVIDUALS PAY MORE TAXES THAN CORPORATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to invite attention of the members of the Senate Finance Committee, as well as all other Members of the Senate, to the fact that there has been a change in the source of the bulk of the national revenue during the war. Prior to 1944 the corporation income-tax law always resulted in a much larger revenue to the Federal Government than did the income tax on individuals. During the year 1944 for the first time the rates on individual income taxes were so raised that the receipts from individuals exceeded the receipts from corporations by considerably more than $3,000,000,000. That was true also in 1945. An inquiry of the Treasury Department elicits the information that the estimates for 1946 are not available, but, Mr. President, I think that this is a matter of great significance. In 1940, for example, the individual income taxes amounted to $982,000,000, whereas corporate income taxes amounted to $1,148,000,000. In 1941 individual income-tax receipts to the Federal Treasury amounted to $1,418,000,000, while corporation taxes amounted to $2,053,000,000. In 1942 individual income taxes increased to $3,263,000,000, and corporate income taxes increased to $4,744,000,000. In 1943 the comparison was: Individual income taxes, $6,620,000,000; corporation income taxes, $9,669,000,000. In 1944, however, there came a tremendous change. Individuals on their income taxes for that year paid the stupendous sum of $18,261,000,000, while corporation income taxes amounted only to $14,767,000,000. I say "only" by comparison. In 1945 the figures were individual income taxes, $19,034,000,000; corporation income taxes, $16,027,000,000.

There must be some significance to these figures, and I should like to have them explained.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I merely wanted to ask the Senator a question. Does he not think it fair in making that analysis to point out that a very substantial part of the income on which taxes were paid in the hands of individuals came from the corporations in the form of dividends, and so forth? So, in reality, there was a double taxation paid on corporation receipts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That, of course, is a factor which is worth considering. I am asking these questions in order to obtain a little information upon the subject.

Mr. HAWKES. I am not questioning the Senator's purpose; I know what his purpose is. The only thing I have in mind is to point out that a very substantial part of the $19,000,000,000 paid by individuals in the form of income taxes came really from corporations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not want to say of this bill that it provides benefits for corporations but high taxes for individuals.

Mr. HAWKES. No. I agree with the Senator absolutely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that it is important to know the significance of these figures. I am moved to make this observation: One of the serious aspects of our whole economic problem is that we have changed from an individual economy to an organized economy. The large corporation has had a more favored position than the small corporation, and both—certainly the large corporation—have had a much better place in the economy than the individual has had. The large corporation is able to sustain itself on reserves or carry-back provisions, whereas the individual does not have the opportunity quite so easily to protect himself. We should be on our guard, it seems to me, against passing a tax bill, the effect of which would be to emphasize this transformation from an individual economy to an organized corporate economy.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the Senator is entirely wrong in his premises.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am asking questions, may I say to the Senator?

Mr. GEORGE. We have an individual income-tax liability base at the present time of $43,476,000,000. That is the total surtax net income—$43,476,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. GEORGE. From page 46.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of the hearings?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; page 46 of the hearings, part I. As the corporation base is only $16,000,000,000, of course, more revenue is obtained from the $43,000,000,000 base than from the $16,000,000,000 base.

Then, too, the individual rate is very high. It goes up beyond 90 percent on individuals, and it is only by virtue of a cut-back that it is held to 90 percent; it would be right up to the roof if it were not cut back under existing law. Individuals do not get sufficient relief in this bill, I grant, and it will be a couple of years before they can be relieved so as to pay what is a reasonable tax; but actually in this country a tremendous volume of business is carried on by individuals, as sole proprietors or partnerships, who are taxed as individuals, so that total surtax net income, after exemptions, is estimated at $43,476,000,000, while corporate net income is estimated at $16,545,000,000. That is the net income of all corporations. The estimated tax in 1946 on all corporation income, including excess profits and capital-stock taxes, is $9,054,000,000, under the present law if that law were continued in effect. That is the estimate of receipts from all corporation taxes—$9,054,000,000—while individual incomes will pay an estimated liability of $13,340,000,000. It is a larger tax than the corporation tax, but the base, of course, is very much greater, and the rates on incomes of individuals have gone up very rapidly since 1940.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did not that same disparity exist in 1942 and in previous years?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it did because of the great number of individual income taxpayers and the high rates on their total surtax net income. There are only 260,000 taxpaying corporations. There are more corporations than that, but some of them do not pay a tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is precisely why I asked the question. I am pointing out that all through the history of the income tax, certainly so far as these figures which I have before me are concerned, from 1930 to date, the Government received more from the corporations in corporate income taxes than it took from individuals, until 1944, when the situation was reversed; so I am inquiring why that change has been made.

Mr. GEORGE. I will say to the Senator that we never levied very heavy taxes on individuals until the beginning of the defense and war period, when our individual tax rates were raised. If the point the Senator wishes to make is that they are entirely too high now, I thoroughly agree.

A FISCAL CRISIS CONFRONTS US

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, Mr. President, I feel that this is the time when the Government needs revenue more than it probably ever needed it before. The war is over, but the economic readjustment has not been made. We have a national debt at this moment, according to the last figures of the Treasury, of

$262,000,000,000, and we are still financing out of deficits. The national income, according to the latest reports from Government sources, is falling off; and when I speak of the national income, I am speaking of the receipts by the businesses and the individuals of the country, and not the receipts of the Federal Government.

Obviously, when the national income falls off and the national debt climbs higher, we are confronted with a crisis, and I seriously question whether we should undertake at a time like this to make any substantial cut in our revenues.

The most appalling thing, Mr. President, from the financial point of view of this Government, it seems to me, is that the pending bill undertakes to make a reduction in the tax revenue of this Government almost as great as the amount of the interest the Government will have to pay upon the national debt next year. The estimate of interest upon the national debt for the fiscal year 1946 was four and a half billion dollars. That is a charge against the Treasury of the United States, and at the very moment when we are confronted with that charge, and are embarking upon the sale of more bonds to the public, we are reducing the receipts of the Treasury out of which that interest must be paid.

Mr. President, I cannot fail to remember that before we became involved in manufacturing war commodities for France and for England, in 1939, 1940, and 1941, and the national debt had reached a peak of about $50,000,000,000, almost twice what it was at the end of World War I, everyone in the country wondered what was going to happen. There were many predictions of the destruction of our system, the system of private property, and those predictions were based upon sound reasoning. But now we have a national debt which is five times greater than the national debt which preceded the war, and we undertake blithely to cut taxes.

Mr. President, are we trying to tell the people of the United States that we have issued from this crisis and that our national fiscal worries are over? Are we trying to tell them that a national debt of $262,000,000,000 does not amount to very much?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator venture a guess as to what would happen to reconversion if we were to continue the high taxes paid by individuals and by corporations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My impression is that it would not seriously affect reconversion, because I believe there can be no successful reconversion unless it is made upon a sound basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is not cutting taxes at this time one of the main features, and will not reconversion be helped by our following that course?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is one of the reasons that is advanced, certainly, but that it is a sound reason I seriously doubt. I think we are blindfolding ourselves.

The truth of the matter is that there is a tremendous demand in the United States for consumer commodities of various kinds. We hear a great deal of the so-called pent-up demand. That pent-up demand is not going to diminish overnight, or be filled overnight. In my opinion, that pent-up demand will not be sufficient to reestablish our economy. But certainly it is a thing upon which we can make the first faltering step toward the reestablishment of a sound economy.

There is a tremendous demand abroad, too, a potential demand, which may or may not become actual. The rebuilding of Europe, if ever we undertake to permit the people of Europe to rebuild, the rebuilding of China, may create a market for vast production here in the United States, but certainly everyone knows that the great danger to sound fiscal policy, the great danger to the system of private property, the great danger to capitalism, is that the national debt will become so great that it cannot be paid. I call attention to the fact that one of the primary contentions of the Communist leaders has always been that capitalism will break down, because national debts cannot be paid. Are we going to invite that sort of catastrophe in the United States?

Mr. President, these, I think, are profound questions, which deserve a great deal of consideration. I understand that an effort will be made to put the pending bill through very quickly. Whether it is desirable to do that or not, I do not know.

AMOUNT OF SAVINGS BONDS

I have in my hand a table showing the holdings of savings bonds in the United States. Series A to D bonds are now in the hands of individual citizens of this country in the accumulated amount, current redemption value, of $3,565,000,000; series E bonds, $29,869,000,000; series F bonds, $2,674,000,000; series G bonds have a face value outstanding of $10,633,000,000, making a total of $46,741,000,000.

Mr. President, these are demand bonds. These are bonds the holders of which may go to any bank or post office and ask for the payment not only of the interest but of the principal. Is it good sense, with $46,741,000,000 worth of savings bonds outstanding in the hands of the people of the United States, to undertake to slash the taxes? I am quite willing, of course, to correct inequities. They ought to be corrected. I recognize the fact that the excess-profits tax is an unnecessary burden upon reconversion and it ought to be eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to finish. I believe the bill as it came from the House repealing only 40 percent, if I am correctly advised, of the excess-profits tax and leaving 60 percent, would constitute an almost insuperable barrier to the little businesses of the United States to recover. Therefore I compliment the Senate Finance Committee for having made provision to repeal it in its entirety. I think that is a justifiable act, because we are here dealing with a tax system for peace instead of a tax system for war. I would like to stimulate all business, little and big too, and give them the chance to make some profits. But we must keep these bonds sound.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in full agreement with the Senator from Wyoming, but I should like to know the extent to which he thinks the excess profits tax should be reduced. In its entirety?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am rather inclined to accept the action of the Finance Committee on that because if I understant it correctly, the formula which was devised in great haste during the war for the purpose of acquiring an increased revenue to help pay for the war is not an equitable formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the bill now before the Senate all excess profits taxes would be repealed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. That is my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, the Senator is questioning the advisability of reducing income taxes as far as individuals are concerned. Am I correct in that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And income taxes so far as corporations are concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the latter reduction amounts, according to the report, to $294,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, it is much more than that.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the report states on page 3; "$294,000,000 to the reduction of other corporate taxes."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I said to the Senator from Georgia a few moments ago, I have not had an opportunity to examine this report or all of these tables, but in response to my question a moment ago the Senator from Georgia said that the reduction of taxes upon individuals will amount to about two-billion-six-hundred-million-odd dollars, whereas the reduction of taxes on corporations will amount to two-billion-five-hundred-million-odd dollars. What the difference is between income-tax reduction and excess-profits-tax reduction I have not had the opportunity to see.

Mr. ELLENDER. According to the report on page 3 the amount attributable to the reduction of income taxes on individuals aggregates $2,644,000,000, and on corporations, because of the excess-profits-tax reduction, it is $2,555,000,000, and the reduction of other corporate taxes amounts to $294,000,000.

To what extent does the Senator feel that reductions should be accorded to individual taxpayers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not talking about details. I am not a member of the Finance Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator——

GOVERNMENT'S TAX RECEIPTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am talking here frankly in generalities. But I am calling the attention of the Senate to what I regard to be a factual situation of the greatest moment. For example, here is another set of figures which I think ought to be in the RECORD. I undertook to make an examination of the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1944. In table 2 of that report I find

a list of the over-all tax receipts of the Federal Government. I took the tax receipts for the years 1920 to 1932, inclusive, because here we find the temperature, so to speak, of the economic body. Here we find the record of the prosperity era of the twenties and the depression era of the thirties. Let no one close his eyes or ears to this record. In 1920 the over-all tax receipts of the United States Government amounted to $6,695,000,000. We had a big debt. We came out of the World War with a debt of $26,500,000,000. And we were possessed then, as we are possessed now, with the passion for reducing taxes, of convincing the people that "This is an easy matter, and we are going to make it convenient for you to make profit."

REDUCE TAXES OR PAY DEBT?

Let us see what happened. We reduced the taxes certainly, and we did not pay the debt. In this capitalistic system of ours under the secretaryship of Mr. Andrew Mellon, the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Albert Gallatin or Alexander Hamilton—I do not know which—we were reducing taxes. We paid off $9,000,000,000 of the debt, to be sure. But we did not pay it off as we could have paid it off with the profits that the people were earning, because we were more concerned with reducing the amount that was paid by the corporations and the individuals. We reduced the taxes so that in 1928, a year before the crash, the over-all tax receipts of the Federal Government were $4,042,000,000, a reduction of $2,650,000,000.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to say that I appreciate very much, so far as I am concerned, the point of view of the Senator from Wyoming is expressing, because unless the Members of the Senate and the people of the United States realize that we have got to do the things which are necessary in order to keep ourselves financially sound and maintain the standing of the dollar in the world, we are going to have great difficulty.

I think there is a difference of viewpoint here. I do not know that there is a difference in objective. The committee has very carefully gone into all these things, and under the circumstance I am in a very definite accord with the recommendations of the committee.

I want to leave this point with the Senator from Wyoming, for whom I have a very high respect and regard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. No one in this body, and no one in the United States knows how much money would be kept out of the Treasury by taking off the excess-profits tax at the present time. We must think about the increased wages, the increased demands, the costs and the ceilings and all other things. I defy anyone in this country to tell me whether business—big business and little business—is going to make excess-profits tax money even with the opportunities for successful operation that lie in front of them. If the excess profit is not there, then by removing that tax we stimulate them to reach for something and thereby augment and implement the use of manpower by setting the machine in operation again. If we have done that we have done a great job without paying the price out of the Treasury.

If the distinguished Senator differs with me, I should like to have him say how he knows, or why he thinks, that under the conditions which are before us the great excess profit from which this revenue to the Government is to come, is to be produced.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator misunderstands me. I have said that I believe the committee is acting wisely in recommending the repeal of the excess-profits tax.

Mr. HAWKES. No; I did not misunderstand the Senator. I understand him perfectly. The point is that when we talk about the approximately $5,000,000,000 which is being taken out of the revenue of the country, about two and a half billion dollars of that amount is from excess profits. I believe that the Senator and I are thinking along the same lines, but I wish to give him my business point of view. I do not believe that today there is a business institution in the United States which knows that it is going to make an excess profit under the conditions confronting business. The Senator was not in the Chamber when we were discussing the question of a general tax bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was in the Appropriations Committee considering the spending of money out of the deficit.

Mr. HAWKES. There is no way by which we can handle the taxation problem satisfactorily to the people of the United States until we handle the problem of the appropriation, expenditure, and waste of money by the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I remind the Senator that a few weeks ago the Committee on Banking and Currency reported a bill intended to equip the Government to make a plan for full employment. When that bill was under debate here it was denounced as unsound because, as it came from the committee, it did not carry provision for a tax to finance possible expenditures. Now those arguments are forgotten.

We know that we are still confronted by tremendous deficit expenditures which cannot be avoided, and by deficit lending. Great Britain started with a request for $8,000,000,000. It is now down to approximately $3,000,000,000. I understand that France wishes to borrow, and Russia. UNRRA is seeking an appropriation of $550,000,000, an appropriation which, in all probability, we must grant, because we cannot permit hunger and starvation to stalk through Europe and the conquered areas. But the obligations of the Government are increasing, and in the name of sound fiscal policy we are now talking about cutting away the taxes.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator. We are all seeking the same point. No one knows just where that point is. However, as I understand, it is the belief of the Senate Committee on Finance, of which I am a member, that the examination of the excess-profits tax, which I understand the Senator favors——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because I believe it would be a stimulus to little business.

Mr. HAWKES. Absolutely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because I believe that the formula under which the tax is paid is defective, in that it creates a basis which is altogether favorable to the large corporation and altogether unfavorable to the small corporation and the new corporation. We need new business.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me say to the Senator that my reasons expressed in the committee were precisely as the Senator has stated. I believe that the removal of the excess-profits tax will do more for little business, more for business which does not have an established, satisfactory basis of earnings, and more for new business, than it will do for old business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is essential; and any expenditure which we make out of the Federal Treasury by way of reduced taxes, as well as by way of appropriations for public works to create employment, is a justifiable and sound contribution by the Federal Government if it results in creating new business and thereby creating new taxes.

Mr. HAWKES. If the Senator will let me conclude, I shall not bother him further.

It is my hope that when we come to the consideration of a general tax bill next year we shall be able to know more about where we are moving in connection with the industrial operations of the country and the needs for money, and be able to devise a bill simple enough for everyone to understand, a bill which will furnish revenue to do the things we are talking about today, because we must keep faith. We must pay our debts. There is no way that I know of to get rid of a debt except to pay it, and this great Nation must pay its debts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HAWKES. The Committee on Finance has used its best endeavors to find a point to which we can reduce taxes and stimulate industry, starting the wheels of business so that we can get the full employment we are all talking about, and thereby produce revenue, because, after all is said and done, a tax bill which would take 99 percent of everything everyone makes, when no one made anything, would not produce any revenue. So, as I stated earlier in the day, we must find the happy medium. We must find a tax which will produce revenue, and which is fair enough so that it will stimulate business to go back to full effort and work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am grateful to the Senator for his contribution to this discussion. I have already expressed my gratitude to the Committee on Finance for the announcement contained in the report, and reaffirmed here upon the floor by the distinguished and able chairman the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], that the committee is now at work upon a revision of the tax structure. It is a job which needs very much to be done.

COUNTRY FACING INFLATION

Mr. President, I was calling the attention of the Senate to the gravity of the

over-all situation. I wish the record to be clear, that this country is facing inflation, and that those who may believe that it is possible for them to profit themselves by avoiding taxes while some other segment of the economy bears the burden are only deluding themselves. I rise to say that we are reenacting the history of the period following World War I. I was pointing out how, during the twenties, we were more concerned with reducing taxes than we were with sustaining the sound basis of our fiscal system by paying off the debt. I read the total amount which was received by the Federal Government in 1920, including customs revenue and miscellaneous receipts. The amount was $6,695,000,000. In 1929 that had been reduced to $4,033,000,000, a decrease of more than $2,600,000,000. In 1931 the revenue fell, not because of the reduction of taxes, but because of the depression. Tax rates made no difference because the people were not employed. So the revenue in 1931 was only $3,190,000,000, considerably less than half the revenue in 1920, and almost $1,000,000,000 less than the revenue in 1928. But in 1932 we were all engaged upon deficit spending, because the income and the profits of the people had almost disappeared. In that year the revenue of the Federal Government was only $2,006,000,000.

This certainly raises the question whether we are wise when we voluntarily undertake to cut the Nation's tax receipts. Are we wise when we set our feet upon the same path which was followed in the twenties, particularly when we know that we are confronted with this tremendous debt of $262,000,000,000, of which $46,000,000,000 is held by the little people of America. Today we are confronted with a debt of $262,000,000,000, and all the rest of the world is looking to us to finance them.

Never did the Nation need revenue more than it needs it now. Never were the people better prepared to bear taxes than they are now. Never was capitalism in greater danger than now. Never was there a more inappropriate time to cut taxes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to compliment the Senator, and I fully agree with him. I am going to extend him a very cordial invitation to join the economy bloc. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I remember that shortly before the full-employment bill was under consideration here, I voted upon this floor to reduce the authorized expenditure for building airports to $50,000,000 a year, while some of those who were attacking the full-employment bill were voting for an authorization of $75,000,000 a year, but no tax to pay it.

Mr. President, now I have said a good deal more than I intended to say——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BAILEY. I welcomed the compromise whereby we reduced the authorization with respect to airports. But we in the Senate cannot levy taxes. That bill originated in the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I made the remark because the Senator invited me to join the economy bloc, and I was merely pointing out that I was $25,000,000 more economy-minded than were some of the opponents of the measure I was sponsoring in an endeavor to increase the earning capacity of the people and the businesses of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. What I wish to say is with regard to the suggestion that no tax was provided for in connection with that measure. I am in favor of a tax program which will pay the way of the airport bill. But we in the Senate cannot insert such a tax program in the bill. We on the Senate side cannot impose taxes. In some of the remarks which I made in the Senate when the airport bill was pending, I said that as matters stood I am inclined to believe that the development of aviation in this country will account for every dollar we appropriate, first by way of revenues from the gasoline taxes, and already we are making money on the post-office end of it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, Mr. President, the full-employment bill of which I was speaking was a declaration of policy, and the tax feature had no particular application as to whether it originated in this branch of Congress or in the House of Representatives.

Now let me add just a further word. We know that the danger of inflation is great. We know that the best answer to inflation is increased production. Anything which contributes toward increasing production, increasing business, increasing employment, is contributing toward the salvation of our system, whether it comes by way of reduced taxation or by way of sound expenditures. But no person in all this country should close his eyes to the danger which confronts our system. As President Roosevelt once said, if I remember correctly, in one of his campaign speeches in 1932, we can wreck free government upon the shoals of unsound fiscal policy. Let us be sure that we are not engaging upon it now.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD the following tables: United States savings bonds outstanding on September 30, 1945; sales of E bonds, by States, in the fiscal years 1944 and 1945; individual and corporate income-tax collections from 1930 through 1946; over-all tax receipts from 1920 through 1932; and expenditures for interest on the public debt from 1930 through 1946. Mr. President, although I discussed this point briefly, after glancing at the table I cannot refrain from calling the attention of those who are here to the fact that in 1930 the interest on the national debt was $659,000,000, whereas in 1945 the interest on the national debt was $3,617,000,000. Over that period there was an increase of almost $3,000,000,000, and the record shows that the receipts of the Federal Government from income taxes upon individuals never reached $3,000,000,000 until the year 1942, when those receipts totaled $3,263,000,000.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States savings bonds outstanding on Sept. 30, 1945

[In millions of dollars]

Series A–D	[1] 3,565
Series E	[1] 29,869
Series F	[1] 2,674
Series G	[2] 10,633
Total	46,741

[1] Current redemption value.
[2] Face amount.
Source: Statement of the public debt, Sept. 30, 1945 (on the basis of daily Treasury statements).

Sales of E bonds by States, fiscal years of 1944–45

[In millions of dollars]

State	1944	1945
Alabama	139	152
Arizona	42	44
Arkansas	74	76
California	970	972
Colorado	90	83
Connecticut	221	212
Delaware	28	27
District of Columbia	135	140
Florida	143	155
Georgia	146	157
Idaho	40	37
Illinois	755	842
Indiana	314	323
Iowa	263	243
Kansas	163	163
Kentucky	128	122
Louisiana	141	135
Maine	55	52
Maryland	153	157
Massachusetts	391	373
Michigan	688	628
Minnesota	250	229
Mississippi	83	87
Missouri	284	273
Montana	55	52
Nebraska	128	127
Nevada	13	14
New Hampshire	33	32
New Jersey	415	421
New Mexico	28	29
New York	1,290	1,365
North Carolina	149	153
North Dakota	58	57
Ohio	714	710
Oklahoma	135	139
Oregon	160	157
Pennsylvania	857	857
Rhode Island	61	63
South Carolina	76	80
South Dakota	54	49
Tennessee	147	147
Texas	495	477
Utah	56	54
Vermont	19	18
Virginia	190	203
Washington	258	247
West Virginia	92	96
Wisconsin	248	262
Wyoming	24	22

Adjustment: Add to 1944 figures $226,000,000, subtract from 1945 figures $20,000,000. $58,000,000 in 1944 was unallocated to States.
Totals: 1944 total, $11,820,000,000; 1945 total, $11,520,000,000 (Daily Treasury statement).
Table above from the Treasury Bulletin for October 1945.

Individual and corporate income-tax collections

[In millions of dollars]

	Individual income taxes	Corporation income taxes [1]
Fiscal year—		
1930	1,147	1,263
1931	834	1,025
1932	427	630
1933	353	394
1934	420	400
1935	527	579
1936	674	753
1937	1,092	1,088
1938	1,286	1,343
1939	1,029	1,156
1940	982	1,148

[1] Includes excess-profits taxes.

Individual and corporate income-tax collections—Continued

	Individual income taxes	Corporation income taxes [1]
Fiscal year—Continued		
1941	1,418	2,053
1942	3,263	4,744
1943	6,630	9,669
1944	18,261	14,767
1945	19,034	16,027
1946 (estimated)	(2)	(2)

[1] Not available.

Source: For 1930–44, table 8 of Annual Report of Secretary of the Treasury for 1944, which figures are based upon Bureau of Internal Revenue reports of collections. For 1945, Bureau of Internal Revenue reports of collections.

Over-all tax receipts—total receipts (including customs revenue and miscellaneous receipts)

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year:	Amount
1920	6,695
1921	5,625
1922	4,109
1923	4,007
1924	4,012
1925	3,780
1926	3,963
1927	4,129
1928	4,042
1929	4,033
1930	4,178
1931	3,190
1932	2,006

Source: Table No. 2, Secretary's annual report 1944.

Expenditures for interest on the public debt

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year:	Amount
1930	659
1931	612
1932	599
1933	689
1934	757
1935	821
1936	749
1937	866
1938	926
1939	941
1940	1,041
1941	1,111
1942	1,260
1943	1,808
1944	2,609
1945	3,617
1946 (estimated)	4,500

Source: For fiscal years 1930–44, annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury. Figures based upon daily Treasury statements. For fiscal year 1945, daily Treasury statement. For fiscal year 1946, revised Budget estimates of August 31, 1945.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Vinson, with respect to the number of taxpayers, starting with 362,970 in 1916, and increasing up to the number we have at the present time. I should like to have the entire paragraph of the statement on that point inserted at this place in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. VINSON. * * *

There you see the number of taxable returns running from 362,970 in 1916 and then up to 4,489,698 in 1924. Then we increased exemptions and there was a drop—I think that was in the Revenue Act of 1926—and there was a drop down to 2,500,000 in 1925. There were 2,470,990 taxable returns in 1926, and in 1931, when it was at the bottom, 1,525,546. Then in 1939, which is the year we generally take as a prewar year—and it may not exactly be a fair prewar year, it may be that 1938 would be better for some purposes—in 1939 you had just less than 4,000,000, and in 1938, 3,000,000 plus. And under the proposal that I suggested you will have 31,500,000. Perhaps 10 times as much as in 1938, and about 7½ times as much as in 1939.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment has been stated, and the question now is on agreeing to it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope we may make some progress with the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will again state the first amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Georgia what the program is. Will Members of the Senate have an opportunity to examine the report at length before we are called upon to vote upon the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. We hope to conclude debate on the bill as early as possible.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Naturally.

Mr. GEORGE. But the bill will have to go to conference. In order that it may be properly administered, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, so I am advised, thinks it should receive the bill around the 1st of November, or else it will not be able to prepare tables, additional forms, and so forth, in time.

I do not know how long consideration of the bill will take. I think we can ascertain that better when we see how many amendments will be offered or what changes to the bill will be suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment of the committee has already been read once by the clerk.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if we are ready to proceed now with the amendments, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I withhold it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no desire at all to impede action upon the bill, and I shall not object to consideration of the amendments now if we are to understand that a final vote upon the bill will not be asked for today.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I cannot make any agreement. This measure is of such character that under the circumstances I shall not be able to make any agreement. I had hoped that we might be able to get through with the bill today or at least tomorrow, but I cannot go beyond that statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the Senator's judgment as to the likelihood of passing the bill today? Does he think that point will be reached?

Mr. GEORGE. It is already nearly 2 o'clock, and we have been in session since 11 o'clock. We have not yet reached the first amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope we have not wasted time.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope not. I cannot answer the Senator's question. The answer will depend on the amendments which may be offered to the bill. There are lying on the table only two printed amendments. I think we will be very lucky if we complete consideration of the bill by tomorrow evening.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall await developments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gurney	O'Daniel
Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Huffman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Knowland	Shipstead
Butler	La Follette	Smith
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Cordon	Magnuson	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Mitchell	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
George	Morse	Wilson
Gerry	Murdock	Young
Green	Murray	
Guffey	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ELECTRIC POWER BOARD OF CHATTANOOGA

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, last Monday I referred to the annual report of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, Tenn. I pointed out that the board made use of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and that electricity was sold by the board at rates which, as I recall without placing my finger at the moment upon the actual figures, brought about an average saving to users, both domestic and commercial, of about 1 cent a kilowatt-hour. Since the advent of TVA the average rate there has been about nine-tenths of 1 cent per kilowatt-hour, while in contrast the average cost of power sold by private power companies in the last year of the Tennessee Power Co.'s operations was 1.7 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Mr. President, the statement of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga has attracted some attention, and several questions have been asked me about it. In order that the Senate may have the full benefit of the report, although a small portion of it advertises the city and area of Chattanooga, I ask unanimous consent that the report in its entirety be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. It is not long, covering only about 20 pages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in reply to several questions which have been

asked me about the report, I should like particularly to point out that the electric power board annually pays taxes to the city of Chattanooga and the county of Hamilton, and with respect to the payment of taxes, on page 25 of the report I find this observation:

Many people do not realize the power board is the largest payer of real and property taxes to the city of Chattanooga and Hamilton County. Last year—

Which means 1944, because this is a current report—

Last year $362,000 was paid, amounting to 6.5 percent of the board's income.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. If the same lines and accessories employed in the distribution of power were in the hands of a private corporation, how much would the tax yield be?

Mr. STEWART. I am not able to answer that question, because I do not have the figures before me. I do not remember what the appraised value of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. system was in the year 1938, when it was sold to the Electric Board of the City of Chattanooga, but I made the statement the other day, and it is included in the report, that the power company's distribution system was sold to the electric power board for $10,850,000. That was during the latter part of the year 1939. There has been therefore more than six full years' operation by the power board, and in that period the power board has paid taxes each year, and has earned in excess of $16,000,000. Within those 6 years they have actually earned and paid for the distribution system which they purchased in 1939 and have earned in addition to that nearly $6,000,000.

I shall be glad to undertake to procure for the Senator, if he is interested in them, comparative figures respecting tax valuations. I cannot say what the tax valuation would be if the power distribution system were still owned by the Tennessee Electric Power Co. or any other private power company. But I can procure for the Senator the figures at which the power distribution system, when privately owned in 1939, the year it was sold, was appraised, and can tell him, of course, as a matter of computation what was paid by way of taxes.

Mr. OVERTON. Assuming $10,000,000 purchase price represented the actual value for which the property in private hands should be assessed, the tax paid by the TVA would represent about 3 cents on the dollar.

Mr. STEWART. Which would be just about correct, I think. I imagine there would not be a great deal of difference in taxes. I do not want to make a statement which is not correct, but I think the valuation is $3 or $3.50 per $100. At any rate, I shall be glad to place the figures in the RECORD. It is an exceedingly interesting comparison to make. It is interesting to study the difference in the cost of power.

In this connection I should like to call attention to some figures which were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 16 of this year by the Honorable JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi. The figures appear on several pages of the RECORD, beginning on page 3344 and appearing on page 3345, page 3346, and page 3347. The figures represent a break-down of different States, showing the amount of kilowatt-hours of power consumed in each State for the year 1944, and the amount paid for electricity in each particular State. This was done by Representative RANKIN to show how much cheaper public power is than power distributed by private companies. He therefore refers to the figures shown in States which do not have public power systems as an overcharge. Whether that is a correct expression or not, should like to call attention to these figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so they might be studied by those interested, in connection with the report of the Chattanooga Electric Power Board, which, it has been agreed, shall be published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I want to pay tribute to Mr. S. R. Finley, who is general superintendent of this company. I forgot to mention his name when I spoke of the subject the other day. He is one of the most capable men of whom I know. He has contributed his part along with the members of the board to the operation of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, which has been conducted, as I said the other day, in the finest and most businesslike fashion. As I said then, and I should like to repeat, I think this report is one of the best accounts of stewardship that it has been my privilege to read.

EXHIBIT A

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ELECTRIC POWER BOARD OF CHATTANOOGA

ELECTRIC POWER BOARD,
Chattanooga, Tenn., October 6, 1945.

To the Board of Mayor and Commissioners, City of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn.

GENTLEMEN: In accordance with the requirements of chapter 455, section 12, Private Acts of 1935, amending the charter of the city of Chattanooga, the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga is submitting herewith a statement showing the operations and financial conditions of the electric distribution system for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945. This statement has been prepared by Arthur Andersen & Co., a nationally recognized auditing firm.

At the end of the fiscal year the board was serving 47,528 customers, an increase of 1,645 over the same period last year. Sales of electricity during the fiscal year totaled 527,194,000 kilowatt-hours, a decrease of approximately 19,000,000 kilowatt-hours over the previous year. Residential kilowatt-hour sales showed an increase of 6 percent, commercial and small-power sales an increase of 8 percent, industrial and large-power sales a decrease of 7 percent. The basic TVA rates, without surcharge, were in effect during the year. The average income of 0.9 cent per kilowatt-hour sold is in contrast to the average cost of 1.7 cents per kilowatt-hour for all sales in 1938, the last full year of private ownership of the electric distribution system which the board purchased.

During the year $280,000 of revenue bonds bearing 2¾-percent interest came due and were retired. Payments in lieu of taxes to the city, county, and other taxing units totaled $361,800.

With the approaching availability of materials and manpower, much needed renewals and replacements of depreciated lines and equipment, for which funds have been accumulated, can be begun. Also, many extensions of the board's lines within its service area to serve approximately 8,000 unserved residents can, likewise, be constructed from funds which the board has accumulated for this purpose.

Savings in electricity costs to the Chattanooga area, based on the average rate charged in 1938, amounted during the last fiscal year to $3,025,763. This makes total savings to electricity users in the board's 6 years of operation of $16,170,045, greatly exceeding the $10,850,000 paid for the system by the board.

Your very truly,

L. J. WILHOITE,
Chairman.

ATLANTA, GA., *July 27, 1945.*

To the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn.:

We have examined the balance sheet of Electric Power Board of Chattanooga as of June 30, 1945, and the statement of net revenues and appropriations thereof for the fiscal year then ended, have reviewed the system of internal control and the accounting procedures of the board and, without making a detailed audit of the transactions, have examined or tested accounting records of the Board and other supporting evidence, by methods and to the extent we deemed appropriate. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards applicable in the circumstances and included all procedures which we considered necessary. Long-term debt outstanding at June 30, 1945 (for which there are no trustees) was confirmed by direct correspondence with the paying agent.

In our opinion, the accompanying balance sheet and related statement of net revenues and appropriations thereof present fairly the position of Electric Power Board of Chattanooga at June 30, 1945, and the results of its operations and appropriations for the fiscal year, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

ARTHUR ANDERSON & CO.

Statement of net revenues and appropriations thereof for the year ended June 30, 1945

Operating revenues:	
Sales of electric energy:	
Residential	$1,746,581.05
Commercial	602,719.96
Industrial	2,349,697.18
Street lighting	72,838.63
	4,771,836.82
Other electric revenues	75,906.14
Total operating revenues	4,847,742.96
Operating expenses and taxes:	
Operation:	
Power purchased from Tennessee Valley Authority	2,068,618.90
Other operation expenses	801,995.39
	2,870,614.29
Maintenance	163,294.11
Provision for depreciation	380,190.04
Provision for amortization of electric plant acquisition adjustments (see note 1 to balance sheet)	335,955.00
Provision for tax equivalents	361,800.00
Total operating expenses and taxes	4,111,853.44
Net operating revenues	735,889.52

Other revenue:		
Interest on bank certificates of deposit and U. S. Government securities	$15,263.80	
Net revenues before revenue deductions	751,153.32	
Revenue deductions:		
Interest on long-term debt	$279,550.00	
Other interest charges	6,700.33	
Total revenue deductions	286,250.33	
Net revenues	464,902.99	
Appropriations of net revenues:		
For additions and extensions	$400,000.00	
Unappropriated net revenues	64,902.99	

Balance sheet, June 30, 1945

ASSETS

Electric plant—at cost:			
Plant purchased (acquisition adjustments in connection therewith estimated by the management at approximately $5,600,000—see note 1), less subsequent retirements		$9,996,999.29	
Construction additions (net)		6,007,613.41	
			$16,004,612.70
Sinking and other segregated funds:			
Particulars	*U. S. Government securities, at cost*	*Cash, including bank certificates of deposit*	
Funds required under bond ordinance (note 2):			
Bond fund		$524,288.75	
Renewal and replacement fund	$500,000.00	200,838.22	
Funds authorized by the board:			
Fund for additions and extensions	400,000.00	229,964.86	
Reserve fund for possible storm damage, etc.		90,000.00	
	900,000.00	1,145,191.83	2,045,191.83
Current assets:			
Cash		$435,107.25	
Working funds		8,223.25	
U. S. Government securities, at cost		200,000.00	
Bank certificate of deposit		100,000.00	
Receivables:			
Customers' service	$260,531.88		
Other (including $14,390.07 merchandise accounts)	26,682.08		
Accrued utility revenues	186,928.36		
	474,142.32		
Less reserve for uncollectible accounts	8,750.88		
		465,391.44	
Materials and supplies, at average cost		178,799.53	
Prepaid insurance and taxes		11,298.75	
			1,378,820.22
Deferred debits:			
Leasehold improvements, in process of amortization			21,728.25
Total			19,450,353.00

LIABILITIES

Long-term debt (see accompanying statement)			$11,990,000.00
Current liabilities (note 2):			
Accounts payable:			
Due Tennessee Valley Authority for power purchased		$179,158.27	
Other accounts payable		30,409.19	
Customers' deposits		116,932.68	
Accrued tax equivalents		182,914.29	
Accrued interest:			
On long-term debt	$139,775.00		
Less amount deposited for payment of interest due July 1, 1945	139,775.00		
Other interest		2,625.91	
Miscellaneous current liabilities		29,338.20	
			541,377.94
Deferred credits: Customers' advances for construction			24,427.15
Reserves:			
Depreciation accumulated since date of acquisition		$1,412,153.69	
Amortization of electric-plant acquisition adjustments (note 1)		1,834,388.75	
Possible storm damage, etc.		90,000.00	
			3,336,542.44
Contributions in aid of construction			54,732.08
Capital contributed:			
Federal grant			1,705,997.24
Accumulated net revenues:	*Appropriated*	*Unappropriated*	
Balance, June 30, 1944	$1,097,711.98	$234,661.18	
Net revenues for the year ended June 30, 1945	400,000.00	64,902.99	
Balance, June 30, 1945	1,497,711.98	299,564.17	
			1,797,276.15
Total			19,450,353.00

NOTE 1.—Pending reclassification of plant purchased and the determination of the amount of acquisition adjustments (estimated by the management at approximately $5,600,000), the board has provided from net revenues a reserve for amortization of electric plant acquisition adjustments in amounts equivalent to the annual deposits made to the bond fund for redemption of bonds.

NOTE 2.—During the year ended June 30, 1946, the board is required (a) to deposit in the bond fund the sum of $346,185 plus interest requirements ($271,850) on long-term debt and (b) to deposit semiannually in the renewal and replacement fund the sum of $150,000 plus a minimum of 1½ percent of the net additions to plant from date of acquisition to dates of deposit.

Statement of long-term debt, June 30, 1945

Bonds representing general obligations of the city of Chattanooga: Electric power bonds of the city of Chattanooga, issue No. 1, maturing serially from 1948 to 1958, interest on $70,000 at 4¼ percent and on $30,000 at 4 percent	$100,000.00
Bonds payable solely from revenues of the electric power board:	
Electric power revenue bonds of the city of Chattanooga, series A, maturing serially from 1945 to 1959, interest at 2¾ percent	6,130,000.00
Less—Amount deposited for payment of bonds maturing July 1, 1945	280,000.00
	5,850,000.00
Electric power refunding revenue bonds of the city of Chattanooga, series AA, maturing serially from 1960 to 1969, interest on $2,450,000 at 2 percent, on $1,580,000 at 1¾ percent and on $2,010,000 at 1½ percent	6,040,000.00
Total	$11,990,000.00

The series AA bonds are callable prior to maturity at their principal amount plus redemption premiums; the other issues of bonds are not callable prior to their respective maturities.

THE ELECTRIC POWER BOARD OF CHATTANOOGA—HOW IT CAME TO BE, THE SERVICES IT PERFORMS, WHERE IT GETS ITS INCOME, HOW THAT INCOME IS SPENT

Homes, business concerns, and factories totaling nearly 50,000 each day use electric power board service—a snap of the switch for lights—an automatic switch starts a motor—in hundreds of ways electricity from the electric power board's system flows through thousands of miles of wires and cables to bring this service.

How did the people of Chattanooga secure ownership and control of the power system? The decision to do so was made at an election held March 12, 1935. After an intense campaign in which there was widespread interest, an overwhelming vote of 19,000 for, to 8,000 against, was cast by Chattanooga's citizens on the question of acquiring an electric distribution system.

On April 15, 1935, this action by the voters was confirmed by legislation amending the city charter in such a manner as to set up the electric power board and define its duties and responsibilities. Five local citizens were named as its members, and the board has now completed 10 years of existence.

The power board was given the responsibility of acquiring and operating the power system. When board vacancies occurred they were to be filled by vote of the remaining members, subject to confirmation by the city's mayor and board of commissioners. Through this method it was believed that business operation free from political handicaps could best be obtained.

It was known, of course, that many of the difficulties of publicly owned power systems stem from political interference, that often public employees are selected upon a basis of whom or for what they vote and not because of efficiency and experience. Chattanooga did not want a politically operated power system. What Chattanooga wanted was a publicly owned power system operated upon sound business principles. It was not to be in politics. Upon this basis it was believed that good citizens, actuated by a sense of public service, could be secured to serve upon the board.

On July 12, 1937, the construction of a publicly owned power system was begun. On August 15, 1939, the privately owned power system was purchased from the Tennessee Electric Power Co. for $10,850,000. The portion of the competing system then completed was added to the system purchased and integrated into one unit.

Ten years of the board's existence have now passed and this description has been prepared to show the service of Chattanooga's electric power board—where it gets its electric power, how it is delivered to customers, the rates that are charged, the services performed, and the board's financial condition.

Throughout the watershed of the Tennessee River, TVA is directing the operation of 27 important dams. These dams store and conserve water, and as one result of their operations a great amount of hydroelectric

power is produced. TVA also operates five large steam-power stations. The TVA power plants are joined together by high-voltage power lines and from this system the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga secures its entire power supply.

The board is TVA's second largest municipal purchaser of electricity. Last year the power board paid TVA over $2,000,000 for electricity. Besides Chattanooga, over 130 other municipalities and rural cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley purchase electricity from TVA.

Six high-voltage lines connect the power-board system to TVA sources of power. A 30-year contract fixes the prices and conditions under which power is to be furnished. TVA last year produced about 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Chattanooga's power board purchased about 5 percent of this total.

These six high lines bringing power from TVA are widely separated, follow different routes, so that weather conditions may least affect them. Any three of them can safely carry Chattanooga's electric requirements in an emergency. All are constantly patrolled and inspected to insure continuous service. As the load grows other lines will be built.

Now, unlike food, soap, and other commodities, electricity cannot be delivered in bulk. It cannot be stored on the pantry shelf until need for its use arises. Although it is energy to do useful work, it is more nearly a service—to be supplied as needed—at whatever hour, day or night, and in the quantity needed. The instant it is needed electricity must be made and delivered at the point of usage.

At the moment an electric light is snapped on or an eye on the stove is turned on, then at that moment back at some power station (say Chickamauga Dam) that much electricity must be made. Many miles of wires deliver it with the speed of light—over 186,000 miles per second—to the point of use. Just that much electricity continues to be made until it is turned off. Then no more is made until again needed.

Most of Chattanooga's electricity is made by the energy of falling water turning a waterwheel to which is attached an electric generator. At Chickamauga Dam, where most of Chattanooga's electricity is generated, some 50,000,000 tons of water are run through the water turbines each day. There it takes about 800 gallons of water to produce the electricity required to burn a 100-watt bulb 1 hour; 8,000 gallons of water to supply the electricity to heat a 1,000-watt iron for an hour's ironing.

The Chattanooga Electric Power Board supplied its customers last year over 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours which required 5,000,000,000 gallons of water flowing from Chickamauga Lake to produce it. The average Chattanooga home used 2,500 kilowatt-hours last year. This required 20,000,000 gallons of water flowing from the lake to produce it. Thus, the electricity used in Chattanooga comes from the force of falling water. It is made by using this nature-created energy for mankind without destroying the water.

We have said electricity is a service and not a commodity. It is—and yet there is a unit of measurement, just like a gallon of water, or a bushel of apples. This unit of electricity is the kilowatt-hour or the use of 1 kilowatt of electricity for 1 hour—a thousand watts' use for 1 hour, or 100 watts' use for 10 hours, or 50 watts' use for 20 hours. Kilowatt-hours are what the electric meter records.

The electric meters of the power board are read once each month. The difference between monthly readings shows the quantity of electricity which has been used. Any user can read his electric meter just as accurately as can the power board meter reader. Each meter has four clock-face dials—reading from zero to nine. The dials are read from left to right and the dial reading is the number just behind the hand.

For greater convenience to customers and efficiency of operation, meters are read once each month. Meter readers each read about 300 meters per day. If all meters were read upon the same day each month it would take 150 meter readers to do it. Upon each of 21 days per month about 2,100 meters are read, 2,100 bills are made out and mailed, and 10 days after mailing 2,100 bills become due and payable. Thus, the minimum number of employees are required for this work and a minimum of congestion at the board's bill-paying office is assured.

Any person can figure his bill out just as easily as do the board's billing clerks. Upon the bill are shown the present and previous month's reading and the difference, or number of kilowatt-hours used in the period. The residential monthly rates are—

First 50 kilowatt-hours per month, 3 cents each.

Next 150 kilowatt-hours per month, 2 cents each.

Next 200 kilowatt-hours per month, 1 cent each.

Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month, 0.4 cent each.

Over 1,400 kilowatt-hours per month, 0.75 cent each.

The difference in readings of the meter from the 6th of last month to the 6th of this month shows 368, or 368 kilowatt-hours used. Now to figure the bill:

First 50 kilowatt-hours, at 3 cents	$1.50
Next 150 kilowatt-hours, at 2 cents	3.00
Next 168 kilowatt-hours, at 1 cent	1.68
Total, 368 kilowatt-hours	6.18

Thus, the total bill for 368 kilowatt-hours is $6.18.

Now we have just seen 368 kilowatt-hours give a bill of $6.18. Suppose twice that much had been used, or 736 kilowatt-hours. Many homes do use this much. The next 32 kilowatt-hours would have been at 1 cent each, or 32 cents, leaving 334 kilowatt-hours at four-tenths cent each, or $1.34. Thus, the extra 368 kilowatt-hours cost only $1.66 more—or the whole bill for 736 kilowatt-hours is $7.84. This shows how the more one uses electricity, the cheaper it is on power board rates.

The power board has only three electric rates: namely, residential, commercial, and large power. The nature of the place where the current is used determines its class of rate. All residences are upon the same rate. Commercial or industrial users of a small quantity are upon the commercial rate. Large industrial or large commercial use is upon the large power rate. Thus, there is no discrimination in billing to customers of the same classification. This is a feature of Chattanooga's public-power operation. The rate for each class of customer has been determined so each classification, and each customer in that class, bears their fair share of the cost of the electric service they use.

Customers' electric bills may be paid either net or gross. There is no discount. If not paid within 10 days from date of bill they are payable at the gross rate, which is 10 percent higher. By his own selection of the time of payment the customer determines whether to pay the bill at the net or gross rate. If there were not this incentive to pay at the net rate, many bills would entail added collection expense, thus increasing the cost of furnishing electricity—with probable higher rates as an ultimate result.

Furnishing electric service is a business requiring experienced men and women to perform the many duties required. Chattanooga's electric power board has about 400 permanent employees. Many of these are experienced craftsmen, engineers, accountants, and people who have become proficient in their duties through training and years of experience.

The board's service lines extend over an area of many miles. They go from Graysville (near Dayton) on the north, to Flintstone, down in Georgia, on the south; from Hales Bar Dam in the southwest to beyond Ooltewah in the east. Nearly 4,000 of the board's customers are in Georgia, and about 50 percent of the total are outside of the city limits. Over 9,000 new customers have been added during the board's years of operation, and extension of lines now planned will add over 3,000 more.

To serve this area the board has 77 miles of high-voltage lines. These bring electricity from the TVA System and interchange it between the board's six high-voltage substations. There it is stepped down from 44,000 volts to lower voltages. Four of these stations were bought from TEPCO and two modern ones, such as the College Hill Station, constructed by the board.

At these stations operators are constantly on duty 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. By means of meters and switches they observe and regulate the flow of current, close switches which may be opened by lightning, and in many other ways watch over and guard Chattanooga's electric service.

Radiating from these six high-voltage substations are 215 miles of 12,000-volt lines serving 53 distributing stations and dozens of large power users. These stations are for the most part automatic in operation, are visited frequently by patrolmen. Through them pass large quantities of electricity.

Many large power users require an individual station for their exclusive use. Chattanooga's cheap electric power allows widespread use of it in industry, thus providing more production, more jobs, and a wider variety of manufactured products. In future years Chattanooga's publicly owned electricity, cheap to use, will be a factor favorable to still more industry, more production of industrial products, more jobs.

The lines you see along many Chattanooga streets, in alleys, or along the highways are distribution lines. Carrying electricity at lower voltages, usually 4,000 volts, they serve transformers which in turn furnish secondary lines with the 115- or 230-volt electricity used in Chattanooga homes. Twenty-five or 30 customers may be served by 1 transformer, from secondary lines, by means of the service wires which terminate at the customer's house.

Control over all lines is maintained by the load dispatchers of the board. They supervise and route the troublemen who are stationed in various parts of the area. Communication is by telephone or short-wave radio, with which all trouble trucks are equipped. This use of radio saves much time in case of a service interruption. Most customer service interruptions are caused by something on the customer's premises—blowing the main fuses. Fuses blown are replaced at no charge by the board.

All lines, substations, and facilities of the board are designed by the board's engineering department. Constant study is carried on to make use of the latest available equipment. Safe construction is carefully kept in mind to avoid accidents to board employees, and assure the most reliable and efficient service at the lowest cost. Only the highest grade materials are used.

Construction of new lines and facilities, and rebuilding of old lines, is carried out, except in rare instances, by the board's line crews and electricians. These skilled men employ the latest tools, are schooled in the safest methods, and in case of severe storm damage to lines and equipment, often work long hours far into the night restoring service.

All incoming service calls are received by the board's service department and routed for prompt handling to the various departments concerned with the service. Telephone operators are on duty 24 hours a day with 14 incoming trunk lines. Transportation facilities of the board include over 90 trucks and automobiles which travel nearly a million miles a year. A completely equipped garage and auto repair station is maintained to service them.

These service facilities are maintained with others in the board's new and modern service building at Oak and Greenwood Streets, just beyond Warner Park. Erected in 1940 at a cost of over $350,000, this service building is a model of efficiency and arrangement for electric-power service. It has been visited by officials of many private and publicly owned systems.

All administrative, customers'-bill-paying, accounting, and sales-promotion activities are housed in the board's office building, at Sixth and Market Streets, erected by the board in 1941 at a cost of $360,000. Here the most modern and convenient bill-paying and customer-contact arrangements are carried out. It is open for business from 8 a. m. to 5 p. m. each week day. A night depository is available for payment of bills after office hours.

Customer-contact clerks are on hand, with comfortable seating facilities for customers, to handle new applications for service, customers' final bills upon terminations of service by moves, rendering duplicate bills, and receiving inquiries and service suggestions. Here over 3,000 duplicate bills are prepared each month for customers who have lost their bills.

Chattanooga's electric-power board does not sell electrical appliances, but it does feel an obligation to its customers, for the benefits derived by them, to further the sale of appliances. All sales are made by dealers, with the board carrying on an educational and promotional service, particularly upon newly developed electrical appliances.

A model electric kitchen is available for demonstration purposes. The board's home-economist staff prepares recipes, teaches cooking and canning classes, conducts food-utilization courses. They are available at no charge for home calls. A complete five-room electric home in the administration building shows the many home uses for electric service. Industrial, commercial, and residential engineers consult with and give electrical advice to the board's many customers. No charge is made for this service.

The board's show windows have won national acclaim for beauty and attractiveness and have provided many interesting displays of educational value in the use and availability of electrical appliances. During the war years these windows, together with all other space available in the administration building, have been devoted to public purposes directly associated with the war effort. A complete appliance repair department for service to the board's customers is maintained. Thirty-five repairmen service appliances at cost—caring for over 35,000 customers' needs each year. To do this and give prompt service requires a large stock of spare parts.

Keeping track of its operations, paying its obligations, pay rolls, and constantly auditing its finances is the board's general accounting office. Here over 21,000 checks and vouchers are issued annually, financial and cost statements prepared. All records are kept according to the best standard practices for electrical utilities. As an added safeguard, the board's books are audited annually by an outside firm of nationally recognized public accountants. All legal obligations are carefully checked by the board's legal counsel.

Power board employees are selected strictly upon a basis of experience and qualifications to perform the duties assigned, and their services are continued upon the same basis. As Federal social-security provisions are not applicable to city employees, the board has placed in effect a moderate pension plan toward the cost of which employees contribute a fair share. In addition there is an employees' group life insurance, sickness and hospitalization plan. About 200 of the board's craft employees are members of an A. F. of L. union with which the board has an agreement.

The electric-power board's customers are its only source of income. Those using electricity for residential use supply 36 percent of the board's income; those using it for commercial use supply about 12 percent, and the large power users supply 49 percent. The remaining 3 percent comes from street-lighting sales, repairing appliances, and from miscellaneous services to electricity users.

Chattanooga is an industrial city and large power users take a major portion of the board's sales of electric current—74 percent of the total kilowatt-hours sold. Its cheap rates provide an opportunity for extensive home use, and 20 percent of the kilowatt-hours sold go for this use. Commercial users take 5 percent and street lighting the remaining 1 percent of total kilowatt-hours sold.

The board's power purchases requires 42 percent of the board's total income. The expenses of operation and maintenance take 20 percent of the income. They account for the board's largest items of expense.

However, electrical equipment wears out, is destroyed by storms and must be replaced constantly. Likewise, new uses by customers require additions to the board's system, and extensions to serve new customers are constantly being made. These renewal and replacement expenses require 8 percent of the board's income, and additions and extensions 6 percent—making 14 percent required for these items.

The power board has outstanding $11,990,000 of the bonds issued when the system was purchased. Each year interest must be paid upon those outstanding and the ones due for retirement paid off. Since 1939, the sum of $1,834,388 has been used to retire bonds. An amount equal to 16 percent of the board's income has been used to pay interest upon and retire bonds.

Many people do not realize the power board is the largest payer of real and property taxes to the city of Chattanooga and Hamilton County. Last year $362,000 was paid, amounting to 6.5 percent of the board's income.

Publicly owned electricity should be sold so that its cost equals the expense of supplying it. That has been the record with Chattanooga's electric power board. In its 6 years of operation, these expenses have required 98.5 percent of its total income, leaving only 1.5 percent as a surplus, available for unforeseeable needs.

Chattanooga has benefited in many ways from its publicly owned power system. One of the most real has been the reduction in the cost of electricity. Based upon the average rates charged in 1933, the last full year of service by the privately owned company, users of electricity have in 6 years of publicly owned power saved over $16,170,000 in their cost of electric service. All classes of users have benefited. In Chattanooga electricity is cheap—and because of this low cost is widely used.

No record of the electric power board's affairs could be concluded without a mention of electric service's part in the war. Very definitely the board's system and facilities have been a part of every war plant in the Chattanooga area. These plants have depended upon the service to supply their war production needs, and it has never been "too little" or "too late." Nearly 30 percent of the board's employees have entered the armed forces. In all this the board has done no more than its duty.

And now in conclusion—electricity is cheap in Chattanooga. This makes it widely used. In years to come this use will vastly increase and Chattanooga citizens will have the use, at low costs, of the many new appliances which require electric current. It will be the policy of the power board to continue to furnish this service as a "business-managed, taxpaying, publicly owned electric utility."

Electrical appliance and residential usage

(The board does not sell appliances)

Fiscal year—	Volume sold by dealers	Percent of customers using—			Average year kilowatt-hour use per residential customer
		Electric refrigerators	Electric ranges	Electric water heaters	
1939-40	$2,067,078	72.0	41.0	18.0	1,864
1940-41	3,134,416	85.0	48.0	20.0	2,086
1941-42	2,462,326	42.0	52.0	21.0	2,232
1942-43	780,520	91.0	52.0	22.0	2,351
1943-44	103,574	90.0	52.0	22.0	2,434
1944-45	165,801	87.0	51.0	22.0	2,515

Sales of electricity in kilowatt-hours

Fiscal year—	Total	Industrial customers	Commercial customers
1939-40	303,978,000	222,052,000	23,297,000
1940-41	431,914,000	325,992,000	28,228,000
1941-42	519,992,000	402,253,000	28,843,000
1942-43	562,634,000	438,155,000	27,310,000
1943-44	546,100,000	417,279,000	27,471,000
1944-45	527,194,000	390,082,000	29,674,000

Fiscal year—	Residential customers	Street-light customers
1939-40	56,601,000	2,028,000
1940-41	75,061,000	2,633,000
1941-42	86,376,000	2,520,000
1942-43	94,749,000	2,420,000
1943-44	98,879,000	2,471,000
1944-45	104,916,000	2,522,000

Number of customers (end of year)

Fiscal year—	Total	Industrial	Commercial	Residential	Street lights
1939-40	39,942	342	4,615	34,978	7
1940-41	42,234	365	4,696	37,166	7
1941-42	44,899	410	4,688	39,783	9
1942-43	45,264	395	4,495	40,363	11
1943-44	45,883	391	4,619	40,863	10
1944-45	47,528	417	4,808	42,293	10

Operating revenues

Fiscal year—	Total	Industrial customers	Commercial customers
1939-40	$3,166,578.38	$1,449,140.27	$489,639.07
1940-41	4,066,597.47	1,939,462.89	574,578.14
1941-42	4,636,458.38	2,296,209.70	587,818.18
1942-43	4,900,415.36	2,466,151.73	558,635.73
1943-44	4,907,260.17	2,397,825.55	562,951.38
1944-45	4,847,742.96	2,349,697.18	602,719.96

Fiscal year—	Residential customers	Street-light customers	Other revenue
1939-40	$1,053,622.29	$58,361.55	$115,814.20
1940-41	1,338,929.21	71,755.87	141,871.36
1941-42	1,513,361.13	71,824.19	167,209.38
1942-43	1,618,767.00	72,687.24	184,173.66
1943-44	1,663,583.94	72,754.36	210,144.94
1944-45	1,746,581.05	72,838.63	75,906.14

Average income per kilowatt-hour sold

Fiscal year—	Total	Industrial customers	Commercial customers	Residential customers	Street light customers
1939-40	$0.0100	$0.007	$0.02	$0.019	$0.03
1940-41	.0090	.006	.02	.018	.03
1941-42	.0086	.006	.02	.018	.03
1942-43	.0084	.006	.02	.017	.03
1943-44	.0086	.006	.02	.017	.03
1944-45	.0090	.006	.02	.016	.03

Purchases of power (all from TVA system)

Fiscal year—	Maximum kilowatt demand	Kilowatt-hours	Percent annual load factor
1939-40	71,187	338,096,000	54.2
1940-41	87,341	471,430,000	61.6
1941-42	98,532	566,659,000	65.7
1942-43	102,470	617,870,000	68.8
1943-44	100,937	600,590,000	67.7
1944-45	107,149	579,963,000	61.8

Customer savings in electricity costs

[Based on average rate per kilowatt-hour in 1938]

Fiscal year—	Total	Industrial customers	Commercial customers	Residential customers	Street-light customers
1939-40	$1,417,367	$805,661	$180,932	$413,188	$17,586
1940-41	2,379,735	1,450,862	258,143	642,684	28,046
1941-42	2,940,888	1,887,217	263,041	766,932	23,698
1942-43	3,249,216	2,103,144	245,786	881,167	19,119
1943-44	3,157,076	1,941,877	247,442	946,822	20,935
1944-45	3,025,763	1,707,155	272,663	1,023,201	22,744
Total	16,170,045	9,895,916	1,468,007	4,673,994	132,132

Employee data

Fiscal year—	Number employed	Average monthly salary— Male	Average monthly salary— Female	Injuries; number lost time accidents	Accidents; number auto accidents
1939-40	417	$156.06	$94.31	16	40
1940-41	422	159.17	93.97	20	63
1941-42	403	172.16	104.62	16	41
1942-43	386	187.35	117.41	8	33
1943-44	385	196.33	123.09	10	20
1944-45	386	206.76	128.01	14	15

ELECTRIC POWER BOARD RATE SCHEDULES

Residential

Alternating-current service at approximately 60 cycles, 110 or 220 volts, either single-phase, two-wire or three-wire; or, three-phase, three-wire or four-wire, as may be required by board.

Rate

First 50 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 3 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 150 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 200 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 0.4 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Excess over 1,400 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 0.75 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Minimum monthly bill: $0.75 per meter.

Commercial

Alternating-current service from the local distribution system at approximately 60 cycles, 110 or 220 volts; either single-phase, two-wire or three-wire; or three-phase, three-wire or four-wire, as may be required by board. (Customers with demands of over 20 kilowatts and/or using over 4,000 kilowatt-hours per month billed on industrial rate.)

Rate

First 250 kilowatt-hours per month, at 3 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 750 kilowatt-hours per month, at 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month, at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Excess over 2,000 kilowatt-hours per month, at 0.8 cent per kilowatt-hour

Industrial

Character of service: Alternating current, three-phase, 60 cycles. Voltage supplied will be at the discretion of board and will be determined by the voltage available from distribution lines in the vicinity and/or other conditions.

Rate

Demand charge (based on 30-minute demand): $1 per kilowatt of demand per month, first 1,000 kilowatts; 90 cents per kilowatt of demand per month, over 1,000 kilowatts.

Energy charge:

First 10,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month, at 10 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Next 25,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month, at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Next 65,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month, at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Next 400,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month, at 3 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Over 500,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month, at 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Charge for energy in excess of 360 times the demand shall be subject to a reduction of 0.5 mill per kilowatt-hour from the otherwise applicable rate.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the first committee amendment, which has already been read, but which will again be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, after the word "amendment", it is proposed to insert "or repeal."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, in line 8, after the word "to", to insert "or repeal of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

(a) Reduction in normal tax on individuals: Section 11 (relating to the normal tax on individuals) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. Normal tax on individuals.

"There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of every individual a normal tax determined by computing a tentative normal tax of 3 percent of the amount of the net income in excess of the credits against net income provided in section 25, and by reducing such tentative normal tax by 5 percent thereof. For alternative tax which may be elected if adjusted gross income is less than $5,000, see Supplement T."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to strike out:

(a) In general: Section 12 (b) (relating to the rate of surtax on individuals) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Rates of surtax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual the surtax shown in the following table:

"If the surtax net income is:	The surtax shall be:
Not over $2,000	16% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$320, plus 18% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$680, plus 22% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,120, plus 26% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,640, plus 30% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,240, plus 34% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$2,920, plus 39% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,700, plus 43% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$4,560, plus 46% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$5,480, plus 49% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$6,460, plus 50% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000.	$7,460, plus 53% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000.	$9,580, plus 55% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$12,880, plus 58% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$16,360, plus 62% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$20,080, plus 65% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$23,980, plus 67% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$30,680, plus 70% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$37,680, plus 72% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$44,880, plus 76% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$52,480, plus 78% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$60,280, plus 79½% of excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$100,030, plus 81% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000	$140,530, plus 81½% of excess over $200,000."

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

(b) Reduction in surtax on individuals: Section 12 (b) (relating to the rate of surtax on individuals) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Rates of surtax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual a surtax determined by computing a tentative surtax under the following table, and by reducing such tentative surtax by 5 percent thereof:

"If the surtax net income is:	The tentative surtax shall be:
Not over $2,000	17% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$340, plus 19% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$720, plus 23% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,180, plus 27% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,720, plus 31% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,340, plus 35% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$3,040, plus 40% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,840, plus 44% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$4,720, plus 47% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$5,660, plus 50% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$6,660, plus 53% of excess over $20,000.

"If the surtax net income is:	The tentative surtax shall be:
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000.	$7,720, plus 56% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000.	$9,960, plus 59% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$13,500, plus 62% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$17,220, plus 66% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$21,180, plus 69% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$25,320, plus 72% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$32,520, plus 75% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$40,020, plus 78% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$47,820, plus 81% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$55,920, plus 84% of excess over $90,000.
"If the surtax net income is:	The tentative surtax shall be:
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$64,320, plus 86% of excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$107,320, plus 87% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000	$150,820, plus 88% of excess over $200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, to strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, as follows:

(b) Limitation on tax: Section 12 (g) (relating to the 90 percent limitation) is amended by striking out "90 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "81 percent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 4, to insert the following:

(c) Limitation on tax: Section 12 (g) (relating to the 90 percent limitation) is amended by striking out "90 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "85½ percent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 1, to strike out:

(1) Section 11 (relating to the normal tax on individuals) is amended by striking out "section 25 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 25".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 103, "Individuals with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000", on page 10, after line 3, to strike out:

If the adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—				If the adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—							
At least—	But less than—	1	2	3	4 or more	At least—	But less than—	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
		The tax shall be—						The tax shall be—								
$0	$550	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,200	$2,225	$283	$188	$93	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
550	575	1	0	0	0	2,225	2,250	288	193	98	3	0	0	0	0	0
575	600	5	0	0	0	2,250	2,275	292	197	102	7	0	0	0	0	0
600	625	10	0	0	0	2,275	2,300	296	201	106	11	0	0	0	0	0
625	650	14	0	0	0	2,300	2,325	300	205	110	15	0	0	0	0	0
650	675	18	0	0	0	2,325	2,350	305	210	115	20	0	0	0	0	0
675	700	23	0	0	0	2,350	2,375	309	214	119	24	0	0	0	0	0
700	725	27	0	0	0	2,375	2,400	313	218	123	28	0	0	0	0	0
725	750	31	0	0	0	2,400	2,425	318	223	128	33	0	0	0	0	0
750	775	35	0	0	0	2,425	2,450	322	227	132	37	0	0	0	0	0
775	800	40	0	0	0	2,450	2,475	326	231	136	41	0	0	0	0	0
800	825	44	0	0	0	2,475	2,500	330	235	140	45	0	0	0	0	0
825	850	48	0	0	0	2,500	2,525	335	240	145	50	0	0	0	0	0
850	875	52	0	0	0	2,525	2,550	339	244	149	54	0	0	0	0	0
875	900	57	0	0	0	2,550	2,575	343	248	153	58	0	0	0	0	0
900	925	61	0	0	0	2,575	2,600	347	252	157	62	0	0	0	0	0
925	950	65	0	0	0	2,600	2,625	352	257	162	67	0	0	0	0	0
950	975	70	0	0	0	2,625	2,650	356	261	166	71	0	0	0	0	0
975	1,000	74	0	0	0	2,650	2,675	360	265	170	75	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	1,025	78	0	0	0	2,675	2,700	365	270	175	80	0	0	0	0	0
1,025	1,050	82	0	0	0	2,700	2,725	369	274	179	84	0	0	0	0	0
1,050	1,075	87	0	0	0	2,725	2,750	373	278	183	88	0	0	0	0	0
1,075	1,100	91	0	0	0	2,750	2,775	377	282	187	92	0	0	0	0	0
1,100	1,125	95	0	0	0	2,775	2,800	382	287	192	97	2	0	0	0	0
1,125	1,150	100	5	0	0	2,800	2,825	387	291	196	101	6	0	0	0	0
1,150	1,175	104	9	0	0	2,825	2,850	391	295	200	105	10	0	0	0	0
1,175	1,200	108	13	0	0	2,850	2,875	396	299	204	109	14	0	0	0	0
1,200	1,225	112	17	0	0	2,875	2,900	401	304	209	114	19	0	0	0	0
1,225	1,250	117	22	0	0	2,900	2,925	405	308	213	118	23	0	0	0	0
1,250	1,275	121	26	0	0	2,925	2,950	410	312	217	122	27	0	0	0	0
1,275	1,300	125	30	0	0	2,950	2,975	415	317	222	127	32	0	0	0	0
1,300	1,325	129	34	0	0	2,975	3,000	420	321	226	131	36	0	0	0	0
1,325	1,350	134	39	0	0	3,000	3,050	427	327	232	137	42	0	0	0	0
1,350	1,375	138	43	0	0	3,050	3,100	436	336	241	146	51	0	0	0	0
1,375	1,400	142	47	0	0	3,100	3,150	446	344	249	154	59	0	0	0	0
1,400	1,425	147	52	0	0	3,150	3,200	455	353	248	163	68	0	0	0	0
1,425	1,450	151	56	0	0	3,200	3,250	465	361	266	171	76	0	0	0	0
1,450	1,475	155	60	0	0	3,250	3,300	474	370	275	180	85	0	0	0	0
1,475	1,500	159	64	0	0	3,300	3,350	483	379	284	189	94	0	0	0	0
1,500	1,525	164	69	0	0	3,350	3,400	493	388	292	197	102	7	0	0	0
1,525	1,550	168	73	0	0	3,400	3,450	502	397	301	206	111	16	0	0	0
1,550	1,575	172	77	0	0	3,450	3,500	512	407	309	214	119	24	0	0	0
1,575	1,600	176	81	0	0	3,500	3,550	521	416	318	223	128	33	0	0	0
1,600	1,625	181	86	0	0	3,550	3,600	531	426	326	231	136	41	0	0	0
1,625	1,650	185	90	0	0	3,600	3,650	540	435	335	240	145	50	0	0	0
1,650	1,675	189	94	0	0	3,650	3,700	550	445	343	248	153	58	0	0	0
1,675	1,700	194	99	4	0	3,700	3,750	559	454	352	257	162	67	0	0	0
1,700	1,725	198	103	8	0	3,750	3,800	568	463	361	266	171	76	0	0	0
1,725	1,750	202	107	12	0	3,800	3,850	578	473	369	274	179	84	0	0	0
1,750	1,775	206	111	16	0	3,850	3,900	587	482	378	283	188	93	0	0	0
1,775	1,800	211	116	21	0	3,900	3,950	597	492	387	291	196	101	6	0	0
1,800	1,825	215	120	25	0	3,950	4,000	606	501	396	300	205	110	15	0	0
1,825	1,850	219	124	29	0	4,000	4,050	616	511	406	308	213	118	23	0	0
1,850	1,875	223	128	33	0	4,050	4,100	625	520	415	317	222	127	32	0	0
1,875	1,900	228	133	38	0	4,100	4,150	635	530	425	325	230	135	40	0	0
1,900	1,925	232	137	42	0	4,150	4,200	644	539	434	334	239	144	49	0	0
1,925	1,950	236	141	46	0	4,200	4,250	654	549	444	342	247	152	57	0	0
1,950	1,975	241	146	51	0	4,250	4,300	663	558	453	351	256	161	66	0	0
1,975	2,000	245	150	55	0	4,300	4,350	672	567	462	360	265	170	75	0	0
2,000	2,025	249	154	59	0	4,350	4,400	682	577	472	368	273	178	83	0	0
2,025	2,050	253	158	63	0	4,400	4,450	691	586	481	377	282	187	92	0	0
2,050	2,075	258	163	68	0	4,450	4,500	701	596	491	386	290	195	100	5	0
2,075	2,100	262	167	72	0	4,500	4,550	710	605	500	395	299	204	109	14	0
2,100	2,125	266	171	76	0	4,550	4,600	720	615	510	405	307	212	117	22	0
2,125	2,150	271	176	81	0	4,600	4,650	729	624	519	414	316	221	126	31	0
2,150	2,175	275	180	85	0	4,650	4,700	739	634	529	424	324	229	134	39	0
2,175	2,200	279	184	89	0	4,700	4,750	748	643	538	433	333	238	143	48	0
						4,750	4,800	757	652	547	442	342	247	152	57	0
						4,800	4,850	767	662	557	452	350	255	160	65	0
						4,850	4,900	776	671	566	461	359	264	169	74	0
						4,900	4,950	786	681	576	471	367	272	177	82	0
						4,950	5,000	795	690	585	480	376	281	186	91	0

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

If the adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—				If the adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—								
At least—	But less than—	1	2	3	4 or more	At least—	But less than—	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
		The tax shall be—						The tax shall be—								
$0	$550	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,200	$2,225	$283	$188	$93	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
550	575	1	0	0	0	2,225	2,250	288	193	98	3	0	0	0	0	0
575	600	5	0	0	0	2,250	2,275	292	197	102	7	0	0	0	0	0
600	625	10	0	0	0	2,275	2,300	296	201	106	11	0	0	0	0	0
625	650	14	0	0	0	2,300	2,325	300	205	110	15	0	0	0	0	0
650	675	18	0	0	0	2,325	2,350	305	210	115	20	0	0	0	0	0
675	700	23	0	0	0	2,350	2,375	309	214	119	24	0	0	0	0	0
700	725	27	0	0	0	2,375	2,400	313	218	123	28	0	0	0	0	0
725	750	31	0	0	0	2,400	2,425	318	223	128	33	0	0	0	0	0
750	775	35	0	0	0	2,425	2,450	322	227	132	37	0	0	0	0	0
775	800	40	0	0	0	2,450	2,475	326	231	136	41	0	0	0	0	0
800	825	44	0	0	0	2,475	2,500	330	235	140	45	0	0	0	0	0
825	850	48	0	0	0	2,500	2,525	335	240	145	50	0	0	0	0	0
850	875	52	0	0	0	2,525	2,550	339	244	149	54	0	0	0	0	0
875	900	57	0	0	0	2,550	2,575	343	248	153	58	0	0	0	0	0
900	925	61	0	0	0	2,575	2,600	347	252	157	62	0	0	0	0	0
925	950	65	0	0	0	2,600	2,625	352	257	162	67	0	0	0	0	0
950	975	70	0	0	0	2,625	2,650	356	261	166	71	0	0	0	0	0
975	1,000	74	0	0	0	2,650	2,675	360	265	170	75	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	1,025	78	0	0	0	2,675	2,700	365	270	175	80	0	0	0	0	0
1,025	1,050	82	0	0	0	2,700	2,725	369	274	179	84	0	0	0	0	0
1,050	1,075	87	0	0	0	2,725	2,750	373	278	183	88	0	0	0	0	0
1,075	1,100	91	0	0	0	2,750	2,775	377	282	187	92	0	0	0	0	0
1,100	1,125	95	0	0	0	2,775	2,800	382	287	192	97	2	0	0	0	0
1,125	1,150	100	5	0	0	2,800	2,825	387	291	196	101	6	0	0	0	0
1,150	1,175	104	9	0	0	2,825	2,850	391	295	200	105	10	0	0	0	0
1,175	1,200	108	13	0	0	2,850	2,875	396	299	204	109	14	0	0	0	0
1,200	1,225	112	17	0	0	2,875	2,900	401	304	209	114	19	0	0	0	0
1,225	1,250	117	22	0	0	2,900	2,925	405	308	213	118	23	0	0	0	0
1,250	1,275	121	26	0	0	2,925	2,950	410	312	217	122	27	0	0	0	0
1,275	1,300	125	30	0	0	2,950	2,975	415	317	222	127	32	0	0	0	0
1,300	1,325	129	34	0	0	2,975	3,000	419	321	226	131	36	0	0	0	0
1,325	1,350	134	39	0	0	3,000	3,050	427	327	232	137	42	0	0	0	0
1,350	1,375	138	43	0	0	3,050	3,100	436	336	241	146	51	0	0	0	0
1,375	1,400	142	47	0	0	3,100	3,150	445	344	249	154	59	0	0	0	0
1,400	1,425	147	52	0	0	3,150	3,200	455	353	258	163	68	0	0	0	0
1,425	1,450	151	56	0	0	3,200	3,250	464	361	266	171	76	0	0	0	0
1,450	1,475	155	60	0	0	3,250	3,300	474	370	275	180	85	0	0	0	0
1,475	1,500	159	64	0	0	3,300	3,350	483	379	284	189	94	0	0	0	0
1,500	1,525	164	69	0	0	3,350	3,400	492	388	292	197	102	7	0	0	0
1,525	1,550	168	73	0	0	3,400	3,450	502	397	301	206	111	16	0	0	0
1,550	1,575	172	77	0	0	3,450	3,500	511	407	309	214	119	24	0	0	0
1,575	1,600	176	81	0	0	3,500	3,550	521	416	318	223	128	33	0	0	0
1,600	1,625	181	86	0	0	3,550	3,600	530	425	326	231	136	41	0	0	0
1,625	1,650	185	90	0	0	3,600	3,650	539	435	335	240	145	50	0	0	0
1,650	1,675	189	94	0	0	3,650	3,700	549	444	343	248	153	58	0	0	0
1,675	1,700	194	99	4	0	3,700	3,750	558	454	352	257	162	67	0	0	0
1,700	1,725	198	103	8	0	3,750	3,800	568	463	361	266	171	76	0	0	0
1,725	1,750	202	107	12	0	3,800	3,850	577	472	369	274	179	84	0	0	0
1,750	1,775	206	111	16	0	3,850	3,900	586	482	378	283	188	93	0	0	0
1,775	1,800	211	116	21	0	3,900	3,950	596	491	387	291	196	101	6	0	0
1,800	1,825	215	120	25	0	3,950	4,000	605	501	396	300	205	110	15	0	0
1,825	1,850	219	124	29	0	4,000	4,050	615	510	406	308	213	118	23	0	0
1,850	1,875	223	128	33	0	4,050	4,100	624	520	415	317	222	127	32	0	0
1,875	1,900	228	133	38	0	4,100	4,150	633	529	424	325	230	135	40	0	0
1,900	1,925	232	137	42	0	4,150	4,200	643	538	434	334	239	144	49	0	0
1,925	1,950	236	141	46	0	4,200	4,250	652	548	443	342	247	152	57	0	0
1,950	1,975	241	146	51	0	4,250	4,300	662	557	453	351	256	161	66	0	0
1,975	2,000	245	150	55	0	4,300	4,350	671	567	462	360	265	170	75	0	0
2,000	2,025	249	154	59	0	4,350	4,400	680	576	471	368	273	178	83	0	0
2,025	2,050	253	158	63	0	4,400	4,450	690	585	481	377	282	187	92	0	0
2,050	2,075	258	163	68	0	4,450	4,500	699	595	490	386	290	195	100	5	0
2,075	2,100	262	167	72	0	4,500	4,550	709	604	500	395	299	204	109	14	0
2,100	2,125	266	171	76	0	4,550	4,600	718	614	509	405	307	212	117	22	0
2,125	2,150	271	176	81	0	4,600	4,650	727	623	518	414	316	221	126	31	0
2,150	2,175	275	180	85	0	4,650	4,700	737	632	528	423	324	229	134	39	0
2,175	2,200	279	184	89	0	4,700	4,750	746	642	537	433	333	238	143	48	0
						4,750	4,800	756	651	547	442	342	247	152	57	0
						4,800	4,850	765	661	556	452	350	255	160	65	0
						4,850	4,900	774	670	565	461	359	264	169	74	0
						4,900	4,950	784	679	575	470	367	272	177	82	0
						4,950	5,000	793	689	584	480	376	281	186	91	0

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 104, Reduction in Withholding of Tax at Source on Wages, to strike out pages 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 as follows:

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$11	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$11	$12	$2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$13	2.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$13	$14	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$15	2.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$15	$16	2.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$17	2.80	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$17	$18	3.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$19	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$19	$20	3.30	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$21	3.50	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$21	$22	3.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$23	3.80	2.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$23	$24	4.00	2.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$25	4.20	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$25	$26	4.40	2.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$27	4.50	2.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$27	$28	4.70	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$29	4.90	3.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$29	$30	5.00	3.20	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$31	5.20	3.40	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$31	$32	5.40	3.60	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$33	5.60	3.70	1.90	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$33	$34	5.70	3.90	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$35	5.90	4.10	2.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$35	$36	6.10	4.20	2.40	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$37	6.20	4.40	2.60	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$37	$38	6.40	4.60	2.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$39	6.60	4.80	2.90	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$39	$40	6.80	4.90	3.10	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$41	6.90	5.10	3.30	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$41	$42	7.10	5.30	3.40	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$43	7.30	5.40	3.60	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$43	$44	7.50	5.60	3.80	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$45	7.60	5.80	4.00	2.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$45	$46	7.80	6.00	4.10	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$47	8.00	6.10	4.30	2.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$47	$48	8.20	6.30	4.50	2.60	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$49	8.40	6.50	4.60	2.80	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$49	$50	8.60	6.60	4.80	3.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$51	8.80	6.80	5.00	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$51	$52	9.00	7.00	5.20	3.30	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$53	9.20	7.20	5.30	3.50	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$53	$54	9.30	7.30	5.50	3.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$55	9.50	7.50	5.70	3.80	2.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0
$55	$56	9.70	7.70	5.80	4.00	2.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$57	9.90	7.90	6.00	4.20	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$57	$58	10.10	8.10	6.20	4.40	2.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$59	10.30	8.30	6.30	4.50	2.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0
$59	$60	10.50	8.50	6.50	4.70	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	10.80	8.70	6.80	5.00	3.10	1.30	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	11.10	9.10	7.10	5.30	3.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	11.50	9.50	7.50	5.60	3.80	2.00	.20	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	11.90	9.90	7.90	6.00	4.10	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	12.30	10.30	8.20	6.30	4.50	2.70	.80	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	12.60	10.60	8.60	6.70	4.80	3.00	1.20	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	13.00	11.00	9.00	7.00	5.20	3.30	1.50	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	13.40	11.40	9.40	7.30	5.50	3.70	1.90	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	13.80	11.80	9.70	7.70	5.90	4.00	2.20	.40	0	0	0
$78	$80	14.20	12.10	10.10	8.10	6.20	4.40	2.50	.70	0	0	0
$80	$82	14.50	12.50	10.50	8.50	6.50	4.70	2.90	1.10	0	0	0
$82	$84	14.90	12.90	10.90	8.90	6.90	5.10	3.20	1.40	0	0	0
$84	$86	15.30	13.30	11.30	9.20	7.20	5.40	3.60	1.70	0	0	0
$86	$88	15.70	13.70	11.60	9.60	7.60	5.70	3.90	2.10	.30	0	0
$88	$90	16.10	14.00	12.00	10.00	8.00	6.10	4.30	2.40	.60	0	0
$90	$92	16.40	14.40	12.40	10.40	8.40	6.40	4.60	2.80	.90	0	0
$92	$94	16.80	14.80	12.80	10.80	8.70	6.80	4.90	3.10	1.30	0	0
$94	$96	17.20	15.20	13.10	11.10	9.10	7.10	5.30	3.50	1.60	0	0
$96	$98	17.60	15.50	13.50	11.50	9.50	7.50	5.60	3.80	2.00	.10	0
$98	$100	17.90	15.90	13.90	11.90	9.90	7.80	6.00	4.10	2.30	.50	0
$100	$105	18.60	16.60	14.60	12.50	10.50	8.50	6.60	4.70	2.90	1.10	0
$105	$110	19.50	17.50	15.50	13.50	11.50	9.50	7.40	5.60	3.80	1.90	.10
$110	$115	20.50	18.50	16.50	14.40	12.40	10.40	8.40	6.40	4.60	2.80	1.00
$115	$120	21.40	19.40	17.40	15.40	13.40	11.30	9.30	7.30	5.50	3.70	1.80
$120	$125	22.40	20.40	18.30	16.30	14.30	12.30	10.30	8.20	6.30	4.50	2.70
$125	$130	23.30	21.30	19.30	17.30	15.30	13.20	11.20	9.20	7.20	5.40	3.50
$130	$135	24.30	22.30	20.20	18.20	16.20	14.20	12.20	10.10	8.10	6.20	4.40
$135	$140	25.20	23.20	21.20	19.20	17.10	15.10	13.10	11.10	9.10	7.10	5.20
$140	$145	26.20	24.10	22.10	20.10	18.10	16.10	14.00	12.00	10.00	8.00	6.10
$145	$150	27.10	25.10	23.10	21.10	19.00	17.00	15.00	13.00	11.00	8.90	7.00
$150	$160	28.50	26.50	24.50	22.50	20.40	18.40	16.40	14.40	12.40	10.40	8.30
$160	$170	30.40	28.40	26.40	24.40	22.30	20.30	18.30	16.30	14.30	12.20	10.20
$170	$180	32.30	30.30	28.30	26.20	24.20	22.20	20.20	18.20	16.20	14.10	12.10
$180	$190	34.20	32.20	30.20	28.10	26.10	24.10	22.10	20.10	18.00	16.00	14.00
$190	$200	36.10	34.10	32.00	30.00	28.00	26.00	24.00	22.00	19.90	17.90	15.90
		19 percent of the excess over $200 plus—										
$200 and over		37.00	35.00	33.00	31.00	29.00	26.90	24.90	22.90	20.90	18.90	16.80

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$20	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$20	$22	$3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	3.90	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	4.30	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	4.60	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	5.00	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	5.30	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	5.60	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	6.00	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	6.30	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	6.70	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	7.00	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	7.40	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	7.70	4.00	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	8.00	4.40	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	8.40	4.70	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	8.70	5.10	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	9.10	5.40	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	9.40	5.80	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	9.70	6.10	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	10.10	6.40	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	10.40	6.80	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	10.80	7.10	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	11.10	7.50	3.80	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	11.50	7.80	4.10	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	11.80	8.10	4.50	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	12.10	8.50	4.80	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	12.50	8.80	5.20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	12.80	9.20	5.50	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	13.20	9.50	5.90	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	13.50	9.90	6.20	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	13.90	10.20	6.50	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	14.20	10.50	6.90	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	14.50	10.90	7.20	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	14.90	11.20	7.60	3.90	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	15.30	11.60	7.90	4.30	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	15.70	11.90	8.30	4.60	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	16.00	12.20	8.60	4.90	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	16.40	12.60	8.90	5.30	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	16.80	12.90	9.30	5.60	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	17.20	13.30	9.60	6.00	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	17.60	13.60	10.00	6.30	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	17.90	14.00	10.30	6.70	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	18.30	14.30	10.60	7.00	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	18.70	14.60	11.00	7.30	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	19.10	15.00	11.30	7.70	4.00	.40	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	19.40	15.40	11.70	8.00	4.40	.70	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	19.80	15.80	12.00	8.40	4.70	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	20.20	16.20	12.40	8.70	5.00	1.40	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	20.60	16.50	12.70	9.00	5.40	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	21.00	16.90	13.00	9.40	5.70	2.10	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	21.50	17.50	13.60	9.90	6.20	2.60	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	22.30	18.20	14.20	10.60	6.90	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	23.00	19.00	15.00	11.30	7.60	4.00	.30	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	23.80	19.70	15.70	12.00	8.30	4.60	1.00	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	24.50	20.50	16.50	12.60	9.00	5.30	1.70	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	25.30	21.30	17.20	13.30	9.70	6.00	2.40	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	26.10	22.00	18.00	14.00	10.40	6.70	3.00	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	26.80	22.80	18.70	14.70	11.00	7.40	3.70	.10	0	0	0
$152	$156	27.60	23.50	19.50	15.50	11.70	8.10	4.40	.80	0	0	0
$156	$160	28.30	24.30	20.20	16.20	12.40	8.70	5.10	1.40	0	0	0
$160	$164	29.10	25.00	21.00	17.00	13.10	9.40	5.80	2.10	0	0	0
$164	$168	29.80	25.80	21.80	17.70	13.80	10.10	6.50	2.80	0	0	0
$168	$172	30.60	26.60	22.50	18.50	14.50	10.80	7.10	3.50	0	0	0
$172	$176	31.30	27.30	23.30	19.20	15.20	11.50	7.80	4.20	.50	0	0
$176	$180	32.10	28.10	24.00	20.00	15.90	12.20	8.50	4.90	1.20	0	0
$180	$184	32.90	28.80	24.80	20.70	16.70	12.90	9.20	5.50	1.90	0	0
$184	$188	33.60	29.60	25.50	21.50	17.50	13.50	9.90	6.20	2.60	0	0
$188	$192	34.40	30.30	26.30	22.30	18.20	14.20	10.60	6.90	3.30	0	0
$192	$196	35.10	31.10	27.10	23.00	19.00	14.90	11.30	7.60	3.90	.30	0
$196	$200	35.90	31.80	27.80	23.80	19.70	15.70	11.90	8.30	4.60	1.00	0
$200	$210	37.20	33.20	29.10	25.10	21.10	17.00	13.10	9.50	5.80	2.20	0
$210	$220	39.10	35.10	31.00	27.00	22.90	18.90	14.90	11.20	7.50	3.90	.20
$220	$230	41.00	36.90	32.90	28.90	24.80	20.80	16.80	12.90	9.20	5.60	1.90
$230	$240	42.90	38.80	34.80	30.80	26.70	22.70	18.60	14.60	11.00	7.30	3.60
$240	$250	44.80	40.70	36.70	32.70	28.60	24.60	20.50	16.50	12.70	9.00	5.40
$250	$260	46.70	42.60	38.60	34.50	30.50	26.50	22.40	18.40	14.40	10.70	7.10
$260	$270	48.50	44.50	40.50	36.40	32.40	28.40	24.30	20.30	16.20	12.40	8.80
$270	$280	50.40	46.40	42.40	38.30	34.30	30.20	26.20	22.20	18.10	14.10	10.50
$280	$290	52.30	48.30	44.20	40.20	36.20	32.10	28.10	24.10	20.00	16.00	12.20
$290	$300	54.20	50.20	46.10	42.10	38.10	34.00	30.00	25.90	21.90	17.90	13.90
$300	$320	57.10	53.00	49.00	44.90	40.90	36.90	32.80	28.80	24.70	20.70	16.70
$320	$340	60.80	56.80	52.80	48.70	44.70	40.60	36.60	32.60	28.50	24.50	20.40
$340	$360	64.60	60.60	56.50	52.50	48.50	44.40	40.40	36.30	32.30	28.30	24.20
$360	$380	68.40	64.40	60.30	56.30	52.20	48.20	44.20	40.10	36.10	32.00	28.00
$380	$400	72.20	68.10	64.10	60.10	56.00	52.00	47.90	43.90	39.90	35.80	31.80
		19 percent of the excess over $400 plus—										
$400 and over		74.10	70.00	66.00	61.90	57.90	53.90	49.80	45.80	41.80	37.70	33.70

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$22	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$22	$24	3.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	4.30	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	4.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	5.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	5.30	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	5.60	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	6.00	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	6.30	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	6.70	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	7.00	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	7.40	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	7.70	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	8.00	4.10	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	8.40	4.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	8.70	4.80	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	9.10	5.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	9.40	5.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	9.70	5.80	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	10.10	6.10	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	10.40	6.50	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	10.80	6.80	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	11.10	7.20	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	11.50	7.50	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	11.80	7.80	3.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	12.10	8.20	4.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	12.50	8.50	4.60	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	12.80	8.90	4.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	13.20	9.20	5.30	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	13.50	9.60	5.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	13.90	9.90	5.90	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	14.20	10.20	6.30	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	14.50	10.60	6.60	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	14.90	10.90	7.00	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	15.20	11.30	7.30	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	15.60	11.60	7.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	15.90	11.90	8.00	4.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	16.30	12.30	8.30	4.40	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	16.70	12.60	8.70	4.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	17.00	13.00	9.00	5.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	17.40	13.30	9.40	5.40	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	17.80	13.70	9.70	5.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	18.20	14.00	10.00	6.10	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	18.60	14.30	10.40	6.40	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	18.90	14.70	10.70	6.80	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	19.30	15.00	11.10	7.10	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	19.70	15.40	11.40	7.40	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	20.10	15.70	11.70	7.80	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	20.40	16.10	12.10	8.10	4.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	20.80	16.40	12.40	8.50	4.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	21.40	17.00	12.90	9.00	5.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	22.10	17.80	13.60	9.70	5.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	22.90	18.50	14.30	10.40	6.40	2.40	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	23.70	19.30	15.00	11.00	7.10	3.10	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	24.40	20.00	15.70	11.70	7.80	3.80	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	25.20	20.80	16.40	12.40	8.40	4.50	.50	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	25.90	21.60	17.20	13.10	9.10	5.20	1.20	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	26.70	22.30	17.90	13.80	9.80	5.90	1.90	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	27.40	23.10	18.70	14.50	10.50	6.50	2.60	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	28.20	23.80	19.40	15.10	11.20	7.20	3.20	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	29.00	24.60	20.20	15.80	11.90	7.90	4.00	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	29.70	25.30	21.00	16.60	12.60	8.60	4.60	.70	0	0	0
$168	$172	30.50	26.10	21.70	17.30	13.20	9.30	5.30	1.40	0	0	0
$172	$176	31.20	26.80	22.50	18.10	13.90	10.00	6.00	2.00	0	0	0
$176	$180	32.00	27.60	23.20	18.90	14.60	10.60	6.70	2.70	0	0	0
$180	$184	32.70	28.40	24.00	19.60	15.30	11.30	7.40	3.40	0	0	0
$184	$188	33.50	29.10	24.70	20.40	16.00	12.00	8.10	4.10	.10	0	0
$188	$192	34.20	29.90	25.50	21.10	16.70	12.70	8.70	4.80	.80	0	0
$192	$196	35.00	30.60	26.20	21.90	17.50	13.40	9.40	5.50	1.50	0	0
$196	$200	35.80	31.40	27.00	22.60	18.30	14.10	10.10	6.10	2.20	0	0
$200	$210	37.10	32.70	28.30	24.00	19.60	15.30	11.30	7.30	3.40	0	0
$210	$220	39.00	34.60	30.20	25.80	21.50	17.10	13.00	9.10	5.10	1.10	0
$220	$230	40.90	36.50	32.10	27.70	23.40	19.00	14.70	10.80	6.80	2.90	0
$230	$240	42.70	38.40	34.00	29.60	25.20	20.90	16.50	12.50	8.50	4.60	.60
$240	$250	44.60	40.30	35.90	31.50	27.10	22.80	18.40	14.20	10.20	6.30	2.30
$250	$260	46.50	42.20	37.80	33.40	29.00	24.70	20.30	15.90	11.90	8.00	4.00
$260	$270	48.40	44.00	39.70	35.30	30.90	26.50	22.20	17.80	13.60	9.70	5.70
$270	$280	50.30	45.90	41.60	37.20	32.80	28.40	24.10	19.70	15.40	11.40	7.40
$280	$290	52.20	47.80	43.40	39.10	34.70	30.30	25.90	21.60	17.20	13.10	9.20
$290	$300	54.10	49.70	45.30	41.00	36.60	32.20	27.80	23.50	19.10	14.80	10.90
$300	$320	56.90	52.50	48.20	43.80	39.40	35.00	30.70	26.30	21.90	17.50	13.40
$320	$340	60.70	56.30	52.00	47.60	43.20	38.80	34.50	30.10	25.70	21.30	17.00
$340	$360	64.50	60.10	55.70	51.40	47.00	42.60	38.20	33.90	29.50	25.10	20.70
$360	$380	68.30	63.90	59.50	55.10	50.80	46.40	42.00	37.60	33.30	28.90	24.50
$380	$400	72.00	67.70	63.30	58.90	54.50	50.20	45.80	41.40	37.00	32.70	28.30
$400	$420	75.80	71.40	67.10	62.70	58.30	53.90	49.60	45.20	40.80	36.40	32.10
$420	$440	79.60	75.20	70.90	66.50	62.10	57.70	53.40	49.00	44.60	40.20	35.90
$440	$460	83.40	79.00	74.60	70.30	65.90	61.50	57.10	52.80	48.40	44.00	39.60
$460	$480	87.20	82.80	78.40	74.00	69.70	65.30	60.90	56.50	52.20	47.80	43.40
$480	$500	90.90	86.60	82.20	77.80	73.40	69.10	64.70	60.30	55.90	51.60	47.20
		19 percent of the excess over $500 plus—										
$500 and over		92.80	88.50	84.10	79.70	75.30	71.00	66.60	62.20	57.80	53.50	49.10

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$44	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$44	$48	$7.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$52	8.60	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$56	9.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$60	9.90	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$64	10.60	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$68	11.30	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$72	12.00	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$76	12.70	4.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$80	13.30	5.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$84	14.00	6.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$88	14.70	6.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$92	15.40	7.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$96	16.10	8.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$100	16.80	8.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$104	17.40	9.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$108	18.10	10.20	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$112	18.80	10.90	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$116	19.50	11.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$120	20.20	12.30	4.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	20.90	12.90	5.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	21.50	13.60	5.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	22.20	14.30	6.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	22.90	15.00	7.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	23.60	15.70	7.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	24.30	16.40	8.40	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	25.00	17.00	9.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	25.70	17.70	9.80	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	26.30	18.40	10.50	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	27.00	19.10	11.20	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	27.70	19.80	11.90	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	28.40	20.50	12.60	4.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	29.10	21.20	13.20	5.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	29.80	21.80	13.90	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	30.40	22.50	14.60	6.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	31.10	23.20	15.30	7.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	31.80	23.90	16.00	8.10	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	32.60	24.60	16.70	8.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	33.30	25.30	17.30	9.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	34.10	25.90	18.00	10.10	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$200	$204	34.80	26.60	18.70	10.80	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$204	$208	35.60	27.30	19.40	11.50	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$208	$212	36.40	28.00	20.10	12.20	4.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$212	$216	37.10	28.70	20.80	12.80	4.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$216	$220	37.90	29.40	21.40	13.50	5.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$220	$224	38.60	30.00	22.10	14.20	6.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$224	$228	39.40	30.70	22.80	14.90	7.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$228	$232	40.10	31.40	23.50	15.60	7.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$232	$236	40.90	32.10	24.20	16.30	8.30	.40	0	0	0	0	0
$236	$240	41.60	32.90	24.90	16.90	9.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$240	$248	42.80	34.00	25.90	18.00	10.10	2.10	0	0	0	0	0
$248	$256	44.30	35.50	27.30	19.30	11.40	3.50	0	0	0	0	0
$256	$264	45.80	37.10	28.60	20.70	12.80	4.90	0	0	0	0	0
$264	$272	47.30	38.60	30.00	22.10	14.20	6.20	0	0	0	0	0
$272	$280	48.80	40.10	31.40	23.40	15.50	7.60	0	0	0	0	0
$280	$288	50.30	41.60	32.80	24.80	16.90	9.00	1.10	0	0	0	0
$288	$296	51.90	43.10	34.40	26.20	18.30	10.30	2.40	0	0	0	0
$296	$304	53.40	44.60	35.90	27.60	19.60	11.70	3.80	0	0	0	0
$304	$312	54.90	46.10	37.40	28.90	21.00	13.10	5.20	0	0	0	0
$312	$320	56.40	47.60	38.90	30.30	22.40	14.50	6.50	0	0	0	0
$320	$328	57.90	49.20	40.40	31.70	23.70	15.80	7.90	0	0	0	0
$328	$336	59.40	50.70	41.90	33.20	25.10	17.20	9.30	1.40	0	0	0
$336	$344	60.90	52.20	43.40	34.70	26.50	18.60	10.60	2.70	0	0	0
$344	$352	62.40	53.70	44.90	36.20	27.80	19.90	12.00	4.10	0	0	0
$352	$360	64.00	55.20	46.50	37.70	29.20	21.30	13.40	5.50	0	0	0
$360	$368	65.50	56.70	48.00	39.20	30.60	22.70	14.70	6.80	0	0	0
$368	$376	67.00	58.20	49.50	40.70	32.00	24.00	16.10	8.20	.30	0	0
$376	$384	68.50	59.70	51.00	42.20	33.50	25.40	17.50	9.60	1.60	0	0
$384	$392	70.00	61.20	52.50	43.70	35.00	26.80	18.80	10.90	3.00	0	0
$392	$400	71.50	62.80	54.00	45.30	36.50	28.10	20.20	12.30	4.40	0	0
$400	$420	74.20	65.40	56.70	47.90	39.20	30.50	22.60	14.70	6.80	0	0
$420	$440	77.90	69.20	60.40	51.70	42.90	34.20	26.00	18.10	10.20	2.30	0
$440	$460	81.70	73.00	64.20	55.50	46.70	38.00	29.50	21.50	13.60	5.70	0
$460	$480	85.50	76.70	68.00	59.20	50.50	41.70	33.00	25.00	17.00	9.10	1.20
$480	$500	89.30	80.50	71.80	63.00	54.30	45.50	36.80	28.40	20.50	12.50	4.60
$500	$520	93.10	84.30	75.60	66.80	58.10	49.30	40.60	31.80	23.90	16.00	8.00
$520	$540	96.80	88.10	79.30	70.60	61.80	53.10	44.30	35.60	27.30	19.40	11.50
$540	$560	100.60	91.90	83.10	74.40	65.60	56.90	48.10	39.40	30.70	22.80	14.90
$560	$580	104.40	95.60	86.90	78.10	69.40	60.60	51.90	43.10	34.40	26.20	18.30
$580	$600	108.20	99.40	90.70	81.90	73.20	64.40	55.70	46.90	38.20	29.60	21.70
$600	$640	113.80	105.10	96.30	87.60	78.80	70.10	61.30	52.60	43.80	35.10	26.90
$640	$680	121.40	112.70	103.90	95.20	86.40	77.70	68.90	60.20	51.40	42.70	33.90
$680	$720	129.00	120.20	111.50	102.70	94.00	85.20	76.50	67.70	59.00	50.20	41.50
$720	$760	136.50	127.80	119.00	110.30	101.50	92.80	84.00	75.30	66.50	57.80	49.00
$760	$800	144.10	135.30	126.60	117.80	109.10	100.30	91.60	82.80	74.10	65.30	56.60
$800	$840	151.60	142.90	134.10	125.40	116.60	107.90	99.10	90.40	81.60	72.90	64.10
$840	$880	159.20	150.50	141.70	133.00	124.20	115.50	106.70	98.00	89.20	80.50	71.70
$880	$920	166.80	158.00	149.30	140.50	131.80	123.00	114.30	105.50	96.80	88.00	79.30
$920	$960	174.30	165.60	156.80	148.10	139.30	130.60	121.80	113.10	104.30	95.60	86.80
$960	$1,000	181.90	173.10	164.40	155.60	146.90	138.10	129.40	120.60	111.90	103.10	94.40
		19 percent of the excess over $1,000 plus—										
$1,000 and over		185.70	176.90	168.20	159.40	150.70	141.90	133.20	124.40	115.70	106.90	98.20

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
At least—	But less than—	The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period										
$0	$1.50	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$1.50	$1.75	$0.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.75	$2.00	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.00	$2.25	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.25	$2.50	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.50	$2.75	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.75	$3.00	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.00	$3.25	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.25	$3.50	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.50	$3.75	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.75	$4.00	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.00	$4.25	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.25	$4.50	.75	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.50	$4.75	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.75	$5.00	.85	.55	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.00	$5.25	.90	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.25	$5.50	.90	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.50	$5.75	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.75	$6.00	1.00	.75	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.00	$6.25	1.05	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.25	$6.50	1.10	.85	.55	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.50	$6.75	1.15	.85	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.75	$7.00	1.20	.90	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.00	$7.25	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.25	$7.50	1.30	1.00	.75	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.50	$7.75	1.35	1.05	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.75	$8.00	1.40	1.10	.85	.55	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0
$8.00	$8.25	1.45	1.15	.85	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0
$8.25	$8.50	1.45	1.20	.90	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0
$8.50	$8.75	1.50	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0
$8.75	$9.00	1.55	1.30	1.00	.75	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0
$9.00	$9.25	1.60	1.35	1.05	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0
$9.25	$9.50	1.65	1.35	1.10	.80	.55	.30	.05	0	0	0	0
$9.50	$9.75	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0
$9.75	$10.00	1.75	1.45	1.20	.90	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0
$10.00	$10.50	1.85	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0	0
$10.50	$11.00	1.90	1.65	1.35	1.05	.80	.55	.30	0	0	0	0
$11.00	$11.50	2.00	1.75	1.45	1.15	.90	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0
$11.50	$12.00	2.10	1.80	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0
$12.00	$12.50	2.20	1.90	1.65	1.35	1.05	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0
$12.50	$13.00	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.45	1.15	.90	.60	.35	.10	0	0
$13.00	$13.50	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0
$13.50	$14.00	2.50	2.20	1.90	1.65	1.35	1.05	.80	.55	.25	0	0
$14.00	$14.50	2.60	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.45	1.15	.90	.60	.35	.10	0
$14.50	$15.00	2.70	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0
$15.00	$15.50	2.75	2.50	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.35	1.05	.80	.55	.25	0
$15.50	$16.00	2.85	2.60	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.45	1.15	.85	.60	.35	.10
$16.00	$16.50	2.95	2.65	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.50	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20
$16.50	$17.00	3.05	2.75	2.50	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.35	1.05	.80	.50	.25
$17.00	$17.50	3.15	2.85	2.60	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.60	.35
$17.50	$18.00	3.25	2.95	2.65	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.50	1.25	.95	.70	.45
$18.00	$18.50	3.35	3.05	2.75	2.50	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.35	1.05	.80	.50
$18.50	$19.00	3.45	3.15	2.85	2.55	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.60
$19.00	$19.50	3.55	3.25	2.95	2.65	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.50	1.25	.95	.70
$19.50	$20.00	3.60	3.35	3.05	2.75	2.45	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.05	.75
$20.00	$21.00	3.75	3.50	3.20	2.90	2.60	2.35	2.05	1.75	1.45	1.20	.90
$21.00	$22.00	3.95	3.65	3.40	3.10	2.80	2.50	2.25	1.95	1.65	1.35	1.10
$22.00	$23.00	4.15	3.85	3.55	3.30	3.00	2.70	2.40	2.15	1.85	1.55	1.25
$23.00	$24.00	4.35	4.05	3.75	3.45	3.20	2.90	2.60	2.30	2.05	1.75	1.45
$24.00	$25.00	4.50	4.25	3.95	3.65	3.35	3.10	2.80	2.50	2.20	1.95	1.65
$25.00	$26.00	4.70	4.40	4.15	3.85	3.55	3.25	3.00	2.70	2.40	2.10	1.85
$26.00	$27.00	4.90	4.60	4.30	4.05	3.75	3.45	3.15	2.90	2.60	2.30	2.00
$27.00	$28.00	5.10	4.80	4.50	4.20	3.95	3.65	3.35	3.05	2.80	2.50	2.20
$28.00	$29.00	5.30	5.00	4.70	4.40	4.15	3.85	3.55	3.25	3.00	2.70	2.40
$29.00	$30.00	5.45	5.20	4.90	4.60	4.30	4.05	3.75	3.45	3.15	2.90	2.60
		19 percent of the excess over $30 plus—										
$30.00 and over		5.55	5.25	5.00	4.70	4.40	4.10	3.85	3.55	3.25	2.95	2.70

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$11	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$11	$12	$2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$13	2.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$13	$14	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$15	2.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$15	$16	2.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$17	2.80	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$17	$18	3.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$19	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$19	$20	3.30	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$21	3.50	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$21	$22	3.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$23	3.80	2.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$23	$24	4.00	2.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$25	4.20	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$25	$26	4.40	2.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$27	4.50	2.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$27	$28	4.70	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$29	4.80	3.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$29	$30	5.00	3.20	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$31	5.20	3.40	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$31	$32	5.40	3.60	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$33	5.60	3.70	1.90	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$33	$34	5.70	3.90	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$35	5.90	4.10	2.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$35	$36	6.10	4.20	2.40	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$37	6.20	4.40	2.60	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$37	$38	6.40	4.60	2.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$39	6.60	4.80	2.90	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$39	$40	6.80	4.90	3.10	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$41	6.90	5.10	3.30	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$41	$42	7.10	5.30	3.40	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$43	7.30	5.40	3.60	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$43	$44	7.40	5.60	3.80	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$45	7.60	5.80	4.00	2.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$45	$46	7.80	6.00	4.10	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$47	8.00	6.10	4.30	2.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$47	$48	8.20	6.30	4.50	2.60	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$49	8.40	6.50	4.60	2.80	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$49	$50	8.60	6.60	4.80	3.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$51	8.80	6.80	5.00	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$51	$52	8.90	7.00	5.20	3.30	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$53	9.10	7.20	5.30	3.50	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$53	$54	9.30	7.30	5.50	3.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$55	9.50	7.50	5.70	3.80	2.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0
$55	$56	9.70	7.70	5.80	4.00	2.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$57	9.90	7.90	6.00	4.20	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$57	$58	10.10	8.10	6.20	4.40	2.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$59	10.30	8.30	6.30	4.50	2.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0
$59	$60	10.50	8.40	6.50	4.70	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	10.70	8.70	6.80	5.00	3.10	1.30	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	11.10	9.10	7.10	5.30	3.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	11.50	9.50	7.50	5.60	3.80	2.00	.20	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	11.90	9.90	7.80	6.00	4.10	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	12.20	10.20	8.20	6.30	4.50	2.70	.80	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	12.60	10.60	8.60	6.70	4.80	3.00	1.20	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	13.00	11.00	9.00	7.00	5.20	3.30	1.50	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	13.40	11.40	9.40	7.30	5.50	3.70	1.90	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	13.70	11.70	9.70	7.70	5.90	4.00	2.20	.40	0	0	0
$78	$80	14.10	12.10	10.10	8.10	6.20	4.40	2.50	.70	0	0	0
$80	$82	14.50	12.50	10.50	8.50	6.50	4.70	2.90	1.10	0	0	0
$82	$84	14.90	12.90	10.90	8.80	6.90	5.10	3.20	1.40	0	0	0
$84	$86	15.30	13.20	11.20	9.20	7.20	5.40	3.60	1.70	0	0	0
$86	$88	15.60	13.60	11.60	9.60	7.60	5.70	3.90	2.10	.30	0	0
$88	$90	16.00	14.00	12.00	10.00	8.00	6.10	4.30	2.40	.60	0	0
$90	$92	16.40	14.40	12.40	10.40	8.30	6.40	4.60	2.80	.90	0	0
$92	$94	16.80	14.70	12.70	10.70	8.70	6.80	4.90	3.10	1.30	0	0
$94	$96	17.10	15.10	13.10	11.10	9.10	7.10	5.30	3.50	1.60	0	0
$96	$98	17.50	15.50	13.50	11.50	9.50	7.50	5.60	3.80	2.00	.10	0
$98	$100	17.90	15.90	13.90	11.90	9.90	7.80	6.00	4.10	2.30	.50	0
$100	$105	18.50	16.50	14.50	12.50	10.50	8.50	6.60	4.70	2.90	1.10	0
$105	$110	19.50	17.50	15.50	13.50	11.40	9.40	7.40	5.60	3.80	1.90	.10
$110	$115	20.40	18.40	16.40	14.40	12.40	10.40	8.40	6.40	4.60	2.80	1.00
$115	$120	21.40	19.40	17.30	15.30	13.30	11.30	9.30	7.30	5.50	3.70	1.80
$120	$125	22.30	20.30	18.30	16.30	14.30	12.30	10.30	8.20	6.30	4.50	2.70
$125	$130	23.20	21.20	19.20	17.20	15.20	13.20	11.20	9.20	7.20	5.40	3.50
$130	$135	24.20	22.20	20.20	18.20	16.20	14.10	12.10	10.10	8.10	6.20	4.40
$135	$140	25.10	23.10	21.10	19.10	17.10	15.10	13.10	11.10	9.10	7.10	5.20
$140	$145	26.10	24.10	22.00	20.00	18.00	16.00	14.00	12.00	10.00	8.00	6.10
$145	$150	27.00	25.00	23.00	21.00	19.00	17.00	15.00	12.90	10.90	8.90	7.00
$150	$160	28.40	26.40	24.40	22.40	20.40	18.40	16.40	14.40	12.30	10.30	8.30
$160	$170	30.30	28.30	26.30	24.30	22.30	20.30	18.20	16.20	14.20	12.20	10.20
$170	$180	32.20	30.20	28.20	26.20	24.10	22.10	20.10	18.10	16.10	14.10	12.10
$180	$190	34.10	32.10	30.00	28.00	26.00	24.00	22.00	20.00	18.00	16.00	14.00
$190	$200	35.90	33.90	31.90	29.90	27.90	25.90	23.90	21.90	19.90	17.90	15.80
		19 percent of the excess over $200 plus—										
$200 and over		36.90	34.90	32.90	30.90	28.80	26.80	24.80	22.80	20.80	18.80	16.80

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$20	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$20	$22	$3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	3.90	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	4.30	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	4.60	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	5.00	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	5.30	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	5.60	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	6.00	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	6.30	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	6.70	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	7.00	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	7.40	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	7.70	4.00	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	8.00	4.40	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	8.40	4.70	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	8.70	5.10	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	9.10	5.40	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	9.40	5.80	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	9.70	6.10	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	10.10	6.40	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	10.40	6.80	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	10.80	7.10	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	11.10	7.50	3.80	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	11.50	7.80	4.10	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	11.80	8.10	4.50	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	12.10	8.50	4.80	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	12.50	8.80	5.20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	12.80	9.20	5.50	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	13.20	9.50	5.90	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	13.50	9.90	6.20	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	13.90	10.20	6.50	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	14.20	10.50	6.90	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	14.50	10.90	7.20	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	14.90	11.20	7.60	3.90	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	15.30	11.60	7.90	4.30	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	15.60	11.90	8.30	4.60	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	16.00	12.20	8.60	4.90	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	16.40	12.60	8.90	5.30	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	16.80	12.90	9.30	5.60	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	17.20	13.30	9.60	6.00	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	17.50	13.60	10.00	6.30	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	17.90	14.00	10.30	6.70	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	18.30	14.30	10.60	7.00	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	18.70	14.60	11.00	7.30	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	19.00	15.00	11.30	7.70	4.00	.40	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	19.40	15.40	11.70	8.00	4.40	.70	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	19.80	15.80	12.00	8.40	4.70	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	20.20	16.20	12.40	8.70	5.00	1.40	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	20.50	16.50	12.70	9.00	5.40	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	20.90	16.90	13.00	9.40	5.70	2.10	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	21.50	17.50	13.60	9.90	6.20	2.60	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	22.20	18.20	14.20	10.60	6.90	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	23.00	19.00	15.00	11.30	7.60	4.00	.30	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	23.70	19.70	15.70	12.00	8.30	4.60	1.00	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	24.50	20.50	16.50	12.60	9.00	5.30	1.70	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	25.20	21.20	17.20	13.30	9.70	6.00	2.40	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	26.00	22.00	18.00	14.00	10.40	6.70	3.00	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	26.80	22.70	18.70	14.70	11.00	7.40	3.70	.10	0	0	0
$152	$156	27.50	23.50	19.50	15.40	11.70	8.10	4.40	.80	0	0	0
$156	$160	28.30	24.20	20.20	16.20	12.40	8.70	5.10	1.40	0	0	0
$160	$164	29.00	25.00	21.00	16.90	13.10	9.40	5.80	2.10	0	0	0
$164	$168	29.80	25.70	21.70	17.70	13.80	10.10	6.50	2.80	0	0	0
$168	$172	30.50	26.50	22.50	18.40	14.50	10.80	7.10	3.50	0	0	0
$172	$176	31.30	27.20	23.20	19.20	15.20	11.50	7.80	4.20	.50	0	0
$176	$180	32.00	28.00	24.00	20.00	15.90	12.20	8.50	4.90	1.20	0	0
$180	$184	32.80	28.70	24.70	20.70	16.70	12.90	9.20	5.50	1.90	0	0
$184	$188	33.50	29.50	25.50	21.50	17.40	13.50	9.90	6.20	2.60	0	0
$188	$192	34.30	30.30	26.20	22.20	18.20	14.20	10.60	6.90	3.30	0	0
$192	$196	35.00	31.00	27.00	23.00	19.00	14.90	11.30	7.60	3.90	.30	0
$196	$200	35.80	31.80	27.70	23.70	19.70	15.70	11.90	8.30	4.60	1.00	0
$200	$210	37.10	33.10	29.10	25.00	21.00	17.00	13.10	9.50	5.80	2.20	0
$210	$220	39.00	35.00	30.90	26.90	22.90	18.90	14.90	11.20	7.50	3.90	.20
$220	$230	40.90	36.80	32.80	28.80	24.80	20.80	16.70	12.90	9.20	5.60	1.90
$230	$240	42.70	38.70	34.70	30.70	26.70	22.60	18.60	14.60	11.00	7.30	3.60
$240	$250	44.60	40.60	36.60	32.60	28.50	24.50	20.50	16.50	12.70	9.00	5.40
$250	$260	46.50	42.50	38.50	34.40	30.40	26.40	22.40	18.40	14.40	10.70	7.10
$260	$270	48.40	44.40	40.30	36.30	32.30	28.30	24.20	20.20	16.20	12.40	8.80
$270	$280	50.30	46.20	42.20	38.20	34.20	30.20	26.10	22.10	18.10	14.10	10.50
$280	$290	52.10	48.10	44.10	40.10	36.10	32.00	28.00	24.00	20.00	16.00	12.20
$290	$300	54.00	50.00	46.00	42.00	37.90	33.90	29.90	25.90	21.90	17.90	13.90
$300	$320	56.80	52.80	48.80	44.80	40.80	36.70	32.70	28.70	24.70	20.70	16.70
$320	$340	60.60	56.60	52.60	48.50	44.50	40.50	36.50	32.50	28.50	24.40	20.40
$340	$360	64.40	60.40	56.30	52.30	48.30	44.30	40.30	36.20	32.20	28.20	24.20
$360	$380	68.10	64.10	60.10	56.10	52.10	48.00	44.00	40.00	36.00	32.00	27.90
$380	$400	71.90	67.90	63.90	59.80	55.80	51.80	47.80	43.80	39.70	35.70	31.70
		19 percent of the excess over $400 plus—										
$400 and over		73.80	69.80	65.70	61.70	57.70	53.70	49.70	45.60	41.60	37.60	33.60

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of the tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$22	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$22	$24	$3.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	4.30	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	4.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	5.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	5.30	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	5.60	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	6.00	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	6.30	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	6.70	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	7.00	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	7.40	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	7.70	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	8.00	4.10	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	8.40	4.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	8.70	4.80	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	9.10	5.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	9.40	5.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	9.70	5.80	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	10.10	6.10	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	10.40	6.50	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	10.80	6.80	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	11.10	7.20	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	11.50	7.50	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	11.80	7.80	3.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	12.10	8.20	4.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	12.50	8.50	4.60	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	12.80	8.90	4.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	13.20	9.20	5.30	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	13.50	9.60	5.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	13.90	9.90	5.90	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	14.20	10.20	6.30	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	14.50	10.60	6.60	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	14.90	10.90	7.00	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	15.20	11.30	7.30	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	15.60	11.60	7.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	15.90	11.90	8.00	4.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	16.30	12.30	8.30	4.40	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	16.70	12.60	8.70	4.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	17.00	13.00	9.00	5.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	17.40	13.30	9.40	5.40	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	17.80	13.70	9.70	5.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	18.20	14.00	10.00	6.10	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	18.50	14.30	10.40	6.40	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	18.90	14.70	10.70	6.80	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	19.30	15.00	11.10	7.10	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	19.70	15.40	11.40	7.40	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	20.00	15.70	11.70	7.80	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	20.40	16.10	12.10	8.10	4.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	20.80	16.40	12.40	8.50	4.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	21.40	17.00	12.90	9.00	5.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	22.10	17.80	13.60	9.70	5.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	22.90	18.50	14.30	10.40	6.40	2.40	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	23.60	19.30	15.00	11.00	7.10	3.10	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	24.40	20.00	15.70	11.70	7.80	3.80	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	25.10	20.80	16.40	12.40	8.40	4.50	.50	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	25.90	21.50	17.20	13.10	9.10	5.20	1.20	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	26.60	22.30	17.90	13.80	9.80	5.90	1.90	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	27.40	23.00	18.70	14.50	10.50	6.50	2.60	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	28.10	23.80	19.40	15.10	11.20	7.20	3.30	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	28.90	24.50	20.20	15.80	11.90	7.90	4.00	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	29.60	25.30	20.90	16.60	12.60	8.60	4.60	.70	0	0	0
$168	$172	30.40	26.00	21.70	17.30	13.20	9.30	5.30	1.40	0	0	0
$172	$176	31.10	26.80	22.40	18.10	13.90	10.00	6.00	2.00	0	0	0
$176	$180	31.90	27.50	23.20	18.80	14.60	10.60	6.70	2.70	0	0	0
$180	$184	32.60	28.30	23.90	19.60	15.30	11.30	7.40	3.40	0	0	0
$184	$188	33.40	29.00	24.70	20.30	16.00	12.00	8.10	4.10	.10	0	0
$188	$192	34.20	29.80	25.40	21.10	16.70	12.70	8.70	4.80	.80	0	0
$192	$196	34.90	30.60	26.20	21.80	17.50	13.40	9.40	5.50	1.50	0	0
$196	$200	35.70	31.30	27.00	22.60	18.20	14.10	10.10	6.10	2.20	0	0
$200	$210	37.00	32.60	28.30	23.90	19.60	15.30	11.20	7.30	3.40	0	0
$210	$220	38.90	34.50	30.10	25.80	21.40	17.10	13.00	9.10	5.10	1.10	0
$220	$230	40.70	36.40	32.00	27.70	23.30	19.00	14.70	10.80	6.80	2.90	0
$230	$240	42.60	38.30	33.90	29.60	25.20	20.80	16.50	12.50	8.50	4.60	.60
$240	$250	44.50	40.10	35.80	31.40	27.10	22.70	18.40	14.20	10.20	6.30	2.30
$250	$260	46.40	42.00	37.70	33.30	29.00	24.60	20.30	15.90	11.90	8.00	4.00
$260	$270	48.30	43.90	39.50	35.20	30.80	26.50	22.10	17.80	13.60	9.70	5.70
$270	$280	50.10	45.80	41.40	37.10	32.70	28.40	24.00	19.70	15.40	11.40	7.40
$280	$290	52.00	47.70	43.30	39.00	34.60	30.20	25.90	21.50	17.20	13.10	9.20
$290	$300	53.90	49.60	45.20	40.80	36.50	32.10	27.80	23.40	19.10	14.80	10.90
$300	$320	56.70	52.40	48.00	43.70	39.30	35.00	30.60	26.20	21.90	17.50	13.40
$320	$340	60.50	56.10	51.80	47.40	43.10	38.70	34.40	30.00	25.70	21.30	16.90
$340	$360	64.20	59.90	55.50	51.20	46.80	42.50	38.10	33.80	29.40	25.10	20.70
$360	$380	68.00	63.70	59.30	54.90	50.60	46.20	41.90	37.50	33.20	28.80	24.50
$380	$400	71.80	67.40	63.10	58.70	54.40	50.00	45.60	41.30	36.90	32.60	28.20
$400	$420	75.50	71.20	66.80	62.50	58.10	53.80	49.40	45.10	40.70	36.30	32.00
$420	$440	79.30	74.90	70.60	66.20	61.90	57.50	53.20	48.80	44.50	40.10	35.80
$440	$460	83.10	78.70	74.30	70.00	65.60	61.30	56.90	52.60	48.20	43.90	39.50
$460	$480	86.80	82.50	78.10	73.80	69.40	65.00	60.70	56.30	52.00	47.60	43.30
$480	$500	90.60	86.20	81.90	77.50	73.20	68.80	64.50	60.10	55.70	51.40	47.00
		19 percent of the excess over $500 plus—										
$500 and over		92.50	88.10	83.80	79.40	75.10	70.70	66.30	62.00	57.60	53.30	48.90

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$44	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$44	$48	$7.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$52	8.60	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$56	9.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$60	9.90	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$64	10.60	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$68	11.30	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$72	12.00	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$76	12.70	4.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$80	13.30	5.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$84	14.00	6.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$88	14.70	6.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$92	15.40	7.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$96	16.10	8.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$100	16.80	8.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$104	17.40	9.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$108	18.10	10.20	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$112	18.80	10.90	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$116	19.50	11.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$120	20.20	12.30	4.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	20.90	12.90	5.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	21.50	13.60	5.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	22.20	14.30	6.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	22.90	15.00	7.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	23.60	15.70	7.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	24.30	16.40	8.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	25.00	17.00	9.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	25.70	17.70	9.80	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	26.30	18.40	10.50	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	27.00	19.10	11.20	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	27.70	19.80	11.90	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	28.40	20.50	12.60	4.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	29.10	21.20	13.20	5.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	29.80	21.80	13.90	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	30.40	22.50	14.60	6.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	31.10	23.20	15.30	7.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	31.80	23.90	16.00	8.10	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	32.60	24.60	16.70	8.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	33.30	25.30	17.30	9.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	34.10	25.90	18.00	10.10	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$200	$204	34.80	26.60	18.70	10.80	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$204	$208	35.60	27.30	19.40	11.50	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$208	$212	36.30	28.00	20.10	12.20	4.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$212	$216	37.10	28.70	20.80	12.80	4.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$216	$220	37.80	29.40	21.40	13.50	5.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$220	$224	38.60	30.00	22.10	14.20	6.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$224	$228	39.30	30.70	22.80	14.90	7.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$228	$232	40.10	31.40	23.50	15.60	7.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$232	$236	40.80	32.10	24.20	16.30	8.30	.40	0	0	0	0	0
$236	$240	41.60	32.90	24.90	16.90	9.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$240	$248	42.70	34.00	25.90	18.00	10.10	2.10	0	0	0	0	0
$248	$256	44.20	35.50	27.30	19.30	11.40	3.50	0	0	0	0	0
$256	$264	45.70	37.00	28.60	20.70	12.80	4.90	0	0	0	0	0
$264	$272	47.20	38.50	30.00	22.10	14.20	6.20	0	0	0	0	0
$272	$280	48.70	40.00	31.40	23.40	15.50	7.60	0	0	0	0	0
$280	$288	50.20	41.50	32.80	24.80	16.90	9.00	1.10	0	0	0	0
$288	$296	51.80	43.00	34.30	26.20	18.30	10.30	2.40	0	0	0	0
$296	$304	53.30	44.50	35.80	27.60	19.60	11.70	3.80	0	0	0	0
$304	$312	54.80	46.10	37.30	28.90	21.00	13.10	5.20	0	0	0	0
$312	$320	56.30	47.60	38.90	30.30	22.40	14.50	6.50	0	0	0	0
$320	$328	57.80	49.10	40.40	31.70	23.70	15.80	7.90	0	0	0	0
$328	$336	59.30	50.60	41.90	33.20	25.10	17.20	9.30	1.40	0	0	0
$336	$344	60.80	52.10	43.40	34.70	26.50	18.60	10.60	2.70	0	0	0
$344	$352	62.30	53.60	44.90	36.20	27.80	19.90	12.00	4.10	0	0	0
$352	$360	63.80	55.10	46.40	37.70	29.20	21.30	13.40	5.50	0	0	0
$360	$368	65.30	56.60	47.90	39.20	30.60	22.70	14.70	6.80	0	0	0
$368	$376	66.80	58.10	49.40	40.70	32.00	24.00	16.10	8.20	.30	0	0
$376	$384	68.30	59.60	50.90	42.20	33.50	25.40	17.50	9.60	1.60	0	0
$384	$392	69.80	61.10	52.40	43.70	35.00	26.80	18.80	10.90	3.00	0	0
$392	$400	71.30	62.60	53.90	45.20	36.50	28.10	20.20	12.30	4.40	0	0
$400	$420	73.90	65.20	56.50	47.80	39.10	30.50	22.60	14.70	6.80	0	0
$420	$440	77.70	69.00	60.30	51.60	42.90	34.20	26.00	18.10	10.20	2.30	0
$440	$460	81.50	72.80	64.10	55.30	46.60	37.90	29.50	21.50	13.60	5.70	0
$460	$480	85.20	76.50	67.80	59.10	50.40	41.70	33.00	25.00	17.00	9.10	1.20
$480	$500	89.00	80.30	71.60	62.90	54.20	45.50	36.70	28.40	20.50	12.50	4.60
$500	$520	92.80	84.10	75.30	66.60	57.90	49.20	40.50	31.80	23.90	16.00	8.00
$520	$540	96.50	87.80	79.10	70.40	61.70	53.00	44.30	35.60	27.30	19.40	11.50
$540	$560	100.30	91.60	82.90	74.20	65.50	56.70	48.00	39.30	30.70	22.80	14.90
$560	$580	104.00	95.30	86.60	77.90	69.20	60.50	51.80	43.10	34.40	26.20	18.30
$580	$600	107.80	99.10	90.40	81.70	73.00	64.30	55.60	46.90	38.10	29.60	21.70
$600	$640	113.40	104.70	96.00	87.30	78.60	69.90	61.20	52.50	43.80	35.10	26.90
$640	$680	121.00	112.30	103.60	94.80	86.10	77.40	68.70	60.00	51.30	42.60	33.90
$680	$720	128.50	119.80	111.10	102.40	93.70	85.00	76.20	67.50	58.80	50.10	41.40
$720	$760	136.00	127.30	118.60	109.90	101.20	92.50	83.80	75.10	66.40	57.60	48.90
$760	$800	143.50	134.80	126.10	117.40	108.70	100.00	91.30	82.60	73.90	65.20	56.50
$800	$840	151.10	142.40	133.70	124.90	116.20	107.50	98.80	90.10	81.40	72.70	64.00
$840	$880	158.60	149.90	141.20	132.50	123.80	115.10	106.30	97.60	88.90	80.20	71.50
$880	$920	166.10	157.40	148.70	140.00	131.30	122.60	113.90	105.20	96.50	87.70	79.00
$920	$960	173.60	164.90	156.20	147.50	138.80	130.10	121.40	112.70	104.00	95.30	86.60
$960	$1,000	181.20	172.50	163.80	155.00	146.30	137.60	128.90	120.20	111.50	102.80	94.10
		19 percent of the excess over $1,000 plus—										
$1,000 and over		184.90	176.20	167.50	158.80	150.10	141.40	132.70	124.00	115.30	106.60	97.90

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
At least—	But less than—	The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period										
$0	$1.50	17% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$1.50	$1.75	$0.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.75	$2.00	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.00	$2.25	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.25	$2.50	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.50	$2.75	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.75	$3.00	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.00	$3.25	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.25	$3.50	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.50	$3.75	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.75	$4.00	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.00	$4.25	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.25	$4.50	.75	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.50	$4.75	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.75	$5.00	.85	.55	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.00	$5.25	.90	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.25	$5.50	.90	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.50	$5.75	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.75	$6.00	1.00	.75	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.00	$6.25	1.05	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.25	$6.50	1.10	.85	.55	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.50	$6.75	1.15	.85	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.75	$7.00	1.20	.90	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.00	$7.25	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.25	$7.50	1.30	1.00	.75	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.50	$7.75	1.35	1.05	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.75	$8.00	1.40	1.10	.85	.55	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0
$8.00	$8.25	1.40	1.15	.85	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0
$8.25	$8.50	1.45	1.20	.90	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0
$8.50	$8.75	1.50	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0
$8.75	$9.00	1.55	1.30	1.00	.75	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0
$9.00	$9.25	1.60	1.35	1.05	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0
$9.25	$9.50	1.65	1.35	1.10	.80	.55	.30	.05	0	0	0	0
$9.50	$9.75	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0	0
$9.75	$10.00	1.75	1.45	1.20	.90	.65	.40	.15	0	0	0	0
$10.00	$10.50	1.80	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0	0
$10.50	$11.00	1.90	1.65	1.35	1.05	.80	.55	.30	0	0	0	0
$11.00	$11.50	2.00	1.75	1.45	1.15	.90	.60	.35	.10	0	0	0
$11.50	$12.00	2.10	1.80	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0	0
$12.00	$12.50	2.20	1.90	1.65	1.35	1.05	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0
$12.50	$13.00	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.45	1.15	.90	.60	.35	.10	0	0
$13.00	$13.50	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0	0
$13.50	$14.00	2.50	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.35	1.05	.80	.55	.25	0	0
$14.00	$14.50	2.60	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.45	1.15	.90	.60	.35	.10	0
$14.50	$15.00	2.65	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.50	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20	0
$15.00	$15.50	2.75	2.50	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.35	1.05	.80	.55	.25	0
$15.50	$16.00	2.85	2.55	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.45	1.15	.85	.60	.35	.10
$16.00	$16.50	2.95	2.65	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.50	1.25	.95	.70	.45	.20
$16.50	$17.00	3.05	2.75	2.45	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.35	1.05	.80	.50	.25
$17.00	$17.50	3.15	2.85	2.55	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.60	.35
$17.50	$18.00	3.25	2.95	2.65	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.50	1.25	.95	.70	.45
$18.00	$18.50	3.35	3.05	2.75	2.45	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.05	.80	.50
$18.50	$19.00	3.40	3.15	2.85	2.55	2.30	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.60
$19.00	$19.50	3.50	3.25	2.95	2.65	2.35	2.10	1.80	1.50	1.25	.95	.70
$19.50	$20.00	3.60	3.30	3.05	2.75	2.45	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.05	.75
$20.00	$21.00	3.75	3.45	3.20	2.90	2.60	2.30	2.05	1.75	1.45	1.20	.90
$21.00	$22.00	3.95	3.65	3.35	3.10	2.80	2.50	2.20	1.95	1.65	1.35	1.10
$22.00	$23.00	4.15	3.85	3.55	3.25	3.00	2.70	2.40	2.10	1.85	1.55	1.25
$23.00	$24.00	4.30	4.05	3.75	3.45	3.15	2.90	2.60	2.30	2.05	1.75	1.45
$24.00	$25.00	4.50	4.20	3.95	3.65	3.35	3.05	2.80	2.50	2.20	1.95	1.65
$25.00	$26.00	4.70	4.40	4.10	3.85	3.55	3.25	2.95	2.70	2.40	2.10	1.85
$26.00	$27.00	4.90	4.60	4.30	4.00	3.75	3.45	3.15	2.90	2.60	2.30	2.00
$27.00	$28.00	5.05	4.80	4.50	4.20	3.90	3.65	3.35	3.05	2.80	2.50	2.20
$28.00	$29.00	5.25	4.95	4.70	4.40	4.10	3.80	3.55	3.25	2.95	2.70	2.40
$29.00	$30.00	5.45	5.15	4.85	4.60	4.30	4.00	3.75	3.45	3.15	2.85	2.60
		19 percent of the excess over $30 plus—										
$30.00 and over		5.55	5.25	4.95	4.70	4.40	4.10	3.80	3.55	3.25	2.95	2.70

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 2, to insert:

(d) Withholding statements:

(1) Section 1625 (a) (relating to withholding receipts) is amended by inserting after "required to deduct and withhold a tax in respect of the wages of an employee" the following: ", or who would have been so required if the employee had claimed no more than one withholding exemption,".

(2) Section 1626 (a) and (b) (relating to penalties in connection with withholding receipts) are amended (A) by striking out "in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this subchapter" in each of such subsections, and (B) by striking out "receipt" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "statement."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Part II—Corporation taxes," on page 23, after line 19, to strike out the following section:

SEC. 121. Decrease in corporation surtax.

(a) In general: Section 15 (b) (relating to the corporation surtax) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the corporation surtax net income of every corporation (except a Western Hemisphere trade corporation as defined in section 109, and except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), Supplement G or Supplement Q) a surtax as follows:

"(1) Surtax net incomes not over $25,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes not over $25,000, 6 percent of the amount thereof.

"(2) Surtax net incomes over $25,000 but not over $50,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes over $25,000, but not over $50,000, $1,500 plus 18 percent of the amount of the corporation surtax net income over $25,000.

"(3) Surtax net incomes over $50,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes over $50,000, 12 percent of the corporation surtax net income."

(b) Mutual insurance companies other than life or marine: Section 207 (a) (relating to mutual insurance companies, other than life or marine) is amended (a) by striking out "20 percent" in paragraph (1) (B), and inserting in lieu thereof "12 percent"; and (b) by striking out "32 percent" in paragraph (3) (B), and inserting in lieu thereof "24 percent."

(c) Regulated investment companies: Section 362 (b) (4) (relating to the surtax on

regulated investment companies) is amended by striking out "16 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "12 percent."

(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, see section 131.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 7, to insert the following section:

SEC. 121. Reduction in normal tax and surtax of special classes of corporations.

(a) Normal tax: Section 13 (b) (relating to the normal tax on corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the normal-tax net income of every corporation the normal-tax net income of which is more than $25,000 (except a corporation subject to the tax imposed by section 14, section 231 (a), supplement G, or supplement Q) whichever of the following taxes is the lesser:

"(1) General rule: A tax of 24 percent of the normal-tax net income; or

"(2) Alternative tax (corporations with normal-tax net incomes over $25,000, but not over $60,000): A tax of $4,250, plus 29 percent of the amount of the normal-tax net income in excess of $25,000."

(b) Special classes of corporations: Section 14 (b) (relating to normal tax on corporations with net incomes of not more than $25,000) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Corporations with normal-tax net incomes of not more than $25,000: If the normal-tax net income of the corporation is not more than $25,000, and if the corporation does not come within one of the classes specified in subsection (c), (d), or (e) of this section, the tax shall be as follows:

"Upon normal-tax net incomes not in excess of $10,000, 15 percent.

"Upon normal-tax net incomes in excess of $10,000 and not in excess of $20,000, $1,500 plus 18 percent of the excess over $10,000.

"Upon normal-tax net incomes in excess of $20,000, and not in excess of $25,000, $3,300 plus 19 percent of the excess over $20,000."

(c) Section 15 (b) (relating to the corporation surtax) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the corporation surtax net income of every corporation (except a Western Hemisphere trade corporation as defined in section 109, and except a corporation subject to the tax imposed by section 231 (a), supplement G, or supplement Q), a surtax as follows:

"(1) Surtax net incomes not over $25,000: If the corporation surtax net income is not more than $25,000, the tax shall be as follows:

"Upon corporation surtax net incomes not in excess of $10,000, 5 percent.

"Upon corporation surtax net incomes in excess of $10,000 and not in excess of $20,000, $500 plus 9 percent of the excess over $10,000.

"Upon corporation surtax net incomes in excess of $20,000 and not in excess of $25,000, $1,400, plus 10 percent of the excess over $20,000.

"(2) Surtax net incomes over $25,000 but not over $60,000: Upon corporation surtax net incomes over $25,000 but not over $60,000, the tax shall be $1,900, plus 22 percent of the amount of the corporation surtax net income over $25,000.

"(3) Surtax net incomes over $60,000: Upon corporation surtax net incomes over $60,000, the tax shall be 16 percent of the corporation surtax net income."

(d) Mutual insurance companies other than life or marine: Section 207 (a) (relating to mutual insurance companies, other than life or marine) is amended by striking out "20 percent" in paragraph (1) (B), and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent."

(e) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, see section 131.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 10, to strike out the following section:

SEC. 122. Reduction in excess-profits tax for 1946.

(a) Reduction in rate: Section 710 (a) (1) (imposing the excess-profits tax) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) General rule: There shall be levied, collected, and paid, for each taxable year, upon the adjusted excess-profits net income, as defined in subsection (b), of every corporation (except a corporation exempt under section 727) a tax of 60 percent of the adjusted excess-profits net income."

(b) Deferment of payment in case of abnormality eliminated:

(1) Section 710 (a) (5) (permitting deferment of tax in cases of abnormality) is repealed.

(2) Section 722 (d) (relating to general relief) is amended by striking out ", except as provided in section 710 (a) (5)."

(c) Repeal of 10 percent credit against excess-profits tax: Section 784 (providing a 10-percent credit against excess-profits tax) is repealed.

(d) Technical amendment. Section 26 (e) (relating to the credit for income subject to the excess-profits tax) is amended—

(1) by striking out "95 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof: "60 percent"; and

(2) by striking out "without regard to the limitation provided in section 710 (a) (1) (B) (the 80-percent limitation),".

(c) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments and repeals made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, see section 131.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 20, to change the section number from "123" to "122", and in the same line after the word "in", to strike out "1947" and insert "1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 20, to strike out:

(a) In general: Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946, subchapter E of chapter 2 (relating to the excess-profits tax) is repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 23, to insert:

(a) In general: The provisions of subchapter E of chapter 2 shall not apply to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 2, to insert:

(b) Carry-backs from years after 1945, etc.: Despite the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the provisions of subchapter E of chapter 2 shall remain in force for the purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by such subchapter for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1946, such determination to be made as if subsection (a) had not been enacted but with the application of the amendments made by subsection (c) of this section and section 131 of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 11, to insert:

(c) Unused excess-profits credit for taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945: Section 710 (c) (2) (defining the unused excess-profits credit) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "There shall be no unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946. The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947 shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1947, is of the total number of days in such taxable year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 23, to insert:

(d) Affiliated groups: Subsection (b) shall be applied in the case of corporations making or required to make a consolidated return under chapter 1 for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945, and in the case of a corporation making a separate return for any such taxable year which was a member of a group which made or was required to make a consolidated return for any prior taxable year, in such manner as may be prescribed in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary prior to the last day prescribed by law for the making of the return for the year beginning after December 31, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 10, to insert:

(e) Claims for refund based on carry-backs:

(1) In general: The first sentence of section 322 (b) (6) (relating to periods of limitation with respect to claims for refund based on carry-backs) is amended to read as follows: "If the claim for credit or refund relates to an overpayment attributable to a net operating loss carry-back or to an unused excess profits credit carry-back, in lieu of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in paragraph (1), the period shall be that period which ends with the expiration of the 15th day of the 39th month following the end of the taxable year of the net operating loss or the unused excess-profits credit which results in such carry-back, or the period prescribed in paragraph (3) in respect of such taxable year, whichever expires later."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at top of page 32, to insert:

(2) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendment made by this subsection shall be applicable to claims for credit or refund with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 4, to insert:

(f) Deficiencies attributable to carry-backs:

(1) Section 276 (d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Net operating loss carry-backs and unused excess profits credit carry-backs. In the case of a deficiency attributable to the application to the taxpayer of a net operating loss carry-back or an unused excess profits credit carry-back, including deficiencies which may be assessed pursuant to the provisions of section 3780 (b) or (c), such deficiency may be assessed—

"(1) in case a return was required under subchapter E of chapter 2 for the taxable year of the net operating loss or unused excess profits credit resulting in the carry-

back, at any time before the expiration of the period within which (under section 275 or subsection (a) or (b) of this section) a deficiency (with respect to tax imposed either by chapter 1 or by subchapter B or E of chapter 2) for such taxable year (whichever is the longer period) may be assessed; or

"(2) in case a return was not required under subchapter E of chapter 2 for the taxable year of the net operating loss or unused excess profits credit resulting in the carryback, at any time before the expiration of the period within which (under section 275 or subsection (a) or (b) of this section) a deficiency (with respect to tax imposed either by chapter 1 or by subchapter A or B of chapter 2) for such taxable year (whichever is the longer period) may be assessed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 7, to insert:

(2) Effective date: The amendment made by this subsection shall be applicable with respect to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 11, before the word "Technical", to strike out "(b)" and insert "(g)", and in line 12 after "December 31", to strike out "1946" and insert "1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 5, to strike out:

(c) Fiscal year taxpayers: For application of subchapter E of chapter 2 to taxable years beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947, see section 131.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 8, to insert:

(h) Fiscal year taxpayers: For taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, see section 131.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Part III—Fiscal year taxpayers" in section 131, on page 36, after line 8, to strike out:

"(d) Corporation taxable years beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947: In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947, the tax imposed by sections 13, 14, and 15, shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(1) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1946, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1947, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year, plus

"(2) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1947, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after December 31, 1946, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 4, to strike out:

"(7) Taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946: In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, the tax shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1945, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1946, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year, plus

"(B) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1946, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after December 31, 1945, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.

"(8) Taxable years beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947: In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947, the tax shall be an amount equal to that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1946, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1947, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 4, to insert:

"(7) Taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946: In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, the tax shall be an amount equal to that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1945, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1946, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 14, to strike out:

(A) Section 710 (b) (1) (relating to the specific exemption) is amended by striking out "except that in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, the specific exemption shall be an amount equal to the sum of (A) an amount which bears the same relation to $10,000 which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1946, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year and (B) an amount which bears the same relation to $25,000 which the number of days in such taxable year after December 31, 1945, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year;".

(B) Section 2 (d) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 is amended by striking out ", and to taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946."

And insert:

(A) Section 2 (c) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 (relating to the specific exemption) is repealed as of the date of its enactment.

(B) Section 710 (b) (1) (relating to the specific exemption) is restored to read as such paragraph read immediately prior to the enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945, to be effective, as so restored, as if section 2 (a) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 had not been enacted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be temporarily passed over, because I am advised that an amendment which I propose presently to offer requires action before action is taken on the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. That is agreeable, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over

Mr. GEORGE. Before the clerk proceeds, I ask unanimous consent to recur to the committee amendment on page 28, line 5. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered, in order that I may offer a technical amendment suggested by the Treasury at that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment at the top of page 28 was agreed to, is reconsidered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 28, line 5, after the word "thereof", to strike out "10" and insert "18." It is merely to correct a technical error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment on page 28, line 5.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 16, to strike out:

(3) Unused excess-profits credit for taxable year beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947: Section 710 (c) (2) (defining the unused excess-profits credit) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947 shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year prior to Janaury 1, 1947, is of the total number of days in such taxable year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 4, to insert:

PART IV—VETERANS' AND SERVICEMEN'S PROVISIONS

SEC. 141. Additional allowance for military and naval personnel.

(a) In general: Section 22 (b) (13) (relating to the exclusion from gross income for military and naval personnel) is amended to read as follows:

"(13) Additional allowance for military and naval personnel:

"(A) In the case of compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, for active service as a commissioned officer (or a commissioned warrant officer) in the military or naval forces of the United States during such war, or, in the case of a citizen or resident of the United States, as a member of the military or naval forces of any of the other United Nations during such war, so much of such compensation as does not exceed $1,500.

"(B) Compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, for active service as a member below the grade of commissioned officer (or commissioned warrant officer) in the military or naval forces of the United States during such war."

(b) Taxable years to which applicable: Subparagraph (A) of section 22 (b) (13), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942; subparagraph (B) thereof shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940.

(c) Credits or refunds for 1941 and 1942: If at any time prior to January 1, 1947, the

allowance of a credit or refund of an overpayment of the tax for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940, and before January 1, 1943, is otherwise prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3761, relating to compromises), a credit or refund of the overpayment of such tax to the extent that the overpayment is attributable to the enactment of this section may, nevertheless, be allowed or made if a claim therefor is filed before January 1, 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 42, to insert:

"SEC. 142. Deferment of certain taxes of veterans and servicemen.

(a) In general: Chapter 38 (miscellaneous provisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 3808. Deferment of tax attributable to service pay for commissioned service and of tax attributable to pre-service earned income.

"(a) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) Tax attributable to service pay: The term 'tax attributable to service pay' means—

"(A) in the case of a war year for which the taxpayer had no gross income other than compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, the tax imposed under chapter 1 for such year; or

"(B) in the case of a war year for which the taxpayer had gross income in addition to compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, the excess of the tax imposed under chapter 1 for such year over the tax that would have been imposed if such compensation had been excluded from gross income;

except that in the case of a commissioned officer (or a commissioned warrant officer) of the regular component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, such term shall not apply to any war year unless a period of time has been disregarded under section 3804 with respect to the tax under chapter 1 for such year.

"(2) War year: The term 'war year'—

"(A) when used with respect to the tax attributable to service pay means any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, and before January 1, 1947; and

"(B) when used with respect to the tax attributable to pre-service earned income means any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, but before January 1, 1942, and before the taxpayer entered upon active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, but does not include any year unless part of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such year became due and payable after the taxpayer entered upon such active service.

"(3) Tax attributable to pre-service earned income: The term 'tax attributable to pre-service earned income' means the excess of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for any war year over the tax that would have been imposed for such year if there had been excluded from the net income for such year the amount of the earned net income (as such term was defined in section 25 (a) (4) as in force with respect to such year, except that in computing such earned net income, compensation for active service in such forces shall be disregarded).

"(4) First installment date: The term 'first installment date' means May 15, 1946, in the case of taxpayers released from active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to December 1, 1945; and in other cases June 15, 1947, or the 15th day of the sixth month which begins after the date of the taxpayer's release from active duty in such forces, whichever is the earlier; except that, if the first installment date with respect to any war year would otherwise occur earlier than the 15th day of the third month following the close of such year, or earlier than the end of the period of time disregarded under section 3804 with respect to the tax for such year, the first installment date with respect to such year shall be the 15th day of such third month, or the day following the end of such period, as the case may.

"(b) Extension of time for payment: Upon application with respect to any war year, made prior to the first installment date, and under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary—

"(1) the time for payment of an amount of the tax for such year which is equal to the tax attributable to service pay for such year and which has not been paid before the filing of such application; and

"(2) the time for the payment of an amount of the tax for such year which is equal to the tax attributable to preservice earned income for such year and which has not been paid before the filing of such application,

shall, in lieu of the time otherwise applicable, be as follows: one-twelfth thereof on the first installment date and an additional twelfth thereof every 3 months thereafter until such tax is paid.

"(c) Suspension of period of limitation: The running of the period of limitation provided in section 276 (c) (relating to the collection of the tax after assessment) in respect of any tax the time for the payment of which is prescribed under subsection (b), shall be suspended for the period beginning with the date of the filing of the application under such subsection and ending 6 months after the date prescribed therein for the payment of the last installment of such tax."

(b) Refund of interest paid: Any interest paid prior to the date of the enactment of this act with respect to tax attributable to service pay, or with respect to tax attributable to preservice earned income, shall be credited or refunded if claim therefor is filed with the Commissioner prior to January 1, 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 4, to insert:

PART V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 151. Reports of refunds and credits to Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Section 3777 (c) (relating to refunds and credits with respect to tentative carry-back adjustments) is amended by striking out in the heading "Carry-back," and by inserting after "section 3780 (b)" the following: "or under section 124 (k)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 152. Extension of treatment of income resulting from discharge of indebtedness.

Section 22 (b) (9) and (10) (relating to the exclusion of income from the discharge of indebtedness) are amended by striking out "1945" in each of such paragraphs and inserting in lieu thereof "1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 153. Lost postwar-credit bonds.

Section 8 (c) of the Government Losses in Shipment Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and also means any bond issued under section 780 of the Internal Revenue Code."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Repeal of capital stock tax and declared value excess profits tax," on page 47, after line 12, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 203. Alternative tax where war loss recoveries included in net income.

Effective with respect to income-tax taxable years ending after June 30, 1945, and before July 1, 1946, section 100 is amended by inserting before the first paragraph thereof "(a) In general:" and by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection reading as follows:

"(b) Alternative tax: If the net income for the taxable year includes any amount on account of war loss recoveries under section 127 (c), then, in lieu of the tax computed under subsection (a), the tax shall be a tax computed as follows:

"(1) An amount computed under subsection (a), after excluding from net income the amount of the war loss recoveries, plus

"(2) One and one-quarter percent of the amount of the war loss recoveries included in the net income or of such portion of the net income as would be subject to the tax imposed by subsection (a) in the absence of this subsection, whichever is the lesser."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Excise taxes," on page 48, after line 11, to strike out the following section:

SEC. 301. Termination of war tax rates after June 30, 1946.

(a) War tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes: Section 1650 (prescribing war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes) is amended by striking out "on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war" and inserting in lieu thereof: "with the close of June 30, 1946,"

(b) Billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys: Section 302 (b) (2) of the Revenue Act of 1943 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys. The increase made by subsection (a) of this section in the tax imposed by section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be effective with respect to the period beginning July 1, 1944, and continuing through June 30, 1946."

(c) Effective date or period of certain decreases: Notwithstanding section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code—

(1) Cabaret tax: The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section with respect to the tax imposed by section 1700 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be applicable only with respect to the period beginning at 10 a. m. on July 1, 1946.

(2) Telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities. The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section with respect to the taxes imposed by section 3465 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply only to amounts paid for services rendered on or after July 1, 1946. The amendment made by subsection (a) with respect to the taxes imposed by section 3465 (a) (2) and (3) of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply only to amounts paid pursuant to bills rendered on or after the first day of August 1946 for services for which no previous bill was rendered. Where bills rendered on or after the first day of August 1946 include charges for services previously rendered, the decreased rates shall not apply to such services as were rendered more than 2 months before such date, and the provisions of sections 1650 and 3465 of the Internal Revenue Code in effect at the time such prior services were rendered shall be applicable to the amounts paid for such services.

(d) Continuation of retailers' excise tax on luggage at lower rate.—

(1) Reduction in rate.—Effective with respect to the period beginning July 1, 1946, section 1651 (a) (imposing the retailers' excise tax on luggage) is amended by striking out "20 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent."

(2) Continuation of tax.—Sections 1654 (relating to the termination of the retailers' excise tax on luggage) and 1655 (defining "date of the termination of hostilities" for the purposes of chapter 9A) are repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 1, to change the section number from "302" to "301."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 5, to strike out the following section:

SEC. 303. Draw-back on distilled spirits.

Section 309 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1943 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Distilled spirits used in manufacture of certain nonbeverage products: In lieu of the rate of draw-back specified in section 3250 (1) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code, the rate applicable with respect to the period beginning April 1, 1944, and continuing through June 30, 1946, shall be $6."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 15, to change the section number from "304" to "302"; and in the same line, after the word "refunds", to insert "And technical provisions relating to reduction of communications tax."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 19, after the word "thereof", to strike out "two new sections reading as follows" and insert "the following."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 3, after the word "on", to strike out "July 1, 1946" and insert "the rate reduction date (as defined in section 1659)"; in line 12, after the word "such", to insert "credit or"; and in line 13, after the word "Commissioner", to strike out "prior to August 1, 1946" and insert "within 30 days after the rate reduction date."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 16, after the word "to", to insert "credit or"; in line 18, after the word "periods", to strike out "prior to July 1, 1946, and also for such period or periods after June 30, 1946 (but not after June 30, 1947)" and insert "both before and after the rate reduction date (but not extending beyond 1 year thereafter)"; on page 53, line 3, after the word "that", to strike out "after June 30, 1946" and insert "on and after the rate reduction date and until the expiration of 3 months thereafter"; in line 5, before the words "the price", to strike out "and before October 1, 1946"; in line 7, after the word "on", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "July 1, 1946" and insert "the rate reduction date"; and in line 11, after the word "reduction", to strike out "under title III of the Revenue Act of 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 17, after the word "the", to insert "credits and"; in line 18, after the word "such", to insert "credits or"; and in line 19, after the word "constituted", to insert "credits or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 25, after the word "on" to strike out "July 1, 1946" and insert "the rate reduction date"; on page 54, line 11, after the word "articles" to strike out "under title III of the Revenue Act of 1945"; in line 12, after the word "such" to insert "credit or", and in line 13, after the words "prior to" to strike out "October 1, 1946" and insert "the expiration of 3 months after the rate reduction date."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 1, after the word "the" to insert "credits and"; in line 3, before the word "refunds" where it occurs the first time to insert "credits or"; in the same line, after the word "constituted" to insert "credits or", and in line 4, after the word "such" to strike out "taxes." " and insert "taxes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 1658. Telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities.

Notwithstanding section 1650, the rates therein prescribed with respect to the taxes imposed by section 3465 (a) (1), (2), and (3) shall continue to apply with respect to amounts paid pursuant to bills rendered prior to the rate reduction date; and, in the case of amounts paid pursuant to bills rendered on or after the rate reduction date for services for which no previous bill was rendered, the decreased rates shall apply except with respect to such services as were rendered more than 2 months before such date; and, in the case of services rendered more than 2 months before such date, the provisions of sections 1650 and 3465 in effect at the time such services were rendered shall be applicable to the amounts paid for such services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 1659. Definition of "rate reduction date."

For the purposes of this chapter the term "rate reduction date" means the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 1, to change the section number from "305" to "303."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of the one passed over.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, is it now in order for me to offer an amendment from the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, after line 10, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 123. Specific exemption for taxable years beginning in 1945.

(a) Amount of specific exemption: Section 710 (b) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Specific exemption: A specific exemption of $10,000, except that, in the case of a corporation whose excess-profits credit allowed under section 712 is less than $15,000, the specific exemption shall be an amount equal to the excess of $25,000 over the amount of the excess-profits credit; and in the case of a mutual insurance company (other than life or marine) which is an interinsurer or reciprocal underwriter, a specific exemption of $50,000;"

(b) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1944. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, see section 131.

(c) Technical amendment: Section 2 (d) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1944."

On page 38 it is proposed to strike out line 14.

On page 37, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "(1) In general."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the objective and purpose of the amendment is far simpler than the language indicates.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether any part of the committee amendment is proposed to be stricken out?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; but I am advised by the legislative counsel that after the adoption of my amendment the portion of the bill which we passed over on pages 38 and 39 would have to be eliminated. The Senator will recall that we passed over a committee amendment. Action on the committee amendment depends upon the action on the amendment which I am offering.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that there has been a very widespread demand in the country for the retroactive application of an exemption of $25,000 in the excess-profits tax, in behalf of the so-called small corporations. The entire excess-profits tax is now proposed to be repealed by the pending bill, commencing next January. I am proposing that in one respect only the Tax Act shall be retroactive to 1945, solely in respect to small corporations.

The proposal as originally presented to the Senate last summer in connection with a previous bill proposed a straight $25,000 exemption for all corporations. That amendment, I may add, came within one vote of being adopted by the Senate. The amendment in that form would have involved a loss of revenue of $185,000,000.

In the Senate Committee on Finance we discussed this problem at some length, and the committee very generally, I think, felt that something ought to be done about it. At any rate the amendment which I have offered failed to carry in the committee as the result of a tie vote. The difference between this amendment and the original proposal for a straight $25,000 exemption is as follows:

The straight $25,000 exemption would apply not only to the small corporations for which its benefits are intended, but would also extend all the way across the board at the base of the exemptions for all corporations. It is for that reason that the benefits would cost $185,000,000.

In the form in which the amendment is now offered to the Senate, the $25,000 total exemption is confined to the small

corporations for which the relief is primarily intended. The net result of the pending amendment would be that in no case would the combined excess-profits credit and the specific exemption be less than $25,000.

To repeat, in the form in which the proposal is now submitted the amendment confines its relief to the smaller corporations, as a result of which the loss to the Treasury would be only $85,000,000 instead of $185,000,000.

Mr. President, I believe that the merits of the proposal are incontestable, because the burden of reconversion falling upon small corporations in the lower brackets is such that it seems to me that immediate relief in respect to 1945 excess-profits taxes is an obvious necessity. The amendment was defeated in the committee only by a tie vote. I submit it to the Senate, and I hope it may be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I just heard the amendment read. It is quite long, and I did not understand all of it. How would the amendment define the smaller corporations?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, it defines itself. The result of the amendment is that in no case shall the combined excess-profits credit and the specific exemption be less than $25,000. In other words, everybody in the lower brackets will get the benefit of this ceiling with respect to the combined exemption for the excess-profits credit and the specific exemption.

Mr. LANGER. So the capital stock of the corporation would have nothing at all to do with it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is a great deal of merit to the amendment. Perhaps if a full membership of the committee had been present, the amendment might have been approved by the committee. At the time the attendance in the committee was reduced. When the amendment was last before the committee, the vote on it was a tie, as the Senator from Michigan has said.

It is true that the amendment would increase the immediate loss to the Treasury, because the 1945 taxes would, of course, be collected in 1946, and the amendment relates to 1945. However, it would strengthen the fiscal or financial position of the smaller corporations; it would give them something to go on. Of course, if we are to have real prosperity, the United States must once again become a nation with a large number of small business enterprises.

So I have no objection to approval of the amendment. We can take it to conference and at least see whether the House of Representatives will be agreeable to it. There may be some other opposition to it, but I merely wish to state that my own position is that, in view of the tie vote in the committee, I have no objection to approval of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated, and which I offer as a substitute for the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 123. Excess-profits tax specific exemption for 1945.

(a) In general: Section 710 (b) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"1. Specific exemption: A specific exemption of $25,000; and in the case of a mutual insurance company (other than life or marine) which is an interinsurer or reciprocal underwriter, a specific exemption of $50,000;"

(b) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1944, and to taxable years beginning in 1944 and ending in 1945. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1944 and ending in 1945, see section 131.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the language of the amendment is the same as that offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself to the tax bill passed last July.

This is the amendment which was offered in behalf of the Senator from Montana and myself for the Senate Small Business Committee, and it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 7800, through several columns in the RECORD, in the discussion of the tax bill which came before the Senate last July. At that time the amendment was rejected by a vote of 31 to 30.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to be sure that I understand the Senator's amendment. Am I correct in the interpretation that it would extend its relief not only to the small corporations but to every corporation in the United States?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall answer the question asked by the distinguished Senator by stating that if it is his interpretation that what relief we gave would go to all corporations, then that is certainly what the amendment would do, because all it proposes is to make the relief retroactive to January 1, 1945.

Certainly if the Congress has taken the position that the excess-profits tax should be eliminated, or certainly if we are to give even the relief which is proposed in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, we should go all the way and should give that exemption to all 45,000 corporations designated as small businesses, on the basis of the legislation which has already been enacted. If we intended to accord the relief in 1946 by the tax bill passed last July, I think there is no reason why we should not go back to January 1, 1945, and make it retroactive. I think there should be no objection in doing that.

As I understand the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, it would reduce some of the benefits as to some of the corporations. I shall not attempt to state the number of them. The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan restricts the relief sought by some corporations, in cases in which they may make a showing that they have made the earnings, as the Senator has already described. That is to be deducted from the exemption; and if the earnings exceed that amount, they will not get the relief as provided in a flat $25,000 excess-profits tax exemption.

I appreciate that the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan would give relief to the corporations which fall in the class with which it deals, but I wish to have the Senate know that we have already legislated to give the relief up to $25,000, in the tax bill passed last July, to all these corporations. If we have already done that, and if that is the position the Senate is to take, then why not go back retroactively to January 1, 1945, and give relief to all corporations regardless of their earnings by making a flat $25,000 excess-profit tax exemption?

Mr. President, we have had several hearings before the Senate Small Business Committee. When the previous tax bill was before the Senate, I went to the chairman of the Finance Committee and I presented the amendment to him. The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee went a long way with us, stating that he himself personally felt that the relief proposed by the amendment should be granted. But at that time, as well as now, the main reason why it was not adopted was that the amendment will reduce the revenue approximately $225,000,000. If the Congress does not adopt the amendment, there will be no reduction at all. If the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan is adopted, relief will be granted, I think, to the extent of approximately $75,000,000, instead of $225,000,000, which would accrue to the 45,000 small businesses which would come under my amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I confess that at the moment I am confused as to the difference between the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan and the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska. Will the Senator from Nebraska explain to a simple mind like mine just what is the difference between the two?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I shall attempt to explain what my amendment would do, and then the distinguished Senator from Michigan can explain what his amendment would do.

My amendment simply provides that whatever relief has been granted in the tax bill of 1945 shall be made retroactive to January 1, 1945.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, Mr. President; the Senator does not mean that, because we have already repealed the excess-profits tax, and the Senator is not proposing to make that retroactive.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no. The exemption given under the old law went up to $10,000; in July we extended it to $25,000. Now I want to make it retroactive to 1945.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The exemption was $10,000, and it was proposed to raise it to $25,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it was $10,000, and the Congress made the exemption $25,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what we did last July, in the bill which was enacted at that time. Then I offered the amendment not only to extend that exemption for the year 1946 but to make it retroactive to January 1, 1945. When we do that, we give relief to these corporations in the amount of the exemption granted by the act which was passed last July. We give relief up to that figure.

The only question is whether we wish to go all the way with all corporations in giving the exemption. If the Senate adopts the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, relief will be denied to all corporations with excess-profits exemptions up to $25,000. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, with some explanations.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. In other words, all corporations would receive the benefit of my amendment, for the amendment would make retroactive the exemption up to $25,000 which has already been granted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator overlooks this fundamental and highly essential fact: When this exemption was voted, last summer, we had not moved into the new tax bill which now is on our desks, and we had not granted $2,500,000,000 worth of relief to the corporations of this country. So what was in contemplation was entirely and totally different.

Now we have a bill containing this very general relief provision. I submit to the able Senator from Nebraska and to my friend the Senator from Oregon, who asked the question, that if we are to add further relief in behalf of the small corporations—which is the purpose of my amendment—there no longer exists an excuse or a reason to generalize it for all the corporations in this country, which is what would be accomplished by the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. If this amendment is adopted, will not it grant to the smaller businesses in which the Senator from Nebraska is interested exactly the same relief which his amendment provides, except possibly it will not be retroactive to January 1 of this year?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That statement, in general, has in it a substantial element of truth. The difference is that under the operation of this amendment, whatever excess-profits credit a small corporation has, plus its exemptions, is carried to an arbitrary $25,000 floor. So a small corporation might not receive entirely a $25,000 credit if it already had some credit in the same category. But all corporations would get a combined credit of $25,000. Other corporations throughout the country, which already come under this bill and are beneficiaries of reductions of two and a half billion dollars, would be eliminated by my amendment and would be covered by the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I think, generally speaking, that the Senator from Michigan has stated the situation correctly, and I believe that I would be willing to accept the explanation.

There is no use of indulging in extended argument. The question is whether we want to extend relief clear across the board, as the Senate Small Business Committee recommended to the Congress last July, with reference to which the vote was 31 to 30. At that time the only argument made against the proposal was that mechanically it could not be carried into effect, that it was too late to adopt the amendment and that it granted an excessive amount of relief, namely, $25,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the presence of the facts as set forth in this bill, does the Senator from Nebraska believe that the Small Business Committee would act today in the same fashion that it acted before?

Let me put the question differently. Are not the facts presented today to the Senate totally different from the facts which were presented to the Small Business Committee when it took the action to which the Senator from Nebraska has referred?

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot agree that the facts are totally different.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Two and one-half million dollars of corporate relief is totally different, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Michigan has a perfect right to his opinion, and if he believes the total difference is as he has stated, he may have it that way; that is all right with me. I am asserting that there are corporations which will be prevented from obtaining this relief because of the limitations embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, although I believe they are just as much entitled to the relief as are the corporations which he wants to include.

I believe that enactment of legislation repealing the excess-profits tax will result in a difference between the effect which will be experienced and the effect to which reference was had last July. But I assert now that if there was a justification for the vote which was registered last July, there is just as much justification for a similar vote now. So far as I can see, there is no difference in the principle or in the relief involved. This amendment would have reference to taxes which have already been levied. It affects relief. I say that in all fairness we should provide for the relief granted by the Congress last July, and make it retroactive to January 1, 1945. If it is right for 1946, it was right for 1945. If it is right in neither case, the amendment should not be adopted. If it is right in both instances, I think my amendment, which covers the situation completely, should be agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator says that if it is right for 1946 it was right for 1945, but he overlooks the fact that in 1946 all the excess-profits tax has been removed. So, according to his argument, if it is right for 1946 to eliminate the excess-profits tax, we should eliminate all excess-profits taxes retroactively for 1945. I am sure he would not think of doing such a thing. What he overlooks is that the conditions under which his amendment was originally presented in the Senate and approved by the Small Business Committee last summer, and the conditions existing today, in the light of this bill, I respectfully submit, are totally different. In my opinion, the relief which he wants for small businesses should be confined to small businesses, and should not go all the way across the board for all corporations in the country for which two and a half billion dollars, through other relief, is included in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I dislike very much to disagree with the Senate Finance Committee, and apparently disagree with the majority of the Members of the Senate. I am opposed to the entire repeal of the excess-profits tax for 1946. I much prefer the House provision in regard to the matter.

The House bill reduces the rate to 60 percent, which, in terms of dollars, is 50 percent. So under the House bill, excess-profits taxes for 1946 would be reduced to 50 percent of what they would otherwise be. I do not believe the Members of the Senate appreciate the fact that under the proposal pending before the Senate with respect to the removal of the excess-profits tax for 1946 there would be a loss to the Government of approximately two and a half billion dollars. That is a pretty sizable sum. It would take care of many of the small businesses with reference to which many Members of the Senate are concerned. It would take care of many reductions in other respects which are included in the bill.

Mr. President, it is said the war is over. Yes; the shooting is over, the artillery is quiet, and the airplanes have ceased to fly. But when it comes to paying the tremendous indebtedness which we incurred during the war, the war is not yet over. We talk about reconversion, but I believe that the coming year will afford an opportunity for profiteering on account of inflation and the anxiety of the public to buy goods which they have not heretofore been able to buy. The great corporations from which a tax burden of two and one-half billion dollars will be removed, will make as much money as they made during the war, and, perhaps in some instances, more money.

I wish to refer to a witness who came before the Committee on Finance. He was making a plea for a repeal of the excess-profits tax. I asked him, "What is the capital of your company?" He said, "One hundred thousand dollars." I asked him, "How much excess-profits taxes did you pay?" He said, "I paid $150,000 in excess-profits taxes in 1 year."

I said, "Then you paid the normal 40-percent tax." He said, "Yes; a total of $190,000." I asked him, "How much did you have left?"

I forget whether he said $35,000 or $45,000 on his $100,000 of capital. The Senator from North Carolina suggests that it was $39,000. I said that it was between $35,000 and $45,000, so I was not far out of the way. This man's company received a $39,000 profit on a $100,000 investment after he had paid $190,000 in excess-profits and corporation taxes. Did he need relief? Does his company need relief? Yet, in the name of stimulating business, and in the name of reconversion, in 1 year we are reaching into the Treasury of the United States and taking out two and one-half billion dollars which the Treasury would otherwise receive through excess-profits taxes.

Mr. President, I may be an extremist. Perhaps I am. I believe in the excess-profits tax. I believe it is a permanently sound tax. Let me show why. Take an individual such as myself, for example. Assume that I make $100 a month and the Senator from Utah makes $100,000 in a year. He pays a higher rate of tax than I pay because he makes a relatively much larger income. If the principle of levying a graduated tax in the case of individuals is sound, why is it not sound in the case of corporations? When one corporation receives a small income on its capital stock, and another receives a high income on the same amount of capital stock, why should not a graduated tax be levied in accordance with the ability to pay?

Mr. President, insofar as I am able to do so, I shall support the House provision with regard to the excess-profits tax. Of course, the bill will go to conference. I presume the fact that it will go to conference is one reason the Senate is accepting so readily most of the committee amendments. I shall not be a member of the conference committee because I am not far enough up on the list. But I wish to say that if, when the conference report comes to the Senate, it contains provisions for repealing all the excess-profits tax for 1946, I shall not vote for it. I would rather keep the present law than vote for a bad law. I think it would be a bad law if we were to adopt the recommendation of the Finance Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very much impressed by what the Senator from Texas has said. I was given to understand, not being a member of the Finance Committee, that the present excess-profits tax contains many inequalities.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know of any tax which does not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to say that the specific inequality which I think is very burdensome is that it favors a large corporation as against a small one; it favors an old corporation as against a new one.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is thinking about the present tax law?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the statement of the Senator that there is no reason why we should not apply the same graduated system to corporate profits which we apply to individual incomes, yet if we have an excess-profits formula which operates to retard the development of new enterprise when we need new enterprise, the question I must answer is: Is it better to scrap the entire excess-profits-tax system, or retain this one, which apparently is acknowledged to be defective?

We have the situation that the bill as it passed the House, preserving 60 percent of the present rate, is also preserving 60 percent of the inequality, and making it difficult for little business to survive.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not question the Senator's claim that there are inequalities in the excess-profits tax law. I think there are inequalities in practically all tax laws. Somewhere along the line, by reason of the universality of its application, it works a hardship on certain particular interests, or certain particular corporations, or certain particular individuals; but the reply is not just to repeal it, the reply is to perfect it and amend it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. CONNALLY. And now we have the chance to do it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was any effort made in the committee to eliminate the defects and retain an excess-profits tax which would not militate against the little fellows while making it requisite for the big ones to pay?

Mr. CONNALLY. A great many amendments were offered, a sample of which was the one offered by the Senator from Nebraska, but the committee was so overwhelmingly in favor of repealing the whole excess-profits tax for 1946 that there was no use trying to amend it or modify it, because the committee was determined to repeal it. I say that with all respect. The Finance Committee is a great committee, composed of able Senators, and that is one reason why I regret so earnestly having to part company with the committee on this particular vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Earlier in the day I sought to inquire as to whether there would be any possibility of Senators who are not members of the Finance Committee having an opportunity to read the part of the report on the bill relating to this question before the Senate is asked to vote on it, and I was given to understand that no such assurance could be given, and that we might possibly be required to vote this afternoon upon the bill as it stands. I am very happy the Senator from Texas has raised this question, because it shows that within the Finance Committee serious consideration is being given to what seems to me to be a matter of the very greatest moment.

If excess profits are to be earned in the postwar period, they should be subject to taxation, it seems to me; but if we have a formula which discriminates against the little fellow and in favor of the big fellow, then we should abolish that formula.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator's theory about wanting to do no injustice to the little fellows appeals to me, of course, but his remedy is not very appealing, because the little fellow is not getting all he is entitled to in taking it off the big fellow. That is where it will come off.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not my remedy. As a Members of the Senate I am in exactly the same position in which the Senator described himself as being a moment ago as a member of the Committee on Finance. Though he was not approving the action that was taken by the Finance Committee, he said, "Well, I cannot do anything, because the vote is overwhelmingly against me."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The situation is that we in the Senate now have charge of the bill, and are we going to take the time to revise it? Are we going to see that before the bill leaves the Senate it will leave in the shape in which we would like to have it?

I should like to see the Senator from Texas take the lead in this matter. He has expressed his disagreement with the position of the committee. Now let him appeal to his colleagues on the floor of the Senate, and I for one will be glad to pledge him what assistance I can render.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. A motion to recommit with instructions is always in order, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. CONNALLY. That will afford some opportunity, I may say to the Senator from Wyoming. So far as the statement of the Senator today is concerned that he could not even be allowed to read the bill, I do not know anything about that; I was not present. I made no such statement. I am a very humble and powerless member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not told that I would not be permitted to read the bill. The very able and always admirable Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, merely said that he could not undertake to enter into an agreement that there would not be a vote today.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was not present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that the Senator from Georgia is only too glad to have Members of the Senate read the report which came from his committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to take up much more of the time of the Senate, but I wish to submit one statement in substantiation of my theory about the progressive tax on corporations as a permanent part of our taxing system.

When Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States—I cannot put my finger on the message and the date, but I can get the reference—in a message to the Congress he advocated the imposition of the excess-profits tax on corporations as a part of our permanent taxing system. I think the immediate occasion of his message was that we are undertaking in the tax laws, during World

War I, to impose an excess-profits tax. In arguing for it he proceeded to make the statement that, according to his view, it should become a permanent part of our tax policy.

Mr. President, when and if it shall be appropriate to do so, I shall offer a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to agree to the House provision on excess-profits tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Instead of instructing the committee to agree to the House provision, would it not be preferable to instruct the commitee to examine the excess-profits tax and eliminate its defects?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a pretty broad program. I understand when we instruct someone we have to tell him what to do, and it would be a little difficult to do that in this instance. What might in the Senator's mind seem to be a defect might to some other Senators seem a great blessing. We cannot generalize and say that we will remove all defects. When we do, the result may be to remove a great many of the "innards" of the thing. I wish to accommodate the Senator, but I am afraid I shall not be able, as a practical proposition, to name the defects. I would not ever submit to a doctor for an operation to remove all my defects. I want to live a little longer. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I used unfortunate language, which may be open to the rapier of the very skillful Senator from Texas. The Senator from North Carolina says in an aside that he has not used a rapier, but a broadax.

Mr. CONNALLY. I meant no offense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly; I understand. The point is that if there is a defective law, we should cure the defect.

Mr. CONNALLY. I grant all that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then why not ask the Finance Committee to study this matter? Those of us who are not members of the Finance Committee are dependent upon the Senators who are.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that we adopted an excess-profits tax in 1940. The distinguished Senator from Texas was then a member of the committee. If there is anything wrong in the excess-profits tax, everyone in this body is responsible for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. GEORGE. Then why study it longer? We have studied it each year since 1940. We have amended the law again and again and again, and, finally, we adopted a general amendment, known as section 722, to prevent hardship in the case of small businesses, and to newly organized corporations, and to those who were in desperate condition. That was a liberal provision, which has not been administered, and will not be administered, because we will never find a Treasury official who will assume the risk of administering such a law.

There is nothing new about the excess-profits tax. If there is a desire to abandon what has made America—that is, the ability of our industry to grow—we will get rid of the excess-profits tax as a peacetime tax. If any want monopoly, then they will keep the excess-profits tax, and keep it high, and I guarantee that there will never be any competition with the monopolistic enterprises in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Georgia that anything I have stated is not to be regarded as a criticism either of the chairman of the Finance Committee or of the committee itself; but it is clear to me, as I think it must be clear to every other Member of the Senate, that we are now undertaking to establish a rule for a peacetime economy, whereas the excess-profits tax which is now on the books is a tax which was adopted in wartime, and which was adopted under the spur of necessity. I do not think that even the Senator from Georgia will contend that the excess-profits tax now on the books is a perfect instrument.

Mr. GEORGE. No; it is not perfect, and no one can make it perfect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not.

Mr. GEORGE. There is no way to make it perfect to fit all conditions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Texas suggests that it can be improved.

Mr. GEORGE. Well, the Senator from Texas has had 4 years in which to improve it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to keep the tax, and the Senator from Georgia wants to eliminate it.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I do want to eliminate it, because I desire the young men of this country to have a chance to engage in business enterprises.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In which I agree completely with the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well. How would the Senator define excess profits? They must be profits over and above a certain income.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well. Either invested capital or an average earning base.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. GEORGE. That is what we have today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not engaged in a debate with the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; but I deplore the kind of debate that is now going on because I do not think the Senator has thought the matter through.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me, I was engaged in a debate with the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator wants a committee to study the bill and to study the excess-profits tax, and we have studied it. The tax was imposed as a wartime tax before we became involved in this war, but we say that it was necessary to prepare for the war. The tax came on in 1940.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator permit me to make a statement?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, I will permit the Senator to make a statement. I do not have the floor, however.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is my position. I said earlier today that I much prefer the action of the Senate Committee on Finance with respect to the excess-profits tax to the action of the House, and I was merely saying to the Senator from Texas that, instead of asking his colleagues to vote for the retention of the House provision he should ask the Finance Committee, if he intends to make a motion to recommit, to try to remove some of the defects which are contained in the excess-profits tax. If I am compelled to make a choice between voting to recommit the bill, to adopt the House provision, or the bill as reported by the Finance Committee, I shall support the bill as reported.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not like the Senator's implication that the Finance Committee had never studied the excess-profits tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I made no such implication, and intended no such implication, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I tried to make clear a little while ago that I could not agree to send the bill, according to the views of the Senator from Wyoming, to the committee to study and work it over. We have studied it, and that is why we know there are some imperfections in it. But, Mr. President, a tax which brings into the Treasury of the United States $2,500,000,000 appears to me to be a pretty fair tax when we have outstanding a public debt of $270,000,000,000. I know there may be some defects in the tax. But where does this tax apply? It applies to excess profits after companies have made profits comparable to what they made for the four base years prior to the war. It applies to profits over and above what they made before the war. Are such excess profits so sacred that when the tax gatherer goes to the man who has made them he can say, "Do not touch these excess profits. It is true they are excess profits, but you must not take them. Go back and tax that little picture-show fellow a little more. Tax that fellow with a low income. Give him a little more of it. But we want these excess profits freed from tax."

Mr. President, I am for free enterprise—yes, free enterprise. We are all for free enterprise if it is on our side of the street. I am for free enterprise, but I want free enterprise treated fairly and justly, and I want a little free enterprise in favor of the Government as well as individuals.

Yes, I want to see new enterprises established. I want to see them grow and develop as we have known them to grow and develop in the past. Certainly I want to see that. But to give $2,500,000,000 to the corporations which are already in existence, which already have their treasuries full of money and bonds and stocks, is not going to help the little fellow who does not have anything, who is just starting out. If anyone can figure out how such action is going to help him I will reverse my position.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, for a moment.

Mr. HAWKES. I have asked this question two or three times today——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry but I was not present when the Senator did so.

Mr. HAWKES. And if I am wrong I should like to have someone correct me, because I believe the distinguished Senator wants to have the facts placed before the Senate and the people in their true colors.

How do we know that we shall have taken off two and one-half billion dollars excess-profits tax from the business of the United States? I want to call the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that in order to do that the excess profits must first be made. Concerns engaged in business have to build them up.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. What assurance have we that they will do it?

Mr. CONNALLY. We have the same assurance we have with respect to all other taxes. We have the estimate made by Mr. Stam, the tax expert. We have the estimate made by Mr. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury. Of course, I am not a prophet. I cannot tell what profit a company will make in the future. But what do the tax experts do? They do what has been done in all human history; they go back to the past and estimate on the basis of what has occurred in the past, consider the trend, and then they form a conclusion. They cannot guarantee it to be correct, of course, But let me say to the Senator in connection with his anxiety in respect to this $2 500,000 000——

Mr. HAWKES. I will say to the Senator from Texas that I have no anxiety respecting it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not trying to be offensive, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. Of course, I know the Senator is not.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the companies do not make excess profits they do not pay. So if the Senator feels that they are not going to make the two and one half billion dollars he can go home tonight and slumber on that silk pillow of his without any worries at all, because the companies will not make it.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish I had a silk pillow, Mr. President, but I really prefer a cotton pillow. That is one of the reasons why I am popular in the South.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator does not have a cotton pillow I will see that he gets one. I am strong for cotton. [Laughter.] The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is not here, and I shall assume to speak for cotton in his absence.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me say, because I believe the Senator is trying, as I am, to ascertain the facts——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am trying to get a little money in addition to the facts.

Mr. HAWKES. So am I, just as much as the Senator is. I do not think anyone is more firmly and more strongly interested in seeing this Government get all the revenue it can than I am, but it cannot get anything out of a dead duck, and it cannot get a golden egg out of a dead goose.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. What we are endeavoring to do is to get the maximum revenue possible.

Mr. CONNALLY. The dead goose does not care whether anything is taken out of it, because it is already dead. A surgical operation does not hurt a dead goose.

Mr. HAWKES. That is true; but let us get back to the little point we are talking about. If I myself were a big corporation, or if I were speaking in favor of the great corporations of the United States, I would agree with the Senator, and I would not ask for repeal of any excess-profits taxes.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the first time I have been put in that class. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. What I am talking about is the same thing that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has just suggested to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, and that is——

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, they did not agree in any respect.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes; they did agree. They may not have known it, but they did agree on a great fundamental in that they believe the repeal of the excess-profits tax will stimulate the small-business man, the man who does not have a decent earning base, and the new businessman, and I believe exactly the same thing. I can also say to the Senator that it is my firm conviction that the repeal of the excess-profits tax—possibly when a new bill is drafted—a change can be made in the graduated scale of taxation, making it larger or smaller as the case may demand; but the repeal of the excess-profits tax, in my opinion, may raise more revenue for the United States than would be raised if it were retained.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator is correct in his estimates, but he doubted any estimates at all a while ago when I mentioned the estimates with respect to how much we are going to save. Now the Senator goes one better than the Secretary of the Treasury and one better than Mr. Stam, and his estimate is that if we remove the tax we will receive a great deal more money than if we retain the tax. I congratulate the Senator. He is a statistician and a Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. May I say to my very dear friend the distinguished Senator from Texas that I have not heard Mr. Stam make any predictions of how much money is going to be made in 1946. He has only made a guess.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is because the Senator has not asked him.

Mr. HAWKES. Oh, yes; I have asked him.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, there he sits over there. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey so he may have an opportunity to go over there and ask him.

Mr. HAWKES. I might also say that Mr. Vinson himself, the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury, says definitely that this thing is a pure picking of the figures out of the air.

Mr. CONNALLY. He is against the provision. He wants it repealed.

Mr. HAWKES. I am following along with the administration in my viewpoint, so that if things do not go as well as we think, the blame will not be all on us.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad the Senator has enlisted under the banner of the administration for the duration. I do not know how long the duration is going to last. I am glad to welcome the Senator to the ranks.

Mr. President, I respect those who advocate repeal of the excess-profits tax. I have no quarrel with them. That is their right. They think that way, but I do not think that way. And since I must vote on my own responsibility I shall vote as I think about the matter. I think it is a very foolish grant of the public funds to hand the money back. We do not have it yet.

Mr. HAWKES. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. But we would get it, because if the Senator from New Jersey is correct, then what we ought to do, instead of increasing taxes, is to continue to reduce them and get more money for the Government every time we reduce them. Cut the taxes down, and get more revenue.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I agree with the last philosophy the Senator has expressed, that is, the proper reduction of taxes carried out in a way that is correlated with the debts and the obligations of the Nation, and watching the development of the business and employment under the process of reducing taxes. I do not believe there is anything more important to the United States than to eliminate every tax which stifles and stymies business and thus stops revenue from coming into the Treasury.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct in the view that we can reduce taxes if we properly correlate them; but the trouble is in correlating. We do not know where to correlate and where not to correlate. He drags in another uncertain element. If he were to say that he was in favor of eliminating taxes, I could understand that; but when we must do all this correlating, it bothers my mind, and I simply cannot grasp it.

Mr. President, I do not believe that we ought to repeal the excess-profits taxes. I assume that the Senate will do it. The committee has recommended it. I respect the sincerity, integrity, and honesty of those who advocate repeal, but I simply do not believe in it. I do not think it is wise. I do not think it is sound. I do not think it compares with the other aspects of the bill. What other interest would benefit by the remission of taxes to the extent of $2,500,000,000 under the terms of the bill? I cannot place my finger on the information at this time, but I am advised that only a relatively small number of corporations would receive the major portion of the $2,500,000,000 through the forgiveness of taxes.

Mr. President, I shall not press the motion at this time, but before the bill is voted upon I shall make a motion to recommit. I shall move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Fi-

nance with instructions to report it back with the recommendation that the Senate agree to the House provision relating to the excess-profits taxes. I regret that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] will not support such a motion. If we adopt the House language, we shall be revising the excess-profits taxes to some extent. If we pass the bill as reported from the Committee on Finance, there will be no revision. The excess-profits taxes will be repealed. I regret very much that I am unable to agree with the Senator. I always like to agree with him.

Mr. President, at the proper time I shall make the motion to which I have referred.

CREATION OF A WORLD REPUBLIC

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to submit a resolution at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution may be submitted.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in connection with the resolution. I dislike very much to interrupt consideration of the tax bill. On the other hand, it may be a welcome respite for Senators to hear of something besides taxes for a few moments.

Mr. President, this is a rather momentous occasion in my experience in the Senate. This is the first resolution I have ever introduced. Furthermore, it is a resolution which may be rather startling to some, and, to say the least, controversial.

My proposal in the resolution is that the Senate go on record as favoring the creation of a world republic. This is not something that I thought of on the spur of the moment. I have studied the problem for a good many years. But, of course, when the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshimo the effect was something like that of a man turning around and seeing a grizzly bear on his tracks. It hurried me up a little, I thought more intensely on the subject and did considerably more research and study.

Recently I have been asking my friends and chance acquaintances what they thought of the idea of a world republic as the most sensible and practical way of maintaining peace in the world. I was rather astonished at the response which I received. Invariably the answer was, "TAYLOR, you have something there. I am for it, but I do not believe anyone else will be for it." When I spoke to the next person I asked him the same question. I tried to put it in such a way that he would not think that I was sponsoring the idea. I wanted to get his honest reaction. Again I would receive the answer, "That is the right idea. It is our only hope of maintaining peace in the world, but I do not think anyone else will agree with you."

Invariably that was the response. Everyone thought that I had something, but that he was the only one with enough vision to see the problem in its true light, and that no one else would agree with me. I talked with a former Senator. I talked with a man from India who has attended Harvard University, and who is now lecturing at a college here. I talked with farmers from my own State of Idaho. The other day I talked with a farmer, and suggested the idea of a world republic as the best means of maintaining peace in the world. He said, "I am for it. That is the only thing that will maintain peace in the world." Knowing that he was a farmer, a grower of sugar beets, and probably a strong advocate of high tariffs and opposed to reciprocal trade, I said to him, "You understand that possibly in the world republic the government might abolish all tariffs between nations." I thought that would stop him if anything would. He said, "That is all right. I still maintain that we must have a world government if we are to hope to maintain peace and avert the destruction of humanity."

Mr. President, I shall now read the resolution. I feel that I should do so because of the nature of it. If it were a resolution in connection with some routine matter, I might submit it and let it go at that. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the atomic bomb and other new and terrible instruments of warfare make it possible that most of mankind and civilization itself may be destroyed should the world become involved in another war; and

Whereas even before the soldiers of this war have returned to their homes another race between nations is already underway to train ever greater armies and to produce more scientifically diabolical weapons in the largest possible numbers; and

Whereas we believe that not only the people of the United States but an overwhelming majority of all people in all countries are sickened by wars, senseless slaughter, and the burdens of great military establishments and crave only peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby calls upon the delegates of the United States of America to the United Nations Organization prayerfully and earnestly to redouble their efforts to secure world-wide agreement to:

Limit and reduce immediately and eventually to abolish armaments, outlaw military training and conscription except for such police forces as the Security Council of the United Nations Organization may deem necessary to preserve the peace of the world; outlaw the manufacture or use of atomic bombs and all other atomic weapons for any purpose whatsoever; outlaw the manufacture or use of other weapons and instruments of war of every kind and nature, except for such weapons as the Security Council of the United Nations Organization may deem necessary to preserve the peace of the world; provide for an international police force capable of enforcing these agreements; and be it further

Resolved, That because the creation of an international police force requires adequate international civil authority for its control and mindful of the long and continued peaceful relations between the 48 States of our own republic and being hopeful that similar principles of government, if applied to all men, will secure to the world the greatest possible opportunity for everlasting peace, we therefore urge that every possible effort of our delegates to the United Nations Organization be directed toward the ultimate goal of establishing a world republic based upon democratic principles and universal suffrage regardless of race, color, or creed; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to use the great powers and influence of his high office toward achieving the purposes of this resolution by instructing the delegates of the United States to the United Nations Organization to propose at the first assembly of that organization the creation of a commission to prepare the drafts of the requisite international conventions, agreements, and treaties for the establishment of the world republic proposed by this resolution.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate, and also the attention of those who may read this statement in the RECORD, to the fact that the original Thirteen Colonies faced precisely the same situation which we face today. They had a loose organization, a league of friendship, among the Colonies, and it was inadequate. They were arguing and squabbling among themselves. They were not progressing in the field of economic well-being. They were fighting among themselves. So the representatives of the Colonies met in convention. It was not called for the purpose of drafting a constitution which would draw the Colonies more closely together. It was called for the purpose of amending the Articles of Confederation. But the gentlemen gathered there realized that confederations, leagues of friendship, and leagues of nations would not keep the peace. They exercised great statesmanship, foresight, daring, and courage. They took it upon themselves to formulate our present Constitution.

Mr. President, at that time it was said that the Thirteen Colonies were too vast to be united under one government. It was suggested they should be divided into spheres of influence, so to speak, even as has been suggested for the nations of the world at the present time. It was suggested that a certain group of colonies should be in one confederation, another group in another confederation, and a third group in still another confederation, because the Colonies were too big to be united in one republic. But our founding fathers thought better of that, and so we have the United States of America.

Mr. President, today we are in the same situation. It is contended that the world is too large for one republic, that there should be spheres of influence and confederations of nations in certain sections of the world. I do not believe in that theory.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what happened yesterday, although I do not think it is necessary to do so, because I am sure that everyone who attended the joint session of the House and Senate held on yesterday will agree with me as to what happened. I am sure all will agree that the reception given there to the proposal of universal military training was very cool. I have attended several such joint sessions. Previously they have always been gala occasions, always the President has been tumultuously received, always he has left the Chamber amid loud applause, and as he has made his exit there has been a burst of enthusiastic applause from the audience. I am sure that yesterday we all noticed that the President was received most cordially, but that as he progressed with his pronouncement that the only way to maintain peace in the

world was by force, there was a marked cooling of the attitude of his listeners. The applause became less and less spontaneous; and as the President left the Chamber, the applause actually died and ceased before he had proceeded more than half way up the aisle. I do not think that was a demonstration of any unfriendliness toward the President; but, rather, it was simply a manifestation of the unutterable depression which had come upon that gathering at the prospect of a renewed armaments race, even before the soldiers of this war have returned to their homes and their firesides.

I believe the people of America are ready—not only ready, but anxious and definitely craving—to have something done to preserve peace in the world and to prevent the beginning of another armament race which, in view of the development of far greater instruments of destruction, can result only in leading to the absolute erasing from the face of the earth of our civilization and of a large percentage of the actual inhabitants of the earth.

Mr. President, it has been my observation that always when great armies are built up they are not disbanded until they have been used for purposes of making war upon some other nation. We have examples of what results from militaristic attitudes upon the part of nations, of peacetime conscription, and peacetime compulsory military training. We have the example of France which had a great army made up of conscripts, and yet its morale was so poor that it fell at the first onslaught of the enemy. We have the example of Germany, which by means of conscription built up a great army that was used for purposes of world conquest. More immediately, Mr. President, we have before us the object lesson of Argentina, where the army has taken control of the country in toto.

So I am opposed to great armies, especially conscript armies, if there is any other possible alternative. I agree that if affairs go on for another year or two as they have been going, and if international relations deteriorate further and further, by that time I shall be compelled to agree with the idea that the only hope of preventing the utter extinction of our Nation will be the creation of a great military machine. But I am not prepared to go along with that idea at the present time, and I will not go along with it now.

Very recently, Mr. President, Representative ARENDS, of the House Military Affairs Committee, suggested that we hide our factories and ourselves in the thousands of miles of deserted mine shafts in certain regions of our country.

That might be a good idea except for the fact that the scientists who invented the atomic bomb tell us that shortly the bombs will be so powerful we would have to dig down at least a half mile. At any rate, Mr. President, I prefer to stay above ground and to embrace my fellowman and call him brother. But that can only be if we have the courage to travel the uncharted road to a world republic.

President Truman had this to say to his neighbors in Kansas City, before the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima:

> It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for us to get along in the Republic of the United States.

I think he spoke from his heart, but I am afraid that since that time he has had too many so-called practical advisers with militaristic learnings tell him that it is absolutely impossible even to think of a world republic, and, therefore, we should arm to fight instead of seeking peace.

I know how that is; I went through a similar experience with my resolution. After I had talked to so many common people and after they all had agreed with me, then I thought, "Well, inasmuch as this is my first resolution, I guess the proper thing to do is to try, before I submit it, to gain some support in the Senate." So I started calling upon Senators to ask what they thought of my proposal and to ask whether they would care to have their names appear as cosponsors of the resolution. The first Senator upon whom I called said he had not even given any thought to the idea of a world republic. He promised that he would and that he would call me later. However, he has never called me. I do not know whether he is still giving it thought or whether he has just forgotten about it.

I went to another Senator and asked him what he thought about it. He thought it was a great idea, but he did not want any part of it. [Laughter.]

Then I went to another Senator, and he was absolutely opposed to it. He said he had recently been to Europe and that they were a bunch of poor white trash and he wanted no part of them, and certainly not to be mixed up in a republic with them.

So, Mr. President, about that time I decided that that was a poor course to pursue, because if I kept on I would be in the sad position of submitting my resolution over the good advice of every Member of the Senate, before I was through with it. So I ceased and desisted, and I am presenting my resolution now on my own initiative, because in my heart I am convinced that this is the only possible solution to the problem of attaining permanent world peace.

There are some who say that the goal of a world republic is unattainable. Well, what if they do? Suppose we do set our sights on an impossible goal—for instance, such as President Roosevelt's goal of 50,000 airplanes a year. The Senate will recall that and will remember that it was laughed at as being the figment of an overwrought imagination, and it will also be remembered that our actual production of airplanes made 50,000 planes a year appear as child's play. So, I say, let us set our sights on an impossible goal; let us display a little of the vision and faith of that great man.

General Marshall, in his recent report to the Congress, said:

> The only defense against this kind of warfare [atomic warfare] is the ability to attack.

Later in his report he reiterated that—

> The only effective defense a nation can now maintain is the power of attack.

What he did not say, but what is implicit, is attack without warning. That is what we face in this world: Nations with atomic rocket bombs aimed at the vital centers of other nations, with a technician sitting at a button, ready to press it and spread destruction to a whole nation, and that state of affairs existing in every nation, and all the nations of the world living in dread and fear.

Mr. President, I fear that if this condition continues, not only will the morale of the people of the world be destroyed, but their morals will be destroyed. If a man feels that he may never live to see the dawning of another morning, probably he will decide to go out tonight and get drunk and celebrate and have a good time, and God knows what will happen to the world if such fatalistic attitudes become prevalent.

There are some who claim that to establish such a world-wide republic is impracticable and impossible because of the many races and religions and varying standards of living in the world. Here in America we also have many races and religions, and we also have greatly varying standards of living—not only between different classes but also between different sections of our country. Even in Canada different languages are spoken in certain sections of that democracy.

It is claimed by many that we cannot even hope to get along peacefully with Russia, let alone accept her into a world republic, because she has an economic system different from ours. We might bear in mind that Canada has a socialist government in the Province of Saskatchewan, but to date, at least, it has not brought on violence or revolution or even serious misunderstanding with the remainder of the Dominion.

Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, has recently returned from Russia. Among other things, he said, "Russia has gone a long way from the doctrines of Karl Marx."

We hear the same thing from many other sources. And certainly we have been moving to the left in our economic forms.

Both Representative MUNDT and Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON said that they found only the greatest interest in and friendliness toward America.

Mr. MUNDT said that he observed no anti-American propaganda, and that "if there had been any, then it has failed completely."

Does that sound like a nation against whom we should arm to the hilt upon the slightest provocation? And if we are not arming in fear of Russia, who else is there at this time to threaten us?

Certainly the United States is the only nation that would dare to risk a war with Russia, and Russia is the only nation in the world that would dare to risk a war with the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a few statements which have been made by scientific experts who had some-

thing to do with the development of the atomic bomb.

Dr. Harold Urey, one of the scientists who helped develop the atomic bomb, said:

Unless we can devise some plan to prevent the manufacture of atomic bombs we shall live in constant fear of sudden and violent death. A world of vast fear and apprehension will be our lot and that of our children.

We must understand that the most devastating weapon of all times is now in our hands and will soon be in the hands of other industrialized countries.

Dr. Robert R. Wilson, on behalf of Los Alamos scientists, foresees atomic bombs thousands of times more powerful than the ones dropped on Hiroshima, said:

Efforts to keep it from other nations will lead to an unending war more savage than the last.

Counter measures would be extremely difficult and uncertain because of the concentrated form of destructive energy and the large number of possible methods of delivery.

Advantage would lie with the aggressor. A single heavy attack, lasting a matter of minutes, might destroy the ability of a nation to defend itself further.

The bomb is a deadly challenge to civilization itself.

Dr. Shapley, Harvard:

The future, if it is to be made safe for civilization, is one in which narrowly national interests diminish and world-wide responsibilities increase.

Dr. A. H. Compton, another prominent atomic scientist, said:

If we are wise we shall take immediate steps to form a world government by international agreement instead of waiting for a third world war of unparalleled destructiveness to determine the rulers of the world.

Dr. H. J. Curtis, one of the men who helped make the atom bomb, predicted that the scientists' suggestion for international control might be scoffed at as visionary.

He said:

In reply I will simply state that the possibility of developing atomic energy was also so labeled a scant 6 years ago, and yet today it is a reality.

We can see no reason why a similar miracle cannot be achieved in international relations.

Dr. Irving Langmuir, General Electric Co. scientist, stated:

There is no possibility of permanently keeping the secret of the atomic bomb * * * Russia is behind us at the moment, but she has a tendency to go ahead at a faster rate than we do. * * *

Their development could reach such a state that all they would have to do would be to push a button and destroy every American city.

General Marshall said:

In the immediate years ahead, the United Nations will unquestionably devote their sincere energies to the effort to establish a lasting peace. To my mind there is now greater chance of success in this effort than ever before in history.

I am not expecting that this resolution will be reported from the committee at once and favorably voted upon. My best hope is that developing events and the pressure of public opinion may eventually bring action before we have traveled too far down the road of military might to bring the monster of armed force under control.

The resolution is before the Senate. It has been submitted. It is up to the people of America to make known their wishes in the matter to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it will be referred.

Preservation of world peace cannot be left to the whims of sovereign states, or to conferences of foreign ministers, or to security councils.

These inadequate agents may suffice for a time, they can even be valuable as architects of a more permanent structure.

The United Nations Organization may have been adequate at San Francisco, but agreements between sovereign nations will not suffice in the atomic age which has come into being since the San Francisco Conference.

General Marshall has said:

If man does find the solution for world peace it will be the most revolutionary reversal of his record we have ever known.

I agree with General Marshall. It will be a revolutionary reversal, but I believe that if we have the courage, the resolute purpose, and the magnificent imagination which was displayed by the framers of our Constitution, this can be accomplished. Those men did not wait for the masses to force them to act. They were leaders. They had been called upon only to revise the Articles of Confederation, but they recognized the futility of confederations and leagues of friendship and agreements between sovereign powers. So they took the responsibility upon their own shoulders and drafted our Constitution. When some objected that they were going too far, Washington said:

It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God.

How well might those words of President Washington apply to circumstances at this very moment in the history of the world.

Mr. President, I call upon the Republican Senators to support this resolution for a world union, in the name of their greatest leader, Abraham Lincoln, who gave his life to the end that our own Union should not perish.

I call upon them in the name of their late statesman, Wendell Willkie, whose profound understanding of world affairs led him to declare, long before the atomic bomb made it crystal clear, that this is indeed one world.

I call upon the members of my own party to exercise the same foresight, and high courage, that motivated the founders of our own Republic when, even though they were called traitors to their individual States, they nevertheless fought the good fight to establish a United States of America, because they believed that the good of all is superior to the proud pretensions of any lesser sovereign entity.

In the name of Woodrow Wilson, who died a martyr to what was considered to be a revolutionary step in the quest of men and women everywhere to end the scourge of war, I call upon Senators of the Democratic Party to wrest this one last chance from the jaws of chaos and establish permanent peace in the world as the alternative to a far more ghastly orgy of death and destruction than the world has ever known.

I call upon them to lend their support to this bold proposal in the name of the man whose bold leadership in our victory over tyranny has given us this last fleeting opportunity to render the greatest service of all time to humanity.

Mr. President, I call upon every Senator, regardless of party, I call upon all the citizens of America, I call upon every Christian, to give support to this proposal. I ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace.

The resolution (S. Res. 183), submitted by Mr. TAYLOR, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this Act shall take effect October 1, 1946: *Provided, however,* That any travel or transportation specifically contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract of carriage or shipment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time, to a fund in the Treasury to be known as the "veterans' farms fund", amounts equal in the aggregate to the total amount set forth in subsection (c) of this section.

"(b) Amounts appropriated to the veterans' farms fund shall be available until expended and shall be utilized, 75 per centum by the Secretary of the Interior and 25 per centum by the Secretary of Agriculture, as follows:

"(1) The amounts available to the Secretary of the Interior shall be utilized by him for the construction of irrigation projects in the reclamation States; and for the purchase and reclamation improvement of such privately owned lands, and the reclamation improvement of such public lands, situated within reclamation projects as are necessary to the proper and integrated development of

said projects, and such Secretary shall dispose of lands so purchased or improved to eligible veterans in family-type farms.

"(2) The amounts available to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be utilized by him for the purpose of assisting eligible veterans to establish themselves upon and improve family-type farms on lands within Federal reclamation projects and on lands within the States in which railroad land grants are located but which are not reclamation States. Funds so available to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be administered in the same manner as funds appropriated for title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended: *Provided*, That such funds may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in the reclamation States and in the other States named in subsection (c) without regard to the prevalence of farm tenancy in said States: *And provided further*, That veterans found qualified for occupancy of a family-type unit on Federal reclamation projects pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act must also be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior. Any funds appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act may be used for the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (3) of this subsection, in the manner and under the conditions provided for the use of funds made available pursuant to this subsection.

"(3) In order to provide for cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of this section, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, pursuant to cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, to consider any money made available by any Federal agency to veterans settling upon land within Federal reclamation projects, as all or a portion of the capital required of such settler under subsection C of section 4 of the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1924 (43 Stat. 702), and where any lands have been or may be improved by means of funds made available to an eligible veteran by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall require the entryman or settler of such lands to enter into a mortgage contract or other security instrument acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture covering his interest in the land and improvements to secure the repayment of the value of such improvements before a subsequent entry is allowed.

"(4) Of the amounts in the veterans' farm fund, the Secretary of the Interior shall expend at least $3,750,000 of the funds available to him, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall expend at least $1,250,000 of the funds available to him, in each of the States mentioned in subsection (c) as having railroad land-grant lands valued at $5,000,000 or more: *Provided*, That if the total of the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) is less than $68,272,770, then the said Secretaries shall expend in each of such States 75 per centum and 25 per centum, respectively, of an amount which bears the same ratio to $5,000,000 as the total of the amounts so appropriated bears to $68,272,770.

"(5) An eligible veteran for the purposes of this section is one who has been or may be declared by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be eligible for any benefits provided for in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as now in force or as hereafter amended.

"(6) No amount shall be deducted or withheld from any payment due to any veteran under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of protecting the United States against loss in connection with any sale of land under this section.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the value of land-grant lands to which carriers have legal or equitable title or possession in the several States is hereby fixed as follows: "Arizona, $7,000,000; California, $14,331,090; Idaho, $1,149,190; Minnesota, $87,228; Montana, $19,209,090; Nevada, $11,112,454; New Mexico, $5,000,000; North Dakota, $1,000,500; Oregon, $171,292; Utah, $349,120; Washington, $8,789,406; Wisconsin, $3,300; Wyoming, $70,100; total $68,272,770."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ED. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
B. K. WHEELER,
E. H. MOORE,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LYLE H. BOREN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I realize that the presentation of the conference report is a privileged matter, but it strikes me that it might be well to hold its consideration in abeyance until we can dispose of the tax bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the conference report results in any debate, I shall withdraw it.

Mr. GEORGE. I think it will lead to debate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado indicate what changes have been made in the form of the bill which was passed by the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only change is in respect to the so-called McFarland amendment. As will be recalled, that amendment provided for certain payments to be made out of the fund for the improvement of land for veterans in some of the States. The Comptroller General found fault with the provision and suggested the changes which have been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Colorado indicate what changes the Comptroller General suggested in the allocations to the various States? I think we should have a fairly full explanation of the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In general, this is what the conference report does: Under its provisions the allocation of funds for the purposes listed in the McFarland amendment is merely an authorization. It is not an appropriation at all. An appropriation will have to be made by the Congress before any money can be taken out of the Treasury and used for the purposes recited in the McFarland amendment.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I have been keenly interested in the proposed legislation. I merely rose to extend my hearty congratulations to the Senate conferees for the good service they have rendered in retaining in the bill the amendment to make the law effective beginning October 1, 1946. That one amendment will save for the taxpayers of the country between $200,000,000 and $224,000,000, as I have been best able to estimate it.

I am very much gratified that the conferees have been able to retain this amendment after the House so hurriedly tried to pass a measure in the last 2 or 3 years. Beginning in December, 1944, I have been objecting to the passage of the bill, but I have no objection to its enactment with this amendment in it, because since I have been on the job fighting the bill, there has accrued to the Treasury approximately a quarter billion dollars, and this amendment adds another quarter billion. After the war is over and all the hauling has been done by the railroads of the country of soldiers and sailors, after they have all been placed back in their homes, and after the declaration that the war has come to an end, the bill will not mean anything because of the enactment of the act of 1940.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report? The Chair hears none, and without objection the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was on my feet. I wish to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the conference report will go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I withhold the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope Senators will await the disposition of the pending bill before other matters are brought forward. It is very desirable to get the bill through today. It will have to go to conference, and it is necessary that it become law by the 1st of November in order that certain provisions of it may become effective. I hope we may dispose of it before other matters are brought forward.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], presented as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], on page 35, after line 10.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that the amendment is in exactly the same language as the amendment I offered last July to the so-called tax adjustment bill, which was identified as House bill 3633. The purpose of the amendment then was to make retroactive to January 1, 1945, the increased exemption in the excess-profits tax, a specific exemption from $10,000 to $25,000. At the last session the Senate passed the bill, but my amendment was not carried, having been lost by a vote of 30 to 31.

We are told this afternoon that the excess-profits tax law is to be repealed. I hope it will be repealed. I have offered my amendment today to make the $25,000 exemption retroactive for the tax

year 1945. I have done so because more than 45,000 small business concerns throughout the country have asked that I offer this amendment, which will relieve them in their reconversion problems, which will give them new money with which to continue their businesses in 1946, especially businesses which have just been started.

The only difference between this amendment and the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan which has now been approved, or will be taken to conference by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, is as to the amount of relief which will be granted. In the Senator's amendment, which is a restricted amendment, as I call it, there will be relief to the extent of about $70,000,000. Under my amendment the relief will amount to about $225,000,000, and 45,000 of the beneficiaries will be small businessmen who are under the $25,000 bracket. That is what I wanted to say. I am not asking for a roll call. I should like to have a voice vote, because now we have made some headway. The amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, of course, has given the small businessmen $70,000,000 of relief, and the Senate Small Business Committee membership appreciates that. But this is the original amendment I offered for the relief of the 45,000 businessmen of this country, to whom we think relief should be given so that they may proceed with their business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, just a word of final explanation, since the Senator from Nebraska has made his statement.

Under the amendment which I have submitted, and which has now been approved by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the relief will be confined to groups in the lower brackets, whereas the relief under the substitute proposed by the Senator from Nebraska would run through the entire list.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have this final word, then, that, based upon the evidence taken, it is my opinion that the amendment I have offered would affect 95 percent of the small businessmen. It would of course give the relief to big business as well, but what is a $25,000 exemption to hundreds of large corporations which have tremendous earnings? My amendment reaches 95 percent of those asking relief under the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The chair is of opinion that the Senate must now recur to the commitee amendment on page 30.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am on my feet to ask that we return to the committee amendment on pages 38 and 39.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that that portion proposed to be inserted on page 39, lines 8 to 16, be omitted, and that the amendment thus modified be agreed to. This is necessary in view of the adoption of the amendment just approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that the amendment which was adopted limits the exemption to $25,000 except to insurance companies, as to which it is limited to $50,000?

Mr. GEORGE. The existing law applies to insurance companies. This amendment does not refer to insurance companies. The amendment just approved, offered by the Senator from Michigan, clearly declares that no excess-profits-paying corporation shall have a total excess-profits credit and specific exemption of less than $25,000 before the imposition of excess-profits taxes.

Mr. MAYBANK. And it is for 1945?

Mr. GEORGE. It applies to 1945. Of course, already we have provided for a flat 25 percent special exemption, beginning in 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendments have all been acted on. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send a motion to the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the motion.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report it back with the recommendation that the Senate agree to the House provision relating to the excess-profits taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. Wages or salaries paid in contravention of the Stabilization Act of 1942.

(a) In general: Section 5 (a) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That in no case shall the amount so disregarded exceed such part of such wage or salary payment as is in excess of the part thereof that could have been paid without contravening such regulations."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be effective as of October 2, 1942.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the amendment is intended to correct and would correct one of the most vicious and deterring practices now affecting American business. During the war every time we were asked to grant authority respecting regulations, under the guise of winning the war, authority was granted freely and with a great deal of generosity. In the Stabilization Act we provided two penalties. There is a criminal penalty at the end of the act for willful violation, and there is another penalty which, stated in simple language, is that wherever any employer raises the wages of his employees above the amount allowed by the regulations of the various regulating bodies the Treasury can deny the employer not only the right to deduct for income-tax purposes the increase in wages but the total wages paid to the employees.

For instance, if a restaurant had 10 employees, and was paying them at the rate of 40 cents an hour, and raised the wages to 50 cents an hour, the Treasury now has the authority to say to it, "You have no right to deduct nor will we allow you to deduct any of the wages paid to any of those employees during the entire time that you increased the wages."

The amendment merely provides for correcting the law and limiting the Treasury, the National Labor Relations Board, and the War Labor Board so they may no longer continue to harass the thousands of employers of small numbers of employees by asking for their books and charging them with having violated the law. They do not charge such employers with having willfully violated the law, under which they can be penalized criminally, but they threaten the little businessman and say, "You violated the law, and if you do not make a settlement we will recommend to the Treasury that it disallow all the wages you have paid to all your employees to date during all the time you are supposed to have been a violator." If such action were carried to the limit under this law the Government could absolutely bankrupt business after business in this country. The situation is fraught with danger. Businessmen are driven to certain adjusters who tell them what they can do.

The amendment simply provides that if one unknowingly violates the law the Treasury can deprive him only of the right to deduct the amount of increase in wages which he did not have the right to make.

If one willfully violates the law he can be fined and put in prison.

But we ought to start now to do away with the vicious practices of these muddling bureaus which are endeavoring to keep themselves alive, and are harassing people and collecting punitive taxes in a way in which they have no right to collect taxes as such.

This is the first chance I have had to present such a measure, and I ask the Senate to accept the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words on this question. The rule of the Treasury Department which permits it to disallow as a tax deductible the full amount which any employer may have paid to an employee inadvertently, possibly against the rules and regulations of the War Labor Board, is a very vicious and a very dangerous thing. It simply means that if

one were employing 100 persons and he raised their wages 5 cents an hour without the permission of the War Labor Board, the Treasury Department could, under its present rules, disallow for income-tax purposes, the entire amount the employer paid those 100 individuals from the time he increased their wages. Let us suppose that was 3 years ago, and that the employer paid the 100 individuals an average of $2,000 a year, which would be $200,000 a year, or $600,000 in all, the Treasury Department can disallow $600,000 as a tax deductible and that might in many instances bankrupt employers.

I could have used for an illustration 10 employees as well as 100. I could have used 10,000 as well as 100. I use 100 as an example. This is a very vicious thing. I do not think it was ever intended by Congress that the Treasury Department should go to the extent and to the extreme they have gone. Many little businesses, such as restaurants, hotels, and other service business of all kinds are not in a position to know exactly what the law is. They are not in a position to subscribe to the services which are available to the larger employers. There is no doubt in my mind that there are literally thousands of them who have raised some poor man's or woman's wages without first securing the consent of the War Labor Board.

Under the act and under the rules of the Treasury Department Government officials are obligated to go through the country and audit the books of every man in business to see whether or not he raised the wages of some poor fellow or some woman, and if they find that he has done so and did not secure permission from the War Labor Board, then they must disallow the total amount the employer has paid that employee or those employees from the day he began to pay them, and that runs into literally thousands and thousands of dollars. The result is that there is not a single employer in the United States who knows where he stands. He does not know when someone is going to come in and audit his books and find that he made some little mistake.

Mr. President, all that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and I are asking by this amendment is that employers who unknowingly have violated the law or the War Labor Board's ruling be penalized only to the extent of the raise they have given; not to the full extent of the full wage or the full salary which was paid an employee or employees.

Mr. President, there cannot be any objection to this proposal. The Treasury Department informed us that they have the right to do what we have been describing; that they have the right to disallow the full amount, but that they are not availing themselves of that right, and they are using good judgment. Evidently they recognize the unfairness of the rule and the act. Therefore, I strongly urge that the Senate agree to the amendment in order that the hundreds of thousands of businessmen in this Nation may know exactly where they stand and what the penalty will be in case they unknowingly violate the law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think this amendment deserves much more careful consideration in the Senate of the United States than it is going to receive if we consider it in connection with the tax bill. I happen to be one who believes that the administrative and enforcement procedure in the so-called penalty cases deserves some very careful review. Unquestionably some legislation should be passed correcting some of the abuses that exist in the so-called illegal wage-penalty cases. But I want to point out that legislation of this type, as encompassed in this amendment, ought to be very carefully considered by way of committee hearings. An appropriate committee should give close attention to it, and representatives of the Government agencies involved, as well as citizen groups, should have an opportunity to present both sides of the question to the Senate.

Mr. President, I want to point out that wage stabilization legislation was passed by the Congress in order to meet a very critical war need. There are many thousands of employers in this country who kept faith with the Congress of the United States, who abided by the language of the legislation which was perfectly clear if one would read it. These law-abiding employers were greatly handicapped during the war by the illegal actions of some employers—and they were not all small employers. Mr. President, this amendment is going to benefit some big chiselers, some big employers in this country who did not keep faith with their Government during the war when it came to living up to the wage policies of this Government.

Take, for example, in my own State, the fine record of most of the great lumber companies. Most of the lumber concerns in my State were very scrupulous in seeing to it that they abided by the wage policies of this Government during the war. Yet they were constantly having their men stolen and chiseled away from them by so-called gypo operators who now, if this amendment is agreed to, will profit from their violation of the wage stabilization program during the war. Such violators will, as a matter of course, plead that they did not willfully violate the law and it will be difficult to convict them at this late date under the criminal provisions of the law.

Mr. President, there are some things at stake in connection with this amendment which should cause the Senate to go slow on such legislation as this. I repeat, the whole problem should be considered by an appropriate committee of the Senate. We should not adopt it by way of a so-called rider on the tax bill. I think that would be most unfair to a large number of patriotic American employers who did not see fit to take advantage of the wage stabilization program by paying illegal wages. Perhaps penalties now imposed are too great but we should not attempt here to determine what changes, if any, should be made. I can tell the Senate that the penalty now objected to was in and of itself very effective in causing many employers to stay in line during the war. Let me also say that not only were conscientious and loyal employers damaged during the war by other employers who wished to steal manpower and who resorted to illegal wages, but a great many responsible labor leaders were greatly handicapped in maintaining discipline because some of their rank and file would say to them, "Another union is getting by with a wage increase with such-and-such an employer. Why don't you go out and get one for us from the Weyerhaeuser Lumber Co. or General Motors?"—or some other great employer who was trying to live up to the war provisions of our wage stabilization program. I know of many instances in which labor leaders told their men that they would not approve of labor pressure for illegal wages.

I, too, protest abuses of enforcement. I know that there is probably too much arbitrary action in regard to the procedures which are being followed in applying the penalties. However, I believe that we would be false to our obligations to law abiding American employers if we were now, without more consideration than this opportunity provides us, to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois. I believe that he ought to present the amendment in the form of a bill. It ought to be referred to a committee for hearings; and then, after careful deliberation, we should decide, first, what procedures need to be changed in applying the penalties, and what, if anything, ought to be changed in regard to the penalties themselves.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to add a word to what has already been said by the Senator from Oregon. In order that we may understand what this amendment proposes, it might be well to read section 5 (a) of the Stabilization Act of 1942:

> No employer shall pay, and no employee shall receive, wages or salaries in contravention of the regulations promulgated by the President under this act. The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any wage or salary payment made in contravention of such regulation shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purpose of any other law or regulation.

Of course, every industry and every employer in the United States had notice of that law, and no one could plead ignorance of the law, because it did not become effective until after it was enacted. Widespread discussion of the penalty provisions of the Stabilization Act was such as to apprise every employer in the United States as to what his rights were.

Following the terms of that law, the President issued certain regulations. One of the regulations, issued through the Treasury Department, was that the amount of excess wages paid in contravention of the section which I have just read should not be considered as costs in the production of articles, which costs might be deducted in the matter of taxes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The order was not limited to excess wages. The order applied to the original wages paid, plus the excess wages. That is what we are objecting to.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was by way of penalty for violation of the law. The President had the right to issue such regulations. The penalty provisions were inserted in the act after long hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which dealt with the Price Stabilization Act. It seems rather inappropriate here, at the conclusion of an interim tax bill, without any consideration even by the Committee on Finance, which has never dealt with the subject of prices, to ask the Senate to agree to an amendment of this kind without any consideration whatever by any committee of the Senate.

Hearings are now in progress before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the OPA situation. I suppose the subject will be gone into exhaustively. Mr. Bowles appeared yesterday and testified. I believe he is coming back tomorrow. Several Senators have advised the committee that they expect to cross-examine him at considerable length with respect to the operations of the OPA. I do not know that this particular section will be involved.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that while this provision is in the Stabilization Act, I doubt very much if such a measure could originate in the Senate, because it seems to me clearly to be revenue legislation. If the House should choose to raise the question I do not believe that such legislation could originate in the Senate. So I think we are forced to put it in some tax bill. I do not remember the exact provision contained in the Stabilization Act, but I know that the enforcement is being done by the Treasury Department. It is not being done by the OPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand.

Mr. TAFT. The officers who are checking up on everyone are Treasury officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is being done under regulations which the President was authorized, in the section which I have read, to promulgate. He is acting through the Treasury Department.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Undoubtedly it was contemplated by the language of the act that the President had the right to issue regulations prescribing the extent to which any of these payments could be made or accepted, or given any legal effect by any of the departments of the Government. This happens to be a regulation in which the Treasury Department is involved.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. Not only is the Treasury involved but the War Labor Board is using the Treasury as an additional weapon to search the books of small companies and keep the Investigating Division of the War Labor Board alive.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as deductions from taxes are concerned, the War Labor Board, as well as the President, must operate through the Treasury. No other agency of the Government could determine whether a particular item of cost should be deducted in the payment of taxes. It must be done through the Treasury.

Mr. BROOKS. There is no set rule by which Government representatives operate in making adjustments. More than 15,000 cases are piled up in Chicago, and they are coming in every day. Investigators are swarming over the community and threatening employers on the basis that they will be denied deductions for the entire wages which they have paid for the whole time unless they make some adjustment. The Price Stabilization Act was not passed to raise revenue. It was for the purpose of holding the line.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course.

Mr. BROOKS. Now it is being used as a revenue-collecting device. The war is over, and the line has been held.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator realizes that if a company, in violation of the law, paid any wages it chose to pay, and then claimed a deuction in its taxes, the question of enforcement would be bound to be involved, and it could be handled only through the Treasury Department. It could not be handled by the OPA or the War Labor Board. They have no authority to determine what deductions may be allowed.

Mr. BROOKS. There is a criminal penalty for willful violation of the law. I am speaking about acts which are not willful.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's amendment would go all the way back to 1942 and permit deductions in cases involving violation of the law in contravention of regulations in regard to wages. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, one company would offer an inducement to take employees away from other companies by paying larger wages than it was entitled to pay under the regulations issued by the President. Under the terms of the Senator's amendment such penalties would be forgiven, and deductions from taxes would be allowed back to 1942.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Even if the pending amendment were adopted, there would still be two penalties for those who willfully violated the President's directive. There would be the penalty of disallowing as deductions for tax purposes the increased wages which were paid, plus the criminal penalty in the act itself, of $1,000 fine and 1 year in jail. I believe we are correct in assuming that at the moment the Treasury Department and the War Labor Board are auditing the books of literally hundreds—and perhaps thousands—of small businessmen as well as large businessmen. They can continue to do so, and they should do so; but my position—and I believe it should be the position of every other Senator—is that, now that the war is over and the line has been held, Government agencies should not be permitted to say to an employer, whether he be a large businessman or a small businessman, "At some time or other during the past 5 years when you were busy making war materials, working under the pressure of war and patriotism, with every employee working for you asking for a wage increase and threatening to leave you if he did not receive it, you paid some of your employees—10 or 1,000—wages in excess of those allowed under the regulations, and we are going to disallow the total amount of wages which you paid those employees during the entire period."

I say that such a thing is vicious, and that it should be stopped. I do not believe that it was ever the intention of a single Senator or a single Member of the House that the Treasury Department should use the tool which the President of the United States placed in its hands in any such a manner. The authority was placed in the Treasury Department by the President, not by the Congress. The President issued the directive.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President could not have done it without authority of Congress. The authority is specific, in the section which I have read.

I wish merely to say this——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment.

The whole policy of Congress with regard to the Stabilization Act and the OPA will shortly come up for consideration. The law expires on the 30th of next June, unless it is extended. The committee which had charge of this legislation will hold hearings on it and go into the subject thoroughly. What will happen, I do not now predict. I do not know what the Congress will be willing to do. However, it seems to me rather odd that the Senate should be asked, on the basis of an ex parte statement by one or two Senators, to change a fundamental law dealing with the stabilization situation. It is true that the war is over. As soon as the news of the armistice reached a soldier who was in the Army in World War I, he started home. Just then another soldier said to him, "Where are you going?"

He said, "I am going home."

The other soldier said, "You have not been discharged."

The soldier who was leaving said, "I enlisted for the war, and the war is over, and I am going."

The other soldier said, "You enlisted for the duration of the war; and while the war is over, the duration has just started!"

Mr. President, now the war is over; the fighting has stopped. But the question of inflation and holding the line and preventing spirals and skyrocketing of prices such as those which occurred after the last war, has just begun. We cannot afford to release the controls and the authority which have been established in behalf of our entire economy. It seems to me that action on this question should await the careful consideration of the committee having charge of the legislation and of the various governmental agencies involved, including the Treasury Department and the President. All of them should be given an opportunity to be heard, before we act upon the matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not believe this amendment has any relation whatever to holding the line against inflation. We are talking about something that has already happened, not about something that will happen in the future.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, so long as there is any law which undertakes to control prices, the agencies which are given jurisdiction and authority to hold the line, as we call it, or to hold down prices will have the same authority as that which they now have on the basis of the laws on the statute books, and the same authority they had when the war was in progress.

Mr. CAPEHART. But authority was given to raise wages without any penalty, provided such increases did not raise the cost of manufactured goods.

Mr. BARKLEY. I see no difference between the effect and operation of the law now and its effect and operation prior to the termination of hostilities. It is still the law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I should like to have a vote taken on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I share the view of the Senator from Kentucky. I do not think we should adopt legislation of this type by way of a rider on a tax bill without having an opportunity for a fair hearing being afforded. But I am impressed with how easy it is, apparently, for us to forget some of the dark days of 1942, 1943, and 1944, when we were bending all our efforts to see to it that our economy was stabilized, so that it would be useful in enabling us successfully to prosecute the war.

When this type of penalty was being considered by the Government, there was brought to bear upon the matter the advice and counsel of some of the great industrialists of America. One will look in vain to find a single dissent among the authorized representatives of industry on the War Labor Board when it came to the question of carrying out the penalties of the act, because we had the experience of the last World War to guide us. During the last World War we had a war labor board, but that board, headed by the great William Howard Taft, had not been given the necessary authority to enable it to see to it that its policies and decrees were enforced. That board had some unfortunate experiences with persons who defied its decrees. For example, the moment the armistice was signed, the great steel industry refused to carry out one of Mr. Taft's decisions, and then he issued the very historic pronouncement in which, in effect, he said, "Would that I had judicial power to enforce this decree."

We do not wish to have a repetition of that experience immediately after this war. If that were to occur, people who had violated the Government's stabilization policies then would come forward and would say, "Well, the war is over now, and we do not think we ought to be held responsible for committing acts which were not in the interest of the successful prosecution of the war."

These matters involve questions of fact, Mr. President; and we cannot determine questions of fact on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I say that if we adopt this amendment, we shall be giving a bonus to some vicious war chiselers who did not live up to their responsibilities when the very future of this country was at stake—chiselers who were more interested in profit dollars than they were in maintaining a stabilized economy during the war.

I will join any Member of the Senate in seeing to it that abusive procedures, if they exist on the part of the War Labor Board, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or any other agency or department of Government, are corrected, so that American citizens may receive a fair hearing. But I think it is most unfair to thousands of people in this country who have lived up to their obligations to the United States under the Stabilization Act, now to come along with an amendment which would relieve from their responsibility, in large measure, a great many persons who ought to have the penalty applied to them.

All I am pleading for is that we may have a full and fair hearing on these procedures, so that we may obtain the facts, and not now undertake to say that we will modify, by way of this amendment, the penalties which the Government felt it necessary to apply when we were in a very serious situation, if we were to have any enforcement at all of our stabilization program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

I have nothing further to say, and I should like to have a vote taken on the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to say that, after listening to the Senator from Oregon, one would think that the proposal was to eliminate all penalties. Again I wish to call attention to the fact that the penalty regarding the amount of wage paid above the wage which the employer was paying prior to the raise is still in force, as well as a $1,000 fine and a penalty of 2 years in jail. As I have said, to listen to the able Senator from Oregon, one would think the proposal was to eliminate all penalties.

I do not subscribe to the view that hundreds and thousands of small businesses in this country should be penalized by the Treasury Department in order to reach a few who have willfully disobeyed the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator have a copy of the regulation about which he is complaining, under which he says thousands of cases are piled up in the office; or does any Senator have a copy of the regulation?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not have a copy of it, but I have copies of the complaints which have come to me in great number, and I have a copy of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I, too, have a copy of the law; but it seems to me that someone who is complaining about a regulation should have the regulation here. I do not even know whether the regulation does what it is claimed that it does.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is there any question in the Senator's mind that the President did issue a regulation in respect to this matter?

Mr. BARKLEY. He issued a regulation, but I should like to see it. I should like to see what it says.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is there any question in the Senator's mind that the regulation did prescribe as a penalty that all the wages paid by—

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; there is a question in my mind about it, and I should like to see the regulation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me suggest that the Senator ask Mr. Stam, who is sitting at his left, and no doubt he will correct the Senator and will tell him——

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to consult with Mr. Stam about it, but the regulation itself would be the best evidence.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say that one difficulty is that it takes 3 days to find a regulation; so many of them have been issued by the War Labor Board and by the President in relation to the matter of wage fixing.

I think I was as active as any other Member of the Senate in connection with the enactment of the Anti-Inflation Act, the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942. I sat through all the committee hearings, and I sat through all the debate which occurred in the Senate of the United States. So far as I know, this particular section was never called to the attention of anyone. It was never debated in the Senate. If it had been, I doubt very much whether it would have been enacted in a form which would justify the present regulations.

This provision says:

> No employer shall pay, and no employee shall receive, wages or salaries in contravention of the regulations promulgated by the President under this act. The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any wage or salary payment made in contravention of such regulations shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

I think a hasty reading of the act will suggest to anyone that what they were proposing to disallow as an income-tax deduction was an excessive payment made in violation of the law, not payments of $20 a week, when only $15 a week should have been paid. I do not think that was the intention of the act, as I read it. I see how it is possible to take advantage of its terms to issue a regulation disallowing the entire wage paid to someone, a small part of which wage is excessive.

So, I do not believe the Senate ever considered this policy, and I do not believe the Government of the United States deliberately, as has been referred to, ever enacted this policy or intended to enact this policy into law. It is one of those provisions, at best, which is intended to permit, by acting under one law, an effort to enforce some provision of another law.

That is a procedure of which I have never approved. In effect, it is government by blackmail; by threatening to impose the penalty provided under one

law, a man is forced to comply with another law.

So far as I am concerned, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois had been offered on the floor when that act was under consideration, prior to its passage, I certainly would have voted for it. I had no idea that the act justified such a regulation as the one which has been promulgated.

If, as the Senator from Kentucky suggests, no such regulation has been promulgated, then no harm can be done by adopting this particular amendment. If there is any vicious chiseler, certainly the vicious chiseler can be reached under the criminal provisions of the law.

So, it seems to me it is a matter which can be properly corrected. If it is not corrected here, I do not see that it can ever be corrected until another tax bill comes to the Senate from the House of Representatives. I believe it should be corrected at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection let me say that it could be corrected when another stabilization act is brought to the Senate or when an extension of the OPA law is enacted, if one is. I am advised that there has been a modification of the regulation. That shows the difficulty in trying to legislate here blindly, without having the regulation before us so that we can see what the President actually did or what he authorized the Director of Economic Stabilization to do. As I understand, there has been a modification of the original order, but not knowing what the original order was, I do not know what the modification was. That does not shed much light on the subject.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, before a vote is taken I wish it to be definitely understood that I represented no chiselers when I offered the amendment. I wish it to be definitely understood that it has been stated today by representatives of the Treasury Department that the Department has the right to deny as a tax deduction every dollar which was paid to every employee for the full period it was paid. It is therefore the right of the Government, under this act, literally to bankrupt company after company. Such power is too vicious to place in the hands of any man making an investigation. This power was granted during the period of the war; now is the time to take it back.

I ask for a vote upon my amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, before a vote is taken, I wish to say that we were informed by officials of the Treasury Department only this afternoon that it may modify the rule so that hereafter it will charge as a penalty only the increase and not the total wage paid. So the Treasury Department itself has modified the rule. That is all the more reason why the Senate should adopt this amendment. The Treasury Department may change its mind within a couple of weeks or 30 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Briggs	Huffman	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Knowland	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capehart	McCarran	Taylor
Capper	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McMahon	Tunnell
Connally	Magnuson	Tydings
Cordon	Maybank	Vandenberg
Donnell	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Mitchell	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Morse	Wilson
George	Murdock	Young
Gerry	Murray	
Green	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the matter before the vote is taken.

I do not desire to argue the question, because I do not know anything about it. Until today I never heard of the complaint to which reference has been made.

I will say to my friends that I do not believe that the method which has been proposed is a proper method of legislating. If the abuse to which reference has been made exists, there is afforded to us an opportunity to correct it, and I would be one of the first to try to correct it. If the Treasury Department is permitting its field employees to terrorize taxpayers, it is something which should be stopped, and stopped immediately.

There is a bill pending before the Banking and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction over price-control legislation. There is a tax bill at this very hour in the Finance Committee. It is already here.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know of any bill dealing with the Stabilization Act, or any likelihood that there will be one before the 1st of next July.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that the committee is conducting investigations in regard to the matter.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand there is any bill dealing with the Stabilization Act.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no bill specifically pending before the Banking and Currency Committee of the character to which the Senator has referred. The committee is holding hearings, but there will have to be a bill presented long before next July. In fact, it will be before the committee soon after the first of the year, and Congress will have to determine whether it will allow the Stabilization Act to expire next June.

Mr. TAFT. The trouble in connection with those matters is that such bills are not taken up until just before the 30th of June. We will at least be postponing the matter for 8 months if we wait for any further action.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I regret being compelled to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. I would not do so under any circumstances if the facts had been developed during the hearing, and there had been opportunity to know precisely what is being done. I do not condone at all any terroristic methods which may have been employed on the part of the Treasury Department, or any of its employees.

There is another reason. We are wasting time, because the House would not accept this amendment. This bill was confined to certain rates. Already we have gone beyond the House on some matters which were remotely connected with the House program. In conference it would be a mere matter of taking the amendment and throwing it out.

There is a bill pending before the Finance Committee which at least deals with taxes and deductions of taxes. The bill will be considered very shortly. If the facts alleged shall be developed, with an opportunity on the part of officials of the Government to have a hearing on the subject, I would be among the very first to act, and I would not only remove this penalty, but put many limitations upon the penalties it may be in their power to enforce. Without regard to the merits of the matter, I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to concur fully in what the Senator from Georgia has said. Reading section 5 (a) I have very great doubt whether the President or the War Labor Board, or any other agency could issue a regulation going beyond the refusal to allow a deduction for the illegal excess in wages. But we have not been able to hear from the Treasury.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not have the floor.

Mr. BROOKS. Would not the Senator take the word of his adviser on taxes to the extent that the Treasury says they have the right, but they have not been enforcing it? Why can we not have an understanding of what the law is?

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to suggest, in accordance with what the Senator from Georgia has said, that there is before the Committee on Finance a tax bill which has come over from the House and which is going to receive prompt and early consideration. I think the committee and the Senate are entitled to have the Treasury or any other agency come before it and make a showing, or at least explain their actions, so that we may proceed intelligently.

In view of my doubt about whether they can go beyond the illegal excess, if I find unequivocally that to be true, I shall join in having the law modified so as to make it impossible; but I do not like

to be asked to vote on an ex parte presentation of a matter in the circumstances described by the Senator from Georgia, when we know what will happen to the amendment. There is no virtue in merely agreeing to an amendment in order that someone might get it in the bill, and then have it go to conference to be thrown out the window. I should like to have the Treasury or the War Labor Board or any other agency that is doing what is charged come before the committee and explain why it is doing it, and why it assumes to think it has authorit. to do it.

Mr. BROOKS. If the distinguished majority leader finds that the Treasury or the War Labor Board have done this, will he join in limiting their power to do it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, that is my present feeling. I want to be sure they are doing it—not that I doubt the sincerity of any Senator, but, as I said, the best proof is to have the witnesses who know the facts testify.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think that since the call has been made for a quorum I should explain to Senators what the amendment means.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator knows that would lead to a counter explanation.

Mr. BROOKS. I think this matter is sufficiently important to justify the Senate's acting, so that if the amendment shall be adopted, even if it is not agreed to in conference, the War Labor Board and the Treasury will know how the Senate feels, that we did not intend to give them the right, merely because some employer raised the wages of his employees unwillfully, to refuse to deduct for tax purposes any part of the wages the employer paid.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have a description of the state of mind of any employer who raised the wages of his employees unwillingly or unwillfully.

Mr. BROOKS. Unwillfully.

Mr. BARKLEY. Every employer knows when he raises his employees' wages. Every employer is advised as to what the law is, and while there may have been some here and there who raised wages without knowing exactly what they were doing, I think on the whole most of them knew, when they raised them above the provisions of the law, they did it in violation of the law.

Mr. BROOKS. If they did it willfully, in violation of the law, they can be put in jail for 1 year and can be fined a thousand dollars, but we should not have them continually being threatened with bankruptcy merely because they violated the law, if it is not proven that they did it willfully. That is what this amendment is aimed at.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Kentucky, let me say that some very small concerns in my State figured that under the Little Steel formula they were allowed to raise wages as much as 15 percent, and they did so in some cases, and have been criticized since by the War Labor Board. So there was a valid excuse for some man feeling in all sincerity he was within the law when he believed he was acting within the law. Some went along 3 or 4 years, and now the War Labor Board agents come along and say, "You did thus and so, and you are subject to this much fine."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, much has been said in the discussion about willful violations of the law and unwillful violations, and as to the penalty which may be imposed in the former cases, and what perhaps should be imposed in the latter.

There may be some question as to just what the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois accomplishes. Am I correct in understanding the Senator from Illinois to say that his amendment provides that in any case where an employer pays wages in excess of the amount set by the Presidential directive under the terms of section 5 (a) of the act mentioned, the excess may be disregarded as an expense item in the tax return for that year?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. And that is true whether it be intentional or unintentional?

Mr. BROOKS. Certainly, intentional or unintentional.

Mr. CORDON. So that if the amendment offered be agreed to, as of October 2, 1942, to date, every employer who paid wages in excess of the amount he was lawfully entitled to pay under the Presidential order may be required to eliminate from his tax deductions all such excess over the legal rate he might have paid, so that that would be a total loss to him in each instance?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The only thing the amendment does then, as I understand, is to say to the employer that as to the amount which he might have legally paid he may deduct that in any instance, but he may not deduct the excess?

Mr. BROOKS. That is exactly correct.

Mr. CORDON. Let me make one more observation, and I shall be through. I call attention, then, to the law itself, and I particularly address the Senator from Illinois. Section 5 (a), to which the amendment is offered as an amendment, provides:

> No employer shall pay and no employee shall receive wages or salaries in contravention of the regulations promulgated by the President under this Act.

I call particular attention to this language:

> The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any wage or salary payment made in contravention of such regulations shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other departmental agencies.

That language would seem to me clearly to authorize the President to make any provision he desired as to the amount of money paid in excess of the legal amount, but a casual reading certainly would not give the impression, and I doubt if a careful reading would cause anyone to reach the conclusion, that that language was intended to provide in any case where an employer made a payment of a dollar over the amount he was entitled to pay, that by virtue of that excess payment of a dollar every other dollar which might otherwise be paid should become tainted and subject to that formula. I cannot believe the law was intended to mean that; and I am for the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I now have the executive order or directive which the able Senator from Kentucky asked for a few moments ago. I shall be very happy to read it, though I do not think it is necessary to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the Senator read it.

Mr. CAPEHART. It reads:

> WAGE AND SALARY PAYMENTS IN CONTRAVENTION OF THE WAGE AND SALARY LIMITATIONS
>
> Section 29.28 (a)—16 of Regulations 111 (26 C. F. R., Cum., Supp., pt. 29) is amended to read as follows:
>
> Section 29.23 (a)—16. Wage and salary payments in contravention of wage and salary limitations not deductible: In any case in which it is certified to the Commissioner, by an administering agency authorized to act in accordance with section 4001.15 of the regulations of the Economic Stabilization Director (32 C. F. R., Cum. Supp., pt. 4001) as amended, that a wage or salary payment for which a deduction would otherwise be allowable has been made in contravention of the act of October 2, 1942—

That is the act we are now asking be amended—

> entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes" (56 Stat. 765-768; 50 U. S. C., App., Supp., secs. 961-971) as amended, or of the regulations, orders or rulings promulgated thereunder, the entire amount of such payment shall be disallowed as a deduction and not merely an amount representing the increase or decrease made in such wage or salary in contravention of such act or regulations, orders, or rulings promulgated thereunder, except that if the administering agency in the light of extenuating circumstances determines and certifies to the Commissioner that a lesser amount of such payment be disallowed as a deduction, ther only such lesser amount shall be disallowed as a deduction. Such a payment will not be allowed for this purpose notwithstanding that the same payment is also disallowed (a) for the purpose of determining costs or expenses of an employer for the purpose of some other law or regulation, either heretofore or hereafter promulgated, including the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or any maximum price regulation thereof; or (b) for the purpose of determining costs or expenses under any contract made by or on behalf of the United States.

That is the Executive order issued by the President and published in the Federal Register under date of March 21, 1945.

I likewise have before me the Federal Register of Thursday, October 29, 1942, in which is likewise published a similar directive or Executive order.

I again desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that today the Treasury Department made the statement that they realize they have the power, under the directive which I have just read, to do the things we have been talking about. But recently they have modified their ruling, and they say that hereafter they are only going to assess a fine or disallow that portion of the wages above the amount the employer was formerly paying before he gave the raise. In other words, the Treasury Department recognizes the viciousness of this Executive order, yet we know that

Government officials are today traveling all over the United States checking up on hundreds of small businesses and large businesses and trying to find out whether at some time or other during the last 4 years they overpaid some employee, and then they are threatening to disallow the total amount the employer paid to that employee as a tax deductible.

Mr. President, that is a vicious thing, and I urge that the amendment be adopted, in view of the fact that the Treasury Department itself admits that it must be wrong.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I should like the Senator to tell us under what provision of law the directive was issued.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the Stabilization Act of 1942.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall make only a brief additional comment or two, but I do want the RECORD to show that I think this debate itself is ample proof of the undesirability of passing legislation in this manner. There are a great many facets to this question. Most of us who want the subject discussed at greater length are somewhat hesitant to take the time of the Senate now because of the importance of getting the tax bill itself passed. However, we think we should go into the detail of this question if we really are to inform the Senate fully as to the problems raised by this amendment. Nevertheless I shall not take the time now, but I think there are a couple of signal points which should be mentioned in the closing moments of this debate.

The comment has been made that if the amendment is adopted then the tax penalty will be imposed as of the amount of wages paid in excess of the legalized amount. But those who make that argument have overlooked the operative facts that were before the Government at the time the wage-stabilization program was adopted. Let me stress this point, that in those days, with the shortage of manpower that faced American industry, it was possible to get hundreds and thousands of men to leave one industry and go to another for a wage increase as little as from 2 to 3 cents an hour. In fact for many months the wage increases authorized by the War Labor Board under the various criteria that the Board was permitted to apply, as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] knows, averaged around two and a half cents an hour. That is all we allowed on the average for a long period of months.

I want to point out, Mr. President, that if the amendment is adopted we will find a great many instances in which it was highly profitable for an employer to pay an illegal wage increase of 2½ or 3 cents or 4 cents or even 5 cents an hour and get the advantage of the profits that accrued to him from his being able to pirate labor away from competitors at that rate and only run the financial risk of having the illegal wage increase disallowed for tax calculating purposes.

So from the President Executive order after Executive order came down authorizing hold the line procedures and penalties. The Congress certainly itself approved of drastic penalties at the time. At least it took no steps to modify the law or check the Executive orders providing for drastic penalties.

What I want to point out is that I do not think we should now say to those employers who paid these illegal wages, "We are going to make your unlawful conduct profitable for you because the illegal wage that you paid"——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I again wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the able Senator from Oregon would like to leave the impression that under the amendment we have offered there is no penalty. There are still two penalties. No. 1 represents the excess that the employer paid, and No. 2 is the penalty under the Criminal Code, which provides for fine of $1,000 and imprisonment in jail for 2 years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am well aware of those penalties, and I was about to address myself to them, in fact, I was just closing my discussion of the first penalty and pointing out, and I want to make my view clear to the Senator from Indiana, that the application of that penalty as it relates to the wages in excess of the legal limit would in many, many cases not be a penalty at all. Such would be the result, because by being able to pirate workers and get workers away from law-abiding employers for a small wage increase the employer could well afford to have those wages disallowed from his tax calculations and still make a great profit on his illegal act.

Let us now go into the criminal statute. I am sure I do not have to explain to the lawyers in the Senate that it is, of course, one thing under a civil action to be able to show that someone violated the law and to apply a malum prohibitum penalty but it is quite a different thing to prove a "mens re" and show a criminal intent or a willful intention to act criminally. We know that the application of criminal statutes in this field of human endeavor results in very few convictions. I think the Government was well aware of that when it used this rather drastic civil remedy. And so to say "Well, there is a criminal statute which you can apply," I think in effect begs the question insofar as the enforcement of any penalty is concerned, because by and large it is not going to result in very many criminal prosecutions or convictions.

It seems to me that we must keep this procedural problem in mind. The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Indiana may be surprised to know it, but I find myself in agreement with them on one phase of the problem. The enforcement procedure used by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the War Labor Board in connection with this law raises the same problem which I have mentioned in connection with a great many other agencies, such as the OPA. I have said on this floor on several occasions that I think it is of great importance that we as a Congress review the enforcement procedure of such agencies to see to it that capricious and arbitrary action is not perpetrated upon the people of this country. I will join with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Indiana in a review of the practices being applied in the enforcement even of this penalty, but I point out to those Senators that, of course, they are not going to prevent by their amendment the survey of the books of American business. If the Bureau of Internal Revenue carries out its legal obligation, it will continue to go into every office and plant in this country and make the determination as to whether or not the employer paid wages which were illegal, if cause is shown as to why the books ought to be investigated. So that harassing experience so far as American employers are concerned will continue under the amendment of the Senator from Illinois just as it will continue if the amendment is not adopted.

What I am interested in is seeing to it that the practices which are being adopted by some of these agencies—the term "blackmail" has been used—in forcing compromises upon American employers and businessmen without a fair judicial hearing is stopped.

In times past I have raised objection to certain practices of the OPA, and I have suggested on the floor of the Senate, and now repeat, that I think we ought to demand a procedure under which, after the Government representatives make their findings of fact from the books, they will not seek to coerce the employer or the businessman to accept a compromise which they propose. Rather they will be required to go before a judicial officer in that community, make their findings of fact known to him, and have him pass judgment on the fairness and reasonableness of the compromise proposal. That is an entirely different question, Mr. President, and yet it seems to me that it is involved in the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois and is the basis to the objections of those who have received complaints in regard to the enforcement of the penalty we are discussing.

I close with this statement: I believe that the ramifications and implications of the amendment are such that, in fairness to many businessmen who kept full faith with our wage and economic stabilization program, we should not attempt to legislate in this way.

I repeat—and I believe that those who know me know that my word is good—that I will join with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Indiana in an investigation of the practices and procedures which are being applied in carrying out the penalties now invoked. But I am not going to vote here, on the basis of anything that has been said this afternoon, that every employer in the United States who took advantage of the wage stabilization program of the Government and paid illegal wages in order to pirate workers away from others should be penalized only to the extent that the wages which he paid in excess of the wages allowed by the Stabilization Act shall be disallowed for tax calculation purposes. If employers had

known that that was to be the penalty, many more employers would have been found paying illegal wages, because they could have pirated men away from other employers at a wage increase so small as to have made it highly profitable to them to pay a wage increase of 2, 3, 4, or 5 cents, and have it ignored in their tax collections.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] who is necessarily absent. Not being advised as to how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent because of deaths in their families.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent attending the Food and Agriculture Conference in Quebec.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]; and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who is one of the members of the Senate delegation to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Conference at Quebec, has been excused to attend its sessions.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—30

Austin	Ellender	Revercomb
Bailey	Ferguson	Robertson
Brooks	Gerry	Saltonstall
Buck	Gurney	Smith
Butler	Hart	Taft
Byrd	Hawkes	Vandenberg
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Wherry
Capper	Millikin	White
Cordon	Overton	Wilson
Eastland	Reed	Young

NAYS—32

Andrews	Knowland	Murdock
Barkley	La Follette	Murray
Briggs	Langer	O'Mahoney
Connally	McCarran	Radcliffe
Donnell	McKellar	Shipstead
George	McMahon	Taylor
Green	Magnuson	Tobey
Hill	Maybank	Tunnell
Hoey	Mead	Tydings
Huffman	Mitchell	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	

NOT VOTING—34

Aiken	Glass	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Russell
Bankhead	Hatch	Stewart
Bilbo	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lucas	Walsh
Carville	McClellan	Wheeler
Chandler	McFarland	Wiley
Chavez	Moore	Willis
Downey	Myers	
Fulbright	O'Daniel	

So Mr. BROOKS' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 56, at the end of line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 304. Paragraphs (a) (1), (a) (3), (a) (4), and (a) (6) of section 3406 of the Internal Revenue Code as enacted in the Revenue Act of 1941 are hereby repealed, effective July 1, 1946.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say that I am familiar with this amendment. While on its face it seems illogical, nevertheless, in view of the fact that the excise taxes may be opened up by the House conferees, it is felt desirable by the majority of the Finance Committee that we have the privilege of going into certain other excise taxes and examining them. This amendment is intended for that purpose, and it deals with certain excise taxes which certainly should be examined if there is to be any reduction of rates in any case.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say if the House of Representatives agrees to our amendments and eliminates any reduction of excise taxes, I would agree that this amendment also be eliminated. But, as the Senator from Georgia has said, I think it should be open in conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee a question relative to section 722 and the way it is being administered, especially in the States in my section of the country.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit us to vote on the Taft amendment? It does not affect section 722.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I shall withhold my remarks until a vote is taken on the Taft amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when Congress passed the excess-profits tax law, it was recognized that the two methods adopted for measuring excess profits—the invested-capital method and the earnings method—would be very inequitable to many corporate taxpayers. At the time when the law was under consideration, the people who lived in Nebraska and in the other neighboring drought States were very much disturbed over the fact that the base years under the earnings method for measuring normal profits were those of the 4-year period 1936-39. It was contended by those who paid their taxes that that was not a fair period of years over which to measure the profits which would accrue to corporations and on which to base the taxes to be paid under the excess-profits tax law.

I wish to point out to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I think more than 30,000 cases have been filed to obtain relief under section 722. There has been considerable confusion in the Treasury Department regarding whether relief will be granted to those who seek it under that section.

Mr. President, I have prepared a complete statement on the matter. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to go into the subject in detail at this time, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the statement which I hold in my hand, together with two exhibits which show the situation in which we in Nebraska find ourselves.

There being no objection, the statement and exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCESS-PROFITS-TAX RELIEF—SECTION 722 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

When Congress passed the excess-profits-tax law, it was recognized that the two methods adopted for measuring excess profits—the invested capital method and the earnings method—would be very inequitable to many corporate taxpayers. At the time

when the law was up for consideration, we folks who lived in Nebraska and in the other neighboring drought States were very much disturbed over the fact that the base years under the earnings method for measuring normal profits were those of the 4-year period 1936–39. Probably not many years in all our history come the farthest from measuring normal profits in our area than these 4 years. We, in our part of the country, knew that the drought had made it impossible for most corporations to make any money at all during these years. It is believed that the large proportions of corporations were actually losing money at this time and the average earnings for Nebraska corporations for 1936–39 is a loss rather than a profit; therefore, under the earnings method, any profit that it made is defined under the excess-profits-tax law "as excess profits."

When corporations in Nebraska are forced to use the invested capital method, they are very badly treated because the average small corporation in Nebraska does not make profit from the capital invested in its business but from the personal ability and efforts of the stockholders and managers. Eight percent of the invested capital of the Nebraska corporation is almost a negligible amount; also for large numbers of corporations in our area. Under the excess-profits-tax law we are bound to use one or two of these methods in measuring normal profits and are assessed the excess-profits-tax rates on all profits earned above these amounts after subtracting the specific exemption. As stated above, those interested in sound taxation, were much opposed to the use of the years 1936–39 as the base years, but when we found that the excess-profits-tax law included section 722, we felt that this provision of the law would result in equitable treatment for the average corporate taxpayer in our area. We were sure that the drought was an event contemplated under section 722 which would permit the average corporate taxpayer in Nebraska to reconstruct his base-year earnings under the law and thus justice would be done in the last analysis.

The excess-profits-tax law left the administration of section 722 to the Treasury Department. A special bulletin has been issued by the Treasury Department instructing revenue agents quite generally to deny all claims for relief due to the drought for all nonfarming taxpayers. This bulletin admits that we had a severe drought but will not admit that the average corporation suffered any because of the drought. The Bureau will grant relief to all farmers who paid an excess-profits tax but I have yet to find a farmer who is incorporated who could have paid an excess-profits tax. Therefore, any relief due to the drought has been for the most part eliminated by the instructions to internal-revenue agents who are administering the law.

The Treasury Department has a definite thumbs-down attitude toward section 722. At the present time there is a campaign on in Nebraska to collect from corporate taxpayers excess profits that have been held back under section 722 and taxpayers are instructed by revenue agents that their cases will have to be taken to The Tax Court if they care to insist upon any relief from these high excess-profits taxes.

I am quite sure that if a study were made, it would be found that corporations in Nebraska and the other drouth States have been paying out a much larger proportion of their income in taxes than corporations doing business in other parts of the country. The reason for this is that in the other parts of the country, earnings during the base years 1936 to 1939 were fair, normal, or above normal, so that corporations doing business in all areas other than the drouth States have favorable base-year earnings and their excess-profits tax payments are greatly reduced thereby.

It is my judgment that section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code provides all the relief that we should expect, provided this law can be administered by someone with a sympathetic point of view. If the average taxpayer could sit across the table from a fair-minded administrator it is probable that relief would be granted to taxpayers if they are rightly entitled to it under section 722.

If we are going to have to look to The Tax Court for relief provided for under section 722, then most of the corporations who now need the relief will be dead and buried before the relief so sorely needed reaches them. In all other tax matters, taxpayers have a right to appeal from the decisions of The Tax Court to the Supreme Court, if that is desired. The Tax Court is the exclusive body for hearing section 722 cases and their decisions are final. It is my opinion that there should be the same privilege of appeal from the decisions of The Tax Court in section 722 cases that exists in all other tax cases.

In all other tax matters the taxpayer has the privilege of paying the tax due and suing for a refund in a local district court. As I understand, there have been more than 30,000 claims for refund filed under section 722, and under the present buck-passing procedure of the Treasury Department most of these cases will have to be tried in The Tax Court. Why not open up the district courts for consideration of these cases? I am sure that a local judge will be much more familiar with the conditions in his own territory than is possible for members of The Tax Court to understand. And there might be better administration if section 722 cases were tried in the local district courts. At least taxpayers ought to have the privilege to try their cases there if they care to. And it would make it possible to speed up the decision of section 722 cases and clear the dockets of The Tax Court, which will be full for many years to come if the present practice of the Bureau of sending everything to The Tax Court is continued.

Several years ago the desirable practice of decentralizing income-tax investigations was instituted by the Internal Revenue Bureau. The local internal-revenue agents are best equipped to examine tax returns and especially section 722 claims. At the outset the local agents settled many section 722 cases, but when the settlements reached the central office in Washington, practically all cases were returned to the field agents with instructions to disallow the claims which they had previously allowed. This very bad administrative practice has worked against the interests of the taxpayers. The result has been that the local field agents have no desire to do anything but reject all section 722 claims. They cannot be criticized from Washington when they disallow a claim as they have been for allowing claims.

It is believed that the settlement of section 722 cases can best be reached in the field. When authority from Washington is adverse to this practice, it makes it almost impossible to administer the section 722 law with speed and equity. There must be sympathetic administration of section 722 if the purposes for which it was intended are to be realized.

DROUGHT FIGURES IN NEBRASKA

Nineteen hundred and twenty-six is parity for agriculture. In this study the 3-year averages 1925–27 are considered parity, or 100 percent, or normal.

Rainfall in Nebraska

[Accepted normal=22.12 inches]

Year	Inches	Cumulative deficiency in rainfall (total from 1931)
1931	19.27	2.85
1932	20.54	4.43
1933	20.23	6.32
1934	14.31	15.13
1935	22.64	14.61
1936	14.42	22.31
1937	17.66	26.77
1938	22.23	26.66
1939	16.28	32.50
1940	17.36	37.26
1941	24.45	34.93
1942	25.17	31.88

NOTE.—The increase in rainfall in 1941 and 1942 brought back farm prosperity in 1943 and 1944. This prosperity is considered "excess-profits prosperity" because it is more than we had in 1936–39.

Farm and income statistics, average for 1936–39

	Nebraska		United States	
	Amount	Percent of normal	Amount	Percent of normal
	Thous. of bushels		*Thous. of bushels*	
Corn production	74,855	33.6	2,330,676	86.2
Wheat production	46,653	95.8	796,305	100.6
Number of hogs	1,795	37.8	45,149	82.9
Number of cattle	3,030	97.5	66,306	109.3
Cash farm income	----------	60.0	----------	80.6
Corporation receipts	----------	76.5	----------	93.2

The following table is copied from The Drought on the Great Plains in the 1930's, published by Business and Industrial Research Division, Special Economic Study No. 1, Bureau of Internal Revenue.

TABLE 20.—*Index of farm income for the United States and 8 drought States, 1927–42*

[1927–30 average=100]

Year	United States (1)	Colorado (2)	Kansas (3)	Nebraska (4)		New Mexico (5)	North Dakota (6)	Oklahoma (7)	South Dakota (8)	Texas (9)	8 drought States (10)
1927	102	102	97	94		98	114	109	94	107	102
1928	105	101	108	107		111	111	110	110	115	110
1929	107	106	111	108		110	103	113	107	104	107
1930	87	91	84	91		81	73	68	88	74	80
1931	63	63	57	62		55	41	49	62	53	55
1932	47	41	39	38		42	31	40	29	44	39
1933	53	43	41	44		44	43	51	36	55	47
1934	65	52	54	55		68	48	55	39	65	56
1935	74	61	61	55		64	47	67	44	66	60
1936	82	73	66	67	Base Period	78	54	60	56	69	65
1937	87	80	69	60		90	62	73	49	86	72
1938	78	65	53	49		83	50	66	50	72	60
1939	81	71	59	55		89	64	70	57	77	67
1940	85	73	60	60		99	72	75	63	79	70
1941	108	88	88	68		109	108	94	82	101	91
1942	147	129	125	108		161	151	133	119	137	129

NOTE.—A better study would be to compare the 8 drought States with all other nondrought States, bearing in mind the drought States have such an important influence upon the total United States farm economy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia whether there is any thought on the part of the Finance Committee of holding hearings or whether there is any other relief which we can expect in a more sympathetic administration of the law, as defined in section 722.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that it has been my purpose, and it now is my purpose, to ask the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the two Houses of Congress to examine section 722 and subsections thereunder and to find out why it has not been administered. I can assure the Senator that I am keenly interested in this very subject. Of course, section 722 illustrates the impossibility of devising a fair and equitable excess-profits tax, and therefore I have thought from the beginning, and I now think, that the real value of the bill now before the Senate is to eliminate the excess-profits tax, because it definitely is a brake on expansion and on the development of new business. I am in thorough sympathy with making section 722 workable, because it will apply to the past, back cases, anyway.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. If there is any needed amendment, I propose to suggest to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that we inquire of the Treasury Department and of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and even of The Tax Court, if necessary, to find out what amendment will make section 722 really workable and serviceable, as we intended to make it.

Mr. WHERRY. That study will be made shortly, will it?

Mr. GEORGE. It will be made just as quickly as we can get to it; yes. Certainly it will be made before Congress leaves here for the holidays.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate that statement. If that is the relief and the procedure which the committee expects to follow relative to section 722, I am quite willing to withhold any amendments at this time; and with the statement which I have placed in the RECORD, we shall wait for the hearings of the joint committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I appreciate the Senator's action. I assure him that we will join him in an effort to have it administered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the statement made by the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Finance Committee, and the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I should like to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a letter which I submitted to the chairman of the committee. It was addressed to me by Dana F. Cole.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, Mr. President; I neglected to say that the senior Senator from Nebraska, as well as other Members of the Senate, likewise was very much interested in this question. The Senator from Nebraska who now is addressing the Chair, has spoken to me about it on more than one occasion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter submitted by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

LINCOLN, NEBR., *October 19, 1945.*

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senate Office Bulding,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I will try to draft in as few words as possible the thinking of the average corporate taxpayer in the drought States of Nebraska, Kansas, North and South Dakota.

When the excess-tax-profits law was adopted, it was necessary to fix some type of a measuring device for defining "excess profits." As you know, the bill provides that all earnings above 8 percent of the invested capital is defined as excess profits, under one definition. Under the other definition, 95 percent of the average earnings during the 4 base years 1936–39 are considered to be normal profits and all earnings above 95 percent of these average earnings is considered to be excess profits and subjected to the excess-profits tax. In addition, all corporations were granted the specific exemption of $5,000, later $10,000, and in the last proposal, $25,000 (not to take effect until January 1, 1946). As I view it now, the $25,000 exemption will never be of any value to taxpayers if the excess-profits tax is repealed entirely. There would have been considerable relief to the smaller taxpayers if the $25,000 exemption had been made to apply to the year 1945 rather than to the year 1946 and subsequent.

Congress recognized that in measuring excess profits at the foregoing definitions it would be utterly unfair to many corporate taxpayers. To alleviate the unfairness which would develop under the excess-profits-tax law, the Congress added section 722 to the Internal Revenue Code. This section 722 is referred to as the relief section of the excess-profits-tax law. The gist of section 722 is that if there was some event (several of which were mentioned in the law) which made the definition of the excess-profits tax unfair to taxpayers, that such taxpayers would be entitled to "reconstruct" their earning base in order to determine a more equitable excess-profits tax computation.

The reason why the average corporate taxpayer in Nebraska and the other States mentioned has been unfairly treated under the excess-profits tax is that the base years 1936–39 were anything but normal operating years in that area. The drought which we were experiencing during that period of time, and prior thereto, made it impossible for the average corporation to have normal earnings during those base years. It is my experience that the average corporation in Nebraska during the base years was actually losing money and any profit that is now made is defined as excess profits under the earnings method. When we in Nebraska have to use the invested-capital method we get practically no credit, because as you know, most businesses in Nebraska are conducted on the personal abilities of management and not upon the capital that is paid into the business.

When the excess-profits tax law was up for consideration we folks interested in sound taxation felt that section 722 would provide, in the last analysis, a fair treatment for the average corporate taxpayer in our area. We felt for sure that the drought was an event such as was contemplated under section 722 and that when the Treasury Department examined the returns of the corporations that taxpayers would be able to apply for the relief provided under section 722 and therefore the taxpayers of Nebraska would not be at a distinct disadvantage in the payment of excess-profits taxes because they would be entitled to a "reconstructed base" which would level out the credits and the taxes they would pay and put them in a more favorable position compared with taxpayers in other parts of the country.

A large proportion of the corporations in Nebraska have been subjected to the excess-profits tax because of the return of agricultural prosperity in our area during these excess-profits tax years. We have had abundant rainfall and abundant crops and as a result the net profit of corporations has reflected the return of agricultural prosperity due to the elimination of the drought. It is my private opinion that Nebraska corporations have paid a larger proportion of their income in taxes during 1943–45 due to this fact than corporations in other parts of the United States. The reason for the penalty is that the base-year earnings were so low, whereas in other parts of the country base-year earnings were fair, normal, or above normal. Corporations doing business in other parts of the country have not suffered the same penalty that we have in our area.

The elimination of the excess-profits tax law does not correct the inequalities. Taxpayers need the relief provided for under section 722 now. Many corporations are looking forward to expanding their businesses and need capital with which to do it. Many of these corporations feel that they are entitled to partial refunds of excess-profits taxes already paid in accordance with provisions of section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code. Many corporations have not paid all of their excess-profits taxes because of the provisions of section 722. However, the Treasury Department is now on a campaign trying to force these corporations to pay the additional excess-profits taxes that have been withheld under section 722 and they are denying the claims for refund provided for by section 722 of the code.

It is the observation of the average businessman that the provisions of section 722 are about as good as could be expected. All that is needed is a sympathetic administration of the law already on the statute books. However, the Treasury Department has a thumbs-down attitude on section 722. The revenue agents are being instructed to reject all claims and the buck is being passed to The Tax Court. As you well realize, if taxpayers are going to have to wait for their relief until The Tax Court can pass on their claims, that many of them will be dead and buried long before the relief to which they are now entitled is granted to them. If all section 722 cases are going to have to go through The Tax Court for final adjudication, then it becomes anything but a relief measure as it was intended.

I have a feeling that the Treasury Department will never be able to administer section 722. It is primarily a relief measure and the Treasury Department's job is to collect additional taxes and not find the refunds properly due taxpayers. It is natural that the Treasury Department's attitude is negative and that we cannot be expected to get a sympathetic administration of section 722.

It would be my suggestion that an amendment at this time would be of great benefit to all corporations that are entitled to relief under section 722, especially for the average corporate taxpayer in Nebraska, Kansas, and the other drought States. My suggestion would be that an entirely new body be created by Congress to administer section 722. I think this body should not be under the control of the Treasury Department but should be directly responsible to the Congress. I am sure that a sympathetic administration of section 722 would be all that any fair-minded taxpayer could wish for. The relief provided for by this law is needed now in this reconversion period. Such an amendment would permit taxpayers to sit across the table from a fair-minded

group whose principal job would be to get the relief to taxpayer when it is needed provided they are entitled to the relief found in the law.

If it would be possible to get such an amendment to section 722 at this time it would greatly speed up the reconversion program in our area.

Respectfully yours,

DANA F. COLE.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, now that I have had printed in the RECORD the letter which I submitted a few days ago to the chairman of the Finance Committee, and to which he has made reply, as he has stated on the floor of the Senate, let me say for the record, in reply, that the chairman of the committee agrees that section 722 should be considered, but not in connection with this bill. He has said it is his intention to give it consideration at an early date.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment to the pending bill; but I realize that I was rather late in submitting the amendment just a few days before the committee finished its deliberations and hearings on the bill, as it now appears before the Senate. I was glad to hear that another tax bill is now before the committee, and I shall submit the amendment in connection with the tax bill which the committee now has before it. The amendment seeks to relieve from the Federal motor-fuel tax any motor-fuel which contains 5 percent of alcohol made from domestic farm crops. As a matter of historical interest, let me say that in 1939 the Senate showed a very sympathetic interest in the plan of making a larger market for farm crops by using some of the surpluses in making power alcohol. In 1939 it was voted down, but without having a hearing on the part of the Finance Committee or without having a report from the committee. However, it was rejected only by a vote of 28 to 38.

In view of the fact that farm-crop surpluses probably will accumulate in the future, and having in mind the experiences of the recent war in the use of alcohol, and also that the Treasury is a little short of funds, I am thinking that Congress now will consider more thoroughly a plan of this nature, which has as its objective providing a larger market for farm crops, thereby making it unnecessary to pay such large Federal subsidies. I bespeak the consideration of the members of the committee for this idea. I shall submit the amendment as an amendment to the bill which the Finance Committee now has under consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill, H. R. 4309, was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will be authorized to correct paragraph, subsection, and section numbers in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was about to make that request.

I now ask that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. I also move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I propose shortly to move that the Senate take a recess until Friday next, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the Presiding Officer be authorized to sign bills and resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEARINGS ON AIRPLANE AND AIRCRAFT DISPOSAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President. I desire to make an announcement for publication in the RECORD that on Monday next at 10:30 o'clock in the morning, in the Senate Office Building, the Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs will hear a report from the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, Mr. Robert A. Lovett, on the disposal of Government-owned aircraft plants. This report has been in process of preparation for a period of 2 years, and it involves matters of great interest in which Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives are very vitally concerned. The report recommends comprehensive industrial preparedness measures to insure the ability of this country to produce aircraft and aerial weapons in order to meet military needs in another emergency. It deals with the necessity of maintaining a peacetime industrial reserve of specialized aircraft plants, and standard machine tools in specified locations throughout the Nation. The importance of preserving the geographical dispersion of aircraft production achieved during World War II, as a measure of vital national defense, is also stressed in the report.

Conferences have been held between the Postmaster General, Mr. Hannegan, and Assistant Secretary of War Lovett, with respect to the possibility of utilizing surplus aircraft for a more complete system of carrying the Nation's mail by air. It is the hope of Postmaster General Hannegan that all first-class mail may be transported hereafter by air, and he is hoping that the Government's surplus planes may be utilized for this purpose by commercial lines.

In view of the widespread interest which this presentation will have to a number of committees of both Houses, I, as chairman of the Surplus Property Subcommittee, have invited the members of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees, the George and Colmer Postwar Economic Planning Committees, the Woodrum Postwar Military Policy Committee, the Manasco Committee on Executive Expenditures, and other committees of both Houses of Congress concerned with aviation policy and plant disposal, to participate in the hearing.

Mr. President, I make this announcement so that all Senators who may be interested may have an opportunity of attending the committee hearing if they so desire.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JORGE LUIS CORDOVA DIAZ TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, November 7, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room in the Capitol building, upon the nomination of Jorge Luis Cordova Diaz, of Puerto Rico, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, vice Honorable Martin Travieso, elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

BLACK HILLS, S. DAK., AS SITE FOR WORLD CAPITAL

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Black Hills mountain country in western South Dakota is adjacent to the States of Wyoming and Nebraska. In South Dakota we are proud that the governors of those two adjoining States have joined with our Governor in extending an invitation that the world capital be located in the Black Hills of South Dakota.

I have today delivered to each Senator on the floor a description of the site, together with arguments in favor of its selection. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the complete text of the invitation submitted by the three governors.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLACK HILLS MOUNTAIN COUNTRY SITE FOR WORLD CAPITAL

General description: The Black Hills mountain country is an area of 6,000 square miles in the States of South Dakota, Nebraska, and Wyoming. It contains the loftiest mountains in the United States with the exception of the Rocky Mountain system. The region rises from the level plains surrounding it to altitudes of 7,242 feet above sea level. It is covered with forests and interspersed with beautiful mountain lakes, streams, valleys and plateaus. It has one of the most pleasant climates in the world and is ideal in its

health and living conditions. In its majestic environment could be constructed a new city for a new idea in the new world.

I. Physical and natural geographic characteristics of Black Hills are ideal for the world capital.

II. The area is free from local influences which would detract from world capital activities.

III. The historical and political background of the Black Hills provides an appropriate foundation for administration of United Nation's affairs.

IV. This region has high educational standards.

V. Recreational advantages are prominent.

VI. A site in the Black Hills would be adequate from the standpoint of military defense and control.

I. PHYSICAL AND NATURAL GEOGRAPHIC ITEMS FAVOR THE BLACK HILLS MOUNTAIN COUNTRY

1. World location: Accompanying map by Luvine Berg, worked out to mathematical accuracy, shows that the Black Hills mountain country, in the center of the North American Continent, in the United States of America, at the junction of the sovereign States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota, is most equally convenient from the standpoint of distance to all the nations of the world. It also shows that under future air travel, this area is not more than 24 hours distant from any of the capitals of the United Nations. The first statement may be questioned on the theory that the earth is a globe and that any point on it is equally convenient with any other point. This is only theoretically true. If the world was all one land mass and its countries of identical size and shape, it would be true, but the way the land mass of the world is located, and the way the nations are divided by their boundaries, the claim above made becomes absolutely true.

2. Climate: The area has typical temperate-zone climate, which is made more equable by the varied terrain and heavy growth of forests and the fact that it is in the midst of the Great Plains country. The following should be noted about its climate:

a. Absence of humidity.

b. Absence of smoke, dust, and gases.

c. Absence of extremes of temperature.

d. Absence of strong winds—no storms or hurricanes.

e. Variety of climate—cool, sunny summers; beautiful spring and fall; moderate winters; we have all four seasons with a gradual change from one to the other.

3. Natural advantages peculiar to the Black Hills mountain country: Pure, bracing air; pure water; absence of insects; heavy forests; variety of altitudes; variety of flora and fauna, climate, and scenery.

4. Variety: The variety of conditions is remarkable. In the Black Hills mountain country are all of the following:

1. Plains.
2. Prairies.
3. Rolling country.
4. Hills.
5. Plateaus.
6. Mountains.
7. Valleys.
8. Forests.
9. Lakes.
10. Streams.
11. Gold.
12. Rocks.
13. Various soils.
14. Wild game: Buffalo, deer, antelope, elk, game birds of many kinds.
15. Variety of plant life and forest timber.
16. Variety of colossal statuary: The Needles as natural statuary; Mount Rushmore as man-made statuary; world's largest collossi.
17. Mineral deposits exposing practically all the classified elements of the earth.
18. Fields, pastures, mines, factories, mills, towns, and cities.

5. Sites: There are numerous sites of varied size and description throughout the 6,000 square miles where a world city may be built and where the individual nations may construct their own establishments isolated from the headquarters and from each other as they may choose.

II. THE BLACK HILLS MOUNTAIN AREA IS FREE FROM LOCAL INFLUENCES WHICH MIGHT DETRACT FROM THE ACTIVITIES OF THE WORLD CAPITAL

1. There is no large city near to absorb the identity or individuality of the world capital city.

2. It is not near the capital of any nation where undue influences might affect it.

3. It is near the junction of three sovereign States, all interested in it.

4. It is in a region of comparatively sparse population, so that the residents of the new world zone would not have to displace, nor conflict with local interests of any large groups of people.

5. It is in the approximate center of the North American Continent, so that there would be no preferential advantage to Europe, Asia, or Africa by locating here. Their advantages in the location would be practically equal.

III. THE HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THIS AREA PROVIDES AN APPROPRIATE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF UNITED NATIONS AFFAIRS

1. The population of the North American Continent is of conglomerate nature. The area was settled and developed by people from all the nations of Europe and from many places in Asia and Africa. Practically every color, race, creed, and nation of people have been prominent in the settlement and development of the North American Continent. All nations would find large groups of their own nationals established here.

2. The basic element of the Government here is the absolute equality of all persons, regardless of color, race, or creed.

3. Another basic element is complete freedom of religion and complete separation of church and state. All religions have complete freedom and equal rights before the law. There is no state religion.

4. The various nations of the North American Continent are all similar in having a union of sovereign states operating under a federal or over-all superior government. This system has developed successfully throughout the years so that the several national governments have maintained peace among their sovereign states and among themselves to a far greater degree than at any other place in the world, and ever before throughout history. That system is similar to the system proposed by the United Nations Charter.

5. The nations of the North American Continent are all examples of government conducted by the people themselves. All of them have governments in which the people elect and control the representatives and officials who in turn administer government responsive to the people themselves. It is largely because of this that the various races, colors, creeds, and nations represented in our conglomerate population have been able to live and develop harmoniously and effectively as nations.

6. America is the last of the major continents to see political organization of states and nations. The American continent is new in world history. It is therefore freer from past historical influences than any other continent. The center of this continent is the Black Hills mountain country. It is the youngest of all in point of development, and offers a place particularly adapted to the objectives and problems of the United Nations as proposed under the Charter.

7. Establishing the capital in the center of the North American Continent insures the most effective cooperation of the nations of that continent. It is equally convenient to all the great nations which surround it. It is the most equally convenient to all the other nations of the world. It will be a location conducive to the most general support of all nations of the world.

8. The Luvine Berg map shows many advantages of this site for the organized nations as they exist today:

(a) The Dominion of Canada, and thereby the British Empire, is only a few hundred miles from it. Much of Canada is of French origin.

(b) The Asiatic Continent, and the part of it controlled by Russia practically touches this North American Continent.

(c) The stepping stones of Iceland and Greenland practically unite the continent to Europe.

(d) The most distant political organizations, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, are parts of the British Empire, which has Canada practically adjoining the site we are proposing.

(e) The South American Continent has nations all with historical and political background and organization almost identical with this continent and conveniently located from a travel standpoint. They can come by automobile direct to the Black Hills over the Pan-American Highway.

IV. EDUCATION AND CULTURE

The Black Hills States rank among the first eight in the Nation as to literacy. The excellent system of public education is an encouragement to those who desire to rear their families in this area. Advanced training in public and private colleges and universities in the arts and sciences in this area has developed many persons of national and international prominence.

V. RECREATION

Stream and lake fishing; hunting deer, antelope, elk, and game birds; swimming in cool streams, lakes, or hot springs; bridle trails, tennis, golf; celebrations and rodeos; in fact, a variety to suit every taste and inclination.

VI. MILITARY DEFENSE AND CONTROL

1. The capital would have a site safe from military operations or capture by any nation other than the United States of America. Some one nation must be entrusted with the site. The United States of America has taken a prominent part in the past 30 years in trying to formulate a world organization for preservation of peace. It can be expected to aid the present proposed organization materially and in every way of reasonable national influence toward success. A site in the center of it should be the safest possible site and the most impartial for all concerned in the success of the United Nations organization.

2. The countries which control the atomic bomb should use it only to maintain world peace. The capital of the world should be in the region where this great power for continuing good was first brought into practicable operation. A world capital and the embassies and establishments of the nations, situated in the Black Hills mountain country, would be in a region best suited to atomic bomb defense and adaptable to atomic bomb maintenance of world peace.

DWIGHT GRISWOLD,
Governor, State of Nebraska.
M. Q. SHARPE,
Governor, State of South Dakota.
LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor, State of Wyoming.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the able majority leader in position to indicate what will be taken up at the next session of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I can tell, nothing of any importance will be taken up. If this were Thursday, I should

move a recess until Monday, but we must meet either tomorrow or Friday, and I thought it would be better to meet Friday. We may recess from Friday to Tuesday, but we will recess at least until Monday.

Mr. WHITE. I thought that possibly the disputed conference report might be taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. That subject may be taken up. It is up to the committees which are involved in the matter.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of sundry postmasters, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Irvin C. Mollison, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Thomas J. Walker, deceased.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, now a foreign-service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to New Zealand;

Samuel J. Fletcher, of Maine, now a foreign-service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America;

Renwick S. McNiece, of Utah, now a foreign-service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America;

Hassell H. Dick, of South Carolina, now a foreign-service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America;

Robert B. Streeper, of Ohio, now a foreign-service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America; and

Stephen C. Brown, of Virginia, now a foreign-service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

James J. Connors of Juneau, Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska (reappointment).

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry employees for appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, October 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 24 (legislative day of October 22), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

FLORIDA

Ralph B. Wakeland, Parish, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

GEORGIA

Charles O. Carter, Climax, Ga., in place of A. J. Trulock, transferred.

ILLINOIS

Clyde V. Manny, Ivesdale, Ill., in place of U. A. Tempel, transferred.

Lewis H. Jenkins, West Liberty, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

INDIANA

Walter Bouse, Claypool, Ind., in place of L. B. Pontius, transferred.

Idelle M. Gallaher, Mellott, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lydia A. Mann, Stillwell, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KANSAS

Ralph Ganson, Canton, Kans., in place of A. M. Johnson, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Laura M. Mathews, Petersburg, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harris A. Stancil, Wheelwright, Ky., in place of J. C. Cantrell, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Lezin J. Lambert, Sorrento, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MINNESOTA

Herman B. Lund, Dalbo, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bonnie B. Martinson, Upsala, Minn., in place of A. E. Osberg, deceased.

Fred A. Melcher, Woodstock, Minn., in place of G. J. Klosterman, removed.

MISSOURI

Maud E. Wilson, Lonejack, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Raymond A. Walker, Clatonia, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mae Slater, Hordville, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW JERSEY

Paul F. Brady, Kirkwood, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary C. Myers, Quinton, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW MEXICO

Quirino Atencio, Dixon, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Richard K. White, Fort Wingate, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW YORK

Charles R. Freece, East Worcester, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Joyce S. Walrod, Georgetown, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Anna C. Townsend, Glenham, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bethel Waters, Marcellus Falls, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John F. Quigley, Mottville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elizabeth F. Filkins, Riparius, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John Speed, Slaterville Springs, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edward P. Kulseth, Gardner, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George W. Skinner, Grandin, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OHIO

Lucy A. Chandler, Bannock, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wallace A. Hamsher, Berlin, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ruth E. Bailey, Franklin Furnace, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Abner D. Banning, Nutwood, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bertha B. Emmons, Pettisville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Annie D. Clark, Oriental, N. C., in place of C. E. Curtis, removed.

Frank W. Fortescue, Scranton, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OREGON

Emma B. Rowell, Rickreall, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Luther C. Davis, Georgetown, S. C., in place of L. C. Davis, April 26, 1942.

Kathryn T. Blanchard, Moultrieville, S. C., in place of B. W. Smoak, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Granvel N. Collins, Camp Crook, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Evalyn A. Berndt, Mansfield, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WASHINGTON

J. Frank Hall, Edwall, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Nina O. Peterson, Comstock, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jeanine M. Gulan, Gile, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Maud E. Odekirk, Springbrook, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 24 (legislative day of October 22), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Frank V. Howey, Cactus.
Gladys E. Tanner, Emery Park.
Helen M. Young, St. David.
Elmer L. Hinners, Somerton.

IOWA

Loretta Stapleton, Elma.
Carl W. Bruggeman, Farmington.
Grover B. Chryst, Forest City.

MINNESOTA

Walter Freudenberg, Saginaw.
Eldora J. Pilotte, Sedan.

NEBRASKA

Bertha A. Lancaster, Barnston.
Russell E. Wilson, Blue Springs.
Lois H. Lincoln, Scotia.

NEW MEXICO

Vincent C. Steele, Grenville. (To correct spelling of name of office.)

NORTH CAROLINA

Floyd P. Thomas, Madison.
Helen H. Johnson, Morrisville.

VIRGINIA

Susie A. Davis, Nathalie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose dwelling place is in the light eternal, help us to see the good and the evil, and choose this day whom we shall serve. With Christlike fervor, enable us to put to shame any false idols of our hearts, free from the swelling words of vain self-esteem. Give us grace to contend fearlessly with the wrong that doth so easily beset us, and hear the beating of our Saviour's heart for a world in ruins, struggling to be redeemed. In our dreams and visions may we see our Nation rising out of the losses and tragedies of war, producing that wealth of treasure which no moth of disunity can corrupt and no injustice can destroy. We pray that we may live under the benign sway of great truths, being just by being true. Humbly and wisely we would devote time and talent to the larger claims of our country, that out of the antagonisms throughout our land may come the glory of a new order, wherein dwelleth reason and brotherhood, progress and peace. In the name of Him who took upon Himself the form of a servant. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

OCTOBER 20, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Virginia my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States for the Sixth District of Virginia, to be effective as of midnight, December 31, 1945.

With assurances of the highest esteem, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

CLIFTON A. WOODRUM.

WOMAN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT DAY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Alabama explain the legislation?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to do so, but I would rather, if the gentleman does not mind and with the permission of the Speaker, ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN], the author of the resolution, to explain it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution requests the President to issue a proclamation designating November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women first voted in a Presidential election. I have introduced an identical resolution which is now pending in the House, having been reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary, and now on the Consent Calendar. Since time is distinctly of the essence, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House will now pass this joint resolution.

The coming November 2 is the twenty-fifth anniversary of one of the historic dates in our national life, for on November 2, 1920, the women of America were first privileged to vote in a Presidential election.

It seems fitting that the Congress should request the President to make a proclamation designating November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day to commemorate the occasion and to call for an observance of the day throughout the land with such ceremonies as the people may deem appropriate in their several communities.

During the quarter century following their enfranchisement, women throughout the country have taken an interest in public affairs which was not possible before they had the vote. Their devotion to the public welfare has been superb and has had a refining effect upon every phase of our political life. This influence for good has reached into every community whenever National, State, or municipal elections have been held.

Recognition of the silver anniversary of this historic day will result in widespread observance by various patriotic societies and women's clubs and in the churches, schools, and community centers.

Thus will we mark an important milestone in our national progress toward community welfare and human betterment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. This has nothing to do with the so-called equal-rights amendment?

Mr. GOODWIN. No; Mr. Speaker, it is entirely in connection with the commemoration of the day on which women first voted in a Presidential election.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day and calling upon the people throughout the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the day on which women throughout the United States first cast their votes in a Presidential election.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: In line 3, strike out the word "authorized" and insert "requested", and in the title, the first word, strike out the word "Authorizing" and insert the word "Requesting."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the only amendments are those amending the title by striking out the word "authorizing" and substituting the word "requesting", and in the body of the resolution striking out the word "authorized" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "requested." The purpose of this request for the immediate consideration of this resolution is simply that the date on which it is to become effective is November 2 and before the regular call of the Consent Calendar, of course, that day will have passed. So I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Requesting the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 255) was laid on the table.

PRODUCTION OF SUGAR AND SIRUP

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 100 permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this legislation?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The purpose of the resolution is to permit the production of sugar and sirup from high moisture or damaged grain and surplus potatoes in plants which produce alcohol. Under the present law, they are forbidden from producing anything other than alcohol in their plants. The purpose of the resolution is to take care of the surplus potatoes and also to take care of the shortage in sirups and sugar. It has a twofold purpose. The joint resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

It has the support of the Treasury Department. At least, they have no objection to it. The Secretary of Agriculture has written a letter to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who reported the bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who reported the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief on this. We have a great many alcohol plants throughout the country which have been producing alcohol for the war effort. Much of it went into synthetic rubber. It was used for other war purposes. There is no demand for the greater portion of this alcohol at the present time, but we do have a situation where we have 60,000,000 bushels of potatoes that are surplus. They are spoiling. They cannot be sent abroad because of lack of refrigeration.

In addition to that, there is a great amount of damaged and wet corn, and it is anticipated there will be more wet corn this year. We have need for sugar and sirup, especially for industrial uses.

A law passed back in 1866 provided that the alcohol plants could not produce any other product. The purpose of this was to facilitate the collection of the tax on alcohol. This bill would permit those plants that are alcohol plants to make sugar and sirups until July 1, next. It makes no change in the permanent law.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is that going to give us more sugar for domestic consumption?

Mr. CURTIS. It will. It will make a great contribution to our sugar supply.

Mr. RICH. Will there be any legislation permitting this sugar that is made in these alcohol plants to be used in the alcohol plants to make more liquor?

Mr. CURTIS. It does not involve that problem at all.

Mr. RICH. We are assured of more sugar if this bill is permitted to pass?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; and especially sirups. Those sirups can be used by industrial users of sugar, and will make all types of sugar more available.

Mr. RICH. We are hearing a great deal about alcohol plants using sugar and taking it from the table. This will in no way affect that?

Mr. CURTIS. As a matter of fact, this does not involve the beverage alcohol type of plant.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I am in favor of the gentleman's bill. I think it will be a fine thing. Under the provisions of the bill, can these alcohol plants go into the dehydration program, dehydrating potatoes?

Mr. CURTIS. Not under this bill.

Mr. JENKINS. That is a very necessary thing. For instance, up in New Jersey, our Republican food study committee made some investigations in the potato fields up there, and also in Maine. We found that because of these investigations they are already taking potatoes out of New Jersey, at the rate of 50 carloads a day, to dehydrating plants. My impression is that these dehydrating plants do have some connection with making alcohol.

Mr. CURTIS. This legislation primarily deals with the type of plant and products where there is no reconversion problem at all. So that, without change, for 2 or 3 days they can make sirup, and then switch back to making alcohol, and vice versa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will this bill preclude the use of these plants for the manufacture of alcohol from corn?

Mr. CURTIS. Not in the least; no.

Mr. HOEVEN. If there should be a surplus of corn, these plants will be available?

Mr. CURTIS. This legislation is here because there is no present adequate demand for industrial alcohol.

Mr. HOEVEN. The manufacture to which I refer—of alcohol from corn—is not included in this bill?

Mr. CURTIS. Not at all.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman will assure us that this is for the utilization of surplus potatoes, wheat, and so forth, and will end on July 1 of this year?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Will this in any way interfere with the synthetic rubber industry?

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, no; not at all. In fact, indirectly I think it will be of great benefit to the synthetic-rubber industry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I knew this bill was coming up. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] contacted me this morning. The passage of this bill does not mean any appropriations by the Federal Government to any agency. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct; and it does not affect the revenue in any way.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It does not interfere with the production of alcohol; the production of alcohol, sugar, and sirup can be carried on simultaneously.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Further answering the gentleman, I may say that this merely clarifies an old law which prohibits any plant manufacturing alcohol to engage in the manufacture of sugars and sirup. That law goes way back to 1866.

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply wanted to disabuse the membership of any idea that the passage of this bill would be followed by any appropriation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is very unusual in that respect.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In my humble opinion the passage of this resolution would aid in the disposition of surplus farm products. This will make possible the use of some 60,000,000 bushels of potatoes for the making of sirups and glucose which can be used by industry. There is also a great need for dehydrating this surplus potato crop. The Scottsbluff Valley in Nebraska last year used the beet-factory machinery to turn surplus potatoes into dehydrated stock food. This should be continued. Sugar is short in this country. One reason we have a surplus of potatoes is due to the fact that the Government made the raising of potatoes and beans more attractive than the raising of sugar beets; hence the farmers raised beans and potatoes but not sugar beets. If a price reflecting a profit for sugar beets were assured, sufficient sugar would be available in this country. The result of the passage of this resolution will be to make it possible to use this surplus farm product, potatoes, in the making of glucose and sirup.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Just yesterday I was reading of some potato-feeding demonstration projects which are being established in New England because the potato crop up there was so large that under our support program they accumulated a lot of potatoes in the name of the Government. The statement was made that to get rid of this surplus, feeding demonstration projects were being set up whereby any farmer could come and get free at the siding all the potatoes he could use for feeding livestock, the only obligation on his part being to make a report on the result of the feeding tests.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, and answering the gentleman from South Dakota. I have been informed by the Department that a lot of these Government potatoes have been given away for demonstrations similar to the one he referred to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand it, under the price-support program the potatoes bought in the name of the Government are Nos. 1 and 2 grades, with the result that on the market we are getting the poorer grade potatoes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will this bill reach that situation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am very sorry to say that it will not.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I may say to the gentleman that in our investigation we found several universities in the country, especially those that have laboratory facilities, making investigations in various new uses of potatoes, with very desirable consequences. It does look as though they have been able to perfect something whereby the potatoes can be used not only in silos but in other ways to add to the food economy of the Nation, using the methods these chemists have been able to develop.

Mr. STEFAN. This bill does seek to do something about food conservation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to know why industrial alcohol plants were restricted from producing these other things, sugars and sirups, in the first place.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield I will be glad to answer.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. That restriction was carried in a law dating back to 1866. It was for the purpose of facilitating the collection of revenue on alcohol that they did not permit any plants that produced alcohol to make any other product whatsoever. This has been worked out satisfactorily to the Treasury. It sets aside that provision until July 1 next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That part II of subchapter C of chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3126. Emergency production of sugars and sirups in industrial alcohol plants.

"(a) In General: Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 2819 and 3122, and of any other law, until July 1, 1946, sugars and sirups from potatoes and from high moisture or damaged grain may be produced in industrial alcohol plants simultaneously with, or alternately with, the production of alcohol.

"(b) Regulations: The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, is authorized to prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this section."

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. GEN. GEORGE F. MOORE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. George F. Moore, who was commander of Corregidor when it fell, has recently returned to the United State after 4 years' imprisonment in Japan.

The defense of Corregidor by General Moore and those under him will go down in history as a brilliant military operation in fighting the enemy against overwhelming odds. The sufferings and sacrifices of General Moore during the long defense of Corregidor and his subsequent imprisonment and the indignities heaped upon him and his men by Japan will not be forgotten by the American people.

The Coast Artillery Association has just given a reception in his honor at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, which was attended by a large number, among whom were many distinguished guests, all of whom were proud to pay tribute to this great military leader, who is a native Texan, a graduate of Texas A. & M., and commandant there when he went to the Philippines.

General Moore is one of the real heroes of this war, and history will so acclaim him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include in each an editorial.

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech on the subject of Federal aid to education.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California (at the request of Mr. DE LACY) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the American Slav Congress.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include a letter from a soldier.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by himself on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

Mr. BUNKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and include letters.

Mr. O'NEAL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement released to the press yesterday by the Democratic members of the Michigan delegation endorsing the take-home-pay program of industrial workers.

REPUBLICAN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I note in Monday's Washington Post that Mr. Herbert Brownell, chairman of the Republican National Committee, has called for the formation of a positive legislative program to present to the people in the next election. Mr. Brownell adds that attacks on the New Deal and President Roosevelt are not enough to convince the people to vote for a Republican regime.

We hope that this will bring to an end the GOP campaign of vilification and hate against the memory of our late great President, a campaign which is disgusting all decent people.

Brownell knows that the people of America prefer the New Deal to the old deal that gave us the Hoover depression, and that the Republican party must offer the people some kind of a new deal in order to get votes enough to control Congress.

It is certainly interesting to hear the Republican national chairman admit that his party has been going along for 12 years without any program at all, except that of attacking the progressive and liberal measures advocated by President Roosevelt and President Truman, and given a vote of confidence in every election since 1932.

However it really does not make much difference what Brownell and his cohorts bring forth, since the people of this Nation are pretty well convinced by now that no matter what the titular heads of the Republican party advocate, the GOP leaders in Congress will manage to repudiate it, as they have in the past, by their reactionary attitude. Their voting record clearly shows their allegiance to special interests over the common man. Their votes on the floor of Congress certainly do not coincide with their campaign promises.

We wish Mr. Brownell well. He has a mighty tough job ahead of him in selling any kind of a progressive legislative program to the Republican congressional leaders.

THE KELSEY-HAYES CONTROVERSY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LESINSKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. HEFFERNAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a farewell address delivered by Capt. John L. Beebe, former superintendent of the United States

Maritime Service Training Station, Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles in each.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include in each excerpts from newspaper and magazine articles.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a radio address delivered by him, and in the other a letter from former Governor Chase S. Osborne, of Michigan.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a radio address delivered by him.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to hear the resignation of the gentleman from Virginia [CLIFTON A WOODRUM] read a few minutes ago. This House is going to lose one of the most outstanding Members I have had the privilege of associating with in the last 10 years. I think CLIFF WOODRUM is one of the most capable, one of the most earnest, and one of the most energetic individuals that we have had in the House of Representatives since I came here. If there is anyone that I would want to follow as a parliamentarian and as a good debater, I think it would be CLIFF WOODRUM. He has been one of the grandest men that I ever knew, and I think that this House is going to lose one of the finest men that it has ever been my privilege to associate with while in the House of Representatives. We are sorry to see him go away from the House of Representatives, and we wish him Godspeed in any of his undertakings, and wish him happiness, good health, and much prosperity.

RADIO NEWS COMMENTATORS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there have been recent references on the floor of the House to radio news commentators and in general the observations of Members of this body have been critical. Perhaps a word of commendation for a radio news program of very exceptional quality is in order. I refer to the General Electric's Voice of Washington news summary we hear every morning at 8 o'clock and at 11 o'clock each evening over Station WOL.

Many of my colleagues have mentioned these particular newscasts to me and in every instance their straight news character has been noted and approved. There is no editorial comment and the presentation is neither colored by inflection nor used as a vehicle for the personal opinions of the broadcaster. In fact, the man giving the news on these General Electric programs is never mentioned by name.

If we are critical of some of the things being said over the air when we tune in to hear the news, we should note this splendid public service being rendered by the General Electric Co. with its WOL news programs and let the sponsor and the radio station know of our appreciation. This is the route to go to get action for radio advertisers who want to hold their audiences. When they know we want and appreciate unbiased news they will soon demand it in news programs they sponsor and the result will be a general handling of news on the radio comparable to the high standards governing the news columns of our great newspapers.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I concur most heartily in the remarks just made. As a regular listener of the Voice of Washington news program I am very much impressed with its high quality. I also believe the General Electric Co. uses excellent judgment in its advertising on the program. It is brief, interesting, and dignified and in keeping with the quality of the news program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN and Mr. BUFFETT asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on atomic energy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of shotgun shells, and further to extend his remarks on the subject of continuing the draft and include a telegram sent to General Hershey.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert a memorial from the Board of County Commissioners of Morrison County, Minn.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include articles from the Washington Post, the Washington Times-Herald, and the Washington Star.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the public, as expressed in many newspaper editorials a few days ago, wondered why John Lewis called off the coal strike. Paragraph 17 of the antitrust laws provides that they shall not "forbid or restrain individual members of such (labor) organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof." I wonder if John Lewis realized that by his breach of contract to coerce the foremen into organizing he was not lawfully carrying out a legitimate object.

I have numerous complaints from my district that if cold weather sets in early there will be hardship and suffering because of the lack of the coal not mined during the strike.

If such is the case, why does not the Attorney General take cognizance of this situation and prosecute John Lewis and his coconspirators? In that way he would reach only the racketeer labor leaders. Organized labor as such, which was opposed to the strike, would in no way suffer.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include House Resolution 325.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GENE SLATTERY OF NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, we have in my Fourth District in Nebraska a young man 12 years of age by the name of Gene Slattery, who comes from North Platte, Nebr. This young man has made a worthy contribution to the war effort. He conceived the idea, when attending one of the auction sales in North Platte, of selling the shirt off his back in order to get money for the North Platte servicemen's canteen.

The canteen at North Platte is one of the outstanding canteens of the country. It has fed over 3,000,000 servicemen. The Union Pacific trains all stop

at this junction point. Towns as far as 160 miles away send delegations and contributions to this canteen. The soldiers going through are given a cup of coffee, a sandwich, or a birthday cake.

Gene Slattery has sold his shirt off his back 21 times and has raised over $2,000 for this worthy project. The shirt was sold at sums ranging from $48 to $201.20. William Jeffers, the president of the Union Pacific Railroad, paid $105 for one of Gene's shirts—later returning it to Gene. Brig. Gen. B. B. Miltonberger auctioned one of Gene's shirts for $187.05. Dr. Dorwart, of Lexington, paid $201.20 for the boy's shirt. This young man pulled weeds and earned $15 with which he bought a wool blanket and had it auctioned off for $150—all of the proceeds going to the servicemen's canteen. He has raised similar amounts of money for the Red Cross, the March of Dimes, the Community Chest, and other benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this wide-awake young man has shown ingenuity and vision. It is young men like him who will make up the America of tomorrow. May we have more Gene Slatterys in the Government of tomorrow.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, immediately after the address by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a speech.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures have permission to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. That is, during general debate?

Mr. COCHRAN. During general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement together with a letter.

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include as part of my remarks a list I have prepared of emergency Federal statutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GRANT of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter from Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago it was called to my attention that boys were being called into the service through selective service before completing their high-school education, and I am pleased to say that national headquarters of Selective Service System, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, has advised me that on September 19, 1945, the selective-service regulations were amended to take care of this situation.

I am placing a copy of Gen. Lewis B. Hershey's letter in the RECORD, for the information of the membership:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., October 20, 1945.

The Honorable L. H. GAVIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GAVIN: I am in receipt of your letter of October 17 concerning the status of high-school students.

On September 19 selective-service regulations were amended to provide that any person who entered upon a course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning before he became 18 years of age and who is ordered to report for induction during the time he is pursuing such course of instruction, shall, upon his request, have his induction postponed until his graduation from a high school or similar institution of learning, or until he ceases to pursue continuously and satisfactorily such course of instruction, or until he arrives at the age of 20 years, whichever is the earlier.

Sincerely yours,
LEWIS B. HERSHEY, *Director.*

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper article and also some quotations.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Truman in his message yesterday urged Congress to immediately enact legislation for outright compulsory military training and nothing else. His attempt to make the people believe that he was not asking for compulsory military training is just plain deception.

Forcing every young man in the United States between the ages of 18 and 20 into a military camp for 1 year makes it a compulsory military program, regardless of what you label it. Indeed, the President asked for a compulsory military-training program and something more. He called for the complete regimentation of every youth in the 18 to 20 age group when he asked that those not physically fit for combat duty be trained in whatever war service they could perform. Surely the people ought to know by this time that regimentation itself is a part of the administration's program. Matters in this respect have not changed.

The Constitution specifically prohibits compulsory military training. The program proposed is opposed to American tradition. I still believe the principles of the Constitution to be correct that adequate defense for the United States can be provided by a Regular Army, Navy, and Militia (National Guard) on a voluntary basis.

In any event this subject is too vital to the American people to be summarily disposed of as recommended by the President. If the administration wants compulsory military training it ought to be willing, in the next election, to go before the people of the country and tell them frankly that it wants compulsory military training and let the voters decide the matter by amending the Constitution.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow after the legislative program of the day and following any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and include the language in the bill H. R. 4471 which I have introduced, carrying forward our educational program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in his memorable address in this Chamber yesterday, the President told us "the United States now has a fighting strength greater than at any other time in our history. It is greater than any other nation in the world."

Mr. Speaker, our educational system and the superiority of the technical training of the American youth has given America its preeminence among world powers. Now that we have won the war our country cannot afford to sacrifice the education of its youth by keeping them in the armed service when there are so many citizens who have finished their schooling available for peacetime military service. In order that all the youth of this country may take advantage of their educational opportunity, I have introduced a bill to release them from mili-

tary service that they may complete their education.

H. R. 4471

A bill to provide for the discharge or release of certain persons from the military and naval forces and to postpone the induction of others

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (f) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Any person between the ages of 18 and 26 who, while pursuing a course of instruction at an educational or training institution, is ordered to report for induction under this act, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed until he has completed his education or training. The term 'between the ages of 18 and 26' shall refer to men who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the date of their birth, but who have not attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of their birth."

SEC. 2. Any person in the military or naval forces who desires to resume his education or training by enrolling in an educational or training institution, if his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, shall, upon aplication, be discharged from or released from active duty in such forces without delay. Any such person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service shall be deemed to have his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 374 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4160) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution making in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 4160, which is a bill to reform and to modernize the Bankruptcy Code.

I have no requests for time on this side. The bill will be explained by members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the bill which this rule makes in order is only equaled by its technicality. We have a splendid, comprehensive and effective national bankruptcy law. The several parts, provisions, and sentences in such a law must be so synchronized as to work in perfect rhythm if the law is susceptible of effective administration.

The original concept of constitutional bankruptcy has been changed and expanded. By virtue of this amplification, the work of referees is entirely different than it was when the law was originally enacted in 1898. No law of this character can be successfully written in a town meeting, in a mass meeting, or on the floor of the House.

The Bankruptcy Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has pondered these proposed amendments not only for months but for years. It has had the assistance of all those groups and agencies participating in the administration of bankruptcy law, as well as those affected either from the standpoint of the creditor or the standpoint of the bankrupt. In fact, I know of no group that is opposing this bill, with the possible exception of a few referees from the larger cities who, under existing law, have very large incomes resulting from the present fee system. It is only human nature that these referees, who can realize from $15,000 to $50,000 a year from bankruptcy fees, should object to a law that fixes their compensation at not more than $10,000 a year, or the amount now received by the Federal judge appointing the referee and to whom the referee is responsible.

Mr. Speaker, the author of the bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], who is a member of the Bankruptcy Subcommittee, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who is chairman of the subcommittee, will go into detail in their explanation. Naturally this will come in the 2 hours' general debate provided in the rule. May I suggest to the membership, however, that it will find a very complete analysis of the bill in the committee report which was submitted by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. That report is concurred in not only by the members of the subcommittee but by the members of the whole Committee on the Judiciary. It should be a part of the record in this discussion. I shall, therefore, include it and adopt the language therein as my analysis of the bill. The report is as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill is aimed primarily at setting up a system of full-time salaried referees to replace the present system of essentially part-time referees compensated on a fee basis.

The committee on bankruptcy administration of the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges has devoted a great deal of time to this measure during the past 3 years. United States Circuit Judge Orie L. Phillips, of Denver, Colo., a member of the Conference, is chairman of that committee. The bill has the approval of the bankruptcy committee and the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges. The report of the bankruptcy committee, made in September 1944, states in part:

"Neither the fee system of compensating referees nor the indemnity fund system of providing funds to pay the expenses of operating the referees' offices works satisfactorily because of the violent fluctuations in the volume of bankruptcy cases. When the volume is abnormally large, referees' compensation in many instances is too high and indemnity fund balances too large. When the volume of business is abnormally small, referees are not adequately compensated, nor are they able to finance the expenses of their offices from current business. A fee and indemnity system is archaic and impracticable and should be abandoned in favor of the referees' salary system."

A fee system of compensation is objectionable for many reasons and has been done away with in most public offices, State and National. In many matters that come before the referee for decision his compensation will be directly affected by the decision he reaches. Whether his decision is or is not affected, it is unfair to place him in this position.

Under the existing system, due to the great fluctuation in the volume of business, referees are poorly paid in many districts, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to secure competent referees. Also, referees are now required to pay the expense of operating their offices out of the business coming to each office. The individual referee's office is too small a unit upon which to base their financing. More than 35 percent of the active referees have been required to make advances from personal funds to pay the expense of operating their bankruptcy offices. These advances have in some instances reached staggering amounts, and there is no way to recover these advances should the referee go out of office. The proposed bill, through the creation of a national expense fund, will put the financing upon a national basis designed to be self-sustaining as under the present act. There is an immediate urgency for the passage of the bill.

The present legislation had its inception in the report released by the Attorney General's committee on bankruptcy administration early in January 1941. The original bill, H. R. 4394, was introduced by Representative Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska. After hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization, the bill was amended, reintroduced, and reported favorably to the House as H. R. 7814 (H. Rept. No. 2666, 77th Cong., 2d sess.). Identical bills were introduced in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses by Representative Sam HOBBS, of Alabama, as H. R. 1107 and H. R. 33, respectively. Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introduced a similar measure, H. R. 3338, on May 28, 1945. Extensive hearings were held on H. R. 33 and H. R. 3338 in June 1945, following which an amended bill, H. R. 4160, was recommended favorably to the full committee.

ENDORSEMENTS

The bill has the unanimous support of all persons and groups who appeared before the committee, including the National Bankruptcy Conference, which consists of representatives of the American Bar Association, the American Bankers Association, the creditor groups, referees, accountants, law professors, and bankruptcy experts. Also, this proposed legislation has the active support of the following:

The Attorney General.
The Conference of Senior Circuit Judges.
The Securities and Exchange Commission.
The Civil Service Commission.
The National Retail Credit Association.
The Commercial Law League of America.
The Bankruptcy Committee of the Section on Corporations, Banking and Mercantile Law of the American Bar Association.
The National Association of Credit Men.
The Bar Association of the City of New York.
The Minneapolis Association of Credit Men.
The Colorado Bar Association.
The Denver Bar Association.
The Chicago Bar Association.
The Bar Association of St. Louis, and many others.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Section 1 of the bill amends section 1 of the Bankruptcy Act by adding explanatory definitions of several new terms recurrently used in the bill, namely, "circuit," "senior circuit judge," "conference," "council," and "Director."

The act creating the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (Public Law No. 299, 76th Cong., 1st sess.) set up the office of Director and provided for councils composed of the circuit judges of each circuit, to act as the primary administrative bodies of the circuit. A considerable portion of the framework of this bill revolves about the Administrative Office, particularly those sections relating to the surveys to be made to ascertain the total number of referees that will be necessary, the territories that they are to serve, the salaries that they are to receive, and the charges which are to be assessed against estates. It has therefore been necessary to define these terms.

Section 2 amends section 34 of the act. The appointment of referees remains in the hands of the district judges. Where there is more than one district judge in the territory, appointments are to be made by a concurrence of a majority.

The term of office is extended from 2 to 6 years. A referee shall be reappointed upon the expiration of the term of his office, unless there is cause for not reappointing him by reason of incompetency, misconduct, or neglect of duty. In the case of a part-time referee, an additional cause for not reappointing him shall be that his services are not needed. The security of tenure afforded by the bill is one of its most important features. The increase in the length of the term, together with the provisions on reappointment and removal, should go far toward assuring a competent referee of continuity in office. The procedure for removal of a referee for cause is set forth in section 34c. In addition, part-time referees may be removed at any time if their services are no longer needed.

The initial terms of the first appointees are to be separated into three groups and the groups have been staggered to expire every 2 years. All subsequent appointments and reappointments are to be for a full term.

Section 3 amends section 35 of the act and prohibits a referee from holding any office other than conciliation commissioner or special master under the Bankruptcy Act, provided, however, that a part-time referee may be a commissioner of deeds, United States commissioner, justice of the peace, master in chancery, notary public, or either a conciliation commissioner or a supervising conciliation commissioner, but not both. In practice, this will permit a full-time referee to serve also as a conciliation commissioner and as a special master under the Bankruptcy Act, but he may not serve as a supervising conciliation commissioner. A part-time referee may serve also either as a conciliation commissioner or a supervising conciliation commissioner, but not both. The changes in clauses 4 and 5 are merely conforming changes.

Section 4 amends section 37 of the act. The bill provides that the Director shall have 1 year within which to make a survey of the entire country in order to ascertain the total number of referees needed, the territories they are to serve, the salaries they are to be paid, and the schedules of charges to be made in asset, arrangement, and wage-earner cases, keeping in mind a full-time system wherever possible. In making these determinations he is to consider both Nation-wide and local conditions, including the amounts available for salaries, the areas and populations to be served, the transportation and communication facilities, the previous types and amount of business under this act in such areas and where such business is centered, the existing personnel, and any other material factors.

The Director and the Administrative Office are best suited to perform a task of this kind. The bankruptcy division in that office is in possession of a great deal of the necessary information, having at hand the necessary bankruptcy statistics and possessing considerable other data which are essential to a survey of this kind. The work could be done thoroughly and impartially. The bankruptcy system needs flexibility, since there may be a considerable variation in the amount of bankruptcy business from year to year. It would seem advisable to entrust this work to the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges and to the Director of the Administrative Office.

In the course of making these surveys the Director is to take into consideration the views of the district judges, referees, bar associations, trade associations, and any other interested bodies and individuals. His final recommendations are to be submitted to the district judges, the circuit councils, and to the judicial conference. The district judges will have an opportunity to transmit their views to their own judicial councils, and through their own senior circuit judge to the Conference. Thus the Conference, prior to making the final determinations, will have the benefit of the views of the Director and of all the judges concerned.

Where it is deemed advisable, the Conference may designate a referee to preside over an area which lies within more than one judicial district. While this would undoubtedly be unusual, it gives the system a good deal more flexibility than would otherwise be possible.

Whenever the office of referee is vacant the clerk is to notify the Director of such vacancy. If the vacancy is a permanent one no appointment to fill it shall be made until the judges are authorized to do so by the Conference. The Conference is empowered, in the light of the recommendation of the Director and of the councils, to change the number and territories of referees, pursuant to section 37c. This subdivision permits reductions in the number of referees to be made only after the office is permanently vacant. A referee can be removed only pursuant to the provisions of section 34c. However, deaths, resignations, and the power of temporarily assigning existing referees from other areas will allow ample leeway for contracting or expanding the system as the amount of business may require.

Section 5 amends section 39 (b) of the act by prohibiting full-time referees from practicing law. Active part-time referees and those receiving retirement benefits will be permitted to practice law except in proceedings under this act.

Section 6 completely rewrites section 40 of the act. The amendments provide for placing all of the referees upon a salaried basis with full-time referees receiving between $3,000 and $10,000 a year. The cost will be borne by the bankrupt estates. The amount of the salary is to be fixed by the Judicial Conference, after it has received the recommendations of the Director, the district judges, and the councils. The maximum salary for part-time referees has been fixed at $2,500, a sum slightly below the minimum for a full-time man. In fixing the amount of salary to be paid, consideration is to be given "to the average number and types of, and the average amount of gross assets realized from, cases closed and pending in the territory which the referee is to serve, during the last preceding period of 10 years, and to such other factors as may be material."

Subdivision b of this section is aimed at assuring a referee that he will receive, throughout his term as referee, the minimum amount of salary fixed for him at the time that he originally takes office. It would be difficult to induce a man to forego a well-established law practice and to accept office as referee if he were not to be assured of at least his starting salary. The security of tenure provided by the provisions on reappointment and removal would mean little if the referee could be forced out of office by a marked decrease in his salary. The committee does not believe that this provision will prove either unduly expensive or make the act too inflexible, for the Conference can expand or consolidate the territory of a referee and can make a redetermination of the salary to be paid whenever the office becomes vacant.

The proviso at the end of subdivision b is intended to discourage frequent small changes in the salaries of referees. It should be noted, however, that the salaries of part-time referees can be changed at any time and, subject to the prescribed maximum, in any amount.

The present act and the general orders contemplate reimbursement to the referee for actual expenditures through the promulgation of local indemnity rules fixing the charges to be made against bankrupts and their estates for the payment of expenses. As heretofore pointed out, the individual referee's office is too small a unit of operation and this, together with the fluctuations in the volume of business, has made it necessary for many referees in times of low volume to personally advance substantial sums to pay their official expenses. Such a system is unsound and cannot be justified in the operation of any court. In some districts this situation has been met by abnormally high expense charges, both to the bankrupts and to their estates where assets are administered. This has resulted in wide variations in the amounts charged for expenses. The uniformity of bankruptcy administration contemplated by article 1, section 8, clause 4, of the Constitution has not been accomplished in this regard.

Two principal changes to improve this situation have been made in the pending legislation. Firstly, it is intended to simplify the charges for referees' expenses and compensation so that they will be easy of computation and uniform throughout the country. Secondly, it is intended to finance the bankruptcy system on a Nation-wide basis and thus relieve the referee of the responsibility of financing his office as an individual unit.

The bill contemplates a simplified system based upon two essential levies: (1) a fixed filing fee, and (2) an additional fixed charge in asset, arrangement, and wage-earner cases according to the size of the estate. These charges will replace the present varied and often complex ones. The compensation and expense charges can be automatically combined since the bases probably will be the same, and they have the additional merit of being readily ascertainable and easily collectible. Each case will bear part of the cost and the asset cases, which generally require the most attention, will pay a larger proportionate share. The system will be uniform throughout the country and will be based on a national operation rather than the individual referee's office.

Paragraph (4) of section 40c provides for the creation of two trust funds in the Treasury of the United States. One is to contain the receipts from referees' compensation including any fees and allowances earned by the referees while acting as conciliation commissioners or special masters under the act, and it is to be utilized for the payment of their salaries. The other is to contain the funds collected for referees' expenses and is to be utilized to pay the salaries of their clerical assistants, office, travel, and general overhead expenses. If there be any deficiency in these revolving funds, the Treasury is to make the payments due out of the general funds of the United States. When-

ever it becomes necessary, the Director is to adjust, with the approval of the conference, the schedules of additional charges in asset and other cases, so that reimbursement may be made to the Treasury as soon as the appropriate fund creates a surplus.

It is intended that the total amount of fees and allowances to be collected for referees' compensation and for their expenses will approximate, respectively, the total amount of the salaries of the referees in active service and the total amount of their expenditures on a yearly basis. The Director is authorized to raise or lower the charges once a year if necessary, but in an amount which is not to total more than 10 percent of the previous year's collections. In this way, so far as the Government is concerned, the system will be self-sustaining over a period of years, as it is at present.

Paragraph (3) of section 40c provides for charges for special services by the referees such as certifying records, supplying transcripts, and similar services. The charges, fixed by the Director and the conference, are to be collected by the referee and transmitted by him to the clerk for deposit in the referees' expense fund in the Treasury.

Bankrupts today pay $25 to the clerk of the court at the time each petition is filed, $15 of which goes to the referee and $10 remains with the clerk. Investigation discloses that the $10 retained by the clerk for his bankruptcy services are greater in proportion than amounts which he collects for other services. The amount retained by the clerk for his services has been decreased to $8 by section 52a. Paragraph (1) of section 40c increases the amount to be paid into the United States Treasury for the referees' salary fund to $17, leaving the total amount of these two items the same as under the present act. This paragraph further provides for the payment of $15 in each estate for the referees' expense fund. It also abolishes the so-called pauper petitions. Under the existing statutory provisions a bankrupt is permitted to file a petition without the payment of any filing fees where he accompanies it with an affidavit indicating his inability to pay them. In such instances, however, many of the referees have later collected the filing fees in installments from the bankrupts. It is deemed desirable, in lieu of the present widespread practice of demanding payment ultimately, to abolish pauper petitions. It seems more advisable to provide for installment payments in meritorious cases and to leave the exact procedures for incorporation in the general orders of the Supreme Court. This has the additional merit of permitting future modifications as experience develops in a relatively simple and direct fashion.

Paragraph (5) of section 40c leaves to the district judge or judges the task of allocating, from funds on hand for pending cases, the amounts due the referees for services rendered and expenses incurred in such cases prior to the inauguration of the new system. After the inauguration of such system, the judge or judges are also to decide whether any subsequent charges should be made against these pending cases for services to be rendered, keeping in mind the payments already made and the new schedules of charges as fixed by the Director.

There will undoubtedly be a considerable amount of money transmitted to the Treasury from the filing fees and indemnity funds of pending cases which have not been fully administered. To this will be added the filing fees of all the new cases filed, so that it would seem that there will be sufficient funds on hand for the payment of the referees' salaries and expenses under the new system, with very little need for initial financing from the Treasury.

The committee believes that in order to attract competent lawyers as referees the salary system should contain, as an integral part of it, some provision for retirement benefits. Accordingly, section 40d (1) extends to all referees and their employees the benefits granted to officers and employees in the judicial branch of the United States Government under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. This places the referees and their employees on the same retirement basis as United States attorneys, clerks of the United States courts, United States marshals and their employees. Gross salaries are therefore subject to an annual 5-percent deduction and the same benefits will be received as are now accorded to other officers and employees in the judicial branch of the Government. Aside from the payments similar to those made by the Government to all other persons receiving benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, the retirement provisions of this bill will involve no expense to the Government.

Provision has been made by section 40d (2) to utilize the services of retired referees in the event that the referee is desirous of working and he is called upon by a district judge. The retired referee does not, by this service, return to his salary status; he continues to receive only his retirement allowance. On the other hand, regular collections for the referee's salary fund and expense fund are to be made from each of the estates which he administers.

Section 7 amends section 43 of the act. When a vacancy occurs in the office of a referee, or when its occupant is absent or disqualified to act, the clerk of the district court shall so notify the Director. In any such case, another referee may be designated by the judge, or the council may designate another referee from the same circuit, or the Conference may designate another referee from another circuit, to act. A permanent vacancy shall not be filled by a new appointment unless it is authorized by the Conference. The provisions of this section provide the widest possible latitude for the fullest utilization of the available referee personnel, and are in accord with the recent trend of having Federal judges from areas with little business assigned to others which are behind in their calendars, to assist in the more prompt dispensation of justice.

Section 8 amends section 51 of the act. The changes made are merely conforming ones. They place the duty upon the clerk of collecting the various fees and allowances for the referees' compensation and expenses, and of transmitting the sums collected to the United States Treasury for deposit in the respective salary and expense funds.

Section 8a amends section 52 as above referred to:

Section 9 amends section 53. As revised, section 53 imposes upon the Director the duty to gather all statistics in regard to the operation of the act and to make annual reports thereon to Congress, a function that he is now performing in accordance with the act creating his office. It is advisable not to enumerate in detail the exact nature and type of the statistics to be gathered, although if this is thought desirable such enumeration may be later specified in the general orders of the Supreme Court. Undoubtedly, with the creation of the Bankruptcy Division in the Administrative Office, a good deal more attention will now be given to this feature and many changes will be necessary from time to time as experience indicates the need for them. The inclusion of the fiscal information on the operation of the referee's salary and expense funds will give some indication of the efficacy of the operation of the system.

Section 10 repeals section 54, as amended. The present section 54, which gives to the Attorney General the power to request information from subordinate bankruptcy officials to assist him in compiling the statistical data required by section 53, is repealed. The Director is now compiling these statistics and he already has the requisite authority to request such information pursuant to section 304 (7) of chapter XV of the Judicial Code.

Section 11 amends section 62 of the act. The primary purpose of the amendments is to secure uniform supervision, together with standard auditing and bookkeeping procedure, by bringing all of these expenditures within the jurisdiction of the Director. This is most necessary, for in order to fix the expense charges provided for by section 40c, he must of necessity have some control over the total amount of expenditures. The committee is of the firm belief that this will undoubtedly result in far better working conditions and equipment for most of the referees than is possible under the existing system.

The provisions of paragraph (1) are identical with those now found in present section 62a, except that the words "other than referees" have been inserted. This section provides that the court shall examine and approve the accounts of all officers "other than referees." Obviously the referee should not audit his own accounts.

Paragraph (2) of this subdivision places all office and other expenditures under the supervision of the Director of the Administrative Office, and is merely a logical extension of the jurisdiction that he now exercises over the clerks of the district and circuit courts, probation officers, and other judicial personnel. In fixing the salaries of the referees' clerical and other assistants, the Director is to take into consideration the classifications for similar work in the offices of the clerks of the district courts so that they may be as nearly uniform as possible. Provision is also made for unusual cases that may require prompt action by the referee, such as may occur when a very large business or corporation files a petition. In such instances, expenditures may be authorized by the district judge in the event that it is not feasible to secure the prior authorization of the Director.

The authorization for the employment of clerical assistants by the referee in paragraph (3) follows similar provisions by which the clerks of the Federal courts employ their assistants upon the authorization of the Director. The inclusion of these provisions will permit the referees to utilize to a considerable extent their present skilled personnel, as well as give them a free hand in selecting and in discharging their subordinates.

Paragraph 4 grants the franking privilege to referees and special masters under the act. The phraseology used is almost identical with that employed in section 75s (4), according a similar privilege to conciliation commissioners.

Travel, lodging, and subsistence expenses of referees and their assistants are set out in subdivision b of section 62. Again, such expenditures are to be subject to the authorization and approval of the Director. Paragraph (1) is patterned after a similar provision for Federal judges, although the maximum is to be $7 a day as contrasted with $10 for the latter. No provision is made for a per diem for referees, again following the practice with respect to the district judges.

The assistants of referees are to be treated the same as regular governmental employees in the executive branch of the Government, with the present $6 maximum per diem allowance for expenses. The Director, however, can fix such lower limit for various classifications of assistants as he sees fit.

Section 12 amends section 64a (1) of the act by according to the fees for the referees' salary and expense funds, priority as an administration expense, on a parity with the other items set forth in that clause.

Section 13 amends section 72 of the act by reiterating that salaries shall be full compensation for referees and that allowances to them while acting as conciliation commissioners or special masters under the act, shall be covered into the Treasury. However, part-time referees may retain their earnings as

United States commissioners and as supervising conciliation commissioners as additional compensation.

Section 14 amends section 117 of the act, by emphasizing the advisability of making the special references under chapter X to the referees rather than to outsiders, except in unusual circumstances.

Sections 15, 16, and 17 amend sections 624 (3), 633 (2), and 659 (1) and (3) of chapter XIII of the act (wage-earner plans), by conforming changes. The amended sections deal with the fees for services and expenses of referees in wage-earner proceedings.

Section 18 provides that sections 1 and 10 of the amendatory act, and so much of section 4 as amends section 37b, shall become effective when the bill is enacted. The other provisions shall become effective 60 days after the conference has promulgated its initial determinations.

Section 19 contains the customary safeguards regarding repeal of inconsistent provisions, and the severability of provisions which may be invalidated.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4160) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4160, the referees' salary bill, with Mr. PRICE of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], 5 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Judiciary is fortunate in its selection of a subcommitte on bankruptcy, of which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is chairman. This committee has given a great deal of time, attention, and valuable constructive service toward modernizing the bankruptcy laws of this country. It is my understanding that the report on this bill from this subcommittee was unanimous and the report of the Committee on the Judiciary was unanimous. The bill will be fully explained by the members of the subcommittee on bankruptcy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is but little necessity for talk on this bill other than by its distinguished author, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], and by his colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], for such contribution as he may care to make, and by our other two able members of the subcommittee on bankruptcy, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI]. That is said not by way of seeking to shut off anyone else who may care to talk about this bill, for the more talk about this bill the better the House will understand and like it.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the subcommittee on bankruptcy and by the full Committee on the Judiciary, and is wholeheartedly supported by 40 organizations the Nation over who have something to do with bankruptcy. A brief collation of a few of them is set out in the report.

This bill has the approval of the Attorney General of the United States, the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges of the United States—of which Chief Justice Stone is chairman—the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Civil Service Commission, the National Retail Credit Association, the Commercial Law League of America, the bankruptcy committee of the American Bar Association, the National Association of Credit Men, and many bar associations which have given it special study. We feel that a brief explanation of what it does is sufficient to sell it to every hearer.

It creates both full-time and part-time referees in bankruptcy, and they have been elevated to a judicial position rather than a subordinate position. It strikes the shackles of the administration of the bankruptcy law in the form of the fee system from the referees and their offices and puts them on a salary basis, without cost to the Government based upon the fact that we have wiped out the exorbitant earnings of some referees in the larger districts but putting a ceiling of $10,000 on the largest salary. Instead of some making $100,000 a year in fees, in flush times, no referee may, after this bill becomes law, make more than a salary of $10,000.

We respectfully submit that while many of them think that is a hardship, we do not believe that the creature should make more than his creator in a legal sense. If the United States district judge who appoints the referee is limited to a $10,000 salary, we think that any referee of his creation might be able to get along on that figure. So it is with confidence, and with no opposition that we bring to the floor today this bill upon which we have worked for 3 years with expert advice from the leaders of bankruptcy thought in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished ranking Republican member of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], who will take charge for the purpose of introducing the author.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know there is no opposition to this bill and there should not be any. For many years, at least 10, efforts have been made to reform the referee system in bankruptcy, to improve the procedure, and eliminate abuses.

A number of bills have been introduced on this subject, but in every case until H. R. 4160 came before us there were objectionable features which incurred strong opposition. Apparently the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy of the Judiciary Committee has written a bill which suits all the groups concerned with bankruptcy matters. As the gentleman from Alabama has pointed out, it has the support of the Department of Justice, the circuit and district court judges, the bar associations, the credit associations, and the referees themselves.

Let me say here that we are indebted to the gentleman from Alabama for the splendid work he has done on this legislation and I should include also the members of his subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED]. We are also indebted to previous chairmen of that subcommittee. I refer particularly to Mr. McLaughlin, of Nebraska, and Mr. Chandler of Tennessee, former able and distinguished colleagues of ours.

Briefly, the principal features of the bill provide for putting the referees in bankruptcy on a full time basis and paying them fixed salaries, thereby eliminating the objectionable fee system. It makes these referees eligible for retirement under the United States Civil Service Retirement Act. It virtually gives them life tenure. Although appointment is for 6 years, reappointment cannot be denied them except for misconduct, incompetency or neglect of duty. It also provides a modern, businesslike method of meeting the expenses of the referees' courts in bankruptcy.

The only objection which can be raised is that the bill will practically freeze in office for life a considerable number of referees who were appointed more for their political connections and influence than for their judicial capacity. That, however, is not a valid argument against a bill otherwise meritorious.

For the sake of the record the bill ought to be explained in detail. For that purpose I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], the author of the bill, 15 minutes.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, bankruptcy has been termed a "gloomy and depressing subject" and has often been characterized as a necessary evil in any modern system of jurisprudence. Goethe once said:

> Let us live in as small a circle as we will, we are either debtors or creditors before we have had time to look around.

Whenever the relationship of debtor and creditor exists, some may always be found who either cannot or will not meet their obligations. Such persons are either unfortunate or dishonest. The laws of ancient days deemed insolvent debtors as criminals and the Romans permitted creditors to inflict upon them both physical torture and death. Probably the first bankruptcy statute known to man, was enacted during the time that

Julius Caesar guided the destinies of ancient Rome. It was a one-sided statute and permitted debtors to escape punishment by surrendering to their creditors all of the property of which they were possessed. It did not discharge the debts but merely avoided the penalties.

In England debt was also considered a crime and subjected the offender to imprisonment. It was to escape such severity of English laws that shiploads of its citizens were willing to go forth from the mother country and start life anew amid the hazards and dangers of the pioneer settlements along the eastern seaboard of North America. The first bankruptcy statute enacted in England came into being in 1542 during the reign of Henry VIII. Like the Roman law enacted about 1,600 years previous, it too, was a one-sided piece of legislation. Unlike the law of Caesar which permitted only the debtor to invoke its protection, the British statute was enacted for the benefit of crediors and merely provided for an equal distribution of the debtor's property without releasing him from his debts. It was not until 1705 during the reign of Queen Anne that England placed on its statute books a bankruptcy law that served the twofold purpose of discharging a debtor from his obligations upon the surrender by him of his property for the benefit of his creditors.

Very little is found in the debates of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 relative to this subject. The clause subsequently embodied in article III, section 8, of the United States Constitution granting to Congress the power "to establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies" was proposed by Mr. Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, and referred to a committee of which Mr. John Rutledge, also of South Carolina, later Chief Justice of the United States, was chairman. Upon a favorable report it was agreed to with scant debate. Mr. Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, observed that "bankruptcies were in some cases punishable with death by the laws of England" and stated "that he did not choose to grant a power by which that might be done here." Mr. Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, said that "this was an extensive and delicate subject" but that "he would agree to it because he saw no danger of abuse of the power by the Legislature of the United States." Connecticut, Mr. Sherman's State, cast the only negative vote on the adoption of this clause. James Madison in the Federalist—No. 41—said:

> The power of establishing uniform laws of bankruptcy is so intimately connected with the regulation of commerce, and will prevent so many frauds where the parties or their property may lie, or be removed into different States, that the expediency of it seems not likely to be drawn into question.

He doubtless had in mind the fact that at that time only two States, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, had bankruptcy laws in force and without a Federal enactment, it would be a simple matter to defraud one's creditors by removing assets into States where local laws were nonexistant.

Irrespective of the adoption of the Constitution and power granted therein "to establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies," no such power was exercised by Congress until 1800, 11 years after the organization of the Government and then only after three successive panics or business depressions which involved millions of dollars and caused such prominent men as Robert Morris to be imprisoned for debt for 3 years and Justice James Wilson of the United States Supreme Court to remove to North Carolina in order to escape imprisonment for debt in his own State of Pennsylvania.

The act passed by Congress in 1800 was repealed in 1803. It provided only for involuntary bankruptcies and was limited to traders. In 1841 a new law providing for voluntary, as well as involuntary proceedings and applying to traders, bankers, factors, brokers, underwriters, and marine insurers was enacted but this, too, was repealed 2 years later. In 1867 Congress passed its third bankruptcy statute which remained on the statute books until 1878 when it, too, was repealed. Nothing was then accomplished until 1898 when a comprehensive bankruptcy statute was enacted, which, though several times amended, remained continuously in force until superseded by the Chandler Act of 1938. Sponsored by our distinguished former colleague, Hon. Walter Chandler, of Tennessee, this law has been acclaimed by lawyers, jurists, and businessmen generally as one of the most worth-while accomplishments of the American Congress in the past decade. It was the result of many years of intensive study by the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, ably assisted by the counsel and advice of representative groups of businessmen, labor organizations, and leaders of the bench and bar.

The year following the enactment of this legislation, Attorney General Frank Murphy appointed a committee of which Solicitor General Robert H. Jackson was chairman, to make a thorough study of the administration of the Bankruptcy Act. Upon the elevation of Mr. Murphy to the Supreme Court and the appointment of Mr. Jackson as Attorney General, Dean Francis M. Shea, of the University of Buffalo Law School, was made chairman. The committee made a thorough and intensive investigation and on December 16, 1940, made a comprehensive report of its findings and recommendations. Briefly it urged a strict supervision of the fiscal responsibilities of referees and advised that the appointment, tenure of office, and compensation of these officials be modified. A bill to attain these results was introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress by another of our distinguished former colleagues, Hon. Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska. After hearings by the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization, it was amended, reintroduced, passed upon favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary and reported to the House. Identical bills were introduced in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

In the meantime the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges gave this matter considerable study and offered many suggestions which seemed pertinent and practical. A new bill was introduced and after hearings and amendments was reintroduced and favorably reported to the House. It is that bill which we now have before us for consideration. It carries not only the approval of your Committee on the Judiciary but also that of the Attorney General; the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges; the Securities and Exchange Commission; the Civil Service Commission; the National Retail Credit Association; the Commercial Law League of America; the bankruptcy committee of the section on corporations, banking and mercantile law of the American Bar Association; the National Association of Credit Men; the Bar Association of the City of New York; the Minneapolis Association of Credit Men; the Colorado Bar Association; the Denver Bar Association; the Chicago Bar Association; the Bar Association of St. Louis, and many others.

The Chandler Act like the one which preceded it, authorizes the appointment of referees in bankruptcy by the several district courts. These officials hold office for terms of 2 years, are eligible for reappointment and are likewise subject to removal upon the discretion of the discretion of the district judge. Their compensation consists of fees derived from the bankrupt estates referred to them for adjudication. Their functions are complex, being both judicial and administrative. They act as an arm of the court, passing on the claims of creditors, schedules of properties of bankrupts, wage-earner plans, priorities, dividends, and a vast number of other duties. They grant, deny, and revoke discharges, swear witnesses, consider testimony, approve bonds and, in fact, act as assistant judges in matters relating to bankruptcies. It is essential, therefore, that persons selected as referees should be of the highest character and have the legal training and judicial capacity to render intelligent and impartial service to the creditors, the bankrupt and the court. Uncertainty of tenure is a deterrent to attaining this objective. The bill now before us retains the right of appointment in the district judges but increases the term of office from 2 to 6 years. It likewise provides that any referee thus appointed shall, upon the expiration of his term, be reappointed unless found to be incompetent, neglectful of his duty or guilty of misconduct. It offers no protection to bad referees but insures good ones against summary dismissal for personal or political reasons.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois just made mention of the fact that the referees who were appointed would be prohibited from practicing law. Under this measure, would the referee so appointed be prohibited from practicing generally or would the prohibition be limited only to bankruptcy cases?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The full time referees would be prohibited from practicing law entirely.

Mr. SPRINGER. They would not be permitted to engage in the practice of law under any circumstances?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. Throughout the United States, the majority of referees in bankruptcy are part-time referees. What provision does the bill make with reference to the practice of law by part-time referees?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That does not affect the part-time referees. Only the full-time referees are prohibited from practicing law.

Mr. HOWELL. Of course, they would not be permitted to practice in cases in which they are interested?

Mr. REED of Illinois. None of them are permitted, of course, to engage in the bankruptcy practice.

Mr. HOWELL. It does not prohibit them from practicing law generally in the district court in which they may receive appointment so long as they are not in matters pertaining to bankruptcy?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Has the gentleman explained the situation where some referees under the fee system make as much as $100,000 a year?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I will explain that in just a few moments.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish the gentleman would also point out that this would greatly lessen the number of referees and would be a saving of the tapayers' money.

Mr. REED of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. With reference to part-time referees, has the gentleman informed the committee that part-time referees will be eligible to act as United States Commissioners in addition to their duties as part-time referees?

Mr. REED of Illincis. That is correct. The bill specifically provides for that.

This bill contemplates a drastic reduction in the number of referees and the creation and maintenance of a system whereby such officials shall devote their entire time to the duties of their offices, shall not be permitted to practice law or engage in other business and shall be paid salaries rather than depend upon commissions for their compensation. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts is required, within 1 year, and from time to time thereafter, to make a careful study of the general bankruptcy litigation in the country as a whole and in each judicial district thereof. From such survey he shall recommend to the district judges, the council of circuit judges for each circuit and the conference of senior circuit judges, the number of referees required, the territory they shall serve, the salary they should receive and the schedule of charges to be made in asset, arrangement, and wage-earner cases. He shall likewise recommend the appointment of part-time referees in territory where the business in bankruptcy courts is not sufficient to justify the appointment of a full-time official. Full-time referees shall be paid salaries of not less than $3,000 per annum nor more than $10,000. Part-time referees shall be paid not more than $2,500. The final determination of these recommendations is made by the conference of senior circuit judges who will have the benefit of advice from the councils of circuit judges, who in turn will have had the views and recommendations of the various district judges of their respective circuits.

The fees from which the referees' compensation is now derived will remain unchanged but instead of being retained by the referees, they shall be deposited in the United States Treasury where a revolving fund is created out of which their salaries will be paid in monthly installments.

Likewise the moneys now collected from bankrupt estates for referees' expenses shall be collected as heretofore but shall also be turned over to the Treasury into another revolving fund out of which referees shall receive their expenses. Inasmuch as referees' compensation and expenses are now borne wholly from the assets of bankrupt estates, it is not unreasonable to presume that the proposed system will be self-sustaining. Such is the opinion of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

Lastly, this bill contains a retirement clause and accords to referees and their employees the benefits granted to officers and employees in the judicial branch of the Government under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930. It places them in the same category as United States attorneys, clerks of the courts, United States marshals, and their employees.

These are the principal features of the legislation now before us. It is the sincere opinion of the various groups and organizations that have studied this problem over a period of many years that the Chandler Act as amended by the provisions of this bill will be greatly strengthened and the administration of bankruptcy in the United States courts will attain a high level of efficiency. If such can be accomplished the debtor and creditor will alike be benefited. The inequities of the present system are all too patent. It is absurd to ascertain that in many cases referees receive remuneration far greater than that of the judges who appointed them and in other instances their fees do not compare with the wages of a salesgirl at a ribbon counter. Certainly the reduction of the number of referees and the certainty of definite salaries, determinate tenure of office, and retirement benefits will attract competent lawyers to a career service in the bankruptcy courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Regarding the retirement provision, does that apply only to the full-time referees, or does it also apply to the part-time referees?

Mr. REED of Illinois. It applies to both.

Mr. SPRINGER. Both would come under the retirement provisions of this bill?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In my remarks I referred to the saving to the taxpayers. I meant to the litigants, not to the taxpayers, because this is paid out of fees that are paid in.

Mr. REED of Illinois. There is no question but that after the system is established there will be a substantial saving both to the creditors and to the bankrupt estates. The bill will cause the administration of the law to be more efficient and the efficiencies contemplated all tend toward economy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it contemplated that practically the same fees will be charged as are now being charged?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The filing fees will be the same as heretofore. An additional fixed charge based on the size of the estate will replace the present varied and complicated schedule of fees. Instead of going directly into the pocket of the referee for his compensation, these fees and charges will go into a revolving fund in the Treasury and then be equitably distributed to the various referees throughout the country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do you set up the amount of salaries to be paid?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The salaries of full-time referees are fixed at a minimum of $3,000 and a maximum of $10,000 per year, to be determined by the Council of Senior Circuit Judges. The salaries of part-time referees will not exceed $2,500.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Under the terms of this bill it will be impossible for a very few referees throughout the country in the larger cities to receive $25,000 to $50,000 salaries, when the judge presiding over the court in which the referee functions receives only $10,000?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct. They will be limited to $10,000.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentleman have any facts or figures to substantiate the statement just made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I think if the gentleman examines the report of the special committee appointed by Attorney General Murphy, he will find on the last page thereof a table in which all referees throughout the country are classified and the amount of compensation they received in the year previous is set forth. My recollection is that about 35 of them received salaries greater than the sal-

aries of the judges, and 8 or 9 of them received salaries in excess of $17,000.

Mr. BENDER. Has not the present system worked out pretty well?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Oh, yes; the present system has worked out well in a great many respects, except that it is inequitable. Many referees are getting compensation greater than the judges who appointed them, whereas other referees in sparsely settled parts of the country, who have done as much work in their offices, are poorly paid.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I think the hearings disclosed that in some sections of the country referees made as much as $25,000 in a single year.

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the committee feel that if we take those exorbitant, outrageous earnings, and average them with all of the others, in the long run it would not cost as much to administer the bankruptcy law as it does now?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct, and it is borne out by surveys already made wherein the average present yearly earnings has been balanced against estimated salaries to a reduced number of referees.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They not only receive those large salaries and fees, but they also carry on their law business.

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Now, when they receive as much as $10,000, they cannot carry on the practice of law.

Mr. REED of Illinois. This bill so provides.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman know of any group, creditors, collectors, or anybody else, opposing this legislation except a few referees living in the large cities where they receive these large fees?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I know of none. I believe the committee has heard of none.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact the present system creates an incentive for the referee to make for a greater distribution to the creditors concerned?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That I would say is one of the evils of the system. A referee should be a fair, impartial, judicial officer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. REED of Illinois. He should render equal justice to the creditors and to the bankrupt. Under the present system he acts as an agent for the creditors because his compensation is increased on each dollar that is disbursed to creditors.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. THOM. Under the present system does a United States district judge contribute a portion of his salary to the retirement fund?

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. The district judges do not contribute to their retirement pay, but under this bill the referees will contribute exactly the same as any civil-service employee contributes to the retirement fund.

Mr. THOM. Which is 5 percent.

Mr. HANCOCK. Five percent; that is right.

Mr. REED of Illinois. More important to me in the enactment of this bill is the fact that it means the abolition of the vicious fee system.

A law which provides that compensation of a judicial or semijudicial officer may be increased or diminished, dependent upon his decision in matters before him for adjudication, creates distrust and suspicion in the minds of litigants, no matter how honest or impartial he may be. Such a law in a free country is outmoded before its enactment.

In concluding these brief remarks I wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to our learned colleague the gentleman from Alabama, Judge HOBBS. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary for the past 3 years, he has labored assiduously and incessantly to perfect a measure that would remedy a serious defect in our judicial system. The universal approval of this bill by the bench, the bar, and business organizations is a high tribute to his perseverance and skill. Although many have to a greater or less degree contributed to the task of constructing this legislation, if, by your will, it is ultimately enacted into law, his will in no small measure be the triumph.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish now to release the time heretofore accorded me for a special order later this afternoon.

NO WAGE CONTROL, NO COST CONTROL, NO PRICE CONTROL—THE OPA SHOULD QUIT

Mr. Chairman, when the act authorizing the creation of OPA was before the House some years ago, I said in substance and in opposition, that the bill—this plan—will not work.

If there is to be no control of wages, there will be no control of costs, and it follows there can be no control of prices. Obviously, at this time, the control of wages is out of the window, as evidenced by the strikes and the attitude of the National War Labor Board.

There has been no real price control, as evidenced by the establishment of an inflationary spiral which may reach the sky.

We should not "kid" ourselves, nor allow ourselves to be knocked off our economic balance by the protestation of those who cannot see the forest because of the trees they have planted.

I still believe that if there can be no control of wages, and obviously as indicated by the strikes there is none; there will and can be no control of costs, so it is time for the OPA to fold up, for there can be no control of prices under such a set-up.

Mr. Chairman, I am unofficially advised through the newspapers that the President and his advisers are trying to find some way to keep inflation within a 15- to 25-percent limit. Why need there be any inflation except for mismanagement and lack of Executive action? The Congress provided the necessary stops and brakes and gave the President the power long ago to put an end to strikes.

That may be water over the dam; so why talk about it in this crisis—and it is a crisis.

Mr. Chairman, as you very well know it is an elementary premise of economic logic that wages determine cost and that without wage control there can be no price control. Since this is so it is time for the OPA to pass out of the picture for there is obviously no such thing as wage control under the existing situation.

The people should not be fooled longer by all the gratuitous insults to their intelligence. To make and to get votes to support the New Deal program the people have been offered up on the altar of futile gestures none of which point to reasonable or rational recovery or reconversion.

The time has come to talk business and to strip the program of all political partisan gestures if we are to survive the period through which we shall have to pass, embarrassed and encumbered by more politics for a purpose, namely, the entrenchment of the New Deal, than ever confronted any other generation. It is high time the people realized that their safety and security rest upon their own effort to divorce themselves from the idea that this is a good Government to live in so long as they can live off it.

I am not fooling myself. I think however, it is time the public should understand, and all they need are the facts: Here is one, namely, that of all the outrageous bureaucratic organizations illegitimately fathered and created by the New Deal unnecessarily, the OPA, as constituted, is it.

It was begotten by the "blue eagle" in an attempt to carry out a program which failed, and for which it had no authority in law.

Thus, OPA has transgressed its statutory powers repeatedly. It has misinterpreted the language of the act creating it. It has arrogated to itself powers nowhere granted to it. It has created unnecessary hardships for the citizens

of this Republic. It has hurt rather than helped the war effort in the ultimate. The facts are proof of my statements. The situation which confronts us is the answer. Had it not been for the good sense of those people who have volunteered, without pay, to see to it that prices were kept down and that proper support was given to the armed forces, the OPA as such would have been the most colossal failure of all the ages, experimentally, which is to say that, despite bureaucratic control and regimentation attempted, all the credit to which the OPA claims it is entitled to, should go to those hard-warking, self-sacrificing, overworked people, nonpaid, who did not get a cent for what they undertook to do. I take my hat off to them, not to the big boys.

The OPA has invaded and abrogated to itself fields of rights belonging solely to citizens, ruthlessly and boldly in its unlawful exercise of the right of search and seizure and prosecution, without redress to any court, so far as the victim might be involved. No man alive has ever seen, and I hope no man will ever live to see, a repetition of so great a violation of the rights of all American citizens again such as has been arbitrarily, regimentally, and cruelly exercised by the OPA in its alleged administration by sufferance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the OPA, as administered in Vermont under the able management of Mr. James Carney, has presented a picture devoid of many of the features to which I have referred. I do not wonder that the people of Vermont, or some of them, are for a continuation of rationing a little longer, as it has been administered under Mr. Carney, where the rights of the people have not been violated as in some places, yet the arbitrary acts of those in high places in OPA have seriously interfered with the efforts of many Vermonters to do business and to save their business.

There can be no question that the OPA is a chicken of the blue eagle, hatched by the New Deal, which necessarily must feed on rationing, hoping to grow as it feeds on the policies of the New Deal.

Mr. Chairman, it is not for me to say it, but I am going to do it, namely, the people are fooled as they have contributed their effort voluntarily to help save the country while the big boys in the bureaucracy have drawn down the money at their expense. The taxpayer pays the bills.

Now that the war is over, or about to be over, it is time to get rid of this paid outfit, and to clean them out of Washington, and to let the people back home run their own business without Government interference or dictation.

Just how self-respecting Americans could be made to believe they must take orders from a bunch of OPA neophytes is beyond me. This either is the people's government, or it is not. It is time right now to try to find out who is running this Government, anyway.

During the war, and to win the war, we in Congress had to submit to a lot of things, and vote for a lot of things—many of them worth while, others entirely not so, to carry out the program in order to win the war.

The day has come now when we may call a spade a spade—not an agricultural implement—without involving national security. So I say, Mr. Chairman, a good place to begin is with the OPA, which has been grossly ineffective; has not served the purpose for which created, because it could not do so, despite its high-paid propaganda agents, and all its publicity to the contrary. It has wrecked the economic stability of the Nation.

The OPA was born of a dilemma. It was always a mistake, used to compel citizens to cooperate, and only by reason of necessity succeeded at all in accomplishment of the ends it sought to attain.

The public should not be longer fooled, for that, as I said in the beginning when I voted against the OPA, it never could be a success. It never has been, despite its arbitrary bureaucratic methods, for you cannot milk a kicking cow while sitting on a three-legged stool, minus two legs.

The truth is, had it not been for the ccoperation of the public—that is the citizens, gratuitously made—the highly overpaid officials never could have done a thing. That needs no proof.

So, now it is time, and long past, for us to be rid of the incubus of the OPA. It is an octupus. The necessity for the continuance of the OPA is answered by the facts, not by theory. It is not needed.

Due to the loyalty and cooperation of the body politic, not under pay, the OPA has done many things to help the war effort, for which the people, not OPA, are to be congratulated. Had it not been for the volunteers, the OPA would have looked like a plugged nickel. What it has done could have been accomplished otherwise. So, again I say it is time for the OPA representative of bureaucracy raised to the *n*th power to fold up and quit and let the people carry on. All it accomplished might better have been done some other way. Those who have drawn down big salaries and have told the nonpaid volunteers where to get off will not like my statements, though they know they are true.

When the story of this war is written by some cold-blooded historian, if he refers to OPA at all, which I doubt, what he writes will be well worth reading. If he tells the truth, he will say that of all the war agencies which were born of a bluff, the OPA has lived off one ever since. It needed three legs in the first place and has tried unsuccessfully to wig-wag on one.

I must admit its publicity staff and its blue-eagle chicks made the people think it did something which it has not done and, in fact, never could do.

Well, Mr. Chairman, all the arguments to the contrary are answered and found in the strikes for higher wages today. These are uncalled for, but they are realistic justifications for all that I have said.

If we are again ever found in a similar situation, such as confronted us when the act to create the OPA was before Congress, I hope somebody may profit by the experience we have enjoyed.

Now with these few words of introduction, I want to know: Why those in command of organized labor's efforts are bound to kill the goose which lays labor's golden eggs? It is beyond the comprehension of all thinking people. Yet that is exactly what is happening.

The hard-working laborer should pray to be delivered from his pseudo leaders. The unreasonable demands now being made by the fomented strikes can result only in inflation. The sooner prices rise the quicker markets will fail. It is inescapably true that wages and prices are Siamese twins; wages measure the cost of everything.

The strong-armed methods now employed openly and covertly will not work.

How do you suppose a manufacturer can be compelled to continue to operate at a loss?

How do you figure employees can be compelled to work at a wage not affording a decent living?

The ultimatum is found in the fact—no theory—that we must either control wages or abandon control of prices. A man who runs may read that and understand it.

Since it is obvious that organized labor, through its champions, will not yield to persuasion, the only way is to teach it something. As Edson B. Smith said recently, and truly:

> It is a tragedy to let men who are not mentally equipped to exercise power intelligently have too much power.

In all the earlier discussions of the possibilities of inflation no one ever thought that it would be organized labor which would insist upon a program which would force inflation. The common laborer is no party to this program, for the average worker is bound to be a sufferer, probably the principal sufferer, from an inflationary spiral.

It is not as though there were anything new about all this. Inflations have occurred in nearly every country in the world and their history is written back centuries before Christ. There were bad inflations in Europe in the 1920's. Indeed, most of the countries of Europe are in the grip of inflations today. So is China.

It is a terrible thing that a few ignorant men in a minority can do so much damage to the majority.

And this same Mr. Smith, whose ability as an economist is recognized worldwide, whose attitude toward labor has always been forward looking and sympathetic with its problems, whose comments have always had the careful consideration of all the real friends of labor, goes on to say:

LABOR POLICY LONG LIST OF MISTAKES

He avers that the Government agency we had the greatest respect for during the war was the OPA. It made millions of mistakes. It irritated practically every American citizen. Its public relations were terrible. But it did accomplish what it was created for, the prevention of an inflation at a time when the productive facilities of the country were mobilized for war.

The OPA, says he, from the very nature of its job, had to be hated. Currently the agency comes in for much condemnation because it is still trying to keep prices down. And it should be emphasized that the fact that the OPA has outlived its usefulness is not the fault of the agency itself. If the rest

of official Washington had done its job as effectively as did the OPA, we would not be having all the trouble we are now having.

It all goes back to the early days of the war when President Roosevelt told Congress that if it legislated price control he would take care of wage stability without legislation. The War Labor Board came into being and soon evolved the Little Steel formula which, while not altogether satisfactory and fair, at least worked more or less well while the shooting was going on.

Since the war ended Government officials have made one mistake after another in labor policy. Labor unions have been encouraged to believe that they could receive higher wages without prices rising, even though a little thought shows how ridiculous this is.

So, Mr. Chairman, may I say that the time for oratory has evanesced. The day for hard-boiled practical statements has arrived. The safety and security of this Republic is not a partisan issue. The time has come to try to save our form of government. It will not be saved unless citizens who are responsible for their representatives unify and awaken to a realization of the crisis confronting them. The Congress is what they make of it by their votes. The tail should not wag the dog.

No American citizen wishes to be reduced to the days of inflation such as confronted Germany and France after World War I, but we are on that road—make no mistake. Temporary alleged labor triumphs against employers or vice versa should only awaken the American people to a realizing sense that they are the folks back of this Government whose will is the law. They are the majority.

What happens in the next 10 years will happen because of the attitude of the men and women of America, who are for or against our form of government. Their homes, their lives, the future of their children is all wound up in the ball of their reaction to socialism, communism, or Americanism. Let me say that I have high hope that out of this melting pot of the world will come a guaranty of such opportunity for succeeding generations as the world has never seen. To make this sure every American must take his job as a citizen seriously. Now is the time for him and her to realize that inflation will hit the worker the hardest, and that the United States Government must either exercise more or less control over economic factors. To put the matter bluntly it must either control wages or abandon its control of prices.

We do not want to see wage control, even if that were politically possible, which it is not now. Hence there is no alternative except to drop price control.

The trouble with official Washington is that it cannot seem to understand it is facing a condition and not a theory. Organized labor it is alleged has grown too strong to yield to persuasion. It is not practical to use force against it. Hence the only alternative is to let it learn from experience. The tragedy of what this may mean is not to be considered lightly.

It is a tragedy to let men who are not mentally equipped to exercise power intelligently to have too much power. And yet this is just what the New Deal did for labor leaders.

Looking at the situation over my shoulder I wonder that I was not more emphatic at that time, when I opposed the establishment of OPA, for after the years of publicity and almost useless Federal regimentation of the people, its record is not good as against what might have been accomplished otherwise. The people, not the OPA administration, made the program as successful as it was, which is not saying too much. The people, without the OPA, could have done and would have done a much better job. The people should congratulate themselves because of the voluntary sacrificial efforts made by them, not because of the compulsory Hitler-like ideas of the OPA, for what has been accomplished.

And now the war will soon be officially declared to be over, as Mr. Smith says, and I agree.

PRICE CONTROL WILL HAVE TO GO

There is no use, he said, in pretending that the Government can control wages any more. If it had started differently it might be able to but that is water over the dam. If there is to be no control over wages, which means no control over costs, there can be no control over prices. This is elementary. The OPA can continue to exist until June 30 next but it cannot keep prices down if costs go up. If it insists on holding the price line while costs are rising the net result is bound to be that goods will not come on the market. No manufacturer is going to make goods which he can sell only at a loss. No retailer is going to buy goods for resale unless he can make a profit on the transaction.

In combatting inflation, price is of importance but it is not as important as production. The quoted price of an article means nothing if there is none of it for sale.

Viewing the situation realistically we are reluctantly forced to the conclusion that the best solution of the present difficulty would be for the OPA to quit. The agency has been maneuvered into an untenable position.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring to your attention a situation that has developed to a critical stage in one branch of the jurisdiction of the Federal courts exercised exclusively by that court. It is the field of bankruptcy administration to which I refer, a branch of Federal jurisdiction, often unpopular in the minds of many people, but nevertheless extremely important as an integral part of our judicial system and of our national economy.

The field of bankruptcy in recent years has been greatly expanded to a point where it not only embraces the fairly simple problems of individual adjudication, liquidation, and discharge, but also involves the rehabilitation and reorganization of large and important businesses and corporations as well. This procedure for rehabilitation and reorganization has been provided at every level of our economic structure from the individual wage earner who honestly desires an opportunity to pay his bills under the protection of the court, to the farmer, the businessman, the real estate holding company, the municipality, the railroad, and the gigantic corporation, all of whom in times of financial stress have sought the protection of the bankruptcy court in an effort to weather the storm rather than liquidate.

The referee in bankruptcy is the principal judicial officer charged with the administration of these cases. It has always been a cardinal principle, whether right or wrong as a principle of jurisprudence, that the bankruptcy court should finance itself completely out of the business coming to that court. To that end the act of 1898 provided for the compensation of referees by a system of complicated fees and commissions based upon the amount of assets realized and distributed to creditors. The fee system was continued in the Chandler Act of 1938. In addition, the original act contemplated that the overhead expense in the referees' offices should be charged to and borne by each individual estate administered by the referee. It very soon became apparent that it was absolutely impossible as a practical matter to prorate or allocate to individual cases all the items of overhead expense in every referee's office. The fluctuations in the volume of business, the size of estates administered, and the uncertainty whether cases would or would not be forthcoming made the development of some other plan essential. As a result there came into being a revolving expense account in each referee's office known as the referee's indemnity fund. It was recognize dand approved officially for the first time by the Chandler Act and the General Orders in Bankrutcy adopted by the Supreme Court immediately thereafter.

The indemnity fund is created by charges made against individual estates pursuant to local rules. When bankruptcy business was brisk this system worked fairly well and in many offices substantial operating balances were established. With the decline in the volume of business these funds have been exhausted in 136 of the 346 referees' offices as of January 1, 1945. There are no funds available to operate these offices except as the referees themselves have contributed their own personal funds for that purpose. The amounts of such contributions have reached staggering sums in several instances, actually running into hundreds of dollars in some cases, and in one instance to more than $11,000. Also, in one district alone, three referees have been retired from office with deficits due them ranging from a few hundred dollars to more than $6,000. There does not seem to be any way, under the Bankruptcy Act, for these sums to be repaid. The number of referees required to make personal advances for the payment of official expenses will increase in the 6 months' period ending June 30, 1945, and the amounts so advanced will rise still further.

These advancements or deficits are made up of cash actually advanced to the indemnity or expense fund; undrawn compensation left in the indemnity account to be used for official expenses; deficits in the indemnity account, that is, an excess of expenses chargeable to bankruptcy over indemnity receipts; and in some instances unpaid expenses like rent, clerk hire, publications, and so forth.

The referees cannot be expected to continue to make such advancements from the present low compensation received under the fee system. In fact, I submit, it is fundamentally unsound for any judicial officer to be required or even permitted to personally finance his own court. The referee's court is the bankruptcy court of original jurisdiction, it is a very important court and it should be put upon a sound business basis. Surely such a system as now exists for compensating the referee and paying his expenses can bring no credit to the Federal courts of this country.

I shall not discuss at any length the fallacies and imperfections of a fee system of compensating judicial officers. Suffice it to say that such system has in almost every judicial office throughout the land been discarded and abandoned. The compensation of the court should not, even in the slightest degree, depend upon its decision in any particular case. Almost every question a referee is called upon to decide affects in some measure or degree the compensation he will ultimately receive. It may be recalled that the Supreme Court in *Tunney* v. *Ohio* (273 U. S. 510), held that where the compensation of a justice of the peace depends on whether he finds the defendant guilty, there is a denial of due process. I do not mean to infer that referees permit this situation to affect their decisions, but they should not be subjected to that pressure. It has been said that while it is important that justice should be done, it is almost as important that justice appear to be done. It is absolutely essential, of course, that the public have confidence in the integrity of the referees in bankruptcy.

Two bills are now pending in this Congress designed to correct these situations. They are H. R. 33, introduced by the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman HOBBS; and H. R. 3338, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman REED. H. R. 3338 was later introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] with some minor changes as H. R. 4160. The specific proposals contained in these bills had their inception largely in the recommendations made by the Attorney General's Committee on Bankruptcy Administration appointed in 1939. That committee briefly recommended the elimination of the fee system of compensating referees, a reduction in the number of referees, and the establishment on a national basis of a referees' salary fund and a referees' expense fund from which the salaries of referees and their official expenses should be paid. In January 1941 a special session of the judicial conference of senior circuit judges was called to consider the report of the Attorney General's committee. After a full and complete discussion, several recommendations were made by the judicial conference which were embodied in a draft of a bill introduced as H. R. 4394—Seventy-Seventh Congress—by former Congressman McLaughlin, of Omaha, Nebr., the then chairman of the special Bankruptcy Subcommittee.

Extensive hearings were held by the Bankruptcy Subcommittee during 1941, at which time several changes of a minor character were proposed, largely by the American Bar Association. These were incorporated in H. R. 7814, which was reintroduced by Congressman McLaughlin November 27, 1942. The bill was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary. Numerous organizations and groups interested in bankruptcy matters, including the National Bankruptcy Conference, the National Association of Credit Men, and the American Bar Association, approved that bill. It was placed on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar, but when it came before the House for action in December 1942 the required consent was not given. No further action was taken in the Seventy-seventh Congress.

The bill was reintroduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress as H. R. 1107 and in the present Congress as H. R. 33, by the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman HOBBS. Later a bill containing certain amendments to which I shall refer later was introduced as H. R. 4160 by the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman REED. These amendments are acceptable to the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman HOBBS. The measure is nonpartisan in character.

In September 1942, the judicial conference authorized and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court appointed a committee on bankruptcy administration which has devoted a great deal of time to this subject during the past 2 years. The chairman of that committee is United States circuit judge, Orie L. Phillips, of Denver, Colo., who appeared before the subcommittee at the hearings held on H. R. 33 and H. R. 3338 a few weeks ago. The principal objective has been and still is the establishment of a system of full-time salaried referees, supplemented where necessary, by additional part-time salaried referees.

In the report of the bankruptcy committee of the judicial conference submitted in September 1943, two changes were recommended in the bill then pending. The first related to the pension system provided for in that bill under which referees who could qualify, were given a 50-percent pension. This feature appeared to be objectionable in some quarters. As a substitute it was proposed that the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act be made applicable to referees and their employees on the same basis as such act now applies to United States clerks of court, United States marshals, United States attorneys, and their deputies and assistants. The other objection came from the district judges in whom rests the authority to appoint the referees. In an effort to guarantee continuity and security in office, which is, of course, highly desirable in any judicial system, the bill then pending provided, in section 34 (b), that a referee if approved by the Director of the Administrative Office should be reappointed at the end of each 6-year term. The Bankruptcy Committee and the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges recommended that this provision be stricken from the bill.

Realizing the imperative need for a change in the system of financing the referees offices, an informal meeting was held in Washington in January 1945, which was attended by the representatives of numerous credit organizations and groups interested in the salary bill, including representatives of the judicial and executive branches of the Government, in an effort to reconcile the views of all parties concerned. Representatives of the National Bankruptcy Conference, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the American Bankers Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Retail Credit Association, and many others were present. It was their considered judgment that the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act should be substituted for the pension provisions of H. R. 33 and that section 34 (b) should be amended to provide that a referee shall be reappointed at the expiration of his term of office unless there existed grounds of incompetency, misconduct or neglect of duty against his reappointment. These proposals and several necessary conforming changes are embodied in the present bill H. R. 3338.

May I at this point outline briefly the important provisions of the bill which fall into two well defined groups, namely, those provisions designed to put into effect a system of salaried referees and second, those provisions designed to cover the expense of their offices. Let me emphasize that the system is to remain as it is now, fully self-supporting and is to be administered as it should be as an integral part of the judicial branch of the Government. Further, it should be pointed out that under the present fee and indemnity system the unit of operation is the individual referee's office. That unit is too small. The present system is satisfactory neither when the volume is large nor when it is small. When cases are numerous, referees' compensation in many instances has been excessive, and when cases are few, many referees are grossly underpaid. The greatest difficulty, however, is encountered in financing the operation of the referees' offices. The individual office is too small a unit on which to base these financial operations. The bill under consideration provides for the creation of a national salary fund and a national expense fund maintained by fees and charges collected in bankruptcy cases from the entire country. In this manner the peaks and valleys will be leveled off. The referees will be given fair, adequate, and reasonable compensation on a dependable basis. their expenses will be paid from a Nation-wide expense fund created and maintained in the same manner.

Briefly, the bill requires a survey to be made by the Director of the Administrative Office of all the factors which would affect the number of referees, their territories and compensation. The Director is to make recommendations to the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges and to

the several circuit councils. The conference in turn is to make the final determination after having considered the report of the Director and the comments of the district judges and the circuit councils. Thus a scientific determination of the needs of this branch of the judicial system is assured.

Since the establishment of the Bankruptcy Division in the Administrative Office in 1942 a vast amount of detailed statistical information and other material has been assembled which will enable the Director to make his survey within a period of from 4 to 6 months without any additions to the staff already provided in the Administrative Office.

The appointment of referees is to remain with the district judges and where there is more than one judge in a district, the appointment shall be made by a majority. If no majority exists, then by the circuit council. The term of office is extended from 2 to 6 years and the referee is given some guaranty of tenure by the provision that he shall be reappointed unless there exists cause against his reappointment by reason of incompetency, misconduct or neglect of duty.

The bill changes the method of collecting the amounts necessary to support the system and the handling of these accounts. Some of the charges are fixed by the bill and in asset cases and in certain other proceedings a schedule of graduated charges is to be fixed by the director. Provision is made for a change annually in the amount of such charges should such action be required in order to operate without a deficit. Any deficit occurring is to be underwritten by the Treasury and reimbursed from funds collected in any suceeding year. The system immensely simplifies the fees to be charged and eliminates a number of troublesome items.

It would scarcely be possible to devise a less satisfactory system of meeting referees' expenses than that now in operation. Under the proposed bill an expense fund would be set up in the Treasury similar in all respects to the salary fund, out of which all overhead expenses in the referees' offices would be paid. It would be derived from cases and assets in the same manner as the salary fund. Indeed, collections for both will be made at the same time and the whole process changed to one of complete simplicity and uniformity throughout the country. I am told that charges made in the various districts throughout the country for the payment of referees' expenses range from a low of $3 per case in a simple no-asset estate to a high of $63 in the same type of proceeding. Surely there can be no justification for this great disparity in expense charges.

Expenditures from the expense fund would be under the supervision of the director and would be in all respects similar to that which he now has with respect to other judicial personnel—judges, clerks, probation officers and the like.

I have been deeply impressed by the complete and unanimous support given this bill by all persons, groups, organizations and departments interested in bankruptcy administration. Many of them have given the situation long and careful study. The bill has the active support of: the Attorney General; the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges; the Securities and Exchange Commission; the Civil Service Commission; the National Bankruptcy Conference; the National Retail Credit Association; the Commercial Law League of America; the bankruptcy comittee of the section on corporations, banking, and mercantile law of the American Bar Association; the National Association of Credit Men; the Bar Association of the City of New York; the Minneapolis Association of Credit Men; the Colorado Bar Association; the Chicago Bar Association; the Bar Association of St. Louis; and many others.

I am convinced that the bill is critically needed if the referee system is to continue to function. The Conference of Senior Circuit Judges emphasizes the immediate necessity for the bill. District judges have uniformly approved the salary system. Credit organizations are strongly in favor of it and sincerely feel that in the long run the reduction in the number of referees, the more efficient use of clerical help in larger and fewer offices, and the more efficient administration of estates will in the long run inure substantially to their financial benefit. Their approval is extremely significant in view of the fact that, in the last analysis under the philosophy that bankruptcy shall be self-sustaining, the creditors pay the bill.

While it is to be hoped that no avalanche of bankruptcy cases will ever again develop in the future, nevertheless, it should be recognized that with the return to a normal peacetime economy there are bound to be financial casualties to be assisted by rehabilitation under the relief chapters of the Bankruptcy Act or liquidated in ordinary bankruptcy proceedings. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the machinery required to handle these judicial functions should be placed upon the highest plain and financed upon a basis worthy of the Federal courts.

In conclusion let me say that this bill merely puts the referee and the financial operation of his office upon a national basis instead of the present individual basis. The system will continue to be self-supporting. It will operate with an increased efficiency in administration. Above all it will create a sincere and wholesome respect for the courts administering this difficult branch of exclusive Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the type of legislation which attracts very little attention so far as the newspapers or the radio commentators are concerned, but after all this is of a most substantial nature and certainly of great interest to every individual citizen of this country. I do not suppose there is anything sadder, more discouraging and more distressing that comes to the average family outside of death than bankruptcy, because when that ordeal faces an individual or a family it certainly is one of the most serious considerations that those people are confronted with during their entire lives. Therefore a system such as we have in this free country, which operates on the principle of private enterprise and individual initiative should have adequate provision for situations which are bound to arise wherein an individual or a company discovers that liabilities exceed assets and that the terrible ordeal of bankruptcy is at hand. It is then that the full protection of law should be given to every American regardless of his race, color, or economic status.

I want to compliment the Committee on the Judiciary for the long and arduous attention which it has given to the provisions contained in the bill now under consideration. I want to join my colleague from Illinois, the Honorable CHAUNCEY REED, in his compliments to the members of the Judiciary Committee and those who worked throughout the long years to perfect the bankruptcy laws of the United States of America. The gentleman from Illinois himself deserves every compliment for his active and persevering efforts in behalf of the measure before us, H. R. 4160.

When the Chandler Act was placed on the statute books of the United States in 1938 it was universally hailed not only in this country but throughout the world as a model bankruptcy law. H. R. 4160 now before us brings our laws so far as bankruptcy is concerned up to date in every respect. I speak not as a member of the Judiciary Committee who heard the testimony of all the witnesses but as a former referee in bankruptcy who was called upon to discharge the duties of this office in a district in central Illinois. I can testify first-hand that most of the abuses and most of the weaknesses in our bankruptcy system are corrected by the provisions of the bill now pending before us.

I know of the abuses that arose in connection with the use of the indemnity fund. This measure explicitly defines the indemnity fund and directs exactly how it shall be apportioned and how it shall be used. I know that in the metropolitan areas where four or five referees in bankruptcy served a great concentration of wealth their fees would greatly exceed the actual value of their services. In metropolitan areas these referees maintained common offices, pooled their fees and expenses, then at the end of the year divided what was left and always found they had come out with a very tidy sum of money, many times in excess of the salary received by the Federal judge who in the first instance had appointed them. I also know of the hundreds of small referees in rural communities where the size of the bankrupt estates were not large and the volume of cases rather high who received very little for their efforts.

I am glad to note that the provisions of this bill seek to correct these inequities along fair standards which have been adopted as a result of long study and investigation made under the supervision of the gentlemen mentioned by my colleague, and previous speakers on this subject.

I again want to compliment the Judiciary Committee and those who have been interested in the passage of this measure. It is needed in our bankruptcy system and certainly it will complete the finest set of bankruptcy laws on the statute books of any country on the face of the earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, desire to express my congratulations to this Subcommittee on Bankruptcy of the Committee on the Judiciary. I think that subcommittee has done a splendid job in the preparation of this bill for presentation to the House. This measure, if enacted into law, will cure many of the existing ills in the administration of our laws relating to bankruptcy.

There are one or two matters that I desire to call to the attention of the House, specifically the present situation with respect to the fees which are charged by the referees in the administration of bankrupt estates. Under the pending measure a full-time referee is limited to a compensation of not less than $3,000 per year and not more than $10,000 per year. The exact amount is to be fixed by the conference of judges, and the judge of the particular court under which the referee operates. Part-time referees are to receive not to exceed $2,500 per year, and that compensation, too, is to be fixed by that same conference.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. On page 10 of the bill reference is made to the salaries paid the referees. I understand, first, that a salary cannot be changed during a term.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is entirely correct, as I understand the pending bill.

Mr. THOM. However, does it mean that a man appointed referee at the time of the enactment of this bill will never have his salary changed during his tenure?

Mr. SPRINGER. As I recall, and if I am incorrect I want the author of the bill to correct me, these referees are appointed for 6-year periods; are they not?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. That salary, which is fixed, cannot be changed during that period of 6 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How about it being reduced?

Mr. SPRINGER. It cannot be reduced during the period of such appointment, which is for a term of 6 years.

Mr. THOM. It seems to me that the paragraph on page 10 provides that during the tenure of the man appointed originally under this act the salary can never be changed during his lifetime.

Mr. SPRINGER. On page 10, the proviso to which the gentleman refers, reads:

> That during the tenure of any full-time referee his salary shall not be reduced below that at which he was originally appointed under this amendatory act, and during any term of any such referee his salary shall not be reduced below the salary fixed for him at the beginning of that term.

Mr. THOM. Does the gentleman interpret that as meaning that the referee who receives his appointment at the time this act becomes effective will not be subject to a salary reduction during his entire lifetime?

Mr. SPRINGER. I might call the gentleman's attention to the next provision in that same section:

> *And provided further*, That no salary fixed under the provisions of this section for a full-time referee shall be changed more often than once in any 2 years, or in an amount of less than $250.

I think, perhaps, that provision is intended to clarify the former provision contained in the measure. Any change may be made of not more than $250 at the beginning of the term, but not during that term. That is my interpretation of that provision.

Mr. THOM. I still think that the first three lines on page 10 of section (b) freeze the salary of the man who is originally appointed as long as he continues in the office of referee.

Mr. SPRINGER. It might do that unless the provision, to which I last referred, would control in reducing it not more than $250 at the beginning of any one of the terms to which such referee is appointed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It seems to me under the interpretation placed on that language it cannot be reduced. It repeats it there in lines 18 to 23 inclusive. Does not that last proviso mean that it can only be changed once in every 2 years, if it is changed at all? It means that you can increase it but you cannot reduce it.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am inclined to think, as the gentleman states, that it cannot be changed more often than once in any 2 years, or in any amount less than $250. I think that provision clarifies to some extent the provisions to which the gentleman from Ohio has referred and, in my opinion, such salary may be reduced or increased, in such amount, and in the manner provided in this bill.

Following in (c) (1) on page 11, it provides for the payments which are to be made on the filing of bankruptcy petitions; the $17 for each estate for the referees' salary fund, and under (b) $15 for each estate for the referees' expense fund, as herein established. I think perhaps that is practically the same as the fees which are paid at the present time.

On this question of the fees which are now being received by some of the referees, I hold in my hand the statement from the Attorney General's Committee on Bankruptcy Administration of 1940, which sheds some light upon this question, and to which I will refer.

In that statement there are set forth some of the fees which are now received by some of the referees. Those receiving over $10,000 and up to $12,500 were 10 in number. They received those fees under the present policy of administering bankrupt estates. Those receiving over $12,500, there were 11 who exceeded that figure, but no one knows how much more they did receive per annum. Over $12,500 and up to $15,000 per year, there were 8 who received that amount in fees. Between $15,000 and $17,500 there were 7 in that class. More than $17,500 was received by 5 referees. There were 4 referees who received more than $17,500 per year, but the exact amount is unknown. Some of the fees which have been received by those acting as referees have been very large. The purpose and the intent of this particular legislation is to reduce those amounts which are now charged against bankrupt estates, and which come largely from the money available for distribution among creditors. By that reduction, by putting some of the referees on a part-time basis, and by reducing the number of full time referees, the cost to the people involved in bankruptcy will be much less than under the present system. The hearings held upon this measure conclusively show that the cost of administration of bankrupt estates will be much less under the provisions of this bill than under the present system. It is the wish of all to preserve for the benefit of creditors the largest possible portion of these bankrupt estates, and that the fees now allowed and paid to referees in bankruptcy be abolished and they be placed on a salary, in the public interest.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter that came to my desk this morning, which I should like to read to you:

FPO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
October 18, 1945.

Hon. GEORGE BENDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Today an ALNAV was received by the station to which I am attached. The general text of this message dealt with the generous (?) reduction of the critical point score for Navy personnel. The score is to be reduced by three whole points on November 1, two more on December 1, and one more on January 1; very liberal, I would say.

On my particular station there are approximately 20,000 men. Of these only 400 had sufficient points to qualify for discharge when

the score stood at 44 or, roughly, 2 percent. As yet I have no idea just what percentage of the total will be affected by the current reduction but can assure you it will not increase appreciably. If the Navy intends (honestly) to reduce its strength to the 500,500 men they claim to need for the peacetime Navy by next September, something had better be done and done quickly in order to come somewhere near this figure. This is not the best they can do.

It has been a particularly sore spot with us Navy men to hear of the big celebration planned for Navy Day involving the use of ships, etc., which could be used to speed up demobilization instead. Is this the thanks we are to receive for our efforts in bringing the war to a rapid conclusion? Is Navy Day more important than the souls of those men who are left to eat their hearts out on some God-forsaken island for unnecessary weeks and months? Does it matter to you who have been comfortable during this war whether these men spend one more minute than necessary in these stinking pest holes? If an admiral's show and display of power be more essential than derelict men of the Army and Navy and people we fought for are content to have us remain so, then I, for one, want to adopt another country as my own.

How about the men who are in the fruitful thirties who are still held by the Navy long after the Army has decided they have served their purpose and reduced its age limit to 34? Are we any more useful to the Navy than we would have been to the Army? Has anyone made an honest effort toward getting the older men out of the Navy? I don't think they have.

I do not want the usual letter saying, "I am doing everything in my power toward this end." I want answers to the questions asked and facts, not time-worn clichés. However, I suppose some broad-beamed Wac or its equivalent will read my letter and answer. Income and corporation taxes seem to be the current interests among our representatives at the nonce.

This is an earnest plea to you for help, which we cannot expect from our officers, who are having quite a good time of it. When they are reduced in rank, they will also suffer a decrease in salary, the difference of which we poor "suckers"—I hope to be a taxpayer again if and when the Navy gives me my release—will have to pay. We dislike the idea of having to pay this difference any longer than is required.

If an attitude of indifference is taken in this matter, the Army and Navy will soon have the toughest thing on their hands they have ever had to combat—mass desertion by the holiday season. I can assure you I would be among them if there were somewhere to go. The prevailing motto seems to be, "Over the hill at Christmas."

This, in conclusion, is another pet peeve. The station is overstocked on small-stores items, mainly white uniforms, which will be obsolete by June of next year. During inspections we aren't allowed to wear the ones we have, but are requested to buy new in order to reduce these stocks. In view of the fact we are to be discharged soon—so they say—we feel the purchase of new uniforms would be a foolish expenditure. Are we correct in our assumptions?

Hoping something can be done for us, I remain your 36-year-old, 36-point constituent who thinks Congress is lying down on the job.

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman now in the United States Navy who wrote me as he did has a justifiable gripe. There are too many officers both here and abroad who need to be demobilized, and I am sure if such demobilization takes place we will accomplish the demobilization of our Army and Navy personnel.

For example: Right here in Washington, we all know there are too many officers sitting around doing nothing but drawing their pay. We need to be just a little more outspoken right on the floor of the House regarding this problem of demobilization. Members of Congress should have the courage to say the things in the well of the House that they say to each other privately.

Elder Statesman Bernard Baruch has urged immediate consideration by our Government of the human side of demobilization. Our returning servicemen are not Army serial numbers, to be regarded as so many infantrymen, signal corpsmen, coast guardsmen, or marines. They are individuals to be treated as individuals.

Today there are only some twenty-two separation centers at work. Scores more are needed to hasten the demobilization process if the rate of separation now effective is to be increased. Meanwhile, thousands of boys languish in Army camps awaiting the call to a separation center, doing little of value in the interval. These men should be furloughed home at once, subject to recall to the appropriate separation center when the center is ready for the processing of their discharge.

Such a policy would enable the serviceman to canvass available business opportunities and make necessary contacts for resuming the former threads of his life or undertaking new responsibilities. It would give him the chance to explore educational offerings of interest. But more important, the home furlough pending discharge would reunite the serviceman with his family at the earliest possible moment and bring the human side of his demobilization to the foreground. We have necessarily caused many a serious wrench in the family lives of millions of people. The least our Government can do is to repair that violence at the earliest possible time.

Underlying the entire question of speedy military demobilization are three fundamental attitudes current in Washington. The first and most pressing is, of course, the insistent desire of millions of Americans to bring home the men and boys who have been removed from the normal channels of life to war purposes. Second in importance to most Americans but nevertheless persistent is the recognition that the occupation of aggressor nations must continue for an indefinite period into the future to prevent the recurrence of wars. Third and unexpressed in official circles is the uncomfortable belief that the administration is afraid of hastening the demobilization process because it hopes to have jobs ready for veterans before the vast majority return home. It is one of the suppressed and subconscious attitudes which contribute to the administration's willingness to permit the War Department to "carry the ball" on all debates concerning demobilization policy. For certainly the demobilization of an army is not a military matter. It is a civilian issue entirely. The military understandably wants to keep as many men as it can in uniform. The Nation's well-being, spiritually, morally, and economically, requires that they come home at the earliest possible moment.

The occupation of enemy lands must not become an exclusively American task in the Pacific area. Nor must we permit our gratitude to the military leadership which has won the war to sway our thinking as to the necessity for keeping millions of men in service. Once demilitarized, with the war-making industrial machinery removed, with all planes and ships removed from service, it will not require an army of 2,000,000 Americans to police Germany and Japan. The faster all those men whose presence is not required for occupation get home, the better for America.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I recently had a call from a major of Infantry, who is in the War Department, and his job for more than 6 weeks has been answering the telephone.

Mr. BENDER. Answering the telephone; getting into each other's hair. When you ask them a question they give you an involved answer. Instead of saying "Yes" or "No," they write volumes because they do not have anything else to do. I say, the sooner we speak up on the floor of the House and call a spade a spade and say the things that we say around the lunch table and say to each other privately in our offices, the sooner these boys will be on their way home.

Mr. Churchill made a real speech on the floor of the British Parliament day before yesterday. He told them a thing or two. He talked pretty straight about demobilization.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Certainly the gentleman realizes that most of the officers today who have desk jobs are the men who did the magnificent job they did in the field. He does not want to charge those men with inefficiency, does he?

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, I know the men who did the job in the field. We cannot say enough in tribute to them. All of us will be eternally grateful for their valiant effort. America owes them a debt that we will never be able to repay. The war is over, and it is time that we called "quits." The greatest service we can render our men who fought the good fight is to get them out of the service and back to their homes at the earliest possible moment. I am not alone in feeling that this is not being done as expeditiously as it should be. I trust that we will break down the barriers, cut out the red tape, and get the boys home as fast as we got them overseas when their services were needed to hasten the end of the Axis Powers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 1 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, as amended, is amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(5a) 'Circuit' shall mean 'judicial circuit' and shall include the District of Columbia, and 'senior circuit judge' shall include the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia;".

(b) Such section 1 is further amended by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

"(7a) 'Conference' shall mean the conference of senior circuit judges provided for by section 2 of the act of September 14, 1922 (42 Stat. 838);".

(c) Such section 1 is further amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"(8a) 'Council' shall mean the council of circuit judges for the circuit, as defined in section 306 of the United States Judicial Code;".

(d) Such section 1 is further amended by inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

"(14a) 'Director' shall mean the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States courts appointed pursuant to chapter XV of the United States Judicial Code;".

SEC. 2. Section 34 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 34. Appointment, reappointment, and removal of referees:

"a. Appointment: The judges of the several courts of bankruptcy shall appoint referees. Where there is more than one judge of a court of bankruptcy, or where the territory to be served by a referee includes territory in more than one judicial district, the appointment, whether an original appointment or a reappointment, shall be by the concurrence of a majority of all the judges of such court or of the courts of bankruptcy of such judicial districts, and where there is no such concurrence, then by the council. Except as otherwise provided in section 37 of this act, each appointment and reappointment shall be for a term of 6 years.

"b. Reappointment: A referee shall be reappointed upon the expiration of the term of his office, unless there is cause for not reappointing him by reason of incompetency, misconduct, or neglect of duty: *Provided, however*, That, in the case of a part-time referee, an additional cause for not reappointing him shall be that his services are not needed.

"c. Removal: Removal of a referee during the term for which he is appointed shall be only for incompetency, misconduct, or neglect of duty: *Provided, however*, That, in the case of a part-time referee, an additional cause for removal shall be that his services are not needed. Any cause for removal in respect of any referee coming to the knowledge of the Director shall be reported by him to the judge or judges of the judicial district or districts in which such referee serves, and a copy of such report shall at the same time be transmitted to the council and to the referee. Such judge or judges may, upon receipt of such report, or upon their own motion, remove the referee for any one or more of the above-mentioned causes; where there is more than one judge, such removal shall be by a concurrence of a majority of the judges, and where there is no such concurrence, then by the council. If the Director shall report to such judge or judges any of the above-mentioned causes for removal of a referee and the judge or judges shall fail to remove such referee, the council may remove him from office for any one or more of such causes. Before any order of removal shall be entered, except, in the case of a part-time referee where the cause for removal is that his services are not needed, a full specification of the charges shall be furnished to the referee, and he shall be accorded by the removing judge or judges an opportunity to be heard on the charges and he shall further, on petition, be entitled to review of such order by the council, and opportunity to be heard on such review."

SEC. 3. Section 35 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Qualifications of referees: Individuals shall not be eligible to appointment as referees unless they are (1) competent to perform the duties of a referee in bankruptcy; (2) not holding any office of profit or emolument under the laws of the United States or of any State or subdivision thereof other than conciliation commissioner or special master under this act: *Provided, however*, That part-time referees may be commissioners of deeds, United States commissioners, justices of the peace, masters in chancery, notaries public, or either conciliation commissioners or supervising conciliation commissioners but not both; (3) at the time when originally appointed not relatives of any of the judges of the courts of bankruptcy or of the justices or judges of the appellate courts of the district wherein they may be appointed; (4) resident and have their offices within the judicial district of the court or one of the courts of bankruptcy under which they are to hold appointment: *Provided, however*, That where a referee shall be temporarily transferred or permanently appointed to another judicial district, residence or office in such other district shall not be requisite for eligibility; and (5) members in good standing at the bar of the district court of the United States in which they are first appointed or, if appointed to serve in territory within more than one judicial district, at the bar of one of such district courts: *Provided, however*, That the requirement of membership at such bar shall not apply to referees holding office on the date when this amendatory act takes effect."

SEC. 4. Section 37 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 37. Number and territories of referees: a. The Director shall recommend to the district judges, the councils, and the conference the number of referees to hold appointment and the territory which each shall serve, after he has made a careful study of conditions throughout the country as a whole, and of local conditions, including the estimated amount of funds available for salaries, the areas and the populations to be served, the transportation and communication facilities, the previous types and amount of business under this act in such areas and where such business is centered, the existing personnel, and any other material factors. The territory of a referee may, if it is deemed advisable, lie within more than one judicial district, but shall be within one circuit: *Provided, however*, That the jurisdiction of a referee in any matter referred to him shall not be restricted to the territory to be served by him but shall, unless otherwise provided in this act, be coextensive with the territorial jurisdiction of the court or courts of bankruptcy whose judges participated in appointing him.

"b. (1) The Director shall, within 1 year immediately following the date of the enactment of this amendatory act, make the initial surveys required by subdivision a of this section, and required for subdivisions a and c of section 40, paragraph (2) of section 633, and paragraph (3) of section 659 of this act. Thereafter, the Director shall, from time to time, make such surveys, general or local, as the conference shall deem expedient. In the course of such surveys the Director shall give consideration to suggestions from any interested parties, including district judges, referees, bar associations, trade associations, and the like. The surveys shall be made with a view toward creating and maintaining a system of full-time referees. However, should the Director find, as a result of any such surveys, any area in which the employment of a full-time referee would not be feasible because of the small amount of business under this act and the extent of the territory to be served, he shall also report separately thereon, with a statement of all the pertinent facts and data and his recommendations and the reasons therefor. Upon the completion of the initial surveys the Director shall report to the district judges, the councils, and the conference concerning the number of referees, their respective territories, the amounts of their respective salaries, and the schedules of additional fees to be charged in asset, arrangement, and wage-earner cases. The district judges shall advise their respective councils, and the councils shall advise the conference, in respect thereto, stating their recommendations and their reasons therefor. The conference shall determine, in the light of the recommendations of the Director and of the councils, the number of referees, full-time and part-time, to be appointed, the respective territories which they shall serve, including the regular place of office and the places at which courts shall be held, their respective salaries, and schedules of graduated additional fees to be charged in asset, arrangement, and wage-earner cases, and such determinations shall become effective 60 days after they are promulgated by the conference.

"(2) The Director shall upon such promulgation divide by lot the total number of referees first to be appointed as equally as possible into three classes. The initial terms of the referees in the first class shall expire at the end of the second year, in the second class at the end of the fourth year, and in the third class at the end of the sixth year.

"(3) Thereupon the Director shall report in writing to the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy the number of referees to be appointed by them in each of the three classes above specified, the respective territories which such referees shall serve, and the respective salaries to be paid to them. The judge or judges shall thereupon appoint, pursuant to subdivision a of section 34 of this act, such referees in each of the specified classes for terms commencing 60 days after such promulgation of the determinations of the conference, and shall select them as far as practicable from the referees then in office within their respective judicial districts.

"c. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the conference may, from time to time, in the light of the recommendations of the councils, made after advising with the district judges of their respective circuits, and of the Director, change the number of referees and the extent of the respective territories to be served by them, as the expeditious transaction of the business of the several courts of bankruptcy may require."

SEC. 5. Subdivision b of section 39 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"b. Referees shall not (1) act in cases in which they are directly are indirectly interested; or (2) purchase, directly or indirectly, any property of an estate in any proceeding under this act. Active full-time referees shall not exercise the profession or employment of counsel or attorney, or be engaged in the practice of law. Active part-time referees, and referees receiving benefits under paragraph (1) of subdivision d of section 40

of this act, shall not practice as counsel or attorney in any proceeding under this act."

SEC. 6. Section 40 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 40. Compensation of referees; referees' salary and expense funds; retirement of referees: a. Referees shall receive as full compensation for their services salaries to be fixed by the conference, in the light of the recommendations of the councils, made after advising with the district judges of their respective circuits, and of the Director, at rates not less than $3,000 nor more than $10,000 per annum for full-time referees, and not more than $2,500 per annum for part-time referees. In fixing the amount of salary to be paid to a referee, consideration shall be given to the average number and the types of, and the average amount of gross assets realized from, cases closed and pending in the territory which the referee is to serve, during the last preceding period of 10 years, and to such other factors as may be material. Disbursement of such salaries shall be made monthly by or pursuant to the order of the Director.

"b. The conference, in the light of the recommendations of the councils, made after advising with the district judges of their respective circuits, and of the Director, may increase or decrease any salary, within the limits prescribed in subdivision a of this section, if there has been a material increase or decrease in the volume of business or other change in the factors which may be considered material in fixing salaries: *Provided, however,* That during the tenure of any full-time referee his salary shall not be reduced below that at which he was originally appointed under this amendatory act, and during any term of any such referee his salary shall not be reduced below the salary fixed for him at the beginning of that term: *And provided further,* That no salary fixed under the provisions of this section for a full-time referee shall be changed more often than once in any 2 years, or in an amount of less than $250.

"c. (1) Except as otherwise provided in this act, there shall be deposited with the clerk, at the time the petition is filed in each case, and at the time an ancillary proceeding is instituted, (a) $17 for each estate for the referees' salary fund, and (b) $15 for each estate for the referees' expense fund, as hereinbelow established: *Provided, however,* That in cases of voluntary bankruptcy such fees, as well as the filing fees of the clerk and trustee, may be paid in installments, if so authorized by general order of the Supreme Court of the United States.

"(2) Additional fees for the referees' salary fund and for the referees' expense fund shall be charged, in accordance with the schedules fixed by the conference (a) against each estate wholly or partially liquidated in a bankruptcy proceeding, and be computed upon the net proceeds realized; (b) against each case in an arrangement confirmed under chapter XI of this act, and be computed upon the amount to be paid to the unsecured creditors upon confirmation of the arrangement and thereafter, pursuant to the terms of the arrangement, and, where under the arrangement any part of the consideration to be distributed is other than money, upon the amount of the fair value of such consideration; and (c) against each case in a wage-earner plan confirmed under chapter XIII of this act, and be computed upon the payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan. Such schedules of fees may be revised by the Director, with the approval of the conference, not more than once during each calendar year, so that the total amount of fees, allowances, and charges collected and to be collected from all sources for the referees' salary fund and for the referees' expense fund will, as near as may be, equal for each fund, respectively, the total amount of salaries paid and to be paid to referees in active service, and the total amount of their expenses: *Provided, however,* That such schedules of fees shall not be so revised for any year that the total collections estimated by the Director for such year shall exceed by more than 10 percent the total collections in the preceding year. The Director, with the approval of the conference, may make, and from time to time amend, rules and regulations prescribing methods for determining net proceeds realized in asset cases, fair values of considerations, other than money, distributable in arrangement cases, and payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan in wage-earner cases; prescribing the procedure for collection by the clerk of fees and allowances for the referees' salary fund and the referees' expense fund; and providing for the effective administration of the provisions of this paragraph (2).

"(3) Charges for the expense of special services relating to or in connection with proceedings before referees shall be made and collected by the referees in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Director, with the approval of the conference, and the proceeds shall be paid by the referees to the clerk for transmission to the Treasury of the United States for deposit in the referees' expense fund.

"(4) A referee's salary fund and a referee's expense fund shall be established in the Treasury of the United States, and the amounts of the various fees and allowances collected by the clerks for the services of referees, and for their expenses, including the fees, allowances and charges for their services and expenses as conciliation commissioners and as special masters under this act, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States for the account of such salary fund and expense fund, which funds are hereby permanently appropriated for the purposes of the respective funds. The salaries of the referees in active service shall be paid out of such salary fund, and the expenses of the referees, including the salaries of their clerical assistants, shall be paid out of such expense fund, by the United States. Any deficiencies of such salary fund or expense fund shall be paid out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and appropriations to pay such deficiencies are hereby authorized: *Provided, however,* That there shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States in any subsequent year so much of the surplus, if any, arising in the salary fund or expense fund respectively as may be necessary to reimburse the Treasury of the United States for payments made on account of such respective funds in any prior year.

"(5) As of the day preceding the date when the referees, as provided by paragraph (2) of subdivision b of section 37 of this act, are to take office, an allocation shall be made by the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy of all filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances, and of all expense funds, due the then-existing referees for services rendered and expenses incurred in the cases pending before them, whether as referee, conciliation commissioner, or special master under this act. The balances of such filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances and the expense surpluses shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States by the referees and the clerks, to be deposited to the credit of the respective salary and expense funds. All cases pending before outgoing referees shall be re-referred, and no additional filing fees shall be required, but additional salary and expense charges may be assessed in such cases in such amounts as the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy may deem equitable, taking into consideration the schedules of additional fees fixed by the Director and the payments previously made therein.

"d. (1) All referees in bankruptcy and employees in the offices of such referees shall be deemed to be officers and employees in the judicial branch of the United States Government within the meaning of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

"(2) Any referee who has retired or been retired under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subdivision d may, if called upon by a judge of a court of bankruptcy, perform, without compensation, such duties of a referee, conciliation commissioner or special master under this act, within the jurisdiction of such court, as such referee may be able and willing to undertake: *Provided, however,* That, when so acting, compensation for his services shall be allowed and paid or deposited and his expenses shall be allowed and paid, as in the case of an active referee."

SEC. 7. Section 43 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 43. a. Vacancies; Referee's Absence or Disability: Whenever the office of a referee is vacant, or its occupant is absent or disqualified to act, the clerk of the district court in which the territory or any part of the territory served by such referee is located shall immediately notify the Director of such fact.

"b. Whenever the office of a referee is vacant, the Director shall recommend to the district judges, the councils and the conference whether a new appointment should be made, and no such appointment shall be made until authorized by the conference.

"c. Whenever the office of a referee is vacant or its occupant is temporarily absent or disqualified to act, or whenever the expeditious transaction of the business of the court or courts of bankruptcy may require, the judge, or any one of the judges, may act, or another referee holding appointment under such court or courts of bankruptcy may be designated by the judge, or by a concurrence of a majority of the judges where there is more than one judge, and where there is no such concurrence, then by the council, to act; or the council may designate another referee from within the same circuit to act, or the council may order that pending cases be re-referred and future cases referred to one or more referees within the same circuit; or the conference may temporarily assign a referee from another circuit to act."

SEC. 8. (a) Clause (2) of section 51 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) collect the fees of the clerk and trustee and the fees for the referees' salary fund and referees' expense fund provided in paragraph (1) of subdivision c of section 40 of this act in each case instituted before filing the petition, except where installment payments may be authorized pursuant to section 40 of this act, and collect the various other fees, allowances, and charges for the services of referees and for their expenses, including their services and expenses as conciliation commissioners and as special masters under this act;".

(b) Clause (5) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(5) transmit to the Treasury of the United States all fees, allowances, and charges collected for the referees' salary fund and the referees' expense fund, and transmit to the trustee, within 10 days after a case has been closed, the fee collected for him at the time of the filing of the petition."

SEC. 8a. Subdivision a of section 52 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 52a. Clerks shall charge and collect for their services to each estate, whether in a court of primary or ancillary jurisdiction, a filing fee of $8. The clerk may collect this amount in installments when such installment payments have been authorized by General Order of the Supreme Court of the United States."

SEC. 9. Section 53 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 53. Statistics: The Director annually shall lay before Congress statistical tables which will accurately reflect the business transacted by the several bankruptcy courts, a statement of the amounts received and disbursed for the referees' salary fund and referees' expense fund, and all other pertinent data."

SEC. 10. Section 54 of such act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. (a) Subdivision a of section 62 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 62. Expenses of administering estates; unauthorized sharing of fees; withholding allowances: a. (1) The actual and necessary costs and expenses incurred by officers, other than referees, in the administration of estates shall, except where other provisions are made for their payment, be reported in detail under oath, and examined and approved or disapproved by the court. If approved, they shall be paid or allowed out of the estates in which they were incurred.

"(2) The actual and necessary office and other expenses of referees shall be allowed when authorized and approved by the Director, including compensation of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants of referees at rates to be fixed by the Director, taking into consideration the rates for comparable services prevailing in the respective offices of the clerks of the several district courts, and the costs of establishing and maintaining their offices with equipment and supplies adequate for their efficient and economical operation, including mechanical equipment and devices and law libraries. Such expenses may be allowed when authorized by a judge of the judicial district or districts in which a referee serves in cases of emergency where it is not feasible to secure prior authorization of the Director. The Director, with the approval of the conference, may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this paragraph (2).

"(3) When, in the opinion of the Director, the public interest requires it, he may, on the recommendation of a referee, which recommendation shall state facts showing the necessity for the same, allow the referee to employ necessary clerical, stenographic, and other assistants. The referee may at his pleasure remove any assistant in his employ. If the office of a referee shall become vacant, the employment of his assistants shall not thereupon be terminated: *Provided, however,* That during such vacancy the Director may terminate the employment of any assistant, if, in his opinion, the services of such assistant are no longer needed.

"(4) Referees and special masters under this act shall be entitled to transmit in the mails, free of postage, under cover of a penalty envelope, all matters which relate exclusively to the business of the courts, including notices in proceedings under this act."

(b) Subdivision b of such section is amended to read as follows:

"b. (1) When authorized and approved by the Director, the actual expenses of travel, and the actual expenses for lodging and subsistence not to exceed $7 per day, shall be allowed a referee while absent from his regular place of office on official business.

"(2) When authorized and approved by the Director, the assistants of referees shall be entitled to the same travel allowances as are provided for employees of the executive branch of the United States Government under the standardized Government travel regulations issued by the President, while absent from their regular place of employment on official business.

"(3) Payment of the expenses allowed or per diem granted under subdivision b and paragraph (2) of subdivision a of this section 62 shall be by or pursuant to the order of the Director."

SEC. 12. Clause numbered (1) of subdivision a of section 64 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The actual and necessary costs and expenses of preserving the estate subsequent to filing the petition; the fees for the referees' salary fund and for the referees' expense fund; the filing fees paid by creditors in involuntary cases; where property of the bankrupt, transferred or concealed by him either before or after the filing of the petition, shall have been recovered for the benefit of the estate of the bankrupt by the efforts and at the cost and expense of one or more creditors, the reasonable costs and expenses of such recovery; the costs and expenses of administration, including the trustee's expenses in opposing the bankrupt's discharge, the fees and mileage payable to witnesses as now or hereafter provided by the laws of the United States, and one reasonable attorney's fee, for the professional services actually rendered, irrespective of the number of attorneys employed, to the petitioning creditors in involuntary cases and to the bankrupt in voluntary and involuntary cases, as the court may allow;".

SEC. 13. Section 72 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 72. Limitation of compensation of officers of court: No receiver, marshal, or trustee shall in any form or guise receive, nor shall the court allow him, any other or further compensation for his services as required by this act, than that expressly authorized and prescribed in this act.

"No referee shall receive any compensation for his services under this act other than his salary; and allowances made to a referee for compensation or expenses while acting as a conciliation commissioner under section 75, or as a referee or special master under any chapter or section of this act, shall be paid to the clerk, and by him transmitted to the Treasury of the United States for deposit in the referees' salary fund and referees' expense fund, respectively."

SEC. 14. Section 117 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 117. The judge may, at any stage of a proceeding under this chapter, refer the proceeding to a referee in bankruptcy to hear and determine any and all matters not reserved to the judge by the provisions of this chapter, or to a referee as special master, to hear and report generally or upon specified matters. Only under special circumstances shall references be made to a special master who is not a referee. The appointment of a receiver in a proceeding under this chapter shall be by the judge."

SEC. 15. Paragraph numbered (3) of section 624 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Where a petition is filed under section 622 of this act, by payment to the clerk of $15 to be distributed, $10 to the Treasury of the United States for deposit in the referees' salary fund and $5 to the clerk, in lieu of the fees of $17 and $8 as prescribed in sections 40 and 52 of this act: *Provided, however,* That such fees may be paid in installments, if so authorized by general order of the Supreme Court of the United States."

SEC. 16. Paragraph No. (2) of section 633 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The debtor shall submit his plan, and deposit with the clerk, for payment into the referees' expense fund a fee, not to exceed $15, to be graduated and charged in the manner outlined in paragraph (2) of subdivision c of section 40 of this act: *Provided, however,* That such fee may be paid in installments, if so authorized by general order of the Supreme Court of the United States."

SEC. 17. Paragraphs Nos. (1) and (3) respectively, of section 659 of such act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(1) the costs of the referee as specified in paragraph (2) of section 633;".

"(3) an additional fee for the referees' salary fund, to be graduated and charged in the manner outlined in paragraph (2) of subdivision c of section 40 of this act, and to be computed upon the amount of the payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan; and commissions to the trustee of 5 percent to be computed upon and payable out of the payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan;".

SEC. 18. Sections 1 and 10 of this amendatory act and so much of section 4 of this amendatory act as amends subdivision b of section 37 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, shall be effective upon approval of this amendatory act. All other provisions of this amendatory act shall become effective 60 days after promulgation of the determinations of the conference, as provided in the said subdivision b of section 37, as amended by this amendatory act: *Provided, however,* That the references contained in paragraph (1) of subdivision b of section 37 as amended by this amendatory act to "subdivision a of this section, and required for subdivisions a and c of section 40, paragraph (2) of section 633, and paragraph (3) of section 659 of this act" are intended to refer to those subdivisions and paragraphs as they will be amended when section 6 16, and 17 of this amendatory act become effective, and section 4 of this amendatory act becomes fully effective.

SEC. 19. a. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with any provisions of this amendatory act are hereby repealed.

b. Nothing herein contained shall have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under any act or acts of which this act is amendatory.

c. If any provision of this amendatory act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this amendatory act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this amendatory act are declared to be severable.

d. Section and subdivision headings shall not be taken to govern or limit the scope of the sections or subdivisions to which they relate.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Florida, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4160) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, pursuant to House Resolution 374, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by himself.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Jacobson.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, October 29, I may address the House for 15 minutes following the legislative business of the day and special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] No quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 175]

Allen, Ill.	Fulton	Mott
Auchincloss	Gamble	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Gathings	O'Konski
Barden	Gifford	O'Toole
Barrett, Pa.	Gossett	Peterson, Ga.
Barry	Granahan	Pfeifer
Bates, Ky.	Green	Philbin
Bland	Griffiths	Ploeser
Bradley, Pa.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Poage
Buckley	Hagen	Quinn, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Hall,	Rains
Butler	Leonard W.	Ramey
Byrne, N. Y.	Halleck	Randolph
Byrnes, Wis.	Harris	Rayfiel
Campbell	Hartley	Rivers
Cannon, Fla.	Hays	Robinson, Utah
Chiperfield	Heffernan	Roe, N. Y.
Clark	Hoffman	Rogers, Fla.
Cole, Kans.	Hope	Rogers, N. Y.
Cravens	Jarman	Rooney
Cunningham	Jenkins	Russell
Curley	Johnson,	Sabath
Davis	Lyndon B.	Sharp
Dawson	Jones	Sheridan
Delaney,	Keefe	Short
James J.	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Delaney,	Kilburn	Starkey
John J.	King	Stigler
Dickstein	Landis	Taylor
Dingell	Lane	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	Luce	Thomason
Douglas, Calif.	Lynch	Torrens
Drewry	McGehee	Vursell
Durham	McGlinchey	Weiss
Eberharter	Madden	Winter
Fernandez	Maloney	Woodrum, Va.
Flannagan	Marcantonio	Zimmerman
Forand	Mills	
Fuller	Morrison	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 318 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by himself including a statement by Rev. Dr. Clinchey, of Hartford, Conn.

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940

Mr. BOREN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title 3, part II of the Transportation Act of 1940 with respect to the movement of Government traffic, for printing in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 1 hour.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I wish to make it plain that I did not ask for this roll call. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] for purposes best known to himself, demanded this roll call.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I had the roll called in order to get the Members over here.

Mr. CELLER. That is quite obvious.

The huge volume of poisoned propaganda that has been spilled in this country by the Hitlerite jackals has had telling results. The evils of fascism and nazism, with their vile theories of racial superiority, have not been restricted to any one nation. Its roots have branched out and have grown deep into the subsoil of our own social, economic, and political life, and minority groups everywhere in this cherished country of ours are faced with the problem of digging up, weeding out, burning down the causes for the spread of this throttling growth. This is an activity which must engage our attention and it is well to know with what forces we will have to cope.

Tom Paine, whose pen proved mightier than any sword during the American Revolution, wrote at that time, "Prejudice, like a spider, makes everywhere its home and lives where there seems nothing to live on."

We must be realistic. We must face the fact that a virulent antialienism and anti-Semitism exists in this country; that there is a conspiracy against the foreign born; against the Negroes, because of their color; that professional "antis," like the spiders, are weaving their webs for the unwary and unsuspecting, especially amongst the lowly foreign born, and if a major depression is permitted to develop in the United States they will have a "field day." They are using the Fascist technique so ably demonstrated by Hitler and his hoodlums and are undertaking to turn against the Jews, Negroes, dagoes, all aliens seeking refuge here and other minorities, the nationalistic prejudices and resentments smoldering beneath the surface due to the chaotic events abroad. Some of them weep profuse, crocodile tears over disorganized Europe and in the next breath reiterate the charges that the Jews are solely responsible for the so-called spread of communism. To be a Jew, they would like you to believe, is to be, ipso factor, a Communist. They would turn Americans against all the foreign born. As a result, hundreds of thousands of Americans labor under the misapprehension that most Russians are Jews. There is no refuting these bigots. Then, too, any proponent of any change in our present economic system is hastily labeled, without hearing, a Communist, therefore, a Jew, therefore a dangerous character.

It would seem to me, in this campaign of hate, that never have men sunk so low. In my opinion, it is a moral catastrophe that has no parallel in history inasmuch as it would appear to be an invitation to fear and ruin. Racism, militarism, theological perversion, scientific lies, are preached and accepted without undue scrutiny. The exploiters of human weakness abound and are as malignant as a cancer. The unwillingness to recognize Nazi-Fascist brutality as a loathsome evil causes one to wonder as to the psychological state of the Nation. Are we to witness here a drama of national distintegration? Christianity—the word is fraught with such a tradition of brotherhood and mutual love—yet millions of its adherents render mere lip service to one of its most fundamental tenets, "Love they neighbor as thyself."

My esteemed friend and the famed author, Mr. E. A. Piller, in his brilliant exposé, Time Bomb, has analyzed the spreading growth of un-American pro-Fascist trends in the United States, as evidenced by the surprising increase in the number of organizations attempting to manipulate man's primitive, unrecognized, unrealized antagonism to the unlike. These groups are obsessed by the specter of communism and are seeking to attract at least a nucleus for supposed resistance. That they will organize total collapse and invite chaos does not occur to them, or if it does, it does not stop their plans. With an evil mixture of arguments, they seek to drag the gullible along a road beset with hazardous pitfalls in order to avoid a collision with the truth. But the House un-American Activities Committee is unperturbed.

The time alloted to me is necessarily limited but I believe it will be sufficient to touch briefly on the more notable examples of the anatomy of our native fascism. I am indebted to Mr. Piller for his challenging treatise on this distressing subject and have utilized his book to supplement my own knowledge of those

forces seeking to betray our invaluable heritage.

It must be stressed that not all these groups operate on the same level but it would appear that their aspirations of a political and social nature coincide—that is, to disrupt the American ideal of democracy which we have nurtured through the years. Most of these organizations concentrate on a venomous hymn of hate directed against all but their own self-selected group.

There is the highly respectable Committee for Constitutional Government, dominated by Frank Gannett and his wide interests, which seems to be ideologically linked with such organizations as the Christian America. Gannett's group has sought to reach into the upper stratum of our society with its highly organized publicity, its pamphlets and its Nation-wide mail campaigns. It has solid financial support. It recently launched an attack against the full-employment bill, now pending in Congress, tracing the ancestry of the legislation to Russia, quoting the Communist Party as saying the bill must pass and picturing it as the beginning of totalitarianism. The executive secretary of this committee is Edward A. Rumely, who was convicted and served in the penitentiary for failing to report German money during the last war.

Texas has provided the background for the Christian American, anti-union, anti-Negro, using the Ku Klux Klan time-worn technique, complete with proposed "necktie" parties, to great advantage, and stressing the idea of white supremacy. When the time is right, they plan a legislative assault to weaken labor, intimidate liberals, educators, clergymen, public office holders and not so incidentally, to frighten the Negro out of his recently acquired feeling of slight security.

The Klan itself is far from dead and is quietly reviving its strength throughout the South. Hoodlum groups are being activated, and, if the liberals do not weaken, terror will stalk the South. Well supplied with funds and excellent political connections, they have refused to divulge the names of persons or organizations supporting them.

The infamous Joseph P. Kamp is director of the Constitutional Educational League, supposedly "educational" in character. He has boasted of his long and close friendship with Martin Dies and recently published a "chiller", in pamphlet form, entitled "From the Files of the FBI", causing the Bureau to enter a vehement denial of its authenticity.

Then there is the Commoner Party, advertising its organizing campaign for "the formation of a Gentile Political party to combat the Jew and Negro racial blocs now active in the political affairs of the Nation." It operates out of Conyers, Ga. This group's leaders, Shipps and Emmons, have also distributed a violently anti-Catholic booklet titled "The Conflict of the Ages." They are known to have influential friends and extensive contacts.

Eugene Talmadge has not been idle. He edits the antilabor, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic papers, the Statesman, demanding white supremacy. But the un-American Activities Committee ignores these vicious groups.

In Houston, one finds the American Crusaders, planning to rid the country of the "niggers" and the "Jews" after the war. This is also the home town of the Order of American Patriots. No less.

In the Midwest, there are two major operational centers—Detroit and Chicago—in which these subversive forces thrive.

Chicago is the headquarters for many "anti" organizations sponsoring much the same program. They are against world cooperation, Jews, racial equality, the "Four Freedoms", and so forth, and so forth. They see red everywhere—and anywhere. "Liz" Dilling and "Nazi" Joe McWilliams are uproariously welcomed at mass meetings held there.

This town may also be ashamed of the fact that it harbors the Gentile Cooperative Association, which publishes the Gentile News, urging Gentile ownership and control of business, civic, social, and cultural groups—a more subtle and devious approach to the so-called Jewish problem.

However, many authorities consider Detroit to be the greatest danger spot in the Midwest. At the moment, the city is seething with unexpressed unrest, and with the many problems attendant upon overcrowding, poor housing facilities, and unemployment due to reconversion cut-backs, it is constantly watched for signs of disorder, played upon as it is by these protagonists of dissension, distortion, and strife.

Then, too, Detroit, is the stamping ground of Gerald L. K. Smith and Father Coughlin. The activities of the latter, until suppressed, are too well known to require repetition at this time. His most recent and seemingly innocuous movement is in the guise of a purely religious society now known as the St. Sebastian Guild, with a reputed membership of 200,000 servicemen, not to mention their mothers, wives, and sweethearts. No one cares to venture a prediction at the moment as to the future prospectus of this group.

Ubiquitous Gerald L. K. Smith is a prominent and proficient disseminator of un-American ideas. He is now head of the America First Party.

In Detroit there is the group known as the United Sons of America running a close parallel to the infamous Black Legion, of Klan inspiration.

It is also estimated that some 2,000 "hell-fire preachers" peddle their nefarious doctrines in pulpits and hired stores throughout Detroit.

But against all this the House Un-American Activities Committee directs no searchlight of inquiry.

In Kansas, Gerald Winrod, previously indicted for alleged sedition, continues his lamentable goings-on unabated.

In Indianapolis, Carl Mote edits the magazine American America Preferred.

In Los Angeles, Dr. A. T. Lovell is the leader of the National Kingdom, the west-coast branch of the Anglo-Saxon Federation. He has offered the observation that there were a few good Jews left, that he had nothing against Jewish women and children but the Jewish adults who had control of the country will have to suffer the penalty and pay for their misdeeds. He doesn't overlook taking a crack at Catholics and Russia gets more than a fair share of his attention.

The American National Democratic Committee—absolutely unaffiliated with the National Democratic Committee—has sought to profit by the association of names in the public mind.

There is the group known as the Knights of the White Camelia, and we must not forget the misguided yet vociferous women's groups, as exemplified in We the Mothers Mobilize for America, National Blue Star Mothers, the Current Events Club in Philadelphia, headed by Mrs. Catherine Brown, an associate and admirer of G. L. K. Smith.

There are many seeking to organize any discontent that may be dogging our returning veterans. We have G. L. K. Smith sponsoring the Nationalist Veterans of World War II. Joe McWilliams has set up the Servicemen's Reconstruction League. Edward J. Smythe hopes to get going with the Protestant War Veterans. There is the proposed Military Order of the Liberty Bell. We have the American Order of Patriots, operating out of Houston, Tex., labeled plainly "for Gentiles only." And as time goes on, unless something drastic is done about it, many more similar hate groups will begin to flourish.

Then there is the DAR, which has given us two striking examples of the Hitler philosophy of Herrenvolk and Sklavenvolk and the Hitler technique of ostracism. Refusing Constitution Hall to two distinguished artists, Marion Anderson and Hazel Scott, was most un-American. Does the Committee on Un-American Activities dare to continue to ignore the DAR?

In the congressional act of 1896, among the purposes for which the DAR was founded, appears the high-sounding phrase "securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty." It should read "securing for white mankind all the blessings of liberty."

The DAR has the right, for example, to deposit its collections in the Smithsonian and National Museums. It is privileged to make an annual report to the Smithsonian's secretary, who sends it to Congress, which has it printed by the Government Printing Office. All these endow the DAR with the character of a quasi-public organization.

Beyond doubt, the DAR has some responsibility to the citizens of the United States under these circumstances, and it cannot exclude any particular race or creed from the hall it owns.

Why does the present Committee on Un-American Activities seek to ape the discredited Dies committee by thus far operating only upon liberal or ultra liberal groups and individuals they suspect? What is sacrosanct about the Fascist organization called the Christian Mobilizers or the Christian Fronters or the resurrected Ku Klux Klan now burning fiery crosses on southern hillsides? Is the DAR a sacred cow?

I have only named a few of the bundle of dangerous demagogues and rabble rousers and peddlers of poison and hate sheets. What about these hate sheets?

I ask the members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate some of them. These damnable publications abound everywhere. Just to name a few: America Preferred, out of Indianapolis; Cross and Flag, published in the South; Destiny, coming from Detroit; Guildsman, from Germantown, Ill.; America Speaks, from California; Constitutionalist, from Wichita; Women's Voice, from Chicago; and the National Record, from Washington.

What is Mr. Adamson, counsel of this committee, doing about these vile, scurrilous, un-American publications and their editors and publishers, who would split America into segments and fill the country with racial and religious antagonism; split the Nation into hostile factions until it could find unity only in some sort of fascist slavery with some sort of fuehrer or il duce where they could also be top dogs?

On the face of all this come the unwelcome rumors—and I hope that they are only rumors—that Robert Stripling is to be discharged from the Army to become counsel again for this Un-American Activities Committee, although he has insufficient points to permit him to be discharged, and just at the time that his unit is to be sent to Japan. This is the same fellow who was deferred from the draft four distinct times. Such tender consideration for this soldier would be a damnable outrage. This is the same Stripling who, with its former chairman, Martin Dies, directed the vaudevillian antics, the brass-band tactics, the star-chamber proceedings of the former Dies committee. I warn the present committee. It can do a constructive job by picking no favorites- -that is by impartially examining liberal as well as conservative commentators, by subpenaing scripts of prolabor as well as antilabor commentators, cross-examining ultra-bourbon newscasters as well as those with social awareness.

The present committee can either adopt the Dies course of unfounded character assassination, lynch law, and prosecutor-jury-executioner complex or it can proceed, as I hope it will, in a manner true to American tradition, with the right to be heard, fair proceedings, and placing emphasis on investigation of all, not a selected few, foreign isms.

This committee has gotten off to a false start by singling out for investigation, broadcasters who can be labeled liberal and ignoring those of ultra-reactionary caste. Specific scripts of the following named have been subpenaed: Cecil Brown, heard on Mutual; Johannes Steel and Sidney Walton, WHN; William S. Gailmor, WJZ; Raymond Swing, of the American Broadcasting Co.; J. Raymond Walsh, of WMCA, and Hans Jacob, of WOV.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Just a moment.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I want to correct the gentleman on a mistake he has made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Adamson also asked CBS to forward a copy of the Eversharp program script of September 30.

This procedure can be interpreted by every reasonable man as an attempt to frighten liberals off the air—these men are all liberals—an attempt to intimidate sponsors of liberal programs. I hope that the Committee on Un-American Activities will take heed.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CELLER. Strangely enough, antilaborites and reactionaries like Rupert Hughes and the vicious Upton Close and the unctious and pontificial H. V. Kaltenborn and the caustic Bill Cunningham and others of their ilk apparently are not to be bothered. They apparently have the imprimatur of approval.

The excuse is given, I understand, that Mr. Adamson started all this. Well, if that is the case, why do not the members of the committee stop Mr. Adamson?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CELLER. If they do not, the committee is responsible. Just wait until I finish my statement, and I will yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman mean the whole statement? I want to correct the gentleman. He made a very bad mistake.

Mr. CELLER. I will yield to the gentleman if he is going to be persistent. I have a high regard for him.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I want to correct the gentleman in this regard. The gentleman is absolutely wrong when he says the committee or any employee of the committee subpenaed any radio scripts.

Mr. CELLER. I said that rumor has it that Mr. Adamson did this on his own account.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. There were no scripts subpenaed.

Mr. CELLER. If that is the case, why do you not crack the knuckles of Mr. Adamson and tell him he had no right to do this without conferring first with the committee?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. They were never subpenaed. I want to tell the gentleman that, and every member of our committee, both Democrat and Republican, will back me up on it.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman speak for the committee?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. No, I do not, but I happen to know in this particular case that no scripts were subpenaed.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will tell me that the names I have mentioned of liberal commentators are to be withdrawn from any subpena and their scripts are not to be requisitioned, I will withdraw everything I say. I presume the gentleman from New Jersey makes a difference between request and subpena. I make no difference. If anyone refuses a request it would be followed by some forceful procedure.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Yes, but the gentleman made a charge that there were scripts subpenaed. I am telling the gentleman he is wrong, as usual.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. I would like to make a statement, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. CELLER. Go ahead.

Mr. COFFEE. I would venture the suggestion to the gentleman that the scripts were not subpenaed, but they were requested.

Every lawyer knows there is a distinction but not a great difference between the two. In that connection, when a request is made by the Committee on Un-American Activities, it is considered as tantamount to a subpena, and the radio broadcasters would look upon the refusal of the committee's request as similar to contempt of the committee or perhaps a prelude to a subpena.

Mr. CELLER. The conclusion is inescapable, unless this request or whatever you may call it, I will tell the gentleman from New Jersey, is withdrawn, we are having a repetition of the deep-seated mania of attacking only one set of opinion molders because they happen not to coincide with the political ideology of Mr. Adamson or the members of the committee. I warn the committee again that the power to investigate is a great public trust, and the committee should not forget that for one single intsant. Six hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars was uselessly, in my humble opinion, spent by the Dies committee, mainly looking for ghosts under the bed, just tidbits that made lurid headlines. That money was spent in trying to destroy that which the committee professed to protect, namely democratic processes.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

WHO CONTROLS THE AIR?

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the question, Who controls the air? Maintaining the air free from monopolistic control has been clearly expressed as a policy of the United States Government. The Federal Communications Commission made this policy vocal when they said:

> It is economically and socially unwise to concentrate the control of broadcast facilities in the hands of a select few, and it is * * * essential to keep the door open to the fullest extent possible for newcomers.

Can we, as a nation, and as a national legislature, point with pride to the successful promotion of this freedom from monopolistic control in the airways? The answer is emphatically, "No."

In the Communications Act of 1934, Congress provided that radio stations should be operated only for "public interest, convenience, and necessity," and it has been the job of the Federal Communications Commission to grant licenses under this general policy.

Let us look at some of the facts that have accrued since 1934. The most appalling facts in connection with the concentration of control over the airways concern the activities of the National Association of Manufacturers and the extent and methods of control they exercise over the air waves.

For example, 10 clear-channel 50,000-watt stations now licensed to members of the NAM, utilize more power and space in the spectrum than all of the Nation's 444 local 250-watt stations put together. Furthermore, the actual networks themselves owe substantial percentages of their income to a few powerful advertisers and advertising agencies. Twenty-six percent of CBS's 1944 revenue came from four advertisers and 38 percent from four advertising agencies. A similar story could be told of the other national networks. Another factor pointing toward increasing concentration is the fact that in 110 cities, in which there is only one newspaper publisher and only one radio station, these two vital ways of reaching the citizens are either owned jointly or affiliated with each other. Another element in this question of concentration is the $71,000,000 worth of radio time purchased on the four major networks in 1944 by 46 advertisers who are also listed among the largest contributors to the NAM.

The fact of the matter is that there is freedom of the air only to those who can pay for it, and who are willing and able to maintain their "in" with the broadcasting systems at a terrific cost annually.

There are many who might say that this extensive power is perfectly legitimate in view of the size of the corporations themselves. To those people, I would say, how has this great concatenation of economic pressure, represented by the NAM, been used in the past? Has it been used for the "public interest, convenience, and necessity" or has this tremendous influence been directed toward perpetuating and furthering the selfish interests of the already wealthy industrialists?

I think the mildest description I could make of the NAM's activities is that they have consistently sought to present what they term the "businessman's point of view." Now, I have no objection if they are referring to the little-business man, the man who comprises a sizeable section of our population and whose interests certainly deserve to be defended. But I seriously question whether this is the case or whether the point of view they are referring to is that shared by men such as the 46 largest radio advertisers and NAM contributors mentioned before. This seemingly harmless defense of monopolists and big-league industrialists has been done so subtly and cleverly that the public is not even aware that they are being propagandized. Day after day, systematically and forcefully, the National Industrial Information Committee, which is part of the NAM, has attempted to hammer home to the American public the NAM's opinion about the national scene in general and the manufacturing industry in particular.

When I say systematically, I mean just that. The National Industrial Information Committee has left no stone unturned in its effort to rally to the cause of NAM every ounce of pressure which the tremendous economic resources of its membership can control.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. In just a moment. I had intended to yield to the gentleman but he was not here and I yielded to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. In short, they have utilized cleverly the well-known Hitlerian formula—if you can tell a story often enough and long enough, eventually people will begin to believe it.

To see the NAM in action realistically, let us look at their methods when a public issue which threatens to intefere with their power and privilige comes before the Nation. Their public relations director said in 1937, "Strikes are being won or lost in the newspapers and over the radio." Under this theory, which they apply to every major issue, their agents get the entire radio system to support their job of winning over the American public. In 1935, at a turning point in our legislative policy, the NAM was active in forcing the active support of radio stations all over the country to defeat the progressive measures then before the Congress. In a letter written at this same time by that same director of public relations, three issues were cited—the Wagner labor disputes bill, the social security bill, and the early adjournment of Congress, which would mean the laying aside of reform legislation. I quote from this same letter, "One, two or three speeches from every radio station in the country during this crucial period, when Congress is formulating its final program explaining important issues to the people, urging them to express their views to Congress would be tremendously effective. Others are utilizing every medium of publicity and education. Are we?"

The diabolical part of this set-up is that the NAM can get radio time to have its views expressed over the national hook-ups, often without even paying for it. It has boasted that as a result of its power over many of the licensees it was able to secure as much as $1,000,000 worth of free time in a single year. NAM employees have been presented as impartial news commentators in daily broadcasts on a national scale, without any revelation of their connection with the NAM.

I charge that there are pitifully few really independent commentators left on our NAM-dominated American air waves. Are we going to allow a committee of this House, speaking and acting for the entire House, to frighten, threaten, or not too subtly to cajole into silence those few commentators and radio programs whose views and interpretations of the news may not meet the exacting tests of NAM censors? With all the power at my command, I shout "No."

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I would like to inquire how much time the gentleman from Washington has to read this statement.

The SPEAKER. He has all the time that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will yield him, included within the hour of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SHAFER. Will the gentleman yield to me later?

Mr. CELLER. I intend to yield to the gentleman later. I hope the gentleman will terminate his remarks soon.

Mr. COFFEE. And how have they done this? By handing cut canned propaganda which they are able to force radio stations to use through economic pressure. Apparently harmless series of programs, designed for the entire family, are full of plugs, however, for the NAM's interpretation of the news. This has been provided as a steady diet for the American public. "Public Information" is what the NAM calls this campaign. This group furnishes free of charge to radio stations a series of dramatic sketches, interviews, and speeches featuring prominent industrialists, all of which are presented to the radio audiences without the identification of the NAM attached. These programs are usually identified with the name of the National Industrial Council, a name unfamiliar to the American public and which is not generally connected with the NAM.

In other words, are we going to censor radio? That is the pertinent point which the gentleman from New York brought up in this discussion, as to whether or not all of us are going to sit back without protest while our own committee, designated by us, requests the scripts of certain special, liberal radio commentators, while ignoring those of a more conservative complexion. That is the issue of freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of the radio.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman states the issue very succinctly indeed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article which appeared today in the Washington Daily News by one of the staff writers of the Scripps-Howard papers, Eugene Siegel. He makes mention of an individual by the name of Carl Mote, who edits a magazine called America Preferred. It might be of interest to quote briefly from this article. It reads as follows:

CLEVELAND, October 24.—Carl H. Mote, Indianapolis hate propagandist whose activities were detailed in Scripps-Howard newspaper articles exposing the Nationalist Party, has been ousted as president of the National Farmers Guild for creating dissension and disunity. The articles appeared in the Washington Daily News.

Mote, whose magazine America Preferred published a letter declaring the war had demonstrated that the Germans are superior to Americans, was removed by unanimous vote of officers and directors of the Guild, meeting at Monticello, Ind. They charged him with misconduct in office, insubordination and with calling Indiana Farmers' Guild directors un-American.

Guild officers said the letter to which they objected was published in the May issue of America Preferred without adverse comment

by publisher Mote. The letter said: "The war has fully demonstrated one thing, and that is that the Germans are superior to Americans and the English physically, intellectually, esthetically, and morally."

GERALD SMITH ASSOCIATE

Mote is a close associate of Gerald L. K. Smith, notorious rabble-rouser. He became president of the Farmers Guild in December 1944. The Guild is active in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

In March 1944, Guild members in Drake County, raided the township hall at Greenville, destroying OPA and Agricultural Adjustment Administration records. A Federal court imposed suspended prison sentences and fines on six of them.

SECOND CLIPPED

Mote is the second important nationalist leader whose activities were curtailed following publication of articles in the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Robert R. Reynolds, organizer and head of the Nationalist Party, has ceased publishing one of the party's organs.

Mr. CELLER. I am glad the gentleman has reemphasized what I said to this man Mote and Gerald L. K. Smith.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I desire to make one or two brief comments on certain points that have been made in the discussion previously. First of all I think all Members are aware of the fact that many of the American native Fascist organizations that have been spewing their hate around this country for the last couple of decades have been giving birth to brand new pseudo veterans' organizations during the last year or so. I am reliably informed that one of the fine veterans' organizations composed of men who have seen service in this war, the American Veterans' Committee, has asked the Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate some four or five of these Fascist veterans' organizations. I am further informed that to date the committee has taken no action upon this request and I should like to know why the Committee on Un-American Activities does not investigate these newly formed Fascist veterans' organizations.

My second comment is that I should like to submit to the gentleman from New York for inclusion with his remarks if he so desires, a table that I have supplementing the remarks made by the gentleman from Washington. I hold in my hand a list of 53 corporations who are among the biggest contributors to the National Manufacturers Association, all of whom have spent large sums of money on the radio. The total amount spent by these 53 corporations, according to Advertising Age, which no one in this House can accuse of being a Communist organization, is $82,729,886 for the year 1944 alone.

I agree entirely with the remarks of the gentleman from Washington; control of the air certainly rests in the hands of the NAM and its affiliated large corporations. If the Committee on Un-American Activities wants to know why there is little freedom of the air I suggest they investigate the NAM and its affiliated corporations.

Mr. CELLER. I shall be glad to include the table:

EXHIBIT No. 6

Table showing network radio time expenditures in 1944[1] by 53 corporations among the 262 largest contributors[2] to the National Association of Manufacturers

NAME OF COMPANY AND 1944 RADIO NETWORK EXPENDITURES	
Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp	$222,892
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	741,606
American Tobacco Co	3,599,777
Armour & Co	295,792
Armstrong Cork Co	403,395
Campbell Soup Co	1,576,473
Celanese Corp. of America	756,093
Chrysler Corp	782,064
Colgate-Palmolive-Peet	3,370,285
Corn Products Refining Co	496,428
Cudahy Packing Co	652,351
Curtis Publishing Co	603,649
E. I. duPont de Nemours	760,650
Electric Auto-Lite Co	623,244
Emerson Drug Co	1,086,576
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	754,140
General Electric Co	2,413,197
General Foods Corp	9,519,882
General Mills, Inc	5,746,107
General Motors Corp	999,219
Gillette Safety Razor Co	703,978
B. F. Goodrich Co	963,025
H. J. Heinz Co	831,376
Johnson & Johnson	311,340
Johns-Manville Corp	863,730
Kellogg Co	3,259,859
P. Lorillard Co	1,527,773
McKesson & Robbins, Inc	473,402
Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co	334,626
John Morrell & Co	290,344
National Dairy Products Corp	1,594,085
Owens-Illinois Glass Co	1,165,403
Pet Milk Sales Corp	800,350
Pillsbury Flour Mills Co	214,304
Procter & Gamble	13,093,076
Pure Oil Co	591,608
Quaker Oats Co	1,999,955
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co	3,420,834
Radio Corp. of America	573,445
Sherwin-Williams Co	1,043,004
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	1,380,563
E. R. Squibb & Sons	891,002
Standard Brands, Inc	3,216,734
Standard Oil of California	209,148
Sun Oil Co	956,348
Swift & Co	1,257,138
Texas Co	1,104,527
United States Rubber Co	1,306,719
United States Tobacco Co	411,504
Vick Chemical Co	779,309
Westinghouse Electric Manufacturing Co	1,473,719
Wheeling Steel Corp	164,643
Wilson Sporting Goods Co	119,195
Total	82,729,886

[1] Source: Advertising Age, March 5, 1945, pp. 42–43. Excluded from this table are (a) all companies spending less than $100,000 in 1944 for network time over the four major networks, and (b) the nonnetwork radio time expenditures of the companies shown.

[2] Source: Report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor investigating violations of free speech and rights of labor; Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, part III, the National Association of Manufacturers, appendix 5, pp. 247–255. Excluded from this table are nearly 12,000 other corporations which are members of the NAM and many of which unquestionably buy radio time.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PATTERSON. I wish to make a few observations. The so-called Un-American Activities Committee is a hang-over from the old Dies committee, which entirely disregarded judicial procedure. Witnesses were not permitted to have counsel; the accused were not allowed to face their accusers. These same tactics have been carried over by the new standing committee. The old was wrong, and this is wrong.

The old committee and this committee have violated the concept of American democracy. We have a Federal Bureau of Investigation to uncover subversive activities in America, and I cannot see why the additional expense of a congressional committee, with no power to take punitive action, should be borne by the taxpayer.

To me this committee is a sham. It is not used to bring to justice those who indulge in un-American activities. Rather it is used as a political weapon against the members of the Democratic Party.

On the eve of the California general election in 1938 the Dies committee released to the press false, perjured testimony against the Democratic candidates for Senator, Governor, and Lieutenant Governor. They were never given a chance to defend themselves against this smear.

The Dies committee and the present committee have investigated the motion-picture industry in California. The Dies committee came up with nothing, and I am sure this one will have the same experience.

The present committee has now embarked on an intimidation through insinuation campaign, investigating the scripts of radio commentators. To my knowledge, one man has already been fired by his station because of the stigma attached thereto.

If this committee can investigate the radio scripts of commentators, it can also review the press and those scripts prepared by all candidates of the Democratic and Republican Parties. Thus, by intimidation through insinuation curtailing the freedoms of speech and press and the thoughts of all people's candidates for office.

To me this is riding herd upon the thought of the American people. It is against the very spirit of our Constitution and our free American institutions. I feel that the activities of this committee are an attempted legalistic body blow against all of us here in the United States who value our democratic form of government. A frightening similarity arises between these activities, those of the Japanese thought police, and Hitler's gestapo.

My purpose in speaking today is to recommend that the Congress consider House Resolution 376, which, when adopted, would bring to the floor, for full debate, House Resolution 58, which in turn strikes out the rules which set up the present so-called un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his observation and before yielding further may I say that there is no static

definition of "Americanism." There must be fluidity in the determination of that definition just as there must be fluidity in all political thought; otherwise we just become robots and automatons. Therefore, when somebody comes on the radio or somebody in the pulpit or somebody in the press speaks for a change, it is idle, it is tragic, to brand that person, regardless of his affiliation, as a Communist or as somebody who is loathsome just because he is dissatisfied with the status quo.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California mentioned Resolution 58. I happen to be the author of that resolution. It is very short and repeals the part of the rule which was adopted, as amended, on the first day of the present session. It is my understanding, however, that a discharge petition with regard to rule LVIII would not lie because of the fact that it is not a public resolution.

There is a way to do something about this. On January 29 of this year I introduced H. R. 1834, a bill to prescribe the procedure of legislative investigating committees and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees.

I have no quarrel with investigating un-American activities. I do feel, however, that we should not have a permanent standing investigating committee of that nature, which was the reason I introduced House Resolution 58. I introduced H. R. 1834, a bill that if adopted would take care of most of this criticism. It is to set up a proper procedure for investigating committees. It was not picked out of the air. Practically the same thing came up over 20 years ago in Great Britain. They were having the same trouble. Then there was an investigation made of this same subject and a report sent to Parliament on investigations by royal commissions.

Rules and regulations were set up that worked the thing out perfectly. I have based that bill upon that report. The establishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee of the House of Representatives brings this problem to a head. At the time I introduced this bill I sent out to practically every educator in this Nation and practically every prominent person, both conservative and liberal, a copy of the bill and asked them for their comments. I am happy to say that a big majority of the educators and prominent people of this Nation have endorsed the bill.

I have here a letter from Dean Landis of the Law School of Harvard University in which he endorses the bill and suggests some few changes which I think are commendable. I think that we should adopt this bill setting up proper procedure of investigating committees not only for the protection of the witnesses but for the protection of the Committee itself. We will then eliminate nine-tenths of the criticism that has been heaped upon the Committee. I have today placed in the hopper a resolution to make H. R. 1834 a special order of business. If we are not considered on that, I shall in due time place on the Clerk's desk a petition to discharge the Committee on Rules so that we may consider this bill.

H. R. 1834

A bill to prescribe the procedures of legislative investigating committees and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees.

Be it enacted, etc.,

DEFINITION

SECTION 1. The term "legislative committee," as used herein, shall mean any joint, standing, select, or special committee or subcommittee thereof, established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress or by either House or by any committee of either House.

HEARINGS OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

SEC. 2. (a) A legislative committee may hold either public or private hearings and may examine witnesses and receive documentary evidence in such hearings.

(b) If the testimony of a witness in a private hearing shall be reported stenographically, he shall be entitled to a stenographic copy of such testimony, upon payment of the costs of such transcript, as soon as the committee shall make any public reference to such testimony.

(c) A witness at a private hearing shall have the right to have his attorney present: *Provided*, That such attorney shall be allowed only to observe the proceeding and not to participate in it nor to advise the witness while on the witness stand, unless the committee member conducting the hearing shall at his discretion allow such attorney other privileges.

(d) A witness who testifies in a public or private hearing shall have the right at the conclusion of his testimony either to make an oral statement or at his option to file a sworn statement, which shall be made part of the record of such hearing.

(e) If a witness at a public hearing shall by oral testimony or documentary evidence defame, allege misconduct by, or otherwise comment adversely upon any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency or officer or employee thereof, and the committee shall not strike such material from the record, such individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency, or officer or employee thereof, shall have the right to file with the committee a sworn written denial, defense, or other explanation, which shall be made part of the record of such public hearing, and in addition the person individually defamed or otherwise the subject of adverse comment shall have the right to testify in person concerning such adverse comment in a public hearing to be conducted by the committee.

(f) No witness shall be deemed in contempt of a legislative committee for refusing to obey a subpena issued by one or more of its members, unless and until the full committee has, upon notice to all its members, met, considered the alleged contempt, and by a majority of those present voted such witness in contempt of such committee: *Provided*, That this subdivision shall not apply to a witness who having obeyed a subpena declines to answer a question at such hearing or otherwise acts contumaciously.

REPORTS OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

SEC. 3. (a) A legislative committee shall not publish or file any report, whether interim or final, unless and until a meeting of the committee has been called upon proper notice and such report has been approved by a majority of those voting at such meeting.

(b) A legislative committee, its members, counsel, employees, or agents, shall not publish or file any statement or report alleging misconduct by or otherwise commenting adversely upon any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency, unless and until such individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency has been advised of the alleged misconduct or adverse comment and has been given a reasonable opportunity to present its sworn written denial, defense, or other explanation to such committee; nor shall any such statement or report be publicly released unless and until the committee, upon notice to all of its members, has met and approved such public release.

NO PRIVATE PROFIT FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS OR STAFF

SEC. 4. No member of a legislative committee, its counsel, employees, or agents, shall for compensation speak, lecture, or write about such committee, its purposes, procedures, accomplishments, or reports, during the existence of such committee.

LETTER SENT TO PROMINENT PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE NATION REQUESTING COMMENTS ON H. R. 1834

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: The establishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee of the House of Representatives brings to a head the problem of procedures surrounding the activities of this, and all other congressional investigative committees.

I opposed the creation of a permanent congressional committee to inquire into the motives and actions of individual Americans. It was and is my contention that the investigation of activities allegedly inimical to the interests of the country is properly the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of the Army and Navy Intelligence Services. I have introduced a resolution calling for repeal of the amendment creating the present Committee on Un-American Activities.

However, whatever the eventual disposition of that resolution, the question of the procedures involved in congressional investigations is one that should be the concern of all persons interested in the protection of the civil liberties of the individual citizen. The stigma of bias and malpractice which was attached, and properly, to the Dies committee will be leveled at the present committee unless steps are taken to prevent it from itself indulging in un-American tactics in its investigations.

I am writing you to obtain your reaction to a bill introduced by me in the House of Representatives which sets up guaranties against capricious or malicious misuse of congressional investigative authority. The bill (H. R. 1834) in no way limits or defines the scope of such authority. Its sole purpose is to protect the rights of persons under investigation by congressional committees.

The ever-increasing scope of inquiries undertaken by committees of the Congress has given to that body an extra legislative power which is subject to none of the controls governing investigations conducted by other arms of the Government. It would be unthinkable for a man under investigation by legal authorities, whether it be the FBI or a local police force, to be accused of a crime and refused the opportunity to answer the accusation. That tyrannical abuse of law is a characteristic of nazism and is vigorously rejected by democratic thought. A man under investigation by the Congress for so serious a crime as un-American activities may be entirely at the mercy of the whim, or of the demands of political expediency, of the Congressmen by whom he may be interrogated.

To correct this legal anomaly, the bill I have introduced in the House sets up rules of procedure which will protect the rights of persons under congressional investigation.

I am enclosing a copy of the bill for your study and would very much appreciate your sending me your comments on it.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. HOOK,
Member of Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will desist, because I want to yield to a few other Members.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I would just like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK], if he thinks, in the event his resolution is adopted, that it will insure a socialistic form of government in this country like they have now in England?

Mr. HOOK. It certainly will not. That is another one of those red herrings, and I am satisfied that the adoption of this resolution will bring about fair play and honesty——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. There are other Members who want to attack the Committee on Un-American Activities who have already written their speeches and given them out to the press. I submit they have a right to be heard.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY]. The Member from Mississippi is becoming solicitous. That is strange.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has made a very able statement of some of the general issues involved in this discussion today. I would like to discuss some aspects of the freedom of the air.

When the House Committee on Un-American Activities requested the scripts of certain American radio commentators——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. A Member who has the floor has to get unanimous consent to read. Now they can all read that stuff in the papers tomorrow. I read it this morning. I make the point of order that he has no right to get up here and read that stuff and take up the time of the Congress without unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. If anybody objects to the reading, the question can be put to the House, and the House can decide.

Mr. RANKIN. I object to its reading. It has all been distributed and everybody is familiar with it.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the gentleman from Washington be permitted to read the statement?

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington may proceed.

Mr. DE LACY. I want to thank the Members of the House for their consideration, and I should like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I could almost make a speech direct on the subject without a prepared statement. However, in the interest of accuracy and with proper qualifications of my opinions I wanted to reduce it to writing.

According to the Washington Post of March 21, 1944, Chairman Dies disagreed with the opinions of Walter Winchell. He therefore decided, and I quote, "to investigate this matter on the ground that it is distinctly un-American."

Mr. Dies convicted Walter Winchell of differing from him. That was proof, of course, that Winchell was a Communist.

Recently the Columbia Broadcasting Co. was requested to provide the House Committee on Un-American Activities with the script of the impromptu "Take It or Leave It" program, featuring Phil Baker, for September 30. This is a question and answer program. It has no script.

What $64 question do you suppose it was which drew the attention of the Rank'n committee?

Phil Baker asked what sort of unity was good for the American people. A Mr. LaValle, said to have represented a Council for American Unity, answered that unity among all the people of America, of people of different races and different national origins, was good for America. He answered that advocating the Fascist theory of racial supremacy was bad for America.

I do not have his exact words and am not trying to quote him, but if his thought was monitored correctly, he was speaking as our forefathers spoke in the Declaration of Independence. He was setting forth the basic American teaching of the equal rights of citizens of this Nation, without regard to whether they are Negroes or Jews or Catholics or Protestants or Italian-Americans or Scandinavian-Americans or Irish-Americans.

Yet for this reason, apparently, for there is no other basic idea in Mr. Baker's $64 program for that particular Sunday, the request made in the name of a congressional committee goes to the Columbia Broadcasting System asking for Mr. Baker's script for review.

What Walter Winchell said in 1944 of Dies' effort to subpena his radio scripts then, can be said today with equal vigor:

> Every citizen of the United States of America has the right of free speech. Any newspaperman worth his salt regards it as his duty. I believe that absolute independence and absolute integrity mean the same thing.
>
> The Constitution of the United States not only provides for the three great arms of Government. The Constitution's heart is that it limits the powers of that Government. And its soul—its Bill of Rights—is that it protects the citizen who disagrees with the men who run that very Government it establishes.

The Rankin committee may tell us that it has not yet raised its voice against Raymond Gram Swing, or Cecil Brown, or Johannes Steele, or Walter Winchell. The committee has done much more than that. Every newspaper knows that the comments of these radio analysts, with the exception of Winchell, have been requested for review by the committee. That is the smear and fear method for which Martin Dies became notorious. That was how Hitler made his beginning.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is not investigating the great pressure campaign which Father Coughlin's Fascist mobsters are putting on to get some of these same commentators off the air. It is not investigating the native Fascist ravings of the notorious labor baiter, Jew baiter, Red baiter, and Negro baiter, Gerald L. K. Smith.

The Rankin committee, on the contrary, is directing its efforts against some of the same commentators whom the Christian Fronters and the followers of Gerald Smith are out to get.

The Rankin committee is setting itself up as a congressional radio-thought police. Here is how the smear-fear technique works: Simply asking the radio stations for radio scripts spreads fear. Advising the press of the request spreads the smear.

The commentators whose scripts are sent for are plainly warned that they are under Government surveillance, that their thoughts are under House arrest, that in the future they must carefully lean toward the thoughts of those controlling the Un-American Activities Committee.

The radio stations and the sponsors of programs, who are in business to make money, are thus put on warning that if they wish to stay out of the center of a smear controversy, they had better get other commentators.

Free speech on the air was thus to be suppressed, not by smashing in people's heads or kidnaping them in the middle of the night into concentration camps, or even lynching them, as is still done in some parts of our country, but by the "gentlemanly" method of pressuring those who dared to differ out of their jobs.

This is not Germany or Japan. This is America. Mr. Speaker, this committee cannot be corrected—it should be abolished.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Does the gentleman feel that the requirement of the Federal Communications Commission that scripts be submitted to the radio stations and preserved by the radio stations is an interference with free speech in America?

Mr. CELLER. No; I do not think that is an interference. Nobody has complained about merely the submission of scripts to the radio stations.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Did the gentleman from New York a few minutes ago say we should investigate a man by the name of LaValle?

Mr. CELLER. I did not mention that name.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I thought the gentleman mentioned the name of LaValle.

Mr. CELLER. I did not.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be appropriate at this time to read a very brief biography of some of the Americans whose scripts have been

requested by the committee. Of course, if it be not true that the scripts of these distinguished gentlemen have been requested by the members of the committee, the committee is here and they can so state. I am reading this on the basis that the scripts have been requested by the committee. The biographies are as follows:

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF COMMENTATORS

Raymond Gram Swing: Raymond Swing is a Congregationalist minister's son, educated at Oberlin. With 21 years' experience as a foreign correspondent in England, France, and Germany, he is also possessed of a ripe knowledge of languages, history, world politics, and modern diplomacy. He is neither firebrand nor evangelist, and is described by Variety as a middle-of-the-road liberal. His background includes editorial work which includes the Wall Street Journal and the Nation. After a period with the BBC in 1934, Swing began to make occasional broadcasts on foreign affairs for CBS and in 1936 went with Mutual.

Johannes Steele: Steele is an American citizen of international experience, having been newspaper correspondent for various papers in Europe, Russia, China, Japan, India, and South America. In 1933 he lectured throughout the United States under the auspices of the United States Commissioner of Education and many public and educational bodies. From 1934 to 1937 he was with the New York Post and Philadelphia Record as foreign editor and chief of their European bureau in Paris. Described by Variety as independently liberal and preeminently qualified he is the author of a number of best sellers, including Hitler as Frankenstein, The Truth About Munich, Men Behind the War, and The Future of Europe.

Cecil Brown (pronounced sess-ill): Brown, winner of the 1941 Peabody award, has a background of newspaper experience which includes service with the United Press, Pittsburgh Press, New York American, and Hearst's International News Service in Paris. He made journalistic history when he reported the sinking of the *Repulse*. Described by Variety as both eminently qualified and a middle-of-the-road liberal, he was fired from the Columbia Broadcasting Co. in 1943 for broadcasting what was termed "nothing but an editorial." His friends say that his continued reference to Ambassador Davis' Mission to Moscow brought the action of CBS. Now he is with Mutual, where he still maintains his independent status.

William Gailmor: Gailmor, a former highly successful orthodox rabbi, traveled extensively in the Middle East and was newspaper correspondent for years in that section. A successful lecturer, book reviewer, and newspaper editorial worker, his last newspaper job was on the radio desk of the New York Daily News. An able news analyst, he was attacked by Westbrook Pegler because, at the time of his greatest success as a rabbi, he suffered a nervous break-down and was arrested and treated for a year at a sanitarium because he had rented a car and driven it at a high speed for days in a state of near nervous collapse. Recovering fully from the break-down, Gailmor began his long newspaper and radio career.

Hans Jacob: Educated in the College Royal Francais in Berlin, in Munich University, Jacob is the author of several novels written from 1918 to 1933 and translated nearly 60 volumes of classics. An official interpreter of the Republican Government of Germany from 1927 to 1933, he served in all League of Nations Assemblies and at all international conferences of the time, including the First and Second Conferences of The Hague, the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and the World Economic Conferences.

From 1933 to 1940, he lived in Paris, France, and became translater for the French Government in 1936 and director of broadcasts in the German language. He escaped from unoccupied France after the fall of France and came to the United States in 1940, a scholar and an advocate of democracy, filled with the terror of Hitlerism. He first broadcast in the German language from Boston and became an English-language commentator in October 1941, bringing his long experience to bear upon the news of the day.

I have not read the document here but have just referred to it using it as notes. Sitting here in the House a minute or two ago, I took the liberty of writing down an extemporaneous definition, which I sort of like myself, of a radical. I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues in the House for whatever it may be worth. This is my extemporaneous definition of a radical: "A radical is one who differs with us to such an extent that we ourselves become radical and intolerant of the opinions of that other radical."

Mr. CELLER. In conclusion, I wish to state there is a great deal of constructive work for this committee to do in weeding out subversive activities, but the committee should not cry out against one "ism" to the exclusion of others. It must not focus its attention only upon Communists and overlook the Fascist and Nazi dangers, and vice versa. We have as much to fear from one "ism" as from the other.

The new committee dare not withhold its fire against the many anti-Catholic, anti-Semitic, anti-Union, anti-Negro propaganda groups, and especially those bigots who peddle the anti-religious and anti-racial poison under the false label of "constitutional" and "good" government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have made arrangements with the two gentlemen who have time ahead of me to allow me to proceed at this time.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Rhode Island agreed to give way to me.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Mississippi spoke to me earlier this afternoon and I consented to moving his time up and I am to follow him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the gentleman from Mississippi, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] desire to proceed later?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. What was the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I ask unanimous consent that following the gentleman from Mississippi, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. With the consent of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed one of the most ridiculous performances that has taken place in this House since I have been in Congress. These unjustified attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities, these smear attacks on the Daughters of the American Revolution by the Jewish gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], have been shocking indeed, to say the least of it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order when he refers to me as "the Jewish gentleman from New York." I ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will allow the Chair, there is one way to refer to a Member of the House of Representatives and that is, "the gentleman from" the State from which he comes. Any other appellation is a violation of the rules.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if he objects to being called a "Jewish gentleman" I withdraw it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the words be taken down.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I ask that those words be taken down.

Mr. RANKIN. I am withdrawing the words. I have not the time to argue such matters.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object to his withdrawing the words. I request that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already stated the rule with reference to the language of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But he repeated it, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. But I withdrew it. I have something else to talk about.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But I object to his withdrawing it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already ruled on the matter and that is the end of it.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will proceed in order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. He repeated it despite the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is exceedingly strange that a man presuming to arrogate to himself the prerogative of speaking for a minority group will rise on this floor and denounce the Daughters of the American Revolution, in the manner the Member from New York [Mr. CELLER] did and then raise a protest when he is even referred to as a gentleman of his race.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman by inference and innuendo has simply repeated what he said at the inception of his remarks when he attempted to state that I was a Jewish gentleman. That is the second time he did it by indirection. I think the gentleman should be called to order and cautioned not to repeat that kind of language.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman refers to the gentleman, if he referred to him at all, as the member of a minority race. The Chair does not think that is a violation of the rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to proceed in order. Does the Member from New York [Mr. CELLER] object to being called a Jew or does he object to being called a gentleman? What is he kicking about?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a little statement.

The Chair trusts that points of order may be properly points of order hereafter, and that a Member before he makes a point of order secures the recognition of the Chair.

The gentleman from Mississippi will proceed in order, and the Chair trusts that the gentleman from Mississippi understands what the Chair means.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I think I do; I have been sufficiently informed during the last few minutes. It seems to be all right for the Member from New York to slur the Daughters of the American Revolution, and other people throughout the country with the communistic expression of Fascist. In those attacks he does not represent the better elements of the Jewish people. In fact, he never does.

I presume, Mr. Speaker, it is in order for me to refer to the Daughters of the American Revolution, whom he attacked, as "white Americans."

I am going to pay my respects to the DAR, one of the greatest organizations over which that flag ever floated. The British Empire is being attacked by him also, yet his people would not have a place to lay their heads in peace if it were not for the British Empire and the United States of America.

To whom do we owe the most—we Americans who have been attacked here today and called native Fascists? That is the line of the Communists. To whom do we owe the most, the Communists and their fellow travelers or the DAR? We owe more to the Daughters of the American Revolution and their forbears who fought and won and established the independence of this country, which these Communists want to destroy, than to any other class of people under the American flag. The DAR constitutes the finest band of Christian ladies in the world, and I resent these attacks on them.

The gentleman from—I better not call him a gentleman, he might demand that my words be taken down—the Member from New York [Mr. CELLER] who just preceded me upbraided the State of Texas. He berated the people of the State of Texas for their lawlessness, when, as a matter of fact, there is not a State in this Union where people strive harder to maintain law and order than they do in the State of Texas. There is not a State in this Union whose sons more generously poured out their blood in this war than have the people of Texas.

He attacks Martin Dies, since Mr. Dies is now out of Congress and not here to reply. If he were here it would be a different story. Nobody contends that the Dies committee did not make mistakes, but I want to tell you that it rendered a service to this country that has seldom been equaled by a committee of either House in protecting this country against un-Americar activities of all kinds.

He also attacks Robert Stripling. Mr. Stripling is now in the service. He is in the uniform of the United States Army, and it ill behooves any man to get up on the floor of this House and attack him under these circumstances.

I will not answer all of these attacks on other places. He talks about what he called "hell-fire" preachers. What an insult to the Christian ministers of this country! These Christian preachers who read the Scriptures and preach the gospel of Jesus Christ are the ones who hold high the torch of religious freedom in this country. They are fighting to save the moral and the spiritual life of America that is being undermined by these unchristian elements and they do not need any advice from the Member from New York [Mr. CELLER].

To hear him talk you would think that the white gentiles were making concerted attacks on the minority races. It is about time that misrepresentatives of these minorities that whine every time you call one of their names, stop attacking the white gentile majority in America.

He attacked the veterans' organizations. Let us see what he called one of them. He said that one of them was a "native Fascist" veterans' organization. Do you think any veterans in this war who fought the Germans are Fascists? That is just a Communist smear expression that they use toward white gentile Americans who are not Communists and have no Communist inclinations.

One fellow asked: "Who controls the air?"

We do not want anybody to control the air or use air waves to spread treason or to libel helpless men and women.

I will not attempt to reply to the attacks made on the National Association of Manufacturers. I thought they had as much right on the air as did anybody else, so long as they do not abuse it.

But I do want to speak a moment about this freedom of the air and to say that we have not subpenaed all these scripts. We merely asked for them, which we had a right to do. Do you know the reason we called for those scripts? Some of those scripts ought not to be drummed into the ears of the American people. The gentleman talked about Johannes Steele. Johannes Steele is a Communist. He is said to be drawing pay from somebody who is not in sympathy with American institutions. I do not hesitate to say that as far as I am concerned he may expect investigation. We are not going to permit him to spread his subversive propaganda without a protest that both he and the network will understand.

The air is not free for everybody to smear, malign, slander, and libel people all over the country.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I will, for a question.

Mr. COFFEE. Did the gentleman ever hear Upton Close on the air?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; before these subversive elements succeeded in driving him off the air.

Mr. COFFEE. That is all I have to ask.

Mr. RANKIN. I have heard Upton Close on the air, and I hope to hear him again.

Mr. COFFEE. I do not object to his talking. My point is that all of them should be accorded equal latitude in what they say on the air without intimidation.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, do you believe a man has the right to go on the air and malign and libel you?

Mr. COFFEE. If the gentleman will permit me to answer, I will.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I will permit the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE. The gentleman and I are old friends. We may differ on political views, but I am sure we can remain cordial.

Mr. RANKIN. We will remain cordial. This is not a personal matter with me.

Mr. COFFEE. I do not countenance anyone lying about anyone else on the air, but under the civil laws of both the Federal and State governments the person adversely affected has his remedy.

Mr. RANKIN. They do not have sufficient remedies now; but they will have if Congress does its duty. The Committee on Un-American Activities is interested in one thing and that is in protecting the safety and welfare of the American people. Whenever things go over the air that are dangerous to that safety or welfare, we are going to investigate them.

Let me give you one illustration, and then I am going to pass on. I had a letter the other day from a detective in London, England, who is affiliated with Scotland Yard. He called attention to the fact—and I want you Hollywood defenders to hear this—that during this war, and especially during the time of the nonaggression pact between Russia and Germany, there were coded German messages going through the moving pictures that were shown all over England, and some of them were made in Hollywood, Calif. He said he decoded some of those messages and brought them to the attention of Scotland Yard. Those messages told just when air raids would take place against certain cities or towns. He said they came just as foretold in those coded messages; but by then all the spies and their sympathizers had been warned to seek cover.

The same thing has been done in some radio scripts. So far as I am concerned, I did not ask for those scripts to be sent in, but I have no apology for it. Whenever it is necessary in order to protect the American people we are going to check up on them. Who knows what lies ahead of us?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that he and his committee are going to take the responsibility of riding herd upon the thought of our people over the radio?

Mr. RANKIN. No, but we are going to do our best to see that the American people are protected.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. The gentleman from Washington mentioned the name of Upton Close, and asked if the gentleman had heard him over the radio. I think that to keep the record straight it should be shown here that Upton Close has been taken off the airways.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SHAFER. He has been off the airways for weeks, because certain groups brought pressure on the Lumbermen's Mutual to take him off the air.

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct.

This man Gailmor has been taken off the air because of his Communist leanings.

His sponsors took him off the air.

I got this letter today and I am going to read it. It is typical of the floods of messages that are coming in from all over the country. I never saw this man in my life. His name is Charles H. Schwab II, and he lives in Chicago:

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Having served our country in both World War I and World War II, I believe that I have demonstrated my desire to uphold and preserve our form of Government.

It is with this same desire that I am writing to thank you for your very fine stand on American principles and righteous American activities.

It is high time that we had more men of your type in Washington to defend the rights of the American people against the unrighteous demands of various minorities, and unless we have men of your type, the very principles we have fought so dearly for will be lost and our country will be ruled by labor racketeers and unprincipled minority groups who are not even Americans.

Assuring you of my wholehearted support and thanking you for your fine activities, I am,

Respectfully yours,
CHARLES H. SCHWAB II.

I suppose it will be said that he is an economic royalist.

The Communist program is to destroy our way of life, it is to destroy our form of government. Take the statements I put in the RECORD on yesterday and read them carefully and you will see that communism is nothing in God's world but syndicalism in disguise. It is the old syndicalist drive to break down and destroy American institutions. When they speak of capitalists, they do not mean just the rich or the well-to-do, they mean the man who owns a home, the man who owns a farm, the man who owns a store or a factory. They would take over everything, if you please, from the steel plants to the dairy farms, and the people would then be subjected to a system of slavery that is revolting to liberty-loving peoples throughout the world.

There is no liberty, there is no personal freedom in a Communist country.

These are the things we are guarding against. American institutions, American liberty, and the American way of life must be preserved

I agree with the President most heartily on one thing, and that is that we must have the strongest Navy in the world, we must have the strongest Air Force in the world, we must retain, as he called it, the know-how of making the atomic bomb, in order that we may protect American institutions at home, and lead the world into a more glorious civilization.

I want to say a word now about this Committee on Un-American Activities. We have been very careful, our investigators have been very careful. We have examined those witnesses that we thought had information that would help us to expose those activities that are detrimental to this country. We are not witch hunting, we are not out trying to smear anyone. Our primary object is to keep that flag flying over a free government, over a free America.

Personally, I resent any man taking this floor and casting slurs at the Daughters of the American Revolution or the Disabled American Veterans, who have just adopted a resolution endorsing the Committee on Un-American Activities; or the American Legion, one of the most patriotic organizations in America, which is on record as supporting the Committee on Un-American Activities; or the Veterans of Foreign Wars, another great and powerful American organization which is on record as backing up the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to answer any questions concerning the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is your committee; it is doing good work; and it is here to stay.

This little group that is attacking us does not stand any more chance to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities under present circumstances than the proverbial elephant did of hanging to a horizontal bar by his eyebrows.

You are just wasting your time. We are here to serve the American people and, as I said, the committee is here to stay.

I helped to create this committee. I did it because of the dangerous situation which exists throughout the world. I did it because we wanted to be sure that America would be protected against enemies at home while our young men were fighting to defend her against her enemies abroad.

We know that throughout the length and breadth of the land there are men posing as Americans and hissing the word "Fascists" at real American patriots, such as the DAR, and who down in their hearts would like to see this Republic destroyed.

God grant that in my day at least that curtain may never rise.

As Daniel Webster once said, "When my eyes shall turn to behold for the last time the sun in heaven," may they not see him shining upon a communistic, socialistic, or degraded nation. But may they see him shining upon a glorious republic made great by those men who fathered the Daughters of the American Revolution; by those men who have fought the battles of this Nation in times of war and sustained its institutions in times of peace.

We are striving to save America for Americans.

God give us the strength to succeed.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FREEDOM OF THE AIR

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to enter into a personal controversy with the gentleman from Mississippi. The issue raised this afternoon on the floor of this House is by far much more important than either the gentleman from Mississippi or me. In fact, it is much more important than any individual who is a Member of this House. The issue involved in the discussion this afternoon, in my opinion, goes to the very root of the most important question before the Nation, the preservation and extension of democratic rights in the United States.

If democratic rights are infringed in the slightest degree, then you may rest assured that that infringement will lead us along the path that was followed in Hitler's Germany and in Mussolini's Italy. We will be following the path of fascism.

I agree, America is in danger. America is in danger from those who would suppress freedom of thought and freedom of expression. Our country has been based on the proposition that men and women irrespective of race, color, or creed can express themselves freely and take their consequences in the courts for any injury that results. Once we deviate from that proposition, then we are playing into the hands of those who would impose on these United States a domestic Fascist state.

Before I continue to develop this thought I want to mention the fact that the quarrel that some of us have with regard to the use of Constitution Hall is not with the Daughters of the American Revolution as an organization. Our quarrel is with those people within that organization who have been condemned by thousands of members of the Daughters of the American Revolution hundreds of times within the last few weeks. Our quarrel is with those members within that organization who are negating the best traditions of the American Revolution. I do not think it is necessary for me to give this House any history, but I think it is worth while repeating that 1,000 Negroes fought with George Washington, and they fought side by side with the fathers of the American Revolution. I believe that the mothers of the American Revolution would not have proscribed any Negro from the use of halls in the fighting days of the American Revolution.

So there is no attempt to smear the Daughters of the American Revolution involved here; nor is there any attempt to throw stones at any patriotic organization, but I do say that we have a right, every American has a right, every American who believes in the fundamental precepts of the Declaration of Independence, has a right to take to task those individuals within the organization

known as the Daughters of the American Revolution who deny to a talented artist, not only today but 7 years ago also, and who profess an intent to continue to deny to talented people the use of Constitution Hall because of their color. If there is anything un-American, I say that that practice is contrary to fundamental Americanism, it is un-American, and you cannot get away from it.

I am sure that the mothers of the American Revolution, if they were alive today, would join us in protest against this un-American practice. They would firmly put a stop to this un-American practice, a practice contrary to the Amercianism that every school child knows, fundamental Americanism; Americanism of the Declaration of Independence.

May I remind the gentleman from Mississippi, that in that Declaration it was said that all men are created equal. When they said that all men are created equal, they did not say, "All men are created equal except Negroes." They did not say, "All men are created equal except Jews." They did not say, "All men are created equal except Catholics." They did not say, "All men are created equal except Protestants." They placed no exception in that Declaration of Independence. They placed no exception in it, and anyone who attempts to place an exception in that document should be investigated by the Committee on un-American Activities.

Now, let us get down to this business of protecting the best welfare of America.

This Committee on Un-American Activities is determined to do what? Protect the welfare of America—the words of the gentleman from Mississippi. Let us see what he wants to protect America from. He has a perfect right to have his views on these things that I am going to mention, but let us see whether or not he has a right to prevent others from expressing views contrary to his on these particular issues. Let us see if he has a right to investigate or subpoena, as un-Americans, those who disagree with his views. I have heard the gentleman from Mississippi say that the FEPC is Communistic. You have heard him, you have heard him during the FEPC debate on the floor of the House. That is a standard that the gentleman sets. That gives you an idea of what the gentleman believes to be Communistic and from what he wants to protect America. Let us follow that a step further. If that be Communistic, as the gentleman professes it to be, then the gentleman arrogates unto himself the right to investigate as un-American any person who advocates the enactment of FEPC legislation. In this category you must place both President Roosevelt and President Truman. Both have recommended this legislation. Communistic FEPC. It was so Communistic that it was placed in the platform of the Republican Party, although that seems to have been forgotten by many Republicans here during the last 9 months. Let us go a step further.

The gentleman has denounced anti-poll tax legislation as Communistic. You have heard him and I have heard him. According to the gentleman, therefore, anybody who advocates anti-poll tax legislation should be investigated for un-American activities. So do you not see what we have done here? We have set up the gentleman from Mississippi as the person who sets the standards as to what is American and what is un-American; and radio commentators will be subjected to having their scripts examined or subpenaed before the committee for investigation dependent on what? Dependent on the standard of American or un-American which the gentleman from Mississippi has set up.

Now, let us have some common sense about this business, Mr. Speaker. Do you want to wave the red-baiting flag on the floor of this House? Go ahead. Do you want to bait labor? Go ahead; that we can fight, that we can argue and debate here. But do you want to place Congress in the position where Congress through the gentleman from Mississippi will judge what is American by his standards? Do we want to do that? That is the fundamental issue involved here. Do we want to permit the gentleman's standards to be the yardstick, the measure, the scale by which a person's activities shall be judged as either American or un-American? That is a serious proposition that I throw forth to the membership. You must not dodge that issue. If this committee continues to hale radio commentators before the committee or to send for their scripts on the basis of what the gentleman believes to be American or un-American do you not see what a plight this Congress has been thrown into?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get down to this Communist business.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I wish to state to the Members of the House that I am proud of my ancestry and of my faith that can compare in dignity and honor with any ancestry, with any faith. Remember that the Scriptures which the gentleman from Mississippi often quotes is of Jewish origin. And I remind the Member from Mississippi——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the gentleman the right to use the word "Jewish" according to his own point of order?

Mr. CELLER. And at Philadelphia, if he will go to Philadelphia he will see the Liberty bell. Inscribed on the rim of that Liberty bell is the voice of Leviticus, taken from the Jewish Scriptures, which says: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

The voice of Leviticus did not say: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land." It said, "Proclaim liberty to all the inhabitants of the land."

Mr. Speaker, my faith is older than that of the Member from Mississippi. As for being a gentleman I need no defense. That may not be said for the Member from Mississippi. I resent his smears of innuendo.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down. He accuses me of "racialism." There is not a man in this House who raises the race question more often than does the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw those words.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Jewish people or any other people need any defense from any attacks that are made here. In referring to any Member of this House as a "Jewish gentleman" there is only one inference. Let us be realistic. It is the practice of advocates of racism to mention one's race for the purpose of arousing discrimination and hate against that person particularly if his race be that of a minority. When you single out a person by his race, color, or creed, particularly when you are engaged on opposite side of debate from him, you are not doing that for the purpose of merely pointing out that the gentleman's race happens to be Jewish or that the gentleman happens to be a Negro. Oh, no. You are baiting the gentleman. You are baiting him because of his race or because of his color or because of his creed. You are seeking to subject him to either discrimination or hate. I want to serve notice that as far as I am concerned, when I am here I shall raise a point of order on all occasions when any Member's race is made reference to, or when anyone is referred to as the "Jewish gentleman" or as the "Negro gentleman." The injecting of race, color, or creed, in my opinion, is not only dangerous but it is subversive of orderly process in this House. It is not only in violation of the rules of this House, but in my considered judgment it is subversive of that kind of Americanism that was expounded by men of all races, yes, Jews, Gentiles, Catholics, Protestants, and Negroes, who defended this country in war. Their different races did not divide them. They were united on the battlefield in defending this country. No man on the battlefield turned around and referred to his buddy as the Jewish member of the Fifth Battalion or the Negro member of the Sixth Regiment. No; they were united by their blood. They shed it together and they intend to live together and drive out for America all and any form of racism.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No. I decline to yield to the gentleman. This Jew and Negro baiting has to stop in this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. All right, go ahead and do it. I will do the same to you, Mister.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right with me.

The SPEAKER. All debate will cease.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order a quorum is not present. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 176]

Allen, Ill.	Fulton	Norton
Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	O'Konski
Andrews, N. Y.	Gardner	O'Toole
Auchincloss	Gathings	Outland
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Peterson, Ga.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gossett	Pfeifer
Barden	Green	Philbin
Barrett, Pa.	Griffiths	Ploeser
Barry	Gwinn, N. Y.	Poage
Bates, Ky.	Hagen	Quinn, N. Y.
Bell	Hall,	Rains
Bland	Leonard W.	Ramey
Bolton	Harris	Randolph
Boren	Hart	Rayfiel
Bradley, Pa.	Hartley	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Hays	Rich
Buckley	Hébert	Rivers
Buffett	Heffernan	Robinson, Utah
Bulwinkle	Herter	Robsion, Ky.
Bunker	Hill	Roe, N. Y.
Burch	Hoch	Rogers, Fla.
Burgin	Hope	Rogers, N. Y.
Butler	Horan	Rooney
Byrne, N. Y.	Jarman	Russell
Byrnes, Wis.	Jennings	Sabath
Campbell	Johnson,	Sadowski
Cannon, Fla.	Lyndon B.	Sheridan
Chiperfield	Jones	Short
Clark	Kee	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Kans.	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Cravens	Keogh	Starkey
Crawford	Kilburn	Stewart
Cunningham	King	Stigler
Curley	Kinzer	Tarver
Dawson	Knutson	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney,	Landis	Thomas, Tex.
James J.	Lane	Thomason
Delaney,	Lea	Torrens
John J.	Lesinski	Towe
Dickstein	Lynch	Traynor
Dingell	McConnell	Trimble
Dirksen	McGlinchey	Vinson
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Vursell
Douglas, Calif.	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Douglas, Ill.	Madden	Weiss
Drewry	Maloney	Welch
Eaton	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Eberharter	May	White
Fernandez	Mills	Winter
Flannagan	Morrison	Wolfenden, Pa.
Forand	Mott	Woodrum, Va.
Fuller	Murphy	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 278 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] may proceed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, at the time the point of no quorum was made I was discussing the significance of referring to a Member or a person by his race, his color, or his creed. I contend, and seriously do so, that that is fascism; and let us see whether I am right or wrong; let us see what happened in Germany. First, the Jews were referred to as "Jewish members of the Reichstag," or "Jewish judges," or "Jewish merchants." What followed? Then the word "Jew" was written over the store windows of these people. After that it was written on their doors where they lived, and later on it was written on their clothing when they were placed in concentration camps. So the use of the word "Jewish" is not resented because people of Jewish origin are ashamed of it. Oh, no; they have all the right in the world to be proud of belonging to that race, particularly as Americans they have a right to be proud of the tremendous contribution they have made to the history of this Nation and most recently to the winning of the war; but the resentment that comes not only from people of the Jewish race but from everyone who believes in democracy and who is opposed to fascism is because the history of the word "Jewish" in reference to an individual, singling him out because of his race, his color, or his creed, has been proven to be fascism where it has happened—and let us pray to God that it will not happen here. The same applies to communism, red-baiting; it is the same pattern followed by Hitler, the same pattern followed by Mussolini, the singling out of a person with whom one violently disagrees as a Communist, red-baiting him, red-baiting labor when it asks for a decent wage, or red-baiting a group of veterans when they ask for their rights as veterans, or red-baiting any individual who joins with other individuals for the purpose of guaranteeing to himself or his group or his organization the democratic rights guaranteed under the Constitution. That red-baiting was the technique used in the destruction of democracy by the Nazi front in Germany and the Fascist squadristi in Italy.

I do hope for the sake of a united America that it will never again become necessary on the floor of this House to engage in a discussion which I could not avoid this afternoon. I would have been remiss in my duty to my country had I remained silent. All I can say to those red-baiters, Jew-baiters, Negro-baiters, labor-baiters, all I can say to those who are preaching the subversive doctrine of race hatred in America whether they do it openly or subtly, whether they do it in Congress or out of Congress, whether they do it by implication and innuendo or by overt advocacy, all I can say to those who have deserted the faith of democracy is what a most revered cardinal once said: "Have pity, O Lord, on the Christian who doubts, on the skeptic who desires to believe, on the convict of life who sets sail alone on the high seas no longer lit by the consoling beacons of an ancient faith."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] may be permitted to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to impress on my colleagues here, that my understanding of our Constitution does not permit the powers which the Committee on Un-American Activities has assumed. No men are pure and unbiased enough to have this immense power to discredit, accuse and denounce which this committee wields. Men naturally let their prejudices enter into the picture. All sides of a question must be weighed carefully by those who must determine things as basic as another man's loyalty to his country. When a man is asked to appear before the Un-American Activities Committee, his reputation is lessened, simply by the connotation implied in the committee's name. It is un-American in itself to be condemned in the press or before the public without trial or hearing. The constitutionally guaranteed protection of the American courts is laughed at by such procedure. It is a gross injury to those who are thus impugned.

Freedom of thought is the most basic of our liberties. No man can deny another the right to think as he pleases. The Japanese thought-control system operated against the very foundation upon which our democracy is founded. If a congressional committee is allowed to dictate what a man may say by frightening and intimidating the sponsors of liberal radio commentators so as to cause their removal from the air ways, it, too, strikes at the very foundation of our democracy.

Our democracy will continue to be healthy and strong so long as it adheres to the principles upon which it was founded—the principles which have carried us so far. If there are any un-American activities in this country, and there have been some as exampled by the sedition trials, the proper authorities to investigate and prosecute are the FBI and the Justice Department which are set up to handle cases under the due process of law.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to include in his remarks made earlier in the day copy of H. R. 1834 and a statement made by himself at the time of the introduction of that bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words to you in behalf of private enterprise. The capitalist system which fosters private enterprise has done great things for our country—and through contributing to the greatness of America, private enterprise has done great things for all the world.

Our system has been called on twice within our memories to perform superhuman efforts in producing, overnight as it were, the sinews of war. Our system started from behind scratch in both cases—and in both cases turned out a job that was the amazement of the civilized world. It is impossible to overlook that performance record in any discussion of the economic or industrial life of our country.

It is our firm purpose that the system shall be preserved and encouraged. Frequently the friends of labor, in whose

ranks I am proud to stand, are accused of enmity toward the principle of private enterprise. This is a deliberate untruth and is a scare cry used to hide from public view the legitimate aims of labor unions. The unions are among the foremost of the champions of private enterprise. For generations organized labor has fought for the right to bargain collectively through representations of their own choosing. They have won that right. They know they cannot enjoy fully the privileges of collective bargaining under a State-controlled system. They know their hopes for a higher standard of living lie in the success of the private enterprise system, and they champion this system for their own preservation.

As a friend, therefore, of private enterprise, I want to call attention to a danger which I think threatens the continuance of our system.

Recently in the Senate there was considered a so-called full-employment bill.

In the arguments which raged around this legislation there was positive evidence that all is not well.

The opponents of this bill seeking for any argument or excuse to nullify its effect sought to pose as the only champions of private enterprise. They sought to create the impression that all who supported the full-employment bill were the enemies of private enterprise. In the amendments which were adopted by the Senate it is evident that what good might have been accomplished by the legislation has been effectively prevented.

The legislation was proposed to prevent the recurrence of the depression through which we all suffered in the early thirties. The proponents of the legislation argued that such a catastrophe might occur again. The opponents of the bill did not deny that they held the same belief. It is taken for a fact then that the danger does exist. The bill proposed a program for effectively dealing with such danger. Its effectiveness has been thwarted and it remains for this House to restore the bill to something like its original character. If this is not done this Nation will be without a weapon to deal with economic disaster. Should the lightning strike and we are caught unprepared, the blame will be laid, rightly or wrongly, at the feet of private enterprise, at the door of the capitalistic system.

I speak, therefore, in earnest appeal to those who honestly seek to protect capitalism. I urge you to consider the risk being run. We have suffered as a people through a terrible depression. We have been regimented in our daily lives because of the necessity brought on by an all-out war. We face an era of peace and prosperity. We all admit there is danger of boom and bust again. If it happens and we are not ready to meet the test, then free enterprise, with a minimum of regulation and restriction, may witness its last day, and we may have substituted in its place a regulated economy, a prospect which many consider horrible.

The proposed full employment is not a proposal for a regulated economy. It is, pure and simple, a proposal to foster full production and full employment. It is a proposal that the National Government shall take an active part in the functioning of our economy. It is a proposal that Government, labor, agriculture, and industry shall cooperate to produce the greatest good for the greatest number.

The proposal actually contemplates assistance to private industry. Its first proposals are directed toward helping private industry and local governments to take care of all employables. It proposes that the National Government shall pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program, which certainly would benefit private enterprise, and to this end the legislation contemplates that the best brains of the land shall be put to work in the charting of that consistent and carefully planned economic program.

Only in the event of failure on the part of private enterprise to provide full production and full employment shall the Federal Government step into the breech with a program, carefully prepared, to provide assured purchasing power for the consumers of the output of private industry. No program may be put into operation without the prior scrutiny and approval of the Congress.

Suppose we pass up this opportunity; suppose we do nothing; consider the dangers we face.

In a prosperous era business can and does assume a great deal of the leadership in our country, particularly along economic lines. Because of the failure of business and industry to meet the crisis of the early thirties, a responsible portion of that leadership was taken away. Business was subjected to new forms of regulation and control. Some of those controls, notably the Securities Exchange Commission and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, have become permanent fixtures and are welcomed by all segments of our society.

Private industry is now faced with a new opportunity for leadership. Responsible leaders of industry and business know there is a social responsibility which they must discharge if they are to exercise that leadership. None of us can go our way alone today. We are all interdependent. We shall succeed together or we shall all fail.

Private industry can discharge its responsibility to the men in its factories and to the merchants, businessmen and professions who depend on that worker's income by a genuine attitude of cooperation. It will profit industry nothing to break the unions—scuttle the full-employment bill—force wages lower—if in so doing it sows the seeds of a new economic crisis. If a new depression comes, who can say what new controls will be imposed on business—who can say business will retain any of its present freedom of operation.

Consider the contrasting positions of labor and industry at the moment.

This Congress enacted legislation to guarantee industry should suffer the least possible inconvenience during the transition from war to peace. Contract termination was made equitable—funds were provided for easing the difficulties of inventory taking—transfer and storage of equipment, and so forth.

Industry faces a booming market—a pent up demand that promises a genuine boom in all branches of business and industry. The result is it knows security—it has no fear—it wishes only to rush headlong into this period neither thinking nor caring about how long it will last—or what it will cost when the bubble bursts.

On the reverse side of the picture is labor—bullied and ridiculed because of what were termed the tremendous sums it took home in wages during the war—although it is a fact that almost 50 percent of all workers were paid wages below the minimum standard provided by legislation of this body.

Prices during the war years were determined by the take-home wages of men working 54 and 60 hours a week and earning time and a half and double time to implement their regular wages. You know as well as I know that there was no great margin between prices and wages during the war. The statistics prove it is a fact that in some cases wages were far behind prices. Yet these people who must still go on maintaining a family and a home were suddenly cut back to 40 hours a week at straight time. The line about which so much has been written and spoken was not cut back and the employee faces a constantly growing danger in trying to make 30 percent less pay meet the current cost of living—with all the indications pointing to rising prices in every line—with industry and business demanding that all restrictions on prices be lifted immediately.

Where is the fairness in this situation? There is not any. Labor wants a square deal and the men at the machines in many cases refused to go on with reconversion and the erection of mountains of profits for industry until labor's just wants were provided for.

Responsible economists admitted labor's position was not only unfair but unsafe for national stability. When labor takes the only step available to it—incidentally a step provided by the Congress—in order to rectify this situation swiftly—it is met with ridicule and abuse. No serious attempt is made to acquaint the public with the justice in its cause. No attempt is made to dispose of the cause of the dispute.

After several months of wrangling over industrial disputes there is today scarcely an industrialist or economist or politician in the country who does not admit openly that labor must have an increase. Today the only argument is about how much. Does that breed confidence? Does that produce security? Is it not proper to argue that such an admission could have been made at the very outset of the reconversion period? If it had been there would have been far fewer disturbances—reconversion would have been well along the way—and the feeling of security which we all want to develop would be an actuality instead of still being in the realm of pious hopes.

So private industry has another opportunity to demonstrate its capacity for leadership, to prove it does wish to cooperate with Government, labor, and agriculture in the building of a greater and freer America.

The full-employment bill is before this House. It will soon, I hope, be out on the floor for a vote. If it is enacted without emasculation, then labor, too, will have

its promise of security. Industry will have offered its genuine cooperation and all levels of our society can face the future united.

I cannot countenance the complaint that the full-employment bill provides a regulated economy. On the contrary, it points out the way to avoid just that. If it is enacted, we shall have no need for a regulated economy. If it is not passed, or if it is passed in such form as to destroy its real purpose, then I predict industry will have lost its opportunity for leadership. I predict further that those who take over that responsibility of leadership will be those who incline toward a regulated economy. Private enterprise can make its own free choice now.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the gentleman has made a very excellent statement on the attitude of the workingmen. I know that in his remarks he has pointed out how the unions and the workingmen have been beaten down under any system of government other than a democracy or a republic such as we have.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE COFFEE SITUATION

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, about 3 weeks ago the Republican Congressional Food Committee issued a report on the coffee situation in which it was disclosed that OPA price ceilings are preventing the better grades of coffee from coming into this country, are accelerating a shift from coffee to cotton production in South American Nations, and are endangering our trade relations with South American countries at the very time when we should be doing everything in our power to promote good feeling and mutually beneficial trade relationships.

At that time, the committee, of which I am a member, recommended that our whole coffee-pricing policy be immediately reviewed and adjusted in order to correct these inequities and provide the American market once more with an adequate supply of good-grade coffee. Since then innumerable and apparently interminable meetings have been held here in Washington between the Office of Price Administration, the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and representatives of coffee-producing countries. Far from achieving results, these conferences have further increased the confusion on this subject and have resulted only in a situation described by one of the Nation's recognized food authorities as "the most fouled up mess I have seen for a long time."

In the meantime conditions in the industry have become chaotic. Small coffee roasters in every part of the country have suddenly discovered that in spite of adequate supplies of coffee in the producing countries they are unable to buy enough to keep their business going. Many of them are down now to a few weeks' supply and what they have is of inferior quality.

On the other hand, however, the big coffee roasters, the chain stores, and the large manufacturers of name brands have continued to purchase coffee through subsidiary companies in the producing areas. During September, according to a report recently released by the Department of Agriculture, coffee purchases in producing countries amounted to 958,000 bags. This is about two-thirds of the normal amount. Such a volume of purchases is surprising in view of the fact that coffee was selling in Brazil and Colombia during September for 2 to 3 cents a pound above legal ceiling prices as established by the OPA.

The answer is that these big companies have subsidiaries established in the coffee-producing countries. Through these subsidiaries they buy coffee at above ceiling prices and take whatever loss is necessary in order to maintain an adequate supply for roasting and distribution in this country. It is obviously impossible for the thousands of small coffee roasters in this country to have subsidiary companies in South America and participate in this wholesale black-market operation. Consequently, a disproportionate amount of the coffee now held in this country is in the hands of the very large roasters and the chain stores while those in the small-business category must go without it.

Not the least confusing aspect of the situation is that spokesmen for the coffee-producing countries who for more than a year have been pointing to increasing production costs and an ample supply of coffee, and requesting removal of ceiling prices, have now changed their line and ask merely that ceiling prices be increased 2 or 3 cents a pound. It is obvious that they fear an actual reduction in price if coffee is once more allowed to move on the free market and prefer an increase in the ceilings in the belief that prices will follow the ceilings and remain pegged there in spite of the laws of supply and demand. Well-informed members of the coffee industry in this country believe, on the contrary, that if ceiling prices and import restrictions are removed completely, there may be a brief, temporary flurry in prices but that the supply is so adequate prices will soon fall to present levels or below.

They point out that the coffee crop in the larger producing countries is at least normal or better this year and that because of trade restrictions and transportation difficulties there is a larger than normal carry-over from previous years' crops in those countries. Thus, the supply is more than adequate to meet the existing world demand on a free market.

They point out also that the anticipated huge demand from Europe has not materialized. Substantial quantities of coffee are being shipped to European countries from South and Central America but these are almost entirely of the higher grades—coffee that sells well above ceilings established by our OPA, while American consumers drink the lower grades. No heavy demand from Europe has materialized, however, because one of the largest coffee-using countries in Europe is Germany and Germany is in no position to buy coffee or anything else on the world market. England, Belgium, and Holland are buying less coffee from South America than anticipated because they are awaiting resumption of trade with their own colonies and holding up purchases from this hemisphere until they find out what they will be able to get from their own territories.

OPA's record on coffee has been one of confusion, arbitrary assumption of power, and resort to outright procrastination and delay when all other subterfuges failed. Shortly after the Republican congressional food-study committee reported on the tangled coffee situation the first of this month, Reconversion Director Snyder requested a report from OPA on this subject. It is understood that this report is not yet forthcoming, although OPA has members of its staff so familiar with every aspect of the coffee situation that it would seem they should have been able to submit a report as rapidly as the words themselves could have been dictated and transcribed.

But delay has not been the only OPA tactic. A few weeks ago it reached new heights of economic absurdity by assuming international authority to regulate profits. It demanded from coffee producers in South American countries records of their costs, production, and profits so that OPA could determine whether or not they were justified in asking a higher price for their product. Mr. Speaker, there is grave constitutional doubt about the authority of OPA to regulate profits in this country; it is absolutely certain the Congress of the United States never gave it the power to regulate profits in South American countries.

The combination of prices and restrictive regulations which are preventing small coffee roasters and distributors from obtaining supplies, while large companies are able to obtain the coffee they need, is an old story. It has happened over and over again in one industry after another, as OPA has dictated our wartime economy. It has happened so frequently and so consistently, that there should no longer be any doubt in anyone's mind that there is a deliberate and definite plan somewhere in the back rooms of our economic bureaucracy here in Washington to squeeze the very life out of American small business. This plan will only be alleviated, not abolished, by an increase of a few cents a pound on wholesale ceiling prices of coffee.

In view of all the factors concerned, it is obvious that the time for "review and adjustment" of our coffee importing policy is past. These policies have been reviewed continuously for more than 2 years by every Government agency concerned, and nothing has happened. It is time to put an end to these inter-agency bickerings. With the South American coffee supply more than adequate to meet our need and transportation readily available, there is no longer any excuse for OPA control of any type over this commodity. To prevent every small coffee roaster in the country from being driven into the hands of his big-time competitors, Reconversion Director Snyder should end this absurd squabble with

our South American neighbors at once by abolishing all OPA price and quota regulations on coffee.

In the opinion of those best informed on this subject, both in industry and in the Government, such a move will not result in an increase of price to the consumer but will, in fact, actually result in a saving. Under present conditions, there is little price distinction between grades of coffee purchased in the producing countries. Third- and fourth-grade coffee sells for virtually the same price as the first-grade product. Upgrading has become universal throughout the industry, from producer to retail distributor, so that American consumers are now buying third- and fourth-grade coffee at the price established for the top quality product. As soon as coffee returns to a free market, grade distinctions will once again become established, lower-priced brands will reappear, and when a consumer pays 32 cents a pound for coffee he will be getting 32-cent coffee, not coffee that should be selling for 24 or 25 cents.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I appreciate the remarks the gentleman has made. Is it not a fact that, because of the OPA ceiling prices, where other countries have been free to pay any price they wanted for good coffee, we have been the victims of having to take the inferior grades, and that has been going on for several years?

Mr. HALE. I believe that to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a friend and an advertisement which appeared in the Tea and Coffee Trade Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to are as follows:

LA TOURAINE COFFEE CO.,
Boston, Mass., Oct. 19, 1945.

Representative ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: The coffee industry of the United States is facing disaster. Inasmuch as New England is one of the centers of this industry, we are vitally affected. We have received no encouragement from either Dean Acheson or Chester Bowles. Any help that you can give us will be most appreciated.

I am enclosing you a copy of an advertisement by one of the most reputable green-coffee brokers in the United States, which appeared this morning in the Boston Herald and has been printed generally throughout the country. This advertisement gives a true and full picture of our situation.

Cordially and sincerely yours,
ADRIEL U. BIRD.

[From the Boston Herald of October 19, 1945]

MUST WE HAVE ANOTHER COFFEE SHORTAGE?

THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THEIR ACCREDITED REPRESENTATIVES ARE ENTITLED TO HEAR THE TRUTH ABOUT COFFEE BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

(Reprinted from the Tea and Coffee Trade Journal, October 1945)

As this is written it is absolutely impossible to purchase a single bag of coffee in any of the producing countries at United States ceiling prices. If OPA regulations continue no coffee will be available for United States consumption. We might be able to get along without coffee, but how about that wonderful good-neighbor policy we so eagerly seek?

European nations, including Great Britain and Canada, have purchased upwards of a million bags of good coffee during the past 6 weeks, at prices ranging from 10 to 20 percent above the ceilings which OPA established in 1941. And what is more, while these foreign buyers received the better quality coffee we in the United States received the poorer grades, and now even the poorer grades are unobtainable. New importations have stopped.

There is a little more than 3 months' supply of coffee in the United States right now, but most of it is of the poorer grades, and the cool months of our heaviest consuming season are rapidly approaching.

WHO WILL BE BLAMED?

If the coffee served in our homes and restaurants grows steadily poorer in quality?

If coffee has to be heavily rationed?

If wide unemployment and failures occur among coffee roasters, importers, and jobbers?

If 100,000,000 Latin American people resent our dictatorial attitude regarding their principal business?

In that event, the blame must be placed directly where it belongs, in the lap of the present administration.

We now consume almost 20,000,000 bags of coffee annually and in view of the fact that we grow none, how can we hope to successfully dictate the international market prices for the coffee produced by at least 14 of our neighbor nations?

The coffee industry is so highly competitive that consumer prices are sure to remain reasonable after the OPA regulations are eliminated and forgotten. The prices will quickly adjust themselves to the lowest possible level if the basic economic factors are permitted to function freely—factors such as cost of production, transportation, distribution, roasting, and lastly a reasonable profit.

Clinton P. Anderson was appointed Secretary of Agriculture because he aggressively sought the truth about this country's food situation. Since coffee is not grown in the United States it was not made the subject of those public hearings and debate. Unfortunately, the truth about coffee seems to have been a secret deeply guarded from the American public.

Congress should promptly undertake a thorough investigation of the whole coffee problem, as part of its duty to the American people and to our Latin American neighbors. When the facts are known, there should be no question as to the necessity of an immediate remedy.

Now that the war is over, it is our opinion that we should immediately do away with ceilings and all restrictions and allow the law of supply and demand to take care of the situation.

The undersigned, on their own initiative and at their own expense, take this means of bringing to the attention of the public and of our governing officials what we deem to be a situation of vital concern to the entire Nation. We believe the opinions expressed meet with the approval of the entire coffee industry.

ANGUS MACKEY & CO.,
Coffee Brokers and Agents, New York, N. Y.

HOW CAN WE PAY FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to talk to you in terms of dollars and cents. Throughout the Nation the question is being asked, How can we pay for full employment? Everywhere people are genuinely worried over the financial burden that would be entailed by a Government program to make possible jobs for all who are able and eager to work.

When I think of the suffering caused by unemployment—the poverty and frustration and broken homes, the stunted development of our boys and girls, the tragic consequences of disease and crime and social conflicts—it strikes me that the human values involved in the opportunity to earn a living are worth almost any conceivable price.

However, that is not the approach that I am going to take here. I shall speak only in terms of goods and services and resources—of those tangibles that can be measured in dollars and cents—not through lack of conviction on the nonfinancial issues, but simply because I want to prove to you that even in terms of the most cold-blooded kind of calculation, full employment pays for itself.

A FULL-EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM DOESN'T HAVE TO INCREASE SPENDING

People fear the cost of a full-employment program because they assume that such a program must necessarily involve greatly increased Federal spending. So the first point I want to make is that under the full-employment bill a great deal can be accomplished without any increase in governmental outlays.

Remember that the essence of the bill is to rationalize and coordinate Federal activities. The aim is to make sure that everything the Government does is geared toward the full-employment objective. No new devices are contemplated; the idea is rather to use the existing tools of Federal policy more effectively.

Almost every act that we pass in Congress affects production and employment. Taxes, social security, price controls, subsidies, foreign trade, monopoly controls—all of these influence incomes or spending or investment or costs of production.

But these separate pieces of legislation have not always affected employment and production in the same direction. In the past they have often canceled each other in effect, because we had no procedure for summing up the total impact. We never knew in advance whether in the last anlysis we were influencing the economy for better or for worse.

The proposal that is now before us would require the Government to equip itself with a national budget or yardstick for determining national goals and for appraising current economic trends to see how they measure up to these

goals. This would give us a quantitative idea of the size of the problem before us at any given time. And the establishment of a joint congressional committee to study the President's legislative recommendations would ensure a coordinated and systematic attack on that problem. For the first time we would be viewing the situation as a whole and knitting our separate legislative items together into a single economic program that would be internally consistent and precisely fitted to the size of the problem. For the first time we would have in this country a national economic policy.

Now the very assurance that we were going about things in this systematic fashion, with our attention riveted upon the full-employment goal, would of itself give an unprecedented boost to the economy. If consumers could count on steady future incomes, they would not hesitate to spend freely out of war savings and current incomes, and markets would expand. If workers were assured of full job opportunity, they would have no motive to slow down production or to resist job-displacing technological improvements, and production would increase. If producers could rely on steadily expanding markets with no cyclical interruptions, they would invest in new plants and facilities, new methods, and new products, they would take advantage of the high-volume low-price formula and sales and output would send national income up to a record level. If States and cities were confident that income and property values would be high enough to yield adequate tax revenues, they would embark upon long-neglected programs of community services and facilities designed to increase the productivity of individuals and of the Nation.

No one of these groups can by itself provide the necessary assurance. But all of the people acting together through the Government can create the confidence that underlies prosperity simply by promising themselves to maintain full employment, and pledging the fiscal and regulatory resources of the Government to back this commitment.

It has been aptly said that depression is nothing but the reflection of mass fear. We have only to replace that fear with confidence, and employment will generate itself. We can literally lift ourselves by our own bootstraps.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES PAY FOR THEMSELVES

Let me, however, make myself perfectly clear on this matter of public spending. I am not saying that increased Federal expenditures will not be necessary under the operation of the bill. And I am not saying that Federal expenditures are undesirable and should be avoided.

I have said, merely, that it is the policy of the bill to underwrite public confidence by providing assurance that employment—and by the same token, markets and production and incomes—will be maintained at a high level.

That assurance is based on all of the resources of the Federal Government—the whole range of policies at its disposal for influencing the economy. Increased Federal spending to create jobs directly is one, but only one, of these many tools. Nevertheless, in a sense the ultimate guaranty rests upon this spending power. The collateral may never have to be redeemed, but it can be if necessary. As with any other underwriting transaction, the promise, simply because it has been made, may never have to be fulfilled. But the value of the commitment rests upon the fact that the financial resources will be available if and when needed.

All of which brings me to the second point that I want to drive home today. Some public expenditures are just as productive as private expenditures. Investments made by the Federal Government pay for themselves in the same way as investments made by businessmen.

Gentlemen, you can judge this for yourself. Consider some of the purposes for which the Government can and does spend money. The Government might spend for research designed to assist businessmen—to make available to producers statistical and technical information enabling them to improve quality and cut costs. The Government might invest in irrigation, flood and erosion control, and other land improvement projects designed to increase land values, develop backward regions, and open up new industries and markets. The Government might lower the transportation costs of industry by investing in highways and airports and river improvements. By eradicating slum and blighted areas of cities, it might enhance urban real estate values and multiply local tax sources. By investing in public schools and health and recreational facilities it can greatly increase the efficiency, morale and know-how of industry's workers. By underwriting private credit it can make capital available to new and small enterprises, and to foreign nations, and thereby expand markets, production, and employment.

Indeed, gentlemen, there is so much that needs to be done to develop the productivity of this country in ways that are beyond the reach of private capital that I feel it would be a national crime to waste a single penny on expenditures that do not pay for themselves. We do not have time for boondoggling.

TAXES WOULD COME OUT OF INCREASED PRODUCTION

I have been talking in terms of real values—of the resources and output created by keeping men at work.

I realize, however, that this does not answer the problem of many of you who are sincerely concerned about the financial transactions involved. You are keenly aware that if the Government spends more it must tax more. Temporarily, of course, it might meet the bill by borrowing, but eventually the debt too will have to be reduced by tax revenues. And you are wondering whether all of us as a nation, or any one of us as individuals, can carry this burden of increased taxation.

Let us look at it first from the point of view of the Nation rather than of the individual. When there is unemployment, part of the working force is wasted in idleness. Men without jobs have to be supported by public funds at least at a minimum subsistence level. Meanwhile, they are not contributing to the national output. This means not only idle men, but also the idle plants and equipment and materials and investment funds which would otherwise be used to keep these workers busy producing goods and services.

Now suppose that money is taxed and channeled by the Government into some of the productive expenditures that I have just described. The result will be to put idle resources to work, to increase private investment and expenditures, and so to raise national income by much more than the amount of the original taxation. The taxes will not have proved a burden on the economy. On the contrary they will more than have paid for themselves—probably manyfold.

Sensible Federal expenditures stimulate production and employment, and in so doing they increase national income. This means higher real incomes all the way around. Workers will be earning more, not only because more of them are employed, but also because wages go up as the Nation's income and productivity rise. Consumers will have more spending power because of the lower prices made possible by increased markets and productivity. Incomes from rents will increase as property values rise. And profits from all kinds of investment will expand along with the general increase of activity. In short, the increased capacity of the Nation's taxpayers will more than keep pace with the need for additional tax revenues.

This means that tax rates will not necessarily have to increase. The additional revenues may be forthcoming merely from the spontaneous expansion of the tax base.

I assure you that if I had the choice of paying less taxes at a lower income or more taxes at a higher income, it would not take me long to make a decision.

Of course, taxes hit some individuals harder than others; they are supposed to under a progressive tax system based on ability to pay. The actual impact upon a given taxpayer will depend on the tax structure. Incidentally, the kind of tax system that will contribute most to full employment is at the same time the kind that is fairest and distributes the burden most equitably. This is a system that goes easy on the consumer and the investor who is really enterprising, and gets at idle or stagnant money in the hands of those who are unwilling to assume normal competitive risks or who have more than they know what to do with.

WE CANNOT AFFORD UNEMPLOYMENT

I started out to answer the question "How can we pay for full employment?" I hope that I have answered it by demonstrating that full employment to a considerable degree pays for itself out of the product created by putting idle resources to work.

Now I want to clinch the argument, if I can, by asking you the question "How can we pay for unemployment?" What will happen to us financially if we allow depression to develop out of this reconversion crisis with which we are already confronted?

Consider this for a moment in the more conventional terms of how to balance the Budget. If unemployment goes up to the 8,000,000 mark, as Mr. Snyder tells us it will, and if it stays there for some time as Mr. Snyder tells us it may, what will be the consequences on the financial operations of the Federal Government?

For one thing, we will face increased Federal expenditures for relief. Not only relief for the destitute unemployed, which will by itself be a weighty item. But also relief for farmers caught by shrinking markets, in some such form as price support payments or export subsidies; relief for financial institutions in the form of heavy payments into underwriting schemes like RFC, FHA, bank-deposit insurance, and so forth; possibly even relief for manufacturers in the form of subsidies. It is a matter of record that when the bottom falls out of the economy, everybody comes running to Washington, and there is a heavy drain on the Federal purse. This cannot be avoided.

But where will the money come from to finance these emergency expenditures? The tax base—in other words, the national income—will go down even faster than expenses go up. And the difference cannot be made up in steeper tax rates without precipitating a still further decline in production and income.

There is not the slightest doubt that such a situation would call for heavy deficit spending. Indeed the history of the growing public debt has been almost exclusively tied up with two kinds of national emergencies—war and depression—simply because these are situations in which it is not feasible to cover expenses through taxation. Prosperity, on the other hand, has never given rise to an increase in the Federal debt.

But this tells only part of the story. In the last depressions we suffered losses that were much more serious and irreparable than the increase of the public debt. In dollars-and-cents terms, we lost 350 billion in national income, millions in farm income, in wages, and salaries, in corporate profits, and so forth. (See O'MAHONEY'S testimony, pt. 1 of the Banking and Currency Committee hearings.) And we cannot even estimate the productive capacity that was lost in real resources through the depreciation of plant and equipment, and the deterioration of human physiques and skills.

Gentlemen, this is the real problem. This is the question that is pertinent and timely. How can we possibly afford unemployment?

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 203. An act for the relief of Margery Anderson Bridges; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 356. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 432. An act to increase from 2 to 3 years the period of limitation on actions for undercharges and overcharges by or against railroad carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 473. An act relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 1084. An act for the relief of John C. May and Eva Jenkins May; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1131. An act for the relief of Jess Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Florence Barrows; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1296. An act for the relief of John A. Hatcher, to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1438. An act to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States Naval Service a career, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 239. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark;

H. R. 240. An act for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks;

H. R. 390. An act to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924;

H. R. 1104. An act to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 1465. An act for the relief of the State of California;

H. R. 1563. An act for the relief of N. Owen Oxley and the legal guardian of Lamar Oxley, a minor;

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis;

H. R. 2668. An act to transfer Ben Hill County, Ga., from the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia to the Americus division of the middle judicial district of Georgia; and

H. R. 3220. An act to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1383. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 239. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark;

H. R. 240. An act for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks;

H. R. 390. An act to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924;

H. R. 1104. An act to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 1465. An act for the relief of the State of California;

H. R. 1563. An act for the relief of N. Owen Oxley and the legal guardian of Lamar Oxley, a minor;

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis;

H. R. 2668. An act to transfer Ben Hill County, Ga., from the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia to the Americus division of the middle judicial district of Georgia; and

H. R. 3220. An act to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in executive session, on Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 a. m., in room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Thursday, October 25, at 10 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, October 25, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full-employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing, to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on Friday, October 26, 1945, on the following: House Concurrent Resolution 85, House Concurrent Resolution 86, House Concurrent Resolution 91, and House Joint Resolution 245, declaring the date of termination of hostilities in the present war. The hearings will begin at 10:30 a. m. and will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee will hold a hearing on Tuesday, October 30, 1945, at 10 a. m., on the star route bills (H. R. 2000 and H. R. 2524) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

798. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the complete Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the Year 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

799. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $679,700 for the Office of Alien Property Custodian (H. Doc. No. 360); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

800. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $1,072,299.69, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 361); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. IZAC: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4421. A bill to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEST: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 1281. An act to provide for covering into the treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RABIN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3940. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.," approved April 2, 1941; with amendment (Rept. No. 1147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3730. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Star City, W. Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1148). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3616. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1149). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOWELL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1219. An act authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Franciscille, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1150). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 927. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937; without amendment (Rept. No. 1151). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4480. A bill to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal; to the Committe on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 4481. A bill to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 4482. A bill designating May 8, the date proclaimed by the President of the United States as the final surrender of Germany and ending European hostilities in World War II, as a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4483. A bill to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 4484. A bill relating to the construction and maintenance of permanent buildings and improvements for banking purposes on the Fort Ord Military Reservation, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 4485. A bill to broaden eligibility for compensation benefits for widows of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4486. A bill to abolish the Santa Rosa Island National Monument and to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of that portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 4487. A bill to require common carriers by railroad to install reflectors on railroad cars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4488. A bill to prohibit the participation in a representative capacity of Government personnel or former Government personnel in certain proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 4489. A bill to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution declaring the end of the unlimited emergency, the national emergency, and the termination of hostilities of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 377. Resolution to appoint an investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. Res. 378. Resolution making H. R. 1834 a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 379. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4421, a bill to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to do all within their power to secure the immediate release from the armed forces of boys and young men desiring to resume their school work; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 4490. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Molly Poindexter, dependent mother of George Poindexter, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 4491. A bill for the relief of Miss Vertie Bea Loggins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 4492. A bill for the relief of Charles Marvin Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4493. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Schrom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4494. A bill for the relief of MacDougald Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 4495. A bill for the relief of William H. Roman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4496. A bill for the relief of Anne Robinson Norwood; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1269. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Adrian Torres and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a question of principle and collective rights acquired by virtue of citizenship extended to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1270. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of A. A. Owen, secretary, Ellis County Agricultural Association, Waxahachie, Tex., favoring House Joint Resolution 216; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the Lord of all being and the goal of all our hopes, teach us the secret of communion with Thee. Enable us to go thrcugh these days without frustration or confusion in our problems. Clothe us with the hero's heart, the poet's vision, and the patriot's voice, that we may strive to lighten the brows of the "heavy laden" and to free them from the pain of the road.

O Thou whose eternal name is Love, give us a clearer insight that we may rise above the expanse of confusion and feel the rapture of a sincere resolution to make every endeavor the measure and the mark of a true man, striking at the very roots of our Nation's ills. Clear and make strong the highway that leads to a solid, united, and intelligent citizenship. O let us feel the surge of a compulsion, a broadening outlook that will keep the wheels of progress turning, that, under God, no formula of any other rule shall ever displace our great democracy. Abide with every Member of the Congress, and when we separate today dismiss us with Thy blessing. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4309. An act to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two letters.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PALESTINE

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have received from Palestine a radiogram which I think would be of interest to Members of the House of Representatives. It reads:

We parents of 18 boys and 2 girls sentenced 16th October by Palestine military court to various imprisonment sentences, mostly 7 years, beg your aid to rouse American public opinion during next 10 days prior ratification sentence by officer commanding British troops, Palestine. Our children, aged 15 to 20, were arrested August 16 at Shuni while camping in wood. Though nothing found on them were taken to Acre Prison. Later police discovered arms cached vicinity camp. No civilians present at discovery. Twenty-six prosecution witnesses failed establish slightest connection between children and arms. Though notebooks found in cache, handwriting and fingerprints don't correspond children's. Children denied all knowledge arms and protested illegality their trial. Yesterday same court discharged Arab Ahmed Suliman Ali of Nimrin accused rifle on roof his house who claimed policeman planted rifle but gave our children total 118 years for unproven offense. We demand cancellation of outrageous discriminatory political sentence. Please help in name all parents.

Signed by a grandmother of one.

Upon receiving this radiogram, I wrote to Lord Halifax and asked him if it would not be possible to make a thorough investigation of this matter. I now await hi reply and will submit it to the House when it is received.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that beginning next Wednesday morning, at 10 o'clock, in the committee room of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will be glad to hear Members of Congress who wish to suggest amendments to H. R. 4276, the public buildings bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], and perhaps others have made such requests.

May I say in this regard that under existing law the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is not authorized to designate specific places for post-office construction and other construction around the country generally. For this reason we should like to limit the testimony of Members to any suggested amendments they may have to offer with reference to the proposals in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Constantine Brown, a Washington columnist.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LARCADE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, millions of human lives have been recently snuffed out that we who survive might live and live more abundantly and in a world at peace. Millions have just died at war to the end that the surviving world might live at peace.

Yesterday, right here in Washington, the United Nations Security Organization for World Peace became an accomplished fact when our own Secretary of State signed a protocol of deposit of ratifications. Yesterday also Poland and and the Soviet Union first signed. Thus the United Nations Charter became a part of the law of the world nations loving peace more than selfish power.

As our own great Nation threw her every resource, manpower, material, and spiritual, into winning this war, our highest duty to our war dead, our highest instincts, and the dictates of self-preservation demand that we likewise, in our generation, throw our every resource, material and spiritual, into winning an enduring world peace.

The invention and the use of the atomic bomb, together with the destruction of life and property; together with the other everpresent and everlasting

catastrophes and tragedies of this last World War have catapulted civilization into an immediate decision. It must be made now. Procrastination will undoubtedly cost the lives of millions of youths of every nation. We had to work to win the war; we must work to continue an enduring peace. Peace does not just happen. Peace must be planned. Peace must be prayed for and worked for.

This Congress must activate, sincerely and emphatically, plans for an enduring world peace. It must back the United Nations Security Organization for World Peace with whatever funds and work are necessary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

TAX REDUCTION LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 4309, an act to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer written by one of his constituents, a noted writer and author, Louis Bromfield.

SPEEDY DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I know everyone in this House is anxious to demobilize the armed services as soon as possible. We have been accusing the brass hats of not wanting to liquidate their commands. In many instances such accusations are justified. In my mail of this morning I got a strange letter from one of my constituents. It was strange in that it actually commended Brig. Gen. Robert Travis, commanding general of the Sioux Falls Army Air Base at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., for the speed with which he had liquidated his command. General Travis has done an outstanding job of demobilizing the Sioux Falls Army Air Base. There is also praise in the same communication for Maj. Gen. Robert Williams and Maj. Louis B. August, who comes from my own district in the State of Washington. Now I am pleased to include this letter with my remarks. It is manifestly an attitude at the military command level that we should recognize and commend.

It takes the Army to demobilize the Army. We in Congress can, by various persuasions, speed up the policy; but it takes men like Generals Williams and Travis and officers like Major August to do the job.

EDGE, DAVENPORT, KEITH & DEPENDER,
Spokane, Wash., October 20, 1945.

Hon. WALT HORAN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR WALT: It has come to my attention through various dischargees from the Sioux Falls Army Air Base that this particular base is being efficiently administered in the expediting of the discharge of individuals connected with the armed forces.

It has also come to my attention that Maj. Louis B. August, of the State of Washington, who has been placed in charge of the processing at this field, has rendered outstanding service in that behalf. I sometimes believe that a word of commendation to a deserving officer is just as important as a word of criticism to an undeserving officer. Hence, I believe it would be in perfect order if you would see fit to write to: Maj. Gen. Robert Williams, commanding general, Headquarters Second Air Force, Colorado Springs, Colo.; Brig. Gen. Robert Travis, commanding general, Sioux Falls Army Air Base, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; commending the efforts of Maj. Louis B. August for his excellent services in that behalf. For your convenience I am taking the liberty of enclosing a short memorandum for your use if you so desire.

Thanking you in advance for this gratuitous but deserved favor, I am

Yours sincerely,

LESTER EDGE.

P. S.—The above-named Major August is a Spokane boy whose family lives here. While my son was in Sioux Falls he was very kind to him. From all reports Major August has really done a wonderful job in Sioux Falls in the matter of processing and discharging soldiers entitled to the same.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANGELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ROBERT STRIPLING

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking note of the controversy that took place here on the floor yesterday, but when the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] graced with a sword when a fan would have become him better, saw fit to bring his argument down to the ranks of the private soldier in attacking poor Bob Stripling, who has been punished enough, I was reminded that pretexts are never wanting when hypocrisy wishes to add malice to falsehood or cowardice to stab a foe who cannot defend himself. I thought I detected beneath the hem of the lion's skin that the gentleman wore the tail of a calf.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words be taken down.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 177]

Andrews, N. Y.	Gamble	Mills
Baldwin, Md.	Gardner	Monroney
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gathings	Mott
Barden	Gifford	Norton
Barrett, Pa.	Gore	O'Konski
Barry	Gossett	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Granahan	Pace
Bell	Green	Pfeifer
Bender	Griffiths	Poage
Bland	Gwinn, N. Y.	Quinn, N. Y.
Bradley, Pa.	Hagen	Rains
Brehm	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Randolph
Buckley	Hall, Leonard W.	Rayfiel
Bunker	Hays	Rich
Butler	Heffernan	Riley
Byrne, N. Y.	Hope	Rivers
Campbell	Jarman	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rogers, N. Y.
Carlson	Jonkman	Rooney
Chelf	Judd	Russell
Chiperfield	Kee	Sabath
Clark	Kelley, Pa.	Sasscer
Cole, Kans.	Kelly, Ill.	Savage
Cunningham	Keogh	Short
Curley	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Dawson	King	Starkey
Delaney, James J.	Landis	Stigler
Dickstein	Lane	Thomas, Tex.
Dingell	Lea	Thomason
Dirksen	LeFevre	Torrens
Douglas, Calif.	Lynch	Voorhis, Calif.
Drewry	McCowen	Vursell
Flannagan	McGlinchey	Weiss
Flood	Marcantonio	Wickersham
Fuller	Mills	Winter
Fulton	Monroney	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

WORDS TAKEN DOWN

Mr. CELLER. I asked just prior to the calling of the roll for the purpose of securing a quorum that the words uttered by the gentleman from Georgia be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cox. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking note of the controversy that took place here on the floor yesterday, but when the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], graced with a sword when a fan would have become him better, saw fit to bring his argument down to the ranks of the private soldier in attacking poor Bob Stripling, who has been punished enough, I was reminded that pretexts are never wanting when hypocrisy wishes to add malice to falsehood or cowardice to stab a foe who cannot defend himself.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, that is not all of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there was more than that.

The SPEAKER. There is one more sentence. It is on another page. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

I thought I detected in the lion's skin that the gentleman wore the tail of a calf.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, that is inaccurate. That is not an accurate transcript. I said:

I thought I detected beneath the hem of the lion's skin which the gentleman wore the tail of a calf.

The SPEAKER. The language here is:

I thought I detected in the lion's skin that the gentleman wore——

Mr. COX. No; I said "beneath the hem of the lion's skin."

Mr. CELLER. In any event, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

It is not necessary to repeat all that the gentleman from Georgia said. The Chair reads these words:

I was reminded that pretexts are never wanting when hypocrisy wishes to add malice to falsehood or cowardice to stab a foe who cannot defend himself.

The gentleman from Georgia specifically referred to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. The Chair is compelled to hold that those remarks are not parliamentary.

Mr. COX. Will the Speaker recognize me? I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, I am always happy to accept the judgment of my Speaker on matters of this kind.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the gentleman from Georgia be permitted during the remainder of the day to proceed in order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I have finished.

Mr. HOOK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's objection comes slightly late.

STRIKE-BOUND PERISHABLE ARMY FOODSTUFFS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call upon the Secretary of War to proceed immediately to remove from strike-bound plants of the General Foods Corp., at Battle Creek, Mich., more than one-half million dollars worth of Government-owned foodstuffs urgently needed for our troops overseas.

George Worrell, acting for the United Cereal, Food, and Bakery Workers (CIO) Union, has defied the War Department in the removal of these processed goods, and the matter has been referred to Washington. At noon today nothing had been done about it.

Several days ago the Quartermaster Department advised company officials that it was very anxious to remove these processed foods for repacking for overseas distribution. It sent a committee of three officers to Battle Creek to determine the basis upon which the material could be shipped. After conferring with both corporation and union officials, an agreement was reached and the terms of the agreement, to which both company officials and union officials had agreed, were reduced to written form. When the War Department representatives went to the union to get their signatures they were informed by Mr. Worrell that the union had changed its mind and would not enter into any agreement of any sort for the removal of this Government property.

The representatives of the War Department then returned to the Chicago Quartermaster's office and, as I said before, referred the matter to Washington.

I am reliably informed that during a discussion of the situation in a union membership meeting, after the departure of the War Department representatives, the adjective "yellow" was used in reference to the Army's action. Were the union leaders correct in this description of the Army? I think it is time for us to find out. It is time for the people of America to know whether the Army, too, has become subservient to union racketeers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to union labor. I believe in labor unions and their pronounced objectives, but I do not believe it behooves any one or two or three union leaders to deprive our soldiers of needed food, or dictate to the War Department or the constituted officers of our Government.

It is true, Mr. Worrell has stated that the foodstuffs he has blocked are not perishable. This is not correct. The products involved include what are known as the 10-in-1 ration pack, and the miscellaneous component parts of this pack include crackers, chocolate bars, cigarettes, and other items which are definitely perishable.

The Quartermaster Department at Chicago says these materials are urgently needed to feed our soldiers. I shall watch closely to see what action is taken to get this food to them.

As a Member of Congress, having the privilege to serve on the House Committee on Military Affairs, I think it is time to put these bulldozing, arrogant, domineering labor leaders in their place. The removal of this food for our soldiers is essential. It is in the public's interest. If necessary, I would suggest the use of troops to do it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington News.

Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and part of a letter.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent to the President of the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on his recent European tour.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CIO

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House should realize the full import of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] said just a moment ago. If my ears did not deceive me he told us that the Army had food in warehouses in Battle Creek but that because of a CIO strike against the company owning the warehouses the CIO threw a picket line around the building and refused to let the Quartermaster's men go through and get the food out for shipment. Our men have been able to fight their way from their homes to the uttermost parts of the world and neither the Germans, the Japs, nor anyone nor anything has stopped them. They whipped the armies of Hitler and Hirohito but they cannot whip the CIO pickets who are withholding food from their buddies because the politicians in Washington will not let them. The Quartermaster's squad was not afraid, they could and no doubt would have gone through that picket line like butter across a red-hot griddle but the administration which has been trading special privileges to labor politicians for votes humiliates the soldier by making him stand back, retreat, at the sight of a CIO picket.

Will the President who spoke so feelingly of compulsory military training Tuesday if he forces our young men into the Army have them trained to stand at attention when a hired CIO picket speaks or passes?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Demobilization and include copy of a bill he has introduced.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article on peacetime military training.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Houston Post containing a letter written by the Lieutenant Governor of Texas.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper report of a serviceman who committed suicide in Hawaii because he did not have enough points to get out and also to include a letter from one of the buddies of the serviceman concerning that tragic incident.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several letters from intelligent, patriotic people concerning the subversive activities of certain broadcasters on the radio.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement by Maj. George Fielding Eliot.

DESCENDANTS OF "MAYFLOWER" PASSENGERS AND SCIENTIFIC "FURRINERS"

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOLIFIELD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SAFEGUARDING MILITARY INFORMATION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 367) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 805) to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. At the moment I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the rule making in order the consideration of this measure in my judgment is absolutely unnecessary. It seems to me that a bill as plain in its terms as this one is should have been approved on the Consent Calendar. There is absolutely nothing in this legislation designed to cover up anything or to enable anybody to avoid the inquiry that is about to be made or is being made by the committee established by this body.

This bill makes it illegal for men in the employ of the Military Establishments to divulge any information concerning our code or our methods of decoding messages sent throughout the world by code.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it not likewise apply to persons outside of the Military Establishments who possibly, as a part of the Military Establishments at one time, learned certain information?

Mr. WALTER. I think it does, and I thing it very properly should, I may say to my distinguished colleague from Indiana. After all, bear in mind this fact: That during the hostilities a great many people were in the employ of the Government for patriotic reasons only. Those people were quick to resume their usual vocations, and naturally so. Every day thousands of people of that sort are leaving the Military Establishments, and it certainly seems to me that their lips should be sealed when it comes to the discussion of some of the things that made possible the winning of the war.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the bill go far enough to reach individuals who are in the employ of the departments of the Government and who, by one means or another, whether criminal or otherwise, took out secret files of the Government and used them for private purposes or turned them over to subversive organizations in this country?

Mr. WALTER. I think that there is a general law that meets that situation. I do not think this legislation would be necessary in order to deal with the hypothetical case that the gentleman has just described.

Mr. DONDERO. But that is not a hypothetical case; that happened.

Mr. WALTER. If it happened, then certainly the people who took these private files out of the Government offices ought to be prosecuted.

Mr. DONDERO. They were, but they were whitewashed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I think the very first sentence of the proposed bill answers the question of the gentleman who just addressed the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is as follows:

That whoever, by virtue of his employment by or performance of services for the United States or by virtue of his employment by any person, firm, or corporation performing services for the United States or by virtue of his service in the armed forces of the United States—

If anybody coming under those categories does the things objected to, he will be subject to punishment.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, that is the fact. However, as I understood the question, it had to do with the taking of confidential files and not code messages. Bear this in mind: This legislation deals entirely with the code and not with other types of communications in Government files. There is a general statute that deals with that situation, I may say to my friend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This bill deals not only with the code but with any information which at any time may have been transmitted by code. Is not that correct?

Mr. WALTER. I will say to my distinguished friend, in anticipation of his next question, that it was the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary to keep open the doors for a full inquiry into the events leading up to Pearl Harbor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, I am at a loss to know why the gentleman anticipated a question of that kind. He must have had this question in his own mind.

Mr. WALTER. I have not been here as long as I have been without realizing that occasionally my distinguished friend indulges in things political.

May I call to the attention of the House the committee report, which in my judgment should allay any feeling that anyone has that an attempt is being made to prevent a full disclosure of matters that might be inquired into in the near future. The committee report very plainly states:

The language in section 5 authorizing the furnishing of information to the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives is intended to include also any joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives.

I understand that one of the members of the committee is going to offer a clarifying amendment. It certainly seems to me that that amendment should be accepted, because I want to make it emphatic that there is no intention under

this legislation to prevent a full disclosure of anything that is a proper subject matter of inquiry.

On the other hand, it seems to me that we owe it to the future security of our Nation to prevent those people who just happen to know about our very secret relations among various Government agencies and with other nations from divulging the manner in which that information is broadcast.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is intended only to guarantee the secrecy of information acquired in the manner prescribed in the bill, then it is objectively correct. I cannot conceive of a single Member voting against any measure which in clear, understandable language protects the security and safety of our Government. Does this bill do that? I am not satisfied that it does, and it would be very unwise for this House to place upon the statute books so far-reaching, all-inclusive, yet indefinite, and uncertain a law. Who is there among us who is fully and completely advised as to just what the complex sentences and language found in the bill mean? It seems to me that the Judiciary Committee should have had hearings on the bill and at least had before it those who drafted the bill and were in a position to explain succinctly the reason for each provision and the meaning intended to be conveyed by the draftsmen. This was not done, and if the bill is permitted to come before the House for action under such conditions, who is well enough informed as to the wishes, desires, and intentions of the draftsmen to speak for them? Mr. Speaker, no bill should be brought out here for action under such conditions. Why all this effort under spur and whip to pass inadequately considered legislation?

The fact that the bill passed the Senate on June 21, 1945, came to the House, was referred to the Judiciary Committee, and no action taken by that committee until the 27th day of September, answers this last question. This is not what usually happens when emergency legislation is asked for.

I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, but was called from the committee room before the bill was favorably reported. I, therefore, did not vote against the report. My position, however, is known to my colleagues on the committee.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I voted against this rule because it seems to me that a bill of this importance warrants more careful legislative committee study and adequate hearings before it is brought to the floor. I am told by members of the subcommittee that before the bill was reported Admiral Redmond from the Navy Department and General Bissell of the War Department stated to the committee that they desired this legislation. No department of our Government uses to a greater extent code, cipher, and cryptograms than does the State Department. Nevertheless, the State Department made no appearance before the committee. The granting and limiting of power and authority provided in the bill are found in the first two sections. You have the bill before you, and you will observe that the first section deals largely with instrumentalities of our own Government and attempts to penalize the divulging of specified information concerning domestic activities. The second section reaches out and includes persons receiving information and knowledge by virtue of their service "in the armed forces of any foreign country." Section 1 provides that none of the secret information shall be given out except when authorized by the head of the department or agency employing the person obtaining the information. However, the last paragraph in the section contains this language: "Authorizations, as herein provided, shall be granted only in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President." In short, none of this information mentioned in section 1 can be given out except by order of the President. The heads of the agencies and departments can only carry out the President's orders. Therefore, only such information will be available to such people as the President, in his wisdom, thinks wise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, section 2, to which I have referred, contains no provision bringing the President into the picture. The information there referred to can only be given out by virtue of the joint authorization of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy.

As one Member of the House, I should like to know why this difference, and I do not believe there is a member of the Judiciary Committee who can state the facts.

This is one of the most far-reaching limitations ever attempted by the Congress. It would seem to prevent the writing of memoirs by those familiar with the war and all transactions incident thereto. General Wainwright is already publishing his story. Were this bill the law of the land, he might be sent to prison for 10 years or fined $10,000 unless his manuscript had been censored and had the approval of the President or these departments.

Who knows but that General Eisenhower or General Patton or General MacArthur or Admiral Leahy might want to write the history of the late war for the benefit, as well as the edification, of our own people and the generations to come? Are we going to prevent any such thing happening and pass a bill which we know little, if anything, about? Mr. Speaker, I hope not.

A habit is easily acquired and it is sometimes very difficult to change acquired habits. During the war, we all voted unstinting power and authority whenever asked for by the President and the departments for the purpose of carrying on the war. That was right and proper because we were in an emergency. Time was of the essence and very few, if any, questions were asked by the Congress. That condition no longer obtains, and there is now no reason why an intricate bill, drafted outside the Congress, should be railroaded through the House without adequate study, hearings, debate, and consideration. This proposed bill has nothing to do with the winning of the war. It would seem that if there is ample law available to deal with these important matters in wartime, then, inasmuch as the war has not been officially terminated, there should at least be opportunity to write well-considered laws to take up where war powers leave off.

Anything worth doing is worth doing well—especially so, when the rights of freemen in a free country are being taken away from them, even in the name of public security.

This rule should not pass but, if it does, this bill should be recommitted for further study.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman imagine any good reason to offer why the rule should not be adopted, if it be the wish of the House to consider this matter at all?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. I think I have a very good reason.

Mr. COX. I take it the gentleman has an open mind on this proposition, and therefore no objection to the matter being presented to the House?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; the gentleman has an open mind, but the gentleman has been here long enough, as has the gentleman from Georgia, to know that you cannot write a technical bill like this one, in a mass meeting, in a convention, or on the floor of the House. There is not a man on the Judiciary Committee, which committee should be able to advise the House, who can give the House anything except his own judgment as to what the bill means. I would like to hear the people who have written this legislation. I would like to have the department or the draftsman describe, sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, the necessity for all of this particular legislation at this particular time.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MICHENER. Briefly, yes.

Mr. COX. This bill comes from the gentleman's own committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. COX. I presume the gentleman knew it was pending in the committee?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. I will answer that. This bill came to the Judiciary Committee on the 21st day of last June, when the war was on, at a time when legislation of this kind would be essential, if it was ever essential, but it laid there without any action on the part of the committee, without any insistence, as I understand it, from down the Avenue, until just recently.

Now, it is not talking politics to ask that all the facts be brought out in the Pearl Harbor matter. I also want all the facts brought out in case Kimmel or Short should ever be court-martialed. I do not want to grant to the President or to anyone else the right to write rules or regulations that will prevent the bringing out of evidence, whether it be before an investigating committee of the House, or before a court martial, or before any other forum which will give to the American people the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Certainly, anything that happened at Pearl Harbor, or since Pearl Harbor with reference to Pearl Harbor, cannot affect the security of the United States. I have confidence in the committee set-up by the Congress to hear the evidence and report. I do not believe that great committee, headed by the majority leader in the Senate—an administration man if there ever was one—is going to permit evidence to go before the people that will destroy our county. If this rule is defeated, this bill will go back to the Judiciary Committee, when hearings can be held, the uncertainties ironed out, and a well-thought-out bill presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have already taken more time than I intended. How much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 9 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, this bill involves two different things. One, it has to do with divulging or revealing the mechanics or means by which we decode foreign messages or transmit coded messages of our own. The other part of it has to do with the revealing or divulging of information acquired by anyone by reason of the decoding of a foreign message or by reason of knowing of coded messages sent by our Government.

The first of those things does not bother me, but the second of them does bother me. It bothers me because of its extreme breadth. It bothers me because it would reach back in the years, years past, affecting men in high position in the Military Establishment and men in the lower stations, and seek to inflict upon them penalties for things that they might do without any intention to injure anybody or, most of all, our country.

We fought a very successful war over the past 4 years. We have just won that war. We did not find this sort of legislation necessary then. Why all this great sudden solicitude for the adoption of this legislation which is so broad and far-reaching. Beyond that, there are already in the statutes penalties for the disclosures of information. And why should this type of information as distinguished from means or mechanisms be given any higher degree of protection than was the same information that might be obtained by a member of the Military Establishment before the message was transmitted in code?

There is another thing that disturbs me particularly about this, and I think you will bear with me in my contention that I am not motivated by any political considerations. We suffered a great disaster at Pearl Harbor, and immediately thereafter two men, Kimmel and Short, were removed from their commands and held up to degradation and disgrace before the people of the country, their countrymen. It was said they would be court-martialed. They have not been court-martialed. The Congress was so concerned about their situation that from time to time we extended the statute of limitations in order that they might be brought to trial and a full disclosure made.

Let me ask the proponents of this bill: Assume that the committee we have set up decides not to call Kimmel and Short; have you not by the adoption of this legislation sealed the lips of Kimmel and Short and all who might know of the circumstances about Pearl Harbor obtained from coded messages and thereby prevented those men from going before the bar of public opinion, their countrymen, and defending themselves against these charges that have been leveled? I say that result would be unconscionable. And if the gentleman from Pennsylvania who says that there is no desire to cover up anything about Pearl Harbor, if he means that—and I am sure he does because he is a man of integrity—then I say he ought to be very happy to support an amendment that I propose to offer in these words:

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall apply to or prevent the communication, furnishing, transmission, or publication (1) of any information or material relating to the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941; or (2) of the records, findings of fact, opinions, and recommendations of the Army Board of Investigation and of the Navy Court of Inquiry relating thereto.

Mr. Speaker, the country is demanding that Kimmel and Short be given a square deal. The country is demanding the full truth and all of the facts about Pearl Harbor. It has been said by many that no one could sit on that lid. I believe the Congress of the United States recognizes its responsibility, recognizes that except as the legislative body acts the country cannot be assured of a full disclosure in which people generally will have confidence.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HALLECK. By what I say here I do not intend to cast any reflections upon the investigating committee of able members that has been set up, but I have served on a few special committees myself. I have seen times when I thought someone ought to be called but who was not called because the committee decided otherwise. I believe we ought not to be a party to the enactment of legislation that would say to Kimmel and Short or to anyone else who knows anything about it: "Whether this committee calls you or not, you having been indicted and charged, are entitled to your day in court at the bar of public opinion to say in your own defense whether or not the responsibility was yours."

I do not want to be a party to setting up a situation under which if this congressional committee does not see fit to call those men or other men, that their lips are thereby sealed. I say again that if the proponents of this legislation mean what they say about Pearl Harbor then adopt this amendment when it comes along.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Indiana is raising a lot of political dust which is quite unnecessary. The amendment that he suggests is as broad as a barn door so far as Pearl Harbor is concerned. I am advised that a distinguished Republican, former Attorney General Mitchell, is to play a very important part in these Pearl Harbor proceedings. As for the delay in bringing up this bill, that cannot be laid at the door of those on this side of the aisle We are not responsible for delay. That occurred in the Senate and more particularly by a Senator from Michigan.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can handle this, if the gentleman from Mississippi will permit it.

The Chair desires to say that the words used by the gentleman are unparliamentary. The Chair repeats, we must in the House try to maintain comity as between the two Houses of Congress. To refer to specific matters that occurred in the Senate or to any individual in the Senate is a violation of the rules.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I may say that in a moment of thoughtlessness I made the statement about delay in the Senate, and I gladly withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker, we must trust the President in this regard to the Pearl Harbor matter. He has guaranteed the fullest possible publicity anent the Pearl Harbor proceedings and beyond that, please be advised that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended this legislation, the Secretaries of War and Navy as well as the State Department want this legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman possibly conceive of any information that might be had by any person in or out of the Military Establishment regarding the disaster at Pearl Harbor that should not be open and free to the public?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know. I do not know what the information might entail. There is a possibility that it might make for cracking of a code in the future. We must not relax in security measures and those in authority have indicated clearly that this legislation is necessary for the future protection of the Nation.

I understand something about the case that emanated from the State Department. That proceeding in particular, which was referred to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], involved an old statute which provided that anybody who takes any kind of property, no matter how insignificant, from any of the departments is guilty of a crime. If you take a pin, staple, or a piece of paper regardless of its contents, you are guilty of a crime. That does not go far enough. Hence this bill concerning information alone or contained in any code.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I have said previously and I still believe that further inquiry into the Pearl Harbor incident was a mistake. However, if I thought that this

bill were intended to be used as a cover-up and to obstruct that investigation which has been ordered I would denounce it. The committee sponsoring the bill say it was not intended and could not be used for that purpose. I believe the committee and I think we should accept the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Knowing the gentleman as I do, I take it that he would be one of the last men in the House to do anything that might say to either Kimmel or Short, "You cannot present your case before the bar of public opinion without regard to whether what you know came in a coded message or not."

Mr. COX. If there is going to be an inquiry, I think it should be a full, honest, and complete one.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman guarantee to me those men will be called and asked by the committee to tell officially what they know?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

GEN. BILLY MITCHELL—THE ATOMIC BOMB—EINSTEIN AND WAR WITH SPAIN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one objection to this bill is it does not go far enough. I think we should protect our secret codes, but we should also preserve the secrets of the know-how, as President Truman calls it, of making the atomic bomb. That is the most important secret in the world today.

I opposed investigation of the Pearl Harbor incident during the war because of the disturbing effect it might have on the morale of the country. But the war is over now, and I would be the last man on earth to deny Short or Kimmel a fair and impartial trial.

But remember that the main witness cannot be called to testify in the investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster. That man is Gen. Billy Mitchell, who was court-martialed back in the twenties because he was telling the American people how to build an air force. Pearl Harbor was lost by the court martial and punishment and degradation of Billy Mitchell, one of the finest and noblest men America has ever produced.

I understand a bill has passed the Senate to confer upon him a posthumous Medal of Honor; but it has hung fire in one of the committees of this House. I want to serve notice on that committee now, that if you do not bring it out, we are going to lay a petition in the well and bring it out for you; and pass it by a landslide. We are going to at least let the world know that Billy Mitchell's spirit marches on, and that we are not going to be caught without an air force again.

Mr. Speaker, I am serious about the secrets of the atomic bomb. I believe that we should keep the secret of the know-how of making that dangerous weapon at all costs.

I received a letter this morning containing one by Dr. Albert Einstein. In it is also a card from Dr. Einstein asking for money to carry on the fight for breaking relations with Spain, which would probably mean war with that country.

This morning I received a petition from a large number of fathers and mothers in my district asking that the bodies of their sons, who gave their lives in this war, be brought home for burial. The American people do not want another war now, yet here is this man, Dr. Albert Einstein, urging us to break relations, which would likely mean war with Spain, and probably war with the entire Spanish-speaking world.

Let me read you what he says:

> This campaign will require both work and money. I am contributing both myself. You have undoubtedly contributed to other organizations which are doing splendid work for the relief of Spanish Republican refugees. But the American Committee for Spanish Freedom is an emergency organization—

Then he underscores these words—

> It was created solely for the purpose of working for a break in diplomatic relations and commercial relations with Nazi-Falange Spain.

That is the present Spanish Government.

Instead of having our boys come home this foreign-born agitator would have us plunge into another European war in order to further the spread of communism throughout the world.

He tries to frighten us with the suggestion that Spain might attack us some day with atomic bombs.

What nonsense! A distinguished admiral told us the other day that it would take England, with all her industry and ingenuity at least 5 years to make the machinery with which to make the machinery to manufacture the atomic bomb. Then how long do you think it would take backward, impoverished Spain to do it?

It is about time the American people got wise to Einstein. In my opinion he is violating the law and ought to be prosecuted.

Here is a man out demanding that we break relations with and declare war on a foreign country that is at peace with both our country and Great Britain.

Great Britain has never broken relations with Spain because it was Spain's attitude that enabled Great Britain and the United States to invade northern Africa.

Here is a man using the mail to raise money to propagandize us into breaking relations with Spain which, as I said, would mean another war probably, and yet these Communists and their fellow travelers are attacking us for maintaining a Committee on Un-American Activities.

I call upon the Department of Justice to put a stop to this man Einstein, or any one else, thus violating the laws of this Government in order to try to get us into another war at this time.

We have had enough war. Let us get our boys back home and our country back to peace and prosperity.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this rule for S. 805 when it was before the Committee on Rules because of the question in my mind relative to two sentences in or portions of this bill, and it was regarding these two provisions that I queried the gentleman from Pennsylvania who opened the debate on this rule.

Instead of answering my queries, he implied that my questions were prompted by politics. I say to him and to the Members of the House if there is any politics of any kind in this measure, or in connection with this legislation, it is not on the minority side of the House or in my heart or mind.

May I read these two sentences to the House? I should like for you to read them with me, if you will. The first is on page 2, beginning in line 5:

> Any material which has been, or purports to have been—

Get the words "purports to have been"—

> prepared or transmitted in or by the use of any code, cipher, or cryptographic system of the United States or any foreign government.

Now please refer to page 3, line 13:

> (5) Any information which has been, or purports to have been, derived from cryptanalysis of messages transmitted by the United States.

Under this bill, the divulging of any such information, whether it is actual information, or just claimed to be information, is prohibited.

Of course, these restrictions not only affect Pearl Harbor and the Pearl Harbor investigation but will affect, control, and stifle any statement or information which may ever be given, or be desired to be given, in the future relative to anything which has happened in our recent wars.

These two sentences are so broad that if this law had been in effect at the time General Wainwright wrote this story of Bataan as it has been printed in the newspapers, in which he stated a message had come through that General MacArthur was to go to Australia and he was to take command, he could be sentenced to prison for 10 years or fined $10,000.

Any ex-serviceman, any old veteran, who sits around the common stove in the home-town grocery store or garage and begins to gas a little bit about what he said to MacArthur, or how MacArthur sent a message by him, or something else, could be indicted, prosecuted, and convicted under this section.

This bill is so broad that it strikes at the very roots of freedom of speech and freedom of the press in this country. No one objects, of course, to protecting the secrets of our military codes or equipment, but why stifle all information as to that which has gone before?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. This bill even penalizes some soldier who wants to be demobilized, if he is brought in on the carpet, even though he has a perfectly just cause. He could be penalized under this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If he discusses a coded message that comes through

which says he should not be demobilized or discharged, he could be convicted.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. What would be the case in regard to General Wainwright in connection with this series of articles that are appearing in the papers every night?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sorry the gentleman did not hear the first part of my speech, as I mentioned that.

This bill is so far reaching it not only would prevent the discussion of Pearl Harbor, but would also interfere with any criticism whatsoever, in the future, of anything else which went on in this war. I say this bill strikes at the constitutional right of freedom of speech.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Is it not true that under this bill no newspaperman could get what is called the inside or background information anywhere in Washington without going to the head of the department to get it as a direct hand-out?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has very ably stated one of the great objections to this bill, an example of the thing I have tried to point out, which would destroy our freedom of the press, as well as our freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, I think this rule should be defeated and the bill sent back to the Judiciary Committee, in the hope it will bring out a bill that is just a little more American.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, you were kind enough to appoint me to serve on the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee. I accepted that appointment and have been most diligently applying myself ever since that time to the tremendous task at hand. I have made no statement to the newspapers, but I have been constantly subjected every day to questions by Members of Congress as to what this committee is doing and intends to do. May I say at the outset that when the resolution providing for this committee was adopted in the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky made a very succinct and clear statement as to the purposes of this investigation. Up to the present moment I have been unable to ascertain any deviation from that purpose. If there should be any deviation from that purpose, I assure you and the country at large that I shall take it before the floor of this House and expose it whenever it occurs. I believe that the committee as constituted and under the direction of the counsel which it has chosen, intends to make a full, fair, and complete investigation of the tragedy at Pearl Harbor and bring to the American people the essential facts relating to that tragedy, provided that the committee is not hamstrung in its activities in its attempt so to do.

What is my responsibility as an individual member of that committee? I assumed that it called for some individual investigation and action. I have tried to read all the pertinent material that I could get my hands on, such as testimony that has never been released, and reports of the Army and Navy Board that have never been released. I have tried to familiarize myself with what the issue is and to outline a case as I would prepare it as a lawyer. I want certain information in connection with this investigation. Other members of the committee want certain information. I want to personally pursue a certain line of investigation in order to develop certain facts. What do I find? I find that in August of this year a directive was issued by the President to all the departments of Government, including the Army and Navy, and so forth, which prevents the employees or officers of those departments from communicating to me any information that I may seek to get. I am glad to say that as a result of actions of our counsel, that directive has been somewhat revised. I call your attention to the revision and point out that it relates only to the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It does not relate to the FBI or the Federal Communications Commission nor does it relate to the curator of the museum at Hyde Park which has in its possession, as I understand, the secret documents that were in the White House. I have been unable to see those documents up to date and neither has the committee. The testimony and documents supplied to the Naval Investigating Committee have not been submitted up to this date nor have they been in the hands of the committee investigating Pearl Harbor. I believe that material will be submitted to the committee. It is a tremendous task to assemble this information. It is a tremendous task to outline the necessary evidence that will be submitted to the committee.

But I am not at all certain, despite assurance given me this morning by Mr. Mitchell, our counsel, but that the adoption of this particular bill, S. 805, may not very seriously jeopardize the work of this committee.

You will discover when these hearings are opened that a large basic amount of the testimony that will be adduced has reference to code material and information. If this bill is passed, it means that anybody in a department is prohibited from giving any information unless it is released by the head of the department. Applying to the Army it would mean, if we made a request of the War Department for information, that information could be furnished by anybody in the Department, provided the Secretary of War so directed, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President. The President has issued an order, dated October 23, a copy of which I have before me, which apparently on the face of it is a directive to those departments named, State, War, Navy, and the Chiefs of Staff, to furnish information to this committee. But I want some information from Mr. Hoover, down at the FBI. How am I going to get it? Senator FERGUSON and I go down there and want to see certain documents. We want to go to Hyde Park and personally examine certain records. Try and get them. You just cannot do it. The matter has got to go through the medium of action by the committee itself and its counsel. If that develops it ought to be perfectly obvious to anyone—and I hope it does not develop; I hope that this committee action will be along nonpartisan lines and of a judicial character so that we will produce the truth, and let the chips fall where they will; but if the situation develops so that a question arises as to whether or not certain proposed testimony that I may want to submit to this committee is questioned as to its relevancy or materiality, and action of the committee is necessary to determine that question, then it will become a question of action by the full committee all the time as to what testimony will be permitted to go in. With the passage of this bill the gates will be closed, and I, as an individual, will not have an opportunity to even talk to a witness to ascertain what he would testify and to get a statement from him if he were called before the Pearl Harbor Committee.

I discussed this matter with Mr. Mitchell, our counsel, this morning. He does not feel the apprehension that some people feel about it. He feels that under the provisions of the bill, as found on page 2, lines 13 to 22, there is ample authority on the part of the President to direct departmental heads to furnish us with whatever information is necessary. Well, the President may do that, but when we seek to ask the President to empower Senator FERGUSON or JERE COOPER or myself in our investigatory capacity to go down there and pursue a line of inquiry, we are blocked, unless the matter is brought before the entire committee and passes through the hands of the counsel in that manner.

Now, gentlemen, this is going to be a job. I rather think that the importance of this bill at this time is greatly overestimated. Certainly, there should be no attempt to tie up information that in no sense involves the national security or the national interest. Yet, as this bill is written, it would prevent the giving of information that could not in the remotest degree, in any way affect the national welfare or the national interest. There are so many things involved that I hope you will give consideration to sending this bill back to the committee at this time, until we can have a little further opportunity to study it. I certainly do not want to see any blocking of the investigation of Pearl Harbor, and I am fearful something might come in that direction if you adopt this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas) there were—ayes 49, noes 111.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 162, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—166

Abernethy	Granger	Patrick
Allen, La.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Gregory	Peterson, Ga.
Biemiller	Hare	Philbin
Bland	Harless, Ariz.	Pickett
Bloom	Hart	Poage
Bonner	Havenner	Price, Fla.
Boren	Healy	Price, Ill.
Boykin	Hébert	Priest
Brooks	Hedrick	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Hendricks	Rabin
Bryson	Hobbs	Rains
Bulwinkle	Hoch	Ramspeck
Burch	Holifield	Randolph
Camp	Hook	Rankin
Cannon, Fla.	Huber	Resa
Cannon, Mo.	Izac	Richards
Carnahan	Jackson	Robertson, Va.
Celler	Johnson,	Robinson, Utah
Chapman	Luther A.	Roe, Md.
Chelf	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Fla.
Clements	Kefauver	Rowan
Cochran	Kelly, Ill.	Ryter
Colmer	Kerr	Sadowski
Combs	Kilday	Savage
Cooley	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cooper	Kopplemann	Sheridan
Courtney	Lanham	Sikes
Cox	Larcade	Slaughter
Crosser	Lemke	Smith, Va.
Davis	Lesinski	Snyder
Dawson	Link	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney,	Ludlow	Sparkman
John J.	Lyle	Spence
Domengeaux	McCormack	Stewart
Doughton, N. C.	McGehee	Sullivan
Douglas, Ill.	McKenzie	Sumners, Tex.
Doyle	McMillan, S. C.	Tarver
Durham	Madden	Thom
Earthman	Mahon	Tolan
Eberharter	Maloney	Traynor
Elliott	Manasco	Trimble
Engle, Calif.	Mansfield,	Vinson
Ervin	Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Feighan	Mansfield, Tex.	Walter
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Wasielewski
Fogarty	Morgan	Weaver
Folger	Morrison	West
Forand	Murdock	Whitten
Gallagher	Murphy	Whittington
Gardner	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
Gary	Neely	Winstead
Geelan	O'Brien, Mich.	Wood
Gibson	O'Neal	Woodhouse
Gordon	Outland	Worley
Gorski	Pace	
Granahan	Patman	

NAYS—162

Adams	Brown, Ohio	D'Ewart
Allen, Ill.	Brumbaugh	Dolliver
Andersen,	Buck	Dondero
H. Carl	Buffett	Dworshak
Anderson, Calif.	Byrnes, Wis.	Eaton
Andresen,	Canfield	Ellis
August H.	Case, N. J.	Ellsworth
Angell	Case, S. Dak.	Elsaesser
Arends	Chenoweth	Elston
Arnold	Church	Engel, Mich.
Auchincloss	Clason	Fallon
Barrett, Wyo.	Clevenger	Fellows
Bates, Mass.	Coffee	Fenton
Beall	Cole, Mo.	Gavin
Bennet, N. Y.	Cole, N. Y.	Gearhart
Bennett, Mo.	Corbett	Gerlach
Bishop	Crawford	Gillespie
Blackney	Curtis	Gillette
Bolton	D'Alesandro	Gillie
Bradley, Mich.	De Lacy	Goodwin
Graham	Knutson	Rockwell
Grant, Ind.	Kunkel	Rodgers, Pa.
Gross	LaFollette	Rogers, Mass.
Gwynne, Iowa	Latham	Schwabe, Mo.
Hale	LeCompte	Schwabe, Okla.
Hall,	LeFevre	Scrivner
Edwin Arthur	Lewis	Shafer
Halleck	Luce	Sharp
Hancock	McConnell	Simpson, Ill.
Harness, Ind.	McCowen	Smith, Maine
Hartley	McDonough	Smith, Ohio
Henry	McGregor	Smith, Wis.
Herter	McMillen, Ill.	Springer
Heselton	Marcantonio	Stefan
Hess	Martin, Iowa	Stevenson
Hill	Martin, Mass.	Stockman
Hinshaw	Mason	Sumner, Ill.
Hoeven	Michener	Sundstrom
Hoffman	Miller, Nebr.	Taber
Holmes, Mass.	Mundt	Talbot
Holmes, Wash.	Murray, Wis.	Talle
Horan	O'Hara	Taylor
Howell	Patterson	Thomas, N. J.
Hull	Phillips	Tibbott
Jenkins	Pittenger	Towe
Jennings	Ploeser	Vorys, Ohio
Jensen	Powell	Vursell
Johnson, Calif.	Ramey	Weichel
Johnson, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.	Welch
Johnson, Ind.	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Jones	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson
Jonkman	Rees, Kans.	Wolcott
Kean	Rizley	Wolfenden, Pa.
Kearney	Robertson,	Woodruff, Mich.
Keefe	N. Dak.	
Kinzer	Robsion, Ky.	

NOT VOTING—103

Andrews, Ala.	Flood	Monroney
Andrews, N. Y.	Fuller	Mott
Bailey	Fulton	Norrell
Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gathings	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Gifford	O'Konski
Barrett, Pa.	Gore	O'Toole
Barry	Gossett	Pfeifer
Bates, Ky.	Green	Plumley
Bell	Griffiths	Quinn, N. Y.
Bender	Gwinn, N. Y.	Rayfiel
Bradley, Pa.	Hagen	Rich
Brehm	Hall,	Riley
Buckley	Leonard W.	Rivers
Bunker	Hand	Roe, N. Y.
Burgin	Harris	Rogers, N. Y.
Butler	Hays	Rooney
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Russell
Campbell	Hope	Sabath
Carlson	Jarman	Sasscer
Chiperfield	Johnson,	Short
Clark	Lyndon B.	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Kans.	Judd	Starkey
Cravens	Kee	Stigler
Cunningham	Kelley, Pa.	Thomas, Tex.
Curley	Keogh	Thomason
Daughton, Va.	Kilburn	Torrens
Delaney	King	Wadsworth
James J.	Landis	Weiss
Dickstein	Lane	White
Dingell	Lea	Winter
Dirksen	Lynch	Wolverton, N. J.
Douglas, Calif.	McGlinchey	Woodrum, Va.
Drewry	May	Zimmerman
Fernandez	Merrow	
Flannagan	Mills	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Bender against.

Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. Andrews of New York against.

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Griffiths against.

Mr. King for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Fulton against.

Mr. Gore for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Fuller against.

Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Carlson against.

Mr. Mills for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Curley for, with Mr. Brehm against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Hope.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Judd.

Mrs. Douglas of California with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Butler.

Mr. May with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. HOLIFIELD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JACKSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOLIFIELD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

COMPOSITION OF THE POSTWAR NAVY

Mr. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 366, Rept. No. 1153), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 80, a concurrent resolution to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday and Tuesday we will take up House Concurrent Resolution 80, which is the composition of the postwar Navy, for which 4 hours of debate is allotted. In the event the bill is disposed of on Monday and a roll-call vote is demanded, I ask the distinguished minority leader if it is agreeable to him to have the vote taken on Tuesday?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not believe there should be a roll call on a bill that does not do much, but that would be agreeable to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Wednesday we will take up the resolution providing for the consideration of a bill appropriating additional funds for UNRRA.

On Thursday we will take up the War Department Civil Functions appropriation bill, if it is reported out.

It is my intention to have a light legislative program on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of the following week because of various local elections that will take place as well as a State-wide

election in a neighboring State in reference to judges.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell me whether the civil-functions bill is a deficiency bill or a regular appropriation bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Deficiency Subcommittee is now holding hearings on the supplemental estimates submitted by the Army engineers to resume rivers and harbors and flood-control projects interrupted by the war. This is supplemental to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

SAFEGUARDING MILITARY INFORMATION

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 805) to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 805, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill being considered, may I say for the benefit of those who were not here when we were discussing the rule resolution, is S. 805. The title of the bill is, to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures on information secured through official sources.

That title is not very clear. As a matter of fact, the purpose of the bill is to prevent those who have acquired information with regard to the contents of code messages by reason of and in connection with their employment by the Government, or who have acquired information with regard to the mechanical things which are used in decoding these messages, from imparting that information except as authorized by this bill.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy say that this is especially important and urgent now, because many people who have been connected with decoding messages are being released from the employ of the Government, and we are advised that after their release there is no legislation and nothing else that can prevent them from giving away or selling this information which they acquired by reason of that employment.

The bill has as its final proviso that the provisions of the bill shall not operate against the committees of the House and the Senate seeking to acquire information.

If there are any questions that any Member would like to ask me in this rather informal discussion of the matter, I would be very glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Was it necessary after the other war to pass legislation of this kind, or was such legislation passed?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I cannot advise the gentleman about that. I do not know.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This matter disturbs me very much from the standpoint of the press and the Congress trying to find out about the mistakes that are being made abroad. Is it not true that practically all the information we get about what our Government is doing with respect to Russia, England, and other countries comes in code and comes through our Government, and is found out by reporters and others from bureaucrats?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not advised as to how they get the information. To be entirely candid, I assume that most of the important information or a great part of it acquired by the Government comes to the Government by code. The most vital secrets dealing with the security of the Government and dealing with the operations as to troops and other important problems come by code. Reports, discussions, and so forth, from our diplomatic agents I assume come by code.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. You could pass a law that would cover that without taking this whole field. This way, it seems to me that we here in the Congress and the press will have no way to find out the terrible mistakes that are made by our bureaucrats in foreign countries.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I appreciate the difficulty of the problem. It is tremendously difficult in dealing with questions of national safety to separate in legislation those things that can be given out by the people who are employed in the Government and those that may not be given out by those employed in the Government. May I call the attention of the gentlewoman to the final section of the bill which is as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall prohibit the furnishing upon lawful demand of information to any regularly constituted committee of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States of America.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that in order to eliminate any question at all, an amendment should be inserted providing that the joint committees be included?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is perfectly satisfactory. I say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that in the report on the bill it is stated that it was intended by the Committee on the Judiciary that the joint committees be included. I think they are included anyhow in effect, but if anybody has any question about that we would be very glad to have that amendment. I would be very glad personally, as I have indicated to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Indiana, when he indicated an amendment which he wanted to offer, that I would be willing in order to harmonize the two sides of the House, to accept that amendment. In other words, may I assure the gentlewoman that there is no disposition, certainly not on my part, and I do not believe there is any disposition on the part of anybody on the Democratic side, not to do this thing right.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I do not think there is either.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think we are trying to do the job right.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think it is a difficult thing, but I want to call the attention of the gentleman to this point, that even if you have that amendment you do not have your investigations by your congressional committees, and some Member would have to find out, perhaps from some bureaucrat, of some of these egregious mistakes that are made and expose them here on the floor of the House. I look back at my speeches since I have been in Congress. Half of them have been obtained through some bureaucrat or somebody in the military. I think it is extremely important.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I appreciate the importance of it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. One thing that disturbs me is this possibility. There are many men now in the military or naval service who have personal knowledge of some things which were done that we know should not have been done.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, that information would not be affected by this legislation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The reason I say it might is because some of that material or something with reference to it might have been transmitted by cryptograph and, therefore, I am fearful that under subsection 3 on page 3 it might act as a gag upon those men to prevent them from telling me or giving me some information that I think the public should have. They would be fearful of the possibility of a penitentiary offense for disclosing to me something that did not come to them through cryptograph but through the agencies of government was transmitted in another way. If that were true, they would not feel free to permit the disclosure of that information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

That has to happen when a country is protecting the secrets of the Government.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I agree with the gentleman, in time of war that is true, but now the war is over. There are some mistakes which were made, which, if brought to light now, might not be repeated.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The war is over in a sense, but the clean-up is not

over. I think the situation is just as black in the world today as it can possibly be. That is my judgment about it. I do not think this country ever faced a situation much more critical. I think we should be pretty careful right now.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I just want to emphasize what my distinguished chairman has just said, that we ought to be pretty careful now. My objective is exactly the same as that of my chairman, as he knows.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I know that.

Mr. MICHENER. Does not the chairman really think, in view of the questions that have already been asked, and considering the uncertainty of the committee itself as to what this language means, that it would be well to take this bill back to the Committee on the Judiciary, if it is an emergency, assemble the committee at once, have the people who drafted the bill come before the committee and tell us what they, at least, had in mind? Does not the gentleman think that would be good legislation? Then we could all get back of the thing that we understand, because we want to prevent leakages, which this bill attempts to prevent, without bringing in any extraneous or political matters.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think it is highly important to prevent the thing which the Army and Navy is trying to prevent. I think it is highly important to do it now. I say this to my distinguished friend from Michigan, and I make this statement publicly: If this bill is enacted, and it develops that the danger grows out of the legislation, which seems to be the apprehension on the part of some, the Judiciary Committee would immediately take cognizance of that fact and bring in remedial legislation. That is what I believe.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am in full accord with the provisions of the bill on page 1, as far as any information concerning the nature and preparation or use of any code, cipher, and so forth is concerned, the mechanics of it. That ought to be protected. But what I do object to is on page 2, where it precludes the use of any information which has been or purports to have been derived from code messages. In other words, let the mechanics be protected, but the messages should be given to the public.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What is the use of protecting the machine if you do not protect the material that goes through the machine?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But the messages.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The only importance of the machine is that it has to do with messages.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No. They claimed in our committee that the purpose was to prevent the disclosing of how our code was made.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No. It was both.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But when a message has been translated into English, it ought to be available to the people.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If you are going to permit people to peddle around what they got from the machine, let them have the machine. What is the use having the machine?

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman has said that, due to the fact that a great many employees had left the Government, these codes will become public property. Would it not be simpler to change the codes? When a trusted employee leaves a bank, they change the combination.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No. What they are trying to do is to prevent publicity on many important codes. We are not through with this war. We are sitting on dynamite right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I hope this debate will not degenerate into a party issue because there should not be any politics in it. That is what it has been thus far. This bill involves the Army, the Navy the State Department, the FBI, various other departments of the Government, and the national safety; we are all interested alike, regardless of party. It goes far beyond the Pearl Harbor controversy.

As the bill stands now I cannot go along with it. There are certain glaring defects which ought to be corrected, and I think you will agree that they should be if you will follow the debate closely and put any partisan ideas you may have out of your minds.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. Let me finish, please.

In my judgment this bill was not sufficiently considered either in the Senate or in the House Judiciary Committee. It passed the Senate without debate. It was reported favorably to our full committee by subcommittee No. 2 after hearing only two witnesses, one from the War Department and one from the Navy Department. When it reached the full committee it was considered very briefly. Although opposition was expressed the bill was reported out. Let us see what the bill does.

It is divided into two sections. Section 1 applies to members of the armed forces of the United States and employees of concerns and corporations, performing services for the United States. Section 2 applies to members of the armed forces of a foreign nation or employees of any foreign nation. Otherwise section 1 and section 2 are practically identical.

I believe that clauses 1, 2, and 4, of both section 1 and section 2 should be passed. They are highly important in war and peace and are designed to protect and preserve the secrecy of our codes and our methods of cryptography; and it would be suicidal to do otherwise. At the same time they are designed to protect the secrecy of our cryptanalysis, the methods we have of detecting and breaking down and interpreting the codes of foreign nations. These two things are advisable at any time; in time of war they are vital. I believe that our cryptographers in the war with Japan did as much to bring that war to a successful and early conclusion as any other group of men. Their work saved thousands of precious lives. They are entitled to glory and national gratitude which they will never receive. We broke down the Japanese code almost at the beginning of the war, and we knew it at the finish of the war. Because of that knowledge we were able to intercept and destroy practically every supply ship and convoy that tried to reach the Philippines or any Pacific island. We knew, for example, that shortly after MacArthur landed on Leyte a large convoy with 40,000 Japanese troops was dispatched to reinforce the Japanese forces there. They were met by our fleet and by our airplanes at sea and were totally destroyed. Not a Jap reached Leyte. Another small example: Our forces knew that a certain high-ranking Japanese admiral was headed for a certain spot at a certain time. When he arrived there our planes were on hand to receive him. I mention these two instances—they could be multiplied many times—to show how important it is to protect our methods and our system of sending secret messages and of intercepting and interpreting the secret messages of a foreign nation.

But when we come to clauses 3 and 5 of both sections 1 and 2, I believe the bill goes way beyond the realm of reason, far beyond anything that has been done before; and if you read them carefully, I doubt if you give your approval. Let me read these clauses to you in condensed form:

> Whoever, by virtue of his employment—having obtained or having knowledge of any material which has been or purports to be prepared or disseminated in or by use of any code, cipher, or cryptographic or cryptanalytical system of the United States or any foreign government or any information which has been or purports to have been derived from cryptanalysis of messages transmitted by the United States or any foreign government, shall willfully, without authorization by the head of the department or agency by which such person was employed, communicate, furnish, or transmit to another or publish any such information or material shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years or both.

That means that anyone in the Government service who, by reason of his employment, obtains any knowledge of any kind derived from a code message of this or a foreign country cannot communicate it to anyone whatever, for any purpose, or at any time from now until doomsday, without first obtaining the express consent of his department head. Such a provision can be used to conceal inefficiency and wrongdoing, to prevent a man being court-martialed from proving in his own defense the orders under which he acted, and to put the seal of complete and permanent secrecy on facts the American people ought to know.

If that provision should be taken literally a member of the intelligence branch

of the Army would be committing a serious crime if he transmitted to his own superior officer the contents of an intercepted message without the consent of the Secretary of War. The story of the recent World War can never be told if that language remains in the bill. General MacArthur, General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, and Admiral Halsey could never write their own biographies and memoirs because practically all of the communications, intra and inter the various departments, are communicated by secret messages in code. If one of our own generals or admirals or diplomats wanted to tell the story of his participation in the war he would have to get permission from the Secretary of War or Navy or State before he could divulge any information he gave or received through the codes. We do not want to do that. No complete history could ever be published by any newspaper or magazine about the records of this war unless a crime was committed by someone punishable by imprisonment for 10 years or by a fine of $10,000 or both.

When the Committee considers this bill under the 5-minute rule I propose to offer an amendment to strike clauses 3 and 5 of sections 1 and 2 so that the objectionable language can be considered in conference and something intelligent be written. I hope we will not pass a bill with such drastic and unreasonable language in it as appears in this bill.

I was amazed to see some of the so-called liberals of this House stand up and defend the bill exactly as reported. The American people do not like to be gagged and this is the most thorough job of gagging I have ever seen attempted in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman who just preceded me for his statement on this proposal. The thing that troubles me about the whole matter is the fact, as the gentleman pointed out, that this bill passed the Senate without debate and that there were only two witnesses before the subcommittee in the House.

The fact is that the letter from the Secretary of War to the distinguished Speaker in the report is dated March 10, 1945, and the letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy is dated September 14, 1945. Apparently most of the consideration of this bill itself was given prior to the end of the war and prior to the creation of the so-called Pearl Harbor Committee.

I have never in my short experience in the House seen more confusion about a bill than has been expressed with reference to this one and while I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Committee on the Judiciary I think the members of that committee are capable of doing a more thorough and convincing job than this bill displays on the floor at this time.

I want to correct some misapprehensions arising from what occurred in the debate on the floor today.

As a member of the Pearl Harbor Committee I want to say that I hope no Member on this floor on either side will attempt to inject politics into this debate on the Pearl Harbor issue. I hope no Member of this House will besmirch the investigation by speaking politically himself, and then commending others for not having politics in it. I do not propose to do that. The fact is that the Army has made available to our committee, insofar as we have heard, everything requested, including secret documents. The fact is that the Navy has made available to our committee every available document and source of information, including secret documents. The fact is that the Secretary of State has designated several persons in his Department to cooperate to make everything in that Department available to our committee. The fact is that the White House has told our committee that everything in the files of the White House, in Hyde Park or elsewhere, will be made available to our committee. I see no reason for any intimation or innuendo or suggestion on the floor of this House or elsewhere that there has been any withholding of information by anyone whatsoever. Insofar as the facts that I am acquainted with, and I have attended every meeting of the committee, there has been absolutely no withholding. I do not propose to take the Pearl Harbor Committee executive sessions and discuss them on the floor of this House, but I do not want anything that occurred in those committee meetings to be the subject of any misunderstandings or misquotations or any innuendos or any intimation that everything has not been going along the line of a complete, thorough, honest disclosure to the American people.

There is apparently an amendment to be offered to section 5 saying that joint committees are to be included. There is also a proposed amendment by the gentleman from Indiana about the bill not precluding the Pearl Harbor Committee from working, notwithstanding the fact that section 5 seems to be rather all-inclusive. But it is a fact that section 5 was written in June of this year, long before the Pearl Harbor Committee was created. Then there is the suggested amendment by the distinguished gentleman from New York as to section 1 (3), which pertains to the material, and as to section 1 (5), which pertains to the information being made available.

I voted for the rule because I wanted the bill to be discussed on the floor and I wanted to have an opportunity to discuss it. But for fear that any citizen of the United States would have the slightest suspicion of any politics in this Pearl Harbor inquiry or in this controversy, I believe that the proper procedure is not to write a bill on the floor of the House but to have it recommitted to the committee and report back a good bill in which there could be no suspicion of politics in this body.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely hopeful that this bill will be recommitted to the committee whence it came for further study. I am sure that if we are as careful as we ought to be in legislating on this day that that will be the result of our deliberations.

I wonder if there is any one here who does not realize that if the measure which is now under consideration had been on the law books of France following World War I, that Clemenceau would not have been able to write his now celebrated memoirs; that if similar legislation had been on the statute books of England that Lloyd George would not have been permitted to write his informative memoirs; and if it had been on the statute books of the United States at that time Secretary of State Lansing would not have been able to write his memoirs, all three of which, with hundreds of others from the pens of ranking Government officials of that day, have contributed so much to the writing of the true history of World War I.

We have been told, also, that there is some sort of an emergency which requires the immediate placing of this bill upon the statute books, even though, as the record discloses, the measure has been permitted to rest serenely in a committee-room pigeonhole, gathering dust, so it would seem, since away last June.

Suddenly, something has happened, what, I do not know, to rekindle the dying embers of this aging emergency into a raging flame requiring our instant attention. Could it be the returning Tyler Kent or the investigation of the catastrophy of Pearl Harbor that has created the need for emergency action by the Congress. That question I will not attempt to answer.

Let me point out to my colleagues that we have been fighting wars for almost 170 years. We have been in about 10 major and minor conflicts worthy of the name of war. They have all been concluded, and the historians then have taken up their pens to write down the true story of their causes and effects. We have never in all that 170 years felt the necessity for any such tongue-tying, gagging legislation as this which is proposed to us today.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I should like to correct the gentleman's statement, because the language of this bill follows exactly the language of the bill that relates to the State Department enacted by the Congress in 1933.

Mr. GEARHART. Since the legislation to which the gentleman refers was enacted long before I became a Member of this legislative body, I need offer no apologies for it. However, it cannot be said that the attention of that Congress was then called to the evils which are contained in the bill that is before us today, and that they took the action they did in the light of the conditions of this day. That would be attributing to them oracular powers which, I am quite sure, they would not themselves lay claim to.

I say to you, I want a truthful, fearless, and uninfluenced history written of this war just so recently brought to a victorious conclusion. It is because I feel the necessity so sincerely that I accepted membership on the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee, this in the hope that I might contribute something to that end so devoutly to be desired. I could not have pursued my committee responsibilities with such enthusiasm up to this date if I had thought that any fetters such as are contained in this bill were to be placed upon us.

If this bill had been enacted earlier, we would not have received to date all the reports which have been referred to by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the top secret reports which have come to us from the War Department, because the officials of that governmental agency would have had to run and get permission from all sorts of high officials before they could have released the information to us. If you put this bill on the statute books tomorrow and there are still further reports to come to us, still further reports that we are seeking, they will not be released to us with such facility and so freely as the ones that have already been placed in our hands, because there will be a procedure to be followed, there will be regulations that will have to be complied with, authorizations which will have to be secured from the White House. There would be no end to the red tape that would have to be untangled before all the regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy under this legislation could be complied with.

I ask you to defeat this legislation, or, better than that, send it back to the committee on a motion to recommit for further consideration.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that there is any misunderstanding about this legislation. I say frankly that I think it would have been better if we could have had a hearing and brought out these points that have been raised here and had them settled in the committee. Full hearings would probably have prevented this uncertainty and misunderstanding on the floor.

I did not think at the time the bill left the committee there was much question about it or opposition to it. I am sure everybody is speaking with the best of motives, because, in the first place, I am certain that everyone wants to protect the codes on which we have spent so much money, on which we have worked so hard and which are needed for our protection. I am also certain that no one here wants an official of the Government who, in a secret capacity or in a confidential capacity, got information which still might prejudice or endanger the lives of our soldiers in the far-flung spaces of the world, to divulge that information he secured in a confidential capacity. On the other hand, I fully appreciate the concern that some Members may have about one section of this bill. No one is more eager than I to protect our freedom of speech and of the press. Whichever course the matter takes, I think it is only fair to call this to the attention of the Members of the House.

On June 10, 1933, the so-called diplomatic code bill, which is 48 Statutes 122, was passed after a full hearing and a great deal of debate both in the Senate and the House of Representatives. If you will look at the bill under consideration while I read the section of that bill which pertained to diplomatic codes you will see that there is not very much difference. I read:

> Whoever by virtue of his employment by the United States shall obtain from another or shall have custody of or access to or shall have had custody of access to any official diplomatic code or any matter prepared in any such code or which purports to have been prepared in any such code and shall willfully and without authorization of competent authority, publish or furnish to another any such code or matter, or any matter which was obtained while in the process of transmission between any foreign government and its diplomatic mission in the United States, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

I think you will find that is about the substance of this bill. The only difference is that this bill applies to confidential code messages in connection with the armed services.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. When was that statute enacted?

Mr. KEFAUVER. This statute was enacted on June 10, 1933. It is 48 Statutes 122. It was enacted after full debate and after an argument was made that it might stifle the press or interfere with the freedom of the press and that one might not be able to publish information which should in the public interest be published. Yet, I have heard no one complain during these 12 years that this act of June 10, 1933, has done anything of that sort.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What would prevent the Army or Navy from putting any of its contracts in code?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I must confess I am not enough of an expert on code or how the Army and Navy handles its matters to say.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to my friend that common sense would prevent it, probably.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I would think so.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Would the gentleman enlighten me as to the meaning of section 2? Could he cite an example or a case to which section 2 would be applicable? I just do not understand what it means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield four additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman I was not on the subcommittee which worked on the bill, but I suppose if someone who is employed or working on the code system of a foreign government gave out information concerning the nature of the preparation of the code or the crytographic system as provided in section 2, or the apparatus or transmitter or any information which he received as a result of working with the code, he would be subject to this section.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not a fact that section 2 relates to those who are employed by or perform services for foreign governments, while section 1 relates to those who are employed by and perform services for the United States of America?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HALE. I think I understand that. My point is that, of course, we would not have any jurisdiction to punish anybody who is not within the jurisdiction of the United States. It would not do any good for us to legislate with reference to a person in the employ of a foreign government unless we could have some jurisdiction over him. This simply relates to citizens of the United States. I do not see why section 2 is necessary if it relates to aliens. I would not expect an alien would be able to divulge the code of the United States, or that if he did we could catch him.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I assume, in answer to the question of the gentleman, that we have a lot of citizens who are working with foreign nations in Washington, in their decoding section.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. We also have many Americans who are serving in foreign armies.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

I do not see anything to be terribly concerned about in connection with this legislation, but I do think it is most important that the country understand it and that the Congress understand it. It is most important that we get something passed very quickly. In view of the fact that some Members seem to have many doubts about the matter, and that we have not had hearings, it seems to me it might be wise to give us a few days and have hearings on this legislation and then bring it back and submit it to the Congress again when the committee can have more unanimity. I think it would be disastrous if this measure were defeated, because we cannot allow all of these employees, who in the confidence of the United States Government or the armed services received this information, to go out and endanger the lives of our people and our relations with foreign countries.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. In reading the bill, it seems to me, of course, we must protect our method of handling the codes, but does not the gentleman think it is rather

naive to think if a man wanted to disclose some knowledge he had to some foreign government that he could not do it, without regard to the law? All he has to do is to go to Mexico and stay there, or to some other foreign country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, of course, we cannot prevent that. All we can do is to take care of the situation the best we can. Something has to be done to protect the code we have and the apparatus we have spent so much money on, and the lives of our soldiers all over the country. It is difficult to believe many people would be willful traitors to their country.

Mr. HINSHAW. But a malicious person could do it anyway.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, we can only do the best we can.

In view of the confusion about the matter, I hope the chairman will agree to let the bill go back to the committee and let us have a hearing and have the hearings printed and bring it back for further consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 805) to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the University of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

RECONVERSION PRICE POLICIES OF OPA

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein excerpts from certain letters to which I shall refer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Congress and the Nation to a situation so alarming and so in need of immediate rectification that it demands the highest priority in our consideration of current affairs. The Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, of which I am a member, has just concluded an investigation of the reconversion policies being followed by OPA. Our committee comprises a cross section of the political thought of the country. The members of that committee were unanimous in their conclusions, and I therefore submit to you that their conclusions transcend party lines, schools of political thought, and are seriously directed toward the heart of the problem.

It may be difficult for you to believe, but the plain, unvarnished fact is that the reconversion policy being followed by OPA is not a policy which was calculated to bring about a transition from all-out war production to all-out peace production, but was designed to limit civilian production and limit reconversion in order that war production should be maintained at the peak levels which the Japanese war required. I join with all other Americans in thanking God that the Japanese war ended, but the OPA did not take notice of the cessation of hostilities. It did not revamp or accommodate its reconversion policy to the fact that with the cessation of hostilities, there was no longer necessity for maintaining war production. It did not accommodate itself to the realistic fact that there was necessity for ever-increasing civilian production. OPA merely proceeded with business as usual.

The stabilization of our Nation's economy cannot and will not ever be attained unless changes are made and made now. In fact, unless changes are made and are made now, the inflationary result of OPA's policies will have gotten so far out of hand that we in the Congress will be able to do little if anything to check the devastation of their policy, and the economy of our Nation will have become a casualty of the war. To prevent this from happening, I ask your support, for the cause I espouse, and the objective I am pointing to is one which merits your deepest concern and effort and denies the controversy of partisan political consideration.

Everyone is in agreement that the backlog of demand for civilian goods is enormous, and that the demand is fortified by the greatest accumulation of individual savings in the Nation's history. Everyone will agree that supply is short, hence there exists what has been termed the "inflationary gap." The instant we bring supply up to the level of demand, we will have licked inflation. The only way we can do it is to gear our civilian economy to the production of goods to meet the existing demand. Can we do it? The answer is obvious if you pause long enough to consider that the productive capacity of our Nation geared to a wartime program produced in prodigious abundance the matériel of war required not only for our own needs, but those required to meet the needs of all the Allied Powers. Surely that same productive capacity, if channeled in the direction of licking our own shortage of civilian goods, will do so in a short interval of time. To bring this about at the earliest possible moment should be the actuating thought underlying all Government concept and action. Indeed, it is our highest duty to the Nation. I ask your support in getting the job done, for it must be done if we are to preserve our standard of living and the integrity and utility of our currency.

The productive capacity of our Nation must be freed from administrative, man-made shackles which deny it the means of resuming peacetime production. Because of OPA's reconversion policy, manufacturers accustomed to making cost-of-living consumer commodities in great volume and at low prices are forced to abandon their product lines and seek new ones, whereas newcomers to the field are permitted to manufacture inferior models of the same products and sell them at prices far beyond those which the legitimate manufacturer would charge. To illustrate—irons, medicine cabinets, awnings. These are not isolated instances. They reflect the rule rather than the exception. That this is true may be seen from the fact that domestic radio manufacturers were denied an opportuntiy to produce table-model radios ranging in price from $24.50 to $34.95, but OPA approved an "in line" price of $44.95 for identical radios assembled in Cuba. The same thing is true about underwear, or practically any other item of apparel or household equipment. In every case we would find that arbitrary and unreasonable pricing provisions have penalized the skilled legitimate manufacturer and have left the consumer out in the cold.

There is no need for facing necessary price increases with fear and trembling—increased labor costs and increased material costs to consumers.

I think the time has come for us to face this fact and stop pussyfooting. I think we need strong leadership, good principle, and sound convictions, and less practical politics. Let us stop searching for a magic formula that will provide labor increases without any increases to consumers. There is no such formula. You cannot eat your cake and have it, too.

On the other hand, it is possible to have pricing policies that will provide maximum incentive to producers at the lowest possible increase to consumers, and this is exactly what your committee feels these recommendations will produce. Both the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce have publicly conceded the need for some increase in consumer prices. Labor leaders now make such concessions privately. All of us know that we have experienced a series of hidden price increases over the past several years. It would be rather naive to assume that the line has been rigidly held.

However, your committee has kept the consumers' interests at heart continually and in making these recommendations, we are confident that they will provide the very minimum amount of increase possible consistent with the reconversion program.

The maximum average price order for the wool textile industry is a perfect example of an order by OPA which was designed and put into effect against the unanimous warning of the entire industry that it was unworkable and would reduce employment and production of critically needed clothing materials for returning veterans and the public generally. OPA's own wool industry advisory committee urgently begged OPA not to adopt the order because it would create a condition of chaos. In reply, Mr. Bowles signed a letter addressed to the chairman of his own wool advisory committee, who is one of the outstanding manufacturers of the country, as-

sailing his integrity of purpose and the honesty of his conduct. This letter ranks among the most impudent and insulting communications ever sent out by a responsible Government official.

Mr. Bowles did not write this letter, but he was willing to sign it, without investigating the facts. The letter was actually written by the very administrators responsible for the unworkable wool-pricing order and it was displayed boastfully days before it was first given out for publication and then mailed, as an evidence of how OPA could crack down on its critics. These hatchet-man tactics are becoming the common practice of OPA. Mr. Bowles, who signs his associates' attacks upon honest manufacturers, is not averse to a little character assassination himself. Testifying before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last Tuesday, he declared that honest businessmen all support OPA and its practices, and that its chief opposition comes from the "1,500 greedy, registered lobbyists."

I would like to inform Mr. Bowles and the Members of the House that I have several hundred unsolicited letters in my files from wool manufacturers alone declaring that the operations of the wool maximum average price order have forced them to cease producing critically needed suiting and overcoating materials required to clothe returning servicemen. They have been forced to center production upon a limited number of the highest priced fabrics and the lowest priced fabrics, not because this is what the public needs and wants, but because it is necessary to manufacture these goods in order to stay within the average price limits established by wool MAP. Production throughout the wool industry today has been reduced between 20 and 25 percent as a result of this order, I am most reliably informed. Millions of yards of critically needed clothing to keep people warm during this winter season will not be made. Other millions of yards of cheap fabrics known as wool MAP goods are being made, which the public is being forced to buy, although it will give inferior service and protection.

Without wool MAP, the wool textile industry during 1946 would be able to produce approximately 450,000,000 linear yards of goods, which is more goods than has ever been used for apparel in this country in any peacetime year. Yet, OPA insists that because of a shortage of woolen textiles, wool MAP is necessary in order to insure cheap clothing. Wool MAP has not reduced the price of a single item of apparel. It has only succeeded in reducing employment and production throughout the entire industry.

Wool textile manufacturers tell me that since this order has been in effect they have been obliged to change their production schedules seven or eight times within the past few months because the trade and the public simply insist upon buying the fabrics they want instead of consenting to buy the kind of fabrics which must be manufactured under the restrictions of wool MAP. If the mills sell the fabrics the public insists on having, it will bring their average maximum prices above the limits permitted and they will be subjected to heavy fines and to the character-assassination publicity which is part of the OPA enforcement operations.

The committee of which I am a member, and informed and highly responsible representatives of the wool textile industry, have endeavored to present these facts to OPA. It has been impossible to obtain any satisfaction. All the revelations of the increasing chaos in the wool textile industry are met with personal attacks and with a parade of brightly colored charts and statistics, having all the suavity and misleading conclusions of a highly organized advertising presentation for a cosmetic or a laxative. I have been informed by outstanding authorities in the industry within the past 24 hours that unless this order is vacated within the next month or 6 weeks, millions upon millions of yards of essential clothing fabrics cannot be made, and the effect upon the employment and earning capacities of the industry will be felt for years.

OPA would have you believe that they now allow pricing in accordance with a standard which would permit manufacturers to reconvert from war production to civilian production. Nothing is further from the truth. Under their standards many legitimate manufacturers who actually engaged in war production are not even eligible to apply for a reconversion price. OPA has defined eligibility in such a way as to exclude any manufacturer who does not come under the technical requirements they set up. Under OPA's regulations, manufacturers are not even allowed the cost involved in the manufacture of their own products, but, as we have seen, they are given incentives to abandon their own production and seek new lines, all of which is wasteful and time-consuming, and the consumer foots the bill by getting an inferior product at an inflated price. The policy which denies manufacturers opportunity to resume their normal production by denying manufacturers an opportunity to recapture their cost and have the incentive of a normal prewar dollar margin of profit not only results in loss of production but prolongs scarcity and adds fuel to the inflationary fire. It also denies workers dismissed from war jobs no longer existent an opportunity to secure gainful employment, and causes a wasteful dissipation of their wartime savings. There you have the spectacle of what is actually happening. On the one hand, the newspapers and radio carry the urgent pleas of Government officials propagandizing people and exhorting them not to cash in their war bonds.

On the other hand, another branch of the Government and other Government officials adhere to obsolete standards which cause unemployment and force the worker to cash in his war bonds in order to survive. That the national income suffers is self-evident. That the dangerous economic conditions are thereby fostered and prolonged is equally evident. I do not charge OPA with deliberately adhering to their policies for the purpose of perpetuating its own existence, but I do say that the sooner its unrealistic policies are swept away, the sooner we will overcome the danger of inflation by permitting the resumption of a peacetime production and enabling the productive capacities of the Nation to serve our needs as they served the needs of the Allied forces all over the world.

An illustration of the utter absurdity of the present policy is found in the rule which permits OPA to take away a price it has previously granted a manufacturer. I will grant you it is almost beyond belief, but this is what actually happened. A manufacturer of cooking utensils, whose plant is located in Michigan, sought and obtained a price from OPA for a frying pan he proposed to make in great volume. Having secured a price, he hired employees, obtained a loan from the Smaller War Plants Corporation, solicited and obtained orders, went to the expense of circularizing his product and advertising it, and after he was in production he received a letter from OPA telling him that they had decided to change his price. The fact that he had made business commitments and secured credit did not matter. All that did matter was that an OPA employee had changed his mind. So long as conditions of that kind are permitted to exist, resumption of peacetime production is utterly impossible. Surround industry with instability and uncertainty, as OPA has, deny it an opportunity to resume normal production, and inflation will not only be upon us, but it will be here to stay beyond recall.

We have given long and careful consideration to this problem and have arrived at certain conclusions and recommendations. The recommendations were issued with the wholehearted approval of some of our colleagues who are known as ardent supporters of OPA, and coming as they do with the unanimous support of all members of the Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies, regardless of their political affiliations or beliefs, they are commended as worthy of your most serious consideration. Do not be misled by any claim that the adoption of these recommendations would mean runaway inflation, if any such claim is advanced, for nothing could be further from the truth. Our recommendations, frankly, will result in some price increases, but these will neither be inflationary nor uncontrolled. They will lower the cost of living instead of raising it, as is happening under the present standards, and will remove inflationary pressures by tending to bring supply into balance with demand. Competition will be restored immediately if the recommendations referred to are properly implemented and administered, and the consumer will benefit by a restoration of quality and the elimination of the ersatz merchandise fostered by present standards.

Consider the case of the awning manufacturer who could not manufacture his product at its prewar price of $1.59. OPA would not grant him an increase of 20 cents which would have enabled the public to secure this item in tremendous quantities at $1.79. But it was perfectly all right for a new manufacturer to get $3.26 for an inferior product. There you have the OPA standard in a nutshell.

Suffer the continuance of such policies and the housewife will be forced to use her market basket to carry currency instead of merchandise.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I understand the gentleman contemplates introducing a resolution amending the OPA law. I am receiving many telegrams based on the belief that a vote would be had on the bill today. Some confusion exists in the minds of the public. Has the resolution been introduced or is there a resolution pending?

Mr. HARTLEY. I appreciate the inquiry of my distinguished colleague from Maryland. I am introducing a resolution this afternoon which will recommend the concurrence of the Congress in the recommendations of the Smith committee to eliminate so-called reconversion pricing policies of the OPA, such as MAP orders, open billing, and the so-called cost-absorption policies, which are disastrously affecting every retailer throughout the United States.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. HARTLEY. I am sorry there has been the misunderstanding that it was to be considered on the floor today. I am introducing the resolution today.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I merely wanted to clarify the situation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wish to preface my remarks by stating that I have been as stanch an advocate of OPA as any person possibly could be, but I wish to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey and I wish to compliment the Smith committee on their report. I know of my own knowledge the truth of many of the statements they make, for I have had experience as a merchandiser myself and have run into these very objections the gentleman seeks to change and abolish. I wish to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. HARTLEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his comment and I may say that the committee welcomed his appearance and testimony before it and the contribution he made to our hearings.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am wondering if the gentleman's proposal will include manufacturers who are desperately trying to commence their reconversion program but who through the pricing policies of the OPA are unable to continue.

Mr. HARTLEY. The recommendations definitely cover that phase of the reconversion program. I might digress at this point by pointing out a specific example I have right here on the desk.

This, I may say, is a sample of how the OPA is contributing to higher prices, how the OPA is helping to bring about inflation rather than curbing prices and keeping down inflation. I have here an electric iron, which is a low-cost electric iron, made by a long established manufacturer of such irons. The maker of this iron came to the OPA and asked for an increase of approximately 20 cents, which would have enabled that iron to be sold on the market today at retail for not more than $2.75.

Mr. HINSHAW. Did the gentleman say 20 cents or 20 percent?

Mr. HARTLEY. At an increase of 20 cents to the manufacturer, which if allowed, would have permitted those irons to be sold on the market at retail for not more than $2.75. He was denied that relief.

In the meantime a Johnny-come-lately manufacturer, who had never been in the business of manufacturing electric irons, went down to OPA and received what is known as an in-line pricing and today this iron here, which does not compare with the first one I showed you, was granted a price of $5.50 and is being sold today for $5.50 to the public, whereas they cannot get this iron for $2.75 as the result of OPA's price fixing.

Mr. HINSHAW. If it were deemed advisable and expedient by the OPA to grant favors to anybody connected with a particular division they could do so in this way, could they not?

Mr. HARTLEY. Definitely. As was recently pointed out by Mr. Chaney of the Underwear Institute, today the only woolen underwear you can buy in the United States is coming in from some country in South America. It sells for approximately $1. If the underwear manufacturers of the United States had been given a fair shake by OPA the same article, if not better, could be sold for 55 cents by our own people.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. We brought out many times in our food studies, and I dare say the same will be true here, that if the company that made that iron went into bankruptcy and somebody came in and bought their assets and started out, they would permit them to sell that best iron for twice as much as they permit the manufacturer to sell it now.

Mr. HARTLEY. That is what is taking place.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is to be commended, and so is the Smith committee, for these recommendations. Certainly the price-absorption order is without foundation or fair play. The manufacturer's cost approval that they require is definitely retarding reconversion and keeping men from jobs. I have a situation in my own district where an employer of labor has a product that costs him to make in the neighborhood of $74. About $13 of that is advertising and sales expense. His actual material and labor costs are around $61 for that particular article. It took him about 2 months to fill in his OPA forms. He waited 6 months and they fixed a price of $57 on an article the labor and material in which cost $61 and the total cost of which is $74. In the meantime this means less goods on the shelf, which adds to inflation, and it also means that people hunt for work and cannot get it.

Mr. HARTLEY. My colleague is exactly right, and let me say that instead of pointing out an exception he is pointing out what is the rule.

Mr. CURTIS. And they make such a requirement of a manufacturer for every article he manufactures.

Mr. HARTLEY. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Whether it is 10, 100, or 1,000.

Mr. HARTLEY. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. It can only have one purpose, and that is to destroy production.

Mr. HARTLEY. We had one witness before our committee representing one of the large organizations in the Nation who testified that they had to hire a warehouse in which merely to file the reports and records that OPA demanded of them. They had to hire a warehouse.

Let me give you another answer to the question the gentleman raised there. The defenders of this pricing policy will say, as have some of the OPA officials before our committee, "Well now, if there is so much wrong with this program, why haven't we had many applications for relief?" I will tell you why they have not had many applications for relief, because the minute a manufacturer goes to OPA and asks for relief, the mere application for that relief places him completely under their jurisdiction and their domination, and they set the rules not only for his price, but they even set rules for his production and every angle of it.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. There are thousands of veterans who are coming back from the Army who would like to start a small retail business. Does the gentleman know of any policy by the Government that makes it more certain that those boys will not be able to start business than the policy of cost absorption that reduces the margin between the wholesale and the retail selling price, and instead of giving the little fellow a chance to start out, channeling the business into the hands of the giant merchandisers who can absorb a large part of that margin and still stay in business?

Mr. HARTLEY. The gentleman's point is very well taken. There is nothing that I know of that will keep these returning veterans from going into a small business, into a little retail establishment, than the present cost-absorption policy that OPA has made.

Let me make this point clear, that the fight we are making against the cost-absorption policy is not one in defense of the great big department stores that OPA is so willing to refer to constantly. We are not defending the great big department stores or the great chain stores. The people who are being hurt by this cost-absorption policy are the small business people in every hamlet in the United States.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. In my own district I find there is considerable difficulty on the part of some of these small manufacturers in getting the OPA to establish a price, a ceiling. In some cases they have had to wait as long as 3 to 4 months to get a price established. Can the gentleman tell me this: Is there any good defense for that?

Mr. HARTLEY. There is absolutely no good defense for that at all. Let me tell you, furthermore, that under their present policy not only is the merchant or the manufacturer in jeopardy because of the delay in getting a price, but do you know that once he has the price there is nothing in the world that will keep that price for him; that they can take the chair right out from under him, even after they have given him that price?

I would like to give a specific example. The manufacturer of a frying pan in Michigan—I have forgotten the full name, the Burnett Co.—appealed to OPA for a price on a rather elaborate frying pan. It has a cover on it and little gadgets giving the temperature and a little vent to let off some heat, and all that. After getting his price on that frying pan and being protected on the price which was established, the Smaller War Plants Corporation loaned him $150,000 to go out and manufacture that product.

After getting the loan, after hiring people, and after making commitments for the sale of that frying pan, OPA withdrew the price. Let me tell you the basis on which it was done.

The price analyst is a young man, a very personable fellow, as most of these boys are, who never amounted to anything in private industry, never had a really responsible job in his life, but today is getting $6,200 down there as a price analyst. His reason for reviewing this price and deciding that it should be changed was not that he did not agree that it cost more to put these little embelishments on the frying pan but that he did not think they were practical. He said, "You can get the same effect by tipping the lid of an ordinary frying pan." Based on that type of reasoning he decided the prices should be changed.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Is that the Burnette Aluminum Co.?

Mr. HARTLEY. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. Would the gentleman have any comment on this set of facts, that Mr. Burnette used to be a Republican in my district and is now up in Michigan. Maybe his politics had something to do with that "impractical" decision.

Mr. HARTLEY. I hope that no such consideration was present, and I hope we are not going to make this a political question.

Mr. CHURCH. That gentleman is a very distinguished businessman and a very honest one. I have every respect for him.

Mr. HARTLEY. Let us keep politics out of this. When I see Members of the House like my distinguished friend from California, who has defended the OPA consistently, ready to agree that there is something that should be corrected here, then I say that when we have the offer of such cooperation we should take him into the fold.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman will yield, I was going to say that the gentleman who spoke previously need not think that it has been leveled only at Republicans. I have Democratic friends in the manufacturing business who have suffered likewise.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can say to the gentleman that it is entirely nonpartisan, that it strikes far and wide, among all kinds of people. I have not found any particular politics involved in it at all. It strikes Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, and everybody else.

Mr. HARTLEY. It certainly does.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Knowing the amount of time the distinguished gentleman has put in on the investigation of this matter, may I ask him for information, in order to correct an impression in my mind, if it is not true that as far as the individual who proposes to go in business, to start a new venture, is concerned, he fixes his own ceiling, he files his costs, and so on. That is what I am advised by OPA. Is there any truth in that?

Mr. HARTLEY. He does file a ceiling, but that has to be reviewed by OPA. Frankly, it is the newcomer in business who gets all the breaks, to the disadvantage and the detriment of the old-line manufacturer.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly what I wanted to bring out. As far as the newcomer is concerned, setting up a new business—I have had this situation up with them—they claim, "Why, you have no trouble with OPA. You start in business and you are a new business. You fix your own ceiling, you file your own prices. OPA does not bother with them." Is that true or is it not? I would like to know.

Mr. HARTLEY. As an initial proposition that is true, but later on they can come along, as I said before, and take the chair right from under him.

Mr. KEEFE. They have done that?

Mr. HARTLEY. They have done that.

Mr. KEEFE. And they are doing it?

Mr. HARTLEY. They are doing it.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. In that connection, I think it should be placed in the RECORD that that help would only be given to a new manufacturer, not a new man in the retail field. He is affected by all the price fixing, cost absorption, and other problems the OPA makes for him.

Mr. HARTLEY. That is right.

We must keep in mind in discussing this problem that it is a rather complicated problem because already in this discussion we have talked about the price fixing, we have talked a little about this maximum average price regulation, and now we are talking about the cost-absorption policy down there. But there is another method they have down there, the question of open billing. How many of you have come across that? Under open billing this is what they do. The manufacturer of an article who has not had his price set sells the article to the retailer. It may be bed sheets, it may be cooking utensils, it may be household equipment. The manufacturer sends those articles without any price being fixed at all, telling the retailer he will let him know later what his cost will be. As a result, the retailer either has to take a chance on selling the article at a loss or keeping it on his shelves. That is what they call open billing.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should like to refer back for a moment, if I may, to the colloquy which took place between the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Wisconsin relative to the ceiling prices fixed on manufacturers already in business, while no prices were fixed on new manufacturers.

I had a recent experience in which a crippled man had been making for a number of years a little weeding tool which he sold for $2.50, as I remember the price. He asked for a price increase to $2.85. He had to fill out all sorts of papers and was told that he could not sell at that price until the OPA had made a decision on his application. After he had waited many months, he finally took the matter up with them. They told him that the only thing he could do if he was impatient was to sell less than $75 worth of these tools per month. Then he could charge $2.85, instead of $2.50, which would permit him to make a meager profit. The man has been restricted to less than $55 worth of sales each month. In the meantime, a new manufacturer or concern that has never made a tool like this has come out and manufactured a completely similar weeding tool and has been given a ceiling price promptly of $3.50. Yet, here is the crippled man who originated the idea and who has been in business for a number of years and who made his livelihood by painfully working at a bench to make these little tools to sell in his community, as I say, here is this crippled man restricted and held down and not permitted to make a living as a result of an arbitrary rule by a bureaucracy in Washington.

Mr. HARTLEY. I thank my colleague from Ohio for his contribution. Once again may I say rather than presenting to the House an exception to what is taking place down there, he has recited what is the rule. That is something we are trying to correct. I know you may not run into so many of these, but let me

tell you our committee is getting them by the hundreds.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Might I interject to advise the gentleman that my office has had several hundred complaints from businessmen in my district and from my State. But I cited this particular example because it appeared to me that there was not even any human interest in the welfare of this crippled citizen and no attempt was made to speed up the consideration of his claim so that he could go ahead and make a living and be self-supporting.

Mr. HARTLEY. May I give my friend an example of what the Office of Price Administration does with its time? That is, let me give you an example of how they waste their time. There was a case called to the attention of our committee where a steamfitter had a small contract to weld a boiler. He went in and welded the boiler. The total bill came to something around $60 or $70. His price was in accordance with the wages and whatever the price should be as a steamfitter. But because he went down to a hardware store and purchased some sort of cement such as you might put on a radiator, for example, and because he used that after he had welded the boiler and put it in the furnace, he was called a manufacturer. When a dispute arose over the bill, the OPA went into the court as a friend of the court, and tried to collect damages against him, calling him a manufacturer. And you know also how they went down to Tennessee or Mississippi, I forget which, to set prices on bootleg liquor in a State that is dry. That is the way they are wasting time down there instead of taking care of these applications that will bring back production and bring employment to our people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say as a matter of record at this point that last June I voted against the extension of the Price Control Act after I had attempted to amend it, as the only method left to me to register my protest against the various practices, and I say un-American practices, that have been going on in the Office of Price Administration. So I feel it is not my fault that these conditions have been permitted to exist.

Mr. HARTLEY. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his position, because he not only takes that position on the floor but within party circles as well.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hesitate to ask the gentleman to yield further, because I know he has a prepared discourse, but I think I have something here which the House would like to know about. At the risk of being mobbed by other Members who are short on shorts, I am going to display two pairs of men's shorts. The one I hold in my left hand is manufactured by an old company. The name of the company I will not give, but it is synonymous with underwear. The short sells, under OPA ceiling price, at 60 cents a pair. I have in this hand—and I have had it thoroughly examined by experts—a short which is of no better quality, purchased at one of the great stores in New York City by myself, and the ceiling price is $1.35. This short was made by a new manufacturer. He got a ceiling price of $1.35.

To further complicate the matter—there is no difference in the quality of these two shorts—when I went to the firm that has the 60-cent short, to purchase shorts for my store in Los Angeles, they said, "We have many thousand"—I will not give the exact number—"many thousand dozens of 60-cent shorts on our shelves. We cannot ship them to merchants throughout America because we cannot comply with the MAP plan. We cannot get the cloth to make 39-cent shorts to balance against the 60-cent shorts." Their experience was that because of that fact their total surcharge ran over $100,000 a month on the 60-cent shorts, and therefore they could not sell them, because they could not get the goods to make the 39-cent shorts, which the MAP plan asks for. If the gentleman will remember, last spring when I appeared before his committee I said at that time that the MAP plan would not work because they did not carry the control back to the source of the material. They did not carry their regulations back to force the mill to make the same percentage of cheap cloth that they made of the higher-priced cloth. Therefore, it would be impossible for a manufacturer to get the same percentage of cloth that he did in his base period, and therefore it would be impossible for him to comply with the MAP plan. That is exactly the result, and these are examples which are indefensible. I called the OPA to my office and showed this to them. I said, "I have supported the OPA plan because I believed it was to prevent inflation in America. I have now come to the conclusion that the OPA cannot any longer function to prevent inflation in America and therefore I am going on the floor and show just exactly this situation, because I have given you a chance to cure it and you have offered me no assurance that you will or can cure it under existing regulations."

Mr. HARTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And to further complicate the matter, I read in the paper the other day that some firm in New York City had recently imported some shorts from South America and was able to sell them at 90 cents.

Mr. HARTLEY. Ninety cents to a dollar, and the same bit of underwear could be sold for 55 cents if they would give our own manufacturers a slight hike which they need.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the height of asininity.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. As the gentleman knows, I am also a merchandiser in private life. I have a manufacturer of pants and overalls in my district. The price range used to be from 15 to 30 dollars. They have been able to get delivery of part-wool pants material, but could get no denim. Under the same rule that the gentleman from California mentioned, they threw a median-priced line through this factory. More than two-thirds of every number in their line is the same price as 1942. These part-cotton pants are identically the same price. For the month of July they had a surcharge against this plant of $3,670, which was hundreds of dollars higher than the gross profit of that plant. For the month of August it was $3,000. Cleveland has refused the man's relief. I brought their story to Chester Bowles sometime ago when we got back here after the recess. He has never replied to my letter. They have the alternative of staying open and going broke, or shutting their doors and going broke, and we have no overalls because there was no denim.

Mr. HARTLEY. I appreciate very much the contribution of my friend from Ohio.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. I believe we ought to talk about something besides shorts, because they are going to say we are hitting below the belt. I will admit that of the samples brought here by the gentleman from California, the 60-cent shorts are of very much better grade in quality and material than the $1.35 garment.

Mr. HARTLEY. I thank the gentleman. But getting back again to the MAP program that is referred to by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, I may say that the Price Administrator, Mr. Bowles, only a week or two ago, I understand, testifying before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, said that all honest businessmen support OPA in its practices and that whatever opposition there is comes from 1,500 greedy, registered lobbyists. I should like to tell Mr. Bowles, and this House for that matter, that I took the trouble to write to approximately 4,000 leaders in the textile industry throughout the United States to get their frank opinion and their criticism of the MAP program. I have a digest and photostatic copies of some of the letters here; and I will tell Mr. Bowles that there is not a leader in the textile industry throughout the United States who does not say that the MAP program, which is the maximum average price program—one of these high falutin' names—has retarded production at a time when we needed it most; it has cut down employment, and instead of giving the people of the Nation a cheaper garment they are actually getting an inferior garment. Not only that, while we are not getting any good domestic wool today—I mean the real high-grade woolens and worsteds, for example—it is permitting foreign competitors, particularly the British, to send in here both woolens and other textiles in the form of garments as well as the materials themselves. They are taking over our markets. In addition to that, whereas the United States, during the war period, had become the style and fashion center of the world, today we are surrendering that position by reason of these policies in the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I am glad to yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman's committee any complaints from small merchants about the necessity of con-

tinually marking up their merchandise instead of having the wholesaler, or the jobber, mark the ceiling price and eliminate the necessity of the small merchant's having to work continually price-labeling his material?

Mr. HARTLEY. We have complaints like that by the thousand.

Mr. STEFAN. I have a lot of letters from merchants in my district. They wonder why OPA would not allow the jobber or the wholesaler to put the price mark or the ceiling price on the merchandise when he ships it out instead of requiring the retailer to put on additional employees to mark up the ceiling price of the materials.

Mr. HARTLEY. The OPA, of course, has issued a recent order, what they call their preticketing order. I do not know whether that is going to meet that objection; but that is one of the recommendations of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee for which I am speaking.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thought I might fill in a little on some things which have come to the committee possibly since the gentleman prepared his remarks, if the gentleman can yield me a couple of minutes' time.

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia and shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. On yesterday a lieutenant of the Navy Department came to the committee with a manufacturer of radios with this statement:

The Navy wanted radios made to a certain specification to send to the southern Pacific area because they had to be made especially for those places in the tropics. This company got the bid for the manufacture of those radios at $14 each and, being the lowest bidder, proceeded to manufacture them. After they had manufactured 3,000 radios, and they are now being held for the Navy, the OPA came in and told them they would have to establish a price. They went there with the Navy and the OPA told them they could not charge the Navy over $9, although this was a Government contract made with the Navy, submitted on bids and received by the lowest bidder.

We had a letter this morning from a manufacturer of what they call mop handles, a little piece of wood that goes into the mop. They had to stop making mop handles because they could not get a price.

We have a letter from a manufacturer of doorknobs. They have been trying to get a price on doorknobs and they have had to stop making doorknobs because they cannot get a price.

We have a letter from the manufacturer of washing machines that has been trying for 6 months to get a price. They took a chance on sending them out, and they are now being sued for $150,000 for having guessed wrong.

These are but a few instances. I do not like to encroach on the time of the gentleman from New Jersey but I thought he would like to have this information. I was glad to see the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] contribute to this discussion because he has been very helpful in his recommendations to our committee. But after all is said and done, we can make all the reports, we can hold all the hearings, we can make all the speeches we want to on the floor of the House, but unless the Congress gets sufficiently aroused to do something about it the reconversion program, the manufacture and distribution of goods, and the employment of men that goes along with it, are going to be seriously handicapped until something is done to remedy the situation. I tell you, it is not a question of these individual cases of hardship we have been talking about; it is a question of the economy of the whole country unless you get this thing corrected so that the goods can get on the market.

Mr. HARTLEY. I thank the chairman of the committee for his fine contribution and for the specific references. As he properly states, all the speeches and all the remarks you and I make on the floor are not going to be worth anything unless we see that the Congress takes the bull by the horns and does something about it.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I want to call the gentleman's attention to one interesting fact that has come out in reference to this whole matter. We have been charged with not properly handling affairs because we have so many professors, men of science, and so forth working. When Chester Bowles was put in charge, many laudatory things were said of him by those who had been criticizing because now, they said, we have there a practical businessman. In many instances that situation did obtain. Yet we find that these scientists and dreamers we heard so much about have produced the atomic bomb and have really delivered a piece of work all over the Nation while many of these practical businessman that they said we needed to have in order to save the Nation have come under more just criticism than anybody else.

Mr. HARTLEY. May I say to the gentleman that I have criticized the professors and the theorists as much as anybody in the House, but I have come to a little bit different viewpoint. I do not know what happens to men when they land in the Office of Price Administration, whether they be professors, economists, or businessmen. They seem to become infected with some kind of a virus that warps their thought. I am amazed to see some of the men down there who I know have had practical experience, men who are in business themselves and who disregard and ignore completely the advice of their own business advisory committees and who by reason of their own experience must know they are not helping the economy of the Nation by some of their regulations.

I am going to ask that I be permitted to read these recommendations without interruption because I will just about be able to finish them.

Recommendation No. 1:

Formulate and immediately place into effect a policy which will permit commodities to be priced by their producers at levels which in the light of accepted standards of accounting will reflect current costs of production plus a normal prewar margin of profit.

This recommendation to permit manufacturers their current cost of production plus a normal prewar margin of profit will destroy the administrative dam now preventing civilian production and stifling manufacturing activity. Current costs of production and normal prewar margin of profit will permit the resumption of all manufacturing activity upon which the national economy so strongly depends. It will afford opportunity for employment and above all it will restore to the Nation the benefits of competitive enterprise at one fell swoop. For the very instant that the manufacturer realizes that his fellow manufacturer and he are both in the same position price-wise, and that both are privileged to change their current costs and normal prewar margins of profit, at that very instant he sharpens his pencil and proceeds to effect savings which will enable him to compete with his fellow price-wise, and failing in that he exercises his skill and ingenuity in an endeavor to produce a more desirable, more efficient, and more attractive product so that you, the buyer, will select his product rather than that of his fellow manufacturer. The adoption of this standard and its proper implementation in the administration will shorten the tenure of inflationary dangers not only by stimulating production and bringing supply into balance with demand, but also by doing away with an aura of scarcity which pervades the Nation. Consumers will no longer need bid against each other for needed goods for they will be available in overwhelming supply. In this regard I commend to you the views expressed by the financial editor of the New York World Telegram on Tuesday, October 23. He said:

(By Ralph Hendershot, financial editor)

Economists may differ in their prognostications as to our reasonably immediate economic destiny, but all are in agreement upon the proposition that our best defense against the dangers of either inflation or deflation lies in the productive capacities of our Nation.

This sound statement of fact is contained in a report filed with the House of Representatives yesterday by a special committee set up to study executive agencies of the Government. It was made with respect to the operations of the Office of Price Administration, which the committee said is making every effort to "gear the productive force of the Nation to the necessities of a war program." In other words, the OPA has not reconverted.

The accuracy of this observation is brought into bold relief by the lag which is apparent on every hand in getting back into civilian production. But the OPA is not the sole cause of this lag, which is doing so much to foster inflation. Labor is playing an important role, too, by throwing monkey wrenches into our economic machinery.

CAN'T SATISFY BOTH

On the one hand the OPA is insisting that prices be held at existing levels. On the other labor is insisting that wages be advanced sharply. Industry cannot meet the

requirements of both, and is holding back, hopeful that President Truman will step into the breach. Mr. Truman has indicated, according to Washington advices, that he will have something to say shortly on the subject.

The greatest need today is for full production of civilian goods. Not only will this aid in supplying demands and thus help to ease the forces of inflation but it will furnish jobs and incomes for those who must have them if war savings are not to be dissipated quickly in meeting the higher costs of living.

This situation affects Government bonds as well as jobs, which adds to its importance. For one thing, when workers are not on pay rolls they are apt to cash in their bonds for living expenses. Likewise, when prices are advancing, as they are bound to do under inflationary conditions, investors are inclined to sell their bonds and invest the proceeds in tangibles as a hedge against inflation.

ADDS TO INFLATION DANGER

Obviously this sort of thing adds to inflation dangers. The credit of the country is weakened and prices are forced to still higher levels as people bid against each other for such goods and other tangibles which are available. This is not mere propaganda. It is serious. Real estate and stocks, among other things, already have begun to reflect these developments.

The OPA is in a difficult position, of course, but it should heed the unbiased advice of such individuals as the committee members, who have just reported to the House. Its aim of keeping a tight lid on prices is admirable, but we have long since reached the point where relaxation to permit normal profits is certain to be more effective in the long run in averting runaway prices.

Recommendation No. 2:

That the policy be formulated and administered in such manner that prices so computed may be suitably reported to regional or district offices of the OPA throughout the Nation, on simplified forms affording no opportunity for the rise of divergent interpretations.

This recommendation contemplates the decentralization of pricing authority so that the California manufacturer may present his problem to a regional or district office in his own community where local conditions are known and understood far more clearly than they could ever possibly be by personnel stationed in Washington far removed from the actual scene. The recommendation has all the merits implicit in home rule. The need for it will be readily apparent if you but undertake a reading of the reconversion order, instructions, and forms put out by OPA.

Recommendation No. 3:

That such prices shall be thereafter effective unless such district or regional office within a specified time of their receipt give notice of patent or latent deficiencies in the computations so reported, in which event such producer shall thereupon be given an opportunity to meet the requirements and objections of the district or regional office. In the absence of notice by such OPA district or regional office within the specified period of time, and in the absence of fraud on the part of any individual reporting, the price so reported shall be thereafter effective.

The principle underlying this recommendation is the principle upon which the American concept of government by law as distinguished from a concept of government by men has its foundation. Notice and an opportunity for hearing have universally been pointed to as the landmarks of justice in government and law. The principle has found congressional support in important legislation, not the least noteworthy amongst which is the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The administrative policy of OPA is openly defiant of this concept of giving a person notice and an opportunity for hearing and proceeds in total disregard thereof. The effect of its policy is to require a manufacturer to go forward on nothing more secure than administrative quicksand when he secures a price from OPA, because OPA reserves the right to take the price away from him at any time whenever one of its staff changes his mind.

Recommendation No. 4.

That prices paid at retail be adjusted so as to reflect any dollar increase allowed to manufacturers, except where the mark-up on the particular item is already sufficient to reflect a normal profit.

Recommendation 4 provides for adjustment of the price to consumers so as to reflect the increased price which the retailer has had to pay the manufacturer for his goods. This is the very minimum that could possibly be allowed the retailer. In fact, it is less than should be allowed, because under this recommendation he will have less than his normal dollar profit. For example, the manufacturer's price is increased 10 cents, and the price to the consumer is increased 10 cents. Because of the fact that the item sells for 10 cents more than it did before, many of the retailer's expenses are increased. For example, his pay roll is increased because practically all persons employed in the retail business are paid bonuses in percentage to their sales over and above their basic salaries. The retailer's insurance is increased because the dollar value of his inventory is higher. His local and State property taxes and franchise taxes are increased. The interest he pays on invested capital is increased, as are his sales taxes, excise taxes, Federal old-age taxes, unemployment insurance taxes, as well as his mark-downs and his inventory shortage. In addition, if his leasehold arrangement is on a percentage basis, as a great many of them are, his rental is increased.

It is perfectly clear that all of these increased expenses have to come out of the retailer's normal margin and of course he is left with much less than a normal profit.

The adjustment of retail prices to reflect any dollar increase allowed to manufacturers must be done on the basis of the individual retailer's experience and needs. The use of industry-wide averages as a basis for determining whether an individual retailer needs a price increase in order to avoid a loss on an item is obviously fallacious. In the first place, industry averages on mark-up and profit consist of a wide variation of individual experiences so that the use of the average must inevitably be too generous for one substantial group and too severe for another equally substantial segment. Beyond this, however, the use of industry-wide averages of the department-store group—which is OPA's practice—is even more serious. The department stores covered by the NRDGA statistics are stores with volumes ranging from $500 to many tens of millions of dollars. These are stores selling so wide a range of merchandise that any single product being priced constitutes less than 5 percent of the volume of such stores. The average performance of this big-store group when applied to the specific problems of the 1,700,000 small retailers for whom the product being priced may be as much as 90 percent of total business, must result in distinctly unfair and inequitable prices. The expenses, mark-ups, profits of the big department-store retailers have absolutely nothing to do with the expenses, mark-ups, and profits of the small crossroads retailer or specialty-store operator doing $20,000 or $30,000 a year and handling one, two, or three commodities on which he must make his livelihood. This recommendation No. 4, therefore, must be interpreted in terms of an individual retailer who faces the specific problem of remaining solvent.

Furthermore, the recommendation calls for pricing that will result in a normal profit on each item. The OPA assumption that if there is an over-all profit a retailer should be required to absorb a loss on an individual item is an uneconomical procedure and one which is purely theoristic.

I have here letters and telegrams from merchants located in every section of our country. These letters were addressed to Members of Congress, to the OPA, and to the President of the United States. They were written by the shopkeepers of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Tennessee, Florida, Texas, Oklahoma, California, Oregon, Washington, Illinois, and North Dakota. They come from the hamlets, towns, and cities of the United States represented by us. Let me read a few excerpts to you:

Here is a letter from a merchant in Manchester, Conn. He writes:

We would point out that already we have absorbed the OPA adjustment price on practically 90 percent of our merchandise, plus freight and other handling charges, according to the OPA ruling in their 580 regarding price ceilings, and we feel that something must be done soon for the retailer.

Here is a letter written to Mr. Chester Bowles from North Carolina:

I have always heretofore believed in our Government as just and showing no partiality, but as I see it now, that is being changed, and the little merchant is fast becoming the under dog. If this squeeze continues, it will be impossible for the merchant to hire additional labor. Therefore, as I see it, it is time to equalize and give all the same showing.

Another merchant writes:

Retailers who hope to help give employment to returning veterans will be throttled. Their costs of operations are rising, and they cannot successfully absorb additional merchandise costs. My own small business has survived for 106 years by faithfully serving our community, but if the ruthless dictates of the OPA prevail in forcing retailers to carry the largest part of the burden of reconversion by being made to absorb rising costs, there will be few, if any, that can exist. To eliminate so completely the profit incentive, to destroy the small merchant, will certainly not help our country.

Another letter addressed to Mr. Bowles says:

There may be no question regarding the fact that producers must have upward adjustments of prices. Their costs of production may be higher. This very same fact may, and will, apply to retailers. But retailers are not, in this instance, granted advances but asked to cut their profits by absorbing increases allowed to mattress manufacturers in face of the fact that retailers' costs are mounting. These absorptions are enormous and unjust for us to assume.

It will develop, if continued, to complete destruction and annihilation of our enterprises, for many of us, which we have striven so hard to build and maintain. These are only a few arguments out of very many which might be stated, but they do express our definite opposition to an unethical and unjust principle.

From Baltimore, Md., a merchant writes:

This philosophy of expecting retailers to absorb all these increases—now demonstrated as definitely being the policy of the administration, will, beyond any question of doubt, if continued, sound the death knell for thousands of established retailers and make it impossible for thousands of returning veterans, who have a right and want to enter the field of retailing to do so.

Here is a human-interest angle. A small shopkeeper in Lebanon, N. H. writes:

My only child volunteered for the Army April 2, 1941. He has been in service since that time and during his absence, I, his mother, nearly 60 years old, have kept this business going as a means of support for myself, a job for him when he returns, and work for seven people who have worked for us a good many years.

I know from many men in the service of the dissatisfaction and bitterness which is being engendered by the strikes, and regulations in favor of those who have profited by the high wages of war workers. I feel that when my son returns and finds the penalties that are being put upon retail business, he will be much disappointed in his fellow citizens. Actions like this breed strikes, and had it occurred to you that retailers could strike as well as many others? This store has been in business nearly 54 years in the same family and no customer has been knowingly overcharged nor will they ever be under the present management. But there is a limit to what any business can stand and continue to operate.

From Oklahoma a retailer writes:

We, too, are having to pay higher salaries. We have already had one of our men return from the service who left only a year ago. We are now paying him approximately $25 more per month than when he left. We have another man who was drafted in 1941. We were paying this man $17.50 per week as a helper on a delivery truck. We offered him $30 a week since he returned but, instead, he went to work at our local airfield.

It is simply going to be impossible for us to put our men back to work on the scale of wages they are entitled to, if these squeezes continue.

Well, I could go on for several days reading paragraphs from these letters. But they all tell the same story.

Recommendation No. 5:

That except where monopolistic control of supply exists price control be suspended on any commodity whenever it appears that the elements of the supply and the demand of such commodity are in a relative state of balance and may be reasonably expected to remain so, or when it appears that the supply exceeds the demand for such commodities. Toward this end producers of commodities shall be afforded an opportunity to demonstrate that such supply and demand have come into a relative state of balance and that no monopolistic control over the supply exists.

The question of determining when supply and demand of a commodity are in a relative state of balance is a difficult one to determine, and for that reason OPA should request and receive the expert help of the industries effected. The industry advisory committees should be reactivated for this purpose and meetings of all such committees should take place within the next 60 days, and monthly thereafter. At each such meeting OPA should present its analysis of the current situation and its recommendations for decontrol. The industry committees should also offer suggestions and recommendations at that time. Decontrol has been moving too slowly, and it is apparent why that is so when we realize how few individuals on the OPA staff are assigned to the formulation and issuance of still more new regulations. The burden of proof from now on should be on OPA and the regulation as to why it should be maintained. Unless it can be clearly proven that the situation of supply and demand on a commodity are not yet in balance, the weight of the evidence should be considered in favor of removal rather than retention.

Recommendation No. 6:

That the Price Administrator concentrate the activity of all members of his staff toward the accomplishment of the objectives of the foregoing policy.

Accomplishing the objectives stated in this recommendation does not require any expansion of the OPA staff. OPA at present has far too many people who are still engaged in the process of writing regulations as if a state of war still existed. Energies should be directed toward removing those regulations and not toward extending or tightening them. If the Price Administrator would make it clear to his organization that speedy essential reconversion pricing and speedy removal of controls are two major objectives, most of the OPA problems would be quickly dissolved.

In this connection too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the proposition that a major task exists with which OPA should concern themselves. It can and should play an important part in the job of stabilizing the Nation's economy. Everyone agrees that the job will be difficult enough, all circumstances being taken into consideration, but instead of leaving them to the fate which the police of that State may influence for them. Can you imagine anything more absurd than the spectacle of a national agency directed toward the objective of improving ceiling prices on bootleg liquor dealers whose activities proceed in definance of the laws of the communities in which they operate? Our investigation also indicates that much time and energy of staff personnel is devoted to conducting research and gathering data to support the out-dated war-based formulas which OPA still adheres to. Obviously the Nation would benefit by the elimination of such activity and the efficiency of the agency would be raised if such practice were abandoned.

Recommendation No. 7:

That the Price Administrator review his policy enunciated in the Maximum Average Price Regulation with a view to revoking or modifying it. Industry has complained so unanimously and bitterly of the effects of this regulation on the reconversion program and on the effort to produce low-cost goods, that your committee is apprehensive that this policy is a definite deterrent to the all-important program of reconversion.

It is high time that a reconversion standard keyed to the times and permitting the transition of industry from all-out war production to all-out peace production be adopted. The atomic bomb put an end to the Japanese war, but not to OPA's war-geared reconversion standard. The standard was designed to maintain war production at all costs and obviously at the expense of civilian production. What the Nation needs now is all-out peace production and unless this obstacle is eliminated our economy will have become a casualty of the war.

In conclusion, may I say that these recommendations we have made are not just in the interests of the profits of a manufacturer or group of manufacturers or businessmen or even of small retailers. It is a fight in the interest of the fullest possible production that we can have in this Nation and the fullest possible employment that we can have. I say to you, unless the Congress does something about it, you are going to have lower production, more unemployment, and you are going to have an inflationary spiral as well. It is high time we did something about it.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time accorded me under a special order heretofore entered be transferred to Tuesday afternoon and be extended to 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WORLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CIO LABOR LEADERS DECEIVE RANK AND FILE AND SLOW DOWN RECONVERSION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, we now enter upon the most difficult, dangerous, and serious peacetime era ever confronting our Nation. At a terrible sacrifice of manpower, life, national resources shot away and depleted and hundreds of billions of dollars in finances, leaving us a debt to carry into the future of some $300,000,000,000, we won the war.

The question confronting us now is, will we lose the peace at home and abroad? Can we remain a Nation divided into pressure groups, fighting among one another here on the home front and hope to extend the proper influence to other world governments for international peace?

Our position at present and for the future is so serious that honest, courageous thinking and action by everyone

who claims to exert power in or on our Federal Government must adopt the policy of telling the people the truth. We should have courageous strong leadership by our Chief Executive, regardless of the political consequences which might affect his continuance or his party in power. The same obligation in national welfare is just as binding on the leadership of the minority Republican party seeking to help direct the course of this Government.

Both major parties should meet the issues courageously in an attempt to steer the ship of state in the interest of our country. They will have to do this to foster and protect the best interest of our Nation and preserve our freedom and liberty which has been guaranteed us under our representative form of government.

Leaders in business and agriculture, leaders of the American Federation of Labor, and of the CIO, representing millions of our people, must accept their responsibility and are as equally bound as both of the major parties referred to to tell the people the truth and cooperate fully on every great issue looking to the welfare of all of the people of this Nation.

A million of the finest soldiers ever to serve under the American flag, who have won the war for us under the greatest sacrifices ever known in warfare, are being released from the Army every month now. They are coming home to take their place in civilian life. They are coming home to a country that, unless conditions are changed rapidly, may not be able to offer them employment to sustain them and their families. In fact, men high in the administration here in Washington predict that in 1946 we may have 8,000,000 people unemployed.

This is a challenge to the administration, to the Congress, to the top labor leaders of the Nation—something must be done about it.

I understand some legislation to correct some of the internal evils is about ready to be reported from one of our major committees.

Reconversion has been held back shamefully through the unwise and destructive policies of the OPA. Unless something can be done soon their policies will continue to hold up reconversion and prevent millions of men from being employed. Their policies are preventing billions of dollars of merchandise to be manufactured and distributed to the people of the Nation, who need and want to buy such merchandise. Their policies rather than preventing inflation are encouraging inflation to a dangerous degree. We need the leadership of the Chief Executive with the cooperation of the Congress to right these wrongs at once. Labor unrest and strikes are abroad throughout the land further holding up reconversion and preventing millions of people from being employed. We need the help of real labor statesmanship in high places today as never before. The obligation rests heavily upon them as well.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks today, I first want to analyze and prove to the Members of Congress and to the people in my district, to the farmers, businessmen, and particularly to the members of the CIO organization in my district, that the top labor leaders in the CIO are not telling their members the truth.

I want to point out that the top labor leaders of this organization are attempting to mislead the conservative and splendid citizens of that organization who make up the rank and file of the CIO in my district and in many districts throughout the Nation.

In order to do this I shall place in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of the official CIO voting record of all of the Members of Illinois, both Democrats and Republicans. I shall analyze this record and I believe my analysis will be of interest to all citizens who read it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that I now be permitted to insert this official voting record at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WORLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

Voting record of Illinois Congressmen January through July 1945

[#, right vote; —, wrong vote; 0, absent, paired, not voting]

Congressmen	Party	District	1 Dies committee	2 Agricultural census	3 George bill, S. 375, House rule	4 George bill, S. 375, recommit	5 Reciprocal trade H. R. 3240	6 Reciprocal trade, recommit	7 Bretton Woods, H. R. 3314	8 Bretton Woods, recommit	9 Poll tax, H. R. 7	10 Federal pay raise	11 Price control, Jenkins amendment	12 Price control, Andresen amendment	13 Price control, Dirksen amendment	14 Excess-profits revision	15 Lea rider to WLB appropriation
Leo E. Allen	Republican	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	#	[1] #	0	—	—	—	—	0
Leslie C. Arends	do	17	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	#	#	—	—	—	—	—	—
C. W. (Runt) Bishop	do	25	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	—	[1] #	#	—	—	—	—	0
Robert B. Chiperfield	do	15	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	#	[1] #	#	—	—	—	0	0
Ralph E. Church	do	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	#	[1] #	—	—	—	—	—	—
William L. Dawson	Democrat	1	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	0	[1] #	#	#	#	#	0	#
Everett M. Dirksen	Republican	16	#	—	#	—	#	—	0	0	[1] 0	0	—	—	—	0	—
Emily Taft Douglas	Democrat	[2]	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	[1] #	#	#	#	#	#	#
Thomas S. Gordon	do	8	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	[1] #	#	#	#	#	#	#
Martin Gorski	do	4	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	[1] 0	0	#	#	#	#	#
James V. Heidinger [3]	Republican	24	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Evan Howell	do	21	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	#	[1] #	#	—	—	—	—	—
Anton J. Johnson	do	14	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	—	—	#	—	—	—	—	—
Edward A. Kelly	Democrat	3	#	—	#	#	#	#	#	#	[1] #	#	—	#	#	#	0
William W. Link	do	7	#	#	#	0	#	#	#	#	[1] #	0	#	#	#	#	#
Rolla C. McMillen	Republican	19	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	#	#	—	—	—	—	—	—
Noah M. Mason	do	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	—	—	—	—	—
Thomas J. O'Brien	Democrat	6	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	[1] #	#	#	#	#	#	#
Melvin Price	do	22	#	#	#	#	#	#	0	0	[1] 0	0	0	0	0	#	#
Chauncey W. Reed	Republican	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	#	0	0	—	—	—	0	0
Alexander J. Resa	Democrat	9	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	[1] #	#	#	#	#	#	#
William A. Rowan	do	2	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	[1] #	#	#	#	#	#	#
Adolph J. Sabath	do	5	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	0	[1] #	0	0	0	0	#	#
Sid Simpson	Republican	20	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	#	[1] #	0	—	—	—	0	0
Jessie Sumner	do	18	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Charles W. Vursell	do	23	—	—	—	—	—	—	#	—	#	—	—	—	—	—	0

[1] And discharge petition.
[2] At large.
[3] Deceased.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, reading from the bottom to the top of this tabulation you will note that according to the CIO they list me as voting 13 times against what they term "labor measures," 2 times favorably, and as being absent on 1 roll call. Reading up the list you will notice that practically all Republicans have about the same record as mine, some according to Sidney's boys, a little better or a little worse. They credit me with voting with them twice. I am afraid one of those votes, in view of what has happened since is wrong and if I had it to do over again they would be able to credit me with only one right vote.

Analyzing the vote further, you will note that all Democratic Members, marked "D" in the first column, have a perfect voting record with the CIO. Now, bear in mind, all of those with this perfect record live in Chicago with the exception of the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, of East St. Louis. All downstate Members except the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman PRICE, are Republicans.

The question I want to raise is why do we view these bills so differently? Why do we vote differently?

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that Sidney Hillman, at the head of the CIO Political Action Committee in the last campaign joined with Mayor Kelly, of Chicago, to elect the New Deal ticket. This combination carried Chicago by such a big majority the State of Illinois went Democratic in the national election. These Democratic Congressmen on the ticket were elected with the support of Hillman with the CIO and Mayor Kelly at the head of the Kelly-Nash machine. When that light is thrown on the subject it is not difficult to understand their voting record. I am not surprised at the Members from Chicago who are elected by the combination of Hillman with his CIO and Mayor Kelly if they vote with the CIO. Nor am I charging that they are not sincere in their decisions—that is their right, privilege, and responsibility.

Now, I want you Members who are interested, the small businessmen, the farmers, and the members of the CIO in my district, to go with me a little further in analyzing this vote. It is important to all of them because herein is involved a question of right and wrong on legislation. Strange to note, is the only one of these bills had anything to do with labor.

The further question arises as to whether or not the voters can be deceived by self-constituted CIO union leaders for their own selfish political gains. And, may I point out to the members of the CIO in my congressional district who are among the most conservative union men in the district and who want to work and produce, that their big-city leaders are deceiving them in tabulating the votes in this chart. This should be of particular interest to the rank and file of the CIO.

Mr. Speaker, you will note under No. 1 they say when I, or other Members from Illinois voted to establish the Committee on Un-American Activities to fight communism, which they called the Dies committee—which it is not—that they regard this as a vote against labor. Their real reason is that they do not want the communistic activities of the people who are trying to overthrow this Government investigated. Their reason is that the CIO in the big cities, is shot through with communism. There is not a man or woman in my congressional district who is for communism and the overthrow of this Government. Every one of them will applaud my vote when they understand they are being lied to by their big-city leaders who are trying to protect the activity of the Communists who seek to overthrow your and our Government.

No. 2, listed as Agricultural Census. I voted against this bill which would cost the taxpayers $18,000,000 to employ some 42,000 people to go out and continuously ask the farmers foolish questions about what they were planting; what they were going to raise; what churches they belonged to, and what lodges they belonged to, and so forth. This vote was not against labor. I voted against this bill to keep the farmers, merchants, and labor from being taxed to keep 42,000 people on the New Deal pay roll at their expense. It was against waste and higher taxes. It was an attempt to deflate bureaucracy so that we could cut down the taxes on the men and women in my district and all over the Nation who work for an honest living.

Mr. Speaker, Nos. 3 and 4. These two bills, one on the rule and one in the committee, were for the purpose of putting the business concerns of this country in a position where they could more quickly reconvert to peacetime production and to give labor additional thousands of jobs. Both of these votes were for business and labor. A vote to get business to start, expand, and reconvert so that millions of laboring men could be employed and people could get merchandise.

They list my vote as wrong and no one could give a good reason why.

Nos. 5 and 6. Reciprocal trade treaties: I voted against further reducing import duties or tariffs on manufactured and agricultural products by 50 percent when imported into this country. This vote was to keep farm produce raised in other countries from coming into this country at a lower price than they could be produced here, and to keep manufactured products made by foreign labor from coming into this country at a lower price than they could be produced by our own workers.

For instance, before the war countless millions of pairs of shoes made in Czechoslovakia, at labor paid about $1 a day, came into our markets in the United States in such volume that thousands upon thousands of American shoe workers were thrown out of jobs because these shoes from Czechoslovakia could be sold at retail in my district and all over the land at far less than they could be made by American workmen paid five times as much per day as foreign workmen were being paid. I recall that over 1,000 shoe workers in my district were idle most of the time during this period because we did not have a tariff high enough to prevent these shoes from coming into the American market at such a low price that the American shoe companies and American workers could not compete against them.

My vote was to protect our laboring men, business, and our farmers. Yet, they say this vote was against labor. Our shoe workers know the statement is false. My vote was also to protect the CIO oil workers in my district and oil producers of my State and Nation against importation of foreign oil. I voted to protect every business, every farmer and laborer, and all Americans on that issue.

No. 10. Federal pay raise: This bill provided for an increase of about 15 percent over present pay and for time and a half overtime for 1,400,000 Federal workers, many of them political payrollers.

It started with those in the low-salaried groups and carried up to those earning a little less than $9,000 a year. It gave those in the high brackets a yearly increase up to $650 a year. At the very time this bill was passed, Senator BYRD, a Democrat, made the statement after his committee had investigated conditions, that there were over 300,000 of those people who had little or nc work to do and should not even be on the Federal pay roll. It was estimated when this bill was passed that it would cost the taxpayers of this country an increase of over $800,000,000 a year. I was against this waste.

I voted against this bill because I was unwilling to provide an increase for some 300,000 people who were not needed on the Federal pay rolls. I thought it was unfair to tax the honest workingmen in my district, the farmers, and businessmen to increase the salary of the bureaucrats throughout the Nation. In fact, that is the only bill of the 15 they list that had any relation to labor whatsoever. I wanted to reduce bureaucracy rather than to expand and fatten it.

Nos. 11, 12, and 13, listed as price control, should be of interest to everyone.

They were not labor measures, however, the CIO so lists them.

They say my vote was wrong on all three of them. Let us see.

The Jenkins amendment, No. 11, sought to put price control, having to do with farm products, under the Secretary of Agriculture. That is really where it belongs.

The Andresen amendment sought the same thing in a modified form.

The administration was driven so hard by the Republicans supporting the Jenkins and Andresen amendments, we forced them to come forth with the Patman amendment which was a compromise which I voted for but I do not see it listed in this chart.

The forces we landed behind the Jenkins and Andresen amendments drove the administration to lifting quotas on local meat slaughterers all over the Nation and helped for the first time to solve the meat shortage of the country. In other words, when we voted for and were successful in compelling the administration to move toward getting meat to put on the tables of the CIO workers in my district and the city people as well, the CIO leaders try to deceive the members of that organization down-State and say that my vote was wrong when I voted to put meat on the tables of the workingmen. And we put it there over the protest of the CIO city leaders. Yes, we did it.

No. 14. Excess-profits provision: This bill again was to speed up reconversion and to make more jobs for the laboring men throughout the Nation and produce more civilian goods, yet they say my vote on it was wrong. Maybe these leaders do not want jobs for their rank and file members. Some leaders apparently prefer they be pulled out on strikes rather than to let them work.

No. 15, as usual, had no relation to labor, and not worth discussing.

To show the fallacy and the dishonesty of their listing of the labor vote of Members, may I call your attention to the fact that only one outstanding labor bill has come before the House so far during the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was the May bill, providing for total mobilization of the Nation's manpower, and was referred to by some as the slave-labor draft bill, backed by the late President and the administration just before Germany surrendered.

Two Members—the gentleman from Wyoming, Congressman BARRETT, and myself—wrote and introduced a substitute bill in opposition to the administration bill, which prevented the drafting of everyone in the Nation, which prevented the waste of billions of dollars, and which was endorsed by every labor organization in America except the CIO. William Green and the American Federation of Labor, Nation-wide, endorsed our bill; over 20 railway labor organizations endorsed it; and the efforts put back of our bill defeated the draft bill, which would have regimented, as never before, everybody in America, including the farmer, laborer, and businessman. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, gave the gentleman from Wyoming, Congressman BARRETT, and myself credit for defeating that bill. We did not offer our substitute as a labor bill. We offered it as a bill against unnecessary regimentation of all the people.

The conservative labor leaders of the Nation saw the merit of it and immediately endorsed the bill wholeheartedly.

The late President Roosevelt and the New Deal leadership in the House insisted that the regimentation bill be passed. Naturally, the CIO went along, as it always does, with the administration—and right here let me point out

that the Communist Daily Worker and the Communist leaders of America endorsed that draft bill. We defeated it.

The point I want to raise is, Why does the CIO not list this, the most important labor bill in a decade, as a labor measure in this chart? The reason is, first, that they endorsed only New Deal legislation. Secondly, that if they so listed this bill, it would give great credit to the Republicans of the House who, with the aid of a few Democrats who put their country above regimentation, made possible the defeat of the New Deal scheme of regimentation. And further, if they listed this bill, it would show that most of the CIO Members of Congress voted against the interests of labor, voted for what was known as the slave-labor draft bill, and yet they ask their members to believe them on endorsements.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to show, as honestly as I can, just how foolish, unfair, and deceptive the political racketeers who are dominating the CIO in its high offices in this Nation can be. This organization, with its leaders in high places infiltrated with Communists which joined itself with the New Deal political leaders, do not want the voters in any district in the Nation to know the truth. They drag in every piece of legislation that the New Deal leaders want, and list it as labor legislation and then try to make the honest rank and file of labor believe that we Republicans who refuse to support such rot are, in fact, voting against labor.

The CIO Political Action Committee proposes to control the Congress, to control the nomination of the Democratic Party nationally at the next election. Those are their plans at the present time. They propose to drive out of Congress every Congressman who will not do their bidding. This program is a challenge to the thinking people of America at the present time. It is equally dangerous to the rank and file of labor. If they are permitted to pauperize the farmer and destroy business, labor will be destroyed with them. They will not succeed. The top leaders of the CIO are too closely tied up with the communistic organizations of this country. The American people are beginning to become alarmed, and they will become more alarmed as the picture unfolds between now and 1948. When the rank and file of the CIO outside of the big cities begin to fully understand where such leaders will take them, they will refuse to pay any attention to their recommendations in the coming elections. In fact, outside of the big cities in Illinois and in various other States, the members of the CIO pay very little attention now to the recommendations of the big city bosses in the organizations which in practically every instance is tied up with the corrupt New Deal political machines such as exist in Chicago, Buffalo, New York City, the Hague machine of New Jersey, the Hannegan machine of St. Louis, and the New Deal political machine of Detroit. The laboring men in my district are plenty capable of doing their own thinking and voting.

The actions of the CIO leaders in Detroit for the past month in slowing down the production of automobiles and trucks, with countless thousands of men out of work, is a fair sample of how far the radical leaders of this organization will go. They are making it impossible, in many instances, for farmers to buy trucks and machinery, for the soldiers who return home to purchase a car or a truck if they need one in their business. They are slowing down reconversion, which will prevent millions of workingmen from getting jobs and will prevent possibly a million soldiers, when they return home, in securing employment after they have won the war for us. They have even tied up hundreds of ships by strikes in our ports, delaying the return home of our soldiers.

Every Republican Congressman wants to see labor steadily employed at a high wage level. None of them want to see labor treated unfairly, yet, at the same time, they want the white-collar workers, the farmers, the little businessmen, and the big businessmen, who are heavy employers of labor, to have a fair deal in the economy of this country. If all are treated fairly, more laboring men will be employed at higher wage levels. Special privileges should be granted to no particular group. If we have to carry on under a debt approaching $300,000,000,000, we are going to have to have a prosperous agriculture, labor steadily employed at a fair wage level, and in order that labor can be employed, small business and big business must be allowed a reasonable profit and return on its investment. We must have harmony between capital and labor. All of the Nation must work and produce as never before if we are to have sufficient taxes to pay our running expenses with something left over to reduce the national debt and to keep your Government bonds at full par value. Yes, and to prevent inflation and national bankruptcy.

We cannot do this by tying up the country with wildcat strikes all over the Nation. Work and production only will do the job. Some sort of a program must be brought forward where differences between capital and labor can be settled by peaceful mediation, without continuously resorting to violence, strikes, and lock-outs. It should have been done when the attack was made on Pearl Harbor. Unless it is done soon, it will be forever too late. The public interest is too great to allow this thing to drift much further.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix concerning land for veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, but for the auspiciousness of the time, I should transfer this special order to another date, but I am of the opinion that what I am about to launch upon is needed in the Congress and elsewhere in the country. I refer to the continued idle talk dispensed, and words displaying distrust and suspicion, toward our allies with whom our men and boys have fought and won the greatest war the world has ever seen.

I am mindful also of the fact that early we adopted a resolution that we proposed to put in motion machinery, under constitutional limitations only, that would assure to America and to the world a just and a lasting peace. We cannot quit now but must undertake, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to maintain, in every way possible and competent, to offer that feeling of good will and friendship with other nations of the world and especially our allies. I was minded to bring this to the attention of the House and of the people in reading last night an article which I am going to read to you. It is entitled "Homecoming":

HOMECOMING

(By Valentine Katayev)

[Translated by Sonia Bleeker]

(Soldiers of many lands, who had been away from home for many years, have been coming back. Changed as they are in many ways, for the most part they are the same boys and the same men who left. And for the most, homecoming will be just like this—an unforgettably tender scene in a recent Russian novel—a scene which is so universally true that it could be the homecoming story of any soldier—of any country.)

A Red Army man was returning home from the front on unlimited furlough. He had gone to war a young recruit and was returning home an expert artilleryman. In his belt was a loaded revolver and two hand grenades ("lemons" the Russians call them). At his side swung a curved dagger in an embossed leather sheath with a shiny brass ball at the tip. A rifle was slung over his shoulder. All this had been carefully registered and stamped before he was permitted to take it with him. His heavy knapsack bulged with personal belongings and souvenirs.

A tall Caucasian sheepskin cap was pulled over one eye. His well-fitted greatcoat with its ample skirt flared about him and made him look even shorter.

Short, agile, and trim, the Red Army man, Semon Kotko, walked swiftly homeward over the frozen steppe.

He should have stopped long ago to rest his aching feet and roll himself a cigarette out of his last ration of crude Rumanian tobacco, but each step brought him nearer home. And he had been away from home—from these open steppes—for 4 years.

Near the horizon one bright star seemed to have slipped over the back of the clear, icy moon and frozen in its downward path in the blue air. A cold February wind had come up toward nightfall and whispered in the fields of dry cornstalks.

The nearer Semon got to his native village, the faster his burning feet moved. Finally, he began to recognize familiar contours in the land. The last 8 miles Semon didn't walk—he almost ran.

Soon dogs began to bark. Semon saw the outlines of houses. It was his own village. He recognized the long outline of the smithy. A bunch of horseshoes hung over the white door, that gleamed blue in the moonlight. Semon let his hand glide over the wooden railings roughened by the chewing of horses. He walked into the yard. In the crooked shade of his own house, he saw the family wagon with its shafts on the ground.

Semon stopped and caught his breath. He tiptoed stealthily over to the window, knocked on the dark little pane, and at the same time jumped to one side and flattened himself against the wall. He stretched out his arms and gripped the cold clay, and tilted his chin to one side. He felt himself shaking so he couldn't breathe. He shut his

eyes and bit hard on his unshaven upper lip. His heart pounded. * * *

For 4 years Semon had planned his homecoming just this way. For 4 years he dreamt that this would be the way he would do it. He would steal on tiptoe to his own house and knock on the window. His mother would come to the door and ask, frightened, "Who is there? What do you want?"

She would look severely at the strange soldier, who woke her thus in the middle of the night and he would brazenly and gaily shout: "Hello, mistress! A Red Army hero—an artilleryman—wants you to put him up for the night. Take the dumplings out of the stove, or whatever it is you have there in the pots. This gunner wants his chow!"

She would continue to stare at him solemnly, without recognition. Then he would draw himself up to his full height, raise his hand in a salute, and announce: "Your Highness, Semon Fedorovich Kotko, your own son, has returned home on leave. Set the table. Let's have the borscht!"

His mother would scream, clutch at her heart, and sink on his breast with her arms about his neck.

For awhile no one came out of the house. The dry snow twinkled about him like mica. Suddenly the latch creaked. The door opened. On the threshold stood a tall, bony woman in a dark skirt and white linen blouse, open at the throat.

Without fear or surprise she looked at the soldier, hiding in the shadows.

"What do you want?" she asked and her voice sounded hoarse.

At the sound of his mother's voice, Semon's heart stopped beating. He stepped out of the shadows and hastily removed his tall cap with both hands.

"Mom," he whispered.

She looked at him searchingly, shaking her head in disbelief, her hand at her throat.

"Mom," he said again and rushed to her and embraced her bony shoulders. His head dropped. He buried his face in the rough folds of her blouse and began to cry like a little boy.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to attempt to add to the thought and beauty of this recital, but I am moved to suggest that in all probability the soldier had married a noble woman, who had lived with the mother while he was away. In this home there were also the wife, a daughter 8 or 10 years of age, and a little boy of 5.

The weapons the soldier brought have been thrown aside. When it was known who the visitor was, the wife, the daughter, and the son rushed to the yard. The wife threw her arms around the mother and her son, the little girl came nearer and grasped, for the moment, her father's coat, as she could reach it. The little boy hugged his daddy's leg; and methinks I can see there, at an eminence but not far away, God in the person of His Son, and, listening, I can hear Him say in at least an admonishing voice, "Peace on earth by good will among men."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. THOMASON (at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON), for 1 week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 29, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, October 26, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full-employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Friday, October 26, at 10:30 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on Friday, October 26, 1945, on the following: House Concurrent Resolution 85, House Concurrent Resolution 86, House Concurrent Resolution 91, and House Joint Resolution 245, declaring the date of termination of hostilities in the present war. The hearings will begin at 10:30 a. m. and will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee will hold a hearing on Tuesday, October 30, 1945, at 10 a. m., on the star-route bills (H. R. 2000 and H. R. 2524) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

801. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

802. A letter from the Acting Executive Officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

803. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for protection of cotton and cottonseed production from the pink bollworm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

804. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $65,000, together with an amendment to a previous submission, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 362); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1152. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 366. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 60, a concurrent resolution to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1153). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4497. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission; to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 4498. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces, and restrict jurisdiction of commanding officers in declaring essentiality, and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. R. 4499. A bill to provide, through aid to the States, for surveys of the need for public educational plant facilities, for the preparation of drawings and specifications for such facilities, and for their construction or acquisition; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 4500. A bill to grant relief to men or women who volunteered their services in any branch of military service in the United States during any emergency in which the United States Government was at war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4501. A bill to provide extra compensation for mine sweeping, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. R. 4502. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. R. 4503. A bill to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and

for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to universal military training; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document 359 entitled "Address of the President of the United States, Before a Joint Session of the Senate and House of Representatives, Presenting His Recommendations With Respect to Universal Military Training"; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 360. Resolution to approve Eighth Intermediate Report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, and to concur in certain recommendations therein contained; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. Res. 361. Resolution proposing means for continuously making available to the Security Council of the United Nations organization information in the possession of any member nation of the United Nations organization with respect to atomic energy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4504. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Dana E. McGowan; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 4505. A bill for the relief of Miss Florence V. Cook et al.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROE of Maryland:

H. R. 4506. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the advisability of dredging the harbor at St. Michaels, Talbot County, Md.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 4507. A bill to authorize a reexamination and survey of flood control at Marshy Hope Creek; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H. R. 4508. A bill for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 4509. A bill granting a pension to George W. Lyman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAVAGE (by request):

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to authorize the Quinault Tribe of Indians, plaintiff in the action No. L-23, now pending in the Court of Claims, as trustee to proceed in and prosecute said action to final judgment therein, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1271. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mr. Robert A. Manire, director of agricultural education, State board for vocational education, Austin, Tex., favoring H. R. 4384; to the Committee on Education.

1272. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Committee for American Relief for Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1273. Also, petition of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1274. By the SPEAKER: Petition of various enlisted men in the Army of the United States, stationed in the Three Hundred and Forty-ninth Engineer Construction Battalion at Fort Lewis, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immediate passage of S. 1410; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1275. Also, petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the preservation of American economy and national self-interest; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 22, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who givest the day for work and the night for repose, grant to us a deep sense of Thy presence in the return of this hour when duty, that stern echo of Thy voice, calls us again to counsel for the Nation's weal. Despite earth-born clouds of misunderstanding and suspicion, keep us from the cynicism that corrodes and from the blight of disillusionment. Make us ever loyal to that high adventure which seeks the larger, nobler way for our struggling race to live together according to Thy will for the good of all. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 24, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 100) permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4160) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints as the members of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, created by Senate Resolution 179, agreed to on October 22, 1945, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART].

The Chair, under further authority of the resolution, designates the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] as the chairman of the committee.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN] be assigned to the Committees on Interstate Commerce, Judiciary, Claims, and the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 24, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1383) to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Calif., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 405) to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

Petitions of several citizens of Lynchburg, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a minimum wage of 65 cents an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The petition of Local Union 817 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 293) to amend the Railroad Retirement Acts, the Railroad Un-

employment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The petition of Dr. C. H. R. Hovde, of Los Angeles, Calif., further praying for redress of his grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram signed by David Lester, secretary of the science committee, Connecticut State division, Independent Citizens Committee of Arts and Sciences and Professions, New Haven, Conn., relating to atomic energy; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from C. E. Beck, general manager of the Ranney-Davis Mercantile Co., of Arkansas City, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

RESOLUTIONS OF INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have received from William E. Sayer, department adjutant, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, Indianapolis, Ind., four resolutions relating to legislation beneficial to war veterans. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolutions and that they be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas 26 years have elapsed since close of World War I and the average age of the veterans of said war is over 50 years; and

Whereas many World War I veterans have now reached the age where their earning power has been reduced, and under the existing insurance laws many of the veterans of both wars to be unemployable; and

Whereas many disabled veterans are denied benefits through the application of the existing regulations, and the combined rating schedule and schedular requirement for a major disability: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the schedular requirement for the payment of nonservice be liberalized to the point that a nonservice pension shall be paid to war veterans who have reached the age of 55 years, and who are 50 percent disabled that a straight computation of the disabilities be rated on the 1933 rating schedule and the combined schedule shall not be applied, and that there shall be no major-disability requirement; be it further

Resolved, That need shall be shown as under present regulations and that the amount shall be the same as that paid the present time $50 per month; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the national rehabilitation committee, the legislative committee, and all Members of the Congress.

Whereas while facial injuries comprise but a small percentage of all types of casualties of war, yet they are the most important from a psychological standpoint of the patient, due to the universal horror of facial disfigurement, and the ensuing mental inferiority complex is more acute than the feeling associated with loss of limb or even sight; and

Whereas there is not only great psychic trauma involved in severe wounds of the face, but also to be considered are the far-reaching social, economic, and rehabilitation problems; and

Whereas this problem is much more serious than it was during the First World War, due to the use of more powerful explosives, and because a far greater number of these casualties survive due to the routine use of blood plasma, sulfanilamides, penicillin, and more prompt use of modern field surgery; and

Whereas almost unanimously these patients insist upon surgery, and would rather have a lump of poor flesh for an ear or nose than the most perfest stage-property accessories that can be built from synthetic substitutes; and

Whereas the most wonderful plastic surgery is being afforded these men by the best talent in the country in the nine hospitals doing this type of work throughout the country, and especially at Wakeman Hospital Center, Camp Atterbury, Ind.; and

Whereas the time for the completion of these most necessary medical services may run for many months and should be done by the same doctors now rendering that service, or others of equally highly efficient technical ability and knowledge: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it become the unswerving duty of the American Legion to take whatever action it deems necessary, and see that this action be executed, be it legislative or otherwise, to insure these veterans and the casualties yet to come of the highest type medical service available after the war, said services being comparable to the excellency now being rendered in our hospitals for our armed forces; and be it further

Resolved, That there be a constant follow-up system inaugurated, thus making it sure that this fine facial plastic surgery be continued and made available for these men as long after the war as it may be found necessary.

Whereas there is a desperate need of additional hospital and rehabilitation facilities for veterans of the last war; and

Whereas the Bunker Hill Naval Air Training Station now being used to train flying cadets will be abandoned by the Navy on or before December 1, 1945; and

Whereas approximately $25,000,000 has been invested in acquiring and constructing this station; and

Whereas the facilities at this station are adequate and adaptable and should be utilized as a rehabilitation training center and hospital for veterans of this war; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration under existing law has the first priority in acquiring Government-owned properties being abandoned as surplus by the Federal departments and agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Indiana, in annual convention assembled, That we appeal to and urge the Veterans' Administration to exercise its right and priority to acquire the Bunker Hill Naval Air Training Station and to convert the same into a rehabilitation center and hospital; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Gen. Omar Bradley, Administrator, United States Veterans' Administration, and to the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Indiana.

Whereas World War II veterans are being discharged from the armed services, suffering from tuberculosis; and

Whereas, there is no United States Government tuberculosis hospital in the State of Indiana, and our veterans are required to go to a veterans' facility located in some other State; and

Whereas experience has shown that World War I veterans would not remain in hospitals so far away from their families, and that they would leave the sanitarium and return home and then later again reenter the hospital, and that some have been readmitted to different hospitals numerous times; and

Whereas, a bulletin from the National Tuberculosis Association states very few of these patients have completely recovered and many of them have constituted an army of discouraged men spreading tuberculosis throughout the county; and

Whereas many of the World War II veterans, who will be discharged suffering from tuberculosis, have already been away from home 2 or 3 years and will not want to leave their families and friends for treatment in a remote veterans' hospital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion use its influence to have tubercular veterans of World War I and World War II treated as near their homes as possible, and that a tuberculosis hospital be set up centrally located in the State of Indiana to remedy this situation, and further, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the national executive committee, and all Members of Congress from Indiana, and released to the press.

SUITABILITY OF BALTIMORE AS THE SEAT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the discussion as to where the seat of the United Nations should be located has quite naturally led to the suggestion that Baltimore be selected for that purpose. The City Council of Baltimore has passed a resolution urging that Baltimore be chosen as the situs of the central offices of the United Nations, and I shall ask that this resolution appear in the RECORD following this brief statement by me.

There are many reasons why Baltimore should be selected, but I will refer to one only at this time. The location of Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore is highly significant. Johns Hopkins is well known to have been the pioneer in advanced research studies in this country. Its priority and prominence in such fields is fully recognized by scholars all over the world. When the Johns Hopkins University really founded the system of graduate research studies in this country, many persons were attracted as students to that university who afterward became very prominent. Among these was Woodrow Wilson, who for years studied history, economics, and political science at Johns Hopkins University and there received his degree of doctor of philosophy. The book which he wrote for his doctor's thesis at Johns Hopkins University was devoted to the subject of congressional government, and it promptly became an outstanding authority on that subject.

The fact that Woodrow Wilson devoted the remainder of his life to the science of government, as a teacher, writer, university president, and finally as President of the United States, was very largely due to his training at Johns Hopkins University.

It is generally conceded that the concept of the League of Nations was largely the product of the brain of Woodrow Wilson. Now that the United Nations are making another effort to set up an organization designed to keep peace in the world, it would be especially appropriate that the city where Woodrow Wilson received his training should be the seat of the new organization of the United Nations. Already in Johns Hopkins University is a school of international relations named after Walter Hines Page, Ambassador to Great Britain during the First World War; and well-established departments of history, political science, and economics are, of course, functioning at Johns Hopkins University.

A strong additional argument for the selection of Baltimore lies in the fact that Dr. Isaiah Bowman, who is the president of Johns Hopkins University, is an outstanding authority on history and government. President Bowman was a close adviser to the Allies when the League of Nations was being formed. His work recently at San Francisco was of tremendous importance in framing the Charter of the United Nations, and he has rendered invaluable services to the State Department for a number of years.

The splendid facilities of the Johns Hopkins University and other educational institutions in and around Maryland, and the proximity of Baltimore to Washington are among the numerous reasons why Baltimore is especially adapted to be the seat of the United Nations.

My colleague [Mr. TYDINGS] is fully in accord with the views which I have just expressed. If he were present today, he would doubtless make a statement on the subject. However, in accordance with an engagement of long standing, he is making a speech today in Detroit on the subject of the Philippines. As chairman of the Territories and Insular Affairs Committee he has been devoting much of his time recently to legislation regarding the Philippines.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the City Council of Baltimore be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution presented by Mr. RADCLIFFE was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 497

Resolution requesting that Baltimore be selected as the home or seat of government of the United Nations

Whereas it will be necessary for the United Nations to select a city for the home or seat of government of the United Nations; and

Whereas the city of Baltimore offers numerous advantages in this respect, among which may be mentioned its nearness to our National Capital, thereby making it easily accessible to the diplomatic representatives of the several nations; and

Whereas the city of Baltimore offers many natural and recreational advantages, such as the Chesapeake Bay, its nearness to numerous mountain resorts, is within easy reach of Philadelphia, New York, and many other cities on the eastern seaboard; and

Whereas there is located in the city the world-renowned Johns Hopkins Hospital, Medical School, and University: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore, That the Secretary of State of the United States be and he is hereby requested to present these and other numerous advantages for selecting the city of Baltimore as the home or seat of government of the United Nations and to urge its selection for this purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the city council be and he is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress.

PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted at the annual meeting of the stockholders of Farmer's Union Cooperative Produce Association, at Devils Lake, N. Dak., representing 954 patron members, protesting against peacetime military conscription.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A resolution was passed unanimously at annual stockholder meeting of Farmer's Union Cooperative Produce Association in a recent meeting at Devils Lake, representing 954 patron members.

"*Be it resolved*, That this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen at Washington, D. C., and be signed by our president.

"Since the United States Congress is considering a peacetime conscription of the Nation's manpower;

"And since the forces backing such a military policy unprecedented in United States history, represent United States Chamber of Commerce, military and Fascist leaders who would impose on us a military machine like unto the ones we are engaged in fighting in Europe and Asia—enemies of peace and freedom;

"Further, since we are engaged in a war costing us at least three hundred billions in taxes and millions of American casualties, and such war for the purpose of eliminating military dictatorship from the earth:

"Therefore, we resent peacetime conscription as a threat to our freedom and our way of life, and request Senators LANGER and YOUNG and Congressmen LEMKE and ROBERTSON to fight said conscription and vote against it and to keep us advised of their action through our president, C. W. Fine, of Sheyenne, N. Dak., and he to report to us."

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1519. A bill to amend the act authorizing the commencement and conduct of legal proceedings under the direction of the Attorney General; and

S. 1520. A bill to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1521. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised," approved July 6, 1939; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 1522, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 1523. A bill to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1524. A bill to amend Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, so as to clarify its provisions with respect to the hours of duty of postmasters and annual and sick leave for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1525. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide educational benefits for persons on terminal leave; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. WALSH) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 112, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

DISPOSITION OF ACCUMULATIONS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill proposing to regulate the disposition of accumulations of strategic and critical materials by establishing permanently by law a policy whereby surplus minerals and surplus metals acquired during the war by various agencies of this country shall now be stock-piled and held definitely by the Government, thus to prevent the utter destruction of American prices and American markets for those commodities which have been accumulated by agencies active during the war for the prosecution of the war.

We have today a vast tonnage of minerals and metals in various forms held by several agencies which were set up to accumulate minerals and metals during the war. If these stock-piled minerals and metals are dumped on the American market or are held as a threat over the American producer in the future, then the American producer will be disturbed if not entirely impeded in production, and American venture money which has heretofore produced from the earth minerals necessary for the welfare of this Nation will not be forthcoming. Investment, to the extent necessary to carry forward adequately the development of our natural resources, will not be made if there is held over the heads of the producers a threat that these vast stock piles may be dumped on the market at any moment. It is my position that these stock piles now in the control of various Government agencies should not be released except by an act of Congress.

Under the Surplus Property Act strategic metals and minerals include copper, lead, zinc, tin, magnesium, manganese, chromite, nickel, molybdenum, tungsten, mercury, mica, quartz crystals, industrial diamonds, cadmium, fluorspar, cobalt, tantalite, antimony, vanadium, platinum, beryl, and graphite.

As of September 30, 1945, the Metals Reserve Company had accumulations of tungsten, copper, lead, and zinc, as follows:

Tungsten (contained WO_3)	pounds	19,693,997
Copper	short tons	508,726
Lead	do	82,335
Zinc	do	571,167

In addition, the Treasury Procurement Division, the War Department, and the Navy Department have stocks of these metals. There is no way of determining

just how much of these are held by the War and Navy Departments.

To illustrate the need for the legislation I am proposing, consider the case of mercury.

On June 8, 1942, the War Production Board directed that 30,000 flasks of mercury be purchased by the U. S. Commercial Company, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Company, from stocks of mercury in Spain so as to preclude its falling into the hands of the Axis. As directed, 30,000 flasks were purchased in Spain during 1942, at a total cost of $7,603,600 or $253 per flask. The United States became the sole owner of this mercury. However, it was shipped to the United Kingdom for temporary storage.

In 1944, the United Kingdom bought 14,000 of these flasks from the United States at $220 per flask, at a loss to us of $462,000 or $33 per flask. The United States still retains title to the 16,000 remaining flasks, which we are told are still stored in England, but some of which, I believe, may have been already returned to this country. The probable loss to the United States on the entire 30,000 flasks has been estimated to amount to $2,100,000.

Although negotiations have been under way with the United Kingdom for purchasing all or part of these remaining 16,000 flasks, the sale has not been consummated. Should negotiations fall through, all this mercury will sooner or later be brought to the United States, and thereafter dumped upon the domestic market as a surplus. The amount that I have mentioned so far is but a drop in the bucket as compared to the 83,638 flasks of mercury which are already stock-piled by the Government in the United States.

Were the total supply of mercury, to which the United States now has title, dumped into the domestic market, it would put an end to the need for domestic production of mercury for the next 2½ years.

When the mercury was purchased from Spain in 1942, the market price was $196.35 per flask. Today the market price borders around $101 per flask. There is no telling to what point the market would drop if the Government stock piles were released as surplus.

This is merely cited as an example, and it can readily be seen what will happen to the production of minerals and metals generally, if the other vast stores of tungsten, aluminum, copper, and other such materials, which are now stock-piled, were released as surplus.

The present bill is being introduced so that such stock piles will be retained by the Government, under the control of Congress, and not be released to the detriment of labor and industry of this country. We must remember that these stock piles represent not merely inert metals and minerals; they also represent man-hours of labor. Held by the Government, under a fixed policy such as this bill proposes, these stock piles are insurance against a possible future emergency; a protection against being caught short. Dumped on the market as surplus, or carried along in such manner that they may be so dumped at any time, these stock piles are not a protection at all, but a serious danger to our economy.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1522) to regulate the disposition of accumulations of strategic and critical materials, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESTORATION OF PALESTINE AS A HOMELAND FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution favoring action by the United States looking to the restoration of Palestine as the homeland for the Jewish people. I ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112) favoring action by the United States looking to the restoration of Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. TAFT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 112, favoring action by the United States looking to the restoration of Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the proponents of this joint resolution, and to express the hope that early and favorable action may be taken upon it by the committee.

I have long been of the opinion that an immediate and definite position should be taken by our Government in behalf of a free Palestine. The delay in taking action has been conducive to misunderstandings here in America, and it has resulted in creating distress and social upheavals abroad. Millions of Americans of all races and creeds believe that the persecutions that have been carried on in Europe with such brutality can be greatly mitigated by opening the doors of immigration to Palestine and a free Jewish state established in that country. America must no longer fail the persecuted people of Europe, among whom the Jews have suffered to an almost unbelievable degree, and we should use our good offices in every way possible to provide a haven of safety where oppressed people can live in peace and possess the frugal comforts of life.

The widespread sentiment here in the Congress, as I observe it, favors freedom through justice for every people desiring and seeking it, and it is high time to emphatically express it by adopting the resolution just introduced. We owe it not only because of the traditions of our country in upholding the rights of persecuted minorities and of recognizing the right of people of small nations to be free, to support a free democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, but we owe it also to the men of our armed forces who have fought and died for the freedom and independence of individuals and nations.

It is part of our war aims. It is a humanitarian cause that touches the hearts of of all who hate oppression and love justice.

In this connection I ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Jewish Homeland," published in the Worcester Evening Gazette, Friday, September 14, which expresses my sentiments and views. I call attention in particular to one paragraph from this excellent editorial:

> It is that the situation of the Jews in many of the European countries, and those who are refugees from those countries, is a human problem which it is the unavoidable duty to mankind to solve, and that it cannot be solved permanently and with decent dignity unless they are established in a homeland of their own. The natural location of this, and the only one which would have the appeal of ancient ties, or be available for acquisition, is in Palestine.

I agree most heartily with the further statement contained in this editorial:

> The plight of the Jewish people in Europe today makes this one of the most poignant problems. They should no longer be the football of fate. They should have a land of their own, in which they can live as a free people unafraid.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JEWISH HOMELAND

The Zionist cause has become so confused by conflicting interpretations of white papers, declarations, round robins, and all forms of political and international maneuverings that the broad principle of it has almost been lost to sight. That broad principle remains no matter who writes white papers, makes declarations, or interprets them.

It is that the situation of the Jews in many of the European countries, and those who are refugees from those countries, is a human problem which it is the unavoidable duty of mankind to solve, and that it cannot be solved permanently and with decent dignity unless they are established in a homeland of their own. The natural location of this, and the only one which would have the appeal of ancient ties, or be available for acquisition, is in Palestine.

The Jews have maintained their racial entity for thousands of years. It is only just that they should have a national entity. For centuries they have been persecuted, hounded, tortured, and slaughtered in European countries, where even the passing of generations and intermittent allowance of civil rights have kept them always in the status of aliens. Justice for them has been haphazard or denied. Yet their contributions to their adopted countries and to mankind have been notable in science, industry, and in culture. It is time they ceased to be the orphans of the world, and it will rest upon the conscience of the world until this is achieved.

It can be achieved only by giving the opportunity, for those who want it, to be established in a land of their own citizenship and government. There are problems to be solved and just and acceptable agreements to be made, but these are not unsurmountable. It will take patience, persuasion, and the demonstration of advantages to be gained all around, but these are normal processes by which the problems of the world have always been finding solution.

The plight of the Jewish people in Europe today makes this one of the most poignant

problems. They should no longer be the football of fate. They should have a land of their own, in which they can live as a free people, unafraid.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4160) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. OVERTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GURNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REDUCTION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 36, line 7, before the period, insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That (a) there shall be discharged from, or released from active duty in, the military or naval forces of the United States without delay, any person who requests such discharge or release and who—

(1) has served on active duty 18 months or more since September 16, 1940; or

(2) has, at the time of making such request, a wife or a child or children with whom he maintains (or would but for his service maintain) a bona fide family relationship in his home; or

(3) has, at the time of making such request, a mother or father dependent upon him for chief support; or

(4) desires to resume his education or training by enrolling in an educational or training institution, if his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service. Any such person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be permitted to be absent from the sessions of the Senate until November 2, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I shall be absent from the Senate for several weeks as a member of the American delegation to the world conference to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from attendance during that period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask consent that I may be excused for 10 days, to go west on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

NAVY DAY—THE FOUNDERS OF THE AMERICAN NAVY

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, tomorrow, October 27, will be Navy Day, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Founders of the American Navy," by Capt. Dudley W. Knox, United States Navy, Deputy Director, Office of Naval History, in the Department of the Navy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOUNDERS OF THE AMERICAN NAVY

Although there is no precise definition of the term "founder of a Navy," the many men who were conspicuously associated with the origins of our Navy might be regarded as its founders.

The first naval forces under Continental pay and control were those established in the spring and summer of 1775 by Generals Arnold and Schuyler on Lake Champlain, and by General Washington near Boston. The lake force saw no important service for nearly a year when under General Arnold it was defeated by a greatly superior British squadron, although the Americans had gained a vital strategic victory by delaying an invading British Army.

The so-called Washington's Fleet, however, was effectively employed at an early date. When General Washington took command of the Army before Boston in July 1775, the extreme shortage of powder and arms persuaded him to commission several vessels in advance of Congressional approval to prey on the sea communications of the British Army in Boston, in the hope of capturing munitions. The first of these vessels was the schooner *Hannah* which sailed on September 5, 1775, under Capt. Nicholson Broughton and brought in a prize within 2 days. Commodore John Manly commanded the little fleet of seven vessels that during several subsequent months were very active off Boston and made other valuable prizes of British ships carrying munitions.

Meantime, under the leadership of John Adams, Congress resolved on October 13, 1775, that two Continental ships be fitted out. This was the legislative birth of the permanent Continental Navy. A congressional naval committee was appointed, consisting of Silas Deane, John Langdon, Christopher Gadsden, Stephen Hopkins, Joseph Hewes, R. H. Lee, and John Adams. This committee laid the foundations of the Continental Navy. It directed the purchasing, outfitting, manning, and operations of the earlier ships, prepared the legislation organizing the new naval service, and drafted admirable rules and regulations to govern its conduct and internal administration. The latter was principally the work of John Adams.

Esek Hopkins was appointed commander in chief of the fleet and had general charge of its preparation at Philadelphia under the supervision of the congressional committee. The work of structural alterations needed to transform the purchased merchant ships into men-of-war was placed under the naval architect, Joshua Humphreys. The rerigging and outfitting of the ships were under Capt. John Barry. The matter of obtaining crews was given the special attention of the commander in chief, Hopkins, who was necessarily so much occupied with the affairs of the fleet as a whole that the preparation of his flagship, the *Alfred*, fell largely to the lot of Lt. John Paul Jones, the second in command on board the flagship.

The captain of each of the other ships attended to various wants of his own ship more particularly. These captains, in the order of rank, were Dudley Saltonstall, Nicholas Biddle, Abraham Whipple, John B. Hopkins, John Hazard, William Hallock, William Stone, and Hoysted Hacker.

The first Continental Fleet put to sea under these officers in February 1776. It proceeded to New Providence (Bahamas) and there landed and captured a large stock of munitions which was taken to New London, Conn., for the Army. Captain Barry was not in this fleet, but remained in Philadelphia and soon was put in command of the *Lexington*, which did splendid service in guarding the Delaware River and its sea approaches.

Following these initial operations which virtually "launched" the American Navy, other ships were put in active service on the home coast and overseas. There were frequent combats in which the "fighting edge" of the Americans was proven to be the highest. Among the more conspicuous who might be said to have fathered the fighting spirit of our Navy in this way were Capts. Lambert Wickes, Nicholas Biddle, John Paul Jones, John Barry, Gustavus Conyngham, James Nicholson, and Joshua Barney.

After the Revolutionary War the Navy went out of existence completely. It was not reestablished until 1794, when Congress provided for the construction of six new frigates, and appointed six captains to supervise the work and to command the vessels when completed. These men were John Barry, who was the senior in rank; Samuel Nicholson, Silas Talbot, Richard Dale, Thomas Truxtun, Thomas Tingey, Stephen four: Barry, Nicholson, Dale, and Sever, were former officers of the Continental Navy.

In 1798 we went to war against the French at sea, hastily buying more ships and appointing more officers. In the subsequent 3 years of quasi-war, Capt. Thomas Truxtun especially distinguished himself in two successful and severe actions in the *Constellation* against French frigates. Lts. John Shaw and Charles Stewart also fought brilliant engagements in smaller ships. Among the squadron commanders were Capts. John Barry, Alexander Murray, Silas Talbot, Thomas Truxtun, Thomas Tingey, Stephen Decatur, Sr., and Richard Dale.

Closely following the quasi-war with France came our Barbary wars in which the most distinguished high-ranking officer was Capt. Edward Preble. He established an enviable fighting tradition in several hard fought attacks on Tripoli by a squadron of 14 vessels under his command, with the frigate *Constitution* as flagship. Under Preble's leadership the loosely knit Navy of that day became a unified fighting force for the first time, and this unification has lasted until the present time.

All of the persons named in the foregoing, from Washington to Preble, may be said to

have had an important part in the founding of the Navy. There were also others who might be included in a group designated as the founders of the American Navy. For example, Benjamin Franklin when acting as our diplomatic representative in France, was largely instrumental in creating a squadron of American ships for operations in Europe, and there was a period late in the Revolutionary War when the Continental Navy would have disintegrated but for the financial and political aid of Robert Morris.

ADDRESS BY HON. ALF LANDON ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the international situation, delivered by Hon. Alf Landon, former Governor of Kansas, before the Kiwanis Club of Lawrence, Kans., on October 25, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS BEFORE MISSOURI BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, on the occasion of the annual meeting of the Missouri Bar Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPERATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of articles on the United States Patent Office, written by Francis P. Douglas, and published in the Washington Star, and also an editorial from the Star on the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

WAGE INCREASES AND CONTROL OF PRICES—EDITORIAL FROM BRIDGEPORT (CONN.) HERALD

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wage Increases With Control of Prices Essential To Save Our Living Standards," published in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Herald of September 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election, which were, in line 3, to strike out "authorized" and insert "requested"; and to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election."

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES OF THE DAR

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from The Protestant and its ministerial associates in the number of some 5,000 clergymen, condemning the discriminatory practices of the DAR in recently refusing the use of Constitution Hall to a talented artist.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NEW YORK, *October 23, 1945.*

SENATOR JAMES MEAD,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Protestant and the more than 5,000 clergymen who comprise its ministerial associates deplore the discriminatory practices of the DAR in refusing Negro artist access to Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C. A proviso in the membership rules of the DAR states that any person who can prove herself to be a descendant of a Revolutionary War soldier is automatically eligible for membership in the DAR. More than 3,000 Negro soldiers fought in the armies of George Washington. The War Department has a record of these soldiers. The Protestant and its ministers respectfully urge that you search the genealogical section of the Library of Congress to determine whether female descendants of any of these 3,000 Negro Revolutionary War soldiers can be found because if they are found The Protestant intends to present them to the DAR as automatic members of that organization. We would appreciate an immediate reply concerning developments in this matter.

REV. BEN RICHARDSON,
National Executive Secretary, Regional Action Committees of The Protestant, New York, N. Y.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to commend The Protestant and its ministerial associates and likewise the DAR chapter at Le Roy, N. Y., who, according to a recent newspaper report, have also adopted a resolution condemning the action taken by the DAR authorities in connection with Constitution Hall. On October 18 the Le Roy Chapter held a meeting at Le Roy, N. Y., and adopted a resolution, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That Te-Car-Na-Wun-Na Chapter, NSDAR, regrets the recent action taken by the national board in regard to the rent of Constitution Hall to Negro artists, and resolved that we urge the immediate repeal of the rule forbidding such renting.

Similar action was also taken by the State Department of Catholic War Veterans at Bayonne, N. J., on October 17.

I also ask to have included in my statement in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Washington Citizens' Committee on Race Relations on October 15, 1945, in which they deplore the action taken by the DAR authorities in regard to Constitution Hall on racial grounds.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Citizens Committee on Race Relations hereby expresses its profound regret at the decision of the DAR to restrict the use of Constitution Hall on racial grounds. We feel this action is not consistent with the patriotic principles of the DAR, and believe it has keenly disappointed all workers for an increased practice of democracy in the District of Columbia, and throughout the country. We are, furthermore, persuaded that such discriminatory decisions as the DAR has just made contribute to tension and division among our citizens.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I also wish to have inserted in the RECORD a letter indicating the position taken by the Committee of Catholics for Human Rights which, like The Protestant and its ministerial associates, has deplored the position taken by the DAR authorities in refusing to rent Constitution Hall to a talented Negro artist who recently applied for that opportunity through a sponsoring committee.

The committee, in a letter addressed to Mrs. Thomas Garrison, president of the National Council of Catholic Women, had this to say:

MY DEAR MRS. GARRISON: Because of the repeated discrimination against Negroes by the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Committee of Catholics for Human Rights is compelled to petition Congress to revoke that organization's charter (on the grounds of violation of its purpose and un-American activities) and to exclude Constitution Hall from tax exemption (on the grounds that it is not a semipublic institution).

As Catholics, we are indignant at the un-Christian attitude of the DAR, their contemptuousness of God-given rights, and their mockery of Christ's sacrifice for every person. We are certain that the members of the National Council of Catholic Women are shocked as individual Catholics at this blatant violation of God's commandment to love thy neighbor. We assure you that it would be most edifying to us as Catholic Americans, and to the entire Nation, if your organization, comprising the Catholic women leaders of the country, would publicly denounce the action of the DAR against Hazel Scott and other Negro artists.

It would demonstrate most aptly the Catholic awareness of the sacredness of human rights, as well as the obligation which citizenship places upon us always to sustain and to defend the democratic ideals to which our country is dedicated. The DAR has sought self-justification by pointing to the "prevailing custom of the District of Columbia regarding schools, auditoriums, theaters," etc. A public statement by the National Council of Catholic Women, whose national headquarters is also in the District of Columbia, would indicate the unquestionable scorn of Catholics for false traditions and our firm adherence to the religiously inspired custom of morality in all things.

If any National Council of Catholic Women members who also belong to the DAR would insist upon a reversion of attitude on race-discrimination by the executive committee and national board of management, and, in the event this proposal is rejected, would publicly dissociate themselves from that organization because of its denial of Christ in its policy and acts, they would demonstrate an inspiring example of the action which expressed Catholic conviction.

We Catholics must denounce these acts of bigotry, uncharitableness, and discrimination which exclude Christ from our life in this country. We look forward to your action on this matter and to a further exchange with you on subjects of mutual interest.

Mr. President, this organization also sent a message to Mrs. Truman, in which they said:

Beg you resign from Daughters of American Revolution because of its undemocratic, ungodly policy of race discrimination. Your dissociation will be an example to the Nation, which is opposed to policy of race discrimination.

Mr. President, I should also like to have included in my statement a very logical editorial from the New York Times of October 14, 1945, entitled "White Artists Only."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE ARTISTS ONLY

In his letter to Representative POWELL, made public yesterday, President Truman

deplored the racial discrimination which barred Hazel Scott from the DAR's Constitution Hall in Washington, but said he couldn't interfere with "a private enterprise." He probably couldn't, but the DAR is not altogether private. It exists under a congressional act of incorporation, for the purpose, among others cited, of "securing for all mankind the blessings of liberty." It has the right to deposit its collections, if it can't find room for them elsewhere, in the Smithsonian and National Museums. It is privileged to make an annual report to the Smithsonian's secretary, who transmits it to Congress, which customarily causes it to be printed in the Government Printing Office. The DAR certainly has some responsibility toward the citizenry at large, including those of races not represented in its membership.

The DAR can't be an exclusive social club and also a public institution. It can't shut out large numbers of good Americans and expect to be venerated by those and other good Americans. It can't stand for the American patriotic tradition and close its doors to the descendants of Crispus Attucks, first American to fall in the Boston massacre, and Peter Salem, said to have fired the shot that killed Major Pitcairn, the British officer who started the Revolutionary War. It can't point to an unbreakable segregation rule, for in January 1943 under pressure of public opinion, it broke that unbreakable rule and permitted Marian Anderson to sing in Constitution Hall. It can't consistently, with a membership descended from revolutionists hang its case for segregation, as the executive committee tries to do, on "prevailing custom."

The ladies of the DAR are responsible for many good works, as any reader of their annual reports (see S. Doc. No. 251, Government Printing Office, 1945) must realize. But their good works will not help the much in popular esteem if they cater to an unworthy and unpatriotic prejudice.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the precious gifts of artistic talent and expression are granted to only a very few. Moreover, they are bestowed without regard to race, color, creed, or condition of life.

The United States has a rich, cultural heritage which has thrived because our people, unlike those of some other countries, have been free to create their own culture in their own way. This freedom must be encouraged to exercise an even greater force in the difficult years ahead, if we are to achieve the lasting peace the world so sorely needs.

Here in America, I believe that our States and municipalities in particular should foster greater cultural growth and development by building more auditoriums, libraries, and other places devoted to the advancement of arts and letters.

Mr. President, I would suggest that here, in the capital of the United States, we build an academy of music, by congressional appropriation, to foster, encourage, and develop the talents of all our citizens.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I shall always stand ready to protest vigorously the type of action which was taken recently when the doors of Constitution Hall in Washington were closed to a musical artist of recognized talent only because of her race. Clearly, those responsible for such discrimination must realize that by their action they are defeating the cause they are presumably striving to advance, namely, full and free expression of true art and true culture. Certainly they must know that narrowmindedness and prejudice can serve only to destroy the very seeds from which true artistic greatness grows.

[On request of Mr. BILBO and by unanimous consent, the following remarks subsequently delivered by him were ordered transposed to this place in the RECORD:]

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New York a question before he takes his seat.

Being a member of the Protestant denomination, I was a little bit shocked a while ago when he introduced for the RECORD a resolution from 5,000 Protestant churches of this country denouncing what I consider to be the patriotic and American stand of the DAR in refusing to let their hall be used as a boogie-woogie reception room for this jazz queen from the island of Jamaica. Will the Senator explain to me what he knows about this Protestant organization which has attempted to interfere with the boogie-woogie dance music of this country? I should like to know who the persons are who compose the organization, where they are from, and what churches of the Nation they represent, if the Senator knows anything about the matter.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, first of all, it is refreshing to know that my colleague from Mississippi was shocked, because I know of no other Member of the Senate who has shocked the sensibilities of the people of my State as much as has the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. I am not responsible for the condition of the Senator's constituency.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, for fear that there might be brought into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a result of any encouragement on my part, a prolongation of this controversy, which has included statements which are derogatory of people in my State whom I admire very highly with regard both to their talents and their patriotic standing in the community, I shall not encourage my distinguished colleague to indulge in flights of fancy which might result from such derogatory statements. I merely say to him that I now yield the floor, and in his own time he may say whatever he wishes about the material which I have placed in the RECORD.

Mr. BILBO. Am I to understand that the Senator refuses to tell me what churches are represented in the telegram he presented? I am a Protestant, and I resent the telegram. I should like to know what churches are involved, and where they are located.

Mr. MEAD. If the Senator can refrain from making disparaging remarks about people who live in my State, I shall very willingly enter into a controversy with him, but the Senator has shown no desire, willingness, or intention to pay such courtesy to my constituents. I therefore hesitate—in fact, I refuse—to encourage a continuation of a controversy which I know will lead to further disparaging remarks.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in reply to the statement of my distinguished friend from New York, I may state that I am not conscious, and have not at any time been conscious, of being disrespectful to his constituents. I am sure he would be surprised were he to read letters which I have received in my office from persons in New York approving the statements which I have been charged with having made upon the floor of the Senate with regard to certain issues before the American people. I admit that there may be a few of his constituents who do not agree with my convictions with respect to certain questions; but I certainly believe that, as a Member of this body, I have a right to know the source of telegrams, resolutions, and other matters which are offered for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe that to be especially true with reference to resolutions condemning the Daughters of the American Revolution, an outstanding patriotic organization consisting of the cream of the womanhood of America. The organization only exercised its constitutional rights by refusing to allow its auditorium to be used for a boogie-woogie jazz performance. The refusal in this instance is not the first which that organization has made in the past when no question of race was involved. It is the purpose of the organization to insist upon a high level of performance when permitting its auditorium to be used for entertainment and cultural purposes.

I have been working for several weeks on some remarks which I propose to make in defense of the DAR, which has been offended, insulted, abused, and denounced by irresponsible people in this country.

Being a Protestant myself, I want the Senator from New York to tell me what kind of Protestants he says are represented in the telegram. If he refuses to do so, and resents the statements which I have made, that is his right. Apparently I have offended some of his constituents, for during the past few weeks various persons have been picketing in front of my home, and making a display of resentment because of some statements I have made on the floor of the Senate. The immunity guaranteed under section 6, article I of the Constitution, to the effect that a Senator is immune against attacks for whatever he may say on the floor of the Senate, does not mean anything to the constituents of the Senator from New York, because some of them have been making a nuisance of themselves on my front porch for several weeks, and it is said that they have been doing so because of my racial views.

Within the past few days I have finished the last chapter of my book on the subject of racial questions, and when it has been read by some persons it may result in extending the picket line a mile long in front of my porch.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I now desire to bring to the Senate a report resulting from an investigation made by the Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

I wish to say, in the presence of my distinguished colleagues, the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and other committees which have to do with the

services, namely, the Army and the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, that it is the policy of our committee to withdraw from investigations which are being made by regular standing committees of the Senate as soon as their investigations are brought to the attention of our committee. That was the policy of our committee from the beginning. It was adopted by the illustrious chairman of the committee, who is now President of the United States, and it is being followed now by me, with the approval of the members of the committee.

Sometime last year we undertook the investigation of the problem of transportation, and that led us to an investigation of transportation in connection with the redeployment of troops, and very naturally that led us into an investigation of the part played by transportation in the discharge of troops.

Now, Mr. President, we are prepared to turn over the material and the information we have to the other committees which have expressed an interest and which are investigating this subject, but before doing so we wish to submit to the Senate a report, which I am now ready to make.

Mr. President, like other Members of Congress, I have been besieged with complaints from soldiers and sailors and their parents, wives, and sweethearts, because of the inability of the boys to get back home.

I need hardly remind this body that from my own State of New York, there has been a perfect avalanche of mail and other communications concerning the subject of Army and Navy discharges. However, Mr. President, it is not to complain of the burdens of a Senator that I rise to speak on this subject today. I merely mention this as one of the circumstances which has led me, as chairman of the National Defense Committee, to make an examination into the practices and accomplishments of both the Army and Navy in handling the tremendous problem of demobilizing our armed forces.

First, however, let me explain that the informal investigation which the committee has made bears no relation whatever to the question of the appropriate size of our armed services, or the degree to which they should be increased or reduced. Those are matters of military strategy and involve the carrying out of strategic plans for the occupation of enemy territory and the ultimate size and strength of our permanent peacetime Military Establishment. The committee has directed its attention merely to the discharge program set up by the military and the manner in which it has been conceived, administered, and carried out.

The committee has been interested in personnel demobilization of the Army and the Navy for several months. It held three public hearings relating largely to the release or furloughing of Army personnel for a few critical industries in which manpower shortages threatened to impair the fulfillment of the program for such industries for the war effort and also threatened to delay ultimate reconversion. These industries were transportation, coal mining, lumber, and textiles. These public hearings were held on Monday, July 23, 1945, Tuesday, July 24, and Friday, July 27.

Subsequently, the committee has held executive hearings in Washington and in the field on the following days: Wednesday, October 3, 1945; Tuesday, October 9, 1945; Wednesday, October 10, 1945.

Field investigation hearings were held at Fort Meade, Md., on Saturday, September 22, 1945; at Bainbridge, Md., on Monday, October 1, 1945; at Fort Dix, N. J., on Friday, October 12, 1945; at Lido Beach, Long Island, on Saturday, October 13, 1945; and Camp Shanks, N. Y., on Saturday, October 13, 1945.

On the basis of the foregoing hearings and additional material furnished to the committee through correspondence and conferences, the following analysis of the discharge system of the Army and the Navy is submitted:

First. Adequate plans for personnel demobilization were not made sufficiently long in advance, with the result that upon the cessation of hostilities, the services were caught unprepared for the mass discharge of their personnel.

Mr. President, this may be due in part to the fact that a number of our large camps and facilities were not being used, and were being closed down, and in some instances were being declared in excess of needs. At that time a plan was made, a very carefully developed plan, for the termination of contracts, but the particular plan for the demobilization of the military personnel was put off altogether too long.

The committee has listened to the description of the Army's matériel demobilization and was impressed with the promptness and efficiency with which procurement was terminated or reduced, almost simultaneously with the end of the fighting. These plans had been worked out in detail long before the end of the fighting and were all set to be placed in operation on VE-day and VJ-day, whenever they might occur. I believe the Army is to be commended for the job of stopping procurement promptly. However, when we turn to the demobilization of personnel and the attention given by the Army to the feelings and desires of human beings, I find it very difficult to be proud of the forethought and planning that must have been known to be just as necessary, if not more so, than the handling of property when the fighting ceased. In contrast to matériel demobilization, which was swift and well-planned, personnel demobilization has been a welter of confusion and lack of forethought.

Dealing in large masses of people to be processed through the steps of the discharge procedure in a short period of time was a tremendous administrative undertaking, which ought to have been carefully planned after study of all the factors which would necessarily be involved, such as transportation; the physical facilities for housing persons in process of discharge; the space and office equipment necessary for the completion and correction of records; the facilities, equipment, and personnel necessary for medical examinations; and the staff who would be required to perform all of the functions necessary to the completion of discharge.

The evidence that such plans were not made sufficiently long in advance was testimony given at the various separation centers themselves that shortages in personnel to handle separations was a limiting factor, as well as shortages of office equipment, medical equipment, and even space. The slow rate of discharges in the earlier stages of the discharge program is also evidence of inadequate advance planning.

Second. The principal bottleneck retarding the discharge of Army and Navy personnel is the shipment of men to this country from combat theaters. Transportation will continue to be a bottleneck as to the European theater until January or February of 1946, and as to the Pacific theater until April of 1946.

In answer to a question, the committee was furnished with a schedule of shipping from all theaters to the United States. The question and answer appear in the hearings and are as follows:

Question 11. The number of men expected to be brought to the ports for discharges by month for the next 12 months.

Answer. Present shipping schedules, as agreed to by theater commanders, indicate the following returns:

October	640,000
November	670,000
December	690,000
January	430,000
February	370,000
March	350,000
April	330,000
May	180,000
June	80,000
July	No figure available
August	No figure available
September	No figure available

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do the figures which the Senator has just given represent our total capacity of ships, or do the figures represent the number of men the theater commanders would like to send home?

Mr. MEAD. The figures represent the numbers agreed upon by the theater commanders.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would that not indicate that the numbers given represent what the commanders desire to send home rather than our capacity to bring them home?

Mr. MEAD. The position taken by the theater commanders is probably a limiting factor. There is included in the situation the number of men who have the required points, the location of those men, the turn-around time for the shipping capacity, whether it be in the Atlantic or in the Pacific; but there is the possibility referred to by the Senator from Michigan, that the position taken by the theater commanders is a limiting factor.

Following the table of figures I have just given, I quote further the answer to question 11:

It will be noted that the above figures reflect a relatively high rate of return during the remainder of 1945, with a lower return thereafter. This is due to the fact that Europe will be cleaned out by this time except for essential personnel which can only be

released as fast as installations can be closed out. General MacArthur's returns which started later than General Eisenhower's continue at a high rate until spring, at which time he will have to taper off his returns for the same reason.

At the hearing held on October 9, 1945, General Gross, Chief of Transportation, testified that a reduction in the figures for October, November, and December of 40,000 per month would have to be made, because of the release of the *Queen Mary*, the *Queen Elizabeth*, and the *Aquitania*—or their equivalent—to the British. The decision to release this shipping was made on October 5, 1945.

A second factor in the shortage of transportation is that the conversion of Victory ships has been delayed approximately 30 days because the repair and reconversion shipyards did not turn out the work as fast as had been scheduled. This conversion program is expected to be completed by November 5. General Gross testified that no speeding up of the discharge process could be accomplished through the conversion of additional Liberty or Victory ships because of the fact that the period required to convert them is so long that they would not be ready for use before ocean shipping had ceased to be a bottleneck.

A further important factor restricting the transportation to the United States from combat theaters is the shrinkage in the capacity of the Air Transport Command, which has receded from a high of approximately 90,000 in July to approximately 44,000 in September. Estimates of capacity of the Air Transport Command for the next few months are as follows:

	Trans-Atlantic	Pacific
October	11,600	16,200
November	10,350	15,300
December	10,350	13,500
January	8,700	9,000
February	7,550	9,000
March	6,550	9,000
April	6,150	9,000
May	5,000	8,100
June	4,300	8,100
July	3,300	6,300
Total	73,850	103,500

The figures for the projected months are not necessarily the number of persons that will be returned, but rather the capacity of the aircraft in units of 250 pounds each. Approximately 80 percent of the units will be represented by personnel and the remainder by mail or cargo.

One of the reasons for the tremendous reduction in air-transportation capacity is that of the nearly 90,000 returned in July, 24,000 were flown on tactical aircraft, which was returning from overseas, representing simply a one-way flight and not used for return flight.

The Air Transport Command, however, carried 65,000 in the month of July. It had been announced in the late spring that the Air Transport Command would carry 50,000 returning military personnel a month. On August 15, this was reduced to 35,000. On September 10, this was further reduced to 10,000 per month. The reduction from now on is at an even faster rate.

General George, commanding general of the Air Transport Command, explained that these reductions were made necessary because the Air Transport Command was losing its personnel and its essentiality for military operations—not only pilots and ground crews, but supervisory personel—who were entitled to discharge under the point system, and that the reductions in carrying capacity were made in order to assure a safe operation.

This is another example of inadequate planning for personnel demobilization. It could well have been anticipated that transportation would be required to return personnel from combat theaters, and a part of the program should have been to maintain personnel in the Air Transport Command sufficient to make a greater contribution to the transportation of returning personnel.

The transportation capacity stated above may be still further reduced by requests by the British and Dutch for the return of additional vessels. This is now under discussion.

Another source of capacity for transporting troops is in new and converted combat ships. These should be utilized for this purpose to the greatest extent possible.

I am told, Mr. President, that new combat ships are being rushed into this particular service as fast as they are available. I have in that connection a table setting forth the types and capacities of new naval ships which will be available for troop-transport service on the dates mentioned in the table. Some of these ships are large aircraft carriers. These are in addition to those now in use.

The following ships will be available for troop-transport service in the Pacific area:

Nov. 1, 1945:	
7 large aircraft carriers, average capacity about 3,500 each	24,800
7 battleships	11,254
11 light cruisers, 800 persons each	8,800
9 heavy cruisers, capacity 900 persons each	8,100
Nov. 5, 1945: 41 escort carriers (baby flat tops), 1,000 persons each	41,000
Dec. 5, 1945: 203 assault transports, capacity 1,400 persons each	284,200
Dec. 5, 1945: 17 assault cargo ships	17,000
Total capacity, 295 ships, Pacific	395,154

The following naval ships will be used for transporting troops in the Atlantic:

Nov. 15, 1945:	
2 heavy cruisers	1,795
4 light cruisers	3,600
3 large carriers, 5,000 persons each	15,000
3 cruiser-carriers	4,800
Total capacity, 12 ships, Atlantic	24,195

The grand total, added to the personnel carrying capacity in the Atlantic and Pacific as the result of the conversion and the utilization of these new ships, is 307 ships, with a capacity of 419,349—above the present capacity. It will include the operation of 307 new ships in the service.

Third. The point-discharge system was adopted upon a theoretical basis without adequate study of the feasibility of carrying out the provisions of the system so that all those entitled to discharge under it might be transported to this country and separated at approximately the same time.

At the committee's hearing on Friday, July 27, Col. William J. Brennan, Chief of the Labor Branch, Army Service Forces, testified:

In respect to the general discharge program, the point system was developed, as you know, after consultation with the GI's themselves regarding what factors should be taken into account in making discharges, and it is the GI's who said that they wanted the four factors which the discharge program uses: length of service, of service overseas, of combat experience, and number of children. They had an opportunity to vote on the occupational qualification as a factor and they turned it down overwhelmingly.

In establishing the system, as described above, the fact was overlooked that there are no central records which quickly disclose the number and location of personnel who would be entitled to discharge under such a system. In order to obtain such figures, reports must be received from the combat theaters themselves, a requirement which obviously would prevent the speedy accumulation of the facts which it would be necessary to have in order to forecast how quickly those who would be entitled to discharge could be transported to this country and processed through the separation centers.

In general, the point system was adopted without adequate study by the services in order to determine whether or not the promises made in the point system could actually be kept by the services. This has undoubtedly contributed a great deal to the dissatisfaction and complaints of the service men and women and their families. For example, I have received a petition from 176 men stationed at Okinawa whose points range from 86 to 105, most of them averaging 95 or better, who state:

Shortly after VE-day our troops were shown a training film called "Two Down and One To Go," which explained the point system for discharge. Most of us agreed that it was a fair policy and were confident that with our amount of points it would not be long until we were released from the service.

The men that are leaving for discharge from Okinawa are not being shipped according to the policy of the point system. In all the cases they are leaving by units instead of the high-point men first. These units are sending men with the minimum required 85 points while the majority of men in our unit, the Fourteenth Corps Artillery, have from 95 to 105 points. At present we have no hopes of going home.

At the rate men are being sent from here, it will be a long time before we can even hope of going home. The War Department's statement, broadcast today, stated, "there will be 6,000,000 men released by July 1, 1946." At the rate they are discharging men from here the majority must be in the States or in the ETO. The War Department has also boasted that they have been able to move 200,000 men and equipment for the invasion at once. Since the surrender of Japan they cannot provide transportation for the few thousand that are eligible to return home for discharge.

We boys won't forget that during the war they were able to send wives of American soldiers from Australia to the States while men

on isolated outposts with 2, 3, and 4 years overseas could not get home.

We were told "that in order not to lower the strength of our unit" we would have to wait for replacements. Our replacements arrived and were assigned to this unit quite some time ago and we are still waiting for our release. Incidently, we are 20 percent over strength at present.

In another broadcast, we were given to understand that the surrender of Japan would have no effect on the discharge plan. According to our personnel officer, "our points are worthless because they are sending units instead." In our opinion, this is not fair to send a man with 85 points ahead of one with 105 points. There is a difference of more than a year's service between these figures. The majority of us have 42 months overseas without a furlough or rotation which in itself should be considered in getting us home.

We have received clippings from American newspapers to the effect that all men with 85 points and over have left Okinawa for home. Was this statement War Department propaganda or newspaper propaganda?

Our unit is a veteran of three combat missions, the Marianas, Philippines, and Okinawa. We are still classed as combat troops.

This is by no means an isolated instance. This situation has been repeated over and over again in the correspondence received by Members of Congress. Persons eligible for discharge under the point system are not being discharged.

Fourth. Substantial improvement has been made in the rate of processing men through separation centers.

The material previously furnished to each of the members of the committee in answer to the committee's questionnaire for both the Army and the Navy showed the improvement made in the rate of discharge and the increased capacity of separation centers. In the Army, the daily rate of separations during the month of September increased from 10,828 on September 1, 1945, to 29,149 on September 30, as of which latter date a total of 1,178,302 persons had been separated since VE-day. In the Navy, daily separations were 2,884 on September 1 and 10,329 on October 1. The increase in the capacity of all separation centers had, likewise, been substantial. In the Army as of the beginning of October, the capacity of all separation facilities was 28,583 a day. Expansions and additions will add 4,100 more to the daily capacity, bringing it to a total of 32,683. In the Navy, the capacity as of the beginning of October was 10,248, which will be increased to a daily separation capacity of 18,465.

With respect to the operation of the personnel separation centers, it should be recognized that the services are wisely seeking to avoid the situation which caused considerable trouble after the last war. At that time records were poor and incomplete and medical examinations were inadequate, with the result that the proper administration of veterans' rights was impaired. Service records, financial records, and physical condition are thoroughly checked under the present separation procedure. This should save a great deal of time and confusion in later years and should more equitably give to the veteran the rights which the law provides. Accurate and complete financial, service, and medical records will prove of great value both now and in future years.

Some of the other time-consuming activities at separation centers, however, might be substantially curtailed. Such activities as orientation and counseling. The natural and paramount urge of the service men and women is to get back to civilian life as quickly as possible and they are in no frame of mind to spend much time on discussing personal problems and prospects of employment at great length with a counselor. Information on the privileges and benefits to which the service men and women are entitled under the GI bill of rights is furnished in pamphlet form. This would seem to serve the major need, which could be supplemented by an advisory service on a voluntary basis for the serviceman to get additional information or personal counseling if he so desired, but this should not be obligatory.

Counseling service is already available and could be made more extensive in the local community where the discharged service men and women plan to reside. After the veterans have actually rubbed shoulders with the problems in their local communities, counsel and advice would be much more valuable than any cut-and-dried procedure at a personnel separation center could possibly be. Already in many local communities there are a number of agencies which are capable of supplying counsel and advice to the veteran. These agencies include the Veterans' Administration, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Red Cross, and various municipal and State organizations.

In that connection, Mr. President, there are at least 8 or 10 information centers in my home city of Buffalo which are under the direction of the local authorities, the State authorities, the Federal authorities, the servicemen's organizations, the Red Cross, and others. So there is an abundance of information centers in the communities, ready to serve the veteran when he returns to his home community. However, counseling service should always be made available on a voluntary basis, even in the discharge centers and in the processing centers.

Mr. President, the sum total of the present situation has been most costly to the long-range objectives of the services themselves and the cause of adequate preparedness in time of peace. The unfavorable reaction, not only among the men and women who have fought and sacrificed in this war, but in the public, generally, has been so widespread as to constitute definitely an important factor in the public reaction to proposed military programs for the future. The services themselves should be the first to be interested in restoring the degree of public confidence which is necessary in a democracy if the Military Establishment necessary to our protection in peacetime is to be achieved and maintained. A continuing acceleration and refinement of the discharge program, having the needs of the services in mind, will have a wholesome effect.

Before I conclude, I wish to say a word of commendation of the new Secretary of War and also of the Secretary of the Navy. They have infused new life, as it were, into this program and other programs, and they have given cooperation to the committee and an increasing interest to the problems of the committee. I conclude by saying that I trust this program will be accelerated and refined and corrected until it reaches its maximum.

Before I take my seat, I desire to read a few paragraphs from a letter which came to my desk recently. It brings to the attention of the reader the attitude of the average GI. The author of the letter very succinctly states in a few words what is very generally, I think, the thought of his colleagues. I read from his letter:

> The daily, incessant, never-ending topic of conversation for each and every GI and officer is without exception the famed overseas theme chant, "When do we go home?" It is rendered in unison, chorus, or individually. The current news on the availability of shipping, daily arrivals, and the factors and contingencies affecting same are watched avidly, much like the ticker tape at the stock exchange, or a score card marker at a ball game.
>
> All soldiers can readily discuss shipping space, troop capacity, speeds, distances, turnabout time, turbines, etc., much in the manner that the hot-stove league holds forth on baseball batting averages and comparisons of the diamond's immortals throughout their respective careers.
>
> It would seem that now all in life is reducible to the one allegedly simple statement and incalculable equation, to wit: the ETO chant. The Army has done a splendid job with its I. & E. program, tours, schools, special service, and the like, and these have proven most deserving and beneficial.

But, Mr. President, the average GI is asking the question, "When do we go home?"—and that particularly when he has the necessary points required for his separation. I wish to commend the GI's for the excellence of their work and for their patience, and I express the hope that all of them who have the necessary points will be home very shortly.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I entered the Chamber a little late, and, accordingly, I look forward with very much interest to reading the Senator's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Will the Senator tell me from which special committee the report he has submitted came?

Mr. MEAD. The report was submitted on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. In the beginning of my remarks I said that about a year ago we began to investigate the question of transportation and the discharge and furlough of men from the service, because of a breakdown in the provision of essential war needs, such as coal mining, rubber-tire production, and so forth, and that led into a study of transportation as it affected redeployment, and a further extension of that study as it affected discharges. I said we have accumulated

this material, we have completed our hearings, and are submitting the material now to the regular standing committees of the Senate, because it is our understanding that they are investigating the question, and it is the policy of our committee not to duplicate any pending investigations or studies.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator state whether, as a result of the study and investigation made by his committee, he is satisfied that every possible effort is being made to provide suitable transportation for the discharge of the men in the Army and the Navy who are anxious to return to their homes?

Mr. MEAD. The report sets forth the information that all the shipping which is available or which can be converted and the new shipping which is now becoming available are being placed in the service, and that the service is being accelerated at a substantial rate, except as it applies to the Army Air Transport Service. There, by reason of the fact that tactical ships are flown only one way, and then are taken out of service, and also because of the fact that personnel is being separated from the service, there is a dimunition from the high point to what might be called a vanishing point. But there is an acceleration of the lift, insofar as the addition of every possible ship of ours is concerned. Some ships flying foreign flags are being taken from the pool, and that results in a loss. But we are told that in the European theater the bottleneck in shipping will be overcome by February, and by April in the Pacific theater.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, have the complaints which the Senator has received come from men who have the necessary number of points for their discharge? Are they complaining about the delay?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; a good many have come from men who have sufficient points; and a petition came from Okinawa, from men who have as many as 105 points, who complained that entire units were being transported away from there; that in some cases low-point men were in the units as well as high-point men, but other high-point men were left there, on the theory that they were waiting for replacements. However, after the replacements arrived, they were still being held there because of the fact that they were to be sent back by units, and sending them back by units really works an injustice on the high-point men.

Mr. WALSH. I have received complaints similar in character to those to which the Senator from New York has referred, and I am gratified to know that his committee is specially considering the transportation features or lack of transportation features. I hope and believe that some good will come as a result of the study which has been made by the Senator's committee, in view of the complaints which have been made.

Mr. MEAD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to make a few observations on the subject to which the able Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] addressed himself. The Senator from New York is the chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. Being a member of that committee, I have been present at its sessions when the committee took up the subject of releasing men from the armed forces.

I desire merely to add some personal observations of my own with regard to the management of the personnel demobilization plans of the Army and the Navy. I wish first to emphasize that the point system is simply not working. The accuracy of that statement is borne out by the reports we have received from the GI's who know how the system is operating at the front. I think it is important that we in Congress should know the views of the men at the front who are subject to the system, and who know how it is operating. I have received many letters and cablegrams, a few of which I wish to read into the RECORD. The first is a cablegram from Reims, France, dated October 9, 1945, which reads as follows:

Eligible for discharge since VE-day. Still here with 93 points. Others in same situation.

As I see it, Congress at the present time should call the matter to the attention of the military authorities—and that is the purpose of my remarks today—and inform them and the people back home of the way the men still serving in the armed forces and their families feel on the subject. For I believe it is important that the entire picture should be presented.

A second telegram is from Mrs. Edward J. Vallier, of Highland Park, Mich., dated September 24, 1945, in which she says:

Please do something for my husband, First Sgt. Edward J. Vallier, No. 16140780 with the Five Hundred and Fifty-ninth American Ordnance Co., CTK APO 758, New York. He has 75 points, over 30 years of age, has been in the Army almost 3 years, was with the First Army since DT4 through all the campaigns to VE-day. He has had but one 3-day pass, no furloughs. He was alerted for CBI theater when VJ-day came and is now in Marseilles. Have just received a letter from him dated the 18th of September stating he is to be sent to Germany. I feel he is cracking mentally. Please help him to get home now.

I shall now read a portion of a letter, dated September 6, 1945, written by a boy on Okinawa to his father and mother, which graphically describes the reaction of the boys themselves to the operation of the Army's discharge system:

It makes me boil. In this outfit we are processing men and sending them home. I can't figure it out. The War Department talks about fairness in sending the men home, and they don't even know the meaning of the word. There are men here who have only 85 points, and they're going home. I have 106, and I'm still sweating it out. The way things are going now, God only knows when I'll be home. I've tried everything I know to get out of here, but can't do a thing about it. The officers here won't do anything for us, just say, "Don't worry, you'll get home." I've been everywhere but can't get anything done. I don't know, maybe I'm nuts, but I think I did my share and maybe a little bit more in this Army, but I'm sure getting a raw deal now. Gosh, I'll have to quit this letter for now. I'm so mad I can't see straight.

Mr. President, I think it important that the men who have charge of the discharge system should understand the mental attitude of the boys who are serving overseas, and who should be sent home.

I cite another instance as revealed in a letter dated September 22, 1945, from the wife of a major who is serving overseas. She writes me as follows:

He entered the service in September of 1942, and has been overseas since January 9, 1943. His service overseas has been completely administrative, and moreover, his specialization in obstetrics and gynecology cannot be used in the Army. Consequently, since the doctors are to be used only for the care of the sick and wounded, I should like to ask for consideration. He has received his fellowship with the American College of Surgeons, but will undoubtedly need some review or experience before returning to practice, since he has not been assigned to medicine or surgery in the Army. On VE-day, he had a total of 93 points, and in December he will be 40 years old.

Another letter dated September 1945, from the wife of an overseas soldier, reads as follows:

I am writing to you for my husband and all the boys who are in the 634 A. A. A. AW. overseas. All these boys are feeling as if they have been let down. They all have over 110 points, have been overseas from 2½ to 3¾ years. They all have five to eight battle stars, several have unit citation and several have purple hearts.

They want to know why they are not home. Their sailing orders have been canceled four times. They asked me to write to you. I also feel the way they do. My husband has been overseas 3 years and 7 months. He has over 117 points and 5 battle stars.

Last evening I received a letter from Lake Orion, Mich., enclosing a copy of a letter addressed by a man on Okinawa to his wife. I desire to put the letter in the RECORD because it relates to something which later I desire to discuss about the commanding officers in the Army as related to a general in the Army. He says:

We are certainly lost on this island. I thought the confusion and wasted effort during the war was colossal but the way things are confused now is beyond all belief. Twice in the last month, a convoy of ships has come here to pick us up and take us to Korea. Both times the orders were canceled and the boats left empty. Last week end a third convoy arrived to take us to Japan. Some of the units were already loaded when the orders were canceled for the third time.

That brings home the question as to whether or not we are using all available ships and the facilities to bring home the servicemen who have been told that they have the qualifications entitling them to be released from the Army.

Mr. President, that was why I asked the able Senator from New York as to the number of ships available and the number of men to be brought home. The figures which I received were, apparently, only those which the commanding officers wanted to be used in connection with bringing the soldiers home.

I desire to say, Mr. President, at this time that the evidence before our committee indicates that there is strong pressure upon the part of our allies to have returned to them the ships belong-

ing to them which are now being used to bring back our soldiers. In the last few weeks there have been taken from us a number of British ships which we had been using for that purpose. I hope that henceforth the officials of our Government in charge will see to it that ships are not released unless they are needed for purposes more urgent than the return to their homes of men in our armed forces who are now serving abroad. I want to read from another letter I have received expressing how one young man feels on this subject:

No wonder they have no ships to take the boys home. They keep them all sailing around from port to port empty. It is hard for me to understand how things could be managed in this manner unless there is some viciousness or at best great incompetence behind it.

That shows the attitude of the boys at the front. I am sorry that he has used that language, but it is what he and the other boys at the front are thinking.

This is important, and I shall quote again from the letter:

The Regular Army just does not want to demobilize.

Mr. President, he gets that from something he sees at the front, and it is important to us here in the Senate that we see what he sees at the front. I quote again from the letter:

Those generals just don't want to go back to captains, majors, or lieutenant colonels. They will stave off that day as long as possible by any means they can use. Also each general fights to keep his division together and if possible take them back to the States as a unit. A general who comes back without his unit is just another returning serviceman. So you see how the point system is twisted and perverted. General Bradley has officers in his unit with 120 points who need only 70 points for discharge but he won't let them go. At the very least there are ten times as many doctors in the Army as they have any use for. During the war they had twice as many doctors as they needed but they gave the excuse that they had to have a large reserve in case of a major disaster. I don't know what excuse they give for holding them now.

The morale is bad. These men who fought well through two or three campaigns are now breaking down from this horrible monotony, inactivity.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the Senator yielding. Like every other Member of the Senate, I have received similar letters from members of the armed forces, and I can understand that in many areas where the soldiers are now stationed there may be incidents which create the impressions conveyed to the Senator in the letter from which he is quoting.

As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I have had occasion to participate in the hearings which that committee has held, and it is my definite opinion that there is no real basis for the suspicion that Army officers are trying to keep the men in the Army for the purpose of retaining rank.

The truth of the matter is that last Saturday, as I remember the figures which were presented to the Committee on Military Affairs, 47,000 soldiers were discharged. It is my recollection that discharges are now proceeding at a rate well in excess of 40,000 every day. There are many inequities, there are many mistakes, no doubt, but when one considers the fact that this country was geared to the prosecution of a war across the Pacific Ocean even after VE-day, and that every effort was being made to transport millions of men across the country and across the seas, with shipping, great though it was, actually inadequate for the job, there is something to be said for the Army, and for the magnitude of the task which arises from the effort to reverse that momentum.

I have often thought of an automobile driving along the highway at 75 miles an hour. I have driven at that speed sometimes, and I know perfectly well that it is not possible to throw a car into reverse immediately. I believe that with all the mistakes and all the discrepancies the War Department and the members of the General Staff are to be commended for the success they have achieved in the discharging of men from the armed forces.

Unless the officers who appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs are misrepresenting their own attitude and their own purposes, all those who are in the Army now can rest assured that the high command, so to speak, here in Washington, is doing everything it can to get the men out of the service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Along the general line of returning to their homes the men in the armed services, about the 12th of October, I had a communication from some marines who were at the Cherry Point station. I addressed a communication to the Secretary of the Navy asking how many marines were at that station who had more than sufficient points to be discharged. On October 24 I received the following communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, October 24, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 13, addressed to the Secretary of the Navy, regarding the number of enlisted men and officers who are now at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., with sufficient points to be discharged.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps has informed me that as of October 12 there were 3,539 male enlisted, 232 female enlisted and 517 officers at Cherry Point eligible for discharge under the demobilization plan.

On October 16 headquarters Marine Corps instructed Cherry Point to transfer 2,000 enlisted men eligible for discharge to Camp Lejeune at a rate of 300 per day. This is to relieve the load at Cherry Point and expedite discharges.

I trust the above information will be of assistance to you.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

ARTEMUS L. GATES.

The point is that many of these servicemen had been at the Cherry Point station for a great many weeks, some of them well over a month, all of them, as pointed out in the letter, having more than sufficient points to be discharged.

On the 6th of October I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Navy asking for certain specific information in this regard. I shall not take the time to read the letter I received in reply, but I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 24, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The following information requested in your letter of October 6 is the data which is readily available at this time:

(a) I feel that the enclosed statement by Rear Admiral Flanigan before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on October 18 gives you the best available answer to requests in items 1, 3, 4, and 5 of your letter, all of which concern returns of personnel and transportation facilities from overseas.

(b) Item 2 of your letter indicates an impression that demobilization was under way for Navy and Marine Corps personnel following VE-day. Actually the Navy and Marine Corps were both building strength during the period from VE-day to VJ-day and returns from the European theater were redeployed in this country or for the Pacific. Separations to civil life during that period fell under such categories as medical, disciplinary, and hardship and maintained a rate of about 25,000 per month for the Navy and Marine Corps combined. Below is the record for the Navy and Marine Corps since demobilization started on August 17 and through October 12:

Navy enlisted	236,431
Navy officers	28,651
Marine Corps enlisted	36,452
Marine Corps officers	2,902

(c) Following are estimates of the numbers of Marine Corps and Navy personnel with points needed for separation as of October 1 in answer to your item 6. Outside the United States the Navy had about 243,000 and the Marine Corps 63,400 as compared with inside United States 189,000 Navy and 20,000 Marine Corps.

(d) In answer to part 1 of your item 7, Navy medical officers as of October 12 were distributed as follows: European theater 1,005, Pacific theater 5,695, and inside the United States 6,880. In answer to part 2 of item 7, medical officer separations for the period August 17 through October 12 were 638.

Sincerely yours,

ARTEMUS L. GATES.

STATEMENT BY REAR ADMIRAL FLANIGAN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION, DELIVERED BEFORE THE SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 18, 1945

As of 1 October the joint Army and Navy transportation program to 30 June, 1946 calls for the return of the following number of personnel from the three major theaters:

From the Pacific, 1,750,000 Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine; 1,500,000 Army.

From India, 244,000 Army; 3,000 Navy.

From Europe, 1,839,000 Army and 16,000 Navy.

For a total of 5,352,000.

Of this total, approximately 520,000 naval personnel manning combatant ships will return in their own ships. The remaining, 4,832,000 must be returned as passengers.

At the present time our transport fleet in the Atlantic consists of 53 troopships, 65 converted Victorys, 200 converted Libertys,

6 hospital transports, 1 large aircraft carrier and the *Queen Mary* having a total passenger capacity of 409,473. In the Indian service we now have 22 troopships with a passenger capacity of 75,469. In the Pacific we have 162 troopships, 1 large aircraft carrier, 35 escort carriers, 100 assault transports, 9 hospital transports and 5 miscellaneous ships with a total passenger capacity of 523,067.

In addition to these ships, all combatant ships returning to this country carry home passengers; for example, last month they brought 17,494 passengers from the Pacific and the two task forces which have just arrived from the Pacific on the east and west coast carried nearly 50,000 passengers. Army and Navy commanders in the forward Pacific area have orders to utilize every available space on returning cargo vessels and some cargo vessels are now being converted in the forward areas to carry as many as 500 passengers.

Since the first of September, 466 cargo vessels and tankers which was 85 percent of those returning to the west coast from the forward Pacific areas brought 9,788 passengers, or an average of 21 per ship. Now that the armed-guard crews have been removed from vessels leaving the United States, vacated guard quarters will be filled on every returning vessel.

By 15 November we will have 3 troopships less in the Atlantic but 3 large aircraft carriers, 3 cruiser aircraft carriers, 2 heavy cruisers, 4 light cruisers, and 22 converted Victorys will be added, a net gain of 61,569 in passenger capacity. By the same time we will have increased the Indian service by the 3 troopships taken from the Atlantic, with a gain of 4,513.

Likewise, in the Pacific, we will add at an early date 6 large aircraft carriers, 4 cruiser aircraft carriers, 6 escort carriers, 6 battleships, 20 light cruisers, 103 APA, 2 hospital transports and 17 miscellaneous ships for a gain of 195,700.

This will give us a transport fleet with a passenger capacity of 471,042 in the Atlantic, 79,892 in the Indian service and 718,767 in the Pacific, or 1,269,791. Fifty-five percent of the fleet calculated by passenger capacity is manned by United States Navy crews, 38 percent by the War Shipping Administration, 4 percent by the Army and 3 percent by foreign nations. The excess passenger capacity in the Pacific over that in the Atlantic is not real. Greater distances and other factors make our monthly lift approximately equal in each ocean.

Between R-day, May 12 and October 12, we returned by ship from Europe to the United States 1,509,405 passengers, while an additional 173,339 came home by air. From September 1 to October 12 we returned by ship from India 9,328 and from the Pacific 245,930.

We will lift from Europe by the end of January all remaining military personnel except 400,000 Army troops now scheduled for occupation, an additional 300,000 men temporarily scheduled for supply and clean-up duty, and 12,000 Navy occupational personnel. We will have lifted all personnel out of India by early in April, while in the Pacific we can lift all personnel, except the Army and Navy personnel required for occupational duty by early in June.

It must be understood, however, that we are, and will continue to be, in a tight position throughout the remainder of this year, despite the fact that we will be bringing home an average of 867,000 men every month. There will be initially more men in all three theaters who are eligible to return home than we can immediately lift. The situation is particularly acute in the Pacific where for the last 3 months of this year there will be considerably more men available to come home than we can carry. Therefore, there will be delays there. But beginning in January we will begin to clear up the backlog of personnel and will eliminate it by April.

In June 1946, 13 months after VE-day, 10 months after VJ-day, we will complete the job of transporting home all except the occupational forces. It took over 3 years to transport them overseas. After the last war we brought home 2,000,000 in a little more than a year. This time we will bring home to the United States within the same period more than three and one-half times as many—the truly colossal number of over 7,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to have these remarks, and to have the debate regarding this important situation.

The Senator from Wyoming indicated that it is difficult to stop if one is driving an automobile at 75 miles an hour. I merely wish to say, in reply to that, that there are times when we have to anticipate that we are going to stop, and our speed is regulated with that in view.

I wish to bring out the point that we laid cut a plan for demobilization of our industry, but the difficulty is that we did not in advance lay out a plan for demobilizing the personnel we had in the Army. Our hearings have demonstrated clearly that that is true, and that is what is indicated in these letters.

Mr. President, I admit, and I say frankly, that the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War are cooperating personally in an attempt to accomplish the task of getting the servicemen home, but the well wishing of the officers here in Washington does not get the job done. We have been to these camps, we have talked to the boys who are coming in, and we know what is going on behind the lines. There is talk about providing personnel for these camps. There are hundreds, literally thousands, of personnel, Waves and Wacs, who do not have the number of points necessary for discharge, who could go to the camps and do the necessary paper work so that the men who have the points could be released.

Mr. President, after we got to the camps, began inspecting them and ascertained the load of work, we found that a system of furloughing had been inaugurated, as indicated by the Senator from California. Now when we go into the camps we find that all the men brought in are being discharged, but the officers are careful to see to it that the camps are not even utilized up to their capacity.

At Lido Beach 2 weeks ago Saturday we held a hearing, and found a camp with the capacity of discharging 2,000 sailors a day which was receiving only a thousand sailors a day. There were men in line who said they had been held for days and even weeks on the West Coast because they did not want to be sent to a camp until they were cleared. So these boys have some defense, and they have some right to bring these facts to the attention of the public. The boy from Lake Orion, whose letters I read, has 95 points.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words respecting the point system. On Friday, July 27, 1945, testifying before our committee, Col. William J. Brennan, Chief of the Labor Branch, Army Service Forces, stated:

> What I am trying to say is that we have the integrity of the point system to maintain in the sense that the boys who still have the fighting to do will continue their respect for and their confidence in it.

Mr. President, if there is anything needed in our democracy it is to maintain the integrity of that system. The able Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] showed that in certain cases the point system is not even being used.

The letters which I have just read rather clearly depict the degree of respect and confidence which the boys who have done the fighting have in the discharge system of the Army.

The confusion and dissatisfaction that now exist with the personnel discharge systems of the Army and Navy can be likened to the situation that would exist if someone suddenly called "Fire" in a crowded theater, announcing that all women 50 years of age with three or more children be permitted to leave the theater first, without knowing, first, how many women there were who would fall into such a category and where they were located in the theater, and without knowing how many of them could get through the exit in what time.

The services should have studied the problems they would face in mass personnel demobilization, forecasting the capacity of the various segments of the pipe line necessary to transport personnel to this country and process them for discharge and should have based their personnel demobilization plans upon the physical limitations so found.

What they did, however, was to select a plan on theoretical basis, giving recognition to factors which sounded fair and equitable, but were simply impossible of attainment. The resulting failure of performance to fulfill promises is probably the greatest source of irritation and complaint. Wide publicity was given to the point system and its fairness and wide publicity has been given to the total numbers of discharged personnel—almost daily, Mr. President, we see published in the newspapers the total number of discharges, but little or no publicity has been given to the physical limitations of ocean transportation, which now appears to be shrinking even beyond the forecast which was previously made, nor has publicity been given to the slowness of the procedure in the actual separation process where the capacity was simply not great enough to handle all those entitled to discharge. Nor has publicity been given to the fact that personnel in the Pacific cannot be discharged as rapidly as those in Europe, regardless of points, partly because of transportation, but also because they are still said to be needed for military operations.

The War Department's answer to this criticism has been simply to lower the points necessary for discharge, which, instead of solving the problem, has simply added to the confusion by making even more persons eligible for discharge who cannot possibly be processed under the limitations existing. This publicity on the surface appears to give hope of an improved discharge system, but actually has exactly the opposite result, since even more persons will now be disappointed.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] stated that there is no foundation whatever for the contention that Army officers want to keep the boys in the service. I shall now read the

testimony of a brigadier general given at one of our hearings, so that information may be afforded as to what he says about this particular point.

In response to a question as to why the Army reduced the points making personnel eligible for discharge, when all those eligible at the higher level of points were not yet discharged, Brig. Gen. Robert W. Berry, Deputy to Assistant Chief of Staff G–1, the personnel branch, stated:

General BERRY. The principal reason is this: You have got to make these men eligible for discharge in order to pry them away from the commanders.

Mr. President, according to the general, servicemen have to be made eligible for discharge in order to pry them away from the commanders.

I continue to read from the hearings:

Senator FERGUSON. All right. That is a different thing. That is exactly what the boys say.

General BERRY. If you don't do that, then you don't get them out.

Senator FERGUSON. Haven't you got control of the commanders?

General BERRY. You have got to keep enough pressure behind these centers. What is building up this discharge rate so rapidly is the fact that the people are there, waiting to go, and if you brought 400,000 people——

Senator FERGUSON. General, it isn't right to a boy, and it isn't right to his parents and his friends, to tell him that he is entitled to get out because he has 60 points on the 1st of November, when you know that he is not going to get out.

General BERRY. On the 1st of November; no.

Senator FERGUSON. You know it.

General BERRY. I know it.

The Army's admission, as quoted in the testimony of General Berry, of the promise of release to more persons than could be handled through the discharge system for the purpose of creating pressure on the commanding officers to release their personnel, seems to be a tacit admission that the discharge system has not been well thought out and well organized, as well as an admission that there is a tendency on the part of high-ranking officers to keep men in the service after there has ceased to be a need for them.

Mr. President, I have cited only four or five letters. I have hundreds of similar letters. I believe that every other Senator has in his files hundreds of letters to the same effect.

An inescapable contributing factor to the confusion, in addition to the lack of careful planning and efficient organization, is the lack of candor of the services in failing to announce the physical limitation upon their ability to discharge personnel.

This could and should be corrected at once by making public unavoidable limitations, such as transportation and military operations such as those in the Pacific, which will make impossible the carrying out of the obligations implied in the point score system.

The most good could be done by the services, by more accurately forecasting the capacity to handle discharges and in making eligible and available for discharge, in an orderly way, those whom it will be possible to discharge, refraining from promising immediate discharge to those whom it will be impossible to discharge.

At this point, I desire to refer to the letter from the 176 men at Okinawa which was read by the Senator from New York, in which the statement is made that the point system is now being disregarded by the Army altogether and men are being returned according to units.

In the speedy and efficient handling of the mass discharge of great numbers of persons, the advantage of handling them by units rather than by individuals is obvious to everyone. Statements such as that referred to in the above-mentioned letter from Okinawa raise the question in my mind whether or not the Army has in fact abandoned, for the most part, its system based upon the point scores of individuals and has resorted to the handling of discharges by units.

So far as the boys at the front are concerned, those who have 90, 100, or 105 points, they still believe the system to be in effect, and they wonder why it is not working.

If this is so, candor requires that the War Department announce this policy publicly so that the men who are serving abroad and who are chafing at being held overseas will no longer be misled into believing that they can be discharged when, as a matter of fact, they cannot.

According to figures furnished the committee by the Navy, there are 204,000 Navy enlisted personnel in the United States awaiting separation. Although the Navy contended to the committee that there is no backlog of unprocessed personnel in the separation centers, it should be noted that the rate of separation for the Navy on October 1, 1945, was 10,329, which would have represented approximately 20 days' work if all of those eligible in the United States were to be separated, without counting the processing of those arriving from combat theaters.

As I pointed out before, at Lido Beach the capacity is 2,000 persons a day, and it is being used only to the extent of 1,000. Those who are there to perform the work have nothing to do, because they are not processing the men through. The Navy was unable to give an adequate explanation as to the reason for the failure to process eligible persons, but denied that they were being held intentionally at other points in the United States to avoid the clogging of separation centers. But, Mr. President, the facts speak for themselves. It is only overseas transportation which is the bottleneck. No claim has been made that transportation within this country from a point where eligibles may be located to the separation centers is any obstacle whatever.

Originally, the Army permitted a commanding officer to retain necessary men. This provision has now been eliminated—September 2, 1945. However, certain classes of officers and enlisted men possessing skills which are in great demand, such as officers doing contract termination and contract renegotiation work and military government officers, may be retained in the Army for a period of 6 months beyond the date they are eligible for discharge under the point system.

In the Navy a commanding officer is permitted to retain for a period of 3 months the men whom he deems necessary. He is required, however, to report monthly to the Bureau of Personnel in the Navy all persons retained under such authority, together with a statement as to whether or not the commanding officer is training relief for such person and whether or not relief is available.

I see as one of the most serious features of the discharge system the failure of the Army and Navy to be completely frank in their public relations. I previously mentioned matters on which publicity was given by the services and matters on which no publicity has been given. In addition to those already mentioned, I wish to point out that a great deal of publicity was given to the fact that 50,000 returning service men and women were to be transported across the Atlantic by the Air Transport Command each month, but little or no public notice has been given to the reduction of this number to 35,000 in August and the further reduction to 10,000 in September, and the fact that still fewer can be returned in the coming months.

I am alarmed at the unfavorable reaction of the soldiers and sailors themselves and their families, as well as the public generally, to the discharge system of the services. I recognize that mass discharge is a difficult and unprecedented administrative undertaking, but to my mind, the evidence clearly discloses that it has not been as efficiently handled as it could have been. The evidence further discloses that the full, accurate facts have not been given to the personnel in the Army and Navy and to the general public. I feel that in our democracy the adverse public opinion which has been created in connection with personnel demobilization will be likely to produce a wave of dissatisfaction with military programs generally, which may, unfortunately, result in weakening necessary and proper future military programs, thus impairing our national security. I certainly hope that no such result will follow.

I also hope that in the future the services will leave no stone unturned to improve their personnel demobilization systems and to give the boys in the service and the public the full facts. The men and women who have risked their lives and have given up the comforts and friendships of home in the defense of our country, and their families and friends at home who have patriotically contributed to our magnificent record in war production, are entitled to no less.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD following the speech delivered by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], several letters which I received dealing with the question of demobilization.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your statement appearing in today's issue of Pacific Stars and Stripes to the effect that slow demobilization by the Navy has lowered morale to the point where it seriously affects voluntary enlistments is a very accurate picture of conditions as they exist here.

The crew of our ship numbers approximately 800 men of whom 37 were eligible for discharge with 44 points as of September 15. Besides these we have a number who are eligible for reasons of dependency, and an increasing number becoming eligible each day under the point system. Our officers have given us to understand that only 20 men will be allowed to go each month, and it is elemental arithmetic that the quota for November and December is already filled with men who were eligible in September. Where then does this leave us who are becoming eligible from day to day? They give as their reason, the fact that we are doing essential repair work on other ships, when, as a matter of fact, less than 20 percent of the crew is working at all, and those few on jobs that could as well wait to be done in the States.

We have no one to speak for us or fight for our rights except our representatives in the House and Senate, and we are hoping and praying that you will rectify these matters, so that we may return to our homes.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 10, 1945.*

The Honorable Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Senate Naval Affairs Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Navy men are depending upon congressional assistance to correct the Navy demobilization plan so that it will be equally fair and just to all.

The following comparison will show the fallacy of the adopted discharge system: A draftee who is 26 years old, is married today, and goes into the Navy tomorrow, he has 23 discharge points at the beginning of his first day of service. A single man of the same age, who has been in the Navy for 1 year, only has 19 points. Is this justice?

The present plan has been proven to be discriminating against both single men and those of us who were married after August 15, 1945, in favor of men married on or before that date. With a handicap of 20 months' service placed against me, this means that although I entered the Navy a year or more earlier than my friends, I will be one of the last men out. Perhaps I was too conservative in delaying my marriage until after the fighting ceased. Having served 3 years in the Navy, I feel that I am equally as deserving of the 10 discharge points as the man who was married on August 15.

If the present plan were revised in only two respects, it would then become unbiased and fair to all. First, service should be one-half point per month for the first 24 months of service, and one point per month for each additional month of service. This assists single men who have served extended periods. Secondly, the 10 points given for marriage should not be considered, but points should be given for parenthood instead. If points are considered for marriage, they should be granted to all, regardless of the date of marriage. Admiral King's original demobilization plan did not grant points for marriage but did grant points for parenthood.

Unless something is done, I wonder whether I will get out in time to start my business functioning again before competitors tie up all my customers. If delayed too long, I may be hunting a job instead of giving employment to others.

Don't you think that 3 years of service in the Navy is enough to warrant a discharge? The Navy has other ideas. I am only one of the many who sit at desks in the Washington Navy offices without anything to do. None of us can get out of service, because we haven't enough points. Although my business is suffering because of my absence, it is not in bankruptcy; therefore, I cannot obtain a release based upon business hardship.

Please give the above your fullest consideration and use your abilities to see that a just and fair Navy demobilization point system is put into effect in the very near future. Thank you for your most appreciated assistance.

Respectfully submitted.

P. S.—Please withhold my name.

U. S. S. "PHAON" (ARB-3),
Care of Fleet Post Office,
San Francisco, Calif.,
October 1, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: We, the undersigned, are fully aware of the many hours which you must spend on legislation and other duties connected with your high office, particularly during these critical times, but we would more than appreciate your taking the time to read this letter which will give you some idea as to what we, the enlisted men in the naval service, think about the demobilization plans, etc., of the Navy.

First of all, sir, may we say that we more than appreciate your many efforts devoted to a fair demobilization plan for the Navy. We have read a copy of your recent letter to Secretary of the Navy Forrestal relative to this subject now uppermost in our minds, and feel that it was equitable in all respects, and showed a careful amount of consideration.

However, sir, we who are writing this letter, who have spent the past 25 months out here in the Pacific (since September 3, 1943, without any side trips to Hawaii, Australia, New Zealand, or other civilized spots) are literally "burned up" when we read of the Navy sending some 300 fighting ships to the east coast so that a big show may be put on for the civilian populace on Navy Day, October 27.

Celebrations, pomp and circumstance are fine, sir, we're all for it and feel that the good citizens on the home front who during the war years worked so hard to supply us with the needs on the fighting fronts, justly deserve to view the ships of the greatest Navy the world has ever known. We're 100 percent for it, as we say, but not at this time. We feel that rather than putting on a vast and lavish show for the folks back home, that every ship should be returned to the Pacific just as soon as possible to pick up the many thousands of Army, Marine and Navy personnel now awaiting return to the States and ultimate discharge from their respective service, and get them home just as soon as possible. At the moment here at Saipan there are many many thousands now awaiting available transportation home, and who have been waiting some 5 and 6 weeks. Yet, the Navy keeps some 300 or more ships on the east coast, for show purposes only.

We are proud of having played a small part in winning a glorious victory, and will always be proud and cherish the thought that we have been part of such a great Navy. We have respect for the Navy and for its accomplishments, however, just as we are able to quickly point out the good aspects, we are also quite able to know of its shortcomings, too. We honestly believe, Mr. WALSH, that the Navy, to date, has not done its utmost, nor its best, to demobilize the men as quickly as possible, and we feel that only by Members of the United States House and Senate demanding speed, will demobilization be speeded up.

When it was necessary for the Navy to get us out into these areas of the Pacific, no time was lost getting us out. It now seems strange that it should take so long to get us home, now that the war has been won. It is our earnest hope that you, and other Members of Congress and the Senate will do everything possible to speed up demobilization of naval personnel. If we can't be demobilized quickly—then at least send us home to civilization just as soon as possible. I'm sure that waiting for release from the Navy will be a little easier back in the States, rather than on some isolated island here in the Pacific.

We realize that it is considered unethical to write to one's representative in the Senate and House, but at times it is difficult to keep quiet, when we see so many injustices all about us. Then too, having been brought up in a great democracy, we relish the right to free speech. We will appreciate this letter being considered confidential, sir, and will appreciate any effort on your part to keep it so.

We beg to remain, sincerely yours.

MONTGOMERY, OHIO, *September 15, 1945.*

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Senate Naval Affairs Committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I should like to add my recommendation for rotation of Navy personnel and the consideration of combat duty in the release of men who have been under fire prior to the release of those who have not had actual sea duty. The following is quoted from a naval officer's letter:

"The boys are in a real turmoil over the latest news from Washington. The Chief of Naval Personnel stated: 'The reason the Navy hadn't considered the combat or overseas duty of a man was because they didn't have records.' You can imagine what a hit that made. We all realize that the Navy has many problems as yet and don't feel that we should drop things tonight and head for home.

"However, most of the Navy's trouble springs from its poor handling of personnel. Not only do they give such treatment that everyone is glad to quit, but they pay no attention to rotation of personnel and now all the people who can run ships are at sea and the ones on the beach, of course, are the ones who can be spared, since they would be useless at sea, and no trouble was ever taken to rotate them and qualify the extra men. It is a grand and glorious mess.

"I hope that the folks at home feel as strongly about this situation as we in the fleet and go after the Congressmen and Senators until some legislative action is taken to provide first for the worn-out kids who fought this Pacific war and then the ones who sat it out in the States. I truly believe that those such as I, will be home in a few months' time, but for the many, many boys that are both young and single who have put two to four grueling years in out here, there should be some consideration.

"The Navy must realize that it is promoting one of the greatest anti-Navy blocs this country has ever seen. I know personally many men who will in later years, merely from their present dealings with the Navy, turn thumbs down on anything pertaining to the Navy, without consideration. That is an unhealthy and dangerous attitude to be breeding and I am sorry that it is happening.

"Unless something is done soon these crews will lapse into an apathetic state that will border on mutiny. It is a sorry spectacle when such tactics are employed under the nose of the public, and nothing is done to alleviate the situation."

It is strange that the Navy cannot keep records as the Army does, when its personnel is contained in compact units and not deployed over wide areas as is the Army's. Please have your committee consider the statements made in this letter, and act according to its conscience.

Sincerely.

OCTOBER 10, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I am writing this letter in reference to a Honolulu newspaper column. I want to thank you, Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Senator K. S. WHERRY and Senator GUY CORDON for expressing the Navy's

demobilization program the way you did. I believe your column was the first in 17 months overseas that really helped build my morale and I'm sure it did for practically every serviceman that is a reserve with a few years in the service out on this rock. If I may take the liberty of telling you just a few gripes from the servicemen overseas:

1. The war is over, yet they say there aren't any ships available to take us back. What happened to all of them? Maybe if these Navy parades were staged after we were returned, the servicemen would appreciate them and have the desire to cheer along with being proud of the Navy that they served under.

2. People don't realize what living is like out in these God-forsaken islands. Sure the climate is wonderful, but that's all we have. Men are like shells just living and occasionally have a few beers which most of the time are the worst brands. We realized when the war was on that it was necessary, but now we are absolutely bored as we know it's just a waste of time and taxpayers' money which some day we will have to pay. After all, we are all going to be civilians in the near future (perhaps). If they can't see our point tell them to try living in their backyard for about a couple of years. I believe there isn't much difference from our present standard of living out here. All we want is to live and lead the life we served for. That isn't asking for too much is it?

3. We realize that many letters of this type have been mailed to you and many others. Why is it that only a few men like you have had the nerve to get it printed. Senator, when election comes again you can bet we know whom to vote for. Not these fellows who don't care about us, but for men who want to help our Nation get back on its feet, after being torn by war. Sure, they're on top now, but they should remember who we servicemen are. We are the men who will have to reconstruct this Nation and make it one of the best. I hope you continue plugging for us, and you can be sure you will be rewarded by God in the future.

4. This letter is being written because we are helpless. Yes, we can beef and beef, but it all adds up to where we started from. If we become too cocky they immediately place us where we can no longer be of any harm. If you read this letter we don't want you to believe it all as a gripe. We are thanking you in our best method we can and that's by writing you a letter of congratulations for taking part of our hardships and desires. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely.

CURRENT SHIPPING SHORTAGE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Where Are the Ships?" published in the Stars and Stripes of October 9, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE ARE THE SHIPS?

Can the current, critical shipping "shortage" be blamed on the transfer to the British of the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Aquitania*, on dock strikes in the United States, and on storms in the Atlantic?

Or is redeployment delayed because the War Department has failed to utilize all of America's mammoth merchant marine in the priority I job of getting soldiers home; because it has miscalculated shipping needs; because it has failed to act aggressively in meeting those needs; because it has failed to order freighters converted to troopships; because it has not pressed into service idle ships; because it has not enlisted the aid of the world's greatest navy in redeployment; because in general it has been neglectful of its most important job since VJ-day.

Are the ship transfers reasons for the month delay—at least—now promised us in redeployment from the ETO? Or are they just excuses?

The best case we have seen stated thus far, tending to prove the latter, was in a letter submitted to the European edition of the New York Herald Tribune by T3c William C. Craig, Jr., and T4c T. S. Hyland. It said:

"All right—whose fault is the latest redeployment crisis?

"1. At the war's end the United States had 5,000 merchant ships." (Source: Time magazine, October 15.) "Using only 3,000 of these converted to carry troops, these 3,000 could have taken every soldier in the ETO home in one trip. Naturally, this would be too much to expect, but it shows the possibilities.

"2. When the United States canceled lend-lease on August 21, the British stated that they would have to withdraw their Queens, as they were badly needed to repatriate their own and Canadian troops.

"3. On October 13 the British withdraw only one Queen and the *Aquitania*. The United States was allowed to keep one Queen for the rest of the year. And the German *Europa* is now ready to replace the *Aquitania*.

"4. If the United States had used only 600 of its own ships, roughly 10 percent of the available total, making only one trip per month, they could have returned every GI in Europe since VE-day. This would leave more than enough ships for (a) the Pacific redeployment and (b) vital commerce and relief.

"5. Operable United States ships are today rusting idly in United States harbors (source of fact: Time Magazine, October 15, page 27. A photograph shows five good new ships laid up in a single small port, Mobile.) There is no shortage of shipping. There is a surplus.

"6. More than enough time has passed since either (a) VE-day or (b) cancellation of lend-lease to convert countless freighters into transports. Nobody can plead (a) lack of time or (b) lack of materials or manpower as excuses. Shipyards have undergone terrific cut-backs.

"7. Army spokesmen now blame the latest redeployment crisis on (a) loss of the British ships, (b) storms in the Atlantic and the English Channel, (c) strikes in the United States. These explanations seem flimsy afterthoughts providentially provided to cover up negligence and poor planning.

"It is outrageous to suggest that redeployment has been slowed up by turning over ships to the British in exchange for use of the *Queen Mary*. We have plenty of ships to turn over without taking any out of service.

"High Army and War Department officials have just talked their way out of one crisis over congressional, civilian, and GI indignation concerning redeployment and discharges. And now another crisis—with no excuse whatever. It is a tragedy to the whole Nation that top Army planners are not wise enough to realize that the peacetime future of the Army depends on its performance during the post-VJ interval.

"When our armies were triumphant on both sides of the globe, any of us thought that perhaps, after all, the professional 'big brass hats' (General Eisenhower's phrase) were shrewd and competent men. But since VE and VJ, millions of GI's and more millions of civilians have returned to their former deep mistrust of the 'military mind.' They had won our trust—then threw it away in an outbreak of poor planning, 'chicken,' bad faith, confusion, and ineptness. The result of civilian mistrust of military authorities may well be a smaller peacetime Army, reduced Army budgets, no postwar training, etc.—thus affecting, perhaps tragically, the future history of the American Nation."

Eloquent as are Sergeants Craig and Hyland, however, it would not be fair to the War Department to accept their argument as fact without hearing what the official Army answer is to their seven points.

Thus far, there has been no explanation satisfactory to soldiers in this theater of the shipping shortage. But maybe there is such an explanation.

It is impossible for us in the ETO directly to ask General Marshall or the War Department's Redeployment Branch or G-3 or the War Shipping Administration what the explanation is.

All that we can do is ask that someone put the questions to the War Department for us and that, in any case, newspapermen in Washington seek to find the full answers to them.

We ask, too, that in any investigation the answers be examined thoroughly and checked carefully, that the profusion and confusion of figures under which the War Department has thus far showed the soldiers and the public be avoided, and that especial effort be devoted to an attempt to find, even at this late date, some means to correct any mistakes that may have been made, and to get the eligible soldiers home and out of the Army.

(Thirty-eight signatures, the Stars and Stripes editorial staff.)

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 2, to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, which is known as the airport bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] on October 22, 1945, that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] be appointed conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, this matter was postponed by agreement on the 22d instant with the view of reaching an agreement as to the conferees to be appointed on the part of the Senate.

I modify my motion so as to nominate as conferees the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the motion as modified is agreed to, and the Chair appoints the Senators suggested by the Senator from North Carolina conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of

public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, be printed showing the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAPACITY OF THE GOVERNMENT TO MEET ITS OBLIGATIONS

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope it will be for only a moment.

Mr. President, during the discussion of the tax bill on Wednesday last I pointed out the anomaly of Congress reducing the tax revenue of the Government at a time when the interest upon the national debt is greater than it ever was at any time in history. I might have added that the interest which we must pay on the national debt this year exceeds the cost of Congress, the Federal courts, the Executive Offices of the President, and all the civil departments and agencies of the Government. So at a time when the Government of the country is confronted with exceedingly heavy obligations, Congress is undertaking to reduce the capacity of the Government to meet those obligations.

Last night in the Evening Star I read an illuminating dispatch from London. It is an Associated Press dispatch, dated London, October 25. It appears under the heading "Britain needs big loan to meet budget deficit." It reads as follows:

BRITAIN NEEDS BIG LOAN TO MEET BUDGET DEFICIT

LONDON, October 25.—Britain must borrow a sum almost equaling 10 percent of her already gigantic national debt if she is to meet the deficit the Labor Government predicts for the fiscal year beginning April 1, 1946.

With a national debt of 23,708,000,000 pounds ($94,832,000,000), the United Kingdom must borrow another 2,300,000,000 pounds ($9,200,000,000) to meet the deficit forecast by Chancelor of the Exchequer Hugh Dalton.

Let me interrupt the reading to point out that the Bureau of the Budget of the United States estimates that the deficit in conducting the affairs of the Government of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, will be $30,000,000,000; yet we are reducing taxes.

Mr. Dalton estimated expenditures for the next fiscal year at 5,565,000,000 pounds ($22,260,000,000) and revenues at 3,265,000,000 pounds ($13,060,000,000).

A large part of the national debt is made up of obligations to be met on specific dates. A possibility that their cost to the Government may be reduced by refunding is seen, however, in Mr. Dalton's budget message to Parliament.

Britain financed a large part of her war costs by creating short-term bonds and floating debt.

Mr. Dalton presumably is considering refunding bonded indebtedness since he repeatedly has spoken of cheaper money in recent weeks.

One of the interesting points of his budget speech mentioned "the exploration in the field of future possibilities of cheaper money and lower interest rates."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming if it is not a fact that within the last few days the newspapers have carried a story to the effect that the British Government is also proposing tax reduction at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not see such a statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe that a statement to that effect appeared in the New York Times.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I yielded a few moments ago to the Senator from Wyoming, with the understanding that he would take only a few minutes. I have been waiting here since 12 o'clock, diligently trying to get an opportunity to make a few brief remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me for a few moments, I shall conclude.

Mr. MURRAY. Very well; a few moments will be all right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, if it be true that the British Government is also reducing taxes, that only emphasizes the trials and tribulations which confront the capitalistic system. It seems to me that in all common sense we cannot undertake to increase our debt and decrease our taxes at the same time. It is interesting to note that the quota which has been established by the Treasury Department for the sale of Victory bonds, which is now about to begin, is $11,000,000,000. We are proposing to reduce the revenue of the Government by approximately $5,300,000,000. In other words, at the same time we are to undertake to borrow $11,000,000,000 more, we are cutting off tax revenues of half that sum.

The established deficit for the fiscal year ending in 1946 will be $30,000,000,000. That will add to the national debt. The estimated national debt as of June 30, 1946, according to the Treasury Department, is $273,000,000,000. We may be under the impression that we are fighting inflation by this. I think those who deal in corporate securities have a very different notion. I hold in my hand a circular which was issued by a certain corporation which deals in investment-trust certificates. Let me read one or two paragraphs from it, with the indulgence of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senator has already consumed twice as much time as I would have consumed in making the few brief remarks I wish to make. I hope the Senator will be able to conclude in a minute or two, or else I shall have to object.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall do so, Mr. President. The Senator is very kind.

According to the circular to which I have referred, the average price on September 1 last, of certain stocks which this company is selling or advising to be purchased, was 41, which is 10 times the reported earnings of 1944, but only four times the earnings which could have been reported without the excess-profits tax.

Reading further from the circular, we find that—

Congress is expected to repeal the excess-profits tax by the end of the year.

The business outlook for 1946 is highly encouraging for two reasons: (1) There is a 4-year deferred demand for all types of consumer goods and industrial equipment; (2) the American public has a record volume of liquid funds to buy the things they want and need.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this reveals a very anomalous and, I think, a rather terrifying condition.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RATES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 694.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694), to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. That question is debatable.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS-GENERAL MOTORS CORP. LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced into the RECORD a telegram from the United Automobile Workers which was addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. It dealt with the great controversy over wage increases and price control between the General Motors Corp. and the United Automobile Workers.

Since then I have been able to assemble certain important facts bearing directly upon the General Motors conflict and likewise of great significance to the Congress and the American people. I ask the indulgence of the Members of the Senate to present this statement of the wage situation in the United States.

The struggle between labor and management in the General Motors Corp. involves directly the welfare of 350,000 workers and their families. In numerous other ways it touches the lives of many thousands more of our citizens—yes, even of millions of them—for what occurs in any major segment of this closely knit industrial society of ours fans out rapidly to the farthermost reaches of its geographic boundaries and moves back and forth amongst its business communities and farming areas.

Moreover, the General Motors controversy is no ordinary dispute over wages and working conditions. It is, rather, the first, big, practical attempt to adjust our wartime economy to the practices of peace, to maintain the high levels of employment and income which are absolutely necessary if we are to continue to prosper as a nation of indus-

trial workers, farmers, shopkeepers, artisans, owners, and managers. What is decided in the General Motors case will largely determine the course we choose to take for the next several years. Whether it be onward to higher and reasonable attainable levels of well-being for our people, or whether it is to be the downward toboggan into another and even greater slump and depression than that in the decade of the thirties, rests in no small degree with the Congress of the United States and this administration.

Labor has proposed to General Motors Corp. that an increase in pay to full-time employed workers under the present 40-hour week be made which will tend to offset the 23-percent cut in take-home pay which has resulted since VJ-day. Labor contends that this adjustment in pay, which, even when made, does not increase the purchasing power and living standards of auto factory workers above their prewar levels, can be made without increasing the cost of automobiles to the buying public. The finances and earnings of the corporation are such that these wage adjustments will not reduce profits unduly or impair in the slightest degree the soundness and financial structure of General Motors.

This administration has studied these matters for the Nation as a whole. While there are individual companies which may differ from the average, and may require particular treatment, the General Motors situation characterizes manufacturing generally.

The New York Times of Thursday, October 25, 1945, reports that the economists of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion calculate that the measurable savings to management in 1946 will allow a wage increase of 24 percent. These savings include the dropping of overtime, the downgrading of employed workers, and the very substantial sums voted by the Congress in the elimination of the excess-profits tax. Other savings not subject to such precise measurement which will be made by peacetime industry, will considerably increase the level of wages possible without requiring any raise in prices to consumers.

The growing unrest among the workers of the Nation, reflected in certain major strikes already harassing the Nation, and others even more serious which are looming on the horizon, must claim our attention. In my judgment, what is primarily responsible is the severe cut already made and in prospect, both in number of employed workers and in the size of the pay envelope the worker takes home to his family on Saturday night. Some five to six million workers will be, in fact are already being, eliminated from manufacturing pursuits altogether. Those fortunate enough to find other employment must be satisfied with jobs paying up to 50 percent less in take-home money than their wartime jobs in manufacturing.

For those who were still fortunate enough to remain in factory jobs, the first cut came in hours of work to 40 a week from a wartime level of 48, which was unquestionably a boon to them and their families in increased opportunity for family life and recreation. But such cuts in working time are reflected in reductions in pay envelopes up to a third or even more of wartime pay. Nor is the story complete here, for not only is overtime pay cut out entirely, but many civilian industries are, by their very nature, lower paying than war industries, and workers must of necessity be degraded both as to the skills drawn upon and compensated for. Here again the result is a substantial lowering of the amount of wages earned.

We are facing a dangerous condition of shrinking purchasing power in our cities and in income on our farms. The cut in take-home pay, coupled with the unemployment already noticeable, has been reflected in a sharp decline in the national wage bill. I am informed from Government statistics, that during 1946, wages and salaries will fall more than $20,000,000,000 below the levels of the first half of 1945. The impact of this drop will be felt in many markets. A cut of this magnitude will reduce the income of farmers by from a fifth to a fourth of what it was in 1945. The reduction of purchases of farm products will be sharply and immediately felt, for there is no way to long defer and cushion the loss of consumers buying power in this highly sensitive sector of our economy.

None of us would voluntarily advocate a reduction of wages with such dire consequences for so many of our people. Yet we are told by some that wages must come down. It is said that wartime levels of earnings cannot be continued. We are urged to take our medicine now, and, no matter how sick it makes us, come up recovered and ready to go again as quickly as possible.

Included in this prescription is the conviction held by some that wage increases cannot be granted now to adjust for the cut in take-home pay of workers without substantially increasing prices of products. Let me suggest that we reflect for a moment on conditions as they are today in our manufacturing industry, which throws much light on this moot question. I conclude from an examination of the facts that we can pay substantially higher industrial wages, thereby offsetting in large measure the cut in take-home pay of workers, without in any way requiring an over-all increase in prices of our merchandise. The elimination of the premium of overtime, and the substantial down grading of employed workers has already considerably reduced labor costs and the wage bill of industry. With increasing productivity, labor costs will be still further reduced as the tempo of reconversion steps up. In manufacturing alone, the experts estimate that since the end of the war labor costs have already gone down slightly less than 10 percent per hour worked. Most of this 10 percent might very properly be passed on to workers in an adjustment of their take-home pay. Such a wage increase does not require the increase in prices of products produced.

But it is in the financial position and profit record of wartime industry that we find abundant proof of my contention that wage increases and adjustments can be made without price increases being necessary.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain evidence in the form of tables bearing on this point. The tables show the profits, sales, and investment and return on sales and net worth period 1936–39 average and 1944, for 1,743 large industrial corporations.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Net sales and profits before and after taxes 1936–39 average and 1944, 1,743 large industrial corporations (by major and minor industry groups)*

[Dollars in thousands]

Number of companies	Industrial group	Net sales			Profits before income taxes			Profits after taxes		
		1936–39 average	1944 [1]	Percent change	1936–39 average	1944 [1 2]	Percent change	1936–39 average	1944 [1]	Percent change
1,743	Total of all companies	$31,629,747	$80,290,807	+153.8	$2,721,983	$8,647,929	+217.7	$2,254,205	$3,416,766	+51.6
1,457	Manufacturing	25,113,580	68,647,265	+173.3	2,280,996	7,364,773	+222.9	1,885,970	2,879,223	+52.7
626	Durables	9,922,057	37,374,985	+276.7	1,001,535	3,868,518	+286.3	807,660	1,285,577	+59.2
47	Automobiles and equipment	2,645,702	8,886,250	+235.9	305,849	861,002	+181.5	247,990	296,055	+19.4
17	Motor vehicles	2,304,146	6,832,832	+196.5	281,869	628,938	+123.1	228,834	234,914	+2.7
30	Motor vehicle parts and accessories	341,556	2,053,418	+501.2	23,980	232,064	+867.7	19,156	61,141	+219.2
17	Furniture and finished lumber products	117,427	234,600	+99.8	8,338	28,266	+239.0	6,844	9,409	+37.5
9	Household and office furniture and fixtures	63,012	123,521	+96.0	4,544	14,463	+218.3	3,722	5,027	+35.1
8	Other wood products	54,415	111,079	+104.1	3,794	13,803	+263.8	3,122	4,382	+40.4
124	Iron and steel and their products	3,101,704	9,172,250	+195.7	221,297	851,301	+284.7	174,307	317,207	+82.9
34	Blast furnaces and rolling mills	2,348,081	6,558,313	+179.3	154,977	590,279	+255.1	122,419	222,357	+81.6
5	Fabricated structural metal products	13,949	418,576	+2,900.8	445	19,571	+4,298.0	339	6,024	+1,677.0
13	Foundry products	78,300	282,289	+260.5	5,356	26,884	+401.9	4,222	8,049	+90.6
25	Heating apparatus and plumbers' supplies	287,179	578,830	+101.6	26,064	84,270	+223.3	19,869	27,078	+36.2
8	Metal stamping and coating	76,973	321,604	+317.8	3,765	54,255	+1,341.0	2,857	15,114	+429.0

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Net sales and profits before and after taxes 1936–39 average and 1944, 1,743 large industrial corporations (by major and minor industry groups)*—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Number of companies	Industrial group	Net sales			Profits before income taxes			Profits after taxes		
		1936–39 average	1944 [1]	Percent change	1936–39 average	1944 [1 2]	Percent change	1936–39 average	1944 [1]	Percent change
	Manufacturing—Continued									
	Durables—Continued									
	Iron and steel and their products—Con.									
3	Tin cans and other tinware	$109,043	$194,567	+78.4	$10,895	$16,979	+55.8	$9,206	$8,067	−12.1
9	Wire products	52,761	147,172	+178.9	4,551	18,059	+296.8	3,674	5,621	+53.0
27	Other iron and steel products	135,418	670,899	+395.4	15,244	81,004	+431.4	11,710	24,867	+112.4
25	Lumber and timber basic products	50,421	114,543	+127.2	908	10,987	+1,110.0	673	5,035	+648.1
63	Machinery—Electrical	885,743	3,947,711	+345.7	105,602	507,251	+380.3	87,092	146,749	+68.5
17	Communication equipment	169,258	780,664	+361.2	13,189	83,498	+533.1	10,655	22,237	+108.7
9	Electrical appliances	35,774	78,822	+120.3	3,723	11,145	+199.4	2,914	4,199	+44.1
25	Industrial electrical equipment	550,589	2,602,245	+372.6	80,084	356,943	+345.7	66,376	106,363	+60.2
12	Other electrical products	130,122	485,980	+273.5	8,606	55,665	+546.8	7,147	13,950	+95.2
180	Machinery—Nonelectrical	1,463,946	5,054,239	+245.2	182,698	689,230	+277.3	146,839	213,779	+45.6
10	Agricultural, machinery and tractors	542,935	1,566,365	+188.5	66,613	171,327	+157.2	52,104	60,011	+15.2
28	Construction and mining machinery	140,662	463,650	+229.6	12,530	54,363	+333.9	10,115	17,032	+68.4
14	Engines and turbines	71,177	523,009	+634.8	5,359	69,165	+1,190.6	4,255	16,494	+287.6
65	General industrial machinery	315,680	1,173,644	+271.8	44,855	193,597	+331.6	37,045	58,041	+56.7
20	Household and service—industrial machinery	120,302	317,446	+163.9	10,004	36,085	+260.7	8,169	12,399	+51.8
19	Metalworking machinery	62,210	303,736	+388.2	10,313	57,531	+457.8	8,156	15,499	+90.0
5	Office and store machinery and devices	143,244	343,113	+139.5	25,309	61,507	+143.0	20,618	20,035	−2.8
19	Special-industry machinery	67,736	363,276	+436.3	7,715	45,655	+491.8	6,377	14,268	+123.7
50	Nonferrous metal and their products	556,044	1,346,837	+142.2	49,766	139,359	+180.0	40,457	46,124	+14.0
10	Jewelry, silverware, watches, etc	60,801	139,909	+130.1	5,671	20,294	+257.9	4,512	6,083	+34.8
3	Lighting fixtures	4,918	9,076	+84.5	158	908	+474.7	128	301	+135.2
16	Other nonferrous metal products	68,634	399,588	+482.2	6,182	40,486	+554.9	5,063	10,773	+112.8
21	Smelting, refining, and rolling	421,691	798,264	+89.3	37,755	77,671	+105.7	20,754	28,967	−5.8
63	Stone, clay, and glass products	464,482	874,166	+88.2	58,966	108,932	+84.7	48,515	46,038	−5.1
9	Abrasives, asbestos, etc	93,013	218,039	+134.4	8,190	28,829	+252.0	6,606	10,720	+62.3
21	Cement	74,187	83,498	+12.6	8,917	3,475	−61.0	7,497	1,207	−83.9
5	Concrete, gypsum, and plaster products	56,290	98,941	+75.8	8,378	10,249	+22.3	7,094	5,720	−19.4
2	Flat glass	82,982	145,529	+75.4	15,725	26,826	+70.6	12,766	14,260	+11.7
8	Glassware—Pressed or blown	112,857	252,047	+123.3	12,383	33,508	+170.6	10,183	11,224	+10.2
4	Pottery	3,967	6,783	+71.0	399	872	+118.5	332	303	−8.7
14	Structural clay products	41,186	69,329	+68.3	4,974	5,173	+4.0	4,037	2,604	−35.5
32	Transportation equipment (excluding automobiles)	400,692	7,168,869	+1,689.1	35,915	563,802	+1,469.8	29,087	167,953	+477.4
17	Aircraft and parts	120,426	5,540,423	+4,500.7	16,049	401,503	+2,401.7	12,906	115,888	+797.9
10	Railroad equipment	221,839	930,933	+319.6	16,622	117,593	+607.5	13,549	38,421	+183.6
5	Ship and boatbuilding and repairing	58,427	697,513	+1,093.8	3,244	44,706	+1,278.1	2,632	13,644	+418.4
25	Miscellaneous durables	235,896	575,520	+144.0	32,196	108,388	+236.7	25,856	37,228	+44.0
12	Scientific instruments and equipment	172,626	427,168	+147.5	27,879	87,019	+212.1	22,437	30,043	+33.9
13	Other durable products	63,270	148,352	+134.5	4,317	21,369	+395.0	3,419	7,185	+110.1
831	Nondurables	15,191,523	31,272,280	+105.9	1,279,461	3,496,255	+173.3	1,078,310	1,593,646	+47.8
31	Apparel	140,994	233,465	+65.5	7,100	27,148	+282.4	5,882	9,464	+60.9
23	Men's and boys' clothing	121,343	201,752	+66.3	5,983	22,766	+280.5	4,948	8,130	+64.3
8	Women's and misses' clothing	19,651	31,713	+61.4	1,117	4,382	+292.3	934	1,334	+42.8
72	Chemicals	1,526,610	3,588,959	+135.1	277,307	682,389	+146.1	2,345,593	261,530	+11.5
18	Drugs, soap, toilet preparations, etc	266,116	614,777	+131.0	40,184	108,432	+169.8	32,740	40,544	+23.8
23	Industrial chemicals	840,913	2,072,478	+146.5	198,512	462,685	+133.1	169,903	178,289	+4.9
9	Paints, varnishes, and colors	183,543	387,672	+111.2	12,201	32,941	+170.0	10,171	14,805	+45.6
13	Other chemical products	109,757	222,909	+103.1	7,358	23,650	+221.4	6,096	9,058	+48.6
9	Synthetic fibers—rayon	126,281	291,123	+130.5	19,052	54,681	+187.0	15,683	18,834	+20.1
224	Food and kindred products	5,122,354	10,746,249	+109.8	213,588	750,656	+251.5	174,462	271,193	+55.4
34	Bakery products	315,495	563,924	+78.7	15,550	47,233	+203.7	12,638	16,474	+30.4
29	Beverages—alcoholic	308,179	1,204,678	+290.9	33,237	155,958	+369.2	26,722	48,760	+82.5
8	Beverages—nonalcoholic	38,565	75,099	+94.7	5,677	14,088	+148.2	4,477	5,930	+32.5
27	Canned and frozen foods	185,446	342,405	+84.6	6,348	29,916	+371.3	5,083	10,233	+101.3
12	Confectionery products	103,373	234,216	+126.6	11,612	43,563	+275.2	9,413	13,591	+44.4
13	Dairy products	821,214	1,631,030	+98.6	31,115	119,660	+284.6	25,777	37,849	+46.8
8	Grain-mill products	188,418	407,584	+116.3	22,928	39,715	+73.2	18,635	18,200	−2.3
46	Meat products	2,430,427	4,930,036	+102.8	24,491	163,100	+566.0	19,238	49,460	+157.1
25	Sugar	371,156	620,796	+67.3	26,539	64,512	+143.1	22,260	39,712	+78.4
22	Other food preparations	360,080	736,481	+104.5	36,091	72,911	+102.0	30,219	30,984	+2.5
43	Leather and leather products	366,937	663,482	+80.8	18,064	54,840	+203.6	14,967	19,855	+32.7
32	Footwear and findings	302,156	541,956	+79.4	17,199	41,837	+143.3	14,380	16,147	+12.3
11	Tanned and finished leather	64,781	121,526	+87.6	865	13,003	+1,403.2	587	3,708	+531.7
73	Paper and allied products	621,175	1,283,078	+106.6	39,402	160,670	+307.8	31,049	56,095	+80.7
26	Converted paper products	174,147	359,514	+106.4	11,687	45,498	+289.3	9,030	15,767	+74.6
47	Paper and pulp mills	447,028	923,564	+106.6	27,715	115,172	+315.6	22,019	40,328	+83.2
39	Petroleum and coal products	4,438,562	7,847,115	+76.8	500,871	1,046,431	+108.9	435,850	708,461	+62.5
34	Petroleum refining	4,377,353	7,726,980	+76.5	498,280	1,036,537	+108.0	433,685	704,347	+62.4
5	Petroleum and coal products	61,209	120,135	+96.3	2,591	9,894	+281.9	2,165	4,114	+90.0
47	Printing and publishing	297,525	514,451	+72.9	24,234	103,072	+325.3	19,502	33,868	+73.7
5	Bookbinding and printing trade services	20,325	35,192	+73.1	1,785	5,960	+233.9	1,385	2,178	+57.3
19	Commercial printing	52,168	91,152	+74.7	3,550	13,240	+273.0	2,880	4,554	+58.1
23	Periodicals and books	225,032	388,107	+72.5	18,899	83,872	+343.8	15,237	27,136	+78.1
14	Rubber products	719,509	2,470,931	+243.4	42,792	266,439	+522.6	35,067	78,188	+123.0
11	Tires and inner tubes	708,327	2,433,981	+243.6	42,015	262,350	+524.4	34,430	76,855	+123.2
3	Other rubber products	11,182	36,950	+230.4	777	4,089	+426.3	637	1,333	+109.3
269	Textile-mill products	949,137	2,167,953	+128.4	42,099	251,052	+496.3	33,042	80,614	+144.0
7	Carpets, rugs, etc	108,836	241,374	+121.8	9,467	21,883	+131.2	7,802	8,620	+10.5
115	Cotton textiles	373,796	882,282	+136.0	16,737	93,817	+460.5	13,208	30,016	+127.3
28	Knitted goods	95,077	137,246	+44.4	4,779	17,990	+276.4	3,890	6,104	+56.9
14	Rayon and silk	80,216	214,830	+167.8	3,029	26,805	+784.9	2,368	8,167	+244.9
76	Woolens and worsteds	217,504	535,118	+146.0	4,394	70,617	+1,507.1	2,972	20,322	+583.8
29	Other textile products	73,708	157,103	+113.1	3,693	19,940	+439.9	2,802	7,385	+163.6
19	Tobacco products	1,008,720	1,756,597	+74.1	114,004	153,558	+34.7	93,896	74,378	−20.8
6	Cigarettes	906,521	1,609,130	+77.5	100,000	130,568	+30.6	82,152	63,674	−22.5
8	Cigars	63,455	103,547	+63.2	4,977	13,521	+171.7	4,037	5,434	+34.5
5	Other tobacco products	38,744	43,920	+13.4	9,027	9,469	+4.9	7,707	5,270	−31.6
87	Mining	985,591	1,811,169	+83.8	158,382	331,406	+109.2	136,849	203,307	+48.6
4	Anthracite coal	93,592	163,715	+74.9	−5,001	12,783	NC	−5,415	9,446	NC
17	Bituminous and other soft coal	150,725	295,824	+96.3	96	28,574	+28,764.6	−592	16,745	NC
34	Crude petroleum and natural gas	185,290	284,450	+53.5	32,629	59,940	+83.7	29,858	48,677	+63.0
23	Metal mining	511,437	991,199	+93.8	115,486	202,116	+75.0	99,366	111,851	+12.6
9	Copper	392,577	846,307	+115.6	78,260	173,937	+122.3	67,210	91,944	+36.8
6	Gold and silver	42,413	10,390	−75.5	17,214	−52	NC	14,613	−396	NC
5	Lead and zinc	37,413	61,967	+65.6	7,185	10,855	+51.1	6,326	8,208	+29.8
3	Other metals	39,034	72,535	+85.8	12,827	17,376	+35.5	11,217	12,095	+7.8
9	Nonmetallic mining and quarrying	44,547	75,981	+70.6	15,172	27,993	+84.5	13,632	16,588	+21.7

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Net sales and profits before and after taxes 1936–39 average and 1944, 1,743 large industrial corporations (by major and minor industry groups)*—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Number of companies	Industrial group	Net sales			Profits before income taxes			Profits after taxes		
		1936–39 average	1944 [1]	Percent change	1936–39 average	1944 [1 2]	Percent change	1936–39 average	1944 [1]	Percent change
7	Construction	$41,503	$62,193	+49.9	$2,272	$3,614	+59.1	$1,883	$1,844	−2.1
21	Services	235,046	458,683	+95.1	17,551	110,643	+530.4	15,085	40,060	+169.5
6	Amusements	187,987	394,857	+110.0	13,722	100,611	+633.2	11,910	36,082	+203.0
15	Other	47,059	63,826	+35.6	3,829	10,032	+162.0	3,176	4,578	+44.1
39	Transportation (excluding railroads)	268,588	513,110	+91.0	14,594	91,877	+529.6	11,073	41,905	+278.5
6	Air	44,060	162,829	+269.6	1,255	28,895	+2,202.4	795	16,779	+2,007.9
8	Warehousing and storage	12,263	30,958	+152.5	358	6,187	+1,628.2	243	2,439	+903.7
11	Water	68,161	47,807	−29.9	2,747	11,705	+326.1	1,991	6,125	+207.6
14	Other [3]	144,104	271,516	+88.4	10,234	45,090	+340.6	8,043	16,563	+105.9
132	Trade	4,985,439	8,798,387	+76.5	248,188	745,616	+200.4	203,344	249,826	+22.9
117	Retail	4,665,533	8,126,656	+74.2	240,769	699,127	+190.4	197,287	236,509	+19.9
19	Apparel and accessories	210,680	407,589	+93.5	8,733	40,212	+360.5	6,983	13,045	+86.8
7	Drugs	128,953	225,590	+76.2	6,091	18,832	+200.5	5,054	6,550	+29.6
10	Eating and drinking places	101,684	155,215	+52.6	4,268	12,435	+184.7	3,479	5,910	+69.9
13	Food [4]	917,123	1,738,742	+89.6	14,262	42,568	+198.5	11,606	17,367	+49.6
5	Furniture and housefurnishings	38,657	49,886	+29.0	2,307	7,336	+218.0	1,870	2,292	+22.6
59	General merchandise	3,162,955	5,398,065	+70.7	197,551	566,908	+187.0	162,401	186,566	+14.9
41	Department stores	1,256,516	2,274,607	+81.0	55,337	246,969	+346.3	45,519	72,830	+60.0
12	Limited price variety stores	864,394	1,403,058	+62.3	72,738	161,876	+122.5	61,621	55,910	−9.3
6	Mail-order houses	1,042,045	1,720,400	+65.1	69,476	158,063	+127.5	55,261	57,826	+4.6
4	Other retail stores	106,381	151,569	+42.5	7,457	11,266	+52.4	5,894	4,779	−18.9
15	Wholesale	319,906	671,731	+110.0	7,419	46,489	+526.6	6,057	13,317	+119.9

[1] Renegotiation reserves have been deducted from sales as well as profits in every case where the amount set aside was shown as a current liability, or was known to be included in the provision for income taxes. Total deductions from before-tax profits for renegotiation reserves amounted to $475,200,000.

[2] Does not include $14,300,000 of refunds resulting from carry-back of prior years' excess-profits taxes.

[3] Includes highway and pipe-line transportation, services incidental to transportation, and radio broadcasting.

[4] Represents food chains only. Since independent food stores are, for the most part, small and unincorporated, their profits are not reported in the usual sources.

NOTE.—Profits are shown before minority interest and contingency reserves which are deemed to be nonallowable appropriations from current income. Amounts disallowed for these items were as follows: 1936–39 average—$73,400,000; 1944—$444,900,000.

NC—Not computed because of an average deficit in the base years 1936–39.

Source: Basic financial data from OPA Financial Reports, Moody's Industrials, and Standard & Poor's Corporation Records.

TABLE II.—*Returns on sales and net worth before and after taxes, 1936–39 average and 1944, 1,743 large industrial corporations (by major and minor industry groups)*

Number of companies	Industrial group	Profits before income taxes—as a percentage of—				Profits after taxes—as a percentage of—			
		Net sales		Net worth [1]		Net sales		Net worth [1]	
		1936–39 average	1944	1936–39 average	1944	1936–39 average	1944	1936–39 average	1944
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1,743	Total of all companies	8.6	10.8	9.7	25.1	7.1	4.3	8.0	9.9
1,457	Manufacturing	9.1	10.7	9.7	25.4	7.5	4.2	8.1	9.9
626	Durables	10.1	10.4	10.2	30.6	8.1	3.4	8.3	10.2
47	Automobiles and equipment	11.6	9.7	20.0	38.7	9.4	3.3	16.2	13.3
17	Motor vehicles	12.2	9.2	21.1	33.4	9.9	3.4	17.1	12.5
30	Motor vehicle parts and accessories	7.0	11.3	12.5	67.6	5.6	3.0	10.0	17.8
17	Furniture and finished lumber products	7.1	12.0	10.7	29.4	5.8	4.0	8.7	9.8
9	Household and office furniture and fixtures	7.2	11.7	14.4	33.0	5.9	4.1	11.8	11.5
8	Other wood products	7.0	12.4	8.1	26.3	5.7	3.9	6.7	8.4
124	Iron and steel and their products	7.1	9.3	5.5	18.3	5.6	3.5	4.3	6.8
34	Blast furnaces and rolling mills	6.6	8.4	4.8	14.8	5.2	3.4	3.8	6.0
5	Fabricated structural metal products	3.2	4.7	4.8	89.3	2.4	1.4	3.7	27.5
13	Foundry products	6.8	9.5	6.1	22.2	5.4	2.9	4.8	6.6
25	Heating apparatus and plumbers' supplies	9.1	14.6	8.6	26.1	6.9	4.7	6.6	8.4
8	Metal stamping and coating	4.9	16.9	6.1	64.1	3.7	4.7	4.7	17.9
3	Tin cans and other tinware	10.0	8.7	8.4	14.0	8.4	4.2	7.1	6.7
9	Wire products	8.6	12.3	14.3	36.3	7.0	3.8	11.5	11.3
27	Other iron and steel products	11.3	12.1	10.7	36.9	8.6	3.7	8.2	11.3
25	Lumber and timber basic products	1.8	9.6	1.5	17.2	1.3	4.4	1.1	7.9
63	Machinery—electrical	11.9	12.8	13.6	48.1	9.8	3.7	11.2	13.9
17	Communication equipment	7.8	10.7	12.1	50.7	6.3	2.8	9.7	13.5
9	Electrical appliances	10.4	14.1	26.5	48.7	8.1	5.3	20.7	18.3
25	Industrial electrical equipment	14.5	13.7	14.3	47.9	12.1	4.1	11.8	14.3
12	Other electrical products	6.6	11.5	9.5	45.4	5.5	2.9	7.9	11.4
180	Machinery—nonelectrical	12.5	13.6	12.2	34.6	10.0	4.2	9.8	10.7
10	Agricultural machinery and tractors	12.3	10.9	10.8	21.4	9.6	3.8	8.4	7.5
28	Construction and mining machinery	8.9	11.7	10.9	34.6	7.2	3.7	8.8	10.8
14	Engines and turbines	7.5	13.2	9.5	72.0	6.0	3.2	7.5	17.2
65	General industrial machinery	14.2	16.5	13.3	43.5	11.7	4.9	11.0	13.1
20	Household and service-industrial machinery	8.3	11.4	11.4	32.5	6.8	3.9	9.3	11.2
19	Metalworking machinery	16.6	18.9	26.3	63.9	13.1	5.1	20.8	17.2
5	Office and store machinery and devices	17.7	17.9	15.6	31.9	14.4	5.8	12.7	10.4
19	Special-industry machinery	11.4	12.6	9.5	44.6	9.4	3.9	7.9	13.9
50	Nonferrous metals and their products	9.0	10.3	9.8	22.2	7.3	3.4	8.0	7.3
10	Jewelry, silverware, watches, etc	9.3	14.5	10.0	28.8	7.4	4.3	8.0	8.6
3	Lighting fixtures	3.2	10.0	4.0	18.7	2.6	3.3	3.2	6.2
16	Other nonferrous metal products	9.0	10.1	14.8	56.6	7.4	2.7	12.1	15.1
21	Smelting, refining, and rolling	9.0	9.7	9.3	16.1	7.3	3.6	7.6	6.0
63	Stone, clay, and glass products	12.7	12.5	10.2	15.9	10.4	5.3	8.4	6.7
9	Abrasives, asbestos, etc	8.8	13.2	11.5	27.8	7.1	4.9	9.3	10.4
21	Cement	12.0	4.2	6.0	2.2	10.1	1.4	5.0	0.8
5	Concrete, gypsum and plaster products	14.9	10.4	9.9	9.9	12.6	5.8	8.4	5.5
2	Flat glass	18.9	18.4	15.2	21.3	15.4	9.8	12.4	11.3
8	Glassware—Pressed or blown	11.0	13.3	14.4	29.6	9.0	4.5	11.8	9.9
4	Pottery	10.1	12.9	19.7	31.9	8.4	4.5	16.4	11.1
14	Structural clay products	12.1	7.5	6.1	6.6	9.8	3.8	5.0	3.3
32	Transportation equipment (excluding autos)	9.0	7.9	7.1	62.3	7.3	2.3	5.8	18.5
17	Aircraft and parts	13.3	7.2	20.7	92.0	10.7	2.1	16.7	26.6
10	Railroad equipment	7.5	12.6	4.1	28.7	6.1	4.1	3.4	9.4
5	Ship and boat building and repairing	5.6	6.4	12.4	75.8	4.5	2.0	10.1	23.1

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Returns on sales and net worth before and after taxes, 1936–39 average and 1944, 1,743 large industrial corporations (by major and minor industry groups)*—Continued

Number of companies	Industrial group	Profits before income taxes—as a percentage of—				Profits after taxes—as a percentage of—			
		Net sales		Net worth [1]		Net sales		Net worth [1]	
		1936–39 average	1944	1936–39 average	1944	1936–39 average	1944	1936–39 average	1944
	Manufacturing—Continued								
	Durables—Continued	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
25	Miscellaneous durables	13.6	18.8	13.5	34.0	11.0	6.5	10.8	11.7
12	Scientific instruments and equipment	16.1	20.4	14.5	33.7	13.0	7.0	11.7	11.6
13	Other durable products	6.8	14.4	9.2	35.2	5.4	4.8	7.3	11.8
831	Nondurables	8.4	11.2	9.4	21.4	7.1	5.1	7.9	9.8
31	Apparel	5.0	11.6	8.6	28.0	4.2	4.1	7.2	9.7
23	Men's and boys' clothing	4.9	11.3	7.9	25.9	4.1	4.0	6.5	9.3
8	Women's and misses' clothing	5.7	13.8	17.5	47.5	4.8	4.2	14.6	14.5
72	Chemicals	18.2	19.0	14.0	26.9	15.4	7.3	11.8	10.3
18	Drugs, soap, toilet preparations, etc	15.1	17.6	25.1	43.6	12.3	6.6	20.5	16.3
23	Industrial chemicals	23.6	22.3	14.3	26.5	20.2	8.6	12.2	10.2
9	Paints, varnishes, and colors	6.6	8.5	8.3	18.3	5.5	3.8	6.9	8.2
13	Other chemical products	6.7	10.6	10.2	24.4	5.6	4.1	8.4	9.3
9	Synthetic fibers—rayon	15.1	18.8	8.8	20.2	12.4	6.5	7.3	7.0
224	Food and kindred products	4.2	7.0	9.0	27.8	3.4	2.5	7.4	10.0
34	Bakery products	4.9	8.4	8.1	27.7	4.0	2.9	6.6	9.6
29	Beverages—alcoholic	10.8	12.9	17.5	53.9	8.7	4.0	14.0	16.8
8	Beverages—nonalcoholic	14.7	18.8	23.1	37.6	11.6	7.9	18.2	15.8
27	Canned and frozen foods	3.4	8.7	5.4	20.7	2.7	3.0	4.3	7.1
12	Confectionery products	11.2	18.6	20.2	55.1	9.1	5.8	16.3	17.2
13	Dairy products	3.8	7.3	10.3	33.6	3.1	2.3	8.6	10.6
8	Grain-mill products	12.2	9.7	25.2	28.5	9.9	4.5	20.5	13.0
46	Meat products	1.0	3.3	4.1	24.8	.8	1.0	3.2	7.5
25	Sugar	7.2	10.4	5.9	13.6	6.0	6.4	5.0	8.4
22	Other food preparations	10.0	9.9	10.5	20.5	8.4	4.2	8.8	8.7
43	Leather and leather products	4.9	8.3	8.6	22.0	4.1	3.0	7.2	8.0
32	Footwear and findings	5.7	7.7	9.6	20.0	4.8	3.0	8.1	7.7
11	Tanned and finished leather	1.3	10.7	2.8	32.4	0.9	3.1	1.9	9.2
73	Paper and allied products	6.3	12.5	5.6	18.4	5.0	4.4	4.4	6.4
26	Converted paper products	6.7	12.7	9.4	26.2	5.2	4.4	7.2	9.1
47	Paper and pulp mills	6.2	12.5	4.8	16.5	4.9	4.4	3.8	5.8
39	Petroleum and coal products	11.3	13.3	8.3	14.6	9.8	9.0	7.3	9.9
34	Petroleum refining	11.4	13.4	8.4	14.6	9.9	9.1	7.3	9.9
5	Petroleum and coal products	4.2	8.2	5.4	15.7	3.5	3.4	4.5	6.5
47	Printing and publishing	8.1	20.0	8.2	35.1	6.6	6.6	6.6	11.5
5	Bookbinding and printing trade services	8.8	16.9	7.3	22.3	6.8	6.2	5.7	8.1
19	Commercial printing	6.8	14.5	10.7	29.8	5.5	5.0	8.7	10.3
23	Periodicals and books	8.4	21.6	7.9	37.8	6.8	7.0	6.4	12.2
14	Rubber products	5.9	10.8	8.9	44.0	4.9	3.2	7.3	12.9
11	Tires and inner tubes	5.9	10.8	8.9	44.3	4.9	3.2	7.3	13.0
3	Other rubber products	6.9	11.1	7.6	30.0	5.7	3.6	6.2	9.8
269	Textile-mill products	4.4	11.6	5.4	25.3	3.5	3.7	4.2	8.1
7	Carpets, rugs, etc	8.7	9.1	8.0	15.9	7.2	3.6	6.6	6.3
115	Cotton textiles	4.5	10.6	5.2	22.7	3.5	3.4	4.1	7.2
28	Knitted goods	5.0	13.1	9.1	29.4	4.1	4.4	7.4	10.0
14	Rayon and silk	3.8	12.5	7.1	34.0	3.0	3.8	5.5	10.4
76	Woolens and worsteds	2.0	13.2	2.6	32.7	1.4	3.8	1.8	9.4
29	Other textile products	5.0	12.7	4.9	23.0	3.8	4.7	3.7	8.5
19	Tobacco products	11.3	8.7	16.2	19.2	9.3	4.2	13.4	9.3
6	Cigarettes	11.0	8.1	17.6	19.7	9.1	4.0	14.5	9.6
8	Cigars	7.8	13.1	7.9	19.7	6.4	5.2	6.4	7.9
5	Other tobacco products	23.3	21.6	12.8	14.2	19.9	12.0	11.0	7.9
87	Mining	16.1	18.3	7.3	14.1	13.9	11.2	6.3	8.6
4	Anthracite coal	−5.3	7.8	−3.8	11.5	−5.8	5.8	−4.1	8.5
17	Bituminous and other soft coal	.1	9.7	0	10.0	−.4	5.7	−.2	5.9
34	Crude petroleum and natural gas	17.6	21.1	8.9	15.8	16.1	17.1	8.2	12.8
23	Metal mining	22.6	20.4	8.9	13.8	19.4	11.3	7.6	7.6
9	Copper	19.9	20.6	7.4	14.3	17.1	10.9	6.4	7.5
6	Gold and silver	40.6	−.5	27.8	−.1	34.5	−3.8	23.6	−.6
5	Lead and zinc	19.2	17.5	13.3	18.5	16.9	13.2	11.7	14.0
3	Other metals	32.9	24.0	9.8	13.7	28.7	16.7	8.6	9.5
9	Nonmetallic mining and quarrying	34.1	36.8	14.2	24.9	30.6	21.8	12.8	14.7
7	Construction	5.5	5.8	10.9	14.8	4.5	3.0	9.0	7.6
21	Services	7.5	24.1	10.2	43.2	6.4	8.9	8.8	15.9
6	Amusements	7.3	25.5	10.5	47.2	6.3	9.1	9.1	16.9
15	Other	8.1	15.7	9.2	23.5	6.7	7.2	7.6	10.7
39	Transportation (excluding railroads)	5.4	17.9	5.2	24.3	4.1	8.2	3.9	11.1
6	Air	2.8	17.7	3.1	26.0	1.8	10.3	2.0	15.1
8	Warehousing and storage	2.9	20.0	.9	15.8	2.0	7.9	.6	6.2
11	Water	4.0	24.5	3.3	13.7	2.9	12.8	2.4	7.2
14	Other [2]	7.1	16.6	8.7	31.5	5.6	6.1	6.8	11.6
132	Trade	5.0	8.5	12.6	30.0	4.1	2.8	10.3	10.1
117	Retail	5.2	8.6	12.9	29.8	4.2	2.9	10.6	10.1
19	Apparel and accessories	4.1	9.9	12.9	39.8	3.3	3.2	10.3	12.9
7	Drugs	4.8	8.1	16.0	35.8	3.9	2.9	13.3	12.8
10	Eating and drinking places	4.3	8.0	6.0	17.1	3.4	3.8	4.8	8.1
13	Food	1.6	2.4	8.6	21.4	1.3	1.0	7.0	8.7
5	Furniture and housefurnishings	6.0	14.7	8.5	23.7	4.8	4.6	6.9	7.4
59	General merchandise	6.2	10.5	13.7	31.0	5.1	3.5	11.2	10.2
41	Department stores	4.4	10.9	10.8	39.5	3.6	3.2	8.9	11.6
12	Limited-price variety stores	8.4	11.5	15.1	28.5	7.1	4.0	12.8	9.8
6	Mail-order houses	6.7	9.2	15.4	24.9	5.3	3.4	12.2	9.1
4	Other retail stores	7.0	7.5	15.6	18.6	5.5	3.2	12.3	7.8
15	Wholesale	2.3	6.9	6.6	33.9	1.9	2.0	5.4	9.7

[1] Net worth is the sum of common and preferred stocks, surplus, and surplus reserves. Calculations are based on the average of net worth at the beginning and end of each year.

[2] Includes highway and pipe-line transportation, services incidental to transportation, and radio broadcasting.

NOTE.—Percentage returns are based on profits before minority interest and contingency reserves which are deemed to be nonallowable appropriations from current income. Renegotiation reserves were allowed as an expense and deducted from profits in every case where the amount set aside was shown as a current liability, or was known to be included in the provision for income taxes. For amount of deductions, see table 1.

Source: Basic financial data from OPA Financial Reports, Moody's Industrials, and Standard & Poor's Corporation Records.

TABLE III.—*The structure of capital—1936–39 and 1944 capital stock, surplus, and long-term debt 1,743 large industrial corporations (by major and minor industry groups)*

[Dollars in thousands]

Number of companies	Industrial group	1936–39 average					1944[1]					Percentage increase or decrease, 1936–39 average to 1944				
		Invested capital[2]	Net worth[3]	Long-term debt[4]	Capital stock[5]	Surplus[6]	Invested capital[2]	Net worth[3]	Long-term debt[4]	Capital stock[5]	Surplus[6]	Invested capital	Net worth	Long-term debt	Capital stock	Surplus
		Dol.	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*					
1,743	Total of all companies	31,750,043	28,029,664	3,720,379	17,903,697	10,125,967	39,338,324	35,266,661	4,071,663	17,822,110	17,444,551	23.9	25.8	9.4	−0.5	72.3
1,457	Manufacturing	26,522,081	23,404,742	3,117,339	15,050,814	8,353,928	33,229,441	29,653,242	3,576,199	15,039,424	14,613,818	25.3	26.7	14.7	−.1	74.9
626	Durables	10,943,239	9,785,329	1,157,910	6,431,683	3,353,646	13,992,609	12,944,807	1,047,802	6,438,385	6,506,422	27.9	32.3	−9.5	.1	94.0
47	Automobiles and equipment	1,556,095	1,528,269	27,826	792,089	736,180	2,291,009	2,282,411	8,598	827,288	1,455,123	47.2	49.3	−69.1	4.4	97.7
17	Motor vehicles	1,350,440	1,336,537	13,903	699,602	636,935	1,921,724	1,917,500	4,224	717,111	1,200,389	42.3	43.5	−69.6	2.5	88.5
30	Motor vehicle parts and accessories	205,655	191,732	13,923	92,487	99,245	369,285	364,911	4,374	110,177	254,734	79.6	90.3	−68.6	19.1	156.7
17	Furniture and finished lumber products	92,832	78,239	14,593	50,563	27,676	108,909	98,679	10,230	48,623	50,056	17.3	26.1	−29.9	−3.8	80.9
9	Household and office furniture and fixtures	44,191	31,490	12,701	14,611	16,879	55,065	45,366	9,699	15,140	30,226	24.6	44.1	−23.6	3.6	79.1
8	Other wood products	48,641	46,749	1,892	35,952	10,797	53,844	53,313	531	33,483	19,830	10.7	14.0	−71.9	−6.9	83.7
124	Iron and steel and their products	4,866,841	4,019,750	847,091	2,969,584	1,050,166	5,430,479	4,719,814	710,665	2,779,560	1,940,254	11.6	17.4	−16.1	−6.4	84.8
24	Blast furnaces and rolling mills	4,024,466	3,255,352	769,114	2,461,078	794,274	4,348,943	3,755,536	593,407	2,320,576	1,434,960	8.1	15.4	−22.9	−5.7	80.7
5	Fabricated structural metal products	12,679	9,260	3,419	7,388	1,872	24,948	24,139	809	10,655	13,484	96.8	160.7	−76.3	44.2	620.3
13	Foundry products	114,488	87,543	26,945	59,776	27,767	146,479	122,510	23,969	49,199	73,311	27.9	39.9	−11.1	−17.7	164.0
15	Heating apparatus and plumbers' supplies	326,848	301,441	25,407	217,810	83,631	337,048	330,201	6,847	200,155	130,046	3.1	9.5	−73.1	−8.1	55.5
8	Metal stamping and coating	70,680	61,310	9,370	27,847	33,463	130,638	89,234	41,404	27,694	61,540	84.8	45.5	341.9	−0.6	83.9
3	Tin cans and other tinware	132,488	129,916	2,572	80,922	48,994	156,820	121,820	35,000	66,038	55,782	18.4	−6.2	1,260.8	−18.4	13.9
9	Wire products	35,133	31,825	3,308	19,343	12,482	53,898	50,719	3,179	19,628	31,091	53.4	59.4	−3.9	1.5	149.1
27	Other iron and steel products	150,059	143,103	6,956	95,420	47,683	231,705	225,655	6,050	85,615	140,040	54.4	57.7	−13.0	−10.3	193.7
25	Lumber and timber basic products	74,099	59,499	14,600	41,679	17,820	72,138	64,924	7,214	41,037	23,887	−2.7	9.1	−50.6	−1.6	34.0
63	Machinery—Electrical	806,697	775,147	31,550	462,046	313,101	1,185,884	1,098,063	87,821	496,010	602,053	47.0	41.7	178.4	7.4	92.3
17	Communication equipment	120,191	109,438	10,753	63,056	46,382	230,907	174,344	56,563	66,681	107,663	92.1	59.3	426.0	5.7	132.1
9	Electrical appliances	14,794	14,046	748	6,341	7,705	24,617	24,332	285	9,602	14,730	66.4	73.2	−61.9	51.4	91.2
25	Industrial electrical equipment	563,338	561,148	2,190	337,984	223,164	795,672	772,701	22,971	367,795	404,906	41.2	37.7	948.9	8.8	81.4
12	Other electrical products	108,374	90,515	17,859	54,665	35,850	134,688	126,686	8,002	51,932	74,754	24.3	40.0	−55.2	−5.0	108.5
180	Machinery—Non-electrical	1,576,844	1,495,546	81,298	980,478	515,068	2,153,690	2,069,842	83,848	1,083,875	985,967	36.6	38.4	3.1	10.5	91.4
10	Agricultural machinery and tractors	638,712	616,623	22,089	422,189	194,434	879,379	838,379	41,000	530,570	307,809	37.7	36.0	85.6	25.7	58.3
28	Construction and mining machinery	124,980	115,056	9,924	88,865	26,191	162,743	162,435	308	93,187	69,248	30.2	41.2	−96.9	4.9	164.4
14	Engines and turbines	63,259	56,655	6,604	34,602	22,053	102,508	102,408	100	33,718	68,690	62.0	80.8	−98.5	−2.6	211.5
65	General industrial machinery	341,484	337,248	4,236	223,549	113,699	458,732	455,420	3,312	218,876	236,544	34.3	35.0	−21.8	−2.1	108.0
20	Household and service-industries machinery	98,277	87,603	10,674	48,834	38,769	128,295	115,702	12,593	43,709	71,993	30.5	32.1	18.0	−10.5	85.7
19	Metalworking machinery	41,505	39,186	2,319	17,471	21,715	93,163	93,163	----------	19,387	73,776	124.5	137.7	−100.0	11.0	239.7
5	Office and store machinery and devices	180,005	162,169	17,836	89,946	72,223	217,510	195,810	21,700	99,464	96,346	20.8	20.7	21.7	10.6	33.4
19	Special-industry machinery	88,622	81,006	7,616	55,022	25,984	111,360	106,525	4,835	44,964	61,561	25.7	31.5	−36.5	−18.3	136.9
50	Nonferrous metals and their products	547,500	507,666	39,834	341,434	166,232	685,897	635,033	50,864	342,146	292,887	25.3	25.1	27.7	.2	76.2
10	Jewelry, silverware, watches, etc	56,912	56,703	209	39,354	17,349	72,074	71,946	128	35,210	36,736	26.6	26.9	−38.8	−10.5	111.7
3	Lighting fixtures	4,720	3,977	743	3,400	577	5,532	4,966	566	2,509	2,457	17.2	24.9	−23.8	−26.2	325.8
16	Other nonferrous metal products	45,648	41,822	3,826	22,822	19,000	111,764	74,706	37,058	25,188	49,518	144.8	78.6	868.6	10.4	160.6
21	Smelting, refining and rolling	440,220	405,164	35,056	275,858	129,306	496,527	483,415	13,112	279,239	204,176	12.8	19.3	−62.6	1.2	57.9
63	Stone, clay, and glass products	638,281	577,952	60,329	357,961	219,991	723,716	690,843	32,873	358,259	332,584	13.4	19.5	−45.5	.1	51.2
9	Abrasives, asbestos, etc	77,491	71,037	6,454	39,447	31,590	110,677	104,188	6,489	47,911	56,277	42.8	46.7	.5	21.5	78.1

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*The structure of capital—1936–39 and 1944 capital stock, surplus, and long-term debt 1,743 large industrial corporations (by major and minor industry groups)*—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Number of companies	Industrial group	1936–39 average					1944 [1]					Percentage increase or decrease, 1936–39 average to 1944				
		Invested capital [2]	Net worth [3]	Long-term debt [4]	Capital stock [5]	Surplus [6]	Invested capital [2]	Net worth [3]	Long-term debt [4]	Capital stock [5]	Surplus [6]	Invested capital	Net worth	Long-term debt	Capital stock	Surplus
	Manufacturing—Continued															
	Durables—Continued															
	Stone, clay and glass products—Con.	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*					
21	Cement	177,308	149,091	28,217	103,247	45,844	165,832	156,940	8,892	98,775	58,165	−6.5	5.3	−68.5	−4.3	26.9
5	Concrete, gypsum, and plaster products	94,566	84,784	9,782	49,261	35,523	114,110	105,096	9,014	50,071	55,025	20.7	24.0	−7.9	1.6	54.9
2	Flat glass	103,396	103,296	100	54,470	48,826	128,371	128,321	50	55,746	72,575	24.2	24.2	−50.0	2.3	48.6
8	Glassware—pressed or blown	96,240	86,192	10,048	52,155	34,037	119,282	116,223	3,059	49,732	66,491	23.9	34.8	−69.6	−4.7	95.3
4	Pottery	2,271	2,027	244	1,011	1,016	2,791	2,791	----------	1,011	1,780	22.9	37.7	−100.0	0	75.2
14	Structural clay products	87,009	81,525	5,484	58,370	23,155	82,653	77,284	5,369	55,013	22,271	−5.0	−5.2	−2.1	−5.8	−3.8
32	Transportation equipment (excluding autos)	542,892	504,707	38,185	304,640	200,067	1,007,034	956,843	50,191	289,696	667,147	85.5	89.6	31.4	−4.9	233.5
17	Aircraft and parts	79,106	77,394	1,712	37,102	40,292	478,571	476,224	2,347	77,925	398,299	505.0	515.3	37.1	110.0	888.5
10	Railroad equipment	433,312	401,165	32,147	258,698	142,567	463,954	417,436	46,518	204,897	212,539	7.1	4.1	44.7	−20.8	49.1
1	Ship and boat building and repairing	30,474	26,148	4,326	8,940	17,208	64,509	63,183	1,326	6,874	56,309	111.7	141.6	−69.4	−23.1	227.2
25	Miscellaneous durables	241,158	238,554	2,604	131,209	107,345	333,853	328,355	5,498	171,891	156,464	38.4	37.6	111.1	31.0	45.8
12	Scientific instruments and equipment	192,694	191,883	1,811	104,826	87,057	296,497	295,160	1,337	127,346	137,814	37.6	28.2	−26.2	21.5	58.3
13	Other durable products	47,464	46,671	793	26,383	20,288	67,356	63,195	4,161	44,545	18,650	41.9	35.4	424.7	68.8	−8.1
231	Nondurables	15,578,842	13,619,413	1,959,429	8,619,131	5,000,282	19,236,832	16,708,435	2,528,397	8,601,639	8,107,396	23.5	22.7	29.0	−.2	62.1
31	Apparel	83,308	82,102	1,206	44,346	37,756	105,474	98,687	6,787	43,687	55,000	26.6	20.2	462.8	−1.5	45.7
23	Men's and boys' clothing	76,786	75,709	1,077	29,746	35,963	95,920	89,163	6,757	39,661	49,502	24.9	17.8	527.4	−.2	37.6
8	Women's and misses' clothing	6,522	6,393	129	4,600	1,793	9,554	9,524	30	4,026	5,498	46.5	49.0	−76.8	−12.5	206.6
72	Chemicals	2,090,384	1,984,190	106,194	1,078,121	906,069	2,759,482	2,608,955	150,527	1,186,642	1,422,313	32.0	31.5	41.7	10.1	57.0
18	Drugs, soap, toilet preparations, etc	197,182	159,838	37,344	85,635	74,203	301,647	257,106	44,541	102,912	154,194	53.0	60.9	19.3	20.2	107.8
23	Industrial chemicals	1,425,524	1,388,668	36,856	738,885	649,783	1,828,393	1,778,094	50,299	797,450	980,644	28.3	28.0	36.5	7.9	50.9
9	Paints, varnishes, and colors	153,446	147,308	6,138	94,746	52,562	200,120	185,677	14,443	97,510	88,167	30.4	26.0	135.3	2.9	67.7
13	Other chemical products	85,205	72,426	12,779	39,980	32,446	107,244	101,809	5,435	44,670	57,139	25.9	40.6	−57.5	11.7	76.1
9	Synthetic fibers, rayon	229,027	215,950	13,077	118,875	97,075	322,078	286,269	35,809	144,100	142,169	40.6	32.6	173.8	21.2	46.5
224	Food and kindred products	2,746,669	2,368,995	377,704	1,553,719	815,276	3,126,366	2,748,083	378,283	1,429,470	1,318,613	13.8	16.0	0.2	−8.0	61.7
34	Bakery products	208,214	191,066	17,148	138,246	52,820	201,455	173,043	28,412	102,915	70,128	−3.3	−9.4	65.7	−25.6	32.8
29	Beverages, alcoholic	235,291	190,458	44,833	105,282	85,176	346,474	305,544	40,930	113,787	191,757	47.3	60.4	−8.7	8.1	125.1
8	Beverages, nonalcoholic	25,621	24,610	1,011	10,742	13,868	38,061	38,061	----------	8,692	29,369	48.6	54.7	−100.0	−19.1	111.8
27	Canned and frozen foods	137,631	118,197	19,434	83,736	34,461	161,374	147,267	14,107	80,660	66,607	17.3	24.6	−27.4	−3.7	93.3
12	Confectionery products	59,084	57,606	1,478	20,596	37,010	82,025	81,612	413	20,183	61,429	38.8	41.7	−72.1	−2.0	66.0
13	Dairy products	370,703	201,256	69,447	198,922	102,334	438,179	363,569	74,610	189,965	173,604	18.2	20.7	7.4	−4.5	69.6
8	Grain-mill products	90,809	90,809	----------	63,249	27,560	141,744	141,685	59	77,332	64,353	56.1	56.0	----------	22.3	133.5
46	Meat products	777,433	604,665	172,768	402,661	202,004	850,738	669,330	181,408	342,160	327,170	9.4	10.7	5.0	−15.0	62.0
25	Sugar	472,785	447,419	25,366	287,942	159,477	485,367	474,079	11,288	275,560	198,579	2.7	6.0	−55.5	−4.3	24.5
22	Other food preparations	369,128	342,909	26,219	242,343	100,566	380,949	353,893	27,056	218,276	135,617	3.2	3.2	3.2	−9.9	34.9
43	Leather and leather products	217,778	208,997	8,781	129,400	79,597	262,667	251,619	11,048	127,121	124,498	20.6	20.4	25.8	−1.8	56.4
32	Footwear and findings	183,436	178,601	4,835	106,717	71,884	217,673	210,497	7,176	104,826	105,671	18.7	17.9	48.4	−1.8	47.0
11	Tanned and finished leather	34,342	30,396	3,946	22,683	7,713	44,994	41,122	3,872	22,295	18,827	31.0	35.3	−1.9	−1.7	144.
73	Paper and allied products	652,304	704,970	247,424	505,884	199,086	1,047,719	891,078	156,641	522,711	368,367	10.0	26.4	−36.7	3.3	85.0
26	Converted paper products	164,144	124,956	39,188	85,058	39,898	212,940	176,452	36,488	93,697	82,755	29.7	41.2	−6.9	10.2	107.4
47	Paper and pulp mills	788,250	580,014	208,236	420,826	159,188	834,779	714,626	120,153	429,014	285,612	5.9	23.2	−42.3	1.9	79.4
39	Petroleum and coal products	6,892,418	6,008,358	884,060	3,805,170	2,203,188	8,625,947	7,353,806	1,282,141	3,828,571	3,525,235	25.3	22.4	45.0	.6	60.0
34	Petroleum refining	6,834,938	5,960,438	874,500	3,767,772	2,192,666	8,560,697	7,287,886	1,272,811	3,787,262	3,500,624	25.2	22.3	45.5	.5	59.
5	Petroleum and coal products	57,480	47,920	9,560	37,398	10,322	75,250	65,920	9,330	41,309	24,611	30.9	37.6	−2.4	1.9	138.4
47	Printing and publishing	350,444	296,699	53,745	179,747	116,952	378,608	320,794	57,814	162,665	158,129	8.0	8.1	7.6	−9.5	35.2
5	Bookbinding and printing trade services	24,341	24,299	42	16,110	8,189	27,178	27,178	----------	16,213	10,965	11.7	11.8	−100.0	.6	33.9
19	Commercial printing	37,309	33,249	4,060	17,125	16,124	48,222	45,245	2,977	16,977	28,268	29.3	36.1	−26.7	−.9	75.3
23	Periodicals and books	288,794	239,151	49,643	146,512	92,639	303,208	248,371	54,837	129,475	118,896	5.0	3.9	10.5	−11.6	28.3

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*The structure of capital—1936–39 and 1944 capital stock, surplus, and long-term debt 1,743 large industrial corporations (by major and minor industry groups)*—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Number of companies	Industrial group	1936–39 average					1944					Percentage increase or decrease, 1936–39 average to 1944				
		Invested capital [2]	Net worth [3]	Long-term debt [4]	Capital stock [5]	Surplus [6]	Invested capital [2]	Net worth [3]	Long-term debt [4]	Capital stock [5]	Surplus [6]	Invested capital	Net worth	Long-term debt	Capital stock	Surplus
	Manufacturing—Con.															
	Nondurables—Con.	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*					
14	Rubber products	654,209	481,307	172,902	360,978	120,329	815,150	623,059	192,091	244,626	278,433	24.6	29.5	11.1	−4.5	131.4
11	Tires and inner tubes	643,358	471,016	172,342	353,537	117,479	800,949	608,947	192,002	238,530	270,417	24.5	29.3	11.4	−4.3	130.2
3	Other rubber products	10,851	10,291	560	7,441	2,850	14,201	14,112	89	6,096	8,016	30.9	37.1	−84.1	−18.1	181.3
269	Textile-mill products	823,560	781,880	41,680	487,271	294,609	1,050,523	1,012,517	38,006	468,480	544,037	27.6	29.5	−8.8	−3.9	84.7
7	Carpets, rugs, etc.	125,050	118,281	6,769	53,118	65,163	139,324	128,879	445	55,459	83,420	11.4	17.4	−93.4	4.4	28.0
115	Cotton textiles	338,058	324,296	13,762	228,701	95,505	435,765	422,007	13,758	209,730	212,277	28.9	30.1	−0.0	−8.3	122.3
28	Knitted goods	55,220	52,271	2,949	34,242	17,929	65,622	59,560	6,062	24,586	34,974	18.8	13.9	105.6	−28.4	95.1
14	Rayon and silk	49,978	42,895	7,083	18,460	24,435	92,936	83,205	9,731	28,456	54,749	86.0	94.0	37.4	54.1	124.1
76	Woolens and worsteds	175,684	169,237	6,447	98,459	70,778	226,683	219,757	6,926	98,110	121,647	29.0	29.9	7.4	−.4	71.9
29	Other textile products	79,570	74,900	4,670	54,101	20,799	90,193	89,109	1,084	52,139	36,970	13.4	19.0	−76.8	−3.6	77.7
19	Tobacco products	767,648	701,915	65,733	474,495	227,420	1,054,896	799,837	255,059	487,066	312,771	37.4	14.0	288.0	2.6	37.5
6	Cigarettes	633,983	568,436	65,547	394,228	174,208	914,079	666,941	247,138	413,428	253,513	44.2	17.3	277.0	4.9	45.5
8	Cigars	63,351	63,165	186	32,672	30,493	74,113	66,192	7,921	26,517	39,675	17.0	4.8	4,158.6	−18.8	30.1
5	Other tobacco products	70,314	70,314		47,595	22,719	66,704	66,704		47,121	19,583	−5.1	−5.1		−1.0	−13.8
87	Mining	2,483,022	2,174,833	308,189	1,348,998	825,835	2,571,736	2,387,876	183,860	1,285,629	1,102,847	3.6	9.8	−40.4	−4.8	33.5
4	Anthracite coal	242,942	130,821	112,121	82,298	48,523	200,498	104,057	96,441	82,479	21,578	−17.5	−20.5	−14.0	0.2	−55.5
17	Bituminous and other soft coal	325,745	272,986	52,759	170,442	96,544	304,062	292,653	11,409	165,625	127,028	−6.7	7.2	−78.4	−6.1	31.6
34	Crude petroleum and natural gas	394,009	364,829	29,180	282,758	82,071	441,336	394,263	47,073	236,635	158,228	12.0	8.1	61.3	−16.5	92.8
23	Metal mining	1,407,698	1,299,719	107,979	751,927	547,792	1,508,169	1,482,854	25,315	750,366	732,488	7.1	14.1	−76.6	−.2	33.7
9	Copper	1,143,702	1,053,382	90,320	655,644	397,738	1,248,534	1,231,716	16,818	655,208	576,508	9.2	16.9	−81.4	−.1	44.9
6	Gold and silver	63,187	61,918	1,269	45,270	16,648	64,870	64,143	727	44,919	19,224	2.7	3.6	−42.7	−.8	15.5
5	Lead and zinc	55,570	54,126	1,444	29,176	24,950	60,412	60,412		28,402	32,010	8.7	11.6	−100.0	−2.7	28.3
3	Other metals	145,239	130,293	14,946	21,837	108,456	134,353	126,583	7,770	21,837	104,746	−7.5	−2.9	−48.0	0	−3.4
9	Nonmetallic mining and quarrying	112,628	106,478	6,150	55,573	50,905	117,671	114,049	3,622	50,524	63,525	4.5	7.1	−41.1	−9.1	24.8
7	Construction	21,909	20,934	975	15,868	5,066	25,062	24,638	424	13,383	11,255	14.4	17.7	−56.5	−15.7	122.2
21	Services	231,237	172,022	59,215	77,024	94,998	319,432	270,959	48,473	81,073	189,886	38.1	57.5	−18.2	5.3	99.9
6	Amusements	178,336	130,264	48,072	50,844	79,420	206,496	227,751	38,745	54,848	172,903	49.4	74.8	−19.4	7.9	117.7
15	Other	52,901	41,758	11,143	26,180	15,578	52,936	43,208	9,728	26,225	16,983	.1	3.5	−12.7	.2	9.0
39	Transportation (excluding railroads)	352,439	281,298	71,201	188,259	92,979	452,322	399,142	53,180	185,765	213,377	28.3	41.9	−25.3	−1.3	129.5
6	Air	45,188	40,437	4,751	22,856	17,581	134,702	122,758	11,944	49,064	73,694	198.1	203.6	151.4	114.7	319.2
8	Warehousing and storage	64,324	39,110	25,214	26,024	13,086	61,128	40,203	20,925	18,998	21,205	−5.0	2.8	−17.6	−27.0	62.0
11	Water	102,518	83,887	18,631	53,177	30,710	90,405	85,170	5,325	42,321	42,849	−11.7	1.5	−71.4	−20.4	39.5
14	Other	140,409	117,864	22,605	86,202	31,662	165,997	151,611	14,386	75,382	75,629	18.2	28.2	−33.7	−12.6	139.3
132	Trade	2,139,355	1,975,995	163,460	1,222,724	753,161	2,740,331	2,530,804	209,527	1,217,436	1,313,368	28.1	28.1	28.2	−.4	74.4
117	Retail	2,022,362	1,863,832	158,530	1,147,489	716,243	2,590,195	2,387,941	202,254	1,140,203	1,247,738	28.1	28.1	27.6	−.6	74.2
19	Apparel and accessories	72,607	67,687	4,920	32,804	34,783	123,221	106,618	16,603	33,864	72,754	69.7	57.5	237.5	2.9	109.2
7	Drugs	38,443	38,038	405	25,375	12,663	54,168	52,371	1,797	26,230	26,141	40.9	37.7	343.7	3.4	106.4
10	Eating and drinking places	89,194	72,249	16,945	41,132	31,117	86,895	73,323	13,572	38,267	35,056	−2.6	1.5	−19.9	7.0	12.7
13	Food	177,867	165,918	11,949	103,744	62,174	235,423	201,612	33,811	111,829	89,783	32.4	21.5	183.0	7.8	44.4
5	Furniture and house furnishings	27,789	27,032	757	17,806	9,226	31,937	31,381	556	16,282	15,099	14.9	16.1	−26.6	−8.6	63.7
59	General merchandise	1,559,863	1,445,142	114,661	891,459	553,643	1,985,907	1,860,713	125,194	878,372	982,341	27.3	28.8	9.2	−1.5	77.4
41	Department stores	695,012	611,699	83,313	301,600	310,099	720,602	640,754	80,048	271,130	369,624	21.1	25.2	−3.9	−10.1	75.9
12	Limited-price variety stores	511,047	480,975	30,072	252,285	228,690	618,601	575,365	43,236	254,548	320,817	21.0	19.6	43.8	.9	40.3
6	Mail-order houses	453,744	452,468	1,276	337,614	114,854	646,504	644,594	1,910	352,694	291,900	42.5	42.5	49.7	4.5	154.1
4	Other retail stores	56,619	47,766	8,853	35,029	12,737	72,644	61,923	10,721	35,359	26,564	28.2	29.6	20.6	.9	108.6
15	Wholesale	116,993	112,063	4,930	75,245	36,818	150,136	142,863	7,273	77,233	65,630	28.3	27.5	47.5	2.6	78.3

[1] The 1944 figures shown here are as of the end of the year.
[2] Invested capital is the sum of net worth and long-term debt.
[3] Net worth is the sum of common and preferred stocks, surplus, and surplus reserves.
[4] Long-term debt consists of bonds, notes, mortgages, etc., with a maturity of 1 year or more.
[5] Capital stock is the sum of common and preferred stocks, less treasury stock.
[6] Surplus is the sum of all classes of surplus and surplus reserves.

Source: Basic financial data from OPA Financial Reports, Moody's Industrials, and Standard & Poor's Corporation Records.

Mr. MURRAY. Here it will be noted that the automobile industry, of which General Motors is a conspicuous example, had a profit based on net worth and calculated before taxes in 1936–39 of 20 percent, but that the favorable wartime atmosphere increased that profit to 38.7 percent in 1944. When earnings after taxes are calculated, the automobile industry had a profit based on net worth for the years 1936–39 of 16.2 percent. Even when the imposition of wartime taxes is considered—taxes which, we will recall, were intended to prevent any corporation making a great gain out of the war effort of the people—the automobile industry showed a profit after taxes of 13.3 percent of its net worth in 1944.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am interested in the figures which the Senator has given, and in his statement that a certain percentage of earnings were realized upon the net worth of the automobile business. I assume that the statement refers largely to capital investment. Does the Senator have any figures with reference to what the percentage of profit was on the gross volume of the automobile business after taxes?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not have that information with me, unless it may be covered in the tables I have just inserted in the RECORD. I know it is available and can be furnished.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my understanding that there is a substantial difference between the net-volume percentage and the net-worth percentage.

Mr. MURRAY. The information is available, and I shall undertake to secure it if it is not contained in the tables from

the Department of Commerce which I have submitted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. The automobile industry averaged $248,000,000 of profits after taxes in the years 1936–39, but in 1944, despite all wartime conditions then prevailing, this profit had risen to $296,000,000. General Motors Corp. made $171,293,000 in profits in 1944, which was 12.3 percent of its net worth.

While profits are expected to decline in 1946, nevertheless Treasury estimates show that because of the elimination of the excess-profits tax, there is every prospect of an actual increase in the earnings of corporations after taxes are paid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator have figures as to the amount of excess-profits taxes corporations paid in 1944?

Mr. MURRAY. I shall come to that. In 1944, that figure was $10,000,000,000; it is calculated it will be $11,000,000,000 in 1946. Couple this with the decrease in the wage bill, due to elimination of overtime pay and down-grading of workers, and the Treasury's estimates will in all probability turn out to be low.

When manufacturing alone is considered in this light, the calculation has been made that a 24-percent increase in wages would leave industry in 1946 with the same level of profits, after paying all taxes, that it earned at the wartime peak. Surely, no manufacturer can stand before the bar of public opinion in the United States and claim that he is entitled to more.

On the contrary, in the interest of an ever-expanding, healthy economy, in his own enlightened, self-interest, in fact, every manufacturer in this country must know that such excessive profits indicate the need for further wage-and-salary adjustments which will still further increase the in-pocket ability to buy goods and services of his workers

Mr FULBRIGHT Does the Senator conclude from those high profits that they should raise wages? Does he not think it is reasonable that we should also keep taxes at the high level prevalent during the wartime period?

Mr MURRAY I have no argument with the Senator about the maintenance of taxes. The facts I am recounting are taken from statistics prepared in Government agencies in Washington, and also from the New York Times statement which was printed a few days ago, as well as the CIO brief which was introduced into the record a few days ago.

Mr. President, I want to be clearly understood. My analysis is of the national situation, the over-all prevailing conditions. I am not speaking here of conditions existing in every plant and business in the country. As chairman of the very active Senate Small Business Committee, I have become well aware of the plight of many small and independent enterprises whose reconversion problems of prices and wages deeply concern me and my colleagues. The Small Business Committee is bending every effort to assist in the solution of these problems.

I am aware, too, that industry is getting out from under the protective umbrella of huge Government war cost-plus contracts. It may be necessary in some plants to produce lower-profit civilian goods. The problems of reconversion requiring the training of labor to new tasks also confront management. But American businessmen have shown a remarkable adaptability and ingenuity. These problems will not hold them back for long.

The efficiency of labor under wartime conditions, even at its remarkable best, was far below what can be achieved in the more orderly ways and under the less hurried and compelling conditions of peace. After World War I, output per man-hour, which is the measure of the effective use of labor power and technology, increased on an average 10 percent per year for 3 years. And despite the relatively great gains in man-hour productivity during World War II, it is confidently expected that the postwar increases in the productivity of labor will hardly be less phenomenal than after the last war. The shorter work week, the elimination of marginal workers, pressure to keep their jobs in a situation of considerable unemployment, the reduction of absenteeism, and the general desire to settle down to the pursuits of peace, will all contribute to this increased productivity of labor.

Management is in possession of modern new plants, largely built through the favorable amortization provision of wartime tax laws. Seventy percent of the nearly $7,000,000,000 of war plant facilities now the property of the corporations was paid for by the taxpayers of the Nation. In addition, large companies are getting the bulk of the Government-owned war plants. With such facilities, management is equipped to show such efficiency in the production of goods at low cost as never before. Combined with the efforts of satisfied, well paid workers, there is in prospect a high level of productive efficiency which will make high wages pay off in high profits, and in greater volume of goods moved into the hands of consumers. This has ever been the American way of meeting the challenge of industrial development.

Mr. President, I do not seek here to try the case of labor against the General Motors Corp. That case transcends in importance its character as a conflict between a union and a company. That case is now before the American people. The Nation's press has spread it on countless front pages, the radio has commented on it as a specially important feature in domestic life, and this body has been asked to give attention to its facts and implications for the general welfare.

One point raised in this controversy does concern the Congress directly. Mr. Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors Corp., has offered as one alternative solution to the controversy between his company and its labor force that Congress amend the Wages and Hours Act, increasing the 40-hour week to 45. The proposal seems to me a demand to turn the clock back. It is being predicted by Mr. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, and by other responsible Government officials, that by next spring the unemployed will number in the neighborhood of 8,000,000. This prediction is on the basis of an assumed 40-hour week. A 45-hour week would result in a still larger number out of work. It is our common responsibility to do everything possible to work in the opposite direction, that is, to reduce the large threatened unemployment.

Several witnesses testifying on the full-employment bill which the Senate passed recently argue that it would be necessary to reduce the hours of work below 40 per week in order to absorb the unemployed. It is my personal conviction that any further reduction of hours at this time would represent a confession of failure—that we are unable to achieve full production and full employment. It would amount to the procedure so common in the period of the thirties of spreading the work. I believe that with the full cooperation of industry, labor, and the Government, we can achieve full employment with a 40-hour week.

For years labor faithfully kept its pledge of no disturbances to interfere with the war effort. Labor abided by the Little Steel formula and obtained no major advances in wage rates despite the enormous wartime profits made by the corporations from Government contracts, and even despite some advance in the cost of living. Then with VJ-day the decision was reached to restore collective bargaining. This was a wise move, for under normal conditions the democratic way of settling differences between management and labor is through collective bargaining.

This administration will soon announce a national policy regarding wages and prices. They will be adjusted in respect to particular factories and local communities through the operation of collective bargaining machinery which takes into account the differences found in each locality.

What is necessary now, if we are to prevent major industrial disturbances, is that the Government stop tipping the scales in favor of any one group. To this end I propose a two-point program.

First. The OPA should be directed to reduce prices to offset any decrease in average hourly wages resulting from elimination of the overtime premium and downgrading. This would encourage management to grant wage increases to offset these factors, and would prevent any undue profits if industry refused to do so.

Second. The Congress should be asked to amend the tax law to provide that any corporation which refuses to bargain collectively in good faith and refuses to accept the mediation or voluntary arbitration offered by the Secretary of Labor is not entitled to the carry-back and carry-forward tax provisions with respect to the income of the year in which it has refused to bargain collectively or to accept mediation or voluntary arbitration services of the Secretary of Labor. If corporations are to engage in union

busting they should be required to do so at their own expense.

I am greatly encouraged by the President's announcement that he will soon explain the wage and price situation to the Nation. But in addition to this important declaration, it is vitally necessary that both sides to this controversy make clear to the American people without equivocation or deception the facts upon which they stand. As I stated a few days ago:

> They owe an obligation to the American people to prevent the dangerous consequences of strikes which would demoralize the country. Both sides must take the public into their full confidence and give a straightforward, honest statement of the facts so that the American people may know whether demanded increase in wages may be made without an increase in prices.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, due to a death in my family I was not able to be present during the debate Wednesday on the tax bill. I have read the report of the debate, and I wish to make a few observations in order to clarify my own position about the bill.

There was one statement in particular, a very short statement by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which I wish to read, and which I approve and support. He said:

> Never did the Nation need revenue more than it needs it now. Never were the people better prepared to bear taxes than they are now. Never was capitalism in greater danger than now. Never was there a more inappropriate time to cut taxes.

I think the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was the only other Senator who expressed any disapproval of the principal features of the bill.

Mr. President, the main reasons for high wartime taxes, including the excess-profits tax, were, first, to hold down the deficit and the need for borrowing particularly from the banking system; second, to reduce inflationary pressures at a time of greatly excessive demands for goods and services relative to supply; and, third, to curb profiteering out of the war.

These underlying reasons for maintaining high taxes apply with equal or even greater force during the critical period of reconversion, because, first, we still face a heavily unbalanced Budget; every dollar of Government expenditures not raised by taxes will have to be borrowed, and to the extent that banks furnish these funds new supplies of money will be added to the already enormous accumulations of liquid funds in the hands of the public as a result of war financing; second, demands, both domestic and foreign, upon our economy are and will continue for an indefinite period to be greatly in excess of supply; and, third, the profits to be made in the next year, at least, will be a direct result of war expenditures and thus just as much war profits as if they were derived while hostilities were still in progress.

Taxation is the last real bulwark against inflationary forces because of the weakening or removal of other controls, such as the War Labor Board exercised over wages and hence prices, or such as the WPB exercised in the construction field. The most prudent course at this juncture would be to defer tax reductions until such time as supply is more nearly in balance with demand and we have begun to approach a balanced Budget. At this stage we would be wise to err on the side of too much rather than too little revenue—taxes can always be reduced.

I wish to remind the Senate that the real period of inflation in connection with the last war was not so much during the war as it was soon after the war. In fact it began about 6 months after the war with the removal of what controls there were during that war, and we are facing exactly the same situation.

To the extent that any taxes are reduced at this time, it means adding just that much more to the public debt, which is already approaching $300,000,000,000. Our first obligation is to protect Government credit and the billions upon billions invested in Government bonds and other savings. Unless the deficit can be overcome now that the war is over and demand continues to exceed supply, the question inevitably arises as to when, if ever, the Budget can be balanced.

Since the basic problem today is one of shortages of goods in relation to demand and purchasing power, prudent fiscal policy requires that high taxes be maintained in order to reduce the deficit so far as possible. Not only is the backlog of demand unprecedented, but the supply of money in the hands of prospective customers is at an all-time high and will be further increased as reconversion and employment in peacetime occupations occur. The situation would be entirely different if we were confronted with a progressive deflation and inventories were in excess of effective demand. Then the problem would be to create more demand for goods and to give employment, and fiscal policy would call for first reducing taxes on the lower incomes.

If any taxes are to be reduced now, however, reductions should not go first to those best able to pay, but to those least able to pay. So far as individual taxpayers are concerned, this can be accomplished by removing the 3-percent normal tax on individual incomes, as proposed by the Treasury. It is estimated that this entails a loss of revenue of about $2,000,000,000. This will remove from the tax rolls about 12,000,000 taxpayers in the lower-income groups. While it will benefit primarily the lowest groups, it will apply to all income taxpayers.

Similarly, if corporate taxation is also to be reduced, the benefits should go primarily to concerns which are not the most profitable, and this, in turn, would be accomplished by reducing surtax rates under the corporation income tax by, say, 4 points, as proposed in section 121 of the House bill. The benefits would, likewise, go to all corporations but would be of the most help to the smaller ones. Such a reduction, it is estimated, would mean a loss of revenue of about $400,000,000.

These two reductions, of primary benefit to the smaller individual and corporate taxpayers, would amount to approximately $2,400,000,000.

Any further reduction would benefit primarily those best able to pay. This is particularly true with respect to repeal of the excess-profits tax. By and large, business and industry which is in the excess-profits tax has never been so well off, never had such vast accumulations of cash or its equivalent, never had bigger earnings after taxes, and never had such glowing prospects of profits as are to be made in filling the unprecedented backlog of demands from domestic as well as foreign sources.

It is significant that expectations of outright repeal of the excess-profits tax are having four adverse effects: First, it is doing much to boom the stock market, drawing into this vortex of speculation funds that the Government ought to be getting. Second, whetting the appetite of labor for bigger demands, reinforced by strikes. Third, inducing corporations in the excess-profits group to avoid any further sales in the last quarter of this year, because, obviously, profits after January 1 would go untaxed so far as the excess-profits tax is concerned if Congress repeals it as of that date. Fourth, inviting inventory speculation in anticipation of profits resulting from rising prices together with lower taxes.

Some moderate reduction in the excess-profits tax may be justified in order to discourage wasteful expenditures, but the tax should be retained at a rate of 70 percent, certainly not less than 60 percent, during the coming year. This will bring in urgently needed revenue from those corporations best able to pay and will be a damper on speculation as well as a curb on war profits. It will help to demonstrate to the public that the Government means to hold the line and protect the purchasing power of the dollar.

The argument that business needs a special tax incentive to produce and to employ people at this time is inconsistent with the basic economic facts. The war demonstrated that if business has orders it will go ahead producing and furnishing employment notwithstanding high taxes. Business has never had such a peacetime prospect for orders as it has today because demands—foreign and domestic—are so large and so far in excess of supply. With such intense demand and the sharp competition for markets, production would go ahead if there were no reduction in the excess-profits tax. It cannot logically be held that removal of this tax will give needed incentive to existing business. As for new business enterprise, its main problem is to obtain material and labor in order to get under way in competition with established industry.

Not unless it were to be carried over as a permanent part of the tax structure and at high rates, could the excess-profits tax be considered a deterrent to new and small enterprises because it usually takes years at best for them to make earnings that would be subject to such a tax. Moreover, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 provides for an exemption of $25,000 under the excess-profits tax. This is a decided boon to the smaller concern,

though it means little to the large and most profitable ones. Instead of benefiting from repeal of the excess-profits tax now, the smaller corporations would lose the advantage of the exemption. And to repeal the excess-profits tax and leave the normal corporation tax as it is would work still further to the advantage of the larger and to the disadvantage of the smaller concerns, generally speaking.

The argument is frequently made that repeal of the excess-profits tax will make no great difference in revenue collections because corporations will pay in dividends to stockholders what would otherwise be taxed from the corporation in excess profits. This would only be true however, if dividend recipients were taxable at the same rate and if there were a sufficiently effective tax on undistributed earnings to induce corporations to pay them out in dividends instead of retaining them and thus adding to the value of their corporate securities. Average rates under the individual income tax are much lower and there is no specific tax on distributed earnings. The result of retaining them is to enhance the value of securities and to add to speculative trading in them. Most gains from such transactions, under present capital gains taxation, are subject only to a maximum rate of 25 percent.

The contention that repeal will help to provide employment and prevent deflation is equally untenable in the light of the foregoing factors. The unemployment we are witnessing is transitional, not chronic. It is not spreading into a cumulative deflation such as we witnessed after 1929, and cannot take such a course so long as purchasing power and demand are so great. Under democratic government, labor cannot be ordered around but is drawn by economic pressure from places where jobs no longer exist in war production to places where jobs will exist in peace production. To characterize the immediate economic outlook as predominantly deflationary is superficial. In order to assure a rapid and permanent reemployment of servicemen and war workers, the first need is to prevent inflationary developments that would lead in the end to an ultimate break-down and deflation such as we had in 1921 for a short period and 1930 for a long period.

Not only on economic grounds, but as a matter of equity, repeal of the excess-profits tax is inconsistent with the facts, for it would benefit, generally speaking, the industrial giants, not small business. During the war years profits of taxable corporations averaged about $25,000,000,000 before taxes as compared with seven billions from 1938 to 1940. Even after taxes, these profits averaged about 10 billions during the war year as against six billions in the prewar years.

While the excess profits have been received by corporations of all sizes, nevertheless, preliminary tabulations for 1943 show that less than 10 percent of excess-profits taxes for that year came from corporations with taxable excess profits of less than $100,000, while over 70 percent came from corporations with profits in excess of $1,000,000. Also, the tabulation shows that income subject to excess-profits tax has been a substantially higher percentage of total income for large than for small corporations. Thus, this ratio amounted to 30 percent for corporations with taxable excess profits under $25,000; 53 percent for corporations with profits between $25,000 and $50,000; and approximately 70 percent for corporations with profits in excess of $500,000.

Not only have corporate profits been higher during the war than ever before, notwithstanding increased rates and the excess-profits tax, but business in general has never before accumulated such vast amounts of liquid assets. According to estimates as of the end of 1944, corporation holdings of Government securities, bank deposits, and currency amounted to nearly $50,000,000,000, or almost four times the amount of the same items at the end of 1939. In the face of this financial position, it cannot be said that business as a whole needs tax relief.

To take off the excess-profits tax now means not only that corporations least in need of tax relief or incentive will benefit by some two and a half billions—half of what the Treasury sanctions in tax reduction at this time—while the repeal would be of no benefit to the great bulk of small or new enterprise, but the position of the larger companies will be still further improved by prospective refunds and benefits under the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945, which are estimated to reach a total of over $4,000,000,000 in the coming year.[1]

For many of the same reasons the wartime excise taxes should be among the last, not among the first, levies to be removed. These, broadly, are taxes on luxuries. To repeal them after July, as proposed in the House bill, would mean a loss in revenue estimated at about $550,000,000. They should be retained until inflationary dangers are past and the Budget in balance.

To sum up, if any reductions are to be made at this stage, they should benefit primarily those at the bottom of the income scale, not those individuals and corporations best able to pay taxes. Repeal of the excess-profits tax, in particular, not only favors the few and the financially strongest corporations, but it would grant them these benefits, including refunds, at the Government's expense when revenue is of critical importance; it sets an example in pocketing what are, in fact, war profits that makes it difficult to argue that labor should be denied correspondingly large wage increases; and the effect is to invite the familiar wage-price upward spiral.

The underlying need at this stage is not to arrest a deflationary spiral and to put funds into the hands of people who will spend them or to offer special tax inducements to business to produce. The basic underlying need is to restore as rapidly as possible a budgetary situation which will maintain faith in the currency and preserve the buying power of the billions invested in Government securities and other savings. This is particularly important in view of the present campaign to sell an additional large number of Government bonds.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN GENERAL MOTORS AND THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, on October 24, 1945, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] asked and obtained leave to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram from Walter Reuther, vice president and director of the General Motors Department, United Automobile Workers, CIO. The telegram contains an account of only a part of what transpired at the press conference held on October 19, 1945, for 18 representatives of the daily press who were making an aerial tour to study reconversion. In order that a complete statement of what occurred may be available to Members of the Congress, I ask that the complete stenotype record of the meeting be printed in the RECORD at this place as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF GENERAL MOTORS PRESS CONFERENCE IN DETROIT, OCTOBER 19, 1945

GENERAL MOTORS OFFICIALS ATTENDING

C. L. Wilson, president.

Albert Bradley, executive vice president.

H. W. Anderson, vice president in charge of personnel staff.

Thomas P. Archer, vice president and general manager of Cadillac motorcar division.

W. F. Armstrong, vice president in charge of manufacturing staff.

H. R. Boyer, Chevrolet motor division.

H. H. Curtice, vice president and general manager of Buick motor division.

Nicholas Dreystadt, vice president and general manager of Cadillac motor car division.

Paul Garrett, vice president and director of public relations.

L. C. Goad, vice president and general manager of B. O. P. assembly division.

John E. Johnson, head of Detroit public relations office.

C. F. Kettering, vice president, in charge of research laboratories division.

W. G. Lewellen, vice president in charge of distribution staff.

F. J. McLaughlin, Pontiac motor division.

Frank Pierce, vice president and director of employee cooperation staff.

S. E. Skinner, vice president and general manager of Oldsmobile division.

Mr. GARRETT. We will come to order, men. This is going to be a business session, no speeches. We are going to try to answer every question.

Salted among you, or perhaps peppered among you, are some of our General Motors executives, that I assume you are going to throw some questions at a little later on.

Now, no doubt you men are going to throw up questions to our executives, and that is all right with us. It may be that some of

[1] This $4,000,000,000 is estimated to include: $1,100,000,000 from the cashing in of postwar refund bonds; $1,200,000,000 from the carry-back of unused amortization charges for plant and equipment purchased under certificates of necessity; $1,200,000,000 from the carry-back of anticipated (1946) losses and unused excess-profits credits, applied against 1945 liabilities payable in 1946; $700,000,000 from the current application of the postwar credit against 1945 liabilities payable in 1946. Due to the many uncertainties involved these estimates, with the exception of the first figure, are necessarily uncertain. However, the estimates are on the conservative side.

our executives will want to throw a few questions back.

Now, in the letter of invitation, it was made clear, but I would like to repeat, because it is very important, that you all bear in mind or realize that whatever is said here tonight is for the Sunday papers. This is going to be an "on the record" meeting; we would like, however, to observe the release date. A stenotype will be made of the remarks here tonight, and copies delivered to you in the morning.

Now we would like to show you a little picture of what has been going on in reconversion work in the various General Motors plants.....

(Movie.)

Mr. GARRETT. I gather that some of you boys started this tour with quite a naive curiosity, to learn more about jigs and fixtures, and know-how, and now that you know, you don't give a damn, but I know all of you are serious in your desire to learn more of what is back of the mechanisms, and to learn something of the progress that is being made on reconversion, and something also of the problems connected with it.

We are very happy that we can now turn this meeting over to our president, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Garrett and gentlemen; I think the General Motors men here tonight are sufficiently familiar with all phases of the business and the problem that we face, that between us all we should be able to answer most any question that you men care to ask us. I know we will try.

The postwar problem of putting our country back at work had and has three or four important parts.

There was first the problem of terminating the war contracts with the Government, working out the financial settlements, and the financial settlements are necessarily tied up with the physical property, because it has to be audited and inventories taken and so forth.

The second was for us to reassemble the necessary productive equipment for peacetime production, and get our plants in physical shape.

The third thing was to get the people reorganized into peacetime jobs, as against wartime jobs.

Now, we have made good progress. If any of you are interested in details, there are men here tonight who can tell you about it. We have made good progress in the contract terminations with the Government, fortunately that was well worked out, and it has been the bright spot in the reconversion picture so far.

The second thing is the physical change in the properties. We have made good progress in that.

Following the close of the German War, not immediately, but in a relatively few weeks, the Government authorized the industry to reassemble equipment equivalent to approximately 50 percent of prewar capacity.

General Motors, as well as other concerns in the industry, were short certain key machines that had been used up in the war effort, or had been made available to others and sold. This equipment had to be obtained and put back in the lines. I think that 50-percent job is fairly well over with; that is, another 30 days or 60 days will see that amount of capacity established.

In the meantime, the job of getting people reconverted seems to have been a little bit more difficult perhaps than the country had foreseen. What you might call the wage-price policy or the economic policy of the country for peacetime had not been too well worked out, and has not been too well worked out to date. As a result, there has been an increasing amount of dissatisfaction on the part of labor unions representing the workmen, and as we have tried to start up our production lines.

I would like to remind you gentlemen, that there are thousands of pieces in an automobile, and until you have all the pieces at the right time and the right place, you do not have automobiles; so we have had a good bit of trouble trying to get started due to strikes on the part of some of our suppliers.

We have also had difficulty in reorganizing men for the peacetime job. Something for nothing has a great attraction for the average American, and this unemployment compensation seems to be quite attractive, too. I think we, in fairness, ought to recognize that a good many people have worked pretty hard during the war. I remember of saying to Mr. Sloan not long ago, that if all the men in General Motors could make half as much for not working as they could for working, I thought that he and I would be pretty lonely.

And for the average workman, this unemployment compensation, tax free, works out considerably more than half of what they make for working, so some of them are in no hurry to go back to work.

So the country does face a problem of getting back to productive work.

I think we sometimes forget that when somebody does get paid for not working, those who do work finally have to sacrifice some of the reward that otherwise should come to them to pay those who do not work.

Another real problem that the country faces, of course, is this one of continuing inflation. The fact that our country financed less than half of the cost of the war by taxes, and more than half of that by bonds, has produced this problem.

Actually, if it had been politically expedient to do so, we could have paid for the war as we went, because we had to live on what we had left over after the war effort. And nobody outside of our country supplied us with anything.

But we didn't do it that way, and to some people, the war seemed like prosperity, when actually war is a great calamity and a great hardship.

We did a remarkable thing in this country. We came very close to maintaining the standard of living of the people, and fight a Global War. No other country came anywhere near close to doing that, either in this war or in any past war. We were able to do it, because people previously not engaged in the labor force, went to work, because of the greatly lengthened hours of work.

Now, when the war is over, and we seem to be rushing to go back to the 40-hour week, a lot of people are in no hurry to go back to work. We do face the problem of having a satisfactory subsistence living for everybody, of having some of the luxuries that all Americans want by which we measure our standard of living, and at the same time paying for the continuing cost of the rehabilitation of veterans, supporting the men who are still overseas, trying to rehabilitate the rest of the world, or helping to do it, and keeping other peoples from stark starvation.

While that is the problem, we are either going to have to work more or we will have to do with less in our own country.

The technological improvements, the greater things we have done in this country in finding better ways to do all kinds of things, the results of that can be taken in one or two ways. They can be taken in a higher standard of living or they can be taken in more leisure time.

Now, realistically, the country faces working out a solution during this postwar period, which cannot immediately be prosperity; working out a solution of the wage-price problem that is reasonably fair to all Americans, and then get back at the job and go to work. Until we do that, none of us is going to be very happy.

Now, those of us from General Motors will do our very best to answer any questions any of you care to ask us about the reconversion, about the labor problem, or anything else that you want to ask us.

Then if it is all right with you men, I would like to ask you some questions. I will leave it up to Mr. Garrott, who answers them. Maybe I will ask you newspaper people to sort of divide, and say whether you go with the speaker or not.

There are two or three I would like to ask you, at least, so we might as well start.

Question. Mr. Wilson, will you tell us exactly, assuming no serious strike interruptions, and assuming a satisfactory flow of materials, will you tell us exactly what the present picture and the future picture are on your lines of automobiles? How many Chevrolets you will make in a day when you finally get into production? How many Pontiacs, and so on?

Mr. WILSON. I expect that the men who are going to do this job had better answer; that is, Mr. Curtice. Let us try out the Buick business on him.

Of course, you have made an assumption that reaches out quite a ways, when you say no interference of any kind, no labor troubles, because that would be wonderful; but if you want the figures on that basis, I am sure that Mr. Curtice will try to give them to you.

Question. Well, do you think of a more reasonable basis?

Mr. WILSON. Well, you have to assume something. That is satisfactory to me, and that is the way it will be.

Mr. CURTICE. For the Buick division, I would like to say that we are in production. We are producing at the rate of about 100 per day. We will continue on that basis during the next week. At the end of that time we will be producing at the rate of about 200 a day.

Going into November, we have scheduled about 10,000 cars, an average of about 500 per day.

We will continue expanding production until we reach our postwar level of 1,800 cars per day, about March 1, 1946.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps, you had better finish on this question; that is about the kind of a start that all of the divisions have, such as Mr. Dreystadt at Cadillac. He can tell you about how he has planned the Cadillac business.

Mr. DREYSTADT. We are planning to build over 5,000 this year. We will build 320 per day in March 1946. We are going to build 60,000 cars in the period of 1 year.

Mr. WILSON. That is 60,000 cars in the period of a year; that is, say, from October 1 to October 1.

Would you like to hear from the others?

VOICES. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Skinner?

Mr. SKINNER. At Oldsmobile, starting Monday morning will be at the rate of 100 a day, and plans made for 2,000 to 2,500 a month, double in November, double again in December, and up to the prewar rate of 1,300 a day on March 1, 1946.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. McLaughlin, can you give the figures for Pontiac?

Mr. Klinger does not happen to be here tonight, and Mr. McLaughlin is pinch-hitting for him.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Pontiac today is running about the rate of 150 per day. We will reach our peak about the first of February. That is, based on the 1941 production.

We will double our October production in November, triple it in December.

Our 1941 average per month was something better than 30,000 per month, in 1941—and we will do that in February.

Question. What is that per day?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. About 1,200.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Boyer, can you give any figures for Chevrolet to these gentlemen?

Mr. BOYER. Well, in Chevrolet, it is necessary to take into consideration, truck production. Through September this year we

have built about 50,000 trucks—commercial and military trucks; roughly about 13,000 military and 38,000 civilian.

During September, Chevrolet produced something under 11,000 civilian trucks.

In October, we had schedule of 9,591 passenger cars. As of Wednesday, we had actually completed something over 1,100.

We are a little slow getting into our October production, due to the various things that Mr. Wilson has told you. We are having trouble getting wiring harness. We have had to go out and place orders with suppliers other than those we counted on to get in production; we are having trouble getting universal joints. The Kelsey-Hayes wheel strike affected Chevrolet to a lesser extent than it did Ford, because we were able to tool around it.

Our passenger car schedule for October, as I have said, is 9,500; for November, it is 19,000; for December, it is 40,000; that is passenger cars.

Our truck schedule is 23,000 in October; 41,000 in November; 44,000 in December.

We will have built during 1945, a total of 238,960 cars and trucks, if we make the schedule. We think that while we are falling somewhat behind schedule now, that will be picked up surely by the end of the year, or possibly in January, when the balance of our 11 assembly plants come into operation.

We have two assembly plants, St. Louis and Kansas City, on car production now. We are rapidly getting into shape in Norwood, Ohio, our Cincinnati assembly plant, which was down for some 3 weeks and 5 days due to a strike. That is all ironed out, and we have been in truck production for the Navy as well as some civilian trucks there, throughout the war period.

Now, prewar Chevrolet was tooled up for some 6,000 cars and trucks per day. The postwar plan calls for increasing that approximately 50 percent, or 6,800 passenger cars and 2,300 trucks per day. That is figuring two 10-hour shifts, and on that basis, we expect to exceed a 2,000,000 car year, or at that rate, by October of 1946.

I think that about sums it up.

Mr. WILSON. I might say that as much as 2 years ago, and when we saw that our country was really measuring up to the war-production load, and that the danger of "too little and too late" was past, we called attention of the proper people in Washington that we were very much disorganized on any possibility of peace production; we stated that at some suitable time we had better start to plan for that, because it really takes about a year to get ready. It doesn't make any difference whether it is a new automobile, or whether it is a gun or an airplane.

Now, I have no quarrel with the decisions that were made. I was not in a position to judge them, but our Government, apparently with information from the military authorities, did not see where any material or men in any important way at all could be spared for the job.

So we are not as well prepared for this peace job as we would like to be.

I want to assure you men we have all been doing the very best we can. If we can get the materials and get the machine tools, we will produce more than these schedules, and have frankly told you that the schedules are right now.

I am also sure that when I tell you that these division managers cannot see more than 3 days to a week ahead, to where they have materials in balance to build any automobiles, that is also true. So we are not making the schedules that 3 or 4 months ago we laid out for October. This is due primarily to strikes, and the strikes in our suppliers' plants, and to the fact that materials we get are not exactly like the models.

We have to have identical parts made with tools. When a supplier's plant is on strike, he has the tools, and you can't make new tools quickly.

Then we get into all kinds of trouble about prices for the parts, too. A new supplier wants a different price, and he gets tied up with the OPA. We have had plenty of trouble.

We are not complaining about it too much. We are trying to overcome it, but I want you men to know that it is real trouble.

Question. Mr. Wilson, is it correct that in Chevrolet, you are going to work two 10-hour shifts?

Mr. WILSON. What did you say, Mr. Boyer?

Mr. BOYER. I made a misstatement there, those are 8-hour shifts. We are figuring on 450 cars per hour.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to point out to you men one thing about this 40-hour week.

A lot of people seem to think that if you cut the week down from 48 or 45 hours, to 40, you employ more people. That isn't so in our business. We have only certain places a man can work, work stations, machine tools for him to work on, to use, or desks in an office. If he only works 5 days a week, the plant is just idle on Saturday.

There is no way to hire another 20 percent of people and have them come in on Saturday only.

Also, I would like to go on record with all of you that there will be more people employed in this country at good jobs, if we work more than 40 hours, than 30, there will be still fewer people employed. If we went to 20, we would all starve, and that is independent of how much you pay and how you juggle the money.

What was the question way over there, now?

Question. I wondered if in any conversations you have had in Washington, you have modified your statement on the 30-percent wage demand that you issued about a week or 10 days ago?

Mr. WILSON. No, sir. I don't care to particularly comment on my trip to Washington; that was an emergency, hurry-up trip, but I can say that nothing has happened since any statements we have made, to have us change in any way any of those statements.

Question. Mr. Wilson, what progress is being made in negotiations with the union on the wage question?

Mr. WILSON. I don't think very much, to be real frank with you. I would like to say this, that our contract with the union as far as working hours is concerned, is just the same now as it was before the war and during the war. We have not in any way reduced rates, hourly rates, anywhere.

We are working more than 40 hours and paying the premium where we are organized to do it. For instance, at our Diesel Electric, our locomotive plant at LaGrange, they are on a 48-hour schedule, yet they have demanded the 30-percent increase just the same.

This reconversion you men have seen in the picture, we are driving right ahead on that, because we want to get it over with.

Question. What is the obstacle in the way of progress in the negotiations, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. We cannot raise wages without raising prices, and as we understand, our present country's stabilization laws, there is nothing for us to do but refuse any wage increases.

The OPA formula that has been given to us to figure our car prices presumes that the profit levels of '36 through '39 (I am talking about percentage profit) were normal and necessary in order to perpetuate this free enterprise and free competitive system of our country.

But they have specified the formula in such a way that to achieve that same position we have to increase our volume about 60 percent.

In other words, we have to do $1,600,000,000 at that annual rate, to achieve the same position we formerly achieved on a billion dollars. In addition, we have to restore prewar worker efficiency, individual efficiency of the men.

We also have to restore our prewar overheads. Many additional expenses have crept into the business during the war, both necessary and possibly unnecessary, for postwar. That is a very big problem, to get those expenses back out of there.

In addition, the new machinery and the new plants we build must be sufficiently efficient, or the technological improvement, if you want to put it that way, must be great enough so that the savings will be at least equal to the additional taxes and depreciation on that new equipment.

When you add those things all up, there is no margin at all for any wage increase, and we have so told the union. There is no provision in the OPA formula for granting any wage increases now, to be taken into account in recognized costs.

The idea that the industry can suddenly become much more efficient, and produce the same number of automobiles with 20 or 25 percent less man-hours of labor is a great fallacy.

As a matter of fact, the automobile industry was the most efficient industry in our country before the war. What happened during the war was that the automobile methods, know-how, if you please [laughter], was applied to the production of military items that had never been produced on a really efficient basis before; in addition, the same know-how was spread throughout our whole country in other industries, and in other places. Many people came to Detroit and learned how to have tools made, came to our plants. We all threw our plants open to everybody.

But on our side, we lost 4 years of progress at our business, so we are starting up now just right where we were in 1941 and 1942. We did not have time to do anything different. This question of technological progress, as you men must appreciate when you look at the things that are involved in it, is a question of time and a lot of hard, intelligent work.

Question. Mr. Wilson, in connection with this wage-price policy, as you called it, for the economic good of the country, what would you say should happen to wages and to prices?

Mr. GARRETT. I wonder if the gentleman would stand up and make the question a little louder?

Question. For the economic good of the Nation as you see it, in connection with your wage-price policy, what should happen to wages, and what should happen to prices?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I think I should give you a straight economic answer to that, and I do not know that it is the political answer. That is not my particular business.

What should happen is that until this aftermath of this war is over we ought to go back to about a 45- or 48-hour week. That is what the rest of the world is going to do. That is the only way that we will produce the volume of materials and goods and a sufficiently low price to satisfy the people of our country. I doubt, personally, if that is going to happen.

In my own memory, I remember the 60-hour week, 40 or 50 years ago. When I first ran a plant it was 50 hours.

People of our country work for three things, and I am talking total, of all producers.

They work for a subsistence living for everybody.

Second, they work for the additional luxury that all Americans like to have.

And, third, they work to support the Government and the extra expenses that are put on all the people.

Now, back when we worked 60 hours a week we did not have the fine tools and equipment that we have today, so men had

to work longer with inferior tools to accomplish as much. As technological improvements came along, engineering, the art of making things, we shortened the workweek, we took some of it in more leisure, we took some of it in an increasing standard of living, we hav more fine things. Government expenses were not very great.

The First World War delayed the progress for a while. Then in the thirties we cut the workweek down too low to have a good standard of living for everybody.

Now, we face the aftermath of the war, with a great big expenditure for Government purposes, to help rehabilitate other countries in the world, to keep them from starving, to rehabilitate our own plants and equipment, and I am afraid that we are not going to have enough left over to establish the standard of living that the average American is expecting postwar, unless we all work a little harder, as apparently we are planning to do.

Question. Mr. Wilson, does your proposal include time and a half for over 40 hours, or is that a flat rate?

Mr. WILSON. From my broad way of looking at it, it doesn't make too much difference how you pay for it, providing you really work.

Question. Do you see any difficulty in industry as a whole expanding facilities to meet this pent-up war demand, to a point where we will be overexpanding the facilities? Do you recommend the 48-hour week or 45-hour week, as an alternative?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I have not been thinking of it in just that way. The facilities are not here, and perhaps industry as a whole does not have the money to expand the facilities suddenly. We cannot do it suddenly, anyhow. These Government plants, built for special purposes, and tooled for special purposes, cannot be turned on just like a faucet and produce automobiles or refrigerators or radios or any of the things that we would like to have. No, each one of these things has to be set up for a purpose.

Question. Perhaps I should say in our tour we have run into one plant after another that is planning multi-million-dollar expansions, and telling us that the demand throughout the country calls for this increased production.

Will that demand hold up?

Mr. WILSON. It will if the people of our country are willing to work for the things that they would like to have.

Question. Who in Washington must settle this, and do you expect Government intervention in any form before a strike is called?

Mr. WILSON. If you can tell me who is going to decide what is right for our country, and get it done, then you can answer for yourself. Whoever has that responsibility are the ones who should do it. I suppose it is a collective responsibility.

Personally, I am afraid that it is not going to be done in time. I do not know whether the problem is too well understood. I think we understand a little better after we run out of gas, or we cannot get up to 24 floors in an elevator, or maybe when the Consumers Power Co. shuts down in 2,200 communities in Michigan, maybe we will begin to understand it is something that we have to work out—to work at, to find the right answer. I doubt if it is going to be done in time.

Question. Do you think it is up to President Truman?

Mr. WILSON. You are a citizen the same as I.

Question. Well,——

Mr. WILSON. Well, let us see how many think it is up to the President?

How many think it is the President's job?

How many think it is Schwellenbach's job? Do you think he has the cards to do it?

VOICES. No.

Mr. WILSON. Well, then, it had better not be his job.

How many think it is up to Congress?

Well, that is as good as I can do for you.

Question. Did you have your hand up? Did your hand go up with "Congress?"

Question. Mr. Wilson, do you say that your suggestion for a 48-hour work week might be the solution for the wage problem, providing sufficient take-home pay for labor?

Mr. WILSON. I think the real difficulty is that we have a law on the books that Congress passed for a 40-hour week. I think that labor will be fearful to change that, even temporarily, to meet the war emergency, or the aftermath of war, the reconversion problems. They will be afraid that labor will lose some gains. I doubt if it will be politically feasible right away to do that.

I know the other countries of the world are going to work more than 40 hours. The real question of a proper work week is the division of leisure time versus working time. Does the average man have sufficient leisure to enjoy the fruits of his labor, or would he like to work a little longer and have more to enjoy in his leisure time? That is the real problem. It is not how much you pay. Fundamentally, money is a medium of exchange.

Question. Mr. Wilson, do you favor the 48-hour week permanently, or just over the readjustment period?

Mr. WILSON. I would only favor it during the readjustment period, say 3 to 5 years. I hope by that time we won't have to feed too many people in other countries, ship too much steel across, and not have something to come back that we can enjoy and add to our standard of living. I hope it will be a two-way street before too long. During this time right now, when we have the tremendous continuing Government expenditures, the producers of the country carry the nonproducers on their backs. There is not any doubt about that.

Question. Mr. Wilson, did I misunderstand you a minute ago, or did you say it didn't make any difference whether you paid time and a half for over 40 hours, or not?

Mr. WILSON. It is the total pay for the week that we are talking about. The reason it does make a difference, is in the way people figure their costs and their labor agreements.

You get into an awful lot of trouble, if you try to guarantee 48 hours' work, because then you don't know whether somebody is going to have a strike in another plant, and you are not going to have material. You have a big argument about it when there is a 50-percent premium concentrated on that particular day's work.

If I were doing it, I would raise all the rates a certain percentage, 5 percent or 8 percent or whatever it takes, and say we only figure overtime after 45 hours, then the whole country would get back to the 45-hour basis. Anyone who worked 45 hours would make as much as he does now working 45 hours, and you wouldn't have the argument about the take-home pay, or whether the industrial worker was on right basis with the farmer.

I would just like to remind you gentlemen, that if you raise the rates 30 percent for industrial workers, and they work 40 hours a week, how does the farmer step up to that one? How does he suddenly get his cows to give 30 percent more milk? You have to talk to the bull about that for quite a long time.

Question. If you pay an 8-percent wage-rate increase, and pay overtime, after 45 hours, and work a 48-hour week, wouldn't that amount to about a 30-percent increase?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; but the country would have the production, from the added time, then the cost of goods would not have to be raised, and the whole country would have 20 percent more. That means that one person out of five or six, that is going to go without an automobile, would have one.

Question. Mr. Wilson, Government controls had to be used during the war, in order to insure full war production. Do you consider this reconversion period enough of an emergency, to warrant the reinstitution of Government controls, dropped since VJ-day?

Mr. WILSON. I don't know of any that have been dropped, that I would recommend be reinstated. I do happen to belong to the group that think, until the aftermath of the war is reasonably cleaned up, and the ordinary laws of supply and demand can reasonably function, that some controls are necessary. That is just my own personal opinion.

How many do you think that? I would like to know. [About 20 hands.]

How many of you think that all controls should be dropped right now? [About five hands.]

How many of you think that the Government should always stay in business. [No hands.]

Question. Mr. Wilson, can we interpret this suggestion you made about raising wage rates and hours of work, as a counterproposal? Have you made that as a counterproposal to the unions?

Mr. WILSON. No; it has not been made as a counterproposal, because the laws of the land are in the way of it.

Question. Mr. Wilson, why haven't you given the press some information on your negotiations with the union?

Mr. WILSON. Maybe it is a little bit like inviting the neighbors in, and all your family relations. Once in awhile you have a little spat with the wife, and you have got other kinds of things going on, and you only invite the neighbors in and tell the world about it, when you get ready to have a divorce, see.

I don't know whether that is a very satisfactory explanation. But collective bargaining is supposed to be the business of the parties involved. When collective bargaining breaks down, and if it is important enough to be a national problem, of course, then you get conciliators, and you get congressional committees and you get panels. When it gets into that stage, we not only are willing, but will insist that it be a public matter. You men will have all the information you care to take an interest in.

Question. Mr. Wilson, I would like to get a little dollar-and-cents perspective on this: Could you tell me how much your pay rolls are running approximately per year, how much this increase would cost, and what your net was in that 1936–39 base, before taxes, and what it was during the war?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I don't know that I have all those figures. Mr. DuBrul may have some of them.

Question. I wanted to get a comparison.

Mr. WILSON. I think I can help you this way, if you want, roughly a third of our income is paid out in wages to General Motors employees, so that if postwar we get all of our facilities together, and we were able to do $3,000,000,000 worth of business in a year, we would hope to do that with about a billion dollars worth of salaries and labor.

If you increase that 30 percent, that will be $300,000,000. Three hundred million dollars would be 10 percent of your $3,000,000,000 sales.

While we think of our own people first, we actually know of no good reason why they should have that preferred position, as against other workers in the country. We also know as a realistic matter, that they cannot put themselves in that position. The steel workers, the rubber workers, even you men will want your 30 percent.

Question. Mr. Wilson, may I ask a question for the benefit of some of your other guests, perhaps? What is this price formula, or are these price formulas given to you by the OPA, and I think that will explain to them a great many things.

Mr. WILSON. Well, it is a public document that all can read. It is a little hard to understand by a layman, but as I said a while ago, it attempts to fix prices on the basis of 1942,

and makes no allowance for any current increases in costs that might be granted to labor.

Incidentally, it does not allow you all of the expenses that you currently have, but only allows you to check your '42 prices back against your '41, on the basis of authorized War Labor Board increases directly applied, and authorized raw material prices.

When we apply that formula to our business, what we get is this, that to achieve the average profit margins of the base years, and incidentally, that is profit before taxes, and since those base years, taxes have much increased so the net to the stockholders is still going to be considerably less. We have to, then, first, restore our prewar efficiency, as far as the individual workman is concerned. He has to make the same number of pieces he did then if the equipment is the same.

Second, we have to restore our prewar overhead expenses. Now, many of the items of overhead expenses, what we call nonproductive supplies, and all the incidental things. A greatly expanded labor department for one thing. The expense of committeemen, collective bargaining in the plant, the foreman's time to talk to them, all those kinds of things add up, to more than they did prewar; and we have got to get that back by some improved way of doing things.

Then, in addition, we have to achieve as I say, more than 50-percent increase in volume, to get that same position. That is all efficient industry can undertake. We rather think it is more than we should be asked to undertake.

There is no margin over that for any additional labor adjustments now.

The OPA formula, and the President's change in policy, which from my point of view, was really no change at all, made on August 18, was that any concern was free to raise wages and salaries, if they would not use that increased cost as a reason for asking for increased prices, or if they would not use it to resist price reductions that otherwise should be made.

Actually, I think the people that have stepped out and raised wages and salaries, instead of lowering prices, if they had the margin to do it, have not been quite playing the game if we are going to stabilize and hold the line.

Question. Mr. Wilson, may I sort of answer my own question? One point that you did not cover has to do with profits.

There are two options. You can take the 1942 prices, or the ones built around 1941 prices, and the second option built around 1942 prices says you can take your average profits for those 4 years or you can take one-half of the average for the industry, and they fix one-half of the industry profit at 4.9 percent, which is completely cockeyed, I think.

Mr. WILSON. You mean it is too low when you say it is cockeyed, is that it?

Question. No; it is too high.

Mr. WILSON. 4.9 percent?

Question. There were only two companies making cars in those years that made as much as 4.9 percent, so your profits are going down and theirs are going up.

Mr. WILSON. Have you yourself ever tried to estimate what you are going to spend in a year, and get it within 4.9 percent? That is a very low margin of net profit on sales.

Question. It is higher than most of them have.

Mr. WILSON. This has been a very competitive industry, and the American people have gotten a tremendous value out of this automotive industry. I was talking to Mr. Kettering the other day, and he said:

"You know, business people are all wrong. All they put in the papers is how much profit they made and how many dollars of sales, and how much dividends they paid. They never tell the people what they did."

Now, General Motors has built 22,500,000 good automobiles for the American people, and there is nothing else in this whole country that has the value in it as compared to an automobile. That is because of all the fine tooling and intelligent engineering that has gone into trying to make cars better every year, and it has been a truly American industry. It has been competitive and it has been trying to do something better every year for the American people.

Everybody squawks about 4.7 percent profit and they want to cut it down so none of us have enough money left to continue our progress.

Question. Mr. Wilson, I didn't get an answer to the second half of my question, about what the profits were in the 1936–39 period, and what they were in the war.

Mr. WILSON. $181,000,000 in the base period, and $174,000,000 in the war, average during the year.

Question. Before taxes?

Mr. WILSON. I don't know before taxes, because we can't count in our company until after the taxes are paid. This idea of before taxes is sort of a phoney.

Our stockholders all pay the tax the second time. They pay on what they get and it is only after taxes that we can put it into the till and use it for better machinery or better plants or pay our stockholders dividends.

Question. What did you report before taxes in '44?

Mr. WILSON. What did we report? Maybe you know, Albert. I can't remember. What was it? It is sort of an academic question, as far as we are concerned.

Question. I would like to know, No. 1, whether the various divisions of General Motors have filed their price schedules with OPA, and if so, what percentage increase is sought?

Mr. WILSON. We have not filed our price schedules with OPA, and in spite of the fact that we think our accounting boys are pretty good, we have not been able to get the facts to a point where we think they are accurate enough to do the job.

We cannot get our suppliers to go in black and white on what they are going to charge us. I can't blame them too much, because they are all threatened with a 30 percent wage increase and they don't know what to charge us.

We are doing a lot of thinking on it, and the men are working at it continually. You know a lot of people think this accounting business is a very exact science. But you really have to get down to brass tacks in this manufacturing business because there are a lot of things that when you are making a forecast, you don't know for sure whether they are going to happen.

Just like the question of whether the men are going to work as hard as they did prewar? They aren't to date.

Question. Mr. Wilson, was the industry consulted before the price formula was fixed?

Mr. WILSON. What would you say, Albert, the answer to that was? This is Mr. Bradley, who will answer this one. It is his end of the business.

Mr. BRADLEY. The representatives of OPA talked to us about this, that, and the other thing. Rather they wanted to know if we wanted to come to Washington to have them deliver a lecture on what their philosophy was, and we said we didn't like to discuss price matters in groups.

So they sent their top men out here to talk things over. They didn't indicate what they were going to do, and then they pinned on us this reconversion-price formula.

Question. Do you think that that is unjust?

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Wilson brought out those points.

Mr. WILSON. It is very tough.

Question. Have you done anything to try to change it?

Mr. BRADLEY. We haven't; no.

Mr. WILSON. No.

Mr. BRADLEY. We can't find out our prices because we can't get our costs from our suppliers. This thing is all frozen with this demand for the 30-percent increase on the part of ourselves and our suppliers.

Question. Mr. Wilson, isn't it true that you have more stockholders than you have employees, and that they should have some consideration?

Mr. WILSON. That is right. We do have more stockholders than employees, currently.

We had a few more employees at the peak in 1943 than we had stockholders, but during the first part of this year we had more stockholders than employees.

Question. What are the approximate figures on these, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. Four hundred and twenty-six thousand stockholders, and the current number of employees I don't know. We expect to have around 375,000 to 400,000 employees postwar, when we get our full plans going. We had around 250,000 prewar.

Question. What are the approximate current figures?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. DuBrul has some figures, I think. Steve, what are they?

Mr. DUBRUL. As for this week, there are 162,000 factory employees working. It would have been considerably higher except for strikes, that is factory employees, and about 75,000 salaried employees.

Mr. WILSON. That is 235,000. Well, that is more than we had in many prewar years, and it is probably about the average for the period of '36 to '39.

Question. Mr. Wilson, is your estimate of postwar employment based on the expectation that there will be a solution of the wage price problem?

Mr. WILSON. The question is, is my estimate of postwar employment based on my expectation that there will be a solution of the wage-price problem—a fair solution. It is based on that. There is no other assumption that you can go ahead on, you know, in good faith, and with intelligence. I certainly am not going to write off this country just yet.

Question. Mr. Wilson, in the event that labor does get its increase, 15 percent, 20 percent, 25 percent, or 30 percent, and there is not a satisfactory increase in price, will General Motors close down, or what will it do?

Mr. WILSON. Well, of course, it would gradually run out of soap and close down, or it could do it ahead of time. We have actually had suppliers now that said, "No, we won't take the business." The Government is having the textile manufacturers now, who are being asked to make the cheaper grades of textiles at a very low price, say, "No, we will shut down."

I hope personally that I will never have to answer that one. I do not know of any reason why the corporation and the stockholders should be put in such a position. We did a good job during the war, we did not make big profits out of the war, we made less than we did prewar. That is on twice the volume of business and understood an awful lot of work, wore out our plants and machinery. I do not know why anyone would want to treat us that way.

Question. But you said that you did not see much chance of getting the price-wage solution—the thing that we are up against now.

Mr. WILSON. We have already made the decision. The answer is "No."

Question. Mr. Wilson, is General Motors planning an expansion program, or are they going to build new plants, and if so, where?

Mr. WILSON. Well, we are going to build one assembly plant in the Boston area. We are building one near Wilmington, in Delaware. We are going to build one at Atlanta. We are leasing a plant from the Government where the North American Co. used to make airplanes during the war. We are going to run that.

Question. Which city?

Mr. WILSON. Kansas City. We are going to build a new plant somewhere in the Los Angeles district. We are starting excavations to build a big pressed metal plant at Hamilton, Ohio.

We are going to build a hardware plant at Columbus, Ohio. We are going to build a plant at Sandusky to expand our capacity, to make ball bearings. We are going to put one in at Elyria, Ohio, and a storage battery plant at Brunswick, N. J.

I don't know how many more chambers of commerce are going to call me up Monday on account of what you men may say. [Laughter.]

Question. Mr. Wilson, how about the assembly plant in Flint?

Mr. WILSON. Well, that is a new plant, too, a new assembly plant in Flint. Mr. Boyer, you can tell about that.

Mr. BOYER. The contract has been let on the Flint assembly plant. It is a $10,000,000 proposition, about 800,000 square feet, for roughly 50 cars now.

This contractor's schedule calls for completion of that building some time in the latter part of July.

There is also one that Mr. Wilson mentioned, the Chevrolet assembly plant in the Los Angeles area. The parts building, the excavation is already started, that is out north of Los Angeles, about in the Van Nuys district, about 20 miles north of the metropolitan center There is about an 800,000 square foot assembly plant going there.

We are also rehabilitating the other seven-or-eight-odd assembly plants, and the total Chevrolet expenditure, appropriations, total about $108,000,000 to date; and that is just the Chevrolet alone.

Question. Mr Wilson, I do not like to keep asking high financial questions, but have you any executive here who would know what the present dividend rate is and what it was before the war?

Mr. WILSON. Sure. [Laughter.]

It is $3 per year, 75 cents a quarter.

Question. Mr Wilson——

Mr. WILSON. I think I had better finish the answer. During the war years, up until this last year, it was $2. Prewar—what was it, in 1941, Albert?

A VOICE. $3.75. He must know what that is.

Mr. WILSON. He probably does. If you are a financial man, you should. What paper are you for, or do you represent?

Question. I am with the Christian Science Monitor, the financial department.

Mr. WILSON. Well, it is all a matter of record. The dividends paid to the stockholders and the earnings made by the company during the war years, were less than in the prewar years, by a substantial amount. That was in spite of the fact that we did more than twice as much business.

Question. Mr. Wilson, this gentleman mentioned a $108,000,000 Chevrolet expansion program. Could you give the over-all figure for General Motors?

Mr. WILSON. I cannot, because it changes every day, and we are having some trouble to get the work done for the estimates that we had previously made. It is looking a little tougher all the time. It is all so mixed up in the figures as I see, between the reconversion expense, and the additional tooling that goes on the new equipment. In other words, if you just wanted to separate off the capital expenditures that are permanent additions, I can hardly do that for you.

Question. Mr Wilson, didn't this movie picture say a total of $600,000,000?

Mr. WILSON. Well, that is about it; I hope we can do it for that; that is about all that we have got.

Question. Does that include reconversion and expansion?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Question Mr. Wilson, will you qualify the statement that you made a little earlier, to the effect that you did not think this wage-price problem will be solved in time?

Mr. WILSON. To avoid serious strikes. I do not; I am afraid it cannot be.

Question. Mr. Wilson, I would like to ask, due to the fact that at the present time it is impossible to arrive at proper costs and also due to the fact that the union claims that General Motors during this postwar period is going to make tremendous profits, would General Motors favor an insulating period, say for 6 months, at the end of which they can arrive at profit-and-loss figures, and if these profits were evident, have a retroactive wage increase?

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask you a few questions, if you don't mind, before I answer that one. [Laughter.]

No. 1 is this: After General Motors pays what you might call a going rate for work, and rates that are higher considerably than the average of all American industry, do you think the profits that we make should have anything to do with the wages we pay?

Question. Possibly.

Mr. WILSON. Well, do you think they should importantly have anything to do with the wages that we pay?

Question. Well, it should not be based on that, no.

Mr. WILSON. How many of you think that it does have, should have, important weight on the wages we pay?

Get the question: After we pay the going wages in all communities—and those wages are much higher than the average of American industry for the equivalent work—do you think the profits that we make should have anything to do with additional wages?

How many of you think they should?

How many of you think they should not?

Now, that is one of the controversies that is going on.

I would like to ask you another one, if you don't mind.

Question. Wait a minute.

Mr. WILSON. I want to ask you a good one now.

Question. Well, let me revise the first one a bit.

Mr. WILSON. You wait until I ask you this question, and you will probably revise a little bit more. [Laughter.]

Do you think that we should pay importantly higher wages than our competitors, when we deliver just as good or better cars for the same price, just because we make more money?

Question. No.

Mr. WILSON. Do you think we should pay higher wages than our suppliers pay for the same kind of work, in similar communities—the steel industry, the rubber industry, the Kelsey-Hayes Co., the parts suppliers? Do you think we should pay higher wages on any kind of a profit formula?

Question. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Do you think we ought to pay higher wages than our suppliers?

Question. Providing the profits warrant. I think it benefits General Motors to do that. It has in the past.

Mr. WILSON. This simply is something that I am talking about being for the things to do. How many of you think that we should be forced to pay higher wages than our suppliers, or than our competitors, just because we happen to be better? How many of you think that we should?

How many of you think that we should not?

Question. Mr. Wilson, just for a change, could I ask you a question? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON. I want to get this man's question next.

Question. Well, you kind of jumped around my point there, and you put me on th defensive on that. In the first place my idea was not forcing the corporation to do it. The idea is that General Motors is faced with a demand on the part of this labor force. General Motors maintain that the profits are not there, at least it cannot see the profits, and this labor force maintains that they are.

Now, my point was, would General Motors favor a period during which proper costs could be set up, and they could show that they are or not, then.

Mr. WILSON. Well, of course, that is what we hoped would happen, that is the normal kind of a thing. But actually, we had the gun put to us awfully quick. Like I said, when the guns were still smoking, when we were still hearing the echoes of the atomic bomb, we got 30 percent. And we are not ready to go after some months, we have to face considerable losses, after all, that is in our business, we have to take it.

This aftermath of war cannot immediately mean prosperity for everybody all over the world, you know. I mean, it just cannot be.

And the union boys are a little hard to argue with. I have not tried it just lately. I have had plenty of experience. You can get one plan blocked out, that seems to be going a long ways for them, and then here they are over here.

They argued with us, "Take it out of the profits that you made during the war."

Well, we didn't make very big profits during the war.

They say to take it out of your excess profits that you paid in taxes, and then get a refund from the Government.

Well, that money has been spent; that helped to kick our enemies. Where is that money going to come from?

There are some laws on the books of the country that were put on there to take care of hardship cases, certain kinds of manufacturers, that had very tough reconversion problems, and all that kind of thing—small business, mostly. General Motors has not asked for a handout yet, and we do not hardly think we should start, because if we are entitled to it, then certainly all the rest of the country is, too.

But the idea that you can take wartime volume and profits, when 85 percent of the profits, over a certain base were paid to the Government, and say, "We are going to take that away, because it is going to be paid to the Government anyhow, and we ought to pay it to the workmen." No one has come up with the answer where the Government is going to get the taxes. The Government has to get the taxes, and if you gave it to the workmen, then it is going to have to tax the workmen. It is easier and cheaper to get it from us, because it is in one place. And another thing, it would not make votes. A corporation does not vote. That is one of the troubles.

But it simply is their idea that we should make a gamble on the future and pay excess wages now, on the assumption that a year from now, when we have all these new plants that I am talking about, that we hope to have in operation by a year from now, and we get over this problem of reestablishing the worker efficiency, get our overheads down to where they ought to be, the idea that then we are going to make a lot of money, and that therefore, we should pay the excess wages, now, is more of a gamble than we think that we ought to be asked to take. None of you men would do it in your private business.

Question. Well, you pulled a Walter Reuther on me, though, in that question, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. I humbly beg your pardon. [Laughter.]

Question (continuing). When you said that, you said first, should General Motors pay more than the average suppliers, and then in the voting, you said, "Should they be forced to?"

Now, I did not mean by any stretch of the imagination, that they should be forced to.

It has been corporation policy, as I understand it, to pay higher wages than the suppliers in even the same area.

Mr. WILSON. We expect to continue that policy, too, and perhaps we would go a little further with it if it were a really free market, a free labor market.

Historically, the industry got along very well by paying good wages and attracting the ablest people to it. We are not in that position, quite, any more; and also, one of the union demands is for industry-wide wages, not only by corporations, but for all communities; so we cannot go quite as far with that one as perhaps we would like to.

Historically, what we have done, with our technological improvements, which is the better way of doing things, accomplishing the same result with less man-hours of labor, of human effort, we have shared with our customers and our employees. The stockholder has gotten a return for the capital that he has in the business. If you do not give it to the customer, you do not expand the volume, and you do not create the jobs. You do not raise the standard of living of our country.

We are not for fewer things for fewer people, you know; we are for more and better things for more people.

Question. Mr. Snyder has referred to 23-percent increase in the cost of living of the workers. Now, if your production standards, efficiency, were maintained as before the war, and your volume were as good as you expect to be after the war, all things being equal, could you grant the workers a 23-percent wage increase and stay in business?

Mr. WILSON. You mean at the same prices?

Question. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. No; we could not.

Question. Mr. Wilson, as soon as that consumer demand spends itself, do you see any signs of depression in the offing?

Mr. WILSON. I would like to make sure that I got that question correctly. Was that for our employees only, or all the workers—if all workers in allied industry get the same 23 percent.

You see, we want that to be understood by everybody that we cannot artificially raise the compensation level of our employees, importantly, above the compensation of our suppliers, if we do not get any suppliers.

Question. I am assuming that all labor contributes to your product.

Mr. WILSON. Then my answer is correct.

Question. Now, my question is, If and when consumer demands spend themselves, do you see a depression in the offing?

Mr. WILSON. That all depends on two things, in my opinion. That is sound policies, as affecting business, and finance. That is, is the country going to go on some kind of a wild speculation or gambling spree; are they going to contract debts that they have no reasonable chance of paying? That is No. 1.

Are we going to keep it on a sound and sensible basis, and have a free economy, or are we going to have too many sections of it that are controlled in one way or another?

That is the first answer we have to have in the country.

The second is, Are the people of our country willing to work for the things they would like to have? Now, you can answer those two, and then you can answer the question.

If we are going to have a free competitive economy, improve it where we have seen its mistakes of the past; if the people of our country are willing to work for the things that they would like to have, as they have in the past, then we should have a marvelous country and a marvelous standard of living.

Question. I would like to find out if the group is ready to hear your questions. I would like to ask a very simple question.

Mr. WILSON. All right.

Question. Has your conference with the President today been satisfactory?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir. I am sort of a modest fellow and I don't expect too much.

Question. I have a simple question, Mr. Wilson. All these divisions have reported their divisions are in production, and these cars are accumulating. You have no price formula to sell them. I assume you are not going to keep them, you are going to send them out to the dealers. How are you going to sell them without a price program, without a price being set?

Mr. WILSON. You say they are accumulating. Those figures didn't sound like much accumulation to me.

Question. Well, they will, if they don't get them out and get them into the hands of the users.

Mr. WILSON. I will tell you what we are going to do. We are going to ship them to our dealers like we have in the past years, before we announced the new prices.

We usually got enough cars in the hands of dealers so that everybody was ready to do business before we said, "That is the price." We are hoping that by the time we get the cars in that shape, that we will have this problem solved. It is either going to be solved, or our plants are all going to be shut down completely and we don't have any cars accumulating, so one of the two is going to happen.

Question. Mr. Wilson, I would like to ask a question on the technological improvements. You have referred to the Hydramatic, the General Motors Hydramatic. Does that mean—and when will it be in the Chevrolet?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I don't know, the chief engineer of Chevrolet is here tonight. I don't know whether Mr. Boyer would like to tackle that one or not.

Mr. BOYER. General Patton opened his mouth once too often. I think I have talked enough for the evening. Frankly, I don't know.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to remind you men that we could not do the normal amount of development during the war, so the first thing we had to do here now, was everybody concentrate on getting the drawings cleared up on the thing we had to put into production now.

Then the thing is, ordinarily our models are settled a year ahead of time, so having gotten the drawings in shape and built the first cars and found out everything is all right, we now have to settle right now what we are going to build for 1947. Then we are going to have to go ahead with our engineering and see what kind of a car we can make that is better, that will please you folks more, for 1948.

So you ask a question, it is such a development thing, that it cannot be scheduled at this time. None of us know when we are going to have them.

Question. Will it eventually be in the Chevrolet?

Mr. WILSON. I would think so, on this simple formula, that anything that is good in the industry, has gone all through it.

Question. Mr. Wilson, you have had a lot of experience with labor in Detroit in the last 10 or 15 years. Do you think that the labor relations are improving or deteriorating, and what do you think is happening? Are they getting any better?

Are you making any headway, or are you falling back?

Mr. WILSON. What do you think, Harry, would you like to answer that one?

Mr. ANDERSON. I didn't quite hear the question.

Mr. WILSON. The question is: What would we say about the over-all labor relations, particularly in Detroit, Mich., in this area, have they been improving through the years, or are they deteriorating?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am assuming that he is talking about everybody, not General Motors, is that correct?

Question. The Detroit manufacturers, automobile manufacturers.

Mr. WILSON. Well——

Mr ANDERSON. I think that the question as asked, I will try to answer this way:

I think that the question of responsibility of the unions is being brought more to the forefront, and that is raising a pretty serious question in the industry generally.

On the whole, I really feel that they are getting a little better than they were back in the early days.

Mr. WILSON. They got an awful bad start with the sit-down strikes. Of course, since the time when the highest court in the land said that that is not a legal thing to do, it has not been so bad, but it did get the thing started on a very bad basis.

The men sort of captured the plants, and a few of them that don't think very straight, thought the plants were theirs, and have acted like the plants were theirs ever since, and that has always been the problem.

Question. Mr. Wilson, are you optimistic?

Mr. WILSON. I might add that according to some labor statistics that were given Mr. Anderson, that the industry as a whole, considering the number of people employed, and the number of people employed in General Motors, had 14 times as many hours of labor stoppage as we did in the corporation.

That is the one reason we are not so hot about being picked out first for the labor blockade. We don't think it was coming to us.

Question. Has General Motors given your final answer on this wage increase, and what is your real position on it?

Mr. WILSON. Our real position on it, and the answer has been given, is that there is no increase that we can or will give at this time, under the present wage-price formulas of the country as we understand them.

If they are changed, we will talk about another set of conditions. If they are not changed, I suppose we will have a strike, unless the men get sensible about it, and say, "Well, now, the corporation is in the middle, is in the hole, and we are too, and we will try it for a while, and wait until we can straighten the thing out, or something happens that is more favorable all around."

Mind you, we are going to work longer hours, and this take-home pay is going to get settled. The take-home pay of the people who are now working is not too bad. Paying those who are working more money would not help those who aren't working, or don't want to work.

Question. Mr. Wilson, out of your experience in the last few years, have you any recommendations to make for improving labor relations generally?

Mr. WILSON. Well, we make them every day. That is Mr. Anderson's job, primarily, and he has got a bunch of able people at it. We do not think our record would be 14 times better than the average of the industry if we had not been working at it.

I do think that we all ought to recognize that this is sort of an experiment for the country, this question of collective bargaining. These tremendous big international unions do have the monopoly power if they want to use it, and abuse it. Perhaps what is the proper common-law approach in the equities and rights of the general public, as well as the principles, is something that we will have to work out with a lot of sweat and a lot of intelligent analysis.

Question. Are you optimistic about the future of a unionized automobile industry?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I think "optimistic" is not necessarily quite the word. I think I should say I am not too discouraged about it.

Unions have a weakness that is fundamentally to the disadvantage of the people of the country, that I have often thought was very definitely a carry-over from almost ancient times in the guilds, where a small

percentage of craftsmen, by restriction of apprentice and activities, placed the value of their services much higher than they might have been in a free competitive society.

When vertical unions take in Chevrolet salesmen, stenographers and truck drivers and teamsters, and when the whole country goes in for one like that you are really trying to raise yourselves by your bootstraps.

In other words, the so-called feather-bedding, the more-pay-for-less-work principle, is not sound. That is contrary to the technological advance. You can have enough feather-bedding to counteract the best brains on the technological side, so the country doesn't gain very fast.

Question. What about incentive wages?

Mr. WILSON. The unions are mostly very strongly against incentive wages, just for that purpose. They have a name that they give a man that is willing to exert himself in a plant. They call him a meat-hound.

Now, unfortunately, the meat hounds built America, you see, so if you starve too many meat hounds, I think it is going to be bad for the country. That is just my own opinion.

Question. Mr. Wilson, on the air Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach made the statement that unfortunately he had found a considerable number of employers who did not want full employment. Have you seen any disposition on the part of employers to fight full employment?

Mr. WILSON. I have never run across such a man. With due reference to the Secretary, that sounds a little political to me.

Any man, you know, that understands this industry business knows that his business and the whole country's business is going to be better when everybody has a job. We will have it in this country if we don't have too much interference with the freedom of individuals and free competition, and if you go the other way, personally, I don't see any halfway mark, that you can have the country half collectivist and half free.

Question. Thank you very much, Mr. Wilson.

TACTICS FOR 30 PERCENT PAY RAISE—UAW-CIO EXECUTIVE BOARD RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILSON. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this place as a part of my remarks a copy of the UAW-CIO executive board resolutions entitled "Tactics for 30 Percent Pay Raise." The resolutions were adopted by the executive board of the UAW-CIO, as appears in the October 1945 issue of a publication entitled "Ammunition," which is an official publication of the education department, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, of which publication R. J. Thomas is president, Richard Frankensteen is vice president, and Walter P. Reuther is vice president.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UAW-CIO EXECUTIVE BOARD RESOLUTIONS—TACTICS FOR 30-PERCENT PAY RAISE

1. Management to be asked for industry-wide negotiations for pay increases amounting to 30 percent of the pay roll, part to be used for correction of inequalities, part for insurance for our members, and most of it for an across-the-board raise in cents per hour.

2. If industry-wide negotiations are refused, one major automobile manufacturing corporation to be chosen for a test. If negotiations fail that corporation will be struck nationally at the most opportune time.

3. During the test period, all of that corporation's competitors will have the opportunity to capture the market from the struck corporation.

4. There shall be no strikes in the effort to raise wages outside the test corporation, if such strikes shall in any way tie up the automobile manufacturing competitors of that corporation.

5. Negotiations with other companies may lead to offers of less than 30 percent. These can be accepted only if they contain a stipulation that in the event more is obtained on the national level, negotiations can be reopened. (This has already been done in Studebaker.)

6. The International Union will take aggressive action against strikes which endanger in any way the success of the outlined program.

7. Strike action shall conform to the Smith-Connally Act and international constitution procedure.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the conference report on House bill 694. At the time the bill was before the Senate I was informed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and notice appeared in the press, that he intended to speak on the bill for several days.

On October 3, while the distinguished Senator from Mississippi was speaking on the bill, I obtained unanimous consent of the Senate to go to my home State of North Dakota with the Surplus Property Administrator, so that the people of North Dakota, particularly the mayors in the various cities, the county commissioners, the heads of the water systems, and farmers would be able to secure some of the surplus left as a result of World War II. Before I left I told the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I expected to return on Monday so that I might take part in the debate.

On Saturday, the day after I left, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] offered an amendment. That evening in the newspapers of North Dakota I discovered that the bill had been passed. Therefore upon my return I served notice that when the conference report came before the Senate I would speak in opposition to it, futile though my opposition might be at that particular time.

Mr. President, I feel that by the passage of the bill the common people are being robbed of hundreds of millions of dollars. I consider this bill more of a steal than Teapot Dome, even if it had been carried out to its full extent.

First of all, I wish to read what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi said when he opened the debate in opposition to the bill. He said:

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, unless one were a daily reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he would not have known anything about the facts in connection with the bill under consideration, because from the beginning the press and radio of the country have been almost absolutely silent in the treatment of publicity with respect to the proposed legislation. In other words, the people of the country do not know the facts and the meaning of the proposed legislation. Even Members of the Senate and Members of the House, unless they are members of the committees which dealt with the proposals know very little about it.

I asked one of the outstanding Members of the House, after the bill had passed, "What do you mean by letting a bill of this character get by the House without your opposition?" He said, "I never heard of it. I know nothing about it."

Mr. President, what must the people of America think about legislation which is passed in that manner?

The distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi continued, as follows:

In order that the people of the country may know what is behind the bill, what is in the bill, and what it is all about, it is necessary that the history of the whole subject be reviewed on the floor of the Senate.

Then he said:

There has been a very large lobby in Washington in connection with this proposal. Of course, the public knew nothing about the lobby. There was no way to tell anything about it, because a lobbyist who is worth his salt does not announce his goings and comings, but quietly does his work.

Mr. President, I say that if there ever was a lobby interested in securing the passage of a measure, it was the lobby which was interested in securing the passage of House bill 694.

The distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi continued his statement, as follows:

I remember that last December, when the bill was reached on the call of the calendar and an effort was made to pass it, I interposed objection and announced that I was willing to filibuster for 30 days rather than see it passed. That evening after I reached my office a railroad lawyer, representing one of the largest railroad systems in the country, came to my office about 6 o'clock in the evening and said he wanted to talk with me confidentially. I said, "Very well." He said, "I understand that you have threatened to filibuster against the bill for 30 days rather than see it pass." I said "Yes; I made that statement." He said "I want to know if you meant it." I said "Yes; I meant it." He said, "You would not reconsider?" I said "No." He said "If you are going to take that position, I am going home tomorrow. I have been here for several months trying to have this legislation passed, but if you are going to filibuster until the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress, it is not necessary for me to stay any longer."

I said, "Very well. I am afraid the people of the country and many Members of Congress have not appreciated the magnitude of this piece of legislation; they have not stopped to analyze it and see what it involves."

Then, Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi continued his statement. It shows the magnitude of what has been put over and what will be put over upon the common people of America if this conference report is adopted:

There are, in the 48 States of the Union 1,934,051,921 acres of land, including water acreage. The railroad promoters between 1850 and 1871 obtained tremendously large grants of land. Let me say that in many cases the men who then came to Congress and to the State legislatures and secured the large donations of land were not the

builders of the railroads. They were the smooth, manipulating operators who secured the grants and then passed them on, for their share in the deal, to someone who would build the railroads. They were merely slick operators, if you please. They were able to persuade the Congress of the United States and some of the States of the Union to grant, donate, give, and patent for them, for the purpose of building railroads, a total amount of 1,179,284,978 acres of Government land—enough land to make 14 States of the American Union. The grant was just that large. As proof of that fact I shall read the names of 14 States of the Union which could have been created within the area of gifts of land made by the Government to the railroads which are involved in the pending bill.

Mark you this, Mr. President:

Sufficient land was donated to the railroad promoters in this country in the 20-year period between 1850 and 1870 to make up the States of Rhode Island, Delaware Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maryland, West Virginia, South Carolina, Maine, Kentucky, Virginia, and New York. The transfer was just that big. Congress and the State legislatures gave to the railroad promoters, I repeat, all that was Government land. Whose land was it, Mr. President? It was the people's land, the taxpayers' land. The railroads thus received land equal in extent to the area of 14 States of the American Union, as composed today. To be exact, the 14 States I have mentioned have a total acreage of 174,770,000 acres, and the railroads received 4,507,978 additional acres. In other words, the railroads received an amount of land equivalent to the area of 14 of our States and several million acres in addition. That gives some idea of how large the grant was.

What was the consideration? For what reason did the railroads plead with the Congress and the State legislatures to grant them all that public land, land which belonged to the Government and the States, land which had been or would have been used for homesteaders as the Nation grew in population? Of course, the excuse was that the land was given to the promoters to project and construct railroads in undeveloped sections of our great Republic.

Mr. President, I come from the great Northwest. Conditions in that area are in very many respects similar to those in the entire western section of the United States. The people, particularly the farmers of that area, have been robbed, looted, cheated, hornswoggled, fooled, and lied to by the big railroad interests of the United States, until the average man there must wonder whether the people of this country own the Government or whether it is owned by the railroads, the oil interests, and the other big monopolies that have been running the affairs of this country for a long, long time. All of us are familiar with the great control of the lumber interests in the West, and all of us know what has happened to the big mining interests of America.

Mr. President, it happens that I do not come from a State which is controlled by a great political machine. I am responsible only to the common people of my State who elected me. Any day that I cannot stand upon this floor and represent them, I shall, under my own conscience, walk out of this Chamber, rather than stand here representing the big monopolies and the big interests that have robbed the common people of this country for years and years and years and, in my judgment, are robbing them by the enactment of this measure.

My grandfather went to the State of North Dakota away back in 1877, at the very time when the Northern Pacific Railroad was being built in North Dakota. He was there when the transcontinental lines were built. He and my father were there when former President Ulysses S. Grant came to Bismarck, N. Dak., to help dedicate the old capitol. My father was a member of the first Legislature of North Dakota, and he knew intimately how the railroads there were operating, how they controlled the legislature. Time and again he told me how it was owned and dominated by the railroads, through the issuance of free railroad passes, until finally a law was passed which made it a crime for any public official to accept such a pass or even to use one to attend a political convention.

Until 1916, through Alec McKenzie and his gang—at one time Alec McKenzie was a receiver of the Northern Pacific Railroad—our State was at the mercy of this bunch of brigands, robbers, crooks, and thieves. When I became attorney general, Mr. President, I moved to raise the taxes of the railroads 300 percent. That caused a lawsuit, as a result of which the people of the State finally achieved something approximating an even break in at least making the railroads pay their just share of taxes.

When the railroads were built through the West, Mr. President, as the majority report said, they received land grants involving 130,000,000 acres of land for the construction of approximately 71,500 miles of railroad. Think of it. For building 21,500 miles of railroad they received a gift of 130,000,000 acres of land. Do you think, Mr. President, I would stand upon this floor and ever vote for a bill or a conference report which would legalize that kind of thing in the United States of America? Most of this land was located in the western part of the United States, although some of it was in the South.

Most of the land-grant acts contained provisions requiring certain specified concessions to the Government for transportation services performed by the railroads on behalf of the Government. It was provided that the railroads operating on the lands so granted would be available at all times to the Government for the transportation of its troops or property free of any toll or charge. But the railroads were not even satisfied with that. They were helped out by the Supreme Court in 1887, when the Court held that the act contemplated merely the free use of the railroad tracks by the Government for the movement of engines and cars operated by it or at its expense. So the people did not get what they thought they were getting when they granted the land, because the Court determined that the right of the Government to the free use of the tracks was worth only 50 percent of the full transportation charge made by the railroads against ordinary shipments. As a result of subsequent legislation that 50-percent base or charge was made applicable to all railroads which were subject to land-grant deductions.

Mr. President, let us place the matter on a plane where we can see it and the smallest farmer can understand it. A railroad was about to be constructed. I am now referring to the Northern Pacific Railroad in North Dakota. The usual land grant—and that is what the Northern Pacific received—was in blocks of 6,400 acres, consisting of alternate sections on each side of the road extending back for 10 miles. So in return for building the railroad the Government gave to the railroad free 6,400 acres or land, or 10 sections for every mile of railroad that was built.

But that was not all, Mr. President. The railroads laid out the towns on the sections which they owned, and sold lots. Cities grew up over night. The railroads controlled those little townsites through subsidiary corporations so that the railroads did not receive the money, but friends of the men who controlled the railroads received it. The result was that those men piled up hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars in addition to what they had already received.

Mr. President, what was that land worth? Land located miles away from a railroad was worth little, but the nearer the railroad came to land the more valuable the land became. When a railroad was built within 10 miles of it a tract of land was worth $20, $25, $30, and $40 an acre. Away back in 1880, depending on how close the railroad had been built to the towns laid out along its right-of-way, the price of the land varied as I have stated. Homesteaders, for example, who filed on the alternate sections not owned by the railroads had to live on the land for a specific length of time, and when they proved up they had to pay from $1.25 to $2.50 and acre for their land, depending on how long they had lived on it. Some of those homesteads were promptly sold. Some were sold before the titles had been legally established; some of the land was sold for as much as $30 an acre. I know the truth of my statement because it was in that vast area of the West that I was born and reared.

But that is not all the story, Mr. President. The officials of the railroads got together and by favoring themselves, their relatives and friends, they made money. Take, for example, the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. It sold land at 60 cents, 75 cents, or $1 an acre to corporations which it owned or which were controlled by it. In turn, those corporations sold the land at $10, $20, $30, $40, and $45 an acre to farmers who came into the Northwest to establish homes. Mr. President, if any Senator doubts the truth of my statement, I may say that I have with me copies of some of the contracts which were entered into between the Northwest Improvement Co., or one of its subsidiary corporations, and farmers who bought land 15 miles away from the railroad. If any Senator doubts my statement all he needs to do is to examine the court records. The records can be brought to the Senate.

But that is not all, Mr. President. Regardless of the cost of constructing the railroads, the money which was actually put into their construction was in

many instances provided by people from foreign countries. The Dutch built the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. It was not built by people who are today receiving benefits from the operation of the railroad. All one needs to do is to go to the Supreme Court of the United States and look at the record of the time when Jim Hill was actively connected with the Northern Pacific. The record will show that many of the Dutch people were robbed of hundreds of millions of dollars. The record will show that railroads were placed in the hands of receivers, that the receivers carefully concealed from the bondholders the true value of the railroads, and that the bonds were subsequently purchased for a few cents on the dollar.

It was not until after the Dutch found out that they had been robbed that they brought law suits.

These statements can easily be verified by reference to the cases in the State and Federal courts in the eighties and the nineties. The people who actually got control of these railroads, such as Jim Hill and his associates, were proven by the court records to be folks who got the bonds for almost nothing, owned the railroads for almost nothing, and had the land for nothing. That, my fellow Senators, was the way the great railroad fortunes of America were created. Millionaires and multimillionaires whose descendants now are living, like the imperial potentates of old, on proceeds which they never earned and which they got by clever, tricky legal and political conniving and manipulation, are the people who are now before the Senate asking to be relieved of the contract which they assumed at the time when we gave away 130,000,000 acres of our public domain. It is this kind of people who are going to be benefited.

Mr. President, when ordinary men sign a contract they are supposed to keep the contract. If one signs a note and does not pay it, he will be sued. If one signs an agreement and does not keep it, he will be sued. The railroads got free 640 acres of land for each mile of track, and they said, "We are going to haul some Government machinery, all the Government wants to haul, perpetually." That was supposed to be the consideration. As I stated a few moments ago, they went into court and in 1940 the court held what they were entitled to pay for this hauling. They are not satisfied with that, and one of the greatest lobbies I have ever known, one of the greatest lobbies, according to the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi, he has ever known, is here now saying, "We are not going to give up what land is left. We are going to keep it all, but we want to be relieved from this contract." If we adopt this conference report, in my judgment we betray the people who sent us here and make a present of all the land that is left.

Mr. President, some of the land that is left has been in litigation in Western States for the last 20 years, very valuable oil land, but the railroads do not give back one acre.

I repeat, when one signs a note or signs a contract he has to meet his obligation, but the railroads say, "We are powerful. We can go to the Congress and can be relieved without paying a dollar."

If this conference report is adopted over my protest, as I know it is going to be adopted, it will mean that the railroads in question will be richer by millions of dollars. There is no need for it. The railroads are not destitute today. As a matter of fact, they have the greatest reserves in their history.

Mr. President, I have some children, and I want my children to know, when I pass on, that on this day, the 26th day of October, I asked unanimous consent to place in the RECORD House bill 694 as it was reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 321 of title III, part II, of the Transportation Act of 1940, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the following: "except that the foregoing provision shall not apply to the transportation of military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use or to the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty;", so that said subsection, as so amended, shall read as follows:

"SEC. 321. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to the provisions of sections 1 (7) and 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, the full applicable commercial rates, fares, or charges shall be paid for transportation by any common carrier subject to such act of any persons or property for the United States, or on its behalf, and the rate determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission as reasonable therefor shall be paid for the transportation by railroad of the United States mail: *Provided, however*, That any carrier by railroad and the United States may enter into contracts for the transportation of the United States mail for less than such rate: *Provided further*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 41, sec. 5), shall not hereafter be construed as requiring advertising for bids in connection with the procurement of transportation services when the services required can be procured from any common carrier lawfully operating in the territory where such services are to be performed."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever is the earlier: *Provided, however*, That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract.

SEC. 3. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates, fares, and charges, shall give due consideration to the increased revenues which carriers will receive as a result of the enactment of this act, so that such increased revenues will be reflected in appropriate readjustments in rates, fares, and charges to shippers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi led a brave fight against the bill, led it almost single-handed, but it was passed, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full the conference report which we are now asked to accept. I want history to record exactly what took place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this Act shall take effect October 1, 1946: *Provided, however*, That any travel or transportation specifically contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract of carriage or shipment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, to a fund in the Treasury to be known as the 'veterans' farms fund', amounts equal in the aggregate to the total amount set forth in subsection (c) of this section.

"(b) Amounts appropriated to the veterans' farms fund shall be available until expended and shall be utilized, 75 per centum by the Secretary of the Interior and 25 per centum by the Secretary of Agriculture, as follows:

"(1) The amounts available to the Secretary of the Interior shall be utilized by him for the construction of irrigation projects in the reclamation States; and for the purchase and reclamation improvement of such privately owned lands, and the reclamation improvement of such public lands, situated within reclamation projects as are necessary to the proper and integrated development of said projects, and such Secretary shall dispose of lands so purchased or improved to eligible veterans in family-type farms.

"(2) The amounts available to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be utilized by him for the purpose of assisting eligible veterans to establish themselves upon and improve family-type farms on lands within Federal reclamation projects and on lands within the States in which railroad land grants are located but which are not reclamation States. Funds so available to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be administered in the same manner as funds appropriated for title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended: *Provided*, That such funds may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in the reclamation States and in the other States named in subsection (c) without regard to the prevalence of farm tenancy in said States: *And provided further*, That veterans found qualified for occupancy of a family-type unit on Federal reclamation projects pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act must also be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior. Any funds appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to title I of the Bankhead-Jones

Farm Tenant Act may be used for the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (3) of this subsection, in the manner and under the conditions provided for the use of funds made available pursuant to this subsection.

"(5) In order to provide for cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of this section, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, pursuant to cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, to consider any money made available by any Federal agency to veterans settling upon land within Federal reclamation projects, as all or a portion of the capital required of such settler under subsection C of section 4 of the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1924 (43 Stat. 702), and where any lands have been or may be improved by means of funds made available to an eligible veteran by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall require the entryman or settler of such lands to enter into a mortgage contract or other security instrument acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture covering his interest in the land and improvements to secure the repayment of the value of such improvements before a subsequent entry is allowed.

"(4) Of the amounts in the veterans' farm fund, the Secretary of the Interior shall expend at least $3,750,000 of the funds available to him, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall expend at least $1,250,000 of the funds available to him, in each of the States mentioned in subsection (c) as having railroad land-grant lands valued at $5,000,000 or more: *Provided*, That if the total of the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) is less than $68,272,770, then the said Secretaries shall expend in each of such States 75 per centum and 25 per centum, respectively, of an amount which bears the same ratio to $5,000,000 as the total of the amounts so appropriated bears to $68,272,770.

"(5) An eligible veteran for the purposes of this section is one who has been or may be declared by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be eligible for any benefits provided for in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as now in force or as hereafter amended.

"(6) No amount shall be deducted or withheld from any payment due to any veteran under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of protecting the United States against loss in connection with any sale of land under this section.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the value of land-grant lands to which carriers have legal or equitable title or possession in the several States is hereby fixed as follows: "Arizona, $7,000,000; California, $14,331,090; Idaho, $1,149,190; Minnesota, $87,228; Montana, $19,209,090; Nevada, $11,112,454; New Mexico, $5,000,000; North Dakota, $1,000,500; Oregon, $171,292; Utah, $349,120; Washington, $8,789,406; Wisconsin, $3,300; Wyoming, $70,100; total, $68,272,770."

And the Senate agree to the same.

E. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
B. K. WHEELER,
E. H. MOORE,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LYLE H. BOREN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a provision was inserted giving away some so-called veterans' farm funds and an attempt was made to make it appear that instead of robbing the veterans they were being given something. In another place there is a suggestion about helping small-type farmers. At the very end the sponsors tell how they are going to give $68,272,770 to Arizona, California, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming; $68,272,770, Mr. President, when, as a matter of fact, they are being relieved in the amount of $20,000,000 each month, so all they are giving is less than four times what they were already legally obligated to pay.

Mr. President, this is not the first time such a bill has come before the Congress. One like it came up once before, and a distinguished group of men who had the interest of the Government at heart got together and defeated it. That was at a time when we were not engaged in war, when we were not busy with a thousand and one things involving peace, involving reconversion, or involving the atomic bomb. If this bill had come up at a time when we were not settling the war, finishing it up, it never could have been passed, in my judgment, but it was brought forward at the time when the average Senator's mind was occupied with a thousand other things. I wish to read portions of what these patriotic men printed as a result of months of investigation, at a time when some were attempting to put over this looting and robbing of the people some years ago. The pamphlet is entitled "Railroad Land Grants—Their Cost and Benefits to the United States Government."

In recent years there seems to be a growing agitation, especially among railroad officials, for repeal of the railroad land-grant laws.

Oh, Mr. President, there are always those who are trying to get something for nothing, to rob the people while the people are not watching. The pamphlet continues:

In recent years there seems to be a growing agitation, especially among railroad officials, for repeal of the railroad land-grant laws. These statutes are the medium through which millions of acres of the public domain, of which the people of the United States were the common owners, were conveyed to private corporations for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and which contain clauses requiring such railroads to transport mail, troops, and property of the United States Government at reduced rates. The latter-named clauses are those against which all criticisms are directed. There never have been, and are not now, any objections or criticisms to that part of the statutes which conveyed the lands, stone, and timber and which, in some cases, provided the loan of United States Government bonds, to the railroad corporations. Grants of land from the Federal Government to aid in various enterprises in the public interest date from about the year 1803 and were in the form of grants to States for the purpose of constructing wagon roads, or rolling roads, as they were sometimes called in those early times. To illustrate, in 1808 various Indian tribes ceded to the United States a strip of land 120 feet in width from the rapids of the Miami in Ohio to the Territory of Michigan and all the land within 1 mile on each side in order that the Government might establish a road to the Territory of Michigan.

Mr. President, I want to come to the part dealing with the railroads:

Many bills appeared in Congress regarding grants between 1833 and 1850. However, in the latter year occurred the first large grant of land in aid of constructing a railroad—that of the Illinois Central (9 Stats. 466, 467.) A proviso in that statute stipulated that "the said railroad and branches shall be and remain a public highway for the use of the Government of the United States free from toll or other charge upon the transportation of any property or troops of the United States." During the following two decades, through various acts, Congress granted, and the railroads of the country as a whole received a total of 132,425,574 acres of the public lands. This total area represents 206,915 square miles which is equal to the combined area of the States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

Think of it, Mr. President, giving away land equivalent to four States of the size of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

We now come to the Northern Pacific Railroad, which I know all about, Mr. President. I know all about how that railroad operated during the time I was attorney general of my State and Governor of my State.

Lands granted to the Northern Pacific Railway Co. alone total 43,159,428 acres. It is safe to say that the majority of these granted lands have been disposed of and the proceeds put into the capital value of the roads.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remainder of the paragraph. It deals with other railroads.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For example, the Santa Fe and predecessor lines received lands aggregating 16,242,841 acres, of which 10,946,005 acres were sold for net proceeds of $19,215,052. These amounts are as of June 30, 1916. The Great Northern Railway and predecessor lines received 2,811,143 acres of land from the Federal Government, of which 2,713,399 acres were disposed of as of June 30, 1915, for a net profit of $15,880,596. The Illinois Central Railroad Co. received 2,598,606 acres of land from the Federal Government of which 2,588,832 acres were disposed of for net proceeds of $23,191,236 (60 Val. Rept. 222.) Many others might be pointed out. A large acreage, however, is still held for use upon which rests approximately 14,411 miles of line now in operation by various owners.

Mr. LANGER. I continue to read:

The meaning of the clause "the said railroad and branches shall be, and remain, a public highway for the use of the Government of the United States, free from toll or other charge, for the transportation of any property or troops of the United States," which appears in nearly all original grants, became the subject of litigation and in 1876 reached the United States Supreme Court on appeal from the Court of Claims in *Lake Superior and Mississippi Railroad Co.* v. *United States* (93 U. S. 442). The result was a 5-to-4 decision—

By the Supreme Court of this country, mind you—

to the effect that the Government only secured for itself the free use of the roadway, or real property and appurtenances, such as roadbed, stations, roundhouses, etc., and that the carriers were entitled to compensation for the use of their rolling stock, personnel, fuel, and work performed in transporting the Government's property. Thereafter, in *Atchison Railroad Company* v. *United States* (15 C. Cls., 126–151), it was decided, after considerable evidence and findings of fact, that 50 percent of tariff rates and fares should be a fair deduction from commercial rates as compensation for the use of equipment, servants, etc.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of that paragraph may be printed in the RECORD, as well as the remainder of that page, and all of the following page, including the table, all of page 4, and a part of page 5.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prior to 1874 a practice of allowing land-grant railroads 66⅔ percent of commercial rates had grown up. Since that decision in December 1879, 50 percent of commercial rates and fares has been allowed, with some exceptions, carriers who received grants of land directly or indirectly from the Federal Government.

It has been stated that the Government and the citizens of the country have been compensated many times over in benefits and in actual reductions in cost of transporting freight and persons, both public and private, for all lands granted railroads, and that these grants, having been many times paid for in benefits, can no longer be viewed in the light of obligations, and constitute only an interesting historical fact in transportation development. Therefore, it is further stated, if continued the deductions become an exploitation by Government of a private enterprise. It has also been stated that the conditions of rate and fare reductions in these grants constitute an unfair burden not only upon land-grant roads but upon competing non-land-grant roads, due to depressed revenues from necessary rate and fare equalizations, affecting directly every important carrier in the western and southern districts and in Central Freight Association territory, and indirectly those in the Trunk Line and New England territories.

Let us examine as closely as possible the correctness of these statements.

First, it is probably undisputed that certain railroads of the country were the recipients of a total of approximately 132,425,574 acres of land through grants from the Federal Government. These lands were granted over the period of years 1833–71. Measuring the value which the Government lost and the railroad corporations gained as a result of the g nts is difficult. While it would seem on first consideration that the average price per acre yielded from the sale of public lands over the period of years when all grants were made would apply, a more careful examination of the circumstances under which a great many of these sales were made reveals that such procedure would not produce a fair average price. To illustrate, from August 4, 1854, to June 2, 1862, the Graduation Act was in effect. This act provided for reductions in the price of land which had been on the market from 10 to 30 years and yet remained unsold. Prices were graduated on those picked-over lands from $1 per acre for lands on the market 10 years without sale, down to 12½ cents per acre for lands unsold for 30 years. But these graduated prices were reserved to actual settlers or cultivators, and a corporation, as such, could not purchase at these low prices, the act providing "that any person applying to enter any of the aforesaid lands shall be required to make affidavit before the register or receiver of the proper land office that he or she enters the same for his or her own use, and for the purpose of actual settlement and occupied by him or herself * * *," (ch. 244, sec. 3, supra). The act did not repeal the law enacted in 1820 establishing a minimum price of $1.25 per acre for all public lands (3 Stats. 566), and this minimum price, it must be remembered, was in effect and applied to ordinary public land throughout the entire period of railroad grants. It is apparent, therefore, that the inclusion of amounts from sales of public lands during the years 1855 to 1862, inclusive, in any calculation designed to produce a fair average price per acre for "ordinary public lands" which railroad corporations would have found it necessary to pay, would defeat that design. On the contrary, it is believed that an average price arrived at by excluding the sales of those years will more nearly represent the price of public lands to railroads through the era of grants. It may readily be seen from the table below that the lowest average price on sales during the 38 years, 1834 to 1871, inclusive, are those during the life of the Graduation Act. The next lowest year was 1837 and this was, no doubt, occasioned by the severe panic of that year. Aside from the years which the Graduation Act was in force, and 1837 and 1846, the average price of public lands had not fallen below the prescribed minimum of $1.25 per acre. The following is a tabulation of the sales of public lands from 1834 to 1871,[1] inclusive, ending June 30 of each year:

Year	Acres	Amount	Average per acre
1834	4,658,218	$6,099,981	$1.31
1835	12,564,478	15,999,804	1.27
1836	20,074,870	25,167,833	1.25
1837	5,601,103	7,007,523	1.07
1838	3,414,907	4,305,564	1.26
1839	4,976,382	6,464,556	1.30
1840	2,236,889	2,789,637	1.25
1841	1,164,796	1,464,364	1.26
1842	1,129,218	1,417,972	1.26
1843	1,605,264	2,016,044	1.25
1844	1,754,763	2,207,678	1.26
1845	1,843,527	2,470,303	1.34
1846	2,263,731	[1] 2,694,452	1.19
1847	2,521,306	3,296,404	1.31
1848	1,887,553	2,621,615	1.39
1849	1,329,903	1,756,890	1.32
1850	1,405,839	1,778,151	1.26
1851	1,846,847	2,370,947	1.28
1852	1,553,071	1,975,658	1.27
1853	1,083,495	1,804,653	1.67
1854	7,035,735	9,285,534	1.32
1855	15,729,525	11,485,385	.73
1856	9,227,879	8,903,064	.96
1857	4,142,744	3,471,523	.84
1858	3,804,908	2,116,768	.56
1859	3,961,581	1,628,187	.41
1860	3,461,204	1,843,630	.53
1861	1,465,604	884,887	.60
1862	144,850	125,049	.86
1863	91,354	136,078	1.49
1864	432,773	687,007	1.59
1865	557,212	748,427	1.34
1866	388,294	546,979	1.41
1867	756,620	1,071,706	1.42
1868	914,941	1,285,451	1.40
1869	2,899,544	5,495,717	1.90
1870	2,159,516	3,123,677	1.45
1871	1,389,982	2,262,844	1.63

[1] This sum has been substituted for the amount shown by Hibbard for the year 1846 which he shows as $665,248. This is apparently in error since Donaldson's Public Domain, p. 17, shows the proceeds from the sale of public lands for the year 1846 to be $2,694,452. Hibbard shows the number of acres sold in that year to be 2,263,731, while Hart, Practical Essays on American Government, p. 257, shows the same figure. Using the figure quoted by Hibbard of $665,248 to arrive at an average price for the number of acres named by both Donaldson and Hart would produce an average of about 29 cents per acre, while to use the sum quoted by Donaldson the average would be slightly over $1.19 per acre, or favorably comparable to the years just preceding and subsequent to the year in question—1846. The preponderance of evidence, therefore, seems to favor the sum quoted by Donaldson, namely, $2,694,452, and has been used herein as being more nearly correct.

It may be seen that an average price per acre over the entire period is $1.22; excluding 1855 to 1862, inclusive, it becomes $1.31; 1850 to 1871, inclusive, the average is $0.98; and 1850 to 1871, excluding the 8-year period the Graduation Act was in force, $1.45. Since all grants to railroads requiring reduced rates were made during the latter-named period, it is believed that $1.45 per acre more nearly represents the average price which railroads would have had to pay for "ordinary public lands," and is so considered. A total of 132,425,574 acres at $1.45 per acre produces $192,017,082, which amount is considered the worth of the lands which passed from the Federal Government to the railroad corporations at the time the grants were made.

Here the matter would probably have ended, being considered as gifts to the railroads, had it not been that acts providing the grants of land contained stipulations which resulted in the Government retaining for itself certain rights which were intended to compensate it for that investment which flowed into the capital structure of the railroads. These stipulations were that the railroads who received grants should carry property and troops of the United States free from toll or other charge, and mail at such charges as the Congress may direct. (In 1876 Congress fixed the rate of compensation for the transportation of the mails at 80 percent of the rate paid to railroads which received no grants or other aids (19 Stats. 78, 82, ch. 179, sec. 13). Such requirements were interminable and, it must be presumed, were accepted by the railroads with a knowledge that they should never cease. As interpreted by the courts these requirements were that the Government should use the real property of the railroads for moving its property and troops "free from toll or other charge" as long as the roads were operated. In view of such contractual relations which clearly established a condition subsequent, the Government may be considered to have retained a property right in the lands which it granted. In *Burke* v. *Southern Pacific Railroad Company* (234 U. S. 669, 679), the Supreme Court stated:

"We first notice a contention advanced on the part of the mineral claimants, to the effect that the grant to the railroad company was merely a gift from the United States, and should be construed and applied accordingly. The granting act not only does not support the contention but refutes it. The act did not follow the building of the road but preceded it. Instead of giving a gratuitous reward for something already done, the act made a proposal to the company to the effect that if the latter would locate, construct, and put in operation a designated line of railroad, patents would be issued to the company confirming it in the right and title to the public lands falling within the descriptive terms of the grant. The purpose was to bring about the construction of the road, with the resulting advantages to the Government and the public, and to that end provision was made for compensating the company, if it should do the work, by patenting to it the lands indicated. The company was at liberty to accept or reject the proposal. It accepted in the mode contemplated by the act, and thereby the parties were brought into such contractual relations that the terms of the proposal became obligatory on both."

Again in *L. & N. Railroad Co.* v. *United States* (267 U. S. 395), the Court stated:

"But the land grant made many years ago in aid of the railroad enterprise was not a mere gift or gratuity. The carrier's obligation to haul property of the United States at reduced rates was a part of the consideration for which the land grant was made. Part of appellant's compensation for hauling the coal was in land, and the balance was in money."

The transactions, therefore, were, in effect, stated simply, thus: United States Government says to recipient carriers, we will convey to you designated lands on which to build railroad and telegraph lines, upon the condition that you complete said railroad and telegraph lines within a specified time and thereafter keep such lines in good repair and operation, and upon the further condition that you, upon completion of such lines, transport mail, troops, and property belonging to

[1] These data are as shown in History of Public Land Policies, Hibbard, pp. 106, 113, and, having been carefully compared with Donaldson, The Public Domain, and table II, pp. 256 and 257, Practical Essays on American Government, Hart, are considered the most accurate obtainable.

us free from toll or other charge and, in consideration of your acceptance of these conditions, we will convey title in such designated lands to you with accompanying values. In the language of the court, the railroads accepted in the mode contemplated by the acts, and thereby the parties were brought into such contractual relations that the terms of the proposal became obligatory on both. Thus we are led to the inescapable conclusion that the Government granted title to designated lands in aid of construction to the railroads, and secured to itself as compensation for making such grants the movement of its troops and property "free from toll or other charge," which has been interpreted to mean 50 percent of commercial rates, this compensation to continue as long as the Government should have mail, troops, and property to transport. The Government in conveying these lands to the recipient railroads thereby contributed to their capital value the sum of $192,017,082 upon which an interest charge is proper and should be set up. Such capital amount surely could not have been obtained elsewhere for nothing, and the Government, with the passing of title to the lands, lost the value thereof with the knowledge that many years would necessarily elapse before any value would come back to it in savings on transportation charges.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we now come to page 5. There we have the testimony of Mr. Charles Donnelly, president of the Northern Pacific Railway Co., a man I know well and whom I heard testify at various times. He testified relative to certain information which had appeared in a pamphlet Facts About the Northern Pacific Land Grants, edited by Mr. Donnelly, and which had had a wide distribution among the Members of Congress.

Under paragraph 3 of that pamphlet Mr. Donnelly stated—I ask that the Members of the Senate pay particular attention to what the president of the Northern Pacific said when he at that time wanted to pull the wool over the eyes of Congress. Mr. Donnelly said:

It is to be remembered, finally, that by the act of 1864 the Northern Pacific Railroad is made "a post route and military road subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricting the charges for such Government transportation." This right to restrict its charges the Government has always exercised, through act of Congress allowing to the Northern Pacific only a reduced percentage of the rates contemporaneously payable to other carriers for like services. The difference between what the Northern Pacific has thus far received for its services to the Government, and what it would have received if it were not for this land-grant restriction, is about $14,000,000. Of the $100,000,000 which the Northern Pacific has received or will receive from its grant, therefore it has in effect turned back $14,000,000 into the United States Treasury.

Mr. President, that is what the president of the railroad said. But listen to what was said by Mr. D. F. McGowan, inspector of lands:

Mr. Donnelly lays great stress upon the fact that the Government has received $14,000,000 by reason of the reduced rates it has obtained under the land grant. It must be remembered that the sponsors of the land-grant bill included the provision for reduced rates as a reason why the bill should be passed.

Which means why the land should be given to them in the first place. But Mr. McGowan said:

They should not now complain of this provision. But, taking the receipts from the sales of the lands, as Mr. Donnelly gives them, at $100,000,000—and the figure does not include over $20,000,000 that they have set off for taxes and expenses—it will be seen that the interest on this $100,000,000 at the low rate of 5 percent would be $5,000,000 per annum. The $14,000,000 which the Government has saved has been over a period of some 54 years—that is, from 1870 to 1924. On a per annum basis the saving to the United States for carrying the mail and for the limited number of other items has been less than $300,000 per annum. Mr. Donnelly does not point out that the contribution by the United States to the capital investment of the Northern Pacific has been $100,000,000 or that this $100,000,000 is worth, at 5 percent, $5,000,000 per annum to the Northern Pacific, and that it is perpetual. It is nearly 17 times as great as the $300,000 per annum saving to the Government. On this basis the Northern Pacific can never turn back to the Government, by reason of a limited number of reduced rates, the sum that will equal what the grant has been and will continue to be worth to it. Certainly Mr. Donnelly's argument under this heading is a specious one.

The testimony of Mr. E. A. Sherman, Associate Forester of the United States Department of Agriculture, is also interesting and pertinent. This is what he said:

Mr. McGowan showed that the total expense upon the railroad, according to their own statement given out to the press, on account of these special rates made to the Government, including mails, passengers, and freight, has since the date of the grant amounted to between $13,000,000 and $14,000,000; that, during the period of 54 years since 1870, has averaged considerably less than $300,000 a year, and also that it covered the period of the World War, during which period we may suppose a great part of its expense was incurred and was actually borne by the Federal Government. According to a sworn statement by Thomas Cooper, vice president and commissioner of the Northern Pacific Railroad, dated September 17, 1919, and now on file in the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroad has received:

Net proceeds to June 30, 1917 (from sales of land)	$78,022,784.13
Outstanding deferred payments, June 30, 1917	18,062,210.79
Estimated net proceeds, unsold portion	11,600,000.00
Total	107,664,994.92

In order to show exactly how it was arrived at, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the remainder of page 6, as well as pages 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

"This is net, after having deducted the charge-off by the Northern Pacific Railroad Co., $14,035,797.86 for expenses and $7,007,740.56 for taxes. In other words, this is the net contribution which the railroad company has received by reason of this grant of land toward its capital investment, the lands having been given in aid of construction, in round numbers of $107,000,000 and upon which they are entitled to earn 5 percent. Approximately 5 percent upon this capital contribution of $107,000,000 would be $5,350,000 per annum. I think the figures speak for themselves. As a matter of fact, the average charge against this capital contribution amounts to less than three-tenths of 1 percent upon the Government's contribution to the capital investment."

Mr. Donnelly's statement tacitly admits that $100,000,000 has been added by the Government to the capital value of the Northern Pacific Railroad by reason of the Government grant of public lands. That this is true cannot be sucessfully denied. There simply isn't any sound law of logic, reason, or economics by which any other conclusion may be reached. The value of the granted lands is reflected in the capital structure of the railroads; it couldn't have gone elsewhere; and to contend that that value did not in the beginning take the place of what otherwise would have required hired capital through the sale of securities, is minus probative value. Some have stated that the right of the Government to require reduced-rate concessions from the railroads be given a value; such value to be an amount which, bearing a stated rate of interest, would yield the known average annual amount of reduced-rate concessions made by all land-grant lines, thereby disregarding entirely the value of the lands the possession and ownership of which is synonymous with the so-called right. The fallacy of this economic theory when applied in this case may readily be seen when it is realized that, in applying it, the value of such so-called right may be made to become any amount which, by application of a stated interest rate, relates itself properly to the known, or estimated, amount of annual concessions yielded. This amount of $192,017,082 must properly be considered and applied as a permanent capital investment in the railroads who received the grants. Bearing interest at 6 percent per annum, which is considered reasonable, that sum would yield $11,521,025 annually and, over a period of 70 years, 1866–1936, $806,471,750 would accrue and represents the obligations of those recipient railroads to the Government.

In passing, it should be mentioned that the Government, to secure the construction of the Pacific railroads (Union Pacific, Central Pacific, Kansas Pacific, Western Pacific, Central Branch Union Pacific, and the Sioux City & Pacific) issued and loaned United States bonds in the amount of approximately $64,600,000 and accepted a second mortgage on the railway properties as security. By 1900 a settlement had been reached, and of about $130,000,000 representing principal and interest owed the Government, all but $5,500,000 was paid or refunded. (Economics of Transportation, Locklin, p. 63.)

Second, the amounts which have accrued to the Federal Government as a result of reduced rate concessions by the railroads on the movement of mail, troops, and property are not accurately determinable. The amounts probably never will be definitely determined unless the railroads' accounts as settled by the Government are audited with this purpose in view. It is extremely doubtful if this will ever be done. Estimates may be made, however, which should furnish a reasonably accurate amount as to what the benefits are. Only a comparatively few land-grant carriers have made reports which reveal the approximate total amounts yielded to the Government through concessions. The method followed here in estimating total concessions made by all roads has been to compute the aggregate amount yielded by four representative systems on which data are complete, and calculate the amount yielded by all land-grant roads on the basis that the aggregate granted mileage of those four systems bears to the total granted mileage in operation by all carriers throughout the entire country. This method while perhaps containing some objectionable features, it is believed produces a more nearly accurate estimate than any hitherto employed, and is surely superior to that of computing the yielded concessions over a 5-year period, 1924 to 1928, the period of greatest railroad prosperity in history, which has been done, and assume that the concessions represented thereby are fair criteria in computing an estimate of total concessions made by all lines for all time. In this connection it must be borne in mind that in the early operations of some of the land-grant railroads the move-

ment of Government property and troops was very sparse indeed. For example, on the Leavenworth, Lawrence & Galveston Railroad, now a part of the Santa Fe System, total concessions reported down to June 30, 1916, were $136,359.14, all of which were indicated as being on the transportation of mail. The logical inference is that there simply was no property or troops transported over that particular line of railroad on which reduced rates might be applied. The companies on which computations have been made operate in the rate territories in which the majority of granted mileage exists and should be fairly representative of all granted mileage in operation. The railroad systems on which computations have been made are the Sante Fe, the Great Northern, the Illinois Central, and the Northern Pacific.

In table I the bases and computations for total concessions made by the Santa Fe are shown. The sums yielded by the Santa Fe and predecessor lines to June 30, 1916, are as reported by that carrier in Valuation Docket No 625, 127 ICC 1, 279-281. To these amounts are added the estimated concessions from that date to December 31, 1936.

MAIL

In arriving at the estimate on mail, annual estimated sums furnished by the Post Office Department 1924 to 1936, inclusive, have been used. Equation of the total sum for that period into an average annual amount per year per granted mile of line for all land-grant mileage operated is $152.82. This basic amount of yield per year per granted mile of line applied to the 1367.38 miles of land-grant line of the Santa Fe, for 20½ years, June 30, 1916, to December 31, 1936, produces the estimated amount sought, or $4,283,742. This plan has been followed in computing the savings on the other lines named above.

TROOPS

In arriving at the estimated amount of concessions yielded on troops, the total for the 5-year period 1924 to 1928, inclusive, is $2,545,202. This total amount is stated as representing 13,710 miles of the total of 14,411 miles of land-grant mileage in operation by all roads, or 95.14 percent. Equation of that total sum into an average amount per year per granted mile of line produces $37.13. This average annual amount applied to the number of land-grant miles in operation by the Santa Fe for the period of 20½ years, June 30, 1916, to December 31, 1936, produces the amount sought, or $1,040,806.

PROPERTY

Total concessions made on the movement of property for the 5-year period, 1924 to 1928, inclusive, on 13,710 miles of land-grant line, as above stated, amount to $8,533,739, or an average per year of $1,706,748, and per year per granted mile of line $124.49. Since a sharp increase occurred in the movement of Government property beginning with the year 1928, it becomes necessary to compute the total estimated savings over two periods, i. e., prior to the year 1928, and subsequent thereto. Therefore, in estimating the amount of concessions yielded from June 30, 1916, to December 31, 1927, by applying the basic amount of yield per year per granted mile of line to 1,367.38, the number of granted miles operated by the Santa Fe, over the 11½-year period, June 30, 1916, to December 31, 1927, a total amount of $1,957,588 is obtained; and for the 9-year period, December 31, 1927, to December 31, 1936, $1,532,025. It has been found that, employing the year 1928 as 100, the movement of Government freight increased approximately 66 percent through June 30, 1935. Assuming that the savings to the Government kept pace with the increase in volume of traffic, it is proper to increase the latter amount of $1,532,025, 66 percent, which increase amounts to $1,011,137, or a total amount of concessions for the period of $2,543,162. Thus the total amount for the two periods becomes the sum of $1,957,588 and $2,543,162, which is $4,500,750.

The totals of these calculations on mail, troops, and property are added to the respective amounts yielded prior to June 30, 1916, to arrive at an estimated grand total concession made by the Santa Fe System lines which is, as indicated, $15,591,282.

The same formula has been followed in estimating concessions made by the other railroad systems enumerated herein and are set out in detail in tables II, III, and IV in order. The grand total amount of estimated concessions for the four roads above named is found to be $59,102,505. Since that total amount represents 37.23 percent of all land-grand mileage in operation throughout the entire country, the total estimated amount of concessions becomes $158,749,678, and this amount, it is believed, represents the maximum concessions which could have accrued to the Government through reduced rates on mail, troops, and property, and includes concessions made in equalizing competing lines' reduced rates.

TABLE I.—*Concessions made by the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. from beginning of operations to Dec. 31, 1936*

Items	Mail	Troops	Property	Totals
Amounts yielded from beginning of operations to June 30, 1916,[1] as reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission:				
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co., Jan. 1, 1879, to June 30, 1916	$1, 355, 370	$374, 103	$676, 288	$2, 405, 761
Leavenworth, Law. & Galveston R. R. Co. (no dates given)	136, 359			136, 359
The Atlantic & Pacific R. R. Co. and the Santa Fe Pacific from January 1882 to June 30, 1916	1, 460, 984	651, 096	1, 111, 784	3, 223, 864
Total	2, 952. 713	1, 025, 199	1, 788, 072	5, 765, 984
Average amount per year per granted mile of line on mail, 1924 to 1936, based on estimates furnished by the Post Office Department, is $152.82. This per-year average amount applied to 1,367.38 [2] miles (land-grant miles of the Santa Fe) over the period of 20½ years (June 30, 1916, to Dec. 31, 1936) equals	4, 283, 742			4, 283, 742
Total concessions on troops for the 5-year period, 1924 to 1928, inclusive, on 95.14 percent of all granted miles operated, or 13,710 miles, amount to $2,545,202 [3]. An average of this amount per year equals $509,040, or $37.13 per year per-granted-mile-of-line. Applying this amount of yield per year per-granted-mile-of-line to 1,367.38 miles for the period of 20½ years (June 30, 1916, to Dec. 31, 1936) amounts to $50,771 per year, or a total for the entire period		1, 040, 806		1, 040, 806
Total concessions on property for the 5-year period 1924 to 1928, inclusive, on 95.14 percent of all granted miles operated, or 13,710 miles, amount to $8,533,739,[3] or an average amount per-year of $1,706,748, or $124.49 per year per-granted-mile-of-line. Applying this average yield per-year per-granted-mile-of-line to 1,367.38 miles for the period of 11½ years (June 30, 1916, to Dec. 31, 1927) equals $1,957,588, and for 9 years, 1928 to 1936, inclusive, $1,532,025. The latter amount increased 66 percent equals $1,011,137, or a total of $2,543,162. This sum plus the amount yielded 1916 to 1927 equals			4, 500, 750	4, 500, 750
Total	7, 236, 455	2, 066, 005	6, 288, 822	15, 591, 282

[1] 127 I. C. C. 279–281.
[2] Schedule of Land-Grant and Bond-Aided Railroads of the United States, Quartermaster General of the Army, Circular No. 4, pp. 32-35.
[3] Rails and Roads, Duncan, pamphlet by Association of Railway Executives, March 1931.

TABLE II.—*Concessions made by the Great Northern Ry. from beginning of operations to Dec. 31, 1936*

Items	Mails	Troops	Property	Totals
Amounts yielded by this road and predecessor lines from beginning of operations to June 30, 1915: [1]				
1879 to 1915	$1, 009, 853			$1, 009, 853
1890 to 1915		$164, 103		164, 103
1889 to 1915			$484, 481	484, 481
Total	1, 009, 853	164, 103	484, 481	1, 658, 437
The average amount of yielded concessions per year per granted mile of line on Mail 1924 to 1936, inclusive, based on estimates furnished by the Post Office Department, has been found to be $152.82. This per-year average amount applied to 599.71 [2] land-grant miles of Great Northern, over the period of 21½ years (June 30, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1936), equals	1, 970, 432			1, 970, 432
The average amount of yielded concessions on troops per year per granted-mile-of-line (p. 8) is found to be $37.13. Applying that amount of yield per year per granted-mile-of-line to 599.71 (Great Northern land-grant miles operated), miles for the period of 21½ years (June 30, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1936), equals		478, 741		478, 741
The average amount of yielded concessions per year per granted-mile-of-line on property has been found to be $124.49 (p. 8). Applying that amount of yield per year per granted-mile-of-line to 599.71 (Great Northern land-grant miles operated) miles for the period of 12½ years (June 30, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1927, inclusive) yields $933,225; and for 9 years, 1928 to 1936, inclusive, $671,922. The latter amount increased 66 percent (p. 8), amounts to an increase of $443.469, or total of $1,115,391. The sum of the yield $933,225 and $1,115,391, equals			2, 048, 616	2, 048, 616
Total	2, 980, 285	642, 844	2, 533, 097	6, 156, 226

[1] 133 I. C. C. 153, 227.
[2] Schedule of Land-Grand and Bond-Aided Railroads of the United States, Quartermaster General of the Army, Circular No. 4, pp. 32-35.

TABLE III.—*Concessions made by the Illinois Central from beginning of operations to Dec. 31, 1936*

Items	Mail	Troops	Property	Totals
Amounts yielded by this road and predecessor lines from beginning of operations to June 30, 1915 [1], July 1, 1876, to June 30, 1915	$1,504,095			$1,504,095
Mar. 24, 1855, to June 30, 1915		$2,639,142	$461,253	3,100,395
Dubuque & Sioux City, Jan. 1, 1876, to June 30, 1915	498,483			498,483
Dubuque & Sioux City, Jan. 1, 1874, to June 30, 1915		4,837		4,837
Dubuque & Sioux City, Jan. 1, 1902, to June 30, 1915			21,530	21,530
Total	2,002,578	2,643,979	482,783	5,129,340
The average amount of yielded concessions on Mail per year per granted mile of line has been found to$ (be 152.82 p. 8). This amount applied to 1,034.31 [2] miles Illinois Central granted miles operated) over the period of 21½ years, June 30, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1936, inclusive, equals	3,398,355			3,398,355
The average amount of yielded concessions on Troops per year per granted mile of line (p. 8), has been found to be $37.13. This amount applied to 1,034.31 miles for the period of 21½ years, June 30, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1936, equals		825,686		825,686
The average amount of yielded concessions on Property per year per granted mile of line has been found to be $124.49 (p. 8). This amount applied to 1,034.31 miles over the period of 12½ years, June 30, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1927, yields $1,609,513; and for 9 years, 1928 to 1936, inclusive, $1,158,849. This latter amount increased 66 percent (p. 8), amounts to an increase of $764,840 or a total of $1,923,689. The sum of the 2 amounts, $1,609,513 and $1,923,689, equals			3,533,202	3,533,202
Total	5,400,933	3,469,665	4,015,985	12,886,553

[1] 46 Val. Rep. 222, 259, 260.
[2] Schedule of Land-Grant and Bond-Aided Railroads of the United States, Quartermaster General of the Army, Circular No. 4, pp. 32-35.

TABLE IV.—*Concessions made by the Northern Pacific Ry. from beginning of operations to Dec. 31, 1936*

Items	Mail	Troops	Property	Totals
Amounts yielded by the Northern Pacific Ry. and predecessor lines from beginning of operations to June 30, 1917 [1]				
Northern Pacific R. R. Co., July 1, 1876, to Aug. 31, 1896	$1,143,482			$1,143,482
Northern Pacific R. R. Co., July 1, 1882, to Aug. 31, 1896		[2] $1,238,216		1,238,216
Northern Pacific Ry. Co., Sept. 1, 1896, to June 30, 1917	2,695,015	[2] 3,159,114		5,854,129
Total	3,838,497	[3] 4,397,330		8,235,827
The average yielded amount of concessions on mail per-year per-granted-mile-of-line is found to be $152.82 (p. 8). This amount applied to 2,362.46 (b) miles, total operated by Northern Pacific, over the period of 19½ years, June 30, 1917, to Dec. 31, 1936, equals	7,040,105			7,040,105
The average yielded amount of concessions on troops per year per granted mile of line is found to be $37.13 (p. 8). This amount applied to 2,362.46 miles over the period of 19½ years, June 30, 1917, to Dec. 31, 1936, equals		1,710,501		1,710,501
The average yielded amount of concessions on property per year per granted mile of line is found to be $124.49 (p. 8). This amount applied to 2,362.46 miles over the period of 10½ years, June 30, 1917, to Dec. 31, 1927, inclusive, is $3,088,082; and for the 9-year period 1928 to 1936, inclusive, $2,646,927. This latter amount increased 66 percent (p. 8) equals $1,746,972, or total of $4,393,899. The sum of $3,088,082 and $4,393,899 equals			7,481,981	7,481,981
Total	10,878,602	3,148,428	10,441,384	24,468,414

[1] 25 Val. Rep. 39, 453, 584.
[2] Includes also concessions made on property and are not separable.
[3] Divided according to ratio these items bear to whole on total of Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, Illinois Central, and Great Northern: Troops, $1,437,927; property, $2,959,403.

It will be seen that the total amount of estimated concessions for all lines on this basis is slightly in excess of 1 percent per annum over a period of 70 years on the original capital investment of $192,017,082. It will also be noted that in the above computations of concessions on troops (passengers), the basis prevailing for the 5-year period, 1924 to 1928, inclusive, has been assumed to have continued through 1936, despite the fact that estimates reveal a moderate decline. It should be pointed out that Civilian Conservation Corps personnel as well as rivers and harbors maintenance personnel do not travel at reduced fares because of these land grant acts and the reduced-rate provisions which they contain. It should be remembered, too, and is significant that, for the period of Federal control of railroads during the World War, from March 21, 1918, to March 1, 1920, the railroads were operated by the Government at compensation based on an average operating income for the 3-year period ending June 30, 1917, land-grant deductions from tariff rates notwithstanding. And for a period of 6 months subsequent to the end of Federal control, a guaranty was made by the Government providing earnings equivalent to one-half the return reflected during the test period (3 years ending June 30, 1917), and in no case less than their fixed charges and railway operating expenses, land-grant deductions from tariff rates notwithstanding. These periods of Federal control and subsequent thereto have been included in the computations herein without regard to the facts just stated. The average estimated amounts of concessions per year per granted mile of line, as shown herein, over the four carriers used, should be the maximum, it is believed, and therefore, indeed, averred that it is higher per year per granted mile of line than would be yielded on any other line, or group of lines, which might be chosen. It is believed this is true because, (1) the only two transcontinental lines upon which reduced rates are made are heavily used on cross-country movements; (2) a great many Army posts, national parks, dam sites, and other Government activities are located on or near these lines; (3) the lines of the Illinois Central traverse a territory where density of traffic is the maximum of any area in which land-grant mileage exists; and (4) these carriers operate trunk lines, or main arteries of commerce which are, or form in part, main through routes, both east-west and north-south, and may be presumed to bear the brunt of equalization of lowest rates made by any other competing land-grant routes. These estimated concessions, it must be remembered, reflect reductions voluntarily made to equalize the reduced rates of competing carriers.

Third, there are no depressed rate conditions which are required to be met by competing roads. Any reductions made to meet the reduced rates obtaining over the routes of competing land-grant carriers are permitted, not required nor necessary, and are wholly voluntary upon the carriers making them. Consequently, no "burden" exists in this respect on non-land-grant carriers other than as chosen by them to obtain traffic which would otherwise move over the land-grant lines. These voluntary reductions which are made to secure traffic which would otherwise move over the land-grant lines is undisputable evidence that the reduced rates are considered remunerative and not, therefore, burdensome, or that the railroad managements which participate in such voluntary reductions are grasping for additional traffic without regard as to whether or not compensation is received therefor.

The conclusions to be reached here are obvious and inescapable. The Government of the United States conveyed title to, stated in round numbers, 132,000,000 acres of the public lands to various railroads of the country, worth $192,000,000 70 years ago which, bearing interest at a reasonable rate, has earned $806,000,000 and it has received in return $159,000,000 in the form of reduced rates on the transportation of its mail, troops, and property. A difference of $647,000,000 remains as an unpaid balance and can never be paid at the rate concessions are accumulating at present.

NOVEMBER 18, 1937.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to read the last paragraph of the report of this patriotic group of American citizens, after making the investigation. Some of them were employed at that time by the Treasury Department. I wish to read what they said it was worth to the railroads at that time to have this kind of a bill passed:

The conclusions to be reached here are obvious, and inescapable. The Government of the United States conveyed title to, stated in round numbers, 132,000,000 acres of the public lands to various railroads of the country, worth $192,000,000 70 years ago which, bearing interest at a reasonable rate, has earned $806,000,000 and it has received in return $159,000,000 in the form of reduced rates on the transportation of its mail, troops, and property. A difference of $647,000,000 remains as an unpaid balance and

can never be paid at the rate concessions are accumulating at present.

There is the record. Years ago the railroads owed $647,000,000 to our Government for lands which had been given to them; and yet, under the terms of the conference report, we are allowing the railroads to keep every acre of public land they got, some of it containing very valuable oil and mineral rights.

I see in the gallery some of the brave soldier boys who went across the water and offered to make the supreme sacrifice. They are coming back now to face a situation in which the average debt per family for those going into business or farming will very likely be in the neighborhood of $5,000.

At this time every foreign country is trying to make loans and obtain gifts from our Government. At a time when we have that kind of a situation, if one of these soldier boys were to buy a little farm, if he wished to borrow money from the Federal land bank he would have to pay 5 percent interest. But our Government has loaned France $2,000,000,000 at 2⅜ percent interest. England is now considering an offer from our Government to lend her three or four billion dollars at 2 percent interest. But if a farmer in the State of Massachusetts or in the State of North Dakota wishes to make a loan from our Government he must pay 5 percent. When we talk to Government officials about it, they say, We must charge our farmers 5 percent in order to keep liquid. We must keep our bonds good. But the farmers cannot get money at 2⅜ percent, or 2 percent.

Within a short time some of the soldier boys who lost an arm or a leg, and who are unable to work, will be receiving $75, $80, or $100 a month, and will be asked to support their families on it. They will be coming before congressional committees and asking for at least a decent amount upon which they and their families may live.

Already I can hear some of the distinguished Members of this body saying, "We would like to give more, but we cannot afford it. We have not the money. We must balance the Budget. We must reduce taxation. We must arrange our affairs so that during the reconversion period there will not be so much unemployment. We would like to do more for these boys, but we cannot do it." I want every soldier boy in America to know that at the very time when that will be said to them, only a few weeks previously a bill was passed in the Senate making a present of hundreds of millions of dollars to the railroads of the United States.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter written by the president of the Farmers Union in North Dakota. I wish to read it into the RECORD. It is dated November 29, 1944, at a time when House bill 4184, which was a bill similar to the one which was finally passed, was under consideration:

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *November 29, 1944.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have before me H. R. 4184, which passed the House of Representatives May 23, 1944, and is now awaiting action in the Senate.

It is my understanding that this bill will repeal the land-grant rates and require the Government to pay the full domestic commercial rate on all Government transportation except personnel of the Army or Navy and military or naval property for military or naval use.

This bill does not require the full domestic commercial rate to be paid on export and import traffic. Export and import rates have been voluntarily established by the railroads and in some cases are below the 50-percent land-grant rates paid by the Government.

I also call to your attention that under part 2 of the Transportation Act of 1940 the railroads would have been paid the full rate provided they returned to the Government the unsold portion of their land grant; the railroads evidently have refused to do this because they have unsold land containing valuable coal and mineral deposits.

I am opposed to the passing of this bill unless it is amended to include the full rate on export and import traffic and return to the Government of the unsold land grant.

Enclosed herewith is an illustration comparing export and import rates with domestic commercial rates.

Trusting that I have made my position clear, I remain,

Very truly yours,
NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
GLENN J. TALBOTT, *President.*

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the enclosure which Mr. Talbott, president of the North Dakota Farmers Union, sent to me. It is entitled "Export and Import Rates Compared With Domestic Rates."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Export and import rates compared with domestic rates

From—	To—	Miles	Commodity	Export rate	Domestic rate	Difference
Chicago	Seattle	2,300	Agricultural implements, 34,000 minimum car.	$1.02	$1.84	$0.82
Do	Beach	1,022	do	1.02	1.12	.10
Do	Seattle	2,300	Refrigerators, 36,000 minimum car	1.07	1.62	.55
Do	do	2,300	Iron and steel articles, 80,000 minimum car.	.46	1.12	.66
Do	Williston	991	do	.46	.91½	.45½
Do	Fargo	628	do	.46	.67	.21

From—	To—	Miles	Commodity	Import rate	Domestic rate	Difference
New Orleans	Cincinnati	836	Vegetable oil in tank cars from East Indies	$0.31	$0.61½	$0.30½
Do	St. Louis	710	do	.31	.56	.25
Do	Kansas City	878	do	.36½	.64	.27½
Do	Chicago	921	do	.37½	.64	.26½
Do	do	921	Linseed oil in packages or tank cars	.42½	.64	.21½
Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles	Boston		Wool in grease in bales	1.05	2.23	1.18

Tariff authorities: W. T. L. 232-A; I. C. C. A-2594; 338-C; I. C. C. A-2822. W. T. L. 207-G; I. C. C. A-2710. Agent Bogue 1021-D; I. C. C. 24. Trans-Cont. 4-O; I. C. C. 1401 and 2C-A; I. C. C. 1400. C. F. A. 491-B; I. C. C. 2920. F. F. A. 15-C; I. C. C. 343. Agent Emmerson 27-A; I. C. C. 244.
Trans Continental F. B., L. E. Kipp, Agent—33-G; I. C. C. 1476.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to read a telegram which I received from Houston, Tex. It is from the Texas Traffic Bureau. It reads as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX., *November 29, 1944.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you vote and work against unconstitutional Boren bill to repeal land-grant rates reported favorably by Interstate Commerce Committee. Carriers' obligation to haul United States property at reduced rates part of consideration for which grant was made. Bill makes no provision for returning lands to Government and represents present to railroads of millions. Please see especially page 193 of subcommittee's report.

TEXAS TRAFFIC BUREAU.

What they say is absolutely God's truth. The railroads still have millions of acres of this loot in their possession. Some of those lands are immensely valuable because of oil, timber, and mineral rights. Our own Government has spent millions of dollars trying to get some of the land back from the railroads, especially the Northern Pacific. The question has been in litigation for many years. Yet, Mr. President, the Senate has passed this bill, donating every single acre of that land. It has passed a bill giving away forever the right which was preserved to the American people when Congress said to the railroads, "We will give you these 132,000,000 acres of land on condition that you forever haul the military personnel and some other portions of Federal traffic for nothing."

Mr. President, I hold in my hand another letter. It is a letter from the United States Chamber of Commerce. Certainly the United States Chamber of Commerce is in favor of this bill. The farmers are against it, but the men composing the United States Chamber of Commerce are for it. In order that the veterans of this war may have forever before their eyes a statement of what the United States Chamber of Commerce did to the farmers and to the laboring men, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., November 24, 1944.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Before the close of this session, we earnestly hope that the Senate will take the opportunity to repeal the land grant rates by adopting the Boren bill,

H. R. 4184, which the House of Representatives has already passed by a very large majority.

Action at this time will eliminate the inequitable arrangement between the Government and the railroads—inequitable because of the greatly changed conditions since the land grants were made over 75 years ago and because of the fact that the Government has saved in reduced rates many times the value of the lands granted.

The membership of the United States Chamber of Commerce has consistently advocated the elimination of the land-grant rates both for the foregoing reasons and because their unfairness extends to competing railroads and truck lines not recipients of land grants, while the preferential rates to the Government place an unfair financial burden upon other users of transportation.

In our view the distortions in the rate structure and the uncertainties involved in the land grant rate system are a handicap to development of business and employment, which is so important for the postwar period. It would be greatly appreciated if you will lend your support to the enactment of H. R. 4184 during the present session of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD L. VOLGENAU.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in closing I wish again to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] for his courage in opposing the bill when it was before the Senate. By opposing it when it first came before the Senate for consideration until the other day, when he was finally induced to compromise, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi alone, by his fight upon this floor and by the encouragement which a few of us gave him to conduct that fight, saved hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States.

My only regret is that some few of us upon the floor of the Senate did not have the ability to convince the majority of the Senate that this is as bad a bill as we believe it to be. I repeat that in my judgment it is an absolute steal. In my judgment, it robs the common people of hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. I believe it is bad legislation. Mr. President, I believe it is the kind of legislation which will make the soldier boys who are coming back to their homes turn in disgust from the men who composed the Congress which passed this kind of legislation in their absence. I repeat that, in my judgment, it could not be passed except for the fact that technically we are still at war; it could not be passed except for the fact that we are busy with strikes, reconversion, and scores and scores of other problems.

I want the RECORD eternally and everlastingly to show, I repeat, that the bill was passed and the conference report was accepted in spite of the fact that the voice of the senior Senator from North Dakota was raised in opposition to it.

I repeat, Mr. President, the least that anyone believing as I do can do is to present the facts as I have presented them here this afternoon. I do not challenge the honesty of a single Senator upon this floor. Each man votes according to the dictates of his conscience. But frankly, Mr. President, after the eloquent speech delivered by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], after the array of facts which he presented, and in view of the undisputed fact that the railroads still have millions of acres of this land which they got for nothing and are going to keep, in view of the fact that we already have this enormous debt of $262,000,000,000, in view of the fact that millions of our boys are still across the water, unable to protect themselves, I say that I have only done my full duty in presenting to the best of my ability, upon this floor at this time, late as it is, my opposition to the conference report; and I wish to have the RECORD show that the senior Senator from North Dakota voted "no" upon the question of the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in connection with the conference report, I desire to have placed in the RECORD just before the vote is taken on it a letter from the Comptroller General explaining why the change which was made in the so-called McFarland amendment was necessary.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, October 22, 1945.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the request of Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND there is furnished for the use of the conference on H. R. 694, Seventy-ninth Congress, the following information in connection with the McFarland amendment, appearing as section 4 of the bill as passed by the Senate October 4, 1945.

It was stated on the floor of the Senate by the author of the amendment adopted as section 4 that the purpose of the amendment was to create a fund, using the difference between the full commercial rates, fares, or charges for travel or transportation and the amounts which would be payable at the land-grant rates, fares, or charges up to $68,272,770 (the declared value of the lands to which carriers have title or possession) before October 1946, to be used for the purchase or improvement of farm homes for veterans in the reclamation States. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 4, 1945, pp. 9394–9395). However, no money is appropriated by the amendment, but carriers are required to forward to the Comptroller General of the United States copies of bills for travel or transportation subject to land-grant rates begun after the date of enactment of the bill and prior to October 1, 1946, showing the difference between the full commercial rates, fares, or charges for the travel or transportation and the amounts which would be payable at the land-grant or equalization rates, fares, or charges. A sum equal to the amounts so reported is directed to be set aside in the Treasury and covered into a "veterans' farms fund," to be available for appropriation by Congress from time to time.

It is impossible to state accurately the total amount which would accrue between now and October 1946 in the form of the difference between land-grant and full commercial rates in cases where land-grant rates are now applicable. The amount of land-grant reductions accruing in recent periods has been estimated as high as $20,000,000 a month (H. Rept. 393, 79th Cong., on H. R. 694, p. 4). The General Accounting Office has estimated that based on a transportation expenditure of $2,000,000,000 to rail carriers during a period of a year the difference between land-grant and commercial rates will amount to at least 10 percent or $200,000,000.

Such difference, even with considerable decline in military transportation, apparently would be far in excess of $68,272,770, and probably would be close to twice that amount during the period between enactment of the bill and October 1, 1946, assuming that the bill is enacted during the present session of the Congress.

Accordingly, it is believed that the explained purposes of section 4 of the bill could be accomplished by eliminating the reporting required by subsection (a) and authorizing the appropriation to a "veterans' farms fund" in the Treasury of amounts equal in the aggregate to the total amount of $68,272,770 set forth in subsection (d) as the value of land-grant lands.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nomination in the foreign service.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I move that the nominations in the foreign service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the foreign-service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Irvin C. Mollison, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James J. Connors, of Juneau, Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CHANDLER. I also ask consent that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 29, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 26 (legislative day of October 22), 1945:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Lt. Gen. Robert Charlwood Richardson, Jr. (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Gen. Courtney Hicks Hodges (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Gen. Jacob Loucks Devers (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Gen. George Churchill Kenney (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Gen. Carl Spaatz (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Ira Clarence Eaker (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Robert Lawrence Eichelberger (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Gen. Thomas Troy Handy (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Gen. Mark Wayne Clark (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Lt. Gen. Alexander McCarrell Patch (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Wilhelm Delp Styer (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Harold Lee George (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. William Hood Simpson (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. James Harold Doolittle (major, Air Reserve), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Lucian King Truscott, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Richard Kerans Sutherland (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. John Clifford Hodges Lee (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Leonard Townsend Gerow (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Albert Coady Wedemeyer (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. John Kenneth Cannon (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg (major, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Oscar Wolverton Griswold (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Walton Harris Walker (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Wade Hampton Haislip (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Joseph Lawton Collins (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Lucius DuBignon Clay (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Alvin Cullom Gillem, Jr. (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Barton Kyle Yount (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Leroy Lutes (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. John Reed Hodge (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. John Edwin Hull (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Raymond Stallings McLain (brigadier general, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Manton Sprague Eddy (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay (captain, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Lauris Norstad (captain, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Edward Postell King, Jr. (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. William Fletcher Sharp (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. George Fleming Moore (colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. George Marshall Parker, Jr. (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Albert Monmouth Jones (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Clifford Bluemel (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Roy Newman Weaver (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Maxon Spafford Lough (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Edward Brougher (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Peter Vachon (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Carl Herndon Seals (colonel, U. S. Army, retired), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Chisholm Drake (colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Bradford Grethen Chynoweth (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Clinton Albert Pierce (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Arnold John Funk (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lewis Charles Beebe (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Luther Rea Stevens (colonel, Infantry, Philippine Army), Philippine Army.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harold Napoleon Gilbert (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edward White Smith (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Francis Farrell (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Dominic Joseph Sabini (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Kenneth Shearer Sweany (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Washington Vaughan, Medical Corps.

Col. Clifford Cameron Nutt (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. James Brian Edmunds (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Norman Everard Hendrickson (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery, National Guard of the United State), Army of the United States.

Col. Glen Clovis McBride (major, Cavalry Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Cutler, Army of the United States.

Col. Ken Reed Dyke, Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Parkman, Jr., Army of the United States.

Col. Erik Henning Nelson (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Harry W. Hill, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of April 1945.

Rear Adm. Donald Royce, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 12th day of July 1942.

Rear Adm. Frederick W. Pennoyer, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of July 1942.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Miles, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 2d day of December 1942.

Commodore Fred D. Kirtland, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of September 1943.

Commodore Harvey E. Overesch, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of September 1943.

Capt. Irving M. McQuiston, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 8th day of July 1942.

Capt. Albert M. Bledsoe, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of September 1943.

Capt. William K. Phillips, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of September 1943.

Capt. John W. Roper, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of September 1943.

Capt. Stuart S. Murray, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of September 1943.

Capt. Emmet P. Forrestel, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of October 1943.

Capt. Edmund T. Wooldridge, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of October 1943.

Capt. Thomas H. Robbins, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of December 1943.

Capt. William G. Tomlinson, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of December 1943.

Capt. Richard F. Whitehead, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 17th day of January 1944.

Capt. Charles Wellborn, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 29th day of January 1944.

Capt. Daniel V. Gallery, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 6th day of February 1944.

Capt. Walter F. Boone, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 10th day of February 1944.

Capt. Joseph F. Bolger, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of February 1944.

Capt. Stuart H. Ingersoll, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 9th day of March 1944.

Capt. Edward C. Ewen, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of July 1944.

Capt. Apollo Soucek, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of July 1944.

Capt. Edward O. McDonnell, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of December 1942.

Capt. Ernest F. Robinson, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Robert C. Lee, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. William A. Read, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Ralph S. Moore, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Carl E. Anderson, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Robert V. Kleinschmidt, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Milton K. Revill, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Roger W. Cutler, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Pay Director N. Loyall McLaren, to be a pay director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Capt. Richard M. Watt, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Director of Inspection Administration, Office of Procurement and Material, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Commodore Henry A. Schade, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Director, Naval Research Laboratory, Anacostia, D. C., and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Edmund E. Brady, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as technical adviser to the Brazilian Merchant Marine Commission, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Dudley W. Knox, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Deputy Director of Naval History.

Capt. William G. Greenman, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Director of Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Carlos A. Bailey, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to the commandant, Ninth Naval District, and commander, Midwest Naval Area, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Herbert J. Grassie, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Henry R. Oster, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Deputy Director of Logistic Plans, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Robert G. Tobin, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as port director, New York, N. Y., and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Albert T. Sprague, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Fifth Amphibious Force, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Arthur Gavin, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States Naval Air Bases, Philippines, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Richard B. Tuggle, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commandant, United States Naval Operating Base, Eniwetok, and Atoll Commander, Eniwetok, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Lemuel P. Padgett, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as director, Petroleum and Tanker Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Alva J. Spriggs, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as director of Electronics Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Kenmore M. McManes, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States Naval Group, France, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Paul B. Tuzo, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Utility Wing, Service Force, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Civil Engineer William M. Angas to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service, to continue while serving as a superintending civil engineer, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Civil Engineer Lewis N. Moeller to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service, to continue while serving as a superintending civil engineer, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 26 (legislative day of October 22), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Avra M. Warren to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Samuel J. Fletcher
Renwick S. McNiece
Hasell H. Dick
Robert B. Streeper

TO BE A CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Stephen C. Brown

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Irvin C. Mollison to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

James J. Connors to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, FROM OCTOBER 1, 1945, WITH RANK OF CAPTAIN

Frank S. Borden
Otis W. Swainson

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, FROM OCTOBER 1, 1945, WITH RANK OF COMMANDER

Charles K. Green
Roland D. Horne

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, FROM OCTOBER 1, 1945, WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Wilbur R. Porter
George A. Nelson

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Arlie C. Henry, Laketon.
James H. Smith, Metamora.

MAINE

Arthur B. Silkworth, Center Lovell.
Peter C. Sanfacon, Grand Isle.
Blanche D. Voisine, Keegan.
John R. Walsh, Kennebunk Beach.
Howard L. Annis, Lincoln Center.
Elva Brackett, Monhegan.
Addie E. S. Smart, Monroe.
Edward E. Kennison, North New Portland.
Don W. Worthing, Palermo.
Eber J. Johnson, Poland.
Enid L. Monaghan, Port Clyde.
Violet G. Blake, South Casco.
Fay A. Patchell, Wytopitlock.

MARYLAND

Dorothy H. M. Williams, Charlestown.
Katherine L. Retter, Phoenix.

MASSACHUSETTS

Laura A. Hepsley, Blandford.
Agnes K. Faxon, Brockville.
Fred E. Daisy, Carlisle.
Marion E. Nordin, East Dennis.
James J. Trioli, Fayville.
Edna May Halden, Franklin Park.
Sarah G. Sampson, Green Harbor.
Lucy A. Freeman, Millbrook.
Laura Boulais, Oakdale.
Lewis W. Jenney, South Carver.
Frank K. Lynch, South Chatham.
Clarence W. Bayles, South Dennis.

Charles T. Williams, South Egremont.
John F. Counihan, South Hamilton.
C. Herbert Jefferson, South Hanover.
Amber E. Columbia, Westport Point.
George O. Vaine, Winchendon Springs.

MISSISSIPPI

Edward E. Perry, Byhalia.

NEVADA

Geraldine S. Sayre, Smith.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Frances B. Donovan, Ashuelot.
John P. Wright, Bretton Woods.
Mertie L. McAllister, Center Barnstead.
Hazel M. Ford, Danbury.
Ruth H. Almeder, Georges Mills.
Florence A. Goodwin, Gilmanton Iron Works.
George H. Yeaton, Gossville.
Barbara L. Swett, Grasmere.
Elise M. Coughlan, Greenfield.
Glenn E. Gray, Kearsarge.
Marion Horner Roble, Melvin Village.
Fred E. Carswell, Milton Mills.
Irene N. Wentworth, New Durham.
Frank E. LaBranche, Newmarket.
Hayden E. Cheney, Newton Junction.
Vernon F. West, North Sutton.
Eunice G. Woodman, Northwood.
Susie C. Simpson, West Rumney.

VERMONT

Beatrice M. E. Holmes, Canaan.
Rose B. Kemp, Craftsbury.
Dorothy M. Stewart, Cuttingsville.
Lou B. Maginn, East Fairfield.
Harold F. Mason, Lyndon Center.
Katherine D. Kelley, Middletown Springs.
May P. Squire, New Haven.
Francis E. Dennis, North Clarendon.
William H. Salmond, Perkinsville.
Fred B. Tilden, Roxbury.
Elwood C. Bacon, Thetford Center.
Henry C. La Morder, Warren.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of the eternal, we thank Thee that Thou art not far off, out on the vast rim of the universe, but nearer to us than breathing; warm, sweet, tender; a present help, waiting to live in us, our daily sustenance, the fountain of a courage that will not fail and of a power that can use our frail weakness as its healing and illuminating channel.

In this confused day, with its noisy voices and contending claims, grant unto these Thy servants that they may be faithful to every trust committed by the people to their hands, giving utterance only to their highest, noblest thought, and that upon their shoulders there may rest unsullied the white mantle of the Nation's honor. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Friday, October 26, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946; and

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce to Senators who are present that at the conclusion of business today the Senate will adjourn until Thursday, and it is expected that on Thursday the reorganization bill and the conference report on the tax bill will be taken up.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has requested me to ask unanimous consent that he be excused from the sessions of the Senate for the week, as he will be necessarily absent on business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from New Jersey.

REFERENCE TO SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS DEALING WITH ATOMIC ENERGY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Following the action of the Senate on the atomic-energy resolution (S. Res. 179), inasmuch as the resolution provides that all bills and resolutions introduced in the Senate, together with those received from the House, dealing with the subject of atomic energy shall be referred to the special committee, if there be no objection, such action will be taken with respect to bills or resolutions now pending before committees or on the table.

Thereupon the following bills and joint resolutions were referred to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy:

S. 1359. A bill to conserve and restrict the use of atomic energy for the national defense, to prohibit its private exploitation, and to preserve the secret and confidential character of information concerning the use and application of atomic energy;

S. 1463. A bill for the development and control of atomic energy;

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to provide for the formulation of policies with respect to the control and use of atomic energy; and

S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution authorizing experiments with bombs or other weapons utilizing atomic energy to determine their effect on naval vessels.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROTECTION OF COTTON AND COTTONSEED PRODUCTION FROM PINK BOLLWORM

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for protection of cotton and cottonseed production from the pink bollworm, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ORGANIC ENABLING LEGISLATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enable the Bureau of the Census to carry on the functions and duties required by organic and other laws (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions and memorial, which were referred as indicated:

A memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Memorial requesting Congress to investigate the administration of the national forests

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"That the United States Forest Service is, in effect and without sufficient congressional authorization, dictatorially exercising legislative and judicial functions in regard to grazing on the national forests, instead of limiting itself to the administration of the forests. A general grazing-reduction program of from 30 to 50 percent has been announced by forest officials. If this program is put into effect it will work a great hardship on, and jeopardize the stability of the users of the national forests.

"It has been called to the attention of this body that the Grazing Service, which is charged with the administration of other Federal grazing lands and which is functioning under a clearly defined law recently enacted by Congress, is exercising a more practical application of conservation and is giving the users a fairer adjudication of grievances and more security of tenure and general stability.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That a congressional investigation be made of conditions existing in connection with the administration of the national forests, to the end that legislation may be formulated which will remove existing evils and give all areas of Federal land for grazing purposes uniform, reasonable, and just treatment.

"Adopted by the senate, September 25, 1945."

A letter from Mrs. Elsie L. Bush, of Baltimore, Md., praying for an amendment to the Social Security Act reducing the beneficial age for widows from 65 to 60 years of age; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Arthur Pierson Burke, of Greenfield, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for placing a gold star in the center of the 48 stars in the field of blue of the American flag as an everlasting memorial to the patriotic dead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 1342) to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, relating to the action taken by the Daughters of the American Revolution in the use of tax-exempt buildings and facilities; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Association

for the Advancement of Colored People, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1349) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, with an amendment that no classification should be made on the basis of age, sex, race, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, endorsing the reconversion tax program sponsored by the National Congress of Industrial Organizations; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes; and also a permanent United States Employment Service; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; ordered to lie on the table.

SLUM CLEARANCE—RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS' COUNCIL FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Citizens' Council for Community Planning, Washington, D. C., commending the Senate on the passage of legislation providing for slum clearance in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITIZENS COUNCIL FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING,
Washington, D. C., October 25, 1945

Resolved, That the Citizens Council for Community Planning wishes to commend highly the Senate for having passed, without a dissenting vote, the slum-clearance and urban redevelopment bill, S. 1426.

The citizens council wishes particularly to pay respect to Senator CAPPER for his long years of untiring effort in working for the passage of such a bill; to Mr. Justice Burton for his patience and perseverance in listening to the various opinions which were presented over such a long period, and to his committee for their documentation and evaluation which was of inestimable value to the present passage of S. 1426; and, finally, to Senator MCCARRAN we wish to express our particular thanks for the amendments which he presented and which were included in the bill.

We believe that this action of the Senate is a tribute to the patience, the understanding, and political skill of these three distinguished Senators.

THE CITIZENS COUNCIL FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY AND MISSOURI VALLEY BASIS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Barnes County Committee for Missouri Valley Authority, held in the city hall of Valley City, N. Dak., endorsing the Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *September 25, 1945*.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting held in the city hall of Valley City, last evening, the following resolution was presented and adopted by a unanimous vote:

"Be it resolved, That we endorse the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority for the development of the Missouri River and its related projects. That we are agreed that it is for the best interest of the State of North Dakota to have such an authority and therefore we urge our governor to give his support to such an authority and that we urge our Representatives in Congress to support the Murray bill known as Senate bill No. 555."

Yours truly,

E. G. RANUM,
Secretary-Treasurer, Barnes County Committee for MVA.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter from E. F. Gilles, secretary of the Wahpeton (N. Dak.) Chamber of Commerce, enclosing a resolution from that chamber relating to the Missouri River Basin and the Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the letter and the resolution were received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAHPETON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Wahpeton, N. Dak., October 25, 1945.
Hon. WM. LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: We are enclosing you a resolution which is self-explanatory. Your cooperation will be appreciated.

With personal regards from the writer, we are,

Sincerely yours,
WAHPETON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By E. F. GILLES, *Secretary.*

The executive committee of the Wahpeton Chamber of Commerce unanimously passed the following resolution concerning the development of the Missouri River Basin at their meeting Thursday evening, October 25, 1945.

In December 1944 a comprehensive Missouri River Basin development program proposed in a joint plan by the United States Army engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation was passed by Congress in the form of Public Law No. 534. This program of great benefit to North Dakota is now ready to be started. The Wahpeton Chamber of Commerce heartily endorses this all-inclusive plan as we believe that the project will build up needed reservoirs of water for irrigation, add to our over-all water supply, provide power development, and reduce costly floods. We urge Congress to immediately provide the funds necessary to bring this project to an early completion.

Further, we oppose the principle of an Authority such as proposed in Senate bill No. 555, known as the Missouri Valley Authority, which wrests from the States their normal and necessary powers of control over natural resources located within their borders. We feel that everything for the best interests of North Dakota is already provided for in the coordinated plan of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, thereby eliminating any need for substitute legislation such as the proposed Missouri Valley Authority.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1366. A bill to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 670); and

S. 1459. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; without amendment (Rept. No. 671).

By Mr. TAYLOR, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 862. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 672).

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 2851. A bill to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein; with amendments (Rept. No. 673).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1526. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim against the United States of J. R. Coleman; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. SHIPSTEAD) introduced Senate bill 1527, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1528. A bill to provide for crediting service as a caretaker for the National Guard in determining the eligibility of an enlisted man of the Army for retirement because of disability; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1529. A bill to provide for payment of travel allowance and transportation to their homes, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1530. A bill to authorize the utilization of the Federal Works Agency in the provision of public-works projects; and

S. 1531. A bill to authorize assistance to States and other public bodies for useful public works; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1532. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain persons as permanent briga-

dier generals of the line of the Regular Army; and

S. 1533. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. KNOWLAND introduced Senate bill 1534, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MURDOCK (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah) introduced Senate bill 1535, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

LOANS AND SUPPORT PRICES ON AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, under a present act of Congress, farm prices are guaranteed at 90 percent of parity for 2 years following the end of this war as proclaimed by Congress. The bill which I am introducing today provides that the provisions of the present law be extended to provide for protection for 5 years in place of 2.

Two years is a short time in which a farmer can feel any measure of security in his operations. It is far too inadequate to plan for the future.

No segment of our national economy is so dependent on national legislation and planning as are our farmers. They are entitled to know what is in prospect for them at least for the next 5-year period. While I recognize that this type of legislation does not fully provide security for the American farmer, it does insure a degree of protection until such time as a better program can be worked out.

Surely no Member of the Congress wants a return of depression years when farmers by the hundreds of thousands lost their homes and moved to the cities, thus greatly aggravating the already bad unemployment situation. Surely our farmers deserve protection after abundantly producing the vital food necessary to win this war during much of which time ceiling prices were imposed upon them when they could have demanded far higher prices for their products.

On behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make effective for three additional years certain provisions of law providing for loans and support prices on agricultural commodities.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1527) to make effective for three additional years certain provisions of law providing for loans and support prices on agricultural commodities, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment my colleague from North Dakota for introducing this bill. I shall support it, and I intend to offer an amendment, when the proper time arrives, providing that farm labor shall be considered when parity price is determined.

LEASING OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill and to make a brief statement in regard to it. It is a bill to amend the Surplus Property Disposal Act by making permissive the leasing of surplus properties for a period up to 10 years. The present Surplus Property Disposal Act imposes a 5-year limitation on the length of such leases.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1534) to amend section 19 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for leases of up to 10 years in the case of certain surplus plants and facilities, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO SHRINERS' HOSPITALS FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for him a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain lands situated within the Fort Douglas Military Reservation to the Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children, and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1535) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain lands situated within the Fort Douglas Military Reservation to the Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children, introduced by Mr. MURDOCK (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

USE OF ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), reaffirming its belief in international cooperation to the end that all the peoples of the world may enjoy liberty and peace, that the Congress hereby endorses the declaration of President Harry S. Truman in his speech in the city of New York on October 27, 1945, that the possession by the United States of the atomic bomb is no threat to any nation but a sacred trust for the preservation of peace.

That the Congress, solemnly affirming its opposition to the use of this weapon in aggressive war, hereby declares its firm and abiding purpose sacredly to observe this trust so announced by the President.

That the Congress favors the participation of the United States in a universal international agreement to outlaw the use of the atomic bomb.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, after consultation with the majority leader, and, as I understand, with his approval, I move that the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] be assigned to duty on the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Burton, of Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the appointment of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, which is about to proceed with the work assigned it, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Atom Research Bill Totalitarian," written by George E. Sokolsky and published in the Omaha World-Herald of October 26.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOM RESEARCH BILL TOTALITARIAN

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The most totalitarian bill ever introduced in the Congress of the United States is S. 1463 entitled "A bill for the development and control of atomic energy," with its counterpart in the House of Representatives. It is totalitarian not only because it gives the Government total control over a commodity and its processes of manufacture but even more because it reduced research, study, experimentation to an instrument of official decision and purpose and sets up penalties which place paralyzing impediments upon the pursuit of scientific truth.

A Commission is to be appointed, to serve for 9 years, by the President with the consent of the Senate. But not one word appears in the bill to indicate what the qualifications of a commissioner are to be. Is he to be able to read a report on atomic energy? Does he know what causes the transmutation of uranium into plutonium? Nothing is said as to his preparation and background for the job—not even that he be a graduate of a university with majors in scientific subjects.

BARRIER TO PROGRESS

Imagine Thomas Edison appearing before a commission of morons, whose only qualification is political orthodoxy, to explain why his design for an electric light is superior to the Welsbach mantle. What progress would we have made in sulfa or penicillin therapy if a license had to be issued to those engaged in the deadly process of experimentation with the unknown?

The bill gives the Commission plenary supervision and control, so far as the jurisdiction of the United States extends, over all sources of atomic energy. * * * Who in all this world knows today what all sources of atomic energy may be? The best-known work has been done with uranium, and that made the headlines. But I have asked men who know what other metals or any other substances, even air or water or the rays of the sun, may not in time become available? And all I get is "Who knows?" "Who can tell?" But Congress is legislating about all sources of atomic energy.

VICIOUS SECTIONS

Section 13 of this act is particularly vicious and, together with section 18, kills progress. These sections kill off scientific research. Further they include the words "communicates or transmits information, data, documents, equipment, etc.," which means that if a professor lectures or works in his laboratory he has to make sure that every word he says is covered by the regulations. And if, as has happened in the very business of producing the bomb, he comes across something like plutonium, which never existed before and is not covered by the regulations, he had better throw it into the ashcan before the commission sends him to jail for 30 years and fines him $300,000, which is what the bill provides if he tells anyone.

And for this sort of nonsense we fought Hitler.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I should like to ask the special committee which has been appointed and which is about to take up the question of research and all that goes with it, including how atomic energy should be handled, to consider a very forceful editorial written by the editor of the

World-Herald, of Omaha, Nebr., entitled "Atomic Despotism."

I should like to refer to one paragraph of the editorial, because I think it is most timely and should receive every consideration on the part of the new committee which the President pro tempore has just appointed, especially in reference to independent research relative to the atomic bomb and atomic energy. Here is the paragraph:

Now as in many another era of history, despotism is the last refuge of the short-sighted and the timid.

When new problems arise, when new forces come into being and create conflicts without precedent, small men say: "Let us turn this over to our Government. Let us trade some of our freedom for a little security."

So it was in the time of Caesar. So, apparently, it is going to be in the administration of the man from Missouri.

Unfortunately this political escapism doesn't always work. Those who bury their faces in despotism's ample bosom sometimes find that they have lost both freedom and security.

Shortly after the announcement of the atomic bomb in a statement to the press I said that I felt before the question of atomic energy was turned over to a commission of the Government we should give great consideration to the development to be permitted to individuals and to the free-enterprise system.

I should like to tell the members of the new committee that no country on the face of the earth has ever done such a production job as has been done by the United States of America. I think that is one of the great reasons—at least leaders in Germany told me so—why we won this war. The mighty production record achieved was the result of individual effort under the free-enterprise system. That fact should not be forgotten by the commission if one shall finally be created.

We should also remember that our system of free enterprise has developed individuals who have been able to accomplish great things because their hands were not tied and because they have their freedom. Thus was brought about the great production which enabled us to win the war.

I should like also to read the last paragraph of the editorial which is as follows:

To control the mightiest physical force ever unleashed we shall need the mightiest spiritual force known to man. And that is the force of the free individual, living in liberty and beyond the angry reach of despotic government.

I ask, Mr. President, that the entire article be included in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC DESPOTISM

"The most totalitarian bill ever introduced in the Congress of the United States."

Thus George Sokolsky, writing elsewhere on this page, describes President Truman's "bill for the development and control of atomic energy."

It is in truth a strange and frightening proposal.

If it becomes the law of the Republic, the President, with the consent of the Senate, would appoint an Atomic Commission which would have supreme authority over the study of the atom, the research into its potentialities, the uses to which it will be put in our America.

Independent research in laboratories and universities would be ended.

Any scientist who, in the pursuit of knowledge, chanced to blunder into forbidden zones would be subject to a whopping fine.

Any lecturer or writer who ventured to reveal knowledge which the Atomic Commission held to be secret would be liable to extreme penalties.

Concerning this fearful secret, which may hold the power of life and death over nations and the earth itself, we, the people, would be told only what a handful of politicians in Washington deemed it proper for us to know.

And back of the edicts of this Commission would stand the authority of the mightiest destructive force ever loosed upon the planet.

"For this sort of nonsense," comments Mr. Sokolsky wryly, "we fought Hitler."

Politically, Mr. Sokolsky is regarded as a conservative. But on this issue he is joined, and vehemently, by the liberalish Atlantic Monthly.

After pointing out the completely totalitarian nature of the President's proposal the Atlantic adds:

"Here in our country, in 1939 and 1940, there were many defeatists who assured us that the democratic way could not stand up to the tests of the modern methods of warfare, as so magnificently developed by a totalitarian scheme. Unless we militarized the whole country from that time on, they said, we were all washed up. The world of the future was to be a world of 'dicipline,' world of uniforms. We would all have to obey orders and high time, too, they said.

"It was against precisely this kind of government, this kind of high secrets, that we have insisted over the years on the constitutional right to a free press. Are the vaunted blessings of atomic power worth the sacrifice of our traditional and hard-won freedom.

Now as in many another era of history, despotism is the last refuge of the short-sighted and the timid.

When new problems arise, when new forces come into being and create conflicts without precedent, small men say: "Let us turn this over to our Government. Let us trade some of our freedom for a little security."

So it was in the time of Caesar. So, apparently, it is going to be in the administration of the man from Missouri.

Unfortunately, this political escapism does not always work. Those who bury their faces in despotism's ample bosom sometimes find that they have lost both freedom and security.

In the two world wars of our time the democratic countries—and the United States in particular—have proved that freedom is more than a pleasant bonus granted by destiny to certain favored peoples. It is likewise the most productive and efficient way of life ever devised on earth.

Undeniably, the first loosing of atomic energy has created vast problems which will test the patience, the wisdom, the good will of the leaders of mankind for years and perhaps ages to come.

But to those who love and respect freedom the Truman approach will seem the completely wrong approach.

To control the mighti st physical force ever unleased we shall need the mightiest spiritual force known to man. And that is the force of the free individual, living in liberty and beyond the angry reach of despotic government.

ORDER FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no particular business before the Senate today, but there are a few bills on the calendar which might be considered. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of unobjected to bills, beginning with Calendar No. 656.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RELEASE OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from time to time letters reach us from men in the armed forces which are most distressing. I never put any of these letters in the RECORD because I realize the difficulties the Army and Navy are undergoing in getting men back from the fighting front; but I desire to read a few lines from a letter written by a most excellent young man who has a wife and two children and who has been in the Pacific now for more than 3 years. I think the letter is worthy of some attention at the hands of the Army and Navy at this time. The letter begins in this way:

It's very quiet here except for one thing—the sound of the boom pulleys loading freight on a Liberty ship nearby. For reasons which I will explain that sound strikes loneliness and despair into my heart much greater than the jungle birds or the air raid sirens did here when we were the advance base in New Guinea. That boat was supposed to take a lot of men out of the jungle but the orders were changed against the skipper's will. It is now loading supplies and equipment which we reportedly sold to the Dutch Government at the rate of 5 cents on the dollar value. The boat will deliver this material to Dutch authorities in Java and in the meantime we men continue to rot in this jungle, and we are rotting mentally, spiritually, and physically.

Mr. President, I skip a portion of the letter, but it is all in that tenor and tone. I wish to read the concluding paragraph:

You can tell all the strikers and other selfish little groups that we men won't try to cut in on their big-salary jobs. I believe most of us would even be willing to stay in prison until they have everything just as they want it, if they will only get us out of the lonely, diseased-infested jungle—we will be willing to pay for whatever wrong we have done our country if we can pay it back there where we can at least talk to our loved ones through the bars. Perhaps we might even get a glass of fresh milk occasionally.

We fellows are far past the stage of hoping or desiring justice or sympathy. All we ask is that the people we fought for have just a little humane mercy on us. Isn't there something that you, our loved ones, can do or say in our behalf?

Mr. President, this is one of the most distressing notes that has reached me from the far Pacific. Men who have been there from the beginning are yet in the jungle, in that diseased-infested area, as this writer calls it. Ships come in expected to take men out, but orders are changed and, on the contrary, merchandise is loaded in those ships and sent to some other government.

That is inexcusable, it is unpardonable, it is even criminal, Mr. President, toward a man with wife and babies at home, who has been in the area of the far south Pacific since the beginning of hostilities, and who still are there, suffer-

ing as this man's letter discloses he is suffering. If I did not know him to be a man of intelligence, culture, courage, and stamina, I would not even present these excerpts from his letter on the floor of the Senate and for the RECORD. But there can be no possible good reason why any ship should be used for any purpose other than the evacuation of men in New Guinea, and other islands in the far Pacific, at this time. Certainly the mere pittance we will receive for merchandise from any other government can offer no possible excuse for the loading of those ships with merchandise for the Dutch or any other government, while our men remain in the jungles.

I am afraid that some in authority do not appreciate what it means to have so many of the finest young men of America feel that they are not only forgotten, but that they are being passed over on excuses which are trivial, and for reasons which are trifling. Here is this man, with more than enough points to discharge him under the most exacting discharge-point regulation that has been adopted by the Army or Navy, sitting there while ships come and go loaded with materials to be virtually given away to other governments.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand that probably the Senate will recess from today until Thursday. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor may have permission to file during the recess a report on Senate bill 191, the hospital survey and construction bill

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RETURN OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO THE STATES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter today received by him as chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor from the President of the United States.

On behalf of the Senator from Montana, I wish to call the particular attention of the Senate to the contents of the letter, and state that the Committee on Education and Labor will begin consideration at an early date of the legislation referred to in the President's letter on the question of the return of the employment offices to the States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 29, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Since my reconversion message to the Congress, in which I discussed the problem of the status of the United States Employment Service, several proposals have been submitted to the Congress for the return of the operation of our public employment office system to the States. All such proposals present basic problems involving the requirements of our national reconversion program and the necessity for effecting such return in a manner which will avoid confusion and disruption during the transition period and provide a sound foundation for the future operation of the service.

With respect to national reconversion, events subsequent to the date of my message have emphasized our continuing need for a centrally operated system of public employment offices for some time to come. But apart from the needs of our national reconversion program, it is imperative that in connection with the transfer of our public employment office system to State operation, the Congress enact legislation which will assure (1) that the States are able to resume such operations on the designated date, (2) that the essential services provided by our local public employment offices will not be disrupted during their transition from Federal to State operation, and (3) that the States' operation of such offices under our Federal-State cooperative program will assure the maintenance of the types of facilities and services required under an adequate Nation-wide system of public employment offices.

The national interest in the maintenance of an adequate Nation-wide system of public employment offices has been recognized since the enactment by the Congress of the act of June 6, 1933 known as the Wagner-Peyser Act. That national interest has been increased and emphasized by our responsibilities to veterans under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and by our responsibilities to the millions of workers who are and will be unemployed as a result of our reconversion from war to peacetime pursuits. If those national interests and responsibilities are to be fulfilled, the functions and standards prescribed for the operation of public employment offices under our Federal-State cooperative program must assure the adequacy and efficiency of the services to be provided and the availability of those services throughout the Nation. Equally, if those national interests and responsibilities are to be fulfilled, our Federal-State cooperative program for the operation of public employment offices must make provision for the maintenance of those services in any State which is either unwilling or unable to provide the type of services required.

As you know, prior to their federalization in 1942 our State public-employment office systems were operated under the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act, which provided for a Federal-State cooperative program in the maintenance of a Nation-wide system of public employment offices. That act provided for financing such State systems through dollar-for-dollar matching of Federal and State moneys. The enactment of the Social Security Act, and the expansion in our public employment office systems which occurred in connection with the unemployment-insurance program under that act, resulted in a tremendous increase in the cost of operating our State public-employment offices. By 1942, between 90 and 95 percent of the cost of operating those State systems was financed by Federal grants. The major part of those Federal moneys was granted by the Social Security Board under title III of the Social Security Act. Since virtually the total cost of the State systems was financed by the Federal Government prior to 1942, I recommend that the Congress eliminate the duplicative fiscal procedures which prevailed prior to 1942, and substitute provision for 100 percent Federal financing of our State public-employment office systems through a single grant procedure. And, as I indicated above, if the national interest in cur public-employment office systems warranted the Federal Government during the prewar period in financing virtually the total cost of such systems under State operation, our increased national interest during the current and future periods warrants the Federal Government in recognizing its obligation to provide public employment services in any State which is unable or unwilling to establish or maintain an adequate State system of public-employment offices.

The transfer of our public-employment office systems from Federal to State operation also presents problems involving the trained and experienced personnel, now employed in those offices, as well as the properties, records, and other facilities now located in State and local offices of the United States Employment Service. Those problems require Federal legislation in order to effect the transfer of such personnel, properties, and facilities to the State governments without confusion or disruption in the service. I recommend that the Congress study these problems and make appropriate provision for their disposition at the time of the transfer of our public-employment offices to State operation.

The enactment at the earliest practicable date of legislation providing for the matters enumerated above and such other matters as the Congress deems appropriate will provide a basis upon which both State and Federal agencies can undertake immediately the necessary steps looking to the accomplishment of the transfer of our public-employment office systems from Federal to State operation in an orderly and efficient manner. More significantly, the enactment of such legislation will provide a sound basis for Federal-State cooperation in the maintenance of a postwar Nation-wide system of public employment offices which will meet the needs of veterans, employers, employees, and the Nation as a whole.

I hope your committee and the Congress will give the foregoing problems prompt and favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

CUT IN BRITISH TAXES—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times of October 24 relative to the British cut in both income taxes and excess-profits taxes. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on last Friday raised some question as to the advisability of Congress now making a cut in the income taxes and the excess-profits taxes. At that time I pointed out that the labor government of Britain had found it possible—and I had recently read an article on that subject—to make reduction in the excess-profits tax as well as the income tax. I did not then have at hand the article which I now ask to have published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH TAXES CUT 10 TO 50 PERCENT IN BUDGET—MEDIUM AND HIGHER BRACKETS GET SLIGHT OVER-ALL DECREASE DESPITE BIGGER SURTAX

(By Charles E. Egan)

LONDON, October 23.—Relief next year for Britain's individual and corporate taxpayers was promised today by Hugh Dalton, Chancelor of the Exchequer, when he presented to a packed House of Commons the labor government's first budget.

The immediate response to the document was favorable in the House and in most parts of the business community. Many described the measure as much less radical than they had expected.

Tax reductions for individuals will come next April at the beginning of the fiscal year. At that time the regular income-tax rates

will be cut 50 percent in the lowest bracket to 10 percent on medium and higher incomes. An increase in the surtax rates applying to those with incomes equivalent to $10,000 and up will partly offset their benefits but leave them with a slight reduction from current liabilities.

Personal exemptions, allowances, etc., for lower incomes are increased to prewar levels. As a result, about 2,000,000 wage earners will go off the tax rolls entirely.

A cut to 60 percent in excess-profits taxes, which now amount to 100 percent was promised to industry. The profits tax cut will become effective January 1.

Many had advocated the abolition of the excess-profits tax as an incentive to business, and Conservative attacks in the House tomorrow are expected to revolve around that point. Increases in surtaxes on larger incomes, Mr. Dalton said, are intended to "continue that steady advance toward economic and social equality which we have made during the war and which this Government firmly intends to continue in peace."

In addition to easing taxpayers' burdens through cuts in income taxes and in the excess profits tax applying to industry, Mr. Dalton disclosed that his Government had ordered an immediate abolition of the purchase tax on a number of household heating and cooking appliances. The continuation of subsidy payments to keep living costs stable and the maintenance of price controls for the same purpose were other policies announced by the Chancellor.

On the long-range objectives of the Government, Mr. Dalton said there was no expectations of balancing the budget next year although the gap between expenditures and income would be narrowed. When the budget is balanced, he continued, the Government will follow a deliberate policy of creating budget surpluses in good years and deficits in depression periods in the interests of maintaining a stable economy.

He outlined also the Government program for family allowances, higher old-age pensions, wider social services, better education and more money for housing and colonial welfare.

In his statement to the House and in a radio address later, Mr. Dalton said that the tax reductions had to be gaged to avoid the dangers of inflation and at the same time encourage increased industrial production.

Receipts through taxes for the current fiscal years will amount to about £3,265,000,000, the Chancellor said. Expenditures will be about £5,560,000,000, leaving a deficit, to be met by borrowing, of approximately £2,300,000,000.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister in the recent coalition Government and leader of the Opposition in the House, arose at the conclusion of the budget presentation. He complimented the Chancellor on his statement, which he described as "bland, mild and temperate." He was gratified, he said, by the restoration of the personal income tax allowances for those of smaller incomes but was anxious about the continuance of war expenditure at the present level.

Mr. Churchill's final comment was that he and those associated with him in the House, regarded the budget as one "that would do no harm, if it did no good."

THE OPA AND THE LUMBER AND SHINGLE INDUSTRIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I understand that, roughly, there is a shortage of 1,000,000 homes for returned veterans. They cannot buy houses. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD two letters addressed by Mr. R. D. Reser, of San Antonio, Tex., to Mr. Chester Bowles; a letter to Mr. Reser from Mr. Chester Bowles; a letter to Mr. Reser from W. W. Woodbridge; and an article entitled "Why Not Bankrupt the Entire Industry Instead of Just Part of It?"

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *October 9, 1945.*

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
House Office Building No. 1,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Acting upon your letter of September 28, 1945, in connection with emergency orders for clear cedar shingles and priority from the American Red Cross, I forwarded such priority orders in line with your instruction to the Red Cedar Shingle Bureau at Seattle, Wash.

In answer to a telegram asking for confirmation of such orders, I have the following telegram:

"R. D. RESER LUMBER CO.,
"San Antonio, Tex.:

"Re telegram: The sale of shingles is handled entirely by the individual mills. We do, however, try to assist buyers, but so far have been unable to be of any assistance. Mills already filled with this type of business.

"RED CEDAR SHINGLE BUREAU."

It would appear that the information given you respecting the manner in which the storm area of Texas could secure red-cedar shingles was inaccurate.

Prior to receiving the above letter from you, which caused me to make this attempt, I had ordered from the M. A. Wyman Lumber Co., 743 Henry Building, Seattle, Wash., shipments of stained cedar shingles which would have cost the consumer $14.05 a square as against a cost of $7.80 to consumer of clear shingles, but canceled this order upon receipt of your letter and direction.

When the Red Cedar Shingle Bureau said it was unable to be of any assistance, I immediately contacted the Wyman Co. in an effort to expedite my original order, and I have the following word from the Wyman Co.:

"Entering order. Probably about 30 days shipment, as have booked about 45 cars since."

This means, of course, that the Wyman Co. must ship 45 cars of stained shingles before they can now reach this order for disaster relief.

In view of your interest in this matter, I thought you would want the above information.

Sincerely yours,

R. D. RESER.

P. S.—Extension of preference rating, American Red Cross Disaster Service, for wood shingles for repair of disaster-caused damage in town of Gregory and in Nueces County, as enclosed, were furnished with orders sent to Red Cedar Bureau on October 3.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *October 22, 1945.*

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
House Office Building No. 1,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: About a year ago, an investigator for the OPA told me that I could not charge for my labor and expense in getting shingles for my customers. This surprised me, but since that time I have had, and my lawyers have had, many surprises. I want to mention a few of them to you at this time while a change in RMP 164 is under consideration.

(a) As soon as I was told that "hiring out" to small lumber yards, or collecting labor and expenses from them when they did not increase the retail price, having, however, always made a commission since I have been in business, I immediately turned over all my books, accounts and records to the local OPA. Voluntarily appearing before the OPA officials here I submitted to sworn examination and caused Mr. Olsen to come here from the State of Washington and he allowed himself to be examined under oath by the OPA; gave them permission to take charge of his records, those of his partner, Mr. Main, and the records of the Northwestern Lumber & Shingle Company, Bellingham, Washington. Our lawyers assured us that if we played fair with our Government it would treat us fairly in turn. So we did not expect a distorted story to be given out of your Office such as appeared in Collier's magazine of September 29, 1945. The intent of this article is obvious.

(b) A few days before the hearing on my protest, which was a matter for the Review Price Branch only—an enforcement attorney of the San Antonio OPA telephoned to the newspaper in Corpus Christi, Tex., and thereafter released a story that was incorrect and calculated to prevent witnesses from appearing for the hearing. Your own records will reveal that I did not make a $1,000 bond "last week" or last month, nor is it fair to speak of decent businessmen as "accomplices" because we have done no wrong in accepting payment for services and the return of expenses.

(c) I was equally surprised to have the enforcement attorney for this district and his assistant present at the hearings. This did not have the effect these gentlemen intended. Nor did visits by OPA investigators to various lumber yards, just before the hearing, intimidate the dealers.

(d) Of course I was surprised to find that your assurances to me, under date of September 28, that clear cedar shingles were available for disaster-relief under Red Cross priority, were without foundation. To this date the Red Cross has been unable to get anything but stained shingles, which the OPA allows to be sold for twice the price of clear and when everyone knows they are no better.

Sincerely yours,

R. D. RESER.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1945.

Mr. R. D. RESER,
San Antonio, Tex.

DEAR MR. RESER: This acknowledges your letter dated September 8, 1945.

The Court Review Branch of this Office has been in communication with your attorneys, Heck, Street and Fowlkes, Esqs., of San Antonio, Tex., relative to your request for an oral hearing. A decision will shortly be made on this point.

With reference to the present emergency need for shingles in several towns along the Texas coast, as a result of a recent severe tornado, I have been informed that retail lumber dealers holding Red Cross priorities should receive speedy shipment of shingles upon forwarding such priorities together with their orders to the Red Cedar Shingle Bureau, 5508 White Building, Seattle, Wash., requesting placement of these orders.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES.
Administrator.

RED CEDAR SHINGLE BUREAU,
Lincoln, Nebr., October 10, 1945.

R. D. RESER LUMBER CO.,
San Antonio, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: In the last paragraph of the letter dated September 28, signed by Chester Bowles, Administrator of OPA, he is in error in his interpretation of the function of the Red Cedar Shingle Bureau. Our organization is in no sense of the word a sales agency, and it has no control whatsoever over the movement of shingles by any of its member mills. The Red Cedar Shingle Bureau serves three purposes for the shingle industry.

First, to promote red cedar shingles.

Second, to protect this product from unfair and unjust legislation.

Third, to inspect shingles manufactured by member mills to see that they rigidly adhere to the grading rules published by the bureau.

We are surprised that Mr. Bowles should discuss priorities as this is a subject entirely under the jurisdiction of WPB.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. WOODBRIDGE,
Secretary-Manager.

[From Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest, Portland, Oreg., of October 15, 1945]

WHY NOT BANKRUPT THE ENTIRE INDUSTRY INSTEAD OF JUST PART OF IT

(By C. C. Crow)

Do you operate an independent retail yard, being satisfied to conduct one business in one city or town? Have you spent a lifetime serving the retailers and manufacturers as a wholesale commission merchant in a territory whose requirements you have studied and understand? Have you been long established in the wholesale business, performing a service of proved value to both the producers and retail buyers and others entitled to purchase in wholesale lots? If you come under any of the above classifications and are not located south of the Mason and Dixon line or handle the product of the mills cutting southern pine, then you are an outlaw. It has been decreed by the OPA that the small retail lumber dealer shall quit business while his line-yard competition across the street moves in on the producing field and hogs the supply through his ability to break down the long-established process of distribution by going directly to the mills with net prices that even eliminate the cash discount.

When the war was on the Government not only asked the wholesaler to use his procurement, distribution, and expediting facilities to help get lumber for our fighting forces, it even demanded that this be done, going so fa as to call him in to auctions with a directive that he take certain orders and follow them through to completion. What about today? Greedy line-yard dealers and wholesale distributing yards who have an exorbitant profit written into price ceilings for them by the OPA, decide that they will crowd the legitimate wholesaler off the road and OPA just turns its head and does nothing as it sees these pampered buyers driving ruthlessly down the left-hand side of the road and chasing the wholesalers off into the ditch.

The commission man has a free-born right to make his services available to either the producer or buyer, all according to the trend of the market. Certainly he is mostly the aid of the small businessman, the small independent retailer dealer who cannot afford to maintain big buying headquarters in some large center, who cannot afford to send men to the Pacific coast and spend thousands of dollars going from mill to mill, waiving the wholesale commission and the normal cash discount in unprincipled competition to grab all of the inadequate supply regardless of the other fellow.

There is one way to correct this injustice and do it overnight.

The Constitution of the United States never intended that any bureau should be empowered to legislate any legitimate commercial activity out of the picture with class discrimination. It never intended that a lumberman engaged in marketing, either wholesale or retail, of timber products produced in the northwestern part of the United States should be denied the same lawful rights as one handling the output of mills in the South. It never intended that a bureau ruling should write in special privileges and fancy profits for a favored few and permit them to strangle others to death with this leverage.

The wholesale dealers, commission men, and independent retail dealers should rise up as a body and demand that Peter Stone do one of two things immediately. He should either make allowance for the payment of an overage on all species, similar to the special privilege now granted to those handling southern pine or, better yet, allow the buyer to pay any sum he may choose to have his buying done, providing that cost is absorbed and not passed along to the consumer. The price ceilings grant this consideration to the manufacturers, who are allowed to pay a selling commission of any amount they choose so long as it is taken out of their net return below the ceiling.

If Mr. Stone is not willing to do this, then there is but one other course open for him and that is to immediately withdraw the retail yard and wholesale distributing yard mark-ups and put them on the same do-business-for-nothing basis that he is arbitrarily forcing on the wholesalers, commission men, and independent retailers who have to be satisfied with inferior remanufactured-in-transit stock today at a cost that absorbs all of their normal retail margin.

If our lumber business can be run without profit, why not be fair and put everybody in the same boat? Take the mark-up away from the wholesale distribution yard, from the line-yard retailer, then grant the employees in the mills and logging camps a substantial increase in wages. Allow an increase in the price of logs. Cut down the grade spread and fix it so that the manufacturers will also be forced to quit business. If it is legal, this game of freeze-out should be imposed upon the entire industry, not just a few of those least able to defend themselves against the entrenched favorites who are in the process of applying the guillotine to their manacled competitors.

Wire, telephone, or write your Congressmen today and insist that all mark-ups be immediately taken out of all lumber ceilings until such a time as the small, independent retail dealer, the commission man, and the wholesale dealer are lifted from the exile list of OPA and their rights as free-born American citizens reestablished.

If you are to be starved out by a biased Government, then let it at least be said that you went down fighting and not meekly submitting to an un-American outrage.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in this connection I also ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter written by Mr. Deward G. Schultz, acting executive secretary of the Independent Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., an association with a membership of approximately 500 independent retail lumber dealers in the States of Wisconsin, Iowa, North and South Dakota, and Minnesota.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT RETAIL
LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 9, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

Enclosed is a copy of our brief delivered to the Minnesota Small Business Commission on October 8 and a letter addressed to the Office of Price Administration, Peter A. Stone, Lumber Branch. A newspaper account of the hearing before the commission is also enclosed for yuor information.

We are calling your attention to a problem facing the independent retail lumber dealer of the Northwest at the present time and hope you will do everything possible to bring about a change in OPA regulations which will enable the independent dealer to purchase lumber on an equal basis with other buyers.

After you have read the enclosed items we believe you will become thoroughly familiar with the situation.

Thanking you very kindly for your attention and for your many factors in the past, we remain,

Yours very truly,

DEWARD G. SCHULTZ,
Acting Executive Secretary.

INDEPENDENT RETAIL
LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 9, 1945.

Mr. PETER A. STONE,
Lumber Branch,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STONE: Our association has a membership of approximately 500 independent retail lumber dealers in the States of Wisconsin, Iowa, North and South Dakota, and Minnesota. Members of our group were in hopes that the method of wholesaler and commissionman mark-ups applicable, since August 1943, to the mill ceiling prices on southern yellow pine, would be extended to all other species of softwood, lath, and cedar shingles. This was expected to come at the same time a recent decision was made to continue the 4 and 6 percent mark-ups on southern pine above mill ceiling prices.

By telephone conversation with your Washington office on the morning of October 3, we were informed that mark-ups for wholesaler and commissionmen of softwood species of lumber other than southern yellow pine were not being contemplated at this time. This is exceedingly disappointing to us since there appears to be nothing in the immediate future to relieve a rapidly developing critical situation for the independent lumber dealer.

At our hearing before the Minnesota Small Business Commission (copy of which is enclosed) we explained the present buying problem of the independent, emphasizing the fact that wholesalers and commissionmen of lumber have lost many of their well-established connections, with the result that the independent dealer is without a source of lumber supply. Under present circumstances the big operators are permitted to pay a representative buyer salary and expenses for locating and buying lumber, while the small operator, who does not handle a sufficient footage to justify an individual buyer, is unable to avail himself of the services of a part-time buyer who needs to be paid only for the lumber he actually locates and buys for his client. Many mills are refusing to pay customary commissions, or no commissions at all.

It is our understanding that these commissions were originally figured in the mill ceiling prices and were to be paid by the mills. Buyers on the west coast and in other lumber-producing areas are paying ceiling prices to the mills and in some instances waiving cash discounts.

As explained in our brief to the Minnesota Small Business Commission, we do not approve of disrupting the well-established, satisfactory channels of distribution. Small business asks no special favors but merely insists upon a fair and equal chance to purchase a just share of the Nation's lumber production. You have recognized the necessity and importance of a wholesaler and commission man in the southern yellow pine field. It is equally important to the independent retail lumber dealer on all other species of lumber. Most independent dealers in lumber and other building material products, are willing to pay for the services rendered them by wholesalers and commission men without increasing consumer costs and are confident that in the long run the well-established and experienced wholesale distribution channels are the most economical for both themselves and the consumer.

Some dealers are rapidly being cut off entirely from their sources of lumber supply. We are heartily in favor of price control of lumber and do sincerely hope restrictions

to prevent runaway prices will remain intact as long as necessary. However, at this particular time we are not allowing ourselves to believe that the Office of Price Administration will permit a price ceiling to be used as an instrument for the elimination of small business from any field. We believe that you are acquainted with the facts. We contend that we are within our rights when we expect immediate relief from a situation that is unjust, unfair, and certainly discriminatory. We, as independent retail lumber dealers, representing an important segment of the Nation's small business, firmly believe that if given a fair chance to secure our just share of the Nation's lumber production, can do our part to successfully carry out the Nation's building program.

Yours very truly,

DEWARD G. SCHULTZ,
Acting Executive Secretary.

INDEPENDENT RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 3, 1945.

A. O. SLETVOLD,
Senator, Chairman, Minnesota Small Business Commission,
State Capitol Building,
St. Paul, Minn.

Honorable members of the commission:

My name is Deward G. Schultz, acting executive secretary of the Independent Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, home office, 1144 Baker Building, Minneapolis 2, Minn. I represent approximately 500 independent retail lumber dealers of the Northwest, of which more than 300 are from the State of Minnesota.

The problem I wish to bring to the attention of the Minnesota Small Business Commission is one which seriously affects every independent dealer in this and other States. It is one which cannot be solved directly by you because it concerns a Federal agency, namely, the Office of Price Administration. We bring the problem to your attention in the hope that after due consideration and thorough understanding, you will lend your support and influence to assist in affecting a quick solution.

The process of making lumber available for consumer use involves three steps which have been recognized as indispensable as far back as the history of the lumber industry records. They are production, wholesale distribution, and retail distribution. As set forth in a recent editorial by C. C. Crow, noted west coast editorial writer, we quote:

"The markets for lumber are spread over the entire face of the globe. Some lumber is produced in nearly every State in the United States. The consumer is often choosey about the species he uses or the section from which it has come. He may be satisfied with an inferior grade of boards made in some comparatively nearby section but prefers dimension that has to be hauled across the continent from the Pacific coast and be equally insistent on using flooring manufactured in the South. Likely as not he may want half a million feet of fir lumber which, to get the best results from a procurement and utilization basis must come from widely separated areas in the producing field and from plants that not only harvest entirely different types of an identical species but with greatly varying manufacturing facilities.

"No one mill, regardless of size, can supply best and most economically everything the buyer requires. Very few concerns, except those with extensive operations in widely separated timbered areas producing in the over-all at least some of the many competitive woods, have ever found it good business to maintain a salaried sales organization of sufficient size to merchandise their own product direct to retail distributors and others legitimately entitled to purchase on the wholesale market. As a sound and natural consequence there has been developed a division of wholesale lumber merchants who with years of experience in the distribution of timber products have become established clearinghouses bringing together the producers, retail distributors, and other bulk buyers, thereby performing a genuine service that is constructive and worth all it costs to that great majority of manufacturers and distant buyers whose wholesale distribution problem is best served through this medium.

"Just what compensation the wholesaler should receive has always been a moot question. Presumably a percentage of the sum involved is the fairest method, as a fixed dollars-and-cents basis can be too much on a low-grade, cheap item and too little on the smaller volumed, higher priced upper grades."

The commission method of remunerating for wholesale distribution service was given official recognition by the Government during the days of the NRA when, after careful study, a percentage was established as a standard. These commissions were paid by the manufacturer to the wholesaler and commission man as compensation for services rendered.

Mr. Crow continues: "It (wholesaler functions) involves the exercising of expert ability and broad knowledge of lumber merchandising which the average so-called mill sales manager, even though having the basic ability, gets no opportunity to develop due to the narrowed channels in which his contacts are necessarily confined in disposing of the product of one plant limited in marketing facilities. The properly financed wholesaler eliminates the credit risk for the manufacturer. He makes it possible for the manufacturer to take only that part of each schedule which he can properly and profitably handle. The wholesalers have earned their place in the picture which has been proved by the record.

To a great extent the independent retail lumber dealer is dependent upon the wholesaler and commissionman as a source of supply for his lumber. When the lumber dealer is in need, for example, of a car of west coast fir, he contacts his wholesaler, giving him the specifications for the material which perhaps will be used in the construction of a creamery, food-processing plant, store building or some other building in his community. The wholesaler fills this order, if he can, calling upon the various mills he represents.

The Office of Price Administration, upon establishing mill ceilings prices, announced at the time regulations went into effect, that the customary commission due wholesalers and commissionmen for their services, had been figured in the mill regulation and were to be paid by the mills with no additional penalty to the retail dealer. In his description of the situation, Mr. Crow continues: "During the war, when our fighting forces needed lumber to the near exclusion of all normal uses, the wholesale fraternity for the most part did a noble job in aiding where it could and accepted with a minimum of complaint, the direct movement of lumber from the producer to the Government as that was the most expeditious method for meeting the national emergency."

"However, the war is over and now what do we find. A tremendously pent-up demand for normal peacetime sources clamors for lumber." Large industrial concerns and retailers, especially chain lumber yard systems through employed salaried buyers, are going straight to the manufacturers, openly offering to make placements at net ceiling prices.

What is the result of this? In numerous cases long established sawmill concerns have recently notified wholesaler connections with whom they have done a lot of business in former years, that in the future they will pay no more selling commissions because they can now get all of the business they can handle, net, direct. Let us see what this actually means to the mills in dollars and cents.

According to the latest figures compiled by the West Coast Lumbermens' Association, the average price received from fir mills reporting for the month of May 1945, was $39.75 per thousand. Of this amount approximately $3 per thousand board feet is customarily paid to wholesalers and commission men to cover their established merchandising costs. Under present Office of Price Administration regulation, a wholesaler or commissionman is not permitted to charge the retail dealer any more than the mill ceiling price. We remind you that OPA originally announced that established wholesale and commission costs were figures in the basic mill ceiling prices.

The result: Wholesale and commissionmen have lost many of their sources of supply. It follows then that independent dealers, an important part of small business in this State, have lost much of their source of lumber supply. Communities in which line yards are located are securing lumber. Other localities served by indpendent yards are securing only meager portions.

What are possible solutions to this problem?

The independent dealer can be left to go searching for lumber himself on the west coast and in other lumber producing areas. To do this would require him to leave his business a share of the time. His purchasing costs would become prohibitive.

It is possible for him to band together with other independent dealers and form a buying organization, hiring representatives to compete with present purchasers for chain-yard systems and large industrials, disregarding entirely well-established wholesale concerns and commissionmen who have rendered a valuable and commendable service to him and to the industry as a whole. This alternative would mean a break-down of our present system of distribution and would result in no saving whatsoever to the retail distributor or to the consumer.

It is further well to consider that the wholesaler and the commissionmen are an important part of small business itself. We as independent dealers do not favor their elimination. They are vital to our future progress and welfare. We, as a part of small business, are glad to pay wholesalers and commissionmen for the services they render but under present Office of Price Administration regulations, are helpless in our efforts to do so.

On southern pine, a major portion of the Nation's lumber production, Office of Price Administration permits a commission to be charged over and above mill ceiling prices. Wholesale and commission mark-ups on southern pine were adopted as a war measure at the request of the War Production Board of the Central Procurement Agency. They were established in amendment 5 to regulation 19 and became effective August 31, 1943. They were adopted as it was believed that the wholesaler's and commissionman's function of purchasing southern pine lumber for retail was needed for the speedy and orderly procurement of lumber for war work. This resulted in changing the position of the wholesaler and commissionman from one of selling agent for the mills, to one of buying agent for the war effort. It was deemed to be the most economic method of securing vitally needed lumber for our armed forces since wholesalers and commissionmen were thoroughly familiar with purchasers and manufacturing practices. As of October 3, 1945, we contacted OPA in Washington by telephone and were informed that southern pine mark-ups would continue. We were further informed during the same conversation that nothing similar is being contemplated on western and northern softwood, or any other species of lumber.

Just why the Office of Price Administration is denying the same system of middleman mark-up on everything else but Southern pine lumber is a mystery at the present moment.

Our association is strongly urging the Office of Price Administration to permit us to compensate our wholesaler and commissionman for services they render, and this at no increased cost to the consumer. We are opposed to a disruption of old established, tried and satisfactory methods of distribution. In our opinion a commission schedule similar to that permitted and now in effect on Southern pine, should be made available. As soon as this has been done, we are confident wholesalers and commissionmen having served us in the past, will again be in a position to serve us in the future.

Small business in this State and elsewhere, as represented by the wholesalers and commissionmen, and independent retail dealers in lumber, are suffering because of present circumstances. Our Northwest area is not securing its just share of desirable lumber suitable for the building programs the people of our State desire to place in operation.

We earnestly seek your assistance and cooperation to secure a speedy correction of the situation which can be made by the responsible Federal agency.

Respectfully submitted.

DEWARD G. SCHULTZ,
Acting Executive Secretary.

RELEASE OF SERVICEMEN—EXPEDITION OF RELEASE FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several telegrams I have received endorsing my measure, Senate Joint Resolution 97, providing for expedition of release of men from the armed services.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAXWELL FIELD, ALA., *October 14, 1945.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

As a medical officer in the service of the Army, I highly endorse your bill, Senate Joint Resolution 97, and hope it can expedite our release as soon as possible.

R. M. REIFLER,
Captain, Medical Corps.

MAXWELL FIELD, ALA., *October 14, 1945.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

As a medical officer in the service of the Army, I highly endorse your bill, Senate Joint Resolution 97, and hope it can expedite our release as soon as possible.

Capt. A. T. KWEDAR,
Medical Corps.

MAXWELL FIELD, ALA., *October 14, 1945.*
Senator LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota,
Washington, D. C.:

As a medical officer in the service of the Army, I highly endorse your bill, Senate Joint Resolution 97, and hope it can expedite our release as soon as possible.

Capt. JAMES A. CHUSTZ,
Medical Corps.

MAXWELL FIELD, ALA., *October 14, 1945.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

As a dental officer in the the service of the Army, my colleagues and I highly endorse your bill, Senate Joint Resolution 97, and hope it can expedite our release as soon as possible.

HENRY C. SANDLER,
Captain, Dental Corps.

MAXWELL FIELD, ALA., *October 14, 1945.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

As a medical officer in the service of the Army, I highly endorse your bill, Senate Joint Resolution 97, and hope it can expedite our release as soon as possible.

JOHN A. STEITZ,
Captain, Medical Corps.

LETTER FROM RICHARD LLOYD JONES, PUBLISHER, TULSA TRIBUNE

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Richard Lloyd Jones, president and publisher of the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TULSA TRIBUNE,
Tulsa, Okla., October 13, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR AND FELLOW REPUBLICAN: Pay the real war workers the "war workers' " wages and you will save America. Today America is not just to the soldiers who fought and won our wars. They have done all they enlisted to do. Now they want to return to their homes and home-making and work in the peace they won. But the Army and Navy, with the consent of Congress, won't let them return. We have trapped them. This is trickery. Unjust and dishonest. And what are you doing about it?

Return to their homes our soldiers who won the war. Free them to fill the jobs that industry and trade are pleading to have filled and you will not only be just but you will set in motion the wheels of enterprise that will give the world a pattern of peace and bring to America unprecedented prosperity, progress, and tranquillity. Deny our soldiers their freedom and you betray them. Hold these men in service against their will, as the Army and Navy brass hats are doing, and you will destroy the morale of the Nation. And don't you doubt it.

We must have a huge standing Army and the biggest Navy to police the peace. But to trap the boys is no way to get this police force. The soldiers were the real war workers—yet we have classed the workers in munition plants, and kind, as the "war workers." Most of them unskilled, we paid them $80 per week while we paid the soldiers a measily little $15 a week. Now let the Republican Party at least be honest with the soldiers.

We must build the policing Army out of volunteers. Pay all who volunteer to join our Army and Navy the wages we paid the so-called war workers and there will be more enlistments than our policing forces can use. And the Government will save money; we will save money, because:

The veterans who want to come home and do the home work will stop these coddled, if not encouraged, strikes. They will get industry going. The country will again prosper and progress.

Here is a cause, and the only cause, that will put the Republican Party back in power. And you are a silly lot of Senators if you fancy anything else will do it. This cause will make every veteran and his family happy and loyal to the party that made these soldiers freemen again.

It will make the policing Army and Navy a quality vocation. It will lure enlistments to overflow the ranks.

The Republican Party cannot win with Whig timidity and befuddlement. Let the Democrats continue to play the boodle game with the Federal Treasury, but let us no longer half endorse the social gains made by Treasury raids.

Give the Republican Party one great creative and curative cause, champion that cause with a patriot's courage, as did the farmers at Ripon 91 years ago and you will have a party that will save the United States of America, as the Ripon-born party saved the Union.

Very respectfully yours,

RICHARD LLOYD JONES,
Editor and Publisher.

THE PRICE OF EGGS—LETTER FROM J. M. THOMPSON

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that eggs prices throughout the Northwest are very low, and that no program has been provided to support the price of eggs to farmers. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. J. M. Thompson, acting director, western division of the United States Department of Agriculture, dealing with the question of egg prices.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., October 18, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This is in reply to your letter of October 9 with which you transmitted a letter relative to egg prices.

When the price of eggs first broke in the Middle West this fact was called to the attention of the Poultry Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, and preparations were started to set up a purchase program to support the price of eggs to farmers. Prices strengthened quickly in most areas and the proposed support program was not approved.

Over the country as a whole the demand for eggs is strong and the price is good. The areas where farm prices are abnormally low are apparently widely scattered and relatively few in number. For this reason preparations for the immediate Government purchase of eggs were dropped.

We are continuing to urge that a program be set up to support the price and are very hopeful that it can be ready to be put into operation no later than December 1, when the season of heavy production normally starts.

The letter from your constituent is returned, as you requested.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. THOMPSON,
Acting Director, Western Division.

PROPOSED COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from H. E. Lillo, of Concordia College, Moorehead, Minn., and a letter from V. J. Hillstrom, manager, Reinhard Bros., Inc., of Fargo, N. Dak., both in opposition to compulsory military training for youth.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCORDIA COLLEGE,
Moorhead, Minn., October 26, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am sending you a copy of an article that I recently prepared for Timely Topics, a publication of the Lutheran Brotherhood. I notice that you have taken a very definite stand against the un-American effort now being put forth to Prussianize this Nation. As I listened to the President's address over the radio, I felt like

murmuring "Thank God for Congress." I cannot believe that the men who have come from the people would so betray those people as to follow the President's leadership in this matter.

The founders of this Nation hated conscription. Webster argued that peacetime conscription was unconstitutional and called a proposal for it "the most ridiculous and abominable that ever entered into the head of man." The common people have always hated conscription. Well might the Minneapolis Star-Journal declare that if the Democratic majority succeeds in putting this measure through there will be a Republican Congress in 1946 and a Republican administration in 1948.

Keep up the good work. Here is a cause that is worthy of the best that a man can give. You will be fighting to preserve the America of yesterday—the America of freedom.

Yours very truly,

H. E. LILLO.

REINHARD BROS., INC.,
Fargo, N. Dak., October 27, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Compulsory military training for youth.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May I please present my opinion, and that of hundreds of people with whom I have discussed this all-important subject, of compulsory military training for our young boys?

I am violently opposed to a plan that would force young men under 20 years old into military training just at the time when they should be entering college. Based upon the experience that I have had in visiting with hundreds of returned veterans, I find, after having been out into the world for 1 year or more, that they are not interested in again settling down to the quietude necessary to concentrate on studying.

Secondly, I do not believe that the ordinary youth of 18 is sufficiently developed, mentally and morally, to withstand these vile temptations and worldly atmosphere of the Army. I believe that it would be a bad influence just at the time when a child is beginning to come into his manhood.

We think training is very fine, but it should be done in the latter 2 years of high school, where both the logistic and the theory of military matters should be taught to the youth.

I believe that those students who can, and do, make the sacrifice to go to college should have the privilege of further developing their military ability and finish as minor officers.

I have visited with my own son, and many other soldiers, and they have told me that they believe that all youth should be taught the science of handling arms of warfare, but they have also emphasized that even though a soldier be put through the most strenuous training a very few weeks of leisure and he has lost much of the physical endurance that he was supposed to retain.

And, most important of all, I do not believe that the United States, which has always stood for the highest and finest things in life, should set up an example of preparation for war, as is definitely presented by a so-called standing army.

I hope that you will oppose the bill that is now proposed, and that you will support me in our belief.

Respectfully yours,

VIC HILLSTROM,
Manager.

UNRRA AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA—LETTER FROM REV. V. F. MIKOLASEK

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Rev. V. F. Mikolasek, rector of St. Josephs Church of Lankin, N. Dak., dealing with the situation in Czechoslovakia, and the need for aid from UNRRA to the people of that country.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH,
Lankin, N. Dak., October 5, 1945.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Member of United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: Excuse me, that I write you in this matter:

The UNRRA, for which such funds are appropriated and collected, deserves a little ventilation. Those two gentlemen, Members of the House of Representatives, when they returned from Europe announced that in some cases there is an improper handling of funds, etc.

Probably people did not believe in the beginning—I did not either, but now I have positive evidence—that everything was not on the square.

Here is the case: In Czechoslovak Republic—I mention only the Bohemia and Moravia—they have a Catholic charity organization to help all needy without any difference as to their religion, nationality, or creed. And that organization was completely eliminated from the list of recipients of help.

Here is the record of the Catholic charity in Czechoslovak Republic: In 1938–39, through the church collections they helped hundreds of thousands of refugees at the cost of millions of Czechoslovak crowns.

During the occupation of land by German troops, they have helped in the institutions 14,000—orphans, old people, sick, or wounded. They have even supported the families of those who were incarcerated.

At last the president of the charity, Monseigneur Stanovsky, was arrested on the false accusation and the organization was keeping its pace.

In 1941–44, they collected in churches and from benefactors and spent 277,584,747 Czechoslovak crowns; 1945, May 9 to August 31, they spent 412,061 Czechoslovak crowns, served 3,747,178 meals free, took care of 172,000 persons, helped by money 24,000 persons. In 4 months, all nationalities included, helped 13,188,600 persons.

France, England, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Poland, all recognized with thanks this work. Only UNRRA did not notice this work and left them without help.

And we are collecting for UNRRA, and Congress is appropriating money for them, and they do such thing.

Please kindly help in this matter. In Czechoslovakia, the head, as I understand, of the UNRRA is a Russian. Why not American, so that everything will be on the level?

Excuse me that I bother you with this matter, but it is important. The UNRRA has to work for everybody who needs the help, not eliminating anyone on account of religion, nationality, or color.

Thanking you for your kind help, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Rev. V. F. MIKOLASEK.

Winter is coming and great suffering.

ATOMIC ENERGY AND THE ATOMIC BOMB—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the opening remarks made by him on the Town Meeting of the Air, October 25, 1945, in a discussion of the subject Should We Share the Atomic Bomb Secret With Any Other Nation? which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on universal military training, delivered by him on October 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATURAL RESOURCES OF MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—EDITORIAL FROM KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Star of October 25, 1945, with respect to the natural resources of the Missouri River Basin, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S NAVY DAY ADDRESS IN NEW YORK—ARTICLE FROM BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "U. S. Rudder Still Needs Firm Hand," written by Bill Cunningham and published in the Boston Herald of October 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Shreveport (La.) Times, one under date of October 25, 1945, entitled "A Sound, Courageous Stand," and the other under date of October 26, 1945, entitled "Reaction to Mr. Truman's Plan," which appear in the Appendix.]

ANGLO-BRITISH RELATIONS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials and two articles dealing with Anglo-American relations, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—ARTICLES BY MARQUIS CHILDS, ERNEST LINDLEY, AND MERLO PUSEY

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record three articles from the Washington Post on the problem of atomic energy, one entitled "Handling the Atom," by Marquis Childs, one entitled "Controlling the Atom," by Ernest Lindley, and the third entitled "Secrecy on Weapons should be Abolished," by Merlo Pusey, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE TVA—STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE FOR THIRTY-ONE NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LAND AND WATER ORGANIZATIONS

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the reply of the coordinating committee for 31 national and regional land and water organizations to statements made by Peter Edson, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. The calendar, under rule VIII, is now in order. In accordance with the order previously entered, the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 656.

TERM OF THE DISTRICT COURT AT KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.

The bill (H. R. 3231) to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARCTIC WEATHER REPORTING STATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 765) concerning the establish-

ment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States and on the international air transport routes from the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, before "air", to insert "civil"; on the same page, line 8, after the word "necessary", to strike out "to initiate and participate"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "such", to strike out "station" and insert "reporting stations"; and in line 4, after the word "cooperation", to insert "with the State Department and other United States governmental departments and agencies", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to improve the weather forecasting service of the United States and to promote safety and efficiency in civil air navigation to the highest possible degree, the Chief of the Weather Bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, shall, in addition to his other functions and duties, take such action as may be necessary in the development of an international basic meteorological reporting network in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, including the establishment, operation, and maintenance of such reporting stations in cooperation with the State Department and other United States governmental departments and agencies, with the meteorological services of foreign countries and with persons engaged in air commerce.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States and on the civil international air transport routes from the United States."

LUBELL BROS., INC.

The bill (H. R. 1630) for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF MONA MAE MILLER, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 1857) for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WINFRED ALEXANDER

The bill (H. R. 938) for the relief of Winfred Alexander was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL D. O'CONNELL AND ALMON B. STEWART

The bill (H. R. 1303) for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. B. GRIGSBY

The bill (H. R. 1560) for the relief of J. B. Grigsby was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. FARRELL

The bill (H. R. 3453) for the relief of John W. Farrell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WINTER BROS. CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1158) for the relief of Winter Bros. Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "received", to insert "by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered", so to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Winter Bros. Co., of Wrentham, Mass., the sum of $2,400; the payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States on account of losses sustained in the execution of Navy contract numbered NXsx-37041, for the supply of pipe taps, entered into by such company on September 13, 1943, such loss being due to a typographical error in the bid which, through a mutual mistake of fact by the contracting officer and the contractor, was not corrected in the signed contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IDA M. RANEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 684) for the relief of Ida M. Raney, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$750", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ida M. Raney, of McCrory, Ark., the sum of $750, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her on January 22, 1944, when she was struck by a flying rock fragment thrown into the air by an explosion which occurred during a military demonstration at Camp Robinson, Ark., which she was witnessing as a guest of United States military personnel: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OGDEN AND DOUGHERTY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 815) for the relief of Ogden and Dougherty, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the words "engineer at", to strike out "St. Louis, Mo." and insert "Columbus, Ohio", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to certify for payment to Edwin Dougherty and M. H. Ogden, trading as Ogden and Dougherty, the sum of $15,414.21, recommended by the United States district engineer at Cincinnati, Ohio, the division engineer at Columbus, Ohio, and the Chief of Engineers as the amount of just mathematical errors in the accepted bid submitted on January 7, 1941, by Ogden and Dougherty for the construction of a hospital building at Patterson Field, Dayton, Ohio, the exigencies of the military service being such as not to admit of delay necessary to correct the errors in the bid before the contract was entered into and the construction work commenced.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, BRAINERD, MINN.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1259) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street, in Brainerd, Minn., which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after "June 13", to strike out "1944" and insert "1945", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn., authorized to be built by the State of Minnesota by an act of Congress approved June 13, 1944, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from June 13, 1945.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE NEAR DECATUR, NEBR.

The bill (S. 1425) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.," approved June 8, 1940, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 8, 1940, authorizing the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at or near Decatur, Nebr., is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to is commenced within 1

year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA., AND TWO HARBORS, MINNESOTA

The bill (H. R. 4083) authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is this a general river and harbor bill or is it a bill dealing only with specific items?

Mr. GEORGE. It is a bill dealing only with specific items.

Mr. WHITE. When I speak of specific items I mean only a few items.

Mr. GEORGE. It deals with only two items, one in Georgia, and one in Minnesota in which the Senator from Minnesota is very much interested. The bill was passed by the Senate before the recess. It was vetoed because it did not put the improvement date along with all other dates in the regular river and harbor bill passed earlier. Now it has been amended to suit the President and has passed the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4083) authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DESIGNATION OF YUBA RIVER DAM, CALIF., AS THE "HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT DAM"

The bill (H. R. 3870) to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the "Harry L. Englebright Dam," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the calendar.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TOTAL DEFENSE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have written a letter today to President Truman recommending the creation of a National Executive Commission on Total Defense to investigate and report back to the President upon the future defense needs and requirements of America in this atomic age.

Such a commission would meet in executive session, seek and interchange defense facts and opinions, and then report their conclusions. The commission would consist of the highest ranking representatives of every segment of American life. These men and women would be closeted for as long as necessary with the finest brains in the land who would reveal to them the facts and opinions on every phase of national and international activity affecting our future defense. The commission would hear from our secret intelligence, which as I have recommended and General Marshall has also proposed, might simultaneously be expanded into a new unified intelligence system covering the earth.

The National Commission would, I believe, be the one outstanding instrumentality from which Congress and the American people could receive intelligent guidance on this problem, namely, the steps which America must take in order to insure her future security. This includes the moot subjects of compulsory peacetime military training, unification of the armed forces, and organization and coordination of the production front.

Since August 6, 1945, mankind has marched centuries ahead and has entered a revolutionary atomic age. Old, smug conclusions, fossilized approaches, segmental views, hackneyed ideas, simply will not afford us adequacy. We remember Billy Mitchell and his advice, and how it was laid aside. The people and Congress must have the facts, and upon those facts they must come to their conclusions on our future defense. Right now neither the people nor Congress possess the necessary facts. What has been made available to them so far is a confusing mess of half-truths, conjecture, and downright baloney.

I propose, therefore, that this commission be appointed by the President, that it consist of the ablest, clearest thinking representatives of—

(a) Our armed forces—military, naval, and aerial.
(b) Our three great religious faiths.
(c) Our educational system.
(d) Our industry.
(e) Our labor.
(f) Our agriculture.
(g) Our science.
(h) Our veterans' organizations and other vital groups.

All these representatives would, of course, have their diverse inclinations and points of view, but they would approach their task with open minds and a sense of their great research and conference mission on whose outcome may well depend the safety not only of every future generation of America but indeed of the world.

I submit the following reasons as making absolutely necessary the formation of such a commission:

First. The world is still in a chaotic, jungle-like condition, and America is still and will be for a long time to come in grave peril. The new League of Nations has yet to begin to function, let alone to prove its adequacy. Each day new, faster, and deadlier inventions in rockets, in atomic power, in guided missiles are making more crucial the most modern defense. Therefore, a commission, such as I propose, is absolutely essential to gather the necessary facts on every phase of our future defense needs and requirements and then to agree on conclusions based on those facts and recommend its conclusions to the Congress.

At present I believe my mail is running 20 to 1 against conscription. That is the same attitude which prevailed prior to Pearl Harbor and prior to the discovery of the atomic bomb. The point I am making is that there is a new equation in the picture, and the proposed commission would consider that factor.

Second. The subject of compulsory peacetime military training demands conclusive justification of a kind we have not as yet received. Perhaps this atomic age has rendered conscription obsolete. Perhaps it has made it more necessary. At any rate, the very concept of conscription is alien to America, foreign to our almost unbroken trend through 150 years of history. Almost every American, including myself, is still irrevocably opposed to militarism, to a military caste system. Yet we are living centuries ahead of where we were before the war began. We sense the great peril that is present today to our beloved country from possible foreign aggression.

Third. The future security of America demands unity and total effort not only on the part of our military, but on the part of science, industry, agriculture, the home, the church, and the school. I have just returned from the Middle West. America is divided today as she has been on few previous occasions. The only way to restore unity is to give our free people the facts upon which they can come together and agree. If the top-notchers in the groups I have named could come to an agreement on this most vital question, not only would Congress be guided but the American people would be reassured.

In the light of all the foregoing, in the light of the potentiality of another and worse Pearl Harbor occurring, it is crucial, I humbly believe, that the President create a national commission on total defense, and that it be set to work on behalf of ourselves and those who are yet to come.

FAREWELL ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHANDLER

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, on April 24 last, I was unanimously elected to be high commissioner of baseball of the United States. This is not a position I have personally sought, although I will confess that above all others it was the one I most desired. Since the position was created in 1921, the only man ever to hold it was Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis, who was appointed to the office from the Federal judiciary in 1921 by the baseball club owners. He served in that position with great distinction for more than 24 years.

The term of United States Senator from Kentucky which I was elected to fill does not expire until January 1949. I asked, and the owners of the big league baseball clubs included in my contract, a provision that I might continue to serve as United States Senator from Kentucky, and also perform the duties of commissioner of baseball.

As all Senators are aware, work in the United States Senate is a full-time job, requiring more time than any one individual has in order to accomplish the many tasks which a Senator is called upon to discharge. I have found that the work of the high commissioner of baseball is also a full-time job, and it is not possible for one man to perform two full-time jobs at one and the same time. So I have had to make an election. I have made that election, Mr. President. I would not say that a man of my age, 47, should foreclose himself for all future time; but at least for the present, this is my last day as a Member of the United States Senate from Kentucky.

I hope Members of the Senate will indulge me, because I have a full measure of sentiment. I am a southerner, and we live on that sort of thing. It is bred in us. My heart is full of gratitude to the people of Kentucky because upon no occasion when I have been a nominee for a public office have they failed to give me an overwhelming majority of their votes. On one occasion I was young, and perhaps I got a little ahead of myself, as they say in the country. I tried to unseat the majority leader, and he defeated me very easily. I learned a lesson, and in a short time I was here on my own. I received some pretty good advice on that occasion. However, as Senators well know, I have always made my own decisions. I have cast independent votes in the Senate. For 18 years I have been in the public service as a master commissioner in chancery, State senator, Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and United States Senator. Because of the generosity of my people I have not been absent from public office a single day since I was first appointed or elected.

Another strange thing is that I have never been able to serve the full term for which I was elected or appointed. Before the term had expired, I always managed to find another place. So it is in this instance. I repeat that I had no desire to do other than remain in the United States Senate. The odds against any man being elected commissioner of baseball are approximately 135,000,000 to 1.

I absolutely refused to ask any baseball club owner to cast his vote for me, much to the disappointment and chagrin of some of my supporters. Among my supporters for this position were Members of the Senate who influenced baseball club owners to recommend me. For that I am deeply grateful. I have in mind especially my very close and dear friend the Senator from Virginia, Hon. HARRY BYRD.

Mr. President, I shall miss service in the Senate. No man could serve here for as long as I have served without forming a very deep attachment for Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. I leave without any regrets, except that I sincerely and devoutly wish that I might have performed and that I might have been able to perform greater services for the people of my Commonwealth and of my country.

I shall become a private citizen with the full knowledge of what is involved in service to the American people. No Senator ought to fail to stand face to face with his people or with any situation which may arise to confront him and his country. I am proud that during the tragic days of the war laws passed and things accomplished by the Senate resulted directly in the finest contribution in men and materials which any country has ever made. Likewise, in the effort to bring about and preserve lasting peace, the contribution of the Senate has been notable. I applaud the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the other stalwart servants of the people for the magnificent job they have done in these tragic times.

I wish to express my appreciation to Les Biffle, Uncle John Crockett, and the other officers and employees who have so much to do with the smooth functioning of the Senate. They have shown me every courtesy and every consideration. I would not have been able to perform the small services I have contributed without constant help, advice, and encouragement from them.

I should like to pay a tribute to the doorkeepers and to the pages of the Senate. One of my prized possessions is a note the pages wrote me saying they would miss me and that the only thing they would regret was that in the future they would not be able to serve me. They have served me well; they have served my colleagues well.

American baseball is the game the people of this country love. My highest obligation is to keep it honest, clean, and straight. That I propose to do. During the last world series all attendance records of American baseball were broken. More than 333,000 Americans saw the seven games of the series, and they paid $1,592,000 to see them, which was the greatest sum of money ever paid to see a series of baseball games. The baseball players divided between themselves in excess of $475,000; the clubs received more than $882,000; and the Commissioner's office received more than $238,000. All records, both for attendance and for receipts, were broken. I do not take the credit for that; but if there had been a failure, I certainly would have been entitled to a generous share of the blame, and I would have shouldered it.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Official Reporters, who have made my speeches look like oratorical gems, when really they were not so good.

I wish to express my appreciation to the newspaper reporters. The only thing a man is entitled to as a Senator and as an officeholder is just, temperate, and decent criticism and a fair representation of the things he does. That I have received here. I acknowledge my gratitude to them.

I shall miss each one of you. I want you to think kindly of me.

Mr. President, there are three ways to retire from public office. One is to die. Too frequently, men have worked themselves to death here and have died. My friend the late Senator Maloney of Connecticut, whose desk I occupy, worked and worried himself to death in the service of his people.

Another way is to stay here too long and be defeated. Certainly a Senator's prospect of accumulating anything is not good; the pay is not good.

The third way is to be offered a fine place. I have such a place. I acknowledge all the way my obligations to that One above who holds the destiny of all of us in the hollow of His hand, and without whom we have no success, without whom we are not entitled to it, and do not deserve it.

Mr. President, only in the United States of America—I hope I shall be pardoned for this personal reference—could a barefoot boy with a newspaper sack across his shoulder race across a tobacco field to a small railway station in a country town in western Kentucky and ask Dr. Homer Carpenter, the chancelor of Transylvania College, what a fellow had to do in order to go to school and have a chance. This country is the only place in the world where such a thing can happen.

Mr. President, I am proud to say that I do not owe anyone in the world a single thing except my good will. I have sought and I have tried to earn the respect of respectable people. Most of all, I wanted the affection of my fellow men.

Having gotten through college—Transylvania, the University of Kentucky, and a season at Harvard—in 9 years after 1930 the people of Kentucky gave me all the offices they could give to one of their sons. Now I have decided, because I have obligations, to take this important job, and to advance, if I am able to do so, the opportunity of every boy in the United States, by helping to provide places to play baseball. I have the firm conviction that if we provide an American boy with something to play with and a place where he can play, we shall have a better country. I want playing fields built as memorials to soldiers. I want soldiers who have lost their youth and their opportunity to be competitive players in sports to coach the youngsters, and the heroes and the big-league baseball players of tomorrow. I want to furnish baseballs and bats and gloves to small boys all over this land. If that can be done we shall have fewer men in the penitentiary, and we shall have a healthier, stronger, happier Nation in the years that lie ahead. That is my opportunity. It is a challenging opportunity.

At the same time I have four children and mama. I call mama the Secretary of War because she makes the decisions on all important matters that occur at my abode. I have two fine sons-in-law and one grandbaby who is my pride and joy. With $50,000 a year and expenses and an opportunity to live at home in Kentucky, I can establish for them an opportunity for some security which the boys in my neighborhood did not have when I was a youngster. They may not do so well—I do not know—but I shall be able to get my boys and my grandbaby all the things I wanted and did not have. That may be a mistake, but if it is I intend to continue to make it so long as I am able to.

I would not advise my colleagues on public questions, because there is not a Senator who does not know more about such things generally than I do. But if the United States shall have to engage in another war in the future it will come from Alaska or that direction; and if we fail to take immediate steps to fortify Alaska and hold it against everyone in the world we will make a serious mistake.

We cannot keep the secret of the atomic bomb, no matter how hard we may try to do so. Although in the past we have always had an opportunity to prepare, because we fought as a member of a coalition and in the first days of the conflict others have carried the brunt of the battle until we could make arrangements to get ready to fight, I

fear that time is past and will never come again. Planes will suddenly appear over cities the size of Washington, and in a very few minutes the city will be completely wiped out. So we must hold bases on the outside so as to be able to prevent such an occurrence.

If I were to advise the War Department, I would urge—and the Senate will not be surprised that I do so—that they let General MacArthur continue to conduct affairs in Japan until the peace is definitely won and established. My observation of him has caused me, without the slightest reservation or question, to appreciate his great qualities as a leader and to realize his great ability as a fighting man, and he knows how to conduct himself, especially with the Japanese people. If he is continued in his present position for a sufficient length of time I have not the slightest doubt about our securing definitely our situation in Japan.

So, Mr. President, for the present this is my last day as a Member of the Senate from Kentucky. For many years Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote a poem for his class at Harvard. I wish I might have been able to write such a poem, because it tells much better than I can of my feeling for all the Members of the Senate. The poem is as follows:

THE BOYS

(By Oliver Wendell Holmes)

Has there any old fellow got mixed with the boys?
If there has, take him out, without making a noise.
Hang the Almanac's cheat and the Catalogue's spite!
Old Time is a liar! We're twenty to-night!
We're twenty! We're twenty! Who says we are more?
He's tipsy—young jackanapes!—show him the door!
"Gray temples at twenty?"—Yes! white if we please!
Where the snow-flakes fall thickest there's nothing can freeze!
Was it snowing I spoke of? Excuse the mistake!
Look close—you will not see a sign of a flake!
We want some new garlands for those we have shed—
And these are white roses in place of the red.
We've a trick, we young fellows, you may have been told,
Of talking (in public) as if we were old—
That boy we call "Doctor," and this we call "Judge";
It's a neat little fiction—of course it's all fudge.
That fellow's the "Speaker"—the one on the right;
"Mr. Mayor," my young one, how are you to-night?
That's our "Member of Congress," we say when we chaff;
There's the "Reverend" what's his name?—don't make me laugh.
That boy with the grave mathematical look
Made believe he had written a wonderful book,
And the Royal Society thought it was true!
So they chose him right in; a good joke it was, too!
There's a boy, we pretend, with a three-decker brain
That could harness a team with a logical chain;
When he spoke for our manhood in syllabled fire,
We called him "the Justice" but now he's "the Squire."
And there's a nice youngster of excellent pith—
Fate tried to conceal him by naming him Smith;
But he shouted a song for the brave and the free—
Just read on his medal, "My country," "of thee!"
You hear that boy laughing? You think he's all fun;
But the angels laugh, too, at the good he has done;
The children laugh loud as they troop to his call,
And the poor man that knows him laughs loudest of all!
Yes, we're boys—always playing with tongue or with pen—
And I sometimes have asked, Shall we ever be men?
Shall we always be youthful, and laughing, and gay,
Till the last dear companion drops smiling away?
Then here's to our boyhood, its gold and its gray!
The stars of its winter, the dews of its May!
And when we have done with our life-lasting toys,
Dear Father, take care of Thy children, The Boys!

Mr. President and colleagues, again and again I say, God bless you and your children always. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I would not wish to allow this occasion to pass without expressing a word upon the departure of my colleague from this Chamber.

He referred pleasantly to a little episode in our lives when our ambitions crossed. He suggested that if he had taken advice other than that which he actually took, he might not have entered the lists. Of course, if he had sought and accepted my advice, he would not have entered the lists because any Member of the Senate, no matter how long or how short his service here may be, who at any time has the former Governor of Kentucky running against him, has a tough job. He finds his opponent to be tough in the sense that he is alert, resourceful, and vigorous. I found it necessary to match my opponent's toughness with my own. Fortune favored me, and when the race was over, Mr. President, I can say for myself—and I am sure my colleague would say the same for himself—that there were no scars left which anyone could see. I do not think there were any invisible scars. There were certainly none as a result of the conflict which had taken place between our respective ambitions.

Strange as it may seem, if my colleague had not made that race he would nevertheless have come here on the same day on which he actually entered the Senate, and would have saved me a great deal of trouble. But regardless of that fact, he came under circumstances which were honorable. He came into this body as a young, vigorous, and wide-awake man who has, as he has said, held all the offices which the people of Kentucky could confer upon him.

In my position as majority leader of the Senate, and in my position as a Senator, I welcomed him as my colleague. I did everything which I could do to make his pathway an easy one, and to cooperate with him and show him every courtesy it was possible to show him, or that anyone had any right to expect from me. He served during the unexpired term for which he had been appointed. At the conclusion of his term of office, I supported him for renomination and reelection against a man who had given me his support when Senator CHANDLER was a candidate against me. I felt that the Senator was entitled to such support. I felt that he had earned it, and I was glad to accord it to him. I have no regrets in regard to the support which I gave him.

When Senator CHANDLER was appointed baseball commissioner I was in Europe as a member of the joint committee investigating the atrocities which had been committed in Germany and in occupied territories. I learned through the newspapers in Paris that he had been appointed baseball commissioner. I had not known until then that he would be appointed. I did not know that he was really interested in receiving the appointment. The names of many persons had been mentioned in the newspapers in connection with the selection of someone to succeed Judge Landis. Immediately upon my return to the Senate, I heartily congratulated my colleague upon having been selected to that important position in the world of sports, and I told him that I had only one favor to ask of him in connection with his new position, namely, that if he found open a place for a good shortstop on a good team in the baseball world I hoped he would give my application due consideration. I think I would make a good shortstop, and if he should find a place of that sort in which I could be of service, while I may not be as agile as I was when I played baseball years ago, yet I could at least, by bulk, stop a ball within any reasonable range between second and third base.

I wish for my colleague the greatest possible happiness and enjoyment in his new work. To say that we will not miss him in the Senate would, of course, not be dealing in frankness. He has been a colorful figure not only here, but during his entire life, and I am sure he will continue to be a colorful figure in this new field of endeavor.

My colleague has the ability to make a successful baseball commissioner. I know he has the desire to make a success in his new position, and I am sure he will do so. I repeat my best wishes for him in his new field. I hope that our paths may cross now and then, and I wish for all his family, for whom I have the greatest personal regard, that enjoyment and that happiness which come to the family of any man who is successful in any field, and in whom they have pride, as they have a right to.

In conclusion, I would only say that our best wishes go with my colleague. We wish for him the power and the opportunity to strengthen the affection in which the American people hold the game of which he is to be commissioner, and we trust he may realize all his ambitions in regard to the task upon which he is now about to enter.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, speaking very generally, I think I shall have to

voice approval of the withdrawal of a Senator on the other side of the aisle either by the voluntary or involuntary route.

Mr. BARKLEY. In this particular case I can guarantee the Senator that it will be only temporary.

Mr. WHITE. In this particular case, Mr. President, the departure of the junior Senator from Kentucky brings to each and all of us a real sense of personal grief, and causes real regret. The Senator had served his State in honorable capacity and with rare distinction. That service, I have no question, was a great contributing factor to his transfer to the national legislative scene. Here he exhibited a most unusual combination of qualities. He has been kindly, considerate, courteous, gracious always, and yet farsighted, forthright, powerful in debate, always speaking with certainty and assurance in behalf of those things for which he pleaded, and contending with equal force and directness against those things which had his disapproval. He has been one of the great Senators from his State.

Senator CHANDLER is leaving us now, to our sorrow. As I have been standing here, I have been endeavoring to recall some words of the Hoosier poet James Whitcomb Riley. Mr. Riley in a poem speaks of the sky overhead as gray and dark, then he speaks of his friend and says:

He is my friend, I said, and
Lo, the thought of him smiled on my heart,
And then the sun shone out again.

I think that all along the path of life HAPPY CHANDLER has been causing the sun to shine a little more brightly for those with whom he came in contact, and with somewhat warmer rays. That has been the experience of his colleagues in the Senate. We have felt the warmth of his friendship, and we deeply appreciated it. We regret his departure from this body. I extend my cordial good wishes for him in a the years which are stretching before him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to say a personal word on this occasion. I shall very much miss my kindly, generous, considerate and always helpful friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. He has rendered able and conspicuous public service. He has exercised independent and vigorous judgment. He has won the confidence and affection of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

He goes to a great task, which intimately affects the morale of America. He will make good there, as he has made good here. He has never been called out on strikes, and never will be. He will never be guilty of an intentional foul. His batting average will always be tops.

I wish him well, and I find a final consolation in the knowledge that he is sure to have a worthy successor, inasmuch as he will be a Republican. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I feel that I cannot let this occasion pass without saying a word to express my regret that the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is about to leave us.

Senator CHANDLER became a Member of this body several years ago, with a great reputation for ability, for sagacity, for doing things, and doing them well, and he has lived up to that reputation while he has been a Member of the Senate. In my judgment, no Senator has made a better impression in a comparatively short time than has "HAPPY" CHANDLER. His kindliness, his democratic manner and his attractive personality have endeared him to every Member of the Senate. I am sure there is not a Senator who does not admire him; there is not one who does not hold him in the highest esteem and respect, and naturally, because one cannot dislike a man of the mold of the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, in season and out of season, in the Senate and out of the Senate, at the hotel in which we both have lived for a long time, I have urged Senator CHANDLER not to take this step, but he has offered the best of reasons for doing so—reasons which we cannot gainsay perhaps. Yet at his age, with the remarkable past that has been his, with the wonderful future that is beckoning him on to greater and finer and better things in this body, I had hoped we might find in the end that he would not leave us. I am sorry he is going. I cannot help expressing the wish that his every ambition and every purpose in making this change may be realized. I wish for him the very best that comes to men anywhere, and I extend the same wishes to his lovely family.

I am very sorry, my friend, that you are going. I am happy that you will be in Washington a part of the time, at any rate, and that we may continue to associate with you, even though we are deprived of your splendid services in this body.

It means a great loss to the Senate of the United States for "HAPPY" CHANDLER to withdraw from it.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the very distinguished and unusual man who is about to depart from this body after a few years of service.

"HAPPY" CHANDLER and I came to the Senate at about the same time. There was only 2 months' difference between the dates when we were sworn in, and it is with a feeling of real and deep regret that I realize that he is not to remain with us as a Member of the Senate.

Someone has said that perhaps the atomic bomb was made from rays of sunshine. I do not know a human being who could come nearer being compared to this great new discovery than "HAPPY" CHANDLER. He spreads sunshine everywhere he goes, and he is quite explosive when he is on the other side fighting anyone here on the floor. He is the kind of fighter a Senator would like to be lined up with and he feels very sorry when the Senator from Kentucky is on the other side of the fence from him. He is a hard hitter and a fair fighter. He has every element of humanity that goes to make up a genuine worth-while, lovable being. He is able and capable. He is fine in every respect. Words that I might continue to utter would simply be spoken in an effort to add to what I have already said by way of making my own feelings emphatic and more expressive.

I regret to see this fine, genuine specimen of southern manhood, statesmanship, and true American citizenship leave this body. But he is going into a work which will give him an opportunity to do great things for the youth of this land because he is going to become the chief referee in the Nation's greatest pastime, baseball. Baseball must be kept clean. It has in the past traditionally been noted for the fine, clean type of young manhood that has indulged in it. Baseball has been noted for the determination among those at the head of it to keep it clean, to keep it the real, genuine American sport.

Let me say again to my friend that I regret to see him leave, and I wish for him every happiness on earth.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as I listened today to the remarks of our colleague, Senator CHANDLER, of Kentucky, my feelings were mingled. On the one hand I felt a deep and sincere regret that he was to leave our body, in which he had served as an active, able, and distinguished Member, and on the other I was happy at his enthusiasm and his vision and his sincerity in transferring his great energy and capacity to another fertile field in which I predict he will serve with outstanding distinction.

It has been my good fortune to know the Senator from Kentucky for quite a number of years, even before he came to the Senate. I had the happy privilege of visiting the executive mansion in Kentucky during his term as Governor of that great State and of being the recipient of his spacious hospitality and his kindly and thoughtful consideration, which was in the best Kentucky tradition. Out of that brief contact I formed a very intense regard and affection for the young man from Kentucky who afterward became a Member of the Senate.

He is a generous man, a kindly man, and, above all else, a man of action.

I can understand why Senator CHANDLER is leaving this body and why he feels that the fields which he will now begin to till are more attractive. I think he is a little unfair to himself when he says the motivation of this action springs altogether or for the most part from personal considerations. A man of his dynamic energy sometimes feels a sense of frustration in Congress, where he is one of 535 individuals, where action is slow and tortuous, and where it is often quite impossible to leave an impress on many matters because of the wide variety and numerous subjects which are here considered.

In the field in which he is now to engage he sees, no doubt, an opportunity to impress upon the youth of our Nation one of its finest ideals—sportsmanship, play, competition, athletic development, and all that is implied by that general description. As I have said, here in the Senate, sometimes there is a sense of frustration. I can see it sometimes in the Chair, sometimes in our leaders on the floor, and at other times in all of us because the problems of the moment are so complex, the variety of subjects is

so far-flung, and the intense study required to master a few problems leaves us very little time to consider others.

The field where the Senator is about to go will be more fertile, because he will be singling his activities, his intelligence and his energies on something that he can mold and something which is of the highest desirability in the scheme of our country for its preservation and its welfare.

Therefore my feelings are, as I said in the beginning, somewhat mixed. I am intensely saddened to see Senator CHANDLER leave this body, but glad that he is going into this new field with such imaginative anticipation as I know he possesses as he takes on the great duties of high commissioner of baseball. While he may not hereafter be present in person, Mr. President, yet his actions here during his tenure of office will not fade into oblivion as the result of his resignation. They will permeate the Capitol as long as all of us who have had the privilege of associating with him are capable of memory.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the various tributes which have been paid the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky. We have all admired his scintillating, brilliant, courageous, independent intellect and the work he has done in the Senate. Personally I feel a sense of loss, because of the very congenial and happy companionship which I personally have had with Senator CHANDLER while he has been here.

I wish him all the success in the world and Godspeed in the new venture in which he has now engaged.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I am sure no one in this body regrets more than I do the departure from the Senate of our beloved colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky. I was advised in advance of his coming to the Senate by the national president of the Phi Kappa Alpha Fraternity, of which he and I are members, and I met him at the front door of the Senate Chamber. Since then my associations with him have led me to believe that he has a most unusual and useful place in the leadership and life of the youth of the United States.

I know his wonderful life-mate, Mrs. Chandler, and I can readily realize that so far his path to usefulness has been largely inspired by her efforts and her noble character.

His usefulness will not cease when he leaves this body in which he has served so well. It is my humble judgment that he has the opportunity and will take advantage of the opportunity to put forward America's greatest national game, for baseball has always followed the flag.

It will follow the flag to the most remote islands of the Pacific.

Baseball has a civilizing effect; it has an educational effect. It causes people, even the least fortunate, to appreciate one another more, and those who learn to enjoy baseball are likely to be willing to live in peace with each other. I know that our colleague who is now leaving us will not fail to stress this opportunity.

Mr. President, I who have enjoyed his friendship through the years he has been in the Senate, wish for him every success in his new endeavor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I cannot fail to associate myself with the kindly expressions of Members of the Senate upon the departure from our midst of the junior Senator from Kentucky, whose frienship I have come both to value and enjoy, in the associations of this body and in the outside associations which afford so much satisfaction in senatorial service. I am sure that the sturdy individualism which has survived all the vicissitudes of politics for so many years will go with him in the new field which he is to enter, where that same sturdiness of character and expression can render so great a service to the youth of the United States in keeping one of the great productive spheres of the cooperative spirit which we need in America, the teamwork which distinguishes this great game to which he is to dedicate his talents, a powerful developing influence in the minds of American youth.

I think probably his pseudonym has been ir some respects a misnomer. I was associated with him in a 45,000-mile tour of the world. While he is happy in all his approaches, that does not indicate the character of a chameleon who is all things to all men. As I have already discovered in discussions in this Chamber, no one has greater forthrightness in expression or is less disposed to temper his utterances to the particular tendencies of the one with whom he is discussing a question. That has been the reason for the distinguished service he has rendered, and that is why he has come to be valued here. Whether we happened to be associated with him or were against him in any particular controversy, no one was ever in any doubt as to precisely where he stood, publicly and privately. It is that devotion to principle which transcends the geniality of his character which has endeared him to so many, and which occasions our expressions here. And yet it symbolizes also, I hope, some of the comradeship of this body, about which we may well occasionally remind ourselves as we think of ourselves as a body dedicated to public service and now bearing tremendous responsibilities. Some of the acerbities of partisan conflict are ameliorated by our recognition of our tremendous responsibility to our country, to the generations which came before, and to the posterity whom we are privileged here and now to serve.

"HAPPY" CHANDLER has symbolized much of the spirit not only of good comradeship, but of high principle which we all in some measure seek to manifest in our lown ives. I think it is quite appropriate that on this occasion, as he takes leave voluntarily, there should be this expression of regard, devotion, and respect. It might be well if more frequently, perhaps, we would all remind ourselves of this quality of friendship, which is, after all, the essence of successful public service as well as private service, and perhaps dedicate a day occasionally, as we have done today, to an expression of that mutuality of regard before it is too late.

If I should die, how kind you all would grow,
In that strange hour I would not have one foe.
There are no words too beautiful to say
Of one who goes forevermore away
Across that ebbing tide which has no flow.

With what new lustre my good deeds would glow!
If faults were mine, no one would call them so,
Or speak of me in aught but praise that day,
If I should die.

Ah, friends! before my listening ear lies low,
While I can hear and understand, bestow
That gentle treatment and fond love, I pray,
The lustre of whose late though radiant way
Would gild my grave with mocking light, I know,
If I should die.

So I think it is altogether appropriate that while our friend is here with us, and before he goes to another field of service, we should express this feeling which is common, and yet which manifests, I trust, something of the associations of us all in the hall in which we are privileged by the mandate of the people now to serve. Disregarding partisan and party lines, we here dedicate ourselves to continued service in this high and holy and common cause.

NAVY DAY ADDRESSES BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point two addresses delivered in New York on last Saturday by the President of the United States, one at the commissioning of the U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and the other a very notable address on the foreign policy of the United States, delivered in Central Park on Navy Day.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON THE OCCASION OF THE COMMISSIONING OF THE U. S. S. "FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT"

Admiral Daubin, Captain Soucek, Mrs. Roosevelt, ladies and gentlemen, one of the pleasant duties in the exacting daily life of a President is to award honors to our fighting men for courage and valor in war. In the commissioning of this ship, the American people are honoring a stalwart hero of this war who gave his life in the service of his country. His name is engraved on this great carrier, as it is in the hearts of men and women of good will the world over—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

If anyone can be called the father of the new American Navy which is typified by this magnificent vessel, it is he. From his first day as President he started to build it.

Even as he started to build the Navy, he began to work for world peace. By his realistic good-neighbor policy, by reciprocal trade agreements, by constant appeal to international arbitration instead of force, he worked valiantly in the cause of peace. By his constant battle for the forgotten man he sought to remove the social and economic inequalities which have so ofen been at the root of conflict at home and abroad. And when he saw the clouds of aggression forming across the seas to the east and to the west, he issued warning after warning which, had

they been heeded in time, might have staved off this tragic conflict.

But through it all, he never faltered in his work to build up the American Navy. For he understood, as few men did, the importance to the survival of this country of the mission of its Navy—the control of the sea. The Axis Powers understood. That is why Germany sought to drive us from the sea by her submarines. That is why Japan tried to destroy our Navy. They knew that if they succeeded, they might conquer all the nations of the earth, one by one, while the Allies were helpless to reach each other across the oceans of the world.

We won the battle of the oceans. By that victory the United Nations were knitted into a fighting whole, and the Axis Powers were doomed to defeat everywhere.

That victory we owe to the men and women in the shipyards of the Nation who in the last 5½ years built carriers like this one, and over a hundred thousand other ships. We owe it to the workers in our factories who built 85,000 naval planes such as those which will soon take their places on the flight deck of this ship. We owe it to the fighting men who took those ships across the seas, running them right up to the home shores of the enemy; to the men who flew those planes against the enemy and dropped destruction on his fleet and aircraft and war industries.

We owe it to that great leader whose name this mighty carrier bears, who understood the importance of overwhelming naval power, and who rolled up his sleeves—and got it.

Building this Navy was only a part of a still larger program of war production with which the workers and industries of this Nation amazed the whole world, friends and foe alike. It showed the abundant richness of our Nation in natural resources. But it also showed the skill and energy and power and devotion of our free American people.

Having done all this for war, can we do any less for peace? Certainly we should not. The same riches, the same skill and energy of America must now be used so that all our people are better fed, better clothed, better housed; so that they can get work at good wages, adequate care for their health, decent homes for their families, security for their old age, and more of the good things of life.

When we set these goals before ourselves we know that we are carrying on the work and the vision and the aims of the man whose name is on this ship. And no man in our generation, or in any generation, has done more to enable this Nation to move forward toward those objectives.

Commissioning this ship symbolizes another objective toward which Franklin D. Roosevelt started this Nation and the other nations of the world—the objective of world cooperation and peace. He who helped to formulate the Atlantic Charter and to organize the United Nations, he who pointed the way in cooperation among nations at Casablanca, Cairo, Quebec, Tehran, Dumbarton Oaks, and Yalta, and who planned the Conference at San Francisco—he knows as he looks down upon us today that the power of America as expressed in this mighty mass of steel is a power dedicated to the cause of peace.

For 14 years, ever since Japan first invaded Manchuria, men and women have lived in a world ruled or threatened by force intended for aggression and conquest. Until El Alamein, Stalingrad, and Midway, the powers of evil were stronger than the powers of good—threatening to spread their rule across the world. We will not run that risk again.

This ship is a symbol of our commitment to the United Nations Organization to reach out anywhere in the world and to help the peace-loving nations of the world stop any international gangster. A hundred hours after leaving New York this ship could be off the coast of Africa. In 5 days she could cross the western Pacific from Pearl Harbor to the Philippines. This vessel alone could put more than a hundred fighting planes over a target.

We all look forward to the day when law rather than force will be the arbiter of international relations. We shall strive to make that day come soon. Until it does come, let us make sure that no possible aggressor is going to be tempted by any weakness on the part of the United States.

These, then, are the two huge tasks before us: realizing for our own people the full life which our resources make possible; and helping to achieve for people everywhere an era of peace. Franklin D. Roosevelt gave his life in search for the fulfillment of these tasks. And now the American people are determined to carry on after him.

He did not find either of these tasks easy. Neither will we. But we approach them in the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt whose words are inscribed in bronze on this vessel: "We can, we will, we must!"

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON FOREIGN POLICY, CENTRAL PARK, NEW YORK CITY

Mayor LaGuardia, ladies, and gentlemen, I am grateful for the magnificent reception which you have given me today in this great city of New York. I know that it is given to me only as the representative of the gallant men and women of our naval forces, and on their behalf, as well as my own, I thank you.

New York joins the rest of the Nation in paying honor and tribute to the 4,000,000 fighting Americans of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—and to the ships which carried them to victory.

On opposite sides of the world, across two oceans, our Navy opened a highway for the armies and Air Forces of the United States. They landed our gallant men, millions of them, on the beachheads of final triumph. Fighting from Murmansk, the English Channel, and the Tyrrhenian Sea, to Midway, Guadalcanal, Leyte Gulf, and Okinawa—they won the greatest naval victories in history. Together with their brothers in arms in the Army and Air Force, and with the men of the merchant marine, they have helped to win for mankind all over the world a new opportuinty to live in peace and dignity—and we hope, in security.

In the harbor and rivers of New York City and in other ports along the coasts and rivers of the country, ships of that mighty United States Navy are at anchor. I hope that you and the people everywhere will visit them and their crews, seeing for yourselves what your sons and daughters, your labor and your money have fashioned into an invincible weapon of liberty.

The fleet on VJ-day consisted of 1,200 warships, more than 50,000 supporting and landing craft, and over 40,000 Navy planes. By that day, ours was a sea power never before equaled in the history of the world. There were great carrier task forces capable of tracking down and sinking the enemy's fleets, beating down his air power, and pouring destruction on his war-making industries. There were submarines which roamed the seas, invading the enemy's own ports, and destroying his shipping in all the oceans. There were amphibious forces capable of landing soldiers on beaches from Normandy to the Philippines. There were great battleships and cruisers which swept enemy ships from the seas and bombarded his shore defense almost at will.

And history will never forget that great leader who, from his first day in office, fought to reestablish a strong American Navy; who watched that Navy and all the other might of this Nation grow into an invincible force for victory; who sought to make that force an instrument for a just and lasting peace; and who gave his life in the effort—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The roll call of the battles of this fleet reads like sign posts circling the globe on the road to final victory. North Africa, Sicily, Italy, Normandy, and southern France; Coral Sea, Midway, Guadalcanal, and the Solomons; Tarawa, Saipan, Guam, the Philippine Sea, Leyte Gulf; Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Nothing which the enemy held on any coast was safe from its attack.

Now we are in the process of demobilizing our naval force. We are laying up ships. We are breaking up aircraft squadrons. We are rolling up bases, and releasing officers and men. But when our demobilization is all finished as planned, the United States will still be the greatest naval power on earth.

In addition to that naval power, we shall still have one of the most powerful air forces in the world. And just the other day, so that on short notice we could mobilize a powerful and well-equipped land, sea, and air force, I asked the Congress to adopt universal training.

Why do we seek to preserve this powerful naval and Air Force, and establish this strong Army reserve? Why do we need them?

We have assured the world time and again—and I repeat it now—that we do not seek for ourselves 1 inch of territory in any place in the world. Outside of the right to establish necessary bases for our own protection, we look for nothing which belongs to any other power.

We do need this kind of armed might however, and for four principal tasks:

First, our Army, Navy, and Air Force, in collaboration with our allies, must enforce the terms of peace imposed upon our defeated enemies.

Second, we must fulfill the military obligations which we are undertaking as a member of the United Nations Organization—to support a lasting peace, by force if necessary.

Third, we must cooperate with other American nations to preserve the territorial integrity and the political independence of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Fourth, in this troubled and uncertain world, our military forces must be adequate to discharge the fundamental mission laid upon them by the Constitution of the United States— to "provide for the common defense" of the United States.

These four military tasks are directed not toward war, not toward conquest, but toward peace.

We seek to use our military strength solely to preserve the peace of the world. For we now know that that is the only sure way to make our own freedom secure.

That is the basis of the foreign policy of the people of the United states.

The foreign policy of the United States is based firmly on fundamental principles of righteousness and justice. In carrying out those principles we shall firmly adhere to what we believe to be right; and we shall not give our approval to any compromise with evil.

But we know that we cannot attain perfection in this world overnight. We shall not let our search for perfection obstruct our steady progress toward international cooperation. We must be prepared to fulfill our responsibilities as best we can, within the framework of our fundamental principles, even though we recognize that we have to operate in an imperfect world.

Let me restate the fundamentals of that foreign policy of the United States:

1. We seek no territorial expansion or selfish advantage. We have no plans for aggression against any other state, large or small. We have no objective which need clash with the peaceful aims of any other nation.

2. We believe in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all

peoples who have been deprived of them by force.

3. We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

4. We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western Hemisphere.

5. By the combined and cooperative action of our war allies, we shall help the defeated enemy states establish peaceful democratic governments of their own free choice. And we shall try to attain a world in which nazism, fascism, and military aggression cannot exist.

6. We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power. In some cases it may be impossible to prevent forceful imposition of such a government. But the United States will not recognize any such government.

7. We believe that all nations should have the freedom of the seas and equal rights to the navigation of boundary rivers and waterways and of rivers and waterways which pass through more than one country.

8. We believe that all states which are accepted in the society of nations should have access on equal terms to the trade and the raw materials of the world.

9. We believe that the sovereign states of the Western Hemisphere, without interference from outside the Western Hemisphere, must work together as good neighbors in the solution of their common problems.

10. We believe that full economic collaboration between all nations, great and small, is essential to the improvement of living conditions all over the world, and to the establishment of freedom from fear and freedom from want.

11. We shall continue to strive to promote freedom of expression and freedom of religion throughout the peace-loving areas of the world.

12. We are convinced that the preservation of peace between nations requires a United Nations Organization composed of all the peace-loving nations of the world who are willing jointly to use force if necessary to insure peace.

That is the foreign policy which guides the United States now. That is the foreign policy with which it confidently faces the future.

It may not be put into effect tomorrow or the next day. But nonetheless, it is our policy; and we shall seek to achieve it. It may take a long time, but it is worth waiting for, and it is worth striving to attain.

The Ten Commandments themselves have not yet been universally achieved over these thousands of years. Yet we struggle constantly to achieve them, and in many ways we come close to them each year. Though we may meet set-backs from time to time, we shall not relent in our efforts to bring the golden rule into the international affairs of the world.

We are now passing through a difficult phase of international relations. Unfortunately it has always been true after past wars that the unity among allies, forged by their common peril, has tended to wear out as the danger passed.

The world cannot afford any let-down in the united determination of the Allies in this war to accomplish a lasting peace. The world cannot afford to let the cooperative spirit of the Allies in this war disintegrate. The world simply cannot allow this to happen. The people in the United States, in Russia, and Britain, in France, and China, in collaboration with all other peace-loving people, must take the course of current history into their own hands and mould it in a new direction—the direction of continued cooperation. It was a common danger which united us before victory. Let it be a common hope which continues to draw us together in the years to come.

The atomic bombs that fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki must be made a signal, not for the old process of falling apart but for a new era—an era of ever-closer unity and ever-closer friendship among peaceful nations.

Building a peace requires as much moral stamina as waging a war. Perhaps it requires even more, because it is so laborious and painstaking and undramatic. It requires undying patience and continuous application. But it can give us, if we stay with it, the greatest reward that there is in the whole field of human effort.

Differences of the kind that exist today among the nations that fought together so long and so valiantly for victory are not hopeless or irreconcilable. There are no conflicts of interest among the victorious powers so deeply rooted that they cannot be resolved. But their solution will require a combination of forbearance and firmness. It will require a steadfast adherence to the high principles we have enunciated. It will also require a willingness to find a common ground as to the methods of applying these principles.

Our American policy is a policy of friendly partnership with all peaceful nations, and of full support for the United Nations Organization. It is a policy that has the strong backing of the American people. It is a policy around which we can rally without fear or misgiving.

The more widely and clearly that policy is understood abroad, the better and surer will be the peace. For our own part, we must seek to understand the special problems of other nations. We must seek to understand their own legitimate urge toward security as they see it.

The immediate, the greatest threat to us is the threat of disillusionment, the danger of an insidious skepticism—a loss of faith in the effectiveness of international cooperation. Such a loss of faith would be dangerous at any time. In an atomic age it would be nothing short of disastrous.

There has been talk about the atomic bomb scrapping all navies, armies, and air forces. For the present, I think that such talk is 100 percent wrong. Today control of the seas rests in the fleets of the United States and her allies. There is no substitute for them. We have learned the bitter lesson that the weakness of this great Republic invites men of ill-will to shake the very foundations of civilization all over the world.

What the distant future of atomic research will bring to the fleet which we honor today no one can foretell. But the fundamental mission of the Navy has not changed. Control of our sea approaches and of the skies above them is still the key to our freedom and to our ability to help enforce the peace of the world. No enemy will ever strike us directly except across the sea. We cannot reach out to help stop and defeat an aggressor without crossing the sea. Therefore, the Navy, armed with whatever weapons science brings forth, is still dedicated to its historic task: control of the ocean approaches to our country and of the skies above them.

The atomic bomb does not alter the basic foreign policy of the United States. It makes the development and application of our policy more urgent than we could have dreamed 6 months ago. It means that we must be prepared to approach international problems with greater speed, with greater determination, and with greater ingenuity, in order to meet a situation for which there is no precedent.

We must find the answer to the problems created by the release of atomic energy—as we must find the answers to the many other problems of peace—in partnership with all the peoples of the United Nations. For their stake in world peace is as great as our own.

As I said in my message to the Congress, discussion of the atomic bomb with Great Britain and Canada and later with other nations cannot wait upon the formal organization of the United Nations. These discussions, looking toward a free exchange of fundamental scientific information, will be begun in the near future. But I emphasize again, as I have before, that these discussions will not be concerned with the processes of manufacturing the atomic bomb or any other instruments of war.

In our possession of this weapon, as in our possession of other new weapons, there is no threat to any nation. The world, which has seen the United States in two great recent wars, knows that full well. The possession in our hands of this new power of destruction we regard as a sacred trust. Because of our love of peace, the thoughtful people of the world know that that trust will not be violated, that it will be faithfully executed.

Indeed the highest hope of the American people is that world cooperation for peace will soon reach such a state of perfection that atomic methods of destruction can be definitely and effectively outlawed forever.

We have sought, and we will continue to seek, the attainment of that objective. We shall pursue that course with all the wisdom, patience, and determination that the God of Peace can bestow upon a people who are trying to follow in His path.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Edward U. Condon, of Pennnsylvania, to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committe on Naval Affairs:

Civil Engineer Ben Moreell to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of February 1944.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations on the Executive Calendar be now disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 29, 1945:

DIRECTOR, NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Edward U. Condon, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 29, 1945:

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Frances E. Gaty, Bassett.
Jethro Denson, Fountain Hill.

COLORADO

Velma Anna Thomason, Adams City.
Lillian M. Drysdale, Austin.
Charles C. Chambers, Cokedale.
Constance Espinoza, Conejos.
Dorothy L. Pollock, Eckert.
Bertha W. Simpson, Iliff.
Ruth H. Murphy, La Jara.
Cecile B. Ashcraft, Matheson.
Frances Tweedie, McClave.
Talitha B. Utterback, Mesa.
John R. Hunter, New Raymer.
Marie E. Entwistle, Nunn.
Thomas A. Davis, Portland.
Albert W. Manhart, Sedalia.
Lyla Munson, Sedgwick.
Ida L. Springer, Segundo.
Mary D. Brunelli, Sopris.
Christine Jespersen, Weldona.

CONNECTICUT

Austin M. Ackerman, Durham Center.
Irma R. Doughty, Groton, Long Point.

DELAWARE

Lorraine E. Kane, Bellevue.
Robert P. Woolery, Grubbs.
Juanita P. Joseph, Harbeson.
Roy W. Anderson, Magnolia.
Frederick Camilli, Montchanin.
Harvey M. Jones, Woodside.

FLORIDA

William Sylvester Middleton, Pomona Park.

ILLINOIS

Blanche H. Davis, Buncombe.
Charles A. Ray, Cottage Hills.
Claude M. Jordan, Enfield.
Antonio Leone, Maryville.
Mary Floyd, Seatonville.

INDIANA

Leone P. Erick, Keystone.
John G. Fahey, Notre Dame.
Jess Harlan Nunn, Richland.

KANSAS

Clifford H. Johnson, Bucklin.
Helen M. McNally, Havensville.
Mary J. Gardner, Republic.
Elaine E. Harrell, St. George.

MISSISSIPPI

Robert W. Bounds, Lawrence.
Andrew J. Hensley, Mantee.
Reid K. Thomas, Michigan City.
Jessie A. Parham, Rome.
John D. Pickens, Toccopola.

MONTANA

Dessie Burnsides, Birney.
Harry Kennedy, Rosebud.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Floyd R. Ray, Warren.

OHIO

Orrin Echelberry, Blue Rock.
Clarence E. Dingledine, Buckland.
Rachel A. Martin, Burghill.
Walter R. Samsen, Clay Center.
Don C. Stockham, Friendship.
Stella E. Dickerson, Glencoe.
Lawrence L. Seyler, Higginsport.
Alice Wilson, Jerusalem.
Anna A. Schoendorff, Kansas.
Lester A. Clay, Lewistown.
Arthur C. Witt, Martin.
John F. DeBord, Maud.
Louis L. Ford, Mesopotamia.
James W. Waddell, Middleport.
Edna F. Kintner, Paris.
Willard I. Hamilton, Peoria.
Paul McKinley, Rarden.
Eileen Martin, St. Johns.

OREGON

Gertrude Tulloch, Mount Vernon.
Edgar W. Peterson, Powell Butte.

VIRGINIA

Nell P. McMullin, The Plains.

WEST VIRGINIA

Walter E. Holliday, Caldwell.
James E. Forbes, Charmco.
Lawrence O. Hunt, Cottageville.
Edna Nutter, Ivydale.
Harvey N. Sanford, Leslie.
Ellen Barr Wiseman, Powelliton.

WISCONSIN

Hattie M. Gannon, Armstrong Creek.
Donald E. Chapman, Ashippun.
Charles H. Barlow, Briggsville.
Agnes M. Pritzl, Cato.
Frank W. Zetzman, Fall Creek.
Omar F. Huebner, Ixonia.
Wence Brzezinski, Krakow.
John J. Flanagan, Lannon.
Austin W. Allard, Luxemberg.
Walter M. Touhey, Maribel.
Edgar H. Bradley, Pickett.
Gilbert H. R. Frey, Richfield.
Winfred J. Hicks, Rockland.
Lillian M. Blonien, Rudolph.
Peter J. Miller, Sherwood.
Kate M. Pottle, Stockbridge.
Lizzie J. Mulvaney, Wilson.
Dorothy Nielsen, Withee.

WYOMING

Mabel E. Harrison, Arvada.
Mary Belle Cozzens, Byron.
Floyd M. Vaughn, Clearmont.
Charles W. Markley, Fort Washakie.
Warren Clark, Frannie.
Eva J. Hokanson, Freedom.
Clifford A. Kizzire, Granger.
Nan L. Cash, Kaycee.
William R. Kirlin, Lagrange.
Florence B. Robertson, Manderson.
Mildred P. Sloan, McFadden.
Walter W. Walker, Yoder.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who has bestowed upon us all the gifts of life, we would be eager-hearted to feel the warmth of Thy divine love; put Thy fatherly hand upon us and kindle our minds with thoughts that will set our spirits aglow to do Thy will and to serve Thy children. Lead us to give ourselves wholly to the service of our fellow men; make us considerate of those entrusted to our leadership and faithful to the duties our country has placed upon us. Lest we plunge into a midnight of human history, make our Republic to know that we cannot live on broken firesides and homeless children. We pray that our lives may be definite in wisdom to understand, in power to execute, and in all things constrained by the spirit of charity. May we love God, follow in the steps of the Master, serve men and fear only sin. We pray in Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 25, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) entitled "An act to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. BROOKS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) entitled "An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

GREECE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, 1940, 5 years ago yesterday, the government of which Mussolini was the dictator unjustifiably declared war upon Greece and its brave, liberty-loving people. The heroism of this small nation of about 7,000,000 souls, with its ancient history, surprised and amazed the world. Its defense against Mussolini and his far superior forces was one of the outstanding chapters in this war, in fact, of all time. Instead of the quick and easy defeat of Greece, as we expected, Greece

and its brave people were defeating Mussolini and his forces until Hitler and his gang stepped in.

In this war and in the last war Greece was on our side, fighting the battle of decency against viciousness and destruction. We cannot and we shall not forget our friends. Greece was our friend in time of war, Greece is our friend in time of peace. The United States, yes, the United Nations should not and cannot forget the bravery and the sacrifices of Greece and its sons and daughters. Greece is entitled to the maximum consideration in its just claims for Greek territory taken from it in the past. That is necessary for its future defense in case of attack. It is entitled to national boundaries that are consistent with its future proper aspirations and defense. The people of America have a strong feeling of friendship for the people of Greece. It is hoped, yes, expected that the sacrifices of Greece will be remembered and that a strengthened Greece will emerge from this war. The representatives of the United Nations, and particularly of the so-called Big Five in their coming meetings, should consider and decide favorably the just claims of brave Greece, our ally and our friend.

On the fifth anniversary of the unwarranted and vicious attack on Greece I know I speak the sentiments of the American people in sending a message of friendship, and a salute to the brave and suffering people of Greece.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a couple of telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with keen interest to the remarks of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. No one familiar with Greek history, the accomplishments, the aspirations, and the hopes of the Greek people could do otherwise than applaud his remarks.

There are not a large number of persons of Greek origin or descent residing in my district. Those who do reside there are leading citizens and are outstanding in their several vocations, and many of them are leaders in the communities in which they reside. These Americans of Hellenic descent have done more than their patriotic duty in the war effort. They are the right sort of people and it seems unthinkable that they should not be honestly, fairly, and considerately treated in the aftermath of this great war, especially in the European territory.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of two telegrams which, in accordance with the permission given me, I include as a part of these remarks. These telegrams express the views of these friends in Michigan. They are as follows:

Hon. EARL MICHENER,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Reports in the American press emanating from Sofia state that our Secretary of State, at the recent London Conference, proposed these terms to Bulgaria: "Guarantee Bulgaria's present frontiers with Greece; Bulgaria pay only actual damages to Greece after subtracting expenses for improvements carried out along the Agean coast during Bulgaria's occupation; Bulgaria to have commercial outlets at Dedeagatch, Kavala, and Salonika."

Mr. Congressman, 1,000,000 Americans of Hellenic descent have not in the past raised their voices for they had, and still have, full confidence in America's justice to properly respect and recognize the just demands of heroic Greece, and to honorably reward her for all her sacrifices.

The above unfair, unjust, and unbelievable proposals to Bulgaria, if true, have shocked us and at a special meeting of the Ann Arbor chapter of the Order of Ahepa, held this day in Ann Arbor, Mich., we raise our voice in protest and appeal to you, Mr. Congressman, to rectify the situation so that justice may prevail and Greece be equitably, adequately, and honorably protected and recognized.

ANTHONY HRONES,
President, Ann Arbor Chapter,
Order of Ahepa.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

Hon. EARL MICHENER,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C:

The Greek-American Progressive Association lodges of Ann Arbor, Mich., unanimously appeal to you to support the just demands and territorial rights of heroic Greece in the peace conference, and rectify the proposals to Bulgaria, so that justice may prevail and Greece be equitably and adequately protected and recognized.

JOHN GAGALIS,
President, Gapa Lodge 80.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE TAX BILL

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on H. R. 4309, the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the President is clicking. In his speech of Saturday, we heard the voice of real America—the America that our fathers knew and loved. It made us feel very clean and very respectable. It made us proud of our President and glad to know that from now on our own administration will make our own foreign policy.

The speech did not come one minute too soon, for millions were beginning to wonder if the appeasement of Russia would ever stop—if we were going to continue to help her loot and enslave the rest of the world, ourselves included.

Mr. Speaker, the speech of the President should put some iron in the blood of his anaemic and colorless State Department. It should unseal the lips of our colleagues just returned from a trip to Russia. The information they brought back belongs to the public and should not be longer held as a profound secret.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an open letter addressed by A. J. Olson, chairman, Minnesota Peoples Political Action Committee, to the Minnesota congressional delegation.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therewith excerpts from magazine articles.

WEST COAST STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include in one a very fine editorial with reference to the President's speech entitled "A Sound Courageous Stand," and in the other to include an editorial from the Washington Post on the armed services forces.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include a newspaper article with each.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a copy of a speech delivered by Walter P. Reuther, vice president of UAW-CIO, over the Mutual Broadcasting System Friday evening, October 26, relative to the labor situation in the Detroit area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LUMBER SITUATION IN REGARD TO SMALL HOMES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LESINSKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to ex-

tend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by a friend in California.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Nashville Leader.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the way in which General MacArthur has handled opium in Japan.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the understanding of the atomic bomb.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by distinguished scientists on the need of a proper governmental research foundation.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from ex-President Hoover, together with certain tables appended thereto.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast delivered by him over the week end.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the close of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, after the regular order of business and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on a political subject, We Must Have a Definite, Clear-Cut Issue in 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill relating to the settlement of accounts of deceased personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The bill provides in substance, that any and all funds and accounts of deceased officers or enlisted persons of our armed forces shall be paid directly to the heirs of the deceased serviceman or servicewoman, as provided under the terms of the bill without the intervention of probate court proceeding. Payment will be made directly subject only to claims for veteran's funeral expenses.

Under present law payments are made where the amount is $1,000 or less. Passage of this bill will save the widows and children and survivors of deceased veterans a considerable amount of unnecessary court fees and legal expenses as well as avoid the necessity of waiting for long periods of time before settlement can be made. It is my understanding that neither the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard are opposed to this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES McMAHON GRAHAM

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the oldest former Member of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, Hon. James McMahon Graham, died at his home in Springfield, Ill., on Tuesday, October 23, 1945, at the age of 93 years.

He was first elected to the Sixty-first Congress which began March 15, 1909, and reelected to the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses.

Born in Castleblayney, county of Monaghan, Ireland, on April 14, 1852, Mr. Graham was an outstanding citizen of his community during his entire lifetime.

A senior partner of the law firm of Graham & Graham, he was dean of the Sangamon County bar and a practicing attorney in Springfield for 58 years.

The city's most distinguished Roman Catholic layman, he was the recipient of one of the highest honors bestowed upon a member of the laity of that church, the Knighthood of St. Gregory. The late Pope Pius XI, at the request of Bishop James A. Griffin, made Mr. Graham a Knight of St. Gregory in 1935 as a tribute to his faithful service to his church. He belonged to the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception Parish and its Holy Name Society.

His long and distinguished career was characterized by public service in many fields of endeavor—as teacher in Champaign County in his early days, member of the Springfield Board of Education, State's attorney of Sangamon County, representative in the Illinois General Assembly, three terms as Representative in Congress from the Twenty-first District of Illinois, the first Sangamon County crippled children's organization, the Springfield Civic Garden Association, the Abraham Lincoln Association, the Mid-Day Luncheon Club, and a charter member of Springfield Council 364, Knights of Columbus.

Mr. Graham is survived by 3 sons, James J. and Hugh J., of Springfield, and Charles W., of Ann Arbor, Mich.; 3 daughters, Sister Agnes Clare, O. P., Sacred Heart Convent, Springfield; Miss Mary A., and Miss Helen K., also of Springfield; 11 grandchildren, and 15 great-grandchildren. One son, Arthur F., preceded him in death.

The Illinois State Journal in its editorial of eulogy said:

> Mr. Graham's useful professional and political life was supplemented with devotion to his home, his family, and to his civic duties. His family life was ideal. He was companion as well as mentor to his children. The community and the church honored him as a distinguished man and entertained affection for him because he was a good neighbor—a man whose great intellect responded to the inspiration of a warm heart.

The Illinois State Register concluded its editorial as follows:

> Mr. Graham loved the city of Springfield and its people. To say that he was a civic leader puts it mildly. He was an exemplary citizen, real patriot, and great American. If there ever was a saint on earth it was James M. Graham. To the members of his bereaved family this newspaper extends condolences on the part of a community which loved him as a brother.

Bishop James A. Griffin used as the text for the funeral sermon "Ye are the salt of the earth. Ye are the light of the world" and included these remarks concerning the passing of Mr. Graham:

> He has found peace in the depths of eternal life. He had a keen, eager, and kindly devotion to duty, and an abiding love of God and a respect for his commands. He was a strong spirit endowed with special vitality. Mr. Graham served faithfully and well and with much intelligence.

As the present Representative of the congressional district so well and ably served by Mr. Graham I can truthfully say that I feel fortunate as well as honored to count him among my predecessors in office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. GILLIE (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks dealing with the return of the soldiers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an item from the Stars and Stripes, Paris edition, of October 20, 1945, and in the other an editorial from the Orange Daily News of October 23.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of October 27, 1945.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday, November 1, after the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OPPOSITION TO PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a telegram from Dennis Cardinal Dougherty of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. In compliance with his request I desire to read this telegram:

> Please oppose President Truman's project for peacetime military training and make known to your conferees my objection to it.
>
> CARDINAL DOUGHERTY.

Mr. Speaker, the ecclesiastical prince of a great church has spoken out of the richness and fullness of his years, and we would do well to heed his admonition and be guided by his devotion.

LOSS OF LIFE IN ARMY TRAINING MANEUVERS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a letter arrived at my office last week from Germany. It is from a veteran of the Battle of the Bulge where he was wounded and had his hands frozen. An excerpt of the letter is as follows:

> These people over here are crazy sending us out on maneuvers. They use live ammunition on it and we are all really scared to go out on it. Last week two GI's were killed out on it from a short artillery round. I guess some of these high brass have not seen enough men get killed while the war was on so they have got to think up something to get a few more killed. I'll probably come off of it a nervous wreck. I am now getting used to doors slamming and so forth. When I get back from maneuvers I will be just like I was when the war ended. Hit the floor when a door slams or someone whistles funny and you start running for a hole. You probably are laughing about it but that's the way we were when the war first ended.

First. How would you like to be the possessor of the Purple Heart and be subjected to these maneuvers under these conditions?

Second. How would you like to have your son or anyone else's son subjected to such treatment?

Third. Why are not such young men released before the football players and the movie actors that have never been out of the United States are so conveniently released?

Fourth. When, I ask, will this silly performance end?

1946 FORD CAR

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, today our people are witnessing the flexibility and productive capacity of our industrial forces.

In a brief space, we have laid aside the tools of war, taken up the wheels of peace, and, despite barriers, have produced and are ready to produce products of vital necessity to our economy.

It is very gratifying that Michigan should play a leading role in our reconversion program. The giant automotive industry was responsible in prewar days for one-sixth of the workers of the Nation. Its war-production record is one of the brightest pages in American history. We who represent the Wolverine State are proud of its leadership in introducing to the Nation the new 1946 Ford V-8 passenger car.

Members of Congress from Michigan were given a preview of the new Ford car last Friday morning. The new car is a symbol of peace and progress. Over 6,000 suppliers in nearly every State of the Union furnish material that goes into the manufacture of a Ford car, including products from farm, factory, forest, and mine.

It is most fitting and proper that one who has contributed so much to the progress of our country, and who is one of its most outstanding citizens, Mr. Henry Ford, through the Ford Motor Co., now directed by Henry Ford II, his grandson, should be among the first to chart a course for full employment and to usher in a new era of prosperity.

He provided low-cost transportation for the common man, opened the highways, brought our people closer together, and did much to make our standard of living the highest in the world.

May that occasion be a signboard pointing to a happier day and cooperation on the part of labor, management, and Government in leading the Nation forward in peace.

PURCHASE BY THE UNITED STATES OF ICELAND AND OTHER ISLANDS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing resolutions which, if adopted by the Congress, will authorize the President to extend to Iceland in the name of the Congress and the American people, an invitation to become a State in the American Union; to open negotiations with Denmark for the purchase of Greenland; to open negotiations with Great Britain, France, and such other countries that may be involved for the purchase of all islands off the coast of continental United States, in the Caribbean Sea and Pacific Ocean that may be deemed essential to the defense of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, and the Philippine Islands.

Further, my resolutions would direct negotiations looking toward the acquisition without cost to the United States of all of the islands mandated to or owned by the Empire of Japan as the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War shall find essential to the maintenance of peace in the Pacific Ocean areas, an obligation which, by unwelcome circumstances, has become the prime responsibility of the United States.

I commend these resolutions to the favorable consideration of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

RECONVERSION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we heard just a moment ago how Henry Ford is trying to get his plant in operation and give all of his employees work.

A committee of this House is now holding hearings on the full-employment bill, but it seems to me, from the requests I get in my district, that the people want the men to work, but they are having a difficult time to find men to fill the jobs. There are more jobs all over the country practically than we have people to fill them. The greatest responsibility and the most important thing for the majority party to do now is to get these strikes settled so that we will have reconversion and have it right. Change some of the laws so men can work who want to and who will not be prohibited from working by illegal pickets.

If people strike, if people close down their plants, this certainly is not in line with prompt reconversion. We want to get these difficulties settled at once and they should be settled by arbitration, or we should have laws that will do it. Do not procrastinate any longer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of Robert W. Johnson.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two clippings from the New York Times.

EQUALITY OF ALL PEOPLES IN THE WORLD

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, everyone will welcome, as the gentleman from Georgia did, the forthright statement on the part of the President of the United States to the effect that America believes peace cannot be established except on the basis of true freedom and equality of all peoples in the world. In my judgment, however, to say that the atomic bomb, bringing to the earth the very basic powers of the universe, has changed nothing in our policy or our outlook is to fly in the face of the one overwhelming fact in the world today. It means simply this: From now on if one is thinking about the protection of the men, women, and children of the cities of this Nation, he must recognize that nothing short of an understanding among the nations of the world can possibly accomplish that purpose. To that end we need to dedicate a greater statesmanship than the mere maintenance of military might can possibly give us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California (at the request of Mr. SAVAGE) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a memorandum submitted by the American Zionist Emergency Council to the State Department on October 23, 1945.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial, and in the other a copy of a resolution from an American Legion Post.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include letters from soldiers in each.

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Tribune entitled "Justice for Greece."

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him on Gen. Frank T. Hines.

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Director of the Budget.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably, without amendment, a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99), authorizing the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to universal military training, and ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held before said committee during the current session, relative to universal military training.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably, without amendment, a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 100), authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 359, entitled "Address of the President of the United States, before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, presenting his recommendations with respect to universal military training," and ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 300,000 copies of House Document No. 359, entitled "Address of the President of the United States, before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, presenting his recommendations with respect to universal military training," of which 75,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 221,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 copies for the Senate document room, and 2,000 copies for the House document room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from North Carolina how these copies are to be distributed in the House?

Mr. BULWINKLE. In the folding room 500 copies, and 500 copies allotted to each Member of the House. They are to be divided equally. The resolution provides for 75,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 221,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think that by printing these copies we shall be able to put across this bill that we are going to have up very shortly?

Mr. BULWINKLE. We will look into that later, to see the effect.

Mr. RICH. I think this is a good start for that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include parts of an article purporting to have been written by Eleanor Patterson, appearing in yesterday's Sunday Times-Herald, having reference among other things to Mr. Winchell and Mr. Pearson.

BUILDING MATERIALS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague from Detroit [Mr.

LESINSKI] in protesting some of the practices being participated in by building-supply houses, the manufacturers, and their sales agents, of those goods which go into the construction of homes. I think private industry can help itself by more equitably distributing the scarce supply of building materials which is now on the market to all people, including individual users as well as those who contract homes on a large scale. I hope it will not be necessary for the Federal Government to step into this picture and bring about a little better order than exists at the present time.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE TAX BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the conference report on the tax bill will be filed sometime today. Does that mean it will be considered tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have conferred with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The conference report will come up tomorrow.

FULL-EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BILLS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the press this morning can be relied upon, there is sad news for the Members of Congress. We are advised that the leader on the other end of the Capitol says we are not going to have the usual recess during the holidays unless two committees of the House get busy and report out the "twenty-five twenty-six" bill, which has been turned down by the Ways and Means Committee, and the full employment bill which the House Committee on Expenditures has. Weak, indeed, must be the bills when the administration is forced to resort to threats for support. Are we children to be promised candy for our support—to be punished if we do not accept orders from the Chief Executive?

My suggestion is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], who is on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, take back to the leadership on the other side the statement that sometimes when you prod a willing mule too much he is apt to balk, and that some folks can stay here until January and long after that and not vote for all legislation demanded by the administration.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RATES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of millions of dollars are involved in this bill. I think the membership should be here. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 179]

Adams	Gardner	Morgan
Andersen, H. Carl	Gary	Mott
Andrews, Ala.	Gathings	Murdock
Andrews, N. Y.	Gerlach	Murphy
Baldwin, Md.	Gillespie	Neely
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gillie	Norton
Barden	Gore	O'Konski
Barrett, Pa.	Gossett	O'Toole
Barry	Granahan	Outland
Bates, Ky.	Green	Peterson, Ga.
Bell	Griffiths	Pfeifer
Bender	Gwinn, N. Y.	Philbin
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Biemiller	Halleck	Powell
Bland	Hand	Quinn, N. Y.
Bolton	Harness, Ind.	Rabin
Boykin	Hart	Rayfiel
Brehm	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Hedrick	Rivers
Buck	Heffernan	Robsion, Ky.
Buckley	Hinshaw	Roe, Md.
Bunker	Hook	Roe, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Campbell	Jarman	Rooney
Canfield	Jennings	Rowan
Carlson	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kearney	Sabath
Celler	Kee	Shafer
Chiperfield	Keefe	Sheridan
Clark	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Keogh	Smith, Wis.
Corbett	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Cunningham	King	Starkey
Curley	Kinzer	Sumner, Ill.
Dawson	Knutson	Taber
Delaney, James J.	Kunkel	Taylor
Delaney, John J.	LaFollette	Thomas, N. J.
Dickstein	Landis	Thomason
Dingell	Lane	Torrens
Drewry	Latham	Towe
Elsaesser	Lea	Vorys, Ohio
Fenton	Lyle	Vursell
Flood	Lynch	Wadsworth
Fogarty	McConnell	Weichel
Forand	McGehee	Weiss
Fulton	McGlinchey	Winter
Gamble	Madden	Wolcott
	Marcantonio	Wolfenden, Pa.
		Wood
		Woodhouse

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). On this roll call 286 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Propeller Club of the United States at its recent annual convention.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the Republican Food Study Committee.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RATES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 694.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this act shall take effect October 1, 1946: *Provided, however,* That any travel or transportation specifically contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract of carriage or shipment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, to a fund in the Treasury to be known as the "veterans' farms fund", amounts equal in the aggregate to the total amount set forth in subsection (c) of this section.

"(b) Amounts appropriated to the veterans' farms fund shall be available until expended and shall be utilized, 75 per centum by the Secretary of the Interior and 25 per centum by the Secretary of Agriculture, as follows:

"(1) The amounts available to the Secretary of the Interior shall be utilized by him for the construction of irrigation projects in the reclamation States; and for the purchase and reclamation improvement of such privately owned lands, and the reclamation improvement of such public lands, situated within reclamation projects as are necessary to the proper and integrated development of said projects, and such Secretary shall dispose of lands so purchased or improved to eligible veterans in family-type farms.

"(2) The amounts available to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be utilized by him for the purpose of assisting eligible veterans to establish themselves upon and improve family-type farms on lands within Federal reclamation projects and on lands within the States in which railroad land grants are located but which are not reclamation States. Funds so available to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be administered in the same manner as funds appropriated for title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended: *Provided,* That such funds may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in the reclamation States and in the other States named in subsection (c) without regard to the prevalence of farm tenancy in said States: *And provided further,* That veterans found qualified for occupancy of a family-type unit on Federal reclamation projects pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act must

also be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior. Any funds appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act may be used for the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (3) of this subsection, in the manner and under the conditions provided for the use of funds made available pursuant to this subsection.

"(3) In order to provide for cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of this section, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, pursuant to cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, to consider any money made available by any Federal agency to veterans settling upon land within Federal reclamation projects, as all or a portion of the capital required of such settler under subsection C of section 4 of the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1924 (43 Stat. 702), and where any lands have been or may be improved by means of funds made available to an eligible veteran by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall require the entryman or settler of such lands to enter into a mortgage contract or other security instrument acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture covering his interest in the land and improvements to secure the repayment of the value of such improvements before a subsequent entry is allowed.

"(4) Of the amounts in the veterans' farm fund, the Secretary of the Interior shall expend at least $3,750,000 of the funds available to him, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall expend at least $1,250,000 of the funds available to him, in each of the States mentioned in subsection (c) as having railroad land-grant lands valued at $5,000,000 or more: *Provided*, That if the total of the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) is less than $68,272,770, then the said Secretaries shall expend in each of such States 75 per centum and 25 per centum, respectively, of an amount which bears the same ratio to $5,000,000 as the total of the amounts so appropriated bears to $68,272,770.

"(5) An eligible veteran for the purposes of this section is one who has been or may be declared by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be eligible for any benefits provided for in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as now in force or as hereafter amended.

"(6) No amount shall be deducted or withheld from any payment due to any veteran under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of protecting the United States against loss in connection with any sale of land under this section.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the value of land-grant lands to which carriers have legal or equitable title or possession in the several States is hereby fixed as follows:

"Arizona, $7,000,000; California, $14,331,090; Idaho, $1,149,190; Minnesota, $87,228; Montana, $19,209,090; Nevada, $11,112,454; New Mexico, $5,000,000; North Dakota, $1,000,500; Oregon, $171,292; Utah, $349,120; Washington, $8,789,406; Wisconsin, $3,300; Wyoming, $70,100; total, $68,272,770."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LYLE H. BOREN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ED. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
B. K. WHEELER,
E. H. MOORE,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate made two amendments to the bill as it passed the House. The committee of conference has agreed on substitute language for both of these amendments.

Amendment No. 1: Section 2 of the House bill provided that the amendment to existing law made by section 1 of the bill should take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of the bill. The amendment of the Senate struck out this section and substituted the following:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect October 1, 1946: *Provided, however*, That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract."

The substitute amendment agreed to in conference is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the words "section 1 of" are inserted before the words "this act", and clarifying changes have been made in the proviso without changing its intended meaning.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment of the Senate added the following section 4 to the bill:

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of all carriers now operating under land-grant rates, including carriers which have entered into land-grant equalization contracts, when billing the various agencies of the Government for travel or transportation subject to land-grant rates begun after the date of enactment of this act, and prior to October 1, 1946, to forward to the Comptroller General a copy of the bill showing the difference between the full commercial rates, fares, or charges for the travel or transportation in question and the amounts which would be payable at the land-grant or equalization rates, fares, or charges. No report filed by any carrier pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be considered or construed as an admission by such carrier with respect to the lawful rate applicable to any travel or transportation performed prior to the date of enactment of this act.

"(b) A sum equal to the amounts reported under subsection (a) shall be set aside in the Treasury, and covered into a special fund to be designated as the 'Veterans' farms fund,' which shall be available for appropriation by Congress from time to time to carry out the purposes of this act.

"(c) Seventy-five percent of any appropriation from said veterans' farms fund shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and 25 percent thereof shall be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture, and shall be utilized by them for the following purposes:

"(1) Funds appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior shall be utilized by him for the construction and settlement of irrigation projects in the reclamation States, including the purchase for disposition to veterans in family-type farms of such privately owned lands situated within Federal reclamation projects as are necessary to the proper and integrated development of said project.

"(2) The funds appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be utilized by him for the purpose of assisting qualified veterans to establish themselves upon and improve family-type farms on lands within Federal reclamation projects and on lands within the States in which railroad land grants are located but which are not reclamation States. Funds so appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be administered in the same manner as funds appropriated for title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended: *Provided*, That funds may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in the reclamation States and in the other States named in subsection (d) without regard to the prevalence of farm tenancy in said States: *And provided further*, That veterans found qualified for occupancy of a family-type unit on Federal reclamation projects pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act must also be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior. Funds appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act may be used for the purposes of subsections (c) (2) and (c) (3).

"(3) In order to provide for cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, pursuant to cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, to consider the money or any part of the money made available to settlers upon land within Federal reclamation projects, as all or a portion of the capital required of such settler under subsection (C) of section 4 of the Act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702), and where any lands have been or may be improved by means of funds made available to a veteran by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall require the entryman or settler of such lands to enter into a mortgage contract or other security instrument acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture covering his interest in the land and improvements to secure the repayment of the value of such improvements before a subsequent entry is allowed.

"(4) The Secretary of the Interior shall expend at least $3,750,000 of the funds appropriated to him and the Secretary of Agriculture shall expend at least $1,250,000 of the funds appropriated to him in each of the States mentioned in subsection (d) as having railroad land-grant lands valued at $5,000,000 or more: *Provided*, That if the total of the amounts reported under subsection (a) is less than $68,272,770, then the said Secretaries shall expend in each of such States 75 percent and 25 percent, respectively, of an amount which bears the same ratio to $5,000,000 as the total of the amounts so reported bears to $68,272,770.

"(5) An eligible veteran for the purposes of this act is one who has been or may be declared eligible for any benefits provided for in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as the same now exists or may be hereafter amended.

"(6) No amount shall be deducted or withheld from any payment due to any veteran under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of protecting the United States against loss in connection with any sale of land under this act.

"(d) For the purpose of this act the value of lands to which carriers have legal or equitable title or possession in the several States is hereby fixed as follows:

"Arizona, $7,000,000; California, $14,331,090; Idaho, $1,149,190; Minnesota, $87,228; Montana, $19,209,090; Nevada, $11,112,454; New Mexico, $5,000,000; North Dakota, $1,000,500; Oregon, $171,292; Utah, $349,120; Washington, $8,789,406; Wisconsin, $3,300; Wyoming, $70,100; total, $68,272,770."

The substitute amendment agreed to is in general similar to the Senate amendment. Clarifying changes have been made, however, and the following substantive changes have been made:

The Senate amendment provided for setting aside amounts in the Treasury into a special fund, and provided that the funds so set aside would be available for appropriations for carrying out the purposes of the section. In order to make it entirely clear that the bill would not itself make an appropriation to the proposed special fund, these

provisions have been modified so that they authorize the appropriation of money for the purpose of creating a fund, and provide for expenditure of the money in the fund, after it has been appropriated, for carrying out the purposes of the section.

In the substitute agreed to the provisions of the Senate amendment relating to reports from the carriers, for use in determining the amount to be made available for purposes of the section, have been eliminated. Briefly stated, the amount to be made available under the Senate amendment was the amount saved to the Government, by reason of payment of land-grant rates and land-grant equalization rates, during the period from enactment of the bill until October 1, 1946. In lieu of these provisions the amendment authorizes the appropriation of $68,272,770, which is the amount set forth in the Senate amendment as the value of land-grant lands to which carriers have legal or equitable title or possession in the several States. It is believed that much administrative difficulty will be avoided by this change.

The Senate amendment directed the Secretary of the Interior to utilize funds for the construction and settlement of irrigation projects in the reclamation States. In the amendment agreed to the words "and settlement" have been omitted. Another activity of the Secretary of the Interior provided for by the amendment agreed to, not provided for in the Senate amendment, is reclamation improvement of land, both public and private, within reclamation projects, to be disposed of to veterans in family-type farms.

In subsection (c) (2) of the Senate amendment authority was granted for utilization, under subsection (c) (2) and (3), of funds appropriated pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, without regard to prevalence of farm tenancy. In the amendment agreed to this provision is limited to funds appropriated pursuant to title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

LYLE H. BOREN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, this conference repot is on the bill that is more generally known as the land-grant bill. The House of Representatives has twice passed this bill by an overwhelming vote, in one instance by a vote with only 17 in opposition. The House stated its position twice overwhelmingly in favor of this bill in its original form.

The conference report being considered today carries an agreement between the House and Senate conferees that is to a degree a modification of the original House bill, in line with the viewpoint of the gentleman from Missouri, the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Georgia, and others who have expressed themselves in opposition to this bill on the basis that during the war period an excessive amount of freight was being handled by the carriers.

The chief amendment to this bill as agreed on in the conference report is to make the effective date of the bill October 1 of next year, or 1 year after the ending of the war, that being one of the major proposals that had been made by some of the opposition here in the House. This is an amelioration toward that view.

There is one other amendment here of some consequence. The Senate put onto the bill an amendment which appropriated whatever money was saved in the form of the difference between the regular rate and the rate to go into effect on October 1 of next year to World War veterans who on application express the wish to settle on family-sized farms, or rather, to appropriate that money to the two Government agencies concerned, dealing with soil reclamation and the creation of resettlement projects so that the money is set aside for veterans.

The House felt that that amendment was not a correct approach to the problem, and instead of permitting such an appropriation to be made we modified that amendment considerably so that there would be no possibility that there would be any money appropriated on any special project without its being first considered by the Committee on Appropriations on the recommendation of the departments involved. So we changed the appropriation to an authorization for that purpose, after a joint conference with the representatives of the Agriculture Department, of the Interior Department, and of the General Accounting Office, who had raised some question as to the difficulties of accounting under this amendment.

Therefore, in the second amendment there now remains only an expression of principle, an authorization. There is no definitive action taken in the second amendment. That is no outright appropriation. It now authorizes the Appropriations Committee of the House to appropriate money to the amount involved in this saving to the Government for the purpose of assisting veterans in establishing themselves on family-type farms. We felt that the Committee on Appropriations should have that opportunity to pass on any project before any specific project of that nature was undertaken.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. In order to determine the amount of savings, the railroads would be required to notify the Treasury the difference between the land-grant rate and the regular rate between now and October 1.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. On the question of the saving the gentleman mentioned in the difference in the rates, that amount to be appropriated for the benefit of veterans, did the committee give any consideration to the thought that under the GI bill of rights certain loans and grants are provided for, and that that is to be administered under the Veterans' Administration? Have you cured the proposition of not letting that be scattered around among two or three different departments?

Mr. BOREN. Yes. I thank the gentleman for asking that question. I think it brings out an enlightening fact here. We did give consideration to that proposition. We wrote into this amendment, that is, the House conferees did, that such a certification had to be made by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. What is the purpose of this amendment? Why are we talking about the veterans' bill in connection with this land-grant bill? We are not making any law providing that these savings shall go to the veterans.

Mr. BOREN. We are making an authorization which makes it possible for the Committee on Appropriations to do that if they see fit to do so, after examination of the proposals that are brought to them in concrete form.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have no doubt but what there is a reason for excluding 35 States from the benefits of the Senate amendment. In fact, I think I know what it is. But in view of what appears, I would like to have the gentleman make a statement on this point. I notice that Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, and Wyoming are all included in the States for which appropriations could be authorized, but that there is no authorization for an appropriation for this farm settlement work in the State of South Dakota.

Mr. BOREN. The naming of the reclamation States was simply a provision which I presume Senator MCFARLAND, who originally sponsored the amendment, took out of the Reclamation Act. You will notice that another portion of the amendment mentions the land-grant States, so that any land-grant State would have an opportunity to participate in this—either land-grant States or reclamation States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then what is the meaning of subparagraph c, which says:

> For the purpose of this section, the value of land-grant land to which carriers have legal or equitable title or possession in the several States is hereby fixed as follows—

And then follows the list of several States with the amount of dollars which might be provided?

Mr. BOREN. It names all the reclamation States and since that particular proviso applies only to reclamation States, it is fixed as to the reclamation States. But, by and large, reclamation States are also land-grant States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Why are North Dakota and Minnesota regarded as reclamation States, and Wisconsin as a reclamation State, but South Dakota not?

Mr. BOREN. These States that are named are evidently the exact States that are named in the Reclamation Act. May I call the attention of the gentleman that in the first section we refer to all the land-grant States, so South Dakota, for example, undoubtedly having land-grant railroad mileage, would be included.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is really an indirect answer that South Dakota does not have land-grant railroads. That is what I was expecting the gentleman to say. South Dakota is just as much a reclamation State as North Dakota.

Mr. BOREN. If South Dakota does not have land-grant railroad mileage and is not a reclamation State, either one or both, then South Dakota would not participate in this.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it is not both a land-grant State and a reclamation State, it would not be included?

Mr. BOREN. If it is not either one, it would not be included.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman has in part at least answered my question. When this bill came from the Senate with the original amendment, it appeared to have retained certain of the provisions of H. R. 520, which this House had taken off. I have been able to make only a hasty reading of this bill, but I believe the feeling of the gentleman is that those objections have been cured by the present wording of the bill, namely, by putting the control of the money in the Committee on Appropriations, which it should do.

Mr. BOREN. We had the point in mind which the gentleman raises here. The Department of Agriculture, of course, is interested in that point. We removed completely from this amendment the objection that the gentleman mentions.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Page 6 of the report reads, in part, as follows:

> Briefly stated, the amount to be made available under the Senate amendment was the amount saved to the Government by reason of payment of land-grant rates and land-grant equalization rates during the period from enactment of the bill to October 1, 1946.

The amount is specified as $68,272,770; is that right?

Mr. BOREN. That amount is the wildest contention of what the bill might represent in savings to the Government.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is the amount the Senate said would be saved. Now, who is going to get the amount that would have been saved after October 1, 1946, if this bill had not been passed, and how much?

Mr. BOREN. The shippers along the railroads will get that benefit.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman inform the House why this bill was considered an appropriate measure to which to attach a provision affecting veterans?

Mr. BOREN. My colleague is advised that the House did not put on this amendment in the first place. It is not unusual for the body on the other side of the Capitol to add legislation to a bill which might not, under our rules, be germane. The House took the position of trying to be judicious about the thing and make it as near as possible according to the system under which we work.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I appreciate what the gentleman says, that the Senate is responsible for this, but, nevertheless, there is in the minds of a great many of us the feeling that this is sugar-coating something that otherwise would be very distasteful to a great many people.

Mr. BOREN. That charge could not be made with reference to the managers on the part of the House, because this body has already passed this bill twice, by an overwhelming vote, without any sugar-coating or anything else. Whatever sugar-coating has been added by the Senate ought to make it more tasty to the opposition, because both provisions are certainly in line with the wishes of the opposition to this bill. I feel this benefit for the veterans is a good thing. Why not help the veterans to obtain a farm?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. It is still a bit nauseating.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. THOM. If this conference report is defeated, and I expect to vote for its defeat, this House still has an opportunity to legislate on the question of irrigated lands for soldiers; is that not true?

Mr. BOREN. Certainly. It might, but you have a chance here to vote for or against the veteran, as I see it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I opposed this bill. Certainly the sop that is in this bill, the money saved under this bill to be used to improve private property, is not pleasing to the opposition. The language specifically says that the Secretary of the Interior can use 75 percent of this money in the improvement of privately owned reclamation projects.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman is leaving out an essential phrase in front of "privately owned"; to purchase privately owned property and improve it.

Mr. PACE. I would like to read it:

> The amounts available to the Secretary of the Interior shall be utilized by him for the construction of irrigation projects in the reclamation States; and for the purchase and reclamation improvement of such privately owned lands, and the reclamation improvement of such public lands, situated within reclamation projects as are necessary to the proper and integral development of such projects, as are, in his judgment, necessary.

Mr. BOREN. I just want to make it clear to the gentleman, and I think your reading verifies it, and I believe the gentleman will see it, that the improvement is a part of the phrase "purchase and improvement of." I do not believe it could possibly be interpreted that he could improve private lands without first purchasing them and making them a part of a public project.

Mr. PACE. Except that after they are purchased they would be public lands. Therefore, why make the reference to private lands if they are publicly owned?

Mr. BOREN. It may be that the juxtaposition of the word would be better to put it afterward, but I still think the gentleman need have no possible fear of that interpretation, because we are talking about putting these lands into a project. You certainly could not improve these lands until they are within a project, and that is here defined. So you would have to purchase them and put them in the project and then improve them.

Mr. PACE. It appears to be very poor use of the language if that is the intention.

Mr. BOREN. That may be, but that is the intention. We have had the legislative counsel on both sides check it, and I do not believe it could be interpreted that way by the Department. I simply wish to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has been passed twice by an overwhelming vote. The House has made its decision on it and at last the Senate has come forth with its version. We have a unanimous conference report on the part of the Managers of both the House and the Senate after a careful consideration of the problems involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is true as the chairman of the committee says, this bill passed the House twice. It is also true however that it was overwhelmingly defeated in the House on one occasion. Those of ous who were responsible for that defeat can take credit for saving the Treasury of the United States billions of dollars. Let us understand what we are doing here.

With our country deep in debt we are asked today to agree to a conference report that will cost the taxpayers of this country at least $200,000,000 annually in the future.

We the Congress, representatives of the people, will abrogate a solemn agreement, a contract, made by those who received 130 000 000 acres of our public domain. The grant of this land was for the purpose of constructing railroads. In return for that land which equaled about 650 acres for every mile of railroad constructed, the recipients of the land agreed at all times the roads would be available for the transportation of Government troops or property free of charge.

Nearly 60 years ago the courts construed the agreement as meaning the roads would be open and available for the Government with its own equipment to move its own troops and property. As a result an agreement was reached whereby the Government paid 50 percent of the commercial cost for the railroads to move its troops and property.

Today you vote to abrogate that agreement and after October 1, 1946, the Government must pay the full commercial rate. When you do this you pay just twice the amount you have been paying in transportation charges over the 21,500 miles built on the property, donated if you please, by the Government.

Let me remind you that those receiving the grants sold a great portion of the property for hundreds of millions of dollars, and the roads still hold land from which they derive great profits from oil and minerals.

It is pertinent to ask what the Government receives when the agreement is abrogated. The answer is, not only absolutely nothing, but as I say, you will place an additional burden of millions of dollars a year on the taxpayers.

Some years ago I assisted in defeating a bill repealing the land-grant rates. By that action those of us who defeated that bill saved the taxpayers several billions of dollars.

If this conference report is agreed to it will then go to the President. If the President signs it then one of the greatest lobbies that ever stormed the Capitol can say, "This is our victory day."

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House it consisted of but a few lines repealing that part of the Transportation Act concerning land-grant rates effective 90 days after the passage of the act. In the Senate that was changed making the repeal effective October 1, 1946. Our conferees accepted the Senate date.

Now listen to this. Brilliant minds in the Senate and Reclamation Service conceived the idea of using this bill as the medium of recapturing for their section of the country part of the money that would be saved to the Government by making the repeal date effective October 1, 1946, so they added a new section which as agreed to by the conferees provides for a veterans' farm fund. Authorization is made for an appropriation of $68,272,770.

(c) For the purpose of this section the value of land-grant lands to which carriers have legal or equitable title or possession in the several States is hereby fixed as follows: Arizona, $7,000,000; California, $14,331,090; Idaho, $1,149,190; Minnesota, $87,228; Montana, $19,209,090; Nevada, $11,112,454; New Mexico, $5,000,000; North Dakota, $1,000,500; Oregon, $171,292; Utah, $349,120; Washington, $8,789,406; Wisconsin, $3,300; Wyoming, $70,100; total, $68,272,770.

The Secretary of the Interior will administer 75 percent of the fund and the Secretary of Agriculture 25 percent in assisting eligible veterans to secure family-type farms and for the construction of irrigation projects in the reclamation States. First, the land will be purchased, the improvements made, and then sold to the veterans.

Now here is another example showing why the parliamentary rules of both Houses should be changed. So far as I know the legislative committees of neither House have ever considered such a project. The amendment was rewritten by the conferees and in such a way that it is not subject to a point of order. Therefore the only way we can defeat this provision is to vote the report down and send the bill back to conference.

Mr. Speaker, we have just announced a victory drive which shows that the Government needs billions in order to carry the war to a successful conclusion that we all desire—a lasting peace. Is this any time to be raiding the Treasury?

I sincerely hope that the House will realize just exactly what this legislation means before Members vote on it.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. General Gross testified before the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee a year ago that he would have to come in and ask for a $240,000,000 deficiency if the bill passed in order to pay the additional freight rates. That is the testimony of the Army alone.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes. The gentleman is a member of that subcommittee, and do not forget that General Gross only spoke for the War Department. Then there is the Navy Department, the Martime Commission, the Coast Guard, the Indian Service, and all other Government agencies that ship over these land-grant railroads and they will have to pay just exactly twice what they are paying today.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is no time to be passing legislation of this character.

You are already providing for a reduction in taxes. A conference report will come up this week which will reduce the taxes in this country nearly $6,000,000,000. Here you are increasing the expenditures of your Government, not only for this year but forevermore.

Who in this House or anywhere else is going to tell you that your troops are going to be home and that all our property is going to be home and shipped to places in the country where it is to remain indefinitely, by October 1 next? The railroad charges will be just as high and our expenses of transportation are going to be just as high.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. It has been said that we have already passed this bill without a sugar coating on it. Would not this be a time and a propitious time to undo a great mistake we have already made?

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely. It would be a great thing if this House would take the position now of sending this bill back to conference and when the conference report comes back continue to vote it down and not let this legislation go into effect which will charge the people of this country double what we are paying to move soldiers, sailors, and Government property.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think it is about time the Government paid its proportionate share for the movement of its property and personnel. Why should we continue to lay that burden on the shoulders of the other shippers and the other users of the transportation companies of America who have had to pay this right along for 50 years?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I come from one of the greatest railroad centers in the United States. I come from a city that a train never goes through. The train either makes up there or it ends its run there. It is the gateway to the Northwest, to the West and to the Southwest. There are over two dozen trunk lines operating into my city.

The headquarters of some of the railroads that will benefit by this legislation are in my city. But that matters not to me. I have taxpayers in my city also. When we pass this legislation we put on the shoulders of the people of this country additional financial burdens.

Now in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts; certainly, if he made a contract with me he would not break it. Therefore, I say the railroads have no right to come in here and ask us to break a contract they made. Let it be remembered that we paid in land 130,000,000 acres for the concession that the railroads granted to us.

The argument that we are placing a burden on the shoulders of other shippers when we receive this reduction in tax rate is not sound. There is absolutely nothing in this legislation that will result in shippers receiving any benefits. Mark my words, the benefits will accrue to the railroads and to the railroads alone. I hope this conference report will be voted down.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the House to a feature of this matter which has not been discussed by the gentleman from Missouri. In passing the agricultural appropriation bill we have set up a fund of $25,000,000 for the veterans of the country as a whole for expenditures under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act for the purpose of according them aid in the purchase of farms under that program. Now it is proposed by this amendment brought back here for consideration by the House conferees to set up a fund of $68,272,700 for the purpose of carrying on a similar program in 13 States, part of which are reclamation States, so called, and part of which are land-grant States; in other words, we have provided $25,000,000 for the veterans of the country as a whole in order to enable them to have this type of consideration, and it is now proposed to provide $68,000,000 plus for similar purposes for the veterans in only 13 States of the Union. So far as I am concerned, I think that the present program for enabling veterans to secure loans in order to purchase farms contained in the provisions of what is known as the GI bill and that which is set up under the appropriation bill for the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is inadequate. I think they are not fulfilling the purposes that Congress had in mind in making provision for them. I believe that, for the country as a whole, provision should be made which will enable the veterans to have a fair opportunity to purchase farms, but I certainly do not believe that at a time when we have only provided $25,000,000 for veterans for that type of program in direct appropriations for the country as a whole we should, in connection with this land-grant freight-rate proposition, make provision for over $68,000,000 for the veterans of 13 States, or those who may be interested in buying farms in those 13 States only.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. We are not opposing the expansion of this program so that the World War veterans can be provided for.

Mr. TARVER. I am trying to make clear that I believe in the expansion of the program. I think the present program is inadequate. But when you begin to extend it, for heaven's sake do not do it by simply making provision for the veterans of 13 States but make provision for the veterans of the country as a whole. Does the gentleman think that I want to say to the veterans of my State that "In order for you to buy a farm you must go out to one of the land-grant States in order to receive part of the consideration provided by Congress in connection with the $68,000,000 appropriation particularly related to veterans who desire to buy farms in those States?" If we have an expansion of the program let us make it applicable to the country as a whole.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. The distinguished gentleman is a Member of the Committee on Appropriations, and under this amendment there could be no steps carried out without further consideration on the part of the Committee on Appropriations. I want to say to the gentleman that while I agree with him fully, whatever we can do for the veterans along this line is sound and wise. This does not conflict with the program already set up with the possible exception stated, and if there is a diversion of funds, they should be returned to the States from which they were taken out. The States themselves have been carrying the penalty for these many, many years. That is why there are inequities, that we have been trying to correct in this legislation.

Mr. TARVER. I feel that if $68,000,000 is a fair price for these lands the railroads still hold, the railroads ought to pay that price before they are relieved from the obligations of their contract, rather than that the price should be paid by the National Government in the nominal way of making provision for the veterans of the war in 13 States only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. There is no relationship whatever between the $68,000,000-plus which is here authorized for appropriation and the land-grant rates. This thing has no business in this bill. It is simply placed in the bill as a sort of a sop to make the whole thing more palatable to the membership of the House and the membership of Congress.

The gentleman says that the Appropriations Committee will review this subject matter before it makes an appropriation. Despite some things that have been said to the contrary on this floor, the Appropriations Committee regards itself as the servant of the House and not as having authority to review the actions of the House. You can rest assured that if this bill is passed as proposed in this conference report, the Appropriations Committee will bring in an appropriation bill to carry out the mandate of the Congress in the amount of $68,200,000-plus. So if you approve this conference report, what you are doing is authorizing the institution of a program for the veterans of these 13 States, the benefits of which will not be enjoyed by the veterans of the other States of the Union. I say that is unfair, it is discriminatory, and in behalf of the veterans of my State and of other sections of the country I protest and say this conference report should be rejected.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the passage of the bill H. R. 694, as I did for the previous bill which sought to abolish land-grant rates. I did that in both instances because I believe that the continued operation of land-grant rates caused an inequitable condition. It meant that the commercial firms in certain States were discriminated against in the procurement of Government business.

For example, a short distance south of the border of South Dakota the Government was building a dam. It required some lumber. A lumber dealer in the Black Hill section of my district, less than 200 miles from the site of this dam, found that although he was the low bidder he was not given the contract because some bidder on the west coast, enjoying a land-grant rate preference, could ship his material to Nebraska and the net cost was less to the Government, so that the contract went to the west-coast shipper.

Now, however, I find that in addition to having given firms where land-grant rates were enjoyed the benefit of that kind of business for, lo, these many years, it is now proposed that a further inequity shall be caused by saying that the Government shall pay full freight rates until October 1946, but that the amount of the difference, estimated in this case to be $68,000,000, shall be set aside in a special fund and be authorized to be appropriated back for the benefit of those same States. I cannot justify that. I voted for this bill originally to correct an inequity. I certainly cannot now vote for agreement to a conference report that sets up a new inequity and says that the Government, meaning the Public Treasury, with moneys collected from your State and your State and your State, shall set up a fund of $68,000,000 which shall be available for appropriation only to the veterans settling on farms in 13 States, upon the basis provided in subparagraph (c).

I call your attention to subparagraph (c). This $68,000,000 which will come from all States according to the proportion that they will contribute to the providing of funds for the paying of freight rates, will be apportioned to Arizona, $7,000,000; California, $14,000,000; Idaho, $1,000,000; Minnesota, $87,000,000; Montana, $19,000,000; Nevada, $11,000,000; New Mexico, $5,000,000; North Dakota, $1,000,000; Oregon, $171,000; Utah, $349,000; Washington, $3,000,000; Wisconsin, $3,000; Wyoming, $70,100.

What justification is there for taking money out of the Public Treasury and apportioning it to 13 States upon such an inequitable or uneven basis? It is proposed that originally this was to apply to the reclamation States. There might be some justification for settling veterans on public lands. But this proposed distribution is not based upon the public lands within the States. It does not apply to that. It is based upon the old original land-grant proposition. Wisconsin is not a reclamation State but it gets $3,000. That would hardly be fair to Wisconsin under any basis of equitable apportionment of $68,000,000. And 35 States get nothing.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I agree with the gentleman very much in many of the arguments he has made. Regardless, however, of what is done, if the conference report is rejected, the very discrimination that he points out between the two shippers of lumber will continue against the people in favor of the Government.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not necessarily. I want that corrected. This conference report should go back to conference and the conferees could bring back a bill substantially as it was passed by the House. If it is desired to put off the payment of the new rates to the railroads until October 1946, and yet to collect the full rate from the Government to create a fund for settlement of veterans on farms, the pool could be distributed equitably among the veterans of all States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that this conference report will be voted down today and that the bill will be sent back to conference. I should like to say very frankly that I opposed this bill the first time it was up. I opposed it twice subsequently when it came up again. I must oppose this bill at the present time on the ground that it is an inequity and an injustice to the people of this country to pass such legislation, either with or without amendment. I will repeat what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], said. He pointed out that you are passing legislation not just for the year 1946 and not just for a wartime period, but you are passing permanent legislation which will cost the people of this country 50 percent more for the hauling of military personnel and goods over the railroads of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this conference report will be voted down and that it will continue to be voted down because October 1, 1946, is not going to mean the end of the transportation of wartime personnel and wartime material by any means. I hope the Congress will bear that fact in mind. We are going to have

our troops in Japan and in Germany and they are going to be there for a number of years. The other day the President of the United States spoke to us in this Chamber and suggested that we have a permanent military training system whereby all youths between the ages of 18 and 20 would receive military training. Naturally, in the course of this training, they would be carried by the railroads of the United States. We should send this conference report back. Also I think it unfortunate to be dealing with the all-important matter of veterans' affairs in a land-grant bill.

I do not think that full consideration has been given. I think it is unfair consideration. Certainly, I am for legislation which will assist the veterans in the matter of care and rehabilitation, but not under any such set-up as this.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. In connection with your opposition to repealing the land-grant law, does not the gentleman think it is about time that the shippers and passengers on the railroads were given relief, and that they should not be called upon to make up the deficit every year because of Government rate reductions?

Mr. O'HARA. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because when the representatives of the railroads were asked in committee what the rate saving would be to shippers, they would not promise there would be a bit of saving to the shippers or to the passengers, because they said it would depend upon conditions when they got around to that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Because of the fact that this legislation is being sponsored by my able colleague from Oklahoma, I deeply regret to feel compelled to oppose this conference report as presented here today. I am very much disturbed about the section that has been added in the other body with reference to reclamation projects. I think the gentleman will agree with me that this is not the proper way to legislate for reclamation. No doubt the gentleman will also agree that it is about time the Congress follow regular procedure and legislate in a proper and orderly manner.

May I make the further observation, that this afternoon the committee for which I have some responsibility, the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations, is holding hearings on budget estimates totaling $93,000,000 for reclamation projects in the Western States. I might add that our committee has been fair, reasonable if not generous in making funds available for the various reclamation projects. Some 17 Members of Congress are listed to appear before our committee in support of these projects. Many of them have heretofore done so. Almost without exception these Members point out that the Congress has heretofore authorized these reclamation projects and usually add that such authorization actually amounts to a mandate. Today this House is told that this $68,000,000 reclamation legislative provision is merely a suggestion to the Appropriation Committee, but tomorrow or next month if this conference prevails, with legislative provision in it, a provision that by no stretch of imagination can be said belongs in this bill, I would not be surprised nor would I blame the sponsor of the Senate provision to say to the Appropriation Committee that such an authorization should be accepted as a mandate for an appropriation for the full amount of $68,000,000.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, twice since I have been a Member of this House I have heard this proposition of abolition of land-grant rates discussed. The committee has considered it, and I think all except one member of the committee has voted for it. Each time the House has overwhelmingly voted for this bill. Now it is in conference, and seemingly there is some conflict over whether or not we are going to approve the Senate amendment which sets up a fund for the rehabilitation of veterans in the 13 land-grant States.

I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that it was those 13 States that gave up their lands which made it possible for the Government to have reduced rates. In my State more than 81 percent of the land in the State belongs to the Federal Government. Eighty-one percent of the land is withheld from taxation by either the State, the county, or the municipalities. Similar conditions exist in many of the other States in the western part of this country. So the States that came into the Union last are the States which gave up land and made it possible for the Government to enjoy these reduced rates. They are young States. They have been deprived of taxable wealth. The only way they can be properly developed is to have the remaining portion of the land which was granted to the railroads set aside as a basis for a fund to create irrigation and reclamation projects.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman's State tax the land that is granted to the railroads?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. The State has a provision to tax lands granted to the railroads, yes; but it does not have the right to tax lands that belong to the Federal Government. Some people say, "Turn this back to the Federal Government. It will not help the States any." It would take just that much more land from the jurisdiction of the States for taxation purposes. In these States there are possibilities for new homes for veterans, veterans who may come from all States of the Union to establish new homes. It may make a home for a veteran from your State. This amendment does not limit the use of the fund to the veterans of any State. This is a possibility for irrigation and reclamation of vast new areas of lands, for if they set aside these funds, then in the wisdom of Congress, money from this fund can be appropriated for the development of new homes which may never be made otherwise. And, mind you, it is set up so the veterans themselves will pay for these homes on a feasible plan. The Federal Government in the end will not lose anything. The Government will gain, the States will gain, and the veterans will gain. So why not pass the Senate amendment?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not a fact that when the 130,000,000 acres of land were turned over to these promoters to build railroads, Arizona was never heard of?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Arizona was a mere territory, but the State later suffered because Arizona eventually became a State. As a matter of fact, Arizona was organized as a territory before the grants were ever made to the railroads. That was in 1861. President Abraham Lincoln signed the bill that created the Territory of Arizona. I am sure my friend from Missouri knows this.

If this bill is passed it is only fair that the consumers of this country get a break, for they are the ones who have paid the rates up to this time, and at the present time the consumer is paying a portion of the cost of shipping all Government goods and personnel. The question is whether or not you are going to do the equitable thing and say that the Government through its taxing powers shall pay its just share, or are you going to load the cost of Government shipping onto the consumer? It is the ultimate consumer who pays the cost of shipping goods at rates to be determined under this bill, and I plead with you gentlemen to load the cost of Government shipping onto the taxpayer, because otherwise it is your constituents, the consumers, who will pay the cost of Government shipping in the end.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder if the gentleman can point to any assurance that we have that the rate is going to be lowered.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I am glad the gentleman from Texas asked that question. As a matter of fact such provision is right here in the bill. The bill itself provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall readjust the rates and that this shall be passed on to the shipper and ultimately to the consumer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired, all time has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOREN) there were—ayes 47, noes 86.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently no quorum is present. The doorkeeper will close the doors, the sergeant at arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 114, nays 167, not voting 150, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—114

Allen, Ill.	Gifford	Murray, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	O'Brien, Mich.
Angell	Goodwin	Phillips
Arends	Graham	Pittenger
Arnold	Granger	Plumley
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	Priest
Beckworth	Gregory	Ramey
Bennett, Mo.	Gross	Ramspeck
Bishop	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Randolph
Blackney	Harless, Ariz.	Reed, N. Y.
Boren	Harris	Rees, Kans.
Boykin	Havenner	Rizley
Bradley, Mich.	Hays	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brown, Ohio	Henry	Rockwell
Buffett	Hess	Rodgers, Pa.
Butler	Hill	Sadowski
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman	Schwabe, Mo.
Chapman	Holmes, Mass.	Sharp
Chelf	Horan	Short
Church	Howell	Simpson, Ill.
Clason	Jenkins	Slaughter
Clements	Jennings	Smith, Maine
Clevenger	Jensen	Stefan
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ill.	Stevenson
Cravens	Jonkman	Stewart
Curtis	LeFevre	Stigler
D'Ewart	Lemke	Stockman
Dolliver	Lewis	Sundstrom
Domengeaux	McCowen	Talbot
Dworshak	McDonough	Tibbott
Elliott	McGregor	Tolan
Ellis	McKenzie	Vursell
Elsaesser	McMillen, Ill.	White
Fellows	Martin, Mass.	Wickersham
Fernandez	May	Wilson
Fuller	Merrow	Wolverton, N. J.
Gavin	Michener	Woodruff, Mich.
Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.	
Gibson		

NAYS—167

Abernethy	Eberharter	Kilday
Allen, La.	Ellsworth	Kirwan
Andresen, August H.	Elston	Kopplemann
	Engel, Mich.	Lanham
Bailey	Ervin	Larcade
Bennet, N. Y.	Fallon	LeCompte
Bonner	Feighan	Lesinski
Bradley, Pa.	Fisher	Link
Brooks	Flannagan	Luce
Brown, Ga.	Folger	Ludlow
Bryson	Gallagher	McGehee
Bulwinkle	Geelan	McMillan, S. C.
Burch	Gordon	Mahon
Burgin	Gorski	Maloney
Byrne, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Manasco
Camp	Gwynne, Iowa	Mansfield, Mont.
Cannon, Fla.	Hagen	
Cannon, Mo.	Hancock	Mansfield, Tex.
Carnahan	Hare	Martin, Iowa
Case, S. Dak.	Healy	Mason
Chenoweth	Hébert	Miller, Calif.
Cochran	Hendricks	Mills
Coffee	Heselton	Monroney
Cole, Kans.	Hobbs	Morrison
Cole, Mo.	Hoch	Mundt
Colmer	Hoeven	Murray, Tenn.
Combs	Holifield	Norrell
Cooper	Huber	O'Brien, Ill.
Courtney	Hull	O'Hara
Crawford	Izac	O'Neal
Crosser	Jackson	Pace
Daughton, Va.	Johnson, Calif.	Patrick
Davis	Johnson, Ind.	Patterson
De Lacy	Johnson, Luther A.	Peterson, Fla.
Dirksen		Pickett
Dondero	Johnson, Okla.	Poage
Doughton, N. C.	Jones	Price, Fla.
Douglas, Ill.	Judd	Price, Ill.
Doyle	Kean	Rabaut
Drewry	Kee	Rains
Durham	Kefauver	Rankin
Earthman	Kelly, Ill.	Resa
Rich	Smith, Va.	Voorhis, Calif.
Richards	Snyder	Wadsworth
Riley	Sparkman	Walter
Robertson, Va.	Spence	Wasielewski
Robinson, Utah	Springer	Weaver
Rogers, Fla.	Sullivan	Welch
Rogers, N. Y.	Sumner, Ill.	West
Ryter	Sumners, Tex.	Whitten
Sasscer	Talle	Whittington
Savage	Tarver	Wigglesworth
Schwabe, Okla.	Thom	Winstead
Scrivner	Thomas, Tex.	Woodrum, Va.
Sheppard	Traynor	Worley
Sikes	Trimble	Zimmerman
Smith, Ohio	Vinson	

NOT VOTING—150

Adams	Fulton	Madden
Andersen, H. Carl	Gamble	Marcantonio
	Gardner	Morgan
Andrews, Ala.	Gary	Mott
Andrews, N. Y.	Gathings	Murdock
Baldwin, Md.	Gerlach	Murphy
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gillespie	Neely
Barden	Gillie	Norton
Barrett, Pa.	Gore	O'Konski
Barrett, Wyo.	Gossett	O'Toole
Barry	Granahan	Outland
Bates, Ky.	Green	Patman
Bates, Mass.	Griffiths	Peterson, Ga.
Beall	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pfeifer
Bell	Hale	Philbin
Bender	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Biemiller		Powell
Bland	Halleck	Quinn, N. Y.
Bloom	Hand	Rabin
Bolton	Harness, Ind.	Rayfiel
Brehm	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Hartley	Reed, Ill.
Buck	Hedrick	Rivers
Buckley	Heffernan	Robsion, Ky.
Bunker	Herter	Roe, Md.
Campbell	Hinshaw	Roe, N. Y.
Canfield	Holmes, Wash.	Rogers, Mass.
Carlson	Hook	Rooney
Case, N. J.	Hope	Rowan
Celler	Jarman	Russell
Chiperfield	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sabath
Clark		Shafer
Cooley	Kearney	Sheridan
Corbett	Keefe	Simpson, Pa.
Cox	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Wis.
Cunningham	Keogh	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	Kerr	Starkey
D'Alesandro	Kilburn	Taber
Dawson	King	Taylor
Delaney, James J.	Kinzer	Thomas, N. J.
	Knutson	Thomason
Delaney, John J.	Kunkel	Torrens
	LaFollette	Towe
Dickstein	Landis	Vorys, Ohio
Dingell	Lane	Welchel
Douglas, Calif.	Latham	Weiss
Eaton	Lea	Winter
Engle, Calif.	Lyle	Wolcott
Fenton	Lynch	Wolfenden, Pa.
Flood	McConnell	Wood
Fogarty	McCormack	Woodhouse
Forand	McGlinchey	

So the conference report was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. Rowan against.
Mr. Welchel for, with Mr. Weiss against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Beall.
Mr. King with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Taber.
Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. John J. Delaney with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Neely with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Griffiths.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mrs. Douglas of California with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Holmes of Washington.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and ask for a further conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BOREN, PRIEST, HARRIS, HOLMES of Massachusetts, and REECE of Tennessee.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit this afternoon during general debate. The subcommittee has under consideration five bills involving the termination of hostilities.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this agreeable to the Republican membership of the subcommittee?

Mr. HOBBS. It is.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the secretary of the Illinois Federation of Retail Associations.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Regional Conference of Commissioners on Interstate Cooperation of the Southern States of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Texas, and Tennessee.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on two subject matters and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

COMPOSITION OF THE POSTWAR NAVY

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 366 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of

House Concurrent Resolution 80, a concurrent resolution to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of announcing that it is my intention to introduce a House resolution which will create a special order for the consideration of the Forand bill, relating to unemployment compensation, which is at present in the Ways and Means Committee. At the end of 7 days, if no action has been taken on this rule or upon the bill itself, I will present a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 366 provides for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 80, which seeks to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the size and composition of our postwar Navy. In my opinion, it would be hard to pick a time that is more appropriate for the consideration of this resolution, coming as it does right after Navy Day and coming after the splendid performance that has been turned in by the Navy in this war.

As a basic proposition it may be safely said, and I do not believe anybody can point out an example to the contrary, that no nation, no major power, has ever lost a war when it has controlled the seas. The converse of that situation is equally true—that no power has won a major war when it did not have control of the seas. Certainly in modern times that has been the case. The Napoleonic struggle would certainly have been relatively short and Napoleon would have triumphed if it had not been for the British Navy. In our own Civil War I do not think there is much question in the minds of military experts but what the South would have won not later than 1863 or the early part of 1864 except for the blockade.

In World War I the Germans were able to rush through northern France and Belgium almost without opposition, but they were not able to escape the stranglehold of the British Navy. The same thing was true in 1940 in the recent war. There was no stopping of the Germans—their tanks and their panzer divisions—in 1940. However, the British Navy did manage to hold on, and it managed to keep that stranglehold on the German Reich, with the result that the same thing happened as had happened before and that always happens—victory finally perches on the banner of the country or the combination of powers that control the seas. In 1940, with the sweeping victory in France, Hitler was never able, or at least was unwilling to take the risk of crossing that little 20 miles of water which separated France from England. The only thing that stood between Hitler and a German victory, which was almost within his grasp, was the British fleet. The only thing that held Japanese and German might at bay until we could arm was the combined might of the fleets of Great Britain and the United States.

As late as this summer the strength of sea power was demonstrated in a way never before experienced when a major power, namely, Japan, fell without her homeland being invaded because of the stranglehold that had been applied by our Navy and because of the fact that we had cut off her shipping and were gradually applying the policy of starvation. Time and weapons may change, and they will change, and when they do the Navy of the United States will change with them, but basic principles will never change. The primary duty of the Navy is to keep the fighting as far from the home front and the home coast and the home shores as possible, and at the same time bring its own striking power to bear upon the enemy.

The current discussion of the power of the atomic bomb is a repetition of the same sort of talk that we heard a few years ago—a new version of the arguments and the great debates that waged as to whether the battleship or the airplane was supreme. There were many people who honestly thought that the days of the battleships and the cruisers and the destroyers were a thing of the past because they could be bombed to destruction by the terrific bombing power and accuracy that was developed. But the history of this war has shown that instead of being obsolete the battleships and the cruisers and the destroyers and the other combat vessels of the Navy merely took on a new arm and consolidated that arm. The arm of air defense and air offense was tied into and made an integral part of the traditional Navy. As a result, we had a stronger and more effective fighting force than we have ever had before.

May I point out one further contribution of the Navy in this war respecting the use of battleships? I maintain—basing the statement on such information that I am able to pick up from persons calculated to know—that it is highly probable, or at least certainly quite possible, that our forces would never have landed in Normandy without the terrific barrage that was laid down by those 16-inch guns and 14-inch guns and 8-inch guns on battleships and cruisers which blasted the coast of Normandy in a way that bombs dropped from the air were never able to do. The bombs caused all sorts of destruction. They broke up communications, but aerial bombs did not plow through those cement walls. They did not cut through nor did they pulverize those shore coast lines in the way that the shells did from those ships standing offshore. The same experience was repeated in the Orient. Many an American soldier and marine is today alive thanks to the awful fire power of our battleships which some called obsolete.

Perhaps the wars of the future will be fought by atomic bombs or atomic weapons, but they will still be directed by men, and those men and those bombs and those machines and those planes which will be used for the purpose of carrying on a warfare with atomic bombs will be manned and escorted by the Navy, and it is the Navy of the future, the Navy of the next few years, that House Concurrent Resolution 80 is directed toward.

If there was ever a report that was worth reading it is the report that accompanies this concurrent resolution. I think all of us, if we are frank, will admit that except where our own committee is concerned, we are sometimes too apt and too prone to skip over reports and not go through them except in a very cursory manner. Sometimes by their nature they are, of necessity, dry. But here is a report that reads almost like a war correspondent's story; a part of this war, if you please. It deals with things that we have been discussing; a résumé of the war that is just over, and gives in a most graphic way the picture as this Committee on Naval Affairs sees it, both with what we can reasonably expect in the next few years and what our needs will be.

We all know that when you get down to deciding a postwar Navy policy, there are just two considerations. You can split it up into any number of subdivisions, but it gets down to two propositions: First, what sort of a navy and how much of a navy do we need for national security? Second, what is going to be the cost of that navy and what can we afford?

When you say "What can we afford" it is only fair to take into consideration the terrific lessons of expense that we have learned in this war, not only in dollars, but in men and in ships which were lost needlessly because of the policies that existed during the twenties and the thirties of letting our Navy get down to a disgraceful level to a point where it was no more than a third- or fourth-rate naval power. That is the sad experience, the repetition of which this Congress is called upon to prevent, under that constitutional provision that places the duty upon us to provide for and to maintain a navy. When you have read the report prepared by the committee headed by the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], I submit that it will be an eye opener as to what our naval policy should be in the next few years.

House Concurrent Resolution 80 is nothing but an expression of opinion, but it is a powerful expression of opinion. It is not a legislative act in the sense that it is an authorization. It merely expresses the considered judgment of this Congress as to what our naval needs may be, the needs to protect our shores and to protect our commitments. The Navy Department, so the report says, has signified that it will be bound by this limit. It furnishes a most valuable guidepost for the Committee on Appropriations in

determining the amount that should be appropriated for the support of the Navy in the next few years.

We must get down to one or two essentials, and one of them is, After this war are we going to maintain a Navy or are we not? That question sounds so elementary as to be almost silly, yet there are people who actually feel, and honestly, but I think mistakenly, that since the advent of the atomic bomb navies are a thing of the past. If you answer the first question in the affirmative, and I think most of us will, then the question comes as to what size we are going to have, and that is what this resolution seeks to do.

Twice within the generation of the younger Members of this body, of whom I am one, we have learned the terrific cost that is brought about by trying to jump into a world-wide, first-class struggle with a second- or third-class Navy that has been starved by appropriations and permitted to go down to next to nothing.

After the last war, when we finished in 1918 and 1919, we had what was for those days a strong and powerful Navy, but the inevitable reaction set in which will appear after this war if we are not careful, the old theory, "Oh, the war is over, we are tired hearing about it, let us move on to other things, it will take care of itself, League of Nations or what not," with the result that the Navy dropped to a point in 1932 where we had only about 89,000 men in the Navy, and we were appropriating an amount for its support that was totally inadequate, particularly when all we had to do was to look at Germany or Italy or other powers and see that a struggle was ahead and inevitable.

At this point, under the leave granted to me at the beginning of these remarks, I am inserting a table which I had prepared by the Navy Department, showing the appropriations and the number of ships and the personnel for certain dates from 1918 to 1945. I feel that it will be of interest and of value to the Members to examine this table and to observe what a policy of naval starvation did to a navy that ended World War I as a great force:

Date	Ships	Personnel [1]		Appropriation [2]
		Officers	Enlisted	
1918	[3] 1,959	22,549	435,398	$652,508,739
1920	937	10,109	108,950	633,025,946
1923	499	7,915	83,185	378,156,006
1927	306	8,944	84,034	355,801,340
1932	291	9,463	81,679	359,642,104
1937	325	9,975	100,771	596,732,228
1940	452	13,162	144,824	1,149,013,330
1941	623	28,421	244,606	3,649,659,342
1943	5,162	170,418	1,507,779	33,080,288,102
1945	6,097	317,316	3,060,154	28,650,451,755

[1] Strength as of June 30 of year.
[2] Source: Bureau of Supplies and Accounts publication Naval Expenditures.
[3] Includes 937 merchant ships.

There are certain facts that are so self-evident that there is no disputing them. One is that, fortunately, we are a country surrounded by oceans. We can neither be attacked nor can we attack except over the water or on the water or under the water. I think that is a particularly good phrase, and I can say that because I have no pride of authorship in it. It is pure plagiarism. I lifted it verbatim from the report of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. However, I think it amply states a premise upon which our whole national defense problem rests, and which determines the character of our international policy. We know that we have taken on certain commitments over a period of years, some of them over a century ago, and some very recently, which always have and always will affect the policy which we must pursue. We must have a navy; we must have an army; or we must have an air force; or we must have all three—or whatever means of defense are available, to protect the continental United States and the possessions of the United States that are not a part of the country itself. That is the sine qua non of our defense policy.

In the second place, we have certain definite international commitments, one of which we have had for over a century, the Monroe Doctrine. That now has been modified. Perhaps modified is not the exact word to use—perhaps a better word would be to say that it has been extended by the agreement at Chapultepec. In the third place, we have new commitments which we have assumed which apply to the postwar period, in particular the United Nations Organization. What that may mean or what that organization may produce by way of a peace-producing organization, no one knows. We hope it will be most effective. There is every reason to believe it can be effective. But in the meantime, like any prudent individual or any prudent nation, we must go on the theory that in the last analysis we have to look out for ourselves and put ourselves in a position where we are at least not attractive to those nations which might find it otherwise desirable to attack us.

This Nation can only be secure if our coast line and our approaches are safe. As a practical matter, you cannot hold a coast line as long as ours by defending every mile of the continental United States. It can only be protected by guarding, maintaining, and controlling those outlying bases, in some instances thousands of miles away, which control directly or indirectly the approaches to our shores. Due to new weapons, such as the airplane and the robot bomb, our whole sphere of protective area has been greatly expanded. It has grown to the point where we must patrol and have control of the North and South Atlantic, or at least the western part of it. We must dominate the Pacific, for the protection of this country, Hawaii, the Philippines, and our other possessions. We do not of necessity have to patrol the whole Pacific Ocean, but we certainly must be in a position to control that ocean if we are to make good the commitments which we have made and if we are to maintain our own national security.

Such a program of national defense is, in the first instance, the job of the Navy. We cannot maintain and hold bases thousands of miles away with armies unsupported by a navy. We cannot protect them with an air force without a navy. It is the Navy that makes possible the uninterrupted flow of supplies necessary to maintain foreign bases.

Thus it is that today and in the future our security is wrapped up in a strong Navy. It is wrapped up in a Navy that is adequate to protect our commitments which we have made; to protect our shore lines; to protect our outlying possessions; a Navy strong enough to make it known to the world that we want peace and that we are going to do what we can to maintain peace, but, putting it bluntly, that any other nation which covets our territory or our resources is going to be forced to defeat the strongest Navy on earth before it gets through the defense that we propose to set up with this postwar Navy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In looking over the concurrent resolution I notice it sets up the number of ships we are to have, but it says nothing about personnel. Does the gentleman feel it might be the right of Congress to designate the number of personnel in the Navy, as well as the number of ships?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Under the eighth section of the Constitution, it is my thought that it is not only the right but the duty of Congress to set such limits both on personnel or on ships or on installations as we shall see proper. I do not know whether that information is available at this time. I have not tried to go into the technical aspects of the bill, because that will be covered by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The bill does go into considerable detail about the number of vessels that will be in the postwar Navy, but it simply says that sufficient personnel shall be provided to adequately maintain and operate the Navy and that proper and adequate facilities shall be provided to maintain and to fully train such personnel; but it does not give us the number of personnel that might be required.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The Congress always authorizes the enlisted strength of the Navy. What we propose in following legislation will be 500,000 men.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would it not be well to have that stated in this concurrent resolution?

Mr. VINSON. No; because that has to be done by a specific statute. This resolution is not an act of Congress. This is simply an expression of opinion of the Congress.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Is there anything in the report to indicate that the Navy thinks it can get 500,000 naval personnel without resorting to conscription?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. If I am not mistaken—and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] can correct me if I am wrong—I do not think this report goes into the question of personnel except in a casual way. Is that not right?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct, but I would state to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] that it is the hope of the Navy Department to be able to get 500,000 enlisted men without resorting to conscription. As a matter of fact, we now have contracts with about 300,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs a question. Is it not a fact that the Navy came within 1,000 of their requirements by voluntary methods last month?

Mr. VINSON. I think that is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would the gentleman feel it might be in order to write into this bill that all personnel in the Navy would be secured by the voluntary method?

Mr. VINSON. The trouble about that is that it would be legislation, and this is not legislation. This is an expression of opinion of the Congress.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that a bill of this character should have been brought to the floor at this inopportune time. It is premature in every sense of the word. We have nothing on which to base a considered judgment as to the size or character of the fleet that will be needed a year from now—perhaps even a few months from now. The bill here proposes what amounts to final action on the vital matters with which it deals before we have had an opportunity to take our bearings or make an authoritative appraisal of what lies before us. The war has not yet ended.

In fact no formal proclamation of the end of hostilities has yet been promulgated. There is every reason for caution and deliberation before rushing in at this first minute of cessation of active conflict. The guns on our ships have hardly cooled. And yet we have a bill here which proposes to freeze the American Navy indefinitely in an unyielding mold which will make no allowances for developments already in the making.

The bill is inopportune and inexpedient for many reasons. In the brief time allotted me I shall mention three reasons why it is too early to ossify the American Navy.

In the first place, the Navy is still in action. Mentally we are still at wartime tempo. When we think of the Navy now—when we envision its future—we are still thinking of it at wartime strength and at wartime activity. It inevitably follows that planning a peacetime navy now we are, consciously or unconsciously, planning a wartime navy. In other words, if planned now we will plan the largest navy suggested—a navy that will delight the heart of the biggest Navy man in the Nation. And the big-Navy men will walk into the Budget Bureau and the Appropriations Committee as soon as it is passed and say, "It is a mandate."

It is still too close to the war. We must have time to develop a sense of perspective before we begin to set the size of the Army and Navy to be maintained in the years of peace ahead.

In the second place, we are unable at this time to estimate with any degree of accuracy the purposes for which a navy will be needed and the scope and range of its activities in the next 10 or 20 years. The San Francisco Charter has just been adopted. But it is a bare framework. Along with the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta agreement and the Potsdam Conference, it is still so inconclusive as to render it impossible for anyone to say what our rights and responsibilities will be in the world organization which will finally be evolved. No one can say yet what our international relations will be or what will be required of us or our Navy in the final codification of international law and order. Our duties and responsibilities may be vastly more than our expectations. Or, on the other hand, they may be vastly less. It is entirely too soon and certainly highly inept for the United States at this precipitate hour to determine finally just what our naval plans will be regardless of unpredictable events impending in the near future.

The third reason is just as persuasive. The Navy is starting on an extensive program of research in atomic warfare. It proposes to make exhaustive investigations and experiments to determine the effect of the atom bomb on naval forces. It is not wholly without the range of probability that it may find that one bomb, such as destroyed the city of Nagasaki, would prove equally effective in decimating any naval force that could be assembled. These studies are just beginning. They may revolutionize naval construction and naval operations. The establishment of any fast and set rule such as this bill proposes should await the outcome of these studies.

There is no emergency here. We are not racing against time. Except for its effect upon appropriations there is no occasion for unseemly haste. I am venturing to enter objections at this time because the time to give attention to appropriations is when legislative propositions like this are brought in here on the floor with no one paying any particular attention. There is not a quorum here. There has not been a quorum and there will not be a quorum all afternoon. Even the full committee that reported out the bill is not here. No one is interested enough to listen to the debate. But with a dozen members in attendance you will vote this bill out and then apply to the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee with this bill—whip in hand—to demand the 651 last ship and the last tender and the last shore establishment this all-inclusive program provides.

The only way you will ever get one-tenth of the Members of the House to take an interest in this bill or vote on this bill will be to make a point of no quorum.

There will eventually be a time and a need for this bill. But not now, with the meagre information available. Why not defer it until it can be passed upon informatively and with deliberation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the last speaker possibly explained the reason why this resolution, which the rule makes in order, is an innovation in this type of legislative procedure. The Congress expresses itself in four ways: First, by a simple resolution affecting the affairs of one body of the Congress; second, by a concurrent resolution affecting the affairs of both branches of the Congress; third, by a bill, which when passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President, or passed over his veto, becomes a law; and, fourth, by a joint resolution which has the same force and effect as a bill and becomes law in exactly the same way.

This resolution, as has been stated, expresses merely a hope, a thought, and a conclusion of Congress. It is based upon a premise, which is included in a number of "whereases" preceding the resolving part of the resolution. Those "whereases" contain, in condensed form, all that has been said or will be said in this debate as to the reasons why this action should be taken at this time. You will notice the resolving clause of the resolution states:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Navy of the United States should consist of ships of not less than the types and numbers.

Therefore, this resolution has no vitality, no force or effect other than the expression of the momentary judgment of the Congress. It is difficult at this time for the Congress to fix the exact number, the exact size, the exact tonnage, and the various types of ships that are to compose our Navy in the years ahead, but, inasmuch as this resolution is merely an expression or a hope, it can have no legal effect.

Remember, this is not an authorization for appropriations. If this bill passes the House and the Senate it will not limit the Appropriations Committee as to the amount of money that may be appropriated or recommended by the Appropriations Committee at any time. On the other hand it might be an encouragement and an invitation to the Appropriations Committee to include in its naval bill items not authorized by law, and then that committee would come before the Rules Committee and ask for a rule waiving points of order against the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that everything set out in the resolution and everything that is set out in the committee report has been authorized by law except in reference to acquisition of islands that were Japanese mandated.

Mr. MICHENER. I am not on the Naval Affairs Committee and I am not an expert. What I learn is from what I have generally observed in connection with what the distinguished chairman

of the Naval Affairs Committee, who has just interrogated me, states, and who knows as much about the Navy as any living man. But I do know that there was a lot of money authorized for the building of a navy and for other purposes in contemplation of carrying on the war for another year.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. May I say to the gentleman that we are confronted with a rather extraordinary situation. Usually when the Congress authorizes naval strength it is for the purpose of later authorizing construction; but we already have this construction today. There is no authorization for new ships. We have this construction. We are merely giving the Navy a guide to what we think should be used in our Navy and also giving them a guide they can follow for the speedy demobilization of these boys whom we want to get out of the service.

Mr. MICHENER. That is true, but under existing law the Navy must first declare all property surplus, which the Navy feels it does not need. It has the option. After such declaration, then the responsibility for the disposition of this surplus shipping rolls over to another agency, so that I do not think that cuts much figure in connection with what is presently before the House.

I am going to vote for this rule, but I want the House to know that I know I am voting for a sterilized proposal.

Of course, there is another thing. It might possibly be, and I do not speak with any information or authority, it is thought by the administration that the enactment of this bill will be helpful in our foreign relations, because it might indicate to other nations that must also furnish navies to keep the peace of the world that the United States of America has already determined to keep this size of navy.

It might have that kind of an effect, but outside of the things I have suggested, I cannot for the life of me understand why we should bring in a concurrent resolution dealing with a great navy, which resolution does not mean anything. We must have a great navy, and I am for the present, and any other navy that is necessary for the national protection, but I believe that mandatory, law, not innocuous platitudes will best provide that navy.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think I understand what the gentleman means, but I am not quite sure. I think I go along with the gentleman, however, on the fact that I do not know just what this thing is all about. Certainly we all forgive sin and we are for the Ten Commandments, and anybody could endorse the first three paragraphs of this resolution, and we all know that the Constitution provides that it is our responsibility to maintain an army and navy, and so forth. Then we find this language:

> Whereas it is necessary for the Congress to determine the size of the immediate postwar navy.

What is the immediate postwar Navy? What do you mean by "immediate postwar Navy?" Does it mean this month or next month or 3 months from now or 6 months from now?

Mr. MICHENER. I am not in a position to state, but my best judgment is that the immediate postwar Navy is all the navy we now have excepting such part thereof as the Navy authorities determine to declare surplus and not needed.

Mr. RIZLEY. Then going down the resolution a little further, if the gentleman will yield, it says:

> That it is the sense of Congress that the Navy of the United States—

I suppose that is the immediate postwar Navy—

> should consist of ships of not less than the following types and numbers.

In view of all that we read in the press, at least about experiments that are going to be made soon, how can the gentleman today say whether we need the following types and numbers of ships for an immediate postwar Navy? How can anybody determine that?

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan will not attempt to answer that question. This rule will pass without opposition.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is on the Committee on Rules and I am not, but I would like to have some information.

Mr. MICHENER. The members of the Committee on Rules do not know any more about the details than the gentleman from Oklahoma does, but we do know about the procedure, and we do have a right to surmise and to inquire.

Mr. RIZLEY. If the gentleman will just yield for one more second, I am not critical of the Committee on Rules. The gentleman says that nobody on the Committee on Rules, at least, knows any more about this than I do. Of course, I do not know anything about it. Is it not one of the functions of the Committee on Rules to give the House an inkling of what the legislation that is immediately coming up for the Congress to consider is all about?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Did the gentleman hear the able speech made by the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RIZLEY. I listened to it very carefully. I heard the explanation made by the gentleman from Missouri, but I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, whom we all admire, and who usually gets what he wants, as one Member of this House this thing at this time just does not make sense to me.

Mr. MICHENER. In answer to the gentleman's question, it is not the function of the Committee on Rules to attend all the hearings before legislative committees, to read all the hearings—if they happen to be printed—and to know all about the bill so that the committee may come into the House and within 1 hour completely explain the bill. It is the function of the Committee on Rules to make it possible that a bill may be taken from the calendar and brought to the floor, where it may have the consideration of the House, under the guidance and with the information of the legislative committee which thoroughly understands the bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. I believe the gentleman ought to go a little further. He says it is the function of the committee to bring out a bill so that it can be considered by the House. Sometimes the function of the Committee on Rules seems to be not to bring a bill out so it can be considered by the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, that is true. The Committee on Rules ofttimes finds that there is other legislation on the calendar which should be brought up under the rules of the House in preference to that for which the rule is asked.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman, a member of the Committee on Rules, feel that it would be in order to designate the number of personnel to handle the size and the purpose and number of the ships we are about to suggest in this pious resolution?

Mr. MICHENER. I think this pious resolution will be subject to amendment. After we have talked piously for 4 hours as to what things ought to be and what we would like, then an opportunity will be given to offer amendments that will make the resolution mean something.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Can the gentleman advise us how many men it will take to operate the Navy suggested here?

Mr. MICHENER. I have no idea. I am going to get that information from the gentleman from Georgia and the Republican members of the committee in the debate on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the rule bringing this concurrent resolution before the House. I am also in favor of the resolution itself.

I have great respect for the knowledge and judgment of the gentleman who has just preceded me, but I cannot go the full way in agreeing with his opinion of this resolution. I believe this resolution does do a very important and definite thing. I believe it does have value.

The Congress of the United States does have the responsibility of fixing the size of the Army and the Navy, as well as for maintaining the Army and the Navy and for obtaining the men needed therefor. Certainly it is not only the right but it is also the responsibility and the duty of

the Congress in a time like this to express its opinion as to what the size of the postwar Navy should be, and by such an expression to guide, during these critical days, the officials of the Navy Department and the officers of the Navy in demobilizing, in laying up ships, and in preparing for the postwar period.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman's observation is correct. This is something more than a pious resolution. This is a concurrent resolution, which is the voice of both branches of Congress. We have the ships already built. This is a direction to the Navy Department. The Navy Department would follow the direction of the Congress. If the Department decided later to change, it would come back to the Congress for legislative action.

Further, this provides for three different categories of vessels—those naval vessels in the active service, those in the limited or ready reserve, and those in the inactive reserve.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not something even more than that? Is it not notice to all the world that we are about ready to quit fooling?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I believe there is something to your statement. But I remember very distinctly, when I was younger than I am now, that another administration, after the close of the First World War, did sink and destroy a great portion of our fleet. I wonder just what many Members of Congress would have to say if we took no action such as this and then perhaps the Navy Department or the administration, the President or someone else, as we sat idly by, would decide to destroy this Navy, or sink a great portion of it, or do away with it, because the Congress, the representatives of the people, had failed to express any opinion or to fix any policy whatsoever as to the type or size of the Navy we should have in the postwar world. I, for one, do not want to see that happen. I think it is our duty, as I said a moment ago, and our reseponsibility as well as our right, to say to the executive branch of the Government and the Navy Department, "We, the Congress of the United States, representing the American people, deem it is wise in the postwar period, in the months and years immediately following this war, that we not reduce our Navy below a certain point or a certain size. We, after all, have a responsibility for the proper protection and defense of this country."

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Supplementing the gentleman's remarks, does not the gentleman also think that it serves notice wherever notice should be served that we do not intend to make the mistake of scrapping our Navy while the rest of the world arms itself, as we did after World War I?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think that is exactly the same point which was made by the gentleman from Michigan. I agree with you. I believe that perhaps such is one of the purposes. But, after all, it is our responsibility to fix the size of the Navy for the guidance of our own executive and administrative officials.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five more minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I think this is a sort of peculiar proposition that you put up here, that this concurrent resolution is being passed to forestall the possibility of sinking our Navy. Who sank our Navy the last time? Was it not the Congress of the United States?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; it was not the Congress, directly. I am very sorry to say that it was our own party administration. I regretted it at the time. It was following an international conference in which we agreed to sink our ships and other nations agreed to tear up their blueprints. The agreement made at this conference was, I believe, finally put in treaty form and ratified by another body of the Congress. The House had nothing to do with it. I did not agree with the leadership of my own party at that time, and I opposed the action. I believed then that it was wrong. I believe that since that time the great majority of the American people have been convinced that a mistake was made.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman think there is any real danger here of a program of that sort being carried out again? I myself cannot accept the proposition that this resolution is for the purpose of forestalling an action of that kind.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope there is no real danger of it. I do not say that this action is only for the purpose of forestalling that. Instead, I say that this action is taken in order to give direction to the Navy Department. The gentleman who addresses me has a well-earned and a well-deserved reputation for believing in and practicing governmental economy. Certainly, this resolution may be conducive of economy. It tells the Secretary of the Navy and the officers of the Navy that we do not want to keep all the ships we have now; that we do not want to maintain a wartime Navy, but instead want to limit it, and have a Navy of but a certain size. Of course, that is something which works both ways.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. There are no estimates in this resolution. I am for a large navy, larger than we had before the beginning of this war. But I just do not understand the idea of this resolution being passed to forestall the possibility of sinking our Navy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will read the resolution again he will note there are some estimates and figures given here, and some definite limitations, which provide we shall not reduce the Navy below a certain size or below a certain number of ships. I ask the gentleman to remember that we already have those ships. They are already constructed. They are in commission. We are simply saying, "You cannot decommission certain ships. You can lay up other ships from this Navy that we now have, within certain limitations, but you shall go thus far and no further."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What number of men will this program require?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The best information I have received, from questions submitted in the Rules Committee, is that it will take approximately 500,000 enlisted men and 53,000 or 54,000 officers.

I want to remind the gentleman this resolution also has something to do with demobilization. It is rather difficult for the Navy Department to demobilize a wartime Navy unless the Department knows what the demands of the Congress and the people are going to be as to the need for, and size of, a postwar Navy.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield

Mr. MICHENER. That is just my point, that this resolution does not do what the gentleman wants done. This resolution simply expresses a hope on the part of Congress, I am sure the gentleman will agree with me, that the future Navy shall consist of the numbers named in the resolution. I would like to put H. R. at the top of this resolution and make it a bill and say, "Thou shall" and not that you hope.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman will have an opportunity to offer that as an amendment to make it a joint resolution instead of a concurrent resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman knows he would like it but he knows he could not get it through.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, the gentleman is clearly mistaken. I accept the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This resolution does not have the effect of binding statutory law. Yet this resolution is brought in by a regularly constituted standing committee of this House which has the duty and responsibility of advising the House on naval affairs and on matters pertaining to our naval operations. This committee has given to the House and to the Congress the benefit of its long years of experience, its investigations, its studies, its knowledge of naval affairs. In recognition of this duty and responsibility the committee has brought this measure before the House, expressing its studied opinion as to what the postwar Navy should be. I believe the Naval Affairs Committee has acted wisely and well. Certainly if there is any committee in the House that does have the knowledge which the rest of us need, as to the size of the Navy we should have, it is the Naval Affairs Committee.

I commend the committee for bringing this resolution before the Congress, and I expect to support their action by my vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all are in favor of maintaining a strong postwar Navy. We must also have a strong Air Force if we are to have a strong Navy. Air power means aluminum for aircraft. I desire to discuss in this connection our aluminum production facilities. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 1945, I addressed the House on the problems connected with the disposition of federally owned light metal plants. My own conclusions were worked out before any of the agency reports were submitted to the Congress. These conclusions were the product of my own investigations. As a result of the extended hearings of the Senate Small Business Committee, substantial factual information is now available. Also, pursuant to the Surplus Property and Reconversion Acts of 1944, the Attorney General and the Surplus Property Administrator have submitted factual reports to the Congress. A good many of the recommendations in these three reports were included in my previous discussion and need not be restated at this time. My purpose today is to stress points developed by the joint Senate committee hearings of October 15 to 19, 1945, and not to repeat points previously discussed.

Initially I want to emphasize the fact that in this approach I am only concerned with maintaining in production these light metal plants in order to preserve the Government's investment and build up our own aluminum industry in the United States. Alcoa, if the highest bidder, should be permitted to secure a part of these facilities if this can be done in the public interest and within the framework of the policy laws passed by Congress and the decisions of the courts. However, since it is now evident that the solution of the disposition problem will need additional congressional action, I am stating facts as they now appear in the light of existing laws. In order to maintain employment and preserve the properties, they should be kept in operation and disposition made of them at the earliest date possible consistent with the public interest.

In order to supplement the three reports to Congress to which I have referred, hearings were held on the other side of the Capitol by the Senate Military Affairs Subcommittee, the Senate Special Committee on Postwar Policies, and the Senate Special Committee on Small Business, between October 15 and 19, inclusive. These hearings brought out a large amount of substantial factual information which should be in the hands of every Member of Congress. The Surplus Property Administrator, in concluding his report, said: "The Surplus Property Administrator recognizes that conditions beyond his control may make this program (program covered in his submitted report) impossible of accomplishment." The hearings disclose that before adequate disposition of these Federal plants can be made, supplemental legislation may be necessary. Under the law the Congress had only 30 days to act on the Surplus Property Administrator's report from the date of its submission to Congress. A resolution was offered and passed in the Senate and sent to the House extending this time 30 days, which means that within the 30 days provided in this act when adopted, Congress must decide the ultimate disposition of the Federally owned light metal plants. If an adequate solution of the reconversion problem is to be had, a decision must be quickly made by the Congress. With this decision before us, Mr. Speaker, I feel it necessary to supplement my previous review and to stress the important considerations developed in the Senate hearings.

Congress has now before it complete reports submitted by the Senate Special Small Business Committee, the Attorney General and the Surplus Property Administrator. These reports should be considered in the light of testimony submitted before the Senate Joint Committee. The issue of monopoly has been brought to the front by the decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, which is the Court of Last Resort in this instance. The aluminum decision is covered in an opinion dated March 12, 1945. This decision held, in effect, that Alcoa was a monopoly in the field of primary aluminum production before the Federal plants were built. Final decision of the court, however, was deferred until such time as Congress settles whether effective competition will result from the disposition of the Federally owned plants. It is, therefore, apparent that adequate and prompt action is necessary for the disposition of the plants within the mandate of the court. The matter resolves itself into a decision for the disposal of the plants so as to create helpful industrial competition and opportunities for small business as well as large, so that the aluminum industry in the United States may prosper and expand.

Congress should approach this situation entirely from factual considerations and not from the standpoint of theory, in such a way as not to interfere with "free enterprise."

If the federally owned plants, some or all of which are now shut down, are allowed to remain idle for any length of time, the working staffs will disintegrate and the Nation will lose the benefits of production and employment and the plants themselves will greatly depreciate in value. Congress can fully maintain a free enterprise system by promoting a sound disposal policy based on wholesome competition. Unsound disposal will tend to undermine free enterprise. The possibility of successful competition rests with the $702,000,000 investment in Government-owned aluminum plants. I trust that the disposition of these key industrial, federally owned plants may be made promptly in such a way as to avoid creating a major controversial problem, in which event the door will be closed to reemployment for many thousands of veterans and industrial workers. Congress has legislated on basic policy and the courts have spoken. The implementing action, if any, must now rest with Congress.

If we are to approach reconversion from a sound standpoint, we must adopt implementing policies that will not lead to increasing the price of aluminum above the fair cost of production and the consequent curtailment of production and use. The previous policy of curtailed production, as I have commented on on numerous occasions, led this Nation into a dangerous situation in 1940, resulting in the lack of an adequate stock of ingot aluminum and an inadequate electrochemical and electrometallurgical plant capacity. Unless this condition is corrected, little opportunity will exist for the creation of full employment during the postwar years in this big industry essential both for war and peace, and we will again face an inadequate supply of aluminum for national defense in case of an emergency.

When Congress passed the Surplus Property Act of 1944, it instructed the Surplus Property Administration to dispose of this property in such a way as to give the maximum aid in the establishment of a peacetime economy of free independent enterprise, to stimulate full employment, to discourage monopolistic practices, to strengthen and preserve the competitive position of small business, to promote production and utilization of the productive capacity, and to use fully the natural resources of the country. These are sound objectives. No one can logically urge a change in such policies. Existing statutes clearly indicate the legislative intent. This intent is further clarified in section 19 of the Surplus Property Act, which provides that the Surplus Property Administrator shall make his report to the Congress before disposition, and that the disposal plan so submitted shall be "consistent with the policies and objective set out in this act." This has been done, but the concluding paragraph of the Surplus Property Administrator's report confirms the fact that supplemental legislation is needed before the stated objectives can be accomplished. Congress has reserved the right to pass on the Administrator's recommendations, and it should do so promptly.

The greatest obstacle to full employment is excessive prices and limited production when results from price-fixing rather than encouraging free competition with low prices and quantity production. Unwarranted high prices, as is well known, curtail production, reduce employment opportunities, and limit purchasing power thereby creating the unbalance between production and consumption.

The specific disposal alternatives now facing us with respect to these Federally-owned aluminum plants are as follows:

First. To lease or sell them to potential competitors in the aluminum production industry by affording equal opportunities to smaller operators.

Second. To lease or sell to Alcoa the plants, in whole or in part, if it is the best bidder and if it can be done so as to keep within the court's decision, avoid monopoly, and promote the best interests of the Government.

Third. To keep the plant gates locked and the plants idle. This will allow these

facilities to deteriorate, which means ultimately writing off the huge Federal investments and hamstringing the aluminum industry.

Fourth. To operate these plants through a governmental agency which, in the interest of free enterprise, is not desirable.

Obviously, in view of the decision of the court of last resort, Congress should not create a monopoly without repealing the Sherman Act. Likewise Congress should not legislate to keep the plants idle and it is not good policy to initiate governmental operations and put the Government in business.

Therefore, the only avenue left open is the sale or lease to Alcoa and its competitors under conditions that will afford equal and fair opportunities to all, prevent monopoly and protect the public interest. Thus far, according to the testimony, there has been no adequate bid for any of these plants without direct Government assistance. The Surplus Property Administrator has recommended disposition in a manner that amounts to subsidies, but the testimony has shown that he does not favor subsidies without congressional authorization. The RFC indicates that it desires to follow the same course. Therefore, the problem rests with the Congress unless other offers are received from responsible bidders. Many thousands of trained employees have been thrown out of employment by the shut-down arrangements made early in September. The hearings seem to indicate that this action was hasty and that the protection of the Government's rights and the operation of the plants could have been provided had the agencies in charge felt the pressing need for such action.

Previous to 1940 this Nation's annual productive aluminum capacity was about 350,000,000 pounds, all in private hands. From 1940 to date this capacity has been expanded sixfold. In 1940 Alcoa was the only American producer of primary aluminum. In 1941 Reynolds became a second producer, with a capacity of around 160,000,000 pounds annually.

During the war the Government, through the Defense Plant Corporation and RFC, has invested $739,000,000 in the aluminum industry, of which amount $34,000,000 represents loans by RFC. The balance represents direct investments in plants and facilities. The Government thereby has acquired ownership of 52 complete plants and equipment in some 37 privately owned plants. The Government's investment in plants requiring implementing congressional action amounts to $608,000,000. As a result the Government now owns over one-half of the wartime aluminum-plant capacity.

Any competitor necessarily faces a complex problem in addition to competing with a company with the resources and experience of Alcoa. In addition, sources of raw material are not presently readily accessible to prospective competitors but may be secured in time. Power resources and markets present difficulties to competition. Power is the most important cost element and the Government also owns much of the power sources, which are operated under laws passed before such a situation could be anticipated.

The program submitted by the Surplus Property Administrator follows section 19 of the Surplus Property Act. The Administrator is definitely committed by the Court decision to give competitors of Alcoa priority on leases or acquisitions. Under the court decision Alcoa could acquire certain facilities provided competition be maintained and on terms that would give no unfair competitive advantage to Alcoa. These are sound. In the hearings the War Department has indicated that national security demands that approximately half of the Federal capacity be maintained for emergency use. The Surplus Property Administrator, in these hearings, has also indicated that preference would be given to bidders on the basis of competence and the ability to maintain operations. The Administrator also proposed to fix rentals and prices on the basis of prospective earnings rather than on the basis of original or prewar cost valuations.

The hearings indicated also that under the law no authority presently exists for the Federal Government to purchase ingot. Stock piling is possible, but such stock piling has been confined to bauxite rather than the more practical material, aluminum. The law and the regulation should make lawful the stock piling of ingot instead of the bulky and perishable bauxite.

The Surplus Property Administrator proposes to make bauxite or alumina available to competitors. At the end of the hearings the vice president of Alcoa submitted such a proposal to the committee. In addition, Alcoa voluntarily went further than business has gone in the past by offering to submit to governmental regulations of raw material. This offer merits the fullest consideration.

In general, the recommendations covered by the Attorney General coincide with the approach of the Surplus Property Administrator and the Senate small business reports. In addition the Attorney General outlined a plan calling for the subdivision of Alcoa into independent operating companies. The Attorney General's suggestion is that the successor companies consist of operating plants and experienced employees and that Alcoa bauxite reserves be allocated among the newly created organizations. With this in view, the Attorney General's plan comprises the disposal of some of the Government-owned plants to the dissolved units and to new independent producers.

The Attorney General's recommendations are based on his conclusion that he and his staff feel that the only way to avoid heavy subsidization and provide competition is through reorganizing Alcoa.

The report of the Attorney General suggests investigation as to the possibility of relocating component plants with emphasis on placing fabricating facilities nearer the points of ingot production. I consider this a sound suggestion. The whole reconversion program is suffering from the unwise location of some of these plants by the War Production Board. Many of us in the Congress from the outset have protested against the unsound location that were being selected and have urged an integrated program in plant location.

Mr. Speaker, the Surplus Property Administrator makes the following three recommendations which should be adopted:

First. That the RFC investigate the engineering possibilities of adopting changes in plant layout to improve disposition capability to the end of recovering the largest possible part of the Government's investment.

Second. That the valuations of the various plants for sale and rental terms be adjusted by the RFC in line with earning power based on ability of each plant to compete successfully with other plants and to keep in operation.

Third. Equipment to be moved to more suitable locations at governmental expense provided such additional costs can be recovered.

To supplement such recommendations I would suggest the following policy additions:

First. The possibility of relocation for the purpose of minimizing transportation costs to areas where low-cost power is available. Low-cost power is the key to sound disposal and successful operation in aluminium production.

Second. The break-down of the oversized plants not salable into units that could be successfully used by small satellite industries.

Third. Investigation covering the creation of opportunities for small competitive business by using parts of this equipment in the aluminum-product field and other allied operations.

Fourth. The Surplus Property Administrator and the RFC should jointly make recommendations to Congress covering the exploration of bauxite reserves in the Pacific territory to enable producers to have free and equal acquisition rights to established reserves. Under present authorizations, such a procedure may not be accomplished without further legislation.

Fifth. It would be helpful if the Surplus Property Administrator and the RFC would report to Congress on what authorization is needed to promote Government-financed research in the aluminum field. This suggestion is not new as Government agencies are now rendering such services in other industries. The Surplus Property Administration and the RFC, under existing laws, do not have the requisite authority to promote or authorize research expansion activities.

Sixth. The Interstate Commerce Commission could aid the Congress on the relation of freight and ocean rates to plant location.

Seventh. Electric power costs studies should be submitted to the Congress by the Federal Power Commission, together with recommendations looking toward the equalization of electric power rates and terms where the Federal power investment will make compensating changes possible, providing rates to consumers based on cost of production and adequate amortization.

In the hearings some witnesses submitted memorandums on the effect of federally owned Colorado River power costs on aluminum production. I am in complete accord with the effort of this group to better their conditions and receive just power rates, but I am not in agreement with the inference that the rates in the Pacific Northwest should be elevated as long as existing rates cover cost of production and amortization of the Government's investment in the facilities.

The calculations submitted in the hearing should be considered with the official studies so the arithmetical and mechanical errors may be eliminated, which, I am sure, will lead to different conclusions than those submitted. It may be pointed out that California has oil and gas which Oregon and Washington do not have. The Northwest obviously is not in a position to, and should not ask California to raise its oil and gas prices because its neighboring States do not have this endowment and, therefore, must pay higher prices. By the same token, California has no right to ask that the natural advantages of the Northwest be ignored in fixing rates for power. There is nothing in the record or in law to uphold such a position in respect to the Northwest power rates. Bonneville power rates are based on law and the cost of production and will pay back the Government's investment. Bonneville stands on its own feet and should not be required to raise its adequate rates to bail out other Government projects of whatever kind or wherever situated.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] at the conclusion of my remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMPOSITION OF THE POSTWAR NAVY

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 80.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 80, with Mr. HARE in the chair.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the resolution may be printed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States the Congress is charged with the responsibility of providing and maintaining a Navy; and

Whereas the wars in which the United States has been engaged are now in the process of being brought to a successful close; and

Whereas it will not be necessary to retain for the Navy all of the ships, vessels, or craft now built, building, or authorized; and

Whereas it is necessary for the Congress to determine the size of the immediate postwar Navy giving due consideration to the security of the United States and its Territories and insular possessions, the protection of our commerce, and the necessity for cooperating with other world powers in the maintenance of peace; and

Whereas such immediate postwar Navy will require an adequate fleet and supporting aircraft, personnel, bases, and establishments: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Navy of the United States should consist of ships of the following types and numbers:

1. Three large aircraft carriers (42,000 tons), 24 aircraft carriers (27,000 tons), 10 light aircraft carriers (11,000 tons), 79 escort aircraft carriers, 18 battleships, 3 large cruisers, 31 heavy cruisers, 48 light cruisers, 367 destroyers, 296 escort destroyers, and 200 submarines.

2. That sufficient aircraft, auxiliary vessels, mine vessels, patrol vessels, landing craft, district craft, and drydocks should be maintained to support the above-enumerated fleet.

3. That adequate facilities to support the Navy should be maintained wherever necessary.

4. That sufficient personnel should be provided to adequately maintain and operate the Navy and that proper and adequate facilities be provided and maintained to fully train such personnel.

5. That ships, vessels, and craft enumerated above should be replaced unit for unit in accordance with existing law, or earlier if the development of weapons, or scientific research make such ship, vessel, or craft obsolete or obsolescent.

6. That an orderly shipbuilding and aircraft replacement program should be maintained.

7. That a progressive program of research and development in all fields of naval warfare be carried on and that an adequate organization and facilities for that purpose be maintained.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 11 to 15, inclusive, strike out all after the word "Navy" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in order to insure our national integrity, support our national policies, guard the continental United States and our overseas possessions, give protection to our commerce and citizens abroad, and to cooperate with other world powers in the maintenance of peace; and."

Page 2, line 3, insert after the words "of ships of" the following: "not less than."

Page 2, lines 5 to 6, inclusive, strike out the words in the parentheses "forty-two thousand tons" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "total tonnage approximately one hundred and thirty-five thousand."

Page 2, lines 6 to 7, inclusive, strike out the words in the parentheses "twenty-seven thousand tons" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "total tonnage approximately six hundred and fifty thousand four hundred."

Page 2, line 7, strike out the words in the parentheses "eleven thousand tons" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "total tonnage approximately one hundred and seventeen thousand."

Page 2, line 8, strike out the comma after the word "carriers" and add the following words in parentheses: total "(tonnage approximately seven hundred and twenty-five thousand),".

Page 2, line 8, strike out the comma after the word "battleships" and add the words in parentheses: "(total tonnage approximately six hundred and sixty-five thousand),".

Page 2, line 9, strike out the comma after the words "large cruisers" and add the following words in parentheses: "(total tonnage approximately eighty-two thousand five hundred),".

Page 2, line 9, strike out the comma after the words "heavy cruisers" and add the following words in parentheses: "(total tonnage approximately four hundred and three thousand),".

Page 2, line 10, strike out the comma after the word "cruisers" and add the following words in parentheses: "(total tonnage approximately four hundred and fifty thousand),".

Page 2, line 10, strike out the comma after the word "destroyers" and add the following words in parentheses: "(total tonnage approximately seven hundred and sixty thousand),".

Page 2, line 10, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "three."

Page 2, line 11, strike out the words "and ninety-six."

Page 2, line 11, strike out the comma after the word "destroyers" and add the following words in parentheses: "(total tonnage approximately three hundred and eighty-seven thousand),".

Page 2, line 11, strike out the words "two hundred" and insert the words "one hundred and ninety-nine."

Page 2, line 12, strike out the period after the word "submarines" and add the following words: "(total tonnage approximately three hundred fourteen thousand), aggregate tonnage, all types, approximately four million six hundred and ninety-eight thousand nine hundred."

Page 2, line 16, after the word "facilities", insert the words ", including bases,".

Page 3, line 1, strike out the words "unit for unit."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the time has come when we must reach a clear-cut decision as to the size and composition of the postwar Navy. By unanimous vote the Committee on Naval Affairs has reported out favorably for your consideration House Concurrent Resolution 80, to express the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy.

This resolution is our proposal for that clear-cut decision by the Congress as to the size of Navy the country should have in peacetime.

At the outset I want to emphasize certain basic points, which are the very heart of the resolution:

First. This is a concurrent resolution. As such it is not legislation but rather a means of expressing the opinion of Congress. Its purpose is to give the Navy Department a congressional-approved blueprint on the size of the postwar Navy.

Second. Neither authorization nor appropriation is involved in this resolution. This is not a building program. The resolution is concerned only with the

ships, aircraft, and facilities that we have now or in the process of being built.

Third. The resolution proposes a small, powerful, and modern active fleet. The active fleet will be backed up by a large reserve that can be mobilized on short notice. The aim is national security at the lowest cost.

Fourth. The fleet proposed by the resolution gives proper emphasis and recognition to aircraft carriers.

Fifth. This resolution recognizes that the mission of the Navy is to control the sea and the air above it, and to keep the enemy as far away from our shores as possible. The resolution provides a postwar plan for first, ships; second, aircraft; third, bases; and fourth, facilities. It is a blueprint in detail, as you will see from the report. The committee is asking Congress to subscribe to that blueprint by passing this concurrent resolution.

OBJECTIVE AND EFFECT OF RESOLUTION

This resolution provides a means of expressing the opinion of Congress as to the postwar Navy. It is a magna charta of Congress against any repetition of the tragic scuttling of our Navy back in the twenties.

This resolution is in keeping with section 8 of the Constitution, which vests in Congress the function not only of providing, but also of maintaining a Navy. What the size of the postwar Navy should be and what we should do with our ships is to be decided by Congress and by Congress alone.

In making that decision we seek, and give great weight to, the advice of the Navy Department. This, the committee has done, for the resolution represents the considered judgment of the Navy Department, bearing in mind not only national security but also the costs of operation.

With the passage of this resolution, the Congress will have accepted its responsibility to first, those who gave their lives that America might remain free and strong, and to second, those who paid for and built the greatest Navy in the history of the world.

As I stated, this resolution is not an appropriation—it is not a building program. It merely proposes what the committee and the Navy Department consider to be the best use and disposition of the ships, aircraft and facilities already built or nearly completed. The standard for this consideration is adequate preparedness at reasonable cost.

But the resolution will serve as a guide to Congress in making future appropriations. It will also serve as a guide to the Navy Department. The Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations assured the committee that this resolution, if passed, would be considered as binding upon the Navy Department.

REASONS FOR THE PROPOSED POSTWAR NAVY

There are two fundamental reasons why we should maintain a strong Navy. First, we have paid dearly to learn that the means to wage war must be in the hands of those who hate war. As President Truman said last week:

> For years to come the success of our efforts for a just and lasting peace will depend upon the strength of those who are determined to maintain the peace. * * * We must face the fact that peace must be built upon power, as well as upon good will and good deeds. * * * In our desire to leave the tragedy of war behind us, we must not make the same mistake that we made after the First World War, when we quickly sank back into helplessness.

By passing this resolution the Congress will prevent any repetition of the scuttling of the Navy as was done after World War I.

As George Washington wisely stated to Congress more than 150 years ago:

> If we desire to secure peace * * * it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

We all know how tragically disarmament failed.

Second, the Navy is a major component of the required strength, for the key to victory and to the freedom of this country will be in the control of the seas and the air above them. This control is the mission of the Navy.

EFFECT OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

To those who claim that the atomic bomb has eliminated the necessity of armies and navies, I cite the statement of President Truman to Congress:

> Even the atomic bomb would have been useless to us unless we had developed a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force with which to beat off the attacks of our foe, and then fight our way to points within striking distance of the heart of the enemy. * * * The answer is clear that the atomic bomb is of little value without an adequate army, air, and naval force. For that kind of force is necessary to protect our shores, to overcome any attack, and to enable us to move forward and direct the bomb against the enemy's own territory.

In this connection, the Secretary of the Navy stated:

> The limitations and uncertainties, which at this state of its development surround the atomic bomb * * * are such that, if we were to give away our fleet and rely wholly on the bomb, we would lose control of the sea.

For emphasis, I repeat that the mission of the United States Navy is to control the seas, which are important to our security, by whatever weapons are most effective. As yet there is no indication that the control of the seas can be effected with atomic bombs to the exclusion of a navy.

No one knows the ultimate effect of atomic power and rocket propulsion on navies as we now conceive them. Any present conclusion is no more than a guess and mere speculation.

But I have proposed that we stop guessing, speculating, and indulging in scientific theory. I have proposed that we make practical tests. I have proposed that full tests, surface and submarine, of the atomic bomb be made on captured German and Japanese ships and our own obsolete vessels. The Navy Department has unhesitatingly agreed to make such tests.

The results of these tests may necessitate new types of ships, but we can neither abandon nor revolutionize the Navy on theory and untested conclusions. I repeat, the atomic bomb may change the type of ships in our Navy, but it does not affect the mission of the Navy to control the sea and the air above the sea.

I call your attention to the Navy Day speech of the President, in which he stated:

> There has been talk about the atomic bomb scrapping all navies, armies, and air forces. For the present, I think that such talk is 100 percent wrong. Today control of the seas rests in the fleets of the United States and her allies. There is no substitute for them. We have learned the bitter lesson that the weakness of this great Republic invites men of ill-will to shake the very foundations of civilization all over the world.
>
> What the distant future of atomic research will bring to the fleet which we honor today, no one can foretell. But the fundamental mission of the Navy has not changed. Control of our sea approaches and of the skies above them is still the key to our freedom and to our ability to help enforce the peace of the world. No enemy will ever strike us directly except across the sea. We cannot reach out to help stop and defeat an aggressor without crossing the sea. Therefore, the Navy, armed with whatever weapons science brings forth, is still dedicated to its historic task: Control of the ocean approaches to our country and of the skies above them.

SIZE OF THE POSTWAR NAVY

The size of the postwar Navy is determined by two factors:

First. The necessity for security, and second, the economic ability and justification for the maintenance and operation of the determined size of the Navy.

Another way of stating the first factor, the necessity for security, is the naval strength that is required to support the national policy. The national policy imposes three principal tasks upon the mission of the Navy:

First. The security of the continental United States and its overseas possessions.

Second. The security of the Western Hemisphere as dictated by the Monroe Doctrine and the Act of Chapultepec.

Third. The commitments of the United States to participate in the maintenance of world peace.

The third task is the least well defined. It will be, until the international peace organization in turn defines the participation of this Nation and other nations in the maintenance of world peace.

Ocean areas over which this country must retain and maintain undisputed control are: First, the western part of the North and South Atlantic Oceans and second, the entire Pacific Ocean. Scientific developments have so shrunken these oceans as to transform them from natural defenses to vulnerable areas that must be occupied and patroled.

Although her army and air force were stronger at the time of her surrender than at the beginning of the war, Japan was defeated even before the land invasion of her homeland. There is no more eloquent example of the weakness of a nation that does not control its surrounding waters.

This was unprecedented in martial history and more than ever proved the importance of sea power—a new type of sea power that means control over the air above the sea, as well as on and under the sea. It also forcefully demonstrated

that as science shrinks space it extends the concept of "surrounding waters" from the shores of our country.

The necessary strength of the Navy for the discharge of these three tasks can never be answered with finality and will always depend upon the "blood pressure of the international community.

With the complete defeat of our enemies, there is no longer need to maintain the Navy at its wartime peak of strength. It is the solemn duty of the Congress to prune the size of the Navy to the safest minimum—but not to such a false economy as to impair the national security.

Reductions of expenditures and speedy releases of personnel must be made immediately. This resolution is designed to accelerate the realization of these objectives.

At the end of the war the Navy was composed of 1,304 combatant ships and 10,292 auxiliaries, making a grand total of 11,596 ships and craft. The proposed postwar Navy, as called for by the resolution, will be composed of 1,082 combatant ships and 5,002 auxiliaries, or a grand total of 6,084 ships and craft—see table on pages 7 and 8 of the report. This means that there would be 222 surplus combatant vessels and 5,512 surplus auxiliaries. I invite your attention to the table on page 8 of the committee's report.

Let me digress at this point and say that the Navy Department under the law cannot dispose of these 222 combatant ships except in one of two ways. They have either to be classified as unfit for duty under the act of 1882 or else their disposition must be specifically authorized by the Congress. But with reference to these 5,290 surplus auxiliaries, the Navy Department tomorrow morning can certify them to the Surplus Property Administrator and he can dispose of them without Congress having a voice in it. If the Members want to see what ships are going to be classified as surplus, they can look in the report on page 8 and they will find the list.

PROPOSED COMPONENTS OF THE POSTWAR FLEET

Obviously, the peacetime task of the Navy does not require that the reduced fleet of 6,084 be maintained in full commission. On the other hand, we might conceivably wish at some time in the near future to muster our full naval strength. To this end, the present plans divide the postwar fleet into three components: First, an active fleet; second, a ready reserve; and third, a laid-up reserve. The active fleet would constitute 30 percent of the proposed postwar fleet, the ready reserve 10 percent, and the laid-up reserve 60 percent.

Plans of the Navy Department provide for a small, compact, active fleet backed up by a large reserve that in time of emergency can be quickly mobilized. The objective of this division is to cut the cost of maintenance and operation and yet be able to muster our full naval strength quickly in an emergency.

By this plan we will avoid engaging in a wholesale scrapping of the world's greatest navy. It is the economical way to handle it and at the same time insure national security.

The proposed postwar active fleet would consist of 297 major combatant ships and 1,375 auxiliaries. It would have a permanent striking carrier-based air force of 1,023 planes. The ready reserve would consist of 104 major combatant ships and 2,209 auxiliaries. The land-up reserve would consist of 681 major combatant ships and 1,418 auxiliaries. This makes 1,082 combatant ships and 5,002 auxiliaries. I call your attention to the tables on pages 8 and 9 of the report.

Manning the proposed postwar Navy will require 13,164 officers and 213,172 enlisted men for the active fleet with its 70 percent complement, 2,033 officers and 30,828 enlisted men for the ready reserve, and 2,038 officers and 23,300 enlisted men for the laid-up reserve. I call your attention to page 29 of the report.

SMALL ACTIVE FLEET

To accurately appraise the operation of the postwar Navy, attention must be focused on the small active fleet of 297 major combatant vessels and 1,375 auxiliaries that is proposed.

This small active fleet is faster and incomparably stronger in firepower and aviation than the pre-Pearl Harbor fleet. It is modern, for all of the ships have been built within the last few years. The picture is even more graphic in the comparison of the combatant vessels of the pre-Pearl Harbor peacetime fleet to those of the postwar peacetime active fleet.

The pre-Pearl Harbor combatant fleet consisted of 345 combatant vessels as compared to the proposed postwar active fleet of only 297 combatant vessels. However, the tonnage of the combatant vessels of the proposed postwar active fleet will be greater than that of the pre-Pearl Harbor fleet—more than 1,750,000 tons as compared to approximately 1,400,000 tons for the pre-Pearl Harbor peacetime fleet.

In other words, the proposed active postwar fleet would be smaller in numbers than the pre-Pearl Harbor fleet—see the table on page 9 of the report—but faster, incomparably stronger, and actually larger in tonnage.

ROLE OF AIR POWER

Let there be no mistake about the role of air power and carriers in the proposed postwar Navy. The fleet will be built around the carrier, for one of the main functions of the other combatant vessels will be to protect the carrier. This is evident from the fact that 116 aircraft carriers are proposed for the postwar Navy as contrasted to 18 battleships and 3 large cruisers. The aircraft strength will be around 12,000 planes with about 8,000 of them in full active-duty status.

These carriers will bristle with about 5,400 planes when called to full force in emergency. About 17,259 aviators will be required.

RESERVE FLEETS

The "ready reserve" ships would be in reduced commission and used to train midshipmen and naval reservists. They could be made ready for service within 30 days. As I have already pointed out, this ready reserve will consist of 104 major combatant ships, 2,209 auxiliaries, and 32,861 officers and men. For a break-down of the types of vessels I invite your attention to the table on pages 7 and 8 of the report; for the distribution of personnel, to page 29 of the report.

The proposed "laid-up reserve" is a new element in our system of national preparedness. These ships would be wholly out of commission, tied up, and with only caretaker crews aboard, but ready on short notice to join the first-line battle fleet. As I have already stated, the laid-up reserve will consist of 681 combatant ships, 1,418 auxiliaries, and 25,338 officers and men.

The existence of a laid-up reserve would give this country the ability to flex its strength quickly in an emergency. It would provide cheap insurance as its annual preservation cost would be only one-tenth of 1 percent of the original cost of the ships.

The combination of the various operating groups will, of course, from time to time, be varied; but the principal operating groups will be built around the principles of powerful striking groups composed of carriers, battleships, cruisers, and destroyers.

These powerful task forces can strike hard and quickly wherever they may be needed. These formations have proved themselves in the war against Japan—to make effective strikes at great distances from their bases and yet defend themselves in enemy area.

I want to call your attention to a table on page 1190 of the committee's hearing on this resolution. This table gives a naval comparison of our proposed postwar combatant fleet to the combatant fleet of the British Empire. The proposed postwar active fleet of this country would be only 297 combatant ships as compared to the British combatant fleet of 594. In other words, our proposed postwar active fleet of combatant vessels would be only one-half the size of the present British combatant fleet. It is obvious that England, so dependent upon maritime trade, will not materially reduce her present combatant fleet.

CRUX OF THE RESOLUTION

This is the crux of the resolution before you. We do not want to maintain the full wartime fleet because the huge expense would not be justified. We must then determine what is the bare minimum of the active fleet that we must maintain for the security of this Nation. Having made that determination, we must decide what to do with the many ships not included in the active fleet.

This places the responsibility upon Congress to choose between scrapping those ships outside of the active fleet or placing them in reserve. We tried scrapping after the First World War. It failed miserably. By this resolution the committee proposes that we place these ships in reserve because this tremendous reserve will make the United States Navy greater than the combined navies of all other nations of the world.

In other words, whenever the critical emergency arises, our great strength will be in our vast reserve and we will not be caught short-handed as we were after

the First World War by making the mistake of scrapping our ships.

The decision for Congress today is clear. Either scrap the magnificent fleet that has been built, or put it in reserve—a reserve the existence of which will do much to maintain the peace of the world.

The Congress has already underwritten the policy of establishing a reserve fleet by having appropriated in the last appropriation bill $20,000,000 for the storage, tying-up, berthing, and preservation of ships in reserve. This amount was increased with the transfer of $65,000,000 from the public-works projects of the Navy to the Bureau of Ships for the care of ships held in reserve. See table on page 17 of the report for list of the berthing sites.

PROPOSED PERMANENT SHORE ESTABLISHMENTS

What I have just said pertains to the composition of the fleet and the forces afloat. I now turn to the shore establishments.

The permanent shore establishments planned for the postwar Navy include: first, bases; second, air stations; third, shipyards; fourth, industrial activities; fifth, berthing sites; sixth, ordnance plants and depots; seventh, laboratories; eighth, supply depots; ninth, hospitals; and tenth, training establishments. An examination of the committee's report shows that we have gone into minute detail to inform the Members of Congress of the naval facilities planned for retention and for which they will have to vote appropriations.

PROPOSED POSTWAR BASES

Postwar bases in five fleet operation areas adjacent to the continental United States are planned—two areas on the Atlantic Coast and three areas on the Pacific Coast. Supplementing the major fleet bases will be 10 smaller bases. For the specific sites of the proposed bases I call your attention to page 10 of the committee's report.

Present plans for postwar outlying bases are subject to action by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the State Department in connection with the United Nations Security Council. However, the Navy Department has listed the following types and numbers of postwar outlying bases, a total of 40, which are listed on page 10 of the committee's report:

Pacific area:	
Regular operation	12
Reduced	10
Caretaker-emergency	5
Total Pacific bases	27
Atlantic area:	
Regular operation	6
Maintenance	1
Caretaker	6
Total Atlantic bases	13

Many of these outlying bases were liberated and acquired through the blood of our armed forces and through vast expenditures. They are absolutely essential to the security of this country.

Members of the Naval Affairs Committee are unanimous in their determination to see that everything is done to keep these island bases, so costly in capture and so essential to our security, and not to permit them to pass from the control of this country—the Nation looked to by the world to maintain peace in the Pacific.

INDUSTRIAL PLANTS

The Navy Department has designated 184 industrial plants and shipyards, costing $919,586,000 and used by contractors in performing their war contracts, which it considers to be surplus. For the list of these plants I invite your attention to pages 22–26 of the report. It is the policy of the Department, as far as practicable, to attach an emergency-availability condition to the sale or lease of these industrial facilities. This is to preserve, as far as possible, the going-concern assets of land, buildings, equipment, skilled manpower, and industrial know-how in readiness in the event of need.

It is preferred to have these plants sold or leased for civilian use under these specific arrangements. Failing this, consideration will then be given to their retention in stand-by. The remainder the Navy Department is considering for storage purposes, but only when there is no industrial use or need for the facilities to support the fleet. For a list of these, see pages 28 and 29 of the report.

In addition to these complete plants which the Navy has, there are also $780,553,000 of scrambled facilities and $213,258,000 of machine tools and equipment furnished contractors where the land and buildings used for war production are privately owned. Few of these facilities will be retained. Most of them will be declared surplus and disposed of.

Cognizance of industrial plants is lodged principally in three Bureaus—Aeronautics, Ships, and Ordnance. Their respective degrees of reliance on private industry operation greatly determine the permanent retention of facilities and the declaration of surpluses.

Because it has never relied in any substantial way upon its own manufacturing facilities for fulfilling its needs, the Bureau of Aeronautics, except in only three instances, does not intend to retain as a part of the permanent Shore Establishment any of the industrial facilities which it sponsored during the war.

In contrast, the Bureau of Ordnance plans to rely on its permanent establishment as its first source of production in case of another emergency and then supplement this capacity insofar as this may be required and practicable by reconversion to war use of privately owned facilities.

The policy of the Bureau of Ships is between these two contrasts of Aeronautics and Ordnance, with the objective being the preservation of enough plants and shipyards, which, added to its permanent establishment, will comply with the demands of national security.

AVIATION FACILITIES

The peacetime goal of major naval aviation facilities is 97 establishments in the continental United States, of three types: First, air stations; second, auxiliary air stations; and, third, air facilities. Not included in these categories, but included in the total of 97, are 1 naval aviation gunnery school and 1 naval aviation material center. A list of these facilities is set forth on pages 11–13 of the report. This peacetime goal represents a reduction of about one-half of the maximum number of 177 major aviation facilities during the war period. However, it is more than twice the 43 facilities of December 1941.

The 97 aviation establishments desired for permanent maintenance are broken down into 39 naval air stations, 33 naval auxiliary air stations, 8 naval air facilities, 1 naval air material center, 1 naval air gunnery school, 10 Marine Corps air stations, and 5 Marine Corps auxiliary air stations. These major facilities planned can support the operations envisioned and at the same time provide a flexible and readily expandable nucleus capable of meeting any emergency. In addition, 92 outlying and satellite Navy-controlled fields are desired by the Navy for retention from the total of 325 that were required to support the wartime load.

As of August 14, 1945, the Government had a financial interest in 136 privately operated industrial facilities sponsored by the Bureau of Aeronautics. Of this number only 21 may be required, in whole or in part, to supply the Navy's postwar aircraft production requirements. The disposal of the remaining 115 excess facilities is well under way. With the exception of, first, the former Brewster aircraft plant in Johnsville, Pa., which has already been acquired by the Navy; second, certain RFC-owned land and buildings of the General Motors eastern aircraft facility at Trenton, N. J., which the Navy proposes to acquire for research; and, third, the Naval Air Material Center at Philadelphia. The Navy does not contemplate the retention and operation of any industrial plants which it has financed during the war.

Because of its desire to preserve a healthy aircraft industry, the Navy proposes to rely on private industry to produce the aircraft required for our peacetime naval aviation program and does not plan to incorporate any additional industrial plants into the naval shore establishment. The Navy is not retaining any facilities for the production of aircraft or engines.

The Navy should engage in aircraft production only to the extent of making a yardstick as to proper costs.

ACTIVITIES OF BUREAU OF SHIPS

To fulfill the demands of the postwar fleet upon it, the Bureau of Ships plans to retain 142 postwar activities in full commission, as follows:

Naval industrial activities	24
Shipyard facilities	38
General industry facilities	17
Model basins	2
Laboratories	45
Landing-force equipment depots	1
Reserve Fleet berthing sites	15
Total activities in full commission	142

The specific activities are listed on pages 15–17 of the report.

With respect to the general industry facilities, the plan of the Navy is to try to get the private companies to keep these plants in full operation so that they can

be converted over to Navy use on a moment's notice. If the Navy is not able to do this, then the plants will probably be declared surplus property and disposed of.

The Bureau is planning for the preservation in the interests of national security of a number of plants and shipyards which were provided for the shipbuilding program during the emergency and war period. The broad prudential objective sought is to insure that the naval shipbuilding and ship-repair potentials of the country are not dissipated below those levels which the international situation and this country's commitments justify.

The plants involved fit into the following general categories of heavy industry: One, shipbuilding; two, ship repair; three, manufacture of main propulsion units; four, heavy foundry; five, heavy forge, and six, manufacture of special tubing. The plants are generally large and expensive, and geographically are spread throughout the country. It is possible that some of them can be supported in their present form by private capital as paying commercial enterprises.

On the other hand, it is obvious that many others, at least in the immediate future, cannot be operated competitively as going concerns. Use of these plants for any commercial purpose whatever will be encouraged provided that, in any emergency, they can be rapidly reconverted to their original status. The working out of this program will be complicated and involve many individual arrangements with manufacturers who may desire to use them.

As of October 25, 1945, there remained 126 combatant ships of the following types and numbers scheduled for completion:

Battleships	1
Aircraft carriers	7
Aircraft carriers, light	2
Aircraft carriers, large	2
Aircraft carriers, escort	7
Cruisers, light	9
Cruisers, large	9
Cruisers, heavy	1
Destroyers	57
Destroyer escorts	6
Submarines	25
Total	126

Contracts for 56 combatant vessels were canceled when Japan surrendered. These were in varying degrees of completion, ranging from zero percent complete to 67.8 percent complete.

The estimated cost—construction and machinery—to complete these vessels was $1,084,577,000, while the estimated cost of construction to the date of cancellation plus the estimated cost of termination and disposal was $477,698,930, leaving an estimated saving to appropriations of $606,878,070.

The total estimated cost of ordnance material for these vessels which had been delivered, plus the noncancellable items, was $193,616,143, while the estimated savings totaled $158,408,348. A total saving of $765,286,418. The percentage of completion for the ordnance material range from 100 percent complete down to 21 percent complete.

Contracts canceled, combatant ships

Type	Number	Percent completed
Battleship	1	21
Aircraft carriers	2	26½–52.3
Aircraft carriers, escort	16	0.4–14.3
Heavy cruisers (8-inch gun cruisers)	10	0–54.0
Light cruisers (6-inch gun cruisers)	10	3½–67.8
Destroyers	11	0–28½
Submarines	6	18–49.2
Total	56	

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Because the Bureau of Ordnance is more self-sufficient than the other bureaus, it will retain a greater portion of its wartime facilities than will the other bureaus. It is presently planned to retain the following ordnance facilities:

Ammunition depots	19
Magazines	16
Plants	11
Storage	8
Net depots	11
Degaussing ranges	9
Deperming stations	5
Miscellaneous	13
Total permanent facilities	92

These facilities are listed in detail on pages 17–19 of the report. From this it is apparent that the Bureau of Ordnance enters the postwar period with a greatly increased shore establishment.

Of greatest interest are the 11 naval ordance plants which, during the war, have been operated by private contractors. These plants have been, or are being, converted to full Navy control with service personnel under the direction of qualified naval officers. The Government's investment in the naval ordnance plants and their particular types of equipment makes it a part of wisdom to retain these plants as stand-bys for future ordnance construction, when, and if, there be a need.

Certain facilities wholly owned by the Navy, or wholly owned less the land on which they are erected, will be retained by the Navy for the purpose of storing various types of inert ordnance equipment which must be retained for reserve purposes.

Of greater importance are the Bureau's research facilities. The key to these, and to that part of the Bureau's research program which will be conducted in its own facilities, is the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Silver Spring. Research and testing work on rockets and the atomic bomb is being conducted at the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif. Ordnance activities devoted mainly to research must be operated close to their capacity if the Navy, as it must, is to keep abreast of modern scientific developments and is to have ready at hand the application of these developments to ordnance problems.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

An indication of the extent of the postwar medical facilities is the planned expansion from the present over-all capacity of 10,300 beds to the goal of 25,632 beds. Fifty-five medical facilities are presently planned by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, as follows:

Naval hospitals (continental United States and Alaska)	33
Naval hospitals (outlying areas)	6
Medical dispensaries	4
Medical research units	3
Medical supply depots and storehouses	9
Total medical facilities	55

These facilities are listed on page 21 of the report.

Needs of the Pacific area include, first, 2,000 beds, and, second, a school of tropical medicine. Research activities will be centered at the Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Md., with stations at Berkeley, Calif., Guam, and Cairo, Egypt.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts plans to retain 21 naval supply depots, 2 fueling facilities—in addition to supply depot fueling facilities—1 naval supply pier, and 1 naval clothing depot. You will find these facilities listed in detail on page 20 of the report. Many other supply activities will be maintained as integral, rather than separate, parts of naval establishments, such as those at navy yards, naval air stations, and so forth.

It is the general policy of the Bureau to abandon supply facilities that have been leased. The only naval supply depot being abandoned is the one leased in New Orleans, La.

Ten naval supply depots located outside the continental limits of this country will be retained at normal capacity—five in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico, and five in the Pacific.

PERSONNEL OF THE POSTWAR NAVY

The resolution calls for sufficient personnel rather than any specific number. However, the size of the postwar Navy expressed in ships is obviously the determining factor for the personnel which will be required. It is estimated that there will be required 500,000 enlisted men and 58,000 officers, of which 40,000 will be line officers and 18,000 staff officers and warrant officers. For their distribution, I call your attention to the tables on page 29 of the report.

You may wonder why there are more men assigned to auxiliary vessels and craft than to combatant ships, since 104,360 men are assigned to combatant ships as compared to 122,529 men assigned to the auxiliaries of the active fleet of the proposed postwar Navy.

In the first place, there are many more auxiliaries than combatant ships planned for the active fleet—1,375 auxiliaries to 297 combatant ships.

In the second place, the modern fleet operating over the vast areas of the Pacific and the Atlantic has tremendous logistics requirements. The auxiliaries, which include tenders, repair ships, supply ships, floating drydocks, hospital ships, and others are the necessary links in the extended chain of logistics. Because of them the Navy was able to keep its ships and men fighting on the spot at great distances from home bases in the past war. The contribution of this factor to victory was immeasurable.

The committee has required the Navy Department to make a detailed ship-by-ship, activity-by-activity break-down of where the personnel of the Navy will be assigned. For these details I call your attention to pages 1367–1379 of the committee's hearing on this resolution.

In order to keep the postwar Navy efficiently and adequately manned, personnel training has been planned to include 224 establishments. These establishments are broken down by types as follows:

Enlisted training	51
Operational training	45
Officer training (including 52 NROTC units)	76
Aviation training	30
Training aids	21
Miscellaneous	1

Specific training activities are listed on pages 1416–1419 of the committee's hearing. The over-all policy followed in selection of postwar training facilities was to utilize to the maximum existing construction and to concentrate training in as large groups as possible, thereby cutting down on overhead.

Of the several officer-training facilities established during the war, it is planned to retain only the Naval Academy, the naval ROTC's, and the postgraduate schools in the postwar training program. The V–12 program, which was an emergency program, will be merged into the naval ROTC program, with a total capacity of 14,000 students.

The entire naval ROTC program will utilize the facilities of 52 colleges. These colleges are listed on pages 1417 and 1418 of the committee's hearing. It is impossible to establish naval ROTC's in every college utilized by the V–12 program for several reasons: First, a number of the colleges did not wish the naval ROTC; second, naval personnel will not be available during the postwar period to staff this many naval ROTC units; and, third, sufficient technical equipment will not be available for equipping this many naval ROTC units.

The 52 locations were selected for the postwar naval ROTC's on the basis of (a) geographical location, (b) quality of instruction available, (c) general over-all reputation of the educational institution, (d) desire of the university authorities for the naval ROTC unit, and (e) normal peacetime enrollment of about 1,000 or more.

During the emergency, facilities at the Naval Academy were greatly expanded, providing for a capacity now of 3,423. It is planned to utilize these facilities to a maximum for the training of Regular Navy officers during the postwar period. Training will be provided in the postgraduate schools covering all specialties required by the postwar Navy.

RESEARCH AND REPLACEMENT

Points 5 and 6 of the resolution propose "that ships, vessels, and craft enumerated should be replaced in accordance with existing law, or earlier if the development of weapons or scientific research make such ship, vessel, or craft obsolete or obsolescent," and "that an orderly shipbuilding and aircraft replacement program should be maintained." These points are made to insure against a navy antiquated by technical progress and developments.

Point 7 of the resolution emphasizes the necessity of unrelenting research, as it states "that a progressive program of research and development in all fields of naval warfare be carried on and that an adequate organization and facilities for that purpose be maintained."

Scientific research will shape the Navy of tomorrow. To this end, the President has issued an Executive order for the reorganization of the Navy Department which establishes an Office of Research and Inventions in the Navy Department, charged with the coordination of naval research, experimental, test, and development activities, and other related duties. In this connection, I have introduced H. R. 4317, a bill giving legislative sanction and authority for this office.

COST OF MAINTAINING THE PROPOSED POSTWAR NAVY

I have outlined the postwar Navy as proposed by the Naval Affairs Committee and the Navy Department. Now, what will the operation and maintenance of this proposed postwar Navy cost?

The Navy Department believes that when the demobilization has been completed and the Navy has become stabilized with respect to ships and the shore plant, with an enlisted personnel of approximately 600,000, including the Marine Corps, the annual cost of maintenance of the postwar Navy will be approximately $3,525,000,000. This estimate is broken down as follows:

(1) Pay, subsistence, and transportation of personnel	$1,150,000,000
(2) Training and miscellaneous activities	60,000,000
(3) Maintenance and operation charges of the fleet	950,000,000
(4) Aviation maintenance cost	1,265,000,000
(5) Marine establishment (exclusive of pay)	100,000,000
Total	3,525,000,000

The costs of the shipbuilding and public-works programs are not included in these costs because the Navy will start out with new ships and nothing but a moderate program will be required. Any shipbuilding or public-works program will have to be considered by Congress.

The committee requested these estimates from the Navy Department because it felt that Congress and the public should know as accurately as possible what the proper maintenance of an adequate postwar Navy would cost.

When you consider the cost of the postwar Navy, you must realize that there are no bargains in national security. The annual cost, as proposed by this resolution, would be about three and one-half billion dollars. But compare it to the price of victory in this war—more than a million casualties and around $300,000,000,000. We could maintain the proposed Navy for more than 85 years for this $300,000,000,000.

It might appear that the aviation maintenance cost of $1,265,000,000 is out of proportion with the other estimated costs of maintaining the proposed postwar Navy. It is the highest of all of the major costs furnished in the list on page 6 of the report.

This is explained by the fact that this item includes the cost of research and an aircraft construction program with an operating force of 8,000 aircraft of up-to-date types.

I think that everyone will agree that scientific research is of prime importance and that its emphasis is rightly in the field of aeronautics. This figure is in itself an answer to those who charge that naval aviation is being relegated to a secondary position by the "battleship admirals."

It must also be remembered that changes in aircraft are revolutionary and frequent. These changes entail enormous expenses.

SUMMARY

That, Mr. Chairman, is the postwar Navy as proposed by the resolution. We have laid our cards on the table. We have given you the postwar Navy in detail. Now it is up to Congress.

This resolution calls for constant research, test, and experiment to keep the Navy modern. Such research and experiment may antiquate ships overnight, may render segments of the fleet useless, but until that time we must keep our Navy intact at the necessary strength and at the lowest and safest cost. This is exactly what the proposed resolution is aimed at—to give a goal to work toward, a goal that the people who are doing the paying will know about, a goal sufficiently flexible to developments and changing conditions.

I point with pride to the fact that the Navy Department is the first Department of the Government to come forward with any postwar plans. I am proud of the prompt and thorough study of the postwar Navy by the Committee on Naval Affairs. Both the Navy Department and the committee have quickly met their initial responsibilities on the postwar Navy.

This vital matter has been passed to the Congress for action. It has become the responsibility of Congress, for as I said at the beginning of my statement, section 8 of the Constitution imposes the responsibility upon Congress of not only providing a Navy but also maintaining a Navy. Congress can fully discharge that responsibility by the adoption of this resolution.

The resolution calls for peaceful security based upon realism rather than upon wishful thinking. It recognizes that peace must be built upon power as well as upon good will and good deeds. For if we remain strong we can insure peace to the future generations. But if we grow weak and are unprepared, we sow the seeds for a Third World War.

This resolution insures against our growing weak by sanctioning a small, but powerful, active fleet, backed up by a vast reserve that makes the United States Navy greater than the combined navies of all other nations.

Our confidence in peace can be justified only if, while the world organizations for peace are in the process of transfer from paper to living reality, all the world knows that the United States

will not scrap its Navy but will remain strong.

The noble intentions of international charters and treaties must be constantly vitalized by the realistic maintenance of a Navy of sufficient strength of matériel and personnel to keep inviolate the national security of the United States. Peace is not only a matter of desire. It is a constant and challenging problem of enforcement.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman.

Mr. WELCH. On page 3, line 11, under subsection 2 of the gentleman's resolution, reference is made to auxiliary vessels. What type of vessels does that cover?

Mr. VINSON. That covers every type that is in the Navy—tankers, landing craft, barges, tenders, cargo ships, repair ships, and vessels of that character. There are some 11,000 of those, and we propose to reduce them to some 5,000 and turn the others over to the Surplus Property Administrator for disposition by that agency.

Mr. WELCH. No one knows better than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs that our American merchant marine is our auxiliary Navy without which the Navy could not function.

Mr. VINSON. It is a part of it—that is right.

Mr. WELCH. It is always referred to as such.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. WELCH. Inasmuch as it is the auxiliary Navy, why did not the gentleman include in his resolution, which I favor, the tonnage to be retained in the auxiliary Navy?

Mr. VINSON. It was simply because it was too hard to figure out. I would rather figure it by numbers. I figured 5,002 ships are to be kept. I cannot state what the tonnage will be, but I will try to figure it out later.

Mr. WELCH. In what category would the gentleman place our American merchant marine?

Mr. VINSON. I would say that the American merchant marine is one of the most important arms of the national defense. It is not in the naval auxiliary, but it is one that the Navy has to depend upon and the Nation has to depend upon. A cross between a naval auxiliary and a commercial method of transportation.

Mr. WELCH. May I ask again: Why did not the gentleman in his resolution refer to the tonnage that should be retained in the auxiliary Navy, which is the American merchant marine?

Mr. VINSON. I would if I could figure it out, but I do not have the time to figure it out. Of course, the gentleman from California is aware that the merchant marine comes under the Maritime Commission, which is not an integral part of the Navy.

Mr. WELCH. I hope that at some near future time the able chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee will figure it out and give Congress the benefit of his judgment.

Mr. VINSON. Very well.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. What will it cost to maintain this Navy?

Mr. VINSON. I am coming to that. We are putting our cards on the table this afternoon. It will be up to you and the other Congressmen to say what kind of a Navy you want, and you are going to know what it is going to cost.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. Before you get into this matter of facilities, may I write to certain people in my district and say these shipyards you have named will be permanent and in full commission, as you say?

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly the blueprint of the whole establishment. If it is put in there it is what the Navy purposes to keep.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yet this is not a bill? It is not legislation?

Mr. VINSON. No, it is not a bill, because these shipyards are already in existence today and already authorized by law.

Mr. GIFFORD. But to keep them in existence, to keep them there, there will have to be legislation?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it depends upon the appropriation that Congress might make. Of course, the Congress in the future might reduce the appropriation.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have a large community and they are in the throes of trouble.

Mr. VINSON. And I am in the same fix.

Now, let us go one step further. Let me go back. Of the 1,082 ships in the active Navy, we only propose to keep 267 in the active fleet. Of the 11,000 auxiliaries in the active Navy, we only propose to keep some 1,300 of them. To man the 297 combatant ships and 1,375 auxiliaries, it will require 213,172 enlisted men and 13,164 officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman has referred to me several times. I just want to say to the gentleman that I want to keep the record straight. I am just as anxious as is the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, in whom we have explicit confidence as chairman of this committee, to keep our Navy strong and to keep America strong.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. That is what we are trying to do here.

Mr. RIZLEY. On the other hand, the question that arises in my mind at this time when the gentleman talks about our needing so many of the certain types of ships and so many men: Is that according to my understanding we already have certain commitments. The peace treaty has not yet been written, we do not know what the result may be of the Navy's experiments, about which I have read, with the effect of atomic energy on ships; so, how can anyone under that state of affairs tell at this time whether the number stated in this bill is too many or too few?

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly what we are trying to do here; we are trying to lay the cards on the table for the Congress to determine from the facts we are submitting and the information before us. Is this the kind of navy that guarantees the security of the country? The naval experts and your committee say it is.

Mr. GRANGER. I understand part of the purpose of this resolution—I believe it was stated in debate under the rule and intimated also by the gentleman from Georgia—is to be sure that the vessels we now have cannot be destroyed or disposed of.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that? I understood what the gentleman said a while ago but I never had understood before that the Navy without some specific authority of the Congress, except as to some old vessels that might not be of any account, could destroy them or give them away.

Mr. VINSON. The Navy cannot dispose of any one of the 1,382 combatant ships without direct authorization from the Congress or else classifying it under the act of 1882 as obsolete and out of date. But the Navy can tomorrow morning declare surplus every auxiliary in the Navy under the bill which is already a law and Congress would have no voice over it whatsoever. That is the situation.

Mr. GRANGER. What I cannot understand is why, if the Navy and the committee can determine the number of ships we need, why they do not in this resolution say what personnel we need to man the ships.

Mr. VINSON. We are going to say that. The reason personnel is not mentioned in this resolution is because the resolution is not legislation. This resolution is merely an expression of the opinion of the Congress. It is neither a building program nor an authorization nor an appropriation; you do not find any legislation in it. Had we said that the personnel should be 500,000 that would have been legislation. I may say to the gentleman that a bill already is on the calendar under which the Congress authorizes and fixes the enlisted strength of the Navy at 500,000.

Mr. GRANGER. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. VINSON. We know it is going to require 500,000 men and 58,000 officers to man the postwar Navy. Later on we will bring it up for the Congress then to determine as to whether or not they will approve the 500,000 enlisted figure.

Mr. GRANGER. Would the distinguished gentleman from Georgia care to say whether or not he thinks in view of the position we take here maintaining a strong Navy that it would not also motivate other nations to build strong navies to nullify everything we do?

Mr. VINSON. I do not believe that at all. It is, of course, humanly possible for people to find all sorts of excuses to get behind when we talk about national defense and the security of this Nation. I saw it back in 1932, I saw it in 1934, 1938, and even in 1940; but Congress had the courage to write upon the statute books the building up of the defenses of this country, and the people poured out their money to build them. We are proposing here today to see that it is not scrapped like it was in the early twenties after the Washington Disarmament Conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. In view of what the gentleman has said that the only way we can have world peace is by force, I want to call his attention to someone who did not come from Missouri, who came out of Galilee, and said that is the way you cannot have peace in the world.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, it is probably true.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree with the gentleman that we must have a strong Navy, but I want to be sure that we are writing sometime somewhere into the law that someone is not going to be able to give the Navy away.

Mr. VINSON. That is already written on the statute books. That was proposed by a distinguished minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] 2 or 3 years ago. You cannot give any of this Navy away without an act of Congress.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. On page 3, paragraph 3 states:

> That adequate facilities including bases to support the Navy should be maintained wherever necessary.

Does that mean that we maintain those bases we already have? The words "wherever necessary" do not mean obtaining additional ones, does it?

Mr. VINSON. Where they are necessary and where we have them, we are going to maintain them. This also refers to island bases in the Pacific.

Mr. JUDD. Then the word "maintained" includes the idea of those already obtained?

Mr. VINSON. It has to be supported by appropriations to keep them so that the Navy can use them.

Mr. JUDD. Well, we have certain ones. It does not mean getting additional ones if we consider they are necessary, does it?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all. This report includes all that the Navy needs as far as shore establishments are concerned and as far as plant facilities are concerned.

Mr. JUDD. It is maintenance of what it already has?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think the gentleman is mistaken when he says that expression does not contemplate that the Navy will acquire bases in the Pacific other than what they might have if in the opinion of the Navy they are necessary.

Mr. VINSON. That is what I said.

Mr. O'HARA. No. The gentleman stated it the other way.

Mr. JUDD. Let us get that straight.

Mr. VINSON. The position of the Navy and the committee is as set forth in the report. There are certain designated bases in the Pacific that are absolutely essential for the security and defense of this country. We propose to keep and maintain those bases. If it becomes necessary in connection with the development of the defenses of this country to secure an island not enumerated in the report, under the language of the resolution, provided the Congress will appropriate for it, the Navy Department probably could take it.

Mr. JUDD. When you vote for this then you are voting that it is the sense of the Congress that the Navy shall have the right to go and acquire whatever bases it may consider necessary?

Mr. VINSON. It has got to be by a specific act of Congress. The Navy cannot acquire property without an act of Congress.

Mr. JUDD. But by passing this resolution it is declared by this resolution, it is our intention that the Navy shall have such power.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think it should have that power.

Mr. VINSON. Why should it not have the power? If the Navy Department, the first line of defense of this country, should go out and find it is necessary to acquire a base in the Pacific, why should it not bring the suggestion back to the committee and the Congress for approval? Should it sit there and say: "We will need it but we are going to keep it to ourselves and not say anything about it."

Mr. JUDD. I do not think we should endorse such a policy under language like this.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman will have ample opportunity to offer an amendment when the time comes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appear here today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 80, which in substance provides for the composition and size of the postwar Navy. The purpose for which the Navy is established and maintained is generally well known. I will dwell on a few of the primary considerations, which together with the facts presented by political conditions in the world today justify the provisions of this bill.

In a broad aspect, the Navy is maintained for two general reasons: One is to prevent war, the other is readiness to wage war effectively so that if forced upon us, war may be brought to a close as quickly as possible with a minimum loss of men and economic resources. In order to do this, the Navy must control the sea area and the air above it wherever the Navy may operate.

In each of the past two wars, our enemies failed to control the seas and they were defeated. The Navy is maintained for other reasons; "it insures our national integrity, supports our national policy, guards the continental United States and our overseas possessions, and gives protection to our citizens abroad." Those are the words of Admiral Leahy in his appearance before the House Committee on Naval Affairs in March 1938, in support of the bill which then provided for a 20 percent expansion in the tonnage of our combat ships. The preamble of this resolution is identical with this declaration of Admiral Leahy with the addition that we should cooperate with other world powers in the maintenance of peace. No matter how altruistic we may be in our fervent desire to maintain peace in the world, we now realize as the result of sad experiences in the past that such altruism falls by the wayside when we see political conditions developing in other parts of the world and which may at any time explode into another devastating war.

The world from a military standpoint is getting smaller and smaller. Many people did not realize only a few years ago that if trouble would break out in Japan or Germany it would ultimately involve the interests of the United States. This can be more readily understood now as the result of the attack on Pearl Harbor and later the declaration of war by Germany on the United States. It all goes back to the amalgamation of the military powers of Germany, Japan, and Italy a few years ago, when they entered into an agreement then known as the "Anti-Communistic Protocol," ostensibly aimed at Russia. We know better today than we did then, that it was actually aimed at the peace of the world.

The American people in those days were tremendously interested in world peace. We had enough war in 1917 and 1918. But after World War I was over, a great naval race between some of the major powers was in the making. The American people then, as now, were interested in maintaining world peace, and to that end a World Disarmament Conference was held in 1922. We were so interested in peace then that we led all the naval powers of the world in the sacrifice we were willing to make in the interest of peace.

In accordance with the terms of the disarmament treaty, signed February 26, 1922, we sank and scrapped 28 battleships, 17 of which were in active commission and the other 11 in various stages of construction. But peace was not to be had for the people of the world. It was relatively only a few years when some of these nations entered into a prodigious naval construction program. It was these facts Admiral Leahy called to our attention in 1938 which resulted in the authorization of the first sub-

stantial increase in the size of our Navy in the 16-year period of time since 1922. His words were prophetic. He pictured the international political conditions which were fast developing across both oceans. He pictured the relative strength of the United States Navy as compared with the naval strength of other powers. He warned us then, as we are being warned now by those in command, that we must place our house in order and be prepared so as to meet the challenge of dictators and war lords who were rising up in the many parts of the world. We owe a great deal to the warning Admiral Leahy gave us in 1938, because it was those ships that came off the ways as the result of the 1938 act which Congress passed that gave us victory in one of the most crucial battles we had in the Pacific in the Philippine area.

These were the ships that went in there and did the job with others launched and commissioned since those days. These were the ships Congress gave to the American Navy and which in the hands of stalwart and heroic officers and men alike brought victory to our cause. While this bill provides for approximately 300 ships in what will be considered the active fleet, 5 of them will be battleships and 20 of them aircraft carriers. This is quite the reverse of the pre-Pearl Harbor fleet when we had 17 battleships and 8 aircraft carriers. The striking force and general utility of the aircraft carrier has proven itself in the war which has just come to a close.

The carrier task force, something unique in naval warfare and developed by our Navy has more than proven its worth. It was only 3 years ago this very month after the devastating attacks that were made on our ships that we had but one aircraft carrier operating in the Pacific, the doughty aircraft carrier *Enterprise*.

We have come a long way since the days of Guadalcanal and the Solomon area, when we were holding on by only a proverbial shoestring. Those were the days when the Navy had little to fight with as the Japs were continuing their advance down through the South Pacific on the way to Australia and New Caledonia. Those were the days when the fighting American men of all our military forces gave all they had and stopped the sweep of the Japs and turned the tide of defeat into that of victory giving us bases from which we could operate, and in a period of less than 3 years drove the Japs back to their homeland in complete surrender. This victory in the Pacific which for the most part was a naval war, however, was a shining example of the magnificent teamwork of all the branches of our military service, including the Navy, marines, Coast Guard, and Army. The courage, skill, and tenacity of our fighting men will go down in history as an outstanding example of the determination of freemen to fight for the things they believed in.

In order to recover our position in the Pacific and drive the Japs back to their homeland 47,000 of our men in the Navy, Marine, Coast Guard, and Army had given their lives. This is nearly the total casualties we had in World War I. Naval operations during this war were not, however, confined to the Pacific alone, it was the Navy that conquered the German submarines in the Atlantic and made it possible for us to transport millions of our troops overseas at a time when our armies were being landed in Africa, Italy, and Normandy. Such operations were unparalleled in the history of warfare. Our Navy even participated in crossing the Rhine and also maintained a tremendous flow of materials and equipment across the Atlantic to the Army that it had put ashore in Europe and Africa. The Navy did not do this without tremendous losses to their own forces in ships and men. The naval losses in both theaters of operation, namely, the Atlantic and Pacific, to date were 56,001 killed, 9,177 missing, 80,260 wounded, making the total casualties 146,279. The naval losses in this war were greater than the combined naval losses in all the wars since the formation of this Government. To these men who made the supreme sacrifice, and to their fighting buddies, the Nation owes a great debt of gratitude which we cannot forget. It is for us who are here today to remember those sacrifices made under such trying conditions and see to it, if the emergency arises, that the men who go forward in the future to fight our battles will have the tools with which to work and the full resources of the Nation to back them up.

The resolution now before the Congress provides for three component parts of the postwar Navy, namely, the active fleet, the ready reserve, and the laid-up fleet. The total annual maintenance cost of this postwar Navy is estimated about $3,525,000,000, of which the active fleet will take $3,275,000,000; the ready reserve, $170,000,000; and the laid-up fleet, $80,000,000. The active fleet will contain approximately 297 combat ships, the ready fleet will contain 104 combat ships, and the reserve fleet, 681 combat ships, making a total composition of the postwar Navy—active, ready, and reserve fleet—of approximateely 1,082 combat ships. In addition to the 1,082 major combat vessels, there will be 6,084 auxiliaries distributed in the three components.

The total tonnage of the postwar Navy, including all component parts, will be approximately 4,698,000 tons as compared with the total tonnage of the combat ships of pre-Pearl Harbor of 1,382,026 tons. It will require approximately 556,427 officers and men to support and operate this postwar fleet.

In addition to the ships and men, we must have all the supporting activities, such as naval aircraft, shore facilities, including operating bases, navy yards, training facilities, supply depots, and all activities which will give full and complete support to the operating fleet.

The determination of the size of the postwar Navy has not been hastily arrived at. Studies have been under consideration by a special board appointed by the Commander in Chief of the Navy for over a year and a half. Thirty percent of the present ships will be in the active fleet, 10 percent in the ready fleet, and 60 percent will go into the reserve fleet, which will be wholly inactive and laid up. The size of the postwar Navy has been determined after a most careful survey of what are considered to be our military and naval requirements under the policies determined and laid down by Congress.

Composition of postwar Navy

Type	Active		Reserve	Total
	Peacetime complement	Reduced complement		
COMBATANTS				
Battleships	5	6	7	18
Aircraft carriers (large)	3	0	0	3
Aircraft carriers	7	4	13	24
Aircraft carriers (light)	0	1	9	10
Aircraft carriers (escort)	10	11	58	79
Cruisers (large)	3	0	0	3
Cruisers (heavy)	8	9	14	31
Cruisers (light)	20	9	19	48
Destroyers	135	40	192	367
Destroyer escorts	36	4	260	300
Submarines	70	20	109	199
Total	297	104	681	1,082

The United States military forces are instruments of our national policy. We depend on these forces to insure the security of the United States and to advance its national interests by military readiness to support its national policies and international commitments. No one can foresee what world conditions will be in the critical period that lies ahead, but we can look backward and see what military unpreparedness has cost us in the past in blood and national treasure. We have learned that no matter how altruistic a nation we are, we can never again let our security depend upon the good will of others. The power to enforce peace should be retained by those people who want peace and who are determined to use all means, including force, to maintain world peace.

Our military leaders have a tremendous responsibility at a time like this. It is their duty to advise us as Members of Congress as to what military forces are required to insure the security of the United States. These leaders recognize that the maintenance of overwhelmingly strong forces in time of peace is politically and economically unacceptable to the people of the United States. They also know from sad experience of the past that if forces of aggression become arrayed against us, we cannot afford—through any misguided and perilous idea of avoiding an aggressive attitude—to permit the first blow to be struck against us. We must be ready now and stay ready, and that requires a force that can bring superior force to bear upon any possible enemy or combination of enemies, and to do it in the outer perimeter of our defenses, not at the gates to our homeland.

To win this war, the United States had to build the largest Navy the world has ever seen. This sea power had unique utility for us. It was the foundation of our ability to dispose our tremendous national strength where it was needed in this war. It was the basis of our ability to fight effectively with allies. It kept our own fields and cities from being battle grounds. It was a major factor

that helped to give us time to build up the military might that turned the tide. It has been a decisive factor in both World War I and World War II. If it is not allowed to waste away, once the apparent need of it has diminished, it can insure our future security and can be made the effective instrument of our unalterable determination to maintain peace.

The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are not barriers for our defense unless we make them so. Rather, they should be thought of as open highways of invasion against us. It is not enough that we defend our coasts. We must have undisputed command of the sea in the outer areas that are vital to the defense of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Western Hemisphere. These areas are the western part of the North and South Atlantic Oceans and the entire Pacific Ocean. There is where we must establish road blocks against possible enemies. To do this, we must have strong, mobile fleet forces and outlying bases, each supporting the other. Bases without strong, mobile forces to defend them may become a liability if allowed to fall into the hands of others. Conversely, mobile forces cannot be projected far from our home coast if we do not have outlying bases to support those forces.

Neither atomic bombs or any foreseeable weapons of the future can in themselves conquer and hold a country. In the last analysis, before the United States can ever be conquered, enemy troops must land on our shores. Our Navy, if maintained at proper strength, can prevent any such hostile movement.

A navy, even at the minimum strength required for our own national safety, will be expensive, but it is cheap insurance for our future welfare.

These are some of the factors that our naval men had to consider in arriving at a determination of what the size of the postwar Navy should be. Not only do we require adequate naval strength, but that strength had to be balanced. The lessons of the war had to be their guide, tempered by an evaluation of what effect new weapons might have upon future warfare. In the war just won five fundamental naval concepts proved decisive:

(a) The carrier task force.

(b) The submarine force.

(c) Naval bombardment of shore objectives preparatory to the landing of

(d) The amphibious forces.

(e) Sufficient mobile logistic support of vessels to render the combatant forces as independent as possible of shore bases.

To set up a postwar Navy, adequate to carry out its conceived mission and providing the minimum forces to continue the above-mentioned tested fundamental concepts, became the problem. The existing Navy was in excess of the probable requirements for these missions and concepts. Most of the vessels comprising this Navy were effective fighting units. Surveying the wide areas over which control of the seas was essential to the defense of our interests, it was apparent that moderate, balanced forces should be kept ready in both oceans. The active fleet as set forth in this program is felt to be the minimum necessary to meet our requirements.

The active and reserve fleets can be expanded or contracted as world conditions might dictate. Until world conditions have settled into a firmer pattern, until we know more definitely just what we face in the future, we should maintain our seapower in strength adequate to meet all contingencies. Your committee, therefore, feels that based on advice given to us by the naval experts of this country that the proposed postwar fleet is the minimum necessary to protect the continental United States and our outlying possessions and to carry out promptly and effectively the policies of the Government of this Nation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I should like to ask him if in his opinion we can raise sufficient men to man this Navy by recruitment without draft.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The very question the gentleman has asked me I laid before the Chief of Bureau of Naval Personnel at a hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs. I asked him whether or not in his opinion we could raise by the volunteer system a sufficient number of men to man the postwar fleet. His answer was that he thought we could. Personally I have some doubts about it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Another question: On the ratio of 1 officer to each 10 men does the gentleman believe we can train enough men in the present facilities at Annapolis or does the gentleman believe we need an additional naval academy and particularly one on the west coast?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The whole question of our officer requirements in the future is now under consideration by the Committee on Naval Affairs in conjunction with the Navy, and it is expected within a day or so that we will bring the personnel bill to this House with respect to the training of our future officers.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But the gentleman thinks we do need expansion?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes; indeed I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the conference report considered by the House earlier in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, we have heard in great detail and with considerable clarity from the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and from our colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], so I do not want to say anything more about the composition of the ships of the Navy. However, this is only a part of the picture as it will unfold from the Naval Affairs Committee in the coming weeks. As you know, you cannot have a great number of ships and not have men to man them. The next thing before our committee, which will be reported in the very near future, is a personnel bill in which we attempt to take into the Regular Navy the temporary officers and the Reserve officers, making but one list and one Regular Navy, with enough enlisted men to man that Navy.

Mr. Chairman, in order to use our ships properly, we must have bases from which to operate, and those bases must be just as far away from our shores as it is possible for us to get them. That is what I want to talk about in the brief time I have at my disposal.

The great massed populations of the earth are in the Orient and in Asia. There are 450,000,000 Chinese, 350,000,000 Indians and Hindus, 150,000,000 Malaysians, and probably around 80,000,000 Japanese. That is where three-quarters of the population of the earth exists today. Some day those peoples, just like the Japanese did a century ago, will find themselves and they will want to take their place in the family of nations.

We have heard an awful lot today and during the past few days about the atomic bomb. The scientists tell us that there is no defense against it. Mr. Chairman, there is only one defense against any kind of weapon and that is to keep that weapon as far away from the shores of our country as we can; because no one has yet been able to annihilate either time or space. When we have our bases projected as far away from the shores of our country as possible, we have done the best and the foremost thing that we should do to keep any prospective enemy at arm's length. I claim that if we maintain control of those bases in the Pacific and in the Atlantic that we have access to today, that we have a right to possess today and to control, we will then be doing the best we can possibly do for the protection of our homeland.

The Naval Affairs Committee, or at least a large proportion of the membership thereof, has made a study of what bases it is proper for us to hold. We have seen those bases, we have considered them, we have studied them from various angles, such as continuity, the ease of fortification, the location, and, again and foremost, the distance from our shores.

We have visualized a great arch in the Pacific starting at Okinawa, passing through the Philippine Islands, and ending at New Caledonia. So if we can maintain bases on the islands of that great arch we will be able not only to see what other nations in that part of the world are attempting to do, not only can we nip in the bud any aggressive action against our shores but we can maintain there offensive forces which would render unlikely the success of any effort directed against us from the Orient. I know we all hate to speak of a prospective enemy because we hope there is going to be peace now for many

generations. But it is our province as a Committee on Naval Affairs to do the best we can for the defense of our homeland. We are not doing our duty and we would be derelict in our duty if we do not do the best we can to foresee what may happen in the future and to provide against it.

All I have to do is to take you back to 1898 and show you how the Congress of the United States fell down in that duty; likewise after the other war, the First World War. True, it is always done by conference; it is always done by the administration, and we say the administration did it. In my opinion that is no defense for us. It is our duty to take care of the future generations in this country, and we are not doing it if we put it up to a few people in the State Department, or a few people in the Navy Department, or into the hands of any President of the United States. The welfare of our people is in our hands, and I say today we would be derelict in our duty if we did not assert ourselves as a Congress and take the islands that we consider are necessary for our defense and build the proper-sized Navy and man it properly.

They talk about Okinawa. Well, says an admiral, "We should not do anything about Okinawa, because we do not want to run afoul of other nations. We should hold it in conjunction with other nations." That admiral undoubtedly knows that Okinawa occupies the most strategic position north of the Philippines. It is equidistant from the southern shore of Japan, the eastern shore of China, and the northern shore of Formosa. It is very necessary that a peace-loving nation occupy the position that our bases give us there today. I have no quarrel with anyone who wants to put this into a trusteeship, provided we are the trustee, because who else has a national interest in the Pacific. Certainly not England, certainly not France, and certainly not Russia. Russia is interested away up there in Siberia. But what could Russia do against a maritime nation, a potentially powerful naval force? I doubt if Russia will ever divorce herself completely from Europe to swing into the Pacific. She does not occupy strategic places enough in the Pacific, and she is a long ways from that theater about which I speak today. But even if she is interested, she still has Sakhalin, just north of Japan. She is still our neighbor through the Aleutians. Is there any reason why we cannot get along well with her? Of course not. But the peace of the Pacific is dependent upon the United States of America maintaining it, and when I speak of the Pacific I mean all the waters of the Pacific. There is no other nation, certainly not England and certainly not France, with the two or three little islands that they hold, probably for exploitation purposes, and therefore it behooves our people in the State Department, those who sit around the conference table, to see that we are the trustee, that into our hands is given the control not only of the mandated islands, the islands formerly mandated to Japan, but all of the islands that we consider necessary, first, for the security of the United States, second, for the security of the whole Western Hemisphere, and, third, for the preservation of the peace and welfare of all the peoples in the Pacific.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say before I ask my question that I find myself in complete agreement with the gentleman from California about our being put in a position where we will control those outposts. Has the Committee on Naval Affairs given any consideration to which branch of the services shall garrison this island or that outpost?

Mr. IZAC. None at all. I would say to my friend from New York that if any such study has been made it is by the chiefs of staff. They have not given to our committee, at least—they may have to the Committee on Military Affairs—any indication of either the islands they want or the islands they consider necessary to our defense and for the purposes I have outlined.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I recollect the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs in support of this concurrent resolution, it gives a list of the outposts which in the judgment of the Navy should be occupied by the United States.

Mr. IZAC. As I understand it, that is a partial list of those bases they consider essential at the present time, but it is an incomplete list, as any official of the Navy Department will state.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the gentleman believe it is implied by the furnishing of that list that those particular outposts shall be manned by naval forces or by marine forces?

Mr. IZAC. I believe it is clearly indicated that those bases——

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not mean the use of them, I mean the garrisoning of them.

Mr. IZAC. The use of them, of course, is by the Navy for primary major bases, secondary bases, and so forth.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. IZAC. But the actual garrisoning of the islands for our protection against assault by a foreign foe is not indicated at all. I would say that the use of the major base, let us say at Pearl Harbor, is of course that we shall have that base for our fleet overhaul and supply, similarly the ones outlying, at Guam, Manus, and elsewhere.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is indicated, then, however, in the opinion of the gentleman, a certain element of partnership between the services with respect to the defense as well as the use of these outposts?

Mr. IZAC. I would believe that to be the intention on the part of the Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. These bases listed for the most part are the major fleet bases. I presume they would operate some of the bases, as the Hawaiian Islands, where we have the Army command, and also the Caribbean area, where the islands are in the possession of the Army but which we use as bases for major fleet operations.

Mr. IZAC. I do not believe there is any departure from the usual plan of defense of those bases where the Navy will have either a major or an auxiliary station.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I was interested in the gentleman's statement that the Navy might prove to be a stabilizing factor concerning, probably, a billion people in Asia and the islands of the southwest Pacific. Does not the fact that the Navy symbolizes our force, coupled with the fact that we have pursued a policy in the Philippines looking toward their liberation, which will happen next year, indicate to the world and is it not an expression to the world that we intend to preserve peace out in the southwest Pacific and in Asia, and that what we do here today may be the very factor that would prolong peace for a great many years to come, perhaps for generations, in a part of the world that is very explosive?

Mr. IZAC. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I will say further that because of the fine record that America has of not being at all imperialistic but being rather altruistic to the extent of making it possible for the peoples of these islands to exercise self-determination and self-rule, it will go a long way toward having those peoples ask that we come in, giving us the strategic end and they taking care of the other end for our mutual benefit. We are not going into any of these places with the purpose of exploiting the natives. We are going in there for our mutual protection. As it happens, in the Marshall Islands, the natives have already petitioned Congress for annexation to the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I might say that we have a 47-year record on that very point of nonimperialism. We did not take anything out of the Philippines. We did not take anything out of Cuba. We did not take anything out of Puerto Rico. In other words, as the gentleman says, we have no imperialistic designs. All we want to do is to preserve our own peace and the peace of the world.

Mr. IZAC. We cannot do that unless they give us the tools with which to operate, and part of the tools are the bases out there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In other words, you cannot have a world governed by law without the force behind the law to make the people obey it; is that correct?

Mr. IZAC. Of course, at the present time in a good many of these places they do not have any law at all. The only places that the Europeans have asserted their sovereignty is whether they thought they could get something out of the islands and where they would be self-sustaining. That is also the case with Japan. Japan bypassed a good many of these islands where they thought they could not make any money. But so far as I am concerned, and I am sure this

goes for most of the members of the committee, we are convinced that we can go into those islands and have our air strips—in fact, the air strips are already there—assert our authority in a strategic sense and get along with the natives in a very fine way without making them feel that it is done on any other than a reciprocal basis and on a mutually agreeable basis.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to ask the gentleman the same question that I asked the gentleman who previously spoke. Does the gentleman think we can raise the enlisted personnel to maintain this type of a navy from volunteer recruits?

Mr. IZAC. Yes. I will answer the gentleman in this way: Next week we will have a bill which as I stated before will bring the Reserves in the Regular Navy. The following week we hope to have the Fleet Reserve bill before the House. That will make it possible for the enlisted men of the Navy to have something to look forward to, a career, so that they are placed in the Fleet Reserve for 20 years and then they have retirement benefits at the end of 30 years. The benefits will be sufficiently great to be attractive to them. Since we have been discussing this bill, I learn from all sides that the men of the Navy are very much in agreement with the objectives of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I look forward with pleasant anticipation to the consideration by the House of these Enlisted Reserve bills. My attention was called to the fact that one of them has already been passed by the Senate and provides retirement pay in excess of the retirement pay given to men in the Regular Army of corresponding rank. For example, a chief petty officer in the Navy corresponds to the rank of master sergeant in the Army. The present law treats both those men alike with respect to pay and retirement compensation. One of these bills which will be pending before us shortly, as I understand it, will lift the Navy man above the Army man.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct. But in 1925 we had a law which is very similar to the one which we expect to pass now. That was changed in 1938. The present law gives the fleet reservist something like $69 a month. Under the voluntary enlistment bill, which was passed a few weeks ago, the Army man is treated exactly the same as the Navy man. Now we are going back to something similar to what we had before 1925. It will give the enlisted man in the Navy something really to shoot for; real retainer pay on which he can live, and paid to him for continuous service at the end of 20 years. There is nothing I can see in the law that prevents the Army man faring in exactly the same way. We now have the Army Reserves that we did not have before. The Army Reserve can retire or be on the reserve list at the end of 20 years. Now we are simply going to raise the pay and benefits to the Navy man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not criticizing for a moment the proposal which is to come before the House through the Naval Affairs Committee to make more attractive the naval service, especially in holding forth the prospect that a man after having served 20 years or 30 years, whichever it may be, may get more money than the present law allows. However, it is a pity, if you will permit me to say so, that the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee could not give joint consideration to things of that sort so that parity in the pay schedules of both services will be preserved.

Mr. IZAC. I am sure that would be agreeable to the members of our committee, but it has been almost impossible to get the two Departments to work together on that. Every time I have suggested a certain bill or a certain type of legislation the Navy Department replies, "We have a man working with the Army on that. There is a joint board, and some day they will report." They never have reported yet. Therefore, it behooves our committee to go ahead and pass this, because we know it will mean men coming into the Navy and making the Navy a career. As far as I can see, there is nothing to prevent an amendment, when that bill comes before us, to do the same thing for the Army Reservists that we are trying to do for the Fleet Reservists.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In the study before the committee of this bill was there any indication that you can state at this time as to what size armed force and land army would be necessary to complement the same strength offshore as the Navy?

Mr. IZAC. No. I am sorry that we on the Naval Affairs Committee do not have the consideration of any military matters, other than strictly naval matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require, to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, an American Navy without adequate bases strategically placed throughout the world would be quite unequal to the tasks which the world of the future will impose upon it. Earlier in the day I made a suggestion which, if adopted, would go a long way toward meeting the great problems with which we are so sorely vexed. With the indulgence of the House, I will pursue the subject further.

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out heretofore, I have today introduced three resolutions which, if adopted by the Congress, will authorize the President to extend to Iceland in the name of the Congress and the American people an invitation to become a State in the American Union; to open negotiations with Denmark for the purchase of Greenland; to open negotiations with Great Britain, France, and such other countries that may be involved for the purchase of all islands off the coast of continental United States, in the Caribbean Sea and Pacific Ocean, that may be deemed essential to the defense of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, and the Philippine Islands.

Further, my resolutions would direct negotiations looking toward the acquisition without cost to the United States of all of the islands mandated to or owned by the Empire of Japan as the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War shall find essential to the maintenance of peace in the Pacific Ocean areas, an obligation which, by unwelcome circumstances, has become the prime responsibility of the United States.

But a hasty review of the public prints reveals that the time has arrived for affirmative action if American rights and responsibilities are to be respected and observed.

With Russia extending herself in all directions and England and France clinging tenaciously to their respective empires—in the interest of their defense, they assert—are we to stand idly by as they divide amongst themselves all of the fruits of our joint sacrifices?

First, we receive the disquieting news that Russia is demanding that she be consulted in the administration of the international settlement of Tangiers; that the Dardanelles be placed in her trusteeship, that she be permitted to establish bases in the Spitsbergen Islands and weather stations in Iceland, and, presumably, in Greenland, too. Further revealing her interest in world areas into which she has never heretofore sought to intrude herself, she has occupied certain Danish islands in the Skagerrack and Kattegat and is demanding that the Dodecanese Islands be turned over to her as a prize of war even though she did not contribute anything to their redemption.

As Russia prepares to expand herself all over the world, France and England tighten their grip upon their outlying possessions, their colonies and protectorates, all of which were saved to them by American arms, American valor, American sacrifice in lives, in materials, in resources, in money, all these beyond evaluation.

And as they cling to what they have and grasp for more and more, America, altruist in the extreme, stands calmly by, too proud to claim its just entitlements, too noble to insist on even a fraction of that which a grateful world of a few weeks ago would have lavished upon us with a generous hand. That was when their vast holdings, their world position, their very existence, hung in the balance.

Now that the victory for which we strove with all our heart has been achieved, those who represent us in international councils, those in the palms of whose hands our destiny rests, seem to be impressed not at all with the bitter struggle for real estate, for military bases, for strategic placements, for control of the crossroads of the world that is going on among the other powers all over the world. If we do not make our demands known before the last flicker of gratitude among our erstwhile allies dies

out, we will be soon awakened from our idealistic dreams of a world of brotherly love to learn that we will have achieved in these days following the close of World War II the same unhappy position that it was ours to occupy after the smoke of the battles of World War I had cleared away.

As the specter of a World War III begins to take form, others took to their defenses while America treats only of the intangible things of the irrepressible spirit. Are we, as war clouds lower, to again ask nothing in return for our sacfrifice in two great wars; are we to profit not at all from the lessons learned at such a cost? Are we, as Admiral King has stated, to be forever "fighting and building and winning and giving away—only to fight and build and win and give away again"?

Are our resources so great, our wealth so fabulous, the lives of our people so cheap, that we can go on generation after generation dissipating our resources, squandering our money in billions, sacrificing the lives of our youth in millions, all this in utter disregard of the practicalities that govern the thinking and control the activities of all of the other nations on this earth?

America must give thought to the ramparts we watch, not merely to the ramparts we once watched. It is time that we give some consideration to the ever avaricious outside world, to the problems that living with them present. Let us think of the future.

The adoption of my resolutions will make clear to the President, his administration, to the world, that America has a policy for an enduring peace, for the future as well as for the present, and that it is one that is based upon the open-eyed recognition of the responsibilities that have become ours, America is not only interested in the peace of the moment but in its security in the future as well.

The islands of England and France off our coasts and in the Caribbean mean nothing to the defense of Europe. But they mean much to the defense of America should we become embroiled in another world conflict—and we should have them.

The islands of the Pacific mean nothing to the defense of the great Eurasian powers, but to America, upon which rests the burden of the maintenance of the peace in the Pacific, they mean everything—and America should have them.

Iceland and Greenland lie on the line of march of any marauding empire that might be bent on world conquest. In the face of an onslaught, Iceland would, standing by itself, be helpless. In any world war that might involve us, they are indispensable to our and its defense. Their strategic value cannot longer be ignored. Icelanders and Americans alike cannot fail to perceive the necessity of a partnership arrangement in mutual defense. We have much to offer to Iceland—military protection of its homeland, dignity and freedom for its citizens, development of its harbors and natural resources, access to the best market in the world for its products.

By accepting American citizenship and statehood under our Constitution, self-government would be guaranteed to them in all matters essentially affecting home rule. By giving up only that which they are quite unable to successfully administer themselves in times of stress, they would acquire under the Constitution of the United States elements of freedom which they have never dared to lay claim to heretofore. As a citizen of the United States and of the Republic of Iceland, an Icelander would acquire and hold in common with all other American citizens the personal protection of our Bill of Rights, the greatest guarantee of personal liberty and individual freedom ever achieved by mankind anywhere on this earth. In addition to these would come the blessing and security of our Federal system, a method of self-government which today commands the respect and admiration of the entire world.

When the Icelandic and American flags fly side by side, then, indeed, will tyrants tremble, dictators despair, freedom-loving people rejoice everywhere, for, as a consequence of the union of these two great peoples, one of the greatest temptations to would-be world conquerors to aggress against the weak people of the world will have been removed from their considerations.

But back and behind all these considerations lies, as it must lie, not only the military security of continental United States—our home land—and of those who will aline themselves with us but the financial integrity of our country as well.

We were too proud to accept any of the spoils of the victory of the war of 1917–19 as our allies and associated powers scrambled for and grabbed everything in sight. When the smoke of battle had cleared away—and a few years had rolled by—not only did good, old, kindly Uncle Sam find himself empty handed but that his pals of World War I had, calling it by the high-sounding name of loans, picked his pockets of billions of dollars, very little of which has ever been repaid.

That must not be permitted to happen again. As a means of preventing it, I arise to propose not loans, nor gifts, nor lend-lease, all discredited and unreal, but real-estate deals, transactions that will not be hanging fire for generations, causing, perhaps, unpleasant international controversies in the distant future but which shall be fully completed here and now, as the consideration passes.

What all this boils down to is that the time has come for the United States to claim something in return for the American dollar credits we are planning to extend to more than a score of nations. Britain, Russia, China, and France, for example, are asking for huge postwar loans to rebuild their devastated countrysides and with which to rehabilitate themselves industrially.

But since our experience in the past is that loans of this character are never repaid, another way of insuring ourselves against loss must be found. Extending loan credits which immediately become gifts is a poor way of protecting the American taxpayer's money.

Instead of again extending dollar credits and calling them loans when we know they will turn out to be gifts, why not make the transactions one for the purchase and sale of real estate at the very outset? Why not acquire these strategic islands, islands of small value to the sellers but of the greatest importance to the defense of America and the performance of our part of the responsibility of maintaining the peace of the world?

This strikes me as common sense, and something which most Americans can agree on.

While Russia and Britain and other countries are everywhere extending themselves, are we going to be caught in the same old song and dance that followed World War I—namely, giving our money away and getting nothing in return?

These vast extension of credits—or loans or whatever they may be called—will not come back to us. In fact, they could only come back to us in one of two ways: either in the form of manufactured goods or raw materials of which we will have a surplus of our own, or in the form of gold, of which we already have a vast useless hoard stored, for want of a better place, under the ground.

That means that—to be perfectly frank—it would be folly for us to permit the loans to be repaid even if the borrowers were able to satisfy their indebtedness, for the importation of billions of dollars of manufactured goods would only glut our market, close our factories, and render millions of our fellow citizens jobless, and an importation of billions of dollars in gold, which Russia, for example, can mine at $6 an ounce and which we would have to accept at $35 an ounce or go off the gold standard, would only mean more unwanted metal to store in the hills of Kentucky.

The time has come for us to face this issue realistically. It is about time we in the United States talked in the same realistic terms as do those in Russia and France and Britain. There is only one thing we can get in return for our loans—that is, only one thing of real practical value to us—and that is real estate. If we got that and nothing else, our millions—yes, our billions would not be wasted.

Is there anybody who contends that the islands off our coasts, those owned by England and France, for example, are necessary to the defense of Europe? That is nonsense. There is no military or naval or air factor into which they could possibly be fitted. If by an unfortunate turn of events our present-day Allies should become our enemies of the future—as Japan and Italy became after fighting loyally at our side in World War I—these outlying possessions would become a distinct menace to our national security in their hands.

On the other hand, they are necessary to the defense of the United States. They are within a few hundred miles of us. They are outlying bastions of our continent. They should be, and of right ought to be, territory of the United States.

As for Iceland and Greenland, these are natural parts of our political and economic world. The Republic of Iceland, the people and government of Greenland would sacrifice none of their liberties under our Constitution, and their citizens would enjoy the protection

of our Bill of Rights. And in time of war, they would have the protection of the most powerful nation on earth.

The future lies before us. We can bungle our opportunities or profit by embracing them. We can go on, as Admiral King once said, "fighting and building and giving away," or we can make our position, in a military and political sense, utterly impregnable by annexing the insular territories I propose. Which shall be our course?

The choice is ours. Are we willing to face the issue?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, House Concurrent Resolution No. 80, which is before the House today for debate, has as its purpose the determination of the size and strength of our postwar Navy by expression of Congress.

Every American citizen is proud of the magnificent showing made by our Navy in World War II. Our Navy demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that it was the No. 1 navy of the world, superior by far to the navy of any other nation.

Since Pearl Harbor, in December of 1941, the Navy of the United States was increased in leaps and bounds until it became the largest, the most powerful, and the most effective navy that the world has ever known. It is interesting to note that on September 8, 1939, at the time of the declaration of the limited emergency by the President, the personnel strength of the Navy and Naval Reserve, active and inactive, was 23,596 officers and 152,181 men. By October 14, 1945, the Navy had expanded to 3,004,811 enlisted men and 323,755 officers. This great Navy, naturally, was the result of the tremendous efforts then being put forth by the Congress and the Navy Department to see that the United States was adequately prepared for naval warfare.

Now that the war is over, and full and complete victory over the enemy has been established, it will no longer be necessary to maintain a navy as large as was maintained during the war period. From the standpoint of necessity, it would not be needed. From the standpoint of taxation, such a navy would be prohibitive But we must not expect to return to a postwar Navy the size of our previous peacetime Navy.

The fact that the United States will have many islands to protect, many naval bases and facilities to maintain throughout the world, and the further fact that the United States has already ratified the United Nations Charter and will become a powerful member thereof in the interest of world peace—all of which statements force us to the conclusion that it will necessarily devolve upon our citizenry to see that our postwar Navy is adequately and efficiently strong in personnel and ships; so that we will still have in peacetime the greatest Navy in the world.

Our country geographically is so located by its proximity to both oceans that our Navy must be sufficiently strong to properly maintain our strength on both oceans. It is the mission of the United States Navy to have control of the ocean and of the air above it; this is our protection for the future. It is the mission of our Navy to keep any enemy, or enemies, as distant from our shores as possible—to save our communities from devastation like that which occurred in the German and Japanese areas. The noble intentions of international charters and treaties must be constantly vitalized by the realistic maintenance of a Navy of sufficient strength, matériel, and personnel to keep inviolate the national security.

Every liberty loving person naturally hopes that the United Nations Charter may develop into an instrument of great strength and power in maintaining peace throughout the world. That is all the more reason why it is necessary for our country to maintain a Navy of adequate size, because as the leader, or at least one of the leaders, of the United Nations, the effectiveness of our fleet must be apparent everywhere.

The resolution before us today raises two basic questions. First, should we maintain a Navy after the war; and, second, if so, what size should the Navy be?

Of course, there could be no argument about the first question. The United States has paid dearly to learn that the means to wage war must be in the hands of those who hate war—that the United States must not sink back into altruistic unpreparedness, but must remain strong. The Navy is a major component of that strength. For the key to victory and the freedom of this country will be in the control of the ocean and in the air over it.

Therefore, the main purpose of the present resolution is to emphasize question No. 2—namely, the size of the Navy—and this resolution before us is to express the sense of Congress as to the size of our postwar Navy.

Our future Navy will have three principal tasks which must be satisfactorily administered in conjunction with the Army—the first one we are quite sure of, namely, the security of the continental United States and its overseas possessions. The second is derived from the Act of Chapultepec, and is coupled with the old historic Monroe Doctrine, and is for the security of the Western Hemisphere. The third—which is the least well defined—relates to the commitments of the United States to preserve the peace of the world.

In the discussion of this resolution before our committee, it was tentatively agreed that an immediate postwar Navy should consist of, first, an active fleet of 297 major combatant ships and 1,375 ships of other types, or a total of 1,672 ships; second, a ready fleet of 104 major combatant ships and 2,209 ships of other types, or a total of 2,313 ships; and, third, a reserve fleet of 681 major combatant ships and 1,418 ships of other types, or a total of 2,099 ships; making a grand total in the active fleet, the ready fleet, and the reserve fleet of more than 6,000 ships.

The active fleet, which will consist of about 30 percent of the whole, will maintain its vessels in full commission and with peacetime complements. The ready reserve ships will be used to train midshipmen and Navy reservists. All of these ships could be made ready for any service within 30 days. The laid-up reserve fleet will consist of about 60 percent of the combatant fleet. These ships would be wholly out of commission, tied up, and with only caretaker crews aboard, but nevertheless ready on short notice to join the first-line battle fleet. The existence of a laid-up reserve would give this country the ability to flex its strength quickly in an emergency. This laid-up reserve will be cheap insurance for the United States as its annual preservation cost will be only one-tenth of 1 percent of the original cost of the ships.

It is estimated by the Navy Department that to properly maintain a fleet of the size just mentioned, it will require an authorized enlisted strength of 500,000 men and approximately 58,000 officers.

Naturally, in the maintenance of a postwar Navy the question of naval aircraft will become exceedingly important. It is presently estimated that less than 12,000 planes—about 8,000 of them in full active duty status—will be necessary in order to have a sufficient postwar Navy. In conjunction with our naval aircraft it will naturally be necessary to have many postwar bases. It will also be necessary to maintain naval aviation facilities, now estimated at 97 throughout continental United States.

It will also be necessary to continue our Marine Corps, which has done such outstanding work in World War II. The United States Marine Corps, as is well known by Congress, is a small body of troops subject to naval command, law, and regulation, and specially trained in the performance of essential naval duties. Its mission is to provide the Navy with adequate amphibious troops, internal and external security forces, and a fleet marine force specially trained for the seizure and deliverance of advanced bases.

To carry out the Marine Corps' postwar functions the enlisted strength is planned at about 100,000, distributed as follows: 13,000 approximately in the security forces, 4,400 on naval facilities, 54,700 in the fleet marine force, and 30,500 at supporting establishments.

The basic Navy postwar plan provides for two fleets—Atlantic and Pacific. It provides for each an amphibious force.

You will recall that when Admiral Nimitz appeared before Congress on October 5, he paid great tribute to the patriotism, zeal, and efficiency of the naval personnel. At that time he also called our attention to the fact that at the end of the war, Japan had a larger army and a far more powerful air force than she possessed on December 7, 1941.

The statistics which the admiral gave us were very interesting. In the home islands of Japan at the time of surrender there were more than 2,000,000 professional military personnel. In addition, there was a large force of home guards, prefectural police and auxiliaries of various kinds. In China, Manchuria, Formosa, and Japanese stolen empire to the South, there were more than 3,000,000 men. All told, Japan could have mustered a trained professional army of

more than 5,000,000 men on VJ-day, as against a total of only 3,000,000 plus on the day the war began.

From the standpoint of air strength, the figures were even more startling. Japan began this war with an approximate total of 5,300 planes of which roughly 3,200 were combatant types. On the day the war ended, Japan's air force had increased by approximately 160 percent to a total of 11,000 planes of which approximately 6,000 were combatant planes.

Just why, then, said Admiral Nimitz was Japan forced to surrender? The answer is apparent. By early August, Japan's fighting fleet had ceased to exist. Of a once great navy, Japan had still afloat only a few ships, many of them badly damaged. Japan's merchant marine likewise suffered practical destruction. So that Japan, a maritime nation, dependent on food and materials overseas, was stripped of her sea power.

The complete annihilation of Japan, as an effective maritime force, was due to the magnificent Navy built up by our country, of which the American people are so proud.

The United States, since its beginning as a nation in 1787, has become the world's most powerful nation. The American flag flies over vast stretches of territory devoted to the interests of the public welfare. As a result of the Spanish-American War, new territory was added to the United States over which our flag still continues to fly. As a result of World War II, many strategic islands and bases, scattered throughout the world, will necessarily come under our protection—either under direct control or under trusteeship sponsored by the United Nations.

Hundreds of thousands of American boys have lost their lives in the German and Japanese wars. Billions of dollars have been spent in the interests of the peace-loving nations of the world. It is self-evident that the United States should now assert her position—namely, that the strategic islands which we have captured in the Pacific should now be ours to use in the future, in time of peace for world commerce, and also as a protection from future potential enemies, should there be any.

We have spent a great deal of money in the islands of the Caribbean and in the South Atlantic. It is, therefore, self-evident that our Nation should claim control and protection of some of these strategic islands in order to use them later on in time of peace for world commerce and also as a protection from future potential enemies, should there be any.

The United States Navy is fully cognizant of this fact and has proposed 27 postwar bases in the Pacific and 13 in the Atlantic—part of which will be for regular operation, part of them under a reduced status, and the balance designated as caretaker emergency.

The resolution before us then becomes all the more important in view of the position that the United States finds itself in as the original father of constitutional government and the world's most intelligent leader in those efforts which will make world peace a possibility instead of a theory.

I, therefore, most heartily endorse the pending resolution and sincerely hope that it will receive the unanimous vote of this House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK) having assumed the chair, Mr. HARE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 80, to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include letters, tables, and telegrams.

The Speaker pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HENRY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WISCONSIN CHEESEMAKERS HAVE $25,000,000 CLAIM AGAINST UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, while reviewing the Private Calendar I noticed a bill (H. R. 1955) which was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CHRIS HERTER, and which has received favorable action from the Committee on Claims contingent upon passage of certain corrective amendments.

To quote from the committee report, the purpose of the bill is as follows:

> To pay to the Revere Sugar Refinery, of Charlestown, Mass., the sum of $115,832.73. This sum represents the amount of loss suffered by the said Revere Sugar Refinery as a result of the failure and refusal of the Office of Price Administration to adjust the ceiling price on raw cane sugar at the port of Boston during the years 1942 and 1943. During this period the claimant was compelled to pay an additional 2 cents per 100 pounds on all raw cane sugar purchased because the OPA neglected and refused to recognize the traditional equality of prices that has always prevailed at the ports of New York and Boston.

That is the purpose of H. R. 1955, as quoted from the committee's "Statement of facts."

It is not my desire, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the merits of this proposed legislation or the findings of the Committee on Claims from the standpoint of whether or not the proposed compensation is reasonable or just. Rather, I want to direct the attention of this honorable body to the fact that legislation of this type will establish a precedent conducive to swamping this Congress with innumerable claims to rectify factual or imagined wrongs suffered by agriculture, industry, producers, and retailers because of the inconsistencies of the Office of Price Administration.

As a factual case, permit me to recite some instances and figures relating to an almost perpetual misunderstanding that Wisconsin cheese producers have experienced with the OPA. I say "perpetual" because it began in 1942 and has continued uninterruptedly and relentlessly to date. Up in Wisconsin we refer to the situation as "Plymouth plus equals Wisconsin minus."

In 1942 the OPA established a price for cheese according to a formula concocted to apply to Plymouth, in Sheboygan County, Wis. The so-called Plymouth-plus price was computed on the basis of 115 percent of the carlot freight rates from Plymouth, Wis., to the point of sale.

The net result was that Wisconsin cheese producers were paid from six-tenths of 1 cent to 2⅓ cents per pound less for their cheese than was paid in other States.

Incidentally, the inequity was aggravated by the fact that producers of Cheddar type cheese in Wisconsin are compelled to pay more for their milk than the manufacturers in other States.

These variations are not confined to widely separated States. Every State adjacent Wisconsin was permitted a higher price for cheese. Minnesota's price was fifty-four hundredths of 1 cent per pound higher than Wisconsin's. Illinois was fifty-two hundredths of 1 cent higher; Iowa, sixty-five hundredths of 1 cent higher, and Michigan fifty-five hundredths of 1 cent above that of Wisconsin. In Montana, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and California the price was more than 2 cents per pound higher than in Wisconsin. The average national price differential would be approximately 1 cent per pound.

In the language of H. R. 1955, the Revere Sugar Refinery was penalized by failure of the Office of Price Administration to adjust an inequitable price ceiling. If this Congress should agree that this individual sugar refinery has suffered a loss of over $115,000, and should decree that the firm be reimbursed out of the United States Treasury for OPA's errors and inconsistencies, what about an equitable settlement for Wisconsin cheese producers?

Wisconsin produced more than 1,100,000,000 pounds of cheese from the time the unfair Plymouth-plus price was established in 1942 to the present. At 1 cent a pound, the average national price differentiation, Wisconsin cheese producers can lay claim to $11,000,000 from the Public Treasury if the sentiments and the virtues of H. R. 1955 are to prevail. And if we consider the price differential of more than 2 cents per pound that exists between Wisconsin and several of the States enumerated here, certainly Wisconsin cheese producers have virtually been mulcted out of approximately $25,000,000 during the 3 years that they have been under the rule of the OPA.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, on the premise that H. R. 1955 is passed by this House, I contend that a precedent will be established that will open the door to thousands of claims. Certainly Wisconsin cheese producers can rightfully demand that the wrongs they have endured because of the incapabilities and whimsies of OPA ought to be rectified by cold cash paid to them out of the United States Treasury.

I submit that legislation like H. R. 1955 is the wrong approach to this deplorable situation, because it deals with effects rather than with causes. The

same administrative inconsistencies which brought about the introduction of H. R. 1955 are prevalent today simply because the Office of Price Administration is permitted to proceed in typical bureaucratic arrogance and without congressional restraint. It seems only logical that remedial legislation dealing with causes is much more in order than that we should be required to sit as a court of equity the while additional claims similar to H. R. 1955 are being created through bureaucratic confusion.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I congratulate the gentleman on his splendid presentation of the problem? But I would not want it to appear in the RECORD that the Wisconsin delegation has been derelict in its duty. May I say to my colleague that the entire Wisconsin delegation, not only in the House, but in the Senate, have worked incessantly to remedy the situation while it was taking place. So that if my colleague from Wisconsin feels that it is necessary to introduce a bill to retrieve this $25,000,000, I am sure he will be perfectly justified in doing so, because we tried to tell the OPA the error of their ways many, many times.

Mr. HENRY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I, too, realize that the entire delegation from Wisconsin has been working diligently on this matter. I merely say that as far as the merits of the claim of the Revere Sugar Refinery Co. are concerned, I do not wish to pass on the fairness or unfairness of it, but if such claims as that are to be paid, then certainly Wisconsin cheese makers are entitled to a large sum of money from the Treasury of the United States approaching something like $25,000,000. If the claim of the Revere Sugar Refinery Co. is paid, certainly we are entitled to consideration from the viewpoint of the Wisconsin cheese makers.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman if he does not also realize that Mr. Leonard Kopitzke and Mr. George Mooney, of the Wisconsin cheese makers, have also exerted every effort trying to straighten out this same situation all during these years?

Mr. HENRY. That confirms what I have said. The gentlemen have been here in Washington and have done a great deal of work so far as the OPA is concerned and have not been able to accomplish anything that approaches fairness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, believing that some discussion on atomic energy from the layman's point of view would be helpful to the Members of the House, I have asked for this time to speak briefly on some of the technical aspects of this amazing discovery recently revealed in its most horrifying and destructive form in Japan. My only qualification for assuming this task is my experience and practice as an industrial chemist before entering public service. I was engaged in metallurgy in the manufacture of steel and aluminum, and in explosives in the manufacture of nitroglycerine, nitrocellulose, tetra-nitroanaline, and in research work on nitro starch.

I do not want to leave the impression that I am an expert on atomic energy. I have found that much of the knowledge I used in chemistry makes atomic energy easier to comprehend, and I believe that we should acquire as much knowledge as we can so that we can act intelligently on the legislation on atomic energy which we will soon have to pass on.

The atomic theory was discovered by John Dalton, an English scientist, in 1808. He said all matter is made up of small indivisible particles called atoms and that the weight of an atom of one element differs from the weight of an atom of another element. This means that an atom is the smallest indivisible particle of matter and that an atom of hydrogen weighs less than an atom of mercury.

Science believed this to be the indisputable law from 1808 to 1919 when Rutherford and Chadwick, English physicists, reported that they had succeeded in knocking protons out of the nitrogen atoms producing hydrogen. This shattered the Dalton atomic theory and proved that the atom was not the smallest indivisible form of matter. That the atom had parts.

Then in 1932 Chadwick discovered the neutron was also a part of the atom.

The third important part is the electron which for all practical purposes makes the atom therefore composed of these three parts:

The electron or outer shell.

The nucleus or center which contains the protons and the neutrons. There are other known parts of the atom such as the neutrino and mesotron. I am confining my discussion to electrons, protons, and neutrons.

LAWS OF CONSERVATION OF MASS AND ENERGY

There are two principles that have been cornerstones of the structure of modern science. The first—that matter can be neither created nor destroyed but only altered in form—was enunciated in the eighteenth century. This is known as the law of conservation of mass. The second—that energy can be neither created nor destroyed but only altered in form—emerged in the nineteenth century. This is known as the law of conservation of energy.

For all practical purposes these two principles were unaltered and separate until some 5 years ago.

It is now known that they are, in fact, two phases of a single principle, for we have discovered that energy may sometimes be converted into matter and matter into energy. Specifically, such a conversion is observed in the phenomenon of nuclear fission of uranium, U–235, a process in which atomic nuclei is split into fragments with the release of an enormous amount of energy.

Einstein as early as 1905 clearly stated that mass and energy were equivalent and suggested that proof of this equivalence might be found by the study of radioactive substances such as U–235 or radium. He concluded that the amount of energy, E, equivalent to a mass, m, was given by the equation $E = mc^2$ where c is the velocity of light, 186,000 miles per second. If this is stated in actual numbers, its startling character is apparent. It shows that 2.2 pounds of matter, if converted entirely into energy, would give 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy. This is equal to the energy that would be generated by the total electric power industry in the United States—as of 1939—running for approximately 2 months.

To the average person without some scientific knowledge or training, atomic energy is a great mystery, beyond understanding and something for only scientists, engineers, physicists, and mathematicians to deal with. The average person thus closes his mind and shuts himself out from any possibility of learning anything about atomic energy believing that it is something so new and terrifying, so deep and impenetrable that he thinks he could never grasp or understand it.

ATOMIC ENERGY IS NOT NEW

Atomic energy is not new. It has always existed. All we have done is discover it. It is as old as the hills.

Can you imagine the utter amazement of the first man that discovered fire? Think of the courage of Ben Franklin when he discovered electricity by flying a kite during a thunderstorm. He did not know then that he would not be electrocuted and he did not have then the slightest idea that electricity would be used to light great cities, drive great power plants, heat homes, cook food, and the thousands of other uses it has been put to.

We know what fire is and how to use and control it. We know how to use and control electricity. Frankly, now should we not learn all we can about atomic energy instead of looking upon it as a monster of destruction, but rather as a great gift to humanity for good, and a means to help mankind live better and happier?

LEARN ALL YOU CAN ABOUT ATOMIC ENERGY

Nothing is more important to our domestic and international future than to learn all we can about atomic energy and the atomic bomb. We should know what the word "fission" means.

We should know what "neutrons" are. We should know what a "chain reaction" is. We should know why "uranium 235" was used in preference to any other element.

Here are some of the answers:

"Fission" means the property to break up into fragments, to split, in this instance into other atoms.

"Neutrons" are subatomic particles which are 10,000 times smaller than atoms and are neutral, hence their name. That is they are neither positive nor negative.

"Chain reactions" are the continuations of the reaction of releasing neutrons which in turn penetrate other fissionable atoms and release other neutrons thereby establishing a continuous reaction.

Uranium 235 was used because it was found to be the one element that was

most easily fissionable by neutron bombardment.

Any discussion by Members of Congress on atomic energy must be based on logical reasoning concerning the future use of it for military and nonmilitary industrial and commercial development. The soundest and most serious thought and consideration that has ever been given to any problem the Congress has ever had to solve must be applied.

The potentialities of atomic energy are too great, too serious, too far-reaching in their effect on the future of civilized mankind.

THERE IS NOTHING NEW UNDER THE SUN

Before Einstein announced the theory that matter can be converted into energy, it was known that neither matter nor energy could be created or destroyed. You can only change its form. In other words to use an old adage, "there is nothing new under the sun," or all matter and energy that now exists has always existed and no new matter can be created; neither can you destroy matter that now exists. All you can do is change or alter its form. That is you can change ore into metal, or coal into coke, or cotton into explosives, but you do not create nor destroy matter. You merely change its form.

But we have only changed its outer form, not its inner form. We have not released any atomic energy. All we have done is rearrange the atoms of the matter we have been dealing with. These atoms, of which all matter is composed, are well protected. They are harder to budge than the most reactionary or conservative Member of Congress. I say this advisedly because you cannot make a man do what he will not do but you can now make the atom do what you want it to do. That is some of them. There are still many reactionary and conservative atoms. The most liberal one is uranium 235, and there is a good reason for this, because U–235 atom has more protons and neutrons, congested and compacted in its nucleus, and more electrons revolving around it than any other known atom, just waiting for a chance to split up and release atomic energy.

ATOMS ARE VERY SMALL

Atoms are very, very small. They are so small that 100,000,000 laid side by side would not measure an inch in length. Everything is made up of atoms—your clothes, food, your body, house, automobile—everything. All matter is made up of atoms.

All atoms are not alike. The principal difference between atoms is in the number of electrons surrounding the nucleus, which always equals the number of protons in the nucleus in all stable atoms. This means that there are a different number of electrons surrounding the nucleus of an atom of gold than there are surrounding an atom of copper, or of tin, or of aluminum, or of iron, and so on.

There are 92 different kinds of atoms. Each have a different number of electrons revolving around their nucleus causing them to have different properties and characteristics.

URANIUM 235 IS VERY VALUABLE AND HARD TO OBTAIN

The most simple or least complex atom is hydrogen, which has only one electron revolving around its nucleus.

The most complex atom known is uranium, which has 92 electrons revolving around its nucleus. That is part of the reason why uranium 235 can be used so successfully as the essential element in the production of atomic energy.

Uranium 235 is not the ordinary form of uranium that occurs in nature. It occurs naturally as U–238, and it takes 140 pounds of U–238 to produce 1 pound of U–235. It is very difficult to convert U–238 into U–235.

One pound of U–235 can produce energy equal to 3,000,000 pounds of coal. Think what that means.

Another thing about U–235 is that when its atom is split up by being shot at or bombarded by a neutron, it yields other neutrons, which, in turn, bombard and split other atoms of U–235 that are nearby. Thus the process, once started, continues, each reaction releasing tremendous heat and energy. This is called a chain reaction.

One reason why U–235 does this so well is because its nucleus has—in addition to its 92 protons—143 neutrons crowded and congested within it, and 92 electrons revolving around the nucleus. Another characteristic of U–235 is that it is fissionable or subject to fragmentation. This is what makes U–235 so valuable for the production of atomic energy and the atomic bomb.

You can—or can you?—imagine how many U–235 atoms there are in one pound of U–235 at 100,000,000 to the inch if laid end to end all of which may be split, and each thereby releasing tremendous heat and energy.

Applying the theory that matter cannot be created or destroyed but only altered in form, then we did not destroy anything at Hiroshima or Nagasaki. All we did was to change its form.

TRANSMUTATION OF METALS

In addition to the source of power from atomic energy, one of the most important possibilities is the development of transmutation—that is, the converting of one element into another. The effect of transmutation on the economy of the world is stupendous and far reaching.

If methods are found to convert lead into gold in commercial quantities, or iron into silver or copper, you can well imagine what would happen to monetary values. And it is possible that these methods will be found through the development of atomic energy.

Transmutation has already been done. We have converted uranium into barium, nitrogen into hydrogen. General Electric has changed silver into cadmium, and silver into palladium and copper into nickel—see page 60, Time, October 29, 1945—not in commercial quantities, but it has been done. Now get your pencils out and start figuring what your silver dollar will be worth 20 years from now.

Transmutation was the first thing the alchemist, the great-great-granddaddy of the present-day chemist, tried to do but he never found out how to change one metal into another, because he did not know the natural law of the elements. The present-day chemist is on the right track because he knows the natural law of elements and is following them.

We can look forward to some of the greatest developments in science we have ever seen. Do not be afraid that atomic energy will destroy anything because matter cannot be destroyed, and all things are composed of matter, mass, or if you please, atoms, and all that can happen is to alter its form. Everything that now exists will still exist just as long as the Almighty God will permit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This discussion would not be complete without recommendations as to what Congress should do about the control of atomic energy.

I, therefore, recommend that we retain the secret of the atomic bomb but offer to use it as a member nation of the Security Council of United Nations if it becomes necessary to keep the peace on justifiable request of another member nation but not reveal the secret.

That we exchange with other nations our knowledge of atomic energy for peacetime purposes for the knowledge they have.

That we urge the abolition of the use of atomic energy by all nations for military purposes.

That we encourage wide and expansive experimentation and development of atomic energy in the United States for commercial and industrial purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JARMAN (at the request of Mr. HOBBS), indefinitely, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946.

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 30, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 a. m. Tuesday, October 30, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee will hold a hearing on Tuesday, October 30, 1945, at 10 a. m., on the star-route bills (H. R. 2000 and H. R. 2524) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream-pollution abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

805. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 for Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, as an amendment to House Document 340, in the revised amount of $951,000, for the National Institute of Health (H. Doc. No. 364); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

806. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $24,500,000 for the National Housing Agency (H. Doc. No. 365); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows.

Mr. STOCKMAN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 608. A bill to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4411. A bill to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3028. A bill to amend the act of August 17, 1937, as amended, relating to the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in the State of North Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2181. A bill to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 1036. An act to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave; with amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4386. A bill to facilitate and simplify the administration of Indian Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3574. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 1154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs; with amendment (Rept. No. 1155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett; with amendment (Rept. No. 1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3225. A bill for the relief of Rolla Duncan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 504. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township; without amendment (Rept. No. 1158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 4510. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact between Colorado and New Mexico with respect to the waters of Costilla Creek; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 4511. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4512. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4513. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916," approved March 15, 1915 (38 Stat. 1101); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4514. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. H. 4515. A bill to direct and require the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces, and to prohibit the drafting or required enlistment of certain persons in the Army or Navy, and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 4516. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Lake DePue in Bureau County, Ill., and connecting channels with the Illinois River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4517. A bill to authorize the payment of the entire amount found due in the settlement of accounts of deceased personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without the appointment of a legal representative of the estate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 4518. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces, and restrict jurisdiction of commanding officers in declaring essentiality, and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4519. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4520. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act approved July 16, 1916, and acts amendatory thereto and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4521. A bill relating to the settlement of accounts of deceased personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of a letter of invitation to the Government and people of Iceland to become a State in the Union of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 262. Joint resolution requesting that negotiations be entered into for the acquisition of certain islands in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and in the Caribbean Sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution requesting that negotiations be entered into with Denmark for the acquisition of Greenland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 264. Joint resolution favoring action by the United States looking to the restoration of Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to provide for proceeding with certain rivers and harbors

projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 382. Resolution requesting information from the Secretary of State with reference to Tyler Kent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 383. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4411, a bill to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 384. Resolution making H. R. 3891, a bill to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 385. Resolution to provide for a study and investigation of the operation of the program for the disposition of surplus property; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4522. A bill for the relief of Bernard Scheff; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. R. 4523. A bill for the relief of Mabel Colliver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4524. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4525. A bill for the relief of Oran Edmund Randall Rumrill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 4526. A bill for the relief of Henry Chudej, individually, and as guardian of Jeanette Jurecek, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4527. A bill for the relief of O. T. Nelson, and wife, Clara Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4528. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Enola R. Lloyd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4529. A bill for the relief of Mark D. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1276. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the members of the congregation of the First Unitarian Church of Buffalo, N. Y., urging that the United States Government seek to broaden the authority of the World Security Council to prevent the use of atomic energy and all other weapons of similar destructiveness for waging war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1277. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Carl S. Locke, of Medford, Mass., and 474 other workers at Submarine Signal Co., asking that unemployment compensation be increased and favoring other items of the CIO legislative program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1278. Also, petition of Edward J. Deady, of Malden, Mass., and 239 other members of the United Furniture Workers of America, Local 136-B, CIO, in favor of the full employment bill and other items of the CIO legislative program; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1279. By Mr. KING: Resolution passed unanimously by the executive board of Western Mechanics, Local 700, of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, CIO, in support of legislation providing officer's status for merchant marine radio operators; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1280. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution from Kiwanis Club, of Portsmouth, N. H., requesting that the Secretary of the Navy take whatever action is necessary to bring about the retention of the United States Submarine *Sailfish* in Portsmouth, N. H., as a naval reserve armory, training center, and public memorial; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1281. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of State Senate of Arizona Legislature, Memorial No. 2, requesting Congress to investigate the administration of the national forests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1282. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Prospect Pomona Grange, No. 25, Patrons of Husbandry of Vermont, Orleans, Vt., that selective service regulations be amended to grant educational deferments to the young men enrolled in our educational institutions to permit them to complete such education through the twelfth grade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1283. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition signed by Mrs. Ellie C. Davis, of Skowhegan, Maine, and other citizens of surrounding towns, asking for a hearing on the Townsend plan by the Ways and Means Committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chapiain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, whose command is over all and whose providence faileth not, let us be aware of Thy presence and obedient to Thy will. Thou alone knowest our needs and can touch us with that spirit that exalts, enriches, and purifies. Guard us against dishonesty in purpose and in deed, helping us so to live that we can stand unashamed before our loved ones and Thee. If we are inclined to doubt, steady our faith; if we are tempted, make us strong to resist; if we should miss the mark, give us courage to try again. Guide us with the light of truth, and keep before us the life of Him by whose example and help we trust to obtain the answer to our prayer.

Clothe us at all times with an earnest and patriotic desire to do great things for a great people, demonstrating the wisdom of popular government. Be with us, blessed Lord, lest we forget that nothing endures which is not in accordance with the laws Thou hast ordained.

"Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart;

H. R. 1560. An act for the relief of J. B. Grigsby;

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor;

H. R. 3281. An act to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June;

H. R. 3453. An act for the relief of John W. Farrell;

H. R. 3870. An act to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the Harry L. Englebright Dam; and

H. R. 4083. An act authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney;

S. 765. An act concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States, and on the civil international air-transport routes from the United States;

S. 815. An act for the relief of Ogden and Dougherty, and for other purposes;

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Winter Bros. Co.;

S. 1259. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.; and

S. 1425. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr." approved June 8, 1940.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 34, 37, and 82.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, and 81, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 121. DECREASE IN CORPORATION SURTAX.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 15 (b) (relating to the corportation surtax) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the corporation surtax net income of every corporation (except a Western Hemisphere trade corporation as defined in section 109, and except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), Supplement G or Supplement Q) a surtax as follows:

"'(1) Surtax net incomes not over $25,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes not over $25,000, 6 per centum of the amount thereof.

"'(2) Surtax net incomes over $25,000, but not over $50,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes over $25,000, but not over $50,000, $1,500 plus 22 per centum of the amount of the corporation surtax net income over $25,000.

"'(3) Surtax net incomes over $50,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes over $50,000, 14 per centum of the corporation surtax net income.'

"(b) MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES OTHER THAN LIFE OR MARINE.—

"(1) Section 207 (a) (1) (B) (relating to surtax on mutual insurance companies, other than life or marine) is amended to read as follows:

"'(B) Surtax.—A surtax on the corporation surtax net income, computed at the rates provided in section 15 (b), except that if the corporation surtax net income is not more than $6,000 the surtax shall be 12 per centum of the amount by which the corporation surtax net income exceeds $3,000.'

"(2) Section 207 (a) (3) (B) (relating to surtax on interinsurers or reciprocal underwriters) is amended by striking out '32 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '28 per centum.'

"(c) REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—Section 362 (b) (4) (relating to the surtax on regulated investment companies) is amended by striking out '16 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '14 per centum'.

"(d) TAXABLE YEARS TO WHICH APPLICABLE.—The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, see section 131."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

"(A) Section 2 (a) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 (relating to the specific exemption) is repealed as of the date of its enactment.

"(B) Section 710 (b) (1) (relating to the specific exemption) is restored to read as such paragraph read immediately prior to the enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945, to be effective, as so restored, as if section 2 (a) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 had not be enacted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 142. DEFERMENT OF CERTAIN TAXES OF VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 38 (miscellaneous provisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"'SEC. 3808. DEFERMENT OF TAX ATTRIBUTABLE TO SERVICE PAY FOR COMMISSIONED SERVICE AND OF TAX ATTRIBUTABLE TO PRE-SERVICE EARNED INCOME.

"'(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

"'(1) TAX ATTRIBUTABLE TO SERVICE PAY.—The term "tax attributable to service pay" means—

"'(A) in the case of a war year for which the taxpayer had no gross income other than compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, the tax imposed under chapter 1 for such year; or

"'(B) in the case of a war year for which the taxpayer had gross income in addition to compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, the excess of the tax imposed under chapter 1 for such year over the tax that would have been imposed if such compensation had been excluded from gross income; except that in the case of a commissioned officer (or a commissioned warrant officer) of the regular component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, such term shall not apply to any war year unless, at the time prescribed for the payment of the tax under chapter 1 for such year, a period of time was being disregarded under section 3804.

"'(2) WAR YEAR.—The term "war year"—

"'(A) when used with respect to the tax attributable to service pay means any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, and before January 1, 1947; and

"'(B) when used with respect to the tax attributable to pre-service earned income means any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, but before January 1, 1942, and before the taxpayer entered upon active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, but does not include any year unless part of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such year became due and payable after the taxpayer entered upon such active service.

"'(3) TAX ATTRIBUTABLE TO PRE-SERVICE EARNED INCOME.—The term "tax attributable to pre-service earned income" means the excess of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for any war year over the tax that would have been imposed for such year if there had been excluded from the net income for such year the amount of the earned net income (as such term was defined in section 25 (a) (4) as in force with respect to such year, except that in computing such earned net income, compensation for active service in such forces shall be disregarded).

"'(4) FIRST INSTALLMENT DATE.—The term "first installment date" means May 15, 1946, in the case of taxpayers released from active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to December 1, 1945; and in other cases June 15, 1947, or the fifteenth day of the sixth month which begins after the date of the taxpayer's release from active duty in such forces, whichever is the earlier; except that, if the first installment date with respect to any war year would otherwise occur earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such year, the first installment date with respect to such year shall be the fifteenth day of such third month.

"'(b) EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PAYMENT.—Upon application with respect to any war year, made prior to the first installment date, and under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary—

"'(1) the time for payment of an amount of the tax under chapter 1 for such year which is equal to the tax attributable to service pay for such year and which has not been paid before the filing of such application; and

"'(2) the time for the payment of an amount of the tax under chapter 1 for such year which is equal to the tax attributable to pre-service earned income for such year and which has not been paid before the filing of such application,

shall, in lieu of the time otherwise applicable, be as follows: one-twelfth thereof on the first installment date and an additional twelfth thereof every three months thereafter until such tax is paid.

"'(c) SUSPENSION OF PERIOD OF LIMITATION.—The running of the period of limitation provided in section 276 (c) (relating to the collection of the tax after assessment) in respect of any tax the time for the payment of which is prescribed under subsection (b), shall be suspended for the period beginning with the date of the filing of the application under such subsection and ending six months after the date prescribed therein for the payment of the last installment of such tax.

"'(d) ESTIMATED TAX.—If the taxpayer is eligible for the benefits of subsection (b) with respect to any war year—

"'(1) for the purposes of the application of section 58 with respect to such year, compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States may be disregarded in determining the gross income reasonably expected for such year, and in determining the estimated tax for such year; and

"'(2) for the purposes of section 294 (d) the tax for such year shall be determined as if such compensation were excluded from gross income.

This subsection shall not apply with respect to a taxpayer for any war year who at the time prescribed for making the declaration of estimated tax for such year is a commissioned officer (or a commissioned warrant officer) of the regular component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.'

"(b) REFUND OF INTEREST PAID.—Any interest paid prior to the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to tax attributable to service pay for any war year, or with respect to tax attributable to pre-service earned income for any war year, shall be credited or refunded if claim therefor is filed with the Commissioner prior to January 1, 1947."

And the Senate agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
ROBERT TAFT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: These are technical amendments and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7: The House bill provided surtax rates on individuals, ranging from 16 percent to 81½ percent, and provided that in no case should the aggregate of the normal tax and surtax exceed 81 percent of the net income.

The Senate amendments strike out the House provisions, provide for a 5-percent reduction in the normal tax, and establish a tentative surtax table, running from 17 to 88 percent, with a 5-percent reduction in the tentative surtax so computed, and provide that the aggregate of the normal tax and surtax shall in no case exceed 85½ percent of the net income.

The House recedes on these amendments.

Amendments Nos. 8 to 19, inclusive: These are clerical amendments and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 20: The House bill provided a tax table for supplement T, dealing with the tax on individuals with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000, which embodied the normal tax and surtax rates under the House bill. The Senate amendment substitutes another table based on the Senate's treatment of normal tax and surtax. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 21: The House bill provided tables for wage bracket withholding by employers of tax from wages paid employees. These tables were based on the normal tax and surtax rates provided in the House bill. The Senate amendment substitutes other tables based on the normal tax and surtax under the Senate amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 22: Under both the House bill and the Senate amendments the exemptions applicable to the surtax are made applicable to the normal tax. Thus employers will no longer withhold tax from those previously subject solely to liability for the normal tax. Under present law an employer is required to provide a statement (known as Form W–2) only when tax has been withheld. Such statements are used by millions of taxpayers as a simple tax return. The amendment requires employers to continue to provide employees with such withholding statements where they would be required under present law even though no tax is withheld under the new withholding provisions. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 23: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 24: The House bill reduced the surtax on corporations by 4 percentage points in each bracket, effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945. The Senate amendment strikes out this provision and provides for a reduction in normal tax and surtax in the case of corporations whose normal tax net income or surtax net income is less than $60,000, effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945. The House recedes with an amendment (1) providing for a reduction of 2 percentage points in surtax rates on corporations with corporation surtax net incomes of $50,000 and over, and (2) retaining the House provisions for corporations with corporation surtax net incomes of less than $50,000, subject to a "notch" rate on the income between $25,000 and $50,000 so as to provide an equitable transition between the 2 percentage points reduction, on the one hand, and the 4 percentage points reduction provided in the House bill on the other hand.

Amendment No. 25: The House bill reduced the excess-profits-tax rate from the present effective rate of 85½ to 60 percent, the reduction to be effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945. The Senate amendment strikes out this provision of the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27: These are clerical amendments and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 28 and 29: The House bill repealed the excess-profits tax effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. Amendment 28 strikes out this provision. Amendment 29 provides that the excess-profits-tax chapter of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945. Senate amendment 29 also provides that, despite the repeal of the excess-profits tax for 1946, the provisions of the excess-profits-tax law shall remain in force so as to permit carry-back of the unused excess-profits credit from 1946 to 1944 and 1945, and so as to assure the making of the necessary adjustments in the net operating loss carry-backs. The amendment provides that there shall be no carry-back of unused excess-profits credits from taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The amendment also makes provision for the application of the carry-back in the case of affiliated groups of corporations.

Technical changes are also made with respect to the periods of limitation for claiming or allowing credits or refunds and assessing deficiencies, attributable to carry-backs. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 30 to 33, inclusive: These are clerical amendments and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 34: This amendment changes the specific exemption in the case of taxable years beginning in 1945 and the Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 35 and 36: These are clerical amendments and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 37: This is a clerical amendment and the Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: These are technical amendments relating to fiscal years and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 40: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes with an amendment making a further technical amendment.

Amendment No. 41: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 42: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 43: This amendment provides for the exclusion from gross income of the entire service pay of enlisted personnel for taxable years beginning after 1940 and preserves the $1,500 exclusion from gross income in the case of officers for the taxable years beginning after 1942, the exclusion in either case to apply only to pay received before the termination of the war, whether or not before separation from the service; and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 44: Under this amendment the time for the payment of the tax liability of commissioned personnel of the armed forces for the years 1940 through 1946, inclusive is, upon application of the taxpayer, deferred, insofar as such liability is attributable to service pay. The liability so deferred is payable over a period of approximately 3 years in 12 quarterly installments. The 3-year period begins on May 15, 1946, in the case of taxpayers released from active duty prior to December 1, 1945, and in other cases on June 15, 1947, or the 15th day of the sixth month which begins after the date of the taxpayer's release from active duty, whichever is the earlier. Under the Senate amendment if the 3-year period begins before the end of a period of time disregarded under section 3804 (relating to taxpayers overseas) the beginning of the 3-year period does not begin until the end of the period so disregarded.

The Senate amendment also provides that tax for the year 1940 or 1941 (to the extent that it is attributable to preservice earned income), which became due and payable after the taxpayer entered upon active service in the armed forces, may also be deferred and paid in 12 quarterly installments over the 3-year period specified above.

Any interest paid prior to the date of the enactment of the act with respect to tax which could be deferred under the provisions of the Senate amendment is to be credited or refunded if claim therefor is filed before January 1, 1947.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment with certain clerical and technical amendments thereto. The technical amendments are as follows:

(1) The conference agreement does not authorize deferment of tax attributable to service pay in the case of officers of the regular component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, unless at the time prescribed for the payment of the tax a period of time was being disregarded under section 3804 (relating to taxpayers overseas).

(2) In determining when the first of the 12 quarterly installments is payable, the conference agreement omits the reference to section 3804 as unnecessary since section 3304 in itself will operate to postpone such first installment date in proper cases.

(3) The conference agreement inserts a provision relating to declaration and payment of estimated tax in order to make it clear that the deferment for which a taxpayer might apply in the future is not nullified by a requirement that the taxpayer currently declare and make payments of estimated tax. This provision does not apply to commissioned officers of the regular component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for the reason that the requirements with respect to declaration and payment of estimated tax by them is adequately dealt with in section 3804.

Amendment No. 45: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 46: This amendment provides that where amounts in excess of $75,000 are allowed as tentative amortization adjustments, the Commissioner shall not be required to report such allowances to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation prior to their payment but shall report them when the correct amount of the tax has been determined. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 47: This amendment extends to taxable years beginning in 1946, the provisions of section 22 (b) (9) and (10) of the code relating to discharge of indebtedness. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 48: This amendment applies to lost, stolen, or destroyed excess-profits-tax postwar-credit bonds the same treatment that is now applied to other Government securities by section 8 (c) of the Government Losses in Shipment Act. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 49: This amendment provides that for income-tax taxable years ending after June 30, 1945, and before July 1, 1946, the declared value excess-profits tax attributable to war-loss recoveries included in net income shall be at the rate of 1¼ percent in lieu of the generally applicable rate. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 50: This amendment strikes out section 301 of the House bill which provided for the termination on June 30, 1946, of the increases made in the Revenue Act of 1943 in various excise-tax rates. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 51: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 52: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 53, 54, and 55: These are clerical amendments and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 56 to 78, inclusive: These are technical amendments. The principal effect of these amendments is to make the

provisions of the House bill relating to floor stocks tax refunds for alcoholic beverages and electric-light bulbs applicable so that the refunds will be made whenever the increases in the rates made by the Revenue Act of 1943 terminate. The House recedes on these amendments.

Amendment No. 79: This amendment provides that the termination of the increases made by the Revenue Act of 1943 in the rates applicable to telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities shall, when payment is made pursuant to bills rendered, take place upon the basis of bills rendered on or after the rate-reduction date for services for which no previous bills were rendered except with respect to services rendered more than 2 months before such date. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 80: This is a technical amendment made necessary by the Senate treatment of the excise-tax provisions and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 81: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 82: This amendment repeals certain excise taxes. The Senate recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, after reading the statement of the conference by the Clerk, a further statement may not be necessary. However, I wish to make a brief statement to the House, and after that, if there are any questions in the minds of Members, I will endeavor to enlighten the House concerning them.

In my opinion, this might be called a bill that was prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means, the Senate Committee on Finance, and the Treasury Department, as we all had a considerable part in its preparation.

A glance at the conference report will show that, as usual, the amendments on which the House conferees receded are much greater in number than those on which the Senate conferees receded. This is usually the case, since the technical and clerical amendments necessary to any rearrangement are usually made by the Senate.

The bills had two major differences which are as follows:

First. Under the House bill, the excess-profits tax was continued through December 31, 1946, at a reduced rate of 60 percent and was terminated as of January 1, 1947. Under the Senate bill, the excess-profits tax was repealed as of January 1, 1946.

Second. Under the House bill, corporations were allowed a four-percentage-point reduction in each surtax bracket. Thus, corporations with incomes of $50,000 or more under the House bill had their 40-percent normal and surtax rate reduced to 36 percent. Corporations with incomes not over $25,000 under the House bill have their combined normal and surtax rate of 25 percent reduced to 21 percent. The House bill also contained a reduction in the notch provision applicable to that portion of a corporation's income between $25,000 and $50,000.

Under the Senate bill, corporations with incomes of $60,000 or more were not granted any relief. Corporations with incomes below $60,000 were entitled to relief, which was somewhat similar to that granted to corporations under the House bill, but with a new rate schedule.

The opposition of the House conferees to the outright repeal of the excess-profits tax as of January 1, 1946, was that by taking such a large part of the total tax reduction for this one tax, it was not possible to keep within the safety limit of $5,000,000,000, and at the same time provide relief for corporations not subject to excess-profits taxes. As I have already stated, the Senate bill granted no relief from the ordinary income tax to corporations with incomes above $60,000.

The conferees reached a compromise on these two major issues. Under the conference agreement, the surtax was reduced in the case of all corporations. Corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less received a 4-percent reduction. Corporations with incomes in excess of $50,000 are entitled to a 2 percent reduction, instead of the 4-percent reduction provided under the House bill. Corporations with incomes of over $25,000 and less than $50,000 are entitled to a reduction of more than 2 percent but less than 4 percent, and which reaches 2 percent at the $50,000 level. Thus the compromise agreement grants relief to all net income corporations, although the relief is not as large as that originally proposed under the House bill.

Of the other amendments, there was no difficulty in reaching an agreement.

So far as the individual income tax was concerned, there was very little to choose between the Senate and House bills. Under the Senate bill, the total relief for 1946 granted to individual income taxpayers amounted to $2,645,000,000. Under the House bill, the total relief granted for 1946 amounted to $2,627,000,000, or a difference of $18,000,000.

The House provision was a better provision from the standpoint of simplification. The Senate provision granted a little more relief than the House bill to taxpayers with incomes between $4,000 and $50,000 and less relief to taxpayers with incomes above $50,000. Up to $4,000, the relief granted was the same under both bills. Your House conferees agreed to accept the Senate provision. In the Senate bill, after the normal and surtaxes are computed under the revised rates in the bill, they are in effect reduced by 5 percent. As the House bill passed here, we provided in effect that all taxpayers should receive not less than 10 percent.

As far as the excise tax was concerned, we found, after we had agreed on the corporation and individual income taxes, if we terminated the wartime increases imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943 now, as provided in the House bill, it would make the loss of revenue too great. For the half year 1946 it would be about $695,000,000. It was recognized by all of the conferees that the excise taxes should have a thorough consideration in the next tax bill. The Senate conferees agreed to recede from their amendment terminating the excise taxes on electric, gas, and oil appliances, photographic apparatus, sporting goods and business machines. In return, the House conferees agreed to continue existing law with respect to the termination of the war tax increases on excises imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943. Under existing law, these temporary increases will be terminated on the first day of the first month following 6 months after cessation of hostilities. Cessation of hostilities can be terminated by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress. However, the Senate conferees agreed to the provisions of the House bill relating to floor stock tax refunds for alcoholic beverages and electric light bulbs, so that these provisions will go into effect at the time the wartime increases under the Revenue Act of 1943 are terminated.

The Senate bill had several excellent provisions granting relief to servicemen. In brief, the provisions exempted all enlisted men from liability for paying taxes and filing returns with respect to their service pay received during the war. Commissioned officers are granted an additional 3 years to pay their taxes attributable to service pay for the war period, the tax so deferred to be paid in 12 equal quarterly installments without interest. In the case of regular officers of the Army, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard, this extension is granted only if they were out of the country at the time their taxes became due. Further relief is granted to servicemen with respect to their tax attributable to earned income for 1940 and 1941, which fell due after they entered the service. These individuals are granted an additional 3 years to pay the tax attributable to such earned income, without interest. The House conferees agreed to these provisions.

The Senate bill adopted the House provisions relating to the repeal of the capital-stock tax, the related declared-value excess-profits tax, and the automobile-use tax.

There were several amendments upon which concessions were made by both sides. The Senate conferees agreed to recede on an amendment increasing the specific exemption for excess-profits tax purposes for 1945. This amendment, if adopted, would have reduced the revenues by $85,000,000. The House conferees agreed to accept several other technical amendments in the Senate bill, some of which were suggested by, and others had the approval of, the Treasury. These amendments in general relate to withholding statements, reporting of tentative amortization adjustments to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, extension of the period in which a corporation may retire its own bonds without the recognition of gain, special relief for lost excess-profits tax bonds, and some relief from the declared-value excess-profits tax in the case of recovery or war losses in 1945.

On the whole, I believe we have arrived at a fair compromise. The total revenue loss amounts to approximately $5,900,000,000 for 1946, which is somewhat larger than either the House bill or the Senate bill called for. However, it was the best compromise which could be reached

and at the same time provide for relief to all corporations instead of merely those liable to the excess-profits tax.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the original proposal of the Treasury reduced revenues by approximately $5,350,000,000. With the stimulus to business and employment occasioned by this bill, the tax loss will not, in my opinion, exceed $5,500,000,000, and it may be much less. In this bill and the prior act, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945, we have removed the obstacles which might prevent reconversion, expansion, and employment.

I say, if industry goes forward, as it is claimed it would if we gave them this relief, if industry will expand its plants and organize new industries and employ additional labor, the business of the country will be benefited. We have taken them at their word. If they do not do it, the responsibility will be on them. It will not be on the Congress. They claim that what they need is encouragement; that the excess-profits tax has a tendency to deter the starting of new and expanding enterprises, and that if we would eliminate the excess-profits tax, it would be an encouragement to business expansion and that as a consequence of business expansion, employment would be increased.

Having given business the green light, I hope the results will justify these reductions. Apart from simplification and administrative measures, and the closing of tax loopholes, I believe that the next tax bill should be directed toward encouragement of our individual income taxpayers, and a revision of our excise tax system.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. In the gentleman's statement he said we made no changes of any consequence with reference to excise taxes. As I understand it, we make no changes whatever in the new bill with reference to excise taxes.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. No changes whatever, except that the Senate conferees agreed to adopt the provisions of the House bill providing for floor-stock refunds when the reductions take effect.

Mr. JENKINS. The excises stay exactly as they are.

Does not the gentleman think that perhaps when we take up the new tax bill after the first of the year and which will be finished before June, we can do something with reference to excises?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We hope to; we are going to make a survey of the whole excise-tax field, and we will do all we can to get rid of wartime excises and wartime increases in excises.

Mr. JENKINS. When we passed the House bill we gave some encouragement to the country that there would be some change made in the excise taxes, but those changes in the House bill applied only to the excises that have been increased during the wartime.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That was all.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. For the purpose of keeping the record straight and so that the House can thoroughly understand it, with the repeal of the excess-profits tax effective January 1, 1946, it will have the effect of putting into operation the act of March 27, 1934, and the act of June 28, 1940, relating to profits in shipbuilding.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The Vinson-Trammell Act provisions to which you refer were only suspended during the period the excess-profits tax is in effect.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. If the excess-profits tax is repealed as of January 1, 1946, contracts and subcontracts entered into in any taxable year to which the excess-profits tax does not apply would be subject to the Vinson Act and certain provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1926.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We are glad we have the Vinson Act still with us. We only suspended it under section 401 of the Second Revenue Act of 1940 while the excess-profits tax was in effect.

Mr. VINSON. But that law operates after January 1, 1946.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. If this conference report is adopted and becomes law, it does with respect to contracts and subcontracts entered into in any taxable year to which the excess-profits tax does not apply.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I wish to ask the gentleman from North Carolina what, under existing law, is the situation with reference to soldiers or members of the armed forces during the period of time in which they were prisoners of war. Are they or are they not required to pay an income tax if they had a taxable income during that time?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Taxes for enlisted men in the war period, so far as they relate to service pay, are forgiven.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understand that. What about the officers?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I understand that the officers will be given an additional 3 years in which to pay their taxes in 12 equal installments without interest, if they have not already paid them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I call the gentleman's attention to what I believe is an unjustifiable discrimination—that is, if a discrimination could ever be justified. As I understand it, if an officer were taken prisoner in the Philippines and held in the Philippines by the Japanese during the time of his imprisonment he does not have to pay any tax, but if the Japanese took him away from the Philippines, took him to Japan to serve his imprisonment, then he has to pay a tax. In other words, two officers in the same detachment are taken prisoners in the Philippines; one stays in the Philippines and one is sent to Japan; the prisoner who stays in the Philippines does not have to pay a tax but the one who is sent to Japan does. I understand that is the law.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. This matter, as well as some other matters relating to service relief were passed over for consideration in the next bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In the meantime the officer who was held prisoner in Japan has to pay a tax. It seems to me the discrimination is hard to justify.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The officer can, under this bill, get an extension of time within which to pay the tax.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But the gentleman believes that will be corrected?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It was discussed, but there was insufficient time to dispose of the matter in this bill. We shall be glad to hear the gentleman or anyone else interested when the next tax bill is taken up, and I assure him that full consideration and study of this matter will be made.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MASON. It is a fact that under the present law a prisoner of war who has been a prisoner for 2 or 3 years, whose pay has accumulated and who gets it in a lump sum at the time of his discharge from being a prisoner of war and his release, has to pay a tax on that lump sum if it is more than the $1,500 annual allowance.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has ruled that the pay of a prisoner of war is constructively received by him as it accrues, and is includible in his gross income in the taxable year in which it accrued. Therefore, the entire lump sum will not be treated as income in 1 year.

Mr. MASON. But in the new bill it will be taken care of.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It has been taken care of by a ruling of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has just discussed the responsibility which is on industry as a result of these barriers being removed. We talk here in terms of a $5,500,000,000 reduction in taxes pertaining to the national income. Now, on what national income is that reduction based?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. On income payments of $130,000,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, taking the rates which this new proposal will give us and applying them against income payments on about $130,000,000,000 dollars of income, we would have an effectuated reduction of $5,500,000,000?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman is correct when he says that the

Ways and Means Committee has removed the barriers against industry; but we must remember that a message will be given to the country tonight, at least based on newspaper reports, that may have something to do with that removal of barriers. We must also remember that OPA is still operating and that literally thousands of industries in this country are today being prevented from proceeding with reconversion plans because of rules and regulations applied by OPA.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Of course, the determination of future income is, to a large extent, guesswork. It depends on many factors. If the income payments are larger than the estimate, revenues will increase. If the income payments are smaller, revenues will decline. No one can tell.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table giving the estimated receipts for 1946 under present law, under the House bill, under the Senate bill, and under conference agreement, together with the estimated reductions in revenues for 1946 and 1947 caused by this bill. These estimates may be far afield but it is the best we can secure at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Estimated tax liability under H. R. 4309 as passed by the House of Representatives, as passed by the Senate, and as agreed upon in conference, compared with tax liability under present law for the calendar years 1946 and 1947 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimated yields, calendar year 1946				Increase (+) or decrease (−), calendar year 1946					Increase (+) or decrease (−), calendar year 1947 [1]				
	Present law	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement	House bill over present law	Senate bill over present law	Conference agreement over—			House bill over present law	Senate bill over present law	Conference agreement over—		
							Present law	House bill	Senate bill			Present law	House bill	Senate bill
1. Internal revenue:														
(1) Income, excess-profits, and capital-stock taxes:														
(a) Corporation taxes:														
Excess-profits tax	4,847	3,685			−1,162	−4,847	−4,847	−3,685		−4,847	−4,847	−4,847		
Normal tax and surtax	3,856	3,481	6,205	5,914	−375	+2,349	+2,058	+2,433	−291	+1,754	+2,349	+2,058	+304	−291
Capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes	351				−351	−351	−351			−351	−351	−351		
Total corporation taxes [2]	9,054	7,166	[3] 6,205	[4] 5,914	−1,888	−2,849	−3,140	−1,252	−291	−3,444	−2,849	−3,140	+304	−291
(b) Individual income taxes:														
Normal tax	2,085	1,303	1,238	1,238	−782	−847	−847	−65		−782	−847	−847	−65	
Surtax and alternative tax on capital gains	11,255	9,410	9,457	9,457	−1,845	−1,798	−1,798	+47		−1,845	−1,798	−1,798	+47	
Total individual income taxes	13,340	10,713	[3] 10,695	[4] 10,695	−2,627	−2,645	−2,645	−18		−2,627	−2,645	−2,645	−18	
Total income and excess-profits taxes and the capital-stock tax	22,394	17,879	16,900	16,609	−4,515	−5,494	−5,785	−1,270	−291	−6,071	−5,494	−5,785	+286	−291
(2) Miscellaneous internal revenue excluding capital stock tax:														
(a) Excise taxes affected by reduction in wartime rates:														
Liquor taxes:														
Distilled spirits	1,473	1,224	1,473	1,473	−249			+249		−472			+472	
Fermented malt liquors	545	513	545	545	−32			+32		−63			+63	
Wines	47	36	47	47	−11			+11		−18			+18	
Total liquor taxes	2,065	1,773	2,065	2,065	−292			+292		−553			+553	
Retailers' excise taxes:														
Jewelry, etc	201	153	201	201	−48			+48		−99			+99	
Furs	90	65	90	90	−25			+25		−44			+44	
Toilet preparations	79	61	79	79	−18			+18		−39			+39	
Luggage, etc	62	47	62	62	−15			+15		−30			+30	
Total retailers' excise taxes	432	326	432	432	−106			+106		−212			+212	
Telephone, telegraph, radio, and cable facilities, etc	126	111	126	126	−15			+15		−29			+29	
Local telephone service	128	107	128	128	−21			+21		−41			+41	
Transportation of persons	188	160	188	188	−28			+28		−60			+60	
Admissions	268	203	268	268	−65			+65		−129			+129	
Electric-light bulbs	14	10	14	14	−4			+4		−10			+10	
Club dues and initiation fees	11	9	11	11	−2			+2		−5			+5	
Bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables	4	2	4	4	−2			+2		−2			+2	
Total excise taxes affected by wartime rates	3,236	2,701	3,236	3,236	−535			+535		−1,041			+1,041	
(b) Use tax on automobiles and boats	140				−140	−140	−140			−140	−140	−140		
(c) Sporting goods	7	7	3	7		−4			+4		−7			+7
(d) Electric, gas, and oil appliances	26	26	17	26		−9			+9		−26			+26
(e) Business and store machines	17	17	8	17		−9			+9		−17			+17
(f) Photographic apparatus	21	21	11	21		−10			+10		−21			+21
(g) All other	2,907	2,907	2,907	2,907										
Total miscellaneous internal revenue, excluding capital-stock tax	6,354	5,679	6,182	6,214	−675	−172	−140	+535	+32	−1,181	−211	−140	+1,041	+71
2. Employment taxes (net)	392	392	392	392										
3. Customs	450	450	450	450										
4. Miscellaneous receipts	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900										
Net receipts, general and special accounts	32,490	27,300	26,824	26,565	−5,190	−5,666	−5,925	−735	−259	−7,252	−5,705	−5,925	+1,327	−220
Refunds on floor stocks [5]		−160			−160			+160						
Net receipts, less refunds on floor stocks	32,490	27,140	26,824	26,565	−5,350	−5,666	−5,925	−575	−259	−7,252	−5,705	−5,925	+1,327	−220

[1] Assumes the same general conditions in 1947 as in 1946, for comparative purposes.

[2] Under the bill as passed by the House, the bill as passed by the Senate, and the bill agreed upon in conference, unused excess-profits credits originating in 1946 could be carried back to 1944 and 1945, as under present law, and would entitle the corporate taxpayers to claims for refunds or reductions of tax payments estimated at $235,000,000. Thus, whether under the conference agreement, the House bill, the Senate bill, or present law, the Federal Government's revenue from taxes would be offset to the extent of $235,000,000.

[3] The estimates of the yield and differences in yield under the Senate bill contain only the following changes from present law: (1) For corporations, repeal the excess-profits tax, repeal the capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes, and reduce the normal and surtax rates for corporations with normal tax net income and surtax net income less than $60,000. In addition under the bill as passed by the Senate a minimum combined specific exemption and excess-profits credit of $25,000 is provided for calendar year 1945. This is estimated to reduce calendar year 1945 liabilities by $85,000,000 but does not affect calendar year 1946 liabilities. (2) For individuals make the normal tax exemptions the same as the surtax exemptions, reduce the surtax rates by 3 percentage points, and reduce the remaining normal and surtax liability by 5 percent.

[4] Estimates of the yield and differences in yield under the conference agreement contain only the following changes from present law: (1) For corporations, repeal the excess-profits tax, repeal the capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes, and reduce the surtax rate by 2 percentage points for corporations with surtax net incomes of over $50,000 and reduce the surtax rate by 4 percentage points on the first $25,000 of surtax net income for corporations with less than $50,000 surtax net income. (2) For individuals make the the normal tax exemptions the same as the surtax exemptions, reduce the surtax rates by 3 percentage points, and reduce the remaining normal and surtax liability by 5 percent.

[5] Tax refunds are classified by the Federal Government as expenditures but are included here as reductions in tax liability since they arise directly from the House bill.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics. Oct. 27, 1945.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] made reference to the fact that the Ways and Means Committee had repealed the excess-profits tax. I think the record should be clarified in that respect. That was recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, a very distinguished former Member of this House as well as a former member of the Ways and Means Committee. I refer to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Vinson.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I tried to make it clear in the beginning of my remarks that this bill includes the recommendations and the ideas of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the Senate Finance Committee. All had a part in it. So far as the Secretary of the Treasury is concerned, a former distinguished Member of this House and a former distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, of course, any recommendation he made to our committee had most careful and thorough consideration. We have profound respect for his ability, courage, character, and judgment.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman indicated that he is going to put in some tables. I wonder if those tables include the tables in the report of the Finance Committee on pages 15 and 16 that deal with the differences between the House bill, the Senate bill, and the conferees' report in reference to personal taxes?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. If it does not, I will include them in addition to the tables I have asked to be included. The tables are hereby included at this point:

Comparison of individual income-tax burden on specified net incomes under present law, House bill, and under Finance Committee bill

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Income-tax burden			Effective tax rate			Reduction in tax burden				
							Amount		Percent		Increase (+) or decrease (−), Finance Committee bill over House bill
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	House bill	Finance Committee bill	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*					
$500											
$600	$23.00	$19.00	$19.00	3.83	3.17	3.17	$4.00	$4.00	17.39	17.39	
$700	46.00	38.00	38.00	6.57	5.43	5.43	8.00	8.00	17.39	17.39	
$750	57.50	47.50	47.50	7.67	6.33	6.33	10.00	10.00	17.39	17.39	
$800	69.00	57.00	57.00	8.62	7.12	7.12	12.00	12.00	17.39	17.39	
$900	92.00	76.00	76.00	10.22	8.44	8.44	16.00	16.00	17.39	17.39	
$1,000	115.00	95.00	95.00	11.50	9.50	9.50	20.00	20.00	17.39	17.39	
$1,200	161.00	133.00	133.00	13.42	11.08	11.08	28.00	28.00	17.39	17.39	
$1,500	230.00	190.00	190.00	15.33	12.67	12.67	40.00	40.00	17.39	17.39	
$1,800	299.00	247.00	247.00	16.61	13.72	13.72	52.00	52.00	17.39	17.39	
$2,000	345.00	285.00	285.00	17.25	14.25	14.25	60.00	60.00	17.39	17.39	
$2,500	460.00	380.00	380.00	18.40	15.20	15.20	80.00	80.00	17.39	17.39	
$3,000	585.00	485.00	484.50	19.50	16.17	16.15	100.00	100.50	17.09	17.18	+$0.50
$4,000	835.00	695.00	693.50	20.87	17.37	17.34	140.00	141.50	16.77	16.95	+1.50
$5,000	1,105.00	925.00	921.50	22.10	18.50	18.43	180.00	183.50	16.29	16.61	+3.50
$6,000	1,395.00	1,175.00	1,168.50	23.25	19.58	19.47	220.00	226.50	15.77	16.24	+6.50
$7,000	1,705.00	1,445.00	1,434.50	24.36	20.64	20.49	260.00	270.50	15.25	15.87	+10.50
$8,000	2,035.00	1,735.00	1,719.50	25.44	21.69	21.49	300.00	315.50	14.74	15.50	+15.50
$9,000	2,385.00	2,045.00	2,023.50	26.50	22.72	22.48	340.00	361.50	14.26	15.16	+21.50
$10,000	2,755.00	2,375.00	2,346.50	27.55	23.75	23.47	380.00	408.50	13.79	14.83	+28.50
$11,000	3,145.00	2,725.00	2,688.50	28.59	24.77	24.44	420.00	456.50	13.35	14.52	+36.50
$12,000	3,555.00	3,095.00	3,049.40	29.62	25.79	25.41	460.00	505.50	12.94	14.22	+45.50
$13,000	3,990.00	3,490.00	3,434.25	30.69	26.85	26.42	500.00	555.75	12.53	13.93	+55.75
$14,000	4,450.00	3,910.00	3,842.75	31.79	27.93	27.45	540.00	607.25	12.13	13.65	+67.25
$15,000	4,930.00	4,350.00	4,270.25	32.87	29.00	28.47	580.00	659.75	11.76	13.38	+79.75
$20,000	7,580.00	6,800.00	6,645.25	37.90	34.00	33.23	780.00	934.75	10.29	12.33	+154.75
$25,000	10,590.00	9,520.00	9,362.25	42.36	38.08	37.45	1,070.00	1,227.75	10.10	11.59	+157.75
$30,000	13,795.00	12,390.00	12,264.50	45.98	41.30	40.88	1,405.00	1,530.50	10.18	11.09	+125.50
$40,000	20,580.00	18,475.00	18,425.25	51.45	46.19	46.06	2,105.00	2,154.75	10.23	10.47	+49.75
$50,000	27,945.00	25,140.00	25,137.00	55.89	50.28	50.27	2,805.00	2,808.00	10.04	10.05	+3.00
$60,000	35,730.00	32,130.00	32,247.75	59.55	53.55	53.75	3,600.00	3,482.25	10.08	9.75	−117.75
$70,000	43,815.00	39,415.00	39,643.50	62.59	56.31	56.63	4,400.00	4,171.50	10.04	9.52	−228.50
$80,000	52,200.00	46,995.00	47,324.25	65.25	58.63	59.16	5,205.00	4,875.75	10.14	9.34	−419.25
$90,000	60,885.00	54,785.00	55,290.00	67.65	60.87	61.43	6,100.00	5,595.00	10.02	9.19	−505.00
$100,000	69,870.00	62,875.00	63,540.75	69.87	62.87	63.54	6,995.00	6,329.25	10.01	9.06	−665.75
$150,000	115,860.00	104,117.50	105,806.25	77.24	69.41	70.54	11,742.50	10,053.75	10.14	8.68	−1,688.75
$200,000	162,355.00	146,110.00	148,551.50	81.18	73.05	74.28	16,245.00	13,803.50	10.01	8.50	−2,441.50
$250,000	209,350.00	188,357.50	191,771.75	83.74	75.34	76.71	20,992.50	17,578.25	10.03	8.40	−3,414.25
$300,000	256,350.00	230,607.50	234,996.75	85.45	76.87	78.33	25,742.50	21,353.25	10.04	8.33	−4,389.25
$400,000	350,350.00	315,107.50	321,446.75	87.59	78.78	80.36	35,242.50	28,903.25	10.06	8.25	−6,339.25
$500,000	444,350.00	399,607.50	407,896.75	88.87	79.92	81.58	44,742.50	36,453.25	10.07	8.20	−8,289.25
$750,000	675,000.00	607,500.00	624,021.75	90.00	81.00	83.20	67,500.00	50,978.25	10.00	7.55	−16,521.75
$1,000,000	900,000.00	810,000.00	840,146.75	90.00	81.00	84.01	90,000.00	59,853.25	10.00	6.65	−30,146.75
$2,000,000	1,800,000.00	1,620,000.00	1,704,646.75	90.00	81.00	85.23	180,000.00	95,353.25	10.00	5.30	−84,646.75
$5,000,000	4,500,000.00	4,050,000.00	4,275,000.00	90.00	81.00	85.50	450,000.00	225,000.00	10.00	5.00	−225,000.00

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Income-tax burden			Effective tax rate			Reduction in tax burden				
							Amount		Percent		Increase (+) or decrease (−), Finance Committee bill over House bill
	Present law [1]	House bill	Finance Committee bill	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	House bill	Finance Committee bill	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*					
$600	$3.00			0.50			$3.00	$3.00	100.00	100.00	
$700	6.00			.86			6.00	6.00	100.00	100.00	
$750	7.50			1.00			7.50	7.50	100.00	100.00	
$800	9.00			1.12			9.00	9.00	100.00	100.00	
$900	12.00			1.33			12.00	12.00	100.00	100.00	
$1,000	15.00			1.50			15.00	15.00	100.00	100.00	
$1,200	61.00	$38.00	$38.00	5.08	3.17	3.17	23.00	23.00	37.70	37.70	
$1,500	130.00	95.00	95.00	8.67	6.33	6.33	35.00	35.00	26.92	26.92	
$1,800	199.00	152.00	152.00	11.06	8.44	8.44	47.00	47.00	23.62	23.62	
$2,000	245.00	190.00	190.00	12.25	9.50	9.50	55.00	55.00	22.45	22.45	
$2,500	360.00	285.00	285.00	14.40	11.40	11.40	75.00	75.00	20.83	20.83	
$3,000	475.00	380.00	380.00	15.83	12.67	12.67	95.00	95.00	20.00	20.00	
$4,000	725.00	590.00	589.00	18.12	14.75	14.72	135.00	136.00	18.62	18.76	+$1.00

[1] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.

Comparison of individual income-tax burden on specified net incomes under present law, House bill, and under Finance Committee bill—Continued

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS—continued

Net income before personal exemption	Income-tax burden			Effective tax rate			Reduction in tax burden				
							Amount		Percent		Increase (+) or decrease (−), Finance Committee bill over House bill
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	House bill	Finance Committee bill	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*					
$5,000	$975.00	$800.00	$798.00	19.50	16.00	15.96	$175.00	$177.00	17.95	18.15	+$2.00
$6,000	1,265.00	1,050.00	1,045.00	21.08	17.50	17.42	215.00	220.00	17.00	17.39	+5.00
$7,000	1,555.00	1,300.00	1,292.00	22.21	18.57	18.46	255.00	263.00	16.40	16.91	+8.00
$8,000	1,885.00	1,590.00	1,577.00	23.56	19.87	19.71	295.00	308.00	15.65	16.34	+13.00
$9,000	2,215.00	1,880.00	1,862.00	24.61	20.89	20.69	335.00	353.00	15.12	15.94	+18.00
$10,000	2,585.00	2,210.00	2,185.00	25.85	22.10	21.85	375.00	400.00	14.51	15.47	+25.00
$11,000	2,955.00	2,540.00	2,508.00	26.86	23.09	22.80	415.00	447.00	14.04	15.13	+32.00
$12,000	3,365.00	2,910.00	2,869.00	28.04	24.25	23.91	455.00	496.00	13.52	14.74	+41.00
$13,000	3,775.00	3,280.00	3,230.00	29.04	25.23	24.85	495.00	545.00	13.11	14.44	+50.00
$14,000	4,235.00	3,700.00	3,638.50	30.25	26.43	25.99	535.00	596.50	12.63	14.08	+61.50
$15,000	4,695.00	4,120.00	4,047.00	31.30	27.47	26.98	575.00	648.00	12.25	13.80	+73.00
$20,000	7,315.00	6,540.00	6,393.50	36.57	32.70	31.97	775.00	921.50	10.59	12.60	+146.50
$25,000	10,295.00	9,240.00	9,082.00	41.18	36.96	36.33	1,055.00	1,213.00	10.25	11.78	+158.00
$30,000	13,485.00	12,100.00	11,970.00	44.95	40.33	39.90	1,385.00	1,515.00	10.27	11.23	+130.00
$40,000	20,235.00	18,150.00	18,097.50	50.59	45.37	45.24	2,085.00	2,137.50	10.30	10.56	+52.50
$50,000	27,585.00	24,800.00	24,795.00	55.17	49.60	49.59	2,785.00	2,790.00	10.10	10.11	+5.00
$60,000	35,355.00	31,780.00	31,891.50	58.92	52.97	53.15	3,575.00	3,463.50	10.11	9.80	−111.50
$70,000	43,125.00	39,050.00	39,273.00	62.04	55.79	56.10	4,375.00	4,152.00	10.07	9.56	−223.00
$80,000	51,795.00	46,530.00	46,939.50	64.74	58.16	58.67	5,265.00	4,855.50	10.16	9.37	−409.50
$90,000	60,465.00	54,290.00	54,891.00	67.18	60.43	60.99	6,075.00	5,574.00	10.05	9.22	−501.00
$100,000	69,435.00	62,470.00	63,127.50	69.43	62.47	63.13	6,965.00	6,307.50	10.03	9.08	−657.50
$150,000	115,415.00	103,765.00	105,383.50	76.94	69.14	70.26	11,710.00	10,031.50	10.15	8.69	−1,678.50
$200,000	161,105.00	145,600.00	148,124.00	80.95	72.84	74.06	16,215.00	13,781.00	10.02	8.51	−2,434.00
$250,000	208,895.00	187,935.00	191,339.50	83.56	75.17	76.54	20,960.00	17,555.50	10.03	8.40	−3,404.50
$300,000	255,895.00	230,185.00	234,564.50	85.30	76.73	78.19	25,710.00	21,330.50	10.05	8.34	−4,379.50
$400,000	349,895.00	314,685.00	321,014.50	87.47	78.67	80.25	35,210.00	28,880.50	10.06	8.25	−6,329.50
$500,000	443,895.00	399,185.00	407,464.50	88.78	79.84	81.49	44,710.00	36,430.50	10.07	8.21	−8,279.50
$750,000	675,000.00	607,500.00	623,589.50	90.00	81.00	83.15	67,500.00	51,410.50	10.00	7.62	−16,089.50
$1,000,000	900,000.00	810,000.00	839,714.50	90.00	81.00	83.97	90,000.00	60,285.50	10.00	6.70	−29,714.50
$2,000,000	1,800,000.00	1,620,000.00	1,704,214.50	90.00	81.00	85.21	180,000.00	95,785.50	10.00	5.32	−84,214.50
$5,000,000	4,500,000.00	4,050,000.00	4,275,000.00	90.00	81.00	85.50	450,000.00	225,000.00	10.00	5.00	−225,000.00

MARRIED PERSON—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Income-tax burden			Effective tax rate			Reduction in tax burden				
							Amount		Percent		Increase (+) or decrease (−), Finance Committee bill over House bill
	Present law [1]	House bill	Finance Committee bill	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	House bill	Finance Committee bill	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*					
$600	$3.00			0.50			$3.00	$3.00	100.00	100.00	
$700	6.00			.86			6.00	6.00	100.00	100.00	
$750	7.50			1.00			7.50	7.50	100.00	100.00	
$800	9.00			1.12			9.00	9.00	100.00	100.00	
$900	12.00			1.33			12.00	12.00	100.00	100.00	
$1,000	15.00			1.50			15.00	15.00	100.00	100.00	
$1,200	21.00			1.75			21.00	21.00	100.00	100.00	
$1,500	30.00			2.00			30.00	30.00	100.00	100.00	
$1,800	39.00			2.17			39.00	39.00	100.00	100.00	
$2,000	45.00			2.25			45.00	45.00	100.00	100.00	
$2,500	160.00	$95.00	$95.00	6.40	3.80	3.80	65.00	65.00	40.62	40.62	
$3,000	275.00	190.00	190.00	9.17	6.33	6.33	85.00	85.00	30.91	30.91	
$4,000	505.00	380.00	380.00	12.62	9.50	9.50	125.00	125.00	24.75	24.75	
$5,000	755.00	590.00	589.00	15.10	11.80	11.78	165.00	166.00	21.85	21.99	+$1.00
$6,000	1,005.00	800.00	798.00	16.75	13.33	13.30	205.00	207.00	20.40	20.60	+2.00
$7,000	1,295.00	1,050.00	1,045.00	18.50	15.00	14.93	245.00	250.00	18.92	19.30	+5.00
$8,000	1,585.00	1,300.00	1,292.00	19.81	16.25	16.15	285.00	293.00	17.98	18.49	+8.00
$9,000	1,915.00	1,590.00	1,577.00	21.28	17.67	17.52	325.00	338.00	16.97	17.65	+13.00
$10,000	2,245.00	1,880.00	1,862.00	22.45	18.80	18.62	365.00	383.00	16.26	17.06	+18.00
$11,000	2,615.00	2,210.00	2,185.00	23.77	20.09	19.86	405.00	430.00	15.49	16.44	+25.00
$12,000	2,985.00	2,540.00	2,508.00	24.87	21.17	20.90	445.00	477.00	14.91	15.98	+32.00
$13,000	3,395.00	2,910.00	2,869.00	26.12	22.38	22.07	485.00	526.00	14.29	15.49	+41.00
$14,000	3,805.00	3,280.00	3,230.00	27.18	23.43	23.07	525.00	575.00	13.80	15.11	+50.00
$15,000	4,265.00	3,700.00	3,638.00	28.43	24.67	24.26	565.00	626.50	13.25	14.69	+61.50
$20,000	6,785.00	6,020.00	5,890.00	33.92	30.10	29.45	765.00	895.00	11.27	13.19	+130.00
$25,000	9,705.00	8,680.00	8,521.50	38.82	34.72	34.09	1,025.00	1,183.50	10.56	12.19	+158.50
$30,000	12,865.00	11,520.00	11,381.00	42.88	38.40	37.94	1,345.00	1,484.00	10.45	11.54	+139.00
$40,000	19,545.00	17,500.00	17,442.00	48.86	43.75	43.60	2,045.00	2,103.00	10.46	10.76	+58.00
$50,000	26,865.00	24,120.00	24,111.00	53.73	48.24	48.22	2,745.00	2,754.00	10.22	10.25	+9.00
$60,000	34,605.00	31,080.00	31,179.00	57.67	51.80	51.96	3,525.00	3,426.00	10.19	9.90	−99.00
$70,000	42,645.00	38,320.00	38,532.00	60.92	54.74	55.05	4,325.00	4,113.00	10.14	9.64	−212.00
$80,000	50,985.00	45,780.00	46,170.00	63.73	57.22	57.71	5,205.00	4,815.00	10.21	9.44	−390.00
$90,000	59,625.00	53,600.00	54,093.00	66.25	59.56	60.10	6,025.00	5,532.00	10.10	9.28	−493.00
$100,000	68,565.00	61,660.00	62,301.00	68.56	61.66	62.30	6,905.00	6,264.00	10.07	9.14	−641.00
$150,000	114,525.00	102,880.00	104,538.00	76.35	68.59	69.69	11,645.00	9,987.00	10.17	8.72	−1,658.00
$200,000	161,005.00	144,850.00	147,269.00	80.50	72.42	73.63	16,155.00	13,736.00	10.03	8.53	−2,419.00
$250,000	207,985.00	187,090.00	190,475.00	83.19	74.84	76.19	20,895.00	17,510.00	10.05	8.42	−3,385.00
$300,000	254,985.00	229,340.00	233,700.00	84.99	76.45	77.90	25,645.00	21,285.00	10.06	8.35	−4,360.00
$400,000	348,985.00	313,840.00	320,150.00	87.25	78.46	80.04	35,145.00	28,835.00	10.07	8.26	−6,310.00
$500,000	442,985.00	398,340.00	406,600.00	88.60	79.67	81.32	44,645.00	36,385.00	10.08	8.21	−8,260.00
$750,000	675,000.00	607,500.00	622,725.00	90.00	81.00	83.03	67,500.00	52,275.00	10.00	7.74	−15,225.00
$1,000,000	900,000.00	810,000.00	838,850.00	90.00	81.00	83.88	90,000.00	61,150.00	10.00	6.79	−28,850.00
$2,000,000	1,800,000.00	1,620,000.00	1,703,350.00	90.00	81.00	85.17	180,000.00	96,650.00	10.00	5.37	−83,350.00
$5,000,000	4,500,000.00	4,050,000.00	4,275,000.00	90.00	81.00	85.50	450,000.00	225,000.00	10.00	5.00	−225,000.00

[1] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.

Mr. JENKINS. Those tables are very instructive with reference to the personal income taxes.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. They are the burden tables

Mr. JENKINS. They tell the whole story.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not recall a situation in connection with the 16 or 17 tax increase bills that Congress has passed in the last 12 years exactly like the one that confronted the committee when it began its labors on the measure now before the House. We were told at the outset that it would be necessary to have the bill pass both Houses of the Congress and on the President's desk by the 1st of November if the Bureau of Internal Revenue were to have time to prepare the necessary forms and get them into the hands of the taxpayers before January 1. Of course, that made it impossible for us to bring in a general tax bill such as we hoped to do earlier in the season. It was necessary for us to cut corners and expedite matters all along the line. Lack of time precluded the possibility of holding public hearings such as we usually hold before beginning the drafting of a tax bill, but this time we could not do so. However, as stated by the chairman of the committee, we hope to begin work on the long-term tax measure early in January and which we hope to have out of the way by the 1st of June so that it will not act to prevent adjournment when the Congress deems the time opportune to do so.

When the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the committee he submitted recommendations that would in effect reduce both the corporate and personal tax burden by about $5,000,000,000. The measure now before the House reduces the tax load by about $5,900,000,000, which is quite a step over the recommendations of the Treasury. I might add that the future tax program as outlined by the conferees representing the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance is such that we cannot look for any substantial reduction in the corporate rate in the long-term permanent bill. However, we hope to do more for the individuals. There will probably be some disappointment in the country over our failure to lower excise taxes to the 1942 level. The House made provision for such a reduction, but the Senate bill provided for continuing the present tax rates and it was accepted in conference. However, we have an understanding that the next tax bill will deal adequately with the question of excise taxes, and that is another reason why we want to get the long-term tax bill out of the way by June so that whatever changes we make in the excise taxes may become effective as of July 1 next.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. If our country, however, should get out of the apparent disadvantage now occupied with reference to business, in other words, if it could get on the broad highway of business again shortly, there is no reason why in the next year we could not reduce taxes as we did back in the twenties.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, the present situation is not comparable with that in the twenties. At that time, when we started reducing taxes—I think it was under the Harding administration that we had our first reduction—we not only reduced taxes three times between 1921 and 1931 but we paid off $10,000,000,000 of the national debt. At that time the national debt was $26,000,000,000. Now it is crowding the $300,000,000,000 mark, which is practically as much as the country is worth from an actuarial standpoint, although I would not advise anyone to sell America short. I think we are just on the threshold of one of the most marvelous eras in the history of the Republic.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman knows, too, of course, that in addition to paying off $1,000,000,000 a year on our national debt back in the twenties after each tax reduction, after each lowering of the rates of taxes, we realized more revenue than we had taken in under the preceding higher rate.

Mr. KNUTSON. Each time we reduced taxes in the twenties the receipts increased substantially.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The estimate has been made that the income from taxes will be reduced by about $5,900,000,000 under this bill. Is it not a fact, however, that the incentive given business and industry as the result of these tax reductions may actually reduce that amount by a great deal and perhaps eliminate it entirely and permit just as heavy a tax revenue to be obtained as in the past?

Mr. KNUTSON. Tax reductions have the same effect on business and on employment as fertilizer has on the soil. The more we reduce taxes the more business we will have, and the more money people will have to invest in the expansion of present business and in new businesses.

May I call the attention of the House to the fact that each war in the past has resulted in the creation of a substantial number of new businesses. Of course, if we were to operate in peacetime under wartime tax levels it would preclude new business from starting, and it would discourage present business from expanding. Those who have given any study to the tax question are unanimously of the opinion that tax reduction is the best possible investment we can make, and it is the best known insurance against unemployment and general business depression.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. As I understand the conference report, you eliminate the noxious $5 automobile tax.

Mr. KNUTSON. Right.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. With regard to the so-called 3-percent Victory tax, we were supposed to eliminate that some years ago but, as I recall, it was replaced by the normal tax of 3 percent. It was just added to the burden of the taxpayers and applied to everybody, in order to eliminate that 3-percent tax.

Mr. KNUTSON. No. The gentleman is referring to the 3-percent normal tax. We did not eliminate that tax, but we did extend to the normal tax the same reductions as we enjoy in the surtax, that is, $500 for each dependent. So it wipes off from the tax rolls between ten and twelve million taxpayers in the lower brackets.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. As a matter of fact, it eliminates the 3-percent tax.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with what the gentleman has said with respect to reducing tax burdens, but we must always bear in mind as evidenced by the detailed history of the 1920's and 1930's that with a tremendous reduction in the tax burdens, the central banking system, the Federal Reserve bank itself, that is, the system, can proceed within 60 or 90 or 120 days to take action which would utterly demolish any effects that a reduction might have in this law or any other law. So there are certain other things which must go along with tax reduction to make business open up, as the gentleman has mentioned. In other words, if the administration becomes terribly fearful of inflation and inflation begins to run quite rapidly, the central reserve banking system can destroy the thing, throw us into a tailspin, create great unemployment, and precipitate a depression. Thus, a reduction in taxes will have lost all its beneficial effect.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman's observation brings to my mind another point. We must cut spending and that is up to Congress. We can rail at the White House. We may rail at the bureaucrats uptown, but in the final analysis the spending is in control of the Congress. As long as we continue to appropriate practically everything that is asked for, there cannot be any substantial reductions in taxes. I understand that my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is against this report. The gentleman from Missouri holds it in his hand to make it possible to bring in another tax reduction bill next year if he will sit on the lid in the Committee on Appropriations. There is no use to

blame it on the President; there is no use to blame it on the various members of the Cabinet and the bureau heads. They will spend money as long as Congress gives it to them. Under the Constitution, we hold the purse strings and when we say, "No, beyond this point thou shalt not go," then taxes will come down some and they will come down in proportion as we reduce appropriations. The two follow each other very closely. As appropriations go up, it is necessary to increase revenues through taxes. The wild orgy of spending which we have had for a decade or more is the greatest threat to our national sovereignty that I can think of. It is also one of the most potent threats to inflation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman knows that it is generally rumored around that the Smaller War Plants Corporation is to be transferred to Mr. Henry Wallace so that there can be freer and more incompetent spending than we have ever had before.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, the purpose of that probably is to enable Brother Wallace to manufacture ammunition for the next campaign.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman now addressing the House has been a Member of Congress for a long time and, of course, he is thoroughly conversant with the procedure of the House. While the gentleman is indicating to the gentleman from Missouri the necessity for halting or keeping down expenditures, it might be well if the gentleman would also call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that legislation authorizing expenditures is the forerunner of the appropriation of funds so authorized to be spent.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will enlarge on my statement by saying that all committees that are empowered under the rules of the House to make authorizations should exercise the same scrupulous care in making authorizations that we expect the Committee on Appropriations to use when they make appropriations.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. If I may be permitted to make an observation, it seems to me it would improve our chances of balancing the Budget if the Federal fiscal year and the taxable year covered the same period of time. As it is, it is very confusing. They talk about the expenditures for the fiscal year 1947. That is an entirely different proposition than the taxable year of 1947.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. When Secretary Vinson appeared before the committee he estimated the deficit for the current fiscal year at $30,000,000,000. On the other hand, Mr. Stamm, chief of our staff, estimates that for the calendar year 1946 the deficit will be $12,000,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What chance is there for the Congress to eliminate deficit spending when President Truman is pressing for the passage of the full employment bill, which is designed specifically to perpetuate unlimited spending?

Mr. KNUTSON. The question answers itself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, all of us agree on the desirability of reducing taxes—when practicable and permissible. We all agree on the popularity of reducing taxes—whether practicable and sensible or not. And certainly we all agree on the urgency of the pressure which has been brought to bear by the big taxpayers—all of whom are more prosperous today than they ever were before—to get this bill on the floor. But tax reduction, as popular as it is, is not the predominant interest of the American people today. The first interest of the people today is national security and national security is not conserved by deficit spending and the attendant inflation which tax reduction involves. It is inextricably bound up in national solvency. In the last analysis, the security of the Nation rests not only on its Army and Navy, or even on the atomic bomb, but upon its financial stability and the integrity of its fiscal relations. A balanced budget is the first line of national defense.

The gentleman who has just spoken tells us that reducing taxes, as provided in this bill, scatters fertilizer to produce a larger revenue. On the contrary, every dollar in reduced taxation, when the public debt is steadily mounting, produces $10 of inflation. It scatters not fertilizer but gasoline.

All economists realize that the great menace of the situation in which we find ourselves today is inflation—inflation rising like a tide on every side. And every dollar taken off taxes and added to the national debt adds to the peril.

Reduced taxation means increased deficit spending. And deficit spending spells inflation. Reduced taxation means failure to reduce the mounting national debt. And the greater the debt the greater the pressure for inflation. Reducing taxation means failure to balance the budget. And there is no greater inflationary influence than an unbalanced budget. Tax reduction in the face of the greatest national debt in history is like throwing gasoline on a fire to put it out. The way to control inflation is to balance the budget. We can balance the budget by 1947, or by 1948 at most, if you will just continue the present rate of taxation. The current rate of taxation is a lower rate than that earnestly recommended by the administration at the time it was levied. Just as the reduction proposed in this bill is a deeper cut than that recommended by the administration today. If you will but leave our revenues alone—modest wartime revenues as they are—the resulting reduction in the public debt and consequent balancing of the budget will prove a greater stimulus to business in the next 2 years than grants of tax reduction and all the loans the Treasury can float. And remember, you will have to continue to borrow money if you insist on reducing the national revenues by reducing reasonable and legitimate taxes.

The colossal mistake of reducing taxes at this inopportune time is indicated by the absurd situation in which we find ourselves—simultaneously reducing revenues and borrowing money to pay current expenses of government. Last Sunday we opened a Nation-wide drive to persuade the American people to buy $11,000,000,000 worth of Government bonds. With one hand we are throwing away $6,000,000,000 in public revenues and with the other hand we are borrowing $11,000,000,000 and thereby adding $11,000,000,000 to the national debt. If we would throw this bill into the wastebasket, where it ought to go, instead of borrowing $11,000,000,000, we would have to borrow only $6,000,000,000. And our national credit would be that much improved and our annual interest account would be that much lower and we would reach a balanced budget that much sooner. Of all those who are supporting this bill is there anyone who will rise and say this is not good business?

Mr. Chairman, every dollar deducted from taxes in this bill adds a dollar to the amount that must be borrowed in the bond drive. And every dollar taken from taxes and added to the public debt increases dangerously the pressure for inflation.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, how it is possible to reconcile a reduction of five and two-thirds billion dollars in taxes next year, as provided by this bill, with the $11,000,000,000 loan we are promoting next month, with a $275,000,000,000 debt now, a $30,000,000,000 deficit next year, and eventually a national debt in excess of $300,000,000,000. How much wider will that open the dikes to inflation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It will combine to produce an inflationary pressure against price levels of the most menacing proportions.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], also sagely observes that if the Committee on Appropriations will just reduce expenditures we cannot only reduce taxes now but we can continue to reduce taxes as retrenchments progress.

Mr. Chairman, we are getting just a little bored by this continuously reiterated alibi trotted out every time it is necessary to make excuse for unwarranted reductions in the national revenues. You can search through congressional records from the First to the Seventy-ninth Congresses and you will find that the last 2 years the Committee on Appropriations has made the greatest reductions in expenditures, both in the departmental establishments and in the

war appropriations, ever made in the history of the Republic. And that is not an idle statement. We brought in only last week a cancellation of appropriations in excess of $50,000,000,000 and we are now engaged in studies and investigations preparatory to the recall of billions of dollars more. But of what avail is it for the Committee on Appropriations to save at the spigot when the gentleman's committee knocks out the bunghole at the other end of the barrel by repealing taxes?

Two things are essential to a balanced budget: First, the maintenance of the national revenues. And, second, economy in expenditure. But the first is the maintenance of the revenues. This bill violates the first requisite. At a time when war incomes, war wages, war prices, and war profits are still pouring in—at a time when war expenditures are still running into the billions, this bill now proposes to drop war taxes. Why, they go together—war profits and war taxes. But instead of requiring this generation which enjoyed the war incomes to pay for the war out of war profits, this bill proposes to pass the cost of the war along to future generations and require them to pay it out of reduced peacetime revenues.

And do not say this generation did not get the money. All this talk about the necessity of scattering fertilizer to help business through the reconversion period completely ignores the heavy incomes enjoyed by war industry. It is only necessary to glance at the financial pages of any metropolitan newspaper any day in the week to see the profits that have been made and the vast reserves that have been piled up by all of them. Nobody needs any fertilizing these days except the National Treasury. And it sadly needs this five or six billion you are proposing to cut back to the profiteers whose lobbyists are industriously promoting tax reduction.

And they are profiteers. If they were not they would not be paying an excess-profits tax. The excess-profits tax is the fairest tax ever levied. As long as business is satisfied with a reasonable profit, a fair profit, a normal profit, the excess-profits tax does not take a cent. It is only when it begins to charge an excess profit, an unconscionable profit, that the excess-profits tax begins to operate. It is only when business begins to profiteer that the excess-profits tax steps in—and it ought to step in. The excess-profits tax not only brings in a much-needed revenue but it is a curb on the profiteer. He reasons, what is the use of profiteering on the public if the excess-profits tax takes away all the excess profits of which I have robbed the people. To that extent the excess-profits tax serves both the consumer and the Treasury. Why repeal it now when business is still gorging on excess profits and the Government needs the money? At least wait until we stop selling bonds and borrowing more money.

Mr. Chairman, the bill ought to be defeated. The conference report ought to be rejected. A vote to agree to the conference report is a vote to postpone indefinitely the balancing of the budget. It is a vote to add to the national debt and to increase immeasurably the inflationary tendencies of these critical times.

And last, let it not be forgotten that every dollar taken from taxation and added to the national debt decreases just that much the potential value of every Government bond in the country. Disregarding their artificial market value, the value of all Government bonds rises and falls with the rise and fall of the national revenues and the national debt. Every American citizen who owns a Government bond has a stake in the vote on this bill. Time will tell just how great that stake is. It may be a good deal larger than you think.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations with considerable satisfaction.

How sweet it is to hear the faithful watchdog bay
As we draw nigh to election day.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it shall be my purpose not to make a long speech, although we are dealing with a very important matter. It has been about 15 years since Congress passed a tax reduction bill. During that time Congress has passed about 12 tax bills, all of which have been bills increasing taxes. I do not have the exact figures before me but I dare say that the tax bills passed 15 years ago, although increasing taxes, only increased them at the rate of a billion or so a year, but in these later years the increased amounts raised from bills have reached the high figures of tens of billions. And in spite of the fact that we have increased our taxes tremendously, all of us know that our country has operated on a deficit of billions of dollars increasing year by year every year for the last 15 years. The deficit for the present year will be in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000 and the deficit for next year will be at least $25,000,000,000. There was a time when we talked confidently of balancing the budget, but there is no immediate prospects of realizing that happy day.

My distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, takes the position that this bill should not be passed. There are many people who agree with him and think that taxes should not be reduced. On the other hand, I think that the temper of the American people is that we should reduce taxes at this time. This should be done by way of encouragement to the business interests of the country and to those who make investments and it should also be done to relieve many small taxpayers who have been included within the tax laws during wartimes. When the gentleman from Misscuri [Mr. CANNON] takes the position that the reductions made in this tax bill is money thrown away, he takes an untenable position. There is no question but that it is perfectly possible to reduce taxes and still increase the national income. As has already been stated on this floor this afternoon, it was clearly demonstrated in the years between 1922 and 1928 that the national revenues could be greatly increased by the reduction of taxes. Taxes were reduced on four different occasions during that time and after each reduction, the revenue of the Government was increased.

It would be perfectly possible at this time to increase the revenues to the Government if we could get rid of many of the fallacious policies of the New Deal. For instance, the doctrine of scarcity which the New Deal has advocated and practiced will never conduce to prosperity. Our Government would best prosper under a program of maximum production. The Republican Party has always maintained that all wealth comes from production and productive efforts. If the New Deal would give up its fallacious policies and adopt a policy of full and complete production, the wealth of the Nation would increase and the national income would increase. The national wealth and the national income are the basis upon which taxes are levied. We cannot levy taxes on poverty and neither can we levy taxes on scarcity.

What we need most in our country is a restoration of confidence. We should have a Government that would inspire confidence. People should be encouraged to support their judgment with their savings and to put forth their energies in an effort to produce and to realize their ambitions. Unnecessary regulations and unfair and punitive restrictions, such as have been practiced by the OPA and other governmental agencies, will never conduce to great production or great development.

I hope that the President will adopt methods other than the oft-tried New Deal methods and that he will be able to guide our country upon an era of great production. It is only by this method we can ever pay out.

Before the war our annual Budget was around $6,000,000,000. During the war it went up nearly to $100,000,000,000. When we return to normal it will be probably $25,000,000,000. We cannot hope to balance the Budget until we can meet our running expenses. We cannot hope to meet our running expenses unless our country is restored to a period of prosperity based upon confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I rose principally to compliment the conference committee upon the results which it has achieved as is shown by the conference report which we are considering at this time. Of course, this conference report will be readily adopted because it really recommends the passage of a bill that I think is better than the bill passed by the House

or the bill passed by the Senate. I think the conferees have, by consultation and by discussion, brought forth a bill that will come more nearly meeting the approval of the American people than either the House bill or the Senate bill. The conferees recommend a bill that will carry reduction of about $5,900,000,000. The bill recommended by the House would have carried a reduction of about $5,300,000,000 while the bill recommended by the Senate would have carried a reduction of about $5,600,000,000.

The increases provided in the bill recommended by the conferees have been granted to the corporations and to individuals in about the same proportion as that provided in the House bill and the Senate bill. In other words, these increased reductions in taxes have not been granted to any one special or any favored group. The tables illustrative of the results that would have been accomplished by the House bill and the Senate bill and the conference report have already been placed in the RECORD. I recommend that all Members read these tables carefully because they tell in figures the story of what Congress has done when it passes the legislation under consideration today.

Corporations were anxious to repeal the sections of the law providing for excess-profits taxes. While some corporations would, of course, have been glad to have had greater reductions, yet most corporations will be pleased with the reductions provided in this bill. As to the provisions applicable to individual taxes it is worthy of note that 12,000,000 persons will be relieved from paying any income taxes. This would seem to be a very large number. But the amount of taxes paid by many of these were hardly enough to pay for the expense of collecting them. While all persons paying income taxes will be given a worthwhile reduction, still it is true that a greater proportionate reduction will be given to the small taxpayer than the large taxpayer. This is as it should be.

It is likely that those who pay excise taxes will be disappointed in the failure of the conferees to recommend some provision that would provide for immediate reduction in excise taxes. The bill which passed the House did provide for the repeal on June 30, 1946, of all wartime excise taxes. By that I mean all excise taxes passed during the war. The bill providing for excise taxes during the war carried a stipulation that all such taxes should be levied during the war and for a period of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities. As I have stated the House bill provided that all such taxes would cease after the 30th of June 1946. The failure of the conferees to include this provision with reference to excise taxes does not preclude the Congress from considering legislation that may be passed later when another tax bill is presented for consideration. It is likely that another tax bill will be presented before the end of June 1946. The matter can be taken up at that time or if the President by proclamation or the Congress by legislation should set the time for the cessation of hostilities sooner, then these taxes will all be repealed in effect within 6 months thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the colossal debt under which our country is staggering and in view of the great commercial and industrial unrest that is now present in our country at this time, it does seem that it may not be a propitious time to reduce taxes. But ours is a great country and we will work out of this unfortunate situation and we will pay the colossal debt which our country owes if and when we restore confidence to business and to our people generally and when we increase production both as to quantity and as to value.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, 5 minutes is altogether too short a time in which to discuss a tax bill. Something has been said about the recommendation of the repeal of excess-profits tax. Some claim it was the Secretary of the Treasury who was responsible for it; others claim it was the Senate Committee on Finance that was responsible. I happen to be chairman of a tax-study committee composed of 27 Members of this House. As a result of that study, a bill was introduced by me on March 27, 1945, urging the repeal of the excess-profits tax law in whole when the war with Germany and Japan ceased, and also a proposal granting $30,000 exemptions to small corporations to aid them, and also a proposal to reduce individual taxes by 20 percent. So the main portions of this bill follow very closely the recommendations contained in that bill of March 27, 1945.

I look upon this bill, notwithstanding the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, as a great incentive to business. We must not forget that during the war some 500,000 corporations and business concerns went to the wall. Every one of those had a pay roll or should have had a pay roll. Those have to be reestablished, and our general industrial setup has to be revitalized if we are going to give employment to the people who are now unemployed or soon will be.

Where does employment come from? I caused to be made an analysis, and I am going to include it in the RECORD, of some 27 corporations in this country showing that practically all of them have more stockholders than they have employees. This is the Dow-Jones list of corporations.

What gave the impetus to the starting of these corporations? It came from what we call venture capital. Venture capital, as you all know, is the money that the little fellow who has saved his money is willing to invest in some proposed corporation. He is going to ask a series of questions when asked to subscribe for stock in one of these corporations. He is going to ask, What are the prospects when dividends are declared of getting some reasonable return, and how soon am I going to get returns? Then he will want to know what the taxes are going to be and how much they are going to take from this return and this dividend. If you have anything like the excess-profits tax on the books, he is going to say, "No; thank you. I am going to wait."

What does venture capital mean in this country? It means that for every person employed in industry $6,000 has to be invested in machinery so that that employee may have a job, and it means risk or venture capital in order to put the men to work in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this bill will encourage venture capital to the extent that we will begin building up corporations all over this country with pay rolls. The Patent Office is filled with new inventions which, if they can get venture capital, will create pay rolls in this country. Then, as the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee stated, when we expand these industries, these pay rolls, and the earning capacity of the people, we begin to get more revenue, so that, notwithstanding what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said, we are not endangering the fiscal stability of this country by reducing taxes at this time. We are furnishing an incentive that will create revenue.

It so happens that I was here and I voted for the four tax-reduction bills during the twenties and, as has been said, each time the revenue increased, but not only that, the pay rolls increased, and, of course, that is where we obtained the revenue. There were six or seven million people out of employment following the last war; we reduced the taxes and gave industry a chance to expand, which it did, and in consequence labor became employed and stability in the economic structure of this Government was restored.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Will the gentleman analyze the statement of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that the excess-profits tax operates only after the profits become unreasonable? I think that was the gist of his argument.

Mr. REED of New York. Well, of course, with the excess-profits tax in operation, no one is going to go out and start a business if the Government is going to take away certain profits. Industry is looking to make all the profit it can; there is no question about that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the great incentive to profits and the great incentive for paying higher wages is the fact that business concerns can make a profit. The best way to bring the price of things down to the consumer is through greater profits. Why? Because industries immediately go into that field where we have the high profits, which brings down the cost so that the people can buy their goods more cheaply.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that during the twenties, when we reduced the taxes, the national debt was also reduced as well from $26,500,000,000 to $16,000,000,000?

Mr. REED of New York. There is no question about that. The debt was reduced to $16,000,000,000 and $1,000,000,000 was paid on the debt each year for 10 years, as a result of lowering the tax.

Mr. RICH. The excess-profits tax as we have it today, taking 95 percent of the income over and above 8 percent on your invested capital, your earned profits, takes everything away from business, and they have nothing left to do anything with after the Government gets through with them.

Mr. REED of New York. That is not the worst part of it. The Government really does not get it, because it leads to all kinds of extravagance and mismanagement in order to avoid the excess-profits tax.

Mr. RICH. If that is eliminated, will they eliminate the 95 percent or will they retain a graduated surtax say, up to 30 percent, like they did previous to the enactment of the 95 percent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. I am sorry. I will have to answer that in the RECORD. The graduated surtax for corporations is retained, but up to $50,000 the surtax is reduced four percentage points, and above $50,000 by two percentage points.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks tables listing corporations, the amount of capital invested, number employed by each one, as well as the number of stockholders, and the average contribution by each stockholder. Then I would like to include, as a part of my remarks, an analysis of the two bills in conference as well as a statement showing the loss in revenues in the different categories.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Calculation of average investment per stockholder (at July 24, 1945, market prices) of the Adams Express Co., American International Corp., and 27 companies whose stocks are included in the Dow-Jones industrial average

Company	Number of employees	Number of common stockholders [1]	Number of preferred stockholders [1]	Total number of stockholders	Average holding per preferred stockholder	Average holding per common stockholder	Average investment per preferred stockholder	Average investment per common stockholder	Total average investment per stockholder
					Shares	*Shares*	[2]	*At market*	
The Adams Express Co.	21	12,200	----------	12,200	----------	108.6	----------	$1,574.70	$1,574.70
American International Corp.	22	5,838	----------	5,838	----------	171.3	----------	1,713.00	1,713.00
Total Adams Express and American International	43	18,038	----------	18,038	----------	179.9	----------	1,619.82	1,619.82
Companies included in Dow-Jones industrial average:									
American Can Co.	23,400	28,235	5,765	34,000	71.5	87.6	$7,150.00	8,409.60	8,198.15
American Smelting & Refining Co.	28,948	22,110	7,496	29,606	66.7	99.1	6,670.00	4,732.03	5,223.67
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	439,700	668,013	----------	668,013	----------	29.0	----------	5,169.25	5,169.25
American Tobacco Co.	10,740	65,181	8,858	74,039	59.5	68.8	5,950.00	5,314.80	5,388.15
Bethlehem Steel Corp.	260,481	52,316	25,983	78,299	35.9	57.1	3,590.00	4,482.35	4,185.37
Chrysler Corp.	125,729	53,991	----------	53,991	----------	80.6	----------	8,644.35	8,644.35
Corn Products Refining Co.	5,000	21,950	2,655	24,605	92.6	115.1	9,260.00	6,963.55	7,208.50
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	63,409	72,637	18,729	91,366	90.2	152.9	9,020.00	24,387.55	21,242.84
Eastman Kodak Co.	42,000	41,038	1,369	42,407	45.0	60.3	4,500.00	10,371.60	10,187.93
General Electric Co.	167,212	235,742	----------	235,742	----------	122.1	----------	5,158.73	5,158.73
General Foods Corp.	11,177	[3] 63,000	----------	63,000	----------	88.5	----------	3,960.38	3,960.38
General Motors Corp.	465,617	401,845	21,860	423,705	84.0	110.0	8,400.00	7,232.50	7,263.80
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	101,571	36,264	19,373	55,637	31.5	56.8	3,150.00	2,868.40	2,966.52
International Harvester Co.	68,940	28,372	10,630	39,002	76.8	142.6	7,680.00	12,304.60	11,047.63
International Nickel Co.	21,881	82,144	8,599	90,743	32.1	177.5	3,210.00	5,746.56	5,507.70
Johns-Manville Corp.	13,000	8,100	----------	8,100	----------	104.9	----------	11,906.15	11,906.15
National Distillers Corp.	4,300	21,385	----------	21,385	----------	106.6	----------	4,210.70	4,210.70
Procter & Gamble Corp.	14,535	42,240	2,747	44,987	8.2	151.7	820.00	8,988.23	8,491.52
Sears, Roebuck & Co.	71,093	59,502	----------	59,502	----------	98.6	----------	11,659.45	11,659.45
Standard Oil Co. of California	20,448	76,767	----------	76,767	----------	169.4	----------	6,818.35	6,818.35
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)	48,904	155,048	----------	155,048	----------	176.3	----------	10,798.38	10,798.38
Texas Co.	28,719	92,402	----------	92,402	----------	121.7	----------	6,389.25	6,389.25
Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.	[4]	73,509	----------	73,509	----------	126.2	----------	10,916.30	10,916.30
United Aircraft Corp.	65,300	37,000	8,500	45,500	30.3	71.8	3,050.00	2,055.28	2,240.32
United States Steel Corp.	314,888	165,371	75,270	240,641	47.9	52.6	4,790.00	3,524.20	3,920.35
Westinghouse Electric Corp.	111,944	46,380	1,982	48,362	161.4	270.2	2,017.50	8,646.40	5,815.23
F. W. Woolworth & Co.	66,672	74,255	----------	74,255	----------	130.7	----------	5,816.15	5,816.15
Total (or average) Dow-Jones companies	2,595,608	2,724,797	219,816	2,944,613	55.1	95.8	5,383.19	6,108.18	6,794.58

[1] Considers shares in a broker's, investment company, or insurance company, same as being 1 stockholder although they may represent holdings of numbers of people.
[2] Lower of market or par. (No par —$100.)
[3] Estimated.
[4] Not available.

Source of data: The Adams Express Co. and American International Corp., company figures; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 1944 annual report; other companies, Moody's 1945 Industrial Manual. All market prices from Wall Street Journal.

Source of tax under present law

[In millions of dollars]

1. Internal revenue:	
(1) Income, excess-profits and capital-stock taxes:	
(a) Corporation taxes	9,054
(b) Individual income taxes	13,340
Total income, excess-profits and capital-stock taxes	22,394
(2) Miscellaneous internal revenue, excluding capital-stock tax:	
(a) Excises subject to war-tax rates:	
Liquor taxes:	
Distilled spirits	1,473
Fermented malt liquors	545
Wines	47
Total liquor taxes	2,065
Retailers' excise taxes:	
Jewelry, etc	201
Furs	90
Toilet preparations	79
Luggage, etc	62
Total retailers' excise taxes	432
Telephone, telegraph, radio, and cable facilities, etc	126
Local telephone service	128
Transportation of persons	188
Admissions	268
Electric light bulbs and tubes	14
Club dues and initiation fees	11
Bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables	4
Total excises subject to "war tax rates"	3,236
(b) Use tax on motor vehicles and boats	140
(c) All other	2,978
Total miscellaneous internal revenue, excluding capital-stock tax	6,354
2. Employment taxes (net)	392
3. Customs	450
4. Miscellaneous receipts	2,900
Net receipts, general and special accounts	32,490
Refunds on floor stocks	------
Net receipts less refunds on floor stocks	32,490
Net change after conference bill,	$26,570.

Estimated net reduction in tax liabilities under conference committee bill as compared with present law, calendar year 1946

[In millions of dollars]

A. Corporation taxes:	
1. Repeal excess-profits tax January 1, 1946	2,555
2. Reduce surtax rate by 2 percentage points for corporations with income over $50,000, and 4 percentage points up to $25,000 for corporations with income under $50,000	347
3. Repeal capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes	234
Total reductions in corporate taxes	3,136
B. Individual income taxes:	
1. Allow same exemptions for normal tax as for surtax	782
2. Reduce surtax rates by 3 percentage points	1,303
3. Reduce normal tax and surtax by 5 percent	559
Total reductions in the individual income tax	2,641
C. Excise taxes:	
1. Repeal of the tax on the use of motor vehicles and boats	140
Total reductions	5,920

Top of income bracket	Combined effective rate, existing law	Effective rate, House bill	Effective rate, conference bill	Point reduction, House bill	Point reduction, conference bill
$20,000	26.5	22.5	22.5	4	4.0
$25,000	27.0	23.0	23.0	4	4.0
$30,000	31.3	27.3	28.0	4	3.3
$35,000	34.4	30.4	31.6	4	2.8
$40,000	36.8	32.8	34.2	4	2.6
$45,000	38.6	34.6	36.3	4	2.3
$50,000	40.0	36.0	38.0	4	2.0
$60,000	40.0	36.0	38.0	4	2.0

First. Individual income-tax rates:

Differences: Senate bill reduces each surtax bracket by three percentage points; House bill reduces each surtax bracket by four percentage points.

House bill rearranges surtax schedules so that each taxpayer will have at least a 10-percent reduction in normal and surtax over existing law.

Senate bill in effect reduces the total normal and surtax, as adjusted, by five percentage points.

Both Senate and House bills allow the surtax exemptions for normal tax purposes.

Reduction in revenues:	*Millions of dollars*
Senate plan	2,644
House plan	2,627

Second. House bill repeals excess-profits tax, effective January 1, 1947, and continues the excess-profits tax through 1946 at the reduced rate of 60 percent.

Senate bill repeals the excess-profits tax as of January 1, 1946.

Loss in revenue—1946:	*Millions of dollars*
House bill	1,300
Senate bill	2,555

Third. Unused excess-profits credit:

Senate bill continues unused excess-profits credit through 1946.

House bill continues unused excess-profits credit through 1946.

Difference: House bill discontinues unused credit after repeal of tax. Senate bill continues unused credit for 1 year after repeal. However, in both cases, the unused credit is continued only through 1946.

Fourth. Reduction in corporation normal and surtaxes:

House bill reduces each surtax bracket applicable to corporations by four percentage points.

Senate bill does not reduce normal and surtax of corporations with incomes of $60,000 or more. It adopts a special rate schedule giving relief to corporations with incomes of less than $60,000.

Loss in revenue—1946:	*Millions of dollars*
Senate bill	63
House bill	405

Fifth. Excise taxes:

House bill, effective July 1, 1947, terminates excise-tax increases imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943 on admissions, jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, liquor, wines, beer, etc.

Senate bill continues existing law so that these increases will be terminated after the first day of the first month following 6 months after termination of present war by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Senate bill also repeals, effective July 1, 1947, manufacturers' excise tax on electric, gas, and oil appliances, photographic apparatus, sporting goods, and business and store machines.

Loss in revenue—1946:	*Millions of dollars*
House bill	675
Senate bill	71

Sixth. Capital stock, declared value excess-profits tax:

Both bills repeal these taxes, effective for fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Loss in revenue—1946:	*Millions of dollars*
Senate bill	231
House bill	183

Seventh. Use tax on automobiles:

Both bills repeal this tax effective July 1, 1946.

Loss in revenue—1946	*Millions of dollars* 140

Eighth. Unemployment taxes:

Both bills freeze old-age and survivorship insurance for 1946 at 1-percent rate.

Ninth. Provisions not in House bill:

MILITARY AND NAVAL PERSONNEL RELIEF

1. All compensation received during any taxable year, beginning after December 31, 1940, and before the termination of the war, for service in the military or naval forces of the United States by an individual below the grade of a commissioned officer is excluded from income. All enlisted personnel would have no income-tax liability with respect to service pay, and would be relieved of filing returns, with respect to such pay.

2. The bill extends the time for paying taxes attributable to service pay of commissioned officers; the tax if so deferred to be paid in 12 equal quarterly installments, without interest.

3. Similar extension of time for payment is provided in the case of taxes attributable to preservice earned income for 1940 or 1941, which became due after the taxpayer's entry into the service.

Tenth. Excess-profits tax relief for corporations in 1945:

The Senate adopted an amendment effective for 1945 which would provide that in no case should the combined excess-profits credit and specific exemption be less than $25,000.

Loss in revenue—$85,000,000

Eleventh. Railroads and other corporations:

The Senate extended the period in which railroads and other corporations could retire their bonds without recognition of gain or loss. Other administrative amendments adopted in the Senate relate to report of refunds in amortization cases to the joint committee, lost postwar bonds, and capital stock tax relief for 1945 in case of recovery of war losses.

First. The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment since it affords a little greater relief to individuals with incomes up to $50,000.

Second. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

Third. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

Fourth. The conferees agreed to a 2-percent reduction on incomes of corporations of $50,000 or more. Thus the 40-percent rate is reduced to 38 percent. The Senate accepted the House provision with respect to the incomes of corporations up to $50,000. These corporations will receive a 4-percent reduction in each bracket under $25,000 and between $25,000 and $50,000 the total effective reduction will be less until it approaches the 2-percent reduction at $50,000.

Fifth. The conferees adopt the Senate provision continuing the excise-tax provisions of existing law but do not accept the Senate provision repealing manufacturers' excise taxes on electric, gas, and oil appliances, photographic apparatus, sporting goods, and business machines.

The House provision relating to floor stocks tax refunds for alcoholic beverages and electric-light bulbs are made to apply under the conference agreement when the wartime excise-tax rates reductions take affect.

Sixth. This was agreed to by both Houses and therefore not in conference.

Seventh. This was agreed to by both Houses and not in conference.

Eighth. Both Houses agreed to this and not in conference.

Ninth. The House agrees to the Senate amendments.

Tenth. The Senate conferees recede as to this amendment.

Eleventh. The House recedes as to these amendments.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, having served for 10 years as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I think I have at least a limited knowledge of tax legislation and the effect of certain taxes upon our national economy, as well as the difficulties of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the consideration of and drafting and passage of any kind of a tax measure. While I am sorry to see this bill bring about certain reductions in revenue that it does—probably eight or nine hundred million more than we hoped for and I am sure the members of the Committee on Ways and Means hoped for—when you consider the legislative processes that a bill has to go through, that is, the House committee, the House, the Senate committee, consideration by the Senate, back to conference, the report of which is before us now, I think that a mighty fine job has been done.

When the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations speaks, people listen, and, of course, a statement from the chairman of that committee is given serious consideration.

The gentleman said that we are throwing away $6,000,000,000. I cannot agree with that statement. I was a member of

the Committee on Ways and Means when the present excess-profits tax was put into operation. The excess-profits tax has no place in a peacetime economy of the country. An excess-profits tax is strictly a war tax. The primary purpose of the excess-profits tax is not tax dollars. The primary purpose has a social objective in view to prevent the making of blood millionaires as the result of war in which many young men and women fighting for our country have given up their lives in order that we might win the war and save our country. The second step is dollars as the result of that social objective.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is it not true that the excess-profits tax conforms to every requirement of the ideal tax, in that it is paid by those most able to pay; that it is a tax on income rather than capital or consumption; that it is the most easily collected of taxes and that it brings in more revenue?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will consult any elementary textbook on political economy and check the excess-profits tax with the basic rules of scientific taxation, he will note that it is the most scientific of taxes. And it is no more a war tax than the sales tax or any other tax now in force.

Mr. McCORMACK. The excess-profits tax in a peacetime economy is a deterrent to industrial expansion. We may differ as to this or that legislation, but basically most of us agree that under our system of government, of free competitive enterprise, where individual initiative exists, we have to look to business in the main for employment. We must have a tax policy that will be an inducement to business. It may be that at times we have to impose more taxes than we would like to, because other problems, duties, and considerations of government may require it. I cannot see any more marked reductions of taxes for some time to come after this one, with all due respect to the opinions of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. But under our system we recognize the fact that business, the little fellows and the big ones, are the ones who with their money invested enable employment to be given to our people. So we have to look to business as a primary proposition, and when there is a break-down we can look to government, those of us who have that progressive outlook, as an implementation.

In this bill the excess-profits tax is repealed. It is an inducement to expansion of business, it is a healthy thing for the country. The excess-profits tax is distinctively a war tax. It is an abortive tax under peacetime conditions.

Mr. Speaker, having all factors in consideration, I think the committee bringing in this conference report has done a mighty fine job.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 137, noes 16.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 297, nays 33, answered "present" 1, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—297

Abernethy	Domengeaux	Howell
Allen, Ill.	Dondero	Huber
Allen, La.	Doughton, N. C.	Jenkins
Anderson, Calif.	Douglas, Calif.	Jennings
Andrews, Ala.	Douglas, Ill.	Jensen
Angell	Drewry	Johnson, Calif.
Arends	Durham	Johnson, Ill.
Arnold	Dworshak	Johnson, Ind.
Auchincloss	Earthman	Johnson,
Bailey	Eaton	Luther A.
Baldwin, Md.	Elliott	Johnson, Okla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ellis	Jones
Barden	Elsaesser	Jonkman
Barrett, Wyo.	Elston	Judd
Bates, Mass.	Engel, Mich.	Kean
Beckworth	Engle, Calif.	Kearney
Bell	Fallon	Kee
Bender	Fellows	Kelly, Ill.
Bennet, N. Y.	Fenton	Kilday
Bennett, Mo.	Fisher	Kinzer
Biemiller	Flannagan	Knutson
Bishop	Fogarty	Kunkel
Blackney	Forand	Lane
Bland	Fuller	Lanham
Bloom	Gallagher	Larcade
Bonner	Gamble	Latham
Boren	Gary	LeCompte
Bradley, Mich.	Gavin	LeFevre
Brooks	Gearhart	Lemke
Brown, Ga.	Geelan	Lewis
Brown, Ohio	Gerlach	Luce
Brumbaugh	Gibson	Ludlow
Bryson	Gifford	Lynch
Buck	Gillespie	McConnell
Buffett	Gillette	McCormack
Burch	Goodwin	McCowen
Burgin	Gordon	McDonough
Butler	Gorski	McGehee
Byrnes, Wis.	Graham	McGregor
Camp	Grant, Ala.	McKenzie
Cannon, Fla.	Grant, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.
Carnahan	Gregory	Madden
Case, N. J.	Gross	Mahon
Case, S. Dak.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Maloney
Celler	Gwynne, Iowa	Manasco
Chapman	Hagen	Mansfield, Tex.
Chelf	Hale	Martin, Iowa
Chenoweth	Hall,	Martin, Mass.
Chiperfield	Edwin Arthur	Mason
Church	Hall,	Michener
Clark	Leonard W.	Miller, Nebr.
Clason	Halleck	Mills
Clements	Hare	Mundt
Clevenger	Harless, Ariz.	Murdock
Cochran	Harris	Murray, Tenn.
Cole, Kans.	Hart	Murray, Wis.
Cole, Mo.	Hartley	Neely
Cole, N. Y.	Hébert	Norrell
Colmer	Hedrick	O'Brien, Ill.
Cooper	Hendricks	O'Brien, Mich.
Courtney	Henry	O'Hara
Cravens	Herter	O'Neal
Crawford	Heselton	Pace
Crosser	Hess	Peterson, Fla.
Curtis	Hill	Philbin
D'Alesandro	Hinshaw	Pittenger
Daughton, Va.	Hobbs	Plumley
Davis	Hoch	Poage
Delaney,	Hoeven	Price, Fla.
James J.	Hoffman	Price, Ill.
D'Ewart	Holmes, Mass.	Priest
Dirksen	Holmes, Wash.	Quinn, N. Y.
Dolliver	Horan	Rabaut
Rabin	Sheppard	Tolan
Rains	Sheridan	Towe
Ramey	Short	Traynor
Ramspeck	Sikes	Trimble
Rankin	Simpson, Ill.	Vinson
Reece, Tenn.	Slaughter	Vorys, Ohio
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Maine	Wadsworth
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Ohio	Walter
Rees, Kans.	Snyder	Wasielewski
Resa	Spence	Weaver
Rich	Springer	Weichel
Richards	Stefan	Welch
Riley	Stevenson	West
Rizley	Stewart	Whitten
Robertson,	Stigler	Whittington
N. Dak.	Sullivan	Wickersham
Robertson, Va.	Sumner, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Robinson, Utah	Sumners, Tex.	Wilson
Rockwell	Sundstrom	Winstead
Rodgers, Pa.	Taber	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rogers, Fla.	Talbot	Wolverton, N. J.
Rogers, Mass.	Talle	Wood
Rogers, N. Y.	Tarver	Woodhouse
Rowan	Taylor	Woodruff, Mich.
Sasscer	Thom	Woodrum, Va.
Schwabe, Mo.	Thomas, N. J.	Worley
Schwabe, Okla.	Thomas, Tex.	Zimmerman
Scrivner	Tibbott	

NAYS—33

Bradley, Pa.	Hull	Outland
Cannon, Mo.	Izak	Patman
Coffee	Jackson	Patterson
Combs	Kefauver	Rooney
Dawson	Kelley, Pa.	Ryter
De Lacy	Kopplemann	Sadowski
Doyle	LaFollette	Savage
Folger	Link	Smith, Va.
Havenner	Mansfield,	Sparkman
Hays	Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Healy	Miller, Calif.	
Holifield	Monroney	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Granger

NOT VOTING—100

Adams	Fulton	Mott
Andersen,	Gardner	Murphy
H. Carl	Gathings	Norton
Andresen,	Gillie	O'Konski
August H.	Gore	O'Toole
Andrews, N. Y.	Gossett	Patrick
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Peterson, Ga.
Barry	Green	Pfeifer
Bates, Ky.	Griffiths	Phillips
Beall	Hancock	Pickett
Bolton	Hand	Ploeser
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Powell
Brehm	Heffernan	Randolph
Buckley	Hook	Rayfiel
Bulwinkle	Hope	Rivers
Bunker	Jarman	Robsion, Ky.
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson,	Roe, Md.
Campbell	Lyndon B.	Roe, N. Y.
Canfield	Keefe	Russell
Carlson	Keogh	Sabath
Cooley	Kerr	Shafer
Corbett	Kilburn	Sharp
Cox	King	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kirwan	Smith, Wis.
Curley	Landis	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney,	Lea	Starkey
John J.	Lesinski	Stockman
Dickstein	Lyle	Thomason
Dingell	McGlinchey	Torrens
Eberharter	McMillan, S. C.	Vursell
Ellsworth	Marcantonio	Weiss
Ervin	May	White
Feighan	Merrow	Winter
Fernandez	Morgan	Wolcott
Flood	Morrison	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Randolph for, with Mr. Granger against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Starkey with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Griffiths.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Brehm.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. King with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Green with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Pickett with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. HAYS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a clipping from the Catholic Review, and, further, to extend his remarks and include an address by Rear Admiral Hussey, of the United States Navy.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an item.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered at Chelsea last Sunday, and further to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a bill he introduced today.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in the first to include an address delivered by Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan before the thirtieth session of the National Academy of the FBI and in the second to include an address delivered before the National Academy of the FBI by Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Samuel B. Pettengill entitled "Blueprint for Postwar Prosperity."

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a Navy Day address by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Sullivan, and in the other a Navy Day address by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, Rear Adm. Thomas L. Gatch.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Secretary of War.

APPROPRIATION FOR UNRRA

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, with the appropriation for UNRRA to operate in the critical winter months reaching us for action in the next few days, I wish to make a few remarks on the urgency of our passing the appropriation without delay.

The food UNRRA provides is the margin between life and death for hundreds of thousands of destitute people in the countries UNRRA serves. UNRRA is now without funds to purchase United States food to keep up the flow in its pipe lines at the time of greatest need. To finance the bulk of its November food shipments UNRRA had to transfer funds previously earmarked for other essential supplies. Procurement of food must be undertaken a month prior to actual shipment. Ships are assigned only after purchase orders are placed. The Department of Agriculture cannot procure UNRRA's food for December until means for payment is on hand. UNRRA's allocations of those foods in short supply cannot be held in reserve. They will be lost to other claimants at an accelerated rate if the appropriation of the $550,000,000 already authorized for UNRRA is delayed by protracted debate and crippling amendments.

The corridor discussion indicates that amendments may be offered to this bill which concern international policies. There is talk of an amendment which would withhold relief for the starving until a political objective is granted. It is as if we said to a hungry boy in Poland or in the Philippines, "Sure we will send you some food, but first get your government to remove all press restrictions." In any case, these amendments should properly be submitted for careful consideration by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House in connection with the new authorization for UNRRA. Attaching them to this appropriation will hold up UNRRA's food purchases until the agreements between UNRRA and several nations are revised. Such international agreements cannot be altered speedily. Any obstruction to the steady flow of our food to Europe this winter means condemning to slow starvation soon after Christmas hundreds of thousands of those we have promised to help "to the limits of our strength."

MOLASSES FOR DAIRY FEED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I carry an appeal from thousands of dairy farmers of up-State New York directed to the Government for its aid in making molasses available to the feed manufacturers of the country.

Everybody knows that molasses is an important base for cow and poultry feeds. What is not generally known is that most of the imported molasses has not been permitted to be used in making up dairy feed since before the war.

The War Production Board insisted that the bulk of molasses be channeled into the manufacture of alcohol while the war lasted. According to reliable information, I have learned this same policy is to prevail throughout 1945 and 1946 and that the Government is planning to purchase most of the molasses we import for this purpose.

No one can say that the authorities have slighted or neglected the alcohol distillers, at least within my personal recollection while I have been a Member of this House. I wish we could say the same for them where the dairy industry is concerned. The shortage of feed in the Northeast is increasingly alarming, yet no one seems to become exercised over that deplorable fact.

American cities will consume more and more milk and other dairy products as our postwar standard of living continues to rise. But this milk must first come out of the cow. The cow cannot produce the milk without adequate feed.

Furthermore, due to the excess rains in the Northeast this past summer, along with labor shortages on our farms, the hay harvest is far below normal. An increased amount of molasses for use on roughage will step up the hay supply in feeding value.

So I am calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, to bring pressure to bear in order to divert a large portion of the imported molasses into the hands of producers of the dairy and livestock feeds which our farmers in the Northeast are earnestly trying to obtain.

I hope this policy will be instituted forthwith for it will contribute in part at least a solution to the ills and complaints of both feeders and dealers all over my section.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit during the rest of the session this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that that order be vacated and that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders

heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a letter on the suppression of free speech for GI's, and in the other to include a letter on the labor situation.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Times.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from a serviceman.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole during the consideration of the Navy bill and to include therein a letter and two statements on the atomic bomb.

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on demobilization of the armed forces and to include certain letters and excerpts. The Public Printer estimates the cost to be $119.40. I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the cost that the extension might be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from a pamphlet.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a Navy Day address delivered by Capt. Lyman A. Thackrey, United States Navy, U. S. S. *Portland*.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, first, by inserting an editorial, and, second, a letter.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks to be made later in the Committee of the Whole, and include therein a statement made by Secretary Wallace before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments this morning on the full employment bill.

COMPOSITION OF THE POSTWAR NAVY

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 80.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 80, with Mr. HARE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FULL EMPLOYMENT—H. R. 2202

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on October 30, 1945:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Expenditures Committee, I am glad to be here and to have the opportunity of discussing with you this problem of full employment.

In the newspapers and magazines, and on the air, and in the proceedings here in Congress, I have noticed an almost universal agreement that full employment is the No. 1 postwar objective for this country. I have seen this conviction growing for 2 or 3 years now, but, even so, I am a little surprised at how nearly unanimous we are now. There are some differences of opinion, really rather slight, in respect to definitions and statistics. There is considerably more disagreement about ways and means. But hardly anybody is willing today to take a position that full employment opportunity is undesirable or even that it is not substantially attainable in a free economy.

Most of us feel very definitely that it will be sheer folly to risk another major depression if we can find any possible way of avoiding it. Some people have forgotten how close we came to real disaster in the early 1930's, but most of us remember quite clearly and realize that mass unemployment simply will not be tolerated again. This free and self-reliant people simply will not stand for another great depression—not after seeing with their own eyes the production and employment they can achieve if they get together and decide what they want to do.

In addition to this general realization that unemployment on any considerable scale would be a deadly threat to our institutions, and especially to our free-enterprise system, I think there is also a healthy and correct appreciation of the fact that world peace depends in large part on our success in maintaining full employment here.

So there we are, and the problem is how to go about the job of maintaining the condition of full employment opportunity. I have approached this legislation, H. R. 2202, in this spirit. As you know, I have been thinking about the problem for a good many years, and especially since about 1938. Then last winter this bill came along and it matched my ideas of how to attack the job very well. I therefore wholeheartedly endorsed it.

The end of the war came sooner than most of us expected. It brought the need for immediate consideration and adoption of a program for governmental and private action to get us out of the war economy—a program to get us through the transition period and into peacetime condition where a man who is able and willing to work will have a real opportunity to earn a living.

I feel strongly that this bill is the necessary first step and that it is needed as the first step toward working out the kind of a long-range program we want, and is also urgently needed for a successful transition.

I hope it will be passed as promptly as orderly procedure will permit, especially since some of the factors that are operating toward recovery are strictly temporary, and it will take some time to get our longer-range machinery functioning.

As I look around and read the papers and the reports and contemplate the management-labor conference that is coming up in a few weeks, I am more and more impressed with the urgency of the situation. The difficulties that are so prominent in the headlines have their roots, I believe, in fear of the future—in lack of confidence in our ability to create and maintain a condition where workers and employers alike will have enough opportunities to earn their livings whether in the form of wages or in profits.

I hope I can share with you some of this feeling of urgency. The Director of Mobilization and Reconversion has estimated that unemployment may reach eight millions in the first quarter of 1946, even allowing for several million withdrawals from the labor force. It will reach some such numbers because our economic machinery simply can't operate quite fast enough to build up peacetime employment as rapidly as demobilization of war industry and of the armed forces will proceed.

There will be a turning point, perhaps in March or April, from which we can move in one of two directions. We can recover, perhaps rather rapidly, if we have industrial and economic peace and confidence in the future. The recovery might even be too fast or too hectic; prices might get out of hand before production comes up to meet the demand and then we would have an inflationary boom that surely would end in another collapse. So I think we must have a unified, coordinated economic program to keep us on the highway even if we do get into a boom late next year.

On the other hand, it is by no means certain that we shall snap out of this critical period. It depends upon a whole set of economic and social factors, including among other things industrial peace, social tolerance, and general confidence. Confidence is essential to the other conditions. I am not now talking about vague, unreal, or visionary things at all; I am talking straight bankers' language, based on economic realities, when I use the term confidence.

If, when the turning point comes, a wave of fear should sweep the country, then it is quite possible that conditions would not improve but would get worse and we would sink into stagnation and depression.

It is by no means certain that the accumulated backlog of demand and the presence of accumulated purchasing power will actually pull us out of the critical period if there should be widespread lack of confidence in the ability of management and labor to get together and in the ability of the Government to do its part. Here again confidence in the future is the key.

Now this turning point is coming along very soon and I urge as strongly as I can that we take appropriate action in time. By appropriate action I mean such legislation and administrative measures as will demonstrate that we take our responsibilities seriously, that we are working as hard as we can on the job, and that we intend to succeed. For such action, H. R. 2202 is the necessary first step. I want to explain why I think this in more detail.

There are three elements in the problem as I see it. First we must have confidence in the future and that confidence must be justified—not mere unthinking optimism.

Second, in order to create such confidence we must have better coordination in Government—better administration and better legislation in matters that affect the economic activity of the country. This economy is now so large and so complex, it is so closely tied to the economic and political development of the rest of the world, and the Federal Government necessarily will occupy and affect such a large part of our total economy—that we simply cannot afford to muddle along and take a chance on another collapse.

We must modernize our administrative and legislative procedures. We must coordinate our handling of expenditures for public investment and for public services, our regulatory activities, and our necessary revenue-raising measures. We must coordinate our fiscal activities, the control of credit

and the handling of the tremendous debt structure. We simply cannot any longer work at cross purposes in these various fields—all of them fields where the Federal Government of necessity will have a major impact for good or ill on the workings of our private economy.

So I note that a general understanding that we are going to coordinate our governmental job better than we have done in the past is a positive requirement for general confidence in where the country is going.

In the third place, confidence will not be justified and coordination will not be effective unless we move promptly to the development of a program for legislative and administrative action. Everybody has ideas about what the Government should or should not do. It is amazing how some people say in one breath, "keep the Government out of business—let business alone," and in the next breath propose a series of actions that they want the Government to take. But it will be necessary for us to take various forms of action, and my point is that we have no assurance of success except by bringing together the various measures that affect the economy in the various ways I have suggested, unless we construct a reasonably unified and coordinated and complete program.

So there we have three elements or stages in our attack on the central problem—confidence, coordination, and a program. If this bill had not been proposed, and if we were sitting here analyzing the situation, we might well write up such a set of specifications.

As I examine H. R. 2202 it fits these specifications very well.

First it states the central objective—full employment opportunity in a free competitive economy—in terms that are generally understood and widely agreed upon. This objective is unquestionably first in the hearts of almost all our people—all, I think, except a few who have special axes to grind. The mere recognition of this great national objective in plain and simple terms is to step in the right direction toward the necessary confidence.

Next the bill recognizes clearly and simply the responsibility of the Federal Government toward this objective. There can be no possible question but that the people of the United States will hold their Federal Government responsible for the attainment of their great central objective. They will hold their elected representatives and their duly designated administrative officials responsible, and they will form their own judgment as to how well we have discharged our obligation. If we fail, or in the degree to which we fail, they will be the judge of how well we have provided the necessary leadership and how wisely we have directed the resources of the Federal Government toward our declared objective.

The actual language of the bill is properly clear and definite on this recognition and responsibility. It says in plain English that the responsibility is to assure the existence at all time of sufficient opportunities.

Finally, the bill sets up a procedure in the executive branch and in Congress that seems to me very well adapted to the formulation and constant improvement of a program for economic action to move toward and maintain the objective of full employment opportunity in a free competitive economy. The procedure set forth is very simple and very businesslike. It is closely parallel to the well-established procedures that have been found necessary in the successful conduct of a private corporation with its president and its board of directors. The bill calls upon the President to submit annually a statement of the situation and of where the country seems to be headed as respects employment and production; and a program for administrative action that he proposes to take in the circumstances thus described; and a program of recommended legislative action.

The making of such an annual statement and preparation of such a program and its revision as situations develop and conditions change would be a powerful influence toward better administration in the executive branch. It would compel the various agencies to consider their own requirements and intentions in the light of the total. It would compel an accounting at periodic intervals of the success of their work. It would be a powerful device in the direction of efficiency as well as effectiveness throughout the whole Federal executive establishment.

The bill finally sets up improved machinery in Congress for the same purposes of coordination and unification of effort. This is a natural development in our legislative history and there can be no question but what it is badly needed to cope with the tremendous problems that will confront the Senate and the House in the future and that I think will be simply unmanageable under current procedures. The machinery set up in the bill is very simple—the joint committee of the Senate and the House large enough to include the heads of the major committees concerned but not large enough to be unwieldy. This committee is directed to receive the President's National Budget message and program and to consider it, calling witnesses or utilizing its own staff as may be found necessary or convenient; and then to report a joint resolution to the Senate and the House for public debate, revision, and adoption as the agreed-upon statement of the situation and of governmental needs and intentions.

I can think of nothing more healthy and more conducive to a rational and prudent approach to these complex problems of the future by the Members of the Senate and the House and by the various committees. It is not another complication—it is a simplification. It would strengthen the hand of every standing committee. It is not too much to say that such a procedure would enable these committees to do their jobs in the face of legislative requirements of the future.

So it seems to me that the H. R. 2202 matches the specifications for the kind of basic legislation we need as the first step toward a program for full employment opportunity in a free competitive economy. It sets up the ojective; it states the responsibility of the Federal Government; and it establishes a procedure that is well adapted for the purpose.

It is the minimum that we must have to start with in order to provide the confidence which is the essential basis of a healthy private enterprise and to make possible the coordination of effort toward the unified objective and to equip us with the procedure under which the administration and the Congress can develop step by step an economic program for unified action toward the agreed-upon objective.

Whatever the Congress finds it wise to adopt in the way of basic legislation for this purpose, I will do my best to help make that legislation work. But I hope you will give us in the administration a clear and definite authorization to do our job, such as H. R. 2202.

I don't know what modifications or amendments you are considering, if any, but I definitely hope you do not weaken the bill. Let me emphasize again the underlying importance of confidence throughout the business world, both to employers and to labor. It is confidence alone that will give us the healthy flow of purchasing power which is the lifeblood of the private-enterprise system. It is confidence alone that will activate the accumulated savings and get them used to satisfy accumulated needs and wants.

The way to build this general confidence is to state in clear and simple legislation written in plain English that we are going to do the job; that we do recognize the responsibility and that our responsibility is to assure opportunities for our workers and our businessmen and our farmers and our professional people to earn a decent living. Any weakening of this commitment would tend to defeat the purpose.

Let us tell the people that we really mean it. Let us also tell them that we recognize the difficulty of the task; that we recognize that in order to discharge this responsibility we must set up new and improved procedures in the executive branch and in the legislature and that we must go on from there to work out a practical program of unified action.

Let me describe a little more specifically what sort of a program of positive action we can work out under H. R. 2202.

I want to say to begin with that I firmly believe a program can be worked out that will provide sufficient employment opportunity in a free competitive economy, without departing from our traditional concepts of individual liberties, including private enterprise; and this can definitely be done without imposing tax burdens or other fiscal practices that would defeat the purpose. Specifically, I believe it can be done without jeopardizing the integrity of our fiscal system.

It can be done without continuing deficits in the Federal Treasury if we want to do it that way. The money we need to balance expenditures can be obtained by taxation rather than by borrowing if that is the policy that seems wise to Congress in the future. Such tax revenues, of course, would have to be obtained from sources where it would not reduce private expenditures so much as to be self-defeating. If we take a dollar of taxes out of the active flow of purchasing demand, we reduce somebody's expenditure and somebody's sale at the cash register by the same dollar. So if we decide to raise enough revenue to balance the Government's expenses, it is perfectly clear that we will have to hunt around and find sources of revenue that will not cripple or strangle the active flow of purchasing demand at the cash register.

The bill you are considering does not specify any single policy in this respect, and I think this is wise. We have yet to solve the problem of finding and taxing idle dollars without reducing unduly the profit incentive. We do know that when a dollar is saved it is withdrawn from the flow of active purchasing power and nobody can make any money out of it until it is spent or invested or until somebody else spends or invests a dollar that had previously been saved. We do not know exactly how much private enterprise will want to borrow and invest nor exactly how much it should and can borrow and invest year by year without getting ahead of its market. We do not know whether the amount that business will want to borrow and invest will be equal to the amount that individuals want to save and lend.

If private business doesn't care to invest year by year as much as individuals want to save, then it is simple arithmetic to figure out that somebody else will have to provide the outlet for the people's savings. Otherwise, the total flow of active purchasing power at the cash register will not stay up where it ought to be and full employment and full production will not be maintained.

If this should turn out to be the case—if business doesn't provide the opportunities for useful investment of the people's savings—then I expect the people will see no reason why they should not provide their own outlet. I expect they will provide such outlet for themselves through their Government by investing the money in useful public projects.

This would add up to what we are accustomed to term a deficit in the Government

budget, although in private business strictly comparable operations are not termed deficits when they are balanced by additions to the capital account. A manufacturer does not write off a new factory during the year in which it is built. There is no more reason why the Government should write off a dam or a highway in a single year.

In all these matters it is clear that the future holds many uncertainties and therefore I think the Government's budgetary policy should be left for future Congresses to determine under the conditions they face in the future. We have just come out of a long period of fiscal disturbance and perhaps we still face several years of extraordinary fiscal requirements. The bill specifies that taxation and revenue raising shall be considered as a part of the program as, of course, they should be. That is as far as I think we should go at this time.

President Truman on September 6 submitted an extensive list of items on which he felt that governmental action is needed in order to steer a steady course through the reconversion period and into a satisfactory postwar economy. He said, "The major objective, of course, is to reestablish an expanded peacetime industry, trade, and agriculture, and to do it as quickly as possible." Then he listed the major fields of action for the consideration of Congress in line with his constitutional duty—and as you know legislation for full employment was among the items.

As I look down the President's list of far-reaching, needed measures, many of which are not yet even in draft form as far as I know, and as I contemplate these extensive areas of needed action, many of which are not covered at all or are very inadequately covered—I am impressed again and again with the sheer impossibility of handling these complex problems unless we first equip ourselves with the machinery set up in H. R. 2202. In addition, at the risk of unnecessary repetition I say again that the whole success of this or any other program for the critical time that lies immediately ahead as well as for the long range—I say that the whole success of such a program depends on creating and justifying a feeling of confidence throughout the land.

The President's list in his message of September 6 contained 21 main headings and I hope you have noted how each item relates to and affects the others and how therefore we should consider them each in relation to the whole of our activity—and therefore how urgently we need the bill which you have before you.

Now what is the difference between such a listing of items and a program for action under the full-employment bill?

The difference is that in constructing the program, specific measures for action on each item would be proposed or described and their effects would be estimated and their relations to other parts of the program would be set forth. Then the joint committee would consider the report and the recommended measures and the estimates. They would change such parts as they found needed change and then report the joint resolution for debate on the floor of each House. The joint resolution would be debated, fully and freely and publicly, and adopted by a record vote. Finally, the specific measures contained in the final program would be drafted and considered by the various standing committees.

In this manner we would work out a program, the parts of which would fit together. As conditions changed and the success of each measure was proved out or disproved in practice, revisions would be made from time to time to improve the result.

It is very closely parallel to the well-established techniques of management in business. A scientific management approach to a business problem usually contains three steps: (1) setting the objectives, (2) allocating the responsibility, and (3) setting up procedures to discharge the responsibility. The procedures begin by setting tasks and quotas; then a coordinated set of processes or machines or operations would be designed and placed in action. Finally—just as a corporation publishes a quarterly report on its operations—there would be a periodic check of the results whereby the performance could be measured and the efficiency of the whole program could be gaged. This is what, as I read it, is done by H. R. 2202.

Summarizing briefly, I am in favor of H. R. 2202 because I believe it is an essential step in creating and justifying the confidence that is essential to the successful operation of our private enterprise system.

I favor the bill because it would set up a procedure for better coordination in the executive branch and in the Congress and I feel that such better coordination is absolutely necessary in dealing with the huge and complex problems of the postwar world.

I favor the bill because it is the only practical way I see whereby we can construct and operate a unified program of governmental action on the scale that clearly will be necessary in the future.

For these very reasons, I would be strongly against any attempts at weakening or watering down this legislation. Such weakening would strike at the very foundation of our work—it would tend to weaken the confidence which is its essential objective. I think we must say clearly and plainly and flatly that we are going to do this job.

Likewise, I would view with strong disfavor attempts to limit or restrict the action programs and measures which future Congresses may find desirable under the circumstances that then exist. I think we should leave the future Congress entirely unfettered to use whatever means they find necessary or desirable under the Constitution.

I would also view as very weakening or restricting any attempt to divide the joint committee, or to limit its scope of consideration, or to relieve it of the necessary duty of reporting its findings back in the form of a joint resolution for open debate in each House and before the people of the country.

Finally, I have said and would emphasize again that a positive program of action is necessary, and that it can be constructed without doing violence to our traditions and our institutons, and without ruining the financial soundness of the country—provided that we agree on the objective of the program, and that we face the responsibility squarely, and that we adopt procedures that will make it possible for us to discharge that responsibility.

All these things add up to my strong support of H. R. 2202. I believe firmly that we can accomplish this task—I see that we must accomplish this task—and I urge that our time is limited and that the need is great.

Give us a good strong legislative authorization and let us get to work.

Mr. CCLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is probably a fortunate happenstance which brings the consideration of this resolution providing for the size of our postwar Navy on the first legislative days following the Nation-wide celebration of Navy Day on last Saturday, the 27th of October. It provides us with an occasion in which to assess our situation and to chart our course for the future.

Following the surrender of Germany in May of this year and the sudden capitulation of Japan in August, there immediately arose a universal demand by the American people for the prompt return of our soldiers and sailors which has resulted in a gigantic process of demobilization, both of our Army and of our Navy. Our historic love of peace and abhorrence for war, coupled with the anxiety, the restrictions, and heartaches of war itself, have caused the American people to demand the prompt liquidation of our Military Establishment. When the last shot was fired in the Pacific and the signature of the Japanese Government was affixed to the surrender, we concluded that the need for an invincible military force was terminated and that we could again turn our swords of war into the plowshares of peace.

This resolution brings us up sharply against the ugly and unpleasant realities of a world not actually and genuinely at peace, such as we might wish to be the case, but rather one in a state of armistice. In spite of the fact that there has been fabricated the framework for a United Nations Organization by which the sores of international discord can be healed without resort to force and war, in spite of the fact that guns are no longer fired and battlefields no longer strewn with bleeding and lifeless bodies, the stark fact remains that greed and suspicion sit at the council tables of the world. Small nations, defenseless and voiceless, are moved about as pawns or cards upon the international table of power politics. The strong and powerful countries constantly scheme and maneuver and jockey for a favorable position, each for itself, although it can be proudly asserted that, out of the shambles of a world prostrated by war, the United States seeks for herself none of the spoils, the indemnities, and retributions which, in and of themselves, are but the seeds for future international conflict and discord; she seeks nothing except that which is essential to the maintenance of her own security and the preservation of the peace of the world. The world is not sailing on an even keel, and yet we carry on our program of demobilization on a grand and vast scale.

Until such time as mutual confidence replaces suspicion, when respect for the rights of others takes the place of greed and when fairness and justice supplant the use of force and intimidation, until that time and only then can we afford to reduce considerably our military preparedness. The danger now is that, in our passionate desire for peace, we might become demobilized and demilitarized to such an extent as to leave us helpless and without the capacity with which to execute our present determination to fulfill our obligation for cooperative effort in the forcible preservation of peace.

The concurrent resolution which we now consider seeks to square our country with these realities by providing for the size of our postwar or peacetime Navy. The program recommended by the Navy Department, as represented by this resolution, appears to be a sensible and orderly approach to the problem. It would retain for eventual use in case of need approximately 75 percent of our present wartime combat strength. Of that force, nearly 30 percent, or 300 vessels, would be operated on what is termed an "active" basis, immediately available

for any eventuality. These ships would be staffed with a personnel force of 70 percent of wartime complement. An additional 10 percent of the ships would be carried on the basis which has been characterized as "ready reserve," staffed only by a nucleus crew but maintained in such condition as to be available for use within a comparatively short period of time. The remainder of the fleet, or approximately 60 percent, would constitute the inactive reserve. These ships would remain idle at various ports and navy yards throughout the country, properly housed in appropriate coats of paint, layers of grease, and modern systems of dehumidification. In military strength, the total of these three categories equals or exceeds the known combined present naval strength of all the nations of the world.

This seems to be the most effective, efficient, and economical method for solving what inevitably is a tremendous and costly responsibility. It is estimated by the Navy Department that the maintenance of a naval establishment of this fashion would cost annually between three and one-half and four billions of dollars, about eight times the cost of our naval operations a decade ago.

Mr. Chairman, much as I approve and endorse the provisions contained in the body of this resolution, to my mind, the most important part of it is contained in one of the clauses of the preamble wherein Congress declares the purpose, objective, and responsibility of our Navy. By that clause, the Congress states that our Navy is maintained "in order to insure our national integrity, support our national policies, guard the continental United States and our overseas possessions, give protection to our commerce and citizens abroad, and to cooperate with other world powers in the maintenance of peace." So far as I have been able to learn, this is the first time that the Congress, by legislative fiat, has declared and delineated the purposes of our Naval Establishment. By the adoption of this resolution, we now give congressional sanction to that which has historically been the policy of the Department itself.

Mr. Chairman, in order to attain our goal of international good will, justice, and peace, it is not enough that we rely upon our good neighborliness with other nations, upon our well-conceived sense of justice nor upon our love of peace itself. It is not enough that we collaborate with other nations in the construction of a world organization nor that we actively participate in the functions of such an organization. It is not enough that we, along with other countries, subscribe to a policy of outlawing war. It is not enough that we maintain a vast naval and military establishment at a terrific and deadening cost to our national economy nor that we train our youth in the discipline and arts of modern warfare. We can have all these factors to the acme of perfection and still someday again find ourselves in the midst of a world conflagration. These are but the tools with which wars are averted and peace is wrought. They are meaningless and useless unless possessed by hands and guided by hearts that are strong, resolute, and determined.

A decade ago, at a Navy Day celebration, I ventured an assertion which applied then, applies now, and will forever apply, if our involvement in a major conflict is to be averted. An invincible naval armada is but a group of painted ships upon a painted ocean unless dominated by the will of its owners that it shall not only be but is used to fulfill the purposes of its owners. This thought has oft been spoken in years gone by but is one to which we have given little heed.

Our purpose as a nation is peace; peace with ourselves, peace with our neighbors, and peace with all nations and peoples of the world. That has always been and will forever remain our purpose. We have the capacity to construct and to maintain a vast military machine for use in war. Let us resolve now, and be forever loyal to that resolution, to wage the peace with the same grim and forceful determination that we have waged the war and constantly be not only ready but, what is vastly more vital, be willing and determined to use all of our power and all of our might to strike down the threat of war if ever its ugly head is raised again at any place or any time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the proposal before us is exceedingly interesting and important. There can be no doubt whatsoever in my humble judgment that unless America is strong in support of righteousness in international behavior the chances for maintaining world peace will be distinctly lessened. I have entertained this belief for a great many years. I still entertain it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise upon this occasion to discuss especially this resolution. Undoubtedly it represents the best judgment of the naval authorities and the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House; not for one moment shall I indicate any lack of confidence on my part in the Navy as an institution; indeed, it commands my limitless admiration. The record of the Navy made during this war was extraordinary and we all ought to be mighty proud of it. Rather I want to call the attention of the members of the committee to the processes by which we attempt to formulate the military policy of the United States. The introduction and presentation to the House of this resolution is a part of our old-time process which, without criticizing the contents of the resolution in the slightest degree, I question very seriously.

Here is the situation as I see it, and it is a situation that has persisted for years and years. Our military defense today consists of three members of a team—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps. To no one of those members can we confide exclusively the defense of the United States; nor can we confide to any two of them exclusively the defense of the United States. I am sure that every person present on this floor will admit that the adequate defense of the United States and its legitimate interests can be achieved only by the combined team composed of those three members.

In my judgment, the Congress should have a better conception of the team than it is now possible for us to have. When we say that the Navy shall be of a certain strength and make a decision in that limited field, we are doing so without any knowledge or information as to what the strength of the Army should be or of the strategic Air Corps. Should the Military Affairs Committee bring in a resolution such as this to the effect that the Regular Army of the United States in the postwar period shall consist, we will say, of a million men, under our legislative processes and under our customs it is fair to say that no member of the Military Affairs Committee will have had any opportunity to study the combination of Army, Navy, and Air Corps, nor has any member of the Naval Affairs Committee in this instance—I say this without implying the slightest criticism of the members of that committee; I am criticizing the system—had any opportunity to study the over-all needs of our national defense—the Army, Navy, and Air Corps, the great team upon which we must depend for our security.

It was a little disconcerting, for example, to read the other day in the testimony given before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by the Chief of Staff of the Army that the proposals contained in this resolution, which may, as I indicated, be perfectly sound as far as the Navy is concerned, had not been brought to the attention of the War Department or had been given any study by that Department. The same statement could be made by the Chief of Naval Operations if the War Department came here with a resolution something like this and it was reported by the Military Affairs Committee to the effect that the plan for the Army and its size in the postwar period had never been submitted to the Navy for study in an attempt to perfect the team upon which we must depend.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I, too, was somewhat disturbed when I read about General Marshall's statement to the Senate committee in the press that the Navy's proposal had never been submitted to the War Department. At the time the hearings were conducted I made inquiry of Mr. Forrestal who was testifying in support of the concurrent resolution and asked him if this proposal had been submitted to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to which he replied in the affirmative. Subsequent to that I read General Marshall's statement. So I wrote to Mr. Forrestal and inquired the exact fact, in response to which I received a communication from him a day or so back in which he said that the Navy's proposal had been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget; and by the Bureau of the Budget had been sub-

mitted to the Joint Chiefs of Staff some time in advance of the hearings held by the committee. So while General Marshall's statement is technically correct that it had not been submitted to the War Department, actually it was submitted to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The statement made by the gentleman from New York is correct, as I understand. The information that has come to me runs exactly parallel with the information he has just given the committee. Nevertheless, the House knows nothing about the over-all plan—nothing; and we are the people who in the last analysis must decide how our defense shall be constructed and maintained.

I am bold enough upon this occasion to utter a complaint to the effect that when this Navy plan was submitted to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that body should have studied it. Remember, that body is composed of the highest-ranking men in all three services. That body should have studied it in conjunction with parallel studies for the Army and the Air Corps and submitted its recommendations to the Congress so that we would have some idea of the over-all problem. That is the complaint I make. It is not against this resolution, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia. I must assume that the recommendations in this legislation are sound. I have no reason to doubt their soundness, but I would rejoice as an individual member of the House if I could see a picture of the whole national defense undertaking, and that is the thing, Mr. Chairman, which Congress has never enjoyed. It is high time that it did.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman is the ranking Republican member of what I thought was a very important committee, the Committee on Postwar Military Policy. Has the gentleman's committee held any hearings or had any information on the matters contained in this resolution, or our general postwar military policy, which involves the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is not the very fact that the Navy report had to reach the Joint Chiefs of Staff through the Budget Office of the President illustration of the lack of coordination which the gentleman is discussing?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just another little piece of testimony in support of my complaint.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that so far as the Committee on Postwar Military Policy is concerned, practically all of its deliberations, if not all, have been confined solely to the question of compulsory peacetime military training?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No. The gentleman forgets that we spent a long time in hearing testimony on the proposal for the unification of the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. And research.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We also spent a long time in listening to testimony from military and civilian scientists in order that we might recommend to the Congress a proper policy for the Congress to pursue with respect to the maintenance, after the war was over, of scientific research in support of the military forces.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is quite true, but with respect to naval establishments they have held practically no deliberations whatever.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; nor Army establishments. We were not looking into the several services, we were trying to formulate an over-all policy or at least recommend such a policy. The proposal for the unification of the War and Navy Departments is a contentious proposal. People disagree about it. I am not going to discuss that here now. My disappointment is that apparently we are on the way toward persisting, as we have done back through the decades, in a process the ultimate effect of which is to deny to the Members of the Congress an over-all view of the national defense. We go at it piecemeal. There are 99 chances out of a hundred that this resolution is sound, but I for one would like to know more about the whole thing, and I think every Member here on the floor would rejoice at such an opportunity.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman understands, of course, that in the past we have never had the War Department come to the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Navy Department come to the Committee on Military Affairs to discuss their immediate problems.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I wish they would.

Mr. IZAC. Perhaps it would be better if we could have all the armed services come before all the committees of Congress interested in that problem, or perhaps a group from each of the appropriate committees of the House sitting as a joint committee. We are only following the old precedent, of course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is exactly true.

Mr. IZAC. As I understand, that is what the gentleman is objecting to. However, the gentleman must realize that when we say there shall be a major fleet base at a place like Pearl Harbor, immediately the War Department knows it must set up a certain-sized garrison for the purpose of protecting that base. The very fact that this has gone to the Chiefs of Staff and they know what the problem of the Navy is in relation to its bases means that they also know what is required of them in that one category of garrison troops, shore fortifications, and coast defenses.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the Congress does not know.

Mr. IZAC. The Congress in time will know the recommendations of each of the departments of national defense and each of the committees that deal with those departments. Would the gentleman have but one department of national defense and one committee of Congress deal with all the national defense?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have already committed myself, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] will testify, on the question of the committee system in the Congress. I have appeared before his committee and suggested certain consolidations of House committees. One of those consolidations involved the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. IZAC. Still the gentleman will admit that until we do change our system here the Committee on Naval Affairs is proceeding in the proper course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is proceeding in exact accordance with our custom, but I think the custom is faulty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman's discussion of this subject disturbs me very much. The problem of determining whether these several services ought to be combined I think is a very important one. I am just wondering whether the passage of this resolution may interfere with a proper consideration of that problem.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman is asking my opinion?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am asking the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it would not.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman does not think it would interfere?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No. That problem is a live problem, and action on this resolution I do not think would prejudice its solution.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Further answering the gentleman from Ohio, does not the gentleman from New York think that it could not have any effect inasmuch as this is not a bill, it has no force or effect, it is perfectly harmless, and it binds nobody anywhere?

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I interrupt there?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In a very true sense it commits the Congress to the support of this program.

Mr. MICHENER. Any commitment would only be a moral commitment. The gentleman has referred to precedent. This is not a precedent. Never in the history of the Congress has a matter of

this type been dealt with by an innocuous resolution expressing merely a hope, as this resolution does. This does not establish the type of Navy. It does not authorize any action by the Navy or anybody else. It is merely a hope. Does not the gentleman think that possibly it is a trial balloon to start something, and, in a manner of speaking, to jump the gun and lead some people to feel that the Congress has taken effective action?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, I would not say that this resolution is merely a trial balloon. I think it is very informing. I am glad of the opportunity to read the report of the committee as well as the details of the resolution itself. It is informing as to the plans of the Navy, but only of the Navy. I would like an opportunity for the House to get a view of the plans of all three of them put together.

Mr. MICHENER. So would I.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I beg to assure the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, as well as the members of that committee, that I did not rise here to criticize them in the slightest, nor to cast the slightest reflection upon a glorious institution—the Navy of the United States. I am merely pointing to what I think is a weakness in our congressional procedure.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. If I understand the statement of the gentleman, which is a very intelligent one, it is to the effect that anything that the gentleman says has to do only with the Congress and what we have not done and should do; is that right?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Some of my criticism is directed at the Departments. As I indicated a moment ago, I think it would have been a wise thing for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to have commented on the plan of the Navy in conjunction with possible plans of the Army and Air Corps, and let us know their thoughts on the matter.

Mr. PATRICK. I think so, too. But could not the Congress have had that by making the effort?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know how you can compel them.

Mr. PATRICK. Could not the Congress ask for the information by asking for a conference and getting knowledge concerning this even if you have to pull it out?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The trouble was, if my recollection of the sequence of events is correct, that it was not known by any Member of the Congress prior to the introduction of this resolution. The Joint Chiefs of Staff had not seen it before its introduction.

Mr. PATRICK. I see the gentleman's point, of course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Was it not necessary for the Navy and also the Committee on Naval Affairs to take immediate action in respect to the policy that we are to follow in the postwar period, when we are facing the demobilization of over 3,000,000 men and several thousand ships? Is that not what Admiral King and Secretary Forrestal had to say before the committee when they were in support of this bill? Admiral King had this to say:

> My overriding concern is that the United States will have a Navy in the future which will be adequate to support the national policy as we understand it. We are unable to make any other representation until we have a more definite national policy than we now have. Even in order to do this we have to make certain assumptions about the tasks which the Navy will be called upon to discharge in conjunction with the Army. The size of the postwar Navy expressed in ships is obviously the determining factor for the personnel which will be required. We shall be faced with the problem not only of operating ships on active duty but also of laying up ships which are to be placed in an inactive status.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I always listen with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], because I have always found him to be a most instructive commentator on facts with which he deals. I was particularly interested in noting that he directed practically all of his comments to the fact that we do not have what I will typify as a unified command of our military forces. At no time in his discussion did he criticize or oppose the contents of the resolution which we have under consideration. In fact, he very studiously directed his comments to the effect that he was not criticizing its proposals, but merely stated that he would be much better pleased and would have had a greater opportunity of concept had there been some comment on the over-all participation by the Army, the Air Forces, and the Navy. And in the gentleman's conclusion, of course, I can only concur, because I think, frankly, that we as sitting Members of the House of Representatives, are always desirous of getting as much information as we can upon any subject with which we have to deal.

However, I have the honor to occupy the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, and naturally have some definite thoughts on this resolution. I want to pay my compliments to the chairman and members of the Committee on Naval Affairs for bringing out a blueprint for the Congress to concur with, in order that we may have some kind of premise to analyze our future appropriations with a reasonable degree of understanding and accuracy.

I was permitted, because of the courtesy and confidence of some members of the Committee on Appropriations, along with other members of my subcommittee, to take a trip to Europe and the South Pacific during which time we traveled over 34,000 miles plus, and had an opportunity to observe the activities of the Navy, and, incidentally, some of the activities of the Army.

At this time I will not usurp the prerogatives of other members of the committee who serve with me on the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations. They can speak for themselves. But I will say to the Members of this House that after that trip I had to change some preconceived ideas about Europe and the future attitude of Europe, politically and psychologically speaking. Without referring specifically to any nation at this time, because I do not think it would be in keeping with conditions that presently prevail, my opinion, predicated upon that trip and observations and knowledge gained from it, and from what has been indicated in the political attitude of Europe for the past 12 years, it is highly indicative that the very least you and I can do in this Nation, to preserve our form of government and our way of living, and give some definite attention to the oncoming generations in this country, is to maintain a navy, an army, and an air force that will be capable of taking care of the international requirements, irrespective of what they may be and when they may occur. As far as I am concerned, I am saying to all of you definitely that that is going to be my future voting policy in this House.

I sincerely trust that the Members of this Congress, as far as they are individually concerned, will not go back to a state of international lethargy such as we did after the last war, and again permit to be created an international chaos that cost us millions upon millions of dollars and millions of the manpower of our Nation. I say that in all sincerity.

I do not know whether my impressions would run parallel with those of any other Member of the House but I have felt definitely over a period of years that had this Nation in conjunction with its so-called allies of that time stopped Germany when she went across into Alsace-Lorraine we would not have had the chaos and destructiveness emanating out of that nation that we experienced, and I further feel if we as a great nation and people had assumed the obligation of preservation which we should have assumed and stopped the Japanese as soon as they sank the *Panay* in the Yangtze River, we would not have had a war with Japan.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman assume that had we had the navy and the army the gentleman deems adequate that the American people could have been induced to step in and take part in those hostilities?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not, of course, want to assume responsibility for the entire American public, but I am willing to assume my own responsibilities. I say to the gentleman from Idaho that if we had then had people in this country with enough foresight and intestinal fortitude to do the job we should have done at that time, my answer would be "Yes." And I deeply regret to see an attitude developing in this country of permitting the Army and the Navy to fade out of the picture under the mistaken idea that some benevolent attitude is going to change European and international policies which have been in existence the last hundred years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. When the gentleman from California, answering the gentleman from Idaho, said, "My answer would be Yes", by "Yes" the gentleman meant that if those things had happened that he had previously stated, as I understand the question asked by the gentleman from Idaho, that war perhaps would have been averted. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman's interpretation of my answer is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Going to the same question again, there would have had to be a decided change in the psychology of the American people had we participated in the war at the time it was declared by France and England.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman from Idaho is quite correct. On the other hand, in my opinion, this Congress is the greatest sounding-board for psychology in the world, and perhaps it would be quite in keeping if more Members of Congress would understandingly lend directive attitudes toward the proper protection and security of our Nation.

Now, if I may proceed with my thought, I wish to give to the nations of Europe my wholehearted concurrence in whatever type of government they see fit to select, because I believe that we as a nation, and a people, are committed to a policy of that character. So whatever I say here is in no manner critical of such governments they may select as long as they are selected under democratic processes. But when you look over the European picture of today what do you find? You find, with the exception of our immediate allies, that there is very little of a directing type of government in evidence, and when you look over the peoples throughout those countries the best that you can finally determine is that the nations are somewhat chaotic in their concepts of the future and its programs. We do have definitely indicated the extreme trend throughout Europe; that trend has been in existence for some 12 or 15 years. What that trend will eventually resolve itself into of course is problematical, but I do not contemplate, and I do not think many other people contemplate, that in the future Europe, insofar as industrialization and modernization of requirements are concerned, will be quite so slow in its concepts as it has been in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California five additional minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe, summing up the whole situation, that you and I today are confronted with a problem that very definitely is going to be the turning point of the direction for the future destiny of this Nation. I believe that we owe a duty to the men who have been over there doing the job for us on the battlefronts and the oncoming generations a consideration that is far greater than some people might wish to concur in. I think it is only a strong nation that can avert international controversies. I want to see my Nation's people discard the apathy of the past and become a little more factual and realistic about the conditions that may prevail in Europe, but at no time utilize our military force other than for preserving what we in this country are willing to live for and what many of our people in the past have been willing to die for. Let us show our interest by passing this resolution.

Insofar as I am concerned, if I have any criticism of the present resolution which the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has brought in, it would be directed only to the fact that this proposal is not legislative, because I would like very much at this time to be able to support the contentions that are involved in this so-called resolution and to have them effectuated into law.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman admits that after all this is but a blueprint of what may govern us in connection with appropriations in the days to come?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And that we may expand or retract the size and the activities of the Reserve Fleet as set up in the resolution. There is nothing binding in it. It is just a guide to go by.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. That is my understanding.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. This is a guide until the emergency is over and conditions become more settled; then, at a later date, a permanent blueprint can be presented to the Congress and we can determine what to do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will say this is a very timely resolution.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As one who also journeyed in the Old World during the past summer, may I say that I share the opinion expressed by the gentleman from California. But from what we know now since the shooting stopped, is the gentleman convinced that the peoples of those countries that were devastated by war are being permitted to set up the kind of government they desire and do it freely and of their own accord?

Mr. SHEPPARD. My answer to the gentleman would be "Yes"; however, in some of the countries I do not think they have done much thinking about the kind of government they should have. There are very few people today directing the masses of people, as my colleague well knows, and, in fact, if I may revert a moment, I picked up a newspaper recently and I read the headline about a million troops fighting in China. China is friendly to us, but the ramifications that may emanate out of those difficulties is an unknown factor at this time and it is something we might pay attention to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the observation made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. I think the gentleman will also agree, I am sure, that while this is not law and does not have the force and effect of law, it is a concurrent resolution setting forth the views of the Congress of the United States. The result would be that the Navy Department would not violate the provisions of this concurrent resolution by going far below the provisions thereof without coming to the Congress and advising of its intention and seeking further congressional action or getting a congressional expression. The effect of it is that it has a certain binding force and effect upon the Navy Department insofar as the combatant ships and the auxiliary ships set forth in the concurrent resolution just reported are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts I would say "Yes," and I would like to add the additional thought as a possible contributing factor emanating out of this resolution and that is its potential psychological effect upon some people in Europe who up to date apparently are not in accord with our democratic processes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad this resolution has come up for consideration because I found in my own State of Massachusetts a feeling that everything is settled in the Pacific because so many of our ships were here for celebration of Navy Day. The gentleman spoke of unrest in China. In my opinion, this resolution will have a very beneficial effect on the public because man after man stopped me on the street and said, "You in the Congress know what is happening and you know whether there is any danger or not; there are so many ships here that we feel there is no danger."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I wish to also commend the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Further commenting on the statement just made by the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I agree with him. I am for

this resolution, but if the Congress wants to accomplish the thing which the gentleman has suggested should be accomplished, how easy it would be to pass a law, which is something more than the momentary whimsical expression of those who happen to be sitting in the Congress at the moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts, of course, has always been a strong-navy man. Years ago I urged a two-ocean navy. I think I was one of the few voices in this Chamber years ago urging appropriations for that purpose, and I felt rather lonesome in those years. The gentleman from Massachusetts recognizes the force of the argument made by the gentleman from Michigan, but disagrees with the gentleman in that it is not a whimsical resolution. I would like to see a bill or joint resolution pass, but this resolution before this body has a voice and power that we cannot ignore and we should not laugh out the window.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the permission granted me yesterday, I insert at this point in the RECORD the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, the House has under consideration today a very important bill for a postwar Navy program. The importance of this legislation will long be noted by future generations of Americans. What to do?—or What not to do? This question is constant in the minds of most Americans in regard to postwar military or naval strength.

It was 18 months ago that I told this House my opinion on the need of great naval strength in the postwar. The postwar time has now come and we, who carry the responsibility of deciding, must make that very important decision. In the period which has lapsed I have visited officially the Pacific battle fronts on two occasions—in December 1944 and in June 1945. Observation of the work of our great battlefleets has become a matter of first-hand knowledge. These experiences and studies have convinced me all the more of the imperative need of United States naval strength.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of this House, has divulged his great store of knowledge regarding the operations and affairs of our Navy. He and the House committee which he so ably heads have done an enormous job in the preparation of the bill before this House. We will do well to follow their guidance.

The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the distinguished chairman of the House Naval Subcommittee on Appropriations—the committee on which I have the honor to serve—and the members of his committee join in cooperative voices to make the opinion of both committees unanimous in their desire for the maintenance of United States naval strength and supremacy.

The purpose of my comment is not to record a repetition of statistical data. Such information has been ably presented. It is needless for me to repeat or to even emphasize it—but I do emphasize the need. I am firmly of the belief that all our actions in the world in behalf of peace must be underwritten here at home with strength. The Navy program, as designed by this bill, in my opinion at this time, is our insurance policy for the future peace of America. To do less would be to leave our house unprotected. I want America to do all she can to prevent another conflagration among nations, but I want assurance of reserve strength in the event we, or they, fail.

What we need now is a peacetime world navy ready and alert and flexible enough to expand to a wartime world navy if need be. God grant that the need shall never again be.

A navy built to crush all adversaries in war can, in trusted and worthy hands, be turned into use as a protective sword in peace.

It is my hope that America will have the wisdom to keep afloat within her fiscal means a navy so strong that our enemies, wherever they may lurk, will forever seek our friendship in the future—a navy so strong that our allies of today will forever look away from any temptation to become our enemies of tomorrow. Such a navy, operated in the spirit of peace and in the cause of justice, may command the respect of all nations for the American desire for peace, for nonaggression, and the autonomy of nations, large and small, throughout the world.

This bill has my wholehearted support. I entreat the House to support it unanimously as a signal to the world of our determination to maintain peace.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution imposes on the Congress the responsibility for raising and maintaining an army and a navy. Congress has discharged that responsibility faithfully and well during the anxious years through which we have just passed. The pending resolution is today's judgment of the Congress on the size and the make-up of the Navy in the postwar period.

Then, too, the pending resolution represents the considered judgment of the Navy as well, after consideration of our own national security and also the costs of operation and maintenance of the fleet as herein proposed. It is estimated that this size postwar Navy would cost some three and a half billion dollars annually. Great as is this amount of money, it is scarcely more than 1 percent of the size of the national debt with which we will come out of this war. That cost must be charged as insurance for our national security. Certain it is that until the pattern of peace becomes plainer than it is today, we dare not do any less.

This resolution does not authorize the construction of a single ton of shipping nor, of course, does it appropriate any money.

The 1,082 combatant ships included within this resolution plus the required auxiliary vessels and craft to support them are already built or under construction. The passage of this resolution ought to be taken as a positive and vigorous declaration by this Congress that we are not going to sink this Navy as we did after World War I.

This resolution does not include all of the present Navy ships. Two hundred and twenty-two combatant ships plus some 6,000 auxiliary vessels, mine vessels, patrol vessels, landing craft, district craft, and dry docks will be surplus under these proposed plans. Some of these surplus ships are damaged beyond repair, some are obsolete, some are just worn out because they have been driven far beyond that reasonable period when ships come in for overhaul and repair. Still others will have to be disposed of under plans yet to be made.

There are many, including myself, who want to know the effects of the atomic bomb on ships at sea. We are assured that those tests will be made, and the Congress and the American people must know the full and complete story of the results.

We must not be too impatient in getting those tests made. They cannot be made this week or this month or this year.

The first job that today's Navy must complete is to get our boys back home. After that can come the long and careful planning that must lead up to any test of the power of the atomic bomb directed against a fleet.

Think of the immensity of that job. Admiral King stated the other day that from 80 to 100 ships would probably be required for these tests. These ships must be spaced at certain intervals so that we can secure the fullest possible information on the effect of the bomb at sea on ships 1,000, 5,000, 10,000 or more yards away from the explosion of the bomb. We must have ships of every type and of every degree of armored protection.

Perfect weather must then prevail in order to move every man away from these free ships before the bombing run is begun.

Whatever may be the results of applying the atomic bomb to a fleet at sea—by air, over the water, on the water, or under the water explosions—those bombs will be carried from some nearby land base or some carrier operation with the fleet tests. They will not be flown across either the Atlantic or Pacific oceans.

Whatever the results of that test may be, it will not affect our need for the maintenance of a strong navy or for the need of those island bases in both oceans, some of which we have won at such a terrific cost.

Scientific development and research will bring new weapons even greater than have come out of this war. There were many who prophesied that the airplane would make the battleship obsolete, but the modern navy, adapting the airplane

to its own uses, developed the fast carrier task force that has proved so effective in the winning of the war.

Tomorrow's Navy will be just as alert and just as effective in the assimilation of the new lessons of war that science and research may produce. I hope that this resolution will have the unanimous support of the Congress.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

This proposal goes beyond the consideration of the constitutional responsibility of Congress to provide and maintain a navy. It strikes at the very roots of our three-branched system of government through the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. House Concurrent Resolution 80, I believe, will lead the way for Congress to restore to itself much of its normal and constitutional authority and responsibility "loaned" to the executive branch for the war emergency. It is an acceptance of the responsibility placed upon the Congress by section 8 of the Constitution to not only provide, but also maintain a navy.

It was necessary to make these "loans" of power to the executive branch. The Congress can be proud of the wise and unselfish manner in which it did make these "loans" of power through broad delegation of authority. The risk of the "loans" has been negligible, in view of the "Victory interest" paid on the "loans." Certainly our trust in the Navy Department has been more than justified in view of the magnificent accomplishments of that Department in the use of the authority delegated to it.

And now Congress is ready to take back that authority and responsibility delegated for the duration to the executive branch, and begins by expressing itself on the size and character of the Navy that should be maintained in the postwar period. It is appropriate to so express the will of Congress by concurrent resolution, inasmuch as the consideration of the postwar Navy will later involve appropriations of funds for the maintenance of the postwar Navy.

The proposed concurrent resolution represents the considered judgment of the Navy, bearing in mind not only national security but the costs of operation. The Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations assured the committee that this resolution, if passed, would be considered as a binding guide to the Navy Department.

Because we have built the world's greatest Navy with the money of the people, we have the responsibility for the maintenance, utilization, and disposition of that Navy to the best interests of the people. The best interest of the people is national security based on preparedness at a reasonable cost. We must fulfill our sacred trust to those who gave their lives that America might remain free. It is our solemn duty to make sure that their sacrifices have not been in vain by keeping America strong.

During the past 5 years Congress has met every request of the Navy for additional authorizations and funds for the ships and planes and guns needed to fight and win the war.

Since July 1940 the House Naval Affairs Committee has sponsored authorizations to increase the strength of the Navy by some 4,000,000 tons of fighting ships, 7,000,000 tons of auxiliary vessels, and 3,000,000 tons of landing craft.

Appropriations to back up these authorizations were provided in full measure and the Navy Department wasted no time in putting them to good use. For example, at the height of the naval shipbuilding program during the calendar year 1944, the Navy's Bureau of Ships was spending money at the rate of $1,000,000 an hour, every hour in the day, for 7 days of every week in the year.

It was this cooperation of Congress that made it possible for the Navy, with the tremendous support of American industry and American labor, to assemble a five-ocean navy in as many years—so that we could accomplish the enormous amphibious operations at Normandy while almost simultaneously our forces on the other side of the world in the Pacific were engaged in the capture of Saipan and Guam.

Speaking of this cooperation of Congress, Admiral Cochrane, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, has said that "it is the complete and irrefutable answer to the challenge of those who asserted that a democracy could not function effectively in time of war."

But now we are coming into a period where it will take even greater courage and leadership on the part of Congress to see to it that the Navy which we have all helped so eagerly to build to win the war is maintained as the strong and powerful weapon to insure a lasting peace.

Now that we have literally thousands of ships already built, there is an almost irresistible temptation to say that we have enough ships to last us for a couple of generations and that therefore, Congress should dry up completely the appropriations which have been flowing so generously to the Navy during the past war years.

Of course, there is no need for Congress to provide the Navy with appropriations on the scale of the wartime programs.

But it is a grave mistake to suppose that you can keep a navy strong by letting it stand still or coast along on what it now has. If we want to coast, we can go in only one direction—and that is downhill.

As we pause on the portals of the atomic era, we should be quick to recognize that the years which lie immediately ahead of us are certain to produce the greatest advances in science and engineering which the world has ever seen. Our Navy must be permitted to keep abreast of those advances.

Today our Navy stands out as the champion among the navies of the world.

We must remember, however, that a world's champion can retain his crown only by keeping in constant fighting trim. Our Navy today is young; it is powerful; and it is trained to the very pink of condition. It must be kept that way in the years to come. Then, and only then, can we be sure that our Navy will guarantee our freedom. Wisely employed, it may also guarantee our peace.

The postwar Navy as called for by the proposed resolution is the seed for manifestation of such sustained strength as to discourage any attack upon this country—to insure that martial history will not repeat itself and plunge the world into the holocaust of a third world war.

This resolution offers the Congress another opportunity to reassert its rightful leadership—to continue its recall of powers delegated in wartime to the executive department—to announce that it will not permit any tragic recurrence of the scuttling of the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope that the Congress will avail itself of this opportunity to convince the public that it is seriously attacking the problem of national security by showing the way in passing House Concurrent Resolution 80.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I endorse and intend to support this resolution.

I suppose I am what you would call a big-navy man. I am in favor of a powerful navy, a modern navy equipped with the finest type of equipment the mind of man can devise. I am in favor of a navy that can protect our interests in both oceans, in every section of the world. I hope I never live to see again the day when the United States of America depends upon the navy of some other country to defend its interests in either ocean.

Under this resolution, which is, as indicated by previous speakers, simply a blueprint for the Navy to follow, and which does not bind this or any subsequent Congress, you will note that no new construction is proposed. The postwar fleet that is proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 80 is composed of ships that have already been constructed.

I am very frank to say that as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs I would be a little hesitant about now embarking on a large construction program of new ships for our fleet. I want to find out, as one member of the committee, what the effect of this new atomic energy is going to be upon the modern battleship, the modern carrier, the modern cruiser, or any other modern combatant ship. I think I can point out to the Members of the House that my concern is also shared by some of the high-ranking admirals of the Navy. May I refer you to page 1234 of the committee hearings. During the testimony of Admiral Horne, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, I was discussing with him the policy of replacement of ships that have become overage or obsolescent. As all of you know, Congress has from time to time passed legislation authorizing the Navy to replace ships as they become overage or obsolete. I asked

Admiral Horne what the policy of the Navy was going to be. I call attention to his reply. Admiral Horne said:

For the information of the committee, there is a study being made of a long-range building program for replacement purposes. Just what that will be I do not know. The matter is being studied now. My own personal opinion right now is that we should go slow until we find out what the characteristics of the new ships should be, in view of the changes that have come about.

I asked him this further question:

The answer to that question leads into this one. I think we are all tremendously interested in it. The reason I asked it was that the Navy was planning to replace obsolescent ships with more modern craft. We would want to move slowly until we found out what the effect of the new atomic bomb is going to be on the modern battleship or carrier, would we not?

Admiral Horne replied:

That is my feeling.

I believe that probably that feeling is shared by a good many other Members of Congress and I am gratified to know that the Navy has announced its avowed purpose of determining at the earliest possible date what the effect of the atomic bomb is going to be on a modern combat ship because until we know that we can not plan intelligently for ships of the future.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I find the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who has given a great deal of study to the subject of military policy and preparedness, strangely persuasive. I also like the suggestion advanced by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] on the same subject. How can we criticize the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and Air Corps for lack of proper unity of command or lack of proper coordination if we continue here in Congress to display that same lack of coordination? I have been a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs for almost 6 years. As to what goes on in the Committee on Military Affairs, I am frank to say I know very little, until their various bills and hearings before the committee are reported to the House of Representatives. I would like to see far more coordination, cooperation, and better liaison between all of the committees that have cognizance of the military establishments of this Government. We look forward hopefully to the day when that will occur. Then we will have some basis for our criticism of lack of coordination or unity in military commands.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield gladly.

Mr. COLE of New York. In order that we may perhaps clear up an apparently unjustified misunderstanding, as to the full legislative import of this concurrent resolution, expressed largely by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], although there are others who seem to share that same apprehension that the concurrent resolution is meaningless, may I point out that those charges as to everything contained in the resolution except section 1 have some foundation, because all sections other than subsection 1 do recite general objectives that have no legislative or statutory force and effect. However, the heart of the concurrent resolution itself is section 1 in which the Congress through the method of the concurrent resolution declares that our Navy shall be not less than the itemized number of ships. When it is borne in mind that all of these ships are actually constructed or soon will be completed, and that they are ships that we have on hand; when it is understood that the Navy under present statutory authority could declare as surplus every single one or all of the ships we now have, then when any person comes in and says that when the Congress declares that the Navy shall not declare as surplus any number of ships below that list enumerated in the concurrent resolution and further states that that declaration is whimsical and ineffective and meaningless, I am at a loss to understand the purposes of a concurrent resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am frank to say I heartily agree with the gentleman from New York. I do not consider this to be whimsical or meaningless. It expresses the sense of this present Congress as to what the composition of the postwar Navy shall be out of ships that have already been constructed. As I tried to emphasize in my remarks previously, we do not embark on any new program of construction. We simply say that of the ships presently available, this shall be the postwar Navy.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but we do not say this shall be the postwar Navy.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. We do say that it is the sense of the Congress that the Navy shall consist of not less than so many ships, and then we outline the number of ships in each particular category.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Using that specific language, those who drafted this resolution very carefully selected language that does not have the binding force of law. That has been said over and over again.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I would like to point out that a very full discussion of that subject was had in committee. The Congress has already authorized every ship that is contained in this resolution. We have authorized the construction of ships in every one of these categories, and we do not have to reauthorize them now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio a question. Does the gentleman think the Navy Department would disregard this concurrent resolution?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am sure I do not know. I am going to find out why we are spending a couple of days debating something that has been very carefully drawn, and very carefully explained as not having the force of law. The job of Congress, as I conceive it, is ordinarily to pass laws. If the gentleman will indulge me a moment further, when it came to the wartime appropriations, what did we do? We did not pass a pious resolution saying it is the sense of Congress that we hoped the War and Navy Departments would not spend all the money we had appropriated. We passed a law in substance repealing the wartime appropriations and cutting them down to what we thought were adequate immediate postwar peacetime appropriations. If the Naval Affairs Committee had come in here with a bill which did the same thing for postwar naval authorizations, then I, for one, interested in a postwar Navy, would understand it and support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman had yielded to me.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am delighted to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I listened with a great deal of interest to the long observation made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], but the gentleman did not answer the question. Does the gentleman think the Navy Department would ignore the provisions of this resolution? Can the gentleman give us a frank answer? Would he say "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In order to answer the gentleman's question I will have to ask a question. Did the Navy insist upon this form of resolution, rather than an authorization for a specific peacetime Navy, and a prohibition against any more of a peacetime Navy?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I say the Navy did not insist on this type of resolution. This is the thought of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, but we have in the testimony before the committee enough information to know that if it is passed in this form the Navy will pay strict heed to it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I can merely say this: If the Navy asked for this form of resolution rather than legislation, I question whether they can be relied upon to follow this. If what we are doing is passing this sort of thing, placing our reliance upon assurances that the Navy has given to the committee, I think that is a very cumbersome way to legislate, and it is unprecedented from the Naval Affairs Committee, for which ordinarily I have such high regard, and whom I ordinarily follow so slavishly. This, however, certainly stretches my loyalty to the Naval Affairs Committee to the utmost.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that we certainly do not wish to stretch the gentleman's loyalty; but we have been very careful in the selection of the language that went into this concurrent resolution and, Mr. Chairman, when the final vote is taken I am sure the gentleman from Ohio will join us in approving the language.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. On that very point of whether or not the Navy supports this resolution, I personally put the question to Secretary Forrestal and also to Admiral King at the hearing on this bill as to whether or not they were in support of this resolution and the answer to the query was that they did. I asked this question:

> Is the Navy willing to support this concurrent resolution and recommend it?
>
> Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes.

That is the point we want to emphasize.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I thank the gentleman for bringing that out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion today the Congress will take the most important action it has taken since the day we declared war on Japan and 2 days later upon Germany, because today the American people speaking in the manner in which we believe a democracy is supposed to speak, through its elected representatives, today the Congress in the name of the people of this country serves warning and serves notice to the people of the world that the American people are going to have peace even if we have to fight to keep that peace.

This is no whimsical, hastily drawn resolution, this is something that has been given great consideration and deep thought, this is an answer to those who say we have no policy for the future, this is an answer to those who dare think we might grow a little soft in the hysteria which is now sweeping the Nation, this is a warning to everybody that America will never again relegate itself to the days which followed the last World War.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman makes a statement that I wish were true about this resolution, but it has been explained by the sponsors of the resolution that it does not bind another Congress; it does not even bind us.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman from Ohio well knows that no law binds any future Congress, no matter in what form it is passed, for a future Congress can repeal or amend any law; and the gentleman from Ohio well knows that an expression from the President of the United States is not binding in law, but assuredly it is given the weight it should carry. While this resolution may not in itself be binding in the law, yet it certainly has the backing of the Navy Department as shown by the testimony read by the gentleman from Massachusetts. The Secretary of the Navy has stated he is in favor of it, Fleet Admiral King has said he is in favor of it; and who would dare, what department would dare go against the expressed will of this Congress speaking for the American people, which says that we are going to keep this Navy to defend what we believe is our peace?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does it not, after all, depend on the Congress as to whether or not we appropriate the money to sustain this size Navy?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts brought up the question of economy because some of the opponents of this bill have asked us how much it is going to cost. Has gold become so dear to us that we are going to keep its luster with the blood of those who died? Has economy become such a god that we are going to sacrifice our principles and our liberty on the altar of false security? In a world today, when the Four Horsemen are running roughshod over the "four freedoms," why do we hesitate to face our sound and solemn duty? I believe it our duty to tell the world that we shall keep our Navy. We must be realistic about it. I listened with great interest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I agree with him in a great many things; but this is the only method of procedure we have at the moment. We have got to take it. This is the only method of procedure we have in this world to preserve peace. Let us take it now and not fall back into the days of 1898 and the days of 1918 and 1919. Our Navy is standing today ready and willing to deliver the foot soldier wherever he may be wanted. Nothing has yet been substituted for the foot soldier, atomic bomb or no atomic bomb, and the only way that any foot soldier can get there to take the land and hold it is through the efforts of the Navy to deliver him there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to another angle, and that is the importance of this concurrent resolution in relation to demobilization.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am glad the gentleman brings that point up, because I want to quote General Marshall as of last evening. This is General Marshall as quoted in the press:

> For the moment in a widespread emotional crisis of the American people, demobilization has become in effect the disintegration not only of the armed forces but apparently of all conception of world responsibility and what it demands of us. If we are to nourish the infant United Nations Organization and thus establish some possibility of a future decent world order, definite measures must be taken immediately to determine at least the basic principles for our postwar military policy, and I have never felt so certain of anything in my life.

The Naval Affairs Committee in this bill gives its answer to General Marshall. We advance a definite, specific policy. We serve notice on the world that America stands willing to guard what it has won at such a dear and heavy price. We are told—and I believe we all agree—that the most effective thing in the prevention of disease is through preventive medicine. This is the preventive medicine that we offer to a diseased world.

How much cheaper would this war have been in dollars, if you want to measure it in dollars, if we had had this type of Navy when Hitler raised his head? Hitler never would have raised his head. But Americans are unsure of everything except their independence. They speak of the atomic bomb and its effect. Why, suppose Caesar's legions had been handed hand grenades, what a devastating effect those grenades would have had on the armies opposing him, and just as much so as the atomic bomb of today. But still they needed the foot soldier.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this world that cannot be competed against; there is nothing in this world presented in a military fashion that has not had something to oppose it, and perhaps in time the atomic bomb will have something to oppose it. Today, the Americans are going to be realistic about this whole situation.

We have to realize that three things stare us in the face right now. They are the strength of our Navy, guarding the secret of the atomic bomb as long as we can guard it for ourselves, and our disposition of the proposal of universal military service; that is, if we want to keep the independence which has been bought so dearly, and I certainly would not advocate any policy which would weaken our position, particularly at this time in a world of chaos, confusion, and unrest.

Only the other day Admiral Nimitz said that sea power is our birthright. Are any of us here willing to trade that birthright for a mess of pottage of false security? Are we willing to tell the mothers and fathers of those boys who are not coming back that they are on foreign shores forever because we failed in our duty? I am not one moved by emotionalism or hysteria about demobilization. I believe they are doing the greatest job they can do, but I do not want to demobilize completely until I know what other people are going to do in this world. Oh, we cannot tell what is in the minds and consciences and hearts of other people. Because they sign charters, because they sign agreements, does that mean that they are going to keep them? With the sole exception of America, every war has been started in this world by the signatory to a nonaggression pact. We know our own hearts. We know our own minds. We do not believe in aggression. We know we want to guard the peoples of the world. That is why I believe in us should be vested the might, and I accept it as a sacred responsibility to guard the heritage that has been handed to us. I want that Navy to float where the weak and the downtrodden can see it and look to it for succor and know that there comes a friend. I want it to be strong for those who dare to be aggressive to look at that Navy with fear and trepidation and hesitation to do anything which would undo that which we have been trying to do for so many years. In the past we have tried to scrap the Navy. We have tried to scrap it and it has failed to keep the

peace. Now, let us keep the Navy. Let us keep our Navy and let us be ready to strike anywhere in the world and—yes—strike and fight, if necessary, to keep peace, which all of us want so much.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, House Concurrent Resolution No. 80 which we are now debating carries no authorization. It carries no appropriation. It merely announces the sense of the Congress as to the composition of our future Navy. We are told by members of the committee that this legislation will prevent the scrapping of valuable naval vessels and that it indicates what the Congress feels should be the approximate size of our postwar Navy. We are told that soon another bill will be brought into the House which will indicate that our future naval personnel will be about 500,000 enlisted man and about 50,000 commissioned officers. Therefore this legislation is part of the step toward giving us a blueprint of what we can look for so far as programs are concerned from this one branch of our defense—namely, the Navy. Some time in the future we may secure similar information from the Army. There is no apparent opposition to this bill. Neither is there any opposition toward the maintenance of a powerful and modern navy. Future events will prove whether or not navies and armies as they exist today are obsolete because of the much discussed atomic bomb. The debate has had some reference to that terrible weapon. Mention has been made that the Navy will soon put this weapon to more test by the use of some obsolete war vessels, as the targets.

It is my purpose in participating in this debate to pay some tribute to the men and women of high learning, the scientists, who actually accomplished the miracle of building the atomic bomb. The men and women who actually worked on those bombs which destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

We hear very little about these great scientists in our daily debates on "Who won the war?" Yet in some circles of authority they are credited with bringing the war in the Far East to a quicker conclusion, thus saving the lives of countless Americans. These are the scientists who produced an entirely new and different weapon. Not just another bomb but something never before made. Nothing like an energy from chemical but a cosmic energy—something that can destroy even creation.

These are the great men to whom I pay honor today. Among them are the 400 scientists at Los Alamos. In debates like this one, which deals with our future defense, I feel that we should hear more from them. Among these great scientists is Dr. Theodore Jorgensen, Jr., of my State, Nebraska. He actually worked on the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima. He was loaned to the Los Alamos organization by the Nebraska State University. He has been kind enough to tell me some of his ideas in a recent letter. They are so interesting and informative that I feel they are of sufficient value to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Congress. One of his recent letters I will read to you at this time. I will also include with my remarks by leave already granted me, recently published statements made by this organization of scientists.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *October 24, 1945.*

Mr. KARL STEFAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I shall be very glad to comply with your request for my views on the atomic-bomb problems.

As you perhaps realize, it is difficult and perhaps impossible to communicate by words a correct and accurate idea of the magnitude of the atomic bomb. You know that it has the explosive equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT, but even so that means no more to you than it did to me that morning on the New Mexico desert before the test explosion. The explosion actually was so terrific that it was greater than anything we could possibly have imagined. One of my friends witnessed it from 20 miles away and he says he never wants to be that close to one again. To be told that Hiroshima and Nagasaki were each destroyed by a single bomb may give a better idea, especially if one sees pictures of the damage. However, it is only possible to know what we are up against by actually experiencing such an explosion. I think all people who are to have a hand in the formulation of the atomic-bomb policy on a national or international scale should actually witness another test explosion. They would then know that this atomic bomb is not just another bomb and their thinking could thereby be clarified. One of the problems of the atomic bomb is to make people aware of this fact.

Another problem of the atomic bomb involves misconceptions about secrecy. The fundamental fact, the secret of the atom, if there could be one, is that of nuclear fission. This fact was published to the world in 1939 and physicists the world over began to speculate on the possibility of an atomic bomb. When work was started, utter secrecy was essential to keep our enemies, in the then undeclared war, from getting any information as to what we were up to. It was essential to keep that secrecy up to the time the first bomb was dropped. But that act told the world what we had done.

Thus the secret that we were working on the atomc bomb, the secret that nuclear reactions go fast enough to act as high explosives, the secret that we had succeeded, all are now known to the world. The general method of preparing the active materials, the general method of assembling a bomb, something of the size of the undertaking, all are disclosed in the very revealing Smyth report. The remaining secrets involve essentially engineering details.

We are now in the process of formulating policy for the control of atomic energy in this country. To my mind there is no doubt that such control is necessary. I am afraid, though, that mistaken ideas about this matter of secrecy may lead to the formulation of such a policy that the scientists, who have done so much to see that we came out on top this time, will be handicapped in their future work. This country cannot afford to have its scientific men studying the colors of butterfly wings. And in all seriousness, I am afraid this will happen if the exchange of fundamental scientific knowledge is surrounded by restrictions, based on an incorrect understanding of the actual state of things concerning the atomic bomb. Even the publishing of complete details of all phases of the development of the bomb would give other nations an advantage of only a couple of years at the most. Perhaps the blanket withholding of technical advances made in this gigantic undertaking would be more damaging to our own scientific development than the relatively small differences in time it would make in other nations having the bomb.

A third and, of course, the most important problem concerns the control of the bomb on an international scale. It is generally agreed now that there is at the present time no defense against the bomb and that the future is unlikely to produce any such defense. An armament race in atomic bombs would undoubtedly end in a war in which all our principal cities and a sizable fraction of our population would be destroyed in the first day of hostilities. Our only possible protection is an international authority with power to police all countries to see that all active material is accounted for in peaceful applications and that no stock piles of atomic bombs are accumulated. I do not say that such a program is not difficult. It will mean that all nations must lose some of their sovereignty. Some may object to such a proposal, but the awful fact of the atomic bomb remains. I believe we should work toward such an international authority as rapidly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE JORGENSEN, Jr.

The following is a statement that has been released by Dr. Robert R. Wilson for the Association of Los Alamos Scientists, an organization of over 400 scientists working on the atomic bomb.

"President Truman, in his message to Congress on atomic power, said, 'Never in history has society been confronted with a power so full of potential danger and at the same time so full of promise for the future of man and for the peace of the world.' The scientists at Los Alamos who worked on the atomic bomb feel it their duty to make public the outcome of their considerations.

"The scientific background necessary to develop an atomic bomb is generally known throughout the world. The technical design and industrial methods of production are at present the secrets of this country, Great Britain, and Canada. However, it is certain that other countries can achieve these ends by independent research. Before many years they also may be manufacturing bombs, bombs which may be tens, hundreds, or even thousands of times more powerful than those which caused such devastation at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

"This country with its highly concentrated industrial centers is particularly vulnerable to such weapons. The fact that the atomic bomb represents such a concentrated form of destructive energy makes counter-measures against each of the large number of possible methods of delivery extremely difficult and uncertain. It is particularly difficult to develop counter-measures that would provide a sufficiently large proportion of interceptions of high-speed missiles of the V-2 type such as recently described by General Marshall. The success of the best possible defense system would in any event require a continuous, hour by hour alert. A single heavy attack, lasting a matter of minutes, might destroy the ability of a nation to defend itself further.

"One proposal is for this country to try to maintain its present position by producing more and bigger bombs than other countries. Merely having more bombs than other countries is not decisive if another country has enough bombs to demolish our cities and stores of weapons. The overwhelming advantage will lie with the aggressor and our superiority might be lost in the first minutes of a surprise attack. A world in which nuclear weapons are owned by many nations and their use held back only by fear of retaliation will be a world of fear, suspicion, and inevitable final explosion.

"It has been suggested that the United States, together with Great Britain and

Canada, assume unilateral control over atomic development throughout the world and by force, or threat of force, prevent all other nations from producing atomic bombs. Other nations will not willingly lose their sovereignty to those who maintain their own in this way. Such a policy will lead to an unending war more savage than the last. We cannot conceive of it leading to a stable, peaceful world.

"We are convinced that we are left but one course of action. We must cooperate with the rest of the world in the future development of atomic power, and the use of atomic energy as a weapon must be controlled by a world authority. We are heartened by the statement of our President in which he says that there will be 'an effort to affect agreement on the conditions under which cooperation might replace rivalry in the field of atomic power.' Such conditions will demand some modification of our conception of national sovereignty. This makes it imperative that we have the good will of all nations, for it must be realized that we are dealing with a deadly challenge to civilization itself.

"We believe that international control is technically feasible. However, we must emphasize that the problems of such control are not essentially technical. For example, the abolition of secrecy in national and international relations may be necessary. A world authority if it is to be effective must eventually realize free access to all laboratories, industries and military installations. We realize the serious problems that control presents. The actualities of the situation require a drastic solution and the atomic bomb is a sufficiently revolutionary force to impel us to such a solution.

"We have seen the beginnings of cooperation among nations during the war. The extension of this cooperation is made imperative by the terrible nature of a future conflict. World-wide control of nuclear energy in which the scientific tradition of international collaboration may play an important part provides a unique opportunity for preventing the current suspicions among nations from growing into tensions which lead to war.

"It was our hope in developing the bomb that it would be a great force for world cooperation and peace. To this end we urge this country to assume its responsibility in the initiation of action leading to a world authority for the control of nuclear energy. The need is urgent. Effective action is impossible not only when other nations have atomic bombs but even when programs for their manufacture are well under way. Lack of decision within even a few months will be preparing the world for unprecedented destruction, not only of other countries but our own as well."

DR. J. R. OPPENHEIMER'S SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE FOR SCROLL PRESENTED TO THE LOS ALAMOS LABORATORY BY GEN. L. R. GROVES, OCTOBER 16, 1945

It is with appreciation and gratitude that I accept from you this scroll for the Los Alamos laboratory, for the men and women whose work and whose hearts have made it. It is our hope that in years to come we may look at this scroll, and all that it signifies, with pride.

Today that pride must be tempered by a profound concern. If atomic bombs are to be added as new weapons to the arsenals of a warring world, or to the arsenals of nations preparing for war, then the time will come when mankind will curse the names of Los Alamos and of Hiroshima.

The peoples of this world must unite, or they will perish. This war, that has ravaged so much of the earth, has written these words. The atomic bomb has spelled them out for all men to understand. Other men have spoken them, in other times, of other wars, of other weapons. They have not prevailed. There are some, misled by a false sense of human history, who hold that they will not prevail today. It is not for us to believe that. By our words we are committed, committed to a world united, before this common peril, in law, and in humanity.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, personally I have no doubt but that the Navy will use this bill, if adopted, and be guided by it, in fact, will call attention to it should someone raise the question of reducing the Navy or of any navy in an age of atomic bombs and aerial attacks of various sorts. I presume most of the Members of the House will vote for the resolution. I shall vote for it. Most of us will take it on the good faith and confidence that is reposed in the Committee on Naval Affairs. Yet I hope it will not be considered out of place if I raise some questions this afternoon with regard to our postwar military and naval policy.

Recently I, too, had an opportunity to look at some of these overseas bases and some of these overseas military and naval installations. I can recall the impression I got when I was at Guam and saw the maps and plans there for developing an outer harbor and an inner harbor. Finally I said to the person who had made the presentation, when it was explained how much we were going to concentrate in the harbor, "I thought we were never going to do that again." He said, "Just what do you mean?"

I said, "Well, I saw Pearl Harbor and what happened there when we had such a concentration of boats and docks and repair yards, and so forth. I thought we were never going to make such a target as that again."

I might have hoped that some discussion of a question like that would have appeared this afternoon, but apparently that is not in the cards and the resolution is going to be adopted pretty much because it represents a sort of stop-gap statement of policy until we do develop an over-all military policy formulated, I hope and pray, by a consideration of Army and air questions as well as those of the Navy.

I had prepared some remarks to offer this afternoon under a special order which were devoted primarily and directly to the President's proposal for 1 year of military or naval training for all young men. Because my observations deal with this whole question of postwar military and naval policy and are pertinent to many of the thoughts that have been expressed this afternoon, I shall make them here at this time rather than later. I have entitled them "There Is a Better Way."

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S PROPOSAL FOR 1 YEAR OF MILITARY TRAINING FOR ALL YOUNG MEN IS NEITHER WISE NOR NECESSARY

Mr. Chairman, the personal appeal of the President to a joint session of the Congress to require 1 year of military training from every young man between his eighteenth and twenty-first birthdays was respectful and thoughtful. It deserves respectful and thoughtful consideration.

The President said that such a system would cause some "inconvenience" and even some hardship, but defended the proposal as the only way to insure security. He said that the advances of science and technology did not eliminate the need for men but rather that they increase the need. He asked for immediate action on the ground that never again could we count on time in which to arm.

With the general proposition that a trained reserve is an essential component of a proper defense force for the United States, I agree, Mr. Chairman; but I do not believe on the evidence before us that it is either wise or necessary to take a year out of every young man's life between his eighteenth and twenty-first birthdays and devote it exclusively to training under the direction and control of the military authorities, Army and Navy.

On the contrary, I venture to assert that President Truman's proposal on military training is neither wise nor necessary, and I base this on three grounds:

First. That it puts too many young men too long under military control in an age of radar, television, jet propulsion, supersonic planes, and atomic bombs; that an adequate defense force can be obtained in a better way.

Second. That the President's plan proposes taking for the United States too much of the job of policing the world for peace that should be shared with the United Nations.

Third. That the President's program would defeat its own end by denying and destroying faith in what the United States stands for.

NOT THE ROAD TO SECURITY

In developing my argument, permit me to reverse the order of those points and deny now that it is either desirable or necessary to appear before the world as a nation strong enough or conceited enough to impose our will on every other power or group of powers. That is neither the road to peace nor security. It has led to destruction every nation which has tried it, including Germany and Japan.

President Truman said:

> It is only by strength that we can impress the fact upon possible future aggressors that we will tolerate no threat to peace or liberty.

Does that mean that the Government wants to be able to rattle the saber whenever its point of view fails to prevail in an international conference? That we will always appeal to arms if we fail to get our way?

You will recall the wry remark attributed to Molotov, to the effect that all Secretary Byrnes needed to do was to hold up a little atomic bomb and get all he wanted. And this morning's paper reports that official Moscow radio last night said that if the atomic bomb should influence the foreign policy of the United States there can be no lasting peace.

Not even my country, Mr. Chairman, can be so sure that she is always right as to say to the rest of the world "It's our way or war."

And not even my country, Mr. Chairman, rich in resources as she may be, can afford to say that we will implement every policy with a show of force.

USE ATOMIC BOMB ONLY FOR DEFENSE

Indeed, my humble opinion is that today the United States should say to the world that we renounce the use of the atomic bomb as an instrument of policy and assure the world that it will be used by us only in self-defense; and further, that our facilities for its production will be at the service of the United Nations to enforce any major decision to which the United States is a party.

Years ago this Nation led the world in a declaration to outlaw war as an instrument of policy· why should we not now, while we are recognized as the leader in the development of the atomic bomb, solemnly pledge that we shall never use it to start a war?

The world would breathe easier and international discussions could proceed in an atmosphere free from fear and suspicion.

Such a proposal does not give away any secrets that we may hold but it takes off the tension that throttles international cooperation today. It is a proposal that can be put forward effectively by us only when we are in the lead in atomic development.

This is a proposal distinctly contrary to the psychology proposed by the President when he pleaded for his particular plan of military training and reserves to impress the world that "we will tolerate no threat to peace or liberty."

Does he mean that we will enforce our desires in Argentine by force?

Does he mean that we will open the doors of Palestine by strength?

Does he mean that we will overthrow Franco in Spain by arms?

Does he mean that we will establish liberty of speech, freedom of the press, and church in the Balkans with the bayonet?

Will we tolerate no threats to liberty in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia except by a show of superior strength?

Will we alone police the peace of Poland? When do we start?

Shall we assume that the United States is the sole custodian of truth and the guardian of peace for all the world?

SHARE THE POLICING JOB

Which leads me to my second proposition, Mr. Chairman, that the President's plan proposes taking for the United States too much of the job of policing the world for peace, which should be shared with other nations.

By any logic under the sun, we cannot convince other nations of our good intentions or our sincerity in the purposes and the possibilities of the United Nations if we insist upon having for ourselves a military and naval strength equal to that of any possible combination of powers on the face of the earth.

Aside from the fact that such an aim will bankrupt the Nation, pursuance of such a policy would insure the defeat of its accomplishment by lining up all other nations against us.

And such a policy, Mr. Chairman, confesses too low a confidence in the moral powers of the universe. There was a time when a man with the spirit of moral leadership stirred the American people and the world by declaring, "No peace can last or ought to last which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed," and who did not plead for an American arms superior to any other power or combination of powers but who was content to say that "right must be based upon the common strength, not upon the individual strength, of the nations upon whose concert peace will depend."

Woodrow Wilson did not call for supreme power in our Nation. It was in the hands of the international organization that he wanted strength "so much greater than the force of any nation or alliance" that no nation or probable combination of nations could stand against it.

And Wilson did not hesitate to plead for considering the "limitation of armies" and of "all programs of military preparation"—which would include asking other nations to consider limiting conscription, the very proposition which the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], has suggested, be explored.

THE STRONG MUST LEAD

If we do now have, as President Truman said, "a fighting strength greater than that of any other nation of the world" and if we honestly intend that the United Nations shall have a strength capable of policing the world, why should we not, while we are strong, lead the world in reducing the rate of competitive arming?

We will not do it when we are weak, and no other nation can do it effectively when it is behind in the race.

Oh, I know that someone will immediately say, "Look what Japan did. She agreed to limit her Navy and agreed not to fortify the islands mandated to her and then renounced both agreements or disregarded them." My answer is that Japan did what she did because there was no international force after World War I to say "No." And Germany rearmed because no nation or group or nations policed the peace.

If we have faith in the United Nations, we ought not to take for the United States alone the job we have committed to the concert of nations.

With Japan prostrate and Germany utterly defeated, I assert that we should take these positive approaches to world peace before we fasten upon America a system which will tend to defeat our capacity at home and our ability abroad to accomplish the very thing we want most.

Now, then, I return to my first proposition that we can have a respectable and adequate military force without requiring universal military training for every young man for a year as President Truman has requested.

WE CAN HAVE ADEQUATE DEFENSE

I base my argument first of all on the ground that in this age of radar, television, jet-propulsion, supersonic planes and atomic power, the energies of our young men can be better applied and their abilities better developed in the schools of the country than in military camps.

A certain amount of basic military training is admittedly necessary for a soldier. That can be secured in much less than a year. It can be obtained by a course of training coordinated with school or college work. It can be obtained in a series of summer camps. And even the larger field of divisional training can be obtained by mass maneuvers of coordinated camp training.

But the wars of the future, if they come, will not be fought by vast armies marching or even moving over great expanses of terrain. At least they will be won by the nations who have achieved the greatest scientific development and the greatest ability to apply scientific knowledge to the demands of war.

LET US HAVE SPECIALISTS

I recognize that immediately someone will say as Admiral King did the other day that that is why you need even more than a year of military training; that the boys cannot master the arts of scientific war in a year's time. But let us examine this thing for a minute.

It was only a few months ago, that when 18-year-old boys were found on the front lines with only 4 months' training that the War Department defended the adequacy of the training that they had received.

And the Navy resisted any attempt to limit to 6 months or a year the training their boys should have before they went into combat.

Their answer to such an observation would naturally be that for some of the duties to be performed, the shorter period of training was enough; but if that be true then why require all young men to take a full year of training?

True, some of the Army need to be trained specialists. True, some of the boys should get a year of training and many of them far more than that. But that is why, I hope, we will have a Regular Army of a respectable size, and why, I hope, that we will have "the strengthened National Guard" which Mr. Truman mentioned but did not elaborate upon.

OVER A MILLION REGULARS

Today we are considering a naval composition bill which contemplates, we are told, a Navy of 500,000 men. The Army will hardly be much smaller, at least not in the immediate future, with the Air Forces included.

That means a million men, all highly trained, all specialists, presumably.

And there will be the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard in addition.

The President proposed that every young man take this year of military training, starting it some time between his eighteenth and twentieth birthdays. He said there should be no exemptions whatever for occupation or dependency reasons or ordinary physical defects, but only for complete physical disability. And he labored very hard to make clear that these men were not to perform military service, but only to be in training.

Now, really, does it make sense to take all the young men of the Nation for a year, put them into military camps, and not require any service from them?

If we are going to do this thing, why should we not require some service from them during that time?

NO EXEMPTIONS—YET NO SERVICE?

There will be a lot of ships to man, a lot of air bases to man, a lot of supply depots to maintain. Are they all to be manned by regularly enlisted personnel or civilian employees and the 1,200,000 18-year-olds in training to perform no service during the year they are housed, fed, clothed, and paid by the Government?

And did the President really mean that there should be no exemptions for occupational reasons?

What of the young man taking a scientific course? What of the young man taking medicine? Is it better training for him to go to a military camp when he finishes high school or get started on his long professional training? Where will he get the best training for service to his country—in camp or at school? And if he goes to camp for a year, will he go back to school?

There is a better way, Mr. Chairman, more in keeping with American ideals and better calculated to get better results for the money expended.

A THREE-PHASE PROGRAM

First, let us have the Regular Army and Navy that prudence and our considered and coordinated economy dictate. Let the men be paid enough to encourage them to become specialists. Let the conditions of living be such that they will want to make the service a career.

Next, let a definite place be assigned to the National Guard and Organized Reserve. Instead of treating it as a sort of step-child, give it the support and consideration which will make it in every county of the country a recognized and appreciated organization of trained citizens who love their country and are trained and ready to defend it.

Then, as to the youngsters—put them all in the country's Reserve and give them all some basic training. I would suggest:

First. That each young man upon becoming 18, without exception for any reason whatsoever, be required to register with a county board, comparable to our selective service boards, and take two examinations, one physical and the other mental, in order to catalog his capacities, plans and training up to that time.

Second. That thereafter, some time before his twenty-first birthday, each boy not excused by his county board for some reason important to the national health, safety or interest, be required to take a 3-month intensive training course, one-half to be devoted to basic military training and one-half to a specialized training, or in lieu thereof, to take an equivalent amount of basic and special training in connection with his school work.

Third. That thereafter until their thirtieth birthday, the registrants be carried on the Reserve rolls of the country, keep their registration board informed of any permanent change of address, and that once during each 3-year period until that thirtieth birthday, they be required to take a 2-week refresher course at an approved station.

WOULD PROVIDE RECRUITS FOR THE SPECIAL UNITS; PRESERVE CIVILIAN LIFE

Such a proposal would save considerable time and money, avoid interruption of school work, insure creation of a trained and somewhat specialized reserve to supplement and provide recruits for the Regular Army and Navy and the National Guard.

And, fundamentally, it would make the youth's military training secondary to his civilian life instead of making his education secondary and his military training primary for that formative year of his life just after he finishes high school.

The President offered no estimates of the cost of his proposal but obviously they would not be small and obviously they would be much greater than the program I have suggested.

For does anyone suppose that the trainees taken for a year will be paid less than the selectees were before the war? Or that they will be fed and clothed for less? Or doctored for less? Or given fewer postservice hospital rights? Or compensated less for injuries sustained in line of duty?

Does anyone in the country presume that Members or committees of the Congress will not be attentive to these young men about to cast their first ballot when they have completed their training and have a lifetime of voting habits ahead?

A MORE EFFECTIVE DEFENSE

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I insist that such a program, which would mean less interference with the normal intellectual development of the youth and contribute more to a normal attitude for civilian life, will produce a more effective defense for the United States.

The argument which the President offered to clinch his proposals the other day was embodied in a hypothetical question.

Assume—

He suggested—

that the United States and Japan had both had a supply of atomic bombs on December 7, 1941. Which would have survived?

His implication, of course, was that Japan could have delivered them on target and we could not.

Ten days ago, at the invitation of the Army Air Forces I went over to Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, to see the greatest exhibit of aerial planes, parts, and weapons that American genius has produced. The one point driven home over and over again by the officer assigned to escort me was that the wars of the future will be battles of destroying missiles hurled at a target thousands of miles away propelled at speeds faster than sound travels, and guided by devices that see and hear faster than human eyes and ears.

I saw the robot plane, flown, directed, and landed by radio control. I saw the Azon bomb, guided to its target, even in the latter days of this war, by a gunner perched in a plane miles away. I saw the jet-propelled plane streak through the sky so rapidly that one had to turn to follow its course across the field. I heard the prediction that V–2 bombs in another war could be sent and directed to a mission 3,000 miles away.

I was reminded that after World War I, France built a Maginot Line which was to guard her borders forever. I do not want our future possible defense limited to the Maginot Line concept. The atomic bombs of future wars will be sent on their mission, not carried there, and I want an army of specialists who will know how to use what the most alert and uninhibited research of our scientists have developed, should the horrible possibility ever come again.

In such development, and in such a fashion will our best defense be developed, in my humble but earnest opinion. I have heard talk of perimeter defense and outlying bases, but from my personal experiences and observations in a world-round trip a month ago, I am convinced that hereafter there will be no perimeter but only outposts, hereafter no fortresses which must be taken because planes will fly high above them, or direct their fire from bases in their home country.

PEACE THROUGH UNITED EFFORT

And all these considerations, Mr. Chairman, bring me back with overwhelming conviction to my original proposition that it is neither wise nor necessary to appear before the world as a nation strong enough or conceited enough to impose our will on every other power or group of powers.

Indeed, I challenge the statement in the President's speech that the peace of the future must be built on power, the power of any one nation alone.

The peace of the future must be built upon a concert of power brought together in an atmosphere of mutual respect and dedicated to the preservation of good will and understanding among the nations of the earth.

If one may be pardoned for a few lines from a poem, I should like to close with these from Kipling's Recessional:

For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding calls not Thee to guard,
For frantic boast and foolish word,
Thy Mercy on Thy People, Lord.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the House when it makes its final determination on this resolution will consider the fact that it comes to the House with a unanimous report from the Committee on Naval Affairs. I believe that committee to a degree that exists in hardly any other committee in the House shows little or no partisanship. That is one of the greatest satisfactions all of us have who serve upon that committee. Members on both sides of the aisle approach the subjects which come before them with a strictly nonpartisan attitude, insofar as it is humanly possible to divorce partisanship from our deliberations. In great measure we owe gratitude to our chairman for that situation. He is never

czaristic in his attitude and never seeks to solely impose his will upon the members of the committee. I think there is hardly an occasion on which a bill coming from the Committee on Naval Affairs is not reported out unanimously.

With respect to the resolution under consideration, what does it propose? It proposes in effect, and I use these figures so the membership can more readily understand the situation, it proposes a personnel later, that will be able to man these ships, of approximately 500,000 men and 50,000 officers. The bill does not mention this personnel strength, but authoritative figures from the Navy Department specifically state that that number of men will be necessary. We have now 3,400,000 men. We will have one-sixth of that number to man this new fleet if the Congress adopts this resolution, and if the Navy Department puts it into effect, as I am sure they will. The Navy personnel will still be nearly twice as large as it was in 1938. We will get a greater service from that personnel than we have ever had heretofore, because if you will look at the table on page 7 of the committee report you will see that through a judicious distribution of this personnel we will have far greater strength than probably this number of men would indicate.

Mr. Chairman, this question is more important even than the consideration of a policy of compulsory military peacetime training, and I say that because the Navy is our first line of defense. You will never be able to man the Navy with a force of conscripted personnel who would only be trained for 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there has been no hasty action on this bill. It was more feasible to bring in a concurrent resolution than it was an authorization because all the ships which now exist have already been authorized by the Congress in the authorizations of 1934, 1938, 1940, and 1941, and all we could say at this time about the practical approach to the problem was that it is the sense of the Congress that the Navy at least conserve the naval strength which we specify in this bill. I may say that the Navy was away out in front in this program because several months before the Jap surrender, in a joint session of the naval committees of the Senate and House, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the staff having to do with operations in the Navy Department, came before those committees and gave us a postwar program practically identical with what you are considering today.

I am sure the House is going to pass this concurrent resolution, and I hope it passes it with such an overwhelming vote that the news will go out to the world that America is determined to have an adequate Navy for its own security and to protect the peace of the entire world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly on an item that is sadly lacking in the committee's report on this resolution. I intend to support its passage, but, in my opinion, the committee has overlooked adequate facilities and necessities, for the training of Navy officer personnel. I introduced a bill H. R. 1371 in January of this year to provide for a naval academy in southern California which has passed through the usual procedure, finally being reported back as "No" from the Navy and no action by the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The report of the committee states that it will require 58,000 officer personnel to man a Navy consisting of some half-million men. It is stated in the report that the expanded facilities at Annapolis are adequate only to provide for the training of 3,423 men per year. At this rate it will take nearly 17 years to train enough men to take care of an officer personnel of 58,000. They have provided for training this personnel, of course, in another way, and that is by training these men in various universities and institutions throughout the United States. A coordinated program insofar as curriculum is concerned, but it is sadly lacking in the coordination that would take place in one institution.

I know the custom that has prevented the consideration of a naval academy at another location than Annapolis and, may I say that it is a sad situation in this country when such a custom prevails, because custom is being broken by this very resolution when we are asking the House to approve and the Senate to concur in the establishment of a personnel of 500,000 men for a peacetime Navy.

If we are going to break that kind of custom, why should we not extend it to further limits and include in this committee report the recommendation for a naval academy for the training of naval officers on the west coast, where adequate facilities are available for year-round training in the air and on the Pacific Ocean? We have heard and we have read in the press, and we know from committee reports that the facilities at Annapolis at the present time are congested. They cannot expand. They are limited in area. They are limited because of area in training facilities. I am not criticizing, you understand, the type of men coming out of Annapolis; neither am I for one minute disparaging or saying that the men who were not Annapolis men in this war did not do a good job, because it was the Reserve officers who had to do a lot of the leg work and the heavy work of the Navy. The Annapolis men did a fine job, there is no question about that. I think we should have more of them, and where facilities are limited as they are at Annapolis, we should seek new facilities where year-round training can be obtained, especially in southern California, on the west coast, where conditions are much better than you can find in Annapolis or, I might say, any place on the east coast.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DE LACY. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement on the need for an academy on the west coast. I think he is aware, too, that bills similar to his own have been introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] and by myself. I think these bills will receive a hearing in the near future.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate what the gentleman from Washington has said, but I will say with all due respect, that the locations recommended by them do not equal those of southern California for year-round training facilities.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Washington makes reference to only two bills having been introduced, one by the gentleman addressing the committee and one by himself. My recollection is that practically every Member of the States of Washington, Oregon, and California have introduced bills.

Mr. McDONOUGH. May I say that when you mention west coast, you have to consider 1,100 miles of the west coast, because that is California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Just to keep the record straight, here is one gentleman from California who did not introduce a bill for the establishment of a secondary naval academy on the west coast.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. When the gentleman mentions southern California, he means down around San Diego; is that not correct?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Any place between San Diego and Los Angeles. I think there is need for an additional naval-training facility equal to Annapolis for officer training personnel of the Navy in some location besides Annapolis, with all due respect for the fine record and the great contribution it has made to the defense of the Nation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I was interested the other day when a Member of this House made the statement that he could not understand why the House should take 4 hours debating a resolution that did nothing. This appears to be a true statement of fact, but upon close examination we find that the Chief of Naval Operations assured the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House that if this concurrent resolution was

passed by the Congress that the Navy Department would consider it binding upon the Department in the establishment of the postwar Navy even though the concurrent resolution did not have the same force and effect as an act of authorization or appropriation.

As has been said many times section 8 of the Constitution places the responsibility of not only providing but of maintaining a Navy upon Congress. No one will question the necessity of the United States maintaining a Navy but it will be necessary for us to determine the size of a Navy that it would be practical for us to keep.

In this regard then it is highly important that this resolution be given much thought and discussion. I am sure that we will agree that the question warrants 4 hours' consideration by the representatives of the people whose future welfare is at stake and from whose pockets will come the wherewithal to maintain this Navy.

In the years to come the statements that are made here today on the floor of this House will, no doubt, make interesting reading. This House is composed now of Members who have had, to put it mildly, a ringside seat during the enactment of the most terrible war that has ever been known by mankind. Some Members of this House have participated in actual combat during this war and many others have had an opportunity to visit the devasted areas, many while the conflict was in progress, and all have had relatives or close friends who have made the supreme sacrifice. Therefore, the necessity for making every attempt to avoid a repetition of such a calamity is uppermost in the minds of every Member of the House, especially when we stop to think that the destruction visited upon the victims of this war was no more than child's play in comparison to what we have every reason to expect should another war break out in the future, even though it may be, comparatively speaking, in the near future. Therefore, it is true that we will without a doubt pass this resolution as if it were nothing but I still say that it has been worth while to have had some discussion.

It is not necessary for me to elaborate on the size of the Navy or the proposed plan to have what is designated as a ready reserve and a laid-up reserve fleet, for I believe we will agree in the wisdom of this plan. There will be no trouble, in my opinion, to pass this resolution which expresses the will of Congress on the size and character of the Navy that should be maintained in the postwar period. Furthermore, considering the composition of Congress as just stated by me, I believe the appropriation for the maintenance of such a Navy, even though it will set the taxpayers of this country back, anywhere from three to four billion dollars per year, will be passed just as readily.

My thoughts are not necessarily concerned with the action of the present Congress in regard to this matter as, I believe, it is reasonable to believe that this Congress is in the mood to put forth every effort to maintain peace. The question is, In what mood will the next Congress or subsequent Congresses be? Neither you nor I can answer that question, but it is safe to say that the next Congress and all subsequent Congresses will reflect to a great degree the sentiment and reactions of the people of the United States as a whole.

Therefore, I believe I can safely come to this conclusion that it is altogether fitting that this subject be gone into clearly today by those of us who know the situation and who know the advantages that we can reap as a country by keeping ready for war at all times.

The danger as I see it in the future will be that we will make every effort to forget the horrors of war and try to console ourselves with saying that was just a terrible nightmare and that it can never happen again. Right now we will say that it was no nightmare and that it can happen again, but what will those who take our places say 5, 10, or 20 years from now?

No one will say that the Navy won the war singlehanded but we all agree that without them we could never have won. However, we know the Navy played a most important part in the victory just attained and we are confident the Navy will take an equally important role in any future war in which we may become engaged, notwithstanding the atomic bomb or any other invention of destruction that may be developed in the future.

As I have already said, it takes no recital of facts to convince Members of this House today that we absolutely must maintain a strong two-ocean Navy.

This brings me to venture this suggestion, that the general public as well as Congress should refresh its memory at regular intervals as to the horrors of this war, and that we should be ever mindful of the probable consequences of another war. I believe our schools will shortly begin to unfold the story of devastation wrought in this war upon mankind through history books and, no doubt, pictures of actual combat. I hope the historians will not make the picture too romantic. I believe our boys and girls should learn of war at its worst. I can hardly think it will ever be necessary for our boys who participated to be reminded of the terrible consequences of another war.

In a few years, however, the pressure will begin to be brought for the reduction of taxes, and Congress will begin to make advances toward the Army and Navy, and before you realize it there will be a ship here or an Army base there that will seem so unnecessary, and as pressure grows the Army and Navy will diminish.

To some people life insurance is a silly, unnecessary expense when a person is in perfect health. Let us all hope and pray that we cannot forget what it cost in lives and money to relax and allow ourselves to become wholly unprepared. A good strong Navy is the cheapest insurance the taxpayers of the United States will ever be able to purchase.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, as stated in the able committee report accompanying this resolution:

> The purpose of the proposed concurrent resolution is to express the will of Congress on the size and character of the Navy that should be maintained in the postwar period.

All of the members of the House Committee on Naval Affairs are entitled to credit and commendation for reporting the resolution before us, and for their hard work and sound judgment in determining through this concurrent resolution what the will of the Congress is in relation to our immediate postwar Navy. So far as Members of Congress are concerned, there is one Member particularly in this body to whom the country is indebted for his leadership. I refer to the affable, able, and courageous chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. Long before Pearl Harbor, like myself and some others, he was an advocate of a two-ocean Navy. He fought for it even in the dark days when pacifism and a false wave of economy prevailed throughout the country. Before Pearl Harbor, he saw the danger threatening our country. He fought to prepare our Nation and to enable our beloved country to defend itself in case of attack. During the war the strain upon his shoulders has been great. With vision and courage, he steadfastly went ahead doing his duty for our country. Under his leadership this resolution comes now before us. It is a tribute to the untiring labor and leadership of the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON.

On Saturday last President Truman, in part said:

> If anyone can be called the father of the new American Navy, which is typified by this magnflicent vessel, it is he. From his first day as President he started to build it.

President Truman was referring to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. How true—how fine—that President Truman paid this powerful and proper tribute to our late war leader. On the occasion last Saturday of the commissioning of the aircraft carrier named in honor and memory of our late President, President Truman also said of him:

> His name is engraved on this great carrier as it is in the hearts of men and women of good will the world over, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

You will note that President Truman said "men and women of good will." How true, how appropriate and fitting and correct that he used the words "good will." President Truman probably had in mind that during his lifetime because of his greatness of character and qualities of leadership, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt had a group of psychopathic haters—not those who honestly disagreed with him, but a certain group of psychopathic haters who tried to destroy him. There are many who honestly disagreed with him and who opposed him honorably. That was their privilege. They exercised it and we respect them for their views in disagreement and the expression of their views. But there was a group, some

powerful because of their vast wealth, not all, but some, and others who loved to hate, who had a psychopathic hatred for Franklin D. Roosevelt. Their hatred has not stopped at the grave. Even after death they are still carrying on their vicious campaign of hate. But so far as these persons are concerned, their hatred of Franklin D. Roosevelt has not stopped at the grave. Their diseased minds are still trying to destroy the memory of our great leader whom they could not defeat in life. Franklin D. Roosevelt, while alive, defeated them four times running. What the psychopathic haters could not do in his lifetime, they will not accomplish after his death.

Franklin D. Roosevelt left to this country a great heritage in many respects. He left to us the heritage of a powerful Navy and the importance of a powerful Navy in the life of America. Franklin D. Roosevelt had learned the lessons of history. He knew that in a war the side that controlled the seas won the war. That is the value of our Navy in the future. That is the value of a strong Navy. That is the value of a strong Air Force. That is the necessity of a powerful organized Army that can be quickly expanded, primarily for defense, but having in mind the hopes and aspirations of our people and all other peoples toward permanent peace through the outlawing of war.

In connection with winning the war by the Nation that controls the seas, I can remember vividly as I stand here now a conversation I had with the late President Roosevelt when Rommel was resting before Alexandria. He had made the drive across Africa and he was resting to replenish his strength with weapons of war and men, and he, Rommel, was preparing to continue his campaign and capture Alexandria, the Suez Canal, and then extend it. There was fear of the Japanese coming in through India, and the Germans and the Japs getting together, contacting; or if they were unable to come in actual contact with each other, controlling the intervening area through their control of the air.

We feared in those days that that was going to happen, with the resultant difficulty of getting weapons of war into China and weapons of war into Soviet Russia; like a big bear squeezing out his victim would have been the result. I can remember in those days when it looked as though Hitler was going to go into Spain for the purpose of trying to capture Gibraltar or besiege Gibraltar; then go into Portugal and take it over, where token resistance could only be made; with the Azores Islands and Cape Verde Islands at stake, vitally important that those islands not get in the possession of Hitler and his gangsters. At the same time there was fear of Vichy France turning Dakar over to the enemy. I can remember—and that conversation can be told now that the war is over—the President was possessed of a grim determination. He said, banging the desk, "Even if Rommel captures Alexandria and the Suez Canal, it is bad, but Hitler has not won the war. Even if he goes into Spain and besieges Gibraltar, and the British and our forces lose control of the Mediterranean, it is bad, but he has not won the war. Even if Vichy France gives Dakar over to Hitler, it is bad; it is a hard blow; but Hitler has not won the war yet. Hitler can win every battle but one battle—the battle of the Atlantic—and until and unless he has won that battle he has not won the war." The battle of the Atlantic was the Navy of the United States and the Navy of Great Britain. That is how important naval power was during the last war. That is how important naval power will be for our country during the years to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we emerge from this war the most powerful Nation in the known history of man. It is our duty to maintain the power that we have, for good. There is nothing wrong or bad in power itself or in wealth itself. Power or wealth, exercised for good, is a beautiful thing to witness. We have developed from one of the smallest Nations of the world, a little over 152 years ago, with the help of God and the hardiness of past generations of Americans and the stalwart fighting heart of the youth of America today, with the able leadership we have, into the most powerful Nation that the world has ever seen. That power we must maintain. That power must be maintained for good, not for evil. Our country stands for the exercise of whatever power it has for good and not for evil. That is why we must see that the power of our Navy and of our Air Forces are not dissipated. Take a globe and see how the United States is situated geographically between Asia and Europe. The inventive genius of man has increased the rapidity of travel to the point where a few hours today will take one to the far corners of the earth—only a few hours. In this short time the most deadly bomb could be dropped upon the unsuspecting people of this or any other country.

Isolation, geographically, is over. Man and his inventive genius has brought that about. We have got to have our national defense geared to the conditions that exist and we have got to have power that will meet any situation that will arise in the future—power for good, first for the good of ourselves, our own national interest, and second, in conjunction with other nations, good for the world. Other nations have their responsibility as well as we have ours.

It is for their national interest to bring about peace the same as it is to our national interest to exercise our power in cooperation with other nations to possess the spirit of good will toward bringing about an early and permanent peace by outlawing war. Power, therefore, is not subversive where used for good; power has its proper place not only within our society in America but for our own Government to use it for our own national interest, and to try and enable mankind to progress along the stony uphill journey toward the goal men and women seek everywhere, a permanent and lasting peace. Yes, we have been blessed with that power and we have got to exercise it, as I said, for our own national interest first. We want peace because it is for the best interest of our country to have peace during the next 25 or 50 years at least. It is in the best interest of other nations likewise, be they large or small, even little Liberia or powerful Great Britain or Soviet Russia. They have got to realize that the people who live in these countries are human beings just as we are; they have their hopes and their little aspirations; they have their ambitions, and I dare say one of the great hopes shared by men and women of good will everywhere without regard to race or color or creed is the hope that this will be the last great global conflict for many generations to come. The national interest of other countries should prompt it; and based upon that alone, not any particularly altruistic viewpoint but the justifiably selfish angle of our own national interest and the justifiably selfish angle of the national interest of other countries should prompt the representatives of our country and other countries to get together in a cooperative effort that would bring about permanent peace through the outlawing of war. And this concurrent resolution from our country's angle is a powerful contribution in that direction in addition to being essential for the national welfare and the national protection and defense of our country in the years to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the resolution be read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States the Congress is charged with the responsibility of providing and maintaining a Navy; and

Whereas the wars in which the United States has been engaged are now in the process of being brought to a successful close; and

Whereas it will not be necessary to retain for the Navy all of the ships, vessels, or craft now built, building, or authorized; and

Whereas it is necessary for the Congress to determine the size of the immediate postwar Navy giving due consideration to the security of the United States and its Territories and insular possessions, the protection of our commerce, and the necessity for cooperating with other world powers in the maintenance of peace; and

Whereas such immediate postwar Navy will require an adequate fleet and supporting aircraft, personnel, bases, and establishments: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Navy of the United States should consist of ships of the following types and numbers:

1. Three large aircraft carriers (42,000 tons), 24 aircraft carriers (27,000 tons), 10 light aircraft carriers (11,000 tons), 79 escort aircraft carriers, 18 battleships, 3 large cruisers, 31 heavy cruisers, 48 light cruisers, 367 destroyers, 296 escort destroyers, and 200 submarines.

2. That sufficient aircraft, auxiliary vessels, mine vessels, patrol vessels, landing craft, district craft, and drydocks should be maintained to support the above-enumerated fleet.

3. That adequate facilities to support the Navy should be maintained wherever necessary.

4. That sufficient personnel should be provided to adequately maintain and operate the Navy and that proper and adequate facilities be provided and maintained to fully train such personnel.

5. That ships, vessels, and craft enumerated above should be replaced unit for unit in accordance with existing law, or earlier if the development of weapons, or scientific research, make such ship, vessel, or craft obsolete or obsolescent.

6. That an orderly shipbuilding and aircraft replacement program should be maintained.

7. That a progressive program of research and development in all fields of naval warfare be carried on and that an adequate organization and facilities for that purpose be maintained.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the bill, that it be printed in the RECORD, and that it be in order to consider all the committee amendments in bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk will report the committee amendments:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "of", insert "not less than."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "forty-two thousand tons" and insert in lieu thereof: "total tonnage approximately one hundred and thirty-five thousand."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "twenty-seven thousand tons" and insert "total tonnage approximately six hundred and fifty thousand four hundred."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "eleven thousand tons" and insert "total tonnage approximately one hundred and seventeen thousand."

Page 2, after line 11, insert "total tonnage approximately seven hundred and twenty-five thousand."

Page 2, line 13, after the word "battleships" insert "(total tonnage approximately six hundred and sixty-five thousand)."

Page 2, line 14, after the word "cruisers", insert "(total tonnage approximately eighty-two thousand five hundred)."

Page 2, line 16, after the word "cruisers", insert "(total tonnage approximately four hundred and three thousand)."

Page 3, line 1, after the word "cruisers", insert "(total tonnage approximately four hundred and fifty thousand)."

Page 3, line 2, after the word "destroyers", insert "(total tonnage approximately seven hundred and sixty thousand)."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "(two hundred and ninety six" and insert "three hundred."

Page 3, line 4, after the word "destroyers", insert "(total tonnage approximately three hundred and eighty-seven thousand)."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "two hundred" and insert "one hundred and ninety-nine."

Page 3, line 7, after the word "submarines", insert "(total tonnage approximately three hundred and fourteen thousand), aggregate tonnage, all types, approximately four million six hundred and ninety-eight thousand nine hundred."

Page 3, line 14, after the word "facilities", insert "including bases."

Page 3, line 21, strike out "unit for unit."

In the preamble, page 1, fourth paragraph, strike out "giving due consideration to the security of the United States and its Territories and insular possessions, the protection of our commerce, and the necessity for cooperating with other world powers in the maintenance of peace; and" and insert in lieu thereof "in order to insure our national integrity, support our national policies, guard the continental United States and our overseas possessions, give protection to our commerce and citizens abroad, and to cooperate with other world powers in the maintenance of peace; and."

Mr. COLE of New York (interrupting reading of amendments). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we are going to consider the amendments to the preamble first?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments to the preamble are considered after amendments to the body of the resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments in the body of the resolution be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I wish to speak in opposition to the first committee amendment on page 2, line 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I arise in opposition to the committee amendment. Mr. Chairman, the original resolution reads thus:

It is the sense of Congress that the Navy of the United States should consist of ships of the following types and numbers.

Then follows a description of the Navy we should maintain. The committee amendment inserts the words "not less than," before the word "ships," so that the resolution becomes not a statement of what we should have, but a statement of a minimum, with no maximum.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the committee amendment is of very great importance. I do not think it is of great importance whether it is in or out because, as I have expressed myself before, this is not legislation and is therefore not the type of congressional action which is in itself of great importance as to its precise wording. I do feel, however, that if the Congress is to give the Navy the support of its approval as to a postwar navy we should say what we mean. I for one am willing to take on faith the Navy's representations and the committee's representations that we need certain ships, but when I approve 3 large aircraft carriers or 18 battleships I do not approve "not less than" 18 battleships, which might run up to 28 battleships, for I am not enthusiastic about battleships.

In view of the colloquy which occurred earlier today, when the majority floor leader questioned me, I wish to make a few statements:

Mr. Chairman, first, I am strong for a strong Navy. I am for an adequate Navy in the postwar period to carry out our purposes, as set forth very ably in the preamble of this bill. I am one of those who was for a two-ocean Navy at the time when our then Chief Executive, the late President Roosevelt, said it was "plain dumb."

Second. I am strong for the Navy's prompt tackling of its postwar planning and, as an old Navy man myself, I was delighted when the Navy, ahead of all of the other armed forces, came out with a concrete plan for what they intended to have a year from now, both as to ships and as to men. I am gratified that they have gone ahead with a specific plan. I regret that we have not heard of such plans from the other branches of the services. The President last week told us of our three lines of defense: First, the Regular Army and Navy; second, the National Guard and ready Reserve; third, the compulsory Reserve. I regret that we are asked to take up the question of the third line of defense—as outlined in President Truman's statement, the compulsory Reserve—before we clear up the first and second lines of defense as outlined in his speech. I am delighted that the Navy has already made plans for the first, second, and third lines of defense.

Third. I am strong for our great Committee on Naval Affairs and, as I say, I have always followed their recommendations in the past.

I now want to express a few regrets about this matter.

First. I regret that the Committee on Naval Affairs did not require the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their advice on this measure before it was brought to us. I share the feeling that was so ably stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Second. I have another regret, and that is that this is a concurrent resolution instead of straight-out legislation saying what the Navy should be and what it should not be, so that we would be legislating instead of piously hoping, expecting the Navy to take on faith the expressions as to their strength that we in turn have taken on faith from them.

After reading further hearings I, of course, have confidence that the Navy will follow its own recommendations which are herein contained. My answer to the majority leader's question as to whether the Navy will follow this resolution is—yes, but I still feel that we should legislate instead of relying upon expressions in letters and oral statements before committees. This is not the way for Congress to carry out its responsibility. I wish that we were here legislating and putting into law the plans, as I understand them, that the Navy has for the postwar protection of our country.

The last thing I want to say is that I favor a merger of the services. I do not share, as an old Navy man, the Navy's inferiority complex in this regard. They fear that they will be outvoted in the new setup. I believe that the Navy will exert an influence far beyond their numbers when we do the sensible thing, get together, on the total problem of defense. The truth is that our problem from now on is not only amphibious, land and water, not only "tribious" land, air, and water, but "heterobious," air, land, water, underwater, and underground, or what

have you, including the stratosphere. With such a heterobious problem, it is a little silly to find admirals who insist on their inalienable right to polish up the handle of the big front door, as defined in H. M. S. Pinafore.

I was attached as an American naval air pilot to the Royal Naval Air Service in 1918 when they were becoming part of the RAF or Royal Air Force and I heard the lamentations of the Royal Navy and was as little impressed as I am now with the lamentations of our great Secretary of the Navy, Jim Forrestal, and his distinguished Under Secretary Gates and their gold-braid supporters in the Navy. I know that way below them the flying, fighting men of the Navy have seen the extravagant duplication in supply and training, the ghastly rivalry in command that have resulted in loss of life to Americans and loss of money, and that they are against this duplication and rivalry and are for unification and teamwork. From Washington to Okinawa the Navy underlings are for amalgamation to save lives and money and time, in buying, and training, and operations. They know the value in human lives, of unity, instead of rivalry, in buying instruments, in directing operations in combat.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this committee amendment, but what I have said goes beyond this particular amendment and I hope the vote on this unimportant matter will not be considered as important on the matters I could not bring up for a vote today.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was placed in the resolution by the unanimous action of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs. As the gentleman from Ohio stated, the original bill did not contain those three words "not less than." The committee was of the opinion that it would strengthen the bill; that there would be no doubt in the minds of the Navy Department officials just what the Congress of the United States intended the size of the postwar Navy to be if we placed a floor under the number and the types of vessels that the postwar Navy should be composed of. This is primarily a Navy composition bill. It is not legislation, as the gentleman has pointed out, because we cannot authorize the building of ships once they have already been authorized, but we can and we do attempt in this resolution to state what we think is the proper and adequate size of the postwar Navy. It can be changed and probably will be changed many times in the years to come. That is the province of the Congresses that will follow this Congress, but for the time being we feel and I am sure it is the consensus of the Navy Department, that the numbers and types of vessels contained in this resolution are sufficient and adequate for the needs as outlined; for the needs of the Navy, the needs of national defense, and the needs of our national postwar policy; and, to implement that policy as stated in the preamble which, unfortunately, was not read.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has just said that the Navy has expressed its views as to what we need, and the Committee on Naval Affairs concurs. If that is what we need, why not say so rather than say that that is the minimum or the maximum? If it is only a general directive, why not say this is what we need, or approximately, or no more or no less? That is my only point.

Mr. IZAC. I would reply to my friend that, of course, we think this is much more positive. You understand there were about 10,000 vessels that we had to deal with and we determined that 1,082 combat vessels and a sufficient number of auxiliaries would be needed in this Navy of ours for the immediate postwar period. We could not be much more adamant and there would not be anything gained by letting the Navy Department, for instance, slip out on us and say, "Well, we can get by maybe with a few less ships, so let us use that money for some other purpose." I think it is very necessary that we, as the Congress, determine the size of the postwar Navy.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. As the gentleman has pointed out, this postwar naval policy will undoubtedly be changed from time to time, but we want the Navy Department to know that it is the sense of the Congress at the present time that it is not going to be less than the number of ships enumerated in the concurrent resolution.

Mr. IZAC. That is exactly the point, I think, and that is the reason why there was a unanimous vote in our committee in favor of this amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Along that line, Admiral King in committee made this statement, that his overriding concern is that the United States will have a Navy in the future which will be adequate to support the national policies as we understand them. We are unable to make any other representation until we have a more definite national policy than we now have.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct. Perhaps the national policy in the years to come will be changed and will demand even more ships or possibly fewer vessels.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the committee amendment be agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are a few observations I should like to make at this time, because this is a resolution from the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I think the comments I am about to make should be of interest to the members of that committee, as well as to the people of the country.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] this afternoon. Those of us who were here will recall that he showed toward the end of his talk some headlines from a Washington newspaper. These headlines stated in effect that 1,000,000 men are fighting in China and that at the present time civil war is in progress.

There is one war area in the world to which we have been shipping troops since the close of actual hostilities, and that area is China. Within the past month we have landed two marine divisions; one, the First Marine Division, at Taku, which later went up the river to Tientsin; a second, the Sixth Marine Division, which was landed at Tsingtao, and elements of which are now scattered throughout Shantung province.

We have sent five of our cruisers to Chefoo, as well as other warships up and down the China coast. Some of our marines have already been wounded in the province of Shantung because of fighting between Chinese elements, and one of our gunboats has been fired on in the Yangtze River recently.

About 3 weeks ago I made a talk on the floor of this House and tried to point out to the Members some of the difficulties which were shaping up on the Asiatic continent. I mentioned specifically that as far as we were concerned we should withdraw all our troops from India, Burma, Korea, and China at the earliest opportunity.

I should like to speak as one who loves his country and his people and who believes that instead of sending additional marines and warships into China, where they may become involved in civil strife in that country, we should withdraw them just as soon as it is possible and allow the Chinese to settle their own internal problems. The Chinese quarrel is not America's, and any military interference from the outside, however unintentional, might lead to larger disputes in which all our present efforts for world peace would be in danger.

I am glad to note that traffic over the Hump is being closed down, and that our men who are flying that dangerous route will be returned home soon. I am glad to note that our men on the Stilwell Road will be recalled very shortly. But I am glad to note the statement issued by the Chinese theater commander to the effect that by the first of the year 6,000 American soldiers will remain in China. That in itself is a good indication, but the factor I am sorry about is the statement, which declares that by that time there will be 53,000 marines in north China. The members of the First and Sixth Marine Divisions and the sailors in the Navy have done their job. I think the best thing we can do is to get them out of China and, at the same time, withdraw our soldiers from there and in India, Korea, and Burma as well. And bring them home just as soon as it is humanly possible to do so. My purpose is asking for this time now is to call to the attention of the Committee on Naval Affairs the fact that additional sailors and marines are being sent into China. I do not want to see this country become involved in the internal affairs of another nation and certainly I do not want to see American servicemen main-

tained in overseas areas where there is a possibility of trouble. These men have done their job in the Pacific and the best policy for us would be to bring them home to their country and their loved ones.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate, and I am going to vote for the bill in spite of, not because of, some of what has been said. My reason is that the world is in a period that Mr. Walter Lippmann in a very excellent article in Sunday's paper called Pacification. I know that it cannot be expected that after a war such as the one through which the world has just passed, settled governments will exist in the nations of the world. Many peoples who ought to be free are not yet free. In other nations civil war has even broken out. American armed forces during this period are of course one of the essential stabilizing factors in a war-disrupted world. I agree with the principles of American foreign policy which were laid down by the President in his speech on Navy Day. The Atlantic Charter principles are there. They are at stake today, too. But the President said another thing on Navy Day which I would like to read:

> The immediate, the greatest threat to us, is the threat of disillusionment, the danger of an insidious skepticism, a loss of faith in the effectiveness of international cooperation.
>
> Such a loss of faith would be dangerous at any time. In an atomic age, it would be nothing short of disastrous.

What might cause that loss of faith? Nothing more surely than for any representative of the United States to state or indicate that he believes peace depends on armed might and on that alone. The realization of peace can never be built by an attitude on the part of the United States of America that we are now the most powerful nation in the world and that nothing except armed force can protect us or keep the peace and that we propose to continue to be so powerful that no nation will dare disturb us or our interests.

Gentlemen, for about two more congressional elections perhaps we may be able to talk that way. But we live in a world where the very fundamental forces of this universe have been loosed by the hands of man. We live in a world where, according to the testimony of every single scientist who knows anything about it, any nation with reasonable industrial capacity will be armed with atomic bombs within 5 to 10 years unless mankind awakens in the meantime to the dread prospect he faces. We live in a world therefore where the issue lies between the building of a world organization able to prevent an atomic war or else the devastation of every nation which presumes to maintain a military establishment large enough to challenge other nations. That is the danger at the very least. I have risen at this time only to say that if the Navy or any other instrumentality of the United States can be used for bringing peace to the world—I do not mean by force, but to help the world settle down where it will be possible for freedom and peace to exist and hence for real security to come to our country—for that great purpose, of course, everything is worthwhile. But I rise also to say that in these few years which lie ahead of us, unless there is that statesmanship which can restore the very faith in international cooperation about which the President spoke, the future is one in which the kind of armed might we speak about today will be of little effect.

Oh, it might help to win a war, but at the end of that war every nation will lie in ruins and its cities devastated. There has to be something more. By the very logic of science itself there has to be something more. For that something more I still look. It is a principle 2,000 years old—the principle of cooperation to save mankind. Suppose America should stand forth before the nations of the world and say that we propose there be established a world authority, which world authority should have the right to police all nations of the world and see that not a single one of those nations manufactures atomic weapons; suppose we said that any nation that did not agree to such a thing and to a full inspection of its nation, and control over its manufacture of atomic weapons, would simply stand alone outside the pale of civilized nations. That sort of leadership, Mr. Chairman, is the only thing, in my judgment, that can make this world safe for our children to live in. Nothing less can meet the needs of the times in which we live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I had prepared an amendment to reduce the number of ships by 40 percent throughout section 1 of the resolution, but decided it would be futile.

When I began to survey what is involved in this resolution, even though it be nothing but a resolution, in conscience it tends to bind each one of us. Probably all of us will be here, I hope, when some real legislation is offered on this subject.

But I am distressed beyond measure. I do not understand our situation here today. In about 3 or 4 days after the last nation has signed the paper which constitutes the United Nations Organization Charter, we find this great country of ours exercised and involved in preparing a very large Navy. The thing that disturbs me most is that we should turn our attention to this, right at this time, before any action is ever taken to try to bring about concord, good will, and peace among the nations of the earth by that operation. But we devote ourselves and we commit ourselves to arming ourselves and assure continued arming of ourselves. Oh, we may say that is just to keep the peace. Well, perhaps that is the reason a man carries a pistol in his pocket. He arrogates to himself infallibility of disposition and conduct and proposes to have other people to keep the peace. Well, we know we are possessed of such unusual attitude toward the world, but I am afraid the world will not accept that exactly as we would have it, but they would begin to wonder, What is the United States in such a hurry about, providing 500,000 sailors, 57,000 naval officers, at a probable annual cost of $3,167,000,000?

What disturbs me is that we are turning our attention to this matter particularly at this crucial time, when we want the world to know that we believe in concord, in amity, in understanding, in the principle of good neighbors; that we propose to rest our case upon that until it shall have been manifested that it cannot succeed. I wish to read what a former Secretary of the Navy said yesterday regarding this matter:

> There is no place in today's world for pessimists. All sensible men know that the goal of understanding and unity to secure the success of the United Nations cannot be reached in a day. But they do not doubt, judging by the changed attitude of the Senate, that it will be achieved.
>
> People who clamor for compulsory military service, retaining overgrown armies and navies, and who say "there has always been wars and there always will be"—these unconsciously—

And I am glad he said unconsciously—

> are aiding the pessimists and endangering the attainment of a warless world.

That is what troubles me today. Let us put first things first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question.

On yesterday I made some point about this being a concurrent resolution rather than a bill or a joint resolution. The gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs was kind enough at that time to suggest that he would accept such an amendment if I would offer it today. I have investigated the matter from a parliamentary situation and find that the gentleman was perfectly safe in making such concession because there is no possible way whereby such an amendment would lie. That could be accomplished only by unanimous consent and I shall not ask it.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the committee amendment to the preamble.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment to the preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 2, line 3, after the words "United States", strike out the word "should" and insert "shall."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, no explanation of this amendment

is necessary. It simply makes more definite the intention of Congress when it passes this resolution.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made during general debate on the bill this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 80, pursuant to House Resolution 366, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 347, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—347

Abernethy	Carnahan	Dworshak
Allen, Ill.	Case, N. J.	Earthman
Allen, La.	Case, S. Dak.	Elliott
Anderson, Calif.	Celler	Ellis
Andrews, Ala.	Chapman	Ellsworth
Angell	Chelf	Elsaesser
Arends	Chenoweth	Elston
Arnold	Chiperfield	Engel, Mich.
Auchincloss	Church	Engle, Calif.
Bailey	Clark	Ervin
Baldwin, Md.	Clason	Fallon
Baldwin, N. Y.	Clevenger	Fellows
Barden	Cochran	Fenton
Barrett, Wyo.	Coffee	Fernandez
Bates, Mass.	Cole, Kans.	Fisher
Beckworth	Cole, Mo.	Flannagan
Bender	Cole, N. Y.	Fogarty
Bennet, N. Y.	Colmer	Forand
Bennett, Mo.	Combs	Fuller
Biemiller	Cooper	Fulton
Bishop	Corbett	Gallagher
Blackney	Courtney	Gamble
Bland	Cox	Gardner
Bloom	Cravens	Gary
Bonner	Crawford	Gathings
Boren	Curtis	Gavin
Bradley, Mich.	D'Alesandro	Gearhart
Bradley, Pa.	Daughton, Va.	Geelan
Brooks	Davis	Gerlach
Brown, Ga.	De Lacy	Gifford
Brown, Ohio	Delaney, James J.	Gillespie
Brumbaugh	D'Ewart	Gillette
Bryson	Dirksen	Goodwin
Buck	Dolliver	Gordon
Buffett	Domengeaux	Gorski
Bulwinkle	Dondero	Gossett
Burch	Doughton, N. C.	Graham
Burgin	Douglas, Calif.	Granger
Butler	Douglas, Ill.	Grant, Ala.
Byrne, N. Y.	Doyle	Grant, Ind.
Byrnes, Wis.	Drewry	Gregory
Camp	Durham	Gross
Cannon, Fla.	Dworshak	Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa	Lyle	Rodgers, Pa.
Hagen	Lynch	Rogers, Fla.
Hale	McConnell	Rogers, Mass.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McCormack	Rogers, N. Y.
Hall, Leonard W.	McCowen	Rooney
Halleck	McDonough	Rowan
Hancock	McGehee	Ryter
Hare	McGregor	Sadowski
Harless, Ariz	McKenzie	Sasscer
Harris	McMillan, S. C.	Savage
Hart	McMillen, Ill.	Schwabe, Mo.
Havenner	Madden	Schwabe, Okla.
Hays	Mahon	Scrivner
Healey	Maloney	Sharp
Hébert	Manasco	Sheppard
Hedrick	Mansfield, Mont.	Sheridan
Hendricks	Mansfield, Tex.	Short
Henry	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Herter	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Heselton	Mason	Slaughter
Hess	May	Smith, Maine
Hill	Michener	Smith, Ohio
Hinshaw	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Hobbs	Miller, Nebr.	Sparkman
Hoch	Mills	Spence
Hoeven	Monroney	Springer
Hoffman	Mundt	Stefan
Holifield	Murdock	Stevenson
Holmes, Mass.	Murray, Tenn.	Stewart
Holmes, Wash.	Murray, Wis.	Stigler
Horan	Neely	Stockman
Howell	Norrell	Sullivan
Huber	O'Brien, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.
Hull	O'Brien, Mich.	Sumners, Tex.
Izac	O'Hara	Sundstrom
Jackson	O'Neal	Taber
Jenkins	O'Toole	Talbot
Jennings	Outland	Talle
Jensen	Pace	Tarver
Johnson, Calif.	Patman	Taylor
Johnson, Ill.	Patrick	Thom
Johnson, Ind.	Patterson	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Luther A.	Peterson, Fla.	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, Okla.	Philbin	Tibbott
Jones	Phillips	Tolan
Jonkman	Pittenger	Torrens
Judd	Plumley	Towe
Kean	Poage	Traynor
Kearney	Price, Fla.	Trimble
Kee	Price, Ill.	Vinson
Kefauver	Priest	Voorhis, Calif.
Kelley, Pa.	Quinn, N. Y.	Vorys, Ohio
Kelly, Ill.	Rabaut	Vursell
Kilday	Rabin	Wadsworth
Kinzer	Rains	Walter
Kirwan	Ramey	Wasielewski
Knutson	Ramspeck	Weaver
Kopplemann	Rankin	Welchel
Kunkel	Rayfiel	Weiss
LaFollette	Reece, Tenn.	Welch
Lane	Reed, Ill.	West
Lanham	Reed, N. Y.	Whitten
Larcade	Rees, Kans.	Whittington
Latham	Resa	Wickersham
Lea	Rich	Wigglesworth
LeCompte	Richards	Wilson
LeFevre	Riley	Winstead
Lemke	Rivers	Wolfenden, Pa.
Lewis	Rizley	Wolverton, N. J.
Link	Robertson, N. Dak.	Wood
Luce	Robertson, Va.	Woodhouse
Ludlow	Robinson, Utah	Woodruff, Mich.
	Rockwell	Woodrum, Va.
		Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Folger

NOT VOTING—83

Adams	Cunningham	Jarman
Andersen, H. Carl	Curley	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Andresen, August H.	Dawson	Keefe
Andrews, N. Y.	Delaney, John J.	Keogh
Barrett, Pa.	Dickstein	Kerr
Barry	Dingell	Kilburn
Bates, Ky.	Eaton	King
Beall	Eberharter	Landis
Bell	Feighan	Lesinski
Bolton	Flood	McGlinchey
Boykin	Gibson	Marcantonio
Brehm	Gillie	Merrow
Buckley	Gore	Morgan
Bunker	Granahan	Morrison
Campbell	Green	Mott
Canfield	Griffiths	Murphy
Cannon, Mo.	Hand	Norton
Carlson	Harness, Ind.	O'Konski
Clements	Hartley	Peterson, Ga.
Cooley	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Crosser	Hook	Pickett
	Hope	Ploeser
	Powell	Sabath
	Randolph	Shafer
	Robsion, Ky.	Simpson, Pa.
	Roe, Md.	Smith, Wis.
	Roe, N. Y.	Snyder
	Russell	Somers, N. Y.
		Starkey
		Thomason
		White
		Winter
		Wolcott
		Worley

So the House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Starkey with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Griffith.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. King with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Pickett with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Adams.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the preamble.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 3937) to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and for other purposes; and that any Member who desires to do so may file minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Flood Control may be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4506) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the advisability of dredging the harbor at Saint Michaels, Talbot County, Maryland, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. This is a bill dealing with rivers and harbors, not flood control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR UNRRA

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 386, Rept. No. 1181)

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on Poland, appearing in the New York Times, and also an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Tribune.

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address she made.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Presidential citation to a constituent, Capt. Joseph J. McCarthy.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein excerpts from the testimony of Leon Henderson before the Committee on Ways and Means touching the subject of wages and prices. The matter exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing, and the Government Printing Office has submitted an estimate of $156. Notwithstanding the cost I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include a speech on China and the peace, before the King County Democratic Club of Seattle.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next following the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday following the legislative business of the day and special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next to call the Private Calendar subsequent to the call of the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF NOVEMBER 5

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds to make an announcement concerning the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the disposition of the bill granting an additional appropriation for UNRRA will complete the business of this week, whether the bill be finished tomorrow or Thursday.

There is no program for next week outside of the calling of the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

RELEASE OF MEN AND WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES SHOULD BE SPEEDED UP

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is receiving a considerable amount of correspondence from men in the armed forces and their families expressing dissatisfaction concerning the delay with which men are being separated from the armed forces. Among other things I suggest at least three things: First, that the so-called point system be reexamined and revised; second, that transportation be increased by utilizing ships and planes not now being put to use but are lying idle; and, third, by increasing the capacity of separation centers and creating new ones where practicable.

Mr. Speaker, experience during the past few months has proved the point system devised by the Army and largely followed by the Navy and Marine Corps in too many instances has been unfair. I am informed, and Army officials advise, that the system was accomplished by taking a so-called Gallup poll of the members of the armed forces and their suggestions were worked out into the present point system. If this is correct then there must have been many large groups of servicemen not consulted. I do not believe there is any Member of this House who can name a serviceman who has reported that he was consulted with regard to the present point system. Incidentally, I have some correspondence with boys who served in prison camps in Germany on behalf of whom no consultation was made. They have no points to their credit for having served as prisoners of the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, our Government did a magnificent job transporting our men and supplies to the war theaters of Europe and the Pacific. It has not been so efficient with respect to the return of these men to the United States. I am not unmindful that men are being returned by the thousands from Europe and from the Pacific area but, Mr. Speaker, I contend that our transportation can be increased if the facilities at our command and under our control were better organized. It has been reported to Congress there are hundreds of merchant ships that are practically idle that could with little difficulty be converted for transportation purposes. The use of 500 of so-called surplus ships would increase the transportation of men by a good many thousand.

There are on hand at the present time more than 1,000 airplanes that are about to be declared surplus by the Army, that could be put into use to bring these men back from the theaters of war. Not all of them, perhaps, could make the long trips, but I am informed a number of them are equipped to do it. It is my understanding that under prescribed rules the air command is expected to declare unused airplanes as surplus property and will turn them over to surplus-property agencies. Instead of following such a procedure why not authorize and direct the Army Transport Command to use these ships for redeployment of troops? And why not use the many ships operating under the War Shipping Administration, including transports, to proceed with the job of transporting troops? I have just observed that one Col. Charles Davidson, of the port of Manila, has made a statement that Liberty ships can be readied within 48 hours for transportation of troops from the Pacific area.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested by some sources that an increase in the number of returned soldiers and sailors will create a bottleneck at the separation centers. The answer to that is comparatively simple. We should extend and

expand our separation centers so that there will be no unnecessary delay in discharges and releases.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of men have been declared surplus and hundreds of thousands more are really not accomplishing any real good for their country. Many of them have been separated from their families for long periods of time. Having accomplished their tasks and having fulfilled their obligations, they ought to get to do it. Every ship and plane and other means of transportation available ought to be put into service and every facility needed for such purpose should be used for getting these boys home. We should be just as efficient in getting them back as we were in sending them over. Allowances must be made, of course, for men who are needed as occupation troops, but that group is small compared with the millions who are surplus and who are not required as a part of the army of occupation.

Mr. Speaker, statements have been made recently to the effect that we should not be too hasty in our release program and that it might be better for the country if it were slowed down a bit. My answer is this, if there is any reason why there should be a slow-down in the release of men and women in the armed forces the American people should know about it. Furthermore, Congress and the people of this country are entitled to have a more definite and a clearer picture with respect to the progress that is being made in our dealings with foreign nations. Hostilities are over now. Our enemies have surrendered. The American people are entitled to be advised and fully informed with respect to settlements and agreements that are being made with foreign nations. In previous years we heard a great deal with respect to a policy of "agreements openly arrived at". This is the time and the place to apply that policy.

Mr. Speaker, a good many bills have been introduced to require the discharge of men and women not needed in our armed forces. I shall be glad to support legislation that would move them along, but none of it has been submitted to the floor of the House for consideration by the committee to which it has been assigned.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this problem, together with the fact that there is so much dissatisfaction regarding the question, I am requesting that the Military Affairs Committee of the House or a committee appointed by the Speaker, be charged with the responsibility of making an immediate and complete investigation with respect to the question of the releases of men from the armed forces with a view of bringing about a speedier and more effective program of releases of the men and women now serving in the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, since the surrender of the Japanese I have used every effort at my command to try to get the Army and the Navy to speed up its machinery and get all of our service men and women not needed in the armed forces, back into civilian life at the earliest possible date. To return these men and women who have served our country faithfully and well to their homes and into civilian life should be our first and foremost obligation. We must see to it that this objective is reached at the earliest possible date.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the question of the hitherto authorized but not appropriated $550,000,000 for United Nations relief will come to the floor this week, I propose to talk to the Members of the Congress passing on to them my observations, the result of a rather extended study of the affairs of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation in the countries which they serve in Europe.

I am glad to say that these investigations and studies were made by me without funds appropriated by the Congress, and in no way by funds given to me by the United Nations or any other government agency. My concern is purely one to pass on to the Members of the Congress my observations, recognizing at the outset that some will be in disagreement. At the same time I am glad to say that we diligently applied ourselves to the task of a study of this important question.

In the first place, I should like to say to this Congress that as a body we promised relief. It has long been a national policy of the United States to view with sympathy peoples in distress, regardless of the country in which they live. I think it can be rightfully said that the policy has won from all of the countries to whom we have heretofore given assistance, everlasting admiration.

Today in many sections of the Old World there are millions of people in dire distress, many of them actually facing starvation, and many of them are suffering from cold. According to official estimates, 180,000,000 of our allies are already in the very vestibule of starvation, and each succeeding day brings the cold winter closer to their doorstep. This $550,000,000 has been authorized by the Congress. Therefore, it was reasonable for those in authority to move ahead in full expectancy of its final appropriation. Most of the western European allies are able to pay. So aside from China, the relief goes to liberated eastern and southern European countries where the need is greatest.

In the countries of Greece and Italy, they have suffered this past year almost unprecedented droughts, thus accelerating the situation. Many of these countries are the lands over which battles raged. Thus we find almost total destruction of housing and the facilities necessary for the people to make a livelihood. Livestock has been driven off and killed.

I fully recognize that there is some disposition on the part of Congress to view with alarm further raids upon the Federal Treasury. I should like to be listed among the first who feel concern in that respect. But I must remind this Congress that there is a Christian obligation that rests on our doorstep. We must think of the future and we must think of these peoples now in distress. We must recognize that in the years to come we must deal with these people with their dwarfed souls and stunted bodies. They will be the future customers of America's product, and even though we face a condition of the Treasury in which is truly alarming, there are other places where reductions can be made. We cannot in the name of Christianity, following the traditions of our country and our Government, fail to lend a helping hand at this desperate hour.

I should not be so ridiculous as to say it becomes our mission to care for all the distressed peoples of Europe. It is totally impossible, first, because of our resources and, secondly, because of the shipping facilities and transportation within the countries. Whatever we propose to do for them in this first cold winter should be done with a definite understand that they cannot expect it to be continuous.

Members of the Congress, I feel profoundly on this subject. We have a duty to perform. But we must make it very clear to these people that they have a responsibility to want to live. They cannot ask us to go on indefinitely. Our duty is crystal clear; we must, insofar as we are able, assist them to get through this troubled winter. Few have any place to sleep and to keep from exposure in the cold winter. The destruction of many sections of Europe passes all understanding.

At the same time, it must be impressed upon these people, whether innocent or otherwise, that they must assume the responsibility for their own rehabilitation at the earliest possible moment.

I fully realize the criticism that has been hurled against the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation, and I recognize that this criticism comes from men and women whose judgment stands high in this Congress. I have no disposition to enter into debate with them. I should like the RECORD to show, however, that my task was devoted exclusively to the study of this problem. We drove many miles into the devastated areas. We saw the burned and destroyed villages and talked with the inhabitants. We saw the destroyed countryside. We discussed the future life with the peasants. We saw the cities reduced to shambles. Greece has 1,417 towns 80 percent or more destroyed.

We visited displaced persons' camps in different countries, particularly in Germany. We saw vast numbers of stateless people. We saw the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation rendering to this particular group the highest type of service, bringing to these people from the four corners of the European Continent cleanliness, decency, reasonable food, and sleeping comfort. These people were formerly handled by the Army. They are gradually being turned over to the United Nations Relief

and Rehabilitation. In this particular capacity alone UNRRA will long remain a monument to which we, the American people, can point with pride.

We recognize that life cannot exist without our assistance. We saw the blown-up bridges, the destroyed transportation. Even with the best that we can do, it will be quite impossible to save the lives of many of the people with whom we talked. Many whom we saw no doubt will never see another winter.

So the question is serious—serious from every angle, but particularly from the truly American angle. We must rush to them from our surpluses the things that are essential. We cannot ignore that there is in Europe today quantities of merchandise that have been shipped there for the Army that will in a large measure represent a total loss because it will never be reshipped to the United States.

Let us not overlook the fact that in the organizing of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation, it was set up on the principle of an international organization. I had no part in that. Right or wrong, that is what has been done. There are many today who debate that it should have been kept exclusively American. I have no quarrel with that philosophy. The facts are we did not do it that way and the cold blasts of winter are close at hand. There is no time to change. Others have said that it should be the duty of the International Red Cross, and to that I make a similar answer. The Red Cross is not equipped to do this job without preparation.

I, in no sense, take the position that the organization of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is perfect. I recognize it was organized at the time of the greatest manpower shortage in the world, and I recognize that it has been exceedingly difficult to obtain administrative directors of high caliber. Yes; I yield to the argument that it has made many mistakes, but so have many other departments of Government. Any organization that operates on such magnitude is bound to make mistakes.

We have heard that vast numbers of trucks in the possession of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation were standing idle. They came into possession of this organization from the Army. A survey of this situation reveals that most of them were unusable and badly in need of repairs. I am convinced that had they been workable they would have been put to work.

I visited every mission. I saw the personnel. I met them. They are of high caliber; the wild stories are positively untrue. I saw the effort being put forth to fit together peoples from the various countries of the world that make up the United Nations staffs. I found no defects in the work they are doing. In fact, I found every nation functioning in an excellent manner. I say this in spite of the fact that in many cases there were people employed in the same room and under the same roof from other countries on a wage standard vastly below that of those employed by the American Government.

In the missions I saw great numbers of fine men and women dedicating themselves to the task, living under conditions which are almost beyond comfort, and still devoted to their task, in the belief that they are giving to the world something that will help a distressed humanity. Their reward is not in dollars and cents but in the personal satisfaction that they can come to the rescue in an hour of great need.

Yes, there is a patriotism in these missions quite comparable with that which inspired our American soldiers and sailors and men who fought in the air. They fought to save the United States. These people less dramatically devote themselves to a cause to save humanity.

I fully appreciate the criticism that can be made against the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation in many sections of the country, and particularly the Balkans. I am willing to concede that perchance some of the goods going into these countries are being misappropriated for the use of their favored political parties. Perchance, this is a question that needs attention. I should be inclined to recognize that the United States place in these countries American representatives backed with authority to determine beyond the shadow of a doubt that no discrimination is practiced.

In Belgrade we questioned Mr. Tito closely for an hour and forty minutes on his treatment of people outside of his party. He stood steadfastly by the position that they were playing the game on international lines.

Here I should like to make my one definite criticism of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I have no knowledge of its plan of organization, little knowledge of how it came into being, or who drafted the rules under which it operates. It is true, however, that it is the policy of the organization to supply the governments with the goods. They in turn are supposed to see that they go into proper channels. There are many wild stories about the misuse of these goods.

I have no proof, but I have deep concern. If the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation has made a great error, it is the fact that they have not remained a relief organization channeling food, supplies, and money through their own organization down to the community level. It is but reasonable to understand that supplies of this character could be misappropriated by the governing forces, and directed in their political interest. I would recommend this reform if possible. How difficult would be this task, I do not know.

I assume at the outset, the organization accepted the fact that we are dealing in the spirit of justice among ourselves. Out of this particular spirit came the United Nations Charter. There is evidence that this is not being fulfilled in many instances. If possible and practical, without adding too greatly to administration, I say with definite emphasis, this correction should be made.

This does not necessarily apply to all countries. There is no reason why it could not work in all countries. There are practices in some countries that I personally view with some alarm.

The sums required are not for food alone. This money goes to buy clothing, medicine, farm machinery, and livestock. We are attempting to bring these countries to a point where they can again be self-sufficient. If we fail to do this, make no mistake about it, we shall be the losers. Our contributions may delay in some measure a reduction of our already too great national debt. It does mean that we help to reestablish for these people their independence, at least in some measure. If they enjoy that benefit then we shall be truly the beneficiary in the years to come.

War-torn Europe faces the worst winter in modern history. Western Germany produces only enough food to provide 1,200 calories a day. That is not enough to prevent disease or to permit men to work. Whether or not the purposes of the United Nations Charter succeed depends upon whether the people in these distressed areas return to normal living. They must go to work. Should they sink further into economic distress, that reaction will be felt in our country.

Poland faces a winter as bad as Germany. Forty percent of the land of Poland remained idle this year. It, like many other countries, has lost its draft animals as well as livestock. Austria likewise faces a desperate situation. The conditions of Italy perhaps are somewhat improved, as is true in Greece. However, Italy and Greece suffer tremendously from a crippled transportation system. Only by the most extreme effort on the part of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation will it be possible to give an average diet to many of the people of Europe of 2,200 calories a day.

Frequently the statement is made to me that the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to which we ourselves are the largest contributor, has gotten out of our hands, and that it is too largely in the hands of the British. I am not denying the fact that we are the largest contributors. I shall attempt, however, at the conclusion of this statement to give you some suggestion of the proper ratio of the countries involved here. But I should like to say this to this Congress—that in our investigations we talked at great length with many in authority. Dealing momentarily with the question of those we call British, I should like to say to you that I should like to be able to obtain the same caliber of intelligence in any business organization in America. I have met no finer people in the world than those who have taken their place in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation for Britain.

I happen to know that it has been with a great deal of difficulty that the governing forces of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation have been able to enlist the interests and talents of our business administrators or executives in this particular work. It is not a pleasant task.

Among the British engaged in this work are some of their greatest generals—one of them was closely associated

with and had much to do with the planning and the landing of our forces on Normandy Beach. He speaks in the highest praise of General Eisenhower and is in my personal judgment a devoted friend. It is my suggestion, if there exists concern today on the part of the Congress about the worthiness of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation, that you dispatch a cablegram to General Eisenhower. Certainly you can rely upon him to wire you factually the information you desire and you can ascertain pretty well from him whether or not things are going at sixes and sevens.

I say to you the question of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation is a difficult task. Difficult because it is international. Difficult because of its magnitude. Difficult because of the character of its work. Difficult because you are dealing with the most difficult side of human existence.

Under no circumstances do I wish for one moment to stand here and address this Congress and give the impression that I stand sponsor for any phase of the Leftist movement. I am speaking to you today in the spirit of helpfulness of a distressed people. I say this to you in the belief that it is the practical thing for us to do. That we cannot fail to do less, and whatever we do will not be sufficient. I have no disposition to approve the principle of left of center. I want the record to show conclusively that I stand in the middle of the road in all the affairs of life. "The product of the means equals the product of the extremes."

I like extremes on neither side of the chart. Complacent, self-sufficiency on the right is dangerous because it is inclined to lack the human touch and become content in its smug surroundings. Those on the other side, represented largely by pressure groups, belligerent in their policies, follow every conceivable means to make charges against the country and the Government; hurling again and again great shocks against the superstructure of government, laboring unwisely under the belief that there does exist suspended in the heavens a great vat of wealth of which they are the rightful owners.

There may be places in human affairs where seniority has its place. In the affairs of men in our relationship in a national picture there should seldom be a time when seniority supplants merit.

I want to be known as one who stands defiantly for the things that are right. I want to be progressive enough to be fair, and I want to be conservative enough to be sound. In the exercises of these two fundamental things of life, I do not feel in any sense that I infringe upon the duties of Christianity or the responsibilities of a civilization blessed and favored as no other nation has ever been. I am greatly concerned as to whether or not we can retain this position, if we leave the distressed peoples of struggling and devastated Europe to shift for themselves in this cold bleak winter now so close at hand. We promised relief. It is time to act.

Status of contributions—all countries—as of Oct. 29, 1945

[In United States dollar equivalents]

	Total contributions authorized or in process of authorization	Total contributions paid or available on request	Total contributions in process or due in 1945
Australia	$38,400,000	$38,400,000	0
Belgium	175,000	175,000	0
Bolivia	95,238	31,746	$63,492
Brazil	30,000,000	10,000,000	20,000,000
Canada	69,369,369	69,369,369	0
Chile	2,153,312	0	2,153,312
China	875,000	875,000	0
Colombia	2,356,493	52,001	2,304,492
Costa Rica	400,000	0	400,000
Cuba	35,000	35,000	0
Czechoslovakia	175,000	175,000	0
Denmark	18,750	0	18,750
Dominican Republic	350,000	245,000	105,000
Ecuador	150,000	0	150,000
Egypt	4,255,833	70,000	4,185,833
El Salvador	128,750	5,000	123,750
Ethiopia	8,750	8,750	0
France	700,000	700,000	0
Greece	87,500	87,500	0
Guatemala	8,750	8,750	0
Haiti	48,750	48,750	0
Honduras	58,750	58,750	0
Iceland	717,975	717,975	0
India	24,042,072	24,042,072	0
Iran	325,100	0	325,100
Iraq	218,250	17,500	200,750
Liberia	8,750	8,750	0
Luxemburg	8,750	8,750	0
Mexico	3,601,500	1,148,000	2,453,500
Netherlands	262,500	262,500	0
New Zealand	8,476,000	8,476,000	0
Nicaragua	128,750	5,000	123,750
Norway	52,500	52,500	0
Panama	408,750	142,083	266,667
Paraguay	38,449	9,900	28,549
Peru	1,000,000	792,692	207,308
Philippines	8,750	8,750	0
Poland	175,000	100,000	75,000
Union of South Africa	18,135,000	5,137,500	12,997,500
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,750,000	1,000,000	750,000
United Kingdom	322,400,000	322,400,000	0
United States of America	1,350,000,000	800,000,000	550,000,000
Uruguay	520,000	505,000	15,000
Venezuela	1,017,500	350,833	666,667
Yugoslavia	122,500	70,000	52,500
Total	1,883,268,341	1,285,601,421	597,666,920

United States part, 71.7 percent.

Source: Bureau of Finance and Administration, Division of Management and Budget, Statistics and Reports Branch.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BREHM (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 765. An act concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States and on the civil international air transport routes from the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 815. An act for the relief of Ogden and Dougherty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Winter Bros. Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1425. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.," approved June 8, 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 31, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 a. m. Wednesday, October 31, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee will hold a hearing on Wednesday, October 31, 1945, at 10 a. m., on the star-route bills (H. R. 2000 and H. R. 2524) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Wednesday, October 31, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream-pollution abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

807. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $9,060,059.36, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 367); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

808. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, to extend reemployment benefits to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who entered the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

809. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), as amended; to the Committee on the Census.

810. A letter from the Quartermaster General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the Forty-seventh National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Denver, Colo., September 10–12, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 368); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

811. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 266. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 131. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3748. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3058. A bill to authorize the use of certain lands of the United States for flowage in connection with providing additional storage space in the Pensacola Reservoir of the Grand River Dam project in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 386. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 266 making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 1902. A bill relating to the trial of the issue of just compensation in the case of condemnation of property for flood-control purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3937. A bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and to abolish the National War Labor Board; with amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Carl Lewis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of R. W. Wood; with amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad; with amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2483. A bill for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 1175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick; with amendment (Rept. No. 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3018. A bill for the relief of R. Fred Baker and Crystal R. Stribling; with amendment (Rept. No. 1178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3073. A bill for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3273. A bill for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4530. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to American newspaper correspondents who lost their lives in World War II; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4531. A bill relating to the reentry of Chinese laborers and Chinese wives and children into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4532. A bill to provide for the discharge of, or release from active duty of, certain personnel in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 4533. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 228, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the amount paid to States from moneys received by the United States on account of certain leases; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 4534. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 228, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the amount paid to States from moneys received by the United States on account of certain leases; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4535. A bill to transfer certain property from the War Relocation Authority to the Colorado River Indian Tribes and the Office of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R 4536. A bill to provide for the admission on motion of certain members of the armed forces and merchant marine to practice law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. J. Res. 267. Joint resolution to provide for proceeding with certain river and harbor projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4537. A bill for the relief of Lillian Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4538. A bill for the relief of Ready-Mix Concrete Co., Ltd., a Hawaiian corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4539. A bill for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4540. A bill for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, coowner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4541. A bill for the relief of Tong Fat Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4542. A bill for the relief of Wah Chan Thom; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4543. A bill for the relief of Leo F. Hannegan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4544. A bill for the relief of Matilda Yim You Hookano; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4545. A bill for the relief of George Leslie Dobson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4546. A bill for the relief of James Y. T. Leong; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4547. A bill granting a pension to E. G. Vans Agnew; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 4548. A bill for the relief of Michael O'Keefe; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1284. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Dr. E. R. Alexander, head of department of agricultural education, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station, Tex., favoring H. R. 4384; to the Committee on Education.

1285. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition containing the signatures of 1,540 workers at the General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y., condemning the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill—S. 1171; to the Committee on Education.

1286. Also, petition containing the signatures of 60 citizens of the Thirty-first Congressional District, State of New York, protesting against the enactment by the Congress of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1287. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Memorial of Orleans Post, No. 23, American Legion Auxiliary, Orleans, Vt., in opposition to the establishment of national cemeteries in the various States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1288. Also, memorial of Orleans Post, No. 23, American Legion, Orleans, Vt., in opposition to the establishment of national cemeteries in the various States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1289. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of Rev. R. G. Lord, J. M. Quinn, and C. L. Rogers, committee, ministerial association, Methodist Church, Greenwood, Mississippi, district, for release of young ministers and candidates for the ministry from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1290. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Vermont State Industrial Union Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Murray-Patman full employment bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1291. Also, petition of the executive committee of the New Orleans Bar Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of H. R. 2181 and S. 920, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1292. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of the campaign of the Hearst newspapers to save the U. S. S. *Enterprise* as a national monument; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. E. O. Clark, pastor, Chevy Chase Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, Thou in whom we live and move and have our being, we come seeking Thy favor in this hour, for we know that unless the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it.

We lift our hearts in gratitude unto Thee for the blessings that abound unto us as a nation. We thank Thee for the sunshine of this day; may it be prophetic of that bright new day for the world to which by faith we look and for which we would earnestly strive. As we are conscious of such abundant blessings of material things, of freedom, of opportunity, may we also realize that unto whom much is given much also will be required. May we as a nation be a worthy leader among the nations of the world to bind up the wounds of our war-torn world and to help heal the hurt of suffering humanity.

We yearn for peace, O God—for real and lasting peace that springs from good will and trustfulness among men. In this strategic day, help us to see that we must match the might of our physical power by the might of Thy eternal spirit, for it is not by might, nor by power, but by Thy spirit that the better day of good will comes among men.

Grant Thy guidance, O Lord, upon this Legislature. May all petty spirit and all sectional division be lost in the larger vision of the common welfare of mankind. This we ask in the name of the Saviour of men, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

"LET US GET TO WORK!"

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading one of the greatest speeches of its length ever delivered.

Yesterday, when President José Linhares, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Brazil, succeeded to the Presidency of that Republic, he was greeted by one of the largest throngs ever assembled in Rio de Janeiro.

He simply stepped forward, and in one of the shortest addresses ever delivered by any President of any country—consisting of only five words of one syllable each—he uttered this profound and patriotic admonition: "Let us get to work!"

He then retired to assume his burdensome duties as Acting President of Brazil.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a young soldier friend.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there is in committee a bill by Representative CANNON dealing with old-age pensions. A majority of the Members of the Congress in their campaign for election promised to do something to improve the pension conditions for the aged, the blind, and the disabled of our country. I ask that this bill come to the floor of the Congress and come soon. I am not asking for a gag rule. Put all the amendments on it you want, but let us see that we do something for these people and do it now.

WAGE INCREASES

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. DOUGLAS of California addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COAL-MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FLOOD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY TO VETERANS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, when this House decreed that returning war veterans were entitled to preference in the purchase of surplus Government property, it was not merely rendering lip service to the veterans. We meant what we said. The day before yesterday I visited the office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in Brooklyn and found that, while since July 1 they had received almost 25,000 applications from discharged war veterans seeking to buy surplus Government property—at the rate of 250 a day—only 200 of these veterans have been successful in purchasing any property. I found that only 200 items of surplus property have been sold to Brooklyn veterans during that period. I mean to get to the bottom of this disgraceful situation and ascertain why it is that the veterans all over the country, and if not all over the country, then why the veterans in Brooklyn, a community which gave more men and women to the armed forces than 38 of the States of the Union, are being discriminated against in this regard.

Why is it that the Surplus Property Administration distributes tons of press releases, statements, and booklets painting in glowing terms the dubious rights of veterans in the acquisition of surplus property when a veteran in New Yerk City is unable to purchase even at the Government's price practically a single

item—no automobiles, no trucks, no medical or dental equipment, no photographic supplies, no building materials, no typewriters; only, as Janice Pollack said in yesterday's Daily Mirror, crushed chicken-feather pillows, camouflage shrimp nets, airport boundary markers, and prison style sinks that no one wants?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONKMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an address delivered by the Honorable Robert Hale, of Portland, Maine, on Navy Day.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include some excerpts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

RETURNING OUR VETERANS TO THEIR HOMES

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith a portion of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, last night the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was criticized over the radio at 10 o'clock p. m. for not bringing certain legislation to the floor of the House. To be specific, the full-employment bill. I want to say for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], chairman of the committee, and the members of that committee, they came in 2 weeks before the Congress convened regularly after the vacation. They have been in session practically all the time, doing hard work in holding hearings, and any criticism of that committee is as unjust as it can possibly be. The committee has worked hard. Yesterday they went into session at 10 o'clock and did not get through until half past 5 last night. They will probably do the same today; they were holding hearings all morning. They have been giving as much time to the legislation that has been requested to be brought to the floor as any committee I know of since I have been associated with this House in 10 years. They deserve the praise of the people of this country rather than any criticism that might be meted out to them by anybody regardless of how high in the office of Government the criticism may come from, from the President down to the doorman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the President of the Philippines and a speech by General Wainwright.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a renunciation of anti-Semitism by Robert Ley, and an editorial from the Washington Post pertaining to it.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from an article by Mr. Barnet Nover.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some letters.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorial comment.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have permission to sit this afternoon during the general debate on the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what committee is it?

Mr. COCHRAN. That the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that agreeable to both sides?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes. The Secretary of the Treasury was present and he is going to return this afternoon. All members did not have a chance to ask him questions.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, that is just what I was talking about a few moments ago. That committee sat all day yesterday and they want to sit today. They are doing a great job in trying to bring forth a bill such as the people of this country would be glad to receive. I think the House should grant them the permission, because of the unjust criticism they received last night on the radio.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if the committee sits this afternoon, the gentleman and I have been over there most of the time, can the gentleman make some arrangement to have some of the sponsors of the bill and some of the administration supporters, who are members of that committee, present?

Mr. COCHRAN. I think most of the members of the committee have been present, but I think we would get along a great deal faster if the gentleman from Michigan would not take up so much time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you do not want any inquiries made with reference to the merits of the bill, that is all right, but all you have done so far is to bring in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] and let them make their statements, and you want us to swallow them. We do not want to do it. We choke on that stuff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the regular business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the President failed to catch any fish down at Reelfoot Lake or whether someone trimmed him on one of the visits he made to the county fairs, but, in any event, evidently not feeling very well, he took occasion last night to scold two committees of this House because they have not jumped through the hoops he sent up. As far as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is concerned, we have been holding hearings, all right, and listening to the administration big shots.

I wish to call this fact to your attention: That bill which the President last night said was necessary to reconversion does not provide for a single thing, not one thing, which the President of the United States cannot do now if he wants to. So, instead of shoving the problem off on us, if he wants to give union politicians something for the purpose of making a political alliance, instead of devoting his time and energies to a solution of the strike situation, that is all right with me. Let him go ahead, but

do not blame us about the delay and confusion. He cannot send up anything he wants to and which he thinks is good in a special message.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by Mr. Wilson, of General Motors, to Mr. Reuther, of the CIO.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Secretary Vinson, made before the House Committee on Expenditures in support of the full-employment bill.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles that appeared in the New York Times.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT OWE YOU A JOB

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts from Economic Outlook, the publication of the CIO.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MOLASSES FOR CATTLE FEED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, molasses can be used for mixing dairy feeds as well as for producing alcohol. During the war the Government purchased practically all the imported molasses for the purpose of manufacturing alcohol. This policy I understand is to continue through the balance of 1945 and 1946. I have appealed to the Secretary of Agriculture, our former colleague, Mr. Anderson, to step in and provide for the distribution of sufficient molasses to make enough dairy feed for all the cows in my district and up-State New York, because I have a very friendly feeling for the people of the big cities in the Northeast and want to see them have sufficient milk and dairy products this next year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

RADIO STATIONS IN ICELAND

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a bad situation has been called to my attention in the War Department. In Iceland they are building three radio transmitting stations at large cost with a lot of troops who ought to be home, even though the right to use these stations has been revoked. To furnish electricity to operate those three stations in Iceland they are building a 500-kilowatt power plant at the cost of half a million dollars. Why do they not bring those 200 men home from Iceland and Greenland?

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNRRA

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 368 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 183]

Adams	Doughton, N. C.	O'Konski
Andersen, H. Carl	Eberharter	Peterson, Fla.
Andresen, August H.	Fellows	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Fernandez	Ploeser
Barrett, Pa.	Flannagan	Plumley
Barry	Gibson	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Gillespie	Robsion, Ky.
Boykin	Gillie	Roe, Md.
Bradley, Mich.	Gore	Russell
Brehm	Granahan	Sabath
Buckley	Griffiths	Simpson, Pa.
Bunker	Hand	Snyder
Byrne, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	Starkey
Campbell	Hope	Sumners, Tex.
Cannon, Mo.	Jarman	Taylor
Carlson	Keefe	Thomas, Tex.
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Thomason
Case, S. Dak.	Kilburn	Wadsworth
Celler	King	Weiss
Cunningham	Landis	West
Curley	Merrow	White
Dawson	Morgan	Winter
Dickstein	Morrison	Wolcott
Dingell	Mott	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Mundt	
	Norton	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 349 Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] 30 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 266 which provides additional appropriations for the United Nations Relief in the amount of $550,000,000. The United States has already appropriated $800,000,000 for relief from foreign nations, making a total of $1,350,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, yet to be borrowed. This is an open rule providing for amendments and proposes 3 hours of general debate.

We, under agreement have committed ourselves to this stupendous sum. We must keep our contracts, but zealously guard ourselves against future one-sided agreements. Under UNRRA as you well know, the United States provides $1,350,000,000 and Russia $1,750,000. Yes; we are giving approximately a thousand times more than Russia, also a powerful nation.

Mr. Speaker, for many months, I have patiently awaited the time when this administration would at least temporarily forget about the problems of foreign nations and confine itself to the momentous job before Congress having to do with our own domestic policy.

Never in all the history of our country has there been such confusion in our land.

We hear much about the necessity of reconversion. Has this administration done anything about it?

We hear a great deal about bringing our heroic soldiers and sailors home. Will any dispute that there has been considerable unjustifiable delay?

We have heard from the New Deal publicity agents the laudable objectives of reorganization and consolidation of our governmental departments. Will any insist there are less civilians on the Federal pay roll than there was 6 months ago?

Mr. Speaker, there is not any intelligent American who will deny that this administration has attempted through time and money to solve the problems of foreign nations. However, most agree very little has been done to solve the problems of our own people. We are faced with strikes, price control, lack of a concrete program for reconversion of industry which will give millions jobs and the never-ending necessity of selling more bonds to finance the Federal Government. Will any say that these problems of our own people have been even minutely solved? Will anyone declare that President Truman has even attempted to mitigate these emergencies? For 12 long years we have had emergency after emergency. Young men and

women, now becoming of age have never lived a normal American life. Nothing but emergency after emergency.

It may be oversimplification to point out the absence of national programs looking to definite recommendations and definite actions on the part of President Truman, with respect to our own national affairs. I doubt if history could reveal and never in my long service in this House has the United States been governed in such a haphazard manner. The executive department has not enunciated any fixed course of action, in respect to our domestic policy. Our foreign policy is very complicated. Lend-lease, Palestine, UNRRA, China, Poland, the Balkans, are serious problems which are not easy to comprehend. Many wonder, if these foreign problems are being handled wisely by this administration, when they well know nothing is being done about our domestic policy. Our country today, Mr. Speaker, with its vast resources of land, labor, finance, industry, commerce, and transportation, is suffering the results of being maladministered and governed by a cracker-barrelled administration playing cracker-barrelled politics close to the executive department. Day after day, I have closely studied the list of Presidential callers carried in the Washington Post. I would ask you if you ever noted an outstanding authority on agriculture, small business, industry, or finance included in that list? Could those listed callers possibly be helpful in the solving of our many problems? I am convinced that the White House will not solve them but we, the Congress, must do so. Are not our people looking to Washington for the solution that never comes? Are they not entitled to immediate relief instead of continuous bungling?

Mr. Speaker, how long will this administration continue to bungle? When will our people be able to return to a normal life? The time requires a statement of fact, by the President of the United States. Can we expect it? If not, the solution of our problems will come through an enlightened public opinion. The people are demanding an efficient and considerate administration. Let President Truman act. The Constitution of the United States provides that the President of the United States shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient. Let him come out now, and give us some concrete and constructive recommendations to solve the many problems before us, not a few general statements, leaping or skipping from one subject to another, or veering irregularly from one problem to another. We heard his message last evening—a message that was not clear, concise, factual, in platting the course of national interests, but filled with the hope that something, somehow, somewhere, will eventually happen.

I am going to follow the recommendations of this administration and vote for this resolution today, which intends to solve the problems of foreign people. Am I unreasonable when I vigorously urge that this administration bring forth some legislation designed to solve the problems of our own people?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, whatever doubts we may have entertained as to the position of the President and his administration, pertaining to labor disputes, were set at rest last evening by the President himself. This is definitely a labor government, and there can no longer be any doubt that the President proposes to give labor all that they ask for, and perhaps more.

It is, of course, the President's right to criticize the Congress and the committees of Congress, if he chooses to do so. However, we also have certain rights, one of which is to analyze what the President said.

When the President, some weeks ago, sent a message to Congress urging the passage of the bill to increase unemployment compensation benefits up to $25 per week, and extend the period for drawing such benefits up to 26 weeks he was following his constitutional rights, if not sound economics.

Surely, the President must know that the operation of the unemployment compensation law, as it now stands, is being badly abused and that many, who should be working, are refusing jobs because they can make almost as much by remaining idle. The President should know that the law, as it now is operating, places a premium on loafing and to further liberalize it would merely prolong the loafing period.

The Ways and Means Committee, which he singled out for attack, heard a number of Government officials in support of the bill and if any criticism is due, it should be charged to the failure of the Ways and Means Committee to also hear the public, who will have to pay the bill.

If the President wants to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor and purchase his reelection at the expense of the public, the onus for doing so must rest upon him.

A majority of the committee, after having heard several Government witnesses, came to the conclusion that the bill which he plead for so fervently last evening would promote unemployment and unnecessarily prolong the period of reconversion.

As for what he said with reference to the full-employment bill, I will leave that to the members of the committee having the measure in charge.

When the President of the United States comes out and advocates an increase in pay all along the line and in the same breath refuses to allow such increases to be incorporated into the production cost, saying that to do so would promote inflation, he is simply indulging in political gymnastics and if he carries that policy into effect it may result in a shut-down all along the line because the American people are not used to doing business for the fun of it.

In effect, the President, in his radio talk last evening, dealt the profit incentive a blow below the belt and I am sure that there are hundreds of thousands of members of organized labor who, deep down in their hearts, feel the same way about it.

No fair-minded individual will question the need for bringing about a proper balance between wages and cost of living. That is not debatable. But when he says that the employer and the small businessman must absorb the cost he is playing with fire and he should know it.

The President was not well advised in the preparation of his radio address of last evening. It was unsound economically, and inflammatory politically. Any high-school boy could have told him that an increase in wages must be added to the selling price of the finished product and to be paid for by the consumer.

The economy of the country is hanging in the balance today, thanks to the vacillating and do-nothing labor policy of this administration. Whatever efforts it has put forth to compose differences between labor and management have been ineffective and abortive. I contrast the labor record of the Truman administration with that of Governor Dewey, of New York, who recently settled a serious strike in New York City almost overnight. Governor Kelly, of Michigan, was equally successful in settling a strike of considerable magnitude some days back. I would suggest to President Truman that he take a leaf out of the books of Governor Dewey and Governor Kelly on how to settle strikes. He could do so with great profit to the country and to himself.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The labor trouble that the gentleman refers to in Michigan had to do with the electric power companies of that State. Things had reached a stage where it was apparent to everybody that if that situation were carried further than it had already gotten it would have tied up everything in the State. I think Governor Kelly is to be congratulated upon the celerity and the firmness with which he handled that situation.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has spoken of the President's implied criticism of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments because of delay, allegedly. I am very eager, for the President and the public to know that his own Cabinet members have delayed coming to that committee until the last few days. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Vinson, delayed until today. The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Wallace, delayed coming to testify until yesterday. Other members of his Cabinet have delayed their coming. They themselves have delayed day after day in coming to the committee after invitations from the chairman of the committee to present themselves.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was told that by the chairman of the gentleman's committee only this morning. The delay is altogether due to the failure of administration officials to come up here and testify. That is true, all of which goes to prove that what the President said last night was nothing but pure, unadulterated sophistry.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inquire if the gentleman is expressing his own opinion or that of the Republican Party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would be glad to reply to the gentleman if he will get me more time.

Mr. BAILEY. I cannot give the gentleman any time, but I certainly would like to know that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sorry lack of time will not permit of my answering the gentleman's question. It would delight me to give him information he now so sadly lacks.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sorry spectacle that we witness here on a day when we gather to serve the people of the world looking to the generosity of America through UNRRA, people in starvation, children in rags, the winter's cold even now upon some of them. Yet, we stand here and hear a political speech, politics in its worst form, on an occasion poorly selected. I would not like to stoop to that. I am surprised that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota in his high-ranking position on the Committee on Ways and Means could find no better occasion on which to step into the role that he took this morning.

Mr. CHURCH rose.

Mr. RABAUT. I am not going to yield.

Yes, we are here to serve the purpose of getting this rule before us in the quickest time possible, and for the further purpose of being of assistance with the generous heart of America.

The other day I referred to UNRRA as a glorified, temporary Red Cross, the American Red Cross.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I will not yield.

Yet here we set it aside, the common mother of charity, beloved in this country, on a glorified scale for the relief of the people of the world and yet we set it aside for the purpose of delving into politics.

Last week we had in this hall an amendment on a recent bill, wherein we grabbed $30,000,000 for the United States Employment Service, did not know where we got it, not a syllable of hearings on it, not a word of testimony, and it had solid support across the aisle from the front to the back seats. Since that day we have had Mr. Altmeyer before us in the committee. He says under section 3 of the original act they were permitted to have the top figure of $80,000,000. With this $30,000,000, you are now up to a total of eighty-seven-million-and-some-odd dollars. So I was correct last week when I told the House they just grabbed it out of the air because now the figure is $87,000,000 plus. So it was true. On top of that you have the returning veterans, whom we are anxious to serve. USES have the largest amount of work that has ever been before them due to the conversion program. The testimony before us is that the monthly job for September was eight times the average monthly job for the whole of last year. This morning the opposition talks about bungling. They talk about chaos. Who is creating chaos? Let the answer fall where it will.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the Republicans for playing politics when they want to. We all play politics. But who encouraged the scorched-earth policy over there, and encouraged little peoples of Europe when they broke their dams? We did. Who of the great human race of men with hearts and souls would today let them down? It is all right to play politics, but shame on you boys when you play politics with the whited bones of the dead and the shriveled skins of the hungry. Our European allies are putting us on the spot now when they declare we should release the full knowledge of the atomic bomb to the world, and they leave us in a diplomatic hole. So let us be careful that we do not again become regarded as the polecat of nations merely because of a little hometown politics.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that often we forget the subject at hand and engage in political discussion when an important measure is before the House. I could not help but notice that the gentleman from Michigan, of whom I am very fond, attacked a Member of the minority because, in his discussion of the affairs of the day, he referred to the very timely subject of the President's address to the Nation last night and the President's criticism of the legislative branch of the Government. Seemingly, the gentleman from Michigan believed the gentleman from Minnesota was out of order in discussing that address, and accused him of talking politics. Then, immediately the gentleman from Michigan turned around and engaged in what I would term an old-fashioned political harangue. Seemingly, it depends upon whose ox is gored.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, the gentleman does not expect consistency on the part of any New Dealer?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not wish to engage in personalities.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not engaging in personalities when I make that remark. I am merely making an observation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I noted that there was an inconsistency in the gentleman from Michigan's position, and for that reason called it to the attention of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Might it not also be a pretty good time to suggest that while the purposes of UNRRA are approved, and while many of us on this side of the aisle expect to support it, we had better begin to understand that America can only feed the world if America is strong at home. We all know what happens to a family when the chief provider dies. So I am not so sure but what in this consideration it might be well if, incidental to it, we began to think about some of the things on the home front that must be accomplished if we are going to discharge our obligations to UNRRA and to the world, the thing about which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] talked. I just wish that on occasion the gentleman would stand up with some of the rest of us to strengthen the country at home and make it possible for us to do something through UNRRA.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wish to thank the gentleman from Indiana for his contribution. Certainly his remarks are very germane to this discussion.

Mr. HALLECK. I had not expected to take any time on this proposition, but I hope, while he has time, the gentleman will explain to us by what sort of world operation UNRRA, to which we are the principal contributor, pours its money and its goods, our money and our goods, into nations that we seek to help, when at the very time the goods and property, yes, the capacity, of some of those nations to rebuild for themselves, is being siphoned off by other nations out of demands made against them. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] might well pay attention to that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Now, gentlemen, my time is running out and I cannot yield further.

This rule makes in order House Joint Resolution 266, which provides for the appropriation of an additional $550,000,000 for the purposes of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. As we all recall, the original Enabling Act or authorization was for $1,350,000,000 as the contribution for the United States' portion of the UNRRA operations. That obligation has been made. Eight hundred million dollars have thus for been paid by our Government on that obligation. There has been a great deal of criticism, and I believe rightly so, of the manner in which UNRRA has been administered. There has been much evidence of waste and extravagance; waste and extravagance which has been entirely unnecessary, and has seriously interfered with carrying out the intent and purpose of the legislation. Certainly, money that is wasted, goods that have not been properly distributed, food that never reaches the hungry, do not help the cold and starving. The American people are not pleased with the situation, as they see it now, in UNRRA. They do not know

what is going on. They realize, as most of us in Congress appreciate, that we have made an obligation to furnish an additional $550,000,000 for UNRRA, and that we are in the position where we will have to make that contribution of more than a half billion dollars in order to keep our word good before the nations of the world. Yet we are not satisfied with that which has been going on. We do not know the full story. The people are not properly informed as to how the money, the food, and the supplies they have furnished under UNRRA, are being used or distributed. For that reason, at the proper place and at the proper time when this resolution is before the House for amendment, I intend to offer the following amendment:

Provided, For the purpose of keeping the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished various countries and peoples by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, that none of the funds appropriated hereby, or none of the commodities, supplies, materials, or services purchased or obtained through the expenditures of funds provided herein, shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal, or economic—to obtaining, dispatching, and disseminating the news, or discriminates in rates and charges for use of such news collecting and dispatching facilities, against the representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, any news representatives of the press and radio of the United States may dispatch from such country.

This amendment is rather plain. I believe every one of my listeners can understand the full meaning of it. It means simply that if a country is to receive our largesse that the proper accredited representatives of the press and radio of the United States must be given fress access to the news, as to what is going on in connection with UNRRA, and must be permitted to dispatch that news to the people of the United States without discrimination of any kind, and that the communication facilities of each recipient country shall be made available for that purpose. Certainly no nation, no country, no government which is receiving this aid for the starving people, as we term them here, of that country or nation can possibly object to letting the American people know just how relief and aid is being distributed and used therein. Certainly there can be no objection to having the representatives of the American press and radio see for themselves and report back to the people of America as to how the money and food which they have supplied and given is being used or distributed in the countries which receive it; and for what purpose it is being used.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Briefly.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Most of this money as shown by the hearings is going into three Communist countries, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, and you have not the ghost of a chance of getting a newspaper correspondent in there to find out how this relief is being used.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps it may help; but again I want to say there can be no legitimate or honest objection to permitting the people of the United States to know how the money they are spending, or the food they are furnishing, is being used in these countries. I shall press for the adoption of this amendment and hope that I may have the united support of all Members of the House who believe in a free press and in the right of the American people to know the truth.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman believe that if someone is starving, a mother or children, in any of these countries, we must say to this mother or to these children that we cannot give relief, although we are able to give it because your country is——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I anticipate the gentleman's question, and I want to say to him that if there is any country on the face of the earth which would rather censor news, or would rather refuse to let the American people know what is going on in that country, than to have their own hungry people fed, then the responsibility rests with that government and with that nation, and not with us, or the people we represent. Surely the gentleman from New York cannot take the position it is either the duty or responsibility of the American people to furnish the great proportion of the money and supplies to feed the hungry and to relieve the suffering throughout the world, but that they shall not be permitted to learn or to know whether such funds or supplies are actually used for the purposes for which we furnish them. To my mind such a position is untenable. It cannot be sustained by any valid or logical argument.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which this rule makes in order is not a general appropriation measure; neither is it a general legislative measure. It is a hybrid. It contains an appropriation as well as legislation and therefore does not come within the provisions of the House rules obtaining in the consideration of general appropriation bills.

There will be 3 hours of general debate, at the conclusion of which time the resolution will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. All germane amendments will be in order. The majority leader has indicated that general debate will be concluded today and that the resolution will be taken up for amendment tomorrow.

I have just listened to the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] which places limitations upon the expenditure of the money appropriated for UNRRA. In this circumstance, the amendment would be germane. I cannot conceive of anyone opposing the purpose of the Brown amendment and, if it is germane to the resolution, then it should be adopted, and I shall support it.

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was established pursuant to an agreement concluded by the United Nations and associated governments on November 9, 1943. The United States became a party to this agreement and the Congress accepted the terms thereof through the enactment of Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, which was approved on March 28, 1944. The UNRRA Council, which is the governing body of the Administration and on which each signatory government has a member, recommended that each member nation whose area had not been occupied by the enemy contribute to the operating expenses an amount equal to 1 percent of its national income for 1943. This was computed to be $1,350,000,000 in the case of the United States and was authorized to be appropriated by Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress. Countries whose territory had been occupied by the enemy were requested to contribute only to the administrative expenses.

The UNRRA Participation Act, 1945, made available to the President for meeting partially the obligations of the United States a total of $800,000,000, of which $450,000,000 was a direct appropriation and the remaining $350,000,000 consisted of authority to transfer to UNRRA supplies, services, or funds available under the Lend-Lease Act. Under this transfer authority, supplies and services have been made available in the amount of $150,000,000 and funds in the amount of $200,000,000. Of the cash which was made available to UNRRA from the United States contribution, over $650,000,000, all but $20,000,000 had been committed on October 21, 1945.

Therefore, $550,000,000 of the original authorization of $1,350,000,000 remains unappropriated and unprovided. This resolution makes this $550,000,000 available to UNRRA to liquidate the original authorization. In short, that is in substance this proposed legislation.

Stating it another way, our country has, by law and contract, obligated itself in the amount of $1,350,000,000 and if we are to comply with that law and contract then we are at least morally bound to pay the $550,000,000 still due.

Mr. Speaker, there has undoubtedly been waste, inefficiency, extravagance, and improper management on the part of the administrators of UNRRA; yet these shortcomings should not preclude our country from fulfilling its obligation and living up to its contract. A number of Members of Congress have visited Europe within the last few months. Some of them have made investigations and given special study to charges of what is happening so far as the administration of UNRRA in Europe is concerned. These Members do not agree as to the

details. They do agree, however, as to the condition in which Europe finds itself as the winter approaches. They do agree that there is to be suffering, distress, and even starvation in some of those countries unless relief is received from the United States. Again, we are confronted with a condition and not with a theory. First, there is the legal obligation under the law and under our contract. Second, there is an obligation rising from typical American instincts of humanity. Now, the amount provided for in this resolution will not solve the problem, but it will help, and regardless of any irregularities in carrying out the terms of the UNRRA pact, I shall support the resolution.

A frank discussion and airing in this debate of UNRRA procedure will be most helpful to better administration in the future. Uncle Sam is not Santa Claus. Every dollar here appropriated comes from an empty Treasury, which means that more bonds must be sold to our people for the express purpose of relieving the suffering of humanity elsewhere. I agree with those who insist that unlimited spending is bound to ruin our country, and very careful scrutiny must be given to additional legislation before new contracts are entered into and new obligations created.

Mr. Speaker, self-preservation is the first law of nature. We cannot help our allies and our friends by pulling ourselves down to their level. We can be of assistance only by keeping strong economically, morally, and spiritually at home, and by example and financial aid, within our means.

I know of no group of our citizens which is opposed to this resolution. I do not say that there are no such groups or persons but I do say I have not heard from any of them. On the other hand, I have received many letters, resolutions, and petitions from residents of my district urging that I support this appropriation. I am glad to do this; but I want to give notice now that the United States cannot continue indefinitely to finance the rest of the world. UNRRA was intended to furnish relief only. It is not intended to furnish the finances whereby overrun and devastated countries are to be rehabilitated. Congress, in its wisdom, has provided other agencies through which any such help may be given.

Mr. Speaker, we all realize that within a few weeks there will be another resolution here urging more appropriation for UNRRA possibly another $1,350,000,000. I do not believe that the Congress should commit itself at this time on any such proposal. An opportunity will be given, however, to Governor Lehman and his staff directing UNRRA to demonstrate that these million of dollars given by our people have been wisely and justly dispersed and where the necessities demanded.

When we recall that there are now 8,000 employees administering UNNRA, that there are 1,300 plus operating in the city of Washington alone, with 900 plus in London and hundreds more scattered throughout Europe, we cannot escape the conclusion that there should be more inquiry and more rigid limitations and regulations placed by the Congress upon this army of administrators. Too much money is going out of the Treasury of the United States and not reaching the needy in the form of food, clothing, heat, and the other things intended.

Mr. Speaker, generous Uncle Sam is contributing 72 percent of all the money implementing the UNRRA international agreement. We furnish most of the money even though this is deficit spending, and before additional appropriations are authorized this whole operation must be carefully screened to the end that relief dollars reach the needy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be no controversy about the adoption of this rule. We have, therefore, not thought it necessary to make any arguments in its behalf. Everyone is agreed that the rule should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 266.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee submits to the House a bill to discharge not only our obligation to humanity but our commitments to the other Allied Nations of the world.

In doing so, may I also say that the recent criticism in the press to the effect that there has been any delay in the submission of this proposition to the House is without foundation.

The Committee on Appropriations has a very crowded schedule. We met on September 5 with the obligation of proceeding immediately to the reclaiming of all war appropriations which had not been committed. It was a long and tedious task and had to be completed without unnecessary delay. We had to retrieve the money while the money was still there to be retrieved. The result was that when this estimate was received, perhaps 2 weeks after the House convened, we were in the midst of hearings on the rescission bill and could not delay or discontinue them and could not take up this bill until the rescission bill had been completed. But the UNRRA estimate had first priority on our agenda, and we have taken it up as the first major item following the disposition of the rescission bill.

In other words, it has been taken up at the earliest possible moment. It could not have been reached any sooner. We have given it priority over every other pending estimate before the committee.

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was established pursuant to an agreement concluded by the United Nations and associate governments, 44 in all, on November 5, 1943. The United States became a party to this agreement and the Congress accepted the terms thereof through the enactment of Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944.

There are those who contend that at this late date, regardless of any agreements we may have made with the nations of the world, that we should withdraw and refuse to participate further. That was the theory of Kaiser Wilhelm, of Germany, under which he repudiated his treaty of obligations and precipitated the First World War. He said, "What are treaties? They are mere scraps of paper." Adolf Hitler, in his Mein Kampf, said that international agreements are made to be kept only as long as it was to the interest of the contracting nations to keep them, and when it is no longer to the interest of the nation to comply with the terms of such agreements they were to be discarded without ceremony or compunction. I am certain there is no one today, and certainly no one in the American Congress, who would have the United States adopt a policy or philosophy of that character.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We were solemnly assured at the time this was voted that it was not a treaty, and that was the reason it was not ratified by a vote of two-thirds of the Senate. This Congress cannot bind itself in the future by an authorization in this matter.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I cite to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois the report recently issued by the Republican conference. This is the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee report to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, October 29, 1945.

I read from page 2, under "Recommendations":

> The $550,000,000 remaining to complete the current contribution of the United States toward UNRRA's operating expenses should be made available immediately.
>
> This is a national obligation. It is unthinkable that the United States should now default on the commitments it has made to UNRRA and which UNRRA in turn has made, in reliance upon us, to the people of the liberated countries of Europe.

I regret that the gentlewoman is out of step with this very authoritative committee appointed to make a specific study of this question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am usually out of step when the Republican

Party acts as a stalking horse for the New Deal.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the statement read from the Republican Food Committee's report. I can realize the force of the fact that we have some commitment to continue UNRRA, but I think also we have an obligation to clear up, if we can, some of the inefficiency and mismanagement in the organization. I think the gentleman would agree with me as to that.

I would like to ask the gentleman several questions, if I may, along that line. First, I should like to know if it is not a a fact that the administration of UNRRA comes chiefly from the London office.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On the contrary, all nations participate. Of course, the British representatives participate along with those of every other constituent nation. The fact that there is no undue influence exerted in London is indicated by the statement made on the floor by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] a couple of days ago.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let us have some official data. I have asked a question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; and I am answering it. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] said here on the floor yesterday——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is not UNRRA operated out of London? Yes or no?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What does the gentleman mean by "operated"?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am talking about the whole set-up. Is the real physical part of UNRRA managed out of London or Washington? Which is it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Out of Washington. The international headquarters are in Washington.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Director is here, but where is the work done?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Administration is from Washington. Of course, the work in detail is carried on through numerous agencies and in various localities. Mr. ROBERTSON, of the gentleman's own party, said——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Missouri knows, and we are entitled to a frank answer.

Now I should like to ask a second question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let me answer the gentleman's first question before he asks a second.

This is what the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON], who has had extraordinary opportunities to see UNRRA in operation at first hand, said in a notable speech on the floor October 30, 1945:

> Frequently the statement is made to me that the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration has got out of our hands and is too largely in the hands of the British. I should like to say to you that I should like to be able to obtain the same caliber of intelligence in any business organization in America. I have met no finer people in the world than those who have taken their place in UNRRA for Britain.

He could not have said that if they had attempted to monopolize or otherwise usurp control of UNRRA's work. I hope every Member of the House will read Mr. ROBERTSON'S speech. It is one of the finest tributes to UNRRA and its efficient administration I have read, and it is by a man who has just returned from abroad and knows whereof he speaks from first-hand observation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not quarreling with what the gentleman said. I would like for the sake of the RECORD and to establish the facts, to read the names of the top 12 representatives who really manage the affairs of UNRRA. I would like to do so for the information of the Members. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall be glad to answer any questions the gentleman has, but if he wishes to make a speech he can do that on his own time. You have as much time on that side as we have on this side.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to read the personnel so that the gentleman can answer whether this is correct or not.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not know what the gentleman is reading. I am not familiar with it. I shall be glad to answer any questions that he might like to ask, but I suggest that if he wishes to make a speech he secure the floor on his own time and include anything that he wishes to include.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am sorry that the gentleman from Missouri takes that position. As one who is going to vote for this legislation because I realize the dreadful existing situation. I do want to clear up in my mind some of the things that need correction.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will answer any question that the gentleman asks, but if the gentleman wishes to insert anything in the RECORD, I suggest that he do so on his own time, when he can include it in full. All the time is taken on this side.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The whole objective of my inquiries and resolutions is to see every dollar possible go to those starving millions of people abroad. I am trying to stimulate greater efficiency through my questions.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to say that is being done and being done very efficiently. Naturally, there is criticism of UNRRA. There has been criticism of everything and everybody connected with the war. That is inevitable. That is to be expected. And some of the criticism may have been justified. It would be extraordinary if that were not true. UNRRA has doubtlessly made mistakes. Undoubtedly, in its early days when its numerous and complicated problems were new and when experienced personnel was difficult to obtain, before a systematic routine had been adjusted, there were errors of judgment and, no doubt, there was waste.

But UNRRA was not unique in that respect. Every other wartime agency had the same experience, including every agency operated by American officers or civilians without exception. And I am convinced that there is no other organization or agency recruited under such circumstances which could have taken this stupendous task and handled it 100 percent perfect.

The important thing now is not whether or not it has made mistakes. Any similar organization would have made mistakes—and did make mistakes. The question is whether those mistakes have been corrected. Again, I want to quote the testimony of a distinguished gentleman from the other side of the aisle. Permit me to read from the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who likewise has recently returned from Europe where he made a particular study of UNRRA. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] says:

> On the whole, I certify that the arrangement is working well and that many of the valid and serious criticisms which were directed at UNRRA 6 months ago are no longer valid.

That is a statement by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who testified after he had personally visited UNRRA offices and missions that UNRRA is today doing an efficient job? I trust that the testimony of these two distinguished members of the party of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] satisfactorily answers his question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman several other questions, if I may.

First, as to the black markets that have been found in UNRRA, resulting from pilfering from UNRRA. Did the gentleman's committee find any evidence of that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We went very carefully into that matter. There was evidence to the effect that there had been black markets in UNRRA. As we know, there have been black markets throughout Europe, in all organizations and jurisdictions, not excepting the United States Army. The most extensive black markets in the world have flourished on goods from the commissaries of the United States armies, officered as they were by the most efficient leadership to be found in the Nation. Again, UNRRA was no exception to the rule. It would be unreasonable to suppose or to expect it would be.

But again I call that attention of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts to the fact that it has been corrected. And this notwithstanding the fact that this afternoon's Washington Star carried a report of a huge black market unearthed yesterday in Tokyo in stolen military supplies valued at millions of dollars. How does the gentleman expect a hastily recruited organization like UNRRA to escape the black market when the efficient leadership of the United States Army has been unable to avoid it? But UNRRA is eliminating it, whereas the American army of occupation is just uncovering the most extensive markets yet discovered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am glad to have that assurance. Morris

Edhman, who is a member of the British Parliament, recently stated there had been at least 20-percent waste in the pilfering of goods that went into the black market in Greece alone.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the mere statement of one partisan speaking in the House of Commons, just as a partisan might rise here and make any unsupported criticism. I do not doubt there was a black market in Greece, just as there was in every other military and civilian organization in that unhappy country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Was there not a Federal investigation of the black market in France? Has that report been submitted to your committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is the gentleman referring to the French black market in the United States Army?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am referring to UNRRA.

Mr. O'NEAL. UNRRA has not been in France, or was not at the time the report was made. There are 1,136 employees in the Washington office. Of those 1,136, there are 983 of them Americans and only 16 Britishers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was talking about the London office, where the actual work is done. I realize that this bureau downtown is about four times overmanned. There are a lot of people down there who should be eliminated, but I am now talking about the people who are actually doing the work in London.

Mr. O'NEAL. If the gentleman can back up his assertion, I would like to have him back it up. The fact is that the countries of the world are working together, and all of them are satisfied as to this set-up, because they have put their money into it, and they are not complaining about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, the gentleman knows that we are putting up at least 72 percent of the money.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is just the point. We have not put it up. Every other major nation has already paid in its full contribution. The United States is the only nation which has not paid in its full share. The purpose of this bill is to appropriate the rest of the money due from the United States. And when we do put it up we will put up no more than our equitable share—the amount we have agreed.

Mr. RABAUT. And with reference to this talk concerning the black market, I think it should be brought out that whatever black market did exist, there has been no personnel connected with UNRRA attached to any of that black-market operation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask one more question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. With reference to the displaced persons abroad, I understand that work is practically concluded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The larger part of it has been concluded. It is not entirely completed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the personnel is not being dropped. As a leader of the economy bloc in the House, I call attention to the report that has reached me to the effect there are about 1,000 people over there who are not needed, but they are still on the pay roll. I know that has not been called to the attention of the gentleman from Missouri, or he would have corrected it, and I hope now he can correct the situation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are assured by representatives of UNRRA, who are in a position to speak from knowledge, that their personnel is being daily readjusted, and is under constant scrutiny and supervision, and that every effort was being made to maintain a compact and effective organization. If the gentleman has anything to the contrary he should let the House have the advantage of it.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman has made very substantial reference to a document of the Republican Food Study Committee. I believe the RECORD should show that that document is not an official document of the committee. It was never considered by the committee as a group or ratified by the Republican Food Study Committee; so it does not represent a document in that sense which has been passed on by that group on this side of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is a special committee officially appointed by the Republican delegation in the House of Representatives. It was made up without exception, of unusually able men, veterans here in the House; and they did an excellent piece of work. While it is my misfortune not to be able to completely agree with all their conclusions, I certainly do agree with their findings on this particular point, and inasmuch as it was submitted officially to the head of the minority party in the House, it speaks for itself.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I am just wondering if during the hearings the chairman sent for any of those persons who were in the London office of UNRRA or any of UNRRA's offices abroad to get their testimony? Those people resigned because they felt there were a lot of things going on they did not like by way of waste and such. I want to say to the gentleman that I expect to vote for the bill, but just like the gentleman from Massachusetts, I feel there are many things that should be cleaned up in the administration of UNRRA. Did any of these persons who resigned because they could not stand the way things were going on testify before your committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad that matter has been raised because it has been widely circulated by columnists over the radio that these men resigned because the American delegation was not permitted to have a free hand because it protested against practices of a subversive nature. That is not true. The only semblance of truth in these reports, according to testimony submitted to our committee, is that they did resign. Mr. Hendrickson of the Department of Agriculture was over there himself, met them and conferred with them, as well as Mr. Lehman, former Governor of New York, now head of UNRRA. Both Mr. Hendrickson and Governor Lehman testified that these men never at any time stated that they had resigned for any such reason. So these statements in the newspapers are not true with respect to the one essential fact to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman answer whether or not his committee did have any of these men before it?

Mr. BLOOM. Answering the gentleman from Illinois, may I not say, Mr. Chairman, that I intend introducing a resolution this week for the additional amount of money the President recommended for UNRRA; and I can assure every Member of this House that in the consideration of this resolution the hearings will be open hearings and anyone who wants to appear before the Committee on Foreign Affairs at that time, on either side, no matter whom he represents, may, and we shall be very glad to hear his testimony—and not in executive or secret session, either. So anyone with information against UNRRA or in favor of UNRRA may be heard, and if you will let the clerk of the committee know, we will be glad to send them notice in time for them to appear.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think it would be very good public policy for UNRRA to be very careful in acquiring commodities that are in the nonfood category, like tobacco, in carrying on its operations and that it should devote as much as possible of its funds to food which goes to the hungry children of these countries?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman realizes that the primary objective of UNRRA is not exclusively immediate relief, although that, of course, is essential and incidental. The primary purpose of UNRRA is to supply food, clothing, medicines, and equipment with a view to helping those people help themselves, to put themselves on their feet. The prime objective is regeneration and rehabilitation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that some contributing countries instead of allocating funds for UNRRA have allocated tobacco, for instance, instead of food? Is there not a tendency in our own country to try to use UNRRA as a dumping ground for certain tobaccos? I am not opposed to anyone using tobacco, but I think the average person would go without tobacco to feed his own children and I think most real Americans would go without it, if they have used it for a quarter of a century, to feed somebody else's children. We should give consideration to that because if we do not we are going to get out on a limb which will not be very popular with the people of this country. We are asking them to contribute $10 apiece to put in a pot at

this time. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman and I are in complete agreement on the subject and I am glad to say that these stories that have been so industriously circulated to the effect that tobacco and liquor and other commodities of that character have been bought with UNRRA funds are without foundation except insofar as UNRRA itself has requested them. For example, there were disseminated all over the country stories to the effect that elaborate dinners were given at which wine and other liquors flowed freely and that all of this was paid for out of UNRRA funds. Governor Lehman testified before our committee that there was no foundation for such statements. He said it was true that he gave dinners to foreign diplomats and to foreign representatives of UNRRA because they are a necessary adjunct to international negotiations. He said that he did give these dinners at which liquor was available to all who wished it, but that every cent required for the payment of such dinners and all liquors served came out of his own individual pocket.

Too much cannot be said in commendation of this great man who has made large personal sacrifices in order to accept the position as head of this complicated and exacting international organization. He is serving without salary; a man who served for years as Governor of New York; one of the most distinguished, one of the ablest, and one of the most experienced and efficient men in America. He is entitled to $15,000 a year as salary as Director General of UNRRA. He has not accepted one penny of it. He has contributed his time and his service and his money to this great philanthropic agency.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I did not say anything about anybody's dinner, I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I am trying to be constructive.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is always constructive and always helpful.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. So that the gentleman from Missouri will understand, I do not pick my facts out of the air. I say that in support of this legislation for the welfare of UNRRA as well as for the welfare of the starving people of this world, that we should not be led off on any tangents and become the dumping ground for the War Department, for example, because they have too many cigarettes, or any other department of Government, and that we should keep our eye on the ball and feed the hungry people of the world.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The participating nations may supply their quota in commodities as long as those commodities call within the categories of needed goods established by UNRRA. But UNRRA accepts nothing that is not up to standard and does not conform to the requirements. Contributing countries must either furnish goods needed for the rehabilitation of the distressed countries or they must pay the cash.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. I followed the discussion of the gentleman very carefully, and I just want to bring this matter to his attention. There has been considerable information to the effect that in certain areas labels are taken off the packages that are sent through by UNRRA, particularly in the Russian dominated part of Europe, the eastern as well as in the southern part of Europe, and that these parcels are then passed around to give the appearance that the Soviet Government is the benefactor for these unfortunate peoples. Does the gentleman not think it would be wise to have incorporated in this legislation a provision that none of this money should be used for political purposes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I can assure the gentleman that we have inquired very carefully into the use of UNRRA funds, and none of them are used for political purposes. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will, within the next few days, commence open hearings on the subject and if there is any indication of conditions to which the gentleman refers they will be investigated further if he will call the matter to the attention of any member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. I have read most of the record of the hearings, and I want to make the observation that Governor Lehman showed an astounding knowledge of the workings of this institution. It was a surprise to me that he had at his finger tips the wide knowledge that he has of the workings of this institution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And a deep and humanitarian interest in its success.

The UNRRA Council, which is made up of one member of each contributing nation, soon after its organization the Council recommended that each member nation whose area had not been occupied by the enemy should contribute to its operating expenses in an amount equal to 1 percent of its national income for 1943. This was agreed to and the recommendation was accepted and approved by the United States Congress. Under that agreement the United States Congress by Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, further authorized to be appropriated the amount computed as due from the United States at $1,350,000,000. Of that $1,350,000,000, the sum of $800,000,000 has been appropriated. The remaining $550,000,000 of the authorization has not yet been provided. The pending joint resolution appropriates the remaining amount authorized by act of Congress.

The Axis forces extended their despotic domination over 35 countries, largely in central Europe, and over half a billion people. Wherever the devastating footsteps of their armies moved, civilization and all the institutions that men hold dear withered and died. The elemental requirements of life itself vanished. And in the barren wake of their ruthless columns we find today a destitution beyond anything experienced in modern times.

In Italy, for example, infants are wrapped in rags or old newspapers. Only 47 out of every 100 born reach their first birthday. The entire population is on a subnormal diet. Unless we come to their aid at this hour, and the hour is growing late, millions must die this winter for lack of food and clothing.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who is particularly familiar with the situation.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Confirming what the gentleman has just said about the shortage of food in Italy and France, the wife of the American consul at Nice, which is in southern France, told me at a luncheon when I was there that she had recently gone into Italy, which is near that part of France, and bought some eggs at what she thought was a bargain price, and she had to pay $6 a dozen for them. I said, "Why don't you buy a hen and raise some eggs?" She said they had seen only one hen lately, and the price was $40. I think that shows that the poor people have a pretty hard chance of getting any food.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am very appreciative of the time the gentleman has already given me. I would not intrude at this moment except to clear up a point about which there was some discussion previously, not with the gentleman from Missouri but with the gentleman from Kentucky, who, I am sorry to say, has temporarily left the floor.

Information given me shows that from July 6, 1945, to about August 10, 1945, the criminal investigation department of the United States Army had four investigators at the UNRRA mobilization and training center at Granville, France. It was revealed, I am informed, there were huge black-market operations on the part of the base staff personnel. It is reported, at that time, at least 127 trucks were missing, and probably more, together with huge supplies of food and clothing. This report, I understand, has been made to Washington. As far as I can find out, this report is not available either to the committee or to anyone else. Those are facts that have come to me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not know how responsible the report of the gentleman is, but if every word of it is true it is nothing new. We concede and we have known that black markets were to be found not only in UNRRA but in the American Army and in every other organization of this kind abroad. When a nation is starving, the suppression of the black market is practically impossible. But Governor Lehman testified personally that both UNRRA and the United States Army were investigating

the situation at Granville and had taken disciplinary action. In other words the situation has been effectively remedied. However, where people are without sufficient food black markets constantly develop.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It ought not to be. People ought to have ordinary honesty and decency in the work of helping distressed huban beings.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Even in this country, where we have such plenty as we have never known before, there were black markets all over the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the gentleman does not condone it, does he?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly not. And I do not condone tuberculosis. But both black markets and tuberculosis develop when there is mass starvation. The very existence of many of the patrons of these black markets depends on their being able to buy surreptitiously. UNRRA has done a commendable work in eliminating the black market and substituting rationed food sufficient to sustain life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my distinguished chairman that the black-market goods were pilfered from UNRRA's trucks, for instance.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; that was true of the markets which bootlegged UNRRA supplies and was true on even a larger scale with supplies pilfered from United States Army trucks. If the United States Army, with its magnificent organization, was unable to cope with this constant pressure of hunger from all sides and protect its trucks, how could UNRRA with infinitely less authority and personnel expect to register a 100-percent record in protecting its trucks? Anybody that expects UNRRA to outorganize and outpolice the United States Army is expecting the impossible. They made a magnificent record under the circumstances.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman from Missouri will permit me to continue, the point I want to make is that the goods were pilfered and found their way into the black market. You could see them in almost every market place, for instance, at Athens and elsewhere. They were sold at such high prices under the pegged exchange that the distressed people got no benefit out of them whatsoever. You would have to be a millionaire under the conditions of their exchange to buy a Westmont ham or fancy Alaska red salmon and things of that sort. They were so very freely on display there.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; that was true of the supplies supplied by the American Army. The very same situation obtained. Here is what Governor Lehman says of it:

Both UNRRA and the United States Army have been much concerned over charges regarding diversion of UNRRA and Army supplies at the staging center at Granville, and both organizations have cooperated through extensive investigations which are not yet complete. To date, disciplinary action has been taken by the summary dismissal of one supervisory official, and another official has resigned. We are awaiting complete reports of the investigation in order to determine whether other action shall be taken.

This is the very investigation to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers.

From the reports which have been made to us to date, it can be stated that whereas there was unquestionably some pilferage of supplies, the figures quoted by Mr. Pearson are much exaggerated.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman confesses that there have been some rather extensive black-market operations in the functioning of UNRRA. Do I understand from what the gentleman has just read that there has been only one dismissal as a result of the rather extensive black-market operations?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Every official who was found to be in any way connected with any improper diversion of supplies has been summarily dismissed. Some of them have come back and told stories about why they were dismissed, which did not jibe with the facts. Naturally, they did not want to come home and tell the truth.

Mr. O'HARA. Have there not been any criminal prosecutions with reference to that type of operation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. UNRRA took all of the recourse it had at its command. They dismissed them and sent them home.

Mr. Chairman, may I say this is not a partisan measure. It is a humanitarian measure. It is an American measure. It is a patriotic measure. There is nothing to be gained politically in any event on this side of the aisle in the passage of this resolution, and I cannot see that there is anything to be gained politically on the other side of the aisle in not passing the resolution. It is purely a matter of discharging our international and humanitarian obligations. UNRRA is not an American agency. It is an international institution. We are merely one of the contracting members. But it has the universal support and approval of every great interest in America. I could read to you a number of letters testifying to that interest, but in the brief time remaining I shall read only two. Here is a letter I received from the American Federation of Labor:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
October 18, 1945.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Federation of Labor urges Congress to appropriate the funds needed by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for the following reasons:

Europe and Asia must have help this winter to provide the minimum of food and clothing needed to prevent widespread starvation, disease, epidemics, and political revolts. Starving people go to extremes to get food, and unless we help to provide minimum needs, we risk revolution leading to fascism or communism. If we allow this to happen, we have indeed lost the goals our boys fought and died for.

UNRRA provides help only to those devastated countries which borrow money to finance their own purchases of food and other essentials, such as Greece, Italy, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. The administration of UNRRA is paid for by 47 United Nations and the 31 nations not invaded in the war each contributes 1 percent of their 1943 national income to provide funds for relief supplies.

Congress has already authorized this contribution from the United States, which amounts to $1,350,000,000, but $550,000,000 of this authorized amount has not yet been appropriated. A second contribution to UNRRA equal to the first will be necessary to meet the needs of starving peoples next spring, the period of lowest ebb for these countries.

Food, clothing, seeds, and farm implements supplied by UNRRA are not a Santa Claus gift. They are the minimum with which war-devastated peoples can rehabilitate themselves sufficiently to sustain life.

If we do not help these people now, we have indeed lost the peace.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I also include the following letter from the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
October 31, 1945.

DEAR MR. CANNON: In my letter to you of October 22, 1945, I expressed the view that it would be unfortunate to include new and restrictive conditions in the pending UNRRA appropriation legislation. In this connection I would like to refer to one of the conditions which has been proposed in various forms relating to the freedom of properly accredited representatives of the press of the United Nations to enter areas receiving UNRRA assistance. I have already indicated to you that I did not believe this proposal, in any of its forms, should be accepted.

I want, particularly, to explain my views on this matter. The reason for my belief, as I am sure you know, has nothing to do with the intrinsic merit of the suggestion; I am thoroughly in favor of that.

I do not believe, however, that the bill appropriating the remaining funds already authorized for our participation in UNRRA is the appropriate device through which to seek the result we all desire.

It would be fortunate indeed if we could provide succor under ideal conditions of all kinds, but hunger and cold and tragedy will not wait upon perfection. We cannot put ourselves in the position of denying promised relief to millions of human beings because we have failed to secure our other objectives in advance.

It is my firm hope that all people may soon enjoy complete access to the news as well as freedom of speech and of belief and of assembly, but I fear that the attachment of conditions in an appropriation bill may hurt rather than help us in our efforts to achieve these ends.

To carry on our foreign relations we have regular mechanisms of international intercourse. We are using these with vigor to implement our foreign policy. We have already met with a considerable degree of success in providing our correspondents access to the news, and I am convinced that the course we are following is the correct one. We must seek our ends by negotiation and agreement, not by ultimatum.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

The letter of October 22, 1945, to which Secretary Byrnes refers is printed in the hearings. This letter is supplementary and is included in response to the frequent suggestion here this afternoon that we should adopt a provision forcing our newspapermen and the newspapermen of other nations upon any country which accepts food from UNRRA.

As will be noted the State Department deprecates such a suggestion. It would be in effect an encroachment upon the sovereignty of any nation upon which we attempted to impose it. It would be interpreted in no other light than an attempt to dictate to other nations their administration of their domestic affairs. It would result in unfriendly interests and governments injecting their representatives into the internal administration of countries whose starving subjects are crying to us for bread this fateful winter.

This is not a coercive organization. It is a free organization. It is an anti-war organization. Hunger breeds wars. This is a proposition to eliminate a cause for war. Let us not impede its progress by an attempt to interpose captious and inappropriate restriction.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and yield at this time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the proposition to vote for an appropriation of $550,000,000 for the continuation of UNRRA. It is brought before us with perhaps the most distressing situation that I have ever seen presented.

We had Mr. Lehman, Director General of the organization before us. He was not familiar with the authorizing act passed by Congress and its limitations. We had before us Mr. Clayton, an Assistant Secretary of State, and he had not read the authorizing act passed by the Congress.

We have presented to us today the statement that this is a treaty obligation. Let me say to you that it is not a treaty obligation. Let me say to you that when the enabling act was passed by the Congress it contained certain restrictions and limitations, and those I propose to read. You will find them on page 240 of the hearings:

SEC. 6. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservations:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 7. In adopting this joint resolution, the Congress does so with the following reservations:

That it is understood that the provisions in paragraph 11 of Resolution 12 adopted at the first session of the Council, referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution and reading, "The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief," contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief.

Then section 8 reads:

In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made under this authorization and by other countries and receipts from other sources.

It was absolutely impossible to get much of a picture of the operations of this organization. I asked for a statement of what was actually obligated out of the appropriations. I was unable to get it. Their auditor in his report in July stated:

As a consequence of the inadequacy of the Administration's accounting and auditing organization it was necessary to increase materially the anticipated volume of detail to be covered by our examination. Due to the circumstances above set forth we have not been able completely to satisfy ourselves that all transactions and liabilities resulting therefrom have been recorded on the books of the Administration. Our examination does not lead us to believe that there has been any wrongful diversion of the funds.

That is the kind of picture we were presented with. They have upon their rolls 92 publicity agents, publicity artists, to publicize UNRRA all over the world. Thirty-six of them are in the headquarters in Washington. A perfect, complete waste of money. Does anybody need to advertise that they have relief available for anybody else? Does anyone need to advertise in a country for folks to come and get bread? You all know that is not correct. I do not know whether that publicity set-up was the one responsible for the propaganda that went out from Washington denouncing the Congress for not acting more promptly upon UNRRA appropriations, but this is the picture.

With reference to congressional appropriations, a Budget estimate was not submitted to us until the 4th of October. Hearings commenced on the 11th and lasted to the 15th. The report was made on the 30th, and the bill called up for consideration on the 31st. I do not know what anybody could expect more than that. Every time anyone says anything, tells the truth about this picture and the situation it presents, he is accused of playing politics.

I am advised by people whom I know to be responsible that of the 1,100 employees in the Washington office not to exceed 500 are necessary. I am advised that the 939 employees in London represent a very considerable overstaffing. I am advised that they have set-ups in Holland, Belgium, and have had in France, with nothing to do. I am advised that their set-ups in connection with the camps they operate, although the Army provides the food and relief articles, is grossly exaggerated and overdone. I believe a very substantial part of their publicity set-up is devoted to propaganda in this country to obtain funds and to obtain legislation, a more reprehensible operation. The articles they get out and the reports they have been submitting to the Congress are so vague and indefinite that it is absolutely impossible to understand anything about their operations from their reports.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the bill as reported is there any limitation or any statement in the report or any reduction in funds to eliminate these two hundred-odd publicity experts now on the UNRRA staff?

Mr. TABER. There is not. They should be off the boards. The idea of having to advertise relief is ridiculous.

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two other things to which I want to call attention. You know, it is terrible for anybody in the Congress to think of such a thing as adding, subtracting, multiplying, and dividing with reference to the figures that are submitted to the Congress by governmental or international organizations. But I have been indulging in that terrible kind of thing and, in my opinion, it is only fair to the Congress to give to it my conclusions. These are based either upon items that appear in the hearings or upon documents that have been submitted to me by UNRRA itself.

There was made available for relief operations by our country and by other countries previous to this item the sum of $1,284,000,000. The total shipments through the month of September run to $530,500,000, leaving $753,500,000 yet to be shipped. Those first figures include the shipping cost of maybe $100,000,000, as well as the cost of the materials that have been sent over there. The highest rate of shipment in any month was $90,000,000 in the month of September.

If they went on at the same rate, the $700,000,000 would carry them to the 1st of May. If they went on at a higher rate, the $700,000,000 plus the $550,000,000 would carry them a long way toward the 1st of July. In other words, the funds that you are supplying here, if you use the tables that they have submitted themselves, and expect a measure of efficient performance in their operations along the line of what they have done in the past in proportion to their future estimates, it should carry them to the 1st of July at least.

There have been several other unsatisfactory results in their operations. In Yugoslavia, for instance, during the period that they have been in there, they have built up the Army since VE-day from 300,000 to 600,000. The way they have operated in Yugoslavia is something like this: There have been 26 agents of UNRRA in Yugoslavia, and they speak 20 different languages, so that they have to have an interpreter to communicate with each other. That is just a sample of the efficiency of that management.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman referred to funds and said that under the past scale of shipments there would be funds enough here to carry them to the 1st of July. What did the gentleman mean?

Mr. TABER. With the funds presently available they could carry on to the 1st of May with some increase in shipments, but with the $550,000,000 that is here carried, there is no question in my mind but what they could carry on to the 1st of July 1946.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is what I wanted to be clear about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As one Member who was in Europe this past summer to take a look at UNRRA, I call the gentleman's attention to one thing. The objective we all subscribe to, but it is the method of administration to which we object. May I ask the gentleman this question, if it is not true that when UNRRA supplies material across the boundary of a country, it becomes the property of that government, and usually the regime in power in that country either sells the supplies to the people or it goes through the natural channels of trade, and thereby builds its government up in the particular country in which the supplies go for relief. Why should they not go direct to the people?

Mr. TABER. I did not know that is so, but it should be stopped and stopped at once.

I do not want anyone to think that I am the least unmindful of the obligation of this country to help in taking care of and relieving distress. I feel just as strongly about it as anyone, but I do not feel that that kind of management that this outfit has had is the kind of thing that I can endorse. I cannot, and I would feel as if I were derelict in my duty as a Member of this House if I did not call attention to that situation.

I appreciate that in Italy, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria, perhaps, as well as Jugoslavia, there is a lot of distress. On the other hand, the funds that are made available here should not be used to build up military establishments. The funds that are made available here should not go for things that find their way into the black market. The funds that are made available here should be honestly and efficiently administered and we should not have an overplus of administrative personnel handling this thing and butting in as leeches upon the body politic. I think that this kind of business ought to be corrected, and hope that some measure will be found to see that it is corrected.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. May I ask the gentleman if there was not appropriated to the Army approximately $1,000,000,000 which was used in the same program by the Army in connection with aid to these people?

Mr. TABER. Not to the same people. UNRRA operation is rather confined to Poland, Czechoslovakia, White Russia, Ukrainia, Italy, Jugoslavia, and Greece. Those are the major nations. There are a lot of smaller ones.

Mr. O'HARA. Did not the Army contribute in these countries where our forces were also?

Mr. TABER. They did in Italy, but I do not think in the other countries that I have mentioned. In France the Army did. In Belgium and Holland they did. In Luxemburg they did, and they are doing so in Germany at the moment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think one reason that this thing is such a flop is because they are going at it the wrong way. After the last war they had a good plan. Did the gentleman's committee go into any of the details of the plan used after the last war?

Mr. TABER. It was presented to us in a way, that is, certain of our Members had the information in front of us. But the trouble here has been the plan; it has been the administration of it and the desire to load the thing up with a great lot of people who did not measure up to the job.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is what I meant. That is one of the ways in which the plan is wrong.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time first from our side, but so many Republicans wanted to speak on this measure that it was advisable to get time from the other side.

At no expense to Congress nor the American taxpayers, I spent about 6 weeks in Greece, Yugoslavia, and other countries of Europe, and recently returned. I believe the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON], the gentleman from California [Mr. KING], and I probably have spent more time looking into UNRRA and the relief, food, and health conditions of Europe than any other Members of this Congress, so I feel we can speak with perhaps some little authority; at least, we should know something about it. That is why I want to talk to you for just a few minutes about this problem today.

You will notice that those on our side are strongly for the appropriation for UNRRA. I want to read briefly a part of the statement that was given to our leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], because I agree with it fully:

> UNRRA should be permitted to finish the job in Europe.

In other words, we on our side, at least I hope most of us, are committed to do the job in Europe and see it through.

> We believe, therefore, that UNRRA should be continued to do the relief job in Europe this winter—and that it should receive the wholehearted support of this Government and the people of the United States in improving its administrative and operating effectiveness and accomplishing its humane purposes.
>
> The $550,000,000 remaining to complete the current contribution of the United States toward UNRRA's operating expenses should be made available immediately.
>
> The United States should contribute its proportionate share of any additional amount found reasonably necessary to fulfill amply UNRRA's obligations in Europe this winter.

So there you have the position of, I believe, the majority on the Republican side.

You notice, too, that the Republicans have been doing most of the asking of questions here today. I think it has been a good thing. They want to clarify this situation and, if it is badly administered—and we must admit in some few cases it might have been—we want to see it clarified and improved. I am sure we will all agree to that.

I will go briefly through some of the criticisms which have been made, because they are made only for the purpose of improving this program. For instance, it has been charged that the administrative expenditures of UNRRA are excessive and unnecessary. Do you realize that the cost of administering UNRRA is just a little bit more than 1 percent of the total expenditures? No other organization in the history of the world can look to that sort of a record so far as administrative expense is concerned. Out of $800,000,000 spent so far they have spent for administrative purposes about $10,300,000. Just slightly more than 1 percent of the total money has gone for administrative purposes. Any fund we have in America today cannot say it has spent relatively as little as that for administrative purposes.

Criticism has been made that we have too few Americans in the set-up in London, or that perhaps London should not be the base of operations that it is. On the other hand, many people say that we should have more of the offices in London, closer to the scene of operations. Nevertheless, we do have the top administrators here in Washington, and the world office is here in Washington. But I am willing to support any movement toward getting more American administrators into this organization. We contribute the largest share of this fund, and we should have a greater percentage of Americans in the administrative body of UNRRA. A year ago, when UNRRA was organized, it was very difficult to get top-notch officials and administrators.

In some few cases we did not get the best men available and who would be available now. UNRRA has been dismissing any incompetent personnel. They have taken on some new people recently who are exceedingly well qualified. For instance they have just obtained the services of General Morgan, of England, who was the right-hand man of General Eisenhower. He will be in charge of the displaced-persons program in Europe. He is one of the outstanding men of this war. There are now a lot of good men available in this country. I believe UNRRA should look to the possibility of getting some of those men into its organization. I shall speak further under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this appropriation. I intend not only to support the appropriation, but all reasonable provisions which may be brought forward with a view to assuring that funds appropriated for relief purposes by the people of this and other countries shall be in fact used for that purpose and for that purpose only.

I support this appropriation because I think we are confronted at this time by a condition and not a theory. I think we are confronted by devastation and by

the effects of drought in certain countries said to have been more severe than any drought within the past half century. We are confronted by the arrival of winter. We are confronted by the testimony of those who should know, to the effect that millions of people on the other side of the water are probably going to suffer terribly in the course of the winter.

I support the appropriation because it is impossible to substitute any other agency which can contribute to the situation this winter. It is too late to make a change. I support the appropriation because I believe that if we shut off contemplated relief at this critical time we are very likely to contribute to a situation which we shall regret from a humanitarian standpoint, and which also from a purely selfish standpoint may prove to be against the best interests of this country.

I appreciate fully the tremendous sums which America has contributed in this and other connections. These sums include something under a billion dollars for relief through our Army; $1,350,000,000 through UNRA, if this appropriation is approved; some $3,500,000,000 through the Export-Import Bank, and some $5,925,000,000, I believe, under the Bretton Woods organization; a total of $11,775,000,000, in addition to lend-lease funds of which $42,000,000,000 has been transferred to other nations, and $1,879,000,000 remains in the pipe line for transfer.

I support this appropriation without commitment as to the further sum which is soon to be requested by UNRRA. I support it despite the apparent lack of information which those who should be most fully posted seem to possess. I support it despite the charges of incompetency, waste, and lack of supervision, and so on, which have been leveled at the administration of UNRRA.

I hope that conditions which have prevailed in the administration of this agency in the past will be speedily remedied in the future.

Mr. Chairman, the maximum contribution for relief purposes for all member nations originally contemplated under UNRRA amounted to $1,882,000,000. Of this total, $1,284,000,000 have been made available, a balance of $598,000,000 remaining to be paid if the original proposal is fully complied with.

UNRRA states that all but seventeen or eighteen million dollars of the total made available was obligated as of September 30, 1945. It further states that all of the $550,000,000 now under consideration will be obligated, if made available, by December 31, 1945, with relief supplies remaining in the pipe line for 2 months or so thereafter.

It would seem probable that requested funds would last for a longer period, almost certainly throughout the winter. Total shipments, for example, through September 30 last, have amounted to only $530,000,000, with a maximum of somewhat under $100,000,000 in the month of September. Mathematically, therefore, available funds might last through April.

UNRRA states, however, that the rate of shipments must and can be increased very rapidly. It hopes for shipments of $140,000,000 in October, $250,000,000 in November, $350,000,000 in December. The accuracy of these estimates remains to be seen.

Generally speaking, the relief work of UNRRA, since its inception on November 9, 1943, has been directed to seven countries: Albania, China, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia.

There is in contemplation further relief for China and Italy—expanded programs—Austria, Formosa, Korea, and the Ukraine and White Russia.

There are small programs also for UNRRA camps and for the Dodecanese and Philippine Islands.

The value of relief supplies actually shipped through September 30, 1945, and the estimated allocation of the $1,284,000,000 which have been made available are as follows:

Country	Shipments	Allocations
Albania	$8,974,000	$18,500,000
China	622,000	59,100,000
Czechoslovakia	73,855,000	172,200,000
Greece	189,756,000	305,800,000
Italy	21,051,000	43,700,000
Poland	89,889,000	258,800,000
Ukraine and White Russia	----------	29,300,000
Yugoslavia	143,638,000	289,600,000
Total, with other expenses	530,505,000	1,284,200,000

The supplies shipped for relief purposes and for rehabilitation purposes, which must be coterminous with relief, are said to have amounted to about 2,000,000 tons. A break-down of the shipments shows the following percentages:

First. Food, 43 percent.

Second. Clothing, 18 percent.

Third. Health and clinical, 7 percent.

Fourth. Agricultural rehabilitation, 7 percent.

Fifth. Industrial rehabilitation, 15 percent.

Sixth. Ocean transportation, and so forth, 10 percent.

Forty percent of UNRRA requirements, exclusive of food, are to be met out of surplus property.

In addition to relief work, UNRRA has aided in the problem of repatriating some 6,000,000 displaced persons. This work has been carried on through 450 assembly centers with from two to fifteen thousand persons in each center. Food and transportation are supplied by the Army. UNRRA supplies personnel to operate the centers and other incidental expenditures. It is estimated that something less than 1,000,000 displaced persons will remain on January 1 next, about 80 percent of these being former citizens of Poland, who cannot be repatriated at this time.

The difficulty in obtaining a clear picture, Mr. Chairman, has been greatly increased, in my judgment, by the inability or unwillingness of principal witnesses to testify on fundamental questions. One of the chief witnesses, as has already been indicated, stated that he had never read the enabling legislation putting this country into UNRRA; stated that neither he nor his predecessor had ever visited any one of the countries in which the relief operations of UNRRA are being carried on, and even off the record was either unable or unwilling to discuss the most fundamental questions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Who was the witness to whom the gentleman refers?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I refer to the present American member of UNRRA, to whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has also referred.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I suggest the reason he could not answer the most fundamental questions is that most of this relief is being given in communistic countries where UNRRA does not know whether the people are getting the relief or not.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Well, the facts are as I have stated them, whatever the explanation.

I think that the hearings and reports that have come to the committee in charge of this bill emphasize the very great difficulty of administering relief through an international organization under present conditions. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that if Uncle Sam had agreed to take on 72 percent of this job, to do it himself, with his own money, and with his own personnel, we should have had more relief, and more efficiency, with the expenditure of much less money.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. And you would have had it administered through the American Red Cross.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Well, I am not particular as to the agency. I think the experience of our relief organizations after the last war substantiates the statement I have just made.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Your hearings show that 2,000,000 tons of food have been shipped to date by UNRRA, and much of that consists not of food but of farm machinery. As a comparison, after the last war, during the same amount of time in which they were thinking about starting UNRRA, the organization under Mr. Hoover had distributed 30,000,000 tons of food, as compared with this 2,000,000 most of which is farm machinery.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Apropos of the remark offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], let me say in one place where I visited in a recent overseas trip a Red Cross worker said to me, "Where is UNRRA?" He said, "We are doing the work here that we understood UNRRA was to do."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it true that some of the food supplies have never left this country?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think that is true to some extent. I suppose they have been handicapped by lack of available shipping.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not know how much actual relief has been held here?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot answer that question.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that what has come to the attention of this committee raises a question as to the whole fundamental premise on which UNRRA was set up.

Here we have a relief problem controlled by the votes of 47 nations, both givers and receivers alike. It is my understanding that decisions of the UNRRA Council are subject to veto, either by military commands or by individual members of a central council of six.

The United States is putting up 72 percent of the money but has only a single vote in determining its use. Despite the fact that this country has been and continues to be the principal giver to UNRRA, it appears that it has very little to say as to proper assurance that the funds are properly spent, that they are not diverted for political or military purposes, that competent and loyal personnel are employed, that administrative expenses are held to a minimum or that activities of the agency are properly audited.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman approve of the fact that the ranking administrative officer immediately under ex-Governor Lehman is a British citizen and that many other highly paid administrative officers are citizens of various other countries, and yet we are advancing most of the money?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Ex-Governor Lehman, who happens to be the Director-General of the organization, is an American citizen. UNRRA, of course, is an international organization and not an American one.

Mr. Chairman, it has been publicly charged that distribution in both Poland and Czechoslovakia has been used for political purposes.

It has been publicly charged that UNRRA intruded itself into the political arena in behalf of the Lublin-Polish provisional government.

It has been publicly charged that while supplies were cleared for Poland, permission to send representatives into Poland to observe the distribution of these supplies was withheld.

It has been publicly charged that passports for UNRRA representatives to Poland and Czechoslovakia were held up for a period of over 6 months.

It has been asserted that food designed for relief in Yugoslavia has been used for military and political purposes, and that food intended for the relief of the people of Greece has been stolen from the trucks carrying it to the extent of anywhere from 20 to 35 percent.

When the Subcommittee on Postwar Economic Policy returned from the other side very recently, it recommended, among other things, according to the press, the administration of relief on nonpolitical lines which do not permit the siphoning off of supplies to another country requiring replacement by UNRRA or the United States.

Let me read you just a few statements by our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] made in Detroit on October 11, after his return as a member of that committee. He said, among other things:

I regret to state that UNRRA failed to alleviate the terrible sufferings of the Polish Nation. * * * The supplies UNRRA sends to Poland for the most part are stolen and find their way to the black market where they are sold at prices absolutely inaccessible to the population. A small part of UNRRA supplies is being distributed to the population, but this distribution is used very obviously for political purposes. * * * American representatives have little or nothing to say about what goes on, although nearly all of UNRRA's funds, 72 percent of them, have been contributed by the United States. * * * The most amazing fact remains, however, that UNRRA's activities in Poland became a political weapon and that the population is not being helped by this international organization.

These, Mr. Chairman, are typical of the charges which have come to members of the committee in charge of this bill from many sources. While the Director General for the most part takes the position that he has no information to confirm the charges, it is extremely difficult for me to escape the conviction that where there is so much smoke there must be some fire.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts has enumerated many things that have been publicly charged. I have heard it publicly charged that these commodities were taken and resold instead of being distributed. Is that true?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand that commodities are sold wherever there is anybody to purchase them.

Mr. Chairman, I could talk at great length but my time is growing short.

The administrative set-up here in Washington has been referred to. It consists of 1,136 people. One of these is on the rolls at $14,500; four are on the rolls at $12,500 or better; five at $10,500 or better; 15 at $9,425 or better; 36 at $8,400 or better; 43 at $7,375 or better; 96 at $6,350 or better; 70 at $5,325 or better; 43 at $4,750 or better, and so on.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has referred to the publicity staff of 92 people, 19 of them in the District of Columbia, 36 drawing salaries of $3,500 a year or better.

I cannot escape the conviction personally, that personnel is not only overpaid but that in many instances it has been both incompetent and of a type to be harmful rather than helpful.

The matter of improper auditing has also been referred to. If the Members will turn to page 23 of the hearings they will find an auditor's report signed by a reputable New York firm under date of July 9, 1945, in which will be found such phrases as "No effective system of internal audit and control," "Inadequate accounting and auditing organization," "Unsatisfactory state of accounting records," "Detailed records generally in state of confusion."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that some improvement has been made in the administration of this organization, but the case is so strong against the administration of UNRRA in the past that, in my opinion, this Congress is more than justified in adopting any reasonable provision designed to assure the proper expenditure of funds made available for relief purposes.

You will find included in the bill in its present form three provisions of this kind; one, placing a time limit when UNRRA shall be cut off; one referring to the furnishing of trade agreements, and export and import statistics periodically to UNRRA; and one, assuring to UNRRA personnel the opportunity of complete observation of operations in their respective countries.

You will find one other provision included in the committee report, referring to the retention of title in heavy equipment. Personally, I think this provision should be in the bill rather than in the report and it may be that other provisions should be included.

I call particular attention in this connection to the final page of the committee report where you will find a letter signed by Secretary Byrnes in which he details six provisions which he characterizes as "provisions which could be included without imposing burdens or responsibilities inappropriate to an international organization." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the provisions at this point in the RECORD:

DRAFT

At the proper place in the provisions making appropriations for UNRRA insert:

"No part of the appropriation herein for carrying out the provisions of the joint resolution of March 24, 1944, entitled 'Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization,' shall be available for that purpose for the relief and rehabilitation of a country subsequent to December 31, 1945, unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services to the government of such country for the nationals of such country will be made only under agreements between the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing—

"(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to UNRRA.

"(2) That markings on supplies furnished by the Administration which indicate the national source of such supplies will not be changed.

"(3) That at regular periods such country will make available to UNRRA statements of its current financial position, which statements shall set forth in detail all receipts of such country from the sale and from the rental of supplies furnished by the Administration.

"(4) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will

be permitted, during the period of its operations in such country, to retain title to all motor transport equipment supplied by the Administration, and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

"(5) That the press of such country will be permitted to publish all statements, relating to the operations of the Administration in such country, made by the administrative head of the Administration's mission in such country;

and, furthermore, that no part of the appropriation shall be used to provide any relief and rehabilitation supplies to be shipped to the receiving countries in Europe later than December 1, 1946, or to the receiving countries in the Far East later than March 1, 1947."

Each of these provisions should be carefully considered with the possibility of including them in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that reasonable provisions will be included in the bill so that we may have the maximum assurance of the proper expenditure of these funds. I hope that passage of the bill will lead to improved conditions in the administration of UNRRA. I hope, above all, that the $550,000,000 which is carried in this bill will serve to alleviate what might otherwise prove to be terrible suffering in the coming winter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. From what the gentleman states I assume he feels that from the standpoint of dollars this is the cheapest way at this particular time to handle the situation. In other words, that the situation over there in Europe is such that we might run into tremendous difficulties which would involve us terribly with other countries unless we make this contribution? Is that the gentleman's position in supporting this bill after listing all of these bad things he has stated?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Personally, I do not care to place myself or to urge that the Nation place itself in the position of cutting off relief at this critical moment, just when winter is coming on. I say that principally from a humanitarian standpoint. I say it also from the standpoint of the national interest, in view of the political anarchy which might well result if relief is denied at this time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has mentioned one other thing in which I am interested, and that is the prospective or the potential request that may follow for additional funds. I believe the gentleman said he would make no commitment as to what his position would be on that. Would the gentleman care to indicate to some of us not too familiar with this how much that request may be?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Generally speaking, it is double the original amount; in other words, each member would be asked to contribute the same amount that it has already contributed. It would involve another $1,350,000,000 as far as this country is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That would be for what period?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. UNRRA plans contemplate that its operations shall cease as to all countries except China at the end of the calendar year 1946, and as to China 3 months later, or, say, April 1947. This additional request will presumably be asked for to take care of the estimated period between the termination of funds now to be made available and those dates.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That answers my question.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I think the gentleman will concede, will he not, that based on the rate of shipments made by UNRRA they can operate until May of 1946 under funds already appropriated?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mathematically the gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct. As of September 30, 1945, funds to the extent of $1,284,000,000 had been made available. Shipments to the extent of $530,000,000 had been made. If shipments are made at the same rate as heretofore UNRRA could carry on through April.

The answer made by UNRRA is that the rate of shipments must and can be very rapidly stepped up. It estimates 140,000,000 tons for October, 250,000,000 tons for November, and 350,000,000 tons for December.

The value of this estimate is of course open to question.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, we are told that the dire need of the populations of the various countries which UNRRA serves is well known. Human misery from starvation, disease, lack of clothing, absence of shelter, and lack of fuel supplies, prevails generally in the former occupied countries, and distressing conditions will continue for months to come. The need for early action to provide additional funds is acute.

President Truman requested the liquidation of the entire authorization of $1,350,000,000, of which $550,000,000 remains unappropriated and unprovided.

Bearing in mind the precepts of our Heavenly Father to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked, I urge the House to adopt this resolution which would deliver ammunition of peace and prevent chaos in these war-torn countries.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, much has been said of Europe's urgent and immediate need for food, coal, and transportation facilities. I am glad to note the average American's willingness to help the peoples of Europe, although a minority will undoubtedly continue to raise noisy protests, crying that America must be fed first.

We know without any doubt that Americans are going to be fed first and that helping Europe this year and probably next is as much a matter of good business sense as it is our human duty. This Government and the people it represents want a peaceful future, with prosperity and security for all peoples. It is now an acknowledged fact that a famine in China has an effect on our own economy similar to breadlines in a major American city. We have learned through the bitter experience of worldwide depression and global war that the seeds of those catastrophes were sown in the economic collapse of Europe following the First World War.

This has been a war of liberation; a war against fascism and its evil threat to civilization. Our armies, together with the armies of our allies, have liberated a grateful Europe. But it will prove a miserable liberation indeed if we have simply smashed the gates of tyranny and oppression to let in final destruction by starvation, disease, and political strife.

We in the United States, in spite of our tragic losses in men and women of the armed forces and the merchant marine, know we have had by far the easiest part of the war in terms of human misery. We have begun reconversion to a peacetime economy with no cities leveled by bombings, no millions of displaced persons, no stacks of human cordwood awaiting the decency of burial. We know the fate of Europe's hungry millions if we do not act quickly.

I know that you have heard many times of the desperate need for food in Europe. You can obtain page after page of statistics on the low-calorie diets of the French, the Belgians, the Dutch, from the Department of Agriculture or the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Let me cite just one example of what this winter means to several European countries, already on the verge of mass starvation. In the present period the per capita consumption of meat in the United States is 145 to 150 pounds per year. In the United Kingdom it is 94 pounds; France, 17.15 pounds; Netherlands, 28 pounds; Belgium, 14.5 pounds; and in Czechoslovakia, 19.8 pounds. If every citizen in the United States would give up 3 ounces of meat a week, two-thirds of Europe's need for meat could be met. This sacrifice on the part of the American people would still give us a per capita consumption of meat greater than before the war.

I think there is little doubt of our role in helping to ease this crisis in the lives of millions of people who knew the cruelty and mercilessness of the Nazi doctrine before we fully realized its intent of world conquest. The issue, then, is not is there need, or are we to help, but how and when. We must not delay any longer. President Truman has asked the appropriation of $550,000,000 to continue the job begun by UNRRA. This we must grant without question, and at the same time assure that the money be used quickly for the purchase and transportation of supplies for Europe. If we do postpone this aid, or drown in the endless words of prolonged debate the hopes of millions, we will fail in our basic responsibility to help those who have fought our common battles, to regain their strength, health, and self-reliance.

President Truman made a pledge for the American people when he returned

from the Potsdam Conferences. He said:

If we let Europe go cold and hungry we may lose some of the foundations of order on which the hoped for world-wide peace must rest. We must help to the limits of our strength. And we will.

This pledge must be kept, but one man, the President of the United States, cannot keep it alone. It is up to the people of this Nation, through their elected representatives, to follow through.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, much of the criticism of UNRRA has concerned conditions over which UNRRA has no control. At the start of its life, UNRRA was necessarily the stepchild of the military. Its operations were held up until the Army gave it the green light to proceed and that meant that it only really began to function in April, 1945, after the Greek civil war was ended. Since that time it has opened full programs in Greece, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, with a recent start in Poland, and a limited program in Italy. In addition, it has collaborated with the military in the care of displaced persons and has undertaken certain specific functions, such as epidemic control and the distribution of clothing in other countries. It has not functioned more fully in western Europe because these nations with gold reserves preferred to make their own requisitions of supplies. They thought that in this way they would receive more favorable treatment than as one of the many recipients of UNRRA's supplies.

During the first months of its existence, two bottlenecks hampered UNRRA's activities. Those bottlenecks were shipping and supplies. Until VE-Day, UNRRA could only get the leavings of the military and often there were few leavings. As an example of one of these bottlenecks, I quote the criticism of my distinguished colleague who visited Greece at the start of its program. He stressed the fact that in a land where transportation was disrupted, UNRRA was trying to function with broken-down trucks which it was not even pretending to repair. What he said was true. All UNRRA had was broken-down trucks. And why? Because the only trucks it was allowed to get were those which the Army did not want, and the only ones which they did not want were those that had broken or were breaking down. Similarly, while UNRRA had put in a requisition months before for spare parts and garage equipment, the requisition was never filled. This is an example of the shortages and bottlenecks which impeded efficient operations in the early months of UNRRA.

With the war over, conditions have changed. Shipping has eased and there are now surpluses. It is ironic that at this point a third limitation is making the continuation of UNRRA uncertain. That limitation is money. UNRRA is now out of funds. Its present supplies will last only until the end of November. If new funds are not voted promptly, the number of ships carrying supplies will fall below schedule by mid-November. There will be no food reaching Europe as cold winter settles in.

At best the winter of 1945–46 will be a grim one. Those who have seen the flattened cities of Europe realize the housing shortage. Millions will try to survive in buildings which have lost their roofs and their windows. There will be little if any heat in most homes this winter. Moreover, the majority of peoples have worn out their clothes. Cities have been bombed out and the survivors possess only the rags which they wear on their bodies. Added then to the cold and lack of warm clothes and decent shoes, there will be hunger all over Europe. In fact, the peoples of the liberated countries have been hungry for a long time back. They have accumulated food needs, since their official rations before liberation were less than a thousand calories a day, to be supplemented if and when one could buy unrationed foods or foods from the black market. Liberation did not bring abundance. In fact, nowhere in Europe are people eating today what Americans would call adequate diets either in amounts or variety.

We Americans continue to be the best-fed people in the world and we eat somewhere between three and four thousand calories a day. Basic rations in Italy are 1,200 calories, chiefly starch foods, supplemented by perhaps 400 calories of ration-free foods. The situation is similar in Greece and Czechoslovakia but probably worse in the Balkans and certainly worse in Austria and Poland. The results can be seen in the mounting figures of infant mortality and in those diseases which stem from malnutrition, such as tuberculosis and rickets.

So far UNRRA has prevented widespread starvation in Greece and in the Balkans. If its meager rations are cut off or delayed, starvation will grow, and so perhaps will social chaos. As General Eisenhower told us, "Without food, there can be no peace."

Certainly epidemics will sweep the devastated areas if UNRRA pauses in its work. Here we have one activity in which all of us must be concerned, even from a purely selfish point of view. We cannot hope to confine disease to devastated regions, for germs do not respect boundary lines.

So far it has been a miracle that no serious epidemic has broken out, like Spanish influenza, which followed the last war. UNRRA has played an important part in controlling pestilence. In China it is fighting cholera and in Europe it has done important work checking such plagues as typhus, with the miracle-working DDT. It has sprayed DDT by planes over malaria-breeding swamps in Italy and in Greece, where the enemy had mined and flooded fields. UNRRA's supplementary feeding programs have been the best preventive against the rising tide of tuberculosis which has made particular inroads among the displaced persons and the undernourished children of Europe.

Because of limited funds, as well as the wish to use responsible local people, UNRRA always works through local agencies. In Naples I saw an orphanage, run by nuns, where UNRRA supplies the food. In Rome and Naples I visited schools where UNRRA furnishes the noonday meal, and I called at distributing centers where supplementary rations are given to those with special food deficiencies. In Athens I inspected a preventorium for youngsters threatened with tuberculosis. In all of these cities I called at warehouses where clothes from the Henry Kaiser drive are received. I also saw some large sewing projects, one of them staffed by women from a displaced persons camp, where these American clothes are repaired and sorted for distribution.

In Germany and Italy I visited many camps for displaced persons. UNRRA will shortly carry the chief responsibility for these people. It has always shared in this work. While the Army has provided food, transport, and security, UNRRA has met other needs. It has screened arrivals to weed out Nazis trying to escape Germany. It has made contact with the land to which the arrival wants to go and it has prevented the spread of disease with its health program of delousing, inoculations, baths, and often the first clean clothes the people have seen in months. It has cared for the sick and helpless. It has started nurseries and classes for children. Many youngsters have become warped through persecution and there is a real job to do in taming them.

An organization is no better than those who staff it. When UNRRA was launched there was a serious manpower shortage and too often UNRRA was handicapped in personnel, as in supplies. This handicap is also lifting since VJ-Day and the staff has greatly improved. Being an international institution, the personnel is also international. It has been charged—and I fear correctly at times—that some of the personnel has allowed UNRRA to be used for political purposes. All supporters of UNRRA want to safeguard it from any such misuse. I believe, however, that amendments at this time are not the proper remedy. In the first place, we have committed ourselves to the initial assessment and any amendments now might delay the urgent program.

Moreover, since UNRRA is an international organization, the method for changing or strengthening the rules should not be imposed unilaterally. We should instruct our representative to propose the substance of whatever amendment we desire to the governing body of UNRRA. That is the form of procedure prescribed by this organization in which we hold membership. The central committee can make policy decisions on short notice. And we can be sure that our proposals will carry great weight. They always have. As an example, at the London conference this year there were two main issues and the United States was spokesman in each case of the view which finally prevailed, as against the views of Russia, it so happened, or some nation in her zone of influence. The two issues were the extension of a full program to Italy and Austria and the continuing care of displaced persons who did not want to be returned to Poland, the Balkans, or the the Baltic region.

I believe there are reasons other than altruism why we must insure UNRRA's success. We won the war at great cost, but we can throw away the victory if we do not see that an orderly world emerges from the destruction. The war, thank God, was not fought in our land, but where it was fought there is ruin, hunger, and desperation. If we abandon these recently liberated peoples before their normal economies are functioning again, we deliver them in a sense to the leaders of violence and revolution.

There is one more reason why UNRRA should succeed. It is the first peacetime venture of the United Nations. If the members cannot cooperate on a temporary, humanitarian project, how can we hope to cooperate on more controversial and permanent plans? We must prove that the United Nations is not just a remote institution which concerns itself with international law and pronounces platitudes on peace. We can prove that the member nations see first things first and minister in practical ways to desperate people. Before men can cooperate politically, they must have bread, shelter, clothes, and medical care. By meeting elemental needs, the United Nations can save the lives of millions, undermine the pull of violent nationalisms which emerge like fascism after every war, and, equally important, they can channelize to themselves the loyalties of men throughout the world.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 184]

Adams	Fuller	Mundt
Andersen, H. Carl	Gardner	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	Peterson, Ga.
Arends	Gillie	Ploeser
Barrett, Pa.	Gore	Plumley
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	Rains
Bell	Granahan	Robinson, Utah
Boykin	Griffiths	Robsion, Ky.
Brehm	Hand	Roe, Md.
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Rogers, Fla.
Bunker	Hart	Russell
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Sabath
Campbell	Heffernan	Simpson, Pa.
Cannon, Mo.	Hill	Snyder
Carlson	Hope	Starkey
Celler	Jarman	Sumners, Tex.
Chelf	Jonkman	Tarver
Cunningham	Kee	Taylor
Curley	Keefe	Thomas, Tex.
Dawson	Kerr	Thomason
Dickstein	Kilburn	Vursell
Dingell	King	Weiss
Drewry	LaFollette	White
Durham	Landis	Wilson
Eaton	Larcade	Winstead
Eberharter	Madden	Winter
Elliott	Maloney	Wolcott
Elston	Mansfield, Tex.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Flannagan	Merrow	Woodruff, Mich.
Fogarty	Morgan	
Folger	Morrison	
	Mott	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COOPER] having assumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 266, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 339 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, before I address myself to some items in the pending joint resolution, I want to pay testimony to a Member of this House to whom I believe the Congress and the country owe a deep debt of gratitude. I refer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable CHRISTIAN A. HERTER. On his own responsibility and by the request of UNRRA, he went overseas this summer and attended the London conference of UNRRA. He made an investigation of its various functions in different countries. He did not ask for the job, but he did assume the responsibility when it was tendered to him, and then returned and made what I esteem to be a human and a critical and a constructive report. He made that report to the House and also appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I think it was very illuminating, and I can think of no finer testimony to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, CHRIS HERTER, than that which appears on the very last page of these hearings. There is a memorandum by the Secretary of State which is addressed to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

In that memorandum the Secretary of State looked with favor upon five of the great number of recommendations made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I can think of no finer testimony and I can think of no greater service to the country and to the Congress. I do believe this House owes the gentleman from Massachusetts, CHRIS HERTER, a debt of gratitude for the job he did this summer in connection with the very thing which is before us at the present time.

I think it is an appropriate time to summarize what has been said and what the situation is at the moment. You may recall that UNRRA was approved in 1943. The first appropriation was made in 1944. We gave them $450,000,000 cash. We authorized $200,000,000 in lend-lease transfers and $150,000,000 in transfers from the military. The total was $800,000,000. There remained then out of the total authorization of $1,350,000,000 the sum of $550,000,000. That is the sum reported in the present bill. Frankly, I am going to vote for the bill. Yet I recognize we are confronted with something of a dilemma. Manifestly, one does not like to spend $550,000,000 of the people's money when you know very well there has been so much inefficiency in this organization. It has a personnel in excess of 8,000 people. It has 1,136 people up here on Connecticut Avenue near Dupont Circle and in other buildings in Washington. It has 939 people in the London office. Out of the 14 key positions in the London office, only 1 is held by an American. Now the odd part of it is that it is our money in large part that is being expended.

Seventy-two cents out of every dollar appropriated or spent by UNRRA is American money. We put up about $1,350,000,000 plus administrative expenses, and the rest of the countries put up the difference between that and $1,876,000,000. So we pay 72 percent and 43 other nations pay the remaining 28 percent. In other words, we pay 2½ times as much as all of the other nations in the world. Furthermore, we are not a suppliant nation—thank God. We are willing to do it. I am confident that our people and the Congress want to do their full share to relieve distress. The only thing we ask is that it be an efficient operation; that is all. Certainly it has not been efficient. It has been top heavy in personnel. I indicated on another occasion, Governor Lehman sat in my office in June and told me from his own lips that there were 1,500 UNRRA personnel at Grande Ville, France, who were drawing pay, subsistence, and rations, and who were doing nothing. When I said, "Why is it?" he said, "We are not getting cooperation from the military." It is an unhappy condition in an organization that will camp 1,500 people in a little town in France and not know in advance whether they are going to get cooperation from the military authorities. That is a rather amazing thing. But I am not going to worry you with a long harangue here over the past inefficiencies of UNRRA.

I am willing to admit there has been an improvement. They have in the Washington office today a commander from the British Navy. He is an Australian by birth. His name is Commander Jackson. He is a fine gentleman and a pretty good businessman. I think under his guidance and by his efforts there has been measurable improvement in the administrative techniques of UNRRA, but we still have a long way to go.

The question has been raised from time to time that perhaps this function ought to be transferred to some other more efficient agency, such as the Red Cross, for example. The story is simply this. This is November. In some of the countries that lie in northern latitudes in Europe, winter is about on the threshold. You cannot make the transition today to the military. You cannot make the transition to the American Red Cross. For then there would be a great deal of confusion at the very moment when distress, hunger, cold, and privation and destitution will be upon those countries. I think we recognize our human responsibilities under this program into which we entered so freely with the other countries of the world.

But does it mean we have to perpetuate inefficiency? Does it mean we have to perpetuate black market operations and pilferage? Does it mean we have to perpetuate waste and extravagance? There has been plenty of it. There has been mention made here today about black market operations. You could travel down in the market sections of Athens and in the stores you could find fancy Westmont hams packed by American packers. You could find tall cans of Alaska red salmon packed by American packers. How did they get there? It was pilfered in some cases; in other cases

it was stolen by the ELAS, which is the actionist group in Greece, who would go into a town after the UNRRA trucks had been there and take their one-third or more, use what they needed, and then sell the balance in the black markets in Greece. All that is past, however. I only ask that it be efficient operation. To that end there has been written into the proposal that is before us today a number of limitations. You will find them on pages 2 and 3. In the first place, we put in a time limit to the effect that goods shall not be shipped after December 31, 1946, except in the case of China, where we made it March 31, 1947. We ought to know whether this is going to be an international WPA or not. Some of the folks who have an occupational complex in a good many of these countries, because their countries were occupied by alien armies for a long time, are willing to sit down in the boat and rest on the oars. What they need is to go in for a little self-help, with some aid and sustenance from us. But let us never permit them to get in the habit of mind where they shall look to the great occidental country in the Western Hemisphere for a continuous flow of relief goods. Do not forget that when Governor Lehman was before us he said, "I will be back pretty soon and I will ask for more money. I will ask for another $1,300,000,000," which is the equivalent of the first authorization.

What we do now is important in being sure that there is an efficient administrative organism so that if more money is appropriated out of the Public Treasury of this country it will go where it belongs, to the actual relief of the needy and distressed. So we put in a time limit for purposes of better control and direction of the relief operation. These dates will carry beyond the next harvest. The time limit is, therefore, adequate.

There is another reason why that limitation is there. We want to be sure that this does not become a great bottomless barrel for the diversion of relief and rehabilitation supplies for the sustenance of armies or political groups in Europe. I suggest you read on page 194 of the hearings a letter that was written to me by an officer in the United States Navy. He was on duty at Trieste. It was a good long letter and very current. It was dated October 3 and reached me about October 12. It is a very revealing business, and I suggest that you read it, because there he makes special point of the fact that there is no assurance that these supplies, intended for distressed, weary, and destitute people, are getting to them. His letter indicates how casual and indifferent many of the investigations and inspections were and there is abundant reason to believe that supplies intended for the needy have been diverted to other purposes.

I am not going to stand idly by and see one nickel's worth of supplies from this country go to sustain a single soldier in Tito's army. That is why we inserted still another limitation. You will find it on page 3, "Facilities, credentials, and documents ought to be provided for UNRRA personnel so that they can make inspections and investigations." They have got to know. How else can we determine that the purposes and objectives of UNRRA are being properly effectuated?

At this point let me digress for a moment to allude to an amendment which I am going to offer. I think we must go further than we have gone here. I think the sunlight of publicity has got to shine in on this thing. So, at the appropriate time, I am going to offer this amendment. It was suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. In a different form it was offered by me in the full committee yesterday, and it was defeated by a vote of 16 to 15. I do not believe it is telling tales out of school to say that that amendment was defeated by one vote. But I will offer it on the floor. It will be offered on page 3. It will be to the effect that these supplies will be contingent upon this condition, along with others:

That the President has indicated to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration that he deems satisfactory arrangements have been made for the properly accredited representatives of the American press to observe and report without censorship on the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished for such country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have been told that in the Balkans and in Poland all relief must be made through Russian hands.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is an open-and-shut matter. If the gentleman will just look at the hearings, that the chief of mission for Yugoslavia is a citizen of the Soviet Union; the chief of mission in Czechoslovakia is a citizen of the Soviet Union. At one time they had a chief by the name of Michael Mimshikov who was handling this matter in Poland. I think he was under fire. Since that time he left the job, perhaps by request, and now Polish relief is being administered by somebody else.

I am glad the gentleman from Minnesota brought up this point, however, because it does give a special point to the thing that I want to say. How are we to know that these supplies go to the needy people without observing them? How do we know that they are not going to be diverted for political or military reasons and purposes? The only way to be sure is, first, to get inspection, and, second, to let the light of day shine in. Somebody said that with the language that is in the bill at the present time you do not need any publicity. Let us examine it for a moment. Suppose an investigator goes to the chief of mission in Yugoslavia and says: "These goods in our opinion have been diverted for a purpose that was not intended." He may not be in sympathy with any disclosure of the kind and he may say: "Oh, that is perfectly all right." I contend that if the American people are going to put up 72 percent of the money then the American taxpayer is entitled to know how the money is expended and what happens to the goods, whether they reach the objective that is intended under the basic act and under this arrangement with 43 other nations.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman believe that until the people of Yugoslavia are given free and unfettered elections Tito and his cohorts will continue to control every item of relief that is sent into that country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the query the gentleman raises is very fundamental, and I shall answer him. You have heard it said here today that we must do nothing to stand in the way of relieving distress, and I shall be the last to stand in the way; but, Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the fact that there are about 300,000 or more American GI's who are slumbering in eternal sleep in all the corners of the earth who will not come back because they became sacrifices upon the altar of freedom. When we were groping around a few years ago to get our bearings suddenly there came this great challenging crusade that these youngsters were fighting in the cause of the "four freedoms." I have heard a thousand GI's mention it because it is the one thing that struck home to the consciousness when you asked them why they were engaged in this great struggle. And so we have been pleased to think we have been doing something in the interest of freedom in all the corners of the earth. Now, then, if that be true, why can we not be consistent in this thing and use every instrumentality and every weapon at our command, whether it is a bank loan or whether it is a credit or whether it is relief, for the purpose of carrying out and spelling out the basic pattern for which so many young GI's have gone down to the dreamless dust and will never come back? I say to you it will be a horrible mockery if we leave the Balkans closed up. If these countries that are suppliants for relief upon our own thresholds are willing to take our bread and supplies but are not willing to permit American press representatives to come in and tell the story of this relief and rehabilitation operation, something is wrong. It is in line, I think, with the President's Navy Day address—you remember it, you remember his 12 points. He said the world is not perfect but we must go on in the direction of the objective of freedom.

Is it asking too much to insist that accredited representatives of the United States press be permitted to enter the countries to whom UNRRA supplies are shipped so that they may observe and without censorship or obstruction report to the American people what supplies have been received, the mechanics of distribution, whether it is an efficient operation, whether said supplies are in good order and meet the particular needs of such an area, whether the quality and nourishment value is all that it should be, whether such supplies are being effectively used, and to what extent the quantity of supplies meets the need which has been described to us?

Unless the authorities in recipient countries have something to hide and conceal from the American people, can you see any reason why there should be opposition to this kind of an arrangement?

The objections which have heretofore been raised are highly academic and legalistic. But this is, after all, a problem in common sense and common morals. If there is nothing to conceal from the country which so tangibly shows its appreciation of the relief problem by assuming 72 percent of the financial burden, then there can be no objection whatsoever to the amendment which I shall propose when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule.

Here, then, is a splendid chance; here is one of the great instrumentalities, one of the great weapons that we have at hand in order to spell out in a small way a little more of this whole fabric of freedom.

I am going to press that amendment upon your good and gracious attention in the hope you will agree that our press representatives may go in and tell the story. I do not ask that the whole lid be taken off and that they be permitted to pry into all the affairs of a country overseas and write anything they want; but I do believe that the American people are entitled to have their newspapermen go over there after the President has been satisfied they can enter, and send their uncensored dispatches back to the United States of America so that the 130,000,000 people who are footing most of the bill may find out what is being done with the money that this very Congress taxes out of them every day of the 365 days of the year.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I agree with a great many things which the gentleman has said and inferred with respect to the conduct of Russia in certain countries of Europe, because I had the opportunity to observe that myself. Our country should try to do something to counteract the manipulations of the Russians. But would the gentleman punish, for instance, the poor people of Poland who have nothing to say or who have been helpless and defenseless against the Russians for the things Russia is doing to Poland?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman forgets that Poland has a type of government of its own, even though it is provisional.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that the people of Poland have had nothing to say, really, about the form of government they now have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is an interesting confession, I may say, and I am glad to hear it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am definite about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is they have a provisional government of a kind. If they want to starve their own people, if they want to get along without fuel, without bread, without clothing, and run them into the very gutter of destitution this winter, that becomes their primary responsibility and not ours.

The heart of America is open, it is openhanded and generous, and we are willing to do this thing, but cooperation is a two-way street and somebody else besides us must be a little tolerant and forbearing. May I add this thought: The authorities in any distressed country who would rather see their people starve or go without fuel or clothing rather than permit the press to enter and freely report upon the operations of this international relief organization would not be above diverting such supplies for purposes that were not intended in the UNRRA agreement. Would anyone quarrel with that inference?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 17 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself very briefly to proposed amendments to the UNRRA bill—particularly the so-called press amendments—and then I would like to read to the Committee of the Whole a letter I have received today from Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, the Director General of UNRRA, in which he expresses in a very direct and straight-forward way his apprehension over the probable harmful and disruptive effect that amendment would have in the administration of relief to the starving people of the Old World.

As I sense the situation, there is substantial unanimity of sentiment in this body in respect to the amount to be appropriated to UNRRA. All, or virtually all, of our Members on both sides of the aisle are ready to vote for the Budget estimate, $550,000,000, which will exhaust the full amount of the legislative authorization. The only differences that will arise, apparently, will be over the strings that will be tied to the administration of the relief funds.

I understand that various limiting amendments have been prepared or are in process of incubation. The most outstanding proposed amendment that has been made public in textual form, as far as I am aware, is one which provides that before any country can become the beneficiary of UNRRA relief funds it must be shown that such country shall and actually does permit the accredited representatives of the press of any member government to enter such country and to observe and report without censorship the operations of UNRRA, including the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished under said UNRRA agreement." I assume that this amendment and probably others on the same subject will be offered in the House.

No one holds in higher esteem than I do the tremendously able gentleman who sponsored this amendment in the Appropriations Committee. I know that there is no kinder-hearted man in Congress than he is, and I wonder whether he has thought about the full implications of his proposal. Are we to decree in this legislation that a little child dying of malnutrition in Yugoslavia shall be denied milk by UNRRA because the Government of Yugoslavia is opposed to a free press? Having been brought up in the arms of the press, I yield to no one in my zeal for freedom of the press, but I cannot agree that there is any justification in denying food to starving people because their governments do not recognize and pay the same reverence to freedom of the press that we do. The starving Yugoslav children are not to blame because the press is not free in their country. They have had nothing to do with it, and they should not be penalized on account of it. All they know is that they are terribly hungry and they are crying for help. Let us not, I pray you, adopt restrictive amendments to this bill that will mean death to their hopes. If we adopt these amendments and the government of Yugoslavia—I use that country merely as an example—refuses to back down and admit representatives of the press, what then? In that event no food will go into Yugoslavia to relieve the starving; no clothing will go in to clothe the naked. Thousands upon thousands of people will perish simply becaus Yugoslavian officials do not recognize one of the institutions of freedom which we cherish—freedom of the press—although they have never enjoyed it and they hardly know the meaning of the term.

We should remember that this is a bill for the relief of human suffering. Our paramount duty is to get food to hungry mouths in as quick and direct a manner as possible. Let us not commit the unpardonable mistake of making our relief dependent upon the reform of political governing bodies. If we do that, millions of starving people whom we would like to help, will die before we can get around to them. Granting that the ruling officials of these stricken countries are as bad as they are said to be, our concern should be for the starving and naked people who right now need our help more than they need anything else in all the world, and we should not make our relief contingent upon reforming political systems.

Many of these small countries are unfriendly with each other, due to age-old animosities. Under the proposed amendment a stricken nation could not obtain food from the United States until it agrees to open its boundaries to the representatives of the press of 44 nations, some of whom are more or less unfriendly, and permit them to come in and pry around. The stricken nation probably would not agree to this condition and meanwhile its poor starving people would suffer and die.

We have a right, of course, to apply any restrictions to the UNRRA appropriation that we desire to apply, for it is the money of the American people, and we Members of the Congress are trustees of the people in voting this beneficence and in determining the conditions on which it shall be granted. We do not actually have to vote any appropriation at all. But as citizens of a Christian land our sense of duty to our Maker, the Father of us all, is not going to permit us to sit idle while human beings suffer the awful pangs of hunger and starvation in other lands. If we are going to relieve these poor people let us do so ungrudgingly and in the most effective way. So what we do let us, I beseech you, do graciously, without any strings and restrictions that would defeat the great humanitarian purpose we are seeking to achieve.

Gov. Herbert H. Lehman was a witness before our subcommittee several days in succession. No witness who ever appeared before us was more frank and honest. He gave every evidence not only of a great heart but a great mind. His exposition of the splendid humanitarian conception known as UNRRA and its function in relieving the distress of the world was most illuminating and inspiring. He pointed out to us the gamut of possibilities of this great human agency, as well as the dangers that beset it, and among the dangers he specifically mentioned the possibility of such restrictive amendments being adopted by this House as will lead all of the other contributing countries to adopt similar restrictions on the use of their contributions, thus causing the entire organization to bog down in a morass of politics, to the final and complete frustration of all of the fine purposes of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

I shall now close my remarks by reading to the committee the letter I received today from Governor Lehman in response to my request for his opinion on the effect of restrictive amendments, notably the so-called press amendment. His letter is as follows:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF
AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 30, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: You have asked me to comment on certain amendments which have been proposed for incorporation in the appropriation legislation for UNRRA now before the House Appropriations Committee. These amendments would make the use of the appropriated funds dependent upon a certification by the Director General of UNRRA that countries receiving UNRRA relief have agreed to certain conditions, including, for example, the admission of foreign-press representatives.

You know, I am sure, that I am heartily in favor of and have always fought for the fullest freedom of the press. The presence of correspondents in all the countries which UNRRA is aiding and the complete reporting by them of the progress of our programs would be welcomed by us. Without doubt, many of the misunderstandings of UNRRA's operations would have been avoided if this had been possible in the past.

I feel, however, that the method of attaining this and other objectives embodied in the proposed amendments is inappropriate. It is inconsistent with the conception that the policies which UNRRA is to apply in bringing relief to the devastated members of the United Nations are to be determined by the United Nations. The governing bodies of UNRRA, its council and central committee, have been meeting at intervals for 2 years, and have laid down in a series of resolutions, now numbering over 80, the policies to be followed by the Administration. These resolutions are adopted after full discussion in which all possible different national points of view can be considered. This, to my mind, is the appropriate procedure for determining UNRRA policy. The United States has taken the lead in the adoption of this international method of dealing with the relief problem, and it would be unfortunate if it were now the first to break away from it.

Of course, the United States has every right to determine whether it will participate in operations of UNRRA carried out in accordance with the instructions given to the Administration by its governing bodies. But the method proposed to be followed by these amendments could lead to disruption of the authority of those bodies by inviting other nations to attach all sorts of conditions to their contributions. As a result, the Administration would no longer be governed by an international organ, but by a series of bilateral arrangements with its various member governments. Also as a result, many of the conditions which would thus by imposed might well be inconsistent and so present insurmountable obstacles to the primary task of bringing aid to the victims of the war.

For these reasons I should consider it undesirable that the proposed amendments be adopted.

I may add that some of the amendments would impose upon UNRRA administrative burdens which it could not hope to carry and which might interfere with its primary relief task. UNRRA, for example, is not equipped to determine whether a press representative has been properly admitted to or excluded from one of its recipient countries. In view of the well-known differences of opinion as to what is the appropriate degree of freedom for reporting, UNRRA might well find itself spending a large part of its time investigating complaints regarding treatment of correspondents instead of on relief to the needy. For these reasons I said in the hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations:

"I should take the view that, since these are conditions imposed by the United States Government on its contribution, I would look to the Department of State, as representing the United States Government, to take responsibility for withholding funds for the relief of any country in the event of a breach of these conditions."

Speaking now simply as an American citizen, I believe that it would be unwise to use the American contribution to relief to attain certain American political objectives, however desirable. If relief fails to come to millions of destitute in Europe or the Far East because one or more of the conditions of the proposed amendments have not been met, America's good name will inevitably suffer. No matter how undesirable one may consider some recipient government's press policy to be, I do not think the American people would wish to use the threat of starvation to attempt to change it.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Director General.

Speaking as one Member of Congress, I am going to stand by Governor Lehman in this matter. I am not going to vote to hamstring him when he is earnestly and conscientiously trying to do the biggest relief job in the history of the world.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this joint resolution, now before the House, which provides for the appropriation of the additional sum of $550,000,000 for the portion allocated to our Nation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, is causing me considerable worry and distress as we approach the time when the vote is taken. I am confident I am not alone in my misgivings upon this subject, because many other Members in this body are also distressed over the consideration of this subject. My distress is occasioned by reason of the fact that in the event this huge sum of money is appropriated to UNRRA, as proposed, that will make the staggering sum of $1,350,000,000 that the United States of America has given for the purposes of UNRRA. We have participated to a large extent in World War II, in that we have provided a huge Army, and a great Navy, both of which have made noteworthy contributions to our signal victory. Not only that vast participation, which was accomplished at our own cost and expense, but we have contributed by and through Lease-Lend some $42,000,000,000 or more, which was used to aid foreign nations to finance their war effort—and we contributed planes, tanks, and guns—we gave ammunition and food—we have been the gracious and the generous Nation among them all, even to a fault which will, in the end, react to our very great disadvantage. That is in the past. Now, we are asked, again, to make a further contribution to aid those countries.

Mr. Chairman, when we scan the report, now submitted with this joint resolution, we find that the United States of America will have contributed the vast sum of $1,350,000,000 to UNRRA, if and when the sum provided in this measure is appropriated for that purpose, while the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will only contribute the sum of $1,750,000. Russia is a very wealthy nation, yet we are making a contribution almost 800 times the amount Russia is giving for this particular purpose. England, also a great and powerful nation, is giving a sum total of $322,400,000 for this purported relief work. As usual, our country is called upon, and those in power have made commitments to yield to that demand made by foreign countries, to give the lion's share of the relief assistance, as well as the aid which was given for the prosecution of the war. We are made the dupes in this entire affair, and the tragic recollection is that those in this administration, and those in charge of our foreign affairs, are ready and willing to give anything and everything to some foreign country, and let our own people, our aged, or laborers, our businessmen and our farmers pay the bill, and then to shift for themselves as best they can. That is a policy to which I cannot subscribe. It is true that we have an obligation, and a sacred duty, to prevent starvation where that is possible; we want to meet that challenge, and we will meet it. Yet we have people in our own country who are in want, and we have starvation with us—we have in this great Nation distress of every kind—and I wonder how we can meet our own country-wide obligations, when the taxpayer is sapped of almost everything he has, to take care of a kindred situation in foreign countries. While our people are working at top speed, following the close of the war, and the people of foreign countries, in many nations, have sat down and they are awaiting relief from some other source, and that source is largely this Nation. As long as we give the handouts, just that long will those nations await the next distribution. It is time that those countries go to work and cease quarreling and preparing to fight another war.

Mr. Chairman, in this agency, UNRRA, it has been reported that practically the entire administration of it comes from

London, England, where the offices are located that direct this relief. Many stirring reports have come respecting the maladministration of this agency. One report came to me, from one of those in the management of UNRRA in foreign countries, that the whole agency was not right—that it was not operated upon a sound basis—and that the entire set-up is no good. From this same source came the report that this agency should be entirely abolished and forgotten as quickly as possible. That report indicated that the money was squandered for needless purposes, and that it did not reach the people for whom it was intended. So many jobs have been created, and so many people have been placed upon the pay roll, that much of the money which should otherwise be available for the poor and the needy is recklessly used and foolishly employed. Black markets have sprung up, in many places, and that a large portion of the available food and supplies have found their way into those unauthorized and illegal places. The administration of this agency, and these funds, is very poor, and that can be confirmed from many and various sources. This money which we grant to this agency belongs to the people of this country. They have earned it by the sweat of the brow, and they have made the contribution to our Government—thinking, of course, that their money was correctly used and properly allocated for the needy and the poor. It is a sad commentary to visualize that such is not the case. But that waste, squandering, and misplacement of funds occur, and no one in the agency, and no one in our own Government, appears to try to stop that debauchery of our money so contributed.

Mr. Chairman, the people of our own country are now wondering when the end will come to the waste, extravagance and squandering of their money. If such heavy drains as this one are to be continued in the future, then there is no possible chance for our country to recover, or to survive. With a debt, following this war, of some $300,000,000,000 or more, and with further and greater demands made for more, and even more, money for the many and various projects presented, all of which will leave us in a state of financial collapse, while other nations will recover from their rather small obligations, which are much smaller than our own, and then we wonder what the end will be.

Today we are facing this issue. It is my hope that our Nation will survive—but there come the times when many despair, because the opportunity to go forward and survive are completely taken away. Yes; we will survive—but the pull will be a tough one, and every measure of this character is simply making it a harder and a tougher pull to make it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to convey my humble thanks to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who made very kind remarks about the report which I had the honor to make to this House on October 10 in connection with a visit that I paid to Europe, where I spent the greater part of my time investigating the actual operations of UNRRA. There was one thing in connection with what he said that I would like to correct. I went to Europe to attend a meeting of the third council of UNRRA at the suggestion of our former colleague, Mr. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture. I was appointed as a delegate to that meeting by the Department of State. When I returned I asked the Secretary of Agriculture if he wished me to make a formal report to him of my findings. He said: "No. Make your report to the House." It was for that reason that I reported very fully with respect to my findings on October 10, and I am not going to cover the ground again which I covered at that time. However, I do want to address myself for a few moments to certain of the amendments which have been adopted by the committee in the bill that is now before us and to certain of the amendments which will be offered tomorrow when the bill is open for amendment.

The one to which I want to address myself first is the one offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], which has to do with the press and reporting by the press on the distribution and the entire operation of relief.

That amendment was also referred to by the last speaker, who seemed to feel that it lay outside the proper scope of this bill; that there might be some embarrassment to member governments or to recipient governments if that amendment were adopted.

I think it is only fair to make the situation entirely clear with respect to the effect of that amendment. In the first place, the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would put on the President of the United States the responsibility of certifying to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration that members of the American press could view freely the operations of this great relief organization. That responsibility the President of the United States and the State Department have already assumed with respect to the countries in which UNRRA is operating. I can certify to the fact that today in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, and in Yugoslavia the members of the American press are allowed to enter freely, and within the very limited facilities of transportation, are allowed to travel freely and report without censorship.

Who, then, would this amendment affect? It seems to me it is very little realized by the Members of the House that Russia has applied for relief. The Central Soviet Government in Moscow first applied for $700,000,000 worth of relief. At a later date, when the Soviet Government realized that, in order to qualify as did other nations for this relief, it must submit a financial statement to show whether or not it was able to pay the cost of relief itself, and must likewise sign an agreement to allow a relief commission to enter the country, it changed its tactics. I am not now saying this in criticism of Russia in any way. Instead of applying for relief through the central government, the governments of White Russia and of the Ukraine, posing as independent nations, made application for relief. They had been admitted at San Francisco to the United Nations Organization in order to give Russia three votes at that Conference.

They were therefore recognized as separate governments and were admitted to the UNRRA organization. It has now been agreed that they should become recipients of some $250,000,000 worth of relief. That relief is now being scheduled by the UNRRA organization. Some $40,000,000 worth of foodstuffs have already been applied for to the Combined Food Board for those areas of Russia, and yet to my knowledge not a living human being from the UNRRA organization or from the American press has ever been within either of those two Soviet republics to ascertain what the need is or even to draw up the standard type of agreement which UNRRA always draws up with a recipient country. These two sections of Russia have undoubtedly suffered greatly as a result of German occupancy but as I said little is known about them. This amendment would in effect apply principally to these republics. Also it seems to me that in our over-all relationship with Russia this question of being able to observe what is happening from the point of view of the distribution of relief supplies on the part of the American people and the other allied nations of the UNRRA organization is of paramount importance. We are all suffering from doubts, suspicions, and misunderstandings in our relations with Russia. That is probably the greatest cloud that is hanging over the head of the world today; the cloud of suspicion and distrust as between the two most powerful military nations of the world. To my mind any step we can take which will lift the curtain, which will let light in on the operations in Russia, and let them see that what we are doing is being done in good faith will restore confidence and make a very real contribution in the over-all picture

Also, this amendment as I say does not put any burden on the relief organization as such, it does not require Governor Lehman or the relief organization to negotiate; it requires the President to do the negotiating which he through the Secretary of State has already successfully done in the case of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia thereby letting daylight into those countries, much to the benefit of all the nations concerned.

This amendment to my mind should definitely be passed and become a requirement of the continued or even the beginning of operations in those particular sections of Russia. With respect to the other amendments that have been offered, as has already been pointed out, at the very end of the printed hearings as they have been distributed, Mr. Byrnes, the Secretary of State, has offered a draft which contains a number of amendments which he feels would not be burdensome amendments on UNRRA. They are identical with those which I offered to the committee some 2 weeks ago; and while some of them have been incorporated in the bill itself there are one or two which I think would be helpful and they will be offered tomorrow when the bill is read for amendment.

The purpose of every one of these amendments is to be constructive. I came back from viewing the operations of this tremendous organization with a feeling that while there were many things open to criticism both in its past operations and in its present operations, nevertheless it was performing a task of such importance, of such magnitude, that we had no alternative either from a humanitarian point of view or from the point of view of our own self-interest but to continue to support it and then to lend whatever influence we have toward making it a better operating medium. The only purpose of these amendments is to perform the latter function. There is not any desire to obstruct; there is every desire to help with these amendments to carry out the fundamental purpose of UNRRA, namely, to distribute relief without regard to race, religion, or political affiliation.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the proposed UNRRA legislation, and I will vote for this appropriation. It is important to remember that a sense of honor must remain paramount in the hearts and minds of the people of the leading nation in the world today—the citizens of the United States of America. It is important to realize that UNRRA is not an American organization. It is rather, an international organization in which the United States of America participates with the other member nations. Most needs of the liberated countries can and will be met from indigenous resources, but only after they receive the relief and rehabilitation supplies needed from abroad to start the wheels of industry and agriculture turning again.

UNRRA has been subject to the same scurrilous attacks and vicious spreading of false rumors that was characteristic of the attack made by certain elements in the early days of lend-lease. Each of these rumors has been tracked down and found to be without merit. This fact versus fiction story unmasked the detractors of the great lend-lease program and now UNRRA finds it necessary to denounce the same traducers and give the lie to these wishers of evil and these doers of harm.

Among the many false charges made against UNRRA are those directed against its finances. The financial program under which UNRRA operates recommends that each uninvaded country contribute to UNRRA an amount equivalent to 1 percent of its national income for the year ending June 30, 1943. In addition, it recommends that all countries, including those invaded, contribute to the administrative expenses of UNRRA. As of June 30, 1945, UNRRA had made requests upon supplying Governments to deliver relief and rehabilitation and to provide shipping and other services amounting to $773,009,000. To meet these obligations it had available contributions amounting to $1,265,632,533, while an additional $23,013,050 had been appropriated but had been deferred until 1946 and 1947.

Supply programs provide for the commitment of more than $1,100,000,000 by the end of the third quarter, which will exhaust practically all of UNRRA's resources. To fulfill all these programs designed to aid the liberated countries to aid themselves, UNRRA will need the remaining $550,000,000 of the United States contribution which was authorized by the joint resolution of March 28, 1944, but which has not yet been appropriated by the Congress. And so, the matter is before us at this time.

I am convinced that this appropriation bill will pass with an overwhelming vote, and I deplore that the Halls of Congress should be made the political forum for the beating of the drums, the sounding of the tocsins, and the airing of the brassy-voiced peanut politician who would use "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" for partisan political gain. Shame on the spokesmen of a party who would warm their hands over the political fires fed with the blood, sweat, and tears of suffering humanity throughout the world.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay tribute to a great American and brilliant administrator in the field of government, present chief of UNRRA, and distinguished former governor of the great State of New York, Herbert H. Lehman. Giving freely of his time, his money, and his health, and reaching deep into the well of his great depth of feeling for humanity, this patriotic American and world citizen has headed the fine organization that is UNRRA in doing the work of Almighty God upon earth. And may I pay tribute to the zeal and spirit and the fine ability of the personnel of UNRRA with whom I have had considerable contacts. After weeding out the misfits and malcontents that are, of necessity, found in any great organization in its early days, the men and women of UNRRA today are a credit to their organization and to their country.

I have no patience for the abuse and criticism directed at the good people of the Washington office of UNRRA, who work day and night to carry out the purposes of the parent organization. And I think particular praise is merited today by the chiefs of the personnel section and their immediate associates for their tireless efforts to sift the chaff from the wheat in performing this tremendous task of recruiting the right people for the right job at the right time. I do not hesitate in saying that those who attack them could not even approximate their success.

Napoleon is supposed to have stated that an army marches on its stomach. Certainly the health, welfare, and happiness of a people hungry and destitute is in a precarious state. Hunger, destitution, sickness, and disease will breed unrest and the specter of communism. Hungry people are fertile fields for the philosophies of the anti-Christ and for those who would make God of the omnipotent state.

If you say to me, "Am I my brother's keeper?" I direct your attention to the condition of your brother steeped in the tragedy that cloaks the rest of the world today. The answer can only be "Yes."

This is not a political matter. There is no political gain for anyone. There confronts us a simple duty as human beings, and when confronted with this cause, my beloved country never fails to recognize and perform its duty.

I hold no brief for the dereliction of duty, for administrative errors or any other faults that have occurred during the formative days of UNRRA, but it ill becomes anyone fully aware that these faults have been corrected to trot them forth now when they serve no good and can act as no example for the future. It is shabby practice to profess belief in UNRRA and then slyly refer to mistakes which UNRRA itself was the first to admit and act at once to correct. Will there never be an end to this "tongue in cheek" support for great humanitarian principles? Will there never be an end to those who speak with a forked tongue at all times when the subject is international in its scope?

The United States of America is satisfied beyond all doubt of the fantastic suffering among our allies. The people of this country are firm in their desire that their Nation shall show again its full measure of devotion to the cause of humanity in assisting in the return of happiness and health to all those who were with us in the West and the East.

I close with the words of President Truman who had this to say in connection with American aid:

> It is an American responsibility, not only to our friends but to ourselves, to see that this job is done and done quickly.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment which will be offered in due time by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], or some other gentleman, as one of the so-called free-press amendments, rather appealed to me at first. Having just listened to two gentlemen explain the effect and purpose of such amendment, I have been turning over in my mind the real value of such proposals, but having listened to the reading of the letter from Governor Lehman, presented by the gentleman from Indiana, I am fearful that it would be a mistake to force this condition of a so-called free press upon the distressed nations of the world as a price of our furnishing them relief. No one values a free press more than I do, and no one wants the full light of publicity turned upon all the doing of UNRRA in every nook and cranny of the world, where it operates, more than I do myself, but certainly Governor Lehman's explanation in that letter against it is a very convincing one. What is the alternative?

We are told that Governor Lehman and other officials of UNRRA admitted that there have been many mistakes made and some waste of this precious fund heretofore. Wasteful extravagance in the handling of relief funds and the affairs of UNRRA is far worse than a corresponding waste in military matters would be, unless in both cases the wastefulness robbed human life, and because of it, increased human suffering. This fund is a sacred fund. The handling of it is a sacred trust. The money of this

fund is blood money, in more than one respect. It is blood money, taxed from the American people, furnished through their sweat and blood. It is blood money also if it is misused and diverted from the mission of mercy to relieve human suffering on which the donors have sent it.

Therefore, I insist that we have more than an expression of good intent on the part of those administering the fund. There must be a careful check. However, it would seem to me that that careful check ought to be by the authority of our Government. I would not rely upon the inspection of the agents of UNRRA, exclusively, but I would have a check and double check by qualified officials who would have no interest other than to safeguard the fund and see that it is used as a sacred trust. It may be that some nations would object to throwing wide their doors to our press correspondents, when this is forced upon them as a condition of receiving relief, but that could not apply to an inspection by authorized agents of our Government as to the expenditure and use of UNRRA funds. I agree that the American people ought to know how faithfully the work has been done in carrying out this great humanitarian mission of our Nation.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I regard this as one of the most important bills that the House will be called upon to consider in this session of the Congress. In my judgment, the people of the country are supporting this appropriation. We have no right, as guardians of public funds, to vote this large appropriation even though the need might appear to us to be very great, unless the taxpayers themselves in providing the revenue evidence their personal interest in the problem and their desire to relieve the suffering that exists in the world.

The idea of its dual purpose: First, to stabilize social conditions and thus serve our national interest through the elimination of discontent and consequent threats to peace; and, second, advancing the cause of humanitarianism in a world that is full of suffering and destitution, has been well presented. We are indeed serving our own interests in rendering this aid, and the appropriation can be fully justified from that standpoint. I hope, however, that it will not have the principal emphasis. This action is significant because it represents our desire to help stricken people, not ourselves.

While we should avoid magnifying the size of this appropriation, we could not in fairness to the American people represent that no sacrifices are involved in the broad program of helping distressed humanity in the various undertakings both governmental and private in the present crisis. Five hundred and fifty million dollars is a lot of money, and this plus the millions being subscribed by voluntary organizations for relief work throughout the world should be an ample demonstration that the American people are still sensitive to hunger and want wherever they exist.

I have been impressed by the fine statement presented to the House on October 10 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who by reason of his experience in Mr. Hoover's food organization 25 years ago, is peculiarly equipped to advise the House regarding some of the practical phases of this program. I am sure the fact that the committee does not agree with all of his recommendations will not obscure the outstandingly constructive service he rendered in submitting a report of observations on his recent trip to areas where relief is being administered. I am glad to join my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in this tribute to our colleague even though I am not convinced as to the wisdom of the gentleman's amendment.

The responsible officials of UNRRA state that it is the purpose of the organization to "help people to help themselves"—that is the proper philosophy and unless we have faith in the capacity of those we are helping to again develop self-sustaining populations, the future would look very dismal indeed.

The food requirements of vast populations are staggering. If America were to double its food production and were to send all of the added supply abroad we still could not bring all of the distressed nations up to minimum nutritional standards. The only hope is in the constructive assistance that enables them to bring out of their own soil as a result of their own efforts the food with which to sustain life and the other things that are elemental in human existence.

I hope that when action on this appropriation shall have been completed it will reflect not a grudging contribution to allay the restlessness of hungry people but rather that magnanimity which is in our best tradition. Unless our hearts are in this action it is scarcely more than a gesture, but if we can, by exerting ourselves, find a way to prove to those whom we aid that the gift reflects a deep concern for human welfare and a desire to conserve human life we will have acted in the true spirit of American leadership and resourcefulness.

The tendency, in a period like this when we have done so much for other peoples our greatest service being to save their freedom, is to retreat to problems of domestic concern. The problems at home are difficult, but we would betray our better natures if we neglected the world's greatest distress and failed to respond in the most unselfish spirit to the plea for aid. The response would be just what it ought to be if the people were fully advised as to the extent of suffering. In spite of the peace this is still an unhappy world, and only the very selfish can be indifferent to that fact.

It seems to me that it is the obligation of the Congress to tell the people that this appropriation of their money, money provided by the taxpayers often with hardship, is in line with our interpretation of their desire to be constructively helpful and generous, even to the point of inconvenience and sacrifice, if necessary, to allay the suffering that is abroad in the world. The appropriation should be made as an emergency action without hesitation and without an attempt to bring it exclusively within the sphere of our own national well-being.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCMILLEN].

Mr. MCMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state my reasons for supporting and voting for a further appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

I spent 6 weeks in July and August of this past summer in Bavaria, Germany, Italy, Greece, and Austria. I traveled with no committee and desired to make unfettered and personal observations of the conditions in these countries and to learn what the natives and others were thinking about. I hoped that the information obtained in this way would assist me in voting a little more intelligently on legislation in Congress having to do with our relationship with these countries.

After leaving Kaufbeuren, Germany, which is located in the American-occupied sector of Germany, I was given a military permit which provided transportation, escorts, and interpreters in making my investigation. Permission was granted to go wherever I wished, stay as long as I desired, and make such inquiries as I saw fit without any restrictions whatsoever.

I intended to visit my son over the week end who was stationed at Kaufbeuren with the Eightieth Division of the Third Army, but remained there several days visiting screening camps, displaced-persons centers, and the natives of this locality. Through interpreters I talked to soldiers who were the remnants of the German Army in screening camps and furthermore visited a camp that was retaining 19 German generals, 1 admiral, and about 20 high political prisoners. I saw and talked to Poles, Ukrainians, and White Russians in displaced persons centers occupied by men, women, and children. I traveled from Brenner Pass to Naples, Italy, by automobile, then to Greece and Athens and finally back to Vienna.

I visited few historical monuments and was little entertained, using my time in observing the condition and mental attitude of these people. Knowledge was gained from American officers, the natives, and others with whom I talked. It was my purpose to get down to a lower level than an ordinary traveler for my study.

The people residing and remaining in these countries were hungry, dirty, and had to a considerable extent lost their common morals on account of the repercussions and devastations of war. I concluded that tens of thousands of men, women, and children would perish this winter from lack of food and fuel unless help in addition to their own resources was furnished to them.

I first was not allowed to go into Vienna but finally was granted permission and found that the conditions there were the most serious of any. At this time I was the only Congressman to have visited this city. This is an example of what I found. My son who was permitted to go to Vienna with me had two Viennese boys under his command in Bavaria whose parents lived in Vienna, and from whom they had heard nothing for several months. These boys gave us

letters in the hope that we might deliver them to their parents. We did not find them in our first day of traveling around through the American and Russian sector of Vienna. The next morning while I was otherwise engaged my son searched and finally found the parents of one of the boys living on the third floor of a respectable looking apartment house. These people were intelligent and respectable citizens of Vienna. Their personal belongings and most of the furnishings of their apartment had been carried away by members of the Red army. They had no fagots for fuel and little food and because of their weakened condition were both unable to forage for themselves for more than was being rationed by the Russian authorities.

The average American consumes about 3,300 calories a day. The Geneva convention contemplates that prisoners of war should receive a minimum of 2,500 calories of food per day. The information was that these respected Viennese people were each receiving only 800 calories of food per day eaten cold for lack of fuel and this allowance prevailed in Vienna. The normal weight of the mother of this boy was 130 pounds. She then weighed only 75 pounds.

The father, a former colonel in the Hapsburg army, was likewise emaciated. Both were slowly dying. Unless this condition is changed in Vienna thousands will die in the winter now approaching. They had been looted of their food and livestock, jewelry, furniture, and machinery by the Red Army in leaving that country. The Russians justified this action as retribution for the same being done to them by these Austrians and the Germans in the drive of the German Army to near Moscow a couple of years previous. Similar conditions prevail in the other countries where I traveled.

I made no special study of UNRRA as it was being operated in a limited way in these countries but I continually heard adverse criticism from both Americans and natives. I have no brief for UNRRA. It has made too many inexcusable mistakes. There is however no other available organization now to carry on the necessary relief and rehabilitation for the cold months to come among these people. We must use this organization as best we can to rescue them from misery and death this winter. While it may be true that the overlords of these people may divert and misdirect a part of this relief and use it to establish a philosophy of government to which we do not subscribe, but the people should not be the victims of such circumstances. We should look at it from a humanitarian viewpoint and will respect ourselves more in doing so. We should spare some of our luxuries for the mere necessities that will save so many of these unfortunate people from death. In doing so, we will obtain the unforgettable friendship from those who are relieved.

If conditions were not so desperate I would agree that the provisos suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] in his speech to the House a few days ago on amendments proposed as to liberty of press and financial statements, but the countries controlled by Russia will not be permitted to agree to such conditions. It is now too late and time does not permit for delay—we cannot rescue the ship but we can provide life belts for the passengers.

We must furnish food, fuel, and enough of our enormous number of 2½-ton trucks now over there for transporting supplies which can be made possible by proper appropriation. Also, reasonable help should be provided in securing seed, fertilizer, and some machinery in planting their crops next spring. I greatly doubt if further help should be provided. At least this is as far as we should go at this time. I am not interested at this moment in the industrial rehabilitation within the power of UNRRA, but only in those things necessary to keep the body and soul of these people together. It is just a humane matter.

It would be tragic indeed if a war to end injustice should culminate in visiting additional hardship upon these unfortunate victims. The world cannot justly deny these people a right to live—a place on this earth where they can just live until the sun may shine a little brighter next spring.

If we are to fulfill our responsibilities as a great and prosperous democratic people, we must act before it is too late.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, we live in a period of time when it seems to be the fashionable thing to do to lay all of our burdens on the Government. Things that individuals and societies and organizations ought to do are turned over to the Government. It seems to me that in addition to whatever aid UNRRA can deliver to the peoples of the world the way ought to be clear so that individuals, churches, and charitable organizations can send food, clothing, and medicines to these distressed people.

It has been my experience in recent weeks to receive many requests from citizens of the United States who want to send packages to their relatives in Europe, but are not permitted to do so. I realize that one of the great obstacles preventing a citizen of this country from sending a package of medicine and food to his relatives in Czechoslovakia, for instance, is the matter of transportation, but certainly if UNRRA or the military could provide the transportation it would lessen their burdens and relieve the Public Treasury. After all, it does not take any more transportation facilities to carry 100 pounds of material that is paid for by a source other than the Treasury of the United States than it does to transport that much material that the taxpayers have to pay for. Why should not a citizen of the United States be allowed to send help to his relatives in Czechoslovakia?

I think we are missing a great chance to spread good will around the world when individuals, our churches, and charitable organizations are denied an opportunity to feed the starving people of the world, and when they are denied an opportunity to send medicines, clothing, and food to these distressed people.

Mr. Chairman, before this money is turned over to UNRRA we ought to have an understanding that UNRRA and the military will use their facilities to deliver those articles of relief that are donated by citizens of the United States. It ought to be done.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman has made a very fine contribution. I think most Members of the House have received letters from their constituency requesting assistance in sending some packages to their relatives, in many cases the relatives being American women married to foreigners, and so on, in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere. I think this supplemental help should be accepted by UNRRA.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. They are people who are well able to help their parents or other relatives who are living in Europe. They would be glad to do it. They do not want the American taxpayer to have to do it. Yet they are denied an opportunity to send that help.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYS. I understand that some of the church relief organizations, such as the Church of the Brethren, for example, which has a large rural constituency, are doing a very notable work in sending livestock for the foundation herds of some of these stricken countries. I know something of the work that has been done by the local congregation, for example, of the Church of the Brethren, through conversations with their leaders. I wonder if that should not be encouraged and if that is not in support of what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to have the gentleman inform me how that transportation is being arranged and to whom it is consigned and who sees that it gets there. I think it is a good thing. Of course, I have no quarrel with the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I can supply the full information on it. I think in view of the gentleman's comment that this is being restrained in some way that it should be supplied. I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman is saying about the need of this voluntary help.

Mr. CURTIS. There is no place where you can take a package and have it delivered to someone in Europe, even thought you pay the transportation charges.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RABAUT. For the gentleman's information, I refer him to page 64 of the hearings wherein I brought up the very subject to which he refers, because the St. Vincent de Paul Society of the Catholic Church, which is a charitable organization which has been in operation in this country for 100 years, this year, has been attempting to assist in its charitable works in Europe and were unable to get their supplies abroad. I brought up the question and I note in

the fine print on page 64 where they show in what manner this may be done. The gentleman makes a very good point and I am very glad that he brought it up.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. In connection with the excellent point which the gentleman has brought up, I think you would be interested to know that many of the leading charitable societies in the country today are trying to work out a package system to give the very aid which the gentleman has in mind. They are planning, as presently considered, to purchase from the Army roughly $33,000,000 worth of 10-in-1 rations which are beautifully packaged and which are surplus and can be distributed by purchase here and through delivery to individuals at the other end and would be available in all sections of Europe.

Mr. CURTIS. Can the gentleman tell me what is being done to enable a person in this country to have something delivered to a specific person in Europe?

Mr. HERTER. These packages would be delivered to a specific person, but they would be standard packages. The difficulty of getting separate packages transported and then finding delivery service at the other end is very much more than is the case with a standard package.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind that the international organization known as UNRRA was never intended to be a relief organization. It so happens that I had the opportunity to spend some time at Hot Springs, Va., where I saw this organization spring into being. The conference at Hot Springs was not a food conference. Food was merely a mask to cover up the real purpose of the assemblage. The fundamental objective of the Hot Springs conference was to lay the foundation stones for an international governmental body.

UNRRA has been foisted upon the United States in the name of a benevolent governmental agency whose work was to be that of mercy. Instead it is, in my judgment, an international racket of the first water. I am measuring my words. I know what was done by America after the other war for the hungry and naked in the stricken areas. Let any one compare the two programs and decide for themselves. Later I shall make a comparison to show the small cost of operating the program of relief that was carried out after World War I with the cost of UNRRA. Suffice it, for the moment, to say that the difference is so great as to constitute a disgrace. Examine the figures and decide for yourself.

The personnel of the UNRRA organization undoubtedly receive the highest salaries ever paid to any governmental agency. I am inserting data showing the income of those employees. Look them over and decide for yourself whether my statement is correct.

SALARIES AND OTHER INCOME OF PERSONNEL OF UNRRA

Shortly after the measure setting up UNRRA was passed I succeeded obtaining a schedule of the rates of pay of the personnel of UNRRA headquarters office. I had great difficulty in obtaining verification by Mr. Lehman's office of my figures. When I first approached that office on the matter of obtaining certain figures and verifying others I was frankly told that UNRRA was an international organization and in substance that it was in no way obliged to furnish Congressmen any information relating to it. After a lot of maneuvering, and when UNRRA office realized that I was in possession of the salary schedule, I was finally successful in persuading Mr. Lehman's office to verify the pay schedule which had been furnished me.

But before going into these salaries I should like to call the attention of the committee to a situation which reveals that the salaries as listed by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration are not the real ones which they receive.

In Director General Lehman's September 1944 report, he states the following:

One of these special benefits is the provident fund, which is intended to solve the problem of interruption of pension rights caused by taking employment with the administration and to provide a form of severance compensation because of the temporary character of the administration's operations. This fund is made up of deductions of 5 percent from the salary of each employee plus an additional 7½ percent contributed by the administration, the total to be available to the employee upon leaving the administration with an honorable record after at least 6 months of service.

Thus it will be seen that the true salaries are 7½ percent higher than shown on the books of this agency.

For example, Director General Lehman's annual salary is not $15,000, as the people have been led to believe, but $15,000 plus 7½ percent of this amount, or $16,125. Whether or not Mr. Lehman intends to take any of the salary allowed him, and I understand he has not taken any up to now, this does not affect the point under discussion, since it is the rate of pay fixed for the person holding the office of Director General which sets the standard. His assistant, whose salary is listed as $14,000, actually receives $15,050. I shall return to the 7½-percent bonus later.

Let us now look at a few samples of salary schedules of this agency, keeping in mind, however, that 7½ percent of each salary must be added to it to reflect the true amount received. Let me repeat that all of these items were made available finally with the greatest reluctance by the office of the Director General.

In the budget for UNRRA headquarters office there is one at $15,000 per annum. This refers, of course, to the Director General, Mr. Lehman. One at $14,000 per annum; 5 at $12,000 per annum; 1 at $11,500 per annum; 7 at $10,000 per annum; 5 at $9,000 per annum; 28 at $8,000 per annum; and so forth.

Now under Budget for Balkan Missions there is 1 at $9,500 per annum; 3 at $9,000 per annum; 13 at $8,000 per annum; 15 at $7,000 per annum; 58 at $6,000 per annum; and so forth.

In the budget personnel services, Bureau of Areas, there is 1 at $12,000 per annum; 4 at $8,000 per annum; 13 at $7,000 per annum; 12 at $6,000 per annum; 9 at $5,000 per annum; and so forth.

In the budget personnel services, Bureau of Supply, there is 1 at $12,000 per annum; 1 at $11,500 per annum; 1 at $9,000 per annum; 13 at $8,000 per annum; 27 at $7,000 per annum; and so forth.

Italian mission observers: 4 at $7,000 per annum; 7 at $6,000 per annum; 3 at $5,000 per annum; and so forth.

Typical salaries paid by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to its officials and employees: Public information officer, $10,000; assistant, $9,000; assistant, $8,000; financial adviser, $10,000; two assistants, $6,000; general counsel, $10,000; assistant, $8,000; assistant, $7,000; library and reports chief, $7,000; historian, $5,000; and so forth.

But the income of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration employees does not only comprise the amount of their salaries plus 7½ percent. In addition they receive liberal allowances when they are in countries other than their country of residence.

Referring again to Mr. Lehman's September 1944, report:

A system of per diem allowances has also been devised for employees of the Administration who are sent to countries other than their country of residence. Under this system allowances are paid to defray the difference between the average current out-of-pocket expense at the employee's post of duty and the comparable expense that would have been incurred in his country of residence or at the office from which he is assigned. In addition a modest allowance is paid to all such employees who are compelled to maintain a separate establishment for their families while they are away from their country of residence. The size of these allowances varies with the circumstances.

Nothing, however, is said in the report as to the amount of per diem allowance UNRRA employees in the field are to receive. The following shows what those allowances amount to:

Single persons stationed at Cairo, Egypt, receive an allowance not to exceed $3.50 per day. Married persons stationed at Cairo, Egypt, receive an allowance not to exceed $7.50 per day, including $4 separation allowance. If food is provided free in Cairo, the above rates will be reduced $3.50 per day. If lodging is provided in Cairo, free, the above rates will be reduced $2.50 per day.

However, the maximum reduction for free food and lodging shall not exceed $3.50 per day.

Single persons stationed at Mahdi, Egypt, are supplied with free food and lodging. Married persons stationed at Mahdi, Egypt, are supplied with free food and lodging plus $4 per day separation allowance.

Single persons stationed at Cairo or Mahdi while away from post of duty on official business in Egypt or other countries in the Near East receive an allowance not to exceed $9 per day. Married persons stationed at Cairo or Mahdi while away from post of duty on official business in Egypt or other countries in the Near East receive an allowance of not to exceed $12 per day (including $3 separation allowance). Such persons will not receive

the per diem allowance attributable to their being stationed at Cairo or Mahdi while away from such station traveling on official business.

I should like to state that when I first inquired at the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation headquarters office about these allowances and stated the amounts it was flatly denied that any such amounts were received. It was only when they realized at that office that I was in possession of the regulations setting up these schedules of allowances that they admitted my figures were correct.

I am informed that these allowances are in many, if not most cases, sufficient to pay for lodging, meals, and so forth, so that no resort need to be had to the salaries for these purposes.

The 7½-percent bonus which UNRRA provides for its employees needs special treatment. As stated in the Director General's report for September 1944 the "provident fund" is made up of deductions of 5 percent from the salary of each employee plus an additional 7½ percent contributed by the Administration, the total to be available to the employee upon leaving the Administration with an honorable record after at least 6 months of service. I know of no authority or precedent that can justify this arrangement. Civil service personnel in the employ of the Federal Government are not provided with anything of this sort. They cannot draw out any part of the Government's contribution to the retirement fund except in the form of retirement benefits after the age of retirement and even then only if they have had 5 or more years of service.

Mr. Lehman says that this arrangement "is intended to solve the problem of interruption of pension rights caused by taking up employment with the Administration and to provide a form of severance compensation because of the temporary character of the Administration's operations."

The presumption is that UNRRA employees are taken out of essential Government employment and that they are expected to return to their former jobs when the work of this organization has been ended. Surely this is a false premise unless it is intended that the employees brought into the Government for the war emergency are to be retained there permanently, which, whether true or not, Mr. Lehman would hardly argue is the case. But even so, this line of reasoning has another flaw in it. If the employees of UNRRA, we are speaking only of citizens of the United States, are to be considered as permanent employees of the Federal Government, that they have only been temporarily separated from it, who is taking the place of those persons in the Federal Government? Is Mr. Lehman's proposition predicated on the assumption that the persons replacing those taken from the Federal Government to be employed by UNRRA are to have only a temporary employment status and that the UNRRA employees are to have their old jobs back in the Government? If so, how does he justify turning the temporary employees out of the Government without giving them the same consideration as is given UNRRA employees?

Or does Mr. Lehman's line of reasoning go so far as to presume that the personnel provided to take the place of Federal employees who have gone over to UNRRA are to be retained permanently in the employ of the Federal Government and that the UNRRA employees who were taken from the Federal pay roll are also to retain a permanent status of employment with the Federal Government? Or just what is Mr. Lehman's line of reasoning?

Furthermore, how many United States citizens in the employ of UNRRA were taken from the Federal pay roll? Why should the taxpayers of the United States pay this bonus to the hundreds of foreigners employed in this organization?

There just is no justification for this 7½-percent provision. It seems to me that the persons responsible for setting up this arrangement, and Mr. Lehman must assume the principal responsibility because he is the Director General of UNRRA, simply saw an opportunity whereby they could by this devious procedure extract what looks to me like unearned income from the taxpayers for the benefit of a privileged group of employees.

Why was it necessary to set up a training center at the University of Maryland and at other points, London and Cairo, to teach UNRRA employees foreign languages, regional orientation, history, and background of international aid, to perform the simple task of handing out bread to the starving? What nonsense this might be considered to be, were it not so tragic. To dissipate and misuse funds voted for relief for these anomalous purposes is, in my opinion, nothing short of a crime.

Just from the angle of conserving our resources and to maintain the integrity and structure of our economy such misapplication of funds is not allowable.

The United States had a most successful experience in providing aid to war-stricken peoples following the other war.

Let me review briefly some of the high points relating to that experience. The data which I shall present were taken from Surface, American Food in the World War, and Reconstruction, and Mellendorf's History of the United States Food Administration.

It is my understanding that the United States Food Administrator served during the other war and armistice, without pay, except $1 per year.

As head of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, the United States Food Administrator and Director General for Relief from 1914 to 1919 directed the shipment and distribution of more than 30,000,000 metric tons of grain, flour, sugar, forage, pork, milk, clothing, medical supplies, and other related items to our allies and the hungry and needy of the war-stricken countries of Europe. The total was valued at more than $4,000,000,000.

On December 1, 1918, the total number of paid employees in the Washington office was 1,339, with a total annual salary rate of $1,705,722, or an average annual salary of $1,274.83.

The number of employees in the States eventually reached a total of about 9,000. The number of volunteers in the States reported about December 1, 1918, as 7,984. On this date there were in the States only 1,583 paid employees.

The total expenditures for food administration were $7,862,669 over the 2-year period from August 1917 to July 1919. This included the cost of temporary buildings—still in use by the Government—and $1,236,377 for printing and binding.

The amount paid for services of permanent and temporary employees in the Relief Administration from August 1917 to July 1919 was $3,793,000.

It is seen from the above totals of salaries that the annual budget for the administration of UNRRA and before this agency had actually started operations was more than three times greater than the annual amount paid for salaries in connection with the United States Food Administration.

Further, the average annual salary rate for UNRRA employees at Washington headquarters, on the basis of the data shown above, is three times greater than was that of the United States Food Administration employees.

It should also be borne in mind that the value of supplies handled by the United States Food Administration was greatly in excess of $4,000,000,000, while the total sum that is to be made available to UNRRA is only about $2,200,000,000.

By no stretch of the imagination, in my judgment, can the claim be substantiated that UNRRA has any of the characteristics of an agency of mercy, or that it can possibly engender good will among the nations. The high salaries and income and the outright gift of 7½ percent which the organization provides for its members, condemns it as the cheapest kind of political racket, so far as I am concerned.

It should be abolished forthwith and not another cent appropriated for it. This is a task of mercy, not exploitation, and it should be undertaken by those who have demonstrated a genuine interest in this sphere.

There are in the United States many men who are fully capable of managing a real program of relief, who would be glad to take the job and do it gratis, as was done in World War I. And the right man could get all the vounteers he needs to help him in this work, as was also done in the other war. That kind, and only that kind, can perform the real task of mercy in ministering to the starving. That kind and only that kind can engender good will among all men.

To answer your question specifically, Mr. LUDLOW, I would say that we have the example of how this was done in the other war.

Let us set up an agency of that kind and do away with this grandiose bureaucratic program which is a disgrace, in my opinion, to nations throughout the

world. That is the way I feel, honestly and earnestly.

I want to help these people. I happened to study on the Continent for nearly a year some time after the other war. I saw in the clinics the aftermath of undernourishment which came about as the result of that conflict. I saw those children growing up with rickets, where you could easily tell the cause of their affliction—undernourishment.

I studied the charts in the tuberculosis wards and saw how the infection and mortality rate rose as undernourishment increased.

I want your committee to understand that I want this work of mercy done, but I want it to be a work of mercy, and, as I said before, not a work of exploitation, and I cannot conceive of this being anything else but the latter.

UNRRA ADMINISTRATIVE SET-UP SHOWING BASE RATES OF PAY OF OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES, PERSONNEL, ETC.—EMPLOYEES ASSIGNED ABROAD RECEIVE CERTAIN ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCES—THE DATA ARE SUBSTANTIALLY ACCURATE, SUFFICIENTLY SO, AT LEAST, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ILLUSTRATION

BUDGET FOR UNRRA HEADQUARTERS OFFICE

One at $15,000 per annum.
One at $14,000 per annum.
Five at $12,000 per annum.
One at $11,500 per annum.
Seven at $10,000 per annum.
Five at $9,000 per annum.
Twenty-eight at $8,000 per annum.
Fifty-two at $7,000 per annum.
Sixty-nine at $6,000 per annum.
Forty-five at $5,000 per annum.
Twenty-three at $4,500 per annum.
Sixteen at $4,000 per annum.
Thirty-five at $3,600 per annum.
Forty-eight at $3,200 per annum.
Forty-one at $2,800 per annum.
Forty at $2,000 per annum.
One hundred and nine at $2,400 per annum.
One hundred and nine at $2,000 per annum.
Twenty at $1,800 per annum.
Fifteen at $1,620 per annum.
Total, $2,624,000.

BUDGET FOR BALKAN MISSIONS

One at $9,500 per annum.
Three at $9,000 per annum.
Thirteen at $8,000 per annum.
Fifteen at $7,000 per annum.
Fifty-eight at $6,000 per annum.
One hundred and thirty-five at $5,000 per annum.
Fifty-five at $4,500 per annum.
One hundred and eighteen at $4,000 per annum.
Ten at $3,600 per annum.
Nineteen at $3,200 per annum.
Fourteen at $2,800 per annum.
Forty-two at $2,400 per annum.
Total, $2,226,800.

BUDGET PERSONNEL SERVICES, BUREAU OF AREAS

One at $12,000 per annum.
Four at $8,000 per annum.
Thirteen at $7,000 per annum.
Twelve at $6,000 per annum.
Nine at $5,000 per annum.
One at $4,500 per annum.
One at $6,745 per annum.
Two at $5,662 per annum.
Four at $4,795 per annum.
One at $4,470 per annum.
One at $4,146 per annum.
Six at $3,600 per annum.
Nine at $3,200 per annum.
Eight at $2,800 per annum.
Fourteen at $2,400 per annum.
Eleven at $2,200 per annum.
Two at $2,000 per annum.
Total, $436,965.

BUDGET PERSONNEL SERVICES, BUREAU OF SUPPLY

One at $12,000 per annum.
One at $11,500 per annum.
One at $9,000 per annum.
Thirteen at $8,000 per annum.
Twenty-seven at $7,000 per annum.
Thirty-two at $6,000 per annum.
Twenty at $5,000 per annum.
Eight at $4,500 per annum.
Four at $4,000 per annum.
Six at $3,600 per annum.
Eleven at $3,200 per annum.
Fifteen at $2,800 per annum.
Forty-three at $2,400 per annum.
Twenty-seven at $2,200 per annum.
Three at $2,000 per annum.
One at $1,620 per annum.
Total, $933,520.

Notable in this budget are the numerous small offices, or subdivisions, consisting of from 3 to 10 persons, usually 1 at eight or seven thousand, 1 at six or five thousand with a secretary; also high salaries paid to analysts for analysis of seeds, for analysis of poultry, for analysis of containers. Salaries of five, six, and seven thousands.

ITALIAN MISSION OBSERVERS

Four at $7,000 per annum.
Seven at $6,000 per annum.
Three at $5,000 per annum.
One at $2,800 per annum.
One at $2,400 per annum.
Total, $90,200.

Part of the Director General's staff consists of an office of public information staffed by—

One at $10,000 per annum.
One at $7,200 per annum.
Three at $7,000 per annum.
Two at $6,300 per annum.
One at $6,000 per annum.
One at $5,300 per annum.
One at $3,900 per annum.
One at $3,600 per annum.
One at $2,500 per annum.
Four at $2,400 per annum.
Two at $2,260 per annum.

Including chief of visual media at $7,000; chief of radio, $7,000; chief of organized groups, $7,000.
Total, $86,220.

TYPICAL SALARIES PAID BY THE UNRRA TO ITS OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES

Public information officer, $10,000.
Assistant, $9,000.
Assistant, $8,000.
Financial adviser, $10,000.
Two assistants, $6,000.
General counsel, $10,000.
Assistant, $8,000.
Assistant, $7,000.
Library and reports chief, $7,000.
Historian, $5,000.
Welfare division director, $10,000.
Deputy, $8,000.
Chief of studies, $7,000.
Two special assistants, $7,000.
One associate, $6,000.
Treasurer, $10,000.
Assistant, $8,000.
Bureau of Finance—Disbursing officer, $8,000.
Budget officer, $8,000.
Budget analyst, $6,000.
Chief accountant, $8,000.
Auditor, $8,000.
Auditor-examiners, $5,000.
Chief administrative analyst, $8,000.
Senior administrative analyst, $5,000.
Personnel division director, $9,000.
Assistant director, $8,000.
Deputy director, $7,000.
Placement and personnel officers, $7,000, $6,000, and $5,000 each.
Administrative service director, $8,000.
Food division chief, $8,000.
Chiefs of four subdivisions, $7,000 each.
Clothing division chief, $8,000.
Two chiefs of subsections, $7,000 each.
Four subsection chiefs, clothing division, $6,000 each.
Industrial equipment chief, $8,000.
Assistant, $7,000.
Three assistants, $6,000 each.
Bureau of Areas, chief, $12,000.
Assistant, $9,000.
Three subsection chiefs, $7,000 each.
One subsection chief, $6,000.
One subsection chief, $5,000.

Recruiting representatives (six or seven of them) salaries range from $6,745 to $5,662 to $4,795 each.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of approval of this additional appropriation for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation, for first, because it will be carrying out in good faith our commitment with the other UNRRA nations. Second, this money is needed by our world neighbors in Europe to help prevent death and disease from starvation, hunger, and privation brought about by this world war. Third, it is the humanitarian thing to do; it is the American way to act. Fourth, it is doing by others as we would have them to do for us; it is the application of the only enduring rule of human conduct which will eventually prevent other world wars. Fifth, there is no other source from which this necessary food and clothing and warmth for this winter for these hundreds of thousands of starving men, women, and children, can come. Sixth, this act of making good on our agreed commitments with UNRRA partners will not only give relief; it will be a definite stepping stone to establishing these European neighbors of ours toward their own independent rehabilitation and will give them time and opportunity to plant and grow and produce at least the beginning of their own home-grown agricultural products and foods.

Expression of opinion and desire from the Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California to me has been almost unanimous in approval of voting these additional and already pledged funds. I am glad it is so for it demonstrates that which I have always known, which is that the people of California are not greedy or selfish or unmindful of the needs and deserts of their European neighbors.

With reference to the proposed amendment from the minority side, limiting the terms and conditions under which this additional money should now be made available, I respectfully say that I have not heard the proponents of such amendments say how they expect the funds we will no doubt vote for this day and tomorrow be used this winter if their proposed amendment carries. I contemplate this Congress and Nation is firmly bound to carry out its original contract with the other UNRRA nations according to the terms of that original contract. That is of course if all the other partners and signatories to the original UNRRA contract refuse to consent and agree to the change which this amendment would impose. I frankly do not believe they would do so, and if they did not do so,

then certainly we would be in a very embarrassing position for it would mean that our funds would then not be available. This would be tragic. It would result in starvation and death from hunger and exposure to thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children. This is unthinkable. What do the gentlemen who proposed this amendment now answer as to this question which I now raise? Can the terms and conditions of the original UNRRA agreement between the UNRRA nations be changed, by but one of those of the original partners thereto? I submit that if the original UNRRA agreement and commitment itself does not provide for a change in those expressed terms by only one of the parties thereto, then this proposed amendment would not only be useless to enact, but it would result in no less than international misunderstanding, misapprehension, and loss of good will, besides death from hunger. I am opposed to the amendment unless the proponents can satisfy that this material change in the original UNRRA agreement proposed by this amendment, can become effective without the approval of all the other UNRRA nations. But, gentlemen, there is no time for delay. Winter is upon these hungry, and starving and naked men, women, and children in the nations receiving UNRRA funds. Will we let any of them starve to death while we are now seeking to impose a condition precedent to the original UNRRA agreement? I cannot believe the proponents of this amendment have thought clearly through on their proposal. For if they have, as to this point, they can promptly and clearly answer and satisfy this House. If they cannot I submit this amendment to be unanimously defeated.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I ask that the first section of the bill be read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Will this resolution be read by paragraph as is the case with appropriation bills, or by sections?

The CHAIRMAN. Inasmuch as it is not a general appropriation bill the resolution will be read by sections.

Mr. TABER. I really think we had better postpone the reading of the bill until tomorrow.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. TABER. There is only one section to which amendments may be offered. It will not save any time to read it tonight.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is understood, however, that all general debate has been finished.

Mr. TABER. Yes; general debate has been concluded.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 266, making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today may extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] may have permission to include certain letters in the remarks he made today in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] may extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from Life magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today in the Committee of the Whole and include certain excerpts from the hearings.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a presentation at the White House of honorary membership in the Missouri Alumni Association to the President of the United States.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to include certain excerpts in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an announcement by OWI.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] may address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow after the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INCREASED PENSIONS FOR SINGLE AMPUTATIONS DUE TO MILITARY SERVICE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks a bill I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more liberal rates of increased pension for single amputations due to service, and for other purposes. This is somewhat similar to another bill that has been introduced but this is more liberal. The bill reads as follows:

A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more liberal rates of increased pension for single amputations due to service, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(k) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of pension provided in part I, paragraph II, subparagraphs (a) to (j), shall be increased by $55 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive, of part I, paragraph II, as amended, the rate of pension shall be increased by $35 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $300 per month."

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(k) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of pension provided in part II, paragraph II, subparagraphs (a) to (j), shall be increased by $41.25 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive of part II,

paragraph II, as amended, the rate of pension shall be increased by $26.25 per month for each such loss or loss of use but in no event to exceed $225 per month."

By the enactment of Public Law 182, Seventy-ninth Congress, September 20, 1945, we provided more adequate pensions for the service-connected disabilities, commonly referred to as double amputees and blind cases. Other similar disabilities were included with a provision for adjustment to higher rates in more seriously disabled cases. These increases, however, left a group primarily consisting of single-amputation cases without any increase of pension. These are cases rated up to total disability for loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, which receive pension based upon the degree of disability up to 100 percent, plus the $35 per month additional pension. Many have high single amputations or lower amputations, or loss of or loss of use of one eye, making it extremely difficult for them to become adjusted, physically and mentally.

I am introducing a bill which will correct this inequality by increasing the additional monthly pension from $35 to $55 for those cases, but not changing the $35 additional pension for the cases covered by the increases under Public Law 182. The latter cases have received increases in their basic rates above total disability together with the additional monthly allowance of $35 being added where there is loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness in one eye having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any one of the higher rates above total disability.

Enactment of the bill will meet an urgent need, encourage these combat casualties, and remove an injustice in the cases described.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE CONSTITUTION—THE ONLY AMERICAN ISSUE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the world is turmoil. Our allies of yesterday are our competitors of today and may become our enemies of tomorrow. Management and labor, through their contentions, are shutting the door on their own future. Race is being alined against race; group against group. A hundred and thirty million Americans are looking for that security which is their birthright. The eyes of hundreds of millions of Europeans are on us—the eyes of men who dare to hope in spite of slavery and the concentration camp—because, as it is written in the fifth verse of the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew:

> Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid.

America is, indeed, the "light of the world." Its people are the inheritors and the stewards of the Constitution of the United States.

In the preamble of the Constitution it is declared:

> We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

For 156 years, this document has been the citadel of the American people; the haven for the enslaved and the oppressed, no matter what the land of their origin.

Let us look at the Constitution in its proper perspective.

The Constitution is the whole. It necessarily follows that laws passed within the framework of the Constitution are parts of the whole. Laws passed by Congress during the New Deal do not and cannot supersede the Constitution itself.

One of the New Deal laws, passed within the limits of the Constitution, is the so-called magna carta for labor. This alleged magna carta designation is not only a misnomer but such a designation is inconsistent with the successful operation of the Constitution for over a century and a half.

The Magna Carta was the grudging agreement forced upon a defeated tyrant by a victorious nobility. What did the Magna Carta do to advance the status of British labor? Not one thing. The accident of birth still kept myriads of Englishmen in a status little better than serfs until the industrial revolution.

This is what our Constitution did for labor: It gave labor the right of free speech, of utilizing a free press, the right of free assembly, the right to petition for redress of its grievances. It gave labor freedom that did not exist for labor anywhere else on earth before or since. It gave labor immeasurably more than any law or group of laws which has been passed since it came into being has ever been able to give labor. It is the whole. The most carefully considered law can be only part of the whole.

What has been said of labor could be said—and as truthfully—of all Americans, individuals and groups, who, by their very citizenship, come within the protection of the Constitution. It is a document of destiny. It guides—it does not circumscribe—our lives. Generations of our countrymen have passed from infancy to old age under its beneficent care. Other Americans have come from foreign shores to share equally in the way of life our Constitution provides. These foreign-born Americans have a great stake in the Constitution. Pulaski and Kosciusko fought that it might be brought into being. It was the second sword of Hungary's great patriot, Louis Kossuth. Its image swayed the acts of Italy's Garibaldi. It was the constant companion of Thomas G. Masaryk, author of Czechoslovakia's brief independence. The spiritual descendants of these men reach out toward it through the stockades of silence which prison their minds, not only in their native lands, but in Bulgaria, in Yugoslavia, in Rumania, in Austria, in Lithuania, in Latvia and in Esthonia.

We have a solemn duty to these shackled souls to keep our Constitution alive. They will not be forever enslaved and, when they are free again, they will need our Constitution to be a beacon for their first faltering steps. We have a duty of equal solemnity to the men and women of our armed services who did so much to keep America free—to preserve intact, for them, the Constitution of these United States.

Is there any doubt that our Constitution will be preserved intact, that it will continue to live?

The Bible says in the twenty-seventh verse of the third chapter of the Gospel according to St. Mark:

> No man can enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except he will first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house.

The strong man mentioned in this passage could well be the American people and certainly the most valuable possession of the American people—the Constitution—could well be the objective of the despoiler.

Since the very inception of the now aging New Deal, the goal of administration leaders has been to bind the American people by deliberately creating the conditions of a class struggle and to systematically, brick by brick, erect a wall between the American people and their life-sustaining Constitution. For over 12 years our countrymen have struggled against the growing pressure of these insidious bonds.

Especially during the Presidential election campaigns has the Constitution been walled up, away from the sight of the people. The real issue of the 1936 Landon-Roosevelt campaign was not the alien philosophy of killing little pigs and plowing under growing crops, advanced by the present Secretary of Commerce. The real issue was the subtle assault on the Constitution by the administration's plan to strike at the so-called "nine old men," and to pack the Supreme Court with administration satellites. The real issue of the 1940 Willkie-Roosevelt campaign was not the ability of either candidate to keep us out of war. The real issue was the brazen affront to the Constitution on the part of the administration in which the time-honored lawmaking functions of Congress were made subservient to the totalitarian method of government by executive decree. The real issue of the 1944 Dewey-Roosevelt campaign was not which man could better finish the winning of the war and the establishment of the peace after the war. The real issue was the administration's steady increase in its planned infringement on the constitutional powers of Congress in the field of foreign policy.

Only once during its long period of Babylonian captivity were the American people permitted a glimpse of their beloved Constitution—and even then, they were allowed only a distorted, administration-controlled view.

While we were still at peace, Roosevelt and Churchill met on the high seas and, as a result of that meeting, the world was given the Atlantic Charter and its highly publicized "four freedoms." Two of these freedoms—the freedom of speech and the freedom of religion—were lifted directly from our 156-year-old Constitution, after which the Constitution was returned to its cell to serve out the remainder of its sentence of

solitary confinement. The other two freedoms—the freedom from want and the freedom from fear—were plagiarized from another document whose teachings have been noticeably absent from the acts of the New Deal both at home and abroad—the Sermon on the Mount.

What should the American people do about it before their Constitution is completely sealed off from them?

I am going to answer that question by telling you a true story of what happened at the United Nations Conference on International Organization held at San Francisco which I attended as an official adviser.

Many of you know the location of the conference meetings—in the American Legion Hall. One of the outstanding features of that impressive building—if not the outstanding feature—was a marble pillar, situated in the lobby, which contained earth from the cemeteries of Europe where so many American boys were buried in 1917–18 and on the top of which there burned an eternal flame.

On my way to San Francisco, I anticipated the effect of this symbol of America's respect for her war dead—so simply and so beautifully designed—upon the men of all nations who went into that conference with a genuine desire for world peace in their hearts.

When I went to the conference hall, I looked in vain for the Pillar of the Eternal Flame. What had happened? Had it been taken away? I was told that it had been walled in to make a storage room for conference equipment. I found this hidden symbol of the great beating heart of America surrounded by crates and boxes; a jewel in an ash-heap.

Then and there, I determined that its confining wall must come down. I consulted one so-called "authority." He could not—or he would not—do anything about it. I went to a second man. The wall was torn down. The Eternal Flame was free. Men of 50 nations passed by that flame with bowed heads. They, and the American military police who patrolled the building, knew the piercing message of that pillar and that flame; that Americans had not forgotten the sacrifice of American youth in the cause of freedom; that the yearning of the American people for peace was real and sincere.

The meaning of this experience is clear.

Americans cannot afford to imprison the eternal flame of the Constitution. Americans have asked one party to tear down the wall. That political party has been either unable or unwilling to tear it down. The American people must now ask the Republican Party to tear down the wall that shuts them off from their Constitution.

It is the duty and the responsibility of the Republican Party to heed the impassioned plea of the American people. We must—we will—do it. The wall between the people and their Constitution will be torn down. We will not be deflected from our resolution by propaganda smokescreens. The will of the people is our will—and that will is inflexible. We will strike the bonds from our countrymen and restore them to their birthright. We will not be turned aside from our pledged purpose by problems which are only a part of the whole—the Constitution—and which can be solved by the legal application of the Constitution.

There is only one issue in the 1946 elections.

There will be only one issue in the elections of 1948.

There can be only one issue in the United States through all the years to come.

That issue is: Do the American people want a Constitution in bondage or a free Constitution.

The Republican Party stands for a free Constitution. Republican victories means constitutional victories. We are confident that the enduring rightness of our cause will triumph, for, without a free Constitution, there can be no free America.

As we stand at the threshold of this battle on which so much depends, we of the Republican Party pledge ourselves to the support of the Constitution of the United States and to the continuing freedom of the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Charles G. Notari, national president of the Sons of Columbus of America.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND THE FARMER

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to speak about the farmer and his stake in full employment.

I do not think we in Congress are sufficiently aware that America's farmers are alarmed—that they are anxiously watching every move that we make in this difficult period of transition to a peacetime economy.

Engrossed as we are in the many problems of reconversion, it comes as somewhat of a jolt to be told that we must also worry about the farmer. We have been too prone to believe that here, at least, the situation was well in hand. Farm markets and farm income are at a record high. Food requirements from abroad are apparently insatiable. And to top it all, we have promised Government support for parity income for the immediate years ahead. Surely there is no place among our current headaches for the farm problem.

Well, the man behind the plow does not see it that way. To him the farm problem is not a thing of the past. On the contrary, it looms up large and formidable as a thing of the future—a future so imminent that it calls for immediate action.

The farmer has not forgotten that agriculture was the first to collapse after the last war. He remembers that depression hit the farms as soon as the inflated foreign demands petered out—several years before the crash of 1929; and he remembers that the depression hit him not only first, but hardest, and remained the longest.

Farmers are on the alert and they sense a number of factors in the current situation which warn them of trouble ahead. They have heard the official prediction that there will be as many as 8,000,000 unemployed in the months just ahead of us. And they know, from the record, that one of the first consequences of this unemployment will be a sharp reduction in the amount and quality of consumer food requirements. Likewise they do not have to be told that the downward pull of this sizable unemployment could easily create such a deflationary psychology that producers would be reluctant to expand production—which means they would fail to replace war cut-backs with new demands for industrial raw materials grown on the farm. Above all, the farmer realizes that foreign-relief demands for food and clothing are only temporary, that strenuous efforts will be made to return Europe as quickly as possible to a more nearly self-sufficient basis, and that the only hope for a reliable and expanding foreign demand rests upon the achievement of stable prosperity at home.

I think it is appropriate to remind ourselves of that which we have a tendency to forget—that the farm problem is a depression problem and has become so knitted into the framework of our economy that we have come to look upon it as almost a permanent institution. The farm problem has become a standard chapter in the economic books, following the chapters on the Banking System and Corporation Finance. And no doubt our complacency on this score has been emphasized by the widespread feeling that we have found a solution to the problem in the concepts of crop control and Government support of parity income or parity prices.

If there is any single word that describes the difficulties which farmers have experienced, that word is "overproduction." Yet we have had overproduction in agriculture only in a very relative sense. When depression hits there is overproduction everywhere in the economy; overproduction because of decline in demand.

For agriculture, however, overproduction has a particularly severe impact. In manufacturing the drop in prices as demand falls off serves as a check upon further production. As profit margins narrow, producers curtail operations, discharge workers, and shut down machinery. This means less output, which in turn acts as a partial brake upon further price declines. And in many cases, this more or less automatic brake, which would operate even in a perfectly competitive economy, is very much accentuated by monopolistic restraints upon output and unduly rigid or administered prices.

In agriculture, however, a decline in prices has exactly the opposite effect. The ordinary farmer thinks and acts independently of other farmers and of the market as a whole. In the majority of cases his own output is such a small segment of total production that he never thinks in terms of the effect he

individually might have upon price. Instead, he accepts the market price, whatever it may be, as a factor beyond his control. Consequently, when that price declines, his reaction is to try to bolster his net income by producing more. He figures that more units will partly compensate for a smaller return per unit.

Another factor which bolsters farm production during a depression is the increase in farm population from the cities. Unfortunately those who fly back to the farms through unemployment and poverty all too frequently lack experience in the fine art of farming and all too frequently they go back to submarginal land. The increase in farm population during hard times is also a consequence of the fact that depression interrupts the normal flight from the farm. So when the depression hits, there is no place in the cities for surplus farm youth, so they stay at home and swell the number of those struggling to eke out a meager subsistence from the land.

Of course, the consequence of this continued high production in the face of shrinking demand is that farm prices plunge downward much faster and further than prices in the city.

However, we have met this problem in the past and with more than a fair degree of success. It was not easy for the architects of the AAA and subsequent legislation along the same line. They were well aware of that paradox which was bewildering the people and confusing all attempts to deal with the problem—the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty. Nor was it to their liking to kill little pigs and plow under wheat when people were starving. None realized more clearly than those lawmakers that the ideal solution would be to expand the market for farm products by bringing about expansion all the way through the economy—that it would be more desirable to fit effective demand to supply rather than the other way around. But they faced tremendous difficulties and the going was slow. Meanwhile, the plight of the farmer was too serious to be ignored. It was important to take immediate steps to bring agricultural income more into line with city income.

It was not only for the sake of the farmer that the Government found it necessary to step into the breach with control regulations or financial assistance. The growing disparity between farm prices and income and those in the city was too much of a wrench for society as a whole. The severe impact upon a large and important segment of the population threatened to throw the entire economy off balance.

Now the farmers were, and always have been, reluctant to accept government support. The farmer is traditionally proud, independent, and self-reliant, and he does not want relief or hand-outs. In the past farmers have recognized the necessity of restrictions and controls and subsidies in the absence of an expanding framework of over-all demand throughout the economy.

But they have never recognized this as the final or ultimate solution. Today as they look ahead to this postwar world of ours, and as they count the tremendous increase in productivity on farms and in factories which holds such great possibilities both for good and for evil, they are determined that now is the time for agriculture to stand upon its own feet.

The farmer is hopeful, but he is not altogether optimistic. After all, he has before him recent estimates of the Department of Agriculture that serious depression could send farm prices down to 60 percent of what they would be under full employment, and net income to less than a third of the full-employment level. Moreover, they recognize this as a very real possibility unless positive preventive steps are taken immediately. Consequently, to the farmer a program for full employment is the first order of business, the fundamental prerequisite for the kind of a nation and a world in which there will be an adequate market for unrestricted and nonsubsidized farm output.

Let me be more specific as to what full employment would mean for the farmer. All of these advantages can be stated in the terms that have the most meaning for him, that is, the effect of full employment on his net income.

One of the most obvious ways in which net income would be stepped up is through increased food consumption under full employment. These war years have given us tangible evidence of what happens to the way people eat when their incomes go up—not only greater amounts, but higher-quality foods. Estimates of the Department of Economics are very interesting in this connection. They indicate that at a full-employment level, per capita consumption of pork and lard would be 43 percent above the average for 1935–39, chickens 40 percent above, canned vegetables 38 percent, eggs 17 percent, beef, lamb, and veal 13 percent, and citrus fruits 54 percent. Consumers would use more textiles, too, for example 33 percent more wool.

These same kind of percentage increases are valid for manufacturing with respect to consumption of industrial raw materials. In fact, if there were adequate markets for manufacturing output, agricultural demands on the part of industry might rise even more spectacularly, because of the development of plastics of all sorts.

Finally full employment would mean an increase of foreign as well as domestic demands. We have as evidence our experience of the twenties, when agricultural exports approximated $2,000,000,000 annually, as contrasted to $750,000,000 during the depression. For certain agricultural commodities the foreign market is extremely important. During the period 1925–34, for every seven bales of cotton consumed in this country, eight were exported. For every 6 pounds of dried fruit consumed in the United States, 4 pounds were exported, and for every 8 bushels of wheat consumed here, 2 bushels were sent out of the country. Sixty-seven percent as much tobacco was exported as was consumed domestically. Prosperity is not a domestic commodity and we are not an insulated country. If we have continued full employment here, the chances are good that other countries will have continued full employment, and their ability to import our goods will remain high and stable.

So much for the demand for farm products under full employment.

But there is more than one way to increase net income. The farmer is concerned with lowering the costs and increasing productivity. This is no paradox. Increased productivity per acre is one of the most promising ways out of the difficulty of low incomes.

Full employment would increase farm productivity in a number of ways. With good markets and prices the farmer could afford mechanization, improvement of stocks, hybrid seeds, and fertilization. An adequate market would enable farmers to diversify crops, thus making the best use of the soil.

More efficient production on the farm has been a threat to the farm laborer. Labor-saving devices were resisted because of the unemployment they would cause. But with the assurance of full employment opportunity, these fears would be dissipated.

Gentlemen, I can think of no more adequate way of summing up what I have been saying about what full employment would mean to the farmer than by quoting to you the very significant estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

Full employment would make possible net farm income two and one-third times the average net income in 1935–39. Serious depression, on the other hand, would bring farm income to a level less than three-fourths that of 1935–39.

In conclusion, may I say the farm problem, as I see it, is not a political matter. At least, the farmers of the Nation do not look at it through political eyes. They are in deadly earnest in the conduct of their business and want to continue to labor long and diligently to provide a living and some of the good things of life for their families.

No; it is not a political problem to them at all, but it is a political problem to the Congress of the United States. The President of the United States, following his illustrious predecessor, has advocated legislation that would make full employment possible and necessarily bring prosperity to the country. While I say it is not a political question, yet in the wisdom of the people of the country they have elected a Democratic President, with a majority in both Houses of Congress, and we cannot escape the responsibility of doing everything in our power to afford peacetime prosperity to the country.

There is one of two courses to follow: Either follow the administration program as outlined in H. R. 2202 or something better, or trifle with the possibility of vast unemployment, which, in turn, means lessening the purchasing power of our people, which means farm surpluses eventually translated into poverty and financial ruin.

I call upon the committee which has in its possession H. R. 2202 to immediately report this measure to the House. No individual should consider himself big enough or his committee powerful enough to deprive the Congress of acting upon

this legislation. The first part of this responsibility is definitely the committee's. If it is not reported to the House, this committee must assume the responsibility of blocking this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that in the interest of national defense and security this House enacted the recent measure insuring the retention of a strong effective Navy. Because I am interested in the Navy and determined to do my part to maintain it as a great instrumentality of national defense, I gladly supported that legislation.

There is a correlated matter that I would like to discuss briefly in connection with the enactment of the Navy bill. The issues are drawn in the impending controversy over unification of the armed forces and both sides have stated their respective positions and are seeking to maintain and justify them. This question is of utmost importance but it is of far more importance that we should not act hastily with regard to proposals to change the coalition of armed might that enabled us to gain such glorious victory in the war.

On the whole, our fighting team has done a very good job despite some occasional fumbling, some missed tackles, some forward passes that overshot their mark, and some quarterbacking that was decidedly off color. In such a gigantic game of life and death where men were shifted around like pawns on a worldwide scale, it was inevitable that mistakes of judgment, strategy and tactics should occur. They did.

But rather than concentrating on the mistakes and errors, rather than doting on the missed tackles and the poor quarterbacking, as a Nation we should be profoundly grateful, proud and overjoyed for the smashing all-out offensive in the air, on land and on and under the seas that enabled us triumphantly to reach our cherished goal.

Even the most bitter critics of the Army-Navy-Marine Corps coalition that won the shooting war, even the most zealous advocate of unification must admit that on the whole our fighting war team played a magnificent game and smashed its way through to a decisive result, considering the obstacles in a comparatively short time, and considering the hazards, with comparatively small losses.

There was only one single glaring instance where the Army and Navy allegedly failed to cooperate in taking prompt, decisive, effective military action and that was at Pearl Harbor, though some also assert that the responsibility for this disaster was entirely beyond the control of the Army and Navy. Be that as it may, I am not going to touch further on that subject at this time because the responsibility for this great disaster, this great defeat, will be fixed, we may hope, by the joint congressional committee now engaged in studying the facts of this episode.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, in practically every other major engagement where collaboration and cooperation between various branches of the armed forces were a vital factor, it can be definitely stated that, as a general proposition, effective coordinated action distinguished our over-all military efforts throughout the war.

In my opinion this is a potent and cogent reason at the very outset for prompting the Congress not to move too hastily to dismantle a system that has worked so effectively in the greatest war of history and to adopt what is at the time being, so far as the United States is concerned, merely a theoretical plan, which is entirely untried and unproved and which is completely at variance with our past traditions and techniques of military and Navy activity that have produced such remarkable and historic results.

As a member of the House Military Affairs Committee perhaps it is natural that I should have more information concerning the work of the Army and possibly, though I strive to avoid it, some definite predispositions in favor of the Army, its General Staff, its ranking officers, and its sterling fighting personnel of the rank and file. I have noted with deep regret that practically all of the outstanding generals of the Army who occupied positions of distinctive leadership during the war are urging unification of our armed forces as soon as it can be effectuated. One thing is clear, and that is that these outstanding military leaders who contributed so greatly to victory are entitled to their views, and Congress should give very careful attention to their opinions. In considering the matter, however, we should not overlook the fact that, under the proposed unification set-up, the Army, by virtue of its unlimited control over large masses of men, appropriations, materials, supplies, and particularly by virtue of its control over the vital air arm of our services, would undoubtedly assert a completely dominating influence.

I yield to no man in the Chamber in my admiration, respect, esteem, and gratitude for our armed services. Like everyone here and like every man, woman, and child in the country, I accord our leaders, our matchless fighting men in every branch of the service, fullest credit for their magnificent achievements in the defense of our country and in behalf of humanity. I could not possibly do justice to the accomplishments of our armed services during the war in such a brief statement, but we must all have in mind that the Army with its all-embracing activities, the land forces, the supply and service units, and by all means the Army Air Forces, whose remarkable efforts in the face of deadly opposition shaped a saga of military accomplishment that will live forever, that braved the thick flak of countless theaters of war to break the enemy lines of communication and supply and literally to pulverize German and Japanese cities until the spirit of our enemies was broken, served us with supreme fidelity and courage. From the invasion beaches of Africa and the desert sands of that dark continent, across the sweep of Mediterranean islands to Sicily, Anzio, Cassino, and the long, bitterly fought Italian campaign, the landing in Normandy, the drive through France and Germany, the heroic stand and recovery at the bulge, to the blood-drenched chapters of Guadalcanal and the islands of the Pacific where some of the most savage fighting of the war occurred, up to the very gates of Japan, the Army hammered its way with superb results.

And the Navy played a great part in shaping final victory. In the early stages of the war the Navy was, in fact, the first line of defense and the first line of offense. Apart from the great heroes of Bataan and the Philippine campaign who gave their all against overwhelming odds to stave off Japanese aggression and by deathless sacrifices gave us additional time to prepare for our subsequent mighty assaults, the Navy carried the main burdens of early warfare. It was the Navy that sought out, destroyed, and checked submarines that were paralyzing our shipping and even threatening our coast line. It was the Navy that protected and implemented our merchant marine to which was assigned the great task—and there was hardly a greater one—of transporting supplies from the vital arsenal of democracy to our tottering allies, punch-drunk and reeling from furious Nazi attacks. It was the Navy that kept the sea lanes open for the passage of millions of young Americans on their way to foreign battlefields. It was the Navy that in the first instance stemmed the surging tide of Japanese power in costly but indescribably heroic sea battles in the South Pacific thousands of miles from its home ports. I will not enumerate all of these engagements, but those of the Dutch East Indies, Bismarck Sea, the Coral Sea, and the subsequent body blow delivered to the Japanese fleet in the crucial and desperate sea battle at the Midway Islands—indeed all these great sea battles—will shine eternally and illustriously in the pages of American history.

These sea engagements were, beyond dispute, decisive, epochal, and of supreme importance to the ultimate success of our arms because they cleared the seas in the Pacific for the advent of our soldiers and marines who subsequently with such magnificent fortitude and valor battled their way through the malarial swamps and the reptile-infested jungles of the South Pacific around or through every island that lay in their path until they had pushed back the barbaric Jap foe to his own homeland or cut him off from supplies, munitions, and food.

It was the Navy which with remarkable coordination with the Army on, under and above the ocean, its submarines striking deadly blows at Japanese shipping and men-of-war, its carriers defiantly sailing close to the mainland of Japan, assailed and pounded by the fanatical kamikaze and the powerful Japanese air force—it was the Navy, I repeat, which blazed the trail and furnished protection, shelter, and transport for the progress of our land forces. It was the Navy that conceived, organized, and directed the invaluable Seabees, who overnight built vital air strips to base our aircraft and enable us to launch

attacks upon the enemy. It was the Navy that landed our fighting forces on the beaches.

The splendid outstanding work of our naval carrier force has not yet been fully recorded or adequately appraised but history will disclose that these units played a truly outstanding and decisive part in forging final victory.

And who can properly describe the unutterable glory of the marines. What group of boys in history, capturing the imagination of our people and the world as they dauntlessly moved forward, have fought, suffered, and sacrificed more, fighting courageously and gallantly against great odds in defense of their country, than these heroic young Americans who from Guadalcanal to Tokyo took the worst and the most that the Japs had to offer, felt the bitter sting of Japanese fanaticism, and then lashed back in return and smashed their way through all obstacles and all opposition, raining blow after blow of punishment and retribution, defeat after defeat upon the enemy, until they brought them into a state of collapse.

Does this unification plan as presently conceived have some place for these Seabees, some place for the naval carrier units and the matchless fighting ships of the fleet, to which I could not pay adequate tribute, some place for these glorious marines that would permit them to maintain their self-respect and individuality, or will they be required to submerge their identity in a great military colossus that would probably envelop national defense organization if full-scale unification is adopted by this Congress?

As I have already stated, I cannot do justice in so brief a space to the great exploits of our armed forces. I can only touch the surface of the magnificent contribution of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to the common war effort. If there was any lack of coordination, any lack of a common purpose, any lack of mutual helpfulness, any lack of wholehearted and utmost cooperation in pursuing the objectives of the war, surely the Nazis and the Japs never knew it. If our experience in the war demonstrated nothing else, in my opinion, it demonstrated that our armed forces as presently constituted and as constituted during the war were able effectually and decisively to meet every major test to which they were put by the great exigencies and crucial demands of unprecedented global warfare.

These are some of the reasons why I think we of the Congress should not permit ourselves to be wheedled or dragooned for any cause into hasty decisions regarding proposed changes that would merge our armed services. Some outstanding military authorities and leading generals in the war whom I highly respect and honor, and who are now so eloquently and so urgently pressing the case for unification, have in the not too distant past expressed a different view in which they opposed this very proposal. I suppose they have the right to change their mind, but we as representatives of the people, also have not only the right but the duty to recognize that there is something more than unity of command involved in global warfare. Pervading the whole effort, pervading the morale and every step of the great enterprise there must be an underlying spirit of willingness and enthusiasm, an esprit de corps, if you will, to cooperate and to utilize the intricate web of specialized skills, specialized manpower, specialized scientific techniques that must go into successful modern warfare. Of utmost importance is the presence of initiative and individuality in each arm of the service moving and guiding its action in accordance with the distinguishing spirit and tradition which it has built throughout the years and which embodies the special education and training which each branch of the service has given to its personnel since inception up to the very present hour.

I am not opposed to a complete and thorough discussion of unification. To the contrary, I favor such a study because I believe undoubtedly there is room for improvement in all lines of our armed services. There is need for cutting out the deadwood, so to speak, and modernizing and streamlining many branches of the armed forces, from reducing the enormity of paper work and records to the consolidation of the procurement, purchasing, and service side of war. Congress should make a very careful study of the possibilities—and there are many in this direction—and in the course of this study we should hear from all shades of opinion on this question and all related questions.

When we think in terms of ultimate unification, of the ultimate merger of all the armed services into one vast administrative and military bureaucracy, or shall I call it oligarchy, we should never lose sight of the fact so very well stressed recently by that great military authority and commentator, Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times, that "throughout history sea powers whose naval operations have been circumscribed and dominated by land-minded strategy have invariably met disaster." As this great and eminent authority points out, Carthage, France, Germany, and Japan, and he might have added another great one, but I presume he left it out for reasons of propriety, all unified their armed forces and then subsequently went down in defeat or recession.

There does not seem to me to be any particular value in forcing the Navy and the Marine Corps by legislative fiat and against their will to join a merger which would subordinate their positions, strip them of independent control of the education and training of their personnel and their policies of individualized development in peace and war, inevitably causing bitterness, dissatisfaction and a spirit of contention which might resolve into constant departmental and organizational conflict. Unity of command is desirable and I have demonstrated it has been substantially achieved during the war. But it must proceed in a democracy, just as the utilization of political power proceeds, from the conviction by those constituting the various arms of the service that each may follow its own traditions and the techniques which have made for success in the past because there is nothing inconsistent between this course and effective cooperation under a unified command as our experience in this war amply proves.

Moreover, a legally enforced merger will not necessarily bring unity of command and it is probably more important to set up procedures by which knowledge gained through bitter experience will be made available to all the armed forces so that differences and disagreements on policy may be avoided and so that the benefits and advantages of unified control may be achieved without surrendering the special marks of individuality and independent initiative that have brought so much glory upon the various branches of our armed forces. As I see the problem our aim should not be toward legalistic unity alone, if indeed at all, but it should be primarily to produce what Mr. Baldwin calls "overall combat efficiency." In addition, there is no particular value in effecting unification even in this sense until we have evolved our future peacetime military and naval programs. These programs are tied in so inextricably with current international relations, the development of atomic power, the sweeping advances in aviation and the trends of threatening political movements throughout the world, that we cannot help to solve these great problems solely and alone by creating a merger of our armed services.

It has been said by great authority and with considerable justification that atomic power will revolutionize warfare. I think no informed Member will want to challenge that fact. It is true as the experts assert that whole cities and whole sections of the country may well be destroyed in the future by atomic missiles propelled by rockets or radio-controlled aircraft. It is conceivable even that whole countries can be substantially annihilated. A whole civilization can be destroyed by this great new scientific Frankenstein that has come to plague the peace of mind of a war-weary world. But we must live with realities. We cannot escape from this world and we must face these problems with courage and determination. And in that connection it is interesting, if horrible to contemplate, what the Navy of the United States might accomplish in case of need if its fleets were deployed with appropriate strategy throughout appropriate oceans of the world, if its vast carrier forces and its overwhelming aircraft strength were to join with that fleet in sending atomic missiles of destruction against ruthless enemies of our country. That is a final thought and a final consideration—though God forbid it shall ever come to pass—which it seems to me ought to give this Congress pause before it embarks upon a unification program that will make the Navy and Marine Corps a mere adjunct of a gigantic military dictatorship which would of necessity, if present world trends continue, be vested with the huge responsibility and power of spending annually 20 to 25 percent of the total appropriations of this Government.

I trust that the Congress will ponder this question with utmost care because upon its correct solution, our future national safety and security may well depend.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DICKSTEIN (at the request of Mr. BLOOM), from October 31 through November 6, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 a. m., Thursday, November 1, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full-employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee will continue hearings on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., on the star-route bills (H. R. 2000 and H. R. 2524) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream-pollution abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

812. A letter from the Director, Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting the fifth quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

813. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to a payment of $854,500 made by the War Shipping Administration as just compensation for three vessels requisitioned from the Colonial Navigation Co. in March 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Anderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4549. A bill relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 4550. A bill to prohibit the unauthorized use of the name or insignia of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4551. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLESPIE:

H. R. 4552. A bill to provide for increasing the rate of pension for veterans of the Civil War, and veterans of the war with Spain, who are blind or helpless or so nearly blind or helpless as to require regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4553. A bill to grant to veterans of the present war a temporary exclusion from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS:

H. R. 4554. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more liberal rates of increased pension for single amputations due to service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to repeal Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4555. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Floyd L. Archiquette; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4556. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Oliver M. Lien; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4557. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Orphey A. Lien; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4558. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Henry O. Solberg; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4559. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Allen Zimmerman; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 4560. A bill for the relief of Nicholas T. Stepp; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1293. By Mr. HART: Petition of committee to abolish racial discrimination of the New Jersey State Industrial Union Council, CIO, 17 William Street, Newark, N. J., for the revocation of the DAR charter and the consequent removal of tax-exemption privileges to Constitution Hall; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1294. By Mr. MAHON: Petition of L. A. Greenfield, postmaster, and 33 other patrons, urging passage of legislation to improve the standards of the star route mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1295. Also, petition of Phil S. Bouchier of Post, Tex., and 33 other patrons, urging passage of legislation to improve the standards of the star route mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1296. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the Arizona legislature, Senate Memorial No. 1, a memorial on the need for hospital facilities in Arizona; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1297. Also, memorial of Arizona State Legislature, House Memorial No. 1, requesting Congress to maintain adequate tariff rates on copper, zinc, and lead; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1298. Also, memorial of Arizona Legislature, Senate Joint Memorial No. 2, requesting Congress to furnish Federal aid for development of airports; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1299. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Valley Grange No. 1190, Smethport, Pa., in opposition to compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose dwelling is the light of setting suns and the ocean and the living air and the blue sky and in the mind of man, we would make our reverent spirits a temple for Thy habitation, for Thou dost deign to dwell also in humble and contrite hearts. In the blackness of the night and in the brightness of the noon, Thou art not far from any one of us.

Break down the barriers that keep our inner lives from Thee, for we confess the evils within ourselves that shut Thee out. Through the clear windows of cleansed souls, may we see the beauty of the world that lies about us, the flaming glory of every task committed to our hands, the divinity of every service that stoops to another's need, and the splendor of integrity that values an approving conscience more than the empty applause

of men. In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 29, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 29, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946; and

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On October 29, 1945:

S. 1383. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia, approved April 8, 1864.

On October 31, 1945:

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BOREN, Mr. PRIEST, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, and Mr. REECE of Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3429) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy;

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to universal military training; and

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document 359, entitled "Address of the President of the United States, before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, presenting his recommendations with respect to universal military training."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is at his home in Vermont indisposed, sufficiently so that it is not prudent for him to return to Washington immediately. I ask unanimous consent that he may be excused from attendance upon sessions of the Senate until the 20th of this month.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROGRESS REPORT OF OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

A letter from the Director of the Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT RELATIVE TO ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN VESSELS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the payment of $854,500 made by the War Shipping Administration as just compensation for three vessels requisitioned from the Colonial Navigation Co. in March 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions and memorials, which were referred, as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 1

"Memorial requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper, zinc, and lead

"To the Congress of the United States and the Department of State:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Finding profitable jobs for the Nation's millions of returning soldiers and other millions of displaced workers in war industries is today's number one problem.

"Arizona's answer to this problem depends in great measure upon keeping its mines—primarily its huge copper properties, and to a lesser extent its producers of zinc and lead—in active operation, and on a basis which will permit the paying of wages commensurate with the American standard of living.

"The rates on zinc and on lead, reduced under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act as much as 50 percent from the level authorized by the act of 1930, place the mining of these metals in a highly questionable class, while a further reduction of 25 percent made possible by the extension of the Trade Agreements Act threatens to remove these industries from the field of Arizona activities.

"The maintenance of an excise tax of 4 cents per pound on copper played a large part in the maintenance of Arizona's splended production of this critical metal throughout the war. It can play an equally large part in keeping thousands of miners and other employees at work during the years of readjustment. A reduction of this rate, which will bring the copper mines of Arizona and other States into economic competition with copper mined in foreign countries at a much lower cost, especially for labor, will seriously impair the activities of Arizona's great copper industry, and while detracting from the State's prosperity materially reduce its ability to contribute to the cause of reemployment.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona prays:

"1. That the tariff rates on copper, zinc, and lead, in their various forms, be maintained at a level that will permit the continued production of these important metals on a large scale, and the employment of many thousands of workers.

"Adopted by the house September 18, 1945.

"Approved by the Governor September 21, 1945."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial relating to Federal aid for development of airports

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The expansion of aviation occupies one of the highest positions in all comprehensive programs for the continued growth and advancement of the United States.

"It is the subject of numerous measures introduced and pending in the two Houses of Congress.

"A feature of every such measure is provision for the extension of Federal aid to the States for the development of airports, and a formula under which such aid shall be allocated.

"It seems proper to direct the attention of the Congress to the circumstance that the allocation of aid to the States solely or primarily in the proportion that the population and area of a State bear to the population and area of all the States is unjust to States of great size having an exceptional amount of federally owned land covered by national forests, parks, monuments, grazing districts, Indian reservations, and other Federally controlled lands.

"Arizona is such a State. Eighty-two percent of its area is federally owned and controlled, and however beneficient and desirable the purposes for which these lands are held by the Federal Government, the fact of such control is a potent reason for sparsity of population.

"Recognition should also be given to the fact that the development of airports in Arizona will be largely in the interest of the various Federal services.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That in any legislation which may be enacted for the development of aviation, containing provisions for the allocation of aid in the carrying out of State programs, the proportion that federally owned land within a State bears to the federally owned land in all of the States be recognized as just and equitable and one of the factors to be employed.

"2. That the factor of total area be accorded a higher value than that of population.

"Adopted by the house September 29, 1945.

"Adopted by the senate September 27, 1945.

"Approved by the Governor October 4, 1945."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Fred S. Berg, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 1342) to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from Dudley O. Paterson, of Denver, Colo., relating to labor unions and strikes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the New Orleans (La.) Bar Association, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 920) to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from Corp. Sidney Blum, San Francisco, Calif., relating to the delay in returning of members of the armed forces from overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Letters in the nature of memorials from H. B. Harkins and Mrs. John Lewis, both of Edgewood, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory peacetime military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Charles I. England, of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the scrapping of the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Enterprise;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITION RELATING TO BUSINESS, EMPLOYMENT, AND SECURITY INSURANCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a petition signed by 250 citizens of Stromsberg, Nebr., relating to Senate bills 690 and 809, to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

There being no objection, the petition presented by Mr. WHERRY was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY:

With millions of employees being dropped from industry's pay rolls during this transition period and with millions of soldiers being returned jobless to civilian life, we fear that American business may go into a downward spiral leading toward great depression unless Congress quickly adopts some program to keep purchasing power at high levels among the masses of the people. A bipartisan measure represented by twin bills, one introduced by a Democrat and one by a Republican, which I believe would accomplish this end, is now before the House. The House bills are H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, respectively. Senate bills are numbers S. 690 and S. 809, respectively. It would provide high monthly annuities, as they retire from the labor market, for men and women past 60, for the blind and disabled, for mothers with dependent minor children. It would raise the money for such annuities by a 3-percent tax levied monthly upon the gross incomes of all business and upon that portion of gross individual incomes in excess of $100 a month. Please use your influence to see that this measure, embodying principles of the Townsend plan, gets a quick and complete hearing by the Ways and Means Committee and then by the Congress as a whole. Please demand a roll-call vote upon it. Please vote for its enactment when it comes up on the floor. I am authorizing the distributors of this petition to inform me, by mail, of your helpful action on this measure, so that I can reciprocate in the only way I as a voter, know how. Thank you.

REGULATION OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE — RESOLUTION OF FOURTH DISTRICT KANSAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Fourth District, Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs at a meeting on October 16, 1945, at Chapman, Kans., affirming support of the principle of uniform regulation of marriage and divorce.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution on uniform marriage and divorce laws

Whereas the divorce rate in the United States has grown until one-sixth of all marriages end in divorce; and

Whereas many broken homes will be imminent following World War II; and

Whereas it is important for normal womanhood to check this threat to the American home by suitable legislation: Therefore be it

Resolved That Fourth District, Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled at Chapman, Kans., October 16, 1945, affirm its support of the principle of uniform regulations of marriage and divorce through uniform State laws throughout the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the State legislative chairman and to our Congressmen and United States Senators at Washington, D. C.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of October 29, 1945,

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction, reported it with an amendment on October 30, 1945, and submitted a report (No. 674) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 1123. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 675); and

H. R. 1862. A bill relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 676).

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to provide for proceeding with certain rivers and harbors projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war; without amendment (Rept. No. 677).

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, at the beginning of the present Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $5,000. That sum has been exhausted. A new resolution has been submitted by the Committee on Banking and Currency requesting an additional $10,000. That resolution, Senate Resolution 182, has been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; and from that committee I now ask unanimous consent to report it without amendment, and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 182) submitted by Mr. WAGNER on October 22, 1945, and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, authorized by Senate Resolution 9, agreed to January 6, 1945, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the same purposes, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount of $5,000 heretofore authorized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of October 1945, from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Sen-

ate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

OCTOBER 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (AA) U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J.	do	1,588
Yeoman (2d cl) John M. Flannery	17 Livingston St., Binghamton, N. Y.	do	1,436

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

OCTOBER 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of Department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	317 Lynn Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$2,400
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,400
Lt. W. B. Borsdorff, U. S. Naval Reserve	1630 Rhode Island Ave. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,400
Loretto F. Jochman, yeoman second class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	3445 Oakwood Terrace NW., Washington, D. C.	do	1,152
Eleanor W. St. Clair, yeoman second class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	1,152
J. Huxman, seaman first class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	WAVE Quarters D, Washington, D. C.	do	742
C. Wilson, seaman first class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	742

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

NOVEMBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Rd NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave SW.	$4,300
Charles Bragman	Arlington Village Apartments, Arlington, Va.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave NW.	6,440
Betty Brimberg	5331 16th St NW., Washington, D. C.	Farm Security Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.	2,100
Olive F. Caldbeck	237 Mississippi Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 2101 Connecticut Ave. NW.	2,320
Groff Conklin	514 2d St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave. SW.	6,230
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Ranier, Md.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	4,600
Patricia Daines	2000 F St. NW., Washington, DC.	Department of Labor, 14th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	2,100
Richard P. Daniels	1743 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	1,704
Marion L. Dillon	3659 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, DC.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,200
Rose Gerber	2513 14th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,030
Joseph McMurray	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Department of Labor, 14th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	5,180
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW.	7,175
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.	2,320
Ruth Morgenstein	3022 Rodman St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,980
Dolores Raschella	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	2,320
Milton Rossoff	2712 29th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Office of Labor, Department of Agriculture	4,500
Capt. Leslie Falk (Medical Corps), Army of the United States.	2804 Terrace Rd. SE., Washington, DC.	War Department, Pentagon Bldg.	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow (Medical Corps), U. S. Naval Reserve.	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,000

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1536. A bill to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by allowing amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste as a deduction in computing net income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1537. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems, and for other purposes; and

S. 1538. A bill to promote the safety of railroad employees and travelers on railroads, and to promote efficiency of railroad operation by providing for the inspection and investigation of conditions under which train-dispatching service may be performed, and for

the promulgation of rules and regulations governing such conditions; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 1539. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Nick Langager;

S. 1540. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lenora Farwell Fritzler; and

S. 1541. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Adams Garfield; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER (by request):

S. 1542. A bill to provide for the adjustment of repayment contracts, cancellation of irrigation charges, and amendment of certain provisions of the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 464), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and for other purposes, Flathead irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1543. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Warren, Pa.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MYERS (for Mr. GUFFEY):

S. 1544. A bill for the relief of Clifford N. MacLloyd; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1545. A bill to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WALSH also introduced Senate bills 1546 and 1547, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and appear under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1548, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER "ENTERPRISE" AND DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN VESSELS, TROPHIES, AND RELICS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the U. S. S. *Enterprise* to the State of New York so that it may be used as a historic relic of the war against Japan and also be a symbol of the bravery and courage and sacrifices of the men of the Navy in the war against Japan. I am also introducing a general bill to provide for the disposition by the Secretary of the Navy of vessels, trophies, and relics of historical interest.

I desire now to speak about the *Enterprise*. There is no ship in the United States Navy whose log is such a complete summary of the naval war in the Pacific, from the sad and desperate beginnings on December 7, 1941, through the tide-turning days at Midway and Guadalcanal, to the bloody victory at Okinawa.

The *Enterprise* accounted for 911 Jap aircraft shot down by her mighty planes and guns, 71 enemy ships sunk by her pilots, and 192 damaged or probably sunk. While accumulating 18 of 22 possible combat stars for carriers in the Pacific area, this gallant ship steamed more than 275,000 miles—the equivalent of 12 times around the world at the equator—in pursuit of the foe. During the last 2 months of the Okinawa campaign, she was helping protect troops on the beach from Japanese air attacks, and during that period was hit four times. Twice she retired briefly for temporary repairs at a nearby base. Then on the morning of May 14, 1945, a bomb-laden Japanese plane crashed into the forward part of the giant ship's flight deck. The resulting explosion blew her forward elevator cleanly out of its well and more than 400 feet in the air, as well as causing a sizable bulge in the flight deck. But worst of all, it killed 14 members of the crew and wounded another 34. Reluctantly, the *Enterprise* withdrew from action.

Most appropriately has the *Enterprise* been called the Galloping Ghost.

I know of no better way of honoring the honored dead of the *Enterprise*, indeed, the honored dead of the Navy, than by preserving the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* as a national memorial to the magnificent job done by the men of the Navy in the war against Japan. Incidentally, the *Enterprise* is the sole survivor of her sister ships, the first *Yorktown* and the first *Hornet*, having been lost during enemy action in the summer and fall of 1942. Six times the Japanese claimed they had sunk the *Enterprise*, but she is still afloat and must be continued afloat so long as Americans honor the bravery, courage, and sacrifices of the men of the United States Navy.

I ask unanimous consent to introduce the two bills to which I have referred and request that they be appropriately referred and printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills (S. 1546) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the U. S. S. *Enterprise* to the State of New York, and for other purposes, and the bill (S. 1547) to provide for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WALSH, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1546

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the U. S. S. *Enterprise* to the State of New York, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to transfer and set over all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the U. S. S. *Enterprise* (CV6), as a symbol of American naval glory, to the State of New York upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may in his discretion prescribe: *Provided, however*, That no expense shall result to the United States as a consequence of such transfer, as a consequence of the terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, or as a consequence of the use and maintenance of the ship by the State of New York subsequent to transfer.

S. 1547

A bill to provide for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That as a symbol of American naval glory and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized upon such terms and conditions as he may in his discretion prescribe, to transfer by gift or otherwise obsolete or condemned vessels of the United States Navy or captured vessels in the possession of the United States Navy to any of the several States, Territories, or possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions or municipal corporations thereof, the District of Columbia, Canal Zone, or to corporations or associations whose charter or articles of agreement denies them the right to operate for profit. In addition to any other condition imposed by the Secretary of the Navy, the transfer agreement shall include an undertaking by the transferee that such vessel shall be maintained in a condition satisfactory to the Navy Department: *Provided, however*, That no expense shall result to the United States as a consequence of such transfer, or as a consequence of the terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, or as a consequence of the use and maintenance of the ship by the transferee subsequent to transfer.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion to loan or give to any of the several States, Territories, or possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions or municipal corporations thereof, the District of Columbia, Canal Zone, soldiers' monument associations, posts of the Grand Army of the Republic, posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, posts of the American Legion, and other recognized war-veteran associations, State museums, libraries, historical societies, and incorporated museums operated and maintained for educational purposes only, whose charter denies them the right to operate for profit, and posts of the Sons of Veterans Reserve, captured, condemned, or obsolete ordnance, guns, projectiles, books, manuscripts, works of art, drawings, plans, models, and other condemned or obsolete material and trophies, flags, and other material of historical interest which may not be needed in the service of the Navy Department.

Such loan or gift shall be made subject to such rules and regulations covering the same as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, and the Government shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer, without reimbursement, such devices and trophies as the Secretary of the Navy in his discretion shall determine, to the Secretary of the Treasury for the promotion of the sale of War or Victory bonds, and to any other Government agency for scientific, experimental, monumental, or display purposes. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell or donate such war devices and trophies for the promotion of the sale of War or Victory bonds.

Mr. REVERCOMB subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may address a question to the Senator from Massachusetts respecting the bill he offered and discussed earlier today?

Mr. MURDOCK. With the assurance that the Senator will occupy but a moment or two I will yield. I should like to proceed with the pending business, however.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, I was very much interested to hear the statement made by the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, with respect to the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*. I understand the purpose of the bill is to transfer that ship to the State of New York. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. There are two bills; one proposing the transfer of the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* to the State of New York, and the other of a general character giving authority to the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of obsolete vessels, relics and equipment which are found obsolete, and which are to be given to

Government agencies and nonprofit institutions.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is not the great aircraft carrier *Enterprise* still a ship usable by the United States Navy? Was she not in numerous engagements, and was she not in service to the end of the war?

Mr. WALSH. I personally do not know but I think she was in service to the end of the war. It has been asserted in the press that she was to be dismantled and that prompted the request to introduce this bill. I, however, will not consent to having any vessel made a historic monument unless it is obsolete, and so declared. I am under the impression that the carrier in question is in that category, but I am not certain. In fact, I read the other day that the carrier was in a navy yard being reconverted for transport service. But so far as I have any influence, nothing belonging to the Navy will be given away to any State or municipality or to anyone unless it is obsolete.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am delighted to have that statement from the Senator from Massachusetts.

THE ARMY-NAVY FOOTBALL GAME

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some months ago I introduced a bill to change the uniforms in the United States Navy—to get rid of the scarf of mourning for Admiral Nelson, of England; to get rid of the three bars commemorating the three great victories of Admiral Nelson, of England; and also to get rid of the 13 buttons on the flap of their trousers, which buttons commemorated the Thirteen Original Colonies still under England's yoke; and to get rid of a collar fashioned after the English uniform of 175 years ago. The passage of the bill seemed hopeless.

But, Mr. President, with the assistance of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Illinois, and some other Senators who assisted, the change has been effected. We are now awaiting, at long last, the announcement of the new type of uniform.

Today, Mr. President, I am introducing another bill on another subject, and I hope that the passage of this bill will also have the assistance of Senators in securing its passage.

For many years, Mr. President, we have had an Army-Navy football game. Originally the charges made to the patrons were small, but the admission price has been increased and increased and increased until if a poor man wants to take his family to see this game the price is prohibitive. And, Mr. President, a poor man who has not reserved tickets for more than a month in advance cannot get to see the game even if he has the money.

It seems incomprehensible to me why our country, which spends billions of the taxpayers' money on the Army and Navy and drafts into the service the sons and daughters of the poor people as well as the rich and sends them to their death on battlefields thousands of miles away from home, should say to the fathers and mothers, "You cannot see the football team of the Military Academy play the team of the Naval Academy unless you apply over a month in advance and pay a price that is as high or higher than the charge for professional football games."

Particularly do I wish to call attention to the fact that constituents in the South and Far West and North can never see these teams play unless they pay many dollars for transportation.

Mr. President, I believe that the admission to this game should be free. I believe that there should be no tickets reserved except 100 for the President of the United States and his guests and the Secret Service; 10 for the Secretary of War, 10 for the Secretary of the Navy, and 10 for the Governor of the State in which the contest may be played.

In the bill which I am introducing today it is provided that this game shall hereafter no longer be played in New York or Philadelphia or possibly Chicago alone, but that, commencing alphabetically, the game shall be played in every State in the Union, commencing next year in Alabama at a place designated by the Governor of that State, so that in the next 48 years the game will have been played in every one of the 48 States.

There was a time when there was a question of transportation and the matter of the young men playing in the game being absent too long from their stations. Today the Army and Navy have planes which can cross the country in a few hours, and that objection no longer exists. Certainly if Congress can appropriate money for every other imaginable purpose for the Army and Navy in peace and wartime, they can appropriate enough more to pay the insignificant cost of this Army and Navy game.

Mr. President, on behalf of our constituents, especially the veterans of World Wars I and II, who desire to see these teams play, our constituents who do not have the money to travel across the country to see them play, our constituents whose sons and daughters have been a part of our Army and Navy for 4 years, I ask that prompt action be taken on the bill.

I ask, Mr. President, why should veterans have to get tickets 6 weeks in advance or else pay speculators, race-horse touts, and scalpers from $25 to $50 a ticket, or nearly 1 month's wages, to see their Academy teams play? To answer this, I ask for a complete investigation to be made at once by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to which I ask that the bill be referred.

I now ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the location of the Army-Navy football game, and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1548) providing for the location of the Army-Navy football game, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the annual football game between the teams of the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy shall be played in the calendar year 1947 in the State of Alabama and shall be played each year thereafter in the State which follows next in the alphabetical order of States after the State in which such game was played in the preceding calendar year. The place within any State at which such game shall be played shall be determined by the Governor thereof.

SEC. 2. No charge shall be made for admission to any such game, and no seats shall be reserved for spectators or guests, except that not to exceed 100 seats may be reserved for the President of the United States if in actual attendance, and not to exceed 10 seats each may be reserved for the Governor of the State in which the game is being played, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, if in actual attendance.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "State" shall inlcude the District of Columbia; and the term "Governor," as applied to the District of Columbia, shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3429) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 80) to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. FERGUSON each submitted an amendment, Mr. DONNELL submitted amendments, Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND) submitted an amendment, Mr. BYRD submitted four amendments, and Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. SMITH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN PARTS OF HEARING BEFORE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 8 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of parts 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the hearings held before the said joint committee during the current session, relative to the organization of Congress.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives insisting upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill

(H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments, agree to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR MILITARY POLICY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 99, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held before said committee during the current session, relative to universal military training.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this concurrent resolution provides for printing certain hearings by the House Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy, and, as a matter of courtesy the Senate should adopt the resolution. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT RELATING TO UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 100, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 300,000 copies of House Document 359, entitled "Address of the President of the United States, Before a Joint Session of the Senate and House of Representatives, Presenting His Recommendations With Respect to Universal Military Training," of which 75,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 221,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 copies for the Senate document room, and 2,000 copies for the House document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives provides for printing additional copies of the President's message to Congress with respect to universal military training. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

SITE ON LAKE MICHIGAN FOR UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on July 12, 1945, I presented Senate Concurrent Resolution 20 to invite the United Nations to establish the site of the new League of Nations within the United States of America. Yesterday I issued a statement in relation thereto, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY PROPOSES LAKE MICHIGAN AREA AS LOCALE FOR UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

On July 12, 1945, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, to invite the United Nations to establish the site of the new League of Nations within the United States of America.

Since then the United Nations Council has decided to locate the League on the friendly shores of America. Soon after the first of the year the United Nations Assembly will designate the specific location within our country for the new League. In all this time I have refrained from expressing any preference as to the specific locale. Now, however, that the choice is soon to be made, I should like to express my fervent conviction that the League should be set up on the west coast of Lake Michigan, within the State of Wisconsin, and within the Milwaukee-Chicago area.

I believe that this vicinity ideally fulfills the following nine requirements, which I believe are absolutely essential for the locale of the United Nations Organization:

1. The world capital should be set up in the heart of America; that is, in the Middle West.

2. It should be located in an area close to the greatest symbol of peace and cooperation in the world, the unfortified boundary line between the United States and Canada.

3. It should be located near the great inland bodies of water; that is, the Great Lakes.

4. It should be located within the vicinity of great metropolises, in order that all the modern conveniences and facilities might be available.

5. It should not be located within the metropolises themselves, subject to all the unstabilizing influences, the congestion, and other problems of the big cities. It should be located in the open countryside, which is truly representative of our America.

6. It should be located in an area close to a great vacation land, in an atmosphere in which the delegates could work with refreshment and vigor. Such a vacation land would, of course, be provided by the nearby great northern expanses of the Badger State, Minnesota, and Michigan.

7. It should be located in an area of humble, industrious, God-fearing folk. Such is, of course, ideally the agricultural area in which the center of the great dairy industry of America is located.

8. It should be located in an area which would be relatively safe, in the event of enemy attack. This automatically rules out locating the League within or in close proximity to a big city.

9. It should be a city started anew from the earth itself, constructed, not in accordance with the sprawling, confused expanses of a metropolis but begun anew with the sole purpose in mind of creating an architecturally ideal world capital—a city set apart—a symbol of the new world we hope to see.

The location of the new League in this area would, of course, give impetus to the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway.

It might, in addition, serve as an impetus to the decentralization which is so badly needed in America.

I am forwarding the text of this statement to Secretary of State Byrnes for retransmittal to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

TUBERCULOSIS IS PREVENTABLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Tuberculosis Is Preventable," delivered by him on the fortieth anniversary of the State Sanitorium at Wallum Lake, R. I., October 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on the subject of business management and economics, at a dinner given by the Financial World in New York City on October 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAINTENANCE OF INDIVIDUALISM AND FREE ENTERPRISE—ADDRESS BY PRESTON DELANO

[Mr. MCKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Preston Delano, Comptroller of the Currency, before the Robert Morris Associates at the regional meeting of the Buffalo-Rochester-Syracuse chapters, at Buffalo, N. Y., on October 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUTURE OF THF GI BILL OF RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY EDWARD N. SCHEIBERLING

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Future of the GI Bill of Rights," by Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander, the American Legion, published in the November issue of the Washington News Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson dealing with the President's speech on universal militar, training, published in the Evening Star of October 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

COTTON RESEARCH—EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTHERN AGRICULTURIST

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitle "More Research on Cotton," from the Southern Agriculturist for November 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION IN PALESTINE—LETTER FROM WILLIAM S. BENNET

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the Palestine situation written by William S. Bennet to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE FARGO (N. DAK.) FORUM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the proposed St. Lawrence waterway from the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum of September 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGE OF LUMBER—LETTER FROM NORTHWESTERN LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Northwestern Lumbermen's Association, Minneapolis, Minn., dated October 25, 1945, dealing with the shortage of lumber, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORT MEMORIES AND NICE PEOPLE—ARTICLE FROM YANK MAGAZINE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Short Memories and Nice People,"

published in the October 26, 1945, issue of Yank Magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, on behalf of the National Memorial Stadium Commission, authorized by Congress, I desire to submit a preliminary or interim report on the activities of the Commission. I will state to the Members of the Senate that I have had placed on their desks a copy of this report, and I express the hope that they will find time to read it because it will afford a clear picture of what the Commission has been doing during the past 10 months without the use of any funds with which to operate.

In presenting this report, I desire also to take occasion to say that there has been a wrong impression created in the minds of some Members of the Congress and the public at large as to the character of the stadium which we are seeking to build. Some persons have the impression that it is strictly a Washington or District of Columbia project. That, however, is totally untrue. This stadium has been launched as a memorial to the veterans of World War I and World War II, and it is proposed to locate it in the District of Columbia, the greatest Capital of the greatest Nation of the world. It could just as well be erected in Chicago or New York or St. Louis or Poplarville, Miss., for that matter; but it is to be a national stadium, and every section of the country should be interested in erecting a befitting memorial to the sacrifices, the gallantry, the bravery, and the success of the veterans of these two great world wars. So, if it be possible, I want to remove from the minds of the public and the Congress the idea that this is a local affair, that it is a District affair, or a Washington affair. This monument is to be erected here only because Washington is the Capital of this Nation.

For the same reason the memorial erected to Abraham Lincoln was located in Washington because he was the head of this great Republic and this is the proper place to locate the memorial to Abraham Lincoln. Likewise, the memorial to Thomas Jefferson could have been located in any other city in the Nation, but Washington is the proper place, because here it was as the head of the Nation, as President, he rendered his great service to the American people, and it is fitting and proper that his memorial should be erected in Washington, D. C.

For the same reason we are proposing to build in Washington the memorial stadium, which is projected as the greatest stadium not only in the United States but in the world, and which is to be built upon such lines and be of such magnitude that there will be nothing in the world like it. It is to be finished in marble; it is to be a covered stadium, and it will have attached to it other attractions which will make it the one great show place of the Nation as a memorial to the soldiers of these two great world wars.

The Commission has gone as far as it can, unless we can get the friendly aid of the Congress to help us. I want to take occasion to assure the Congress that, while it would be all right for the Congress to appropriate money for the construction of the stadium we are projecting, we do not propose to let the taxpayers of the country pay 1 cent in the construction of the stadium, because we were instructed as a commission to devise ways and means to make it a self-liquidating proposition, which we think we shall be able to do. When, however, it comes to financing the project in order to get committals from the financial bodies of this country that are willing to put their money into the project, it will be necessary that certain things be done by the engineers and architects, so that we can convince business concerns that may be willing to invest their money to build this greatest stadium in all the world.

It is to be finished in marble. It is to be covered with aluminum. It is to be an all-weather building. We are very anxious to expedite the erection of the stadium because we hope to have the World Olympics held here in 1948, and, with proper expedition, we will be in a position to enter the competitive field for the holding of this great international event.

I trust that my colleagues in the Senate will put this report in their pockets and take time to read it, so that they may obtain some idea of what we propose to do. The report is signed by all members of the Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report submitted by Mr. BILBO was received, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and to be printed as a Senate Document (No. 96), as follows:

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

To the Congress of the United States of America:

The National Memorial Stadium Commission, by authority granted in a joint resolution, approved December 20, 1944, and entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," hereby presents a preliminary report as directed by the resolution, as follows:

1. The consideration of a suitable site for a National Memorial Stadium.

2. To procure plans and designs and make estimates of the cost thereof.

3. To endeavor particularly to formulate a method of financing on a self-liquidating basis.

This report is based on reports received from subcommittees heretofore appointed as follows:

(1) Subcommittee to study site.
(2) Subcommittee to study plans.
(3) Subcommittee to study financing.

1. SITE

From the outset of our activities three sites were considered and the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee is that the site referred to as the East Capitol Street area in Anacostia Park, near the National Guard Armory, presents the best facilities, not only as to traffic facilities, appropriate size, railroad connections, airplane landing strips, automobile parking space, aquatic sports in the nearby Kingman Lake, and the general plan of this area.

The Commission in recommending the Anacostia Park site has acceded to the best thought and wishes and expert advice of the following: Washington Board of Trade, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the National Capital Parks, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and a citizens' group which held mass meetings November 18, 1944, in the Departmental Auditorium. A more detailed report by the subcommittee on site selection is on file with the Commission.

2. PLANS

After consultation with various architects and engineers and making a study of several proposed designs and after holding an open meeting where all interested architects and engineers appeared, the Commission by a unanimous vote selected and employed the firm of Pettigrew, Cook & Associates, architects and engineers, of Dallas, Tex., to make necessary designs and plans for the proposed National Memorial Stadium.

From surveys, data at hand, and many thousands of personal endorsements, the Commission would like to suggest that a stadium be built of ample size to accommodate the largest national events now to be held or likely to be held in the future which are adaptable to a stadium.

We would like the stadium to be developed so when it is completed it will be large enough to use as a center for national and international programs which would include all types of sport activities, youth-fitness programs, Boy Scout jamborees, 4-H Club meetings, military competitive activities, veterans' programs, interhemisphere activities to promote good-neighbor programs, international Olympics, and mass gatherings for religious, fraternal, and labor organizations. Locally, it could be used for annual cherry-blossom activities, Fouth of July celebrations, inauguration ceremonies, and national political-party conventions.

We would like to recommend that the plans for construction of the stadium provide that it be covered and that the design will incorporate a hall of fame for sports, certain rooms for veterans' organizations with their auxiliaries, and archives for the records and rewards of past and future youth-fitness programs, as well as athletic accomplishments.

That the stadium incorporate in its structural designs a space for lessees to house exhibits of national interest and memorials to the men and women who have served in the armed forces.

In further consideration of the development of these plans, the Commission recommends that adequate automobile parking space be provided, railroad facilities be considered, as well as a landing strip for privately owned airplanes.

The Commission would like to emphasize in its report that final details on plans should be developed that will enable the Commission to make definite recommendations to Congress after an appropriation of funds is available for the study.

3. FINANCING

The Commission is of the opinion that the stadium should be operated on a sound business basis. The cost of erecting the same should be liquidated out of income over a period of years. Obviously there must be some long-term financing. When these costs have been ultimately paid, the property with all improvements thereon should revert to the Government of the United States.

If the project is to be privately financed, and it is the opinion of the Commission that it should be so financed, it would appear that the lenders would want the protection of a lien on the stadium to secure whatever bonds that may be issued. In order to accomplish this, the Government, at

the time when the financial arrangements have been completed, would have to make a conditional grant of the land now owned or hereafter acquired by it as a site for the stadium.

We further recommend that the stadium project be exempt from all Federal and local taxation for the following reasons:

(1) It will encourage private capital to invest.

(2) It will enable the management of the stadium to get the benefit of a more favorable interest rate.

(3) As the Government is the ultimate beneficiary of the property, taxation would merely delay the date of acquisition by it.

(4) The stadium is to be a memorial to the veterans of World Wars I and II. As such we want it to be a real memorial. By adopting a tax-exempt program, it relieves management of the burden of meeting taxes, thereby enabling it to function more smoothly and efficiently.

The Commission is of the opinion that it cannot at this time suggest a definite program of finance. It has been impressed by the testimony of several witnesses appearing before it that there are many sources from which potential income may be derived. We would prefer to see the construction financed by private capital rather than by public funds.

If funds are to be secured from private sources, however, certain architectural and engineering surveys will have to be made. To aid the Commission in financing the cost of these studies, we respectfully suggest for the consideration of the Congress an authorization and direction to the Federal Works Administrator to advance the necessary funds for this purpose.

The Commission has labored long and diligently and has accomplished much more than was to be expected while operating without funds but we have proceeded as far as possible without funds and cannot make a final report and recommendation to the Congress, nor secure a commitment of private funds with which to construct the stadium, unless and until the Commission is empowered to secure a loan for architectural and engineering services to be provided by the Administrator of the Federal Work Agency and for this purpose the Commission hereby offers as a substitute for Senate joint resolution 83 now pending the following resolution, to wit:

"Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Federal Works Administrator to make loans or advances of funds to be used for the purpose of making plans for the construction of the National Memorial Stadium

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to make loans or advances, from any available funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to the Commission appointed pursuant to the provisions of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia,' approved December 20, 1944, to aid such Commission to finance the costs of the architectural, engineering, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction in the District of Columbia of a public works consisting of an athletic field and stadium as a Nation-wide permanent memorial to the men and women who gave their lives while serving as members of the armed forces of the United States during World War I and World War II. Any such loans or advances made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be made without regard to the provisions of section 501 (b) of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. Any advances made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be repayable in accordance with the provisions of section 501 (c) of such War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944."

Respectfully submitted.

THEO. G. BILBO,
Senator from Mississippi, Chairman.
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Representative from West Virginia, Associate Chairman.
JAMES M. MEAD,
Senator from New York.
FRITZ G. LANHAM,
Representative from Texas.
SID SIMPSON,
Representative from Illinois.
J. RUSSELL YOUNG,
President, Commissioners of the District of Columbia.
FLOYD D. AKERS,
Board of Trade, City of Washington.
JOHN A. REILLY,
Banker, City of Washington.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield while I ask the Senator from Mississippi a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator from Mississippi finished his statement?

Mr. BILBO. I have finished, except for answering the question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. If it is for a question, I will yield. I was about to ask for a quorum.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator permit me to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with everything the Senator from Mississippi has said with reference to the stadium. In my opinion—and this is the predicate of a question—a dead wall built of marble for the purposes of a stadium, and for the purpose of showing our respect to the men who fought the war, is proper and in keeping with what we do in our country in such matters. We have built memorials to Jefferson, to Washington, to Lincoln, and to others, and I am not against that type of memorial. Does not the Senator from Mississippi feel, however, that a real memorial to the boys who actually fought the war would be the enactment of legislation by the Congress which would protect in their liberties as American citizens all those who fought the war, such, for example, as legislation providing for fair employment practices? What does the Senator think about that?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, recently I spent 2 days in an endeavor to convince the Senator from New Mexico that his proposition is absolutely absurd, un-American, and unconstitutional. Most certainly it has not anything to do with a stadium in honor of the soldiers of World War I and World War II.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield to me a little further?

Mr. BILBO. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator think that a law which will protect a soldier who fought in this war in his right to employment, in his right to fair treatment, in his right to the benefits due him under the Constitution and laws of the country, will be of more benefit than any stadium? Does not the Senator think that would be more appropriate, so far as doing him justice is concerned, than any building we could erect?

Mr. BILBO. I could very well afford to say "Yes" to the Senator, but, at the same time, the FEPC, about which the Senator is talking, would not do what he expects of it and what he hopes it might do. It would do the soldiers more harm than good.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is obvious that this is a debate, and is not a question.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi a question.

Mr. BILBO. With the permission of the Senator from Georgia, I shall answer.

Mr. LANGER. I am not a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, but it is my understanding that for a great many years there has been an effort to clear up the slum districts in the city of Washington.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. There is a shortage of materials. Does not the Senator feel that before we build a stadium costing millions of dollars we should clear up the slums in Washington?

Mr. BILBO. We have already attended to that. The Senate has already passed a bill providing for the appropriation of $20,000,000 to make Washington the cleanest city in America. Having done that, let us do something else.

Mr. LANGER. I fully agree with the Senator, with this exception: There is a shortage of building materials all over the country, and does not the Senator feel that we should take the $20,000,000 and clear up the slums before we build a stadium?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to inform the Senator that this country has such wonderful natural resources that we have materials which make it possible to do both jobs, and then some.

Mr. LANGER. We have not the materials in the West.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before calling up the conference report on the tax bill, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Fulbright	Langer
Austin	George	Lucas
Ball	Gerry	McClellan
Barkley	Green	McKellar
Bilbo	Gurney	McMahon
Brewster	Hart	Magnuson
Briggs	Hatch	Maybank
Brooks	Hawkes	Millikin
Butler	Hayden	Moore
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Murdock
Capper	Hill	Myers
Chavez	Hoey	O'Daniel
Connally	Huffman	Overton
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Eastland	Kilgore	Revercomb
Ellender	Knowland	Robertson
Ferguson	La Follette	Saltonstall

Taft	Walsh	Willis
Taylor	Wheeler	Wilson
Tunnell	Wherry	Young
Tydings	White	
Vandenberg	Wiley	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent attending the Food and Agricultural Conference in Quebec.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE and Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent on business. The Senator from New Jersey has been excused.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

GENERAL MACARTHUR—OLD AGE RETIREMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of October 7, 1945, by Claude A. Blair, chairman on State and National Affairs, National Committee for Old Age Retirement, Coast to Coast. The letter deals with the policies which are now being pursued in the Pacific area by General MacArthur, and encloses a newspaper item dealing with the nomination of Dean Acheson to be Under Secretary of State, as well as a newspaper article dealing with the workers' security fund, and certain comments are made by the writer on the latter subject.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR OLD AGE RETIREMENT, COAST TO COAST,
October 7, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator of Nebraska,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed paper item was sent to our committee, because of the great feeling throughout the Nation for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and it is felt that words cannot ever speak highly enough for wonderful efforts made by the Army, Air, and Navy in the Pacific by the man who told the people of the Philippines "I am coming back." His word was good.

It is not time for our State Department supervision of any of the war districts. When the Army, Air, and Navy have finished their job then is when the State Department should accept the responsibility.

Perhaps all have the best of intentions. Accidents and misunderstanding are matters that cannot always be avoided. However, if we think twice, it may help.

The State Department in our California United Nations Conference has given the world a peace charter. Why not give everyone all over the world something to work on, so as to accomplish the "four freedoms" as shown by the Atlantic Charter?

Without a foundation we cannot have security and give the protection necessary. What about our social security? What is the delay? Many of the radio commentators have this to say: "Can the Nation wait, unemployment, veteran complaining, Russian bloc, basic foundation, Atlantic Charter, review of veteran cases, enlisted men 4 years?"

Hollywood reporter: Congress better hurry up or they will get the axe next fall.

Another reporter has this to say: "You and I are pretty poorly represented in Congress."

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE A. BLAIR,
Chairman on State and
National Affairs.

[From the Springfield Daily News of September 24, 1945]

WHERRY OUT TO BEAT ACHESON NOMINATION—NOT SATISFIED WITH ACTING STATE SECRETARY'S EXPLANATION, CHARGES MACARTHUR SMEAR

WASHINGTON, September 24.—Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY (Republican, Nebraska) called on the Senate today to sidetrack the nomination of Dean Acheson to be Under Secretary of State and charged the existing of a "smear" campaign aimed at ousting Gen. Douglas MacArthur as occupation chief of Japan.

"We seem to be confronted with an organized campaign to remove General MacArthur," WHERRY protested in a Senate speech opposing confirmation of the Acheson nomination.

He opened the appointment on grounds Acheson issued a needless "rebuke" to MacArthur last week in a press-conference comment on occupation policy for Japan and MacArthur's estimate that United States occupation forces probably can be cut to 200,000 within 6 months.

Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson defended himself today against congressional complaints that he had rebuked Gen. Douglas MacArthur on matters dealing with the occupation policy in Japan.

His defense was contained in a reply to Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY (Republican, Nebraska) who submitted a series of questions to Acheson Saturday and asked for public answers by today. WHERRY said the answers would determine his course of action when Acheson's nomination to be Under Secretary of State comes before the Senate again today.

Acheson's reply consisted of a copy of the Potsdam Declaration, the White House statement of occupation policy sent to MacArthur August 29 and made public Saturday, and a stenographic transcript of Acheson's controversial press conference statement last week on occupation policy.

He did not answer WHERRY's questions individually.

Acheson said in an accompanying letter to WHERRY:

"It is plain to me from your letter of September 21 that you have not had before you the statement which I made in response to a question from the press.

"I enclose the stenographic transcript of both question and answer. I also enclose a copy of the Potsdam proclamation, calling your attention specifically to paragraphs numbered 6 to 12 and the statement of general policy relating to Japan which has been released by the White House.

"With the documents before you, you will have the exact text of my answer and also the official pronouncements of the Government on the same subject with which to test the correctness of my statement."

[From the Boston Daily Record, October 8, 1945]

WORKERS' SECURITY FUND IS DWINDLING

(By Kent Hunter)

WASHINGTON.—Some 70,000,000 American men and women, who have been paying 1 percent of their pay checks into what they fondly believed was a social-security fund which would eventually give them up to $85 a month old-age retirement pay, ought to start writing to their Congressmen.

As the situation stands today, unless changes are made, the fund will be able to meet all maturing claims of eligibles up to 1950—only half of the claims by 1960—and only one-third of the claims by 1970.

Here is the situation—and the House Ways and Means Committee is getting plenty of gray hairs over it.

When social security was legislated into being in 1935 it was provided that employers would take a 1 percent payroll deduction each week, to be matched by the employer, on all money earned up to $3,000 a year, until 1945. Then the deduction and employer contribution was to increase to 2 percent from the employee and 2 percent from the employer—an additional increase to 3 percent each by employer and employee to come later.

PROTESTS FREEZE

But when 1945 rolled around Congress "froze" the 1-percent rate.

A. J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, testifying before a congressional committee, protested that "freezing" of the rate means that the fund went theoretically $16,500,000,000 behind the potential impact of all claims then eligible or due to become eligible.

And he pointed out further that the saving fact was the wartime shortage of labor. More than 650,000 men and women eligible to apply for social-security benefits had not done so because they were still drawing high wartime pay during the absence of younger workers in the armed services.

When VJ-day came, with heavy cut-backs in war industry and labor forces, thousands of the "oldsters" who had carried on with war jobs, filed their social-security claims, and prepared for retirement.

CHOICE OF THREE

To meet the increasing drain on the fund, the committee members see one of three moves necessary. They are:

1. Increase deductions from pay checks and contributions from employers in the immediate future;

2. Decrease the amount of benefits promised the beneficiaries under the 1935 terms of the Social Security Act;

3. Meet the social-security deficits from year to year by allocation of funds raised by taxes and paid into the general funds.

This should have the right-of-way over all other legislation.

Ten years has now passed and $6,000,000,000 gone without any accounting.

Now the social security want to increase the tax so as to cover up the losses.

Saturday Evening Post, August 7, 1943, tells the people that they will not have anything to say about the management of their affairs.

The aged have not been granted a representative on the Social Security Board.

The wage earners and others are taxed without representation, and the world peace charter plainly states no taxation without representation.

What about the individual appeals of the taxpayers or applicants.

Are we running the Nation on laws or rules and regulations?

What about Government employees drawing annuities and working earning salaries, are deductions made when they go to work?

Congress should continue the social-security tax freeze until the people are granted their rights in the management of their affairs.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before calling up formally the conference report on the tax bill I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only 5 or 6 minutes at the outside. I rise primarily for the purpose of making what I call a suggestion respecting a very important matter.

The use of the atomic bomb against Japan was entirely justified. By her utter disregard of all the rules of civilized warfare she brought the bomb on herself. She got precisely what she deserved. It was very dramatic and perhaps even poetic justice which brought about the use of the atomic bomb wholly and alone against the Japanese who had led all the rest in their utter disregard of the rules of civilized warfare. We all believe, and I think most of the world believes, and I hope Japan now believes, that she got just what she deserved.

THE MILITARY PHASE OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

But, Mr. President, the atomic bomb is, as we now understand it, the most destructive agent ever created to destroy human life and property. Because of its danger to human lives; because of the fact that its use must take the lives of the innocent as well as those engaged in warfare; because of its power even to destroy cities with millions of people, I believe that it should not be used as an instrument of war.

The atomic bomb as a weapon in warfare should be outlawed in all the world just as poisonous gas was outlawed a few years ago by practically all of the nations.

The United States, Mr. President, should first take steps to get an agreement to outlaw the atomic bomb while the formula is solely in our hands. We should lead the world in the humanitarian and civilized movement to outlaw this great weapon of destruction which unfortunately kills the just and the unjust, the weak and the strong, men and women, children and babes alike. The United States should take the big, generous, humanitarian, civilized course and ask all the other nations to join us in that course.

We, nor any other nation, can afford to condemn to almost certain death the millions of innocent men, women, and children in cities like New York, Philadelphia, and Washington; like London, Paris, Berlin, and Rome; like Vienna, Moscow, Constantinople, and Shanghai; like Rio de Janiero and Buenos Aires, and all the rest of the great cities by the use in times of war of the most destructive bomb ever created.

The atomic bomb as a military weapon should be outlawed by all other nations of the earth and as soon as possible and before it can possibly become an international menace.

To my mind it might be impossible ever to outlaw the atomic bomb if we first gave away our formula to other nations.

Once in the possession of one or two nations, we probably never would get unanimous agreement to outlaw it. In the hands of possibly 50 or 60 nations it would be utterly impossible to get such an agreement.

The United States owes absolutely nothing to any nation. Many nations owe us, and some of them owe vast sums which they have never made an effort to pay and will never pay.

We are under no possible obligation to any nation to transfer this formula of destruction in war to them or any one of them.

While we owe no debt to any other nation, we do owe a debt to humanity. Let me repeat, we owe a debt to humanity. The only way to satisfy that debt to humanity is to outlaw the atomic bomb as a weapon of war while it is in our power to do it. In my judgment our obligation is a paramount one.

The formula cost the United States in cash $2,600,000,000. It cost no other nation anything. Does any American really and honestly even remotely dream that if conditions were reversed and some other nation had discovered the formula of the atomic bomb such nation would transfer the formula to us without money and without price? Surely no American statesman, nor even any American scientist, could make himself believe such a thing if he were honest with himself.

At the present time to transfer this formula to others would be most provocative of other wars. Every other nation desiring its neighbor's territory, or having an enmity toward another nation, would feel that the time, the place, and the opportunity existed to be avenged on that neighbor.

Every other nation desiring to extend its trade or secure other advantages from its neighbors would regard this bomb, if they had it, as a chance to carry out its design.

If we gave away this formula, to my mind, the world would be in another great war again within 25 years, perhaps within half that time.

But it is said that other nations will certainly obtain the formula themselves anyway, and very quickly. Judging from the newspapers, some scientists guess that they will have it within from 2 to 5 years. There are several answers to this statement, but we need to refer to only two of them.

If we cannot obtain an agreement to outlaw the bomb as a weapon of war—and it is hardly to be doubted that we can do it while we are in control of it—it would be a deterrent to scientists in other nations and a deterrent, if not an inhibition, to other nations themselves to attempt to develop a weapon which by reason of world-wide agreement they could not use in war anyway.

There is another important reason that seems to be overlooked, the reason being that probably every other nation expects to borrow the money from the United States in order to develop its kind of atomic bomb. But the money question is a deterrent. It is true that some scientists now say that it could be produced at one-half the money we expended on it. Granted. What nation in the world today could put up $1,300,000,000 in cash for production? And what nation would think of putting up such a vast sum for an experiment after agreeing to outlaw the atomic bomb as a weapon of war?

It may be argued that, having spent $2,600,000,000 to find a formula to produce this weapon, it would be foolish to outlaw it. Not at all. It is claimed that this bomb stopped the Japanese war and that that fact alone is payment in full in the saving of lives and in the saving of money to repay us for the money America expended in producing the bomb.

Finally, until the atomic bomb is outlawed, the whole world is and will be in a state of unrest, doubt, and fear instead of being at peace for which our brave boys have fought and have paid such a price in human lives.

Let us outlaw the atomic bomb and begin by preparing an agreement for all nations to outlaw it.

Life is dear and sweet to every reasoning man, woman, and child. Wholesale destruction of human life without regard to innocence or guilt, without regard to age or condition, is simply barbarous and is against all the laws of God and man.

Three-fourths of the people of London, for example, might be opposed to a war which the British Government decreed. Yet a nation at war with Britain might, by dropping a few atomic bombs on London, kill or destroy not only the three-fourths, but the other one-fourth of the people as well.

THE INDUSTRIAL PHASE OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. President, we do not know the industrial or other uses to which atomic energy may be applied. Its value may be small or its value may be tremendous, surpassing any production that has ever taken place in the world. No one knows. Our scientists do not know and our politicians do not know. Even our newspapers do not know. Therefore, surely the formula for this atomic energy should not be given away to other nations or to other people while it is in this state.

Under these conditions, under no circumstances should we take any action limiting our control of atomic energy or limiting our development of atomic energy. It has cost us $2,600,000,000 up-to-date; and if it has industrial value, as I believe it has, we ought, as a Gov-

ernment and as a people, to obtain as much of a return as possible from its production and use. No disposition of this atomic energy of any kind should be made until we know its value and the uses to which it may be put.

The Senate has appointed a committee of 11 Senators to go into the whole matter of atomic energy and make a report of what it finds. Until the coming in of that report, I hope none of us will grow hysterical about giving away our formula for the production of such energy. I have every confidence in the fairness, integrity, and ability of the members of this committee.

Mr. President, I would not stop or interfere with the investigations of our own scientists or those of any other country; but we are under no obligation to give up what we ourselves have discovered and produced at such great cost to us, and to us alone.

I would put an inhibition against using atomic energy in warfare, but not the slightest inhibition to the development and use of atomic energy for industrial or other peaceful purposes.

For the present, this energy should be wholly in the hands of the United States Government and our researches and investigations and experiments should go right on under an appropriate organization.

This may be the most important development of the present war. Let us guard it with the greatest care.

PROTOCOL ON POISON GAS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement which was prepared for me by the Parliamentarian of the Senate, Mr. Charles L. Watkins, concerning what was done about the poison-gas protocol. It seems that there was a protocol signed by practically all the nations against the use of poison gas in war. By a strange coincidence, the United States has never signed that protocol. It has lived up to the protocol, but it has never signed it. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by Mr. Watkins may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS, OR OTHER GASES, AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE, SIGNED AT GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, ON JUNE 17, 1925

The protocol contains the following provision:

"The present protocol will come into force for each signatory power as from the date of deposit of its ratification, and, from that moment, each power will be bound as regards other powers which have already deposited their ratifications."

The protocol was signed by numerous nations, and ratified by the following countries, the United States, however, not being among the number:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Esthonia, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, India, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Siam, Turkey, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The dates of ratification extended from 1928 to 1935.

The following countries adhered to the convention, which, in effect, constituted ratification:

Australia, China, Ethiopia, Persia, Iraq, Ireland, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in respect to the practical use of the atomic bomb, I hope the world will adopt the same course which was adopted with reference to the practical use of poison gas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was going to suggest that if it is possible to outlaw the atomic bomb, why not go the whole step and outlaw war?

With reference to the statement the Senator made with regard to poison gas, I wonder whether the protocol was the determining factor in not using poison gas. My understanding is that no humanitarian instincts, no regard for treaties, influenced Adolf Hitler or the Japanese, but that the reason why they did not use poison gas was that they knew poison gas would be used against them if they should use it against the Allies.

Mr. McKELLAR. All I can say in answer to the Senator is that both nations signed the protocol outlawing the use of poison gas. The Senator has said he wishes to outlaw war. I am a thousand percent with him. I was intensely interested in the San Francisco Conference, and I hope it will outlaw war. I want to outlaw war. That is the reason why I wish to take the first step, by outlawing the use of one of the most cruel and inhumane methods of killing people ever devised in all the history of the world. I hope the outlawing of its use will lead to the outlawing of war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Recently, yesterday as I recall, I read that Great Britain and Canada know all about how to produce the atomic bomb. How are we going to keep the secret, if they have such knowledge?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is their concern. I believe that both Great Britain and Canada, if the matter should be presented to them by the United States, would gladly sign an agreement or a treaty to outlaw the use of the atomic bomb. Who knows whether England or Canada knows about it? I do not, and I never heard any evidence to suggest it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to make a reference to the question asked by the Senator from Colorado. When the Senator uses the words "outlaw war," does he conceive of having that done by merely another agreement or protocol, or does he conceive that it might be done by further strengthening the United Nations Organization?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am hoping and praying that the San Francisco Conference or the organization set up by that Conference will be able to find some method of making future wars impossible. That is my ambition. That is why I favored that Conference. I was one of those benighted people as it seemed at that time, 25 years ago or more, who believed in the League of Nations as a preventive of war. I do not believe civilized nations ought to go to war. I was willing to stand 1,000 percent with the great Woodrow Wilson then to outlaw war along that line. I am still willing to go a thousand percent with the San Francisco Conference or any other group that will outlaw war.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Montana, who first addressed the Chair. Then I shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, all I wished to say was that I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee upon his statement, and I say that I fully agree with him with reference to the atomic bomb and the desirability of not divulging the secret of the bomb to others.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I also agree with the statement of the Senator from Tennessee with reference to the atomic bomb. At this time I should like to ask the Senator a question. While we know that the atomic bomb is an instrument of mass destruction, what about the recent actions of some of our allies? The press of today and yesterday carried the general news that the British were sending Mosquito bombers into Java. What difference does it make whether inhumanity affects 20, 30, or 100 innocent persons, or whether it affects a million?

Mr. McKELLAR. Seemingly the difference is in the number.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But it is still inhumanity.

Mr. McKELLAR. Any killing of innocent humanity or the killing of innocent humanity along with guilty humanity is, to my mind, all wrong, and we ought to do everything under heaven that we can do to prevent it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I am trying to make, if the Senator will indulge me for a moment, is this: No human being who has any respect for the dignity of humanity would tolerate or condone the murder of the British general which recently occurred in Java. But we know if 30, 40, 50, or 100 Mosquito planes are sent there, the people in that region who had no more to do with the situation than had we, will suffer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I am not familiar with the facts concerning what has taken place recently in Java. I hope nothing was done to hurt the people of that country because, having visited it, I know that it is a very productive and delightful country. I do not think, however, that that particular question should overshadow the grave problem with respect to what we should do with this destructive agency which we ourselves have used in warfare. I think our use of it at that

time was proper. I have no criticism to make of the use which was made of the atomic bomb. But as to the future, inasmuch as the entire world wants peace, as it would seem according to what took place at the San Francisco Conference, I hope that we may make every effort to outlaw the use of the atomic bomb as a weapon of warfare.

I thank the Senate.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE presented the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 34, 37, and 82.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, and 81, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 121. Decrease in corporation surtax.

"(a) In general: Section 15 (b) (relating to the corporation surtax) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the corporation surtax net income of every corporation (except a Western Hemisphere trade corporation as defined in section 109, and except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), Supplement G or Supplement Q) a surtax as follows:

"'(1) Surtax net incomes not over $25,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes not over $25,000, 6 per centum of the amount thereof.

"'(2) Surtax net incomes over $25,000 but not over $50,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes over $25,000, but not over $50,000, $1,500 plus 22 per centum of the amount of the corporation surtax net income over $25,000.

"'(3) Surtax net incomes over $50,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes over $50,000, 14 per centum of the corporation surtax net income.'

"(b) Mutual insurance companies other than life or marine.

"(1) Section 207 (a) (1) (B) (relating to surtax on mutual insurance companies, other than life or marine) is amended to read as follows:

"'(B) Surtax: A surtax on the corporation surtax net income, computed at the rates provided in section 15 (b), except that if the corporation surtax net income is not more than $6,000 the surtax shall be 12 per centum of the amount by which the corporation surtax net income exceeds $3,000.'

"(2) Section 207 (a) (3) (B) (relating to surtax on interinsurers or reciprocal underwriters) is amended by striking out '32 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '28 per centum.'

"(c) Regulated investment companies: Section 362 (b) (4) (relating to the surtax on regulated investment companies) is amended by striking out '16 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '14 per centum.'

"(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, see section 131."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(2) Technical amendments.

"(A) Section 2 (a) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 (relating to the specific exemption) is repealed as of the date of its enactment.

"(B) Section 710 (b) (1) relating to the specific exemption) is restored to read as such paragraph read immediately prior to the enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945, to be effective, as so restored, as if section 2 (a) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 had not been enacted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 142. Deferment of certain taxes of veterans and servicemen.

"(a) In general: Chapter 38 (miscellaneous provisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"'SEC. 3808. Deferment of tax attributable to service pay for commissioned service and of tax attributable to pre-service earned income.

"'(a) Definitions: As used in this section—

"'(1) Tax attributable to service pay: The term "tax attributable to service pay" means—

"'(A) in the case of a war year for which the taxpayer had no gross income other than compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, the tax imposed under chapter 1 for such year; or

"'(B) in the case of a war year for which the taxpayer had gross income in addition to compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, the excess of the tax imposed under chapter 1 for such year over the tax that would have been imposed if such compensation had been excluded from gross income;

except that in the case of a commissioned officer (or a commissioned warrant officer) of the regular component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, such term shall not apply to any war year unless, at the time prescribed for the payment of the tax under chapter 1 for such year, a period of time was being disregarded under section 3804.

"'(2) War year: The term "war year"—

"'(A) When used with respect to the tax attributable to service pay means any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, and before January 1, 1947; and

"'(B) when used with respect to the tax attributable to pre-service earned income means any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, but before January 1, 1942, and before the taxpayer entered upon active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, but does not include any year unless part of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such year became due and payable after the taxpayer entered upon such active service.

"'(3) Tax attributable to pre-service earned income: The term "tax attributable to pre-service earned income" means the excess of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for any war year over the tax that would have been imposed for such year if there had been excluded from the net income for such year the amount of the earned net income (as such term was defined in section 25 (a) (4) as in force with respect to such year, except that in computing such earned net income, compensation for active service in such forces shall be disregarded).

"'(4) First installment date: The term "first installment date" means May 15, 1946, in the case of taxpayers released from active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to December 1, 1945; and in other cases June 15, 1947, or the fifteenth day of the sixth month which begins after the date of the taxpayer's release from active duty in such forces, whichever is the earlier; except that, if the first installment date with respect to any war year would otherwise occur earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such year, the first installment date with respect to such year shall be the fifteenth day of such third month.

"'(b) Extension of time for payment: Upon application with respect to any war year, made prior to the first installment date, and under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary—

"'(1) the time for payment of an amount of the tax under chapter 1 for such year which is equal to the tax attributable to service pay for such year and which has not been paid before the filing of such application; and

"'(2) the time for the payment of an amount of the tax under chapter 1 for such year which is equal to the tax attributable to pre-service earned income for such year and which has not been paid before the filing of such application.

shall, in lieu of the time otherwise applicable, be as follows: one-twelfth thereof on the first installment date and an additional twelfth thereof every three months thereafter until such tax is paid.

"'(c) Suspension of period of limitation: The running of the period of limitation provided in section 276 (c) (relating to the collection of the tax after assessment) in respect of any tax the time for the payment of which is prescribed under subsection (b), shall be suspended for the period beginning with the date of the filing of the application under such subsection and ending six months after the date prescribed therein for the payment of the last installment of such tax.

"'(d) Estimated tax: If the taxpayer is eligible for the benefits of subsection (b) with respect to any war year—

"'(1) for the purposes of the application of section 58 with respect to such year, compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States may be disregarded in determining the gross income reasonably expected for such year, and in determining the estimated tax for such year; and

"'(2) for the purpose of section 294 (d) the tax for such year shall be determined as if such compensation were excluded from gross income.

This subsection shall not apply with respect to a taxpayer for any war year who at the time prescribed for making the declaration of estimated tax for such year is a commissioned officer (or a commissioned warrant officer) of the regular component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.'

"(b) Refund of interest paid: Any interest paid prior to the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to tax attributable to

service pay for any war year, or with respect to tax attributable to pre-service earned income for any war year, shall be credited or refunded if claim therefor is filed with the Commissioner prior to January 1, 1947."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, we were able to reach a fair compromise on the bill with the House conferees. The Senate conferees receded on three of the Senate amendments and accepted a few amendments, largely clerical, to other provisions.

The House conferees accepted all the Senate amendments on individual income taxes. The Senate amendments with respect to veterans were also accepted with the exception of a slight technical change.

On corporation taxes the Senate amendments with respect to the excess-profits tax were accepted. The House conferees, however, insisted upon an over-all reduction in the corporate surtax rate which was not provided in the Senate version of the bill. A compromise was reached which reduced the combined normal tax and surtax for corporations with income of $50,000 or more from the present rate of 40 percent to 38 percent. For corporations with incomes of less than $50,000 the first surtax bracket for income not exceeding $25,000 was reduced 4 percentage points. This gives the following combined normal tax and surtax brackets for corporations with income under $50,000:

Combined normal tax and surtax rate in bracket

Income:	*Percent*
Not over $5,000	21
Over $5,000 but not over $20,000	23
Over $20,000 but not over $25,000	25
Over $25,000 but not over $50,000	53

The House conferees also insisted on omitting the Vandenberg amendment, which would have provided a minimum combined excess-profits credit and exemption of $25,000 for corporations with respect to the calendar year 1945.

On excise taxes, the Senate amendments were accepted with one exception. The exception is the Taft amendment, which would have repealed the excise taxes on sporting goods, gas, oil, and electric appliances, business machines, and photographic apparatus, effective July 1, 1946. It may be recalled that the Senator from Ohio said that if the House agreed to the other Senate amendments with respect to excises he would agree to the elimination of this amendment.

The estimated reduction in tax liabilities in 1946, under the conference committee bill, is about $5,900,000,000. This can be compared to the estimates for 1946 of approximately $5,650,000,000 under the Senate bill, and $5,350,000,000 under the House bill. However, it should be pointed out that the reduction in liabilities in 1947, under both the conference and Senate bills, are considerably less than under the House bill.

The loss under the conference committee bill is a greater loss than the Senate conferees would like to see. However, a loss of this size was necessary in order to reach a fair compromise with the House. It also should be understood that these estimates make no allowance for the effect which this bill will have on the level of income of the economy. We believe that the bill, through its aid to business and consumers, will substantially increase income levels. Thus the actual loss in revenue should be less than the $5,900,000,000.

Mr. President, I would like to insert into the RECORD a table showing a comparison of the estimated tax liabilities for 1946 and 1947 under present law, the House bill, the Senate bill, and the conference committee bill. It should be understood, however, that this table does not make any allowances for an increased level of income as a result of this bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated tax liability under H. R. 4309 as passed by the House of Representatives, as passed by the Senate, and as agreed upon in conference, compared with tax liability under present law for the calendar years 1946 and 1947 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimated yields, calendar year 1946				Increase (+) or decrease (−), calendar year 1946					Increase (+) or decrease (−), calendar year 1947 [1]				
	Present law	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement	House bill over present law	Senate bill over present law	Conference agreement over—			House bill over present law	Senate bill over present law	Conference agreement over—		
							Present law	House bill	Senate bill			Present law	House bill	Senate bill
1. Internal revenue:														
(1) Income, excess-profits, and capital-stock taxes:														
(a) Corporation taxes:														
Excess-profits tax	4,847	3,685	-------	-------	−1,162	−4,847	−4,847	−3,685	-------	−4,847	−4,847	−4,847	-------	-------
Normal tax and surtax	3,856	3,481	6,205	5,914	−375	+2,349	+2,058	+2,433	−291	+1,754	+2,349	+2,058	+304	−291
Capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes	351	-------	-------	-------	−351	−351	−351	-------	-------	−351	−351	−351	-------	-------
Total corporation taxes [2]	9,054	7,166	[3] 6,205	[4] 5,914	−1,888	−2,849	−3,140	−1,252	−291	−3,444	−2,849	−3,140	+304	−291
(b) Individual income taxes:														
Normal tax	2,085	1,303	1,238	1,238	−782	−847	−847	−65	-------	−782	−847	−847	−65	-------
Surtax and alternative tax on capital gains	11,255	9,410	9,457	9,457	−1,845	−1,798	−1,798	+47	-------	−1,845	−1,798	−1,798	+47	-------
Total individual income taxes	13,340	10,713	[3] 10,695	[4] 10,695	−2,627	−2,645	−2,645	−18	-------	−2,627	−2,645	−2,645	−18	-------
Total income and excess-profits taxes and the capital-stock tax	22,394	17,879	16,900	16,609	−4,515	−5,494	−5,785	−1,270	−291	−6,071	−5,494	−5,785	+286	−291

[1] Assumes the same general conditions in 1947 as in 1946, for comparative purposes.

[2] Under the bill as passed by the House, the bill as passed by the Senate, and the bill agreed upon in conference, unused excess-profits credits originating in 1946 could be carried back to 1944 and 1945, as under present law, and would entitle the corporate taxpayers to claims for refunds or reductions of tax payments estimated at $235 millions. Thus, whether under the conference agreement, the House bill, the Senate bill, or present law, the Federal Government's revenue from taxes would be offset to the extent of $235 millions.

[3] The estimates of the yield and differences in yield under the Senate bill contain only the following changes from present law: (1) For corporations, repeal the excess-profits tax, repeal the capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes, and reduce the normal and surtax rates for corporations with normal tax net income and surtax net income less than $60,000. In addition under the bill as passed by the Senate a minimum combined specific exemption and excess-profits credit of $25,000 is provided for calendar year 1945. This is estimated to reduce calendar year 1945 liabilities by $85 millions but does not affect calendar-year 1946 liabilities. (2) For individuals make the normal tax exemptions the same as the surtax exemptions, reduce the surtax rates by 3 percentage points, and reduce the remaining normal and surtax liability by 5 percent.

[4] Estimates of the yield and differences in yield under the conference agreement contain only the following changes from present law: (1) For corporations, repeal the excess-profits tax, repeal the capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes, and reduce the surtax rate by 2 percentage points for corporations with surtax net incomes of over $50,000 and reduce the surtax rate by 4 percentage points on the first $25,000 of surtax net income for corporations with less than $50,000 surtax net income. (2) For individuals make the normal tax exemptions the same as the surtax exemptions, reduce the surtax rates by 3 percentage points, and reduce the remaining normal and surtax liability by 5 percent.

Estimated tax liability under H. R. 4309 as passed by the House of Representatives, as passed by the Senate, and as agreed upon in conference, compared with tax liability under present law for the calendar years 1946 and 1947 [1]—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimated yields, calendar year 1946				Increase (+) or decrease (−), calendar year 1946					Increase (+) or decrease (−), calendar year 1947 [1]				
	Present law	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement	House bill over present law	Senate bill over present law	Conference agreement over— Present law	Conference agreement over— House bill	Conference agreement over— Senate bill	House bill over present law	Senate bill over present law	Conference agreement over— Present law	Conference agreement over— House bill	Conference agreement over— Senate bill
1. Internal revenue—Continued														
(2) Miscellaneous internal revenue excluding capital-stock tax:														
(a) Excise taxes affected by reduction in wartime rates:														
Liquor taxes:														
Distilled spirits	1,473	1,224	1,473	1,473	−249			+249		−472			+472	
Fermented malt liquors	545	513	545	545	−32			+32		−63			+63	
Wines	47	36	47	47	−11			+11		−18			+18	
Total liquor taxes	2,065	1,773	2,065	2,065	−292			+292		−553			+553	
Retailers' excise taxes:														
Jewelry, etc	201	153	201	201	−48			+48		−99			+99	
Furs	90	65	90	90	−25			+25		−44			+44	
Toilet preparations	79	61	79	79	−18			+18		−39			+39	
Luggage, etc	62	47	62	62	−15			+15		−30			+30	
Total retailers' excise taxes	432	326	432	432	−106			+106		−212			+212	
Telephone, telegraph, radio, and cable facilities, etc	126	111	126	126	−15			+15		−29			+29	
Local telephone service	128	107	128	128	−21			+21		−41			+41	
Transportation of persons	188	160	188	188	−28			+28		−60			+60	
Admissions	268	203	268	268	−65			+65		−129			+129	
Electric-light bulbs	14	10	14	14	−4			+4		−10			+10	
Club dues and initiation fees	11	9	11	11	−2			+2		−5			+5	
Bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables	4	2	4	4	−2			+2		−2			+2	
Total excise taxes affected by wartime rates	3,236	2,701	3,236	3,236	−535			+535		−1,041			+1,041	
(b) Use tax on automobiles and boats	140				−140	−140	−140			−140	−140	−140		
(c) Sporting goods	7	7	3	7		−4			+4		−7			+7
(d) Electric, gas, and oil appliances	26	26	17	26		−9			+9		−26			+26
(e) Business and store machines	17	17	8	17		−9			+9		−17			+17
(f) Photographic apparatus	21	21	11	21		−10			+10		−21			+21
(g) All other	2,907	2,907	2,907	2,907										
Total miscellaneous internal revenue, excluding capital-stock tax	6,354	5,679	6,182	6,214	−675	−172	−140	+535	+32	−1,181	−211	−140	+1,041	+71
2. Employment taxes (net)	392	392	392	392										
3. Customs	450	450	450	450										
4. Miscellaneous receipts	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900										
Net receipts, general and special accounts	32,490	27,300	26,824	26,565	−5,190	−5,666	−5,925	−735	−259	−7,252	−5,705	−5,925	+1,327	−220
Refunds on floor stocks [2]		−160			−160			+160						
Net receipts less refunds on floor stocks	32,490	27,140	26,824	26,565	−5,350	−5,666	−5,925	−575	−259	−7,252	−5,705	−5,925	+1,327	−220

[1] Assumes the same general conditions in 1947 as in 1946, for comparative purposes.
[2] Tax refunds are classified by the Federal Government as expenditures but are included here as reductions in tax liability since they arise directly from the House bill.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics. Oct. 27, 1945.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Am I correct in understanding that with the elimination of the so-called Vandenberg amendment there will be no application of the excess-profits credit retroactively to the year 1945?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The relief, of course, is in the elimination of the excess-profits tax so far as the future is concerned.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What will be the effect on the small corporation? I understood the Senator to say that the elimination of the excess-profits tax does not apply to the present year. Am I correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator refer to the year 1945?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. The Vandenberg amendment was eliminated in conference. That amendment would have provided a minimum combined excess-profits credit and exemption of $25,000 for corporations with respect to the calendar year 1945.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The tax adjustment, if I correctly understand the Senator, will have no effect on the present year because all excess-profits taxes will, under the bill, not be abolished until the first day of January next.

Mr. GEORGE. They will be abolished after December 31, 1945, or on January 1, 1946.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, does the conference report retain the exemption with respect to the pay of servicemen?

Mr. GEORGE. The exemption provision remains exactly as agreed upon in the Senate, except with regard to one technical amendment. The amendment was merely a clarification of the language.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly. There has been some criticism of making any tax reduction at a time when the Government is operating at a deficit. I believe that all of us have some sympathy with that point of view.

The Budget estimate of Government expenditures for the present fiscal year is approximately $66,000,000,000, while the income will be $36,000,000,000 under the existing tax law. The deficit, therefore, will be $30,000,000,000. This bill does not actually make any reduction in the receipts for the present fiscal year except $1,000,000,000 from individuals during the first 6 months of 1946. So the deficit to which I have referred will be increased by only $1,000,000,000. It is also likely that expenditures can be reduced below the $66,000,000,000 figure which has been estimated.

The purpose of making tax reductions is to encourage industry to go ahead, expand their plants, expand their reconversion facilities, and build up greater employment. That is almost impossible to do with a 95-percent excess-profits tax and an over-all 80 percent excess-profits tax. The main purpose, as I see it, is not to hand out a piece of pie to every taxpayer, but it is to create an underlying condition which will encourage people to go ahead with greater business activity and employment in 1946, 1947, and 1948, because when people plan business activity they have to look ahead.

The reductions in corporation taxes under this bill are somewhat larger than I would make them; yet if we are ultimately to make such reductions, I believe it is just as well to make them now. We say to every business corporation, "You may retain 62 percent of any profit you can make." It is a very simple formula, and I do believe that under

those conditions every business will be substantially encouraged. Frankly, I doubt if we are going to be able to reduce business taxes again for a number of years to come; certainly not during the next 2 or 3 years. I think it is perhaps wise that such reductions as we are going to make we should make in advance so that business may know what the rates are going to be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What will be the effect of the lower taxes upon wages? Will not the reduction enable the business of the country to pay correspondingly higher wages and to that extent be inflationary?

Mr. TAFT. If that should be the result it would defeat the purpose in reducing the taxes. As a matter of fact, I do not agree with the argument that the removal of the excess-profits tax justifies a general increase in wages. A large number of corporations do not pay excess-profits taxes. Their reduction is only 2 percent, their over-all normal and surtax being reduced from 40 percent to 38 percent. Of course, any wage increase would apply to them as much as to others, and if an attempt is made to give a general increase of wages equal to the probable income from the excess-profits tax, it will probably put out of business a good many of the smaller corporations who are not in the excess-profits class.

I do not think we can say that the removal of the excess-profits tax will justify higher wages; higher wages must be justified in various businesses on the ground that productive ability is increased, or that wages are out of line. There may be reasons in particular cases for an increase in wages.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator say that earnings should not be considered in connection with wage increases?

Mr. TAFT. That is one of the considerations, certainly. However, I will say to the Senator that if a firm is peculiarly efficient and for that reason has large profits, I think they ought to be passed down in lower prices rather than in increased wages to the fortunate people who happen to be in that particular industry. The earning ability may probably be due to an increased use of improved machinery or otherwise. I think most economists feel that gains in productive ability because of the use of machinery are better reflected and are more for the general benefit if they are passed on in decreased prices than they would be through an increase in wages in the particular industry. As a matter of fact, the practical question involves something of both—those working in the industry should get some increase, and some of it should be passed back in prices.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the removal of this tax encourages high wages, is not that inflationary in the present circumstances? Since we have removed or are removing most controls on savings from taxes which may be passed on in wages, does not the Senator consider that inflationary? Would it not have an inflationary effect?

Mr. TAFT. I do not consider a reduction in taxes as inflationary. We are not giving anybody anything back. We are saying that a man who operates a business in peacetime must pay 38 percent of his earnings to the Federal Government in taxes. That is the peacetime rule. We are not passing anything out to anybody; as I see it, we are simply letting business know what their future taxes shall be, and what has been the tax during the war seems to me to have no relation to the future tax at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator says we are not passing out anything; but what has been paid in the form of taxes may hereafter be paid in increased wages, which go to enhance purchasing power.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Arkansas is assuming in the first place that companies which have made war profits out of war business will be able to make excess profits out of peacetime business conditions. The Treasury estimates that earnings subject to the excess profits tax in 1946 will be about one-third of what they were in 1944; so that when we come to decide what excess profits are going to be it is a very difficult thing to calculate under the conditions. Those who have paid excess profits in war might have no excess profits during peacetime. We are attempting to say here what the rule for business enterprise shall be in time of peace. We are saying that the rate shall be 38 percent of anything earned by corporations on the same basis, except that we would make it lower for corporations with incomes less than $50,000 a year. On wages it has some effect, but certainly it cannot be said that just because the excess-profits taxes are removed a corporation can turn around and pay higher wages, because the great majority of companies did not pay excess-profits taxes, and a much smaller proportion would pay excess profits if such taxes were continued in 1946. The permanent effect of this bill is to reduce ultimately the Government's postwar income based on an estimate of $125,000,000 of national income, which is taken out of the air, to about $27,000,000,000 a year, after this bill is passed. We are coming, I hope, to a postwar budget of not to exceed $20,000,000,000 a year which would mean that we could ultimately hope for a further reduction from $27,000,000,000, we will say, to $22,000,000,000. I believe that at least $1,000,000,000 of such income ought to be applied to a reduction of the national debt, leaving about a billion dollars leeway for additional projects which are before the Congress. I may say there are projects before the Congress calling for about $10,000,000,000 additional but I do not think there is any leeway for such schemes if we are ever going to effect any further reduction of taxes.

In my opinion, there must be a further reduction, and I hope such a reduction may be considered next year in excise taxes and personal income taxes, but the total amount of the reduction probably cannot be more than $5,000,000,000, if we expect to balance the permanent peacetime budget. I do not mind borrowing money to some extent for what might be called the aftermath of war expenditures; that is, expenditures really chargeable to the war and running for a year or two after the war is ended. And we may be able to make some of that up by the sale of surplus property. But I think it is desirable to get back as soon as possible to what may be called a normal postwar tax system so that all may know what the tax system will be. We must not reduce taxes to a point below what, in all probability, the normal postwar bill is going to amount to. I doubt whether we can consider for some years to come any reduction in corporation taxes. I hope we may consider further reduction in excise taxes and in personal income taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Members of the Senate that I am deeply regretful that the relief asked for, by the amendment offered by the members of the Small Business Committee, by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, was not adopted by the Senate. We were rather reluctant to accept it but were very appreciative when the so-called Vandenberg amendment was adopted as a substitute by the Senate. As I understand, even that relief, which would have applied mostly to small corporations retroactively in the year 1945, will be denied, should we adopt the conference report.

I am sure that the chairman of the Committee on Finance is very sympathetic with the new businesses which have been established and the small corporations which need relief in order to continue, and which would have benefited by the so-called Vandenberg and Wherry amendments. I think there should have been a flat exemption of $25,000 retroactively to January 1, 1945. But regardless of that, those of us from the so-called drought States were very hopeful that at least the Vandenberg amendment would be adopted by the conferees, because it would have afforded some relief for the year 1945, and that would have helped tremendously in our section particularly. The distinguished chairman is committed to hold joint hearings on section 722, which has to do with hardship cases, and I hope we will get a more sympathetic administration of that section as a result of those hearings. The amendment would have helped tremendously in those States where the people have not even the advantage of a sympathetic interpretation of section 722.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield, let me say that again I find myself in agreement with him.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad the Senator is in agreement with me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that in the Senate we talk a great deal about small business, and I think the Vandenberg amendment at least made a gesture in the direction of helping small

business. Now, of course, it is completely eliminated, because the provision as to next year means nothing whatever. I think everyone agrees that during the war small business, on the whole, has been much less profitable than large business. I personally would like to see the Vandenberg amendment reinstated in the bill, if I could do anything about it.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his contribution. I agree with him in his conclusion. However, as I have before stated, I have implicit confidence in both the minority leadership on the Committee on Finance, and especially the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I am satisfied they are sympathetic and I daresay they have done the very best they could in the conference to accomplish what the members of the Small Business Committee and myself wanted done, and I am deeply appreciative of their efforts.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I may add that we did everything we could, of course, to bring about an agreement on the amendments adopted by the Senate, including the Vandenberg amendment, but under the insistence of the House it was simply impossible to reach an agreement unless that amendment was eliminated. We agreed to that action most reluctantly, because I realize as keenly, I think, as anyone else, as keenly as does the Senator from Nebraska, that the smaller corporations, corporations with limited incomes, incomes up to fifty or sixty thousand dollars, certainly need what they might have saved by a minimum combined excess-profits credit and exemption applicable to 1945, as the amendment of the Senator from Michigan did, to fortify them and to enable them to meet the impact of conditions which they now face, and which they will face in 1946.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the reason why we had to give up that amendment was that the House insisted on a general reduction in the corporation surtax. The figure was then so large that they would not agree to the other $80,000,000 of this tax.

It should be pointed out the bill does give extra relief to all small corporations in the future, whereas the amendment applied only to those which had earned excess profits, which is a small proportion of the total. The committee did not feel we were discriminating in any way against small corporations. I think it would have been better if those very active ones which made a great deal of money during the year could have some rescission of war taxes to enable them to have more working capital during the reconversion period, but I do not think it is fair to say we have neglected, in our action or the action of the Congress as a whole, the interests of the small corporations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in response to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I may say that I did not mean to infer that the committee had been dilatory about its work. I take at full value the statements of both the senior Senator from Ohio and the senior Senator from Georgia that they have done everything possible to preserve the Senate amendments in the conference. But the fact that the Vandenberg amendment is omitted means that we will be confronted with the same pleas and requests which have been made by businessmen before our committee. We have received such complaints in the Small Business Committee I believe from every State in the Union, to the effect that they needed this relief retroactively to January 1, 1945. The fact that the amendment goes out of the bill does not mean that the committee has neglected its duty or has been dilatory, or has shirked its responsibility, but it is relief about which those particular complainants are most interested and insistent. We had hoped that at least the Vandenberg amendment would be carried in the conference bill.

As I stated when I rose, I do not intend to continue opposition to the conference report. We have discussed and debated at length these amendments. We had a vote on the Wherry amendment in July—it lost 30 to 31 in the Senate, and I take it the conferees have done everything they could to keep the Senate amendments in the proposed legislation, but I say once again, that businessmen throughout the country have testified that the amendment would give them more relief than anything else we could do, that if there was a desire to keep business going and to get it reconverted, this was what they needed most. It is most timely, and if we could have gotten approval of the amendment it would have meant substantial relief to small business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not understand how the conference report without the Vandenberg amendment is any concession to small business. I am not clear on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the interpretation of both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Ohio, in order to forego insistence on the Vandenberg amendment they compromised by getting greater relief in the normal surtax on earnings up to $50,000. The Senator heard the explanation by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For the future.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. That is very helpful for the future, but what the businessman wants is relief here. I am inclined to think that if we could have retained the Vandenberg amendment, or even insisted on a $25,000 excess-profits-tax exemption, in the final analysis, in this critical period, it would have been of more benefit to business, than what we are to do in the future. That is the way I feel about it personally, and I had hoped that, regardless of what might have been done about relief in the future, we could have gained the relief for small business at this time, for those who want to stay in business, and those who started in business in 1945, and for those who are more anxious to maintain their pay rolls and keep business in operation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is where the future expansion of employment is most likely to occur.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my theory. If we can maintain it and get more new small business going in the United States, we will have settled our most important reconversion problem.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I think the RECORD should show that there was opposition to the Vandenberg amendment from the Treasury Department, on the basis that a good many returns have already been made, and that it would be most difficult in the administration of the law. This objection did not relate to the principle involved, but it was a fact in the consideration of the subject and contributed to the unwillingness of the House conferees to support the Vandenberg amendment. Of course, there were other objections.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. That was also presented on the floor of the Senate last July when the so-called Wherry amendment was considered. Candidly, I realized that we had many difficulties to overcome in order to have it worked out.

As I have said, I am taking at its face the statement of the Senate conferees that they have done everything they could. We have already had the arguments on the Senate floor, and I shall not take more time, but I feel strongly, as I have said, about the relief which might and should have been extended to small business.

If they are to be denied the relief—and they are, if we adopt this report—then there is one more thing I would suggest to the Senator from Georgia, namely, that he proceed with the joint hearings to be held on section 722, because in my section of the country, where the period following the drought was fixed as the base, there has been an inequitable tax exemption. I wish to point out to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance that more than 30,000 appeals which have been filed have not been passed on in Washington. Our constituents are still anxiously waiting to see what is to happen by way of a decision on those cases. In my State by taking the years 1936 to 1939, following the drought, the Government has established a period that is not equitable in arriving at excess profits, and I sincerely trust that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance will hold hearings and, if it can be done, afford the relief our people must have. Let us go back and establish a fair base period for the drought States so they may be given the relief to which I think they are entitled.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator that that question will be looked into. The Senator is quite right in saying that section 722, the general relief provision against the hardships of the excess-profits tax, has not been administered. Whose fault it is is precisely what the committee wishes to find out. It wishes to know why that

section cannot be administered. Although the excess-profits tax is repealed for the future, that is, beginning with the next year, the point raised by the Senator is of extreme importance to small corporations and other corporations whatever size they may be, suffering severe hardships because they still have unclosed certainly their taxes for 1945, perhaps for 1944, many of them for 1943. If section 722 can be administered as the Finance Committee intended it to be administered, and hoped it would be administered when it was placed in the law, very great relief would come to the excess-profits taxpayers, the taxpayers, of course, who would have been benefited by the Vandenberg amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his statement, because I know that the section of the country we call the drought States will appreciate any relief which can be obtained under a proper and sympathetic interpretation of section 722. It is significant to note that there are 30,000 appeals under that section pending in Washington.

I should like to say further that I have before me a bulletin issued in Washington which said that the district offices would permit the establishment of a satisfactory base period, and advised claimants that they could obtain relief if they would submit their appeals to Washington. After they appealed to Washington last year another bulletin was issued countermanding or contradicting the former bulletin.

So I say once again that if we are not to be given relief from the excess-profits tax retroactively for 1945, I hope that the committee will take action which will permit the claimants from the drought-stricken States to use a base period which is equitable in determining their excess-profits tax for the years following the drought, and that the law will be administered sympathetically.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not want to detain the Senate long. I merely wish to say, particularly because I could not be present during the debate on the bill when it was before the Senate, that I highly disapprove of the elimination of the Vandenberg amendment, and furthermore, because of reasons which I need not now go into, I also think this bill is premature. For those reasons, and because of the removal of all excess-profits taxes, I disapprove of the conference report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question of the Senator from Arkansas as to what we had done with small corporations perhaps was not answered. We have reduced the rates on corporations with incomes of less than $5,000 a year to 21 percent from 25 percent; on corporations with incomes from $5,000 to $20,000, 23 percent from 27 percent; on corporations with incomes over $20,000 and under $25,000, from 29 percent to 25 percent. So that the reduction for those corporations is twice what it is for any larger corporation, on the basis of the percentage of earnings. The larger corporations have also been given some benefit, but we have given the small corporations a greater benefit, and I think that future benefit will be of great assistance to them, and will be something upon which they can rely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is it not true also that the reductions just referred to apply uniformly, while the excess-profits tax reductions do not apply uniformly? And is it not true that many small businesses had no excess profits?

Mr. TAFT. I would think certainly not more than 10 percent of the small corporations had any excess profits.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious, of course, that the conference report will be adopted. However, I want to express very briefly my deep regret that the conferees on behalf of the Senate did not agree with the House portion of the bill relating to excess profits for 1946. In view of the colossal debt which our country owes, and with the favorable prospect for business in 1946, particularly in the case of those corporations which have heretofore paid excess-profits taxes, I think it is a blunder for the Congress to repeal all excess-profits taxes as of January 1, 1946. I see no reason why we should remit, as it were, a very substantial tax from these corporations when it will be no great burden to them, for the reason that they are already allowed what was regarded as a normal prewar income before any excess-profits tax applied.

I wish to express my hearty disagreement with that portion of the bill. With many other portions of the bill I agree.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Texas has just said. Does he not think it is fair to say that the business in this year and in the coming year should still be considered war business? The accumulation of orders is certainly a part of the war. It is not really peacetime business. The idea of what a peacetime tax should be is not particularly appropriate to this year and next, is it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that by reason of governmental control and the prohibition of manufacture of many articles which will now be released, the profits and benefits to the public and to the manufacturers in those lines are most certainly directly attributable to the state of war.

I hold in my hand an article—I do not vouch for it because I do not know whether it is true—by an Associated Press staff writer entitled "More Plant Profits Seen Even With Pay Hikes." This is a digest of views of a number of Government agencies, and they predict greater corporate profits for 1946 than for any war year. I say I do not vouch for that statement; I do not know about it; but certainly there is nothing, as I see it, upon the horizon which would tend to discourage the belief that in 1946 the manufacturing concerns of the country are going to enjoy a profitable and prosperous year, and, whatever we may think, industry and the people who make money are the ones who are going to have to pay the war debt. We cannot get the money out of those who do not have incomes and who do not have profits.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that even in spite of the high excess-profits tax business as a whole during 1944 had a greater net return after taxes than in any other year in the history of this country? In 1944 it was about $10,000,000,000 as against about $8,000,000,000, was it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept the statement of the Senator, and thank him for it. We certainly could have maintained the part of the excess-profits tax for 1946, which the House did, by adopting the 60-percent rate, which, in effect, would have only been a 50-percent rate.

I may have an exaggerated view of this matter. I favor a reasonable excess-profits tax even in peacetime, because it is merely the application to corporate incomes of the principle of the graduated income tax.

The Senator from Arkansas, as president of Columbia University or some other great enterprise, might receive three times as much salary as did the Senator from Texas, but he would also pay a higher rate on that income. If a corporation is very prosperous and has a high rate of income based upon invested capital, why should it not pay a higher rate of tax than a corporation which is not earning as high a rate of income on its invested capital?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator's contention. I ask the Senator if he does not feel that, instead of repealing the excess-profits tax, it might have been better to improve the base, if there is something wrong with the administration of the excess-profits tax? It would be better to improve the base than to repeal the excess-profits tax, because in my opinion the question of excess profits involves also the question of inflation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that this bill is regarded more or less as a temporary measure. There was a general disposition not to consider any new or involved aspects of taxation, with a view to waiting to take up those matters in January. However, the total repeal of the excess-profits tax by this bill will discourage any reinstatement of the excess-profits tax when we meet in January. That is one reason why I wished to express my opinion at this time.

Mr. President, without an any way vouching for the figures, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the newspaper article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE PLANT PROFITS SEEN EVEN WITH PAY HIKES

(By Sterling Green)

Government economists foresee higher factory profits in 1946 than in any war year,

even if wage rates are increased to keep average hourly earnings at last April's wartime level.

The figures, which indicate 1946 profits of manufacturing corporations at $6,300,000,000 after payment of taxes, were submitted yesterday to the Reconversion Advisory Board to assist its study of a national war-price policy.

They were prepared by economists of John W. Snyder's Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, at request of the advisory group headed by O. Max Gardner, former North Carolina Governor.

Members of the advisory board conferred with President Truman, after debating the wage-price question in a special session in the White House.

NO POSITIONS TAKEN

OWMR official later said "no decisions were reached and no position taken" by the advisory board, which is composed of public representatives and spokesmen for labor, management, and agriculture.

The wage and price statistics offered for consideration were not officially made public, but it was learned that they indicate—

That the take-home pay of the average factory worker with one dependent in 1946 will have 10-percent less purchasing power, after taxes are paid, than his earnings in January 1941.

That the ability of management to pay higher wage rates in 1946 will be improved by certain measurable declines in costs, although some other cost factors which cannot be measured might alter this ability.

INCREASES COULD BE OFFSET

That, based on the measurable factors only, wage rate increases averaging about 24 percent could be offset by the dropping of overtime payments, up-grade wages, and the excess-profits tax.

The latter estimate was carefully qualified. The economists noted that it was impossible to gage the effect on profits of the following problems connected with the switchover to civilian goods:

The replacement of profitable wartime lines with lower-profit civilian goods; the necessity of breaking in green and inefficient workers; the low rate of output during the early stages of reconversion; and a decline in total volume of output in some industries.

On the other hand, the Government economists forecast that large increases in productivity would occur which in many cases would permit payment of higher wages.

STRIKING DIFFERENCES FOUND

The OWMR reports emphasized that there were striking differences in costs and profits from industry to industry, so that the averages used would help only in formulating a national policy, not in solving the wage problem of any specific industry.

The decline in earnings for the average worker during 1946 will be accompanied by unemployment—and total loss of earnings—for about 8,000,000 persons by next spring, the OWMR study predicted.

At the same time the total national output will drop from its wartime rate of $206,000,000,000 to $165,000,000,000, or somewhat less, as military production declines.

The reaction of the Advisory Board to these studies was not immediately made known, and White House officials said Mr. Truman had no comment to make.

However, the flurry of activity in the White House and in Snyder's office indicated that Mr. Truman was preparing shortly to issue his promised statement on wage-price policy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. MURDOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1120.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KILGORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hart	Myers
Austin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Hoey	Robertson
Brooks	Huffman	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Capper	Kilgore	Tunnell
Chavez	Knowland	Tydings
Connally	La Follette	Vandenberg
Cordon	Langer	Walsh
Donnell	Lucas	Wheeler
Eastland	McClellan	Wherry
Ellender	McKellar	White
Ferguson	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Magnuson	Willis
George	Maybank	Wilson
Gerry	Millikin	Young
Green	Moore	
Gurney	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1120.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1120) to provide for reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Reorganization Act of 1945."

TITLE I

SEC. 1. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to—

(1) facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

(2) reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and by abolishing such agencies as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government;

(6) eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

(7) provide for making currently and continuously, subject to the limitation contained in subsection (d) of section 4 hereof, such adjustments in the Government establishment as may be necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a), and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this title, and can be accomplished more speedily and efficiently thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

SEC. 2. No reorganization plan under section 4 shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(a) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(b) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(c) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(d) transferring to any other agency any executive department or all the functions thereof; or

(e) consolidating with any executive department any other executive department or all the functions thereof; or

(f) abolishing any executive department or all the functions thereof: or

(g) establishing any new executive department, or changing the name of any executive department, or designating any agency as "Department" or the head of any new agency as "Secretary"; or

(h) divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions; or

(i) increasing the term of any office beyond that now provided by law for such office.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency or the functions thereof to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency or the functions thereof with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the abolition of any function or functions; or

(5) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part (by reason of reorganizations under this act or otherwise, or by reason of termination of its functions in any other manner) does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the reorganization plan will not have, any functions,

is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of any reorganizations as to which he has made findings hereunder and which

he elects to include in the plan, and shall transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization specified in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of subsection 1 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session.

(b) Any reorganization plan prepared and transmitted pursuant to subsection 3 (a) shall—

(1) make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by such reorganization;

(2) make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with any agency reorganized as the President deems necessary by reason of the reorganization: *Provided*, That such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which the appropriation is originally made and any appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury;

(3) make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished;

(4) designate, in such cases as the President deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization;

(5) make provision for such further measures, consistent with section 2, as the President deems necessary in order to facilitate administration with respect to any agency affected by a reorganization, including provision for the appointment, compensation, and duties of the head or any other officer of such agency: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed to any office under a reorganization plan for a fixed term in excess of 4 years and no provision shall be made under a reorganization plan for the appointment of any person as the head of an agency or (except for appointment under the classified civil service) as a policy-maker or at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 per year, except by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That no reorganization plan shall fix the compensation of any person at more than $10,000 per year.

SEC. 4. (a) The reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect, in accordance with the plan, upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to the Congress, during which the Congress shall be in session without adjournment sine die, but only if during such 60-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating that the body so resolving does not favor the reorganization plan: *Provided*, That if during such 60-day period either House of the Congress shall pass a resolution referring the reorganization plan back to the President with a request for specific changes, the running of such 60-day period shall be stayed until such time as the President shall reaffirm his approval of the plan as transmitted, or shall retransmit the plan with changes; and if he shall retransmit the plan with changes, it shall be deemed to be a new reorganization plan.

(b) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time lafer than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

(c) If the reorganizations specified in a reorganization plan take effect, the reorganization plan shall be printed in the Federal Register and shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws.

(d) No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before July 1, 1947.

SEC. 5. Whenever the employment of any person is terminated by a reduction of personnel as a result of a reorganization affected under this act, such person, if he served without time limitation, shall thereafter be given preference, when qualified, whenever an appointment is made in the executive branch of the Government, but such preference shall not be effective for a period longer than 12 months from the date the employment of such person is so terminated.

SEC. 6. (a) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of any agency or function reorganized under the provisions of this act and in effect at the time of the reorganization shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such reorganization had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed, except as otherwise provided in a reorganization plan.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization plan under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such officer under the organization so effected.

(c) All laws relating to any agency or function reorganized under the provisions of this act shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 7. When used in this act—

(a) The term "agency" means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation owned or controlled by the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, authority, administration, or other establishment in the executive branch of the Government, except the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission, the United States Tariff Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Land Bank System, the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "establishment in the executive branch of the Government" does not include the General Accounting Office, which is an establishment in the legislative branch.

(c) The term "policy maker" means one who devises, or who has final authority, sole or joint, in the creation of or ordering into operation, plans, estimates, programs, or administrative procedure relating to an agency's operations and in conformity with law, or pertaining to the function of the agency and the administration of law, as prescribed by Congress.

(d) The term "reorganization" means any transfer, consolidation, coordination, abolition, or other measure, referred to in subsection (a) of section 3.

SEC. 8. The second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), being the last sentence of the said title I is hereby repealed.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in sec. 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means any resolution introduced in either House of the Congress in pursuance of subsection (a) of section 4 of this act, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the * * * does not favor the reorganization plan numbered * * * transmitted to Congress by the President on , 19 ," the first blank space therein being filled with the name of the resolving body, and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order,

and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(b) All appeals from the decisions of the chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which, being in the nature of a substitute, is open to amendment, and any amendment thereto should be proposed before the vote is taken on the committee amendment.

AMERICAN FUNDAMENTALS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, today I have heard quite a debate on tax matters. The average American knows very little about taxes, except that he has to pay them.

I am in receipt of a letter dealing with American fundamentals of which every American knows. I wish to take a little of the time of the Senate to read the letter. It is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

WOODSIDE, QUEENS, N. Y., *October 29, 1945.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: On the eve of election, November 6, 1944, my former Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said:

"When the ballots are cast your responsibilities do not cease. The public servants you elect cannot fulfill their trust unless, you, the people, watch and advise them. Raise your voices in protest when you believe your public servants to be wrong; back them up when you believe them to be right."

Recently, President Truman said these historic words:

"Today we stand on the threshold of a new world. We must do our part in making this world what it should be, a world in which the bigotries of race and class and creed shall not be permitted to warp the souls of men."

These words are not high-sounding empty phrases spoken to lull the people into deceptively peaceful sleep. These words have life and meaning. They are the essence of democratic government, which is defined best as "government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—all the people, not just a chosen few.

I am an American who believes in the ideals of Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee. I raise my voice in protest against the vicious discriminatory religious and racial hate, as spouted by some of the more reactionary citizens of America.

I am an average American citizen whose only claim to prominence is a lone 16 days of picketing in Washington, D. C. I would not have interrupted my self-imposed picketing duty were it not for the fact that my leg wounds, incurred in the Pacific battle of Savo Bay aboard the cruiser *Vincennes*, made continuous action impossible.

My parents were poor Polish immigrants who came to this country in search of what did not exist in Europe. In their labored English they told me that the United States represented promise and hope to all who suffer in dull, throbbing defeat. They understood America, understood it far better than these same reactionaries, some of whom are descended from generations of native-born Americans.

I grew up in New York's lower east side, where all the ingredients of the melting pot that is America are fused into a most wonderful country. I studied and played with Italians, Jews, Irish, Negroes, and others whom some persons would dismiss as "undesirable nationalities." As I was not important, wealthy, or aristocratic, I was only an unimportant, poor, ignorant kid—I called my friends Americans and they thought of me as an American, too.

Of course, there were plenty of street gang fights. Children in poor, crowded slums need some form of activity. My head was once bashed in for defending a Jewish lad in a gang scrap. But those kids and their parents would never have listened and believed in some speakers with their blind prejudices.

I enlisted in the Navy on August 2, 1940. I knew that a war against fascism was inevitable and I wanted to fight it from the beginning. I did not know that the Hitlerian shoots I was helping to destroy were already transplanted to my own country, and were now trying to choke and invalidate the very thing we were fighting for.

As pharmacist's mate on the U. S. S. *Vincennes*, a heavy cruiser which participated in the battles of Coral Sea, Midway, Guadalcanal, and Savo Bay in the Solomon Islands, I served with other Americans, men whose origins were Negro, Jewish, Irish, Italian, Hungarian, Polish, and Greek. They lived, fought, and died together—for the United States of America, their country.

Let me tell you two short stories—incidents that prove to me a man's a man, regardless of his race, creed, color, or national origin. During the battle of Savo Bay the left arm of a Negro boy aboard the *Vincennes* was shattered by shrapnel. I applied a tourniquet, did what else I could for him and left him to look after the other wounded men. When I returned, he was not lying there—he was on the line passing ammunition with his one good arm. That man is dead now—he gave his life for America and the preservation of democracy.

Another lad, his chest crushed by a piece of shrapnel, was hurt so badly that nothing could be done for him except to make his last minutes as comfortable as possible. I gave him something to dull the pain and he died soon afterward. His dead hand dropped open and in it was a Star of David and a picture of a pretty girl holding a chubby, smiling baby. He never saw his son. This boy died for America and the promises it must make and keep to his child. Shall these promises be abrogated by any unintelligent persons today? Should such men be called "niggers" or "kikes"? It was they who kept this country free. Should anyone speak against them?

I saw boys suffer and I looked at the dead faces of many more. And out of my wide experience with death, I would like to say that a pure southern white and a Negro or a Jew or an Italian die for the same reasons and show the same physical manifestations in death. Negro blood and white blood have exactly the same chemical make-up. All blood congeals in death. Black and white limbs grow equally stiff. Italian and Negro hearts stop beating as tragically as southern hearts. The screams and grimaces of dying men have nothing to do with their origins. They are men, human beings, simply that, nothing less, nothing more. And that is enough.

The *Vincennes* was bombed and sunk on August 9, 1942. I did not abandon ship when the order was given because I had a duty to my wounded shipmates. I stayed at my battle station and administered first aid to my fallen comrades. While engaged in my tasks, I was hit by shrapnel and received serious wounds, including a compound fracture of the left leg in four places—an injury from which I shall never recover completely, I crawled through the warm blood of Negroes, Italians, Jews—the blood of Americans. Incidentally, only 30 percent of the Negroes on our ship survived. They all died for something many of them had never had in life—a way of living which did not exclude them from the things which all men should regard as their due.

I would not be alive today were it not for the 4 pints of blood plasma. I do not know whether it was Jewish blood, Christian blood, white or Negro blood. All I know is that it saved my life and I am thankful to any American regardless of his race, creed, color, or religion, because perhaps his blood flows in my veins. If any bigoted person ever visited the "blood bank" perhaps I have his blood in my veins—that would be most ironic.

I spent the next 3 years in naval hospitals. During this time the Navy sometimes sent me out to make war-bond and blood-plasma speeches. Most of my days, however, were spent in the hospital. Here I met, talked to, and lived with other wounded men. We had plenty of time to think and to read the newspapers. I have seen tears come to the eyes of my sick buddies when they read some of this terrible hate propaganda. "Was this what we fought for?" "Was this why my arm or leg was thrown aside? God, if this is true, what a horrible waste it's all been." That's what those silent tears said to me.

After my discharge from the St. Albans Naval Hospital, I decided to speak out against all hateful prejudices and attacks. In my picket line, I carried a sign reading "Was it in vain that I fought for democracy?" I had no response except someone sent me a book of speeches—not even autographed.

It wasn't easy or pleasant to walk up and down the street in front of the place I have chosen to picket. My leg cannot stand that much exercise very well. I was annoyed by questions about the "organization" I represented. I do not and never have represented any formally organized group. I was a lone American demanding the fruits of democracy for himself and 133,000,000 other Americans. If victory is to have more than a mere military connotation, we must see that discrimination against minority races and groups is no longer tolerated in speech or act.

I intend to keep doing my part. Others are joining me. Our voices are clear and sure. We are going to fight intolerance wherever we find it. We will expose intolerance in Catholic, Protestant, or Jew. We will organize and expose it in New York and in California and in Mississippi and in all the other States, up and down and across the land.

I have received hundreds of letters from servicemen and civilians. All except two congratulated me on my stand. And if I could talk to the two who were on the other side, perhaps I could make them understand that something like Mr. Willkie's One World is the alternative to no world at all.

We face a serious problem in the returning veteran who might listen to any person's Fascist foaming. There will be emotional, economic, and social maladjustment. Twisted, bitter hearts may respond to their cynical, vicious talk. They may become eager to "put the nigger in his place." Impatient, hungry men are seldom logical or progressive.

I know nothing about politics. I have never sought or held office. I am a leader only in the sense that I am not afraid to speak for millions of others. Their voices are blended in mine.

I quote from some of the letters I received during my stay in Washington:

1. "I read with interest the account in the newspapers of your one-man fight. It was about time someone had enough guts to tell what the servicemen think and I admire your courage for being the first. You have become the spokesman for all the fellows in service, and you can be sure that we're all

behind you 100 percent. I sincerely hope that you are only the first of thousands of GI's who will come home and campaign actively for the Americanism that we've been fighting for."

2. "By the time this letter reaches you, if it ever should, I feel confident that your call for ex-servicemen to aid you will have been answered by many others like yourself. I know that if it were possible, I and countless others still in service who have read of your campaign, would be right there beside you because most of us feel with you."

"Perhaps this letter should be in a vein of thanks, to express in some way the gratitude of all of us to you for representing those who are unable to join you other than to lean on our pens as a means toward silencing those in America who are creating racial and religious intolerance; those here at home who pit black against white, Jew against Gentile; those who have forgotten and forgiven Tojo and Hitler just as surely as we haven't."

"From Tokyo, from Germany, from wherever Americans are, they are with you in heart because they cannot be with you in person."

3. "The WIVES, Inc., an organization of women of every faith, creed, and color, whose husbands have fought and died in every branch of the armed forces for preservation of the democratic ideals, want to express their gratitude for the magnificent stand you are now making."

4. "Our country needs more and more men like you who have the courage publicly to condemn what threatens the public welfare. It takes a rare audacity of spirit to dare to make oneself conspicuous in the public interest, and I salute you for displaying it.

"Our son died in this war knowing very well, despite his youth, that what he fought for was the brotherhood of man, and that the fight must be fought at home as well as abroad.

"My husband joins me in admiration of your stand, and in pleasure in the knowledge that, whether he admits it or not * * * will know from now on that he cannot unchallenged attack the basic idea of Americanism."

5. A copy of a telegram was enclosed with this letter. It reads: "Sixty-eight of us are sending $34 to Edward Bykowski. Although he has discouraged contributions, we hope it will enable him to continue picketing. We are servicemen of many racial strains who are strongly opposed to the antiracial prejudices."

6. "As a southern woman and a Democrat concerned about giving full opportunity to every human being, I want to cooperate with you in my small way.

"I am one of 130,000,000 citizens who want to thank you personally for offering your life for what you at least thought was a fight for human freedom, and I appreciate the way you continue to carry on the fight in the place it should have started—at home.

"May I take you to dinner while you continue this fight for me? Enclosed is the dollar for the check."

7. "Enclosed please find a money order for $5 to help you in your fight, which I trust you will accept in the spirit it is given by me.

"This is given in memory of our boy who died at Saipan, fighting like you and the rest of us for the cause. In my opinion, it is not fair that you alone should carry the expense.

"Too bad that we can't settle this matter the way it really should be settled."

Part of the money I received was given to the American Library Association—for books for the libraries of all States. The balance is being used to carry on this fight against intolerance and bigotry.

John Galsworthy said, "The measure of democracy is the measure of the freedom and sense of individual responsibility in its humblest citizens." These letters and all the others written to newspapers and Congressmen prove that the sense of individual responsibility is alive and fighting. And in a democracy, when the people fight, the people win.

Too many of my "kike," "dago," and "nigger" friends are nothing now but crumbling bones under lonely white crosses and Jewish stars. What they died for must not die with them. It must live after them in the free thoughts and courageous speech of their children's grandchildren.

VE-day and VJ-day were great and joyful days in our history, but we veterans are looking forward to a VA-day—a victory in America day. We lived and fought for the day we could come back to peace, and instead, we read of Hitlerian doctrines. Politicians had better learn that if they try to destroy the "work, laugh and live together" philosophy, that is America, they will destroy themselves at the polls. America will win this war, too.

Yours for a greater victory—freedom for all and a real peace.

EDWARD A. BYKOWSKI,
Chairman, Bykowski Committee for Human Rights.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on September 29 I addressed a letter to the Secretary of War asking for certain specific information regarding the return home of men from overseas. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD, together with the answer from Secretary Patterson.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War, War Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I should like to have you furnish me at the earliest opportunity:

1. Figures showing by months the number of men in the Army who have been sent home from the European theater of operations and from the Pacific, with a separate break-down in each case.

2. The same information, preferably by weeks, showing the number of men who are being returned to civilian life—both sets of figures to commence as of VE-day and VJ-day for the respective theaters.

3. The number of ships now being used in the redeployment and whether or not there has been an increase in the number of ships used or a decrease in the number being used for this purpose.

4. The number of Navy warships that are now being used to bring soldiers home from Europe and the Pacific and to what extent such ships have been used. Also the number of men they have brought home from each theater to date.

5. The number of men being brought home from each theater by plane and the number of planes currently being used for this purpose.

6. What arrangements we have with the British Government under lend-lease or reverse lend-lease for the continuous use of the "Queens" in the redeployment of our troops, and whether the British Government has requested the release of these vessels to be returned to the commercial trade or to the British for rehabilitation and preparation to be put into commercial trade.

7. The number of men now in the two theaters with more than 100 points, and the number, by brackets of 10, from 70 to 100 points.

8. The number of medical officers in the Medical Corps who are now in the two theaters and in the United States. Also the number of doctors who have been released from the service since VE-day.

Rest assured that your courtesy in supplying this information at the earliest possible date will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

OCTOBER 30, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: The information requested in your letter dated September 29, 1945, is submitted below:

1. Personnel debarking in the United States by air and water:

From Europe (ETO and MTO):	
May 12 through 31, 1945	50,000
June	290,000
July	341,000
August 1–14	171,000
August 15–31	238,000
September (preliminary)	383,000
Total	1,473,000
From Pacific (Western Pacific and Middle Pacific):	
May 12 through 31, 1945	6,000
June	32,000
July	46,000
August 1–14	25,000
August 15–31	20,000
September (preliminary)	79,000
Total	208,000

2. Information is not available on returns to civil life by theater. Total returns to civil life are listed below:

May 12, 1945	4,490
Week ending May 19	18,079
6 days ending May 25	18,787
Week ending June 1	23,279
Week ending June 8	26,353
Week ending June 15	32,221
Week ending June 22	40,280
Week ending June 29	47,385
Week ending July 6	40,435
Week ending July 13	37,930
Week ending July 20	34,260
Week ending July 27	36,146
Week ending Aug. 3	38,014
Week ending Aug. 10	36,686
Aug. 11 through Aug. 14	23,288
Total	457,633
Aug. 15 through Aug. 17	16,717
Week ending Aug. 24	46,830
Week ending Aug. 31	59,995
Week ending Sept. 7	80,573
Week ending Sept. 14	104,058
Week ending Sept. 21	148,144
Week ending Sept. 28	202,017
Week ending Oct. 5	234,516
Week ending Oct. 12	266,190
Week ending Oct. 19	301,843
Oct. 20–22 (inclusive)	135,180
Total	1,596,063
Aggregate (since VE-day)	2,053,696

3. At the present time 512 regular troop carriers are being used in redeployment, an increase of about 60 since VE-day.

4. Navy warships are returning both Army and Navy personnel to maximum capacity. Their availability is dependent upon the ability of the fleet to release them for this service.

5. It is estimated that transport planes are presently making 465 trips a month across the Atlantic returning approximately 9,000 personnel, and the Pacific 720 trips returning approximately 13,500 personnel. The above figures do not include tactical aircraft returning to the United States with crews and passengers for whom there is space.

6. Prime Minister Attlee recently wrote to President Truman stating that in view of

the end of the war and the necessity for returning British soldiers to their homes, he could no longer justify to his people the retention by the United States of the *Aquitania* and the Queen ships. He stated that he must ask for the return of these ships or equivalent shipping space in American ships. President Truman, therefore, directed our representatives on the Joint Chiefs of Staff to make this space available to the British, and it was decided to return to them the *Aquitania*, one of the Queen ships, and to give them American shipping space equivalent to the second Queen which this country would continue to use.

Our use of the Queen ships and the *Aquitania* has been based on an agreement with the British made last May which was to run until the end of this year, during which period it was expected the war with Japan would continue.

The release of this shipping will cost us about 120,000 personnel spaces by the end of December. It is expected that this loss will be made up by the end of January 1946, at which time the shipping then available in the Atlantic will be able to return men from Europe as rapidly as the theater can release them. The surplus personnel now in the theater will have been removed by that time, and we will be operating on a current basis. It is not planned to remove shipping from the Pacific to replace this loss in the Atlantic due to the fact, first, we were not counting on this shipping beyond the end of the year, anyway, and, second, because the spaces are more vitally needed in the Pacific where distance makes the return of men from that area slower than in the Atlantic.

Important fact is that the boats were intended for redeployment—not for bringing men home—therefore the British were justified in asking for their share of the return-home shipping.

7. Following are estimates (as of October 15, 1945) of enlisted men in European theater and the Pacific theater having point scores 70 or over. Reports from which this estimate was made group scores 85 and over. Hence, information is not available as to the number of men having scores over 100, and the number of men in brackets from 85 to 100. For your further information, it is estimated that all men having scores of 85 or over will be out of the service by November.

Europe (ETO and MTO):	
85 and over	125,000
80–24, inclusive	120,000
70–79, inclusive	393,000
Pacific (middle Pacific and western Pacific):	
85 and over	75,000
80–84, inclusive	50,000
70–79, inclusive	170,000

8. Following are Medical Corps officers as of August 31, 1945:

European theater (ETO and MTO)	11,865
Pacific theater (western Pacific and middle Pacific)	6,397
Zone of interior	[1] 26,079

[1] Includes some officers relieved from active duty but who are included in the strength until their terminal leave expires.

The total number of Medical Corps officers returned to civil life (relieved from active duty) from VE-day through October 19, 1945, amounted to 8,815.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to state that there are several points which I think are of interest to the Senate in connection with this whole policy of the return home of men from overseas. All of us have received letters from both the Pacific and the European theaters of operations. The Army and the Navy have been doing a job, and I think they are to be commended for the speed with which they have been bringing men home, but I am not satisfied that the men have been returned as rapidly as they could be.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Secretary of War points out in this communication that the President of the United States had received a letter from the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Atlee, regarding the release of the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Aquitania*. I do not think any of us can have any legitimate objection to the British wanting those ships returned in order to bring their own men home, but what I think we can question is that those ships were released before we had a plan for taking up the total loss of lift which resulted from the release of the ships.

It seems to me, and I think the Members of the Senate will agree, that we need now a coordinator of military transportation, so that full use can be made of both war vessels and commercial vessels which are available to us, and also the air lift that is available to us. None of us wishes to see the United States forces in the European theater and in the Pacific reduced to such a point that this Nation cannot uphold its standing in dealing with the problems which today confront the world. However, I feel that those men who are not needed in our occupation forces in the Pacific and in the European theater of operations are entitled to be brought home just as expeditiously as possible and with all the facilities the Government can muster to bring them home. Otherwise, we will have a tremendous morale problem on our hands.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Senate committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 20, after the word "Board" it is proposed to insert "civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army."

Mr. MURDOCK obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Cordon	Hayden
Austin	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Ball	Eastland	Hill
Barkley	Ellender	Hoey
Bilbo	Ferguson	Huffman
Brewster	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Briggs	George	Johnston, S. C.
Brooks	Gerry	Kilgore
Butler	Green	Knowland
Byrd	Gurney	La Follette
Capper	Hart	Langer
Chavez	Hatch	Lucas
Connally	Hawkes	McClellan
McKellar	Radcliffe	Walch
McMahon	Reed	Wheeler
Magnuson	Revercomb	Wherry
Maybank	Robertson	White
Millikin	Saltonstall	Wiley
Moore	Taft	Willis
Murdock	Taylor	Wilson
Myers	Tunnell	Young
O'Daniel	Tydings	
Overton	Vandenberg	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, we are about to begin the consideration of S. 1120, which is commonly known as and referred to as the reorganization bill. I doubt that there is any subject which has come before Congress which is so frequently referred to in both Houses of Congress as Senate bill 1120, and what is intended under its provisions. In my opinion, it is one of the most important bills Congress has considered in a long time or will consider during the remainder of this session.

Due to the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, was called back to his State on very important business, he requested me to present to the Senate S. 1120 as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Many of the amendments which are contained in the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary were vigorously opposed by me during its consideration. Because of that fact, I might find myself in an embarrassing position, Mr. President, in the presentation of the proposed legislation. However, I shall attempt to make my statement respecting the proposed legislation as objective as possible. But I do reserve the right in making that statement to advert to and explain my position on some of the amendments as they were considered by the subcommittee and by the full membership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1120 was introduced nearly 5 months ago, on June 7, by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], acting for the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In the Committee on the Judiciary, S. 1120 was referred to a subcommittee, which fixed a date for hearings, and invited every major Federal agency to attend and testify if it desired to do so. Most of the agencies invited replied to the invitation with a statement that they did not desire to testify. Testimony was received from the Comptroller General of the United States, from the Director of the Budget, from the United States Maritime Commission, from the Solicitor of the Department of Commerce, and from the General Counsel of the Federal Works Agency. In addition to these representatives of the executive branch, testimony was received from a representative of the Association of Interstate Commerce Practitioners, a representative of the National League of Women voters, a representative of the Railway Labor Executives Association, a representative of the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor, and a representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Letters from nearly all the major agencies in the ex-

ecutive branch of the Government also were made a part of the record, as were various letters from interested parties outside of government.

An opportunity to testify was granted to every person or agency which asked to be heard.

The hearings, which consumed 5 days, were concluded on September 18, and the bill was thereafter considered by the subcommittee in executive session. Numerous amendments were approved by the subcommittee. The subcommittee then reported the bill, as amended, to the full committee, where it was again considered, section by section, and further amendments were added. In the form in which it is before the Senate now, this bill is different in several respects from the text of the bill as originally introduced. The changes represent the views of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

One of the most important questions the committee had to decide was whether to require the approval of both Houses of the Congress in order to permit a reorganization plan to go into effect.

This decision involved consideration of a constitutional question, and the committee felt its responsibility most keenly. The responsibility was particularly great because of the expectation that the Supreme Court probably would refuse to pass upon the constitutionality of any reorganization act approved by the Congress, on grounds that it is a political question and not properly subject to court review. The two views on this constitutional issue, while divergent in their conclusions, agree with respect to one premise: namely, that any action by the Congress requires the concurrence of both Houses.

One view is that this concurrence is required even in the case of a negative action such as a concurrent resolution disapproving a reorganization plan. It is my humble opinion that this view is the correct one under our Constitution. Proponents of this view contend that by this bill the Congress is conferring as a practical necessity, if there is to be efficient reorganization, extraordinary powers on the President, but that this extraordinary power conferred upon the President is so well canalized, and the standards are so well set up and sufficiently specified, that the functions of the President under this legislation are executive functions, and that there is not a delegation of any legislative power.

I take the position that Congress cannot delegate to the President fundamental legislative powers any more than it could delegate to some other executive agency or officer legislative powers.

I take the position that if there are legislative functions delegated to the President by this bill, then the bill, if enacted, would be unconstitutional.

It is not my contention that other members of the Judiciary Committee, who agreed with me that there should be a concurrence of both Houses in any disapproval of a reorganization program, would fully agree with me in my position that there is not, and cannot be, a delegation of legislative powers under this legislation. There may be some members of the committee who insist on the concurrence of both Houses in a resolution of disapproval, that may take the position that legislative functions are delegated by this proposed bill. But if my position is correct, that this bill does not, and could not, within the Constitution, delegate legislative power, but that the functions of the President under it are wholly executive, then the attempt to give to either House of Congress, by action which is not legislation, power to disapprove administrative acts, raises a grave question as to the validity of this provision of the bill.

The language of the bill, as I construe it in simple terms is, that under both general and specific standards, we confer on the Executive extraordinary powers in order to get a reorganization job done which we all agree is absolutely necessary. And because of this conferring of extraordinary powers, the Congress sees fit to reserve the right, before a reorganization plan becomes effective, to examine it and even to veto it. But in the reservation of such a veto power, it is my opinion that under the Constitution it must be a concurrent veto power of both Houses and not a separate veto power of either House.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has just expressed his own personal view on that particular point, with which view I am in accord.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am happy to have that information.

Mr. HATCH. Was the question which the Senator is now discussing ever considered by the subcommittee?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. I believe that more attention was given to this particular question than to any other question which was discussed while I was a member of the subcommittee. However, I became a member in place of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who was necessarily absent from the Senate. The chairman of the committee asked me to serve in his place.

Mr. HATCH. The reason I asked the question is that I was also a member of the subcommittee. I was not present at the last few sessions, or at the meeting of the full committee. However, during the time when I was present, the question of constitutionality was never raised in the subcommittee.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was raised in the latter part of the hearings, which I attended. I recall that the Senator from New Mexico was not present.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. As I understand the bill, if a plan is submitted by the President and is not acted upon by either House, it becomes law. In other words, such a plan could become law by default.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under the language of the bill as reported by the committee, when a reorganization plan is submitted by the President, it becomes law at the expiration of 60 days unless during that period it is disapproved by either House of Congress.

Mr. MOORE. Then it could become law by default of the Congress?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. It would become law under the terms of the bill which we are now discussing. In that bill Congress provides—and in a sense commands, if such a word is appropriately used in connection with the Chief Executive—that the Chief Executive examine, investigate, and study the whole executive department of government with a view to reorganizing for the purpose, among others, of reducing expenses of the executive department, for the purpose of increasing efficiency, and for numerous other purposes. To accomplish those purposes Congress sets up standards in the bill. In other words, it transfers extraordinary power to the President—of necessity, I should say, if we want reorganization—but in granting that authority to the Chief Executive we canalize that authority between well-established banks, within specific restrictions and qualifications, and with specific directions as to how it shall be done. My position is that when Congress passes the bill in that form, and it is approved by the President, then the functions of the President under that type of legislation are not legislative, but are executive and administrative. Therefore my position is that if and when the President exercises executive functions in carrying out the policy of Congress as authorized under a law of this kind, and submits to the Congress what he has done as an Executive under the direction of Congress, the Congress cannot, except by concurrent action, and should not, strike down the executive functions so performed, so long as they are within the standards and qualifications established by the Congress.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator made the remark that it was necessary, in order to have reorganization, to delegate this authority to the President. I should like to have him expand his views on that subject.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall reach that question later in my statement. I think probably if I were permitted to proceed, many of the questions now being asked would be answered. However, at the conclusion of my statement I shall be very happy to answer any question if I can.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I know that the Senator does not wish to be interrupted because he desires to finish his statement. However, something was said which caused me to wonder if perhaps I had misunderstood the Senator's statement of his personal view concerning the legality or constitutionality of either House, by itself, being able to disapprove a plan and make it ineffective.

Mr. MURDOCK. In my judgment the spirit and letter of our Constitution contemplate that whenever the Congress

acts legislatively it must be by concurrence of the two Houses, and under our system cannot be by the action of one House exclusively.

Mr. HATCH. That is the way I understood the Senator, and I agree with that view.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am honored to have the Senator agree with me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator contend that the two Houses can enact legislation by not acting at all? Such procedure would be concurrent, in that neither House would act. Does the Senator contend that we can enact legislation in that way?

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly do not contend that Congress can legislate in any way except by concurrent action of the two Houses. Certainly, I do not imply—and I think it is an incorrect inference on the part of the distinguished Senator from Michigan to say that I advocate or support—the position that Congress can legislate by inaction.

Mr. FERGUSON. I drew that inference as a conclusion from the Senator's answer to the other question. As the bill was originally introduced, it would permit Congress to enact legislation by both Houses failing to act. As reported by the committee, the bill would give either House the right to object; and if either House objected the plan would not become law.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not agree with the Senator's statement as to the enactment of legislation by inaction, or failure by the Congress to act. I know that the Senator takes the position that if concurrent action by both Houses were required in connection with the resolution of disapproval, one House would be permitted to control the situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask the Senator this question: If the House should fail to act within 60 days, and the Senate should fail to act within 60 days after a reorganization plan is presented, as the bill was originally drafted would the plan have become a law?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. The President, acting in his executive capacity, submits a plan to the Congress under the legislation contemplated in this bill. If the concurrence of both Houses were required in a resolution of disapproval, the program of the President would become the law of the land unless both Houses acted within the time limit.

Mr. FERGUSON. As the bill stands today, if the House should fail to act within 60 days, and the Senate should fail to act within 60 days after the reorganization plan was submitted to Congress, would the plan become law?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. The plan of the President, which carried out the policy laid down by Congress and submitted pursuant to law, would become the law of the land. But I invite the Senator's attention to a very analogous situation affecting court procedure in our Federal courts. All of us who have ever practiced in the Federal courts or have had anything to do with procedure in the Federal courts know that attempt after attempt was made to unify the rules of procedure, but no success was had until the Supreme Court of the United States was given the power to write the rules of civil procedure. A provision of the law conferring that power was very analogous to the matter the Senator has called to our attention. It was to the effect that if and when the rules were submitted by the Supreme Court and were pending in the Congress for a period of 60 days, with no action taken, they would become the rules of procedure of the Federal judiciary.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I, for one, believe there is no greater need than that for the reorganization of the Federal Government of the United States. I am in favor of the pending bill with, I think, two modifications in the form of amendments which I have sent to the desk and have asked to be printed. One is a modification which will simplify the rules so as to make sure that a vote can be reached on the question in either House within the time limit.

So, I am in favor of the bill as drafted, with several exceptions which I have stated in the amendments I have submitted.

I am not opposing the bill. As it came from the committee I think it is now constitutional and proper, because either House will have a right to vote—in fact, if the amendments are approved, it will become mandatory upon the Houses of Congress to vote upon this issue within the 60-day period.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Question was asked whether any plan would become effective by reason of inaction. It was asked whether we could legislate by inaction. I ask the Senator if it is not true that any law requires affirmative action by both branches of the Legislature and approval by the Executive, unless it is passed by a necessary two-thirds majority over the veto of the Executive.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator has very correctly stated legislative procedure under the Constitution.

Mr. HATCH. The vitality of this procedure does not come from inaction, but it is given vitality by the law which we are about to pass. That is the affirmative, strengthening, life-giving action.

The proposal to do away with such action, to which we give life when we legislate in a constitutional manner, is, not to legislate by inaction, but to kill legislation which has been properly executed. Under the pending bill it is proposed that the death blow may be given proper legislation by having either branch of Congress act separately and independently of the other.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I think the Senator has stated the position I take even better than I could state it.

While I have the highest regard and the utmost respect for the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan who, in my opinion, is always sincere in the position he takes, I would be less than frank if I did not tell him that what he does and what he has accomplished by his great industry and perseverance in amending the bill, if the amendments he has offered and supported become law, is to make reorganization absolutely impossible.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator that at least the Senator from Michigan was sincere in his attempt to have the bill come to the floor in its present shape. I am of the opinion that if the bill is passed as it is now written, with several amendments as to procedure, it will safeguard the rights of the citizens by an act of Congress.

But, Mr. President, in this bill, even now, we give to the President the right to abolish functions created by legislative acts passed by both Houses of the Congress and approved by the President or becoming effective by reason of his failure to act—which, under the Constitution, would result in having the bill become a law. If we are going to permit the President to abolish those functions, which would be a repeal of a legislative act, without any action by Congress, but by reason of the failure of Congress to act, then there is no place in the Constitution where we can find authority for any such procedure, namely, to delegate to the Chief Executive of our Nation the right to repeal laws without any further acts of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I merely reiterate that I consider that the Senator from Michigan has been very sincere in what he has done in connection with this legislation. In fact, he is deadly sincere; and by being deadly sincere in his theory on this matter, in my opinion, he kills any chances of efficient and expeditious reorganization.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I was interested in the Senator's constitutional point. As I understand his position, it is that the President, in acting under this act, is performing an executive function.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is my position.

Mr. TAFT. Let me state what I do not understand. Last year we passed a bill taking the RFC away from the Department of Commerce and setting up the RFC as an independent agency. When we did that, it was a legislative function. As I understand the Senator, he says that after we pass this bill, the taking away of the RFC from the Department of Commerce will become an executive function. I do not understand how the same act can be both an executive function and a legislative function. I wonder whether the Senator will explain that, because in a way it is the basis of his constitutional objection to this particular procedure.

Mr. MURDOCK. My answer is that if the bill delegates fundamental legislative functions, it is absolutely unconstitutional. I take the position that when Congress acts legislatively within the Constitution and canalizes the powers

conferred on the President, as we do in this bill, and sets up specific standards under which certain functions by the Executive are to be performed, they become and are executive and administrative functions; and in my opinion Congress can no more constitutionally delegate legislative functions to the President than it can delegate legislative functions to some other executive.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have always supposed that when we gave some body the power to make regulations having the force of law we were delegating legislative functions, and that we could do it only if we prescribed certain standards by which it should be applied, but that a rule-making body in effect is legislating, under our authority, and that we can so delegate it only if we prescribe the standards by which it shall be done.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the distinction the distinguished Senator fails to make is that where proper legislative standards are set up by the Congress, they remove the legislative aspect of the functions which are performed by the executive department or by some administrative agency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a moment?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the Senator will admit that the moment he has done that, we may pass a law and absolutely nullify his act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Absolutely.

Mr. TAFT. It then again becomes a legislative function.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that functions must be classified according to their nature, not according to the person who is authorized to exercise them.

Mr. MURDOCK. I take the position, and I think decisions of the Supreme Court will support it, that Congress cannot delegate its fundamental legislative functions. But if the Congress by the passage of legislation sets up specific standards and qualifications to control the executive or the administrative agencies of Government in carrying out the will or policy of the Congress, then the functions performed under that legislation are executive, not legislative.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to proceed before yielding further.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask the Senator to yield for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall yield in just a moment.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to present my view as I have written it out, and then I wish to support it by presenting an opinion of a former Attorney General which I have here. I have great respect for the opinion and I am sure my Republican colleagues also will have. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

I will return to my statement as to the view I took in the committee, which, I hope, is the view of many members of the Judiciary Committee.

One view is that concurrence is required even in the case of a negative action, such as a concurrent resolution disapproving a reorganization plan. It is my humble opinion that, under our Constitution, this view is a correct one. The proponents of this view contend that by this bill Congress is conferring, as a practical necessity, and if there is to be efficient reorganization, extraordinary power on the President, but that such extraordinary power is so well canalized, and the standards are so well set up and sufficiently specified, that the functions of the President under this legislation are executive functions, and that there is no delegation of legislative power.

I take the position—and I am speaking for no one but myself—that the Congress can no more delegate to the President legislative powers than it can delegate them to some other executive agency or officer. I take the position that if legislative functions are delegated by this bill to the President, the bill, if enacted, would be unconstitutional. It is not my contention that other members of the Judiciary Committee who agree with me that there should be a concurrence of both Houses in any disapproval of the reorganization program, would fully agree with me in my position that there is not and cannot be a delegation of legislative powers under this bill. There may be certain members of the committee who insist on the concurrence of both Houses in a resolution of disapproval, who may take the position that legislative functions are delegated by this proposed bill. But if my position is correct that this bill does not and could not, within the Constitution, delegate legislative power, and that under the bill the functions of the President are wholly executive, the attempt by action which is not legislative to give to either House of Congress—and I challenge any Member of the Senate to show under the Constitution how one House, without the concurrence of the other, can take legislative action——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. President, I repeat. If my position is correct that this bill does not and could not, within the Constitution, delegate legislative power, and that under the bill the functions of the President are wholly executive, the attempt by action which is not legislation to give to either House of Congress power to disapprove administrative acts, raises a grave question as to the validity of this provision of the bill. The language of the pending bill as I construe it in simple terms, is this: Under both general and specific standards we confer on the Executive extraordinary powers in order to get the reorganization job done, which we all agree is absolutely necessary. And because of that conference of extraordinary powers the Congress sees fit to reserve the right, before the reorganization plan becomes effective, to examine it and even to veto it. But it is my opinion that under the Constitution such a veto power must be a concurrent veto power of both Houses, and not a separate veto power of either House.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. In support of that contention, if the Senator from Ohio will pardon me, I refer to an opinion of former Attorney General William D. Mitchell, dated January 24, 1933. That was during the Hoover administration. I read from the opinion in part as follows:

> In the act of June 30, 1932, making an appropriation for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, and with a view to economy in the operation of the Government, the Congress gave authority to the President, by Executive order to consolidate, redistribute, and transfer various Government agencies and functions, and established a general formula for his guidance.

That is what we would do in the pending bill; not only generally, but also, in my opinion, specifically.

> By section 407 it was provided that the Executive order should be transmitted to the Congress in session and should not become effective until after the expiration of 60 days from such transmission and that "if either branch of Congress within such 60 calendar days shall pass a resolution disapproving of such Executive order or any part thereof, such Executive order shall become null and void to the extent of such disapproval.

And that is the language of this bill. Either House reserves the right to veto or to disapprove, and having disapproved, the program of reorganization fails.

I continue reading from the Attorney General's opinion:

> It must be assumed that the functions of the President under this act were executive in their nature or they could not have been constitutionally conferred upon him, and so there was set up a method by which one House of Congress might disapprove Executive action. No one would question the power of Congress to provide for delay in the execution of such an administrative order, or its power to withdraw the authority to make the order, provided the withdrawal takes the form of legislation. The attempt to give to either House of Congress, by action which is not legislation, power to disapprove administrative acts, raises a grave question as to the validity of the entire provision in the act of June 30, 1932, for Executive reorganization of governmental functions.

The language which I have read is taken from former Attorney General Mitchell's opinion as set forth in volume 37, Opinions of Attorneys General, 1932 to 1934, at pages 63 and 64.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Regardless of the question of what we call this action of the President, I do not understand why, if it is an Executive act, it can be disapproved by a concurrent resolution of both Houses, which is not a legislative act, any more than by one House of the Congress. What is the difference?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would say to the Senator from Ohio that his very keen mind raises what in my opinion is an important question. In my opinion, in

order to conform absolutely to the Constitution, the concurrent resolution would not be sufficient. Action should be by joint resolution and referred back to the President for his approval. But I assume that the Attorney General, in writing his opinion, took the position that inasmuch as the President of the United States had already approved the reorganization program, it would be useless and unnecessary to resubmit it to him for his approval, and that a concurrent resolution, which is an expression of both Houses of Congress, would be sufficient.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the logic of the Senator, in plain English, that the committee bill is unconstitutional lead him inevitably to the conclusion that the House bill is also unconstitutional?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I think not. I do not take the position, without any qualification at all, that the bill is unconstitutional in its present form. I assert to the Senator that it raises a very grave question of unconstitutionality, one which should be avoided if the purposes of the bill can be accomplished by rewriting it in different language.

Mr. TAFT. I wish only to say that I more or less agree with the Senator in his conclusion.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am extremely happy to have the Senator say so.

Mr. TAFT. I would much prefer to have this question submitted in the nature of a joint resolution which would have to be passed by both Houses of Congress, and would then be in the form of legislation. It would be possible to apply the rules so that there could be no filibustering, and the question would be voted on in both Houses as submitted by the President. It seems to me that such procedure would eliminate from the discussion all constitutional questions, as well as afford a much fairer system, and I do not think it would result in killing the reorganization program.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is now suggesting the very situation which we would accomplish if we passed the bill in its present language. In other words, we move up the hill, and direct the President to perform these functions and bring back a reorganization plan. We specify what he may do and what he may not do. Then, after having marched up the hill, we march down again by saying to the President, in effect, "But, Mr. President, we want to maintain the legislative status quo just as it is today, and reserve the right of either House to reject what you do regardless of what the other House may think."

I would say to the Senator, and to the proponents of the Senate language which is now before us, that we would accomplish just as much if we were to send to the President of the United States a highly embossed invitation to go ahead and submit to the Congress some reorganization plans, and, after having been submitted, we would act legislatively on them, and if both Houses should concur we would send them back to him for his approval.

If Senators take the position that that is the way to reorganize the Government and that it can be done in that way, then why are we fussing around with a reorganization bill? Why not send an invitation to the President and say, "Mr. President, we do not like the overlapping, we do not like the duplication, we do not like the tremendous expense of the executive department, and we invite you, Mr. President, to take a look at the thing and then send up a plan. If we do not like it, we will reject it, we will throw it back in your lap, and reorganization will come to naught."

Mr. President, Senators know we are not equipped and do not have the time to give reorganization the attention it needs; they know that it cannot be done within the Congress within any reasonable time, but if they are sincere in wanting reorganization, then let us set up the standards, as we have in this bill, and repose a little confidence in the patriotism, honesty, integrity, and good faith of the Chief Executive of the United States. He was elected, not by one State, not by a group of States, but he was elected to the office of Vice President by the voters of the entire country.

I say, Mr. President, that all the righteousness, all the honesty, all the sincerity, all the patriotism in the United States are not exclusively resident in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY and many other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, together with other Members of the Senate, I am compelled to go to another committee meeting at this time. I wish to inquire what the desire of the Senator with reference to procedure in regard to the bill is. I want the Senate to remain in session as long as possible today to consider the bill, and I assume it is not possible to dispose of it today. In that view I wanted to suggest that all Senators who have amendments to offer present them, so that they may be printed and be on the desks of Senators tomorrow. I do hope we may conclude the consideration of the bill tomorrow. What is the Senator's purpose about that?

Mr. MURDOCK. My purpose was to make a very brief opening statement on the bill, which would probably have taken me about 20 minutes, but I am always willing to yield to my distinguished colleagues. I am anxious to complete my statement as quickly as possible, and I have no objection to the Senate recessing at any time the distinguished majority leader may desire.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is entirely in the hands of the Senator from Utah, because I must be absent, and other Senators interested in this matter have to be absent for a while, perhaps for the rest of the day; I do not know. I was just inquiring what we might be able to do by way of having an understanding.

If we cannot conclude consideration of the bill today—and I do not think we can—I urge Senators who have amendments to offer to present them, so that they may be printed and be available tomorrow, and in the meantime let Senators proceed to discuss the bill as long as any Senator desires to do so. I do not wish to hurry a recess, but in view of the fact that I am compelled to be absent for an hour or so, I wondered if we could have a general understanding that the consideration of the bill could not be concluded today.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it seems to me that the consideration of the bill cannot be concluded today, and I am extremely pleased to note that much interest is now being exhibited in the bill. I think it is important, and I think perhaps if Senators having amendments would submit them, so that they could be printed and be ready for reading and examination in the morning, that would expedite the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that some 8 or 10 amendments have already been submitted and are on the table. What additional suggestions will be made I have no knowledge of. I understand, further, that a number of Senators may wish to discuss either the bill generally or specific amendments. I am very much gratified at the assurance just given that there will be no pressure for a vote this afternoon either on the bill or on amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask a question.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I must go to a committee meeting, and I should like to know whether any amendments are to be disposed of this afternoon.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me that the probability is that no amendments will be acted on this afternoon.

Mr. OVERTON. I am the author of the pending amendment, and I should like to know.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Utah yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has yielded to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not yield to the Senator from Missouri to yield to other Senators.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Utah a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall be very happy to answer.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the question which I desire to ask the Senator from Utah arises from the fact that in my opinion the pending bill does constitute a delegation of legislative power. I have the very greatest respect for the opinion and judgment of the distinguished Senator from Utah, but all of us realize that sometimes different minds conceive subjects differently.

The amendment which I have submitted this afternoon is only a sentence, together with a supplement which is necessary with respect to certain procedure, and it reads:

All or any part of the reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect when, and only when, such reorganization or part thereof respectively shall have been first approved by concurrent resolution passed by both Houses of Congress.

Arising from this amendment and from my interest in the subject, I wish to call to the attention of the Senators certain language appearing in the majority report, which is the only report I have seen from the committee, with respect to the matter of delegation of power. I call attention particularly to the following language on page 3 of the printed report:

In an effort to achieve the practical objectives of reorganization of the executive branch, this bill provides that part of the legislative power of the Congress shall be delegated to the President, and that the action of the President, taken in the exercise of the legislative power so delegated, shall be the law of the land unless it be set aside by a resolution passed by a majority vote of either House.

I call attention to the further sentence immediately following, where the report says—and I emphasize this language:

Such a delegation of legislative power does not operate to deprive either House of the Congress of its constitutional right to have no change made in the law relating to organization of the Government without the assent of at least a majority of its Members present and voting.

Then I call attention to the next sentence, which reads:

Under this bill either House of the Congress, upon seeing precisely how the President proposes to exercise the general power delegated to him by this bill, will have, in effect, its own independent right to veto the Presidential action; and thus to retain the essential authority vested in it by the Constitution.

I next call attention to the fifth paragraph on page 4, which starts with the words:

In delegating certain legislative power to the President, this bill exempts from the exercise of such power the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General and certain independent regulatory agencies.

Mr. President, the question which I ask the distinguished Senator is whether or not, in view of his analysis of the law as he comprehends it, he disagrees with the language of the majority report in referring, in these instances to which I have made reference, to the delegation to the President of legislative power of the Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. I most respectfully do disagree with those statements in the majority report. I prefaced my remarks by calling attention to the fact that I had to oppose, and vigorously oppose, certain amendments which are now incorporated in the Judiciary Committee version of the bill. Of course, the report should reflect, and in my opinion it does reflect, the majority vote and the majority opinion of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand, then, from the distinguished Senator, that there is a difference of opinion among the Members of the majority as to whether there is or is not a delegation of legislative power to the President. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not say that there is a divergence of opinion in the majority of the Judiciary Committee, but I say there is a divergence of opinion, and a very emphatic one, I should say, between my views and the views of the majority.

Mr. DONNELL. In other words, as I understand from the very clear exposition the Senator has given, there is no delegation of legislative power, there is simply a setting up of certain standards which the Executive must follow; that the action taken by the Executive is executive action, and consequently there is no delegation of legislative power as the majority report undertakes to recite in the instances to which I have referred. Am I correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall attempt now to state, as nearly as I can, the position taken by the other Members who disagree with me.

The other view is that under the Constitution, no legislation can become law without the approval of both Houses of the Congress. That it is the constitutional right of either House of the Congress to withhold its approval of any proposed legislation, and thereby to cause the legislation to fail. Under this view, the Congress is not delegating to the President its right to legislate—in reading that statement, which is merely my understanding of the majority view, I hope that it will not in anyway be imputed to me—it is merely delegating to the President the exercise of that right in the first instance, and subject to congressional approval. The question, it is argued, is whether the Congress will approve a reorganization plan, once it has been transmitted; and proponents of this view contend that the issue of granting or withholding approval is not changed by the fact that the bill provides for a negative form of resolution with respect to reorganization plans. If the bill provided for a resolution in affirmative form, with respect to reorganization plans, it seems clear that the concurrence of both Houses in the resolution would be required. Therefore, say the proponents of this view, if either House elects to withhold its approval of a plan, the form in which that election is recorded makes no difference in the final result; and neither House should be deprived of its constitutional right to require that any legislation shall have its concurrence in order to become effective.

That is a statement, if I may address myself to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, of the position of the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary that either House should have the right of veto, instead of the position I take that there should be a concurrence of both Houses in the veto.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say that there is no difference of opinion between the distinguished Senator and myself as to the proposition that the action, whatever action is to be taken by Congress, should be taken by both Houses. The difference between us, I take it, is that in my judgment affirmative action must first be taken by the Houses of Congress in order to create the legislation validly, and that the mere use of the power of veto does not validify the action of this bill in delegation, as I see it, of legislative power.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator. The first view expressed, which favors the requirement for disapproval of a reorganization plan, if at all, by concurrent resolution of the two Houses, is apparently supported by an opinion of Attorney General Mitchell, given early in 1933—I have already read an excerpt from that opinion—which suggested that granting to either House of Congress "by action which is not legislation, the power to disapprove administrative acts, raises a grave question as to the validity of this entire provision of the act."

The gist of the Attorney General's argument, in that opinion, clearly was that there is no authority whereby either House, acting alone, can take what amounts to legislative action.

Answering this argument, proponents of the opposite view point out that the power exercised by the President under a reorganization act is not basically administrative, but is rather an exercise of a delegated legislative power; that this power cannot constitutionally be fully exercised without the approval of the Congress, and that, as Attorney General Mitchell pointed out, there is no authority whereby either House, acting alone, can take what amounts to legislative action. If a reorganization act requires a concurrent resolution to render a reorganization plan operative, one House of the Congress can, by its own action, and without regard to the action of the other House, in effect approve a reorganization plan and put it into operation. The fact that the action by which a single House registers its approval of a plan is negative in form, and is technically a refusal to disapprove, is immaterial, according to this view. The fact remains that such action, by one House, would render action by the other House wholly unnecessary; or, assuming one House had disapproved a plan, the other House, by withholding its disapproval, and thereby tacitly approving the plan, could make it effective in spite of the expressed will to the contrary of the other House.

It is this later view which was taken by the majority of the Judiciary Committee. The bill as reported to the Senate thereby provides that a reorganization plan shall become effective 60 days after its transmission to the Congress, provided that during such 60-day period neither House passes a resolution disapproving the plan.

Another important question considered by the Judiciary committee was whether it is proper for the Congress to be required to take all of a reorganization plan or nothing; or whether some means might be worked out for amendment of a plan. The committee's solution to this problem is a provision permitting either House of the Congress, by resolution, to suggest specific changes in any plan transmitted. In the event of such a resolution, the running of the 60-day period would be stayed until the President had replied. If he adopted the suggestion, and retransmitted the plan with a change or changes, the 60-day period would start anew. If the President reaffirmed his original position, the running of the 60-day period would resume.

Under this provision, a means is afforded for crystallizing the issue with respect to any particular portion of a reorganization plan which one House of the Congress may disapprove. Opportunity is given to the President to remove the objection by changing the plan, and thus avoid jeopardizing the other provisions of the plan. On the other hand, an opportunity is thus afforded the President to defend the specific provision attacked in the resolution, and cite his reasons why that provision should be approved, if that is his view. Since direct congressional amendment of a reorganization plan is clearly infeasible, because of the very complexity of such a plan, the committee believes that this provision goes as far as it is practicable to go in preserving the prerogative of the Congress to guide Government reorganization.

On the question of exemptions from the reorganization power which this bill would delegate to the President, there was some division of opinion within the committee. The exemptions now contained in the bill do not represent either an expansion or a contraction of the exemptions voted by the House of Representatives. The list of exemptions in the Senate bill was built up in the committee by the process of voting separately on each exemption which any member of the committee wished to propose.

Realizing that it could not forecast exactly what exemptions may be in this bill when it eventually becomes law, the committee was much concerned with the problem of protecting quasi-judicial agencies from any type of reorganization which would divest them of their quasi-judicial powers, or hamper the free and independent exercise of those powers. The committee therefore worked out the provision found in subsection (h) of section 2, on page 11 of the bill, which provides that no reorganization plan shall provide for or have the effect of divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions. It is clear that even if every extemption now contained in the bill should be wiped out, the subsection I have just read would still provide a substantial measure of protection for the quasi-judicial functions and powers which Congress has by law delegated to agencies in the executive branch, and which should, in accordance with the wishes of the Congress, continue to be exercised independently and free from prejudice or pressure.

Still another important question before the committee was whether the President should be given the power, under a reorganization plan, to abolish functions. Despite the importance of this question, it gave the committee very little trouble. One of the purposes of this bill is to effect economy in the executive branch of the Government. Substantial economies cannot be brought about unless the power to abolish functions is granted. Every Senator is familiar with the way in which functions of defunct agencies pop up at the next appropriation hearings, in another agency. We have seen it time after time. It does no good to abolish an agency or a bureau or a section if its functions are merely transferred somewhere else and remain a charge upon the Federal Treasury, and a basis for appropriations estimates. In the interests of doing a good job, the committee has therefore included in this bill the authority to abolish functions under a reorganization plan.

The bill prohibits establishment of any new executive department under a reorganization plan, or changing the name of any executive department, or creating any new Cabinet position, or merging any two or more executive departments. The reason for this provision is the view of the committee that any such change is of so great an importance that it should be made, if at all, by affirmative act of the Congress.

In order to make a reorganization plan workable, it is necessary that authority should be granted for providing, under the plan, for the appointment, compensation, and duties of various officers of the Government. The committee was anxious that this necessary grant of power should not be used for political or patronage purposes. Accordingly, the committee has written into the bill a proviso under which no person may be appointed to any office under a reorganization plan for a fixed term in excess of 4 years without confirmation by the Senate; and under which no person who either receives compensation in excess of $5,000 per year, or who is a policy maker, can be appointed without Senate confirmation unless he is appointed within the classified civil service.

It should be made clear and emphasized that this is not a patronage grab provision. The purpose of this provision is not to give the Senate any increased measure of control over the appointments in question, but rather to induce the promotion to newly created jobs of qualified persons within classified Civil Service. Provisions somewhat similar to this have in the past been proposed or adopted as riders on appropriations bills or other measures; but those provisions required Senate confirmation without regard to whether the appointee was a civil service career man. The effect of those provisions was, clearly, to give the Senate patronage control. The provision which the committee has written into this bill simply says, in effect: "A reorganization plan should not create new jobs for patronage purposes. Therefore, so long as appointments and promotions are made within the classified civil service, they will not be subject to congressional review. However, if the executive elects to make appointments to such newly created jobs without regard to the civil service, then those appointments, so far as they concern policy makers or persons to receive compensation in excess of $5,000 per year, must come to the Senate for confirmation." To put it still another way, the bill does not make any new jobs political appointments; but it does require that if the executive desires to make political appointments, they shall come to the Senate for confirmation just like any other political appointments. This provision is intended to operate, and should operate, to encourage appointments and promotions within the classified civil service.

The committee has written into the bill a provision that no reorganization plan shall fix the compensation of any person at more than $10,000 per year. It was the view of the committee that if any job is to be created at a salary greater than the compensation of members of the Congress, it should be done by act of Congress and not by a reorganization plan.

The committee considered at length the question of whether the reorganization authority granted by this bill should be permanent authority, or should be limited in time. The House bill, which was before the committee, provided for termination of the reorganization authority on June 30, 1948. The bill as reported to the Senate provides for termination of this authority July 1, 1947. It should be pointed out to the Senate that in his reorganization message, the President asked that the authority be granted on a permanent basis. It was the view of the committee that a provision for such a permanent grant of authority might very well jeopardize the chances for approval of the bill, because of a natural reluctance by the Congress to confer authority of such a large extent upon some future President. It was the view of the committee that the authority granted by the present bill should be limited well within the term of the present chief executive; and that future Presidents, if they desire similar authority, should come to Congress with a request for reenactment of reorganization legislation.

Those are the major issues comprehended in this bill. We are all agreed as to the need for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. We are all substantially in agreement that the Congress cannot do the whole job. This bill provides a means whereby the job can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not care to speak at this time. It occurred to me that there had been a practical understanding that no action would be taken on any amendments this afternoon. Very few Senators are present. I think the Senator from Utah has ably discussed the main features of the bill from the standpoint of the committee. Probably debate on the amendments as they are offered will develop more fully some of the questions which he has mentioned. I wonder whether it might not be well to take a recess at this time until tomorrow.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think there was an understanding—and it is thoroughly agreeable to me—that the bill might go over until tomorrow if there were no

further discussion this afternoon, and that no amendments would be voted on this afternoon. I have no objection to such an arrangement.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

DISPOSITION OF ACCUMULATIONS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS—CORRECTION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an explanation of certain figures which he inserted in the RECORD on October 26 in connection with the introduction of his bill to regulate the disposition of accumulations of strategic and critical materials, and that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 26, which contains a statement by the Senator from Nevada, be corrected for the permanent RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator PAT MCCARRAN today stated that certain figures which he inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 26, in connection with the introduction of his bill to "freeze" all Government-owned accumulations of strategic and critical materials, had been challenged. According to the Senator, these figures were obtained from the Senate Committee on Small Business, but a further check with all known sources available to the Metals Reserve Company indicated that the Senate Small Business Committee had included other factors, and that there is a discrepancy between the figures used by the Senator and the amounts actually owned by the Metals Reserve Company.

Senator MCCARRAN has therefore today issued the following corrected list:

As of September 30, 1945, the Metals Reserve Company had accumulations of tungsten, copper, lead, and zinc, as follows:

Tungsten (contained WO_3) (pounds)	19,693,997
Copper (short tons)	508,726
Lead (short tons)	82,335
Zinc (short tons)	571,167

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MURDOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment in the Navy, for temporary service;

Sundry officers for appointment in the Naval Reserve; and

Sundry officers of the line of the Navy to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ben Moreell to be civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from February 1, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. MURDOCK. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, November 2, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 1 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 1 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Ben Moreell to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from February 1, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Clara M. Ketchum, Bonnerdale.
Dixon G. Baker, Humnoke.
Richmond A. Waller, Keo.
Claude Spore, St. Charles.
Dewitt E. Tucker, Tucker.

FLORIDA

Ralph B. Wakeland, Parish.

GEORGIA

Charles O. Carter, Climax.

ILLINOIS

Clyde V. Manny, Ivesdale.
Lewis H. Jenkins, West Liberty.

KANSAS

Eugene R. Jones, Liberal.
Claude F. Averill, Rantoul.

KENTUCKY

Laura M. Mathews, Petersburg.
Harris A. Stancil, Wheelwright.

MARYLAND

Josephine Warrenfeltz, Breathedsville.
Edith S. Wright, Elk Mills.
Robert D. Sewell, Hydes.
Kathryn M. Hurlock, Kennedyville.
Evelyn C. Mast, Loch Raven.
Allie J. Twiford, Marbury.
Alice T. Walter, Nanticoke.
Irma Esham Bowen, Newark.
Mahlon McKinley Poe, Texas.
Ethel B. Spilman, Washington Grove.

NEBRASKA

Raymond A. Walker, Clatonia.
Mae Slater, Hordville.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edward P. Kulseth, Gardner.
George W. Skinner, Grandin.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 1 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Lucressa H. Morrison to be postmaster at King of Prussia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous and His ears are open unto their prayers. The face of the Lord is against them that do evil.

Eternal and ever-present God, before whose eyes the darkness becomes as the day, cleanse our hearts from every evil affection; with godly fear and humble trust, we would come to Thee, claiming all that is conveyed in the wondrous name "Our Father." Let this dear and ever dearer truth help us to see Thee in the cloud and in the clod, in the lustrous noontide and in the cool of the evening, and, above all, in human men as brothers.

In these moving days, we commend to Thee our country, our President, our Speaker, and the Congress; in all our various duties and spheres of service, grant that our motives may be one. As we face the stark responsibility of victory, grant that whatever we do may be in utter conformity to Thy will and to the blessed ideals of a Republic which is the inspiration of liberty-loving people in all the earth. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter printed in the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several letters and several newspaper excerpts.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a petition to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of H. R. 4013, a bill providing for the discharge on request of all inducted men who have had honorable service of 2 years in the armed services. The petition is No. 7.

H. R. 4013, Mr. Speaker, makes mandatory announced plans of the War Department to discharge men with 2 years of service. At the same time it extends the same program to other branches of the armed forces. What is good for the Army should be good for the Navy. Passage of this legislation will insure fair treatment in respect to discharges to every man, regardless of where he served. It will bring new hope to veterans with long service who are being retained in service in spite of promises that have been made by the War Department that they would be released.

Members of Congress who want to give more than lip service to the soldiers and sailors of World War II should sign petition No. 7.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH A. McGINNIS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I learned this morning with profound sorrow of the death of a very distinguished and able legislator of my State. I refer to Hon. Joseph A. McGinnis, of Ripley, N. Y. He served as speaker of the Assembly of the State of New York with great distinction for a long period of time. He was loved and respected by everybody in western New York. I know of no man in public life who has such a host of friends throughout the country as my dear friend Hon. Joseph A. McGinnis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Air Lines Public Relations Faces the Future," by Thomas J. Deegan.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Hon. Sumner Welles.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a very interesting editorial which appeared in last Sunday's Boston Post.

THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LARCADE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD by inserting two statements.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech delivered by Maj. Gen. L. R. Groves, officer in charge of the atomic-bomb project, and also to extend his remarks in another instance and include an editorial from the Arkansas Democrat.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, because I am entirely familiar with the bill, because it came through the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy of the Committee on the Judiciary, and that entire committee has given much study to this proposed legislation. I am in full accord with this measure. However, I would like for the distinguished gentleman from Alabama to explain the bill so other Members may know about it.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported favorably by the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy, and also has been unanimously approved by the full Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill simply extends the duration of the power under the composition phase of bankruptcy so as to enable railroads that are not insolvent to avail themselves of the composition privilege, as has been done, notably by the Baltimore & Ohio, without the interruption of traffic for even one trip. The use of this power under this bill has resulted in preventing bankruptcies and in saving millions of dollars which would have gone to pay receivers, trustees, attorneys, and other costs of bankruptcy.

The act to be extended by the pending bill expires today. There is no opposition. The distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished gentlemen on both sides of our committee, particularly our own member the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who is senior Republican member of the Bankruptcy Subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], and all of the others are of one accord in asking that this be done. The reason it is brought up specially now is that it expires at midnight tonight, and we must act before the regular call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the bill was reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; that is correct.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out article X of chapter XV and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"ARTICLE X—TERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

"SEC. 755. The jurisdiction conferred upon any court by this chapter shall not be exercised by such court after November 1, 1950, except in respect of any proceeding initiated by filing a petition under section 710 hereof on or before November 1, 1950."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include the remarks recently made by Hon. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, on Sunday last, at Hyde Park.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including therein a dedicatory address by Harris J. Booras at Hyde Park last Sunday.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include some excerpts from a letter and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 185]

Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	Morrison
Andersen, H. Carl	Gibson	Mott
	Gillie	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser
Barry	Hancock	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Hand	Ramey
Bell	Harness, Ind.	Rich
Bender	Hartley	Robsion, Ky.
Bland	Havenner	Roe, Md.
Boykin	Hébert	Russell
Brehm	Holifield	Sabath
Buckley	Hope	Short
Bunker	Jackson	Sikes
Campbell	Jarman	Simpson, Pa.
Carlson	Keefe	Slaughter
Chelf	Kefauver	Snyder
Clements	Kerr	Somers, N. Y.
Courtney	Kilburn	Stigler
Cunningham	King	Stockman
Curley	Kinzer	Sumner, Ill.
Dawson	Landis	Sumners, Tex.
Dickstein	Lesinski	Thomason
Dingell	McDonough	Vinson
Domengeaux	McGlinchey	Wadsworth
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Weiss
Eaton	May	White
Eberharter	Merrow	Winter
Fisher	Morgan	Wolcott
Flannagan		Wolfenden, Pa.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that during the debate I be authorized to insert in the RECORD two editorials, one from the New York Times and one from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the resolution, House Joint Resolution 266, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional amount fiscal year 1946, to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267), to be available for expenditure in the manner specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Participation Appropriation Act, 1945, $550,000,000: *Provided,* That no relief or rehabilitation supplies procured out of funds heretofore or herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except China after December 31, 1946, and in the case of China after March 31, 1947: *Provided further,* That, insofar as possible and practicable, agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply shall be utilized in filling United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration requisitions for food and agricultural commodities.

No part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing:

(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

(2) That such country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the letter from the Secretary of State, relative to the various amendments proposing limitations which have been suggested, which appears in the RECORD this morning at page 10222, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the following editorial from the New York Times.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE FREE PRESS AMENDMENT

Republican leaders of the House of Representatives have given their approval to a free press amendment which they propose to attach to the bill appropriating additional funds for UNRRA. This amendment would prohibit the use of United States funds for war relief in any country whose government infringes upon freedom of information or expression, or places any barriers—technical, political, legal, or economic—against the free exchange of information among the peoples of the world.

We welcome the interest of the House Republicans in a good cause, but believe that in several respects their present proposal is mistaken. In the first place, action to meet hunger and pestilence cannot wait; on humane grounds the relief problem is so acute, and the case for prompt and generous aid is so strong, that the Republicans have chosen a wrong spot to launch their crusade. They would be better advised to attach a "free press" amendment to legislation dealing with the subject of long-term loans for purposes of reconstruction and expansion. But even here their proposal seems to us to be too sweeping. For in its present form it would bar United States aid to governments which did either one of two things or both: (1) Denied freedom of speech to their own people within their own borders or (2) prohibited American correspondents from having free access to news for publication in this country.

We cannot properly use our financial power to attempt to compel other countries to establish freedom of speech and press for their own people; for, highly desirable as this would be, judged by our own standards, we would be using our power here to interfere with the domestic affairs of other nations. But we can quite properly insist upon freedom of access to news for our own purposes—and we would, in fact, be well advised to do so. For if billions of dollars of American credit are to be used for reconstruction loans to other countries, the American public which provides such credit is surely entitled to acquire all the information it wishes to have and needs to have about the conditions prevailing in those countries. This is, in fact, the only way in which loans of this kind can be made with real responsibility.

We suggest that the House Republicans take a second look at their amendment and consider whether there is not a better place and way to put it forward.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I also ask that the accompanying excerpt from the Washington Post of October 23, on the same subject, be read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read, as follows:

We should like very much, of course, to have American newspapermen unleashed in countries where their movements are now restricted; and we hope that the State Department will continue to press for this right. But we doubt the wisdom of obtaining it through the threat of withholding food from the hungry. Freedom for American press representatives is a political matter, however desirable; and the attachment of it as a condition upon an act of charity smacks of playing international politics with relief.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, these two editorials are taken from notable newspapers, the first from the New York Times, frequently spoken of as the greatest newspaper in the world, and the second from the Washington Post, the editorial page of which has a recognized standing throughout the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if amendments of this character were adopted, the distribution of relief by UNRRA in the Philippine Islands would be prohibited because General MacArthur still considers it necessary to maintain restrictions upon the local press which would bring Philippine relief within the purview of such amendments. I do not think anyone would want to go that far. In other words, this bill, which is for the regeneration and the rehabilitation of the destitute and starving peoples of occupied Europe, would be made an instrument of political reform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during a recent trip that the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee made to inspect our military bases throughout various parts of the world, I was given an assignment by that subcommittee to go into the educational program of the I and E Division of the European theater. I went into that program and I made a report to my subcommittee and to the chairman of the full committee which I wish at this time to give to the House of Representatives.

This report is as follows:

REPORT TO WAR SUBCOMMITTEE, APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Before I begin this report I would like to take a brief paragraph to pay my compliments to Lt. Col. W. W. Bodine, Jr., of the Theater Visitors' Bureau, in Paris, and his whole complement of officers, for the splendid manner in which they handled the bureau. Their problems are made very trying at times by the influx of unannounced committees, Army personnel and distinguished people from almost all nations. Yet in every instance they handle their problems with dispatch and with courtesy. I want to express my thanks to them for the splendid manner in which they assisted me in my work. I would like also to give special credit to Maj. Loran Clark, who was assigned by the Visitors' Bureau to assist me in my work in inspecting the educational program of I and E. Major Clark is a resourceful, courteous, and untiring worker. He has been of great assistance.

For the benefit of those who may not have had the opportunity of studying the education program of the I and E Division, I may say that the program is broken down roughly into five types of schools. These I shall give in the order of what I feel to be their importance to the soldiers.

First, is the training within civilian agencies. This is the program in which the student enrolls in existing universities and colleges in the country in which he is located and there is taught in English, regardless of what country he is in.

Second, is the Army university centers at Biarritz, on the Bay of Biscay in France, and Shrivenham, 70 miles west of London in England, in which the soldier receives the regular college course under the instruction of educators including both civilian and military faculty.

Third. The Warton American Technical School, at Warton, England, offers 35 courses from aircraft maintenance to interior decorating.

Fourth, USAFI (United States Army Forces Institute), which is merely a correspondence school under Army command, is subdivided roughly into: (1) correspondence courses offered by Army instructors; (2) liaison between the soldier and colleges offering correspondence courses in the States; and (3) self-education.

Fifth, is the command schools. In this program every command of battalion strength or above has its own school with a 2 weeks' course in subjects of interest to the enlisted men.

INSPECTION AND DISCUSSION

TWCA: The Training Within Civilian Agencies Section of the Education Branch of Information and Education Division offers learning opportunities in 148 subjects, ranging from Fine Arts to Infestation Control. This instruction is given through existing facilities at 24 French schools and universities, such as the Sorbonne in Paris, the University of Grenoble, the University of Dijon, etc. The enrollment within French institutions is 1,410. Ninety-one British institutions have enrolled 4,584 soldiers in such institutions as the Royal Academy of Medicine, the Royal Scottish Academy of Music, Oxford, Cambridge, etc. Eleven Swiss colleges were prepared to accept 1,750 students in November for 3 months' courses but I understand that this program was later canceled. Regardless of the country in which the schools are located, all instruction is given in English.

Biarritz: Biarritz American University is located in southern France where college level summer semester courses are given in 317 subjects. This university has been established in the resort town, using the facilities and villas that otherwise would be vacant. The climate and general surroundings are ideal for the pursuit of academic learning. This university was opened August 20, 1945, with an enrollment of 4,000 soldiers. However, 20 percent were returned to their units as high point men during the 2 months' course. One student was returned to his unit for misconduct within the university. The balance completed the course. The faculty is composed of 133 civilian and 138 military instructors, of which 48 percent of the total hold doctor's degrees, 38 percent master's degrees, and they represent 144 different colleges in 40 States. Two hundred forty-three of the faculty have had recent connections of faculty level with civilian institutions. They are current in their field and have a great enthusiasm for the job at hand. The one thing that was very noticeable at Biarritz was that the school had only been recently opened and there was a critical shortage of textbooks, chemical supplies, and furnishings of various sorts. Part of this was due to the fact that the university had only been recently opened and part due to transportation difficulties. Some professors were instructing with the notebook system because texts and other material which they had relied upon had not yet arrived.

Shrivenham: Shrivenham American University is located 70 miles west of London, England, in a permanent military base erected in 1935. The plant facilities are excellent. This school has a capacity comparable to Biarritz, offers the same scope of subjects and also has the same high caliber instruction. Here more equipment in all lines was found because Shrivenham had been in service longer than Biarritz.

Warton: The Warton American Technical School, located at Warton, England, offers 35 courses, from aircraft maintenance to interior decorating. The school opened September 17, 1945, with an enrollment of 2,500 students for a period of 8 weeks' instruction. Succeeding sessions of the school will permit 4,000 students to attend. The faculty is composed of 208 civilians and 269 military instructors. This establishment would cost $10,000,000 to duplicate in the United States. All materials, including machine-shop equipment, radio repair, and aircraft were obtained within the theater. These materials had served their primary purpose and are virtually salvage.

USAFI (U. S. Army Forces Institute): This section of the education branch has been in operation for 2 years, offering 3 services. A $2 fee is charged for enrollment and once the soldier has enrolled any number of courses may be taken. One hundred and sixty thousand students have applied for one or more correspondence courses during the past 2 years. However, for the month of August of this year the enrollment reached 27,000 and it has been averaging 1,000 per day since then. Correspondence courses are offered in any subject that in any way lends itself to this method of instruction. The second most important part of this program is liaison between civilian schools and universities and the soldier so that he may enroll direct with the institution of his choosing and take their established correspondence or extension courses. USAFI will pay up to half the charge for courses of this nature but not exceeding $20. The third service is a self-teaching program in which there are no tests, grades, or credits given unless specifically requested by the student. When tests are requested an examination is sent to a commmissioned officer who is named by the student. Papers are then forwarded to USAFI headquarters for grading. All instruction as outlined in the above paragraphs will be recognized by existing American educational institutions and industry. The value, however, may not be adjudged the same by all institutions, but each student participating will receive a certificate giving the details of the course studied, hours of instruction, and grade.

Command schools: The theater commander directed that each unit of battalion strength (normally 1,000) or larger would establish instruction in subjects of interest to the enlisted personnel. The Six Hundred and Fourth Camouflage Engineers' Battalion, which was visited, offered courses in 10 subjects, ranging from languages to auto mechanics. In this battalion of 354 men, 244 had taken 1 or more 2-week courses of 20 hours per week. The faculty was drawn from the personnel of the battalion; both enlisted men and officers instruct on an equal footing and with equal capabilities. The school is located in the battalion area, which is composed of several commercial buildings that were abandoned prior to the war. Materials for instruction are taken from the salvage depots or are a part of the battalion basic equipment or are drawn from other material units on memorandum receipts. There are 626 command schools in operation within the theater, having a total current enrollment of 100,144, offering 306 different courses.

DISCUSSION

While visiting at Warton Trade School I made a particular point to question some of the students in every branch of the training program there. The final question was, "Do you expect to follow this work when you get back into civilian life?"

And the answer invariably was "Yes."

All of those interviewed were eager to have an opportunity to reenroll for further instruction. There was a complete absence of military formations; reveille was dropped because the sincerity of the students made it unnecessary; and all students, whether officers or enlisted men, were considered on a par. The students at the university level were serious and frankly amazed at their ease in swinging back to the habits of academic life. The general opinion was, "This is the best thing the Army has ever done for me." I found this same attitude at the command schools and the Army university centers at Biarritz and Shrivenham, and, in fact, in all branches of the training. A poll of the students at Biarritz American University revealed the following statistics:

Seventy-eight percent said they liked the university very well.

Nineteen percent liked it fairly well.

Two percent definitely said they did not like it.

The remaining 1 percent were undecided.

Eighty-four percent said they would register for a second term if given the opportunity.

Eight percent said they would not register for another term.

The balance were undecided.

Ninety-six percent were going to recommend the university to their buddies.

Less than one-half percent said they would tell them to stay away.

Seventy-four percent felt they were learning more than they had in their former (pre-Army) schools or colleges.

Ninety-two percent are getting along very well in their school work.

Eighty-four percent said the teaching skill of the instructors was as good as or better than their former schools or colleges.

Polls at all of the schools reflect the same attitude on the part of the students.

Instruction: The civilian instructors in all schools represent the highest caliber of men in their field. The civilian academic adviser at Biarritz is Dean J. D. Russell, of the University of Chicago, who is secretary of the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central American Colleges and Secondary Schools. He has stated that one of his reasons for participating in this program was to safeguard the value of the credits that may be transferred back to the colleges in the United States. It is his opinion that the nine credits received for the college-level summer-semester courses will probably be cut back to seven credits, which is normally given for a 2 months' course. However, he states, "Colleges are increasingly giving credit on the basis of what is in the boy's head, rather than what is on paper. We have told the boys to come here for the learning experience and forget about the credits, and if you run into a registrar who will only take what is on paper and not consider your ability, shop around until you find one who has a little more progressive outlook."

The civilian faculties of all schools have been impressed with the maturity of the soldiers compared with students in the States of like ages, their seriousness and desire for learning. These civilian instructors feel that they have been given a great opportunity by being allowed to meet the soldier-student in Europe, in that they will be better prepared to met him in their colleges when he returns to the States. It appears there is an advantage in having mixed faculties of civilians and military personnel. The civilian instructors feel that if only civilians were on the teaching staff that they would be set aside from the Army picture, rather than being drawn into it as they are today.

The commanding general of the Biarritz American University summed up the feeling of his staff when he said: "These boys are perfectly normal—they are not neurotics. The writings at home about the way the colleges will have to deal with the returning soldiers and his difficulties in adjustment have been, from our experience here, 98 percent wrong." This statement was also confirmed by the civilian faculty. Without exception the military personnel who have been associated with the education program feel that its continuation is of utmost importance. The general attitude was that it would be necessary to keep a large number of troops on the Continent to demonstrate the power of the occupational forces by their great numbers; yet there would be actually a limited amount of work for the troops to do. It can be argued that if 5 perce[illegible] of the occupational forces were given educational opportunities while in Europe that the force can be reduced by 5 percent. However, that is not a true reflection of the facts. The personnel that would be away from duty for 2 months studying would in fact be troops that were ready and available within the theater for any duty they were required to perform. From the line of reasoning that the force can be reduced by the percentage that would be in school, it might be argued that the entire military strength of the country can be reduced by the percentage of those soldiers who are on leave at any given period.

The relation between the Army and the civilians of the area in which the school has been located has been more cordial than in any other locations.

The staffs of all schools have been in favor of civilian instructors. Although there are both enlisted men and officers instructing in all schools along with the civilians, no preference has been made by virtue of grade. Ability has been recognized. There is no conflict between officer students with enlisted instructors or vice versa. The one point of friction is where an enlisted man is doing the same level of instruction, or in some cases a higher level than a civilian or high-ranking officer who is drawing a considerably higher wage. However, it must be stressed that the only basis of disagreement is in regard to remuneration received for the work performed. It appears that the students will go to civilian instructors for counsel and guidance in preference to the military, and in most cases the civilian instructor will be fresher in his subject and reflect greater enthusiasm.

It was impossible to interview the GI who was not in the schools but I made a special point to contact everyone that I could, on the streets or wherever he may be, and ask him about the educational program. The one and only kick that I received from any soldier was that he had tried to get in and could not. This, of course, was owing to the fact that only a small percentage of the Army forces are allocated to the school program and those responsible for the program have tried to arrange as large a turnover as possible so that as many as possible could take advantage of the schooling. Every soldier with whom I talked felt that it was a good program and should be continued. This opinion on the part of the soldier cannot be considered prejudiced, because never at any time did I disclose my identity or my purpose in asking the question.

CONCLUSIONS

After my inspections and discussions with the civilian and military faculty, the students enrolled, the GI's, and the following officers: Gen. Walter B. (Bedell) Smith, Brig. Gen. Paul W. Thompson, Chief, Information and Education Division, TSFET, Brig. Gen. Claude M. Thiele, Comandmant, Schrivenham American University, Brig. Gen. Samuel L. McCroskey, Commandant, Biarritz American University, Brig. Gen. Cyrus H. Searcy, Commandant, Warton American Technical School, Col. Edwin P. Lock, Jr., Chief of Education branch, Col. John L. Chamberlain, Chief, TWCA, Education Branch, Lt. Col. Irvin M. Rice, Chief of Command Schools, Education Branch, Lt. Col. Theodore A. Siedle, Chief, USAFI, Col. Louis P. Leone, Chief of UK Base, Maj. William H. Toumey, executive officer, Public Relations Section, Information and Education, I can sum up my conclusions as follows:

First. I agree with the general who said that the writings at home about the soldiers and how they would have to be adjusted when they returned are 98 percent wrong. In fact, I feel, after having observed these students and talked with them, that the adjustment must be made on the part of the people at home and not the soldier. The soldier now is a mature man. He knows what he wants and he is going after it.

Second. Every officer involved is highly cognizant of the fact that we have a great responsibility to our soldier in a foreign theater, whether he is there temporarily or whether he shall remain in the occupation forces. They are no doubt well aware of the Hunt report, made by Col. I. L. Hunt, who studied the 1918–20 occupation, now in the Library of Congress, in which he was very condemnatory from the point of view that nothing was planned from the soldiers of the occupation forces, that is, relatively speaking. These officers are not interested in this program because of some benefit they may get, because they prefer to return home. They are interested in the standard of our Army and what provisions we shall make for our soldiers.

Third. The Army, from the enlisted men to the top rank, feels that this program is well worthwhile, and while it is possible to curtail it, not only the Army but the Congress should give sufficient attention to the educational facilities made available to our Army.

Fourth. I was somewhat prejudiced when I began the inspection because I thought that perhaps a soldier may enroll in one of these courses to take a vacation or get a change in atmosphere and that perhaps the schooling was secondary. All such skepticism has completely dissolved after having seen the students at work and talked with them and after having talked to those responsible officials connected with this program.

Fifth. That there is a good deal of complaint coming from the men who have not been able to enroll in the schools and this is solely because of the fact that it is impossible to accommodate all of those who have applied. This complaint cannot be eliminated under the present circumstances because the selection of the student is left to his commanding officer. This complaint at a later date may be eliminated by setting up a system of competitive examinations, giving the soldier his chance, whereby he either enters or eliminates himself.

Sixth. I have always been vitally interested in the education of the young people of this Nation and in the past few years I have been vitally interested in the educational standards of the armed forces of this Nation. After having had this wonderful opportunity to study the educational program of the I & E Division, I have come to the conclusion that the elimination of this program by either the Army or Congress would be nothing more nor less than gross stupidity. The Army of the future must be not only a highly technical Army but an Army of men who are well educated and quick thinkers. The Army in the past has not attracted the type of soldier that is necessary for the Army of the future. Educational qualifications have been low. Aren't we more interested in having a skilled Army than in providing bed and board for those who take refuge in the Army? Never again can we afford to revert to such an Army.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the presumption that as a matter of national policy a varied and comprehensive education program should and will continue to exist for the occupational forces, I make the following recommendations:

First. Based on an occupation force of 250,000 men, which is 120,000 less than our committee was informed would be the actual force, but which appears to be a more current estimate, I recommend that the program for training within civilian agencies, that is, within existing educational institutions in Europe, shall be continued.

Second. That one Army university be maintained, preferably at Biarritz or Shrivenham, whichever is found to be the most beneficial and less expensive.

The reason I recommend Biarritz or Shrivenham is because in discussion with the authorities and in my own opinion I came to the conclusion that a man in school should be out of the occupation zone and when he returns to his command would be refreshed and have a different viewpoint. In other words, his morale would be lifted.

Third. One Army vocational training school to remain at Warton, England, for the reasons that they have an excellent plant which would cost $10,000,000 to install with new equipment but which has cost a very small fraction of that sum owing to the fact that it is salvage equipment; secondly, because rental expense in all probability would cost nothing under our reverse lend-lease program; and third, because the equipment would be difficult to move to the Continent.

Fourth. Continuation of what is known as USAFI, or correspondence schools.

Fifth. Continuation of the command schools.

Sixth. Alternative. In the event that we found it inconvenient and too expensive to maintain either Biarritz or Shrivenham as an Army university, then as an alternative I would recommend an Army university at Oberammergau. The problem of establishing a university at Oberammergau, would be rather difficult, while at the same time the

expense would be less, but the soldier would not have the advantage of getting out of the occupied zone and getting a respite from his duties and surroundings. Also plant facilities would not be available and I would only recommend Oberammergau as a final alternative.

From a study of the cost of the present program and the probable cost based on an occupational force of 250,000 men, I have come to the conclusion that the program would not cost more than $15,000,000 and perhaps even less. Therefore, I further recommend:

Seventh. That the War Department submit an estimate to the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of whatever sum is necessary to carry out the recommended program, and that our committee give this our most careful consideration as a matter of molding future policy in regard to occupation troops and as affecting future policy in the standing army.

JAPAN

I have not had an opportunity to study the situation or to confer with authorities in regard to provisions to be made for the occupation forces in Japan, but I would recommend that action be taken to establish comparable educational provisions for these forces.

The Navy has a definite and fixed policy for their enlisted personnel. It has worked successfully and, therefore, I see no reason why our Army should not have a similar policy.

Respectfully submitted.

JOE HENDRICKS.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that two petitions have been placed on the desk, Nos. 7 and 8, which provide for discharge of the Military Affairs Committee from further consideration of bills which have for their purpose the discharge of boys who have served honorably 18 months and 2 years respectively.

I hope that the Members will not disappoint the soldiers in all parts of the world by failing to sign these petitions. Here is an opportunity to show whether or not you are for or against these boys who are idling away their time in foreign sections of the world, and who should be demobilized and returned home.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and to the letter and to the editorial which he had the Clerk read.

I am rather surprised that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri would bring in this letter and editorial or would discuss a matter which is not before the committee. The statements to which he alluded are not contained in any amendment that is being or will be considered by this body. The amendment which has been considered and recommended by the minority members of the committee deals only with free access to the news by representatives of the American press and radio, and only as to news of the activities of UNRRA. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the subject as to whether or not there should be freedom of the press for the newspapers and the radio of other countries, but provides only that representatives of the press and radio of the United States be permitted to enter the countries where relief is being extended under the provisions and direction of UNRRA, and report back to the American people how their money and goods are being used and distributed for the purposes of relief. It is the only method I know of by which the American people may be fully informed. It is the only way I know of by which we can at least partially guarantee to the American press and radio proper access to the news as to the operations and the functionings of UNRRA under this appropriation.

I regret very much the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to throw into this debate an issue which is not before the House and which will not be before the House as this debate continues to its conclusion. There is no attempt being made to control or dictate to any other nation or any other country as to the type or kind of press they may have in their own countries, but only to fix as a proviso to the granting of these funds that the American people may be given the right and opportunity to know how their money is being used, how their food is being distributed, and whether or not, in fact, the food that we give and the money that we contribute is actually reaching the starving people we want to help. So I hope the House will understand that the issue discussed by the gentleman from Missouri is not before this body.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, UNRRA came to the floor of this House from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If you will put your minds back to that time you will perhaps remember that one of the main things this House was trying to do was to set up an international body that would draw the nations of the world together. It seemed as though such a body could best control the food supply of the world and could best regulate the relief to be given to the overrun countries. Let us not forget that as we discuss this particular bill.

During the 2 months that I spent in eastern Europe and the Near East as a member of one of the subcommittees of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I found what I had expected to find, and that is that the international method is very ponderous, very difficult. Every committee is made up of people who speak different languages. Interpreters are needed in all meetings. Language differences are the external evidences of differing backgrounds. These differences have to be acknowledged, studied, and gradually eliminated. It is a slower process than would have pertained if we had assumed the full responsibility. But we decided on the slower method. There is no reason for us to feel that results cannot be attained.

Another possibility some of us envisaged during the original discussions of the bill was that UNRRA could and would be used politically. I took occasion to bore into this possibility at some length. I did all I could to have inserted in the bill some safeguard against such usage of relief, unfortunately without success. Events have justified my fears.

I will not attempt to discuss the personnel problem except to say that when the positions were filled the fighting forces had the first call on available people. At different times during these 2 years when the need for certain highly qualified and well-trained leaders weighed heavily upon UNRRA, requests were made to the armed forces for a few such individuals and were denied. Other countries saw fit to release a few such requested people from their armed forces.

During the 2 months of my trip I was able to contact the actual work of UNRRA in Athens only. There I had opportunity to discuss the situation with UNRRA directors and staff workers. I found the directors alive to the problems though they stated frankly that they had learned much wisdom by the trial-and-error method.

What impressed me most was that in Athens there was a real effort being made to carry out the original intentions of the UNRRA plan which was to help people to help themselves. I found in Athens a skeleton of UNRRA personnel showing the Greeks how to help themselves, how to make something out of nothing, how to make more out of that little. When I found the rehabilitation center, headed by Miss Bell Greve, whose work in crippled work we in Cleveland have rejoiced in for many years, I knew the quality of what was being established in Athens. Such women as Dr. Dodge, of Boston, Miss Baggalley, of London, gave me assurance of the health work being done. When the Minister of Public Health told me of the 500,000 tubercular cases needing attention I rejoiced that through a canny Scot, Dr. MacDougall, the Athenians were launching a national tuberculosis organization. My satisfaction flowed over when I found that a group of hospitals run by Greeks had secured Ruth Faust—a graduate of the Western Reserve University School of Nursing of Cleveland, to head up the establishment of a school of nursing which will begin to fill the great nursing need of Greece. The new physical therapy school is to be run by a young woman from Ohio's Twenty-second District that already has three on the staff of the rehabilitation center.

I am glad to attest here and now to the quality of work being done by the UNRRA staff in Athens. To my mind it is what UNRRA started out to do. Through the help and knowledge of experienced personnel Greece is being helped to help herself. Surely this is what the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was created to do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Strike out all after line 2 on page 1 and insert the following as a substitute for the bill:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the American Red Cross to provide for relief and rehabilitation of the kind described in the agreement set forth in the joint resolution of March 28, 1944 (Public Law No. 267, 78th Cong.), in those foreign countries eligible to receive relief and rehabilitation pursuant to such agreement, the sum of $550,000,000: *Provided*, That no relief or rehabilitation supplies procured out of funds heretofore or herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except China after December 31, 1946, and in the case of China after March 31, 1947: *Provided further*, That, insofar as possible and practicable, agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply shall be utilized in filling American Red Cross requirements for food and agricultural commodities.

"No part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until the President has received from the chairman of the American Red Cross a certification to the effect that the furnishing by the Red Cross of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between the American Red Cross and such country or other suitable arrangements providing:

"(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to the American Red Cross.

"(2) That such country shall supply accredited American Red Cross personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of this act, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

"SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Act, 1946."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the pending resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri withhold the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we met an hour earlier today in order to conserve time, I trust the gentleman will not require time on an amendment on which we must eventually submit a point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment in good faith. I want to send the Red Cross to feed these people instead of sending an aggregation of bureaucrats to exploit people all over the world.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman from Mississippi will observe the rules of the House. He was recognized by the Chair to speak on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri, that it is not germane?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi is not germane to the pending joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will speak to the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, I want to show that the amendment is germane. Why? What is the object of the bill? What are we trying to do? We are ostensibly trying to feed the hungry peoples of Europe. I am offering to substitute the Red Cross for an international bureaucracy because we know that the Red Cross will feed those people and use every dollar that is expended for that purpose.

I contend that this amendment is in order. It carries out the provisions of the bill which is to provide funds to feed hungry people in the devastated areas of Europe. I know one thing, if this amendment is adopted and the Red Cross assumes this responsibility, those hungry people of Europe will stand a great deal more chance to get fed than if these funds were turned over to a group of bureaucrats.

If we are really in earnest, Mr. Chairman, I submit that my amendment carries out exactly what the bill is intended to accomplish.

If the amendment is adopted, it will do just exactly what the Christian people of America want done. It will feed the hungry people of Europe and other devastated areas, through the Red Cross, the greatest organization of its kind, the greatest organization of mercy the world has ever known, and the one organization that we could depend on to get definite information in the prison camps throughout the world in this war.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment I have offered is germane and that the point of order should be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPARKMAN). The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] offers an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes the point of order that it is not germane to the House joint resolution under consideration.

The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] would be to substitute the American Red Cross for the organization that is provided for in House Joint Resolution 266, and the organization that was provided for in Public Law 267, to which the present joint resolution seeks to make appropriations.

The Chair believes the amendment is not germane, and consequently sustains the point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 2, line 14, after the word "until", insert "(a)."

On page 3, after subsection 2, insert a new paragraph, reading as follows:

"(b) That the President has indicated to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration that he deems satisfactory arrangements have been made for the properly accredited representatives of the American press to observe and report without censorship on the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished for such country."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, first let me observe with respect to the editorial from the New York Times, which the distinguished chairman of this committee had read by the Clerk a short time ago, that that editorial was written and published on October 18, about 2 weeks ago. It related to something that appeared rather vaguely in the press, and did not constitute anything definite that was before the Congress or any committee or any party committee thereof. It was nothing more than a general observation on the subject of free press, and manifestly bears no relation to the specific amendment that is before us at this time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The actual wording to which the editorial referred was taken from a resolution adopted by the American Society of Editors and Publishers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. The amendment on the desk simply says that when the President must indicate to UNRRA that satisfactory arrangements have been made——

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, it is the other way around; UNRRA must certify to the President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. The President must indicate that satisfactory arrangements have been made for the entry of accredited press representatives into the recipient countries to report and observe without censorship on only one thing, namely, the utilization and distribution of UNRRA relief and rehabilitation supplies.

Now, why should we not ask for this? Yesterday I indicated that we are putting up 72 percent of the money. Certainly the people from whom the money is taxed are entitled to know what is going on. There are a number of reasons in support of it. Consider for a moment this recent London conference that UNRRA had. There was a distinguished delegate there from Yugoslavia by the name of Nicoli Petrovic. It was he who made the suggestion that no relief should be given to people who refused or failed for any reason to go back home. Here is the official Journal of UNRRA for the London Conference, dated August 20, and it contains the speech delivered by Petrovic. His country, Russia, and Czechoslovakia finally voted against the resolution. But the question I raised is this: Suppose distressed people who did not want to go home because they were afraid of the authorities and of what might happen to them, at long last did go home. Will

they get any of the supplies? How shall we know unless the press can give us some report on what is actually taking place.

There is carried in this authorization a possible $61,000,000 for White Russia and $189,000,000 for the Ukraine. There is not a single bit of UNRRA personnel in those two Soviet republics at the present time. Suppose $250,000,000 worth of supplies, of which the American people foot the bill for 72 percent, are sent to those republics. How shall we know for what purpose they are used unless the accredited press representatives have an opportunity to give us a report thereon? The subcommittee adopted a provision to the effect that they must admit our investigators and they must be able to inspect distribution. But we must go further for this very important reason: Let us take a country like Czechoslovakia. Who is the chief of mission in Czechoslovakia? It is Peter I. Alekseev. He is a citizen of the Soviet Union. Suppose an American investigator finds there has been diversion of relief supplies for military or political purposes; he must go to the chief of mission, who happens to be Mr. Alekseev. He says: "Look here, a report has come to me which I think ought to be disclosed." But suppose Mr. Alekseev does not wish them to make the disclosure, then what? Then we are right back where we started. It becomes necessary then for that sort of thing to be ventilated in the press.

Then there is this question of Rumania. Are you forgetting that in August of this year the State Department of the United States Government sent a very sharp note to the Groza government in Rumania? What was the content of that note? The language was that the existing government does not adequately represent important democratic elements, and for that reason we did not propose to go along with them. Now may come the distribution of UNRRA supplies in Rumania. Who will get it? Who will be responsible for distribution? It will be the Groza government against whom a protest has been made by our own State Department. They will have in hand the distribution of these supplies; and how shall we know that they will not be funneled to people of certain ideologies who agree with certain things that happen over there, unless the press representatives can go there and make a full and complete report on the subject?

Consider for a moment Bulgaria. If she is going to ask for relief supplies we should be getting this whole story. When I was in Istanbul last spring there was then in Bulgaria a Soviet army of 250,000 soldiers. The president of the Allied Control Commission was the Soviet general in charge. General terrorism was in progress there. Jews in that country were being herded into the ghettos, their property was being confiscated, instrumentalities for a livelihood were being taken away from them; and there is a great segment over there in distress who are not in favor with the Bulgarian Government today. Will they get any of these supplies? How shall we know unless the press can freely go there and without censorship ventilate abundantly the whole story so that the American people whose money is being expended for this purpose will know the story?

We have here a provision for relief and rehabilitation supplies for China. This morning at 7:30 I was rather interested in hearing a radio report to the effect that our allies, the Soviet troops, were funneling machinery and equipment out of Manchuria. Yet it is proposed here to use money for the purpose of replacing necessary relief and rehabilitation equipment and machinery. How much do we know about this story? I confess to you frankly I know nothing about it, and we shall know nothing about it until the uncensored and unfettered representatives of the American press can go there and tell us the whole story.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter; let us not forget UNRRA will be back here soon. They will be asking for another $1,300,000,000. Why not make this a kind of interim proposition as it were, have our press representatives go and give us a report on what is happening, and then we can more intelligently if we are so disposed appropriate further funds if necessary? This amendment is limited wholly to observation and report on UNRRA and UNRRA alone.

For the life of me, I cannot see any objection to it. It simply states that if there is an authority in one of these countries that would prefer to let his people starve than to let the light shine in, then we will have to presume and infer that that kind of an attitude might be responsible for diverting the supplies that we are sending there at the present time. If there is nothing to conceal, if these are to be open covenants openly arrived at, as Woodrow Wilson once said, there can be no objection to this amendment which simply gives the press authority to report on the utilization and distribution of hundreds of millions of dollars of supplies purchased out of the Treasury of the United States through the generosity and willingness of the American people.

Is that too much to ask?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman has been talking about Rumania and Bulgaria. Do they come in under UNRRA?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who knows?

Mr. BLOOM. But we do know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Czechoslovakia is there. Yugoslavia is there, Albania is there. Who knows what other countries may ultimately be added to UNRRA?

Mr. BLOOM. I know the gentleman from Illinois wants to be fair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will add that what I said can be applied to Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland just as well.

Mr. BLOOM. That is not what the gentleman said. The gentleman is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter that the Committee has under consideration, I believe practically the only highly controversial issue in the joint resolution which we have before us today.

It is well for us to remember one or two things in approaching consideration of this amendment. In the first place, it cannot be too often stated as a reminder that we are not dealing entirely and wholly with funds of the American people. Seventy percent of the fund is our money, but this money is being put into a common pot or fund under a treaty agreement with 45, 46, or 47 other nations, a solemn undertaking carefully and deliberately considered by the Congress of the United States and to which we placed our signature. That is No. 1.

If we were dealing with our own funds to be handed out as a generous gift to another nation, of course we could easily, freely, and without restraint attach any condition which we might wish to attach. But that is not the case. This is not an American enterprise. It is a United Nations relief organization, set up very deliberately and very carefully after the most painstaking thought by the Congress.

There is another thought in this connection. It can be conceded—none of us would deny it—that some of these funds perhaps have been wrongfully diverted, some of them may have been wasted. In spite of the greatest care that may be taken in the future, this will perhaps happen again. But we must remember that they are being disbursed and handled under the most difficult conceivable conditions. What the Congress wishes to have done, and I am sure the American people want it done if it can be, is to see that these dollars or every penny of them that they can follow gets into the hands of proper authorities for the relief of the peoples of the world who need to have this relief.

I am in entire sympathy with the purpose behind this amendment—and so is the committee—and the suggestion of the distinguished and able gentleman from Illinois, the purpose of doing the very thing that he says should be done, and that we all admit should be done, namely, that we should follow scrupulously, carefully, and relentlessly the application and the spending of every dollar of this money; that we should see to it, if it is humanly possible, that they do not go to support political groups or political activities; that they are not diverted into the black markets, but that they do get into the hands of the people who are starving and need them.

What have we done? We have directly approached that problem. None of these funds can be used; none of these funds can go into any country under section 2 of this bill. Let me read you what must happen:

That such country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe

conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

We have provided that no country can participate in these funds unless Governor Lehman's organization-accredited personnel are given free access and safe conduct in order that they may follow up to their ultimate destination every dollar and every ton and every ounce of the goods and the money that we have sent there for the relief of these people. It is necessary to do that, because when UNRRA comes back again, as it undoubtedly will, for additional funds, the Congress must know what has happened. I am confident that Governor Lehman and UNRRA will cooperate with the Congress and will send dependable and authentic people to follow up their supplies and their administration in these countries and give an authentic account to the Congress of it. We have a right to demand that. It is our legitimate right to follow those funds, and I have no doubt we shall get that from the Governor.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. If the gentleman admits that the committee has done right in imposing that particular condition on these relief funds, wherein is the inconsistency that the American press likewise be allowed to observe it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for that word, because he brings me immediately right to the very point I expected to make. The right to have a representative of UNRRA follow the ton of goods to see that it is delivered, and to report back to the Congress what has happened to it, is an entirely different proposition from throwing open the gates of those countries to admit promiscuously any accredited representative of the press to go there and write anything that his imagination might suggest to him ought to be written. That is the difference.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I submit that those countries whose doors are closed have their press agents all over this country, writing everything that happens here, and a great deal that never happens here.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true, but we are dealing with a realistic situation here. There is nothing that you could inject into this bill that would be more politically confusing, that would be more of a handicap, that would immediately raise more questions about the administration of this organization, than a provision of that kind, just exactly for the reason that the gentleman from Mississippi stated. It is most offensive to the United States of America and to our people to have foreign representatives here, although we believe in freedom of the press.

Just let me show you this, members of the Committee. Just stop and ponder for a moment. What is superimposed before any nation can share in this relief? The President must first make a finding before UNRRA can give a ham sandwich to any starving child in the gutter of any country. The President of the United States has to make a finding. All right, No. 1. He has to "indicate." I do not know what it is when the President indicates something. That is rather mysterious phraseology, but any way he must "indicate" not to the Congress but to the United Relief Organization that he deems that satisfactory arrangements have been made.

What are going to be the satisfactory arrangements? Do you think the President is going to be able to make arrangements that are entirely satisfactory to the press? Maybe he can. That is a big order.

Satisfactory arrangements have been made for properly accredited representatives of the American press.

What are properly accredited representatives of the press? What is the press? I am told at the session out at San Francisco there were so many accredited representatives of the press, that there was not room in the auditorium for the delegates to get in. In other words, under this amendment you throw wide open the doors of every one of those nations for any representative of the press to go in and write anything he wants to write. What good it is going to be after you get it? Is the Congress going to legislate on some newspaper article that is published, or would you not want an authentic statement by a reliable representative of UNRRA who has been sent in there to investigate the situation?

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. In view of the fact that every speaker for it—and I am going to vote for it—has admitted that UNRRA has blundered, bootlegged, been crooked, and everything else, is there any reliable representative of UNRRA that you can trust from Lehman down in a report that he would give?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have not made any such admission as that which the gentleman indicates. I think some have admitted that there have been blunders made and that there will likely be blunders made in the future. Would you be helping the administration of this project by throwing it open to the press? Why not rather have the organization send its own representatives to make a report to Congress?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "until", insert "(A)."

Page 3, after subsection (2), insert new paragraph reading as follows:

"(B) That, for the purpose of keeping the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished various countries and peoples by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, that none of the funds appropriated hereby, or none of the commodities, supplies, materials or services purchased or obtained through the expenditures of funds provided herein, shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal or economic—to obtaining, dispatching and disseminating the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or discriminates against the representatives of the press and radio of the United States in rates and charges for facilities used in collecting and dispatching such news; or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which may be prepared in or dispatched from such country by representatives of the press and radio of the United States."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment I have just offered and which you have just heard read implements and makes more effective the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I believe this substitute amendment is necessary for technical reasons. Representatives of the press and radio of the United States have encountered many difficulties in countries which ostensibly have granted access to the news, but too many times have found convenient to say, "So sorry, please," or to have some reason why it was impossible to permit the proper handling of the news, to dispatch it, or to get it out of that country. This substitute amendment simply provides the representatives of the American press and radio shall have access to the news insofar as the activities of the UNRRA are concerned in any country which receives the benefits of the appropriations made herein, and that such representatives shall not be discriminated against in any way by overcharges, by failure or refusal to permit them to use the facilities of that country to get the news back to the United States in exactly the same way the press of that particular country can use such facilities. It simply implements, in other words, and makes possible the full fruition of the idea and thought behind the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

I regret very much that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia, has seen fit to attack the motives of the press—or should I say the honesty of the press—or the reliability of the press? Seemingly, he believes American newspapermen and radio reporters cannot be trusted to give a true picture to the American people of what is being done in these countries which are receiving aid from UNRRA, or how the funds are being expended or used, or whether or not the food is actually reaching the starving people we are attempting to help by the adoption of this resolution. I believe that most of us here have the feeling we can trust the

American press and the American radio. Certainly we trust them here in this country. Let me ask if there is a single individual in this Chamber who wants to take the floor and demand and insist American press and radio representatives be barred from sessions of the Congress, and not be permitted to report that which goes on here in this body to the American people. We trust them. Often we do not agree with all of their conclusions. Yet they have the right to interpret the news, as it is made here, as they see it. We have all sorts of representatives of the press here. We have differences of opinion within the press. The Daily Worker, which someone mentioned a moment ago, is represented in this Press Gallery. I do not agree with all the Daily Worker says or does, or all that appears in print in that publication. Yet I will stand on this floor and fight for the right of that publication or any other publication, under the constitutional provision for a free press, to be represented in the gallery of this House and to tell the American people what goes on. Certainly no one can contend that the American people are not entitled to know how the funds are being expended that are appropriated here.

I want to point out, if I may, to the gentleman from Virginia that my amendment does refer specifically to the funds that are appropriated herein. We are not attempting to control the funds contributed by other nations to UNRRA, but we are making a requirement as to how the funds we furnish can be expended, and that in order they be expended properly in different countries we be given the opportunity to have representatives of the American press and radio there to report back to us what is being done with our money and with the food and supplies we furnish. The best assurance of proper administration of UNRRA is freedom of the American press and radio to report fully, without any restriction, back to the American people. Under this resolution we are not attempting to say that any other nation shall have freedom of the press within its country. We are simply saying that the American press and radio shall be given access to the news of UNRRA in the countries which are receiving the benefit of this appropriation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. What effect would the adoption of either of those amendments have, in the judgment of the gentleman, on the continued participation of the other nations in this relief and rehabilitation program?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the only effect it would have would be that the other nations would accept this arrangement and would provide for freedom of the American press and radio within their countries to report on the operations of UNRRA, and as a result thereof we would have a much better administration of UNRRA. It would be the only effect, in my opinion, because, if they need the funds, they will certainly not object to the American people knowing how such funds are being expended, or that our food is actually reaching the people. I think they would want the American people to know all about it. Certainly, if we were being helped, we would want everybody who was furnishing that help to know about it, and to know that we were grateful for it.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman from Ohio is a newspaper publisher, and I also have been a member of that profession for a number of years. I am very much interested in the subject of freedom of the press, but I want to ask the distinguished gentleman this question: Does he not feel that if we embark on a policy in which we tie up the question of freedom of the press with a governmental agency, we pave the way to restricting that freedom of the press?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly not. Our State, county, and national statutes are filled with provisos that the press must be given access to the activities of Government. We have the right, not only the right but the duty and responsibility, to see to it the same access to the news is extended to our press operations over there, because, after all, we are checking up only on our own operations under UNRRA, and reporting only on the expenditure of our own funds.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Freedom of the press is one of the most important and vital parts of the Constitution. It is our only method of forcing the correction of mistakes. Does not the gentleman think it is against the spirit of the Constitution to spend the money of the American people without giving them the right of freedom of the press?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is one of the things we fought for, of course.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the purpose of both amendments is identic. I do not object to it. I have just kept my amendment to the minimum side and left it with the President to determine when these satisfactory arrangements are made.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think this amendment does exactly what the gentleman's amendment does, except it does reach out and meets the technical problems involved, and that is exactly what the American press and radio want and must have if we are to have free access to the news.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot get some idea as to how much time is required on these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in one hour and a half, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does that mean that the Members now standing will be the participants in the limitation of time and that it will be equally divided among them?

Mr. MUNDT. Further reserving the right to object, will the Chair advise the membership how much time that will give each Member desiring to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-four Members are standing. This would give each Member 2½ minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. That is insufficient time. It seems to me we should not cut off freedom of speech when we are talking about freedom of the press; so I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I amend my motion and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the amended request of the gentleman from Missouri that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 hours?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio unfortunately raises the issue of free press in the consideration of the measure before the Committee at the present time and ignores the primary purpose of the measure, the question of relieving as far as we can human suffering and distress. There is not a Member of this House but who strongly believes in and will fight for the principle of freedom of the press; we are concerned however today with legislation with reference to people who are starving, many thousands of whom will not be alive 3 or 4 months hence after the next winter unless relief reaches them. People cannot live on freedom of the press, people have got to have food, shelter, and clothing; and we are legislating with reference to people who have gone through years of suffering, the terrific destruction of war enveloping them. Human beings, creatures of God like each and every one of us, are the primary objects of this legislation, yet by this amendment they would be subjected to the condition precedent of freedom of the press being put into operation in the country in which they live before they could receive any assistance—and this by action of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I have only a minute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned my name; will he not yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have only a minute remaining; I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, we are appropriating the last $550,000,000 of $1,350,000,000 that we committed ourselves to. If there is any place where these proposals should be considered it is in the next bill which will come before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and which will require legislation. These questions may well be acted upon there; but this amendment violates the contract our Government en-

tered into as a result of the Congress of the United States passing the necessary legislation. If this amendment is adopted and food and clothing are denied people as the result of such action, then the very thing we are trying to avert will occur, people will be driven to adopt some ideology of government foreign to their desires; either they will resort in plain language to communism or to anarchy. That will be the result of this amendment.

If we fail these unfortunate people UNRRA and the appropriations we make are intended to help—if we fail to do those things humanity calls for—if we permit general suffering and distress to exist as it will during the coming winter even doing all that we can for them—we are leaving these people in the position where they are likely to do the very thing we hope they will not do. Our failure to act effectively will be a contributing factor that will bring about a condition of disillusionment and chaos, and thinking and acting by way of reaction which might prompt them to turn to false ideologies of government.

How strange it is to listen to inconsistent statements of some. On the one hand they argue with emotional appeal and effect we should not give relief unless there are strings attached to it, or because of fear of people adopting strange ideologies of government when they know, or ought to know, that failure to give as complete relief as is possible will probably drive those very unfortunate people of other lands to adopt forms of government that do not recognize the dignity and personality of the individual. While I know the author of the pending amendment did not intend it, the amendment is likely to be a contributing factor in bringing about such results.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill, House Joint Resolution 266, now before the House for consideration is a joint resolution making an additional appropriation of $550,000,000 for UNRRA. I was one of those in the House who voted against the creation of UNRRA—not because I was opposed to appropriating money for relief purposes for the needy, helpless, and unfortunate peoples of those countries who are presumed to be the recipients of the relief, but because I believed then, and certainly I believe now, that it was a very serious mistake to create an UNRRA to distribute funds, of which 72 cents out of every dollar is the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

Certainly I want to make my position crystal clear—no one in this House is more anxious, ready, and willing to aid these distressed people who cannot help themselves than am I. But I want the hard-earned tax dollars of the people of the United States to be expended for relief and not wasted. Certainly we should not be a party to keeping an organization functioning that is permitting the use of relief dollars to play power politics, to foster and aid communism, to aid, assist, and abet Tito and his cohorts, and—in general—permitting food, designed for relief, to be used by irresponsible provisional governments for military and political purposes. My authority for those statements are our own colleagues who have been over there, on the ground, and evidence contained in the record of the hearings by the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and a number of the gentlemen who are now engaged in the presentation of this bill.

The administration of these relief funds—more than 72 percent of which are the dollars of the citizens of the United States—should have been made the responsibility of the State Department of our own Government. We had just as well be realistic about this thing. Feeding the needy is essential to building good will. I am for letting the people over there know that this food and clothing and these relief dollars that they are getting are coming from a country based on a Republican form of government, a representative democracy, where a free people, working under a free enterprise system, with free schools, free speech, and a free press, have been able to build up a system that totalitarian governments cannot compete with—a country that has rescued them from the bondage of dictators twice in less than half a century.

If the State Department does not want to set up their own organization to administer this fund, then why could not it be handled through the great American Red Cross? The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said yesterday that it was too late for the Red Cross to step into the picture. I cannot agree with him. This great organization has never fallen down in any undertaking. Yes; it is November, but according to the record made here and statements made on the floor of the House, there are enough funds already made available that can be used until May 1946. Certainly the State Department, or the Red Cross, or an efficient organization with a United States complex, can be set up in that length of time to honestly and efficiently handle this fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, over the week end I studied carefully Public Law 267, chapter 135, second session, House Joint Resolution 192. I call your attention to the fact that as the basic agreement controlling this matter it cannot be changed except according to the express terms thereof. There is no provision in the basic agreement which we entered into by which this Congress can now change the terms of that agreement, excepting by consent of the signatories thereto, as is provided in the international agreement of November 9, 1943. That fact is expressly set out in article VIII of the agreement itself. Said article VIII expressly provides that the agreement under which we are now acting and contributing this money cannot be changed by an act of any one of the parties unless the action is ratified by two-thirds of the nations signatory thereto. And we do not have time to get those signatures before hundreds of thousands of innocent people have starved or frozen to death.

I submit, therefore, that all of the proposed amendments which are in fact fundamental changes, modifications, and variations of the agreement of November 9, 1943, under which we are going to again make an appropriation, are of no practical effect until or unless ratified by the other UNRRA nations first. Meantime winter is upon us and thousands will perish. To now insist upon a material change in the operating agreement of November 9, 1943, before we allow our money to be used, will no doubt mean it will not be used this winter at all, because, gentlemen, 43 other UNRRA nations are parties thereto, and under article VIII a two-thirds vote is required of the Council including the votes of all the members of the Central Committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman agree that we can make such an appropriation or refuse to make it?

Mr. DOYLE. Certainly we can refuse it and let millions of people starve to death, too.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then if we have the power of making or refusing to make the appropriation, certainly we can make it under conditions.

Mr. DOYLE. I disagree with the gentleman. The only reservations this Congress made in the terms of the original agreement were set forth in section 6, page 7 of the act itself, by which we make two reservations; this proposed amendment is not one of those reservations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In that case if we were permitted to make the instrument which we have already made, the gentleman agrees that legislation is necessary for the appropriation?

Mr. DOYLE. Legislation is necessary to complete the appropriation up to the amount of our original aggregate amount.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will consult the debates at the time the original resolution was adopted, he will find over and over again in those debates the specific statement that we were making no commitments that we would make an appropriation.

Mr. DOYLE. All right, does the gentleman now feel we should not do so?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was stated that when the time came to make an appropriation we would either make it or refuse to make it.

Mr. DOYLE. Certainly, you can refuse and let children starve and freeze.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Now, if we can refuse to make an appropriation we can also make an appropriation with a condition attached.

Mr. DOYLE. But that condition was not reserved in the foundation agreement of November 9. When the Congress enacted this legislation originally that condition you state was not reserved. The proposed amendment is directly contrary to the terms of the reservations; there is no time for the necessary legal

and red tape processes to become effective before thousands have first starved.

I submit you can either pass this appropriation without the proposed amendment or substitute, or you can let thousands of people starve to death. I fear the amendment will cause so much delay in the use of funds that thousands will first starve.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I say to the gentleman that if I determined at a given time to give him some money to apply to a certain project, when that time comes I can say, "I cannot give it all to you but I will give you some." Would the gentleman take it?

Mr. DOYLE. I answer by saying to the gentleman that there is no analogy in his question and the case in point. Hungry people are dangerous people. Starving people, made so as a result of this war, must not become the victims of delay, caused by lapse of time necessary to try to get 43 other nations to consent to this different condition which the gentleman is now trying to impose upon this immediate appropriation before it can be used. It amounts to a condition precedent which cannot reasonably be expected to be met. In fact, I will state that it is an impossibility to accomplish by the time this winter is upon Europe. And this money is needed this winter to feed starving stomachs. Time is of the essence of action today by this Congress. Crowding hunger waits for no red tape or international conferences or change in a written agreement by 44 UNRRA nations.

There is no opportunity to reform the news or political philosophies of European nations by imposing this condition in this agreement. For, if you try it, gentlemen, you definitely commit hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women, and children to death by sure starvation and other forms of sure and tragic death.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are unduly concerned about the practical effect of this amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] merely requires the President to certify that satisfactory arrangements have been made for the press in the countries that are receiving this aid. The President today can certify that in Czechoslovakia, in Yugoslavia, and in Poland satisfactory arrangements have already been made.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Suppose we have made satisfactory arrangements and assume further that the countries do not keep these arrangements or change them. What are you going to do then? You have got to find out from day to day or minute to minute that the arrangements are being lived up to, yet the people are starving in the meantime.

Mr. HERTER. Certainly, if there is any change in a government that is an entirely different situation. That is not the question that is confronting us at this moment. This particular amendment applies only to the countries in which no relief has yet been given. It applies to two provinces of Soviet Russia, White Russia, and the Ukraine. It would apply to Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland if and when those countries should be admitted to the group that can receive UNRRA aid. Today they are not eligible as ex-enemy countries.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman heard the remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia in which he was calling attention to the fact that under the limitation proposed by the bill as now before us the representatives of UNRRA would be permitted to make reports. Would not the gentleman agree with me that the essential difference is then whether or not we would have reports in the nature of self-serving declarations by UNRRA representatives, or whether we would have some objective reporting by people who have no particular interest in anything else than giving us the facts?

Mr. HERTER. I fully agree with the gentleman from South Dakota. It seems to me that the argument is used that you are trying to punish the starving people by putting on these restrictions. The restrictions which already appear in the committee bill apply just as much as the amendment that is now before us; in other words, there is no one who is going to be sacrificed insofar as this amendment is concerned. There is absolutely no danger that somebody is going to go hungry because of the acceptance of this amendment.

Let me speak for a moment about these two Provinces of Soviet Russia. They have undoubtedly suffered considerably as the result of the war. They are undoubtedly entitled to relief. On the other hand, those two Provinces are today absolutely closed. If they should say, "We will not allow the American press to come in here and see relief distributed," they can always turn to their mother government in Moscow, which has billions of dollars in gold available with which relief can be bought; in other words, there is absolutely no necessity for saying that a single human being will starve because a relief operation is not conducted in the open. To my mind many suspicions will be alleviated by conducting these operations in the open instead of conducting them behind closed doors; in other words, I think, from the point of view of our relationship with Russia, to have these things done openly so that the people cannot continuously say that something is wrong with the operation is a benefit rather than the opposite.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts is the author of the bill, and he has not had as adequate opportunity as other Members in presenting legislation of this character. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield my time to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. I am very grateful to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, let me analyze a little further the effect of this amendment from the point of view of what is happening today. It is very little realized that UNRRA is operating in a very limited sphere in Europe today. It is operating in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Yugoslavia, in Albania and in Greece, with a small limited operation in Italy. Those are the only countries in which it is operating in Europe today. There is not a single one of those countries which does not allow completely free access to accredited press representatives.

I have before me a letter from the Yugoslav Embassy giving the exact dates upon which the pronouncements were made in Yugoslavia with regard to the admission of the press. Yugoslavia, strange as it may seem, was the first country which took all censorship off press correspondents' reports; in other words, the amendment that is being offered here is not going to cause a single individual to suffer one iota in any country in which UNRRA is today operating.

Let me come back to the countries to which it might apply. It is only these two Socialist Soviet Republics of which I have spoken. Nobody has yet visited those countries to ascertain the extent of the relief. They have made application. They were admitted to the UNRRA organization. They have submitted to the combined food board certain requirements for food. Those are being today considered. UNRRA has no agreements with those nations as it has with all the other nations that are being served; in other words, a considerable period of time must go by before any relief supplies can be sent into those countries in any case. Are we going to sacrifice those nations? Are we going to sacrifice the suffering people of those nations by the adoption of this amendment? To my mind absolutely not. There is no such question involved.

Let us be very frank about it. Only recently it came to my attention that one of these republics had made a request to the combined food boards for a certain tonnage of vegetable oils. I am not going into the exact figures but I can give the exact figures if any Member wants them. Simultaneously with that request there appeared in the dispatches a report to the effect that Russia had concluded a trade agreement with Finland. In that trade agreement with Finland Russia was obligated to deliver to Finland the exact amount of the same vegetable oils that was being asked for relief in one of its component parts, namely, the Ukrainian Republic.

Let us have these things in the open so that we do not have suspicions, so that we do not have distress. Let us be able to look at the thing. As I say, and as I have said before, nobody is going to suffer as a result of the adoption of these amendments, and it may be that our actual relationships with the areas con-

cerned will be vastly improved by doing things in the open and in the sunshine.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I add to the illustration the gentleman gave as to Finland the fact that we were in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and held a conference with six employees of UNRRA, two Americans, two Canadians, an Egyptian, and one whose nationality I cannot recall. They told us that Yugoslavia had just received a certain number of millions of bushels of food from UNRRA and had concluded a trade agreement with Russia whereby they were exporting to Russia a like amount of the same type of food. That is one reason we should have a free press in that area.

Mr. HERTER. I fully agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid we are getting away from the very thing around which the action we are seeking to take revolves. I fear also that the statesman from Ohio was not using his usual high degree of statesmanship in thinking clear through a proposition when he came forward with his amendment to supplant that of his colleague.

In an international matter we have to think, of course, what would flow from a policy of this kind, what would be the consequences of the amendment on other nations. There is quite a difference, which we have not always recognized in the debate here today, between doing a thing which obtains only in our Nation and doing, if necessary, that same thing when it is in another nation.

We did not ask these little people among our allies how they felt about freedom of the press and what they regarded as proper use of the press when we asked them to scorch their earth. We merely said we would stand behind them, and we asked that they scorch the earth by their policy and release the water from the dams, and it was done. They will think a whole lot more about that than we will when we come and say, "Now, we are going to continue to give you food, but we are going to put certain restrictions on it." As a schoolboy you found the evil of changing the rules after the game has started.

There is another reason I wanted to give you in this approach to the subject. If you should carry this amendment, you must go further and must supply the mechanics. Let me quote this from the statement of Governor Lehman, so that you may see where you are left. I quote his words. They appear in the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings, on page 10232.

> I may add that some of the amendments would impose upon UNRRA administrative burdens which it could not hope to carry and which might interfere with its primary relief task. UNRRA, for example, is not equipped to determine whether a press representative has been properly admitted to or excluded from one of its recipient countries.

How can the President have agencies determine day by day what is being done by the press? By the time a determination could be made and action taken on it something new might develop, and so on ad infinitum.

So, if you are going to impose this obligation on the President, you have to go further before you complete the job you attempt here and provide the mechanics for him to do it. Who would dare undertake the job of providing such mechanics? You just leave it dangling in the air. If you are going to undertake a thing like this, it is your duty to carry it out. I do not believe many of those who feel a responsibility on themselves and their leaders to carry the program out would come forward with an amendment like this. It would merely put us in the hole with no chance to get out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think something should be said first of all in response to the very eloquent appeal of my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] who just preceded me and whose eloquence in this case I am afraid exceeded his logic. He said that something should be done to provide the mechanics whereby UNRRA can determine whether accredited newspapermen were accredited newspapermen or not.

Mr. PATRICK. I said the President.

Mr. MUNDT. All right, then, the President.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. What I said or tried to say was that if we are going to put this amendment in and give the President that responsibility we would have to go forward and provide the mechanics whereby he could do it.

Mr. MUNDT. I accept the correction.

Mr. PATRICK. We would have to provide the mechanics whereby he could do it when the Governor says himself that he can not do it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. That makes it an even more amazing statement. Certainly the President of the United States with all of his staff is able to determine whether an accredited newspaperman is an accredited newspaperman or not; and if he cannot so determine, he can ask Governor Lehman to call upon these $10,000-a-year men he has in UNRRA as publicity agents—and why UNRRA needs publicity agents is beyond the realm of my understanding—the President and/or Governor Lehman can call upon these well-paid advisers to find out whether or not an accredited newspaperman is an accredited newspaperman.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. COX. If I understood the gentleman from Alabama correctly, his opposition to the pending amendment grows out of the fear that its adoption would be construed as an unfriendly act toward Russia.

Mr. MUNDT. That is perhaps true but his speech would not so indicate.

I next want to respond to the rather strange argument that has been advanced, first by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and then picked up by later speakers on the Democratic side who for some unconvincing reason do not want the light of publicity to shine down upon the way the UNRRA money is being expended in Europe. This is beyond my understanding of how public bodies can justify their expenditure of public funds.

The argument they advanced is this—that Congress has no right, because UNRRA is a treaty-sustained organization, to make any suggestions or any recommendations to UNRRA. That is the argument of the very able and usually logical gentleman from Virginia. But the very bill the committee brings to us violates in two different places the strained theory by which the majority speakers have tried to defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The bill itself on page 2 and page 3 suggests provisos whereby none of this money should be spent unless—and then it sets forth certain provisos for UNRRA. In other words, the logic of our Democratic friends comes down to this point, that any amendment offered to UNRRA legislation suggesting proposals to be carried out by the UNRRA organization is invalid and improper according to the argument originated by the gentleman from Virginia if it comes from the Republican side, but it is perfectly all right and appropriate if it comes from the majority side. The committee under the Democratic leadership is doing twice over precisely the thing that it complains about our trying to do on this side because we are trying to provide freedom of the press in connection with the distribution of UNRRA.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the arguments advanced to the effect that the Brown-Dirksen amendment is out of order because it issues a directive to an international organization such as UNRRA, do not hold and that they are mere red herrings when one reads the bill which the committee has brought before us and which the objectors to the freedom of the press amendment are themselves supporting. Permit me to read sentences 11 to 21, inclusive, of the bill, which those who would defeat our free press and free radio are supporting. Here is the language itself:

> No part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing.

Then follow the provisos marked Nos. 1 and 2 of section No. 1 of this bill. These provisos deal with trade agreements, barter agreements, and statistics and they deal also with the rather futile and fantastic proposal that UNRRA must

set up an investigatory staff to investigate itself. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia and other Democrats are supporting restrictive and directive language but they object to similar, although very much more effective and realistic, language being written into the bill by a Republican amendment which implements the Republican policy of free press and free radio so that the public may get the facts rather than simply be befuddled by press releases and inspired publicity which becloud the true conditions existing under UNRRA.

I think there should also be called to the attention of the House this rather significant fact, not only does the United States distribute 72 percent of the supplies of UNRRA from the standpoint of paying for them, but today substantially only four countries are receiving any large contributions from UNRRA.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the time allotted to me to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you, Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that our subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs visited and studied UNRRA conditions in all four of those countries which are now receiving UNRRA. We have just recently completed a 63-day study of economic and political conditions in Europe, Asia, and Africa. We studied UNRRA in Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Greece.

In Greece we found that UNRRA is doing a comparatively good job. Strangely enough, Greece is the only one of the four countries where UNRRA is largely functioning which today has a free press. Greece is the only one where the public press and radio people have a free opportunity to say what is going on in UNRRA. Every Member of Congress, whether Democratic or Republican, who investigated UNRRA conditions this summer came back with the same report, namely, that UNRRA is doing its best job in Greece.

The UNRRA officials themselves say it is doing its best job in Greece, despite the fact that 60 percent of the money expended by UNRRA is being spent in Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, where it is administered by Russian administrators and where there are no uncensored reports coming out, from the standpoint of the radio and the press.

We heard several reports in Europe that Director Lehman has already agreed to place Russian officials in charge of UNRRA in White Russia and the Ukraine. That would mean that the country which contributes nothing to UNRRA supplies would run the UNRRA show in five-sixths of the countries mostly benefiting from UNRRA and the country supplying 72 percent of UNRRA's supplies would direct its operations in only one beneficiary country.

Mr. Chairman, this is not leaning over backwards. This is falling completely head over heels.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from South Dakota, if he thinks all the Democrats are opposed to this amendment, he is mistaken.

Mr. MUNDT. If that is correct, and I hope it is, that is once when I am happy to be mistaken.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call attention to another fact. They talk about the right to send our press where we send our money. Is it not a fact that we sent our press everywhere that we sent our boys over there to win the war?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct and the press and radio reporters contributed mightily and bravely to our war effort.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Greece is in the British sphere of influence, and there they have a free press. The rest of them are ruled by Moscow-dominated puppets, and they have nobody to check up on them.

Mr. MUNDT. It is correct that Greece today has a free press. One of two things seems to be apparent from the evidence: A country which makes no contribution whatsoever to UNRRA should not have its people administering 60 percent of the program. I think that makes for reduced economy and efficiency. Either we are justified in that conclusion or we are justified in saying there should be a free press and free radio to see what these people are doing with our money in those areas serviced by UNRRA.

TAKING THE BLINDERS OFF THE BLUNDERS

I believe those who are interested in helping the folks in Poland, in helping the folks in Czechoslovakia, and in Yugoslavia, if you want UNRRA to go to the relief of the hungry and starving and dying people, should vote for this amendment which brings the press and radio in to see that UNRRA supplies are being used for the purpose intended by the American Congress and the American people. If you want it to be used for political purposes, if you want it to be used for trade, if you want it to be used to maintain puppet armies in these various countries, then keep the shades of darkness around UNRRA; let the nations which contribute nothing to the administration of UNRRA continue to run 60 percent of the program, but do not go back to your districts and say, "Our heart bleeds for the people of Poland and of Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia," because you have driven the dagger of despair into the hearts of those areas by prohibiting the press and radio from recording the truth concerning the administration of UNRRA and the use being made of its supplies. I urge the support of the Brown-Dirksen amendment.

Everybody talks about the blunders and abuses existing under the present administration of UNRRA. Even the UNRRA officials admit them but they endeavor to keep their real nature from the people. This will take the blinders off those blunders. This will permit the bright light of honest, uncensored, unbiased publicity to shine upon what UNRRA is doing and where UNRRA is going. It will mean more food for empty stomachs, more clothes for naked bodies, more fuel for empty stoves, and more houses for homeless people. It may also well mean less supplies for propaganda and political purposes and if it does, the people of America will have added cause for satisfaction. Surely nobody should oppose permitting the press and radio people to observe the operations of UNRRA and to tell the facts about them except those desiring to befuddle the public by beclouding the issues. Let us adopt this amendment and in that manner serve at least this slight notice that the precepts of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter are not entirely forgotten in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately this entire debate has developed into carping criticism and political international discussion on a question that should not enter into this debate at all.

At the present moment there are 180,000,000 people in Europe who are suffering. Millions will undoubtedly pass away, due to starvation, cold, and many kindred ills as a result. It was my hope that what the committee agreed to in the way of a proper follow-through of these expenditures would satisfy those who honestly wanted the distribution to go to the needy of the world, Europe in particular. Instead of that, we have a debate upon whether we can force upon other nations a change in their political philosophy, a subject which does not in any way have a right in this debate. The feeding of those who are to be saved is the all-important matter, to my mind. Unfortunately we hear speakers talk about the Democratic side and the Republican side. Are we to tell a mother with a starving child in her arms, "Because we do not like the political philosophy of your country you can starve"?

I do not concur in the statement that if this amendment is passed no one will suffer. Anyone who looks upon this question fairly and honestly must realize that any impediment thrown in the way of the distribution of food and clothing and a place to live is going to cost added suffering to that which already exists.

We did not examine the political complexions of our allies when they were fighting the war and we were supplying them with equipment, supplies, and troops. Feeding and clothing the victims of war is as much a part of our responsibility for the victory of decency as any battle in which our men engaged.

These people who look for excuses to minimize the help we are duty bound to give by every obligation God-fearing people ever assumed forget that the fighting is over but not the war. We have had victory over arms. We are still fighting for peace and we will be fighting for peace for a long time to come. Rehabilitating the victims of our enemies—and

our enemies themselves were their own victims too—is part of our fight for peace. Until they are restored in body and mind and soul they cannot get to work to restore themselves economically. The chaos and confusion the proponents of this amendment would nourish by their refusal to put first things first is what leads to communism. Hungry people are desperate people.

UNRRA had planned to ship $70,000,000 worth of United States food in November to stave off starvation in Europe. It did not have the funds for food and therefore had to use $50,000,000 which had been allocated for clothing, industrial equipment, medical and veterinary supplies, agricultural equipment, and sundry other items of necessity for food instead. As it was, $20,000,000 less food was sent than was planned and none of the supplies I just mentioned.

The minimum required amounts of food for December shipments to UNRRA amount to approximately 450,000 tons, consisting of grain, dried peas and beans, canned fish, sugar, meat, dairy products, and dehydrated potatoes. This in addition to Army surplus food amounting to 150,000 tons. But in order to get this food on the boats for shipment by the end of the year this $550,000,000 must be received by UNRRA before the end of next week because of the machinery of procuring the food and readying it for shipment involved.

Here are interesting figures showing how much our October UNRRA shipments amounted to in terms of what each person in the United States consumes during the course of a year:

Grain, 5½ pounds, or six loaves.
Meat, 1/10 ounce.
Fish, 3 ounces.
Eggs and dairy products, 10½ ounces (dried).
Dried vegetables (90 percent peas and beans), 1⅛ pounds.
Coffee, tea, cocoa, 1/10 ounce.
Fruits, 1 ounce (dried).
Sugar, 9½ ounces.
Fats for soap, ⅛ pound (less than one cake per person in the United States).
Fats, 9 ounces.

The average yearly consumption of fats and oils per person in the United States is 44 pounds. The lowest subsistence level is 20 pounds per person. In Europe the level is as low as 3 3/10 pounds per person per year in Poland, and 4⅕ pounds per person per year in Italy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] is recognized.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, there are two things I should like to nail down before very long: one of them is, that I believe there is complete lack of logic in the argument advanced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]—or a change of position—when he declared that the Dirksen amendment would be an attempt by unilateral action to affect the existing UNRRA agreement. I am willing to assume that is true, but I point out then to the gentleman from Virginia and to all who heard him that subsections (1) and (2) of section 1 are in the same category. It must follow therefore, and every logician will admit, that the gentleman is not concerned about that argument, he is abandoning it.

So we are left only the question of whether or not this proposal is fair in asking that accredited representatives of the press be sent in, and conferring upon the President of the United States, who happens to be of the same political party as the majority, the duty to indicate when accredited representatives of the press may enter. Now, let me get this clear in my own thinking, I will not permit you to put on my shoulders the charge that my supporting this amendment means that I am not in favor of feeding suffering people, for this reason: If the request that people shall be permitted to go in and look—I am talking about the Dirksen amendment—is a time-honored, moral, decent request, one generally credited with being based on a moral foundation, then the burden of not feeding those people is upon the governments who deny that reasonable request. I do not want people to suffer, but if you ask me for aid and before I give it I ask of you that which is reasonable, and you refuse, having the power to grant it, then the responsibility is on your shoulders when you refuse to consent to that which is generally accepted as reasonable and not I.

So in the instant case, the governments who refuse this generally accepted reasonable request based on a moral foundation are the ones responsible, not the Members of the American Congress. To me that is unanswerable, and is the reason why I have resolved it the way I have. I will go one step further, this fund is not the largest of any individual, it is not raised by popular subscription, it is a fund which is raised by taxes lying upon the economy of the United States; and I believe the people of the United States are entitled to use methods which are generally accepted as giving a clearer and a more factual picture of the method of distribution, which no one in the well of this House can declare is oppressive, wrongful, or undemocratic.

If this be true, then I refuse to bear any moral stigma for supporting this amendment, and I am willing to rest my case on that argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I would be inclined to support either of these amendments if they were incorporated in the legislation as it was originally written, because I am a firm believer in the freedom of the press, even though all of us at times feel that that freedom is sometimes abused. However, in considering these amendments you must bear in mind the fact that we as a Nation have already entered into a solemn agreement with other nations. Having entered into that agreement, if we attempt to attach conditions to our further participation under the terms of our contract, if you please, what effect will that have on other nations participating in this great humanitarian program.

It seems to me at a time when we should be leaning over backwards, even farther than we have been, in order to try to bring order out of the chaotic conditions that exist in the world today, we will create a very bad impression if the people of other nations feel that we are ready at any time to run out on our solemnly executed contracts. We can ill afford to do anything that would create that impression. Today every nation of the world either feels everlastingly grateful to us for the part we played in the recent struggle for freedom or respects our might. I saw something of the operations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, having been in Germany just a few days after the liberation of Buchenwald. Within hours after our troops took over that concentration camp, French nationals were being moved by the hundreds back into France and into that entire area came representatives of other governments. I talked with many of the people connected with UNRRA. They were intent on getting their people back to the countries that they had been taken from as quickly as possible. I was greatly impressed by the sincerity of purpose they expressed.

Certainly UNRRA has not functioned as smoothly as we would have it function. Bear in mind that at its head is one of the greatest administrators in this Nation, a man whose integrity and ability has never been questioned. He was forced to recruit the people who are now engaged in this relief and rehabilitation work at a time when the most competent people, not only in our land, but all over the world, were engaged in important military work. If this great administrator, ex-Governor Lehman, was unable to get up a perfectly functioning administration, then no one could have done so.

I say that the time to consider amendments such as the ones we are now considering is when the next bill comes up. We can properly do it at that time. But let us not create the impression that we, as a Nation, do not honor our solemn obligations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in view of the reservations we have already made in existing legislation, and in view of the agreed reservations already in this present resolution, it seems to me that to argue that the putting of this reservation upon our contribution at this time is breaking faith and not living up to our obligations, is to make an argument that is unsound, far-fetched, and very unworthy of the splendid gentleman from Pennsylvania who just preceded me.

Here is one thing that has not been pointed out sufficiently. This is not a free-press amendment. It does not provide for a free press in any country except the United States. This is an amendment, not to require a free press elsewhere, but to prevent a gagged press in our own country, to prevent other countries from gagging and censoring our own press. That is all we are doing. These accredited representatives do not have to be permitted to publish a word

in the countries where they go. There can be all kinds of precautions made by the governments of those countries so that not a word from these correspondents can be published there, but we are going to prevent other nations from gagging our own press and censoring our own press as to matters that are the concern of the United States and our own business.

We have had emotional appeals about withholding food from a starving baby in order to enforce our political views. How are we to know whether that baby gets food or not? If we insist on knowing, through the adoption of this amendment, we help that baby. We do not interfere with the press of that country. The only interference that might result would be with the plans of those nationals who gave our gifts to troops or political adherents instead of to starving babies. This kind of interference is badly needed in certain areas I am told, and if it results from publication of the truth, not in some other country, but in our country, that will help starving babies.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In fact, this amendment does not make any requirement whatsoever that anything that the American press or radio may write or say will be published in the country where the information is obtained?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is the point I was endeavoring to make. We call this a free press amendment. We ought to call this an American information amendment.

We are going to run into this sort of thing from now on. We have certain customs and traditions as to how Americans get information. They get it not only from Government sources, but they get it through a free press and through accredited press representatives in this country and all over the world. As we deal with other nations in international affairs, they bring up the suggestion, "Well, now, we do not have a free press. We do not tell our people anything, and therefore we do not think you should tell your people anything about what goes on." That is a fundamental conflict on which I propose our country should not yield at all. I think that the democratic processes that we believe in are still going to be fundamental, even though we deal with countries that do not believe in a free press. We must draw a line between tolerance of others' practices, and surrender of our own principles.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. In support of the able answer he gave the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would like to quote from the bill on line 16 the language referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]:

> The furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing.

Then there are two specific limiting provisos.

Before anybody votes against this amendment on the basis that it issues a directive to UNRRA he should be familiar with the basic language used in the bill as now written wherein two directives to UNRRA already appear.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I supported UNRRA during its earliest days, and helped put through this enabling legislation in committee and on the floor. I felt it was of great significance not only as a means of relieving world-wide suffering, but as the first international organization to be created to deal with postwar problems. I have wanted desperately to see it succeed. I confess my great disappointment with UNRRA to date. Of course, they have accomplished something. It would be almost impossible to fail to accomplish something good with the millions they have had available. But I have had constant, violent complaints about UNRRA's administration, poorly organized, inefficiently run, overstaffed and overpaid, with supplies wasted or going into black markets or going nowhere at all, or being diverted for political purposes. I have never heard anyone familiar with it but not connected with it, say, "All things considered, UNRRA is doing a good job." Only yesterday I received a letter from an officer in military government, who, with an excellent opportunity to observe, told the same story of overpaid UNRRA loafers failing on their sacred trust of relieving suffering.

Of course, we will carry out our present subscription and appropriate this $500,000,000, but UNRRA, as far as I am concerned, is on probation. I hope for the sake of the millions who are suffering, that they succeed, and do better than they have to date. In any case, UNRRA's days are numbered, either they will complete their job promptly and efficiently and wind up their affairs, as we were told they would in the original hearings; or they will continue to dawdle with their sacred task, and the sponsoring nations will wind them up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, an affirmative statement by the Congress in support of the purposes offered by the amendments presented by the gentlemen from Ohio and Illinois is long overdue in this Congress. I propose to support the principles which are enunciated, and I trust that others will vote as I shall vote, and that there be a cutting across party lines on a fundamental issue of this type.

It is not the charitable father, Mr. Chairman, but it is the unwise father who gives money to a son or daughter in indiscriminate amounts. It is an unwise parent who does not take the precaution to check on what is done with funds and the purposes for which the money is spent. It is so with our country as we participate in funds for UNRRA. When we are considering, as we are today, this type of subject matter, I think it is well to remember what was correctly written yesterday by one who has followed for 35 consecutive years national and international trends from Washington, D. C. This journalist, David Lawrence, says:

> Above all there has grown up in my mind an unequivocal conviction that the freedom of the press is the real safeguard to representative government. Minority views sometimes become majority views in the court of public opinion. Irresponsibility of utterance is to be deplored, but even irresponsibility often becomes the forerunner of responsibility. The evolution of press criticism has been toward greater and greater responsibility, and, in the last analysis, an informed opinion is the best assurance of the continuance of representative government.

When I vote for this proposal I shall not do so and allow any person to charge me with failure to recognize the needs for food and clothing and housing by unfortunate groups of people throughout the world. I have supported UNRRA and shall vote for the measure presented at this time. This support does not indicate, however, that I must withhold my approval of the principle of opening the channels for our press and radio outlets of vital information and opinion.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I wonder if the gentleman feels that the President, by any mechanics he would employ, could photograph the sky today and then determine in some manner how the sky would be tomorrow? Before he could act under this amendment there might be an entirely different condition than obtains at present.

Mr. RANDOLPH. My friend is wrong in speaking about the colors which will be reported in different hues day by day. Let us report them as they appear on that certain day. Of course, there is nothing static—there is constant change.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. He has had great experience in public life. Has it not been his experience that the full and free reporting of the news has always led to better administration of public affairs?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Often I have disagreed with what has been reported, but I will fight to see it reported.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Our news reporters on the battle fronts did not color their reports to suit their own opinions, did they?

Mr. RANDOLPH. This Nation's reporters went with the services in actual combat. Let us continue, as a thinking Nation, to keep the searchlight of public opinion on our dealings between America and other countries under the operation of UNRRA. There is a courageous course to pursue—and I earnestly urge adoption of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the objections voiced by certain honorable gentlemen that these amendments will curtail the activities of UNRRA at this time, that they do not fit in with our original agreements certainly do not appear to be logical when one reads lines 11 through 21 of the resolution as presented to us. As the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] made clear in his excellent discussion of UNRRA some days ago these amendments simply make incumbent upon certain countries the same methods in operation in other countries receiving UNRRA help. My interest is first and foremost to see that food and relief reach those in Europe who need it most. To this end I believe this particular amendment is valuable. I believe a great many more people will be fed, a great many more will be housed and a great many more will have the relief they need medically and in every other way if the light of day is permitted to shine on what is done.

I am in accord with the sense that has been voiced here that to have 60 percent of the directing responsibility vested in the nationals of those countries who contribute nothing is out of balance, but in justice to some of those from other nations who are trying to do their best, I want to say here that one of these—a Russian—has been doing an unusually good job, with fairness and dispatch.

We are so apt to see only our own point of view in this as in all matters that come before us, even though in our quieter moments we know that there is no problem that does not have at least two sides, and often three or four. Our whole purpose today has one goal: the relief of the suffering in Europe. Those of you who have not been over can have no conception at all of what the winter is going to mean, with no food, no fuel, no homes. In Greece, only one of all the many blasted countries, there are few roofs to shelter the homeless who took refuge in the mountains. There is little or no transportation, with winter ahead. In spite of that, the Greek people and the people of the other overrun countries are full of courage. The Greeks are beginning to lift their own load through the help of UNRRA, through the help and the advice they are getting, through the help of the skeleton group we have out there. Whatever we can do to let in the light will insure an ever increasing amount of the assistance of which we carry the largest share, reaching the tragic need of the men, the women, and the children of the devastated areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Dirksen amendment and the substitute amendment. Since I have been in this House, I have heard my friends on the minority side at every opportunity insist upon the incisiveness of their logic. For the first time today I am impressed by the clear, incisive, pitiless, cold brilliance and perfection of these logicians. I am trying hard to believe that the proponents of these amendments, and I rather think in their hearts they do, want to serve humanity as much as my friends to the right, whether it is in Europe or any place else. They have become enamored today, however, with the seductive voice of their own brilliant thinking. Let me paraphrase an expression: "Let there be logic though the heavens fall." This is the logic of a Catiline, not the logic of a Cicero. This is the logic of the Bourbons, the sun kings of France, not the logic of the humanists of France. I think of Poland today and I point out to you the satellite of Russia, the Polish Government, in no wise speaks for the vast majority of the people of Poland. If there is any indication from Russia that some reporter is not welcome in Warsaw, then according to this amendment UNRRA ceases—even though my friend from Massachusetts says that is not the case today, yet it can be the case tomorrow. You can starve just as thoroughly and die just as completely on the plains of Poland tomorrow, happy that you are dying logically, as my friends suggest, but nonetheless just as thoroughly. They do not take the next step. The next step is this: This is not a question of a free press; and if it is, I was the first man in this session of Congress to propose a resolution for a free press, for news obtained equally and fairly at the source and disseminated equally and fairly by all agencies of all countries. This Congress in the last session passed unanimously a resolution introduced by our former colleague, Senator FULBRIGHT, thus giving its testimony to freedom of the press. Must you do it every day?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, I am heartsick today. I voted for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation in good faith. I trusted that those who were appointed to administer it would act in good faith—feed the hungry—not have a racket. I hope I can vote for it again in good faith. If this amendment is defeated and a self-serving investigator may investigate for the purpose of whitewash when sponsors here of UNRRA have conceded that they have blundered; that they have bootlegged; and that they have been irregular then it is apparent why some politicians are protecting the job holders rather than feeding and clothing the needy. Of course they do not want all acts to come out of dark cellers into the light of day. I arrived at Granville the day it was necessary to discharge a former British officer, Colonel Patterson, in charge of that spearhead, for bootlegging in gasoline purchased with our money. Not all of the workers were irregular. However most of our country's workers were also heartsick that some had been allowed to plunder under the name of relief work. What can be more tragic?

Some workers there were doing a good job. I want to praise Florence Collins and Mr. Barber. They would be happy to have full publicity to their good work. Let us have impartial publicity—not that from within; not a self-declaration.

In good faith, let us feed the starving, and not make UNRRA a great money-spending feast for some of the investigators and screeners that are looking upon this for fat jobs. Let us pass this to feed people and give to all people self-respect. Let us keep those devout workers who are helping and educating peoples in order that they may help themselves, and get rid of those who are exploiting under the name of relief.

Let UNRRA really mean United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and never again be referred to as Unnecessary Nuisance Rendering Ridiculous Assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall not use 3½ minutes. I merely want to say that, in my opinion, the issues are very definite on the legislation under consideration today. We are faced with the choice between two plans for action with the other nations of the world on a very basic and simple problem, relief and rehabilitation. We may pass this appropriation and thus make available funds which we have already pledged, without hampering amendments, and by so doing work in harmony with a world organization which we helped to create for this great relief job; or we may restrict the use of our contribution so that America's help for war-wrecked humanity will be so isolated from other UNRRA funds that it will never reach that great mass of destitute, cold, and starving people of the world who need it most.

Stated even more simply, we must choose, in this humanitarian work of mercy, to work effectively with our friends through the United Nations Organization and thus make new friends, or lose another opportunity of spreading our ideals of individual dignity and freedom through an isolation pattern of action. With so many potential problems in the days just ahead, involving and requiring international cooperation, are we going to encourage suspicion and distrust abroad in our action in so basic a matter as relief and rehabilitation?

The amendments proposed, in substance, say, unless a country submits to being remolded overnight to a pattern which we alone prescribe, then the war wrecks of that country may die of willful neglect so far as we are concerned. This is a bargain which a country dedicated to freedom and justice can hardly afford to drive with a starving humanity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment to guarantee the freedom of the American press wherever we send American money for human relief. Otherwise we might never know just what that money is being used for.

Freedom of the press in this country originated with Thomas Jefferson, the father of the Democratic Party; and there never was a time when it was more necessary that we maintain freedom of the press than it is today.

In my opinion, a free press in the areas of the oppressed will prevent more

misery and more suffering than will the money we are spending there.

There is the greatest saturnalia of rape, robbery, murder, and plunder now going on in some of the occupied areas of Europe that has been known since the days of the invasion by Genghis Khan.

We owe it to those helpless women who are being outraged, we owe it to those helpless men who are being robbed or murdered, we owe it to those helpless children to turn on the sunlight of publicity wherever we send our funds; and nothing will contribute more to that end than a free and untrammeled American press in that area.

That is one reason I wanted the Red Cross to do this work. The Red Cross would have seen to it that this money was spent for relief of the distressed without the brutalities now being committed.

I have in my hand a letter from a Presbyterian minister in Berlin whom Dr. Otto Piper, of the Princeton Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., says he knows and for whose absolute trustworthiness he vouches. This minister served a term in a German prison camp and knows what suffering means. Here is what he writes:

The distress that passes every day through our office and which we witness on every road and square of Germany is beyond words. I have known the sufferings of the Jews, and I have borne the tortures of a concentration camp; but what takes place before our eyes at the present moment surpasses everything of the past. I think of those, for instance, who take their lives. Thousands of bodies are dangling from the trees around Berlin, and nobody takes even the trouble of cutting them off. Thousands of corpses float in the Oder and Elbe Rivers down to the ocean; nobody cares. Thousands and tens of thousands perish of hunger and exhaustion by the roadside; other thousands do not know where in the world they will ever find a home again.

He then proceeds to give a few horrible examples. He says:

Pastor S: His two daughters and a grandchild (10 years old) suffer from gonorrhea, result of rape. His mother, 83 years of age, died of consequence of rape.

Is that what we have been fighting for? God forbid!

Then this Presbyterian minister who spent time in one of Hitler's prison camps goes on to say:

Mrs. B reports about the flight of our friends, the N's:

"Mrs. N was killed when she resisted an attempt to rape her. Her daughter, engaged to our eldest son, raped and deported, allegedly to Omsk, Siberia, for indoctrination."

He goes on and gives other illustrations of a similar nature; but withholds the victims' names for safety reasons.

Under such conditions do you want to send money for relief to those countries without at the same time sending the greatest agency we have for publicity to the civilized world, the American press? A free press in those occupied areas would help to put a stop to these brutal, inhuman, unspeakable, outrages.

We can never condone these outrages, and justify ourselves before the bar of future public opinion.

Here is an article from a recent issue of the Reader's Digest telling about the murder and plunder of the people of Bulgaria:

I SAW THE RUSSIANS TAKE OVER BULGARIA

(By Charles Lanius)

(On August 18, Secretary of States James F. Byrnes informed Bulgaria that the United States Government did not consider the present Bulgarian government "adequately representative of the important elements of democratic opinion" and was not satisfied that the scheduled elections would permit the people to vote "free from force and intimidation." Two days later British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin in the House of Commons, referring to Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary, said, "The impression we get from recent developments is that one kind of totalitarianism is being substituted for another." What is back of these recent developments? And what is the interpretation of democracy in the Balkans at present? In order to understand the moves of the British and American Governments, it is important to know the facts, to know what has gone on in the past year under an almost complete news blackout.)

I watched the Red army roll into war-shattered Sofia, Bulgaria, at 4:10 in the afternoon of September 16, 1944. I stayed on in Bulgaria 8 months to see what happens in a country the Russians take over.

I had arrived from Turkey on September 7. Bulgarian consular officials in Istanbul wanted American newspapermen in the country ahead of the Russians. A car met me at the frontier, and with two pistol-packing secret police, I bounced off over the dirt highway for Sofia.

The next morning I saw the new Prime Minister, Constantin Muravieff, long-time liberal. His government, a coalition of all democratic parties, had been formed the week before. He impressed me as an honest, straight-talking democrat. He told me how desperately he was trying to conclude an armistice with the Allies. But the next day a Communist-dominated coalition seized the government and he was thrown into jail.

The first Russians crossed the frontier on September 8. Dog tired and filthy from battle, they rode their beaten-up vehicles like conquerors, impassive as wooden Indians. This was a battle outfit and looked it. Pink-faced youngsters, weather-beaten old timers with drooping mustaches, barrel-chested giants, and runty anemics—all had one thing in common, the appearance of fierce, relentless warriors.

A shining American Packard led the mud-covered, nondescript column. Jeeps and American trucks made up half the vehicles.

Stories of rape and looting had preceded the Russians from the provinces. But cheering started when the lead vehicles passed under Stalin's portrait hanging from a hastily thrown up red-bannered victory arch. Many Bulgars shouted their welcome.

That night Sofia's restaurants and cafés were filled with hungry Russians. Red-capped military police patrolled the streets. Buxom Russian women, complete with boots and tommy guns, appeared to take over traffic. A week later the Russians had completed the occupation. The Red army started foraging operations. Peasants, who only a few hours before had been waving red flags, howled when Soviet soldiers drove off pigs, horses, and cattle, and helped themselves to fodder. After a few disastrous incidents, the farmers learned it was best to let soldiers take what they liked.

It soon became clear the Soviets would run Bulgaria on an inflexible totalitarian basis. They ruled indirectly but effectively through the Fatherland Front, a "nonpartisan" organization of the type usually favored by Moscow.

The Fatherland Front was organized by shrewd, auburn-haired Mme. Tzola Dragoytchova, fanatical Communist trained in Moscow, and today Bulgaria's dictator. With the Communists controlling the well-armed mountain partisans and the Russian Army penetrating the country, it was comparatively easy for her to put Communists in key positions in the new government.

At the time of the coup d'état Communists comprised not more than 5 percent of the total population of roughly 6,000,000. The bulk of the people are Slav peasants, pro-Russian by tradition but definitely not pro-Communist. Nearly every peasant owns his own farm. He is his own master. Citizens of Sofia, an overgrown country town, are sons and grandsons of peasants. When a man makes money, he invests it in real property. Big fortunes are practically nonexistent.

When the Communists seized power, Anton Yugoff, a smooth-talking factory worker under death sentence for Communist activity, came out of hiding to take over the ministry of interior and turn Bulgaria into a land of terror. The afternoon after the coup d'état I heard Yugoff tell a brigade of young partisans, from a window in the War Ministry, that they represented the new law in Bulgaria. The partisans, mostly teen-aged boys and girls, were armed with tommy guns and automatic pistols. Bandoleers of cartridges hung from their shoulders, grenades sagged from their waists. Yugoff told them they were now hunters instead of the hunted. Their mission was to ferret out and destroy their enemies.

In every city and village in Bulgaria, Communists took over the civil administration. Ordinary criminals—murderers and thieves—were released from prison and put into Yugoff's police. Often they'd arrest people for no better reason than that they were well dressed. Old grudges were settled with bullets. Bulgarians say that in nearly every municipality the chief of police, the mayor and the tax collector, and sometimes their assistants, were shot or beaten to death.

More than 100 former ministers, deputies, and members of the late King's official household were sentenced to death at a trial in the people's courts, packed with Communist prosecutors, judges, and jurors. The condemned, including Prince Kyril, brother of the King, were stripped, machine-gunned, and tossed into bomb craters.

According to official Bulgarian reports, the people's courts sentenced 2,007 persons to death and 3,064 to jail. Some were guilty of aiding the Germans, but many others did not deserve punishment. Ex-Prime Minister Bagrianoff, who tried to make an armistice with the Allies and told the Germans Bulgaria was getting out of the war, was one of them. Many died only because they might rise as opposition leaders and menace the new regime.

Before long a strong reaction began to set in against the Soviets and the stooge government. Bulgarians had expected a liberal democratic rule by the people. Instead they got a Communist dictatorship more autocratic than previous Nazi-controlled governments.

One direct result of this political recoil was that Bulgarians looked toward the United States more than ever before. They had had a bellyful of fascism; they didn't want communism; they thought the United States would help them become a democratic country. Russians and Communists were well aware of this tendency and set out to undermine American prestige.

Their first opportunity came when four American soldiers arrived from Turkey to find and evacuate shot-down American airmen imprisoned in Bulgaria. Headed by Lt. Harry Harper, the group did an excellent job. Within 3 days, 335 officers and men were on their way to Turkey. But there were still other Americans in the provinces. It was up to Harper and his crew to track them down.

Then one night a Russian lieutenant went to the villa where the Americans were staying. He told Harper that Americans weren't wanted in Bulgaria. Harper protested to the Russian commandant. The commandant gave the Americans 24 hours to cross the frontier. A British mission under Col. Harold Gibson received the same order.

Harper wanted to stay and be arrested, but Colonel Gibson was worried about an "internation incident." At about 6 o'clock that night both missions, with about 15 automobiles, met in front of the Hotel Bulgaria. The Soviets held up the departure for 2 hours so that Sofia citizens couldn't possibly misunderstand what was happening. Then, under an armed Russian escort, the missions pulled off for the Turkish frontier. Hundreds of Bulgarians witnessed the departure, and were justifiably bewildered. Weren't the Russians, British, and Americans allies? The next day the whole story plus trimmings was all over Bulgaria.

American and British members of the Allied Control Commission began to experience the greatest difficulties in getting supplies and personnel into Bulgaria. Many officers and State Department officials waited for weeks to enter the country. Once in, they were permitted no freedom of action. Without special permission Americans couldn't go outside a 6-kilometer area drawn around Sofia. Even then a Russian officer accompanied them.

Last winter members of the American military mission had to have special written permits for Sunday skiing. Armed Russians guarded them like prisoners of war. When American officers went deer hunting in January, they had to provide food and accommodations for Russian officers. If Maj. Gen. John A. Crane, head of our military mission, and Maynard B. Barnes, our State Department representative, wanted to go for a drive in the country, they had to ask permission days in advance and take Russian officers along.

In March an American interpreter, Sgt. Boris ("Bucky") Kuvshinoff, was severely beaten by two Soviet officers. He told me how it happened from his cot in the infirmary. The Russians stopped "Bucky" at night on one of Sofia's main streets and arrogantly demanded his identification papers.

"I saw the Russians were spoiling for trouble," said Kuvshinoff. "They cussed me out in Russian and said Americans were 'Fascist s. o. b.'s' and 'two-faced allies.' I realized I was in a bad spot, so I suggested we go to the Russian headquarters and I would show my papers. One of the officers pulled his gun and slapped me across the chin. Then they both went to work on me. They knocked me down, kicked me, and banged my head against some cement steps."

General Crane made a formal protest. Three weeks later the commandant, Colonel Smirdoff, called an American officer and an interpreter to his office.

"We have conducted a thorough investigation," he stated quite blandly, "and find those men were not Red Army officers. They were White Russians who stole Soviet uniforms and attacked the sergeant in order to discredit the brave Red Army."

The American interpreter said: "Colonel, you may think Americans are damn fools, but we aren't dumb enough to swallow that one." Smirdoff merely smiled and signified the incident was closed.

Stool pigeons and police spies abound in Sofia. Three men sat with notebooks in a screened-off cubbyhole just inside the clerk's counter at the Hotel Bulgaria, tabulating the goings and comings of every foreign guest, Russians excepted.

Friends and acquaintances suddenly stopped calling on me. When I met them on the street they invariably said they'd been questioned by the militia and had decided it was too dangerous to be seen with an American. Others refused to talk anywhere except in the open where no one could overhear. Even people who had business at the American legation hesitated to go there.

The hostile, suspicious attitude of the Russians and Communists has had a twofold effect: Our prestige has suffered enormously, while Soviet prestige has been enhanced. The Bulgars were quick to note the studied contempt behind Russian actions. Most of them wondered how a self-respecting and powerful nation could remain passive under such humiliating treatment.

From day to day the Bulgars lived under the lengthening shadow of Russia. When the news of President Roosevelt's death reached Sofia, a Communist lawyer amazed me by asking, "Do you think the new President will be Communist? We are very strong over here, you know, and Stalin will probably insist on it."

The Communists hope to make Bulgaria economically dependent on Rusisa. I know an American tobacco man who spent months in Bulgaria trying to buy tobacco. He negotiated with the Communist-dominated Fatherland Front's trade commission, which had seized every leaf of tobacco. When the American offered to pay in dollars, the Communists said they must have goods. He then offered four kilos of cotton for a kilo of tobacco. But the Communists sold the tobacco to the Russians, who paid a price approximating one kilo of cotton for a kilo of tobacco.

Back in America I learned that Russia has offered tobacco companies here large quantities of Bulgarian tobaccos at top prices. American tobacco men believe that the Russians have no intention of allowing Bulgarians to deal directly with American representatives. They will take the tobacco themselves and sell it at fancy prices to American buyers.

When the Fatherland Front took over, Bulgaria's treasury was practically empty. It was decided to float a liberty loan. Men with machine guns solicited subscribers. Every Bulgarian had to contribute.

The Communists are making strenuous efforts to Russianize the country. Political training has been introduced into the schools by new teachers. Many of the former teachers are in concentration camps for reeducation of the politically unsound. Textbooks have been rewritten with a Communist-Russian slant. The Russian propaganda machine is in full swing. Control of the cinema has been accomplished neatly.

I found it impossible to write an honest report from inside Bulgaria. Contact with the outside world practically ceased. Soviet censorship was clamped down tighter than ever. The privilege of mailing letters abroad was suddenly stopped. Telephone and cable communications were cut off. Only censored cables to New York and London could be sent—via Moscow. Too much information about true conditions in the country was seeping out.

Any candid observer who has seen the Fatherland Front in action can testify that it is not "broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population." Some Bulgars predict that within 2 years Bulgaria will be a Soviet republic.

Are we going to send the money of the overburdened taxpayers of this country into those areas, under these circumstances, without making provisions for representatives of the American press to keep us informed as to what is being done?

Here is an article from the pen of Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Washington Star of October 22, 1945.

There has never been a more severe critic of Hitler and his Nazi regime than Dorothy Thompson. Read what she has to say in the following article:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The trial of war criminals will be held under unhappy circumstances. They are accused of "planning, preparation, initiation, or waging of a war of aggression * * * in violation of international treaties, agreements, or assurances," and the indictment reviews the history of the absorption of Austria by the device of compelling one government to give way to another under the threat of force and the cry of union.

Yet at the very moment the indictment appears, it is reported that Marshal Tito is massing an army near Greece; a violent propaganda campaign against Greece has started; the cry has gone up for the "union of all Macedonians"; and in time of peace a force of 300 planes recently received from the Soviet Union is mobilized.

The picture is almost identical in the indictment against the Hitlerians.

Other reports describe outbreaks of violence between Czechs and Poles.

The war criminals are accused of crimes against humanity—of murder, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts, though the Potsdam declaration specifically supported, in principle, mass deportations of Germans from all surrounding states; though tens of thousands, including women and children, after all arms have been laid down, are being brutally maltreated; though tens of thousands of non-Germans are thrown into prison for refusing "loudly to applaud or blindly to obey" despotic governments who put themselves into power by coup d'état, and who, in Rumania, for instance, have posted up in the squares of towns and villages the terrible threat "we have taken power with blood and it is only with blood we shall give up."

It is in this dreadful postwar world of continuing crimes against humanity, committed only too often in the name of humanity, this world where the people have become, as it were, parts of the landscape to be trodden under the feet of power-seeking liberators; this world where millions of men strangle in their throats—that humanity must be defended against men who started this terrible madness, by men who have been unable or unwilling to check it.

It is perhaps no wonder that the judges did not take their oath upon the Bible.

And what is the purpose of the court, whence its legal authority? Is it to be the precursor of a genuine supreme court of international justice that by fiat here create the substance of a new law of nations before whose stern and lofty bar all nations and their leaders must henceforth be prepared to stand?

Or will it instead establish the precedent that in the future victorious governments in some war will shoot their numbers opposite in the camp of the beaten?

If it be the first, a great step will have been taken in behalf of the conscience of mankind; if it be the second, a step will have been taken backward into a realm where political matters are separated from ordinary law and a sphere of law decreed where there is, in truth, no law—the sphere of the extraordinary commission, the feme, the people's tribunal, which have been never the defender, but always the terror, of humanity.

We cannot avoid this issue, even in the unspent passions of war and the righteous wrath which all of us feel. The public conscience demands justice and punishment; the demand arises out of genuinely outraged conscience. All law is, in the end, the register of the state of public conscienness and conscience. But woe if it is polluted to other ends than those of justice!

As I see it, it is deeply regrettable that the tribunal consists of judges appointed

only by the governments of four great powers. From whom do they derive their authority to judge? Can they, in the nature of the composition of the tribunal, judge for the world? For humanity? Does not the very fact that the nations they represent are at once prosecutor, judge, and executioner give one pause?

Why should not a supreme court of the United Nations, set up as a principal organ of a new peace system, have taken over these trials? Why should there not have sat on this tribunal at least one judge from a small and powerless country, such as Denmark, and a neutral land, such as Switzerland?

The war is over and it is time for the civilized nations of the earth, and especially the victors in this conflict, to prove their worthiness to lead the world back into the ways of peace.

In order to do that we must have the confidence of Christian men and women throughout the world. But we can never gain and hold that confidence if we condone the murder of innocent men, the plunder of helpless homes, and the rape of helpless, innocent, Christian women by ruthless savages—whether they be Germans, Japs, or Russians.

These shocking outrages must not continue in any area where American money is being sent for the purpose of relieving human suffering. All the money we could send to Europe would not remunerate one innocent woman for such an outrage.

In another article which appeared in the Star recently Dorothy Thompson says:

Russian soldiers have been encouraged by loot as a policy. They rape without a policy.

Then she makes this statement, which is contrary to the facts of history. She says "all armies loot and rape."

I happen to live in a section of country that lost a war once. The South was literally overrun with Federal soldiers at the close of the Civil War, but no such orgy of attacks on the women of the South ever took place. Lee's army marched into Pennsylvania prior to the Battle of Gettysburg, but history does not record a single instance of a Confederate soldier attacking a Pennsylvania woman. If such attacks had been made, Lee would have had the offenders shot immediately; and Grant would have done the same thing under similar circumstances.

No. Civilized armies do not loot and rape; but savages do.

Miss Thompson goes on to say:

When discipline breaks down, armies cease to be armies and become bands. But bands are most unreliable as instruments of a state in war.

A policy of unrestricted revenge breaks down the morale of the victors. It is a disintegrating factor. If you sow to the wind you reap the whirlwind—in the twentieth century as in Biblical times.

This is obvious in Eastern Europe, and its limits are not yet set.

The Russian-sponsored governments of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary have no real popular support, and therefore have no authority. Where there is no authority there is chaos.

* * * * *

But anarchy on the Russian frontiers, with the participation of Russian troops, bodes ill for so highly disciplined a regime as the Soviet. Generalissimo Stalin must have severe headaches.

It bodes ill, also, for the morale of the other allied armies. The Potsdam measure will, of course, increase it. If deindustrialization is ruthlessly carried out in the west as well as the east, homeless, foodless, workless hordes—without even the discipline of daily work—will surround the American, British, and French occupation forces. These forces are composed of human beings—a fact constantly overlooked—and the result will not be favorable to orderly occupation or military morale.

What we have to fear, therefore, is not war, but the collapse of large parts of the world into total anarchy, with all its concomitants of lawlessness, banditry, and crime.

Needed is a thorough revision of occupation and political policy—it is no less in the Russian interest to revise it than in our own. We cannot get world organization out of anarchy. We must take thought now of the immediate necessities of policy, rather than of the ultimate use of the atomic bomb. For there is more than one way in which the world can blow up.

The mob is a human variety of nuclear disintegration.

The United States is the greatest Christian nation the world has ever known. Our country has been the leader of all the nations of the earth in the onward march of modern progress, as well as in the promotion of the peace, happiness, and prosperity of mankind. And we, the representatives of the American people in the Congress of the United States, cannot afford to sully that glorious record, or permit it to be done by others with our knowledge and consent.

Therefore it is our duty to see that the American press is given the privilege of turning the pitiless sunlight of merciless publicity on to such conditions throughout the earth—and especially in those localities where the American taxpayers' money is being spent to relieve human suffering, and where such misconduct might be laid at our door, or charged to our account.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment to insure a free American press the right to go wherever this money is sent, and keep our people informed as to what is going on.

Let us keep America's record clean.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I expressed my views on this bill an the Brown amendment. I have listened studiously today to the debate on the Brown amendment as well as the Dirksen amendment. I have heard nothing that would cause me to change my mind. We can, of course, bring emotional arguments into the picture; we can, of course, talk about starving people and forget that the only purpose of the Brown amendment is to see to it that the relief reaches the needy. I commend to you the argument made a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] in reply to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. The gist of the controversy is summed up in their statements. Not a man in this House knows as much about feeding the hungry people of Europe as does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. He assisted in feeding the Belgians during and after the last war, he knows the problems, he knows the feeling of the people in the devastated countries in Europe. To bring his knowledge up to date, he visited Europe recently, not on a junket of any kind but to study problems as the gentleman from Massachusetts, CHRIS HERTER, studies them. You cannot read his 5-minute argument and not be impressed, if not convinced. What would you think of your local associated charities if it gave away the relief you pay for to persons who refuse to let the association or the community know how the relief was used?

The American people are at the present barred from inspecting Russia. If Russia prefers to let its people go cold and hungry rather than to permit the press to inform the world as to the need for help, as well as whether the intended relief is reaching the starving people who have been described here today, then the responsibility is Russia's.

Mr. Chairman, the Brown amendment speaks the sentiment of the American taxpayers who are furnishing this money. If everything is honest and above board, what is there to fear? The spotlight of publicity will do much to clarify the atmosphere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the gentlemen who have offered and those who will support these amendments are sincere in their purpose and I must say that they offer a terrible temptation particularly to anyone who has had the opportunity of observing conditions in Europe. I had that opportunity. I hold no brief for, nor do I condone the despicable things, which have been done in Europe by one of our erstwhile allies. The things I saw in many of those countries alarmed me and unfortunately they are still going on.

If we had no agency to watch the operation of UNRRA I would be inclined to support this amendment. But I do not think this is the way to approach the problem. For instance, I do not see how I can vote to penalize the poor starving people of Poland, who have had nothing to say about the creation of the satellite government which the Soviet has forced upon them. I do not see how I can penalize the people of Yugoslavia who have had nothing to say about constituting the government of Tito as spokesman for that country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. I was about to say to the gentleman that the best thing he could do about that is to send a free press in there and give the information to the world.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. If I thought that was the way to solve the problem I would do it, but I can imagine that Russia, which has no love for the people of Poland, who have suffered more than any nation in this war, would with great glee welcome any excuse to prevent food and aid going to the people of Poland because, actually, they want more of them to starve to death.

As I stated, Russia cannot be condoned and I hope our State Department will

find some other method of counteracting what she is attempting to do in Europe. I say that with full emphasis and I hope our Government is aggressive about it; but I cannot, and I am not willing, to take the chance of trading the starving stomachs of the people of Poland and Yugoslavia and elsewhere for some advantages that might accrue to the press or the correspondents of the press, because I do not think we can afford to take that chance with these starving people.

For these reasons, I hope the amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I consider it important to raise my voice today in opposition to both of the amendments—the one offered by the gentleman from Illinois and the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. What we should do here today, and the only thing we should do, is to study the consequences of these amendments in relation to the starving people of the world whom we are trying to help.

Suppose a stricken foreign nation is governed by a little oligarchy—a diabolical oligarchy, if you please—and this oligarchy says, flatly, "We are not going to allow a foreign press to enter our country." Of course, that would be a diabolical attitude. But what would be the result?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman knows I have very little time.

Mr. TABER. The thing that bothers me is why would they refuse admission to the press unless they were going to abuse the supplies that were given them?

Mr. LUDLOW. Suppose there are a million or a million and a half starving little children in that country whom we want to succor and save. In these circumstances, under this amendment, if adopted, they could not be succored and they could not be saved. That would be permitting that diabolical little oligarchy to completely frustrate the grand and beneficent purposes of UNRRA. I believe in a free press, but when it comes to priority of procedure I believe in giving the first priority to the starving children and a lesser priority to a reform of foreign political systems.

Let us not forget that our contribution to UNRRA is a voluntary effort, a grand humanitarian effort on the part of the American people to relieve suffering fellow beings in other parts of the world. Let us not dilute our efforts and put a cloud on our magnificent humanitarian purposes by making our charity depend upon the reform of political governing bodies abroad. My objection to that is that it penalizes the starving people whose immediate relief should be our first concern. If we will just remember them and forget about foreign restrictions on the press, we will see our way clearly out of this morass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the legislation we are debating at this time deals with relief of foreign people. The bill calls for $550,000,000, the remainder of funds which we originally promised to the organization known as United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief. More than 40 countries participate in the program.

American people have always been ready to help in the relief of suffering of mankind. There is no apparent opposition to allowing UNRRA finish its current program. There should be no opposition to helpful amendments, such as the ones offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. Let me read to you the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. It is to the effect that these supplies of relief which we are discussing will be contingent upon the following condition, along with others:

> That the President has indicated to the UNRRA that he deems satisfactory arrangements have been made for the properly accredited representatives of the American press to observe and report without censorship on the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished for such country.

This amendment should be adopted because it merely deals with the American part of the money. It does not affect money contributed by other countries. It should be known that out of every dollar spent by UNRRA the American people furnish 72 cents. Therefore, the American taxpayer should know something about what is being done with his relief money. The debate has developed the fact that UNRRA has not been efficient; that there is much room for improvement; that money has been diverted for purposes that people who need relief do not get it; that information is not allowed to leak out of some of the countries where our relief is going.

This amendment merely would allow the American press to go into those countries and tell the American people whether or not their relief money is being spent for the purposes we appropriate it. We are told that we cannot get that information in any other way. American people know the terrible conditions existing now and which will grow more terrible when winter comes to some of these countries. Our representatives have come back with stories of horrible conditions. Innocent men, women, and children will die from cold and hunger this winter. We want to prevent as much of that as we possibly can. There is no opposition to that. But we are informed reliably that we cannot get information to which American people are entitled. This amendment would give us some light. The American taxpayers are entitled to it. The sick, cold, and hungry people in Europe would benefit by it.

The American people should know about the tremendous sums America has contributed in this relief and other connections. These sums include something under a billion dollars for relief through our Army; $1,350,000,000 through UNRRA, when this bill is passed; some $3,500,000,000 through the Export-Import Bank, and some $5,925,000,000, under the Bretton Woods organization; a total of $11,775,000,000, in addition to lend-lease funds, of which $42,000,000,000 has been transferred to other nations, and $1,879,000,000 remains in the pipe line for transfer.

In this bill we are appropriating the remainder of the original $1,350,000,000 obligated for UNRRA, or $550,000,000. All of these funds represent the funds we get from the American people through taxes and loans. In this legislation we complete our last obligation to UNRRA. But we are informed that this organization plans to come before us very soon for another $1,350,000,000 for European and Chinese relief. Then why should not the American taxpayer know the entire story? Why should not the American people know just how much of their relief money is being used for administration? How much of it is actually going to the hungry, the cold, and the sick human beings in foreign lands? How much is being diverted?

I cannot understand the opposition to this amendment. The hearings disclose that the Secretary of State indicates that such an amendment would in no way handicap the relief work of UNRRA. It is true that freedom of the press is not recognized by some governments of the world today. But it is recognized in the United States. I know it is being demanded by people in other lands. That is beside the point. It is my belief that, while the American people want us to send this relief to the hungry, cold, and sick people they also demand that we see to it that their relief money goes where they intend it shall go—to suffering humanity. This amendment will help us get this information for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my experience in traveling around the world that where the American press has gone and brought to light the suffering of humanity American relief has come more abundantly.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has had great experience in the Far East, and he knows what the distribution of relief means. Does the gentleman agree with me that where the American press has gone and seen things for themselves, that American relief has come more abundantly?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I agree with that. And I say it is not because we do not want to feed these starving children that we favor these amendments. It is precisely because we do want to feed them that we are for these amendments. We see internal conflict threatening in China today. Some of this appropriation and much of the next appropriation, which I will support if relief is administered under proper conditions, will go to China. We have no right to send that money into China or into Europe without making sure that it goes to the people who need it. If any nation or faction in a nation will not allow the

press to come in freely to observe how relief is administered and people there starve as a result, it becomes the responsibility of that nation or that faction, not ours. If we send supplies in without making sure that they go to all people who need them, then we take the responsibility for the starvation of those who may, God forbid, be denied food because of their political beliefs. If we reject these amendments, it is we who sign their death warrant.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly. Does not the gentleman also agree that an amendment like this would be acceptable to the countries who participate in this organization known as UNRRA?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, a great many of the neediest people throughout the world will welcome it, because it is their best assurance of getting food to keep from starving. The knowledge that the distribution of relief will be observed by accredited reporters will facilitate rather than hinder the proper operations of UNRRA.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I just want to emphasize the point brought out by the gentleman from Minnesota. Is it the gentleman's opinion that if the men, women, and children, who will be the recipients of the food contributed by UNRRA had the opportunity to vote on this measure, they would want the American press there to give assurance that they would receive this food?

Mr. STEFAN. Not only that, but a majority of the governments participating in UNRRA would vote this way in my opinion. I think it would get more relief to the suffering people. It would discourage this alleged diversion of relief because those who divert relief for private or political purposes would fear to face the court of public opinion which the American press can form by publishing the truth about how our relief dollars are being handled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me to be fundamental that there arises a division with that line that passes under the clock, but it is strange to me that it should develop in a matter of this kind. I cannot make out the circumstance that brings that about.

We have here a resolution which makes this recital:

> That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional amount for the fiscal year 1946 to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267).

Now we propose to tack onto that this, that we will abide by that only in the event you permit the United States to attach certain provisions and limitations.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I do not have time to yield.

Mr. MICHENER. There are plenty in there.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You are doing it now.

Mr. FOLGER. The section to which the gentleman refers is purely as machinery for orderly operation of UNRRA.

We do not have the right to do that. I say that we must remember that UNRRA is the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, not exclusively that of the United States of America. It is to be administered as a united effort to relieve the suffering of the women and children, those who perhaps themselves will have no voice in whether a representative of this division of the press or another shall go in before any administration of relief is allowed.

I am somewhat surprised that one of the gentlemen to the left, who carries his political badge in his pocket and only puts it on his lapel when occasion seems to justify it, should claim that he is willing to risk denial of relief to the women and children of any country, whether it be one that some man sees a ghost about under the bed every night, and comes here to tell us about it in the morning, or some other nation; that he is willing to justify the withholding of that relief by saying to those little children and those women, "Your authorities would not permit us to carry a little bread into your house." Everyone is for freedom of speech and the press, but this is not an appropriate place to pose the subject; and we have it anyhow. And responsible members of the press, highly regarded newspapers, have assured us this is an idle gesture and unwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to mix hard, sound business principles with emotions. We are having a lot of emotional appeals here on these two amendments. These amendments are needed. Corruption does not thrive in the blazing light of publicity. The principle of freedom of the press is right. The amendments give the country light on what goes on in UNRRA.

The gentleman who just preceded me spoke about new restrictions we will impose upon UNRRA by adopting these amendments. We now have restrictions put in by the committee which were not in the original bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from North Carolina who just spoke to the fact that provisos are attached to this resolution; in fact, the great proportion of this resolution is made up of provisos. Therefore, the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina that no proviso can be attached to this resolution and that it is wrong even to offer one falls of its own weight.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I should like to reply to that intelligent remark.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, I cannot yield now.

As a physician and surgeon, I think I have probably seen as much disease and pain and distress as any Member of this House. I am sympathetic with trying to do something for people that are hungry, that are diseased, that have pestilence in their country. I am reminded, however, that this resolution and the money we are appropriating does not permit relief by UNRRA in several countries where disease and starvation are rampant today. We only go into a few countries. The amendments suggested here will shed light on what is being done by UNRRA with the American dollar. This is good sound business principle. People have starved ever since the world has been in existence. The people of China have been starving for centuries and probably will continue to starve. We in America want to do everything we can to relieve hungry, starving peoples. But if we have a diabolical government in those countries, as was suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina, which might prohibit us from going in, I say that same diabolical government will prevent the starving people of those countries from getting the relief they need because the starving people are on the wrong side of the political fence.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. May I remind the members of the committee that in those three countries where the press cannot get in today, they had a free press until Russian puppets were put in there through American aid and influence. We owe it to them to give it to them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentlewoman. It has been my experience, having visited many countries of the world, that where there is full publicity corruption does not thrive. I think we should think that over. Let us get down to sound, solid, business reasoning and forget about some of the emotional appeals that are being made. I feel these amendments should be adopted. The American people are entitled to an accounting from UNRRA.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in feeding the hungry and starving people all over the world. I regret to see that this amendment is being made a partisan issue. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] said that this idea of giving our people an opportunity to know what is being done with their money, and how it is being spent, originated on the Republican side of the aisle.

May I suggest to the gentleman that there are a few on his, the Democratic, side of the aisle with sufficient vision to see the necessity of our being informed about what is being done with our taxpayers' money. The intelligence is not all on our side of the aisle. The American people have a right to know that this money is used exclusively to feed the hungry—that no liquidator of other na-

tions' people gets any of it for liquidation purposes.

I believe in the freedom of the press. I shall, therefore, support the Brown substitute to the Dirksen amendment. I still believe in the "four freedoms," that were so fervently proclaimed to the world, and so universally accepted, and then so conveniently lost. The "four freedoms" for which our sons won two major world wars. The "four freedoms" for which our sons gave their lives, limbs, health, and their time. Those "four freedoms," if we persisted in them, will correct any and all abuse of power in Europe.

I was glad the other day when the President of our great Nation pointed out to the world that there were some gangster nations, or should I say some Peck's bad boys, in our own crowd—among the United Nations. I only wish he had gone a little further and had told us who those bad boys are, and told us what they are doing—told us that they were engaged in liquidating and grabbing other nations' people and territory.

If our President will do this, and throw open the blinds, and let in the white light of publicity, we will then annihilate their iniquities with public opinion, and make them decent. His name will then go down with the immortals as a savior of humanity and civilization.

The time has come when the world should know what is going on in Europe. There is more bloodshed there perhaps, and more oppression, than there was during the war. It is not enough for us to threaten that we will not recognize the theft; we must give publicity to it. Let us find out who the guilty nations are. You cannot accomplish this fact by keeping the candle under a half bushel.

I cannot understand why any Member should be afraid to find out whether the funds, that we are here authorizing, are being used to feed the hungry, or misused to feed the liquidators of the hungry. I thought that not so long ago we had decided that we would not give any more blank checks, that we were going to know and keep tab of the taxpayers' money that we appropriate. Do we want foreign politicians who believe in liquidation of other nations' people to get these funds to feather their own nests?

Do we want the continuous waste and squandering of these funds, and thus allow the people who need this help to starve? The time has come that we protect our own money, and know where it is going, that we make sure that it will be spent for the purpose for which it is appropriated.

We have been told that we entered into a solemn agreement—into a treaty—with 43 foreign nations. Well, what of it? We entered into an agreement to feed and clothe the needy and rehabilitate the conquered nations. That included Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and others.

That was the contract and that was the agreement. Any violation of that agreement or any misappropriation of funds under that agreement is not only our concern, but is a crime and should be exposed if it exists. We should see to it that we are informed, and have the means of information to know whether or not these funds are being misappropriated. I deny emphatically that we are violating any agreement when all we are doing is insisting that that agreement be kept, and the purpose of that agreement be executed and carried out honestly and efficiently.

Suppose I gave to a friend of mine $100 worth of food to give to a starving family. Then suppose I had reason to believe that he was not delivering the food, but eating it himself. Would it not be proper for me to designate someone, when I gave him another $100 worth of food, to see that he delivered the food to the persons for whom it was intended? Would that be a violation of any agreement? No; it would not. Such reasoning can only come from a superficial sort of thinking.

When we agreed to put over two-thirds of our money up against the 43 other nations' less than one-third, we had and have a right to know that it was being spent for the objectives and purposes for which we furnished it when we entered into the agreement.

Suppose we were told that it was being misappropriated, that some liquidator of other nations' people or some horse thief stole it. Do you mean to tell us that to inquire about it would be a violation of an agreement or treaty? Would you tell us that it was our duty to continue to give it to the liquidator, or to the horse thief, and let the people for whom the appropriation is made starve? Surely we are not that ignorant in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure the gentleman appreciates that the Brown amendment does not do a single thing to Russia that is not being done today to all of the countries, every one of them, where UNRRA is furnishing relief.

Mr. LEMKE. I agree with the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have been associated with UNRRA longer than anyone else in this body. I have been associated with it for over 2 years; in fact, some months before it was brought to the floor of the House.

After listening to all the arguments today, I am afraid that we are trying to decide something here now that should first be considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee. These questions are far too important to be presented here with so little study and consideration, and without being first given the public hearings and deliberate study and consideration that characterize the work of a legislative committee. We must remember that we are not acting alone in UNRRA. We are cooperating with 46 other United Nations who are also members of UNRRA and who have agreed upon the procedure to be followed in supplying relief. If we make these reservations, we open the way for them to make restrictions themselves based upon their own ideals and ideologies.

The Foreign Affairs Committee will soon consider in open public hearings a bill which I am preparing to introduce, to extend UNRRA. We should not, in our haste to bring freedoms of various kinds to these unfortunate people, take action which will deprive these starving millions of the very food and shelter which alone will make their survival through the winter possible.

In principle, I am for the noble objectives of these amendments. I want to see freedom of speech and freedom of the press everywhere. But, action to meet hunger and pestilence can not wait. The need is urgent, and when so many people are actually facing the slow tortures of death by starvation, I feel that we are making a mistake if we say to them, "until you win the right to the same freedoms we enjoy in America, you will receive no food from America."

I have been one of the first exponents and sponsors of UNRRA. I have also been one of its first and foremost critics. I do not approve of many of the things it has done, but its great humanitarian objective, that of saving the lives of the millions of homeless and starving victims of the war, should not be lost sight of in our consideration of this bill. We should decide whether this amendment should be agreed to or not by our hearts. Let our hearts tell us what is the right thing to do; how we can really do the things that we so much desire to do; and not allow the question of politics or anything else to enter into it while the poor war-victimized people of the devastated countries are starving.

These questions which have come up on the floor of the House today will be up for consideration before the Foreign Affairs Committee within a few short days. Let us go into these matters thoroughly then, at the proper time and in the proper way. Hasty legislation of this sort is all too likely to prevent the relief we all want to provide. May I again repeat, let us listen to the dictates of our hearts and do nothing today which might deprive starving men, women and children of the food which will spell to them the difference between life and death this winter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments presented. I believe we have seen $800,000,000 of American money spent under conditions which are not satisfactory to the American people. I believe that we are trustees in handing over that $800,000,000 of taxpayers' money to UNRRA. UNRRA was given a great opportunity to handle it correctly. It has done a good job, but it has failed in many particulars, as has been stated on both sides of the aisle. For that reason I believe that we, as trustees, having engaged in this enterprise, now faced with the need of presenting $550,000,000 more to UNRRA, should take whatever further steps are necessary to safeguard the proper expenditure of that money.

It seems to me, if I were a trustee for an estate and I were engaged in an enterprise and I had contributed part of the funds, and I found that the persons to

whom I had turned over those funds were not spending them in accordance with honesty, with justice, and with fairness, that they were cheating, that they were stealing, that they were engaging in black-market business, and other nefarious enterprises, I, as trustee, if I went before a judge, handing them more money without taking such safeguards as were open to me to take, would expect to be told that if any of the money was lost, and that I had been remiss in what I was doing, I would have to make it good out of my own pocket.

I think in voting here today, if, as we are told by people on both sides of the aisle, by permitting the press to go into these countries, if there are any where there is improper handling of UNRRA supplies—I am not saying there are, but assuming there are—if by their going in and giving us facts we can get a better measure of help and aid to the needy people of all the countries of Europe and throughout the world it is our duty here this afternoon to adopt the amendment which will give us that ability.

I have been in relief work myself. I was on the relief committee in Belgium in the winter of 1914–15. I know how people suffer when they do not have food. We served 52,000 meals regularly in Brussels at one soup kitchen. We gave food to the children in schoolhouses and allowed them to sit there and eat it. Everybody got exactly the same kind of food. The relief work was carried on by Americans, by subjects of other countries, and by local residents behind the German lines. This war is now over. If we could carry on that great enterprise in those days of the First World War under men like former President Hoover, carry it on in such manner that the feeling throughout the world was that the job was well done, I can see no reason today why with the war over and with the United Nations in full control of every spot on earth where relief is to be granted, we cannot have the work done in a much better way than the reports given here indicate it is being done.

The funds will be spent. This amendment will result in the starving peoples of the world receiving a much larger share of each dollar contributed. I shall vote for this amendment, and I shall vote for the bill whether the amendment is adopted or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, obviously one cannot discuss this subject in 3½ minutes. In this brief time therefore I shall not be able to yield for questions.

In the first place, permit me to say that this subject distresses me very much because I feel pretty keenly about this matter. Many of you are aware that some seven of us Members made a trip over Europe recently and had an opportunity to observe at first hand some of the things that were going on. We are now engaged in preparing a report to the Congress making certain recommendations. When we got back here we gave out a press statement and among other things we said we were recommending to the Congress that loans should not be made to these countries unless certain things were done, and among those was the question of freedom of the press, an open-door policy established.

This amendment at first blush would seem to be right in line with this forthcoming report, but when you analyze the situation, when you have an opportunity to see what is going on over there, as many of us have had, you cannot help but question whether or not we can, on a strictly relief measure, attempt to impose these obligations which we propose to advance on question of loans. The two propositions are entirely different. I wish I could go along with you because I feel so keenly about the way certain countries over there are operating against the interests of the common man—but when you see as I saw an aged woman who possibly had pawned an heirloom offering a GI $10 for a 5-cent bar of candy, $10 of American money, then you wonder if it is wise to attach a condition such as proposed by this amendment to a purely relief measure.

To be perfectly frank about it, this amendment is aimed at our late ally, Russia. Certainly, I have no brief to hold for Russia in what seems to me to be its high-handed and rather arbitrary policy in dealing with these countries now under her virtual domination and control. Moreover, as I have previously stated, I am for a straightforward, forthright, and firm policy in dealing with Russia. I think everybody understands my views on that question. But it seems to me that what we are doing here today is to say to these small countries under Russian domination and control, "we do not like the way Russia is treating you; therefore, we too are going to penalize you by saying that we are not going to contribute to the relief of your misery and starvation."

I wish I could go along with this amendment. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the objectives sought. I may be wrong, I do not know, but I do know that it is my duty, having observed these conditions as I did, to speak my little piece in this limited time. When it comes to the matter of loans, I will go all the way with you, but on the question of human misery I will not agree to attach these conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, the part that is most tragic about this discussion is not the fact these men, women, and children in Europe are starving. The most tragic part of this discussion is the fact that at this stage of the game we, the people of the United States of America, have practically to fall on our knees to secure a provision whereby one of our allies will see to it that others of our allies are fed. This tragic condition exists in Europe simply because we in the Congress have not had the fortitude to face the issue and we have at all times sacrificed principle to expediency.

If we provide UNRRA appropriations without the Brown amendment, we are continuing our cowardly policy of sacrificing principle for expediency. After all, we have suffered 800,000 casualties in Europe. The Polish people have suffered 7,000,000 casualties in Europe. For what? For freedom, for the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

Mr. Chairman, I am more concerned about freedom than I am about food, and I know something about these people in Europe, because I have been talking to hundreds and thousands of their relatives and descendants here in this country for the past 6 months.

Where does this call for more food, where does this call for more clothing and for more medicine, come from? Does it come from the people who have given their all for freedom? Not at all. This call for more clothing, more food, and more medicine comes from the chiselers and the gangsters and the racketeers that have forced a government against the will of those people.

We owe an obligation to those people bigger than food. We owe an obligation to those people bigger than clothing. The obligation we owe them is one of fulfilling our promise of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

This appropriation bill with the Brown amendment will indicate that the Congress of the United States of America is exerting once and for all the principles upon which we entered this war, namely, that we are all through handing out for the sake of expediency. From now on we are going to have some segment of principle in our acts, and we are going to say that the purposes for which we entered this war are going to be given to those people who fought along with us.

I am for the Brown amendment because it is something that has been needed for a long time in the hand-out policy that we have had without limitation because, in my opinion, we have sacrificed principle to expediency altogether too much, and that has been responsible for the tragic condition which exists in Europe today, where we have to practically get down on our knees and beg that we may give crumbs to the people of Poland, crumbs to the people of Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, we seem to be together on two grounds. Everyone here seems to be for relief for the suffering in the United States and everywhere. Everybody seems to be for freedom of the press. But when we go that far the path branches out, and I am sorry to say that the aisle seems to divide the two paths.

If you will bear with me just a minute, let me repeat a little of the history of UNRRA. The history of UNRRA shows that in 1943, under the leadership of the United States, 45 or 46 nations, through their representatives, met here in Washington and agreed to the principle that all the nations of the earth are responsible when it comes to feeding and clothing the suffering and needy peoples of the earth, and that the United States could not be considered solely responsible for the relief of those conditions. Those nations, through their

chosen representatives, entered into an agreement that each nation would pay into a common fund so much on the basis of wealth. I think the base year was 1943. We agreed to that. The legislation ratifying that agreement was overwhelmingly passed by this body. We committed ourselves to the payment into that common fund of the great sum of $1,350,000,000. We agreed later on in 1944, in an appropriation bill, to give $800,000,000 of that amount at one time, and now we are asked to carry out the rest of our obligation. All right. Was there anything said then about the "four freedoms"? Was there anything said in any one of these bills about freedom of the press, freedom of religious worship, or the other freedoms as a condition precedent to the obtaining of this relief. Why, no. We knew when we passed those bills that in many countries needing relief there was no such thing as freedom of the press. We knew that. We know that as long as time lasts there will probably not be real freedom of the press, as we know it, in some of these countries.

Some of you say that we are not obligated to UNRRA. Some of you say we are not obligated to pay the rest of this money, but I cannot honestly look at it that way. I am one of those who has criticized certain foreign nations who repudiated their debts and who called the notes upon which they placed their signatures scraps of paper. I do not want the United States to get into that category. If the great United States Government and the Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people, can take the position that we can tack conditions onto this bill now after we have committed ourselves to pay this amount into this common fund, then I contend that some Catholic country member of UNRRA in South America can tack on a provision later that none of their contribution is to be paid out to the distressed and needy unless the Pope first blesses it; or some condition precedent equally as ridiculous. Let us stand up to our obligation. We are obligated. We should keep the faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be realistic, and I look at this thing just like something that used to happen up in our country. I live in that Dutch section of Pennsylvania that was known as the tramp's paradise for a long time. The country was just running full of tramps, because the people were good and had a lot of stuff to give away. Then finally some fellows began coming out from town in wagons and picked up loads of produce. They would get a ham at one farm and a slab of bacon at the other farm, a bushel of corn here and a bushel of wheat there, a few dozen eggs and a bushel of produce somewhere else, for the poor people in town. Then the question arose, What are they really doing with it? One day one of the farmers followed one of these rascals up, and he found he sold a good deal of it, and what he did not sell he put in his cellar. One exposure settled that business. That is the way I look at UNRRA. If someone from here showed an interest, much food now appearing on the shelves of certain stores in those countries where only the rich could buy it would find its way to the poor and needy as it should. If I were not for these amendments, if I were not following up these shiploads of produce, supplied by our people to be distributed by UNRRA, to see what becomes of it, I would be ashamed of myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the question before us goes a great deal further than what we are arguing here today. I want to say that I am personally willing to divide the last penny with a person or people rather than see them starve, but I do not believe our Government has the right to levy a tax, thereby fixing my standard of charity, and I am, therefore, fundamentally opposed to the whole program, because I am not certain that this program is a primary function of Government, although we can hardly afford to vote against the bill. I will not have time to go into this phase of the matter and I am not going to be doctrinal or dogmatic, but this is purely a program of charity and I have always been taught that charity is a personal matter, and I am afraid the Government is trespassing upon the privileges of the church, the Red Cross, or other charitable agencies, and if we continue to assume their privileges or responsibilities it may be the beginning of a coalition of church and state or it may be the beginning of the ascendancy of the state and descendancy of the church.

But the Congress has heretofore acted almost unanimously, 3 years ago when it agreed with 45 or 46 other nations to create a relief agency. That is, they by agreement provided an administrative agency to dispense funds to feed the hungry and clothe the naked in continental Europe and elsewhere. This agency is generally referred to as the UNRRA, and we are now considering an amendment to an appropriation bill which would say to the people who agreed to this program of relief: "You shall change one of the fundamental tenets or at least one of the fundamental laws of your government to correspond with that of ours, that is, freedom of the press, or else your people will not be allowed to share in the distribution of these funds." I believe thoroughly in freedom of the press, and I believe every country should provide for it, but when we put this amendment on here we say to every one of those other nations that do not have freedom of the press, "We are not trying to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, we are trying to change the fundamental laws of your country." That is exactly what it means and there is no way around it.

Then we go further. We say we are selecting someone to represent us, to see whether the funds are being distributed according to his or her way of thinking. That is, we are selecting the press of the country to represent us. This amendment will place the responsibility on the press to see that the distribution of funds is made in accordance with its or their views. The press, so far as I have heard, has said, in effect, it is not willing to assume the responsibility and is, therefore, opposed to the amendment. The information submitted by reading two editorials into the RECORD here today shows they are opposed to this amendment. According to the record made here today the press is opposed to having delegated to it and charged with the responsibility of making these investigations.

The crux of the proposed amendment is that if any country to the agreement creating the UNRRA should refuse any accredited member of the press from this country or to furnish any such person any information requested by such person then that country will not be permitted to share in any of the funds coming from the United States and placed into the common fund for use by UNRRA. Now suppose any one or more of these countries or suppose all of them should say, "All right, we will amend our laws or modify our established policy of censoring the press provided that none of the funds shall be available to any other country unless such country repeals or modifies its laws to permit people from our country or other countries to enter without limitation for any special purpose regardless of any law or laws it may have relative to the restriction of immigration." What do you think would be the attitude of our country? Suppose 40 or more of the other contracting countries would insert such a provision in their appropriation bill for UNRRA? What would be our attitude and where would there be any relief for the Filipinos? And what would happen to other unfortunate people to whom we are trying to demonstrate the spirit of Christianity? We know this Congress is not going to change its immigration laws to please any country or to accommodate any other country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have been laboring under the impression that one of the fundamental objectives for which the Second World War was fought was freedom of the press everywhere in the world. I have also been laboring under the impression that one of the fundamental principles to which the members of the United Nations solemnly pledged themselves was that same freedom of the press.

I am for freedom of the press, of course. I am for it in this instance insofar as it is provided for in the Dirksen amendment because I believe it affords the best possible assurance that the fundamental purpose of UNRRA will be carried out.

What is that purpose? That purpose is the delivery of food, clothing, medicine, and relief to those who are suffering on the other side of the water. That is the purpose, imperative at this time.

Yesterday I mentioned at some length specific charges which have been leveled at the administration of UNRRA—charges of diversion of relief for political

purposes; charges of diversion of relief for military purposes; charges of waste, of incompetency, and of general lack of proper supervision.

How in the world, Mr. Chairman, are we to have any assurance that essential food and clothing will actually reach the people who are suffering unless we assure proper supervision?

I believe the adoption of the Dirksen amendment will contribute greatly to proper supervision in the interest of those who are in need for whom this money is being made available.

The case against the administration of UNRRA in the past surely justifies the adoption of the amendment.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the House, and particularly to the attention of my friends to the right of the aisle, the material appearing on the last page of the committee hearings. I refer to a letter addressed to the chairman of your committee by the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes.

In the letter, the Secretary encloses a draft of six provisions which he says the Department believes could be included in the appropriation bill without imposing upon UNRRA impossible administrative burdens or responsibilities inappropriate to an international organization.

Provision No. 5 suggested as a condition precedent to the receipt of funds, reads as follows:

(5) That the press of such country will be permitted to publish all statements relating to operations of the Administration in such country made by the administrative head of the Administration's mission in such country.

This proposal, Mr. Chairman, dealing as it does with the regulation of the domestic press of countries receiving relief goes much further than the amendment under consideration offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

If the Secretary of State feels that his proposal does not impose "responsibilities inappropriate to an international organization" it seems to me that there should be no hesitation on this score in respect to the pending amendment.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the opposition to this amendment, which by the way is confined entirely to the right of American representatives of the press to go in and check on UNRRA operations, is that it will prevent people being fed. Let me say that instead of preventing people from being fed, the adoption of this amendment will give the people of the United States the opportuntiy to see that its money is being used to feed the hungry. Without this amendment, they would not get that food. Why would there be any reason that any other country would refuse to let the representatives of the press in to check on this proposition unless it was that they were abusing the privileges that come to them as a result of UNRRA?

That is the reason why other countries might be opposed to this. But let us feed the hungry. Let us adopt this amendment, and see that the starving people in those countries have an opportunity to get something to eat. Let us not hamstring them. Let us not fool them and defeat them, but let it go through clean and right. That is the reason why this amendment must be adopted, if we want the hungry in those countries to be fed. The opposition to it is based upon the failure to think the thing out and properly understand it, and upon the idea of some folks that they must play politics with everything, regardless of whether it is right or wrong. Now it is right that we should ask that those countries permit representatives of the press from this country to go in there. Let us adopt this amendment and see that they do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to close debate.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] and not taken by them be given to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], representing the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, do I understand we have reached the closing speech of the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized to close debate.

Mr. LUDLOW. The committee desires the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible for all of us to face this issue without political bias, and to go into the subject on its merits. I would like for us to brush away some of the cobwebs on this whole proposition. I believe we would see the picture a little more clearly than we have up to the present time.

UNRRA was started as an international proposition. The great heart of the world went into this endeavor. Forty-four to 48 countries united to take care of the distress and misery in the countries that suffered under the war through invasion. They did that, I think, largely because of the impulse on the part of the world toward humanitarian ideals. It is a cause for hope that nations may be able to unite for world betterment and peace. It was also recognized that this was done to establish economic stability so that the world would become better adjusted and, this in turn, would benefit all countries. They did not set up just an organization in one country. They formed a council composed of all the countries, and they selected an American to head that council. The American who was selected was a gentleman who had attained great success in private business, as a public servant, and in the humanitarian field. He recruited the finest group of men he could find in this country and elsewhere. They applied themselves to the job of helping these people and they have done a marvelously successful piece of work. With thousands of new men coming in to the work and a task that is spread all over the world many mistakes have been made; but, Mr. Chairman, those distressed people have been fed, they have been clothed, they have been helped, and great progress has been made in aiding the suffering. We can take much pride in the fact that we led that effort through the solicitous and intelligent work of the director-general of UNRRA, Governor Lehman. We put in our part of the money; so did the other countries, and it was harder on most of them than it was on this country. England, beaten to its knees by the war, torn and battered and worn, not only subscribed its $322,000,000 but put up every dollar of it promptly and did not ask for a lot of individual restrictions and things, which might impede the progress of the world and the work. We put part of ours, which was based on the income of 1943 according to the formula. What was the income in 1944? This country was far better off than those countries on that basis, and had that been the criterion our proportionate share would have been much greater. We have not suffered so much as many of the other participating countries.

A most amazing thing has happened. Although apparently there is much good will for the bill, amendments are offered that will either kill or impair the work of this international group. And based on what? And this is the most amazing thing that has happened since I have been a Member of this Congress, as I have just stated. An amendment is offered based on freedom of the press, yet no one has shown or attempted to show that there is not freedom of access for the American press in those countries today. Not a paper in the United States that I know about has complained that they cannot go into any of the countries being served. I took the trouble while this debate was going on and while pleas were being made for freedom of the press and the failure to give it to the American press, I took the trouble to call up and find out what the facts were and I wish every man who has spoken had taken the same trouble to look into the matter. I found that at the Potsdam Conference the representatives of the three governments agreed that the Allied press should receive full freedom to report to the world upon all developments in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland. The same agreement was reaffirmed also as to Poland, and Poland is one of these countries. Our correspondents have been admitted to those areas since that time and are there today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. Let me finish; I have so short a time at my disposal. With respect to Austria and Czechoslovakia—Czechoslovakia is in here—correspondents went in with our armies, and since the end of the war in Europe have traveled in those countries outside the American zones. In Italy and Greece our correspondents went in with the liberating armies and have since traveled freely in those areas. There are also American correspondents in Albania, another of the countries. American correspondents are also in

China and some even in the Soviet Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I cannot yield, I have but a few seconds remaining, and this is the only time I have spoken on the bill either in general debate or in the reading of the bill for amendment.

The first American press representatives were admitted to Jugoslavia some time ago. More and more have been admitted since and a substantial number are there now. That is the reason I say it is a most remarkable thing that we are complaining of a condition that does not exist. The press is not complaining, no paper in the United States that I have seen has said one word about it.

Mr. Chairman, stating that those facts do not exist proves that such an amendment is entirely unnecessary; but even admitting the point they make, I am opposed now to this Government saying to these other governments that are prostrate, "You must do it or we will not give you any money." If we say that, every other country of the 44 can say the same thing: "Open your doors, let us come in." What would happen? The press of 48 different countries would be in there reporting not only on UNRRA but they would be reporting on anything else that might be of political benefit to their respective countries.

It is not fair for us to say that, and the last thing I ever hope to see this country do, when it is performing a charitable act, is to say: "I have the money in my hand, Albania; I have money you need terribly, but if you do not do what I tell you to do you do not get any of it."

There is prostrate Greece, torn to pieces, and we would say to them, "We have got the money in our hand. How much do you need? But if you do not do what we tell you to do you do not get any of it."

We could say the same thing to Czechoslovakia, Italy, Poland and the rest of these countries.

Mr. Chairman, we have a job to do. The rest of the countries are willing to do their part without restrictions. Let us be wise but not hard as to the money that goes to the people of those desolated who need it so badly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN of Ohio) there were—yeas 144, noes 132.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 158, noes 147.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 158, noes 135.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 3, after line 8, insert a subparagraph, as follows:

"No part of the appropriation shall be available after December 31, 1945, unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification that the number of persons on the pay roll of said administration engaged in publicity and information activities has been reduced to five."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it would be acceptable to me if the gentleman from Missouri would modify his request to restrict it to this amendment and all amendments thereto, but not to the section.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to get rid of the waste that exists in UNRRA with reference to the publicity artists to sell UNRRA to the United States and to the recipient nations. They have 92 publicity artists scattered all over the world trying to tell these people how to come and get it. On top of that, they have 43 persons in headquarters in Washington—43 out of an administrative personnel which is grossly excessive, to wit, 1,136 people. Is it not about time we did something to stop these people from wasting money? Did you ever hear anything more ridiculous? Anyone who has read the reports which they have put out can see how far they come from telling the story of what is being done in each country that they are supposed to serve. No one would want to provide the funds for this publicity set-up after that. It really ought to be all cut out, but I have been conservative and have left them five in the amendment that I have offered. I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we will get rid of that waste of 87 publicity artists.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment shows clearly or should convey clearly to the country just what is happening here today, with human beings facing death unless they receive relief, having their condition made the subject of politics in this Chamber.

The amendment offered by the gentleman reduces the number of certain employees to five. What about the other countries that are signatories of the United Nations relief organization? What about them? Do you think we can act arbitrarily? I said earlier in the debate, the next bill that comes up is a different proposition. But we passed legislation committing our country. Other countries have entered into UNRRA as the result of it. The next bill is a new bill, and then, when further action is taken by other countries, they know what the United States stands for and how we feel in acting by congressional action. We are violating a contract we have made with over 40 other nations. The violation of that contract affects millions of people who are starving.

I hope we will have a roll call on the amendment that was adopted. That amendment should properly be termed, "An amendment to deny relief to human beings." That is just what it is. You can take it or not. That amendment, as a condition precedent, will prevent relief being given. Millions of people are facing starvation next winter. The amendment should be labeled, "An amendment to prevent relief." What a position to place the United States of America in. Of course, you the Republicans do not like what I say, but you are going to be put on a roll-call record.

I wonder how Americans of Italian blood are going to feel; I wonder how Americans of Polish blood are going to feel; I wonder how Americans of Austrian blood and Hungarian and Czechoslovakian as well as Greek blood feel, their relatives over there that our appropriation is aimed to help?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is not the effect of these two amendments, considered together, just this, that you open the doors of all these nations to the press, which includes the unfriendly press, to tell the black side of the story of UNRRA? Yet by this amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], you cut off UNRRA's publicity side of the case.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is partially correct. Basically, it is human beings. The adoption of the amendment, much as we support it as Americans, frustrates the basic purposes of our efforts to relieve human beings.

I wonder what the organized religions of this country, that recognize that the economic condition of people affects their spiritual outlook, will think about this? I wonder how the organized religions of America, the great Catholic church, of which I am a communicant, and the Protestant creeds that have gone on record for relieving human suffering abroad, as well as the Jewish faith, are doing to feel with this amendment already adopted in Committee of the Whole, if it is not defeated in the House? I hope it is defeated; and furthermore, I hope the political amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is also defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 99, noes 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 2, line 10, after the word "commodities", strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "Not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available for procurement of domestic raw wool from stock piles of the United States Government, and not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be available for procurement of domestic raw cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, the act of June 30, 1944, appropriating $450,000,000 for UNRRA, contained the following language:

Not to exceed $21,700,000 shall be available for the procurement of 61,700,000 pounds of domestic raw wool, and not to exceed $43,200,000 shall be available for the procurement of 345,500 bales of domestic cotton.

That was in the act of last June, in which act we appropriated $450,000,000 to this organization. That provision has been very helpful to the wool producers, the cotton producers, and our Government in moving surplus cotton and surplus wool. We still have in this country an enormous surplus of wool, and, of course, you all know that the Government owns several million bales of cotton.

You will find from page 58 of the hearings that under the present bill, instead of providing a similar program, it is proposed to spend $17,000,000 for wool textiles and $20,000,000 for cotton textiles. That is under the head of blankets and comforters, $12,000,000, wool textiles $5,000,000, cotton textiles $20,000,000.

Here is our position: In the first place there is a very critical shortage of textiles in this country at the present time, and will be for many months. It seems foolish to make textiles in this country and ship them to Europe when they are so badly needed here.

In the second place, after months of investigation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, we found that there are hundreds of textile mills in Europe today standing idle on account of lack of raw cotton and wool. All of the mills in northern Italy are ready to go into operation. You also have textile mills in Czechoslovakia and in other countries served by UNRRA.

It seems to me the part of wisdom that instead of shipping $20,000,000 worth of cotton textiles to Europe we should ship them $20,000,000 worth of cotton and let them help themselves. It means two, three, four, or five times as much clothing for the same money if they get the cotton and produce the textiles themselves than if the textile goods are produced in this country and shipped over there. I have no complaint against the textile mills of the United States, of course, but they have all they can do in the next 2 years to supply the American people with textiles. It seems to me it is utterly senseless to put in this bill an expenditure of $20,000,000 for cotton textiles to be shipped to Europe when they have their own textile mills and they have their own people to work in them. They can help themselves and have much more of the commodities than if the finished goods were shipped over there.

Another Member is going to speak in a minute about the wool situation, so I will not attempt to cover that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. From what source does the gentleman get the information that the cotton-textile industry in this country will have more than it can do in the next few years?

Mr. PACE. I think every merchant in America will substantiate that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not think that is a justification for the statement because the textile industry within a year is going to have a difficult time.

Mr. PACE. Well, say within a year. This is to be done in the next 6 or 8 months. All of these shipments will be made in that time. Why should we spend $30,000,000 of new money for these cotton and wool textiles when the Government already owns millions of dollars worth of cotton and wool? This amendment would result in quite a saving and would be helpful in removing these surpluses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia has made an excellent statement of the situation and if Members will let their minds run back to last year they will recall that it is identical with the action which the House took a year ago. We took the figures which were indicated as to the prospective expenditures for wool and cotton and earmarked that amount of money in the contribution that was to be made by UNRRA for the purchase of stocks which the United States Government already owned.

Bear in mind this amendment merely requires that we shall buy what we already own, so to speak, and make our contribution in material in which we already have an investment. Last year we earmarked approximately $40,000,000 for cotton and twenty or twenty-one million dollars for wool. The amendment now offered does not go that far. It only proposes to earmark $20,000,000 for the purchase of cotton and $10,000,000 for wool.

The Commodity Credit Corporation today owns approximately 500,000,000 pounds of wool. The Government already has its money invested in that wool. The money we have invested in it is slightly above the market. A parallel situation exists in cotton. These United States-owned stocks will be a drag on the market and if we do not use them in making our contribution we will own that cotton and own the wool and then go out and buy more on the world market, which will simply take that much more money out of the Treasury and mean a further depression to the price.

This proposal is in harmony with the purposes as set out in the original UNRRA bill which provided that we could make contributions in cash or materials. This means we will make it in material; we will make it in material that is wanted, not material that is not wanted, and we specify the amount that can be expended for that purpose. I recognize that there is language in the bill this time which suggests that if possible and practicable we should use such stock as the Secretary of Agriculture indicates that we have a surplus of. But that is not mandatory. In our investigation of the problem last year we found that it was not intended to use the wool stocks Uncle Sam already had purchased, but to go out and buy some other stocks on the world market. It simply makes good sense to use what we already have.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. Was this matter presented to the committee, or is the gentleman just springing it on us here today?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We are not just springing it today, because an identical provision was contained in the bill last year. We expected to see it in the bill when it was reported this year.

I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when the President sent up his message on UNRRA, he classed raw wool as the No. 3 requirement of the people of Europe. It seems strange to me that in the justification for this appropriation we find that 20 percent of the money is going for wool and cotton textiles, footwear, and equipage, but nothing for wool or cotton.

As the gentleman from Texas pointed out, in northern Italy, in Poland, and in Czechoslovakia they have the mills and the manpower, and all they need is the raw material to manufacture their own clothing. If these people are given the opportunity they can readily convert the cotton and wool that we have in abundance into the clothing they so desperately need. It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that with the tremendous stock pile of domestic wool presently owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, amounting to 530,000,000 pounds, and with a new

crop of 400,000,000 pounds coming on in the spring, that inasmuch as we are putting up 72 cents out of every dollar that is used in UNRRA, that it is only common sense to use some of that surplus of raw wool under this program.

I call your attention to one more fact. The United Kingdom has a stock pile of between four and five billion pounds of wool, and certainly common sense dictates that we should make every effort to dispose of as much of our own stock pile of wool as possible as soon as possible. I hope that the members will see very clearly that we are merely taking the same money that is allocated here for wool textiles that may be purchased elsewhere and using that money to purchase raw wool and cotton that presently belongs to the United States and is stockpiled in the warehouses throughout the country. I trust that the amendment is adopted.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this resolution because it is the humanitarian duty of this Nation to contribute to the starving and homeless people of Europe. I also favor the passage of this amendment because I am confident it will insure the delivery of the food, clothing, and shelter to the people who need this aid. Every Member of Congress took an oath to uphold free press, free speech, and freedom of religion when he entered Congress. We are now asking that these European countries recognize the constitutional right of this Nation wherever the funds we are appropriating are sent to aid the needy of Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one of the great advantages of this bill is that it incidentally stabilizes farm prices in the United States. It was testified by all who appeared before the committee and who were in a position to know, that the agricultural products bought and distributed by UNRRA under this law supported farm prices in the United States. Last year, as has been said, UNRRA bought and shipped out large amounts of wool and cotton. As I recall, UNRRA's shipments of cotton from the American market approximated 335,000 bales.

The American farmer is UNRRA's largest customer. Vast quantities of wheat, millions of pounds of surplus cheese and dried milk; and thousands of bushels of potatoes were bought last year—and will be bought again this year if this appropriation is made. UNRRA's purchases have, from the first, bolstered our farm markets at home and at the same time met our obligations to our allies in domestic commodities which we supplied at a profit.

And we are assured that the same program will be followed whever possible in the expenditure of the money provided in this bill. American cotton and wool, and cotton and wool products, will again be purchased for shipment into the occupied areas of Europe.

But the consumption of American products is incidental to the primary purpose of the bill. The first objective here is the relief of destitute people. The purpose of this amendment is the relief of cotton and wool producers.

Is this a bill to help the distressed or a bill to dispose of surplus products?

The category which has been referred to, and which is printed in the hearings, was compiled after a careful canvass of the situation on the other side. It is the result of a comprehensive study of what they need—what those people in Europe require. If we change it at all, that means we propose to give them something they do not need in order to find a market for something we want to sell.

Who do you want to benefit here—the fellow that wants to sell something or these people in such desperate need on the other side?

It has been said they have all sorts of textile mills in north Italy. We were informed there are no factories, plants, or mills left in north Italy. When the Germans retreated they took with them everything in the way of machinery or manufacturing facilities.

But if the wool and cotton growers were interested in an amendment of this character, they should have come before the committee and given us an opportunity to inquire into that phase of the matter. Even if there is merit in the amendment, certainly this is no way to legislate.

Let me assure you UNRRA is going to take every pound of American wool and cotton it can possibly use. But we ought not to compel them to take stuff that is not suited to their purpose, merely to enable us to sell something we want to get rid of over here.

The whole question in this amendment is, Are we legislating here for the relief of the cotton growers and the wool growers, who are going to be taken care of anyway in as far as it is possible to care for them, or are we legislating for the benefit of distresssed people whose lives depend on getting adaptable food and clothing in the next few weeks? Their needs have been carefully studied and analyzed, and these categories have been prepared and submitted to us and have been accepted by the committee. I trust at this late hour no one will throw any monkey wrenches in the machinery.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does not the gentleman want to modify his statement about the cotton mills in northern Italy? Our committee has been positively informed that they were not damaged in the slightest and are there ready today to operate. All they need is some cotton and some coal.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our committee was told that when the Germans retreated they took with them all machinery that was movable and destroyed the rest. It would be extraordinary if they deviated in that respect from their policy followed in Russia.

Of course, the primary question here is not whether the German armies left plants ready to be operated but whether we propose to send the pitiable remnants of humanity left in these countries what they ought to have or something we want to get rid of.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is not for the purchase of cotton and wool from the growers, it is for its purchase from stocks held by the United States Government.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Those stocks will be purchased if UNRRA can use them. We have that assurance.

But when shipped to the point of consumption they should be in the form in which requested and the form in which they can be used for the regeneration and rehabilitation of the people for whom intended.

The adoption of the amendment would drastically interfere with that program and would be most unfortunate in its effect on the people for whom intended, and especially on our standing with the rest of the 44 nations who are engaged with us in this great humanitarian enterprise. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 61, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLOOM: Page 2, lines 3 and 4, after the word "except", in line 3, strike out the word "China" and insert in lieu thereof "in the Far East"; and on line 4, after the word "of" strike out the word "China" and insert in lieu thereof "any country in the Far East."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: On page 3, after line 8, add the following new paragraph:

"(3) That the Administration if it determines such a course to be desirable will be permitted during the period of its operation in such country to retain title to all motor equipment supplied by the Administration and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts this amendment because they already have that right.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is purely a permissive amendment insofar as UNRRA is concerned. It is in the exact language that is used on the last page of the hearings of the committee as one of the amendments which the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, feels are not unduly burdensome amendments and are proper to this bill. Furthermore, the Committee on Appropriations itself in its consideration of this amendment devoted to it two paragraphs of the report which I hold in my hand. In the report the committee made this statement:

Under agreements now in force between UNRRA and the countries to which aid is being rendered, title to supplies and equipment pass to the recipient countries. In the case of heavy equipment, such as transport vehicles, the committee believes UNRRA should retain title so that any residual value after the period of relief necessity has passed may be recovered. A further and equally important advantage that will accrue from the retention of title is the degree of control which UNRRA would have over distributing these supplies within the countries aided. UNRRA would be in a position to deal much more realistically with the difficult internal distribution problem if title to transport equipment rested in UNRRA.

That is the statement made by the committee itself.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I call attention to the fact that on page 227 of the hearings Governor Lehman states that he offers no objection to the proposed amendment as long as it is in permissive form.

Mr. HERTER. That is my understanding. Governor Lehman has no objection to this amendment as long as it is in the permissive form in which it has now been offered.

Mr. Chairman, there is no exaggerating the importance of being able to retain title to transport equipment under certain circumstances. It so happens in Greece when title and the operation of motor vehicles in the relief operation was turned over to Greece, at one time there was a very heavy loss from pilferage, black marketing, and other operations. When UNRRA regained title to the equipment and put in a proper checking system, the actual losses of relief supplies were reduced to 1½ percent, an extremely effective distribution loss—very much better, in fact, than the general military losses that were incurred in the distribution of supplies by the military.

It seems to me that from the point of view of the efficient operation of UNRRA, this is only a perfecting amendment, to which neither the governmental officials nor Governor Lehman have any objection. It would give the people great assurance that, in the event of emergency, trucks would not be used for military purposes or for purposes other than the distribution of relief. There is always the danger that some sudden flare-up might lead a government to try to use relief trucks for purposes for which they were not intended. Hence, if it is made clear that the title to these trucks would be retained in UNRRA, the people would be much more definitely assured as to the safety of relief operations.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. How many trucks are involved? The reason I ask the question is that I noted in the newspaper the other day they expect to pick up about 50,0000 trucks from the Army. Does the gentleman intend that that should remain the property of UNRRA?

Mr. HERTER. At the present time there are I believe about 12,000 trucks employed for relief purposes in the countries in which UNRRA is operating. How many more trucks UNRRA will buy I do not know. Transportation is one of the most terrible problems in the whole of eastern Europe. You cannot import food without moving it to the places where starvation is greatest. It would give the people much greater assurance if the title to those trucks could remain in UNRRA in connection with the conduct of efficient operation.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, on one side we hear criticism of UNRRA because they have too much publicity. On the other side we heard criticism because they do not give out enough publicity. Apparently we need more publicity and a larger public-relations department in UNRRA, because there is some confusion and misunderstanding in the House as well as in the country about UNRRA.

I was very happy that the proposed amendment, limiting the number of publicity personnel to five, was defeated. I thought it would not get a single vote. As a matter of fact, I think UNRRA and its tremendous, far-flung organization of 44 allied nations, expending $8,000,000,000, should have a much larger public-relations branch. The Army, the Navy, and virtually every department of the American Government has such a department. The American people are entitled to know the facts and get the true information about UNRRA and its activities. Almost everybody in America has relatives in Europe, in some country or another. They are vitally interested in knowing about the work UNRRA is doing. They are in support of UNRRA. They are supporting it, and they should be told the story. So if any criticism should come to UNRRA, it should be of the fact that they have not blown their own horn enough. They have not told enough about what they are doing in Europe today. They are doing a fine job, in spite of the great handicaps they have had in the last year.

We went into a displaced person's camp in Germany, for instance, and there were four people there administering and taking care of a camp composed of 8,000 Poles, Lithuanians, and people of other nationalities. There were only four people handling the job. UNRRA should have a larger personnel, a greater administrative force than they have now.

Yes, UNRRA has made some mistakes, but it is a new organization. It was developed and organized only about a year ago, when manpower was short, and it had to accept what there was available. Now, since they have discharged some people who were incompetents, a few persons take a lot of stock in their complaints. They had to discharge some employees because they did not fit into the picture, and now, when better men are available in England, America, and throughout the world, they are enlisting those people and putting them into their organization.

There was some complaint here about speaking 20 languages to carry on the work in one country. We have many Americans and Englishmen who can speak five or seven languages. They are a part of this organization. This is a great asset because this is an international organization.

Complaint was made that food was sold. Yes, it has been sold by UNRRA, and the money put into relief funds. In Greece, UNRRA supplied over 80 percent of the food for Greece. There was not any food for the storekeepers. Some food was sold but the food that was handled in this manner was sold to people who had the money to pay for it. Then UNRRA used that money to furnish relief to poor people who could not pay for it. This, it seems to me, is good business on the part of UNRRA. It was sold to people who had the money to pay for it, put into a relief fund for other needy people.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only presently functioning international organization in which we now participate. It is doing a tremendous job, and it is absolutely necessary that we continue supplying our portion of the funds necessary for UNRRA to function. We have pledged that UNRRA would get our support, and we must not fail now. People in Europe this winter are starving by the millions and many thousands of them will die of starvation this year. Let us not hamper and hamstring the efforts of this organization by delay. Let us appropriate the money for the food, shelter, and the clothing they need so badly, realizing that no matter how much we give it will still fall far short of the need. We must not let them down.

In closing let me say that I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 266, making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Ad-

ministration, pursuant to House Resolution 386, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question was ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Brown-Dirksen amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The remaining amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "until", insert "(A)" and on page 3, after subsection (2), insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"(B) That for the purpose of keeping the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished various countries and peoples by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, that none of the funds appropriated hereby, or none of the commodities, supplies, materials or services purchased or obtained through the expenditures of funds provided herein, shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal, or economic—to obtaining, dispatching and disseminating the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or discriminates against the representatives of the press and radio of the United States in rates and charges for facilities used in collecting and dispatching such news; or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which may be prepared in or dispatched from such country by representatives of the press and radio of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 188, nays 168, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

YEAS—188

Adams	Blackney	Clevenger
Allen, Ill.	Bolton	Cole, Kans.
Allen, La.	Bonner	Cole, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Bradley, Mich.	Cole, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Brooks	Corbett
Andrews, Ala.	Brown, Ohio	Cox
Angell	Brumbaugh	Cravens
Arends	Buck	Crawford
Arnold	Buffett	Curtis
Auchincloss	Butler	D'Ewart
Baldwin, N. Y.	Byrnes, Wis.	Dirksen
Barden	Canfield	Dolliver
Barrett, Wyo.	Cannon, Fla.	Domengeaux
Bates, Mass.	Case, N. J.	Dondero
Bell	Case, S. Dak.	Dworshak
Bennet, N. Y.	Chenoweth	Earthman
Bennett, Mo.	Chiperfield	Ellis
Bishop	Church	Ellsworth
	Clason	Elsaesser
Elston	Johnson, Calif.	Reece, Tenn.
Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Fallon	Johnson, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Fellows	Jones	Rees, Kans.
Fenton	Jonkman	Rizley
Fuller	Judd	Robertson, N. Dak.
Gamble	Kean	Rockwell
Gathings	Kearney	Rodgers, Pa.
Gavin	Kinzer	Rogers, Fla.
Gearhart	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Gibson	Kunkel	Schwabe, Mo.
Gifford	Larcade	Schwabe, Okla.
Gillette	Latham	Scrivner
Goodwin	LeCompte	Shafer
Graham	LeFevre	Sharp
Grant, Ala.	Lemke	Simpson, Ill.
Grant, Ind.	Lewis	Smith, Maine
Griffiths	Luce	Smith, Ohio
Gross	McConnell	Smith, Wis.
Gwinn, N. Y.	McCowen	Springer
Gwynne, Iowa	McDonough	Stefan
Hagen	McGehee	Stevenson
Hale	McGregor	Sumner, Ill.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMillen, Ill.	Sundstrom
Hall, Leonard W.	Manasco	Taber
Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Talbot
Hancock	Martin, Mass.	Talle
Hébert	Mason	Tarver
Henry	Michener	Taylor
Herter	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas, N. J.
Heselton	Mundt	Tibbott
Hess	Murray, Tenn.	Towe
Hill	Murray, Wis.	Vorys, Ohio
Hinshaw	Norrell	Vursell
Hoeven	O'Hara	Weichel
Hoffman	O'Konski	Welch
Holmes, Mass.	Philbin	White
Holmes, Wash.	Phillips	Whitten
Horan	Pittenger	Wigglesworth
Howell	Plumley	Wilson
Jenkins	Poage	Winstead
Jennings	Price, Fla.	Wolverton, N. J.
Jensen	Ramey	Wood
	Randolph	Woodruff, Mich.
	Rankin	

NAYS—168

Abernethy	Gore	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Gorski	O'Neal
Baldwin, Md.	Gossett	Outland
Beckworth	Granger	Pace
Biemiller	Green	Patman
Bland	Gregory	Patrick
Bloom	Hare	Patterson
Boren	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Pa.	Harris	Pickett
Brown, Ga.	Hart	Price, Ill.
Bryson	Havenner	Priest
Bulwinkle	Hays	Quinn, N. Y.
Burch	Healy	Rabaut
Burgin	Hedrick	Rabin
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Rains
Camp	Hendricks	Ramspeck
Cannon, Mo.	Hobbs	Rayfiel
Carnahan	Hoch	Resa
Celler	Hook	Richards
Chapman	Huber	Riley
Cheif	Hull	Rivers
Cochran	Izac	Robertson, Va.
Coffee	Johnson, Luther A.	Robinson, Utah
Colmer	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rogers, N. Y.
Combs	Johnson, Okla.	Rooney
Cooley	Kee	Rowan
Cooper	Kelley, Pa.	Ryter
Courtney	Kelly, Ill.	Sadowski
Crosser	Keogh	Sasscer
D'Alesandro	Kilday	Savage
Daughton, Va.	Kirwan	Sheppard
Davis	Kopplemann	Sheridan
De Lacy	LaFollette	Slaughter
Delaney, James J.	Lane	Smith, Va.
Delaney, John J.	Lanham	Somers, N. Y.
Doughton, N. C.	Lesinski	Sparkman
Douglas, Calif.	Link	Spence
Douglas, Ill.	Ludlow	Stewart
Doyle	Lyle	Sumners, Tex.
Durham	Lynch	Thom
Elliott	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Engle, Calif.	McGlinchey	Tolan
Ervin	McMillan, S. C.	Torrens
Feighan	Madden	Traynor
Fernandez	Mahon	Trimble
Fisher	Maloney	Voorhis, Calif.
Flood	Mansfield, Mont.	Walter
Fogarty	Mansfield, Tex.	Wasielewski
Folger	Marcantonio	Weaver
Forand	Miller, Calif.	Whittington
Fulton	Mills	Wickersham
Gallagher	Murdock	Woodhouse
Gardner	Murphy	Woodrum, Va.
Gary	Neely	Worley
Geelan	O'Brien, Ill.	Zimmerman
Gordon		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Starkey

NOT VOTING—74

Andersen, H. Carl	Gerlach	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillespie	O'Toole
Barrett, Pa.	Gillie	Peterson, Ga.
Barry	Granahan	Pfeifer
Bates, Ky.	Hand	Ploeser
Beall	Harness, Ind.	Powell
Bender	Hartley	Rich
Boykin	Holifield	Robsion, Ky.
Brehm	Hope	Roe, Md.
Buckley	Jackson	Roe, N. Y.
Bunker	Jarman	Russell
Campbell	Keefe	Sabath
Carlson	Kefauver	Short
Clark	Kerr	Sikes
Clements	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	King	Snyder
Curley	Landis	Stockman
Dawson	Lea	Thomason
Dickstein	McKenzie	Vinson
Dingell	May	Wadsworth
Drewry	Merrow	Weiss
Eaton	Monroney	West
Eberharter	Morgan	Winter
Flannagan	Morrison	Wolcott
	Mott	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Bender for, with Mr. Starkey against.

Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Beall for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Gerlach for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Andrews of New York for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Stockman for, with Mr. Peterson of Georgia against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. H. Carl Andersen for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Keefe for, with Mr. Clements against.

Mr. Carlson for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Rich for, with Mr. Roe of New York against.

Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Vinson against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Hope.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana and Mr. BROOKS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BENDER. I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 340, nays 17, answered "present" 1, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—340

Abernethy	Fellows	Larcade
Adams	Fenton	Latham
Allen, Ill.	Fernandez	Lea
Allen, La.	Fisher	LeCompte
Anderson, Calif.	Flood	LeFevre
Andresen, August H.	Fogarty	Lemke
Andrews, Ala.	Folger	Lesinki
Angell	Forand	Lewis
Arends	Fuller	Link
Auchincloss	Fulton	Luce
Bailey	Gallagher	Ludlow
Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	Lyle
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gardner	Lynch
Barden	Gary	McConnell
Barrett, Wyo.	Gathings	McCormack
Bates, Mass.	Gavin	McCowen
Beckworth	Geelan	McDonough
Bell	Gifford	McGehee
Bennet, N. Y.	Gillette	McGlinchey
Bennett, Mo.	Goodwin	McGregor
Biemiller	Gordon	McMillan, S. C.
Blackney	Gore	McMillen, Ill.
Bland	Gorski	Madden
Bloom	Gossett	Mahon
Bolton	Graham	Maloney
Bonner	Granger	Manasco
Boren	Grant, Ala.	Mansfield, Mont.
Bradley, Mich.	Grant, Ind.	Mansfield, Tex.
Bradley, Pa.	Green	Marcantonio
Brooks	Gregory	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ga.	Griffiths	Martin, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Gross	Michener
Brumbaugh	Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.
Bryson	Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Nebr.
Buck	Hagen	Mills
Bulwinkle	Hale	Mundt
Burch	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murphy
Burgin	Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Tenn.
Butler	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hancock	O'Brien, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hare	O'Brien, Mich.
Camp	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Canfield	Harris	O'Neal
Cannon, Fla.	Hart	O'Toole
Cannon, Mo.	Hartley	Outland
Carnahan	Havenner	Pace
Case, N. J.	Hays	Patman
Case, S. Dak.	Healy	Patrick
Chapman	Hébert	Patterson
Chelf	Hedrick	Peterson, Fla.
Chenoweth	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Chiperfield	Hendricks	Philbin
Church	Henry	Phillips
Clason	Herter	Pickett
Cochran	Hesselton	Pittenger
Coffee	Hess	Plumley
Cole, Kans.	Hill	Poage
Cole, Mo.	Hinshaw	Price, Fla.
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Price, Ill.
Colmer	Hoch	Priest
Combs	Hoeven	Quinn, N. Y.
Cooley	Holmes, Mass.	Rabaut
Cooper	Holmes, Wash.	Rabin
Corbett	Hook	Rains
Courtney	Horan	Ramey
Cox	Howell	Ramspeck
Crawford	Huber	Randolph
Crosser	Hull	Rankin
Curtis	Izac	Rayfiel
D'Alesandro	Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.
Daughton, Va.	Jennings	Reed, Ill.
Davis	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
De Lacy	Johnson, Calif.	Resa
Delaney, James J.	Johnson, Ill.	Richards
Delaney, John J.	Johnson, Ind.	Riley
D'Ewart	Johnson, Luther A.	Rivers
Dirksen	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Dolliver	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson, Va.
Domengeaux	Jonkman	Robinson, Utah
Dondero	Judd	Rockwell
Doughton, N. C.	Kean	Rodgers, Pa.
Douglas, Calif.	Kearney	Rogers, Fla.
Douglas, Ill.	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Doyle	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, N. Y.
Durham	Kelly, Ill.	Rooney
Earthman	Keogh	Rowan
Eaton	Kilday	Ryter
Elliott	Kinzer	Sadowski
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Sasscer
Elsaesser	Knutson	Savage
Elston	Kopplemann	Schwabe, Mo.
Engel, Mich.	Kunkel	Schwabe, Okla.
Engle, Calif.	LaFollette	Scrivner
Ervin	Lane	Shafer
Fallon	Lanham	Sharp
Feighan		Sheppard
		Sheridan
Simpson, Ill.	Talbot	Weaver
Slaughter	Talle	Weichel
Smith, Maine	Tarver	Welch
Smith, Va.	Taylor	West
Smith, Wis.	Thom	Whitten
Somers, N. Y.	Thomas, N. J.	Whittington
Sparkman	Thomas, Tex.	Wickersham
Spence	Tibbott	Wigglesworth
Springer	Tolan	Wilson
Starkey	Torrens	Winstead
Stefan	Towe	Wolverton, N. J.
Stevenson	Traynor	Wood
Stewart	Trimble	Woodhouse
Stigler	Voorhis, Calif.	Woodrum, Va.
Sullivan	Vorys, Ohio	Worley
Sumners, Tex.	Vursell	Zimmerman
Sundstrom	Walter	
Taber	Wasielewski	

NAYS—17

Arnold	Gibson	Rizley
Bishop	Hoffman	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Jones	Sumner, Ill.
Cravens	Mason	White
Dworshak	Norrell	Woodruff, Mich.
Ellis	Reed, N. Y.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Hara

NOT VOTING—73

Andersen, H. Carl	Flannagan	Murdock
Andrews, N. Y.	Gearhart	Neely
Barrett, Pa.	Gerlach	Norton
Barry	Gillespie	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Ky.	Gillie	Ploeser
Beall	Granahan	Powell
Bender	Hand	Rich
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Robsion, Ky.
Brehm	Holifield	Roe, Md.
Buckley	Hope	Roe, N. Y.
Buffett	Jackson	Russell
Bunker	Jarman	Sabath
Campbell	Keefe	Short
Carlson	Kefauver	Sikes
Celler	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Clark	Kilburn	Snyder
Clements	King	Stockman
Cunningham	Landis	Thomason
Curley	McKenzie	Vinson
Dawson	May	Wadsworth
Dickstein	Merrow	Weiss
Dingell	Monroney	Winter
Drewry	Morgan	Wolcott
Eberharter	Morrison	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Mott	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Stockman against.

Mr. Beall for, with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Rich against.

Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Clements with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Kilburn.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Anderson of Minnesota.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Short.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Gillie.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Buffett.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Neely with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Thomason with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Monroney with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mott.

Mr. King with Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. WHITE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BREHM, who is absent because of illness. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "aye." I voted "no." I withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to universal military training; and

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document 359, entitled "Address of the President of the United States before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, presenting his recommendations with respect to universal military training."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 694) entitled "An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic," disagreed to by the House; agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4309) entitled "An act to reduce taxation, and for other purposes."

FEDERAL AID AIRPORT ACT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. LEA, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr.

BOREN, Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, and Mr. HALLECK.

RETURNING MONEY TO THE TREASURY OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1281) to provide for covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is no objection as far as I know, but I trust the gentleman will give the House a brief explanation of the bill so that the membership may be informed.

Mr. WEST. I will be glad to do so, Mr. Speaker.

When we passed the Philippine Independence Act, there was a provision in the act that the United States Government should collect certain imports and taxes and place them to the credit of the Philippine Government, in the United States Treasury, to be paid over to the Philippine Government on July 4, 1946, to be used for special purposes. That was carried out. We collected the taxes. Some of the money is in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. It is money that belongs to the Philippine government, and they need it very badly now?

Mr. WEST. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. It is badly needed in the emergency, and they need it now?

Mr. WEST. Yes; because they have not been able to collect taxes for 3 years. When Japan invaded the Philippines they destroyed what money they had on hand that they could not get out of the country.

Mr. STEFAN. And it is their own money?

Mr. WEST. It is their own money.

In the passage of the Independence Act we applied it to special purposes, but this act permits the Treasury to pay this money over to the Philippine Government to be used for general purposes.

Mr. KNUTSON. At this time?

Mr. WEST. At this time, rather than on July 4, 1946.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to the Resident Commissioner.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, we will be very grateful to this House if we can have this money right away. It belongs to us. It was impounded. It is the sugar excise tax and the coconut oil excise tax given us by law payable on July 4, 1946, as was explained by the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

As you know, our country has been devastated by a barbaric enemy. We have not been able to collect taxes for more than 3 years and our Government needs this money. It will therefore be of real help to our Commonwealth Government if we can have this money right now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the proceeds of the excise taxes imposed by section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code, and of the import taxes imposed by sections 2490 and 2491 of the Internal Revenue Code, heretofore or hereafter collected, which but for the enactment of this Act would have been required to be held in separate or special funds and paid into the Treasury of the Philippines, together with any moneys which but for the enactment of this act would be authorized to be appropriated in accordance with section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, including the unexpended balance of the amount subsequently appropriated under Public Law 371, Seventy-seventh Congress, and any accruals of any of the foregoing, shall be immediately paid into the general funds of the Treasury of the Philippines, to be used for the benefit of the people and government of the Philippine Islands as they may by law provide.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 5

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I ask my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader, as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday both the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendars will be called.

There is no further business for the rest of the week. It is hoped that on Monday unanimous consent can be obtained to adjourn to the following Thursday, and from the following Thursday to the following Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is due to many elections that will take place that week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Partly; but I believe it only fair for me to state that even if there were no elections next Tuesday the House has caught up with its legislative business, with all its rules, and there would be nothing for next week anyway.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the probability of there being legislation on Armistice Day, the following Monday? It is supposed to be a legal holiday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not assign legislation for that day, and I will agree now that there will be no legislation assigned for Armistice Day, but after that we shall have to start legislating when bills come out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not complaining, because the House has been very cooperative, but if we are to succeed in getting away for any kind of reasonable Christmas recess we must pass the full employment bill——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We do not care whether we have a recess or not, we would just as soon stay here and do what is needed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Also the unemployment compensation bill from the Ways and Means Committee. After we dispose of them we can get away for a good recess.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remark in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on a bill he introduced today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a GI Joe.

GENERAL PATTON

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 I called to the attention of this House an article in the Washington Times-Herald and the New York Daily News relating to General Patton's removal from command of the United States Occupation Army in Bavaria.

I described this article, written by John O'Donnell, as vicious, as defamatory, and as grossly inaccurate.

Eight days later, on October 19, that same writer publicly admitted that "after careful investigation" he had found his statements "were untrue." He retracted and apologized for his assertions that General Patton's transfer was due to pressure of influential Jews and that the soldier in the slapping incident in a Sicily hospital was Jewish, but he made no specific retraction of remarks he had attributed to Patton in the original column.

I said on October 11:

The blackest reflection cast upon the character and the good name of General Patton is the insinuation that he is anti-Semitic.

John O'Donnell carefully avoided any further reference to this phase of his now-discredited story, but I would like to offer for the information of the House and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of correspondence between General Patton and Mr. Joseph Wilner, a resident of Washington, D. C., completely refuting O'Donnell's implications:

[Cablegram]

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
October 11, 1945.

Gen. GEORGE S. PATTON, Jr.,
ASN O-2605, Commander Fifteenth Army, APO No. 408, New York, N. Y.:

As bereaved father of two sons lost in service, one Capt. John Wilner of your command, I am deeply distressed at injustice being

done your reputation by columnist John O'Donnell of Patterson newspapers. Article attributes to you certain remarks derogatory of Jewish servicemen at time of Sicily hospital incident and falsely asserts soldier involved, Charles Herman Kuhl, was Jewish. Whole implication of article is that you are guilty of sentiments contrary to the fair-mindedness which my son's correspondence described. Would appreciate assurance of misrepresentation your attitude by aforementioned newspapers.

JOSEPH WILNER.

LETTER OF REPLY

HEADQUARTERS, FIFTEENTH
UNITED STATES ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
APO 408, October 15, 1945.

Mr. JOSEPH WILNER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILNER: Replying to your Western Union telegram I am glad to have the opportunity of categorically denying that I have ever made any statement contrary to the Jewish or any other religious faith. I am a sincere believer in the Supreme Being and have never interfered with or even examined the religious or racial antecedents of the men I have the honor to command. My sole effort has been to provide victorious soldiers who can serve their country and defeat the enemy with the minimum loss to themselves.

With appreciation of, and thanks for, your interest, I am

Yours truly,

GEORGE S. PATTON, Jr.

It is all very well for a writer to lightly dismiss lies spread before a million and a quarter readers but I, for one, cannot agree that this closes the incident.

In a nation where freedom of the press is something to be dearly cherished and safeguarded, serious considerations of responsibility of a newspaper to its readers and of ethics of the journalistic profession enter into a matter such at this—where that freedom is abused.

These considerations give rise to a number of pertinent questions:

First. If his "careful investigation"—after publication—disclosed his statements to be untrue, why was not such investigation made before publication?

Second. If General Patton's denial of the statements attributed to him by O'Donnell were so readily ascertainable by a private citizen by directly communicating with the general why, in the interest of accurate reporting—and particularly because of his professed concern for General Patton's position—did O'Donnell not attempt to make a similar check before writing his column?

Third. If Mr. O'Donnell's conclusions were based upon uninvestigated theories, assumptions, or personal prejudices—as now appears to be the case—was there not a responsibility on the part of his editors to have checked his statements?

Fourth. In view of O'Donnell's belated admission that his statements were untrue and printed without careful prior investigation, how much reliance can be placed upon the accuracy of his writings in the past—and in the future?

FORGOTTEN BOYS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I have contacted the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps hundreds of times since the end of the war with Japan, relative to discharging certain personnel who are serving in each branch. I appreciate the fact that many are being discharged every day, but there are many forgotten boys in each branch of the service who are not receiving the just awards due them, that is, their separation. Many of these have more than sufficient points to be released, many have dependent families and many desire to reenter school.

I am receiving most pathetic letters—in one instance a youngster from my home town who volunteered for service with the Marine Corps shortly after Pearl Harbor, has spent the entire time in the Pacific, except 8 months, participating in every major invasion made by the marines, was wounded two or three times and today has over 100 points, yet, he has been sent to Japan with the army of occupation. This youngster is the only child of a widowed mother who needs him, yet, he is still retained even though he has more than the necessary points for a discharge.

I read a letter yesterday from a boy on Okinawa telling of the untold hardships they are enduring since the typhoon, which struck with such violent force when practically 100 of our vessels, large and small, were damaged and strewn over the beach. The quarters of almost all the forces on the island were blown away and they have only been able to get some Army C and K rations; how the Seabees have been ordered to utilize available lumber and other materials for the construction of officers' clubs, some of which will cost over $25,000, yet they will only be utilized for 60 or 90 days, while the enlisted men are sleeping out from under shelter. I have had numerous letters from parents and from the boys themselves stating the conditions under which they are living since the destruction by this typhoon.

Mr. Speaker, may I give you some excerpts from one letter:

This letter is more or less what I would call an exposition dealing with the typhoon that we had just a few days ago. I may be wrong in my assumptions, but I have good reason to believe that you all, and the United States public as a whole, are not being told the full truth or even partial truth in regard to these typhoons. By listening to the newscast from the United States and from what other people have written to their boys, sweethearts, and so forth, out here, we (the crew) have arrived at the conclusion that the United States Government is, in relation to this, entirely wrong.

In short, what happened here during the last typhoon might well be considered a major catastrophe. Had the war still been going on it would have been equal to a staggering naval defeat. As it is, however, it is just a very horrible naval disaster and nothing is said about it.

To begin with, 900 men lost their lives. Most of them were drowned. Six hundred were seriously injured—of this 600, one-third were amputation cases, and this list is not complete.

The following information was revealed to me by a person in a very reliable position. Five ships were sunk, 67 were aground, 3 were capsized, 4 are lost, 7 missing, and 10 damaged heavily. One of this 10 was cut in half. There you have it—around 100 ships either lost or damaged beyond repair. Our repairs due to the damage we suffered from being rammed on September 16 (in another typhoon) cost $20,000 just for our one ship.

As to what should be done, I cannot advise, unless the Navy abandons this place. Big ships like ours and others can put out to sea, but these small ships, floating hotels, and drydocks cannot. They must try to withstand the fury of these monstrous storms—and very few of them can do it.

Also, for your information, there is very little of anything going on here in the way of repair work or anything else. In fact, we go to division school, a futile waste of time, just to take up time.

At this very moment there is another typhoon raging north of here a few hundred miles. Whether we will have to go out to sea again I cannot say.

I am not trying to excite you or scare you, but I do want you to know what is really happening out here. I cannot understand why the United States Government will subject its ships to such danger and loss, time and time again, for seemingly no reason at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the leadership of our forces on Okinawa had practically 2 days' notice of the approach of this typhoon, and yet they took no precaution whatever. Another "Pearl Harbor" which could have been avoided if the commanders had been on the alert.

My further information is that our ships in many instances are being utilized to transfer Jap prisoners back home when our youngsters are deprived of means of transportation home to their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, there are literally thousands of men in the service who are above 35 years of age, with families—wives and children—who need them, who should be released; men who were engaged in a profession or business which they closed and volunteered for service in defense of our country and now they are kept at far-away stations with very little hopes of being released until they acquire a certain number of points, which is an arbitrary method of giving discharges—discharges should be given on the merits of each. I know of one attorney who is now stationed in a far-away place, 40 years of age, with nearly 3 years' service, doing nothing but whittling away time; yet he is informed he cannot be released until next April. This man has a family who needs him and why keep men in service under these conditions?

There are many teen-agers who were drafted or volunteered before they were 18 years of age, from behind the school desks, who are most anxious to return to school and continue their course of studies. And, now on account of their long service, they are reaching an age that it behooves them to reenter school and push their courses of study and they should be discharged.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the Army and all other branches of our service should, if they expect to give discharges on the point basis, do justice to others by having a survey made by each commanding officer of his group and

weed out those worthy cases and send them home. If the chiefs of our armed forces do not do this, then the Congress should take the initiative and pass legislation forcing them to.

NATION'S HOUSING PROBLEM GROWS WORSE DAILY—DALLAS MAYOR TELEGRAPHS THAT 2,000 SERVICEMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES IN DALLAS ARE WITHOUT ADEQUATE SHELTER—DEMANDS TEMPORARY HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a telegram received from the mayor of Dallas, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past month I have been voicing the warning that our national housing problem was growing steadily worse, and that immediate action by the administration was necessary if hundreds of thousands of our returning servicemen were to be sheltered this winter.

Washington representatives of the speculative real estate interests brushed aside that warning, and assured us the industry could build all the houses needed.

Today the crisis I predicted has arrived. Down in Dallas, Tex., 2,000 returning servicemen and their families are without adequate shelter. The city council met, and describing the situation as desperate, instructed Mayor Woodall Rodgers to telegraph me, pleading for temporary housing to meet the emergency.

I shall have more to say on this subject, but to insure that this plea is immediately heard, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include Mayor Rodgers' telegram to me on this subject:

DALLAS, TEX., *October 31, 1945.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Lack of housing in Dallas for returned servicemen and their families and for the wives and families of men still overseas has created an extremely critical situation. More than 2,000 returned servicemen and their families are without adequate shelter, as many as 4 families living in accommodations suitable for 1. They cannot secure or hold jobs without shelter. As more men return the situation will become progressively worse. It is already desperate. Private construction cannot remedy this situation, first, because of nonavailability of materials and, second, because the need is immediate. Temporary shelter is needed today and for the next 12 months, by which time private builders should be able to secure materials and take care of the need. The City Council of the City of Dallas unanimously adopted a resolution today instructing me to bring this situation to your attention and urgently recommend that the Congress take immediate action either in the form of new legislation or amendment to existing legislation to make it possible to provide this temporary housing. The responsibility of furnishing this emergency housing is definitely one for the Congress of the United States as a part of the war emergency. They alone have the power of legislation to furnish this remedy and thousands of returning veterans in distressing need are looking to the Congress for immediate relief. The cities are helpless under the circumstances and we urge most earnestly Congress pass legislation that will solve immediately this pressing problem. We cannot overemphasize the importance and urgency of this problem.

WOODALL RODGERS, *Mayor.*

NAVY DAY, 1945

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, Navy Day, 1945, was perhaps the most significant and certainly the most memorable in the glorious history of our Navy. In the 160 years since the establishment of the Navy by the Continental Congress Navy Day has been celebrated under varying conditions in peace and war. This year the interest in the Navy, which has been increased by the amazing feats of that service culminating in the crushing defeat of our enemies at both ends of the earth, was manifested by celebrations in many cities.

The most important and most colorful demonstration occurred in New York City beginning in the morning when President Truman attended the commissioning ceremonies of the superaircraft carrier U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Those simple ceremonies were so thrilling and impressive that I am offering a resolution to have them, together with the important speeches of the day, preserved for posterity in the form of a House document.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 5 minutes following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include quotations from the Reader's Digest and from certain newspaper articles.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain editorial comment.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Col. J. Monroe Johnson on the Bulwinkle bill.

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which he received from C. W. Aeppler, of Oconomowoc, Wis.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, one on the question of legislation concerning atomic energy and the other in relation to agricultural development in Los Angeles County.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two newspaper items from the Atlantic News Telegraph, of Atlantic, Iowa.

Mr. COCHRAN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from the Honorable Lindsay Warren.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include a letter received from President Truman.

The letter referred to follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 29, 1945.

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I am most anxious that the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments report out the full employment legislation. Such legislation is of the utmost urgency and importance to the future of our Nation.

I feel sure that the people in every State of the Union are for this kind of measure and are looking to their Congress to act.

It is already two and a half months since Japan surrendered. Reconversion of our plant to peacetime production is well along. The future is rushing toward us.

It is not enough to make a transition to temporary prosperity. We cannot repeat the mistakes made after the last war. This time we must build on a more solid foundation. We must take those steps now that will move us with firm purpose toward full employment and keep us there.

There are some who say, "Let's wait and see what happens." Such a course would be the height of recklessness. We must look ahead. If we wait for protracted mass unemployment to come upon us, we face another disaster. To no major situation has it been more applicable that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

It is time that the people be reassured by the Congress that the Government stands for full employment, full production and prosperity, not unemployment and relief.

I have talked to hundreds of workers and hundreds of our veterans. These men and women who have worked and fought to defend our American institutions expect us to take the steps necessary to translate their victory on the battlefield to peacetime jobs with security and opportunity.

Full employment legislation has the firm and complete support of my administration. The Senate has already passed such legislation and I am sure that the House will want to make its position clear to the American people at the first possible opportunity.

I do not refer to any specific bill. I refer to the general purposes and principles of full employment legislation.

If this legislation could be reported out of committee so that it could be passed by the Congress by Thanksgiving, it would give that day particular significance for millions of American families who remember only too

well the dark days of the depression, and want reassurance that we shall never again have another 1932.

Very sincerely,

HARRY TRUMAN.

PEOPLE MISINFORMED ABOUT UNRRA

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, hardly without exception, Members of the House who have taken the floor of this House have admitted that UNRRA authorities have bungled the job; that great waste, maladministration, and outright thievery have occurred and great sources of food supplies have failed to reach those who need them most. It is also frankly admitted on this floor that politics has played an important part in the handling of the program. It would seem that this is the time for this House to decide whether continued appropriations should be made from the Treasury of the United States in view of the present situation.

Government propagandists have done a most effective job with the public, which has been led to believe that all of the money we appropriate will be used to help the starving people in Europe. I daresay that no Member of this House would deny starving people the right to food, but we know, and it is admitted by the proponents of this legislation, that all of the money is not going for that purpose. We are led to believe, however, that UNRRA will do the job, but the facts belie that assumption. It is doubtful if UNRRA can ever function efficiently so that food, clothing, and other human necessities will be furnished the starving people in Europe. UNRRA would seem to express merely a program of good intentions with good American dollars which can never be recaptured for the American taxpayer.

In considering the bill now before us, we must admit that our Government, by previous action of this Congress, is committed to make the appropriation asked for, and I call attention to the fact that our taxpayers are paying seventy cents out of every dollar for this international relief program, although some 45 other nations are signatories to the UNRRA agreement.

This afternoon, we have been debating the advisability of adopting amendments in an effort to see if some semblance of order and efficiency could not be injected into the administration of these funds, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no one who has taken this floor during this debate has offered any proof that these amendments will insure efficiency and dispatch in the administration of these funds to insure that starving people will get relief. I submit further that any amendment is surplusage in view of the basic UNRRA agreement and any action we might take in that direction is solely advisory or merely expresses a legislative wish. This, of course, is ineffective in view of existing circumstances.

In view of the fact that most of the UNRRA funds are going into countries dominated by the Russians, it seems fair to conclude that much of this money will be used for political purposes and in furtherance of Russian communism. The money will be used in those countries to feed people who promise to support the cause of communism, while those who deny it will go without this help—all of which the American taxpayer deplores.

Notwithstanding just criticism of this entire program, yet in the fear that some hungry and deserving people may be denied this relief, I shall vote to support the pending bill. I will do so with great reluctance and with full knowledge that my conduct in this respect may ultimately result in considerable criticism against me.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this Congress to conduct a full-sized investigation of this entire program so that when UNRRA comes again for additional funds, this House may be fully advised as to what success, if any, we have had between now and that time. Personally, I would prefer to see this whole program of relief administered by the United States Army, by the American Red Cross, or by the Society of Friends. Any of these three agencies are free from graft, corruption and inefficiency and the American taxpayer would be assured that if the program was administered by any one of them, he would be receiving a full value for his money.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the proper point in the RECORD in reference to the bill that was just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, November 8, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENGROSSED COPY OF BILL BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive a message from the Senate on the bill H. R. 3492 and that the Speaker be authorized to sign the engrossed bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on October 10 I called to the attention of the House the cases of Philip J. Jaffe, Kate L. Mitchell, John Stewart Service, Emmanuel Siguard Larson, Andrew Roth, and Mark Gayn, charged with appropriating certain secret documents from the files of this Government. I further said that the handling of these cases bears all the earmarks of a whitewash and that such procedure is a threat to our national security. The charges were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the public press.

I want to point out to the Members of this House and especially to the Members on the Democratic side of the aisle that complacency on their part has contributed to and permitted the infiltration into important and key positions of our Government, through their administration, elements so subversive that the actual security of the Nation is at stake.

It is to my Democratic colleagues who believe in constitutional government, who are silent in public but speak in private of the attacks being made on the security of this Nation, that I address myself.

Why do you tolerate the infiltration into your party and your administration of individuals whose purpose is to destroy the form of government which we all have sworn to support?

Why have none among you demanded that this serious situation be corrected? Without your tacit consent and support, this condition could not exist.

What is it that is more important to you or any of us than the security of this Nation?

Time and time again, on the floor of this House evidence has been introduced, documental evidence, as to the character of some individuals in important policy-making positions in the Government and yet, after 13 years of New Deal administrations, the Communist influences in the Government have increased to the point where even the rank and file of the American people are becoming aware of the danger.

How long are you Members on the Democratic side of the aisle going to place what you wrongly imagine to be party loyalty above the welfare of the Nation?

Let me call your attention to some unpleasant, startling, and dangerous facts. Determined efforts to destroy the records of subversive persons and activities in various departments of our Government have been made. There have been proceedings and investigations by the Military Affairs Committee of both the House and Senate concerning the destruction of confidential records in the War Department, and the commission-

ing of Communists in the United States Army. War Department officials admitted before the House committee that persons with communistic records had been commissioned in the United States Army in sensitive and confidential positions.

Now an attempt is being made to do away with the loyalty examinations which have and should be an absolute requisite for any American seeking civil-service status. This condition has been growing and continues to grow. There are laws on the statute books which are being violated, but all attempts and all efforts to clean out the insidious individuals who are undermining our Government are defeated because of the overwhelming number of the majority party who talk about the Constitution but seemingly do nothing to uphold it in this particular.

I speak in no partisan vein, but solely as a Member of this House devoted to his country and eager to promote the general welfare and our common defense. We can indulge in politics on political questions, but when the security of our homes is at stake let us rise above partisanship. The national interest is not a partisan question. Let us join hands and weed out the individuals who have infiltrated into our Government.

Every American should be on the alert and warned by the strategy employed recently by Communists to bring about revolution and the overthrow of our system of freedom and self-government. We seek permanent peace in the world, but we have none at home. Communist-led strikes flourish in key industries and multiply from coast to coast within our fair land.

A longshoreman's strike in England at the same time that a similar strike is in progress here in the United States indicates a well-organized and coordinated plan to gain control of essential transportation and achieve the objective of communism; namely, world revolution. This was no mere coincidence.

There can no longer be any doubt as to what is in store for us as a free people, when one reads in the press the following statement, appearing in a New York newspaper on October 16, 1945. I quote:

> No one willing to face the facts can doubt that this struggle for control is at the bottom of the present strike in New York or that communism versus American democracy is the basic issue.
>
> But communism, for many years the recipient of political favor—and favors—from those whose sworn duty it should be to fight it with all their strength, is resurgent, openly out again to destroy our form of government.
>
> And there is nowhere in our national political life any public man with guts enough and patriotism enough, apparently, to cut the issue clear and stand up in the defense of America against this imported, invading philosophy of defeat, frustration, degradation, and slavery.

The last paragraph presents a challenge to Republicans and Democrats alike, and to every American to rise in defense of his home and country. It is a challenge that calls for action. Let us meet it as freemen with freedom's might.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

STRIKES, PRICES, AND WAGES

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, in his notable wage-price address, President Truman made three important contributions toward the solution of the country's labor-management difficulties. First, the President reduced to clear and simple language the inescapable relation of a decent wage structure to the country's general prosperity.

> What happens to wages is important * * * to business, for example—

The President said—

> not only because wages represent an essential item in the cost of producing goods, but because people cannot buy the products of industry unless they earn enough wages generally.
>
> What happens to wages is also important to the farmer. The income he earns depends a great deal on the wages and purchasing power of the workers in our factories and shops and stores. They are the customers of the farmer and cannot buy farm products unless they earn enough wages.
>
> The fact is that all of us are deeply concerned with wages, because all of us are concerned with the well-being of all parts of the economic system. That is a simple truth. But like all simple truths, it is too often forgotten.

Second, the President announced an important change in Government policy, one that will encourage businessmen to grant wage increases, knowing that they will receive full consideration later if they find they must ask for price increases, even though their wage increases were not approved at the time given.

And third, President Truman unhesitatingly threw the full weight of his administration behind labor's demands for justified wage increases. He reinforced labor's claim that industry can and should pay increases out of its staggering profits.

Because we hear a great deal on this floor about strikes and will shortly be called upon by the House Military Affairs Committee and the Judiciary Committee, and perhaps a few other committees yet unheard from, to pass repressive labor legislation, President Truman's remarks are most timely. They begin to direct our attention down under the surface to where the real trouble lies.

I want to lay before this body some of the stubborn facts underlying current labor disputes. I want to expose to the light of day some of the disruptive influences that are at work, for selfish ends, provoking trouble.

Just what is the wage picture in our great manufacturing industries today?

I have here the economic study prepared for the Advisory Board to the Office of War Mobilization. It is the study which President Truman had before him as he prepared his wage-price address of last Tuesday.

From its carefully documented pages emerge these challenging findings:

First. The gross weekly pay of the average worker in manufacturing has increased from $26.64 in January 1941 to $47.12 in April 1945, a gross rise of 77 percent.

Second. The cost of living has risen at least 32 percent during that same period, and millions who never paid income taxes before have been hit by war taxes. Allowing for price and tax increases, the average worker's take-home pay in 1941 dollars rose from $26.47 to $31.47, which is only 18 percent net gain from the 77 percent dollar rise.

And this does not tell the whole story, either.

Let us examine the make-up of that high, wartime wage of $47.12 per week, that luxurious wage of $47 a week we hear about being so too, too much for a plain worker and his family. On paper that wage looks like a gain of $20.43 a week over January 1941. Of this increase, however, $4.05 came from working longer hours; $3.33 came from overtime rates after 40 hours; $2.07 came from workers shifting from lower paid to higher paid industries, war industries; $4.32 came from increased hourly rates; and $6.71 came from incentive and merit payments, upgrading, reclassification of work, and shift premiums.

Assuming that the higher hourly rates will not be materially cut and that perhaps half the increases from liberal classification can be retained by the worker, the gross weekly pay of the average manufacturing worker in 1946 will fall to $33.96 a week, if he works at all. This is a 28 percent cut below his April 1945 pay check.

And that workers' money wage of $33.96 will buy 4.7 percent less in 1946 than his average 1941 wage of $26.64. The actual worth of $33.96, the handsome weekly pay of a manufacturing worker in the world's richest country, taking off his taxes—presuming him to have one dependent—is 10 percent below what he earned in January 1941.

Mr. Speaker, what are workers and their families supposed to do in this situation? Stand still and take it?

Are the men and women of labor, whose prodigious efforts and patriotic working record supplied the arms, made the atom bomb possible, delivered the food and weapons where they were needed when they were needed—are the men and women whom we were praising yesterday as the heroes of the home front, as our production soldiers—are the fathers and mothers and older brothers and sisters of our fighting men supposed now to thank their country for rewarding 8,000,000 with the prospect of certain unemployment and those who remain at work with an actual wage 10 percent lower than they earned for the same work in 1941?

What will happen to the serviceman who comes back to his job? When we get them out of the Army and Navy, as we daily exhort the services to make haste in doing, where will our fighting men stand, economically?

This is the shocking situation that a worker who left his bench in 1941 to join the United States Navy will find himself in when he goes back to that same bench.

He left a wife and two children at home when he enlisted. Uncle Sam has been sending his wife and children a check for $100 each month. The father himself has been drawing $38 each month and, in addition, his housing and food, figured by the Navy at $67.50 each month, although no civilian could buy it for that. His clothing allowance is $4 monthly and his medical care $2.

Our Navy friend is therefore receiving, altogether, the equivalent of $48.80 a week in real wages.

Today he goes back home honorably discharged. He takes life easy for a little while, and then goes out to get his old job back. He works at the same bench and he does the same work he did in 1941, but his take-home pay, after taxes and adjusted for a 32 percent price increase, is worth nearly 5 percent less. In 1941 dollars, and that is the only way we have of measuring gains or losses in real wages and living standards—in 1941 dollars he is getting only $25.40 a week. Why, when he was in the Navy, Uncle Sam sent his family $100 a month.

The difference is that now he is honorably discharged. Now he is back from fighting for his country. Now he is a plain worker again. Now he has to live and feed himself and his family on a factory wage that is worth only a few dollars more a month than the Government allowance that formerly went to his dependents.

The returned serviceman with no dependents is in an even worse position. His 1946 earnings back on his old factory job will be 15.6 percent less in buying power than his 1941 earnings.

And Members of Congress profess amazement and indignation that labor should be standing with its back to the wall, fighting with every weapon at its command to protect millions of American families against economic degradation.

Why most of us in Congress, especially if we have families, find increased living costs and extra expenses making it difficult enough to get along on $10,000 a year, even with the additional $2,500 expense allowance. How do labor's enemies here expect a worker's family to make it on a real wage of $25.40 a week?

And the older worker who stayed at home is no better off than the serviceman. His weekly wage averaged $26.64 when the war began. It shot up to the fabulous figure of $47.12 in April of this year.

There it was, that fabulous, that glittering wartime income of the man who produced such unheard of quantities of weapons just while he was loafing on the job—there it was, $47.12 a week, worth only $31.47 after deducting taxes and figuring increased prices.

And now that income, if the worker has a job at all, like his brother's income who just came out of the Navy, is down to $25.40.

But, of course, the war worker has savings, great savings. Are not the banks bulging with the people's wartime savings? Do not the American people hold millions in war bonds?

The average war worker's family has less than $600 in savings.

Where do the manufacturers think they are going to sell their refrigerators, radios, and cars? Who is going to buy them? They cannot sell to the huge new crop of war millionaires alone.

And what unemployed family is going to put its $600 savings into a new car when it does not know where its rent and bread are coming from?

How long will that $600 even exist to provide the famous backlog of purchasing power we hear about unless this Congress passes the emergency Unemployment Compensation Act, which President Truman has so long and so vainly asked our balky Ways and Means Committee to pass out for a vote?

Are unemployment and low wages the rewards this Congress wants to give the American people for playing so substantial a part in winning a war to rid the world of want and fear?

President Truman said "No," and the country says "No."

We will hear, of course, that industry cannot afford wage increases, that labor should work a 45-hour week, that the OPA must give way to demands for even higher prices.

But what is industry's picture?

By 1944 over-all profits, prior to taxes, for all industry had risen 213 percent over the 1936–39 level.

Motor vehicles, parts, and accessories rose 896 percent.

Aircraft rose 1,686.4 percent.

Iron and steel rose 276 percent.

Lumber and timber products rose 1,256 percent.

Even after taxes, with the heavy excess-profits tax in effect, profits rose out of all proportion to wage increases. After taxes, profits for all industry were 34.8 percent higher than before the war.

Motor profits rose 221.3 percent.

Aircraft, 526.7 percent.

Iron and steel, 113 percent.

Lumber and timber products, 511.7 percent.

Repeal of the excess-profits tax for 1946 means another $2,700,000,000 profit for industry. Why, just in anticipation of the repeal of that tax, the market value of securities listed on the New York stock exchange has risen 10 percent.

The fact is that as of March 31, 1945, American corporations had $46,900,000,000 of liquid capital. $25,900,000,000 more than in 1939.

The fact is that between 1940 and 1945 American corporations have paid $25,900,000,000 out in dividends to their coupon clippers.

The fact is that a handful of corporations and a handful of individuals have grown unbelievably rich out of the work and the heartbreak and the blood of this war.

We cannot blame them for liking war and wanting another one. We cannot blame them for wanting to stop America's tens of millions of working and farming and fixed-salaried families from having a wage and price policy which will represent a real gain in living standards and home security.

We cannot blame this handful for looking after its own interests first, but if its policy prevails in this Congress, America will be committing economic suicide. Smaller businesses will go down with labor's decreased purchasing power. Farmers will return to the days when food rotted on the ground and in warehouses while people in cities went hungry. Mass unemployment and discontent will cause the American people to ask the most far-reaching questions of our free-enterprise system.

Is this warning couched in overcharged language?

Let us look at the actual picture in one industry with which I have some familiarity.

In the State of Washington 60,000 A. F. of L. lumber workers are on strike.

Is it a wildcat strike? Were these men forced out of their jobs by some of Westbrook Pegler's nightmare "goons"?

These men took a strike vote under the Smith-Connally Act. They deliberated and they voted to strike. They were quite cool and rational. The balloting was secret and under the supervision of a Government agency.

The men wanted $1.10 an hour, $44 a week, about $28 in 1941 dollars.

The men wanted the lumber industry to bargain collectively, in industry-wide negotiations.

Since lumber has been negotiating for 4 years on an industry-wide basis with the CIO for those of its operations which fell in that organization's jurisdiction, there is, of course, no reason why lumber could not bargain industry-wide with the A. F. of L. for its operations.

But could the lumber industry pay the munificent wage of $44 a week to its workers and their families?

Nineteen hundred and forty-four profits in the lumber industry were up 1,256 percent over the 1930–36 level, before taxes. After taxes, 1944 profits in lumber were 511.7 percent above the 1936–39 level.

Lumber prices, as anyone knows who has done any home remodeling, have increased 70 percent since 1939. Even since price control went into effect in 1941, lumber prices have risen 36.3 percent. Yet wages are up only 15 percent, all that time.

Lumber prices and profits are the highest in history. This industry can pay its workers $44 a week for their seasonal work, but it refuses to, and why?

Here is the answer out of its own mouth, Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest, for August 31, 1945, long before the strike broke out:

The facts are—

Said this industry spokesman, that—

the average producer does not care whether his men strike. Some have expressed the opinion that they are afraid that they will not. With the average manufacturer already in the high income-tax bracket he will receive very little net reward for operating the balance of this year and the moral obligation to run no longer exists.

Please weigh those words, "The obligation to run no longer exists."

Then listen to another business magazine, Business Week. It says:

Behind the large lumber strike in the Northwest, is the operators' determination to stand pat, because they earned this year just about all the present tax laws will per-

mit them to keep. Their attitude is that a show-down with labor might as well come now as later; in fact, better now than later.

Mr. Speaker, some of us may differ in our views. Some of us honestly uphold different opinions as to what causes labor disputes. But we are all reasonable men and we all know the meaning of words.

Here is a voice of business and the voice of the lumber industry telling us that the lumber industry itself wished this strike, that it, in effect, provoked the strike at this time in order to get out of paying into the United States Treasury excess-profits taxes that would otherwise help our country pay the staggering financial burden with which the war has saddled us.

Sixty thousand workers are on strike. The country desperately needs lumber. Northwest businesses are stagnating: Fruit needs boxes, fish needs crates, and the building industry is curling up with its blueprints.

All this because the obligation to operate is no longer felt by Northwest lumber barons.

The country needed lumber to win the war. It needs lumber now and the income from the rest of this year's excess-profits tax to help win the peace. But the lumber barons prefer to stop. They want to slug it out now with labor, at Uncle Sam's expense. They have gone back to their old dream of the last war, to smash union labor in the lumber industry.

They do not have to operate until next year. Men and their families can get mighty hungry in the winter months intervening—months in which lumber does not not fully operate in any year.

Mr. Speaker, the lumber barons of the Northwest are on a sit-down strike against the United States Government. They are blocking our country's plans for peacetime construction. They not only have provoked a strike to break and discredit labor. By recognizing no obligation to operate, they are forcing other business in that area into a period of stagnation and are depriving 35,000 additional workers and returned servicemen of jobs they might otherwise have had filling orders for basic lumber and timber products.

Our Northwest war plants are closed down. Tens of thousands are out of work with servicemen being daily welcomed home. Yet the lumber industry in that area, so supremely arrogant that it recognizes no obligation to help solve these pressing regional and national problems, is deliberately refusing to operate.

It has placed the blame on labor but that false cry will receive no credit among informed and thinking men. I hope that America's big industries will not all follow the disruptive example set by lumber.

Industry can afford to pay as much as a 24-percent wage increase and that without raising prices. While the exact percentage possible may vary from industry to industry, a 14-percent wage increase would still allow manufacturing concerns an estimated profit in 1946 of $6,300,000,000. That is almost three times what industry's profits were in 3 years just before the war.

A wage increase of 24 percent would allow those same corporations an estimated profit next year, after taxes, of $4,800,000,000, more than twice as high as the prewar average and almost as high as industry's 1942 profit of $4,900,000,000.

By getting at the roots of America's labor troubles, this Congress can help solve them.

First, we can lead the way to a national goal of higher wages and higher purchasing power by immediately enacting legislation to grant the same take-home pay to all Government employees for the 40-hour week as they received for 48 hours during wartime. My own bill (H. R. 4308) would do just this for civilian employees of the Navy. Such action, applied to all Federal employees, would set the pace under the President's program for this Nation.

Second, we must bring to this floor for a vote the reconversion measures which President Truman laid before us as long ago as September 6, including unemployment compensation, the 65-cent minimum wage measure, full employment legislation and public works and public assistance acts. In this category must be placed the great developments of the Missouri and Columbia Rivers, a sound national housing act and other legislation to provide employment for the 8,000,000 persons we now know will be out of work next year.

Thirdly, let us have an end to the stampede, led by the National Association of Manufacturers, for antilabor measures such as the amendments to the Smith-Connally Act proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. Such restrictive measures have always created more turmoil and strikes and revolts than they have ever prevented. We cannot raise people's living standards by trampling on their rights.

With such a program, Mr. Speaker, this Congress can set this Nation upon the pathway to industrial production, prosperity, and employment.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. HOOK. Is it not a fact because of the protection they have of 2 years' profits under the tax bill that might be one of the incentives for wanting to close down?

Mr. DE LACY. Exactly.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. HOOK. Do you not think that this group is very well protected in unemployment compensation under the tax bill while the laborers of this Nation are being deprived of unemployment compensation through this trying period?

Mr. DE LACY. I do. The fact is the industry can afford to pay as much as 24 percent wage increase without raising prices at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AID TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include the report of our committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to present to the House of Representatives on behalf of its Committee on Labor Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped a preliminary report and recommendations on problems of amputees. I wish to thank the members of this subcommittee for their assistance in this investigation, and for their concurrence in this report.

The members of the subcommittee are: The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the gentleman from California [Mr. PATTERSON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN], and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ADAMS]. It is my privilege to be chairman of this subcommittee.

We submit to the House that:

When our men went to fight the Second World War they were provided with weapons and tools which were the result of scientific and engineering arts of the most advanced kind. They learned to fly great planes by means of sensitive and almost human instruments. They used radar. And, finally, the atom bomb. In using these weapons, 17,000 of them lost arms or legs, or both.

Only through talking with these men, as members of this subcommittee have done, is it possible to realize their disappointment upon returning to this country and being supplied with artificial arms and legs which have hardly been improved in the last 50 years. These veterans feel that proper concern for their welfare is not being demonstrated by the Government they have been serving.

The Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped of the House Committee on Labor undertook to study the problems of amputees. In doing so, the committee called witnesses who were amputees, both veteran and civilian. Other witnesses were men responsible for the care of amputees in the Army, Navy, Veterans' Administration, and Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Witnesses came from labor, from limb manufacturers, from veterans' organizations, and from groups working on the development of better appliances. Other amputees have contributed their experiences by mail.

The problem of satisfactory artificial legs and arms is such an urgent one that we feel impelled to submit a report based upon our hearings on the subject, without waiting to complete the other subjects being considered in our more general study of aid to the physically handicapped.

The return of our war amputees has made the need for devices more tense

and dramatic. The situation, however, has been unsatisfactory for a long time.

We have observed shocking examples, and have been told by soldiers and veterans of unsatisfactory appliances and methods of supplying and fitting appliances. One of the explanations may be found in the fact that the Army amputation centers, serving 14,400 amputation cases, have been staffed by 339 persons, of whom only 25 had had previous experience in the mechanics and fitting of artificial limbs.

Testimony given the subcommittee indicates that a skilled limb mechanic needs apprentice training for 3 or 4 or 5 years, depending upon his aptitude. To become an expert fitter, he needs 3 or 4 years more of experience.

We are told that limb mechanics and fitters were drafted and placed in other work, and in fighting units, though it was apparent that there would be a shortage of persons skilled in this work. One of the larger manufacturers reports losing 50 percent of his staff in this manner.

The subcommittee has requested that all men skilled and experienced in this work be located and returned from military duty to limb shops at once.

The attitude of the Federal Government, as expressed through the Veterans' Administration, toward men who have lost arms and legs in this war seems to have been in the main a negative one—a concern to see that neither the veteran nor the Government is defrauded monetarily by limb manufacturers.

The nature of a prosthetic appliance and the fitting process is such that the appliance can have no possible value to any person other than the amputee for whom it is made. There is the further consideration that fittings are troublesome and time-consuming, and the breaking in of a new limb is so painful that requests for unneeded legs are not apt to arise frequently.

To set severe limitations of time or price is to condemn the veteran who is badly fitted to needless and inexcusable pain and inconvenience. Only 140 of the more than 300 limb manufacturers are under contract with the Veterans' Administration. The veteran, in some instances, has reported finding what he wanted in a shop not having a contract with the Veterans' Administration, and purchasing from such a shop at his own expense. We believe that this is undesirable, and that any limb a veteran wants sufficiently to pay for with his own funds should be provided him free of charge by the Veterans' Administration. We believe that setting a limit upon the number of limbs a man may purchase in a given period of time creates a hardship upon the veteran who is the victim of unsatisfactory fitting, and that demonstrated dissatisfaction should warrant the purchase of a new device. Not only do we recommend that in the case of an ill-fitting device should the veteran have access to a new device, but that improvements which will inevitably be the result of research should be made available to him without charge as soon as they are discovered.

The nature of the service and the appliance is of such importance to the veteran that he should be dealt with patiently and generously until he is satisfied. He cannot do his work if his leg is bothering him. He cannot patiently accept pain when he is aware that limbs can be satisfactorily fitted for other veterans. Each amputation presents an individual problem in fitting, and it should be considered that the obligation is not met until comfort and utility of the prosthesis are secured for the amputee.

We believe that the veteran's satisfaction should be the only objective of the Veterans' Administration, and that limbs should be provided freely, and from whatever source the veteran may select, and of whatever quality and refinement he may desire, regardless of cost.

Veterans who have returned to work cannot be expected to spend the time now required to secure necessary repairs. Although it is difficult to imagine a fraudulent request to the Veterans' Administration for crutches, or a request not prompted by need, we were told of one veteran's being kept waiting for 2½ months before his request was granted. We have been told, among other examples which may be found in the transcript of the hearings, that a veteran in the city of Washington, needing an artificial hand repaired, must go to three separate places to secure the service. One veteran, after going through this procedure a few times, now wears his hand with the strap governing its manipulation broken because he feels he cannot take the time from his school work to have the repair made.

For veterans living in more isolated places, and more dependent upon the proper functioning of their appliances, this is an even greater difficulty. One young man tells us of having to drive 30 or 40 miles each time his arm needs repair to reach an artificial limb maker who has a contract for such repair work with the Veterans' Administration. Some of these repairs are simple mechanical repairs which could be made by a local machinist or blacksmith or shoemaker.

Veterans should be informed of the places nearest their homes where repairs may be readily secured. Repairs should be quickly available throughout the Nation, and the Veterans' Administration should take steps to provide the services in areas not now offering adequate repair service by other agencies.

A repair bill should be honored upon its presentation and certification in the name of an amputee. It represents a service of such unique character as to permit of the minimum of fraud, and presents a risk so small that the Veterans' Administration should assume it without hesitation.

The procedure for securing repairs to limbs must be greatly simplified for the veteran.

Anyone who likes may open an artificial limb shop at his own pleasure. He is not required to qualify in any manner whatever to enter upon the conduct of such a business. This is particularly shocking when it is considered that one cannot become the operator of a beauty shop or a barber shop without first proving to a board of examiners that one can meet some standard of proficiency. The Federal Trade Commission may deal with some of the problems of the industry by calling an Industry Conference and setting up a trade practice code for the limb manufacturers. The Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped, on May 16, of this year, requested that such a conference be called, and the Federal Trade Commission has recently announced a plan for holding such a conference.

To protect the customer, we urge that the Federal Trade Commission be forthwith charged with the responsibility of policing the artificial limb industry scrupulously, and that it request and be provided with any personnel and funds it may require to accomplish this end.

The subcommittee has heard testimony of veterans who lost so much time from work in attempting to secure satisfactory appliances, or in treating stumps made sore by unsatisfactory appliances, or in having their appliances out of use while being repaired, that we feel that the Veterans' Administration should find a suitable method for reimbursing these men for such loss of time. One man reported that he had finally secured a satisfactory leg—at his own expense—and estimated that it had cost him a total of $1,600 through loss of time from work and through selecting his satisfactory leg from a maker not under contract to the Veterans' Administration. Others reported that they lost so much time that they found it necessary to give up their work altogether and seek new jobs when their legs were in shape for work. This represents a problem of great seriousness to young men who are trying to establish themselves again as workingmen in spite of their handicaps.

We recommend that means be devised to reimburse veterans for time lost from work because of unsatisfactory artificial appliances.

We are inclined to feel that the new administrators of the Veterans' Administration should be extended some tolerance, since they cannot have had time to solve all of the problems which were deep-rooted in the organization when they took over its administration. It is suggested, however, that the veteran cannot be expected to wait patiently with an open stump, or a prosthetic device he cannot use, until the reforms are instituted. Some of these problems might be given a short-term solution by drawing upon the resources of the Army and Navy amputation centers, and we believe that the Veterans' Administration should give its immediate attention to developing some method for accomplishing this. If the veterans' facility in Washington, for example, cannot handle its amputation cases quickly, and satisfactorily, the veteran finds it hard to understand why he cannot return to the limb shop at Walter Reed Hospital for the service. We are aware of the legal technical difficulty of having men who are charges of the Veterans' Administration cared for by the installations of the War and Navy Departments but believe that a contract arrangement might be quickly made to cover this objection and that this should be promptly done.

With the end of hostilities, the Army and Navy may be expected within a short

period of time to have discharged all amputation cases resulting from this war. The Veterans' Administration is just beginning its responsibility in full force. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is responsible, together with the States, for the care of employable civilians. There is a large number of individual civilian amputees not falling within the responsibility of any of these agencies. There are reported to be between 30,000 and 70,000 new civilian amputees each year in this country. Total amputees for the armed forces in World War II is about 17,000.

The problem of the veteran amputee is a direct and inescapable responsibility of the Federal Government. Anything accomplished in securing better prosthetic appliances for veterans will soon be brought to the civilian amputee in the normal course of events. We can provide the veteran with the finest now available, and still not meet our obligation, for the best is poor by modern engineering and industrial standards. We can only meet our obligation by seeing that something better becomes available, and this can only be done by research and study.

The artificial-limb industry cannot be looked to for the necessary improvements. It is a small industry, and is made up largely of shops employing less than half a dozen people. The attempts of the industry to improve limbs by research have been failures. We have been told by people who have studied the matter, that there is little substantial difference in the limbs being made and furnished veterans now and those made at the close of the Civil War. There has been a small lightening of the material used, and some improvement in a hip control limb for high-above-the-knee amputations. Veterans, however, report that, even without special training in mechanics and engineering, the wearer soon finds for himself ways by which his appliance might be improved. One man testified that he had, himself, added an inch and a half to the length of his limb. Another told of having bored 2,000 holes in his limb to lighten it after having been sold the lightest limb which could be commercially supplied.

Very late, in February of this year, the first research project of any scope was set up under the National Research Council with funds provided by the Office of Scientific Research and Development. Since the war has ended, there is an urgent necessity to place this project under another agency, since the Office of Scientific Research and Development cannot provide funds and authority beyond December 31, 1945.

We believe that the Federal Government's obligation to undertake research until substantial improvement is made clear. We believe that the research should be continuing, and that development in better limbs should not be permitted ever to lag far behind industrial and engineering advances in other fields so long as the Federal Government has the responsibility of supplying appliances to any of the amputees of the Nation.

We believe that the Board for Prosthetic and Sensory Devices should be placed under the direction of one agency of the Federal Government, and that it should be supplied generously with funds. The Board should be headed by a director who can give his entire attention to the project. The Board for Prosthetic and Sensory Devices now makes use of existing industries and agencies through the placing of contracts for research. In addition to the contract procedure now in use, we believe the research project should have sufficient staff and facilities to test devices and suggestions brought to its attention by individual inventors. We believe that research on artificial limbs should be done by one board, and should not be undertaken by several agencies at once. The work should be so organized that all agencies having the necessity to deal with amputees are assured of reaping the benefit of the work, and of sharing in the doing of it to the extent of advising, counseling, and supplying the project with case material and with information which might be useful to it. But the responsibility should be placed squarely with one agency and not divided.

The research work should be continuing and well financed. Solutions to short-term problems should be sought urgently, and improvements should be made available to veterans as rapidly as possible, without waiting for the final solution to long-term problems. This is not a proper place for economy.

Whatever advancement may be made in the field of prosthetic devices is apt to come about through the development of patentable devices. We believe that any improvements made by research as a result of the Federal Government's expenditures should be free of royalty, as is now provided, on all limbs supplied the Government or any of its agencies. We further believe that they should be withheld from any manufacturer of prosthetic devices not making his patents available generally. This is an industry which should depend for business more upon careful and considerate service than upon monopoly of patentable devices. The best possible device is of no value to the amputee unless it is available to him and is properly fitted.

Several months ago the subcommittee requested the Department of Justice to investigate any antitrust violations of which the artificial limb manufacturers might be guilty. This investigation is being pursued vigorously. We believe it may be expected that any violations of the law in this field will be dealt with adequately. We recommend that the Department of Justice should continue its investigation of antitrust violations in the limb-making industry.

Because the Veterans' Administration has no tradition of successful research or scientific excellence, and because the Army and Navy will very soon be relieved of their amputation cases through discharge, we believe that the Federal Government's project of research on artificial limbs should be placed within the United States Public Health Service. The Public Health Service has a long record of fine scientific and medical work; is staffed with excellent scientific personnel; knows the technique of working with doctors and surgeons; and has learned the technique also of working with other agencies of the Federal Government. We have no fear in making this suggestion, that sound results may not be expected to be arrived at as rapidly as possible, and made available to all who need the benefit of advancements in the art of prosthesis. We believe that the Board for Prosthetic and Sensory Devices, and the work of its committees, should be transferred at once to the United States Public Health Service, and that all funds for research in the fields of prosthetic and sensory devices appropriated by the Federal Government should be centered in this one Board, and not divided among other projects of a like nature in other agencies.

We believe that the Board should be ultimately placed under the direction of whatever agency of the Federal Government is finally given responsibility for the Federal Government's general program of scientific research.

The amputee shares a number of problems common to all physically handicapped. They have to do with his employment opportunities, with the attitude of the public toward his disability, and with his rehabilitation and medical care if he is a civilian and not eligible to receive the excellent surgical and hospital care available to the amputees from the military and naval services. These aspects of the subject will be dealt with in subsequent reports. For the meeting of the immediate problems, we recommend:

First. That all men skilled and experienced in the work of making and fitting artificial limbs be located and returned from military duty to limb shops at once.

Second. That the veteran's satisfaction should be the only objective of the Veterans' Administration, and that limbs should be provided freely, and from whatever source the veteran may select, and of whatever quality and refinement he may desire, regardless of cost.

Third. The procedure for securing repairs to limbs must be greatly simplified for the veteran.

Fourth. That the Federal Trade Commission be forthwith charged with the responsibility of policing the artificial-limb industry scrupulously, and that it request and be provided any personnel and funds it may require to accomplish this end.

Fifth. That means be devised to reimburse veterans for time lost from work because of unsatisfactory artificial appliances.

Sixth. That the legal technicality of having men who are charges of the Veterans' Administration cared for by the installations of the War and Navy Departments be overcome by a contract arrangement, and that this be promptly done.

Seventh. That the Federal Government's obligation to undertake research until substantial improvement in prosthetic devices is made is clear; that the research should be continuing, and that the development of better limbs should not be permitted ever to lag far behind industrial and engineering advances in other fields so long as the Federal Government has the responsibility of supplying appliances to any of the amputees of the Nation.

Eighth. That any improvements made by research as a result of the Federal Government's expenditures should be free from royalty, as is now provided, on all limbs supplied the Government or any of its agencies; that they should be withheld from any manufacturer of prosthetic devices not making his patents available generally.

Ninth. That the Department of Justice should continue its investigations of antitrust violations in the limb-making industry.

Tenth. That the Federal Government's project of research on artificial limbs should be placed within the United States Public Health Service.

Eleventh. That the Board for Prosthetic and Sensory Devices, and the work of its committees, should be transferred at once to the United States Public Health Service, and that all funds for research in the fields of prosthetic and sensory devices appropriated by the Federal Government should be centered in this one Board, and not divided among other projects of a like nature in other agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

BRAVE AND HEROIC GREEKS NEED HELP

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago last Sunday, on the 28th day of October 1940, that late but unlamented buffoon, Benito Mussolini, blithely embarked upon one of the greatest of his fiascos.

Without the slightest provocation of any kind, mouthing his usual boastful and bloodthirsty nonsense, this sawdust Caesar threw his armies against Greece in the confident hope that he could easily add it to his rotten Fascist empire.

It seemed so easy—almost as easy as the rape and conquest of Abyssinia and its brave but virtually unarmed warriors who had to fight tanks and planes with clubs and spears.

Greece was so small and so relatively weak—a peace-loving country of 7,000,000 people against a warlike empire 7 times its size which had been steadily mobilizing and elaborating plans of conquest and plunder for years.

It seemed so easy that Mussolini boasted that his Black Shirt legions would be tramping the streets of Athens in 2 weeks, and most of the world fearfully expected as much.

But then, a miracle happened—a miracle of human faith and courage, another heroic chapter in the struggle of peace-loving men against aggression, one more proof of the invincibility of the free human spirit even when faced with apparently hopeless odds.

At the end of 2 weeks, far from being in Athens, Mussolini's black-shirted hoodlums were frantically running for home in full retreat, dropping their loot and throwing away even their arms as they fled toward the rear, cut down and harassed on every side by those they had hoped to despoil.

Twelve picked Fascist divisions, completely equipped with every engine of modern warfare, had more than met their match in four meager Greek divisions armed with little but the flaming courage in their hearts and a profound conviction that it was better to die as free men than to live as slaves.

The modern Greeks proved themselves the true sons of the heroes of old who stood at Thermopylae, a mere handful of them, and turned back the charge of mighty Persian hordes bent on plundering the priceless treasures of ancient Greece and reducing its fair cities to ashes.

The rout of the Fascist legions at the Battle of the Pindus was as decisive as the smashing of the Persian hordes on the fields of Marathon more than 2,000 years ago, and in time will be as renowned in song and story.

Victory was won by almost incredible effort and the strategy that brought it about was brilliant.

Hopelessly outmanned and outgunned, with Mussolini's tanks swarming through the fields and his planes darkening the skies, the Greeks knew that it would be needless slaughter and sheer suicide to meet the enemy head-on and attempt to stop him in open country where he could bring all the strength of his mechanized force to bear.

So Greek troops took to the hills, abandoning the roads to advance along the mountain tops over the roughest kind of terrain, inching their way forward across the sharp and stony slopes of famed Mount Parnassus, more than 7,000 feet high. Their aim was to infiltrate behind the enemy and cut him off, and then swoop down upon him from all sides and grind him into dust.

Soon the men had only the supplies and ammunition they could carry on their backs, for mule trains could no longer follow them. Many began to suffer from hunger and cold. Hearing of this, the women in the valleys dropped their brooms, loaded themselves with food and blankets, and in a long unending procession they struggled up into the mountains at night to aid and comfort their men, often crawling forward on hands and knees.

Back and forth they went, night after night, carrying provisions and ammunition, even dragging little mountain guns up the slopes, oblivious to all dangers, forgetful of sleep and fatigue. Many of these brave women were killed, and many died of exposure and exhaustion. But they succeeded magnificently in providing the sinews of war that made victory possible.

Nothing can crush a brave people in arms when they have a good cause to fight for.

At a given signal, the Greeks swooped down from the mountains behind the enemy and took him completely by surprise. Trapped and confused, they raced headlong into machine-gun and artillery nests. Less than half of them managed to escape. When the smoke of battle cleared, almost 10,000 once swaggering Black Shirts lay dead in the valley of the Pindus, more than 3,000 were prisoners of war, and the remnants of Mussolini's army were quickly chased out of the country and pursued deep into Albanian territory.

The Battle of the Pindus, we should never forget, was one of the turning points of the war. All Americans remember the thrill of it, for it was the first Allied victory after a long series of staggering defeats for the democracies, stretching back to Munich and beyond, back to the days when Britain and America, in violation of every dictate of humanity and against our own obvious self-interest, cravenly abandoned the Spanish people to the butcheries of the Italian and Nazi allies of General Franco.

That was really the first battle of World War II, and we almost paid for our mistake with our lives.

Thank God, we never abandoned the Greek people, and never shall.

We can never forget what their heroic resistance meant to our cause, even in terms of military victory. The Battle of the Pindus threw the plans of the Axis out of gear. The Greeks so mauled the forces of Mussolini that finally the mighty German Wehrmacht had to come to the rescue, pinning down a large Nazi force that might have been used to great effect elsewhere.

The Italian failure in Greece destroyed Italian morale in the field and at home. It reduced Mussolini to the status of a snarling puppet unwillingly doing Hitler's bidding. It made it necessary for the Germans to replace or supplement Italian troops everywhere with German troops, which they did not want to spare from the western front. It made it necessary for the Germans to divert food and supplies from other fronts to maintain their armies in Greece, since the country was too poor to support them even though they commandeered everything available.

The stubborn resistance of the Greek people and their neighbors, the Jugoslavs, even after their armies had been forced to surrender, threw Nazi military operations off schedule, slowing down operations in north Africa and delaying the attack on Russia, giving the Soviet Union more time to prepare.

As a consequence, when the Nazis struck eastward, they found a much stronger Red army than they had counted on, which again threw military operations off schedule and gave America more time to prepare and mobilize its full resources as the great arsenal of democracy.

Today, with the sun shining again, we are apt to forget by what a narrow margin we managed to squeeze through.

We are apt to forget—and we never should—those dark days just 3 years ago, in the fall of 1942, when the Nazis were in the streets of Stalingrad and hammering at the gates of Cairo, and the Japanese were running wild in the Pacific, threatening to drown a whole continent in blood.

The tide of Fascist barbarism was finally stemmed and turned back at Stalingrad and El Alamein, and the margin of victory here was, in a real sense, won at the Battle of the Pindus by four small Greek divisions and the heroic women of the countryside.

The whole civilized world owes them an eternal debt of gratitude.

It is a personal debt upon every man, woman, and child, of every race, creed,

and color, in all the lands where human decency is respected, and human freedom is prized and loved.

And it is a debt that must be paid, not only in words, which is the easy way, but in deeds.

The starvation, misery, and torture endured by the Greek people from October of 1940 until the spring of 1945 must never be forgotten. The figures are too appalling to be believed. Because they never admitted that they were defeated, the Greek people were subjected to continual punishment. Greece never settled down to relatively quiet occupation, like some other countries. Greece was a battleground until the end. Deaths recorded by the Greek Government in exile read again and again, "Fallen for the fatherland—field of battle, Athens"—or Corinth, or some other city under occupation.

Guerrilla activities never ceased. Hiding out in the mountains, fed and armed and clothed by faithful friends in the villages, Greeks of every age, both men and women, kept up the fight. They waylaid ammunition trains, raided supply convoys, kidnapped officers, and generally made life miserable for the Italians and the Germans.

In the villages and cities slogans appeared on every wall, sneering at the conquerors and further dividing the Italians and the Germans. Greek holidays always found someone bold enough to hang out a Greek flag or chalk a patriotic message. Saboteurs damaged enemy defense works. Laborers, even though starving, refused food and wages to work for the Germans.

Frantic because the people refused to be licked, the Germans instituted vicious reprisals. We read with horror of the destruction of the Czech village of Lidice. But did you know that 1,339 Greek villages were destroyed, 870 of them razed completely to the ground?

Orders were given to shoot 100 Greek hostages for every German ambushed. But that did not stop the continuous attack upon small bands or single enemies wherever a Greek with a knife or a carbine could find one.

The destruction to the land and productive capacity of Greece was appalling. Three million acres of standing timber was destroyed, one-third of the entire nation's small forest reserve. Grapes for currants and wine are the staple agricultural product of Greece, both for export and home consumption. Vineyards valued at $222,744,444 were systematically uprooted, either in reprisal or to make air fields and other military installations. Olive trees, providing the staple food of the country, were cut down for firewood or otherwise destroyed, to the value of $13,000,000. Farm machinery and tools, agricultural waterworks, equipment of the wine and tobacco growers associations, motor cars and trucks, roads and canals—everything which was necessary to Greece's small and struggling agriculture was pillaged or destroyed.

The destruction of the villages, together with the taking over of dwellings for occupation forces, left over a million homeless without food, clothing or shelter. Roughly, 260,000 died of starvation and many are dying still from its delayed effects or present shortages. In all, about 415,000 died or were killed during the war.

The situation in Greece today is desperate. Because they withstood the Axis so long, and never let conquest down their fierce spirit of liberty, the Greek people are impoverished and desperate now. They cannot get on their feet without our aid. They are weak and diseased, their production is destroyed.

Their main markets and source of food supply were in southeastern Europe. For the present, this field is closed to them so that they must find food and markets elsewhere. We must come to their rescue in return for the magnificent job they did in holding the line against the enemy before we were ready.

We must—and shall—bring back new hope and life to these gallant people who sacrificed so much that we and our children might enjoy our lives in peace and plenty.

These people need food.

These people need clothes.

These people need money to nurse the sick, to rebuild schools and hospitals, to repair their shell-torn cities, to restore their shattered industries so that they can again become self-supporting and take their place in the commerce of the world.

These people, as brave as any of the fabled heroes of ancient Greece, ask little enough.

And so far as this country is concerned, I am sure they do not ask in vain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

REDUCED PAY SCALES IN THE MINING INDUSTRY—SHRINKAGE OF THE NATIONAL PAY ENVELOPE

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, American wage earners and salaried employees have suffered four very sharp reductions in their earnings since VJ-day that must be repaired.

1. SHORTENED WORKWEEK

The first big cut has been the reduction in the workweek. Since VJ-day the mines, mills, and factories have been returning to the 40-hour week, with many working less than 40 hours. Overtime payments are ceasing. This has cut wages by 23 percent. Many workers are not even getting as much as 40 hours' work a week, so that their take-home pay has dropped by as much as 50 percent.

Here is an example: John Doe got $1 an hour and worked 48 hours to earn 52 hours' of pay, or $52 a week. This was before he was cut to 40 hours a week. Now he gets only $40 a week. This is a cut of 23 percent—$12 divided by $52. To restore his earnings requires a 30-percent increase, or $1.30 an hour for 40 hours—$1 multiplied by 130 percent—to bring his earnings back to $52 a week.

2. UNEMPLOYMENT

A second big cut in the national pay envelope is the increasing idleness of hundreds of thousands. Unemployed persons do not draw wages and salaries. Two million were unemployed in the first week of September. This was a hundred percent increase over VJ-day—August 14, 1945. By the first week of October the ranks of the unemployed were well over 2,000,000. John W. Snyder, Reconversion Chief, in his fourth report—September 30, 1945—reports further that:

By next spring, with demobilization running at better than a million a month, unemployment may rise to 8,000,000.

OPA economists say it may be 10,000,000. Both may be too conservative in their estimates. What does an unemployed worker mean to the Nation? Here is an example. In June 1945 the average manufacturing worker, according to the United States Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics, received $46.35 a week. He is laid off, unable to get another job, and becomes unemployed. He goes on unemployment-compensation benefits which, for the Nation, average $16 a week. This is a reduction of $30.35 in his weekly income, or a cut of 65 percent. He cannot live on such an income nor can he provide for his family on it.

John W. Snyder reports—September 30, 1945, report, page 23—that:

By September 21, 2,008,000 different individuals had filed claims for compensation and about 1,516,000 of these were still claiming out-of-work benefits.

Two million unemployed workers have already suffered reductions approximating 65 percent in their weekly incomes, and the number of wage earners and salaried employees who will suffer such cuts within the next few months may rise to eight to ten million.

Such drastic reductions in the national pay envelope can take America into a downward deflationary spiral, unless they are repaired by substantial wage and salary increases that will assist in putting the unemployed back into gainful private employment.

3. DOWN GRADING

The third cut in the national pay envelope comes about through down grading. This is the demoting of wage earners and salaried employees to lower-pay jobs. A plant empoyed 5,000 before VJ-day, and then laid off 2,000. A reshuffling of the working force takes place and hundreds are demoted, down graded, to lower-paying jobs.

Or the plant is entirely abandoned, and all 5,000 are laid off. They have to get other jobs or go on unemployment compensation. Some get other jobs within the same industry, but, first, in lower-paying plants or, second, on lower-paying jobs. Others get lower-paying jobs in other industries that pay lower wages and salaries.

Here is an example. John Doe was making gun mounts for $1 an hour. We have seen how his $52 weekly income has shrunk 23 percent to $40 due to the return to the 40-hour week. But he is hit a second way. His job is abolished and he has to take another job that only pays 85 cents an hour. This brings his weekly earnings—85 cents multiplied by 40 hours—down to $34. How does this compare to the $52 he was making? It is a 35-percent cut.

But worse, another John Doe cannot get a job in the same plant. He has to go back to the pottery plant where he used to work before the war. The best job they have for him pays 75 cents an hour. For 40 hours this brings John Doe's weekly income down to $30—a cut of 46 percent.

But still worse, another John Doe cannot get back in the pottery. He is too old; or he hurt his back during the war. He has to go to a repair garage for a job. He helps change tires, grease cars, and so forth. All the garage pays him is 65 cents an hour, or $26 a week of 40 hours. This is a cut of 50 percent in John Doe's weekly income. He is $26 a week worse off than he was before VJ-day when he earned $52 weekly.

These reductions, forced down gradings, are going on all over America, and they are taking a big slice out of America's national pay envelope. How many billions of dollars? This is answered in a later report on the national pay envelope.

4. INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY

There is still a fourth cut taking place in the national pay envelope. More goods are being produced by fewer people. The War Production Board reveals that four workers can now produce the same amount of goods that before the war required the labor of five. During the war basic wage rates have been frozen at 15 percent above January 1941, while the amount of goods produced by each worker has risen by at least 25 percent. During the war wages have lagged behind rising productivity by 10 percentage points.

Something has to be done about these four wage cuts. Four workers can now do the work of five. One is displaced. Unless the wages of the four remaining workers are raised substantially, the one displaced worker is going to be without a job permanently. The four remaining on the job have to have enough purchasing power to buy more good that, in turn, will provide a job for the displaced worker. Or else 25 percent—one out of five—workers will not be able to find private jobs.

But more is needed. Not only must employed workers have sufficient purchasing power to keep the wheels of industry turning and to provide jobs for workers displaced by new machinery and improved efficiencies, they must also have adequate wages to provide for their families. The wage earners and salaried employees still working are doing so, as shown above, at 30 to 50 percent less money than they received before VJ-day. Such a huge shrinkage in the national pay envelope must be repaired. It must be repaired for the additional reason that today's dollar is worth 45 percent less than it was before the war.

WAGES AND SALARIES MUST BE RAISED NOW

What does this mean? Substantial increases must be made now. With a 30- to 50-percent cut in earnings due to the shortened workweek and downgrading; with over two million already on unemployment benefits at 65 percent less per week than when they were drawing wages and salaries, and with each remaining dollar of earnings and unemployment compensation benefits worth 45 percent less due to higher prices, the American wage earner and salaried employee is in a serious plight.

Let us get back to John Doe again. Take a look at the $40 weekly wage or salary that he is now getting. How much is it really worth? The cost of goods has gone up 45 percent since January 1941. So in terms of 1941 dollars this $40 a week is worth only $27.60—$40 divided by 145—a week. John Doe's purchasing power has been cut so that he is only able to buy $27.60 worth of goods in terms of 1941 prices.

For the critics who protest that living costs have only risen the 33 percent that the Presidential Committee on the Cost of Living found, here is John Doe's plight. His $40 a week is only worth ($40 divided by 133) $30. Labor says it is only worth $27.60. But whether you take the minimum 33-percent figure or labor's more realistic figure of 45 percent, the conclusion is the same. John Doe cannot keep his family healthy on a weekly income of $27.60 or $30, nor can such an income keep the American economy healthy.

Wage earners and salaried employees getting 30 to 50 percent fewer dollars that are in themselves worth 33 to 45 percent less, cannot provide for their families or buy enough goods to provide jobs for others. They need a substantial wage advance. Unless such advances are now made, America cannot have healthy workers or a healthy economy.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Has the gentleman figured out what the total wage for workers has been annually during the war? What I am trying to get at is this: If we have a 50-percent cut as the gentleman has outlined, it would show that our economy is in a crucial stage unless we do something to build it up again. I was wondering if the gentleman found out how much the total earnings for 1944 have been?

Mr. ROWAN. I do not have those figures available, but I shall be glad to send them to his office.

Mr. SAVAGE. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which provides for an immediate congressional investigation of the activities of the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of government with respect to their administration of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. Particularly I have in mind inquiring into violations of section 12 and section 14 of that act, violating civil-service rights of war veterans.

I have long been concerned about the failure of the Civil Service Commission to observe the intent of Congress as expressed in the Veterans' Preference Act. Upon numerous occasions I have called the attention of Congress and the Nation to the need for civil-service reduction in force regulations which strictly adhere to the interest and purpose of section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act, and which would adequately protect the civil-service rights of all veterans. As long ago as April of this year, I requested the chairman of the House Civil Service Committee for an investigation of this very subject. I regret that no definite action has been taken to inquire into the question as to what extent the civil-service rights of veterans were being violated.

Since then the situation has grown steadily worse. Many of my colleagues, as well as I, have received letters from every part of the United States which show bitter resentment concerning the treatment accorded war veterans in the Federal service. I personally have investigated many of these allegations and have found them to be accurate. My files are replete with proof that the Civil Service Commission and the other departments and agencies have ignored the intent of Congress with respect to the civil-service rights of veterans time and time again. It is true that upon at least one occasion the Commission has amended its reduction-in-force regulations, but after all the ballyhoo of publicity had died down I find the veteran in Government service no better off than he was under the old reduction-in-force regulations.

In spite of the evidence which is in my possession and in the files of the other Members of Congress and in the files of various veterans' organizations, the Civil Service Commission still admits it can do no wrong. To divert public opinion the Commission points with pride to the large number of veterans it is placing in the Government service each month. Fully 75 percent of these are returning servicemen and are entitled to return to their jobs pursuant to the Selective Service and Training Act, and in most cases the Commission had less than nothing to do with replacing these veterans in their old jobs.

The reduction-in-force regulations of the Civil Service Commission which are followed by the departments and agencies of the Government in eliminating Federal employees contain many loopholes which result in prejudicing the rights of veterans. A few examples will suffice to illustrate my point.

Efficiency ratings remain the guiding criteria upon which reductions in force are based, and too little weight is given length of service and veterans' preference. This procedure is grossly unfair.

By the arbitrary designation of areas of competition employees appointed for the war period may be removed beyond the effects of a reduction in force, while veterans and career service employees receive discharge notices. Reductions in force should be made on an agency-wide basis, and no exceptions should be allowed.

Last week the President by an Executive order allowed disabled veterans working for the Federal Government to secure permanent civil-service status. That helped, but just this week the Civil

Service Commission issued regulations blanketing into permanent status about 25,000 war-service appointees who had prior Government experience. This action does not help either the career-service employees or the veterans. The net effect of this action is to blanket in the spoils system which has been in effect during the war, and also to remove 25,000 jobs which should be filled by veterans from the outside. This action places veterans now in the Federal service holding war-service appointments in a disadvantageous position respecting reductions in force, because 25,000 employees have been lifted into a high category and are no longer in competition with such veterans. The justification for this action by the Commission is the more amazing in view of the fact that the President has not declared an end to the war emergency.

The charge that the departments and agencies are using reductions in force as a device to eliminate certain employees whom the departments and agencies cannot properly discharge is not without foundation. If an employee is incompetent he should be discharged, but reductions in force should not be used as a device to further the evils of a personal patronage system which is more prevalent today than it ever has been since the passage of the original Civil Service Act.

I ask that my resolution receive immediate favorable consideration so that no longer will the Congress be charged with failure to stop violations of the civil-service rights of veterans. Under this resolution full and open hearings should be conducted and everyone wishing to testify upon the subject matter should be allowed to appear and be heard. At the same time this investigation is being conducted the question of amending section 12 of the Veterans Preference Act should be explored. If a full and complete investigation is conducted I am confident that the Civil Service Committee will favorably report H. R. 4069—a bill I introduced, making it mandatory upon the executive branch of the Government to see that the Federal employees with veterans' preference are the last to be discharged when reductions in force are made.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], is recognized for 5 minutes.

RUTH BRYAN OWEN ROHDE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Organization has become a reality. The hopes and prayers of millions of people are taking visible form. The social implements created under the Charter will soon be ready for the maintenance of international peace and security, and for the progress toward better economic and social conditions for all peoples.

The United Nations, who stood shoulder to shoulder during the war, now aline themselves in a closely knit organization pledged to build for succeeding generations a better and a safer world.

I am proud that the United States has thrown off the muffling garment of isolationism and is taking full responsibility as a great world power. In war, our country demonstrated its vast resources and industrial power, and the indomitable courage of its fighting forces. In the challenging years to come our leadership along the road of peace must be no less strong and sure.

The American people have demonstrated their wish that the United Nations Organization should achieve the high goals set for it. American men and women everywhere will watch with deepest concern, the choice of the four American members of the United Nations Assembly who, with the Honorable Edward Stettinius, will comprise our delegation. On their seasoned judgment, wise experience, and their accurate interpretation of the American viewpoint will depend not only the worth of America's contribution, but the far larger implications of eventual world cooperation.

Our American public wants members chosen to the United Nations Assembly who will measure up to the great responsibilities which will rest upon them. Therefore I am bringing before the House the qualifications of one who was for 4 years a member here.

I am proud to urge that at least one of the members of the United States delegation be a woman. The Charter has declared that men and women shall be equally eligible for appointment. By their services in war and peace, American women have earned this representation. But the selection of both men and women must rest on experience and qualification to serve. There must be no other determining factor.

Many prominent people have placed before the President and the Secretary of State the name of a woman well qualified and well beloved in this body, Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde.

Her public service has added luster to a distinguished family name, and she has achieved a record exceeded by that of no other American woman. At the San Francisco Conference she served as special assistant in the Public Liaison Division of the State Department.

Here in Congress she was the first woman member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, serving for 4 years. Then she represented the United States at the Inter-Parliamentary Union in 1930. Her appointment as Minister to Denmark made her America's first woman diplomat. Years of residence abroad in Europe, Asia, and Africa qualify her to speak the language of many nations both literally and figuratively.

Her audience in the United States include the people of every State of the Union, and almost every community in each State. No one figure would serve to draw the women of America so close to the United Nations organization as a friend and neighbor who has addressed their club and their forum. No one else could so effectively create in the minds of peoples in other countries the true concept of "an American." And, finally, amongst the world's statesmen who will meet at the United Nations organization, Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde would be accepted as a personal friend and distinguished colleague.

Therefore I propose the appointment of Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde as one of the American members to the United Nations Assembly because she has proved herself to be an able diplomat, legislator, educator, homemaker, humanitarian, author, public speaker, and is typical of all that is best in our American womanhood.

As I stated before, many prominent people and organizations have recommended Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde to the President of the United States as a member of the United Nations Assembly, a list of which I could submit. However, I feel that her qualifications speak perhaps more loudly than those recommendations. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD the qualifications of Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde and also a letter which I addressed to the President of the United States under date of August 10, 1945.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to follow:

Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde: Born, Illinois; girlhood, Nebraska; education, Nebraska University and Monticello College; wife of Maj. Borge Rohde, United States Army, just returned from overseas duty; present residence, New York City and West Virginia.

Political: Member of Congress from Florida, 1928–32. Member of Foreign Affairs Committee, 1928–32.

International affairs: United States representative at Inter-Parliamentary Union, 1930; minister to Denmark, 1933–36; chairman, Institute on Reeducation of Axis Countries, N. Y. U., 1945; Special Assistant to Chief of Liaison Division, Department of State, San Francisco Conference, 1945.

Foreign languages: French, Danish, German.

Foreign residence: England, 3 years; West Indies, 3 years; Germany, 6 months; Egypt, 3 years; Denmark, 4 years; Far East, 1 year.

Social service: Secretary, Duchess of Marlborough's Maternity Hospital, 1915; superintendent, five workrooms for unemployed women, London, 1915; VAD nurse, Egypt, 1915–18; member, board of advisers, Federal Reformatory for Women, 1938–45; member, board of trustees, Starr Commonwealth for Boys, 1940–45.

Field of education: Member, board of trustees, University of Miami, 1925–45; member of faculty, University of Miami, 1925–27; visiting professor in government and social science, Monticello College, Alton, Ill., 1939–42.

Honorary degrees: LL. D., Rollins College, Florida; LL. D., Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; LL. D., Hillsdale College, Michigan; L. H. D., Florida State College; L. H. D., Russell Sage University, New York.

Club affiliations: Delta Gamma Sorority; Delta Kappa Gamma (teachers' fraternity); Theta Sigma Phi (women journalists' fraternity); Daughters of the American Revolution (originator of Citizenship Project); Federation of Women's Clubs, past president

Miami Woman's Club; honorary member, Business and Professional Women's Clubs; honorary member, Quota Club; honorary president, Women's Council for Postwar Europe; member, P. E. O., and Overseas Service League; consultant, Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace.

Author: Six books.

Lecturer: Over 25 years, covering every State in the Union, and all types of communities.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When the United States delegation to the United Nations Assembly is selected, I feel very strongly that our country should have at least one woman member. In going over the field of the able and outstanding women in our country, and certainly there are many, I can think of no one better equipped from the standpoint of ability, background, training, education, and experience than Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde, and I respectfully submit her name for your earnest consideration.

Mrs. Rohde served as a Representative in Congress from Florida from 1928 to 1932. During this service she was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the House. In 1930 she represented the United States at the Interparliamentary Union in London. From 1933 to 1936 she was our Minister to Denmark. She was chairman of the Institute on Reeducation of Axis Countries at New York University. Only recently she served as a member of the State Department staff in the capacity of special assistant to the Chief of the Liaison Division at the San Francisco Conference.

Mrs. Rohde has a splendid educational background, holds honorary degrees from several colleges, has done outstanding work in the field of social service, has been a leader in women's club work, has command of three foreign languages, and in her broad and varied work and experience has had contact with the common people of the world, both at home and abroad.

I sincerely request that when the delegates are appointed Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde be given every consideration.

Thanking you, I beg to remain,

Respectfully,

JOE HENDRICKS.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BARRY (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart;

H. R. 1560. An act for the relief of J. B. Grigsby;

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor;

H. R. 3261. An act to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June;

H. R. 3453. An act for the relief of John W. Farrell;

H. R. 3870. An act to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the "Harry L. Englebright Dam";

H. R. 4083. An act authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation; and

H. R. 4309. An act to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 a. m., Monday, November 5, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full-employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream-pollution-abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

814. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs

815. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

816. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 369); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

817. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $746,004.50, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 370); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 754. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4522) for the relief of Bernard Scheff, and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4561. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to American newspaper correspondents who lost their lives in World War II; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4562. A bill to insure the preservation of technical and economic records of domestic sources of ores of metals and minerals; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4563. A bill to grant to Reserve officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard the right to purchase articles of ordnance in the same manner as these articles are now purchased by officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4564. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain lands situated within the Fort Douglas Military Reservation to the Shriners' hospitals for crippled children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4565. A bill relating to the purchase of poultry by the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4566. A bill for the development and control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4567. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians, or any tribe, or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4568. A bill entitling the enlisted men and noncommissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to the

same number of days of annual leave and to the same privileges of accumulation, and so forth, as are granted to the officers in their respective branches; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 4569. A bill relating to credit for service rendered in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps by members of the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4570. A bill to amend the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, to extend reemployment benefits to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who entered the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4571. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4572. A bill to eliminate the requirement of an oath in connection with applications for benefits under all laws and regulations administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4573. A bill to authorize the establishment of an agricultural research laboratory in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. J. Res. 269. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to invite all the members of the United Nations to participate in a conference to be held in Washington at an early date to take appropriate action to enable the people of all the friendly countries of the world to utilize atomic energy in the pursuits of peace and to outlaw it as an instrumentality of destruction in time of war; to provide for the drastic reduction in the armament and the military and naval personnel of all the great powers of the earth; and to take any other action that may be considered necessary to achieve the foregoing objectives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORE:

H. Res. 387. Resolution creating a select committee to study governments of occupied enemy territory; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 388. Resolution to print proceedings attendant upon the commissioning of U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, Navy Day, 1945; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 389. Resolution to investigate administrative violations of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 by the Civil Service Commission and by the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois:

H. Res. 390. Resolution with respect to foreign policy of the United States as it relates to the Republic of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4574. A bill for the relief of Bernard Scheff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 4575. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles J. King; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R 4576. A bill for the relief of Ben W. Schubert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 4577. A bill for the relief of Dolores Joyce; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4578. A bill for the relief of Mario Generazzo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 4579. A bill for the relief of Domenic Scipione; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4580. A bill granting a pension to Paris Peerson; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1300. By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, in support of full employment and unemployment compensation and for the passage of the Murray-Wagner and Kilgore-Forand bills; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1301. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of members of Townsend clubs from Winger, Thief River Falls, Mahnomen, McIntosh, and Bejou, Minn., persons residing in the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, requesting Congress to act on H. R. 2229 without further delay, and pass it with whatever perfecting amendments might be proper, without changing any of its objectives. This resolution was signed by the following: Andrew Shasky, secretary for the meeting; Phil DeMasters, Bejou Club; John I. Olsen, Winger Club; R. A. Gausen, Thief River Falls Club; and Anton Hollan, Mahnomen Club; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1302. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of UAW-CIO executive committee, Racine, Wis., regarding opposition to compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1303. Also, petition of Local No. 72, UAW-CIO, Kenosha, Wis., regarding care or treatment of veterans at facilities of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1304. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition signed by 76 residents of Franklin County, Ohio, urging early consideration and a favorable vote on the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1305. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Berwyn, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to its endorsement of the Murray-Patman full employment bill; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. In a day of violence and of swift and shifting change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into devouring flame, enable Thy servants in the discharge of grave responsibilities of public trust to be calm and confident, wise and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast, their faith unshaken that out of the ruin and wreck of today Thou art making all things new. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 1, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1281) to provide for covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States.

The message also announced the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. LEA, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, and Mr. HALLECK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart;

H. R. 1560. An act for the relief of J. B. Grigsby;

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor;

H. R. 3281. An act to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June;

H. R. 3453. An act for the relief of John W. Farrell;

H. R. 3870. An act to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the "Harry L. Englebright Dam";

H. R. 4083. An act authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation; and

H. R. 4369. An act to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American Legion of the District of Columbia relative to the alarming increase of juvenile delinquency in the District of Columbia, and asking the assistance of the Congress in providing sufficient places of supervised recreation for juveniles.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas statistics reveal juvenile delinquency is on the increase in the District of Columbia, and while efforts have been made to solve this unwholesome problem, no concrete effort has been made to provide sufficient places of supervised recreation for juveniles, with the exception of the splendid work of the few boys' clubs, whose funds are obtained from the generosity of the citizens of the District of Columbia, but which, unfortunately, are limited, due to the high costs of separate buildings to house this much-needed activity: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia include in their annual budget to Congress a sum of not less than $100,000 which will provide the necessary equipment and help to provide evening activities in some of our junior and senior high schools, which activities will include dancing on Friday and Saturday evenings, be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution is not intended to discourage nor eliminate the good work of the Boys Club under the sponsorship of the Rotary Club; the Boys Club of the Metropolitan Police, or the Merrick Boys Club, to all of whom we owe a debt of gratitude. It is earnestly hoped that the directors of those clubs will be a working partner in this program; be it

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the House District Committee, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Board of Education, Parent-Teacher Association, the Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, the Boys Club, the Boys Club of the Metropolitan Police, the Merrick Boys Club, the Rotary Club, the Washington newspapers, and the Touchdown Club."

The above resolution was unanimously passed at the department convention of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1448. A bill for the relief of William Wilson Wurster; without amendment (Rept. No. 678);

H. R. 601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children; without amendment (Rept. No. 679); and

H. R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Leslie O. Allen; without amendment (Rept. No. 680).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 831. A bill for the relief of James Alves Saucier; without amendment (Rept. No. 681);

S. 1077. A bill for the relief of Oscar S. Reed; without amendment (Rept. No. 682);

H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Annie M. Lannon; without amendment (Rept. No. 683);

H. R. 2027. A bill for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 684);

H. R. 2160. A bill for the relief of John J. Gall; without amendment (Rept. No 685);

H. R. 2166 A bill for the relief of the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 686);

H. R. 2241. A bill for the relief of Florence Zimmerman; without amendment (Rept. No. 687);

H. R. 2399. A bill for the relief of Arlethia Rosser; without amendment (Rept. No. 688);

H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz; without amendment (Rept. No. 689);

H. R. 2481. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 690);

H. R. 2642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 691);

H. R. 3137. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 692); and

H. R. 3302. A bill for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler; without amendment (Rept. No. 693).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 3660. A bill to provide for financial control of Government corporations; without amendment (Rept. No. 694).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of October 1945, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

NOVEMBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.	$2,980.00
Joan P. Karasik	1919 19th St., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,300.00
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	6,230.00
Fritzie P. Manuel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	5,180.00
Darel McConkey	509 Fontaine St., Alexandria, Va.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	5,180.00
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,650.00
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	3,090.00
Mary Jane Oliveto	500 B St. NE., Washington, D. C.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	2,100.00
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	6,230.00
Herbert Schimmel	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	9,012.50

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

DIRECTOR, NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Commerce Committee I report unanimously the nomination of Edward U. Condon, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination be considered and confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward U. Condon, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Louisiana state the reason for the speed in confirming the nomination?

Mr. OVERTON. The reason I ask for confirmation of the nomination now is

that the appointment is a very important one. Mr. Condon's services are immediately desired in respect to consideration of problems in connection with the atomic bomb.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed, as in executive session, and, without objection, the President will be notified.

PETROLEUM AGREEMENT WITH GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive H, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, an agreement on petroleum between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in London, September 24, 1945. I make this request so that it may be readily accessible to Senators and the press.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the agreement and it will be published in the RECORD.

The agreement, with an accompanying paper, is as follows:

AGREEMENT ON PETROLEUM BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

PREAMBLE

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, whose nationals hold, to a substantial extent jointly, rights to explore and develop petroleum resources in other countries, recognize:

1. That ample supplies of petroleum, available in international trade to meet increasing market demands, are essential for both the security and economic well-being of nations;

2. That for the foreseeable future the petroleum resources of the world are adequate to assure the availability of such supplies;

3. That the prosperity and security of all nations require the efficient and orderly development of the international petroleum trade;

4. That the orderly development of the international petroleum trade can best be promoted by international agreement among all countries interested in the petroleum trade, whether as producers or consumers.

The two Governments have therefore decided, as a preliminary measure to the calling of an international conference to consider the negotiation of a multilateral petroleum agreement, to conclude the following Agreement.

ARTICLE I

The signatory Governments agree that the international petroleum trade in all its aspects should be conducted in an orderly manner on a world-wide basis with due regard to the considerations set forth in the Preamble, and within the framework of applicable laws and concession contracts. To this end and subject always to considerations of military security and to the provisions of such arrangements for the preservation of peace and prevention of aggression as may be in force the signatory Governments affirm the following general principles with respect to the international petroleum trade:

(a) That adequate supplies of petroleum, which shall in this Agreement mean crude petroleum and its derivatives, should be accessible in international trade to the nationals of all countries on a competitive and nondiscriminatory basis;

(b) That, in making supplies of petroleum thus accessible in international trade, the interests of producing countries should be safeguarded with a view to their economic advancement.

ARTICLE II

In furtherance of the purposes of this Agreement, the signatory Governments will so direct their efforts:

(a) That all valid concession contracts and lawfully acquired rights shall be respected, and that there shall be no interference directly or indirectly with such contracts or rights;

(b) That with regard to the acquisition of exploration and development rights the principle of equal opportunity shall be respected;

(c) That the exploration for and development of petroleum resources, the construction and operation of refineries and other facilities, and the distribution of petroleum, shall not be hampered by restrictions inconsistent with the purposes of this Agreement.

ARTICLE III

1. With a view to the wider adoption of the principles embodied in this Agreement, the signatory Governments agree that as soon as practicable they will propose to the governments of all interested producing and consuming countries the negotiation of an International Petroleum Agreement, which *inter alia* would establish a permanent International Petroleum Council.

2. To this end the signatory Governments agree to formulate at an early date plans for an international conference to negotiate such a multilateral petroleum agreement. They will consult together and with other interested governments with a view to taking whatever action is necessary to prepare for the proposed conference.

ARTICLE IV

1. Numerous problems of joint immediate interest to the signatory Governments with respect to the international petroleum trade should be discussed and resolved on a cooperative interim basis if the general petroleum supply situation is not to deteriorate.

2. With this end in view, the signatory Goverments agree to establish an International Petroleum Commission to be composed of six members, three members to be appointed immediately by each Government. To enable the Commission to maintain close contact with the operations of the petroleum industry, the signatory Governments will facilitate full and adequate consultation with their nationals engaged in the petroleum industry.

3. In furtherance of and in accordance with the purposes of this Agreement, the Commission shall consider problems of mutual interest to the signatory Governments and their nationals, and with a view to the equitable disposition of such problems it shall be charged with the following duties and responsibilities:

(a) To study the problems of the international petroleum trade caused by dislocations resulting from war;

(b) To study past and current trends in the international petroleum trade;

(c) To study the effects of changing technology upon the international petroleum trade;

(d) To prepare periodic estimates of world demands for petroleum and of the supplies available for meeting the demands, and to report as to means by which such demands and supplies may be correlated so as to further the efficient and orderly conduct of the international petroleum trade;

(e) To make such additional reports as may be appropriate for achieving the purposes of this Agreement and for the broader general understanding of the problems of the international petroleum trade.

4. The Commission shall have power to regulate its procedure and shall establish such organization as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this Agreement. The expenses of the Commission shall be shared equally by the signatory Governments.

ARTICLE V

The signatory Governments agree:

(a) That they will seek to obtain the collaboration of the governments of other producing and consuming countries for the realization of the purposes of this Agreement, and to consult with such governments in connection with activities of the Commission;

(b) That they will assist in making available to the Commission such information as may be required for the discharge of its functions.

ARTICLE VI

The signatory Governments agree:

(a) That the reports of the Commission shall be published unless in any particular case either Government decides otherwise;

(b) That no provision in this Agreement shall be construed to require either Government to act upon any report or proposal made by the Commission, or to require the nationals of either Government to comply with any report or proposal made by the Commission, whether or not the report or proposal is approved by that Government.

ARTICLE VII

The signatory Governments agree:

(a) That the general purpose of this Agreement is to facilitate the orderly development of the international petroleum trade, and that no provision in this Agreement, with the exception of Article II, is to be construed as applying to the operation of the domestic petroleum industry within the country of either Government;

(b) That nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as impairing or modifying any law or regulation, or the right to enact any law or regulation, relating to the importation of petroleum into the country of either Government;

(c) That, for the purposes of this Article, the word "country" shall mean

(i) in relation to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Kingdom, those British colonies, overseas territories, protectorates, protected states, and all mandated territories administered by that Government and

(ii) in relation to the Government of the United States of America, the continental United States and all territory under the jurisdiction of the United States,

lists of which, as of the date of this Agreement, have been exchanged.

ARTICLE VIII

This Agreement shall enter into force upon a date to be agreed upon after each Government shall have notified the other of its readiness to bring the Agreement into force and shall continue in force until three months after notice of termination has been given by either Government or until it is superseded by the International Petroleum Agreement contemplated in Article III.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorised thereto, have signed this Agreement.

Done in London, in duplicate, this twenty-fourth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and forty five.

For the Government of the United States of America:

HAROLD L. ICKES.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

EMANUEL SHINWELL.

LIST OF TERRITORIES TO WHICH THE AGREEMENT ON PETROLEUM BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND APPLIES

As indicated in Article VII (c) of the agreement on petroleum between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in London September 24, 1945, lists were exchanged as of the date of the agreement, of the territories of each of the two Governments to which the agreement is to apply. The territories named in those lists are as follows:

1. Of the United States of America:
The continental United States
Alaska
Hawaii
Puerto Rico
Virgin Islands
Panama Canal Zone

2. Of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
The United Kingdom
Aden
Bahamas
Barbados
Basutoland
Bechuanaland Protectorate
Bermuda
British Guiana
British Honduras
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
Gold Coast—
(a) Colony
(b) Ashanti
(c) Northern Territories
(d) Togoland under British Mandate
Hong Kong
Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands—
Antigua
Montserrat
St. Christopher and Nevis
Malay States—
(a) Federated Malay States—
Negri Sembilan
Pahang
Perak
Selangor
(b) Unfederated Malay States—
Johore
Kedah
Kelantan
Perlis
Trengganu; and
Brunei
Malta
Mauritius
New Hebrides[1]
Nigeria—
(a) Colony
(b) Protectorate
(c) Cameroons under British Mandate
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Palestine (excluding Transjordan)
St. Helena and Dependencies
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
Straits Settlements
Swaziland
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Transjordan
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Virgin Islands
Windward Islands—
Dominica
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Zanzibar Protectorate.

[1] The New Hebrides are administered as a British-French condominium.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1549. A bill for the relief of Duane N. Thompson, a minor; and

S. 1550. A bill to amend the act of May 2, 1940, entitled "An act for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the war with Spain and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899" (54 Stat. 176), by extending the time for filing of claims thereunder; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. WHERRY introduced Senate bill 1551, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1552. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1553. A bill to provide sick and annual leave for war service indefinite substitutes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1554. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SHOTGUNS TO OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill which has to do with selling shotguns that are now owned by the military to others than officers of the armed forces. I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill and that it be referred to the proper committee.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1551) relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday I sent to the desk for printing an amendment intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 1120. The office of the legislative counsel of the United States Senate, at my request, subsequently redrafted the amendment. The amendment as it was redrafted has been reprinted, and I now send it to the desk in its redrafted form.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Missouri in its redrafted form will lie on the table.

FREEDOM TO WORK

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, in order to show how at least one more soldier feels about losing his freedom to work while he was in the Army fighting for freedom and liberty, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an Associated Press article dated November 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERAN REFUSES TO PAY UNION FEES; REENLISTS

SALT LAKE CITY, November 1.—Myron F. Oliver wasn't "just kidding" when he said he would rather go back into the Army than pay union fees to hold his job.

Mr. Oliver, who was discharged October 12, after 5½ years in the service, reenlisted yesterday as a master sergeant.

He said he had been offered a promotion at the sheet-metal shop where he worked, but was informed he would have to pay a $50 initiation fee to an A. F. of L. union first. "I objected to earning the job and then paying for it," he said.

"I talked it over with my wife and decided I would rather go back to the Army."

WITNESSES AND RECORDS FOR PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from Houston, Tex., signed by several citizens of that city.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX., *November 1, 1945.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.

Telegram to President: "We, the undersigned, make this urgent appeal and respectfully request that you revoke the order that you have signed which provides that witnesses and records for the Pearl Harbor investigation may be summoned only by majority action of the 10-member Senate-House committee. We believe that you wish this committee to be as free and unhampered as the Senate War Investigation Committee, which did such outstanding work under your chairmanship. We feel confident that a full

and complete investigation will clear up the situation and silence the rumors and suspicions that have been aroused about Pearl Harbor. We respectfully suggest, therefore, that each individual committee member have the right to call any witness to testify or to call for any document or records to be placed before the committee for examination so that not the slightest doubt can be left in the mind of any American citizen that the investigation was not complete—a thorough one. A copy of this wire is being sent to each member of the committee."

Senator, can you insert above in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Dr. Elva A. Wright, Raymond P. Elledge, Mrs. Ethel Brousius, H. L. Mills, Mrs. M. L. Gill, Roy L. Arterbury, Mrs. J. D. Kelly, E. M. Biggers, Leona Hagy, Mrs. Hallie Ruth Mosely, Mrs. Ida Ward, Mrs. Roy L. Arterbury, C. M. Redfield, Mrs. Eugene T. Harris, Mrs. Louise Barnett, W. F. Albert, W. N. Michels, Mrs. M. Sperling, M. W. Lee, Mrs. Irene Davis, Frank Gossett, Mrs. W. F. Albert.

REDEMPTION OF GERMAN MARKS PRINTED BY RUSSIA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on his return from Europe, Mr. John W. Hanes, one-time Under Secretary of the Treasury, reported in the New York Journal-American of September 9, that United States authorities had turned over to the Russians the plates from which occupation marks are printed.

Further down in the newspaper article I find this statement by Mr. Hanes:

"But you can't blame the Russians," Mr. Hanes said. "They were smart. You can blame our own stupidity and nothing else. Who wouldn't spend someone else's money?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the entire article, including the statement by Mr. Hanes, be printed in the RECORD. In this connection I desire to suggest to the Military Affairs Committee and the Finance Committee especially that this is another case of printing for occupied territory money which the United States Treasury makes good, and upon which, apparently, there is no check whatsoever. I think it is high time that an explanation should be made. This policy should be defined or classified or both.

If Mr. Hanes, who was at one time Under Secretary of the Treasury, made such a statement as is reported, this administration should be required to clarify its policy. If what is being done is a judicious thing to do, if it is the right thing to do, I should like to have the policy made clear; but if other nations, and especially Russia, are continuing to use printing presses to print German marks which the United States Treasury is called upon to redeem, I think Congress should know about it. I believe the time has come when we should withdraw the plates from Russia and that this policy should be discontinued.

The printing presses are running full blast at home—printing money for unnecessary bureaucratic agencies and programs, but now we learn that unrestricted printing is being done by Russia, which has borrowed the plates, and the taxpayers of the country will be called upon to redeem the paper money.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the article presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

IS UNITED STATES PAYING DOLLARS FOR GERMAN MARKS PRINTED BY RUSSIANS?

Upon his return from Europe, John W. Hanes, one-time Under Secretary of the Treasury, reported in the New York Journal-American September 9 that United States authorities had turned over to the Russians the plates from which occupation marks are printed.

He said that since then the Russians are running hog-wild with the marks their presses are turning out on a mile-a-minute basis, that these marks are not redeemable in the Russian ruble but are redeemable in the United States dollar at the rate of 10 cents per mark, and that the United States Treasury (really the United States taxpayer) is being milked rapidly and to a degree yet unknown, according to the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy.

"'But you can't blame the Russians,' Mr. Hanes said. 'They were smart. You can blame our own stupidity and nothing else. Who wouldn't spend someone else's money?'

* * *

"Mr. Hanes could not tell the exact circumstances under which the Russians cajoled the Americans out of the money engraving plates. But, he said, once the Americans yielded the plates the Russian printing presses began rolling. The spending orgy—and inflation—was on.

LIKE THE HORSE TRACK

"'The net result was as obvious as can be,' Mr. Hanes said. 'The Tiergarten resembled nothing so much as a busy day at the Belmont betting windows. The Russians, naturally, will buy anything you have to sell for any amount. They have nothing to lose.'"

Various confirmatory and some qualified reports have been sent from Berlin, but nothing seems to deny the general accuracy of the situation as he portrayed it.

The New York Times (September 14) said in part, "that Russian occupation marks were identical except that the Russian-produced notes bear a dashmark before the serial number. No restriction was placed on the volume of occupation currency any power could issue * * *."

"* * * It is a matter of record that in the first month of the American occupation of Berlin troops of the Second Armored Division sent home something like $3,000,000 in excess of their pay. This represented the proceeds from sales of watches, cigarets, chocolate, and fountain pens to Red army soldiers."

PAPER FOR DOLLARS

Raymond Daniell, in the New York Times (September 15), says:

"So every soldier who succeeds in changing them (Russian-printed marks) into dollars is conducting a one-man raid on Uncle Sam's Treasury because he is exchanging worthless paper for real American dollars."

From the Wall Street Journal (September 27):

"Washington denies we're paying off Russia's occupation marks in Berlin.

"* * * Informed Washington officials now say, however, that while we did let the Russians have our plates, any marks they are printing from them bear their distinguishing symbol. All occupation currency carries the separate symbol of the issuing Big Four powers, it is explained, so there is no excuse for any confusion or redemptions.

"We let the Russians have our plates, Washington says, to make their currency uniform with ours—except for those symbols, of course."

SOME BOTTLENECKS OF RECONVERSION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Some Bottlenecks of Reconversion," delivered by him before the seventeenth annual meeting of the Gray Iron Founders' Society, Chicago, Ill., October 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EFFECT OF THE ATOMIC BOMB ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Effect of the Atomic Bomb on American Foreign Policy," delivered by him before the Foreign Policy Association at a meeting in New York City on October 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

INLAND PLANTS TO AID DEFENSE PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY WEST CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for Mr. BRIGGS) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "National Safety and Economy Require Inland Plants To Aid Defense Program," issued by the West Central Industrial Council in October 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTERS FROM MEN IN THE ARMED SERVICES RESPECTING DEMOBILIZATION

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a group of Navy officers and men at Okinawa, a letter from a group of Army officers and men in France, and a letter from a group of 300 Army officers and men in the United States respecting discharge from the services, which appear in the Appendix.]

INDIVIDUAL SECURITY IN THE POSTWAR WORLD—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Individual Security in the Postwar World," issued for the Trans-Radio Press by the Secretary of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRIG. GEN. HARRY H. VAUGHAN—STATEMENTS OF REV. CLIFF R. JOHNSON AND CHAPLAIN LUTHER D. MILLER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters, one from Rev. Cliff R. Johnson, minister of Westminster Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., and the other from Luther D. Miller, Chief of Chaplains of the United States Army, with regard to an address recently delivered by Brig. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan before the women's auxiliary of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, which appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Guffey	Murdock
Austin	Gurney	O'Daniel
Ball	Hart	Overton
Barkley	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brooks	Hill	Robertson
Butler	Hoey	Russell
Byrd	Huffman	Taft
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Taylor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Tunnell
Connally	Knowland	Vandenberg
Cordon	La Follette	Wheeler
Donnell	Langer	Wherry
Eastland	McClellan	White
Ellender	McKellar	Wiley
Ferguson	Magnuson	Willis
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
George	Millikin	Young
Gerry	Moore	
Green	Morse	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent attending the Food and Agricultural Conference in Quebec.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE and Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent on business. The Senator from New Jersey has been excused.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 17, line 20, after the word "Board", it is proposed to insert "civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment I have submitted is as follows:

On page 17, line 20, after the word "Board", insert "civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army."

The civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, were excepted from the Reorganization Act of 1939. The Committee on the Judiciary in reporting the bill has not included the Corps of Engineers within its list of exceptions.

The Corps of Engineers, Mr. President, was organized in 1802. It has been in active existence as an arm of the Federal Government in relation to river and harbor improvements and flood control, and other matters of public engineering, for a period of over a century and a quarter.

Who constitute the Army engineers? They are selected, Mr. President, from the highest one-tenth in the classes of graduates from West Point. The highest one-tenth in the classes enter or are privileged to enter into the Corps of Engineers. Those below the highest 10 percent cannot enter the Corps of Engineers. They, therefore, start out as cum laude graduates, well-educated men, splendidly equipped for the great work which they are to undertake. The Corps of Army Engineers have, during their long existence, done their work not only skilfully, but without fear or favor. Regardless of who might be in power, whether it be a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, there has never been any political favoritism practiced by the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if his experience in the committee and in the Senate in dealing with controversial issues which are somewhat regional in character, such as that in the Connecticut River Valley, has developed the fact that the Corps of Engineers has been able to maintain a strictly scientific attitude, and has kept its hands off the controversies which arise in the committee and in the Senate in making the policy that is adapted to an area?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Vermont is absolutely correct. That is true not only with reference to the projects in the New England States, but it is true in reference to projects throughout the United States. In that connection I dare say that no representative of the Corps of Engineers appeared before the committee to ask for the exemption of the corps from this bill. They stand aloof from any question of policy that may be adopted by the Congress of the United States. What they do is to concentrate their thought and attention solely upon their work, which is the engineering investigation and approval or rejection of projects.

As Senators well know, they do not initiate projects. They act only at the behest of the Congress of the United States. There is not a survey made throughout the United States that is not directed by the Congress of the United States. After the engineers have made a survey and an exhaustive examination through the district engineers, and the division engineers, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Chief of Engineers, and through all the processes that are necessary in order to arrive at a sound conclusion, then their report is submitted to the Congress of the United States for adoption or rejection.

It was shown in testimony taken not long ago that of the total projects that were investigated by them more than 60 percent were rejected as being unsound and uneconomical. If a project is economically justified in their opinion from an engineering standpoint, that project is recommended to the Congress of the United States regardless of the location in which it is, and regardless of who the Senator or who the Representative may be that is sponsoring the project.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. What functions now performed by the Corps of Engineers might be transferred if this amendment were not adopted?

Mr. OVERTON. All their civil functions. And let me add that there is no function that I know of being discharged by the Corps of Army Engineers that could properly be transferred to any other agency of the Government.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. If this amendment were not adopted, would authority be delegated to the President to transfer such functions?

Mr. OVERTON. Authority would be delegated, and there would be an implied invitation on the part of the Congress to the President to make such a transfer. If there were no exceptions in the bill, if all the agencies of the Government were turned over to the President for reorganization purposes, then it could be said that there was no request made upon the President to investigate the Corps of Engineers. But when the committee reports a bill which excepts 10 or 12 agencies of the Government, and leaves out the Corps of Army Engineers, it is an expression of opinion, if adopted by the Congress, that that is a matter which the President should investigate, to determine whether or not there should be a transfer of the functions of the Corps of Army Engineers to some other agency of the Government.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. That would be the effect of the passage of the bill in its present form.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Whereas if the Senator's amendment were adopted, it would be an expression of the Congress to the effect that it was satisfied with the services which this agency is now performing, and that it was the consensus of opinion of the Congress that it should not be disturbed.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. If any Senator can suggest any other agency to which the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers could be properly transferred, I should be very glad to consider it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers were transferred to the Tennessee Valley Authority so far as the Tennessee River was concerned; and I assume that proposals for the Missouri Valley Authority will contemplate the transfer of the civil functions of the Corps of Army Engineers to the Missouri Valley Authority. Is that not correct?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; provided that such an authority is legislatively authorized.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not possible that once the exception were made, the President might transfer such functions, so far as they relate to the Missouri River, to the Reclamation Service or the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If this transfer of functions were made, what would become of all the records covering years of study of many projects not yet constructed?

Mr. OVERTON. Some new agency would have to undertake to do the best it could with those projects.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the Senator's opinion would that mean a restudy of all the projects?

Mr. OVERTON. Unquestionably there would have to be restudy, reexamination, probably resurveys, and prolonged delays. And by whom? By some other agency not nearly so well qualified as the Corps of Army Engineers to attend to projects relating to our inland waterways and our harbors.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that all those records covering many years of studies and engineering reports, made at great expense to the Government by the Army engineers, form the basis for future developments?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct. It is a continuous and progressive advance. Some of the greatest engineering works in the world have been constructed by the United States Army engineers. Take the great dams. As an example, I cite the Fort Peck (Mont.) Dam, the greatest earthen reservoir ever constructed. That was built by the United States Army engineers.

Mr. MAYBANK. What would become of the inland waterways?

Mr. OVERTON. Take the Bonneville Dam, which was constructed by the United States Army engineers. The Denison Dam on the Red River was constructed by the Army engineers. The dams for the protection of the city of Pittsburgh were constructed by the Army engineers.

Mr. MAYBANK. Aside from the various dams, what about the inland waterways?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is absolutely correct in raising that question. Take the harbors. Take the magnificent harbor of Boston, with its Cape Cod Canal. That project is the work of the Army engineers. Take the great port of New York, and the harbors which make it one of the greatest ports in the world. Those harbors are maintained by the Army engineers. In that connection I mention the port of New Orleans, in my own State. The jetties at the mouth of the Mississippi River which keep that great port alive are the work of Eads, a great Army engineer, and they are now being maintained by the Army engineers.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator has mentioned a number of great projects. Is it not true that in peacetime the Army engineers gain experience which makes them efficient in wartime?

Mr. OVERTON. That is absolutely correct; and I shall dwell on that thought a little later.

There are other ports. Take Houston, which has been developed into a great port through the work of the Army engineers. The same is true of the harbor of San Pedro, in Los Angeles.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I suggest to the Senator from Louisiana that not only are the Army engineers better equipped as a result of their peacetime experience for handling their duties in wartime, but by virtue of the experience which they gain in wartime they are far better equipped to handle the engineering work which comes to them in their peacetime activities.

Mr. OVERTON. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

The Panama Canal is one of the greatest engineering projects in the world. It was constructed by the Army engineers. The coastal canal which stretches from Maine to Mexico is the fruit of Army engineering proficiency.

Our inland waterway navigation depends upon the work of the Army engineers. The great Father of Waters is a mighty avenue for water-borne commerce. The 9-foot channel which makes the Mississippi River capable of carrying such commerce, and which will soon be developed into a 12-foot channel, is the work of the Army engineers. It carries freight from the Gulf of Mexico to the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and up the Illinois and Chicago Rivers to the city of Chicago and the Great Lakes.

We can look around Washington and see further examples of the work of the Army engineers. The Capitol, in which we are now seated, is the work of the Army engineers. The Library of Congress was constructed by the Army engineers, as were the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, the Memorial Bridge which spans the Potomac River, Key Bridge, Cabin John Bridge, and the magnificent water works of the city of Washington.

Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to go into further detail as to what the Army engineers have done. They have done it because they are thoroughly trained and exceptionally expert in the work. It is their life work. No other agency of the Government that I know of could take over this vast enterprise.

As has been suggested by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], what has been accomplished in wartime has been accomplished by reason of the fact that we have had an experienced group of men to meet the engineering necessities of war. When we started the construction of camps, they were built very rapidly. That job was turned over to the United States Army engineers. It was said that time was of the essence. The camps were constructed almost overnight, and were made ready to house our troops and aid in training them for the heroic service they rendered.

When our troops had to land off the coast of Normandy, the artificial harbors had been constructed by the Army engineers, and various works were put into operation by them which permitted our troops not only to land successfully, but with a great reduction in the loss of life. After they landed and started through France, roads had to be repaired in order to move our troops and equipment. The Army engineers preceded our fighting forces, building roads, repairing bridges, and constructing railroads for the transportation of our men across France and into Germany. They were the vanguard that led our troops on to German soil, across the Rhine and other rivers. They did not stop and ask, "How do we cross these rivers?" They simply said, "When do you want to cross and where do you want to cross?" And the work was done.

Mr. President, in other theaters of war the Corps of Army Engineers rendered a great and magnificent and immortal service to the cause of the Allies in the war. That is so true that other nations, realizing the superiority of the United States Army engineers, are today undertaking to establish programs of peacetime work so as to train their own engineers, in order to have them prepared for combat duty.

The question which addresses itself is simply whether we are to authorize and impliedly request the President of the United States to make any alteration with respect to this branch of our service.

Mr. WHEELER rose.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I agree with everything he has said about the Corps of Army Engineers. I have a great deal of respect for them, and I think they have performed a wonderful service.

In the Commitee on the Judiciary, however, there was a proposal to include under the bill all the quasi-judicial organizations which were established by Congress for the purpose of carrying out the will of Congress—for instance, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and similar organizations. I felt that those agencies certainly should not be included in the bill, for if that were done those independent agencies would be

placed under some department of the Government and they would soon lose their independence; they would become dominated by whoever might be the head of the department under which they were placed.

With respect to the Army engineers, I share very largely the views of the Senator from Louisiana. I have not the slightest objection, I say frankly, to having the Army engineers exempted. But I do not think we should similarly exempt all the bureaus or agencies which some persons might like to have exempted from reorganization because in the various departments of the Government there are many bureaus or agencies which duplicate one another.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; and many of them are susceptible of being reorganized. I agree with the Senator about that. A differentiation might be made, as suggested by the Senator, on the ground that some agencies exercise quasi-judicial powers and others do not. Therefore, it may be argued that agencies exercising quasi-judicial powers should be exempted. That might be satisfactory to the Senator as a member of the Judiciary Committee, but I take it that it would not be entirely satisfactory to all Members of the Senate, or of the House of Representatives, for that matter, because many of us think there should be other grounds of differentiation.

Mr. WHEELER. Not only is it a fact that such agencies are quasi-judicial but agencies such as the Federal Communications Commission have been created purely as an arm of the Congress, as distinguished from the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. ANDREWS. For instance, the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, so far as that is concerned, that may be true as regards the Corps of Engineers, as the Senator from Florida suggests. The Corps of Engineers acts solely at the direction of the Congress of the United States. The Corps of Engineers does not plan a project or inaugurate it or complete it unless the Congress of the United States has so directed. The Corps of Engineers does not undertake to investigate a project until the Congress has approved it. Also, of course, the Corps of Engineers does exercise judicial discretion. It has voluminous regulations with respect to the waterways. Some of them deal with whether obstructions shall be built; some of them deal with the question whether bridges may be put across rivers, and where, and under what circumstances. I have seen the regulations; they are most voluminous, and they deal with various matters in which the Corps of Engineers is called upon to exercise quasi-judicial functions.

Mr. WHEELER. The only flaw in the Senator's argument is that it likewise applies to the Forest Service, the Reclamation Service, and hundreds of other agencies which I could point out. Frankly, Mr. President, I have no objection to exempting the Corps of Army Engineers; but I do not wish to have the Senate proceed to exempt first one and then another and then another agency, regardless of whether they are arms of the Congress or of the executive branch of Government. I made that distinction in the Committee on the Judiciary.

However, I repeat that I have not the slightest objection to exempting the Corps of Army Engineers, and I think there is a good deal to what the Senator from Louisiana has said as to why the Corps of Engineers should be exempted.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, Mr. President, the argument based on the making of a distinction between judicial agencies and nonjudicial agencies was not mine; but since that argument has been advanced, I have simply said that much can be said in that regard as to the functions of the Corps of Engineers—in other words, that in many respects they are quasi judicial in character.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment. So far there appears no serious opposition to it. Therefore I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, not because of any desire on my part to have the Corps of Army Engineers reorganized, but because I am definitely of the conviction that the bill already contains too many exemptions. Instead of adding to the exemptions included in the bill, I believe we should strike out many of those which now are in it. Later I shall discuss that question more fully. At present, I wish to digress for a moment and talk very briefly about something else.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday, demonstrating his deep interest in and appreciation of the vast potentialities for evil existent in the atomic bomb, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the President pro tempore of the Senate, made an earnest plea for immediate action to relieve us and the world from the fear and threat of the use of atomic energy for purposes of war.

I listened most carefully to every word the distinguished Senator said. I desire to pay a compliment to him and to all others who are attempting in any way to reach an understanding or realization of what the release of atomic energy means to the world of men; for on August 6 of this year, in the twinkling of an eye, the whole world was changed. So sudden and revolutionary was that change, Mr. President, that it is no wonder that now we and the people of all other nations grope and flounder without as yet, perhaps, a full appreciation of what has taken place in the world.

The Senator from Tennessee suggested as an immediate answer to the use of atomic energy to destroy for purposes of war, that all nations immediately outlaw such use. It was suggested that a formal agreement be entered into by the nations of the world by which all would forever be precluded from using the bomb as an instrument of war. I would that I could agree with the distinguished Senator that the protection against the destructive use of atomic energy could be secured by any kind of an agreement.

Indeed, Mr. President, it should be an easy matter, I believe, to secure an agreement today when we and our neighbors, Great Britain and Canada, alone possess the detailed knowledge of manufacturing processes, and are the only one who actually possess this horrible engine of death and destruction. If, under those circumstances, we who possess the essential knowledge would be willing to forego its use in war, surely every other nation should be willing to enter into such an agreement. Of that, I do not have the slightest doubt, but I wish I could be as certain of the effectiveness of such an agreement as I am of our ability to lead the other nations of the world into such a compact. It is not doubt, skepticism, or even distrust on my part which forbids my reaching such—shall I say—an easy solution. I do not distrust all the other nations of the world. I do not think that our own Nation alone possesses all the virtue, spirit, desire, and willingness to abide by an agreement and abstain from the use of such a terrible weapon of war as the atomic bomb. There are other nations in the world which are just as altruistic, utilitarian, and as honest as are we. There are many other nations whose solemn word and treaty obligations are as valid as our own.

But, Mr. President, to me at least, bitter experience compels the absolute and certain knowledge that all nations are not so minded. I shall not enumerate the numerous agreements and treaties which have been breached and broken by aggressor nations who have not hesitated to break them when they have believed their own physical strength and power were sufficient to win victory for themselves, and dominate, control, and perhaps enslave other nations of the world.

Notwithstanding the absolute failure of all such ventures on the part of such aggressor nations, and their defeat, their natures have not been changed. Their desire to rule, conquer, subdue, and enslave remains. Even though, apparently, some of them are now deprived temporarily of the means to wage war, who knows how long such conditions will prevail? Who knows but that atomic energy itself, a force which we have discovered and have loosed in the world, may become the very means by which aggressor nations will again attempt to travel the road to rule or ruin?

While atomic energy itself may be the equalizing force which will make the weakest nation as strong and as powerful as our nation is, who knows at this moment that we, who alone posses the essential knowledge of the atomic bomb, will continue in sole possession of it for any length of time? Opinions as to the length of time such security may be enjoyed are, at the best mere guesses; no man knows of a certainty. But it is argued that agreement has been effective. It was suggested on yesterday that it was effective in the use of poison gas because gas was not used in World War II, and that perhaps we can safely rely upon an agreement to prevent not only the use of poison gas but the use of atomic energy and other scientific discoveries in every

field, including the biological as well as the chemical.

Mr. President, I cannot ease my conscience, I cannot satisfy my own mind with any such belief. On the contrary, I am perfectly convinced, and believe beyond any peradventure of doubt, that the use of poison gas was not prevented by agreement. Our enemies used every dastardy and uncivilized means of warfare. They would not, because of treaty or agreement, have hesitated to use poison gas when they kept no agreement and respected no treaty. In my opinion the use of poison gas was prevented only because the enemy well knew that he was more vulnerable to its use than we were. He well knew that our progress in science had been as great or even greater than his, that we possessed as much knowledge of poison gas as he possessed, and perhaps more and that our superior air force, the power of which he knew full well, would pay him in kind perhaps a thousandfold if he started the use of poison gas. That and that alone, Mr. President, prevented him from releasing deadly fumes which might have pervaded into every home. Let us take no comfort from the fact that he did not use poison gas. Neither can we take much comfort from the expense involved in developing the process necessary to produce the atomic bomb, as has been suggested. We have been asked what other nation in the world had $2,000,000,000, or even half that sum, to devote to the development of the atomic bomb.

Mr. President, Hitler answered the question of expense when Germany, enslaved and bankrupt, built and equipped the strongest armed force which the world had seen until that time. He did it without money. Money is not the only essential. In those states and nations where the individual is but the subject, and perhaps the slave of the state, men and material are the necessary factors which enter into the constructive processes, and not dollars and cents. Other nations have men and material in quantities which are almost as great as our own. In some respects they are even more available because the rights of property, the rights of human beings, and the rights of individuals are not involved, and they may be taken and used without any thought of compensation. In those countries money is of relatively small importance. So let us not take comfort in the thought that other nations may not have dollars and cents.

In saying these things, Mr. President, I am not and do not want to be critical of the suggestion that the atomic bomb should be outlawed. I want very much to see every possible step taken which will prevent the use of atomic energy, or any other force in settling disputes among nations. If we could prevent such use by agreement, then, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] suggested yesterday, why stop with outlawing the atomic bomb? Why not outlaw war itself, as was once done by agreement? The nations of the world actually did outlaw war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If we can outlaw the atomic bomb, why cannot we outlaw cannon, airplanes, and other weapons of warfare?

Mr. HATCH. If we can outlaw the use of the atomic bomb we can outlaw the use of every instrument of war. In fact, we can outlaw every instrument of warfare if we can outlaw war itself.

As I have already said, Mr. President, we did outlaw war itself by agreement, and the world miserably failed in that agreement.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not see why it would not be possible to outlaw the use of the atomic bomb and set up, through the United Nations Organization, an inspection service to which nations would voluntarily submit themselves so that it would be possible to ascertain whether any nation was in fact constructing or starting to construct atomic bombs. If it should be ascertained that such construction was in progress, or that preparations were being made for such construction, I see no reason why the United Nations Organization should not be warranted in using its armed forces in preventing the continuance of manufacture. I can agree that war cannot be outlawed merely by entering into an agreement such as the Briand Pact. The use of the atomic bomb cannot be outlawed, but I do not see why, with an effective United Nations Organization, a declaration could not be made against the use of the atomic bomb for all purposes, that the United States itself will not use it, and that the United Nations will move against any nation which undertakes to violate the rule which it is attempted to lay down.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, nothing the Senator from Ohio has said is in disagreement with what I have said. I think that what he mentions is a part of and only a part of what must be done. I am pointing out in what I have to say today what I was afraid would be a general interpretation of the address which was delivered yesterday, that by simple agreement—that is what I said—the atomic bomb could be outlawed. That cannot be done; and I do not want the people of America and I do not want the peoples of the world to believe that the Senate of the United States understands or believes such a thing as that or is going to adopt such a policy as that. That is the reason I am making these remarks.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator not think, however, that an international agreement such as that to which he has referred is certainly the first and, in my opinion, a very necessary thing to be brought about at the present time?

Mr. HATCH. I certainly agree that we must have international agreement and understanding, but it must be backed by something more than the paper upon which it is written.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in full agreement with that statement, but I cannot help but believe that we must—and I say the sooner the better—enter into such an agreement and then implement it to the fullest extent possible, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. HATCH. There is no disagreement at all so far as I am concerned with what the Senator has said.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think the Senator misapprehended what I had to say yesterday insofar as obtaining peace by agreement is concerned. The agreement has to be implemented of course. But at this time we are the absolute owners of the atomic bomb. Some other nation may have a smattering of knowledge about it, but that is all. None of them owns it; they cannot own it because it is our property and we can dispose of the Nation's property only under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

My purpose in making the statement yesterday—and I am afraid the Senator misapprehended it—was to suggest that while we are the sole owners of this great destructive instrument of war, we are in a position, peculiarly fortunate for the peace of the world, to take the lead and ascertain what effect it would have upon the nations of the world and the peoples of the world if the United States, the genius of whose sons has created this great destructive instrument, should say that inasmuch as human beings without regards to whether they were participants in war—they might even be opposed to war and be entirely innocent—would be stricken down, the atomic bomb should be outlawed. At this time when we are being charged by other nations with trying to build up a great military system and when, despite our adherence to the San Francisco Conference agreement, our actions in increasing our forces and holding on to everything we have got and have had during the war cause them to doubt whether we are really for peace, if we take a generous, kindly, neighborly stand and take the lead in the movement to outlaw this greatest instrumentality of human destruction every created by man, all our neighbors will feel that we want to carry out our professions and want to stop war and bring about a permanent peace. There is no better way in my judgment to prevent the use of the most destructive agency ever devised by man. While we have it and before any other nation obtains an interest in it—no other nation has contributed a dollar to it—we ourselves ought to take the lead in preventing the use of this great destructive agency as an instrument of war.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not think I misunderstood the Senator yesterday. In the beginning of my remarks I complimented him.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; and I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I did so because he brought this matter to the attention of

the Senate. I also complimented him on the position which he takes in saying that our Nation, which is responsible for releasing atomic energy, must be the nation which shall lead the world in its proper use for constructive and not destructive purposes, and certainly, Mr. President, that must be done by our taking the lead in promoting international agreement and accord.

My point, I repeat, is simply that as I read the newspapers they seemed to stress that the Senator from Tennessee was proposing a simple agreement to outlaw the use of the atomic bomb. I am certain, as I am sure the Senator from Tennessee is, that no simple agreement would have the effect he desires.

Mr. McKELLAR. I said so yesterday in the plainest English I knew how to use. Of course, the agreement must have power behind it. The United States is behind it, and that is considerable power. I said the reason why we can do it now is because we own it and have the power to do with it as we desire. The secret belongs to us. When we undertake to outlaw the atomic bomb the other nations will be obliged to agree, and then, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio said a while ago, it would be a very simple thing for the great peace organization which we have established, or propose to establish, as the result of the conference at San Francisco to ascertain by appropriate examination of the factories in the various countries whether they are undertaking to violate the agreement which they would undoubtedly make.

I think today Great Britain would be delighted to enter into such an agreement; I believe Russia would; I believe China would; I believe every other nation in the world would enter into such an agreement. But if they had the formula for these bombs themselves, if we should transfer the formula for making the bomb to them, and they then had an equal interest with us in it, I am not so sure that we could get an agreement to outlaw the bombs. I am not so sure that the peace organization that we established at San Francisco would undertake to carry out the agreement even if it were made by a few nations.

My purpose in discussing the question yesterday was to suggest that power be provided to enforce any agreement which might be made. If we outlaw the atomic bomb and an agreement is made, I doubt whether any other nation will do what we have done and find the formula for it. It is quite an expensive task. I am still for a permanent peace, but I do not believe we can obtain a permanent peace if we give away the process for making these bombs, or if we do not shield the innocent men, women, and children against this deadly machine of war. The use of this atomic bomb is not war as we understand that term, but it is purely a barbaric mass destruction of all people against whom it is used, whether they are fighting or engaged in war or not.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not discussed the steps which I think should be taken. I hope to address the Senate on that subject more fully at some later time, but as an inkling of what is involved when we talk of outlawing or controlling this tremendous force, I wish to read very briefly from a book entitled "Modern Man Is Obsolete," by Norman Cousins. This is an extension of an editorial which appeared in the Saturday Review:

> Reject all other arguments for world government—reject the geographic, economic, the ideological, the sociological, the humanitarian arguments, valid though they may be. Consider only the towering job of policing the atom—the job of keeping the smallest particle of matter from destroying all matter. This means control. But control is no natural phenomenon. It does not operate of and by itself. Control is impossible without power—the power of investigation, the power of injunction, the power of arrest, the power of punishment. But power, like control, cannot be isolated, nor is it desirable except under carefully defined circumstances. Power must be subordinate to law, unless it is to take the form of brute, irresponsible force. Here, too, we are involved in an immediate interrelationship, because law can be derived only through government. Law is a product of moral, judicial, executive, legislative, and administrative sanction—all of which adds up to government. And government means what it says: the process of governing. It is not decentralization, it is not informal organization, it is not the right of veto or the right of secession by any State or States. It is a control body none of whose members has the right or the means of aggression or withdrawal. It is the source of legitimate action and legitimate redress.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, in regard to the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] for exempting from the application of the bill, if and when it becomes law, the civil functions of the Army engineers, I wish to join him in everything he has said complimentary to the Board of Engineers, which is a great organization. It is true they are entitled to the confidence of the Congress, to our compliments, and to all the good and gracious things we may say about them. But I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that everything they have done has been done under a President of the United States as well as under laws enacted by the Congress of the United States and approved by the President and executed by him.

Mr. President, to me it is not convincing argument to say that we should exempt an agency from the application of the proposed legislation merely because it is efficient and has rendered valuable service in the past. If we take that view of reorganization, then there will never be any reorganization, things will remain in status quo, because it is my opinion that with few exceptions we can refer to every executive agency of the Government and point out its efficiency, its accomplishments, and what can be expected in the future. I join the Senator in complimenting the board of Army engineers. I go one step further and, because of his great persuasive powers, compliment them in having the distinguished Senator from Louisiana as their advocate and sponsor in this Chamber.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words to my colleagues on this side of the aisle. We all admit, and our colleagues on the other side agree with us, that there should be reorganization in the executive departments. They point to duplication, and we point to it. They point to overlapping of functions, and we point to it. We are constantly complaining of such conditions, and another matter we complain of most vehemently is terrific and tremendous expenditures in the executive departments.

Mr. President, we talk, but do little about it. Our complaints come to the attention of the President, and he, in response to our complaints, sends a message to the Congress requesting that, if we are not willing to undertake reorganization as a matter of legislation in the Congress, we legislate appropriate policy and authority to enable him to do it. I state that we cannot do it here; it is too complex; it is too big a job; it takes too much time. So, in my opinion, the Congress of the United States simply cannot do the job.

The President sends his message to us, and, realizing that the Congress cannot do the job, says, "I am willing to undertake it. Living with the whole executive department day in and day out," the President says to us in his message, "I am closer to it, I know more about its deficiencies than you do, and I am willing, under your guidance, in conformity with your policy, following your directions, to reorganize the executive agencies and establishment of government."

Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues on this side of the aisle to the fact that, being the party in power, the Democratic Party, having a Democratic majority in the Senate and in the House, having a Democratic President, if there are deficiencies in our Government, if reorganization is needed—and no one here will say it is not—then it is the responsibility of the Democratic Party to move into the picture and accomplish a reorganization in line with legislation such as now pending before the Senate. Our colleagues on the other side say they want reorganization, but reorganization is not their responsibility; it is the responsibility of the majority party.

Only a few months ago the President of the United States was our colleague in the Senate. We knew him here. We know him now. If this legislation is adopted, it terminates before expiration of the term of office of the present President of the United States. I say to the Senate today: Is the man in the White House any different from the Senator who sat here among us? What change has come about, Mr. President, in that man which warrants the Senate of the United States in imagining that he will do something destructive, let us say, to the great organization of the Army engineers? He is just as cognizant of their great reputation and the magnificent work they have done and will do in the future as is the Senate as a whole, or as is any individual Senator.

So I ask: Is it fair, is it logical, is it reasonable to assume that the Chief Executive, who is not only the Chief Executive so far as the Army engineers are

concerned, but their Commander in Chief, will transfer them or reorganize them or do anything that will destroy their efficiency or their ability to perpetuate the valuable services they have rendered in the past? Mr. President, I simply cannot believe that the argument is logical. I simply cannot believe that by reason of the efficiency of a great organization they should be exempted from the reorganization bill, if reorganization is really desired.

Mr. President, when I see all the amendments which are on the table today I am rather doubtful whether in good faith we want reorganization. We cannot get it unless we are willing to delegate some little power and repose some little confidence in someone in the executive department to move into the situation and take action. We cannot talk about what some other President may do because the act terminates before the termination of the present Chief Executive's term of office. So I say we need have little fear or little apprehension as to his doing anything destructive to this great organization.

Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who inspires me every time he takes the floor of the Senate, that if it were merely this organization for which exemption is requested I would say, "All well and good, let us accept it." But just so sure as the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is adopted, a dozen other amendments will be offered calling for the exemption from reorganization of a dozen other agencies. Already there are in the bill 13 exemptions. If the Senator's amendment is adopted that will make 14. How under the sun can reorganization be effected if we exempt one after another every executive agency in which someone has a special interest?

I say to my Democratic colleagues: Reorganization is our responsibility. If we want it we should want it in good faith. If we want it in good faith, then we should be willing to give a Democratic President whatever power is necessary to carry out our legislative policies within the well-defined banks and standards fully set out in the proposed legislation.

With all due respect to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Mr. President, I hope his amendment will be voted down.

I wish to add one more word before I take my seat. This very question of exempting the civil functions of the Army engineers came up before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. It was discussed thoroughly and after full discussion it was decided to leave that agency out of the bill. I think that action should have some weight with the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the very able and distinguished and courteous Senator from Utah almost disarms me with the complimentary phrases by which he refers to my humble work in the Senate. I wish to express my appreciation of what he has said about me, and in return to say in all seriousness that there is no Senator for whose ability, courage, and patriotism I entertain a higher admiration than I do for the Senator from Utah. In fact, I usually find myself in agreement with him.

It seems to me that the Senator destroys his own argument, however, when he undertakes to ask us to support the administration and at the same time advocates a bill which departs from the recommendation of the President of the United States. The President, in seeking at the hands of the Congress the power of reorganization, did not suggest that any exceptions whatsoever be made. There was not a single agency that he thought should be exempted. The President's recommendation was that all agencies should be turned over to him for reorganization purposes. The Committee on the Judiciary has not only departed from the recommendations of the President as respects agencies, but even as respects departments. The bill reported by the committee inhibits the President from making any reorganiza- of any department and transferring that department to another department or even calling the head of any reorganized agency a secretary.

The question as it addresses itself to me is: Why should the Committee on the Judiciary say, "We are privileged to depart from the program laid down by the President of the United States, but the remaining Members of the United States Senate must not do it. We present certain exemptions, 13 in number. They are our sacred cows. They are not to be touched. They are hallowed. They are sanctified by our action. But you, the Senator from Louisiana, and you, the Senator from Ohio, and you, the Senator from West Virginia, and you, the Senator from Maine, and you, the Senator from Ohio, and other Senators, cannot propose any exemption because that would be contrary to what the President desires." What the President desires is that there be no exemptions; and if the Judiciary Committee had complied with the President's suggestion, and reported a bill containing no exemptions, I know I would not have offered the pending amendment. But the committee says, "Here are a number of untouchable items in the executive departments. They are not to be made the subject of reorganization." When the committee says that, it impliedly says to the President, "All other agencies are open to reorganization, and we invite you to reorganize every other agency, because if we had any doubt whatsoever as to other agencies, we would have included them in the exemptions. But since, for example, the Corps of Army Engineers is not included in the exemptions, therefore the Corps of Army Engineers is a fit subject matter for your consideration when it comes to reorganizing the agencies of the Government."

I suggest to the able Senator from Utah, who has charge of the bill, that I believe the Judiciary Committee has made a mistake.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am only too happy to agree with the Senator that that was a mistake. I vigorously opposed it in the Judiciary Committee. But let me ask the Senator this question: Does the Senator favor reorganization at all?

Mr. OVERTON. I favor reorganization. When the President delivered his message I stated in the press that I favored the reorganization plan of the President. I favor it now. But the committee does not present the reorganization plan of the President.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should say that we have materially departed from it.

Mr. OVERTON. That, alas, is true, indeed.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure that when the Senator says he believes in reorganization he means it. But the Senator takes the position that merely because in the wisdom of the majority of the committee a few exemptions were made, any Senator who wishes to have some pet organization exempted is entitled to have that done because the Judiciary Committee saw fit to exempt 13 organizations.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not make that contention. Any Senator who proposes an additional exemption must justify it. The able Senator says that I undertake to justify the exemption solely on the ground that the Corps of Engineers of the Army is efficient. I have done so not merely on that ground, but also on a number of other grounds which it is not necessary for me to repeat. However, on the question of efficiency, I made the statement that I could not conceive of any other agency of the Government, either in existence or which might hereafter be created, which could perform the scientific work being performed by the Army engineers. There is no other agency either now in existence or that could be created, which could do the work done by the Corps of Army Engineers in relation to our inland waterways, our harbors, and our flood-control work. It has performed stupendous tasks in a masterful manner. If that be true, why invite the President to dismantle such an organization?

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator does not take the position, does he, that the Chief Executive is not as cognizant of the facts which he states as is the Senate?

Mr. OVERTON. I take cognizance of the fact that the Senator's committee reports a bill which invites the President of the United States to dismantle the Corps of Army Engineers. I say that that is wrong. It ought not to be done. If the committee had confidence in the President, it should have reported a bill with no exemptions, leaving it to the President to reorganize the various departments and agencies. Does the Senator mean to tell me that he thinks the President might wish to reorganize the Interstate Commerce Commission and transfer it to some other agency? If not, why say to the President, "You cannot do it?"

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not do that.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's committee did it; and the Senator stands here as a representative of the committee and a proponent of the bill which the committee has reported to the Senate. If the Senator will move to strike out all the exemptions and exceptions, I will

abandon my amendment. But the Senator does not do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yesterday I prefaced my remarks by the statement that I was not in accord with all the provisions of the bill. I stated very emphatically that I probably would find some embarrassment in presenting the bill, but I did it because of a request coming from the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], just as the Senator from Louisiana introduced the bill because of a request from the same distinguished Senator. The Senator should not blame me for the inclusion of all these exemptions, when I voted against most of them in the committee.

Mr. OVERTON. The bill which I introduced as a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Nevada contained no exemptions whatever. I stand on that philosophy and that doctrine. I stand behind the President.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish the Senate would join the Senator in that stand.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well; but that is not the question before the Senate. What is before the Senate is a bill reported by the Judiciary Committee which exempts 13 agencies and fails to exempt an agency which I believe every Senator, even including the Senator from Utah, believes should be exempted. In fact, he says so, because he says that he dares not for a moment entertain the thought that the President of the United States would ever interfere with the activities of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. MURDOCK. I said that because of the argument which the Senator from Louisiana made; and it seems to me that that is an answer to his argument. If all the things he says are true, if it be true that the functions of the Army engineers could not be transferred to another agency with any expectation of greater efficiency, or even as great efficiency as is now the case, certainly the President can be depended upon not to destroy the efficiency of that great agency.

Mr. OVERTON. I am sure the Senator could go further, in his heart of hearts, and stand before the Senate and say, "It is my own independent judgment that the Corps of Army Engineers should be exempted."

Mr. President, I submit the amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Austin	Ferguson	Knowland
Ball	Fulbright	La Follette
Barkley	Gerry	Langer
Bilbo	Gurney	McClellan
Brewster	Hart	McKellar
Brooks	Hatch	Magnuson
Byrd	Hayden	Maybank
Capper	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Connally	Hill	Moore
Cordon	Hoey	Morse
Donnell	Huffman	Murdock
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Overton	Taft	Wherry
Radcliffe	Taylor	Wiley
Revercomb	Tunnell	Willis
Robertson	Vandenberg	Wilson
Russell	Wheeler	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to the committee amendment on page 7, in line 20. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WILLIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] who I understand would vote "yea" if present, and let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent attending the Food and Agricultural Conference in Quebec.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE and Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Texas and is, therefore, necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

I also announce the following general pairs: the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]; the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]; and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries received in an accident.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is detained on official business, has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has been excused, is absent on business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—36

Andrews	Gurney	Morse
Austin	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hoey	Revercomb
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Knowland	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Wherry
Cordon	Magnuson	Wiley
Eastland	Maybank	Willis
Ellender	Millikin	Wilson
Fulbright	Moore	Young

NAYS—18

Barkley	Hayden	Murdock
Byrd	Hill	Myers
Donnell	Huffman	Russell
Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Gerry	La Follette	Vandenberg
Hatch	Langer	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—41

Aiken	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Saltonstall
Bankhead	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bridges	Kilgore	Smith
Briggs	Lucas	Stewart
Buck	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	Mead	Tobey
Carville	Mitchell	Tydings
Chavez	Murray	Wagner
Downey	O'Daniel	Walsh
George	O'Mahoney	White
Glass	Pepper	

So Mr. OVERTON's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a motion?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to proceed with my remarks. I should be glad to yield for a question, but not for any action.

Mr. OVERTON. There will be no debate in connection with the motion.

Mr. TAFT. The motion is debatable, with due respect to the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. I assure the Senator that if any debate ensues, I shall withdraw the motion.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. WHERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the bill which is now before the Senate deals with a vitally important subject, one about as important, in my opinion, as anything the Senate has had before it, certainly since we have returned from the summer vacation. I think it is most unfortunate that very few Senators have been on the floor during the debate, that very few Senators, apparently, take any interest, though the bill involves a vitally important proposal, that of delegating a large part of our legislative power to the President of the United States.

We are asked to delegate to the President one of the most important legislative functions given to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States. The organization of the departments and the entire executive administration, the division of powers and the exact manner in which they shall be exercised, the extent of those powers and the restraints upon them, have been the subject of legislative action since the Constitution was adopted. Many of the most extensive debates and bitter contests which have taken place in Congress for 100 years have dealt with these subjects. I need refer only to the recent transfer of the RFC from the Department of Commerce to the Federal Loan Agency, the recent action in taking the Rural Electrification Administration from the Department of Agriculture and making it independent, because we felt it was being interfered with due to political considerations, as examples within a recent brief period.

The authors of the original bill and of the committee amendment both admit this, in effect, by the curious provision permitting Congress as a whole, or either House of Congress, to veto action taken by the President under authority of the proposed bill. Whatever the Constitutional situation, it is quite clear that the authors of the bill feel that Congress should not delegate this power without restriction, but should reserve some power of further approval. I think we must all agree that, in effect, the business of reorganization and the creation of bureaus in departments is a legislative function.

We are asked to delegate this power, apparently, on the ground that Congress is incompetent to deal with a problem clearly imposed upon it by the Constitution. The argument is that the opposition of the bureaus is so strong that wise consolidation cannot be enacted into law.

Undoubtedly, Mr. President, Congress has been negligent in its dealing with this subject from an over-all standpoint. It has added one bureau after another without coordinating their activities or carefully planning to prevent duplication. But I do not agree that it need necessarily continue to be negligent. I believe that a committee of the Congress, with the assistance of the Executive, should formulate a plan of reorganization and, submitting it in sections to the Congress, secure approval if it is in fact a sound plan. I think we should at this time formulate such a plan, setting up the basic structure of the postwar government, and leaving some discretion to the President, within the basic outline which we establish, to improve and coordinate. Since I have been in Congress, no attempt has been made to work out legislation for a sound plan of reorganization, and I do not admit that we would fail in that test. Certainly it is no more complicated than the atomic bomb or the formulation of a United Nations organization.

However, Mr. President, I do not greatly object to the pending bill with the committee amendment, because it does not transfer from the Senate the ultimate power of passing on any reorganization plan proposed. It merely transfers the formulation of the plan to the Executive, and leaves to us in the Senate the power to veto that plan, just as we might disapprove any plan proposed by a committee.

I think this would be better accomplished if the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] were adopted, so that we would pass upon the question in an affirmative way. His amendment, which will be offered, provides that a joint resolution must be adopted by both Houses of Congress in order to approve any plan submitted by the President. I think that would be more in accordance with the Constitution.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In view of the Senator's reference to the proposed amendment, I inquire whether he would have objection if the amendment might now be considered as having been offered and as being before the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator for the purpose of offering the amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has referred, and which has already been sent to the desk in printed form.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the amendment be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 14, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 14 on page 15, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. (a) No reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving the plan or a part thereof. In the event such joint resolution approves the plan, each of the reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect on the date of enactment of such joint resolution or on the date specified pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to any particular reorganization, whichever may be the later date. In the event such joint resolution approves only a portion of the reorganizations specified in the plan, each of the reorganizations approved shall take effect on the date of enactment of such joint resolution or on the date specified pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to any particular reorganization, whichever may be the later date.

On page 15, line 21, after the period insert the following: "If only a portion of the reorganization specified in the plan take effect, so much of the reorganization plan as relates to those reorganizations shall be so printed."

On page 18, beginning with line 13, strike out all down to the end of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may point out that the adoption of the method proposed by the Senator from Missouri for dealing with a reorganization plan submitted by the President would meet all constitutional objections. It is said that the committee amendment is unconstitutional because it gives either House the right to veto. It seems to me it is obvious that if that is unconstitutional it is just as unconstitutional to adopt the terms of the original bill which provides that the two Houses together may veto; because that is no more a legislative act than the action of one House. As a matter of fact, I doubt whether in effect this proposal goes to the same provision as the committee amendment. It would require action by both Houses and if either House disapproved, then the proposal could not become law. I think it meets the constitutional objection, and I could support the bill only if we retain at least the substance of our right to veto any change in the organizations and powers which we, the Congress of the United States, have heretofore established.

Mr. President, I am in full accord with the idea of changing the rules of the Senate so that plans of this kind shall be passed upon, so that we may no longer have any difficulty with the problem of amendment or with problems of delay in acting on such questions. I am glad if we impose upon ourselves the restrictions which we do under this bill to assure a prompt consideration of these measures. Unfortunately, I do not think the provisions of the existing bill do that very well.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand the amendment of the Senator from Missouri which the distinguished Senator from Ohio seems enthusiastically to support, strikes out that entire provision.

Mr. TAFT. I did not study that part of the amendment, but in any event in my opinion we should adopt the definite rule.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I understand the Senator he certainly does not agree to that part of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TAFT. No; I think the Senator from Utah is correct. I think we should impose rules upon ourselves because I think the difficulty has been not so much the inability of the Congress to formulate

a plan of reorganization as the fact that when such a plan is presented one amendment after another, such as that of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], which was adopted, is presented, until the whole over-all conception is changed.

I am quite willing that we limit ourselves; that we shall not have the right to amend; that we shall pass on the plan as it is submitted to us, and say "Yes" or "No." Furthermore we should provide that the question shall come definitely to a vote.

In that regard it seems to me that title II, which deals with the rules, imposes a rather difficult task on those who may be trying to get a vote on a resolution disapproving a proposed reorganization. The resolution goes to a committee. If the committee does not report it, the committee does not do anything. That is likely to happen. If the chairman is in favor of the plan he does not call a meeting of the committee. Then it is necessary to make a motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution. Then it is necessary to make a motion to take up the measure. While attempts are made to impose restrictions on filibuster and delay, we all know that even under the cloture rule and other procedures it is not at all certain that we can successfully stop filibusters.

The Senator from Michigan has an amendment which proposes very simply that when a joint resolution to approve or to disapprove is introduced, if the amendment of the Senator from Missouri is adopted, it would go to the committee, but 10 days after that time it would become the special order of business in the Senate of the United States. I think that would be a great improvement in the matter of rules.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will indulge me for a few minutes, let us look at what the amendment of the Senator from Michigan does. It provides that automatically at a certain time the resolution concerning the reorganization plan shall come to the floor for debate. Then it provides that automatically at a certain hour there shall be a vote on the resolution. The Senator can certainly see that that type of procedure simply would not work. Suppose someone who opposed the resolution should obtain the floor; under the amendment of the Senator from Michigan he could use the entire time from the beginning of debate to the close, and then there would have to be a vote taken by the Senate without any other Senator having a right to speak at all.

Mr. President, it is an easy thing to rush in with amendments and try to change a plan that has been well thought out, but I call attention to the fact that in the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri the Senator from Ohio was not cognizant of what that amendment did. I am sure he was not familiar and is not familiar with all the implications of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. I want to expedite to the utmost extent consideration of a resolution which might be presented, but I do not want to do it by some haphazard method which has not been well thought out. I am sure the Senator does not want to do so either.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, these amendments are not actually before the Senate, and I shall be glad to debate the details of the amendments when they are before the Senate, but the substance of what I have said is, I think, true. The Senator suggests, I take it, that the Senator from Michigan has left out the provision contained in the pending bill to divide time equally. I think it ought to be included in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, if that is what the Senator is concerned about.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I mean. That is only one defect in it, however.

Mr. TAFT. On the other hand, I think it is wrong to require the opponents of a reorganization plan to assume the burden, first, of a motion to discharge the committee; second, of a motion to bring up the bill; and, third, the debate itself on the reorganization plan. They are at a considerable handicap. A motion to discharge a committee is always a difficult one to adopt in the Senate of the United States. Here is a case where the committee has 10 days to consider. They may only meet once. It is not at all certain that the chairman will even call the committee together. I do not believe that burden ought to be imposed. It seems to me that if we are to make a rule to bring the matter to a vote without possibility of amendment, it ought to be brought up on a certain day after it is submitted, and disposed of, yes or no.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Utah referred to the fact that the amendment I offered a few moments ago does not include title II or the equivalent of it as it appears in Senate bill 1120. That is correct because of the fact that the bill is based upon the theory that the President may transmit a plan which upon receipt, unless something is affirmatively done by Congress, shall become law. Consequently, the amendment which I have submitted, which would require passage of a joint resolution, would not be met by title II.

I have no objection, however, to the inclusion of a section corresponding to title II to cover the situation presented by the plan which I have submitted; and, if I may have unanimous consent to do so, I now send to the desk a further amendment which incorporates a plan for a special and speedy consideration of the question.

Mr. TAFT. I take it the Senator from Missouri desires to modify his amendment to include such a provision?

Mr. DONNELL. I do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I want only to make the point that I think it is important—indeed, that it is the most important point if effective reorganization is to be achieved—that a comprehensive, over-all plan should be formulated and drafted, with consideration for all the different agencies concerned, and worked out as a consistent plan, and then rules should be provided to enable us to determine for ourselves that we will vote "yes" or "no" on that plan. I think that is an important feature of the bill and should necessarily be retained. I think if we do that it will eliminate most of the reasons which in the past have perhaps interfered with the passage of effective legislation.

Under such rules, President Roosevelt submitted a considerable number of reorganization plans under the Reorganization Act of 1939. Every one of those plans would have been enacted under the provisions of the committee amendment with the exception, I think, of one. It was possible, in other words, for the President to get both Houses to agree to all but one of the reorganization plans which he submitted. So I believe that the contention that the Congress will not adopt a reorganization plan is no longer valid.

It is doubtful whether that one plan should have been approved. It was approved, as a matter of fact. I think it was the one which to a large extent destroyed the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Board. But I think that is the only one the approval of which would have been prevented by the provisions of the committee amendment or the Donnell amendment which is now before the Senate.

We cannot assume that everything the Executive recommends is necessarily right. In fact, under the unlimited powers of the First War Powers Act, the President has been shifting departments and bureaus in such a way and so fast as to demoralize and seriously interfere with the effectiveness of many bureaus. Changes have been made solely to meet personality problems, or indirectly to change policies which the President did not approve, and with respect to which he did not care to say directly to the agency that he wished to have them changed. There should be some stability about Government organization if it is to be effective.

Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment which reads as follows:

Provided, That no reorganization plan submitted shall contain any disposition in conflict with any act of Congress passed after January 1, 1943, dealing expressly with the creation, transfer, consolidation, or coordination of any agency or the distribution or coordination of powers or functions between agencies or within any agency.

It seems clear to me that the President should not be able in any plan to reverse action taken by Congress within a few years, after careful consideration. I believe that the President should accept the verdict of Congress and design his plans with care and deliberation within the limits which Congress has so recently determined. After several years perhaps conditions will have changed, and the same principles need not apply.

It may be argued that we still retain a veto power, but the President could tie up a reversal of a recent congressional action with a number of very desirable improvements, and thus prevent Congress from insisting on the decision which it had already reached.

Let me refer to a number of examples. Last January we passed a bill to take the RFC from the Department of Com-

merce and restore it to the Federal Loan Agency. The conditions which led to our decision have not changed.

Last spring we passed a bill to take the Rural Electrification Administration from the Department of Agriculture and set it up as an independent agency. If those decisions are reversed today, or within a few years after their adoption, it seems to me that it should be done by specific act of Congress. And yet under the terms of the bill, the moment it was enacted the President could wrap up a fine reorganization plan and include in the plan the return of the RFC to the Department of Commerce, or the return of the REA to the Department of Agriculture, and we should be confronted either with rejecting a good plan or deliberately swallowing the decision which the Congress recently made.

The Congress recently established the Smaller War Plants Corporation to make loans to small business. It was felt that the RFC, dealing in huge figures, would not take much interest in making loans to minor concerns; and it did not. Under this plan the President could merge the Smaller War Plants Corporation in the RFC and completely destroy the purpose of Congress.

In this connection, the President is even given power to abolish functions. Surely he should not be able to abolish a function established by Congress within the past year or two, after deliberate study. The idea is that he should be able to abolish obsolete agencies. On the other hand, if we have deliberately established an activity within the past 2 years, it seems to me that we certainly should not now grant the power to nullify what the Congress has chosen to do.

Even more important than the transfer of bureaus is the distribution of powers within bureaus. The Senate Committee on Education and Labor has just been considering a bill to provide Federal aid for the construction of hospitals. We now find the bill on the Senate calendar. We gave great consideration to the powers of the Surgeon General, and had conflicting testimony on that subject. We finally decided that in certain respects, particularly in the making of regulations prescribing standards, his action should be subject to the approval of a Federal Hospital Council, containing a number of experts on the subject. I very much hope that the Congress may enact that bill within the next month.

The moment after that law was enacted, under the terms of the pending bill the President could submit a reorganization plan abolishing the Federal Hospital Council and transferring all its powers to the Surgeon General or to the Federal Security Administrator. He could abolish the Office of Surgeon General, and turn the whole plan over to the Federal Works Administrator or the Social Security Board. Changes of this kind in a reorganization plan might be of minor importance, and likely to be dwarfed by the more important issues contained in the plan. It seems to me that when we deliberately adopt a policy, at least for 2 or 3 years after that time, the President should not be able to reverse the action taken by Congress after careful consideration. These are legislative questions, and we legislate about them every day in Congress. I do not believe that we should delegate to the President even the power to formulate and submit to us a plan which would deliberately reverse a recent action taken by Congress.

Take the Bretton Woods bill which we passed last summer. Many powers of the American representative on the fund and on the bank can only be exercised with the approval of a board made up of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank. The President could abolish the Board and give unrestricted power to one man to permit the sale in this country of $9,000,000,000 of guaranteed foreign securities. The passage of the bill was largely obtained by carefully designed restrictions on the power of the American representative. Yet, now we propose to let the President abolish all those restrictions as part of a general reorganization plan.

With great deliberation, Congress established the independence of the Export-Import Bank, giving proper representation to the departments on its Board. If this bill is passed, it may be transferred the next day to the State Department, or the Federal Reserve Board, or the Treasury, or it may be entirely abolished and its functions transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Consider the problem of the Missouri Valley Authority and the manner in which the President might change the situation there. Under this bill he could transfer the Reclamation Service, or that part of its work dealing with the Missouri Valley, to the Army engineers. After the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], he could no longer transfer the Army engineers to the Reclamation Service. He could transfer the Federal Power Commission to the Army engineers or to the Reclamation Service. By such transfers he could determine the whole character of the development of the Missouri River, and he could do this the day after Congress had determined on the proper organization for Government work on the Missouri Valley and reverse any action taken by Congress.

We are now considering the establishment of a permanent National Housing Authority. While I favor a unified housing department, it is strongly opposed by many who desire the FHA and the Federal home-loan banks to be completely independent. We are trying to make them autonomous in many respects while retaining a unity in the entire department. The President could wipe out these restrictions and put the loaning agency under public housing, or vice versa, and he could do it the day after we worked out the policy, entirely reversing the action of Congress.

Senators will remember the soldiers'-vote bill. It was passed with the assurance that the Army and Navy would administer it with complete impartiality, as they did, but the President could transfer soldiers' voting tomorrow to the Postmaster General if he wished to do so. He could transfer the War Food Administration to the OPA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am interested in what the Senator says about transferring the Reclamation Service to the Missouri Valley Authority. There is no such thing as a Missouri Valley Authority, except in conversation.

Mr. TAFT. What I intended to say was that it could be transferred to the Army engineers, or that the President could transfer the Reclamation Service work in the Missouri Valley to the Army engineers, or unify it all under the Army engineers. After the adoption of the Overton amendment, the functions of the Army engineers could not be transferred. The whole thing could be put under the Federal Power Commission. In that way the President could, in effect, create a Missouri Valley Authority, because by concentrating all the work in the hands of the Federal Power Commission, the effect would be the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Ohio contend that the President could appropriate money without an act of Congress?

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. BYRD. The Missouri Valley Authority would require enormous expenditures. An effective Missouri Valley Authority could not be created simply by transferring one bureau to another.

Mr. TAFT. So far as expenditures are concerned, we could put the appropriations in the rivers and harbors bill, or they could be put in a reclamation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Congress would have to do that.

Mr. TAFT. Congress could put the appropriations in all kinds of bills.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot let the statement stand unchallenged that a Missouri Valley Authority could be created by transfers.

Mr. TAFT. After the Missouri Valley Authority was created, it could not build a dam unless Congress authorized construction of the dam. The question of what can be done in the Missouri Valley is entirely different from the question of who is to do it. It seems to me that the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority is not so much a question of what is to be done as it is a question of who is to do it. Is it to be done with an interest in reclamation, an interest in navigation, or an interest in power? So far as appropriations are concerned, we can appropriate the money without having a Missouri Valley Authority. This bill would enable the President to convert the Reclamation Service into a Missouri Valley Authority if he should see fit to do so, exercising all the powers of the Army engineers, all the powers of the Federal Power Commission, and all the other Federal powers relating to the Missouri River.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As the Western States see it, the danger in the proposed Missouri Valley Authority scheme is that under it the Federal Government would be given authority over the waters of the States. In connection with reclamation activities, the Reclamation Service only develops the waters for the citizens of the State. It never takes ownership.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator that this bill could not affect the powers of the Federal Government over the States. So far as that abjection to the bill is concerned, my statement does not apply.

Mr. President, the examples which I have given show the tremendous power which we are asked to delegate to the President of the United States. They illustrate the fact that unless we are going to abdicate our duties as well as our proper functions, we must retain the right to approve proposals made by the President. Furthermore, I think it is clear that any action taken by Congress in this field should stand for 2 or 3 years without the proposal of changes which are linked up with such desirable changes that they practically have to be accepted.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I believe the Donnell amendment should be adopted. Although I shall vote for the committee amendment if the Donnell amendment is rejected, because the ultimate theory of it is the same, I think the Donnell amendment is much more constitutional.

I feel very strongly that the adoption of my own amendment is necessary unless we are going to admit that the President can overrule Congress on matters of legislative policy. I feel that the procedure specified in the bill should be made more clear.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Ohio propose to amend the proposal of the Senator from Missouri with respect to the——

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Missouri has already amended his proposal.

Mr. BYRD. He has not amended it with respect to recent legislation, though.

Mr. TAFT. No; that is my amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator from Ohio offering that amendment as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TAFT. No; I shall offer my amendment when the proper time comes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Am I correct in understanding that the pending amendment is the one offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, as modified.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the amendment I have submitted, as modified in order to cover the point which was mentioned by the distinguished junior Senator from Utah and which was concurred by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, has been sent forward to the desk. The printed amendment which was submitted earlier today contains the matters of substantive law, as I esteem them to be, as distinguished from procedural matters. At this time I shall discuss both the substantive matter and the procedural matter embraced in the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator, for the information of some of us, read the proposed amendment which is now under discussion?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes, Mr. President; I shall be pleased to do so. Senators who have the printed copies of the amendment as submitted earlier today will find it helpful, doubtless, to read the earlier portion of the amendment from the printed copy. The amendment as now modified is as follows:

Beginning on page 14, line 23, strike out all down to and including line 14 on page 15—

Which is section 4 (a)—

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) No reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving the plan or a part thereof. In the event such joint resolution approves the plan, each of the reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect on the date of enactment of such joint resolution or on the date specified pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to any particular reorganization, whichever may be the later date. In the event such joint resolution approves only a portion of the reorganizations specified in the plan, each of the reorganizations approved shall take effect on the date of enactment of such joint resolution or on the date specified pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to any particular reorganization, whichever may be the later date."

Then, Mr. President, the amendment proceeds by providing that—

On page 15, line 21, after the period, insert the following: "If only a portion of the reorganizations specified in the plan take effect, so much of the reorganization plan as relates to those reorganizations shall be so printed."

Mr. President, the modification submitted a few moments ago, which I shall call the procedural portion of the amendment, necessarily is somewhat tedious because of its length. However, I shall read it as expeditiously as possible, and I trust that its meaning will appear as I proceed. In substance, the purpose of the procedural portion of the amendment is to provide for covering the situation with which the substantive portion of my amendment deals, namely, the proposal that no reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving the plan or a part thereof.

The bill as it now is pending with the committee amendment covers the converse situation, which I think should be stricken out, namely, the provision for a resolution to the effect that the particular House—either the Senate or the House of Representatives—does not favor the reorganization plan.

So, Mr. President, as I read the procedural portion of the amendment which I have offered, I ask Senators to bear in mind the fact that it covers the point that before a proposed plan is binding it shall first have been approved by affirmative action of the Congress. The procedural portion reads as follows:

On page 19, beginning with line 4, strike out all down to and including line 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term 'resolution' means only a joint resolution, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Congress approves [the following portions of] the reorganization plan No. ——, transmitted to Congress by the President on ——— —, 19—,' the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled and the matter in brackets being used or not used as may be appropriate in the particular case. In the event the matter in brackets is used, a colon and appropriate language defining the portions of the plan approved shall be inserted after the date in the resolution. As used in this title, the term 'resolution' does not include a joint resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan."

Then, Mr. President, the amendment further proceeds with various other details which are necessary in order to harmonize with the earlier portion. They read as follows:

On page 19, in line 19, after the period, insert the following:

"If the committee to which a resolution is referred decides to report such resolution, it may report such resolution as referred or may report it with an amendment or with amendments, but no such amendment or amendments shall change the form of such resolution as provided for by section 202 or make it applicable to more than one reorganization plan."

Then—

On page 20, in line 3, after the word "other", insert "identically worded."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have a clear understanding of the Senator's amendment. Do I correctly understand that, under the amendment, when the President sends a reorganization plan to the Congress, the Congress can amend it?

Mr. DONNELL. To this extent: If for instance, a plan consisting of items 1 to 8 is submitted, Congress would, under this plan, be entitled to say, "We will approve items 1, 2, 3 and 4, but not items 5, 6, 7, and 8."

But the amendment would not permit the the incorporation of two reorganization plans. The only effect of the portion of the amendment to which I have referred is that Congress may select portions of the reorganization plan, rather than to take all of the reorganization plan, if it desires so to do.

Mr. BYRD. Could Congress insert any new matter in a Presidential plan?

Mr. DONNELL. No. Congress would have to take the plan as submitted, and either adopt all of it or portions of it, but not some additional plan.

Then—

On page 20, in line 7, strike out "a" and insert in lieu thereof "an identically worded."

On page 20, in line 17, after the word "through", insert "identically worded."

Finally, on page 21, beginning in line 3, strike out all down to and including line 9—

That is to say, subdivision (b) of the present section 205—

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Amendments to the resolution, except amendments changing the form of the resolution as provided for by section 202 or making the resolution applicable to more than one reorganization plan, shall be in order. Debate on the resolution and on all appropriate amendments thereto shall be limited to not exceed 20 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No motion to recommit the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution or any amendment thereto is agreed to or disagreed to."

Mr. President, the basis of the substantive portion and, in fact, also the procedural portion——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Misscuri, no 60-day limitation is placed upon the Congress for consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the basis of the proposed amendment is that the bill, in its present form before the Senate, constitutes in my opinion, and was so indicated yesterday, a clear delegation of legislative power to the President, and therefore violates the Constitution of the United States. The purpose of the amendment is to remove the delegation of legislative power, and to require that any reorganization shall be accomplished through the constitutional exercise of legislative power. That the bill constitutes a delegation of legislative power is affirmaively and repeatedly stated in the report of the Judiciary Committee. I recall with much interest the very able discussion by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] yesterday afternoon in which he took the position that there is no delegation of legislative power. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact tht the report of the Committee on the Judciary, every member of which I believe is a distinguished lawyer, contains on page 3 the following language:

In an effort to achieve the practical objectives of reorganization of the executive branch, this bill provides that part of the legislative power of the Congress shall be delegated to the President, and that the action of the President, taken in the exercise of the legislative power so delegated, shall be the law of the land unless it be set aside by a resolution passed by a majority vote of either House.

Can it be seriously contended, Mr. President, that the Judiciary Committee, consisting entirely of distinguished lawyers, did not mean that there was a delegation of legislative power when, within the very sentence which I have read, the expression "legislative power" occurs twice? But perhaps it might be a mere inadvertence that such reference appears in that one sentence. Let us proceed to the next paragraph in which the Judiciary Committee has said:

Such a delegation of legislative power does not operate to deprive either House of the Congress of its constitutional right to have no change made in the law relating to organization of the Government without the assent of at least a majority of its members present and voting.

And so, Mr. President, we find that within those two paragraphs three distinct references have been made to a delegation of legislative power to the President of the United States. But, perchance, there might have been some error in those two sentences, I proceed with the next paragraph:

Under this bill either House of the Congress, upon seeing precisely how the President proposes to exercise—

What?—

The general power delegated to him by this bill, will have, in effect, its own independent right to veto the Presidential action; and thus to retain the essential authority vested in it by the Constitution.

But not only do these references to the delegation of legislative power from the Congress to the President occur in the committee report, but I proceed to the next page wherein I read as follows:

It seems apparent that the President will make large use of the Bureau of the Budget in exercising the legislative power respecting reorganization which this bill delegates to him.

I proceed further into the next paragraph of the committee report, and I read as follows:

In delegating certain legislative power to the President, this bill exempts from the exercise of such power the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General and certain independent regulatory agencies.

Mr. President, here are five distinct and separate sentences in which there appears a reference to the power delegated to the President, and in four of those sentences there is a specific mention of power as being legislative power which is delegated by the bill to the President of the United States.

So, Mr. President, when I undertake to assert on the floor of the Senate that this bill constitutes a delegation of legislative power to the President, I have strong authority in favor of the position which I take, namely, authority from the Judiciary Committee, with reference to which I find not a single member of the committee who signed the report taking a contrary view. Only the distinguished Senator from Utah, who so clearly expressed his views yesterday, has taken thus far upon the Senate floor an attitude contrary to that which is expressed in the report of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, we start with the proposition that the Committee on the Judiciary, composed of experienced lawyers and distinguished Members of the Senate of the United States, have come forward with statements, one after another, as I have indicated, to the effect that under this bill there will be a delegation of legislative power to the President of the United States. But there was no error on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary in so stating. For the bill itself clearly shows that, in fact, there is a delegation of such power to the President.

I invite attention to only a few words in the bill which, to my mind, are conclusive of the proposition. I refer to page 12 of the bill, section 3 (a), beginning in line 3, and read as follows:

Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

And so forth. I shall refer to it in a moment—

he shall prepare a reorganization plan.

Congress does not prepare the reorganization plan. It is not prepared following a recommendation of the President of the United States. Congress does nothing up to that point.

He—

The President of the United States—

shall prepare a reorganization plan.

That is a function which is ordinarily performed, at least in theory, by the Congress of the United States. I refer to the preparation of legislation. But the bill provides that the President shall prepare the reorganization plan.

On the next page, beginning in line 2, the bill provides that the President "shall transmit such plan to the Congress, together with a declaration" mentioned in that section.

So we find the President on the one hand preparing a plan and on the other hand transmitting it to two Houses of Congress.

Let us now turn over to page 14, line 23, and read:

Section 4 (a). The reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect, in accordance with the plan—

And so forth. Not in the event that Congress does something itself, but the plan shall take effect if Congress does nothing. In other words, the only action which is thus far taken by anybody is taken by the President, who has first prepared the plan and then submitted it to Congress.

Under section 4 (a) the reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect if Congress does nothing. If we sit here and do not do one solitary thing, the plan prepared by the President of the United States becomes the law of the land, and overturns and supersedes legislation which may previously have been enacted by Congress. If there could be any clearer illustration of legislative process than the process to which I have referred, namely the preparation of the bill, the preparation of the plan, the transmittal of the plan, and the subsequent taking effect of the plan, without one single act of any kind, nature, or description, having been performed by Congress, I am at a loss to know where it could be found. There could not be a better illustration of the delegation of legislative power.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the exceedingly interesting argument which was presented yesterday by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] to the general effect that the power which the President will exercise pursuant to this bill, if enacted, will not be legislative

power, because no legislative power has been delegated to him.

I again invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the very committee of which the distinguished Senator from Utah is a member stated time and time again, as I read a few moments ago, that there is a delegation of legislative power to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, it is contended by the distinguished Senator from Utah that this bill sets forth standards for the action of the President, and that in carrying out the provisions of the bill he is employing executive and not legislative power. I should like to examine as briefly as possible the bill for the purpose of determining whether or not it does provide standards of the nature referred to by the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Section 3 of the bill undertakes to state what it is necessary for the President to do before he prepares the reorganization plan. The language on that point consumes nearly all of page 12 of the bill. The gist of it is that he must, in order to be entitled to prepare a plan, make a finding. What is that finding? It is a finding that a transfer, a consolidation, a coordination or abolition in whole or in part of an agency or a function is necessary or desirable in order to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a). Those purposes are as broad as the limits of human language.

Let me read one of the subdivisions of section 1 (a). I refer to subdivision 7, which states one of the things upon which the President may base the preparation of his plan. He does not have to find all seven of these things. If he finds any one of them, he may prepare a plan after having so found.

What does the provision say? It refers to a limitation, by the way, contained in subsection (d) of section 4, which pertains solely to the fact that—

> No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before July 1, 1947.

So this limitation to which I refer is merely one of time. But this is what the President may base the preparation of his plan upon: He shall determine what changes in the organization of the agencies of Government are necessary to—

> Provide for making currently and continuously * * * such adjustments in the Government establishments as may be necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency.

Is there any possibility of that provision creating the standard to which the distinguished Senator from Utah referred yesterday? If the President finds that a certain change is necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency he may prepare a plan.

I refer also to similarly broad language elsewhere in section 1. He shall determine what changes in the governmental organization are necessary to "facilitate orderly transition from war to peace."

He is to determine what changes are necessary to "increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable."

I shall not read the other provisions. They are similarly broad.

The point to which I add emphasis at this time is that these requirements upon the President of the United States, which are termed "standards" by the distinguished Senator from Utah, are as broad as the limits of human language, and that they do not determine with any preciseness or particularity any rule which must be followed by the President. The very language to which I have referred itself clearly corroborates the judgment of the Committee on the Judiciary in saying that there is a delegation of legislative power.

The only prohibition, by the way, that is made against the plan with regard to which the President may act is that which is set forth in section 2, and relates largely to the time to which functions may be extended or agencies may be extended. It relates also to the fact that there may not be an abolition of executive departments, that a new function may not be created, that quasi judicial agencies shall be preserved, and so forth.

There is not in the pending bill, however, from cover to cover, any precise and definite standard set up, as is true in the case, for illustration, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Radio Commission, and other agencies to which I might refer, which are illustrations of the exercise by Congress of legislative power, at the same time giving directions to the Executive as to standards which it shall follow in carrying out the powers set forth in the law.

Under the pending bill, subject only to the broad, general considerations to which I have referred, the consideration, for instance, that in his opinion the reorganization would increase efficiency, the words which I mentioned a few moments ago; the President may consolidate, for instance, the Civil Service Commission and the United States Employment Compensation Commission, or he may not do so. There is no standard under which he is to determine whether in the case of those two commissions he shall or shall not consolidate their functions. He may transfer the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics from the War Department, or he may not do so. He may transfer it into the Navy Department, or he may not do so. He may transfer it into the State Department or any other executive department of Government, or he may not do so.

These particular illustrations are cases in which functions and commissions and committees have been created by act of Congress; yet the President, by his ipsi dixit, without the necessity of finding anything except the broad, general things to which I have referred, may make the consolidations, the changes, which he deems proper.

So, Mr. President, I undertake to say that the bill creates no standards which would make the action proposed not a delegation of legislative power. Clearly, in my judgment, it is a delegation of legislative power, as stated time and time again by the Committee on the Judiciary, as I have shown.

There is one decision of the Supreme Court of the United States with which we are all familiar. I shall not undertake to read it in great detail, but I have it before me, and I refer to it because of the very striking similarity between that case and the one which the Senate is considering.

I refer to the famous NRA case, the case of Schechter Corp. against United States, reported in Two Hundred and Ninety-fifth United States Reports, at page 495, in which the Supreme Court of the United States declared the codes of so-called fair competition to be unconstitutional and void because they embodied the exercise of an unconstitutionally delegated legislative power, in this case especially the poultry code.

The President, if he should find the following things, was authorized to make the code. If he found that such associations or groups which applied for the code "impose no inequitable restrictions on admission to membership therein and are truly representative"; if he found that the codes themselves "are not designed 'to promote monopolies or to eliminate or oppress small enterprises and will not operate to discriminate against them, but will tend to effectuate the policy' of title I" of the National Industrial Recovery Act, he was authorized to prepare and promulgate the code.

The policy that is referred to in title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act is defined by the Court at page 534 of the decision. I shall read only a very small portion of it. I read it, however, because it is so closely akin to the situation which is presented in the case now before the Senate. Says the Court:

> For a statement of authorized objectives and content of the "codes of fair competition" we are referred repeatedly to the "declaration of policy" in section 1 of title I of the Recovery Act. Thus, the approval of a code by the President is conditioned on his finding that "it will tend to effectuate the policy of this title."

Then the Court undertakes to say what policy is, and here is the language:

> It is there declared to be "the policy of Congress"—
>
> To remove obstructions to the free flow of interstate and foreign commerce which tend to diminish the amount thereof; and to provide for the general welfare by promoting the organization of industry for the purpose of cooperative action among trade groups, to induce and maintain united action of labor and management under adequate governmental sanctions and supervision, to eliminate unfair competitive practices, to promote the fullest possible utilization of the present productive capacity of industries, to avoid undue restriction of production (except as may be temporarily required), to increase the consumption of industrial and agricultural products by increasing the purchasing power, to reduce and relieve unemployment, to improve standards of labor, and otherwise to rehabilitate industry and to conserve natural resources.

These, Mr. President, were the objectives, these were the so-called standards under which the National Industrial Recovery Act was undertaken to be sustained.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I regret to interrupt the Senator, but I take it his reference is to the Pan-American case.

Mr. DONNELL. No; I have the Pan-American case, and shall come to it in a few moments. This is the Schechter case, in 295 United States Reports.

Returning to the case, the Court considers whether or not the board, general language such as that to which I have referred, constitutes a standard. In this case there was a situation in which the Presidential decree permitted organization by trade and various other associations, and this is what the Court said:

Would it be seriously contended that Congress could delegate its legislative authority to trade or industrial associations or groups so as to empower them to enact the laws they deem to be wise and beneficent for the rehabilitation and expansion of their trade or industry? Could trade or industrial associations or groups be constituted legislative bodies for that purpose because such associations or groups are familiar with the problems of their enterprises?

Then says the Court:

Could an effort of that sort be made valid by such a preface of generalities as to permissible aims as we find in section 1 of title I?

The Court continues:

The answer is obvious. Such a delegation of legislative power is unknown to our law and is utterly inconsistent with the constitutional prerogatives and duties of Congress.

Then, Mr. President, the Court undertakes to point out from the National Industrial Recovery Act itself what limitations have been imposed upon the exercise of the President's discretion. The Court says substantially what I have indicated thus far. Then it uses this language:

But these restrictions leave virtually untouched the field of policy envisioned by section 1.

That is the precise effect of the further finding that the President is to make, that the code will tend to effectuate the policy of this title.

Then the Court says, which, as I take it, is very much in point in the case of the pending bill, because the bill now before the Senate requires the President to make certain findings. Section 3 of the bill provides that:

Whenever the President, after investigation, finds these various generalities which are specified to exist, he shall act.

This is what the Court says with respect to similarly broad general language in the NIRA case:

While this is called a finding, it is really but a statement of an opinion as to the general effect upon the promotion of trade or industry of a scheme of laws. These are the only findings which Congress has made essential in order to put into operation a legislative code having the aims described in the Declaration of Policy.

Hastening on in the case, I call attention to this further language on page 541:

Instead of prescribing rules of conduct, it—

That is, the law—

authorizes the making of codes to prescribe them. For that legislative undertaking, section 3 sets up no standards, aside from the statement of the general aims of rehabilitation, correction, and expansion described in section 1. In view of the scope of that broad declaration, and of the nature of the few restrictions that are imposed, the discretion of the President in approving or prescribing codes, and thus enacting laws for the government of trade and industry throughout the country, is virtually unfettered. We think that the code-making authority thus conferred is an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power.

Mr. President, the same thing is true of the bill which is now pending before the Senate. There are broad generalities in the bill which do not in any sense constitute standards of the preciseness and definiteness to which the Senator from Utah referred.

Does such a delegation of power violate the Constitution of the United States? I shall undertake to show that it clearly does. Article I, section 1, of the Constitution says:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The section does not say that a part of the legislative powers shall be vested in Congress. It does not say that Congress shall have a right to dispose of or to delegate to someone else any portion of the legislative powers. All the legislative powers granted shall be vested in the Congress of the United States, consisting of a Senate and House of Representatives.

I take it that every lawyer in this body, and almost every nonlawyer in it, would concede the fact as a proposition independent of this bill that there cannot be a lawful delegation by the Congress to another branch or organization or department of the Government of functions which exclusively belong to the Congress itself.

I quote merely a sentence from the case of O'Neal against United States, reported in 140 Federal, second series, page 912, in which the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit says:

In carrying out the constitutional division of the powers, it is a breach of the fundamental law for Congress to transfer its legislative power to the President.

Then I come, Mr. President, to the case to which reference was made by the distinguished Senator from Utah a few moments ago, namely, the case of Panama Refining Co. against Ryan, 293 United States, reported at page 388 and following. I call attention particularly to the following language which was used by the Justice of the Supreme Court who handed down the decision of the case, namely, Chief Justice Hughes. It reads as follows at page 421:

The Constitution provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Continuing he says:

And the Congress is empowered "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" its general powers.

I continue to read:

The Congress manifestly is not permitted to abdicate, or to transfer to others, the essential legislative functions with which it is thus vested. Undoubtedly legislation must often be adapted to complex conditions involving a host of details with which the National Legislature cannot deal directly. The Constitution has never been regarded as denying to the Congress the necessary resources of flexibility and practicality, which will enable it to perform its function in laying down policies and establishing standards, while leaving to selected instrumentalities the making of subordinate rules within prescribed limits and the determination of facts to which the policy as declared by the legislature is to apply. Without capacity to give authorizations of that sort we should have the anomaly of a legislative power which in many circumstances calling for its exertion would be but a futility.

Then the Court proceeds with this significant sentence:

But the constant recognition of the necessity and validity of such provisions, and the wide range of administrative authority which has been developed by means of them, cannot be allowed to obscure the limitations of the authority to delegate, if our constitutional system is to be maintained,

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is now reading from the Panama Refining Co. case?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand, the Senator construes the opinion in that case to say that the Congress cannot delegate its legislative powers to the Executive?

Mr. DONNELL. Clearly so, in my opinion, yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I took that position as emphatically yesterday as I possibly could, and I take it again today. I am fully in agreement with that position.

My position is that if the bill now before the Senate delegates essential legislative power, which I deny, then certainly the bill is unconstitutional under those decisions.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Utah for his observation. I understand his position exactly, namely, that this is not a delegation of legislative power because in his opinion standards are laid down under which the Executive must act. The view I take is that under the Schechter decision, the NIRA decision, it is perfectly clear that there are no standards laid down of the type, nature, or description which are essential to constitute a limitation and definition of the administrative duties which the executive department should perform. The Interstate Commerce Commission of course has the power to fix railroad rates, but there are definite, specific provisions which lay down the rules under which it must operate. The same is true with respect to the Federal Communications Commission, and also the Tariff Commission. All three of them are cited in the Schechter case. But when we come to a piece of so-called legislation which undertakes to lay down, as I see it, with due respect, in more or less oratorical language, broad channels in which the President may find that a certain reorganization may be necessary or desirable—and I quote from the bill—"in the interest of economy and efficiency," to say that that sets up a standard under which the Executive may act, to my mind,

is utterly unsupportable under the decisions. It is unsupportable, Mr. President, by the very statement repeatedly made, as I have previously indicated, by the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary, which refers time and time again in its very interesting report to the delegation of power.

Mr. President, I shall take very few moments more. There is one statement in the report which to my mind is not correct. I have no doubt it is intended to be, but I think it is wrong. That is the paragraph on page 3 which says:

> Such a delegation of legislative power—

That is to say the delegation of legislative power which the committee itself says is created by this bill—

> does not operate to deprive either House of the Congress of its constitutional right to have no change made in the law relating to organization of the Government without the assent of at least a majority of its Members present and voting.

Mr. President, as I read the bill it says no such thing. As a matter of fact if the President prepares the plan and transmits it, it becomes law unless a majority of one House of the Congress shall determine it shall not become law. In other words there is no requirement in the bill, as will be indicated by this excerpt from the report, to the effect that before a plan devised by the President shall become law, it shall receive the support of the majority of the Members of Congress. A majority is required in order to overturn what he does, and if, for illustration, in this very body, there were a tie vote upon a reorganization plan submitted by him, a situation, in other words, in which there was not a majority in favor of his proposal, under the bill the plan for reorganization would take effect and be the law of the land.

So I submit, Mr. President, that that statement in the report is in error.

In conclusion, I desire very briefly to recapitulate my view. My view is that the pending bill, S. 1120, is a clear delegation of power to the President of the United States. My view is that that proposition is established very clearly by decisions, particularly in the Schecter case to which I have referred.

My view is that under article I, section 1 of the Constitution of the United States, as stated repeatedly by the Supreme Court of the United States and other distinguished courts of our land, there cannot be validly a delegation of legislative power by Congress. We are elected to this body, Mr. President, for the purpose of carrying out our legislative duties, and for us to say to the President, "You may perform those duties, and then send to us whatever plan you have, and if we do not like it we will say so"—that is a clear abdication of our powers.

It is perfectly clear to my mind that when the Congress attempts to authorize the President to prepare and transmit a reorganization plan, which, if we do absolutely nothing about it and do not even listen to it, becomes the law of the land, that is an exercise by him of legislative power, and we will have abdicated the power which is vested in and imposed upon us by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, in these days there may be some who raise a question as to the advisability of bringing constitutional questions into play. To my mind, we have not yet arrived at the point at which we can in justice either to the oath of office which we took or to our duties to the people of our country disregard the Constitution of the United States.

I quoted on the floor of the Senate the other day some remarks made in the Farewell Address of Washington. I shall not read them all, but there is a sentence or two which I think are appropriate and in point in this case. Washington said:

> It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking, in a free country, should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding, in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another.

He might well have added the converse, namely, that it behooves us to see that in our country no branch of the Government undertake to abdicate the powers vested in it.

Proceeding further, he points out the importance of preserving reciprocal checks and balances in the exercise of power:

> If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular, wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance, in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can, at any time, yield.

Some time ago I read a sentence or two from a former President of the United States. I shall close these remarks in opposition to the bill and in favor of the amendment which I have offered by quoting those words. In my judgment the amendment which I have offered properly provides that no plan shall become law unless by joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, which, of course, would require signature by the President of the United States. I undertake to say that the gentleman who wrote these words is entitled to respectful consideration. I quote from the words of President Coolidge, who wrote this with respect to the Constitution:

> The Constitution of the United States is the final refuge of every right that is enjoyed by any American citizen. So long as it is observed, those rights will be secure. Whenever it falls into disrespect or disrepute, the end of orderly organized government, as we have known it for more than 125 years, will be at hand.
>
> The Constitution represents a government of law. There is only one other form of authority, and that is a government of force. Americans must make their choice between these two. One signifies justice and liberty; the other tyranny and oppression. To live under the American Constitution is the greatest political privilege that was ever accorded to the human race.

Mr. President, if the Congress passes the pending bill and sends it to the President, authorizing him to prepare a plan of reorganization and transmit it to Congress, and then, without one single solitary act being performed by Congress, it becomes the law of the land, you and I, Mr. President, if we vote for the bill, will have voted to abdicate the legislative power which is vested in the Congress of the United States. So this afternoon I plead for this amendment, which would leave in the Congress of the United States the function which it has. We can consider every recommendation which the President makes. We should respectfully consider his recommendations, and then determine whether or not we shall legislate the reorganizations which he proposes. The legislative responsibility rests upon our shoulders, and cannot be abdicated by us to the President of the United States or to any other person, branch, or department.

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Green	Moore
Austin	Gurney	Morse
Ball	Hart	Murdock
Barkley	Hatch	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brooks	Hill	Revercomb
Butler	Hoey	Robertson
Byrd	Huffman	Russell
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Cordon	Knowland	Tunnell
Donnell	La Follette	Vandenberg
Eastland	Langer	Wheeler
Ellender	McClellan	Wherry
Ferguson	McKellar	Wiley
Fulbright	Magnuson	Willis
George	Maybank	Wilson
Gerry	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a diversion from the matter which has been under discussion; but it seems desirable at this time to report to the Senate the situation with regard to the so-called Pearl Harbor investigation, for in recent days there have been developments which have given some concern to the members of the minority who are in some measure responsible for the investigation.

I wish to call attention first to the words of the majority leader in presenting the resolution on September 6. After referring to the varying reports from the Army and Navy, several of which had been submitted and were published on August 28, as I recall, by the President, with various additional reports by the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary

of War to the President, the majority leader had this to say:

But these reports, Mr. President, are confusing and conflicting when compared with one another, and to some extent contain contradictions and inconsistencies within themselves.

That is certainly a moderate statement.

The majority leader then said:

Under these circumstances it is not strange that widespread confusion and suspicion prevail among the American people and among the Members of Congress.

He went on to comment that the defenses of the members of the various forces who are charged with derelictions are themselves inconsistent and contradictory. So he proposed in his resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, which was adopted on that date, that—

The Congress itself should make its own thorough, impartial, and fearless inquiry into the facts and circumstances and conditions prevailing prior to and at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack.

He went on to say:

This inquiry, Mr. President, should be of such dignity and authenticity as to convince the Congress and the country and the world that no effort has been made to shield any person who may have been directly or indirectly responsible for this disaster, or to condemn unfairly or unjustly any person who was in authority, military, naval, or civilian, at the time or prior thereto.

He further said:

It should be conducted without partisanship or favoritism toward any responsible official, military, naval, or civilian, high or low, living or dead.

He concluded as follows:

It ought to be so complete and so fair that no person could doubt the good faith of the report and the findings made in it, or those who make it.

That resolution was adopted 8 weeks ago. The committee was appointed. Its membership from this side of the aisle, as I understand, was recommended to the Presiding Officer by the minority steering committee. Certainly it was without the solicitation of either of the minority members, the junior Senator from Michigan and myself, who were named without solicitation or without knowledge on my part that my name had been suggested. I have assumed that possibly it was thought that because of the experience which we had had in the so-called Truman committee, now the Mead committee, we had developed some knowledge or facility, possibly, in investigations of the executive department. That is a matter as to which I am not informed.

Now 8 weeks have elapsed. We have selected counsel. We have sought, in the occasional meetings of the committee, to clarify some of the issues we face. But we have finally reached a point where the disagreement among the members of the committee, unfortunately on majority and minority lines, indicates some concern, at least on our part, as to whether we are going to accomplish the results which the majority leader so clearly outlined as to command the confidence of all elements of our citizenship in the good faith and the completeness with which the investigation would be carried on.

It developed, we finally discovered, that at the time when the President issued these reports on Pearl Harbor, there was issued at the same time an Executive order, which has never been published, which placed a complete ban on any discussion by any member of the armed services with anyone whatsover of the field of this investigation, which is perhaps the single most important field, so that no officer was at liberty to discuss it.

When that was learned, a proposed modification of the Executive order was considered by our counsel. So far as I know, it was not discussed with the members of the committee. It was discussed by the counsel with the members of the executive departments, the Army and the Navy. Finally it was presented to the President by the counsel, with the presence of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, counsel for the committee, and with the majority leader, the chairman of the committee. At that time suggestion was made for several modifications in the order, proposed by the junior Senator from Michigan, who, so far as I know, was the only one, at least on our side of the aisle, familiar with its preparation. Those modifications would have accorded certain larger latitudes to individual members of the committee.

It is my understanding that that was presented to the President, but as the result of objection it was not accepted, and the original draft of the order prepared by the counsel, which confined the approach of the committee to the action of the full committee or its counsel, was adopted by the President and executed on October 23 as an exception to the previously existing order.

The feeling which we have on our side, in approaching this matter, is that out of all the developments of recent years in connection with investigations of executive departments, and particularly in connection with the Truman committee, it has become evident that there are very sharp divisions not only between the executive and legislative departments in connection with the disclosure of information, but even within the departments themselves, as revealed in the comment of the majority leader with respect to the inconsistencies and contradictions which exist between the reports which have been filed.

As a result of the development and the vast expansion of executive activities during the past decade, there is a great deal of bureaucratic jealousy and isolationism, if I may so term it, with the result that department officials look with some hostility upon each other, and, as we well know, it has been widely thought that some of the difficulties incident to the situation were the result of a lack of collaboration between even the executive departments themselves. When we have had reason to consult with the legislative departments we have observed repeated instances of what I have been talking about, where very doubtful tactics were pursued by the executive departments in repelling investigations by the legislature.

As a result of 4 years of experience certain practices and procedures have been developed in the Truman committee which, it was assumed by the Senator from Michigan and myself, had become sufficiently well established to be followed in the conduct of an investigation of this character and importance.

Under the chairmanship of the Senator who is now President of the United States, those practices and procedures were developed. Without referring to the degree of confidence, judging from the comment throughout the country, the committee has enjoyed, because to do so might seem immodest, I believe it has been shown that as a result of its procedure never in the entire history of the Truman committee has there been a divided report or divided action. To me that is not merely a tribute to the man who presided over the deliberations of the committee, and to the individual members of the committee, but it is a tribute to the processes and methods which had been developed during the course of conducting investigations, in that no member of the committee needed ever to feel that he was circumscribed in any way in fully exploring any phase of any matter which seemed to him to be relative, and with regard to which he wished to direct the attention of the committee.

Mr. President, we find ourselves now at the parting of the ways, where the privilege and the authority to which I have referred are denied to individual members of the committee, and, as we believe, the matter should be presented to the Members of the Senate so that they may understand thoroughly the extent to which our capacity to serve is, in our judgment, circumscribed.

As a result of our protest in recent days, the exception which the President made on October 23 in the Executive order of August 28 has this morning received the consideration of the committee, and it was voted that the President should be requested further to modify the order so that any officer or other employee of the Government might be free to discuss any phase of this matter with any member of the committee. We are profoundly grateful for that proposed liberalization of the order, which we trust the President will accept. But it is regrettable that 8 weeks after this investigation started it is even necessary for the minority members of the committee to ask that such a liberalization of this order should be put into effect. It is even more disturbing that it has become necessary to make a further request that the committee members be granted the same latitude in the examination of governmental records that was always accorded without question during the history of the Truman committee, and which is now, under the Executive order, accorded without question to the counsel and members of the special committee's staff. Regardless of whether we are prepared, I myself proposed this morning

to ask the chairman and the counsel of the committee whether an individual member of the committee might examine governmental records to ascertain their condition, the order in which they have been kept, why certain records are missing, and why certain files have been destroyed, as we have been reliably informed.

Those are some of the reasons why we feel that this is the proper forum in which to report the difficulties under which we have been working and which we trust may be corrected as time goes on. We feel it incumbent upon us to report the situation to this body before we carry the responsibility of preparing the full, complete, unbiased, and nonpartisan report which was the expectation of this body when it agreed to the resolution under which the responsibility was created. It is for these reasons that we report the situation to the Senate, and we hope that it may result in such modification of certain orders as will permit the full liberty of investigation which we feel is essential to the demonstration of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield for a comment upon the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to make a detailed comment, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I feel that the time has come when I, too, must make a statement upon this floor in reference to this important matter.

From the time the Senate agreed to the resolution I deemed it advisable to make no report upon this matter. My only comment was that I hoped that the committee would be able to develop all the facts in the case. But I feel that the time has now come when I, too, must report to the Senate what I find to be the situation at the present moment.

As I have said, I am extremely reluctant to ask for the attention of this body upon this subject, which only a short time ago we believed had been disposed of, but recent developments compel me to present the problem with which we are now confronted. I refer to the investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack, the authorization for which was provided by the Senate and by the House of Representatives by the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 27.

After having been properly constituted and supplied with a counsel and a staff, at the very outset of its labors the committee was faced with a procedural problem which, it seems, we have been unable to solve. Mr. President, the problem has been brought clearly to the front by a newspaper release containing an interview given today to the press by the chairman of the committee with respect to a meeting which the committee held and with respect to meetings which were held by the committee within the past 24 hours.

The problem concerns the scope of the inquiry, the relevancy of evidence, and the right of individual members of the committee to aid in developing the information which the committee seeks.

The questions with which we are now confronted will best be understood if I put them in their proper setting.

As it is known, Mr. President, the committee was constituted to make a full, fair, and open investigation of the events and circumstances leading up to the Pearl Harbor attack. It will be recalled that the determination of Congress to make such an investigation was reached after three prior investigations had been made. The proposal to investigate was made by the majority leader, I having offered a resolution to the same effect. It was only a short time after the Army and the Navy Board of Inquiry had rendered separate reports, which were filed while the Congress was not in session.

Referring to the reports, the majority leader said, as quoted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], as follows:

> They are confusing and complicated when compared with one another, and to some extent contain contradictions and inconsistencies within themselves.

The majority leader said further:

> Under these circumstances it is not strange that widespread confusion and suspicion prevail among the American people and among the Members of Congress.

On his own initiative the majority leader declared that Congress itself should make its own thorough, impartial, and fearless inquiry into the facts and circumstances and conditions prevailing prior to and at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack, no matter how far back it might be necessary to go in order to trace the situation which existed prior to and at the time of the attack.

The distinguished majority leader continued as follows:

> I am convinced that the Congress and the country desire an open public investigation which will produce the facts and all of the facts, so far as it is humanly possible to produce them. Such an investigation should be conducted as a public duty and a public service.

I agreed at that time and I agree now that there is no greater public duty than service on this committee, and no greater opportunity for public service than in this investigation.

The committee was established as a bipartisan one for the purpose of assuring an investigation free from politics, and one which would guarantee the people once and for all that all the facts would be disclosed to them.

It was in the light of this background and in that spirit that the resolution creating the committee was approved by both Houses of Congress.

I am sure that each member of the committee recognized the solemn obligation with which he was charged as an individual. No member would have consented to serve on the committee without the assurance that he would not be restricted in any way whatsoever in his individual discharge of this grave responsibility.

Soon after its appointment the committee was confronted with a question of procedure of the highest importance to the performance of its duty. We found that on August 28, 1945, at the time, or at least about the time when the Army and Navy Inquiry Board rendered its report—I think it was that very day—an order had been made by the President prohibiting any member of the armed services from discussing matters which had been held confidential in the report. It was therefore necessary at the very outset, if the committee was to properly to perform its work that the Executive order be changed.

Mr. President, this order was not brought to the attention of the counsel of the committee by the respective armed services of our Government, it was not brought to my attention by them, but we have a copy of the order. The chairman of the committee has referred to it, and I therefore deem it advisable that the Senate should know the exact wording of the order, and what has happened up to this time in relation to the order, and what kind of an order it was.

On the 23d of October 1945, the President approved a modification of his previous order. I am sorry to say that the new order still remains limited in scope by its own wording, according to the interpretation put upon it by the committee counsel and the majority of the committee.

At this point I should like to insert the text of the President's order requesting the State, War, and Navy Departments to aid the committee, together with copies of further orders we requested in order to remove the restrictions.

I read:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *August 28, 1945.*
>
> Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Attorney General, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the Budget, the Director of the Office of War Information.

That is rather inclusive—

> Appropriate departments of the Government and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are hereby directed to take such steps as are necessary to prevent release to the public, except with the specific approval of the President in each case, of:
>
> Information regarding the past or present status, technique or procedure, degree of success attained, or any specific results of any cryptanalytic unit acting under the authority of the United States Government or any Department thereof.

That is signed by Harry S. Truman, President of the United States.

Mr. President, I happened to be in the office of counsel for the committee on the 23rd day of October 1945 and at that time the counsel showed me this memorandum, or a proposed change of the memorandum:

> Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

We notice, Mr. President, that this does not include the Attorney General, the Director of the Budget, or the Director of War Information.

The order, proposed and shown to me, reads as follows:

> In order to assist the joint congressional committee on the investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack in its desire to hold public hearings and make public pertinent evidence relating to the circumstances of that attack, a specific exception to my memorandum dated 28 August 1945, relating to the release of information concerning cryptanalytic activities, is hereby made as follows:

The State, War, and Navy Departments will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, for such use as the committee may determine, any information in their possession material to the investigation, and will respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed services whose testimony is desired by the committee to testify publicly before the committee concerning any matter pertinent to the investigation.

That is signed by the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, October 23, 1945.

Mr. President, it will be noted in the exception to the order previously issued that a witness can do nothing else but appear before the committee and testify publicly. He cannot give any information, prior to his public testimony, to any member of the committee or to the counsel of the committee.

Mr. President, when the counsel for the committee showed me that order, I had certain suggestions to make, and the counsel agreed with them, and in his own handwriting wrote upon the copy which I now have in my hand. It was the same down to the language "and will respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed", where we inserted the words "or civilian" before the word "services." We struck out the words "whose testimony is desired by the committee but", and then we inserted the words "give information to the committee, its counsel, and its members, and testify publicly before the committee concerning any matter pertinent to the investigation."

Mr. President, the original memorandum, and the one which is signed, does not even allow the counsel of the committee, or anyone else, to talk to any member of the armed services. That condition existed until 11 o'clock this morning. That order was issued by the President.

Knowing the President as I do, I cannot understand why the order with the change made by the counsel for the committee was not signed. But the counsel for the committee and the majority leader appeared at the White House, and when they returned I am informed by the counsel that they brought back the original order as drafted, which, until this very hour, does not allow the counsel or any member of the committee, or the committee itself, to do other than to call the witnesses for open testimony.

Mr. President, how can this committee function with that upon the record?

Eight weeks had passed, and we felt that something should be done. I drew up a proposed resolution, which was taken to the committee yesterday, because we wanted to modify this regulation by the President of the United States upon a committee of Congress seeking to ascertain the facts. The President of the United States has said that he, too, wants all the facts presented to the people of the United States. That is the only desire I have, that all the facts be presented to the people. Having that in mind, after 8 weeks, it was my desire to take this matter up before the committee, and without giving any press releases about it, to have the committee put in such a position that it could properly function and give to the people of the United States all the facts. This is what I proposed:

That for the further purpose of removing any restrictions, fears or inhibitions which may exist on the part of past or present Federal employees and members of the armed forces, in order that they will feel free to make available to the joint committee, its individual members, and counsel any information in their possession material to the investigation;

The committee respectfully asks that the President approve the following memorandum:

"MEMORANDUM FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, COMMISSIONS, AND BUREAUS, INDLUDING THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

"In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to 'make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack,' you are hereby directed to give the committee, its individual members and counsel your full cooperation.

"You are further directed to give the committee, its individual members and its counsel access to all records, documents, and information in your possession, whether of secret or top secret nature, and to advise all your employees to afford the committee members and their counsel the fullest possible cooperation. Their inquiries should be answered fully and all Federal employees, or members of the armed services, past or present, should consider it their duty to volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge concerning the subject of the committee's investigation.

"In addition, copies of any papers, required by the committee, its individual members and its counsel, whether secret or top secret, should be furnished willingly, any present directives to the contrary notwithstanding.

"It is understood that all information so developed and all records and copies of records so obtained by the committee, any individual committee member or its counsel shall be made available to the committee counsel for the information and use of all other members of the committee."

Mr. President, as stated by the chairman of the committee, that proposal was rejected this morning by a vote of 5 to 3. At the same time I asked to have considered another proposal, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE GUIDANCE OF COUNSEL AND MEMBERS OF THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

In executive meeting, Friday, November 2, the committee approved the following rules of procedure by unanimous consent of the members present.

I drew up the resolution asking to have it agreed to, as follows:

That for the purpose of giving full effect to the order of the President of the United States, approved October 23, 1945, or any amendment thereto, that "the State, War, and Navy Departments will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, for such use as the committee may determine, any information in their possession material to the investigation"; and

For the further purpose of enabling the committee, its individual members, and counsel to perform the duties and responsibilities vested in them by the Congress of the United States to "make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events and circumstances leading up to or following the attack made by the Japanese armed forces upon Pearl Harbor"; and

By virtue of the authority vested in the committee by Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

The committee approves and adopts the following rules of procedure:

1. The State, War, Navy, and any other department or agency will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, to its counsel or to any of its individual members any information and records they shall at any time request, and will respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed and civilian services, past or present, to give full information and records to the committee, its members, or counsel, and to testify publicly at the request of the committee, its counsel or any committee member concerning any matter which the committee, its counsel, or any individual committee member may deem pertinent to the investigation.

2. All information so developed and all records and copies of records so obtained by the committee, its counsel or any individual committee member shall be made available to the committee counsel for the information and use of all other members of the committee.

Mr. President, when those two proposals were before the committee for action another proposal was prepared, and it was adopted unanimously. The last two read were rejected by a vote of 5 to 3. I shall not read the preliminary part, which I have read before in another proposal.

The committee respectfully asks that the President approve the following memorandum.

Memorandum for the chief executives of all Federal departments.

I wish to read it again to show the difference between the two memorandums or orders:

In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to "make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack," you are hereby directed to give the committee, its individual members, and counsel your full cooperation.

That is almost identical with the language of the other resolution that I asked to have adopted.

You are further directed to give the committee, its individual members, and its counsel access—

The difference between these two memorandums is simply that the members of the armed services and the various agencies would be able to talk to a member of the committee. But it specifically provides, and it is limited to that, so that they cannot show any records to any member of the committee.

While this was going on, Mr. President, and while the committee was considering the two proposed resolutions which I had presented to the committee providing for a full disclosure, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] offered a resolution asking that he might be specifically authorized to go to the records of the FCC so he could examine them to ascertain how certain records were kept, and whether or not certain records were missing. He included in his resolution also the statement that another document was missing in the War Department and he desired to look over the files of the War Department to ascertain how they were kept, and the numbering system, and the outline, which he might find there.

Mr. President, a vote was taken upon that resolution and the committee by 5 to 3 did not agree to the resolution. In other words we now have the situation that the Senator from Maine, one of the members of the committee, is forbidden by the committee to look into the files. I expressed the same desire respecting the same item, to look into the files and to ascertain how they are kept.

I say, Mr. President, that it is absolutely impossible for the committee to function properly and cross-examine witnesses who may appear before the committee, if we do not have the facts. How can we properly cross-examine and bring out to the public the facts as to why and how it may not be possible to obtain from the files of the Army of the United States of America papers which are material to a matter so important as is this Pearl Harbor investigation?

I would not feel that I could sit in the committee and ask questions of the witnesses so as properly to develop for the people of the United States once and for all the evidence in this case.

Mr. President, the fact that files are missing, the fact that records are missing are material to the issue that the congressional committee was established to develop.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator mind naming those who voted for and who voted against the Brewster resolution?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the chairman of the committee has named to the press those who voted for and those who voted against the Brewster resolution. The votes for the proposed resolution—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned, and so far as any other member of the committee is concerned, the Senator from Michigan is at liberty to reveal the names of those who voted for and against his resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, the information has already been given to the press, so I will place it in the RECORD. The vote for the resolution was as follows: GEARHART, BREWSTER, and FERGUSON. The vote against the resolution was: the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], Mr. MURPHY, of the House, Mr. CLARK, of the House, and Mr. COOPER, of the House. The vote was the same on the two resolutions which I proposed.

Mr. President, the essential point of this order, as interpreted by the majority of the committee, is that only the counsel of the committee may receive and develop information on the subject of the investigation. In other words, we have this situation: The principals in conducting this investigation are Members of Congress. They have been duly elected by the people of the United States from their respective districts and States and have been appointed to conduct the investigation. They have employed counsel, who has employed associate counsel, only one of whom I have met, although I understand there are two others. Authority is granted to the agent which is denied to the principals. That is where we stand today. We are compelled to go to the people of the United States and say, "We, your agents, who are Members of this Congress, cannot guarantee to you that we can develop all the facts."

Mr. President, If this situation continues, we shall never be able to say to the people of the United States that we individually believe that every fact has been produced in this matter.

The majority leader has stated, and the RECORD shows, that up to date there have been three investigations. I could name five investigations up to date, and none of them agree. What the people of America want is the facts, and what the members of this committee should want is nothing but the facts.

Other members of the committee sought by amendments to have it made possible for any member of the committee to receive and develop information from any of the departments or agencies, and from all individuals concerned in the inquiry. However, the majority of the committee refuses to approve this policy. So at the very outset of our work we are confronted with the following issues of procedure on which the committee is divided:

The first of these issues goes to the scope of the investigation. Is the committee, or are any of its members, to be limited in the range and subject matter of the investigation? Are we confined in our investigation only to the matters appearing in the existing official reports? Are we limited to the dead records of the Roberts' report and the report of the Army and Navy inquiry, and the other investigations?

The committee counsel, supported by the majority of the committee in their votes on these resolutions, takes the position that we are limited to a great extent to the matters appearing in those reports That seems to me to be in direct contravention of the assurance we had when the resolution was before this body for approval. I should like to read the colloquy which took place among Senators at that time.

Addressing himself to the majority leader, the minority leader [Mr. WHITE] asked:

> And the resolution gives practically plenary powers of investigation with respect to all matters which occurred before the time of Pearl Harbor or thereafter, which relate in any way to the occurrence of the attack?

The able Senator from Kentucky replied:

> Yes. Whether those things happened in Washington, or whether they happened in the Philippine Islands, or whether they happened in Japan, or whether they happened anywhere else in the world—if they relate themselves, prior to or subsequently, to the attack, the committee can go into them. I think the language is broad enough to permit that.

Considerable concern about the powers of the committee led the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to pursue the question further, and the following took place:

> Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator consider that the language is broad enough to go back to the beginning of the war; that is, I mean to the general policy, the application of the Neutrality Act, the shipment of scrap, and so forth?

The able Senator from Kentucky replied:

> Yes. I think it is broad enough to go back to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria or to any other period in past history that can in any way be connected with or relate to the attack on Pearl Harbor.
>
> Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since the Senator is the author of the concurrent resolution, and since that is his interpretation of it, I am willing to accept that interpretation. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 6, 1945, p. 8343.)

Mr. President, this clearly indicates that it was the intention to give the committee complete power of investigation with respect to any matter whatsoever believed to be pertinent to the Pearl Harbor attack. We now find that by interpretation of the committee counsel—and I shall cite an example in a moment—the scope of the investigation is to be limited chiefly to the information developed in the existing official records.

Let me read an example of what I have mentioned:

OCTOBER 29, 1945.

For Lieutenant Colonel DUNCOMBE,
War Department.

(Re Wyman case.)

The Wyman case enters into the Pearl Harbor inquiry in two aspects:

1. Delays in completing fixed radar stations and information center;

2. Delays in building new airfields for better dispersal of planes.

As to 1, it is not probable that if the fixed stations had been ready before December 7, the result of the attack would have been different.

The mobile stations were available, but shut down at 7 a. m., and there is no reason to think the fixed stations would have been kept in operation after that hour.

Furthermore, the mobile stations did pick up the Jap planes at about 132 miles, and the fixed station range is said to have been 200 miles, and there is little advantage in that.

Also, the planes were not warmed up ready to fly, and some were not fueled and their guns had been dismounted the evening before, so with the fixed stations all installed, it is hard to believe it would have changed the outcome. The information center, though in a temporary building, was operative.

Despite all this, we should have evidence as to when the fixed stations would probably have been ready if the contractors under Wyman had been diligent and competent. The record suggests that delay in building road to one fixed station was the trouble.

As to 2, the addition of airfields prior to December 7 would have dispersed planes and saved some airplane loss. [See Short's letter of March 15, 1941, to Marshall, in response to Marshall's letter of March 5 (Army Board Record 19-23).]

We should have some evidence as to when airfields would have been ready if the contractors had been competent and diligent. This seems to require the testimony of engineers who were in Hawaii in 1941 and observed the work and are qualified to deal with these points, and would like to have you select one or more such witnesses for us to examine.

Mr. President, the counsel of the committee is asking the War Department to select the witnesses. A little later I shall come to what has been done as to some of the witnesses in this case.

Reading further:

Whether the deficiencies of the contractors selected by Wyman were due to incompetency, drunkenness, lack of organization or disloyalty is of no direct importance in this inquiry.

Mr. President, the counsel for the committee has taken it upon himself to say what is competent and what is not competent. Am I to remain silent and not tell the Senate of the United States that I believe that each member of the committee should be able to look into the facts and tell the people, through the committee, what the facts are?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Did the Senator ever bring that circumstance to the attention of the committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I did not.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator ever advised any member of the committee that counsel had reached some decision contrary to what he thinks should have been done?

Mr. FERGUSON. I may have. Let me inquire of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the subject——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator might also include other members in his inquiry. So far as I recall——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that what the Senator is now saying seems to be very highly prejudicial to a correct understanding of the situation. This transaction was never brought to the attention of the committee. I never heard of it before today. This is the first information I have had about it. I am a member of the committee, and I have tried to attend its sessions. The Senator well knows that the first understanding was that any matter could be presented to the counsel and finally the committee would decide whether it was relevant or material or proper. The committee has never been asked to go into this particular matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator understand what this instrument is?

Mr. GEORGE. I understand the Senator's reading of it; that is the first I ever heard of it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The counsel gave it to me. When I asked for certain papers in relation to the Wyman case——

Mr. BARKLEY. The Wyman case has not been brought before the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the point I make.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Wyman case involves a transaction between Colonel Wyman and someone by the name of Rohl, I believe. But so far as I recall, it has never been brought to the attention of the committee. It is a matter which the committee will have to determine hereafter, after receiving testimony concerning Colonel Wyman and Mr. Rohl, who seems to have been a contractor, according to information which I have obtained from the newspapers.

But the committee has never had that information brought to its attention, so far as I recall.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not know who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think this illustrates the reasons why I feel so strongly that the individual members of the committee should have some rights and responsibilities. If this showing is correct, it certainly indicates that the committee and all its members must assume some portion of responsibility in determining the course to be followed. While I fully share the ideas as to discussion with members of the committee, I also, out of deep experience, believe we must assist in every proper way in trying to find the truth, which, after all, is all we are seeking. Who is to be damaged by that?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another interjection?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I do so simply in the interest of having a fair statement made of this matter. This transaction, this memorandum of counsel, the declination of counsel to go into certain matters has never been brought to the attention of the committee. Yet here it is paraded before the public as if the majority of the committee had made such a decision. Both of the distinguished Senators who have spoken on this floor well know that had it been brought to the attention of the committee, the committee could have taken appropriate action on it. There is yet time; in fact, the committee has not reached the stage of introducing testimony or evidence at hearings, and at any time the matter may be brought up. There never has been an understanding that the counsel should have final authority to determine what is to be put into the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is precisely the fundamental issue here, since under the ruling of the majority of the committee this morning, no individual member of the committee is permitted to go—even if accompanied by a member of the counsel——

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask to be permitted to finish my statement.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; probably the Senator has the floor, and I can take it later on.

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly.

Mr. President, I say that under the ruling of the majority of the committee this morning no individual member of the committee is to be permitted to go, even when accompanied by a member of the staff of the committee—as proposed by me—to look at the records of this Government. That is the fundamental issue with which we are here faced.

I wish to read the resolution which we presented this morning and which presents this issue squarely. This is not the proposal that was voted down. It was laid on the table. But I think the members of the committee will agree that this fairly summarizes what I requested of the committee this morning. I read the resolution:

Whereas determination regarding the significance of missing files and records in Government files; and

Whereas various members of the committee have had their attention directed to what are considered to be significant omissions in the files and are desirous of determining by examination, the Government records and the system used in connection therewith and the destruction thereof: Now, therefore, it is moved that the chairman be authorized on behalf of committee to authorize any member of the committee, upon request, in company with a member of the staff, to examine any records deemed to be relevant to the current investigation.

That was the substance of the motion and request on my part which was rejected by the committee. This particular motion is now on the table. I have been informed by one of the members of the committee that if I were to add this language, it might be approved:

Subject to the reference of such request to the full committee, if the chairman deems it advisable.

So far as I am concerned, that is perfectly acceptable.

I simply ask the right to go to the chairman of the committee, tell him there are certain records and files which I should like to examine, ask him to designate a member of the counsel's staff to accompany me—I would not desire to go there alone, and be allowed to examine the records and see whether any rumors or reports I had received were correct.

That is what has been denied. Out of 4 years of experience, I say that is precisely the latitude which must be allowed, not because we lack confidence in the counsel or staff, but because they are necessarily limited in scope, and because the 10 members of the committee have a direct responsibility to find out, so far as possible, the truth.

Mr. President, after the Army report was made to the War Department, what did the Secretary of War think? He did not think it told the truth. So the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, issued this directive to his staff—and I quote from the report of November 23, 1944, after the report of the Army Board at Pearl Harbor had been made, criticizing certain members of the service. This is what Secretary Stimson said:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF G–2

SUBJECT: PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

In connection with the recent report of the Army Pearl Harbor Board, a number of unexplored leads have suggested themselves which require investigation.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that this was in November 1944, 3 years after Pearl Harbor, but they were still discovering unexplored leads, in trying to fix the responsibility.

I continue to read from the memorandum:

I have directed that this investigation be undertaken by Maj. Henry C. Clausen, JAGD.

This memorandum is directed to all persons:

You are directed to give Major Clausen access to all records, documents, and information in your Division, whether of secret or top secret nature, and to advise all officers of your Division to afford Major Clausen the fullest possible cooperation. Inquiries made by Major Clausen should be answered fully and the persons interrogated should volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge concerning the subject of Major Clausen's inquiries.

In addition, copies of any papers required by Major Clausen, whether secret or top secret, should be furnished him, any present directives to the contrary notwithstanding.

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

I think I may summarize the results of Major Clausen's investigations. They carried him entirely around the world in securing affidavits in which persons who had previously testified before the Army Pearl Harbor Board repudiated in substantial respects the evidence they had previously given. Mr. President, what kind of a way is that to conduct an investigation? What else could have been had in mind except to clear the records of certain individuals concerned?

It is because of certain items in the so-called Clausen report that it has seemed perfectly evident to those of us on this side that we should have at least as much latitude as that accorded to the members of the staff in looking at the files of the Government; and I think the Senator from Michigan can recite from the record some amazing contradictions secured by Major Clausen in his examination of persons who previously made statements under oath before the Army Pearl Harbor Board.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has referred to certain items in relation to the inquiry conducted by Major Clausen. I simply wish to place on record this information which was obtained in Paris on the 27th of July 1945:

Any prior statements or testimony of mine which may be contrary to my statements herein, including among other things as to the processing and delivery of material, and to whom and when, should be modified and considered changed in accordance with my statements herein. This affidavit now represents my best recollection of the matters and events set forth and a better recollection than when I previously testified before the Army Pearl Harbor Board, and is made after having my memory refreshed in several ways and respects.

Mr. President, when he appeared before the Board he testified from a memorandum that he—this man Bratton—and General Miles had made on the 10th of December 1941. Is it any wonder that the members of the committee want to look at some of these matters?

In relation to the question now raised by the Senator from Maine, I read the affidavit of Gen. Sherman Miles:

Concerning testimony that I gave before the Army Pearl Harbor Board, 8 August 1944, as corrected by my letter 18 August 1944, I wish to add that I avoided any statement concerning details of information and intelligence which I had derived from top secret sources, then called—

And I omit a word—

or any intimation that such sources existed. The reason I so limited my testimony was because prior to my appearance before the Board, Brig. Gen. Russell A. Osmun and then Col. Carter W. Clarke of G–2, War Department, transmitted to me instructions from the Chief of Staff that I was not to disclose to the Army Pearl Harbor Board any facts concerning the—

I leave out a word—

intelligence mentioned, or the existence of that form of information or intelligence in the period preceding the 7 December 1941. Accordingly, I have obeyed that instruction.

Mr. President, I believe that the matter in relation to Clausen was material to this issue. The question is: Should the agents of the committee, should the associate counsel, have greater rights than the members of the committee themselves who desire to function as members of the committee and bring before the committee something which they have ascertained in order that it may be developed as evidence?

I was a member of the Truman committee. We developed many cases. We had free latitude. We were able to develop facts without rendering minority reports. It has never been essential or required that we appear on the floor of the Senate and advise the Senate of the United States that we were harmed or hindered in any way in the development of evidence. But when we present to the committee resolutions, asking that we be authorized to act and perform our responsibilities to the people of the United States, certain things have taken place, and I have related to the Senate what happened. I have done so reluctantly, but I feel that the time has come, after 8 weeks of this investigation, that the people of the United States should know and appreciate that in the future each member of the committee cannot and must not be held responsible, and that they cannot exercise their individual talents in developing all the facts pertaining to the issue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret that it has been deemed advisable or desirable on the part of some members of the committee to bring to the floor of the Senate some disagreement with respect to procedure in the investigation which was authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 27. But there is nothing in the matter from which I shrink in the slightest degree. There is nothing in the record of the committee of which I am ashamed, or for which I make the slightest apology. There is nothing in the record of the committee that is not orderly, in my judgment, and in the judgment of the majority of the committee, not proper with relation to determining upon the matter of procedure. And it is a question of procedure that is involved in this present discussion.

Quotations were read from the statement which I made when I offered the resolution, with reference to the kind of investigation which I contemplated, and the necessity for it. I stand by the statement I made at that time. Nothing has been done since then that was in the slightest degree inconsistent with every statement which I made at the time I offered the concurrent resolution creating the joint committee, which was unanimously adopted in both Houses.

An insidious reference was made this afternoon to the fact that the committee was authorized 8 weeks ago, and by implication that it has not yet started the hearings, which are to be held in public as provided for in the resolution, and which are desired by every member of the committee. I may say that public hearings are not only desired, but they are insisted upon.

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not mean to imply that the investigation had been started. I do not think we should start it until we are adequately prepared. I did not intend to indicate that we should go ahead before we are ready.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say also that I do not wish to intimate that we are ready to start the hearings.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not expect the Senator to intimate that. If his resolution and the procedure provided by it were adopted by the committee, I doubt whether we would ever be ready to proceed with public hearings, if every member of the committee were authorized separately, not as a committee set-up but individually, separately, to bore around in all the departments of Washington to find something which he thought should be brought out by way of testimony. Under the resolution of the Senator from Michigan, individual members would not even be required to bring what they found back to the committee so that the committee could determine whether those matters should be made public.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that both of the resolutions to which the Senator refers make that specific provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; one of them hints at it, but the other, as I recall, is silent on the subject. It would be left to the individual members of the committee to determine, without action of the committee, whether a certain paper or a certain witness shall be brought before the committee to be heard in public.

Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall read both resolutions in a moment.

Mr. FERGUSON. They will clearly show what was provided by them.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe the answer to the Senator's suggestion that we would never get anywhere is the fact that the Truman committee made more than 100 reports under this same procedure.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Maine, who was a member of the Truman committee, apparently feels that this committee ought to practice entirely the procedures of the Truman committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think the committee could do better.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President of the United States happens to be the one who was chairman of the Truman committee.

It took its name from him. It is the same individual, then a Senator and now the President of the United States, who did not approve the order which is the subject now in dispute before the Senate. I suppose that he might be regarded as having obtained as much information and wisdom from his experience as chairman of the committee as any other member of the committee might have obtained.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure that he did, and he followed his well-established practice of adverting to the Secretary of the Navy who objected to signing the expanded order, as I should have done in his case.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is beside the question.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is very pertinent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was discussing what seemed to me to be the inference, from the continued mention of 8 weeks, about the beginning of the public hearings in this investigation. I wish to say that following the adoption of the concurrent resolution, which was unanimously adopted without amendment, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, the able Senator from Tennessee, proceeded to appoint the members of the committee. They were important appointments. I believe that the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate both realized their responsibility, under all the circumstances, in choosing the members of the committee. I may say that the President pro tempore appointed the members on the minority side who had been recommended by the Republican steering committee. There was no meeting of the Democratic steering committee. The minority caucused in regard to this matter before any resolution was adopted. It had a right to do so, and I am not complaining about it, but the minority party of the Senate caucused with regard to the matter and demanded, as I recall, an investigation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. We approved the demand for an investigation. The Senator will undoubtedly agree that the resolution was probably the result of our demand, and the Senator himself introduced the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was not the result of the demand, I will say to the Senator. There is no use going into it, but inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio has intimated that my action was the result of the Republican caucus, I may suggest that as soon as I had read the reports of the Army and the Navy I made up my mind that there should be another investigation. I had the resolution prepared, and offered it as soon as possible, at the very next meeting of the Senate.

I wish to make a consecutive statement, Mr. President, and I decline to yield further until I have completed my statement.

I wish to say for the RECORD that there was no caucus held by the majority party. The Democratic majority have never caucused on this matter, because it did not regard it to be a partisan political subject. We might say that we recognized our responsibility in the matter as the majority party, and it was for that reason, in part, that I offered my resolution as the majority leader of the Senate. It was a responsibility which we accepted. It was one from which we did not run, and it is one from which we do not run now.

We never caucused about it, because we did not think it was a partisan, political matter. No steering committee was ever called together to select the majority members of the joint committee, either in the House or in the Senate.

The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the President pro tempore, exercised his own judgment with respect to the appointment of the majority members of the joint committee, and he accepted the judgment of the minority steering committee with respect to the minority members, and in that respect he did not exercise his own judgment, except to the extent that his judgment was that he would accept the members suggested to him by the Republican steering committee.

Every member of the committee recognized the stupendous task involved in making the investigation. Everyone recognized that all the records which had been made up to now, all the hearings, all the reports, had to be read and studied. There are volumes upon volumes of the testimony in the War Department alone, between 40 and 50 volumes of testimony, which had to be gone through and studied page by page before we could know what had already been developed in the hearings which had been held in secret. Those were all confidential or executive hearings. None of the testimony was ever made public.

It was perfectly obvious that the committee could not do all that, with all the rest of our work here, both on the majority and minority sides; it was perfectly obvious that neither the committee as a whole nor individual members of the committee could have the time to go into all that testimony, brief it, and master it, and lay it out so that the committee could understand what had been adduced already as a basis for the conclusions of the Army and Navy boards, or the Roberts committee, or the subsequent investigation into this matter referred to a while ago by the Senator from Michigan, the Wyman-Rohl affair, which was withheld, I think, by the Secretary of War because the investigation had not been completed. It was completed later and the report was made public. But it has never been brought to the attention of the committee. Of course, it will come to the committee's attention, and will be gone into by the committee when it gets to taking testimony, insofar as it has any relationship to Pearl Harbor, and I imagine it does have some relationship to the installations for defense at Pearl Harbor. Certainly no one could know without having read the report of the testimony, having the report of the hearings to see what the facts are.

Anyway, this testimony, consisting of volume after volume in the War Department alone, had to be gone into by someone who was trained. It was not an easy matter to select counsel for the committee. There was delay. There is no use going into that, except to say that the committee unanimously selected one of the outstanding lawyers of the United States, a man who enjoys the highest reputation for integrity and ability and for moral character among the members of the bar and people of the United States, a former Solicitor General of the United States under a Republican administration, under Mr. Coolidge, and a former Attorney General of the United States, under Mr. Hoover. His selection by the committee was acclaimed all over the country, in press and otherwise, as a wise selection, one which would at least relieve the committee of the charge of being partisan, because he was the highest legal officer in the Government under two Republican administrations, a man who never did support the present administration and never voted for Mr. Roosevelt in any of his campaigns, as I am informed.

He is a man who was unanimously selected to go through all this mass of evidence and reports and papers and documents of all kinds in order that the committee might be prepared, through its counsel and his assistants, to proceed to take testimony. We have permitted the counsel to select his assistants, indeed, we had to let him do so. We could not impose upon him someone for political reasons. He was not chosen for political reasons, except as it was necessary to get away from political reasons. We could not impose upon him some political appointments in choosing those who should assist him in the investigation. We have given him free rein in choosing his own men. He has had to search for them. He has found four or five men, without regard to politics. I have not asked him what their politics may be. I am told one or two of them are Republicans, but I do not care what their politics may be so long as they are able and honest men and can assist Mr. Mitchell in finding out what the facts are.

We have discussed the question of procedure. There must be an orderly presentation of the case when we get into the public hearing. I do not think anyone would dispute that. We may regard it, in a sense, as an enormous lawsuit. It does not involve the recovery of something against someone else, but in all the mass of this material the committee would have been entirely helpless if it had ordered hearings and gone into hearings and called Tom, Dick, and Harry before it, and asked all sorts of questions, without knowing whether they had testified previously, or what they had testified previously, and whether all the witnesses were called who might know anything about what happened at Pearl Harbor, or what led up to it or induced it.

The general counsel told us 3 or 4 weeks ago, after seeing the size of the job, that it would take him and his staff until approximately the 10th day of November to be ready for the committee to begin its hearings in public. We talked about going to Pearl Harbor. At the first meeting of the committee some of the members urged that we go to Pearl Harbor

just to see it, although the conditions are different now. The ships are not there, and probably the installations are not there, but the bay is still there, the mountain is still there, the lay of the ground is still the same, and therefore it was thought we should look at the bay and size it up and see how big it was so that we might determine whether there were too many ships concentrated there, whether the mountain was farther back than it had been represented, and whether the planes coming over to attack Pearl Harbor should have been seen.

The sentiment to go to Pearl Harbor ebbed and flowed, like the tide in the bay. At the first meeting it was suggested that we should go. It was suggested that we should go at once, before we started hearings, it being urged that we could understand the testimony better if we could see the bay and the mountain back of it. The next time we met there was some doubt about that. There was a feeling that we should not take a trip to Pearl Harbor the first thing for fear it might be thought that all we were doing was starting out on a junket; it was thought that we should hold some hearings and get some testimony before we went to Pearl Harbor. That was debated back and forth, and at the next meeting the members decided that probably they had better go on to Pearl Harbor, and that Mr. Mitchell should go with them, that he should see the bay and the mountains and the physical aspects, so that he could know better how to ask questions.

The upshot was that yesterday we all decided, unanimously, that we would not go, for the present at least, that it would take a week away from the time the committee has, with its counsel, getting ready to begin the hearings. There is a limitation in the resolution providing the committee shall make a report by the 3d day of January, and it is my hope and belief we can make the report by that time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BARKLEY. On that point, yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. On the matter of the trip to Pearl Harbor?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. As the only member of the committee or the counsel who had ever seen Pearl Harbor, I was responsible for urging that the committee should see it, in order that the minuscule character of the bay——

Mr. BARKLEY. There the Senator goes. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. Should impress the committee, as I felt it had a very important bearing. I have constantly advocated that, as the chairman knows.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has. I do not think the Senator was the first to suggest it. I think a member of the committee from the House did.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. KEEFE.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; he first suggested that we go. It was something worthy of consideration. But in view of later developments, I think the committee wisely decided, and without dissent, not to go.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator said the decision was unanimous. I wanted to make it clear that at any rate I did yesterday change from my original feeling, because I thought it was important that we get adequately prepared. That was my reason for the feeling that it was premature.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct about that. He thought we should go, and other Members thought we should go, but we decided against it, and it was without dissent.

This morning the committee picked the 15th day of November as the day on which to begin the hearings. Mr. Mitchell has advised us that he will be ready to present to the committee enough evidence out of all the mass of stuff through which he has gone, so he hopes we may proceed continuously morning and afternoon for at least two or three weeks, when there may have to be a lull in order to gather more material, though we hope we can proceed continuously.

When the President released the reports of the Army and Navy boards of inquiry on the 28th or 29th of August he issued an Executive order which applied to the revelation of information with respect to these cryptoanalytic codes, that is, he issued the Executive order prohibiting the disclosure of any information obtained by these departments on the cryptoanalytic code, which is a technical term for a certain type of code. I do not want here to reveal anything that would be harmful, but we all know that the Government has been enabled to keep informed of what is going on over the world with respect to all sorts of international affairs, and during the war was able to determine almost to an infinite degree the location of Japanese warships, and where they came from, and all sorts of things. That did not end when the war concluded, and it was perfectly natural that the Navy Department hesitated—and properly hesitated, at least they have ground for hesitation—to allow anybody to reveal the method by which they obtained the information.

Therefore on the 28th of August the President issued his order with respect to these cryptoanalytic codes, and nothing else. It did not cover anything else except that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator will agree that that is perhaps the single most important field of our investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may turn out to be. Also the single most important field of the Government's activities in obtaining information from all around the world. It is a tremendously important thing. The committee will go into that, it is bound to do it, in order to go into what happened up to and following the day of Pearl Harbor. Nobody questions the committee's intention to go into all those things.

I wrote a letter to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury and to the President asking all of them to designate somebody within their respective departments with whom the committee and its counsel could deal. In other words, if we went down there cruising all around over the Pentagon Building we would not find anything. But there was somebody down there who knew where it was. And the same is true in the White House files. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Navy all designated someone within their departments who could furnish this information to the committee and its counsel upon request. And they have cooperated. They have turned over to the committee, through the counsel, everything that he has asked for.

The Navy Department, on account of these cryptoanalytic code situations, was a little hesitant about it, and it is because of that that the President was requested to modify his directive of August 28 by releasing all these departments from the inhibition he had placed upon them, so far as the committee was concerned, in obtaining the information pertinent to the inquiry. It is not left to the Department to determine the pertinence of it. It is left to the committee to determine that. And it was made very plain that the committee is to determine what is pertinent, and not someone in the Department.

So the order of the 23d of October lifted the ban which the President had issued before this investigation was ever ordered, before anyone offered a resolution here, because his order was issued on the 28th of August, and the resolution under which we are acting was not submitted until the 6th of September. So that it could not have contemplated an investigation. It had no relationship to this investigation. It was a protective measure which the President thought was necessary in order to keep anyone in the Navy Department, the War Department, the State Department, or other agencies from revealing the latest methods by which information was being obtained on very important matters.

So the counsel, Mr. Mitchell, after talking with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of State—and he talked to me about it, and an appointment was made to see the President—Mr. Mitchell was asked to draw up an order which he thought would be adequate to serve the committee's purposes.

In the meantime the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] asked that an alternative order be drawn, based upon the controversy here now—that the President issue a modification saying that the ban would not only be lifted, so far as the committee is concerned as a committee, but that it would be lifted insofar as each individual member of the committee was concerned, so that each member, without any authority from the whole committee, without ever consulting the whole committee, without even consulting the counsel, on his own could go down to any department and pick out any paper, and pick out anything that he thought he ought to see.

The President did not sign that order. He signed the general order lifting the ban so far as the committee is concerned. That is the nub of this controversy.

I will read now the order issued by the President. It is a memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated October 23, 1945.

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to hold public hearings and make public pertinent evidence relating to the circumstances of that attack, a specific exception to my memorandum dated August 28, 1945, relating to the release of information concerning cryptoanalytic activities, is hereby made as follows:

The State, War, and Navy Departments will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, for such use as the committee may determine, any information in their possession material to the investigation, and wil' respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed services whose testimony is desired by the committee to testify publicly before the committee concerning any matter pertinent to the investigation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Approved October 23, 1945.

That was a release on behalf of the committee as a committee.

When the Senate passed the joint resolution it authorized the committee to appoint, as usual, subcommittees. It did not authorize a single member of the committee to act as a subcommittee, although I presume under a liberal interpretation of the terms of the joint resolution, if the committee saw fit to appoint a subcommittee, it might appoint one of any size it saw fit. Whether it would reduce it to one member is a matter which I will not here discuss, but it would be unusual to reduce a subcommittee to one member, although I have the feeling—in fact, I think the committee is generally agreed that under the terms of the joint resolution the committee could authorize a single member of the committee to do a specific thing with or without being accompanied by counsel. Therefore the whole matter of procedure and determining whether any single member of the committee shall be authorized or permitted or directed to do what is now a matter of controversy here is within the control of the committee itself.

But instead of that, this morning the Senator from Michigan offered his resolution. I wish now to read what we actually did this morning. We discovered, after discussion, that there might be some hesitancy on the part of witnesses within the various agencies of the Government to come forward voluntarily and offer information either to the committee or to the counsel of the committee, or to individual members of the committee. This morning the committee unanimously adopted this order:

The Joint Congressional Committee on Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack respectfully asks that the President approve the following memorandum—

That is, we are unanimously asking him to modify his order of October 23 in the following manner:

Memorandum for the chief executives of all executive departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack and to supplement previous directives and arrangements for full disclosure to and cooperation with the joint committee, and to add to the protections given in that provision in section 3 of the concurrent resolution creating the joint committee, which reads as follows—

I read section 3 into the concurrent resolution for the purpose of relieving any witnesses anywhere of any fear that there might be reprisals against them if they testified before the committee, either voluntarily or pursuant to summons:

SEC. 3. The testimony of any person in the armed services, and the fact that such person testified before the joint committee herein provided for, shall not be used against him in any court proceeding, or held against him in examining his military status for credits in the service to which he belongs.

As the author of the resolution I had in mind in framing that section that certain men have been under scrutiny and criticism, and others in the armed services may be called upon to testify. We wanted, so far as possible, to relieve them of any fear that what they might say would be used against them in any future trial in which they might be involved, or might be held against them in their records in the departments. So we inserted this section as a means of protection. It was as far as we could go in a concurrent resolution.

In view of that, this is the order which we asked the President to issue:

You are directed to authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, whether in the armed services or in a civilian status, and whether or not called to testify before the joint committee, if interrogated by the committee or any of its members or counsel, to volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge bearing on the subject of the committee's investigation, and whether or not so interrogated, to come forward voluntarily and disclose to the committee, or to any of its members or its counsel, any information such persons may have on the subject of the inquiry which they may have any reason to think may not already have been disclosed to the committee.

We have unanimously asked the President to modify his order by issuing this order, so that anyone in any department of the United States Government who has any information or thinks he has any information may be not only permitted, but encouraged and adjured to come voluntarily before the committee as a whole, or before the committee counsel, or before any individual member of the committee, to reveal what he knows. Of course, when such information is brought to the attention of the committee, if the committee feels that it is material, it can have such witness brought before the committee to testify fully in regard to it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator used the word "adjured."

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. That is not as strong as "command." It does not say that he must do it, but it encourages him and holds before him the duty to do it.

Mr. BREWSTER. As the Senator will recall, that was a point of considerable discussion, and we finally settled on the word "authorize."

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, but the word "authorize" in circumstances like that is bound to be interpreted as moral encouragement for the person to come forward and give any information he has to the committee, to its counsel, or to any member of the committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Undoubtedly it is designed to relieve him from fear.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct, if he has any. There may be fear on the part of some. If there is such fear, we want to relieve the person of it so far as we can.

That is what we did this morning. Two proposals were offered by the Senator from Michigan, which I think have been read. I will include them in my remarks also. The first proposal was as follows:

That for the purpose of enabling the committee, its individual members and counsel to perform the duties and responsibilities vested in them by the Congress of the United States, by virtue of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session; and

That for the further purpose of removing any restrictions, fears, or inhibitions which may exist on the part of past or present Federal employees and members of the armed forces, in order that they will feel free to make available to the joint committee, its individual members, and counsel any information in their possession material to the investigation;

We have already taken care of that in the section of the concurrent resolution which I read.

The committee respectfully asks that the President approve the following memorandum:

"Memorandum for: The Chief Executives of all Federal Departments, Agencies, Commissions and Bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

"In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to 'make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack', you are hereby directed to give the committee, its individual members and counsel your full cooperation—

We have already attended to that—

"You are further directed to give the committee, its individual members and its counsel access to all records, documents, and information in your possession, whether of secret or top secret nature, and to advise all your employees to afford the committee members and their counsel the fullest possible cooperation. Their inquiries should be answered fully and all Federal employees, or members of the Armed Services, past or present, should consider it their duty to volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge concerning the subject of the committee's investigation.

"In addition, copies of any papers, required by the committee, its individual members and its counsel, whether secret or top secret, should be furnished willingly, any present directives to the contrary notwithstanding.

"It is understood that all information so developed and all records and copies of records so obtained by the committee, any individual committee member or its counsel

shall be made available to the committee counsel for the information and use of all other members of the committee."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not that last paragraph seem adequate, so far as this resolution is concerned, to guarantee that all this information shall be made available to the committee? At one point the Senator raised some question on that score with the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Apparently the last paragraph does place upon the individual member the duty to lay before the committee whatever he obtains. But the crux of the whole thing, and the real difference between the majority and minority members of the committee, is on the question whether, on his own, any member—I, the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Maine, the Senator from Michigan, or any of the House Members—himself as an individual, armed by this amended order, shall be permitted to go into any department and go into any records, in the presence of no one else, and pick out what he thinks ought to be made public or brought to the attention of the committee. The committee felt that it was established as a committee, and that it must function as a committee. It was authorized to appoint subcommittees in cases in which that was found necessary.

Inasmuch as this was a matter within the control of the committee, it was felt that the President ought not to be asked to modify his order so as to authorize individual members of the committee to cruise around among all the papers in all the departments to determine for themselves, each individually, whether some paper or document which might not necessarily even have any relationship to Pearl Harbor should be examined or brought to the attention of the committee. The restrictive phrases in the proposed resolution, if there are any, are rather evasive and vague as to whether they would even be limited so far as concerns investigating or looking at papers which have no relationship to Pearl Harbor. In the mass of all the various papers, undoubtedly each individual member would have the authority to examine all the private papers of any man who ever held public office, in order to find if there was something in there which had some relationship to Pearl Harbor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How would the private papers of a man who held office be in the files of the Government?

Mr. BARKLEY. He might leave them there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then does not the committee think the committee should be able to see them and determine whether they relate to Pearl Harbor?

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee can see them. The committee can see any paper in Washington, any paper in Hawaii, any paper anywhere in the world that bears upon this investigation. The committee can do that, and its counsel can do that; and if anyone brings to the committee even a suspicion that there is a paper somewhere, the counsel would be authorized to look into it and see whether there is any such paper. That is what I am talking about—to have the committee, rather than individual members of the committee, take the authority to do this.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator feel that it is possible for Mr. Mitchell, as counsel, individually to examine all the files and records in this case?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is not only possible for Mr. Mitchell and his corps of assistants——

Mr. FERGUSON. No, Mr. President; my question was not directed to his assistants. I referred to Mr. Mitchell himself.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, Mr. Mitchell would be just as able to do that as would the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Maine or the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt as to his capacity.

Mr. BARKLEY. But we have authorized Mr. Mitchell to have a corps of assistants, and, of course, these papers must be parceled out among them and investigated by them. It could not be done by any one man. It would take from now to Christmas of next year for one man alone to go through all the papers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quite agree with the Senator that Mr. Mitchell would be fully as competent to examine the papers as would any one of the Senators on the committee. Perhaps the Senator would not intimate that he would be more competent.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I never intimate that anyone could be more competent than our colleagues here.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator properly paid great tribute to Mr. Mitchell, but he is obliged to operate through his various assistants. I do not know how many he has. I do not know their names. I have never seen them; I do not know them. I have confidence in Mr. Mitchell; but I would wish that the majority leader would have the same confidence in the Members of this body, so that we, too, might scrutinize governmental records, so that we might have the privilege which is now accorded to any of the members of the committee staff, the names of whom we do not know. We would like to have the same privilege as that accorded to the members of the staff which have been selected by someone. The same privilege and authority which is accorded them might rest with the individual members of the committee.

In all the requests which I have made—this is somewhat in conflict with the statements recently made by the majority leader—I have said I would be happy to go to the majority leader, as chairman of the committee, and request authority to go with any member of the staff whom the counsel might designate to accompany me at all times. But I did desire that latitude. While I cited two instances in which I did want to go and do this—instances in which authority was refused——

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to come to that in a moment——

Mr. BREWSTER. The thing which chiefly concerns me is the resistance. If it were not for that, I would not be so concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as concerns the matter of Senators not knowing the staff, I will say to the Senator from Maine that the staff is doing its work in the Senate Office Building, in room No. 201, and that is in the same building in which the Senator from Maine has his office. Evidently he has not been to that room to consult with the staff or to get acquainted with them. But I do not know that that is the fault of the staff. It certainly is not my fault.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was not raising any question as to the competency of those gentlemen. I was simply asking that perhaps the members of the committee could be considered as being equally competent to do the character of work accorded to young men who have recently been secured.

Mr. BARKLEY. I never understood that the resolution authorized each individual member of the committee to be a private detective in his own individual capacity. We were appointed as a committee. All the authority conferred upon us was conferred upon us as a committee. Unless I am acting in my capacity as a member of that committee, in the committee, I am just ALBEN W. BARCLAY, Senator from Kentucky; I have no more authority than does any other Senator, unless the committee itself, after considering the matter, authorizes me to do something within its jurisdiction and within its authority. That is my view of the function of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, who first rose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to inquire whether the chairman of the committee was present with Mr. Mitchell when the two orders were presented to the President?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I was present. I made the appointment and I went down with Mr. Mitchell—if the Senator wants to know what the facts are.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am just after the facts.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I did that. Was there anything wrong with it?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as I understand the matter, I agree with the Senator that the committee, under the present Presidential modification of the order, has full power to authorize any member of the committee or any group of members to do these various things. As I understand, the Senator is very clear about that, and I agree with him.

The only point is that when we individually came to request, as I did under my resolution, that the chairman or the committee authorize me or the Senator

from Michigan to go look at certain records, that permission was refused.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall come to that and I shall explain exactly what happened. I do not think the Senator has drawn a true picture of it—unintentionally, of course.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is the first resolution the Senator from Michigan asked that the committee adopt. It would request the President to modify his order so as to give individual members of the committee the right themselves, as individuals, without any consultation with the committee or the counsel or anyone else, to go into any department and search out any paper they saw fit to search for. That resolution was defeated by a vote of 5 to 3, and I am one of the 5 who voted against it. I do not think it was proper. I do not think it comported with the proper course of a committee, acting as a committee. I do not think the Senate would ever concede that I should constitute myself a private detective, acting on my own, without any relationship to any authority which might be conferred by the committee on me, either as a member of a subcommittee or individually, to go into the departments and search for something that I thought I wanted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not the function of a special committee that is formed by the Senate to go out and investigate, to do the very thing the Senator says now is denied to the members of the committee? Is not that what the members of the committee are for? Are not they supposed to uncover everything they possibly can uncover, that will reveal the desired information?

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true. But there is a difference between the action of the committee as such and the action of an individual.

Reference has been made to the Truman committee and the Senator from Maine may have been actuated largely by what happened in the Truman committee. The Truman committee was investigating the current war. It was investigating occurrences in thousands and thousands of war plants. Obviously, that committee could not go as a committee to investigate what was going on in all the war plants. That committee authorized individual members to go out and make such investigations, but they were authorized by the committee to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Did not the Senate authorize each of the members of the committee to sit on the committee and individually and as a committee uncover every fact which could be uncovered?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senate did not do so. If the Senator wishes an answer, let me say no jurisdiction was conferred on the members of the committee as individuals. All 10 of them make up a group, and that group makes up the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean one of them would be considered as being above another.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Senate left it in the jurisdiction of the committee to determine whether all of the members or any part of them might be designated fo any particular purpose as the proceeding goes along, while it is in progress, so as to meet each situation as it arises.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. As I now understand the position of the Senator, there are records and information here of two characters. One is composed of written records and the other is composed of those which are in the memory of men. As the Senator from Kentucky now presents the matter, he has accorded this individual freedom to individual members of the committee under the modification proposed by the President—in other words, that any member of the Government or the armed services may go to any individual member of the committee and freely volunteer information which is in his own mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is right.

Mr. BREWSTER. But if he calls attention to some records in the Government files down in the vast Pentagon Building, and if he says, "If you go to room X and look at record Y," then the door is locked, and that liberty is not accorded to individual members of the committee. That is what I cannot understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the door is not locked. Whether someone goes to a member of the committee or whether a member of the committee goes to someone, and states there is such a record, all the member of the committee has to do is to go to the committee and say, "I am informed there is such a record and I want authority to see it." Does the Senator think that is too much to do?

Mr. BREWSTER. I certainly do. I think the Senator from Kentucky, as chairman, should be authorized to permit me to do that, and I think it is a very simple request and a very necessary request if confidence in the committee is to continue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, now, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the second resolution offered by the Senator from Michigan. I shall call attention to it only briefly, because in part it is similar to the other one. I shall read section 1. The rest are preambles:

> The committee approves and adopts the following rules of procedure:
>
> The State, War, Navy, and other departments and agencies will make available to the Joint Committee on Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, to its counsel, or to any of its individual members any information and records they shall at any time request, and may respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed and civilian services, past or present, to give full information and records to the committee, its members or counsel, to testify publicly at the request of the committee, its counsel, or any member, concerning any matter which the committee, its counsel, or any individual committee member may deem pertinent to the investigation.

The objection to that resolution was that it would authorize any single member of the committee to bring in a witness, without ever being heard by the counsel or the committee, and to have him testify—although the committee might not know anything about his testimony—as to what he said in private.

Our position is that in any case a member of the committee should apply to the full committee for authority to have any such witness testify what he claims to know, so that there can be some orderly process in determining whether he shall be called as a witness or not. That motion was voted down.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator read paragraph 2 of the resolution and see whether it carries out what the Senator has just stated?

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, paragraph 2 reads as follows:

> All information so divulged and all records and copies of records so obtained by the committee, its counsel, or any individual committee member shall be made available to the committee counsel for the information and use of all other members of the committee.

In other words, it shall be made available to the counsel; but under the previous paragraph, a committee member could bring in that witness and could have him testify, without having the committee know anything about it. The committee member who did that would be required to make the information available to the counsel of the committee. But regardless of the counsel and regardless of anything else, under that resolution a member of the committee would be given the right to bring in the witness, anyhow, and have him testify, without having the committee know anything about it or without having the committee decide whether the witness should testify or not on whether he knew anything of value.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As my memory serves me, at the first meeting at which Mr. Mitchell appeared, he told us of certain interference when he had another Government case, and one of his stipulations was that he should have the right to produce any witness or any fact; and the Senator from Michigan at that specific time stated that each and every member of the committee would have that same right, and that he—the Senator from Michigan—would concede that the counsel would have that right; and it was then and there agreed that each and every member of the committee, as well as counsel for the committee, should produce any witness in this case.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, of course, that situation grew out of an entirely different matter. Mr. Mitchell had been employed by the Government to prosecute a case in Chicago involving a newspaper which was accused of having violated the law in revealing military secrets.

Mr. Mitchell, when he was employed, made it one of the conditions that he was to understand that he was to go forward with the case. The evidence was in process of being presented to the

grand jury in Chicago. The Navy Department had theretofore said that it would be all right to yield the secrets with respect to these codes, and that it was necessary to do so in order to indict. In the middle of the process the Navy changed its mind and decided that it would not be wise to reveal the secrets. The ground was therefore cut out from under Mr. Mitchell, and he said he did not want to be put into a situation where he was allowed to go forward with a set of facts and then at the last minute have the carpet pulled out from under him so that he would be left high and dry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions to which reference has been made be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

In executive meeting, Tuesday, November 1, 1945, the committee approved the following by unanimous consent of the members present:

That for the purpose of enabling the committee, its individual members and counsel to perform the duties and responsibilities vested in them by the Congress of the United States, by virtue of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and

That for the further purpose of removing any restrictions, fears, or inhibitions which may exist on the part of past or present Federal employees and members of the armed forces, in order that they will feel free to make available to the joint committee, its individual members and counsel any information in their possession material to the investigation;

The committee respectfully asks that the President approve the following memorandum:

"Memorandum for: The chief executives of all Federal departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

"In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to 'make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack,' you are hereby directed to give the committee, its individual members and counsel your full cooperation.

"You are further directed to give the committee, its individual members and its counsel access to all records, documents, and information in your possession, whether of secret or top-secret nature, and to advise all your employees to afford the committee members and their counsel the fullest possible cooperation. Their inquiries should be answered fully and all Federal employees, or members of the armed services, past or present, should consider it their duty to volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge concerning the subject of the committee's investigation.

"In addition, copies of any papers, required by the committee, its individual members, and its counsel, whether secret or top secret should be furnished willingly, any present directives to the contrary notwithstanding.

"It is understood that all information so developed and all records and copies of records so obtained by the committee, any individual committee member or its counsel shall be made available to the committee counsel for the information and use of all other members of the committee."

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE GUIDANCE OF COUNSEL AND MEMBERS OF THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

In executive meeting, Thursday, November 1, 1945, the committee approved the following rules of procedure by unanimous consent of the members present:

That for the purpose of giving full effect to the order of the President of the United States, approved October 23, 1945, or any amendment thereto, that "The State, War, and Navy Departments will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack, for such use as the committee may determine, any information in their possession material to the investigation"; and

For the further purpose of enabling the committee, its individual members, and counsel to perform the duties and responsibilities vested in them by the Congress of the United States to "make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events and circumstances leading up to or following the attack made by the Japanese armed forces upon Pearl Harbor"; and

By virtue of the authority vested in the committee by Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

The committee approves and adopts the following rules of procedure:

1. The State, War, Navy, and any other department or agency will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, to its counsel or to any of its individual members any information and records they shall at any time request, and will respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed and civilian services, past or present, to give full information and records to the committee, its members or counsel, and to testify publicly at the request of the committee, its counsel, or any committee member concerning any matter which the committee, its counsel, or any individual committee member may deem pertinent to the investigation.

2. All information so developed and all records and copies of records so obtained by the committee, its counsel, or any individual committee member shall be made available to the committee counsel for the information and use of all other members of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it correct to say that it was then conceded that the counsel should have full latitude, and that his investigation should be all-inclusive?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Mitchell was assured that he would have an absolutely free rein.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand it, there is now a limitation upon the members of the committee so that they cannot do what counsel can do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is begging the question.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum which was unanimously agreed to be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memoradum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack respectfully asks that the President approve the following memorandum:

"Memorandum for: The chief executives of all executive departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack, and to supplement previous directives and arrangements for full disclosure to and cooperation with the joint committee, and to add to the protections given in that provision in section 3, of the concurrent resolution creating the joint committee, which reads as follows:

"'SEC. 3. The testimony of any person in the armed services, and the fact that such person testified before the joint committee herein provided for, shall not be used against him in any court proceeding, or held against him in examining his military status for credits in the service to which he belongs.'

"You are directed to authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, whether in the armed services or in a civilian status, and whether or not called to testify before the joint committee, if interrogated by the committee or any of its members or counsel, to volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge bearing on the subject of the committee's investigation, and whether or not so interrogated, to come forward voluntarily and disclose to the committee, or to any of its members or its counsel, any information such persons may have on the subject of the inquiry which they may have any reason to think may not already have been disclosed to the committee."

Respectfully,

———, *Chairman.*

NOVEMBER 2, 1945.

Mr. BARKLEY. Here is a resolution which was offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] earlier in the day which was not agreed to but which was rather held in suspense:

Whereas determination regarding the significance of missing files—

I wish to say that the unequivocal statement has been made that there are missing files. So far as the committee knows, so far as the counsel knows, and so far as any individual member of the committee knows, there is no basis for the bald statement that there are missing papers. There have been rumors floating around to the effect that papers are missing, but if there are any such, the committee will find it out. If anyone will tell any individual Senator that any paper about which he knows anything is missing, that person will be called before the committee and asked to give whatever information he knows about the matter.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am quite surprised to hear the majority leader make that statement, because it appears in the records, if he has read them, that there are documents which are missing. That fact appears in the testimony which has already been given to the Pearl Harbor Board. Much of the investigation was concerned with the location of such ma-

terial. I made the statement repeatedly before the committee that I had been reliably informed that two complete files of a certain character, which I stated, were missing, and I asked permission to go and see how the records were kept, and whether they were missing. I asked for such permission, and I was only this morning denied such permission by the majority of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am coming to that point right now. There were certain papers that were withheld. They related to a part of the War Department investigation. They were withheld for reasons which were given at the time, and which were later revealed and made public.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will examine the Army and Navy reports he will find that the Army report specifically says that certain records——

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that relate to the monitor service?

Mr. FERGUSON. It relates to two services.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was an instance in which during the past 4 or 5 years the offices of the monitor service—a technical name which I do not now understand, but which I hope to understand when we get into the investigation—were moved, and installations were moved to another place entirely. During the process of moving it seems that some of the papers were displaced, and have not yet become located.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would not the Senator say that they were missing?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no basis for the statement that someone has filched the papers out of the files.

Mr. BREWSTER. When it is said that papers are missing, that may not be true, but there is this evidence: With regard to a certain telegram which has been considered to be of great importance, a certain member of the staff testified that it was missing. He was severely censured by the chairman of the board, Admiral HART, who is now a Senator from Connecticut, for making the statement. Admiral HART said, "I have myself seen that telegram." Within the week I asked Senator HART about the telegram, and he said, "I find that I was mistaken. I have never seen that telegram." That would indicate some conflict, at least, of view.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is no longer in the Navy and not subject to any intimidation. If his memory on that subject failed him, it cannot be charged to anybody above him in the Navy.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was merely indicating that the officer who testified the telegram was missing may have been incorrectly informed.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems that Admiral HART had said that at one time he had seen the telegram, and later he said that he had not seen it.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be the fault of memory. The Senator does not indicate that the Senator from Connecticut, formerly Admiral HART, deliberately changed his statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Not at all. I was trying to establish the fact that the responsible naval officer who testified with regard to the missing paper may perhaps have been correct. The only refutation of his statement was the statement of Admiral HART, who subsequently said that he was misinformed.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee will go into that subject, and I am satisfied it will go into it exhaustively. It is not necessary to designate one individual to do what the whole committee can do.

I read the resolution which the Senator from Maine submitted.

> Whereas determination regarding the significance of missing files and records in Government files; and
>
> Whereas various members of the committee have had their attention directed to what are considered to be significant omissions—

Of course, that creates no suspicion. The word "significant" has no connotation in this instance with respect to any deliberation in connection with an omission. It merely happens to be a significant omission.

I continue reading from the resolution:

> in the files and are desirous by determining by examination of the Government records and the system used in connection therewith and destruction thereof;
>
> Now, therefore, be it moved:
>
> That the chairman be authorized on behalf of the committee to authorize any member of the committee upon request in company with a member of the staff, to examine any records deemed to be relevant to the current investigation.

I objected to having any such authority. I did not feel that, in advance, the committee should give me blanket authority to designate any member of the committee who might request that I designate him to investigate any facts, and all facts connected with this investigation. I did say, and I repeat, that if any member of the committee, as the hearing proceeds, and the facts are unfolded, will come to the committee and say that there are certain things which should be looked into, that he knows about them, and that he would like to have the authority, either the committee can authorize him to do it, or if, based upon the committee's determination, the committee desires me to authorize any Senator to do it, I would have no objection; but I do object, and I objected in the committee, to having blanket authority given to me, and putting upon me the responsibility of saying whether any individual Senator could have blanket authority to go anywhere in any department and look at anything he thought he would like to look at. I think these things should be brought to the committee so that the committee can take its own responsibility in respect to them.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is not that precisely what I did before the committee this morning, following the Senator's suggestion? Did I not request authority of the full committee that I be permitted to go and look at certain records, and was not that denied?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator asked the committee to direct me to authorize the Senator at once.

Mr. BREWSTER. No, I asked the committee to authorize me, in accordance with the Senator's suggestion, and that was voted down.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was voted down.

Mr. BREWSTER. So it was contrary to what the Senator has just stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Maine took advantage of the fact that the committee voted down two resolutions offered by the Senator from Michigan, and voted down another resolution offered by himself that I be immediately directed to authorize the Senator from Maine in person to go and investigate the records. In fact he made his motion before the other resolution was voted on.

Mr. BREWSTER. That statement——

Mr. BARKLEY. I said I did not want that authority, and I objected to it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure there is no occasion for our being under misapprehension. I first presented the resolution asking that the Senator be authorized to give this permission at any time. When he indicated that he did not want such authority, that he wanted the committee to do it, I said, "Very well, I will now ask the committee to authorize me to go and examine these records in company with a member of the committee staff," and that proposal was voted down, in conflict with what has been here stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I stated to the committee, in connection with these other things, that I did not want to be authorized to do that, and I did not myself desire to take the responsibility of having the authority to determine whether the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Maine or any other Senator should be given by me, under a blanket authorization of the committee, authority to do what the committee had just voted it could not do by asking the President to modify his directive.

As the hearings proceed, I say to the Senator, and I said it in the committee this morning, if any occasion arises when the committee desires to authorize a subcommittee to do these things, or wants to authorize a single Senator to do it, or wants to give me the authority from time to time, as situations arise, I should not object to that, but I do object, and I do not think it is fair to me, as the chairman, to be saddled with the responsibility, for the rest of the hearings, in advance, before we even start, of determining whether any individual Senator shall go down by himself, or with the counsel, to investigate, to look at papers, and see what he pleases in the various archives of the Government.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. We have been over this four or five times, and I have stated repeatedly that my final request, which was rejected by the committee, was not addressed to the chairman in any way. The chairman of the committee said he wanted to be out of it, and I said, "Very well, I ask the committee for the authority," and that was denied.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator was asking the committee to do what had already been included in the resolutions of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It has been said what would be done if these questions arose during the hearing. We have been told that the hearings will proceed mornings and afternoons, continuously. What time will there then be to prepare to go and look at the files? Here I am on the floor advising the Senate of these facts, and on the first occasion, days before the hearings are to open, one of the members of the committee has been refused, not by the chairman, but by the committee on a 5 to 3 vote, an opportunity to look into the files of the United States Government; and he is a member of this investigating committee.

Mr. President, what counsel would start a case in court, what counsel would start hearings, without all the evidence, so that he may at the proper time produce the evidence and properly examine any witnesses? What counsel would cross-examine a witness or examine a witness who did not feel that he knew all about the facts in the case? That is just what the Senator from Maine asked for.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I used to practice a little law before I came to Congress, and it has always been my understanding that when a client employs an attorney he has confidence enough in him to let him manage the case. I do not think an attorney would try to handle a case if a client tried to manage it.

Mr. FERGUSON. When a client hires a lawyer, the client is very careful to take all the facts to the lawyer. This is not such a case. This is an investigating committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has frequently referred to the analogy of a lawsuit and therefore I adopt his analogy by assuming that the committee in a sense is the client of Mr. Mitchell. He is the general counsel. We employed him because we had confidence in him. I think that confidence has been justified and is justified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the rules of procedure which were unanimously adopted this morning in the committee for the conduct of the committee when the hearings are in progress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

OCTOBER 13, 1945.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE (SECOND DRAFT)

In the interests of an expeditious, fair, and thorough inquiry the joint committee has adopted the following rules of procedure:

1. All sessions of the committee at which evidence is received will be public, at which the press and the public will be admitted and all evidence obtained by the committee bearing on the inquiry will be presented at public hearings.

2. Witnesses will be examined by counsel for the committee and committee members. All testimony will be under oath.

3. A witness who was in the service of the United States at the time of or prior to the events being inquired into may be represented by counsel of his own selection.

4. No personal attorney for a witness nor attorney or representative of a Government agency may object to questions propounded by a member of or counsel for the committee, or interrupt such examinations.

5. Following examination in chief by the committee and its counsel, a witness may be examined by his own attorney.

6. Prepared written statements from witnesses will not be received except with the permission of the committee nor unless submitted to counsel for the committee a reasonable time prior to presentation, provided that any witness who has been in the service of the United States and whose conduct has been the subject of scrutiny, shall be given an opportunity prior to closing of the testimony to present such a statement at a public session of the committee.

7. Any evidence deemed by the committee to have probative force may be received.

8. Any person desiring to testify before the committee shall make written request to testify, addressed to the chairman of the committee. The written request must state, in addition to the name of the person proposing to testify, and his official capacity, if any, the fact or facts available to such proposed witness and the extent of such proposed witness' personal knowledge thereof. All requests will be considered and sources of information thus submitted respected insofar as a fair and open conduct of the inquiry will permit. Attention is called to section 3 of the concurrent resolution establishing the joint committee, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 3. The testimony of any person in the armed services, and the fact that such person testified before the joint committee herein provided for, shall not be used against him in any court proceeding or held against him in examining his military status for credits in the service to which he belongs."

9. The above procedure shall be equally applicable to hearings before any subcommittee that may be designated during the course of the inquiry. The committee will feel free to modify or suspend any of these rules as conditions may justify.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask also, inasmuch as it has been brought up, that the record vote by which these motions were defeated or adopted this morning be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. BREWSTER. Before that permission is granted, I would ask to see the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes—I appreciate the Senator's situation. He desires to look at this record as he desires to look at other things.

Mr. BREWSTER. In view of the statement the Senator just made, I desire to examine the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator can examine it to his heart's content. But it is typical of the Senator's attitude in this whole matter.

Mr. BREWSTER. I must call the Senator's attention to the fact that there is no record whatsoever of the vote refusing me permission to examine the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was no record of that. There was not an aye-and-no vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was not there a vote?

Mr. BARKLEY. There was a vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. Where is the record of it? Read it to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Here it is. The roll call when members voted as their names were called. The roll was not called on the Senator's motion, and he knows it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is that a record of the meeting, then? Where is the record of the vote on my motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the record of the vote that was cast on the resolution discussed here. If the Senator does not want it to go in, very well. Members have been asked to reveal who voted for and who voted against. I gave consent to the Senator from Michigan to put it into the RECORD. I am now asking that it go into the RECORD.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask that the hand vote on the motion made by the Senator from Maine be put in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. The hand vote?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Government Printing Office has any way by which to put a hand vote into the RECORD, I am in favor of it being done. I might say this, if it will give the Senator any satisfaction, that the hand vote was identical with the roll-call vote on these other motions.

Mr. FERGUSON. That answers the question.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think it ought to be made clear under what circumstances this vote was taken. I am a bit ashamed to do it, but nevertheless for my own sake I shall do it very frankly.

We were debating the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as to whether we would call on the President to issue an Executive order or modify one, so that any member of a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress might go into the secret files and inspect documents. When we were about to take that vote, and because, perhaps, of something that I had said, or maybe some other member of the committee had said, the Senator from Maine, irrepressible as he is, and delightful and charming as he is, rose to test the committee's good faith in what it had said. Under those circumstances I voted against his proposal. But his motion is pending there. I shall do it again, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. President, as the hour is late, I do not want to make a speech——

Mr. BARKLEY. I have concluded, and I yield the floor to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. No; the hour is too late.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator from Georgia desires to be heard, he has that right.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I shall not undertake to make a full statement about this matter, but I should like to get the facts straight in the RECORD.

First. Mr. Mitchell was selected as counsel. I did not desire to go on the committee, and I think the Chair will bear me out in the statement that I made some effort to be excused from serving on it. But I decided that I might be of a little service in helping the committee select counsel and get under way in this important investigation. Mr. Mitchell's name, along with the names of others, was suggested to the

committee, and finally he was unanimously agreed upon. I thought him an excellent selection then and think him an excellent selection now.

I had never heard, until the distinguished Senator from Michigan referred to it on the floor this morning any statement of the attitude of the counsel for the committee regarding the investigation of the Wyman matter. I knew nothing about it except I had read something in the newspapers and heard something over the radio, but not in connection with the work of the committee at all. I knew nothing about the other matters that the Senator read. They were never formally brought before the committee, and when the statements are here made that so and so was testified about, distinguished Senators, of course, mean before other investigating committees, not before this committee, because we have taken not one single line of testimony.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I took for granted that my statement was very clear on that point.

Mr. GEORGE. I am afraid it is not clear, I will say to the Senator, to the general public.

Mr. FERGUSON. I certainly want to make it clear at this moment that no testimony has been taken and no evidence has been adduced before the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. None whatever.

Mr. FERGUSON. None whatever.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. I think that ought to be thoroughly understood in order to understand what we are here discussing.

Mr. Mitchell, the counsel selected, in his first appearance before the committee wished to have one thing very definitely understood, that if he developed any facts, regardless of where they led or how they pointed, he was not, to use his own expression, as I recall it, to have the carpet pulled out from under him when he was proceeding. We assured Mr. Mitchell, of course, that he would have that authority and that right, and that we would not put any brakes upon him, but that we desired him to go very fully into the whole matter and develop it all.

I had not heard until very recently, and then not through the committee, of the August 28 order of the President. The counsel for the committee had discovered the existence of that order in some way. I do not know that it is material how. I do not even know how he learned about it. But he, in connection with the chairman of the committee, and apparently with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, knew of it at least, because he made a suggestion or a form of order or modification which he wished to have approved.

At any rate, the counsel, with the assistance of the chairman, and perhaps of others, was undertaking to get the President to modify his order, that is to say the August 28 order which was issued before the committee was ever created, and had no reference to it. The President had modified the order, and under the plainest terms the committee had been given full right to make inquiry into the secret files of the War Department, the Navy Department and the State Department. We were also advised that full permission would be given the committee to make examination of the files which might be described strictly as the White House files, not being directly under his jurisdiction, as the present President conceived. He had asked that that authority be sought and obtained elsewhere. The committee was advised that that authority would be given, but we have not seen the form of that authority. There is no question on earth that the President had given to the committee full authority to go into the files.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The difficulty with that is that if that was the understanding of counsel and the majority leader, the way the order stood on the record it would certainly be interpreted by the officials of the War Department, the Navy Department, and various other departments to impose a strict limitation, and that it had only been modified in a certain way, and that was to call them as witnesses rather than to interview them. So I take it that the modified order to the men in the services would govern, rather than the verbal understanding of the committee counsel and the majority leader.

Mr. GEORGE. We unanimously agreed to request the President to issue a further directive, so to speak, about which I think there is no dispute. I am coming to the one real question involved, and that is this: The President of the United States issued a directive to his executive officers commanding that they deliver to the committee any evidence which the committee might deem pertinent or relevant to its investigation. The question arose as to whether that Executive order should be amended so as expressly to give to any individual member of the committee what the President had already granted to the full committee. Personally I thought that would be an improper request to make of the President of the United States. I still think so. I do not believe the President of the United States would grant it, and I can very well see why he should refuse it, because he would have a perfect right to say, "I have granted to your committee all you have asked of me. Your committee can determine by its own internal regulations how it proposes to act. I am not going to say by Executive order that any individual member of a joint committee of the House and Senate can go into the confidential files of the Government and take out of those files any paper which the individual member may wish."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, the President has authorized—at least verbally—the right of counsel and assistant counsel to do that very thing.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no doubt that the President would recognize the right of any agent selected by the committee. That is exactly the point in this controversy. There is a great tempest in a teapot here. The committee has all the authority it needs. It has the right to act. It may designate its counsel. It may select the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Maine, or a Member of the House on that committee, to make certain inquiries and investigations. But why should the President be asked to amend an Executive order which in broad terms gives to the committee all the authority it could ask? Why should the President be asked to amend the order so as to say that the committee or its counsel, or any individual member of the committee, may have authority to examine the files? So long as the committee acts, and the person who is selected by it has the authority of the committee to act, he can get anything in the world he wants from the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Since the President modified his original Executive order the committee counsel has obtained from the departments everything he has asked for or thought material. Of course, in the multiplicity of all these things he has not yet obtained it all, but he has not been denied anything he has called for in the name of the committee, and, of course, all he has called for has been in the name of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The second proposal offered by the Senator from Michigan requested the committee to authorize each member to do what it authorizes the counsel to do. One resolution asked that the President authorize it. The second resolution would have the committee authorize the various members, as representatives of the committee, to obtain the evidence.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if I may proceed, I stated in the beginning, and I shall now repeat, that it always has been my position, and always will be, that the question of who is to represent the committee is within the authority and responsibility of the committee. It is not within the authority or responsibility of the President of the United States. When the President of the United States gives to the full committee all the authority it can ask, it seems to me that it would be little less than impertinent—and perhaps worse than that—to say, "Mr. President, please amend your order again, so that representatives of the committee may go into the files and obtain documents."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am trying to finish, because I do not wish to make any further statement on this question. The position which I took—and it was the real position of the other members of the committee, to my knowledge—was that, the President having already given the general blanket order, the control of the agencies of the committee was, of course, a matter for the internal regulation of the committee itself. I stated that when any responsible

member of the committee came before the committee at any time and said, "Upon these facts I desire either to make or have made a specific inquiry or investigation," I certainly would not vote against it. I voted this morning against the proposal presented by the Senator from Maine. When we were discussing the question of having the President say that each member of the committee should have the right of access to the files of the departments, the Senator, in the midst of that discussion, and by the time the vote was to be taken, as if to challenge the good faith of those of us who said that we believed, in all good faith, that the committee would have the right to select its agents and to regulate them and to control them, made a motion, which was disposed of, and we then proceeded to decide whether we would go further and ask the President to modify the Executive order. I also voted against asking the President to modify his order, for the reasons which I have already stated.

That is all there is to this question, except the feeling of some members of the committee—I do not say that it is not justified, but I say that it is most unfortunate—that they perhaps lack confidence in the counsel—not that they question his integrity, his intelligence, or his ability, but they fear that the counsel will not go as far as they wish to go. Whenever the occasion arises for the committee itself to decide that some member of the committee or an agent selected by the committee from the outside should make further inquiry and examination into any department, or into any of the secret archives or records of the Government, I shall certainly not vote to deny to the committee the right to give its permission.

I can very well understand why the distinguished Senator from Kentucky did not wish to have the rather heavy responsibility of saying to any individual member of the committee who came to him and asked permission to make a secret examination in the files of the White House, for example, that he did not wish that authority given to him. I think that would perhaps be a responsibility which he ought not willingly to assume. Actually it is a question for the committee itself to decide, in a matter of such importance as this.

This is not a question as saying to the counsel of the committee, "I have information that John Doe or Bill Smith is able to testify before the committee, and wishes to testify." This question involves the most confidential files of the man who was President of the United States when the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred, and who until a short while ago was President of the United States—the most important and highly confidential papers any government can have.

I respectfully suggest that so long as the committee may determine who is to make examinations or who is to have opportunity to scrutinize or to inquire, the matter should be left in that shape.

Personally, my own feeling is that I would not want to go to a department and make an investigation on my own, as a member of the committee. I would certainly want to have the authority of the whole committee before I assumed the responsibility of taking out of the files of the Government documents of the character which may be involved in this case. I think there is an anticipated brake on the members of the committee that will never arise as a practical consideration, because I think the committee undoubtedly will, on any reasonable showing by any member of the committee, be entirely willing that the inquiry be prosecuted and be made.

Mr. President, that is my position in this matter. I regret that there is the slightest feeling of fear on the part of any Member as to the honorable intentions of the distinguished counsel selected by the committee, and I believe that those fears are groundless, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the statement of the Senator from Georgia. He made several characterizations which I hope are not to be taken too seriously. One is as to the irrepressible Senator from Maine. The other is as to responsible members of the committee. I am sure the Senator did not mean to indicate that some members of the committee are not responsible.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; I did not mean to say that at all. I say that any responsible member of the committee——

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean that any member of the committee is not responsible?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; not at all. Is the Senator from Maine a lawyer?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; I am.

Mr. GEORGE. Has not the Senator heard the most distinguished members of the bar and the most distinguished jurists of the country ask counsel if he makes a certain statement in his capactity as attorney?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I mean. I mean that he assumes responsibility for a request when he makes it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Well, in that sense I welcome it.

Mr. President, I appreciated the statement regarding the action on my motion, inasmuch as the Senator from Georgia established very clearly that I did make a motion that I be permitted or authorized by the committee, without regard to the chairman's authorization, to go and examine certain records which I considered of importance. That motion was voted down, as the Senator from Georgia stated.

I have before me the record which the majority leader, as chairman of the committee, asked to have inserted in the RECORD. It is entitled "Votes and Action Taken", and it purports to be a record of the meeting of the committee this morning. There is no reference whatsoever either to my motion or to this vote or to the refusal of my request. I do think that in justice to the committee and the records, and in justice to the chairman of the committee, who I am sure wishes to be accurate and fair, that vote should be inserted in the record before it is incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that at the time when a yea-and-nay vote was demanded on one of these motions, there was no regular secretary of the committee, and the chairman asked one of the members of the committee to act as secretary to call the roll, which he did. This record represents the roll call as that member of the committee made it on the motions on which there were yea-and-nay votes.

Mr. BREWSTER. It does not so specify. It says "Votes and Action Taken." There certainly was action taken which is not recorded in that record.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, that roll call was intended to be on the two motions made by the Senator from Michigan and the other one to which I referred. My recollection is that when the Senator made his motion, which he interjected prior to the taking of the vote on the first motion of the Senator from Michigan, the vote on that motion was by a hand vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is right.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was not a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is right.

Mr. BARKLEY. Therefore, the man who was designated as secretary evidently thought it was not necessary to make a record of just a hand vote, because we had kept no record as to the proceedings up to the time of the roll call.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say that I do not think the chairman had asked the member to serve as secretary until after the hand vote was taken and before the yea-and-nay vote was taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. I had not asked anyone to act as secretary until there was a roll-call vote; and the vote on the Senator's motion, as I said, was the same—5 to 3—as the vote on the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the majority leader be willing to complete the record, before inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that the complete record of the action in the committee may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think I could do that by asking unanimous consent that the vote—that is, the vote taken by the raising of hands—on the motion made by the Senator from Maine, which was the first vote cast in the committee, but was not a recorded vote, be inserted here by the statement that the same members of the committee who voted against the subsequent motion voted against his motion, and the same members who voted for the subsequent motion voted for his motion, as he made it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, Mr. President, on the vote taken by the show of hands, the following members voted for the motion made by the Senator from Maine——

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator from Kentucky state what the motion was, or shall I state it?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would have to do it from memory.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator permit me to state my motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. It was, in substance, the motion in writing offered here.

Mr. BREWSTER. No; would the Senator permit me to state the motion, inasmuch as I made it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, the Senator can state his interpretation of it, of course. I do not know whether he can state it from memory any better than I can, because he made it on the spur of the moment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I moved that the committee authorize me to investigate two specific records to which I had made previous reference. That was the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, on that motion the following members voted for it: FERGUSON, GEARHART, and BREWSTER—three. The following members voted against it: COOPER, MURPHY, CLARK, GEORGE, and BARKLEY.

Mr. President, I ask consent that that vote follow the votes included, on which there was a roll call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The document, with the addition above ordered, is as follows:

VOTES AND ACTIONS TAKEN

Vote on Senator FERGUSON'S proposed change in Executive order: Cooper, no; Ferguson, aye; Gearhart, aye; Murphy, no; Clark, no; Brewster, aye; George, no; Barkley, no; 5 noes, 3 ayes.

Vote on Senator FERGUSON'S motion to adopt special committee rules of procedure: Cooper, no; Ferguson, aye; Gearhart, aye; Murphy, no; Clark, no; Brewster, aye; George, no; Barkley, no; 5 noes, 3 ayes.

Vote on setting date for commencement of hearings as of November 15, 1945: Cooper, aye; Ferguson, present; Gearhart, aye; Murphy, aye; Clark, aye; Brewster, present; George, aye; Barkley, aye; 6 ayes, 2 present.

Draft of rules for committee procedure agreed to unanimously.

Vote on Mr. BREWSTER'S motion that he be authorized by the committee to investigate two specific records to which he had previously referred: (Vote cast by show of hands.) Cooper, no; Ferguson, aye; Gearhart, aye; Murphy, no; Clark, no; Brewster, aye; George, no; Barkley, no; 5 noes, 3 ayes.

Brewster motion authorizing chairman to in turn authorize individual members to conduct investigation now pending before committee.

Counsel suggested outline of case.

Committee adjourned to meet on Wednesday, November 7, 1945, at call of chair.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Georgia, and I also know that he did not mean to intimate that there had ever been any proposal—although I think his language would be susceptible of such a construction—that any member of the committee or its counsel would have any right whatsoever to go into Government files and take out papers and take them to the committee or anywhere else. I have never heard of such a proposal. The proposal of both the Senator from Michigan and myself was that we should have the right to examine the records; but it has been agreed at all times, and Mr. Mitchell in analyzing the request of the Senator from Michigan stipulated that the requests were to come through the committee counsel, if we desired one or another record to be secured. It was never thought that anyone individually should remove records. I think a part of the Senator's statement might have carried such an implication.

But it still continues to be the very firm impression of the minority members that the right of the individual committee members, after consultation with the committee, if desired—and I agree that the committee has the power, under the Presidential order, to do what both Senators have said—after approval of the chairman or the committee, under orderly procedure, and in company with counsel, if desired—and I should so desire—to examine records to which their attention may be directed by officers of highly responsible character who may be ready to give information on these lines is a highly important phase of this investigation.

I speak to that effect out of a considerable experience in this field, and as one under the deep conviction that it was as a result of that full latitude, always accorded by the chairmen of the Truman committee, both past and present, that the individual members always were able to come to a unanimous conclusion.

As the Senate knows, it has always been my earnest conviction that if any value is to be derived from this investigation it must come from the committee's finally reaching a unanimity of opinion, which is so glaringly missing in the five previous reports, as the Senator from Kentucky so forcefully pointed out. It has been my hope and desire to achieve such unity of thought and action as would enable us finally to arrive at a conclusion which could command the confidence of everyone. It is in that hope that I go forward, and I still hope as the result of the statement of the Senator from Georgia that he will be willing to accord the privilege he denied to me this morning, because he thought I was testing his good faith. I do not know what he meant by that statement. I am most earnest in my request. Certain matters have been brought to my attention concerning which I wish independently to conduct an investigation. The Senator from Michigan has in mind the same thing. I hope that the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Kentucky will not feel that I am challenging their good faith in my request, but that they will consider the request in the interest of the great responsibility which has been placed upon us. If I am irrepressible I trust that it may seem that I am so, because I am in the search of truth. I promise to bring to the Senate and to the committee whatever facts I can bring to them at any time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senator from Michigan has in mind the same thing as that which has been expressed by the Senator from Maine. When the Senator from Maine and I discussed the question of looking into the files, I may say that those files had already been discussed in a meeting of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot proceed further with consideration of the unfinished business today. I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I wish merely to reiterate that I feel personally that the questions which we have been discussing may arise on the merits of the situation as we proceed. I doubt the wisdom of either the committee itself, or the chairman of the committee, giving blanket authority in advance in all cases which may arise in the future. I have also believed, and I believe now, that when such matters arise we should be able to solve them in the interest of obtaining the truth.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objections, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say to the Members of the Senate that it is contemplated that the Senate will take a recess until Tuesday next. In view of the fact that elections will be held next Tuesday, and that many Members of the Senate are interested in such elections and wish to be absent on Tuesday, there will be no business transacted on that day. In order that Members may have ample opportunity to return to Washington following Tuesday's elections, it is contemplated that the Senate will recess on Tuesday until the following Thursday, at which time consideration of the reorganization bill will be resumed.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate recess until next Tuesday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, November 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 2 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Wallace S. Gourley, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Hon. Frederic P. Schoonmaker, deceased.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. George Sterling Brown, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from November 11, 1945.

Second Lt. Grant Renne, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from November 23, 1945.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Jack Glendon Fuller, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 20, 1945.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Clyde Pickett, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from November 1, 1939.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Christopher Columbus Strawn, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

Maj. Lawrence Leroy Skinner, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

Capt. Hugh Mackintosh, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1939.

Capt. Victor James MacLaughlin, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 11, 1941.

Capt. Joseph Reisner Ranck, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Robert Taylor Strode, Field Artillery, with rank from November 24, 1942.

Capt. Gardner Wellington Porter, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Richard Giles Stilwell, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

Second Lt. Edward Johnson Dravo, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1944.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. John Edwin Murphy, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from December 1, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Harvey C. Heath, Enterprise, Ala., in place of M. L. Warren, transferred.

James C. Campbell, Grant, Ala., in place of V. E. Kirkland, transferred.

ARIZONA

Mary E. Owen, Higley, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edward H. Kuhn, Litchfield Park, Ariz., in place of J. F. Fisher, resigned.

ARKANSAS

James Luther Whitfield, Casa, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Joe Sanguinetti, Banta, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eula M. Cook, Cambria, Calif., in place of G. E. Shamel, resigned.

Milton H. Jones, Pinedale, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bertha E. Colahan, Romoland, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elanora M. Larson, Sunnymead, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONNECTICUT

Louise S. Werner, East River, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

DELAWARE

Homer W. Pratt, Kenton, Del., in place of A. G. Arthurs, resigned.

IDAHO

Alvin R. Lund, Harrison, Idaho, in place of R. W. Cope, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Lillie Doyle, Durand, Ill., in place of D. W. Waller, transferred.

John D. Lopp, West Salem, Ill., in place of T. J. Gawthorp, deceased.

Richard C. Bell, White Hall, Ill., in place of H. O. Johnson, deceased.

IOWA

Earnest T. Hannah, Hanscll, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KANSAS

Glenn Vernon Downs, Leoti, Kans., in place of H. H. Spear, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Rester E. Richardson, Bogalusa, La., in place of K. B. Anderson, resigned.

Eunie E. Sisson, Bonita, La., in place of Lillian Causey, resigned.

Margaret G. Reily, Gloster, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Michael J. Lawton, Harahan, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Vinnie A. Ramey, Welsh, La., in place of J. L. Derouen, resigned.

MAINE

Harry B. Harris, Canaan, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MARYLAND

Rebecca E. Slaughter, Brooklandville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frank T. Crouch, Chase, Md., in place of J. A. Erdman, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mary J. Charron, Hebronville, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSOURI

Francis F. Hulett, Sturgeon, Mo., in place of E. S. Stewart, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Elger E. Miller, Hollywood, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Josefita E. Miera, San Antonio, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW YORK

Ida Pietrobelli, Cottekill, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harry A. Monros, Harris, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Velma G. Banner, Maryland, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas G. Spring, Morton, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Richard L. Folger, Dobson, N. C., in place of H. A. Sprinkle, resigned.

Pauline D. Rary, Jonesville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Carrie Walker Inskeep, Roaring Gap, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nora Lane Boyce, Tyner, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH DAKOTA

Doris M. Larson, Lignite, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OKLAHOMA

Albert Smith, Devol, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William R. Baker, Maramec, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OREGON

Howard T. Edson, Glendale, Oreg., in place of A. J. Nebel, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles J. Tumelty, Broomall, Pa, in place of E. D. Bonsall, retired.

Anthony Cickavage, Frackville, Pa., in place of W. F. Dewey, deceased.

Dorothy M. Steuart, Salina, Pa., in place of J. S. Fennell, retired.

Bette M. Logan, West Monterey, Pa., in place of M. V. Jordan, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Joe F. Mason, Seneca, S. C., in place of E. F. Lewis, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ann Brooks, Florence, S. Dak., in place of E. F. Heuer, transferred.

TENNESSEE

John W. Hudson, Pocahontas, Tenn., in place of C. H. Carr, resigned.

John Frank Rucker, Rutledge, Tenn., in place of E. F. Fugate, resigned

TEXAS

Clark Tabor, Clyde, Tex., in place of R. C. Clemer, deceased.

William C. Harrell, Emhouse, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lucille R. O'Connor, Newgulf, Tex., in place of Crecy Longmire, resigned.

Randolph B. Gafford, Turkey, Tex., in place of Willis Walker, transferred.

UTAH

Stella M. Peterson, Redmond, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VERMONT

Bliss W. Farrar, Craftsbury Common, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WASHINGTON

Bette M. Robertson, Belfair, Wash., in place of M. E. Theler, resigned.

Hans Christoffersen, Marlin, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edith M. Snook, Orting, Wash., in place of G. A. Johnston, resigned.

William Clifford Adkins, Sumas, Wash., in place of H. L. Easterbrook, resigned.

Macil C. Lee, Wilsoncreek, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Verl A. Bokath, Rib Lake, Wis., in place of R. J. Voemstek, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 2 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Edward U. Condon to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be admirals for temporary service

Frederick J. Horne
Richard S. Edwards

To be vice admirals for temporary service

William S. Farber
Harry W. Hill

To be rear admirals for temporary service

Houston L. Maples
Frederick W. McMahon
Augustus J. Wellings
Roger W. Paine
Claude O. Kell
Grover C. Klein
Thorvald A. Solberg
Frederick E. Haeberle
Norborne L. Rawlings
Donald Royce
Frederick W. Pennoyer, Jr.
Arthur C. Miles
Fred D. Kirtland
Harvey E. Overesch

To be rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service

Irving M. McQuiston

To be rear admirals for temporary service

Albert M. Bledsoe
William K. Phillips
John W. Roper
Stuart S. Murray
Emmet P. Forrestel
Edmund T. Wooldridge
Thomas H. Robbins, Jr.
William G. Tomlinson
Richard F. Whitehead
Charles Wellborn, Jr.
Daniel V. Gallery, Jr.
Walter F. Boone
Joseph F. Bolger
Stuart H. Ingersoll
Edward C. Ewen
Apollo Soucek

To be rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service

Edward O. McDonnell

To be commodores in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service

Ernest F. Robinson
Robert C. Lee
William A. Read
Ralph S. Moore
Carl E. Anderson
Robert V. Kleinschmidt
Milton K. Revill
Roger W. Cutler

To be pay director in the Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service

N. Loyall McLaren

To be commodores in the Navy, for temporary service

Richard M. Watt, Jr.
Henry A. Schade
Edmund E. Brady, Jr.

To be commodore in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service

Dudley W. Knox

To be commodores in the Navy, for temporary service

William G. Greenman
Carlos A. Bailey
Herbert J. Grassie
Henry R. Oster
Robert G. Tobin
Albert T. Sprague, Jr.
Arthur Gavin
Richard B. Tuggle
Lemuel P. Padgett, Jr.
Alva J. Spriggs
Kenmore M. McManes
Paul B. Tuzo, Jr.

To be civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service

William J. Angas
Lewis N. Moeller
Archibald D. Hunter

To be civil engineer in the Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service

Robert C. Johnson

To be pay director in the Navy with the rank of commodore, for temporary service

Robert F. Batchelder

To be rear admirals in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service

Andrew F. Carter
Ellery W. Stone
Edmond J. Moran
Giles C. Stedman
Paul F. Foster
Lewis L. Strauss

To be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service

George C. Dyer
Herbert G. Hopwood
Maurice E. Curts
Oswald S. Colclough
Thomas G. W. Settle
Thomas B. Inglis
John E. Gingrich
Charles B. Momsen
Felix L. Johnson

To be rear admirals in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service

Sidney W. Souers
Luis de Florez

To be medical director in the Naval Reserve, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service

Winchell M. Craig

To be pay directors in the Naval Reserve, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service

Gerald A. Eubank
Wilfred J. McNeil

To be civil engineer in the Naval Reserve, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service

Kirby Smith

To be commodores in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service

Thomas Blau
Antoine O. Rabideau
Alvin O. Lustie
Joseph B. Lynch
Isaac J. VanKammen
John M. Gill
Claude O. Bassett
Webb C. Hayes
James E. Arnold
Gene Markey
David S. Ingalls
John D. Small
Howland R. Gary
Warner N. Grubb

To be medical directors in the Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service

Thomas B. Magath
Richard A. Kern
Don S. Knowlton
Thomas M. Rivers
Alphonse McMahon

To be dental surgeon in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service

George C. Paffenbarger

To be pay directors in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service

John W. Landregan
William L. Nelson

To be chaplain in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service

Robert J. White

To be civil engineers in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service

Cuthebert P. Conrad
Roy M. Harris
Francis M. McCarthy

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Assistant paymasters with rank of ensign

Howard W. Burnett, Jr.
Kenneth R. Klofkorn
Joseph C. Snyder

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Mary L. Hasty, Milroy.

LOUISIANA

Leo Thom, Hayes.
Bess L. Cook, Loranger.
Lezin J. Lambert, Sorrento.

MAINE

Ida M. Pitts, Harrison.

MICHIGAN

Theodore R. Shepard, Alba.
Mary Schymanski, Anchorville.
Lulu M. Pyykkonen, Atlantic Mine.
Belle Edwards, Attica.
Karl W. Pendell, Bailey.
William E. Warner, Bedford.
Simon F. Close, Birch Run.
Bruce McFall, Brant.
Adrian L. Eldred, Breckenridge.
Edith G. McNamara, Brethren.
William W. Plank, Buckley.
Helen G. Paul, Clifford.
Clara S. Moore, Curtis.
Ethel M. Baldwin, Decker.
Roscoe B. Huston, Detroit.
Burchett Doster, Doster.
Robert E. Van Driesen, Eagle.
George H. Messenger, Eckerman.
Olive M. Martin, Elmira.
Gordon S. Ehle, Fenwick.
Reatha M. Linke, Filer City.
Ervin C. Dunckley, Frederic.
Maxine Hilden, Free Soil.
Katherine Shay, Germfask.
Minnie Wilson, Gould City.
Martha M. Prell, Hawks.
Frances Lindberg, Hessel.
Beatrice Gissberg, Hulbert.
Erwin V. Lamb, Jeddo.
Lucile M. Nichols, Jerome.
Lembi H. Timonen, Kearsarge.
Diana Wardwell, Leonidas.
Bessie M. Cubalo, Lincoln.
John S. Dunsford, Marlette.
Harvey G. Groat, Melvin.
Mamie B. Deford, Mikado.
Frank B. Mills, Millersburg.
Gertrude C. Frank, Moline.
Elwin E. Ritchie, New Troy.
Isabelle C. Clover, Onondaga.
Hazel E. Vredenburg, Ossineke.
Florence B. Munn, Paris.
Floyd C. Fuhriman, Perkins.
Lester L. Laser, Prattville.
Ann Brietner, Riga.
Myrtie S. Dunbar, Samaria.
Bessie B. Morse, Sandcreek.
Evelyn Wykoff, Sans Souci.
Kenneth C. Potter, Shelbyville.
Cecil Fay Neal, Smiths Creek.
Velma Gillard, Spruce.
Vera I. Driffill, Tipton.
Albin Lahikainen, Toivola.
Wilfred N. Holman, Trimountain.
Mable V. Rose, Trufant.
Olive E. Niles, Vanderbilt.
Orton E. Melchoir, Wallace.
Elver I. Carroll, Walloon Lake.
William J. Roberge, Wilson.

NEW MEXICO

Quirino Atencio, Dixon.
Richard K. White, Fort Wingate.

NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph L. Goudreau, Shields.

OHIO

Lucy A. Chandler, Bannock.
Wallace A. Hamsher, Berlin.
Ruth E. Bailey, Franklin Furnace.
Abner D. Banning, Nutwood.
Bertha B. Emmons, Pettisville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John H. Evans, Agar.
Ruth E. Peterson, Brandon.
Agnes Malloy, Burbank.
Granvel N. Collins, Camp Crook.
Josephine Tompers, Cavour.
Margie L. Smith, Cheyenne Agency.
Cornie J. Ver Steeg, Corsica.
George Lehnert, Glenham.
Anton Koslowski, Grenville.
Gladys F. Johnston, Hazel.
Harry O. Starksen, Hetland.
Fred Coates, Igloo.
Sidney Parkinson, Kadoka.
Marion L. Rowse, Lebanon.
Della I. Olson, Lily.
Evalyn A. Berndt, Mansfield.
Mildred E. Van Houten, Northville.
Dona E. Linehan, Oglala.
Harold M. Bitzer, Tolstoy.

WISCONSIN

Nina O. Peterson, Comstock.
Lillian M. Hickey, Custer.
Kathleen F. Baker, Embarrass.
Jeanine M. Gulan, Gile.
Harry C. Lowe, Hazelhurst.
Albert L. Greiling, New Franken.
Ellsworth R. Helgoe, Rock Falls.
Erwin N. Theisen, Rockfield.
Maud E. Odekirk, Springbrook.
Urban B. Remmel, West Wrightstown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou Christ, whose glory fills the skies and whose divine presence makes all life new and free, be with us yet, lest we forget. Through every exhaustion and bewilderment, erase from the brow of America the stigma of disunity and give us the will to stand with unyielding conviction for the rule of right and justice. Crown our citizens with Thy regenerating spirit, thinking no longer in terms of force and power, but with a deepening surety that poverty and privation, want and woe can be relieved through the ministry of the Golden Rule.

In Thy great mercy, empower us all with that wisdom which disturbs pride and prejudice and that scorns inglorious conflict and strife. O throw Thy halo of peace and understanding over all who sit at the conference table; may their devotion be as true and loyal as was that of the defenders of our land on the field of battle. O grant that our country may not tarry long between two worlds, one dying and the other struggling to be born. Give us the spirit to live in concord with all peoples, and bless us this day with thoughts that overleap the flights of time, with a vision of our country that is to be, and Thine shall be the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 1, 1945, was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the other special orders, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the other special orders today, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo, D. D., to the graduating class at the FBI Academy.

SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next, and that when the House adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a bad time for Congress to be adjourning, when we have legislation before the House providing for the demobilization of the men in the armed forces. Men who have been there continuously for 18 months or 2 years, men who have dependents at home who need their attention, thousands of young men who need to return to college—all have to be discharged, and I want to see that they are given the opportunity.

They deserve our attention. That is what we are elected for, and until that legislation is brought to the floor of the House for a vote I am going to object to any adjournment for more than 1 day at a time.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

SLAVE LABOR

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GALLAGHER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], who is one of this Nation's foremost authorities on contract renegotiation, be permitted to extend his remarks on that subject in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Hon. James A. Farley in New York City and a separate article.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Eliazer Hatch Smith on the development of the Coast Guard.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER) was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances in the Appendix and include in each correspondence and resolutions.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include newspaper articles.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects and include newspaper excerpts in each.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain pertinent material.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include therein extraneous material.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on the award of the Mexican Cross of Military Merit to Col. Modesto E. Rodriguez.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Indianapolis News.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next I may address the House for 20 minutes after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Wednesday, October 31, 1945, on page 10213, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], referring to H. R. 2202, the full employment bill, now before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, made the following statement:

> If you do not want any inquiries made with reference to the merits of this bill, that is all right, but all you have done so far is to bring in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] and let them make their statements, and you want us to swallow them. We do not want to do it. We choke on that stuff.

Neither the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] nor I was present at the time the gentleman from Michigan made his statement or we would have attempted to give him correct information. Both the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I have told the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], that we would be glad to reappear for questioning whenever the committee requested it, and we have awaited that invitation, which thus far has not come.

At this time I should like to extend to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] a challenge to debate the full employment bill with me on the floor of the House next Thursday afternoon, or at any other time which is satisfactory to the gentleman. I know that the Members of this House are interested in the merits of the bill, and I believe they would welcome the opportunity to hear it discussed frankly and openly. They would probably also welcome the opportunity to hear the gentleman from Michigan indulge in one of his usual statements concerning the working people of the United States.

I await the reply of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUTLAND], let me say this: You do not need to wait until Thursday of this week; I will proceed with this joint debate this afternoon as soon as the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered are disposed of. What the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California did was to appear before our committee, tell their story, then they had to go away, or the committee had to adjourn to go on the House floor. I am not criticizing, just stating the fact; the point is that hearings have not been finished. If the gentleman wants to discuss the merits of the bill this afternoon, I will try to accommodate him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the China Lantern and a letter he wrote to the Secretary of War in reply thereto.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, November 19, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by L. B. Pearson at the closing session of the Conference of the Food and Agricultural Organization at Quebec.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF JESSE JONES TO A CABINET POSITION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I am issuing a special invitation to my friends on the other side of the aisle to remain for a special order today because I expect to needle the Republican Members and the Republican Party more than I will the Democratic Party in my political speech, and also I shall name Jesse Jones to a Cabinet position, because I believe he is the type and caliber of man that we need in the Cabinet to pull us out of the financial and economic morass in which we find ourselves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO MINORITY TO FILE REPORT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that various members of the Military Affairs Committee may be granted permission to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 4280.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable A. Pearley Feen, delivered as retiring president of the Vermont Bar Association before that association on October 2.

Mr. Speaker, this will slightly exceed the limit prescribed by the Joint Committee on Printing, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests; first, that if we have this debate today between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Michigan, I ask unanimous consent that each one of them have 20 minutes to hold this debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot put an "if" request.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, then I request that they each have 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from California desire the time and will make the request the Chair will put the request; otherwise he prefers not to do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 20 minutes to follow the gentleman from California in order to discuss the full employment bill today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, at this time a meeting is being opened by the President where labor, government, and business will get together in harmony and for the best interest of our Nation and our people. In order to do so men will have to meet, determined to do so by peaceful, lawful means in the spirit of the Golden Rule. May they all have that spirit. I hope the meeting was opened by prayer, for the delegates need divine guidance and if they do not get it I am fearful that the efforts of those who are meeting will not be what we may expect, and what the country needs. You cannot work together jumping at each other's throats; laws must be such that every person has an equal chance, equal opportunity, equal consideration, and deal with each other as brothers, or certainly in a Christian spirit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a resolution and in the

other a letter on the subject of compulsory military training.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and quotations from a letter.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the papers today report that one of the senior advisers of this administration, Bernard Baruch, is now urging that Congress be given an over-all balance sheet revealing the consolidated totals of United States international commitments.

His comments encourage me to renew the request I made on October 3 in a resolution requiring the Treasury to furnish Congress a complete summary of American financial commitments abroad.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible that the serious decline in sales of bonds may be due to the failure of the administration to give the people a clear picture of existing and proposed commitments abroad. The people put up the money. The people are entitled to the facts about these commitments.

OPA SERVICE RIBBON

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a service ribbon with the Victory sign and the letters "OPA." It is well made with a safety clasp and is, apparently, being sent out by the OPA to members of the various OPA panel boards in the United States and to others who are willing to wear them. It looks like this was part of a propaganda scheme of trying to sell OPA to the country and making it a permanent organization. A chairman of a panel board in my district received one of these service ribbons and returned it to me with these remarks:

I am enclosing a couple of articles—I'll let you name them—received from OPA to members of ration boards. Any man with self-respect for himself or his standing in his community wouldn't be caught wearing them down the street but it is about all one could expect from the type of men on the pay roll of OPA—just a bunch of political parasites. I would suggest canceling their appropriations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of harbors of refuge and include a short article by Mr. Howard Everett in connection therewith.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Poland and include a letter from the Polish-American Congress to me under date of October 27, together with a copy of a letter which the Polish-American Congress wrote to President Truman under date of October 3. If the extension is too long under the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD notwithstanding that rule.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at two places in the RECORD and in one to include a statement by one of the scientists who developed the atomic bomb, a series of questions and answers regarding its implications, and in the other a statement by 515 scientists saying there is not possible any adequate defense against the atomic bomb.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the St. Lawrence waterway and include therein an article from the Pathfinder.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Oklahoma veterans' homestead project

Mr. DWORSHAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a broadcast by Mr. Raymond Swing on October 31.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of the life of President Wilson.

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on wages, prices, and profits.

Mr RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news story which tells of the vigorous support of General MacArthur for a unified command.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan and Mr. HOFFMAN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RETURN OF PACIFIC VETERANS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a petition addressed to me in the form of a letter from some 40 boys in the Pacific.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WILSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in the House on the 19th of October and include therein a letter of King Ibn Saud to President Roosevelt and a copy of the letter from President Roosevelt to King Ibn Saud.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a Negro named Charles Lee White.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RETIREMENT RIGHTS OF CIVIL SERVICE WORKERS ENTERING ARMED FORCES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3256) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1939, as amended, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to join the armed forces of the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 2. Sections 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, are amended by striking out the words 'June 30 of each year' wherever they appear in such sections, and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'December 31 of each year': *Provided*, That interest shall not be compounded as of December 31, 1945."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "2" and insert "3."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "3" and insert "4."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the distinguished chairman of our committee explain the bill and the amendments so that the Members of the House may be informed?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the amendment changes the date for the computation of interest on funds of employees in the retirement fund to the calendar year instead of the fiscal year. The purpose is to save clerical work because of the fact that the withholding tax is necessarily computed at the end of the calendar year. They will thus be able to do it all at one time rather than to have to compute these deductions twice a year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF ACCUMULATED LEAVE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I want to say to the membership of the House that some 60 days ago I introduced a bill to take care of the terminal leave pay of the enlisted men. So far I have not been able to get it out of committee. I think this Congress should take care of these officers. I am not objecting to that, I want them taken care of, but I think the GI Joe is entitled to terminal-leave pay and accumulated-leave pay just the same as the commissioned officers. I hope the membership of this House, after you consider this bill, giving these men what the gentleman from Georgia is asking for, will give the GI Joe what he asks for. I will ask for consideration of that bill just as soon as I can get it before the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman from Florida. But I think we should also pass a law to permit the discharge of men who have been in the service constantly for 18 months or more, or men who have dependents, wives, children, or dependent parents at home to look after, or young men who want to go back to school. I say the Congress is not doing its duty, if we do not pass a law immediately to permit those men to be discharged and stop keeping them standing around in uniformed idleness at Government expense.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Of course, we all want our boys back home as soon as possible. There is no question about that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have considerable sympathy with the position expressed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. In fact, I have written and have received a reply from the War Department, and I will insert that letter in the RECORD.

I should like to ask the gentleman a question, however. The gentleman will recall that some time ago, during the war, I talked with him about the necessity of legislation of this type. That was at a time when there was a shortage of manpower, when there were many positions of critical importance to the war effort, which officers who were being retired could fill to meet the manpower shortage. Now, however, with a great many returning veterans and with the manpower situation changed, I am wondering why the necessity for the bill at this time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, there are many cases of men who have served in the Army and Navy who left jobs in the Federal service to go into the military service. They are entitled to have their positions back. The departments want them back. They need them, so they tell me. They cannot go back and draw their terminal leave unless they sacrifice their civilian pay.

Then there are other men coming out of the armed services who have been offered employment in the Government service who are in the same situation.

There is a third class, some men who have gone to work in a civilian capacity and who have drawn their terminal leave and receive no civilian pay. I know of one case right here in the Congress, where a Member's secretary is doing that right now. There are three or four classes of cases that are covered.

I cannot give the gentleman any specific answer to his question, but there is still a demand, apparently, because my committee is receiving calls every day about the matter, for the services of these men coming out of the Army and Navy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I can see there is justification for it in the case of someone who was in the Government service, who is now out of the Army and who wants to go back to his position, but with respect to the man who is entering the Government service for the first time, does the gentleman feel there is necessity for that? And further does the law at the present time prevent a man from accepting private employment during the period of his terminal leave?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It does not, and I must say that to that extent the present situation is discriminatory against the man who enters the government service. It is also true there are some States who cannot employ a man while he is drawing terminal pay from the armed forces. We have taken care of that situation in this bill insofar as we have been able to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall not object particularly in view of the fact that these men who are in the armed services want to go back to their regular jobs, but I should like to ask permission, Mr. Speaker, to insert in my remarks a letter received from the War Department in the matter of the payment of terminal leave to enlisted men as well as to officers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The matter referred to follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE BUDGET OFFICER,
Washington, D. C., October 25, 1945.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: Reference is made to your inquiry of September 29, 1945, relative to War Department regulations with regard to leave and furlough privileges.

Under existing law, commissioned and warrant officers are authorized leave at the rate of 30 days per year and they may accumulate not more than 4 months of unused leave. It is the general policy of the War Department to grant terminal leave up to the maximum accumulation permitted by law to officers separated from the active service upon honorable conditions.

Under existing law, there is no limitation on furloughs which may be granted enlisted personnel. However, Army regulations administratively provide that furloughs may be granted to enlisted men upon the basis of 30 days a year plus such additional brief periods as may be necessary in emergencies, or to cover travel time. Such furloughs do not include passes which may not exceed 3 days in duration or delays usually authorized in connection with official travel, temporary duty, and return to station of origin. Reenlistment furloughs are for a period of 90 days or less, including travel time. Upon separation from the service, enlisted men are not granted terminal leave.

Under the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 most personnel having 60 days or more of active service, and below the grade of major, will receive upon separation from the service a cash payment of $300 if the individual has served outside the continental United States, or $200 if all of his service has been performed in this country. Under present War Department policy, War Department personnel who return from overseas to reception stations in this country and are in need of recuperation, rehabilitation, or who are to be redeployed, are sent at Government expense to their homes or places selected by them for a period of 30 days plus travel time. Such time is not charged against leave or furlough.

The War Department has been requested to submit reports on H. R. 411, 1160, 2454, and 2478, Seventy-ninth Congress, bills providing for granting of terminal leave to enlisted men with pay, or lump-sum payments in lieu thereof. The War Department has considered these bills and has submitted a proposed report to the Bureau of the Budget for advice as to whether the proposals are in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. RICHARDS,
Major General, GSC, United States Army.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, all in the world this legislation does is to give to officers during terminal leave the same right to employment or reemployment in the Government as any private person has. Is that correct?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct, and the bill was unanimously reported by the committee. In response to what was said by the gentleman from Florida, we are not undertaking to deal with terminal

leave as such, because our committee has no jurisdiction over that subject matter; that is a matter for the Military and Naval Committees of the House. This bill does permit their employment in a civilian capacity and their payment as civilians in spite of the fact that they may be drawing terminal leave from the Army or the Navy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, because I believe, if I understand this bill correctly, that it eliminates a discrimination against those men on terminal leave who might wish to return or enter Government service.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But I understood the gentleman to make the statement that he wanted this legislation enacted because of the need for these men in the civil service of the United States.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I said some of the departments and agencies of the Government had contacted me and said that in specific cases they have need for individuals who were on terminal leave.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it the gentleman's belief that there is a general need for additional employees within the Government in civil-service positions?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I would not say that. As a matter of fact I am hopeful that they will continue to reduce the number of Federal employees as rapidly as possible.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And if these gentlemen are returned to civil-service employment under the provisions of this bill if it is enacted into law, will those whom they replace be stricken from the pay rolls, or will they be given other positions?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I cannot answer that specifically. I know that in some cases they will occupy positions that are now temporarily filled by war-service appointees, and to that extent they will replace some now on the pay roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I can understand where there may be some need for certain specialists, and certainly all of us want the men who have been in the armed service to go back and take their positions in civil-service employment wherever they wish to do so, but I am also very cognizant of the fact that we have some 3,000,000 men and women on the pay roll of the United States under civil service, and that the general public, the tax-paying public, is asking that this great number of employees be reduced as rapidly as possible. I am hopeful that if this bill is adopted and enacted into law that those who return to the Federal pay roll will take the place of someone who is dismissed from the Federal service.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I think I ought to explain to the gentleman from Georgia that the bill which I have introduced to speed up demobilization of these men in the armed forces who are no longer needed has been introduced only about 25 or 26 days. Until 30 days have passed, I cannot file a petition on the Clerk's desk to bring that bill out for passage. There are two bills now pending that have been introduced for more than 30 days, one by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], and one by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. They are almost on a parallel with the bill which I have introduced, but not exactly. For that reason I do not want the House to be adjourning 3 days at a time and depriving me of the right for another week or 10 days to file that petition and bring to the floor of the House a bill that will start demobilization of these men in our armed forces in earnest.

This is in order to let these men, especially the ones with dependents and the ones who want to return to school, get discharged from the service and come home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making provisions for payment of employees of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, for accumulated or accrued annual leave when ordered to active duty with the military or naval forces of the United States," approved August 1, 1941, as amended April 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 200), is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Any person, who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall have entered upon active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or in any of their respective components, may, while on terminal leave pending honorable discharge from or release from active duty in such service, enter or reenter employment of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia (including any corporation created under authority of an act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the United States Government, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress), and, in addition to compensation for such employment, shall be entitled to received pay and allowances from the armed forces for the unexpired portion of such terminal leave at the same rates and to the same extent as if he had not entered or reentered such employment.

"(b) Any such person who, prior to the date of enactment of this section, entered or reentered such employment without having used all accumulated and current accrued leave to which he would have been entitled as a result of such service had he not entered or reentered such employment, shall upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he would have been entitled while on terminal leave for the unused portion of such accumulated and current accrued leave had he not entered or reentered such employment."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the act entitled 'An act making provisions for payment of employees of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, for accumulated or accrued annual leave when ordered to active duty with the military or naval forces of the United States,' approved August 1, 1941, as amended April 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 200), is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 2. (a) Any person, who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall have performed active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or in any of their respective components, may, while on terminal leave pending separation from or release from active duty in such service under honorable conditions, enter or reenter employment of the Government of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia—including any corporation created under authority of an act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress—and, in addition to compensation for such employment, shall be entitled to receive pay and allowances from the armed forces for the unexpired portion of such terminal leave at the same rates and to the same extent as if he had not entered or reentered such employment.

"'(b) Any such person who, prior to the date of enactment of this section, entered or reentered such employment without having used all accumulated and current accrued leave to which he would have been entitled as a result of such service had he not entered or reentered such employment, shall upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he would have been entitled while on terminal leave for the unused portion of such accumulated and current accrued leave had he not entered or reentered such employment.

"'(c) Any such person who, while on terminal leave from the armed forces, performed or shall hereafter perform services for the Government of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia—including any corporation created under authority of an act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress—for which he would have been entitled to be paid had he regularly become employed or reemployed in a civilian position prior to performing such services, and had he not been receiving pay and allowances from the armed forces for the period during which such services were performed, shall, if he has not otherwise been compensated for such services, be entitled, upon application therefor filed with the General Accounting Office, or, in the case of a person performing such services for a Territory or possession, filed with the appropriate agency or officer of the Government of such Territory or possession, to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the compensation he would have received for such services had he been regularly employed or reemployed and had he not been receiving pay and allowances from the armed forces.

"'(d) Any such person who enters the employment of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, shall upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he is entitled for the unused portion of his accumulated and current accrued leave.

"'(e) No waiver effectuated prior to the date of enactment of this section of any right to receive any payment to which a person would otherwise be entitled under this section shall operate to deny such person entitlement to such payment.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the adjustment of the compensation of certain members or former members of the armed forces of the United States who, before the expiration of their terminal leave, have performed, or shall hereafter perform, civilian services for the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow I may have permission to speak for 20 minutes on the full-employment bill, following any special orders that may have been heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks tomorrow I may have permission to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

COMPLIANCE WITH STATE INSPECTION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3321) to provide that the several States shall continue effective measures of control and protection against the importation, introduction and spread of noxious weeds, injurious insects and animal and plant diseases, and to guarantee that purchasers or recipients of seeds, livestock, and poultry feeds, nursery stocks, fertilizers, and other agricultural chemicals shall have the protection guaranteed them under the laws enacted by the several States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill tell us what he means by it?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF CADETS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 320) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306.)

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, a similar bill relating to Annapolis was objected to and knocked off the calendar; therefore it seems to me we might as well knock this one off the calendar.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the bill referring to Annapolis was at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I think the appropriate procedure would be to recommit this bill to the Committee on Military Affairs and if the gentleman will make that request I shall have no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

REIMBURSEMENT OF OFFICERS, ETC., FOR PROPERTY LOST, DAMAGED, OR DESTROYED IN SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 559) amending the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the Naval Service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service," approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service," approved October 27, 1943 (57 Stat. 582; U. S. C., Supp. III, title 34, sec. 984), is amended to read as follows: "That the Secretary of the Navy and, subject to appeal to the Secretary of the Navy, such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, and to ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay any claim filed under oath of the commissioned, appointed, enrolled, and enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and of the Coast Guard when operating as a part of the Navy, and of civilian employees of the Naval Establishment, for loss, damage, or destruction of their private personal property, including household effects, occurring on or after October 31, 1941, when such loss, damage, or destruction is not due to fault or negligence on the part of the claimant and has occurred or shall hereafter occur under the following circumstances:

"First. When the loss, damage, or destruction is due to operations of war, shipwreck, or other marine disaster, or the wreck of an aircraft or other disaster thereto: *Provided*, That the term 'marine disaster' as used herein shall include an accident occurring on board a vessel.

"Second. When the loss, damage, or destruction is in consequence of the serviceman or employee having given his attention to the saving of the life of another, or of property belonging to the United States.

"Third. When such property is lost, damaged, or destroyed by reason of being shipped on board an unseaworthy vessel by order of an officer authorized to give such order or direct such shipment; or is lost, damaged, or destroyed, whether or not due to negligence on the part of Government personnel, while in shipment pursuant to orders issued by competent authority, but where the property was transported by a common carrier, the reimbursement shall be limited to the extent of such loss, damage, or destruction over and above the amount recoverable from such carrier.

"Fourth. When such property is lost, damaged, or destroyed by reason of being furnished at the direction of competent authority to another person under conditions of immediate and urgent distress.

"Reimbursement may be made in all such cases for loss, damage, or destruction of such articles as are required to be possessed and used by officers, enlisted men, and others in connection with their service or employment, and such additional items of personal property, including household effects, money, or currency, as the Secretary of the Navy shall determine to have been reasonably and properly in the place where they were lost, damaged, or destroyed, in consequence of the service or employment in which the serviceman or employee was engaged: *Provided*, That reimbursement may be made for loss of money or currency only when such money or currency has been deposited for safekeeping as provided by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy or as provided by orders of the commanding officer."

SEC. 2. Existing claims under this act shall be presented within 2 years from the date of enactment of this act and all such claims hereafter arising shall be presented within 2 years from the occurrence of the loss, destruction, or damage, except that any person missing, who is not willfully absent, or any person who is a prisoner in the hands of the enemy, or who is interned in a neutral country, shall in addition be allowed 1 year from the time of return to the jurisdiction of the United States in which to file such claim.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING NAVY WITH A SYSTEM OF LAWS FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3759) to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy and his designees are authorized to exercise with respect to any claim against the United States for damages to or loss or destruction of property, real or personal, or for personal injury or death, caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the Navy Department, or of the Navy while acting within the scope of their employment, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Navy Department or of the Navy, the respective powers conferred upon the Secretary of War and his designees by the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372) as amended by the act of May 29, 1945 (Public Law 67, 79th Cong.).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy and his designees are further authorized to exercise with respect to claims of military personnel or civilian employees of the Navy Department

or of the Navy for damages to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, the respective powers conferred upon the Secretary of War and his designees by the act of May 29, 1945 (Public Law 67, 79th Cong.).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Such appropriations as may be required for the payment of claims under the provisions of this act are hereby authorized. Appropriations available to the Navy Department shall be available for the settlement of claims by the Secretary of the Navy or his designees under the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 4. The act of December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066), shall be inapplicable to the Navy Department 60 days after approval of this act, and the act approved October 27, 1943 (57 Stat. 582), is hereby repealed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING PRIVILEGE OF RETIREMENT TO JUDGES OF CERTAIN DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 565) to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MILITARY SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 805) to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. ROCKWELL, and Mr. SPRINGER objected.

AMENDING SECTION 401 (A) OF THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4191) amending section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to preserve the nationality of certain United States citizens who have been unable to return to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a bill that passed this House in the Seventy-eighth Congress. It is a bill which extends the time by which a native-born citizen of the United States, who has lost his citizenship because of his parents' action and through no fault of his, may have until 1947 to return here; to state that he does not want the citizenship of his parents but he does want to retain his American citizenship.

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois, for whom I have a great deal of admiration, as he knows, if this is not merely a subterfuge to get the camel's nose under the tent. I am opposed to all this vicarious or piecemeal breaking down of our immigration laws. I see no reason on earth for it. Many of these people left this country in order to keep out of war—to dodge the draft, in other words. Some of them went to other countries, probably to profiteer. If their children are with them now when the war is over, if they want to come back here, let them come in as aliens, if they come at all, and not give them preference over other people from those same countries. I am not in favor of this method of tearing our immigration laws down by piecemeal. You make a terrible mistake.

As much as I admire the gentleman from Illinois, I cannot go along with him on this proposition.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I further reserve the right to object in order to clear the atmosphere and at least to get across to the gentleman from Mississippi what this bill really does.

Mr. RANKIN. I heard it discussed before.

Mr. MASON. When we passed the Nationality Act in 1940 we placed in it a provision that any native-born citizen who as a child was taken back to the country from which its parents came would automatically have his citizenship taken away from him if his parents took out citizenship in that country again. We also stated in that act that he might have 2 years to come back here and declare that he did not want that citizenship but did want to retain his American citizenship. You must remember that the war broke out shortly after we passed that act, and for the 2 years he could not come back because of the war. This bill just extends the time for that type of a person to come back here and say, "I want to be an American citizen because I was born there. Regardless of what my parents did when I was under age, I still want to retain my citizenship in America." That is all this bill does.

Mr. RANKIN. With all the gentleman's eloquence, he has not yet persuaded me to yield, to multiply the mistakes that Congress made in 1940.

Mr. MASON. Of course, the mistakes the Congress made have nothing to do with this bill at all.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman wants to extend the mistake made 5 years ago.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman from Mississippi wants to say that all the mistakes of the past are incorporated in this bill, which has nothing to do with it.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a mistake incorporated in it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman says "all the mistakes of the past," yet the Nationality Act was passed 5 years ago, so remember that all the mistakes were not made in the Republican administration.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am not accusing the Republicans of making all the mistakes. I make some myself, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman is making a serious one now.

Mr. RANKIN. I don't think so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4162) to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases prior to and including verdict, or finding or plea of guilty.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LARCENY IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4180) to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr Speaker, will some member of the Committee on the Judiciary tell us what this bill does? If not, I will ask unanimous consent that it be passsed over without prejudice. I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], who reported the bill, is here. Can he tell us the provisions of the bill?

Mr. REED of Illinois. This bill is a revision of the present statute on larceny. That statute is long and involved. The first sentence thereof has 431 words. This bill revises it by dividing that sentence into several sections or paragraphs, classifying each of the particular offenses that constitute the crime of larceny. It likewise amends the Larceny Act by including with it embezzlement, and broadens the act to include larceny by air, that is, larceny of property being transported through the air. Those are the principal changes in the bill.

There is another provision that I think is new matter, relating to an employee in interstate commerce who steals or embezzles property belonging to the owner, the company, or any person who is a traveler in interstate commerce.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will this reduce the definition of crimes in any way? I have in mind that a few years ago we worked very hard to obtain the passage of a law to strengthen Federal laws that would control the theft of

cattle and transporting them in interstate commerce. Does that reduce the protection which the cattlemen of the West obtained at that time?

Mr. REED of Illinois. It does not reduce anything at all. It merely broadens the law.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, it increases the protection against such larceny and the transporting of stolen goods from one State to another.

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, this does not make any change in the penalty provisions of the law?

Mr. REED of Illinois. No, there is no change in the penalty.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Or in the definition of what constitutes larceny in interstate commerce?

Mr. REED of Illinois. No, there is no change.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of February 13, 1913, as amended (47 Stat. 773; U. S. C., title 18, secs. 409 to 411), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whoever shall—

"(1) unlawfully break the seal or lock of or enter any railroad car, vessel, aircraft, motortruck, wagon, or other vehicle containing interstate or foreign shipments of freight or express, with intent to commit larceny therein; or

"(2) embezzle, steal, or unlawfully take, carry away, or conceal, or by fraud or deception obtain from any

"(i) railroad car, motortruck, wagon, or other vehicle,

"(ii) station house, platform, depot, or terminal,

"(iii) steamboat, vessel, or wharf.

"(iv) aircraft, airport, aircraft terminal, or air navigation facility,

"any goods or property moving as or which are a part of or which constitute an interstate or foreign shipment of freight or express, with intent to convert such goods or property to his own use, or shall buy, receive, or have in his possession any such goods or property, knowing the same to have been embezzled or stolen; or

"(3) embezzle, steal, or unlawfully take, carry away, or by fraud or deception obtain any baggage which shall have come into the possession of any carrier for transporation in interstate or foreign commerce, or shall break into, steal, take, carry away, or conceal any of the contents thereof, with intent to convert the same or any part thereof to his own use, or shall buy, receive, or have in his possession any such baggage or any article therefrom, of whatever nature, knowing the same to have been embezzled or stolen; or

"(4) embezzle, steal, or unlawfully take by any fraudulent device, scheme, or game, from any railroad car, motortruck, steamboat, vessel, aircraft, or other vehicle operated by any carrier, or from any passenger or employee thereon, when such railroad car, or the train of which it is a part, motortruck, steamboat, vessel, aircraft, or other vehicle is moving in interstate or foreign commerce, any money, baggage, goods, or property, with intent to convert the same or any part thereof to his own use, or shall buy, receive, or have in his possession any such money, baggage, goods, or property, knowing the same to have been embezzled or stolen; or

"(5) being an employee riding in, on or upon any railroad car, motortruck, steamboat, vessel, aircraft, or other vehicle transporting passengers or property in interstate or foreign commerce and having in his custody funds arising out of or accruing from such transportation, embezzle or unlawfully convert to his own use any such funds; shall in each case be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(b) The carrying or transporting of any such money, freight, express, baggage, goods, or property from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, knowing the same to have been embezzled or stolen, shall constitute a separate offense and subject the offender to the penalties prescribed in subsection (a).

"(c) The term 'interstate or foreign commerce' shall include transportation from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to another State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to a foreign country, or from a foreign country to any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

"(d) The term 'aircraft' shall mean airplane, glider, blimp, balloon, dirigible, helicopter, rocket ship, parachute, or any contrivance used or designed for navigation of or flight in the air.

"(e) The term 'motortruck' shall mean truck, truck-tractor, trailer, semitrailer, automobile, bus, or other vehicle used upon or designed for use upon roads, highways, or streets.

"(f) The term 'wharf' shall mean dock, quay, pier, or any structure or contrivance designed for the loading or unloading of water craft.

"(g) Prosecutions under this act may be instituted in any district wherein the crime shall have been committed, or in which the offender may have taken, removed, brought or been in possession of said money, freight, express, baggage, goods, or property.

"SEC. 410. Nothing herein shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof; and a judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of any State shall be a bar to any prosecution hereunder for the same act or acts.

"SEC. 411. To establish the interstate or foreign commerce character of any shipment in any prosecution under this act the waybill, or other shipping document, of such shipment shall be prima facie evidence of the place from which such shipment was made."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 13, after the word "employee", insert "of any carrier."

Page 3, line 15, after the word "vehicle", insert "of such carrier."

Page 4, line 25, strike out the figures "410" and insert in lieu "2."

Page 5, line 6, strike out the figures "411" and insert in lieu "3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING PUBLIC LANDS TO SAFFORD, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3444) to grant the title of public lands to the town of Safford, Ariz., for the use of its municipal water system.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Arizona explain this bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS]. Safford, by the way, is his home town. The town of Safford draws its water from the surrounding mountains. This water supply must come across the public domain. The source of this water supply is on the public domain. It is desirable, and in fact imperative, that title to about 160 acres of land pass to the town of Safford. The bill provides that the land shall be paid for at an appraised value, but not less than the ordinary rate of $1.25 an acre. It is public domain and mountain land which is necessary for the city's water supply.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it an easement which they are acquiring or does the title in fee simple to the real estate pass to them?

Mr. MURDOCK. The fee simple title to the real estate passes.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The price to be paid for the land will be the appraised value of the land, but not less than $1.25 an acre.

Mr. RICH. The Secretary of the Interior does not make any recommendation as to the passing of the title to this town. Your proposal appears to take the very minimum which the Government will get for this land. What is the actual value of the land?

Mr. MURDOCK. They will pay not less than $1.25 an acre. May I say that the Committee on Public Lands reported this bill unanimously, as the chairman of the committee will verify.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. There is a committee amendment which provides that the town of Safford shall pay the appraised value of the land which is to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, but at any rate that the price paid shall be not less than $1.25 an acre.

Mr. RICH. Then the land is going to be appraised and they are not going to get it for $1.25 an acre?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Unless the results of the appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior determines that that is the value of the land. They pay whatever is the appraised value.

Mr. RICH. That is what I am getting at. We have had a number of cases in the Interior Department, especially in your State, where you get land for a municipal work at a very nominal sum. The fact of the matter is you get it too cheap. You ought to be willing to pay what the land is worth. If that is the intent and purpose of this legislation, that the land shall be appraised by the Secretary of the Interior and that they shall pay to the Federal Government what the land is actually worth, then I have no objection. But if that is not the case, I would object to the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. The price will not be less than $1.25 an acre according to the terms of the measure.

Mr. RICH. That does not mean anything. We have a lot of terms here that are misleading. I want to know that the Federal Government is going to get the dollar value of the land as appraised by the Secretary of the Interior. It might be $100 per acre and if

so I want $100 per acre for the land or it might be more or less.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The law in those States provides that they shall pay the appraised value. My observation is that the Department of the Interior does not give away very much.

Mr. RICH. I think they have been giving away a whole lot, if my interpretation of the Interior Department is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. I trust the gentleman will not object, nor any other gentleman will object, as this fast-growing town of Safford, Ariz., needs to safeguard its water supply. It will pay the fair appraisal value of the land. The gentleman will see on page 2 of the bill that this land is to be appraised by the Secretary of the Interior and paid for accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the conditions hereinafter specified, the Secretary of Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the town of Safford, Ariz., for municipal water purposes all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the public lands of the United States which is described as follows: Southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter, section 5, township 6 south, range 28 east, of the Gila and Salt River base and meridian in Graham County, Ariz., containing one hundred and sixty acres more or less. The Secretary of the Interior shall describe by metes and bounds in the deed of conveyance the exact land to be conveyed and transferred.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the express condition that if the town of Safford, Ariz., shall at any time cease to use the said property for its municipal water system or in conjunction therewith, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate, such property, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, subject to the conditions and reservations hereinafter specified, there is hereby granted, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to patent, to the town of Safford, Ariz., for municipal water purposes all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the public lands of the United States which, after survey, will be described as follows: Southeast quarter northwest quarter; southwest quarter northeast quarter; west half southeast quarter, section 5, township 6 south, range 28 east, of the Gila and Salt River base and meridian in Graham County, Ariz., containing one hundred and sixty acres, more or less: *Provided*, That, prior to the issuance of such patent the said town of Safford shall pay the appraised value of such land, to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, which shall not be less than $1.25 per acre: *Provided further*, That such patent shall contain a reservation to the United States of all oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found in the land, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE HATCH ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPALITIES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1497) to amend subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is whittling away at the Hatch Act. I would like to have the gentleman from Alaska explain to us the necessity for the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical with one that passed the House late in the last session of Congress but was not acted upon by the Senate because of lack of time.

It simply seeks to give employees of the Government-owned Alaska Railroad the right to participate in municipal affairs. As it is now, those employees constitute a considerable portion of the residents of the towns along the Alaska Railroad and they can take no part whatsoever in local affairs. This bill has been approved by the Department of Justice and by the Department of the Interior. It would give those people the same right that the employees in the Federal Government, living in nearby municipalities in Maryland and Virginia, now have. The municipal elections in Alaska are nonpartisan. This bill would not confer upon the Alaska Railroad employees the right to participate in Territorial or National political affairs, but simply the right to take part in the local elections, such as city council, and so on.

Mr. KEAN. What is the proportion of people living in those communities who do work for the Alaska Railroad?

Mr. BARTLETT. It is hard to say right now, but at Anchorage about 25 percent of the population were employees of the Alaska Railroad before the war. Since then it is a lesser proportion, but in any event, considering all the towns along the railroad, it is rather substantial.

Mr. KEAN. Can the other 75 percent not take care of your local affairs?

Mr. BARTLETT. They can, but those people are substantial citizens in the communities and they are disfranchised. They live in the towns. They are taxpayers, but they have no right now to participate in the community affairs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If I remember correctly, that railroad is 467 miles long from Seward to Fairbanks.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. How many trips a week do they make now?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think they are making two trips a week now.

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to say to the gentleman from New Jersey—I am fairly familiar with the Alaska Railroad and conditions in Alaska generally. As far as I am concerned, I think they should change the whole thing and say the Hatch Act ought to be repealed, because I think it is a farce and a failure. It has done more harm than good. But I certainly think these people in Alaska, living along a railroad 467 miles long, especially with reference to the people at Anchorage and Seward and at Fairbanks, they put in very little of their time running on the trains. They are taxpayers, I assume; and I can see no reason on earth why they should have this kind of muzzle put on them. While I do not think they are going to get very excited up in that cold country over a municipal election, I do think they should have the right to participate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I have had considerable experience, having been a railroad man in the early days, and I think I understand this situation. In the case of a school election, or acting as one of the school trustees, perhaps the agent or the telegraph operator in a little community would be asked to serve. That community is mostly made up of prospectors and bachelors, and there are very few families. I think this is a fine bill and that it ought to be passed. I have had experience, and I know the need for letting railroad men participate in municipal affairs and school affairs.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think, with the Members on the Democratic side now all talking for this bill, that they are all getting sick and tired of the bill they passed a few years ago called the Hatch Act, and that they would be glad now if they had never passed that legislation? Would not the simple thing be to do away with the Hatch Act? Then you would not need this legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. As a member of the Interior Appropriations subcommittee I was one of the delegation which made an inspection tour of Alaska this past summer. It was our privilege to meet many of the employees of the Alaska Railroad. I found them to be a mighty fine class of people. I think they are good, civic-minded American citizens and I certainly hope there will be no objection to this request.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say to the gentleman that if the bill is objected to and it goes over until next time I am going to offer an amendment to repeal the Hatch Act.

Mr. KEAN. And it would equally effectively kill this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), as amended by the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 61h), be, and it hereby is, amended by adding to said subsection, at the end thereof, the following sentence: "The provisions of

the second sentence of this subsection shall not apply to the employees of the United States Government, including the employees of the Alaska Railroad, residing in municipalities on the line of the railroad, in respect to activities involving the municipality in which they reside."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING TIME FOR HOLDING TERMS OF COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3167) to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 112 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 28, sec. 193), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 112. The State of Washington is divided into two districts, to be known as the eastern and western districts of Washington. The eastern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Spokane, Stevens, Ferry, Okanogan, Chelan, Grant, Douglas, Lincoln, Adams, and Whitman, with the waters thereof, including all Indian reservations within said counties, which shall constitute the northern division; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Asotin, Garfield, Columbia, Franklin, Walla Walla, Benton, Klickitat, Kittitas, and Yakima, with the waters thereof, including all Indian reservations within said counties, which shall constitute the southern division of said district. Terms of the district court for the northern division shall be held at Spokane on the first Mondays in April and September; for the southern division, at Yakima on the third Tuesday in May and on the second Tuesday in November, and at Walla Walla on the first Mondays in June and December. The western district shall include the territory embraced on the first day of July, 1910, in the counties of Whatcom, Skagit, Snohomish, King, San Juan, Island, Kitsap, Clallam, and Jefferson, with the waters thereof, including all Indian reservations within said counties, which shall constitute the northern division; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Pierce, Mason, Thurston, Chehalis, Pacific, Lewis, Wahkiakum, Cowlitz, Clarke, and Skamania, with the waters thereof, including all Indian reservations within said counties, which shall constitute the southern division of said district. Terms of the district court for the northern division shall be held at Bellingham on the first Tuesdays in April and October; at Seattle on the first Tuesdays in May and November; and for the southern division, at Tacoma on the first Tuesdays in February and July. The clerks of the courts for the eastern and western districts shall maintain an office in carge of himself or a deputy at each place in their respective districts where terms of court are required to be held."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 11, and on page 2, line 14, after the word "first", strike out "Mondays" and insert in lieu thereof "Tuesdays."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING FURTHER THE DISPOSITION OF PRIZES CAPTURED BY THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4321) to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1420, to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of August 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 746), as amended (34 U. S. C. 1159), is hereby further amended to read as follows: "That the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all prizes captured during war if said capture was made by authority of the United States or was adopted and ratified by the President of the United States and the prize was brought into the territorial waters of a cobelligerent or into a locality in the temporary or permanent possession or occupation of the armed forces of the United States or was taken or appropriated for the use of the United States, including jurisdiction of all proceedings for the condemnation of such property taken as prize."

SEC. 2. Section 4621 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1137), is hereby further amended to read as follows: "Any district court may appoint prize commissioners, not exceeding three in number; of whom one shall be a naval officer, active or retired, approved by the Secretary of the Navy, who shall receive no other compensation than his pay in the Navy, and who shall protect the interests of the Department of the Navy in the prize property; and at least one of the others shall be a member of the bar of the court, of not less than 3 years' standing, and acquainted with the taking of depositions."

SEC. 3. Section 4624 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1140), is hereby further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the seized property is taken or appropriated for the use of the United States whether before or after it comes into the custody of the prize court, the prize court is authorized to proceed to adjudication on the basis of an inventory and survey and an appropriate undertaking by the United States to respond for the value of such property without the necessity for either an appraisement or the deposit of the value of the prize with the Treasurer of the United States or any other public depository."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a House bill (H. R. 4231) were laid on the table.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER DAY

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 111, designating January 5 each year as George Washington Carver Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 5th day of January of each year is hereby designated as George Washington Carver Day, in commemoration of the great scientist, and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in universities, colleges, schools, and churches or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, strike out the words "each year" and insert in lieu thereof "1946."

Line 6, strike out the word "annually."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to honor a great American, George Washington Carver.

He was, first of all, a Christian, whose daily work was worship; whose laboratory, a shrine; there the hidden alchemy of the Creator was revealed to him more clearly than to those of lesser genius, and there lowly peanuts became a channel of blessing for mankind, as he worked joyously and incessantly toward such ends.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day."

PROVIDING FOR TERMS OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 940) to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 94 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 174), is amended to read as follows:

"The State of Nevada shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the district of Nevada. Terms of the district court shall be held at Carson City on the first Mondays in February and May, at Las Vegas on the first Mondays in March and October, at Reno on the first Mondays in January and June, and at Elko on the first Monday in November: *Provided*, That suitable accommodations for holding court at Elko shall be provided by the local authorities but only until such time as such accommodations shall be provided upon the recommendation of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in a public building or other quarters provided by the Federal Government for such purpose."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "provided", strike out the balance of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "without expense to the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPLACEMENT OF GOVERNMENT CHECKS WHICH HAVE BEEN LOST OR DESTROYED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4350) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will the author of the bill make a statement as to the object this bill seeks to achieve?

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under existing law, when a check is lost, destroyed, or mutilated, the disbursing officer who issued the check must reissue the check.

We have many men in the armed services who are going out of the service. Many of these checks are lost. For instance, the benefit checks for the dependents of men in the armed forces are sometimes lost. The disbursing officer in the Treasury Department is retiring, I believe, on the 1st of December. Quite a few of those checks are mutilated, lost, or destroyed. If this bill is not passed, then the payee will have to go through the formality of filing a claim, having that clear through the General Accounting Office, then going back to the Treasury, which may take a year or a year and a half.

Mr. DONDERO. Does this have any bearing on the question of forgery?

Mr. MANASCO. This bill does not change any of those provisions.

Mr. DONDERO. It does not change them at all?

Mr. MANASCO. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 528), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as hereinafter provided, whenever it is clearly proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that any original check of the United States is lost, stolen, or wholly or partly destroyed, or is so mutilated or defaced as to impair its value to its owner or holder, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, before the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the original check was issued to transfer the amount of the original check from the account of the drawer to a special deposit account carried in the name of the Secretary of the Treasury on the books of the Treasurer of the United States, and to issue against such special deposit account to the owner or holder thereof a substitute under current date showing such information as may be necessary to identify the original check, upon the receipt and approval by the Secretary of the Treasury of an undertaking to indemnify the United States, in such form and amount and with such surety, sureties, or security, if any, as the Secretary of the Treasury may require; but no such substitute shall be payable if the original check shall first have been paid: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to relieve any certifying officer or his sureties or any disbursing officer or his sureties of any liability to the United States on account of any payment resulting from the erroneous issuance of the original check: *And provided further*, That the authority herein conferred to issue substitute checks may, in the case of checks issued on account of public-debt obligations and transactions regarding the administration of banking and currency laws, be exercised without limitation of time.

"(b) An undertaking of indemnity shall not be required under subsection (a) of this section in any of the following classes of cases except as provided in this subsection: (1) If the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied that the loss, theft, destruction, mutilation, or defacement, as the case may be, occurred without fault of the owner or holder and while the check was in the custody or control of the United States (including the postal service when carrying mail for any officer, employee, agent, or agency of the United States when performing services in connection with an official function of the United States, but not including the postal service when otherwise acting solely in its capacity as a public carrier of the mail), or of a person thereunto duly authorized as lawful agent of the United States, or while it was in the course of shipment effected pursuant to and in accordance with the regulations issued under the provisions of the Government Losses in Shipment Act; (2) if substantially the entire check is presented and surrendered by the owner or holder and the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied as to the identity of the check presented and that any missing portions are not sufficient to form the basis of a valid claim against the United States; (3) if the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied that the original check is not negotiable and cannot be made the basis of a valid claim against the United States; (4) if the amount of the check is not more than $200; (5) if the owner or holder is the United States or an officer or employee thereof in his official capacity, a State, the District of Columbia, a Territory or possession of the United States, including the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, a municipal corporation or political subdivision of any of the foregoing, a corporation, the whole of whose capital is owned by the United States, a foreign government, or a Federal Reserve bank: *Provided, however*, That in any of the foregoing classes of cases the Secretary of the Treasury may require an undertaking of indemnity if he deems it essential to the public interest.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section whenever it is clearly proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that any original check of the United States drawn on a depository in a foreign country or a Territory or possession of the United States, including the Panama Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands, is lost, stolen, or wholly or partly destroyed, or is so mutilated or defaced as to impair its value to its owner or holder, the drawer of the original check or such other officer or employee of the United States as may be authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury with the concurrence of the head of the department or agency upon whose behalf the original check was issued is authorized, before the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the original check was issued, to issue to the owner or holder thereof a substitute under current date showing such information as may be necessary to identify the original check, drawn against the account of the drawer of the original check or such other account as may be available for the payment of such substitute, upon the receipt and approval by the Secretary of the Treasury of an undertaking, to indemnify the United States, in such form and amount and with such surety, sureties, or security, if any, as the Secretary of the Treasury may require; but no such substitute shall be payable if the original check shall first have been paid. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to relieve any certifying officer or his sureties or any disbursing officer or his sureties of any liability to the United States on account of any payment resulting from the erroneous issuance of the original check.

"(d) The Secretary of the Treasury shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of the provisions of this section.

"(e) Notwithstanding the provision of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section, whenever any original check of the Post Office Department has been lost, stolen, or destroyed, the Postmaster General may authorize the issuance of a substitute, marked 'duplicate' and showing the number, date, and payee of the original check, before the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the original check was issued, upon the execution by the owner thereof of such bond of indemnity as the Postmaster General may prescribe: *Provided*, That when such original check does not exceed in amount the sum of $100 and the payee or owner is, at the date of the application, an officer or employee in the service of the Post Office Department, whether by contract, designation, or appointment, the Postmaster General may, in lieu of an indemnity bond, authorize the issuance of a substitute check or warrant upon such an affidavit as he may prescribe, to be made before any postmaster by the payee or owner of an original check.

"(f) Substitutes issued under this section, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, except those for checks issued on account of public-debt obligations and transactions regarding the administration of banking and currency laws, shall be deemed to be original checks and shall be payable under the conditions set forth in section 21 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 725t). Substitutes for checks issued on account of public-debt obligations and transactions regarding the administration of banking and currency laws shall be payable without limitation of time.

"(g) The term 'original check' wherever used in this section means any check, warrant, or other order for the payment of money, payable upon demand and not bearing interest, drawn by a duly authorized officer or agent of the United States, the District of Columbia, or the District Unemployment Compensation Board, on their behalf against an account or funds of the United States, the District of Columbia, or the District Unemployment Compensation Board, including instruments issued by any corporation or other entity owned or controlled by the United States, the funds of which are deposited and covered into the Treasury of the United States or deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, but does not include money, coins, or currency of the United States; as used in subsection (e) of this section it means such an instrument drawn by a duly authorized officer or employee of the Post Office Department.

"(h) Any power, authority, or discretion conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury by this section may be delegated by him, in whole or in part, subject to such terms and

conditions as he may prescribe, to such individuals as he may designate within the Treasury Department or to the head of any other departments or agency of the Government or of any Federal Reserve bank, and the head of such department or agency or Federal Reserve bank may, when such action is not inconsistent with the terms and conditions of the delegation by the Secretary of the Treasury, redelegate any power, authority, or discretion conferred upon him pursuant to this subsection to any officer or employee within such department, agency, or Federal Reserve bank."

SEC. 2. Sections 300 and 3647 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 119), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective on December 1, 1945.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we revert to Calendar No. 250 and at the appropriate point I may be given the privilege of revising and extending my remarks at that point in the RECORD where the bill was under consideration, and that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] may have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION DIVIDENDS AND INSURANCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4428) to adjust the rate of dividends paid by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation on its capital stock and to decrease the premium charge for its insurance.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 402 (b) of the National Housing Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 12, sec. 1725 (b)), is amended by striking out "the Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall be entitled to the payment of dividends on such stock out of net earnings at a rate equal to the interest rate on such bonds, which dividends shall be cumulative" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall be entitled to the payment of dividends (which dividends shall be cumulative) on such stock out of net earnings until July 1, 1945, at a rate equal to the interest rate on such bonds, and after June 30, 1945, at a rate equal to the average interest rate on the bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation outstanding during the the period with respect to which such dividends are paid or accumulate."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 404 of the National Housing Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 12, sec. 1727 (a) and (b)), are amended by striking out the word "one-eighth" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "one-twelfth."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 404 of the National Housing Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 12, sec. 1727 (c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) If an insured institution has paid a premium at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of 1 percent of the total amount of the accounts of its insured members and its creditor obligations for any period of time after June 30, 1945, it shall receive a credit upon its future premiums in an amount equal to the excess premium so paid for the period beyond such date."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIMITING THE TIME FOR BRINGING CERTAIN ACTIONS UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2788) to amend title 28 of the United States Code in regard to the limitations of certain actions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. BIEMILLER, DOYLE, and MADDEN objected.

REQUIRING WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS TO MAKE SWORN STATEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2543) to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will somebody explain this bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this bill would require weekly and semiweekly newspapers to file with the Post Office Department annually their paid subscription lists. This same provision applies to city newspapers. The bill is sponsored by the weekly newspapers. They are overwhelmingly in favor of it. It will not require any additional form to be filed by these weekly newspapers. It is believed if the bill is enacted and the weekly newspapers are required to report under sworn statement their paid circulation it will redound to their advantage.

Mr. RABAUT. How does it affect a weekly newspaper that pays certain agencies to make its delivery and thereby has an expense? The newspaper delivers the paper free.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The weekly newspaper could report both its paid and free circulation if it so desired.

Mr. RABAUT. Must it have a paid circulation?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes; in order to get certain mailing privileges under the second-class mailing act. It will not effect the situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. RABAUT. There is quite a controversy up in Detroit about that. There are certain newspapers in Detroit that are given away. They have a heavy circulation, and they pay a great deal of money for the purpose of distributing the newspaper; whereas the other newspapers make a collection once a month of 10 cents each, in the case of the smaller newspapers, which money goes to the boy who delivers the paper. The paper that collects the 10 cents falls in the category of a paid subscription newspaper, while the paper itself gets none of the money. The boy that delivers it gets the money. There is the other situation where the paper pays a distributing agent a certain amount of money to deliver the papers. I want to know if it is the opinion of the committee having this bill in charge that both of those papers are under consideraion in this legislation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the papers described by the gentleman from Michigan do not enjoy second-class mailing privileges, they consequently would not come under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Under those conditions I will have to object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I trust the gentleman will not object. This bill in no way alters or modifies the law admitting this class of matter to the mails. It does not affect the distribution of free newspapers or periodicals in the slightest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. RABAUT. I will be glad to withhold it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under what basis would the gentleman think that the newspapers could come out and enjoy mailing privileges and not be required by Federal law to make sworn statements of circulations?

Mr. RABAUT. May I say to the gentleman that there is a very close margin here. One paper really makes a collection of a very nominal sum which it gives to the boys who deliver the paper. The other paper pays an equal or similar amount, and also actually has a fine circulation. It does not collect a fee from the people who receive the paper but pays it itself, and under that category it is not considered in this bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Do either of those papers enjoy mailing privileges?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I think so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If neither of those papers enjoy mailing privileges, an amendment to cover them would not be germane to the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RELIEF FOR THE RESIDENTS OF GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1139) for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of granting immediate relief to the residents of Guam by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims arising in Guam, the Secretary of the Navy, and such other officer or officers as the Secretary of the Navy may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, are hereby authorized to appoint a claims commission or commissions, each composed of one or more officers of the Navy or the Marine Corps, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payments of amounts determined as just compensation, where accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and in final settlement, including

waiver of any claims against the War Damage Corporation, of claims for damage occurring in Guam, including claims of insured but excluding claims of subrogees, on account of damage to or loss or destruction of public property, both real and personal, or on account of damage to or loss or destruction of private property, both real and personal of residents of Guam, including claims for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages incident to use and occupation of real property, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise, when such damage, loss, or destruction is the result of or incident to hostilities or hostile occupation, or is caused by or incicident to noncombat activities of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps forces or individual members thereof, including military and civilian employees thereof, where the amount of such claim does not exceed $5,000: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered by such commissions unless presented within one year after the occurrence of the accident or the incident or engagement out of which such claim arises, except that claims arising out of accidents, incidents, or engagements, after December 6, 1941, but prior to the first day of the month following enactment of this act, may be presented at any time prior to the expiration of 1 year after the latter date: *Provided further*, That any such settlements made by such commissions shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe and may, in cases where the amount exceeds $2,500 but does not exceed $5,000, be subject to the approval of such commanding or other officer of the Navy or Marine Corps forces, as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe; and the Secretary of the Navy shall have authority, if he deems any claim in excess of $5,000, or any claims for death or personal injury to residents of Guam arising under the conditions herein set forth as a basis for property damage claims, to be meritorious, to certify such amount as may be found to be just and reasonable thereon to Congress as a legal claim for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress the for, together with a brief statement of the character of such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed: *Provided further*, That no claim of any person who has voluntarily aided an enemy of the United States, or of any national of any country at war with the United States, or of any ally of such enemy country, except when the local military commander or his designee shall determine that such national was at the time of the damage or injury and still is friendly to the United States, shall be allowed under this act: *Provided further*, That any such settlements made by such commissions under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 2. In the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy or his designees, settlements of claims under section 1 of this act shall be made by reimbursement in kind from available Government property stores and services and/or out of the appropriation current at the time of settlement, for "Pay and subsistence of naval personnel."

SEC. 3. Insofar as the claims of residents of Guam arising in Guam are concerned, this act is in lieu of all other provisions of law authorizing settlement of war-damage claims by the agencies of the United States Government, but shall otherwise be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, all other provisions of law authorizing consideration, ascertainment, adjustment, determination, or payment of claims by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 4. Claims of the type described in section 1 hereof on account of damage to or loss or destruction of property, both real and personal, or personal injury or death of any person, caused by Coast Guard forces, or individual members, including military personnel and civilian employees thereof, or otherwise incident to activities of such forces, arising at any time while the Coast Guard shall be operating as a part of the Navy may be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, and paid in the manner in this act provided for the settlement of Navy and Marine Corps claims: *Provided*, That no claims on account of damage to or less or destruction of property, or personal injury or death, caused by Coast Guard forces or individual members thereof, or otherwise incident to the activities of such forces, shall be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, or paid under the provisions of this act at any time when the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department.

SEC. 5. This act shall not apply to claims of persons not permanent residents of Guam or to claims not arising in Guam.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING LAND FOR RESETTLEMENT IN GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1362) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of effecting the rehabilitation and resettlement of the residents of Guam, the Secretary of the Navy, or such officer as he may designate for such purpose and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is hereby authorized to transfer to the naval government of Guam, for transfer or sale by the naval government of Guam at its discretion, to such persons and upon such terms and conditions and at such times as it may determine to be suitable, in replacement of lands acquired for military or naval purposes in Guam, such lands owned by the United States in Guam as may be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, after consultation with the Secretary of War, not to be required for military or naval purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING TRAVEL PAY AND ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS OF THE WAR WITH SPAIN AND THE PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1192) granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who either enlisted in the Regular Army in the year 1898 under special act of Congress for the duration of the war with Spain or enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army during such war for the regular enlistment period but secured his discharge under General Order No. 40, issued at the headquarters of the Army, Adjutant General's Office, Washington, May 10, 1898, and who (1) was honorably discharged from such enlistment while serving in the Philippine Islands, (2) did not there reenter the military or naval service of the United States through commission or enlistment, and (3) embarked at Manila within 1 year after such discharge for return to the United States, shall, upon application to the Secretary of War, be allowed and paid his actual necessary expenses, if any, for lodging and subsistence in the Philippine Islands for the period, not exceeding 3 months, during which he awaited transportation by Government transport, and, in addition, for the distance from Manila, Philippine Islands, to San Francisco, Calif., the travel pay and commutation of subsistence allowed under section 1290 of the Revised Statutes, as in effect at the time of such discharge, to soldiers of the Regular Army honorably discharged on expiration of enlistment, less any sum or sums of money actually paid by the Government to such person at time of such discharge or subsequent thereto by way of travel or allowances for transportation and subsistence between such places.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 4, strike out down to and including line 21, and insert "States, shall be allowed and paid the sum of $75 as reimbursement for lodging and subsistence in the Philippine Islands for the period during which he awaited transportation by Government transport, and, in addition, travel pay and commutation of subsistence, for the distance from Manila, Philippine Islands, to San Francisco, Calif., at the rate of travel pay and commutation of subsistence allowed to soldiers of the Regular Army honorably discharged on expiration of enlistment, under section 1290 of the Revised Statutes, in effect at the time of such discharge, less any sum or sums of money actually paid by the Government to such person at the time of such discharge, or subsequent thereto, and transportation and subsistence between such places.

"SEC. 2. Claims hereunder shall be settled in the General Accounting Office.

"SEC. 3. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to certify to the Congress, pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 266), all claims allowed hereunder.

"SEC. 4. Application for the benefits of this act shall be filed within 3 years after the date of its passage.

"SEC. 5. Payment to any attorney or agent for such assistance as may be required in the preparation and execution of the necessary papers in any application under this act shall not exceed the sum of $10; any person collecting or attempting to collect a greater amount than is herein allowed shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS to the committee amendment: On page 3, line 9, strike out the period and add a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such payments shall be without interest."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, strike out "(3)" and insert "(6)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS HUDSON RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3940) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.," approved April 2, 1941.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved April 2, 1941, granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Rensselaer and Saratoga, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Hudson River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y., at or near River Street in the city of Mechanicville, be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "operate a" insert the words "free highway."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS MONONGAHELA RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3730) granting the consent of Congress to the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Star City, W. Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Monongahela River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Star City, W. Va., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BRAINERD, MINN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3616) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street, in Brainerd, Minn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1259) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street, in Brainerd, Miss., authorized to be built by the State of Minnesota by an act of Congress approved June 13, 1944, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from June 13, 1945.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3616) was laid on the table.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE WABASH RIVER, ST. FRANCISVILLE, ILL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1219) authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the author of the bill explain why it is necessary to maintain a toll bridge at this point and why it is not a discrimination against other communities that operate free bridges? If the author is not here to explain, Mr. Speaker, I will be constrained to object.

FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER, POPLAR, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 927) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved July 28, 1937, heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved July 18, 1939, granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana and counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, Mont., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont., is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years after the date of the termination of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

AMENDMENT OF PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2240) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 359), as amended, or of any other act authorizing the crediting of prior service in the National Guard or in the Organized Militia for longevity or other pay purposes, shall be applied, notwithstanding any other provision of law, as authorizing the inclusion of any periods, otherwise creditable under such provisions, which may have been served in such organizations by persons before reaching the age of 18 years. The provisions of this act shall be effective from June 1, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That any service which would be creditable, for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes, of members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, or of any of the reserve components thereof, except for the fact that such service was, or shall be, performed prior to the attainment of the age of 18 years, shall, under such regulations as the head of the department concerned may prescribe, be credited notwithstanding such fact.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall be effective from June 1, 1942, and shall cease to be in effect 6 months after termination of the present war."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINING RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES—DESCHUTES COUNTY, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 608) to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill explain why we should exclude this land. As I understand, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] introduced the bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill was before the Committee on Public Lands. The only mineral that has thus far been located in

this area is pumice. It is an area in which they want to set up a recreational area. There are other large areas which contain pumice. All of the claims that have been already filed are protected. This is merely to set aside a recreational area.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That within the following-described real property situated in Deschutes County, Oreg., namely, section 13 to 16, inclusive, sections 21 to 28, inclusive, sections 33 to 36, inclusive, township 21 south, range 12 east, Willamette meridian; sections 16 to 21, inclusive, sections 28 to 33, inclusive, township 21 south, range 13 east, Willamette meridian; sections 1 to 4, inclusive, sections 9 to 12, inclusive, township 22 south, range 12 east, Willamette meridian; and sections 4 to 9, inclusive, township 22 south, range 13 east, Willamette meridian; deposits of all minerals are excluded from the operation of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive (relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3028) to amend the act of August 17, 1937, as amended, relating to the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in the State of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in the first paragraph of section 4 of the act approved August 17, 1937, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 16, sec. 459a–2), relating to the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in the State of North Carolina, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, accept for administration, protection, and development by the National Park Service a minimum of 10,000 acres within the area described in section 1 of this act, including the existing Cape Hatteras State Park, and, in addition, any other portions of the area described in section 1 hereof if the State of North Carolina shall agree that if all the lands described in section 1 of this act shall not have been conveyed to the United States within 10 years from August 17, 1937, the establishment of the aforesaid national seashore recreational area may, in the discretion of the said Secretary, be abandoned, and that, in the event of such abandonment, the said State will accept a reconveyance of title to all lands conveyed by it to the United States for said national seashore recreational area."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 8, strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "fifteen."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4396) to facilitate and simplify the administration of Indian affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to direct an inquiry to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs in regard to this bill. As I understand it, H. R. 4386 proposes to give the Secretary of the Interior authority to delegate to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs certain powers which he has under the General Statutes, and in turn authority to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to delegate those powers still further to any employee in the Office of Indian Affairs. The general purpose, I think, is to expedite action on many Indian matters and it is desirable. But I am a little disturbed by the possibility that the delegation of some of these powers to some minor clerks or employees might create situations that would not be entirely satisfactory. I note in reading the report on the bill that the committee states:

The Commissioner also pointed out in his testimony that appropriate machinery for appeals would be provided which would give aggrieved parties the right of appeal to a higher authority in the event of any misuse of delegated power.

That would be reassuring as it is found in the committee report except that in the bill itself, on page 2, there appears this sentence:

The Secretary or the Commissioner, as the case may be, may at any time revoke any part of the delegation made pursuant to this act, but no such revocation shall be given retroactive effect.

I am disturbed by that language, "no such revocation shall be given retroactive effect," because I am wondering how an appeal can be effective unless the Secretary or the Commissioner should overrule the decision which has been made by the person to whom the power had originally been delegated.

Mr. JACKSON. May I say to the gentleman that what we are doing in this particular bill is giving authority to the Commissioner and to the Secretary of the Interior similar to that which has been given to other Government agencies which have set up regional offices for the carrying out of the functions provided for them by law. As far as the section that the gentleman refers to is concerned, I assume that there might be some question as to the effect of a withdrawal of a previous delegation of authority to a subordinate officer. In order to prevent any possible difficulty that might arise by reason of the revocation of that authority where perhaps a vested right had accrued, or something similar, we think it is necessary to have that.

For instance, if a decision has been made by an officer who is authorized under the provisions of this bill to make a decision, granting a small right-of-way over some logged-off land which does not amount to anything, and subsequently that authority is repealed by a directive of the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, it would have the effect, would it not, of upsetting the title to that right-of-way?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I can see where that might be true, but what I am concerned with is that in the original application of the delegated power some Indian might be divested of a basic right. I want to be sure that he has adequate protection.

Mr. JACKSON. There is no intention to do that. The use of the word "retroactive" is to protect any vested right that may have accrued as the result of a decision. The committee went into considerable detail on this matter and tried to work out some language that would provide some limitation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me there must have been some question in the minds of the committee or else they would not have had this paragraph saying that the Commissioner would attempt to work out some machinery to give the right of appeal, but in view of the possible conflict between that and this clause about retroactive effect, I am wondering if we might not put the bill over today and give me an opportunity to consult with the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs and possibly it may be clarified.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

ADJUSTING PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF THE NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4411) to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentlewoman from Maine, the author of this bill, would explain to us just what it provides.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, the bill merely proposes to rectify existing inequalities, and place the Navy nurses on the same basis as the Army nurses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This does not in any way raise the Navy nurses above the pay level of the Army nurses, does it?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. No. It simply places them on an equal basis. As long as the Navy nurses are working, they get the same pay as the Army nurses, but as soon as they retire they go on 75 percent of their base pay. Perhaps the simplest illustration of the existing inequalities is the comparison of the retired pay of a Navy nurse with the rank of ensign to the retired pay of an Army nurse with the rank of second lieutenant—the Army equivalent of ensign. The retired ensign nurse gets only $67.50 monthly

while the retired second lieutenant nurse gets $112.50 monthly. The difference is in the base pay of $90 as compared to $150.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the act under which the pay and allowances were set for the nurses was passed originally covering both branches. That is, both the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps in the same legislation. Just how did this discrepancy creep into it?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The gentleman will remember that when the law was amended affecting the Army nurses placed in this category, the Navy Department did not have proper information to submit on the floor, and the Committee on Naval Affairs decided to put it over until they could have a complete report from the Department, which has just now come in.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And this is in pursuance of that intent?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. That is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentlewoman a question.

I notice in paragraph 1 of the bill, which refers to the fact that the pay of the nurses in the Navy shall be the same amount as that of naval officers of the same rank. Will that in any way bring about a discrepancy between the Navy nurse pay and the Army nurse pay?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. No. It will bring the Navy nurse pay to the same place as the Army nurse pay. The Navy nurses were given the relative rank but not the relative pay as far as retirement is concerned. This bill will correct this and put them on the same basis as other commissioned officers, Army nurses, Waves, Wacs, and so forth.

Mr. BROOKS. As long as naval officers of the same rank are getting the same pay as Army officers of similar rank, the same situation will prevail with reference to nurses?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. It places everybody on the same basis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the effective period as defined in section 4 hereof, (a) each member of the Navy Nurse Corps shall receive the same pay, money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters, mileage and other travel allowances, that are now or may hereafter be prescribed by law for officers of the Regular Navy of corresponding rank and length of service, which shall include, on and after October 1, 1944, all allowances and benefits on account of dependents as provided in section 4 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended.

(b) In computing the service for all pay purposes of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, such persons shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they held appointments as nurses or commissions in the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps.

SEC. 2. (a) Each member of the Navy Nurse Corps who hereafter is retired by reason of physical disability incurred in the line of duty shall, if the proceedings resulting in retirement be instituted prior to the expiration of the effective period as defined in section 4 hereof, be entitled to retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay of the rank in which serving, under temporary or permanent appointment, when such disability was incurred, computed as provided in this act.

(b) Each member of the Navy Nurse Corps who, subsequent to December 22, 1942, and prior to the date of enactment of this act, has been retired for physical disability incurred in the line of duty shall, beginning on the first day of the first month next following the date of enactment of this act, be entitled to retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which she would have been entitled at the time her disability was incurred had her active-duty pay and allowances at such time been computed as provided in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall apply equally to Naval Reserve members of the Navy Nurse Corps while employed on active duty.

SEC. 4. The effective period as used herein shall mean the period beginning on July 10, 1944 (except as otherwise specified in section 2 and except that no allowances or benefits under any section of this act on account of dependents for any period prior to October 1, 1944, shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act), and ending 6 months after the termination of the present war as declared by Presidential proclamation or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, whichever shall first occur.

SEC. 5. No person, active or retired, in the naval service shall suffer, by reason of this Act, any reduction in pay, allowances, or retirement benefits to which she was entitled upon the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSACOLA RESERVOIR—GRAND RIVER DAM PROJECT, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3058) to authorize the use of certain lands of the United States for flowage in connection with providing additional storage space in the Pensacola Reservoir of the Grand River Dam project in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands of the United States located in the State of Oklahoma and held for Indian school purposes, to wit: All those parts of the northeast quarter southeast quarter section 20, and the northeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter, and southeast quarter southeast quarter section 21, township 27 north, range 24 east, Indian meridian, Wyandotte Reserve, in Ottawa County, lying between elevations 750 and 760 feet above mean sea level, may be used perpetually by the United States, and its duly authorized agencies and representatives, to flow thereon and withdraw therefrom the waters of the Pensacola Reservoir of the Grand River Dam project for the purpose of and in connection with controlling floods and the production of hydroelectric power.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to determine, in such manner as he may deem appropriate, the reasonable value of such use, including therein all damages to adjacent lands not now subject to flowage rights, together with the improvements and crops thereon, and also the damages caused by the flood of May 1943, and, when so determined, the amount of such compensation and damages shall be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Seneca Indian School at Wyandotte, Okla., pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560). The unobligated balance of funds under any allotment heretofore made for the acquisition of additional storage space in the Pensacola Reservoir shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for payment of such compensation and damages, notwithstanding any time limitations heretofore established by the Congress with respect to the availability of such funds.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRE LOSS REIMBURSEMENT TO CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL OCCURRING AT TUTUILA, AMERICAN SAMOA, OCTOBER 20, 1943

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1076) to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $4,000, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered is connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

REIMBURSING CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR FIRE LOSS AT UNITED STATES NAVAL CONVALESCENT HOSPITAL, BANNING, CALIF., ON MARCH 5, 1945

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1102) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized

and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,672.25, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSING CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNELL FOR FIRE LOSS OCCURRING AT PLYMOUTH, ENGLAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1103) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $4,310.90, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR FIRE LOSS AT BERMUDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1119) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $243.95, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR FIRE LOSS AT TUTUILA, AMERICAN SAMOA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1134) to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102–A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $804, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102–A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSING CERTAIN MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST ON THE STEAMSHIP "MAASDAM"

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1215) to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would be interested to know from the chairman of the committee what these marines were doing in June 1941 on a boat which was torpedoed.

The chairman of the committee does not seem to be present. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF UNITED STATES FISH HATCHERY PROPERTY AT BUTTE FALLS, OREG., TO THE STATE OF OREGON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 131) to authorize the conveyance of the United States fish hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to convey to the State of Oregon, at any time within 3 years, title to the property known as the United States fish hatchery property near Butte Falls, Jackson County, Oreg., consisting of 13,277 acres of land, together with improvements thereon.

SEC. 2. Any conveyance executed by the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the purposes of this act shall contain the express condition that the grantee shall use the property exclusively for fish cultural purposes, and the further express condition that the title and right to possession of the lands so conveyed, together with improvements thereon, shall revert to the United States upon a finding by the Secretary, after notice to such grantee and after an opportunity for a hearing, that the grantee had ceased to use the property for such purposes; and such lands and improvements thereon, upon such reversion to the United States, shall be returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNITION OF CIVILIAN OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN CONSTRUCTION OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3748) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, approved May 29, 1944."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944, be, and the same is, hereby amended, effective May 29, 1944, by adding to the last paragraph of said section 2 the following sentence: "The terms 'citizens of the United States' and 'a citizen of the United States', as used in this act, shall be so construed as to include those who, through naturalization,

became citizens of the United States on or before May 29, 1944."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

PROCEDURE IN CONDEMNATION OF PROPERTY FOR LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1902) relating to the trial of the issue of just compensation in the case of property for flood-control purposes. This bill was placed on the calendar on October 31.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the unofficial objectors' committee has a rule that no bill that has been placed on the Consent Calendar after a certain date shall be brought up except in the regular way except in cases of extreme emergency. I would like the gentleman from Mississippi to explain the extreme emergency for this legislation at the present time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's request, permit me to say that I have no fault to find with the rules of the unofficial objectors' committee. This bill should have been placed on the calendar on October 30, having been reported on that day. It really should, therefore, have been subject to call today. The urgency consists in the following facts, and I will make the explanation just as brief as possible.

Under the provisions of the act of April 24, 1888, as amended by the act of August 1, 1888, Federal procedure in condemnations of lands for public buildings and for public purposes generally is in conformity with the State laws.

The act of April 24, 1888, as amended by the act of August 1, 1888, is known as the Conformity Act. All condemnations for river and harbor improvements and all condemnations with respect to general flood control are made under the Conformity Act. The only exception in flood control is in the lower Mississippi Valley. Whether there is a jury or whether there are commissioners will depend upon the State law. The State law will control, except in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Under section 4 of the Lower Mississippi River Flood Control Act of May 28, 1928, commissioners are provided in Federal condemnations, and this act is applicable to the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Mississippi, and to a less extent to Tennessee and Kentucky. The act constitutes the exception to the general rule which makes the laws of the States applicable to condemnation proceedings in the Federal court. The pending bill is to amend said section 4 so that it will be in accordance with the general Conformity Act.

Here is the urgency. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] introduced the pending bill on January 31, 1945. My colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], having previously introduced a similar bill, is, with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], sponsoring the pending bill. It was referred appropriately to the War Department for report. The views of the Justice Department were also requested. That report was submitted, as disclosed by the committee report on the pending bill, on May 21. Hearings were immediately held by the Committee on Flood Control. During the course of those hearings, it developed that the committee was in absolute accord with the purposes that my colleagues, the two gentlemen from Mississippi, had in mind, to wit, providing that the laws of the States in the lower Mississippi Valley shall obtain in Federal condemnations. Thereupon the attorneys for the Department of Justice and the War Department were instructed to submit an amendment to the pending bill which would make the act of 1928 conform to the laws covering condemnations in the other 42 States of the Union, which is the Conformity Act of 1888.

That was submitted in June. It was impracticable at that time to have further hearings. Following the reconvening of the Congress, because of the engagement of members of the Committee on Flood Control on other committees, it has been impossible to have hearings until recently. During the hearings, which were held and concluded about a week ago, this bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Flood Control and the Chairman was instructed to have it placed on the Consent Calendar and he was also instructed to ask its immediate consideration in view of the fact that the President had submitted a recommendation for a budget appropriation to be included in the deficiency bill to be reported and considered to resume flood-control work that was discontinued in 1943 under the WPB directive L41.

If there is a delay for 2 weeks, there will be a delay in this matter going to the Senate. It is urgent that this bill be passed so that these works may be constructed under the deficiency bill, having been discontinued some 2 or 3 years ago because of the war, and it is necessary that the condemnations be uniform.

I submit to the gentleman that there is an urgency, that the bill merely enables the trials for Federal condemnations in flood control in the six States in the lower Mississippi Valley to be in accordance with the conformity act that obtains in all of the other States. I favor the bill. If it were not for the pending deficiency bill, I would not ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter when property is acquired by the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, in connection with any project for the control of floods, the proceedings with respect to the determination of the issue of just compensation for the taking, shall conform, as near as may be, to the proceedings existing at the time in the courts of record of the State within which the property is situated with respect to condemnation proceedings instituted by such State.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 4 of the act entitled 'An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes,' approved May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 536; 33 U. S. C. 702d), is hereby amended by deleting the words 'In all such proceedings the court, for the purpose of ascertaining the value of the property and assessing the compensation to be paid, shall appoint three commissioners, whose award, when confirmed by the court, shall be final,' and substituting therefor the words, 'In all such proceedings the practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceedings shall conform as near as may be to the practice, pleadings, forms, and proceedings existing at the time in like causes in the courts of record of the State within which such district court is held, any rule of the court to the contrary notwithstanding.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled 'An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries and for other purposes,' approved May 15, 1928."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO REQUIRE WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS ENJOYING MAILING PRIVILEGES TO MAKE SWORN STATEMENTS OF CIRCULATION

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to H. R. 2543, which I asked to be passed over without prejudice. The bill has now been sufficiently explained to me, and I wish to withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 2 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, secs. 233–234), is amended by inserting after "daily", the words "and weekly", "semiweekly", and "triweekly."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

REVERE SUGAR REFINERY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1955) for the relief of the Revere Sugar Refinery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 693) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Saunders Memorial Hospital, Florence, S. C., the sum of $25,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of losses sustained by such hospital as the result of the failure of the United States Army Engineer Corps to carry out a contract to lease or purchase such hospital to the United States, for the duration of the present war, and 6 months thereafter: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGARET McWILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1090) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret McWilliams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Margaret McWilliams, formerly of 2781 Jefferson Avenue, Mount Clemens, Mich., the sum of $1,180.64, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by being ejected by Army officers at Selfridge Field from their location while doing business as the Selfridge Inn on September 4, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEANNETTE C. JONES AND MINOR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of Jeannette C. Jones and minor children.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on War Claims.

MYRTLE C. RADABAUGH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3987) for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to receive and consider the claim of Myrtle C. Radabaugh, on account of the death of her husband, Claud Clair Radabaugh, which is alleged to have resulted from an injury sustained by him during the year 1935 while working as a rural mail carrier from Long Prairie, Minn., under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, except that the time limitations in sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of said act are hereby waived: *Provided*, That such claim be filed within 6 months after the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM F. BACON AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 201) for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William F. Bacon, the sum of $3,500; to the estate of Myrtle Jackson, the sum of $3,500; to the estate of Catherine Smith, the sum of $3,500; and to the estate of Tibbie Spencer, the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of the claims of such estates for compensation for the deaths of their respective decedents, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by them when the passenger bus in which they were riding collided with a United States Army vehicle near Allenhurst, Ga., on April 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MINNIE A. BELTZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 542) for the relief of Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz, Seattle, Wash., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on August 18, 1944, when she was struck while crossing Aurora Avenue at the intersection of Halladay Street, Seattle, Wash., by a United States Navy station wagon: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KLAU-VAN PIETERSOM-DUNLAP ASSOCIATES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 562) for the relief of Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc., of Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of $1,664.05, in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States (1) for compensation for services rendered at the request of district representatives of the War Production Board, in preparing a presentation setting forth the facilities in the State of Wisconsin for the manufacture of plywood aircraft, and in conducting the necessary research in connection therewith, and (2) for reimbursement of expenses incurred by it in the preparation of such presentation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE J. ROSS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 788) for the relief of the estate of George J. Ross.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of George J. Ross, of Salt Lake City, Utah, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said George J. Ross, as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the auto-

mobile in which he was riding collided with a Government-owned automobile driven by an employee of the Federal Public Housing Authority in the performance of his official duties, near Farmington, Utah, on March 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLIE TYSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 883) for the relief of Charlie Tyson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charlie Tyson, of Aberdeen, N. C., the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of having been shot by a member of the military police force of the Army of the United States, in Aberdeen, N. C., on April 25, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LILLIAN EPSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 979) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Lillian Epstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Mrs. Lillian Epstein, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the injury and death of Mrs. Lillian Epstein as the result of an accident which occurred on September 26, 1944, on Wadsworth Avenue, 40 feet south of One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Street, New York City, N. Y., when the said Mrs. Lillian Epstein was struck by a United States mail truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. EDMOND J. SAINT AMANT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 980) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond S. Saint Amant, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. Saint Amant, Jr., of Biloxi, Miss., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their daughter, Lucille Saint Amant, who died as a result of injuries sustained when she was struck by a United States Army truck in Biloxi, Miss., on March 17, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENTRAL LEAF TOBACCO CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 994) for the relief of the Central Leaf Tobacco Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Central Leaf Tobacco Co., Inc., Durham, N. C., the sum of $848.60. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States for losses sustained as the result of a United States Army truck colliding on November 27, 1944, with a truck owned by such company while the latter truck was parked against the curb in front of 808 Holloway Street, Durham, N. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. ERNEST L. BARLOW

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1023) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest L. Barlow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernest L. Barlow, Issaquah, Wash., the sum of $250, and to Mrs. Ernest L. Barlow, the sum of $250. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on November 22, 1941, by the said Ernest L. Barlow, by his wife, Dorothy M. Barlow, and by his minor child, Delores J. Barlow, when the automobile in which they were riding on Hazelwood Highway between Renton and Lake Washington Bridge, King County, Wash., was struck by a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HIBERNIA I. CONNERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1027) for the relief of Mrs. Hibernia I. Conners.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Hibernia I. Conners, of Memphis, Tenn., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her on December 6, 1944, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by an Army vehicle driven by a civilian employee of the War Department, at the intersection of East Parkway South and Union Avenue, in Memphis, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST LT. JACK SANDERS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1118) for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $71.80 to reimburse First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed by reason of a premature explosion due to a faulty detonator while engaged in a field problem in demolitions at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and

the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1183) to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising from activities of the War Department or of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Crecencio L. Garcia, of Jemes, N. Mex., $5; to Oscar L. Horton, of Athol, Mass., $64.50; to Royal Insurance Co., Ltd., of Seattle, Wash., $245.25; to Robert D. Myers, of Indiana, Pa., $37.50; to Pearl Spaulding, of Daytona Beach, Fla., $45; to H. R. Potter, of Austin, Tex., $49.70; to Maria W. Atwood, of Franklin, N. H., $450; to the River Lines, of San Francisco, Calif., $1,000; to Corey Bros., of Charleston, W. Va., $293.62; to the American Automobile Fire Insurance Co., of Detroit, Mich., $42.57; and to Kui T. Ching, of Honolulu, T. H., $482.40. The payment of said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the claimants named above against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of property caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the War Department or of the Army, determined by the Secretary of War to be meritorious which are not payable under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army": *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. W. FREEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1199) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment as if the United States were subject to suit in tort, upon any claim against the United States arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman, late of Dobson, N. C., who was killed January 28, 1938, near Dobson, N. C., when the automobile which he was driving was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck operated by one Paul J. Flynn: *Provided*, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed a total sum of $5,000.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman", approved June 26, 1943, is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS A. HANLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 843) for the relief of Francis A. Hanley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Francis A. Hanley for disability resulting from an injury alleged to have been sustained by him while in the performance of duty during employment in July 1942, as a clerk in the Post Office Department at Albany, N. Y., and to determine said claim upon its merits under the remaining provisions of said act: *Provided*, That claim for benefits shall be filed with such Commission within 90 days from the date of the approval of this act: *And provided further*, That no benefit shall accrue under this act prior to the date of approval thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after "'injury", insert "to his leg when he is."

In line 2, after "have" strike out "been sustained by him while" and insert "fallen over a waste-paper basket with an armful of mail."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SYBIL GEORGETTE TOWNSEND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 850) for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sybil Georgette Townsend, 1605 Ainslie Street, Chicago 40, Ill., the sum of $59, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from Chicago, Ill., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service Pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex., as a result of administrative action: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERCY ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1234) for the relief of Percy Allen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Percy Allen, Bailey Island, Maine, the sum of $2,112.24. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Percy Allen against the United States for damage to his business and property resulting from activities of the United States Army at Bailey Island, from July 1942 through December 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1841) for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ALFRED LEWIS COSSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1960) for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased; to pay the sum of $10,000 to the estate of James M. Cosson, deceased; to pay the sum of $10,000 to the estate of James M. Cosson, Jr., deceased; to pay the sum of

$10,000 to the estate of Winnie Cosson, deceased; and to pay the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. James M. Cosson; to pay the sum of $5,000 to the legal guardian of Thomas Cosson; to pay the sum of $5,000 to the legal guardian of Franklin D. Cosson; to pay the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Pearl Cosson; to pay the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, all of DeFuniak Springs, Fla., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Alfred Lewis Cosson, James M. Cosson, James M. Cosson, Jr., Winnie Cosson, and for personal injuries sustained by Mrs. James M. Cosson, Thomas Cosson, Franklin D. Cosson, Mrs. Pearl Cosson, and I. D. Cosson, as the result of saturation bombs being dropped in the yard and near their home by a United States Army plane operating from the Elgin Field Proving Ground, Fla., on August 11, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures "10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "5,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "5,000."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "3,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "3,000."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the figures "10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "2,500."

Page 1, line 11, strike out the figures "5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "500."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the figures "5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "3,000."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the figures "10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "1,000" and "6,000", respectively.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAY H. McCLEARY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1978) for the relief of Jay H. McCleary.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 765–770), the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Jay H. McCleary for disability due to injuries received while he was traveling on board a railroad passenger train from Minneapolis, Minn., to Washington, D. C., on official business in the service of the United States on January 7, 1940, and to determine said claim upon its merits under the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That said claim shall be filed with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "disability", insert the words "alleged to be."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY GALIPEAU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2290) for the relief of Mary Galipeau.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Galipeau, of Wallace, Idaho, the sum of $10,661.20. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mary Galipeau against the United States on account of the death of her husband who lost his life as a result of being struck by an Army vehicle on September 2, 1943, in Wallace, Idaho.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,661.20" and insert "$5,384.90."

Page 2, line 1, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANNAH AND DORIS HIDDE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2401) for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hannah Hidde, Greendale, Wis., the sum of $201, and to Doris Hidde, Greendale, Wis., the sum of $525.25. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde against the United States for personal injuries, property damage, and expenses, sustained by them as a result of a collision, on January 1, 1941, about 22 miles west of Baton Rouge, La., between the vehicle in which they were riding and a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "201" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "50."

Line 7, strike out the figures "535.25", insert in lieu thereof the figures "436.25."

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONITE WATERPROOF GLUE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2431) for the relief of Monite Waterproof Glue Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

WILLIE HINES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2544) for the relief of Willie Hines.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Willie Hines, of Palatka, Putnam County, Fla., the sum of $2,500 in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, loss of earnings, and other expenses, sustained by Willie Hines when he was struck by a United States Navy International tractor numbered 62758 with trailer numbered 76967 on November 11, 1944, while driving his car on United States Highway No. 17, north of Bostwich, Putnam County, Fla., in an orderly and lawful manner: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,514.48."

Line 7, strike out the word "his" and insert "all."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUBUQUE AND WISCONSIN BRIDGE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2748) for the relief of the Dubuque and Wisconsin Bridge Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Dubuque and Wisconsin Bridge Co., Dubuque, Iowa, the sum of $481.67. The payment of such sum

shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Dubuque and Wisconsin Bridge Co. against the United States for toll charges for the use of their Eagle Point Bridge by a rural mail carrier for the period October 1, 1936, through June 30, 1944. A contract for the payment of such toll charges was canceled by the Post Office Department on September 30, 1936, because of the refusal of the General Accounting Office to grant credit for such payment. This decision was subsequently reversed and a new contract negotiated, effective July 1, 1944, to pay such toll charges: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract of the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTHER L. BERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2826) for the relief of Esther L. Berg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Esther L. Berg, of Portland, Oreg., the sum of $6,624.54, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her on July 29, 1944, at Portland, Oreg., on the premises of the United States Veterans' Hospital, Markham Hill, said city, by reason of the negligence of the officials and employees of said hospital in permitting the steps leading to the entrance of said hospital to be and remain in disrepair and to become covered with mud and water and to be unsafe for use by pedestrians seeking to enter or leave said hospital, as a result of which the claimant, Esther L. Berg, was caused to slip and be thrown violently to the ground thereby inflicting on her serious and painful injuries. That by reason thereof claimant was thrown on her back, striking her head on the edge of the steps and doubling her leg and foot under her body, resulting in an oblique fracture of the lower third of the fibula, bruises and other painful injuries; that claimant by reason thereof had to have said limb placed in a plaster cast, be confined in a hospital for a long period of time and to suffer great pain therefrom; that the claimant has not fully recovered from said injuries and her physicians advise her that it is impossible at this time to determine whether or not she will suffer permanent disability therefrom; that she was compelled to expend for necessary medical and hospital care $824.54; that claimant will have to spend additional sums for said purposes which are estimated to aggregate the sum of $100. At the time the claimant received said injuries she was the wife of a veteran (who has since died) who was a patient in the veterans' hospital, and the claimant was making a call upon him.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "6,624.54", insert in lieu thereof the figures "2,472.54."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the remainder of the bill, beginning with line 8, and insert in lieu thereof ", hospital and medical expenses, as a result of a fall at the United States Veterans' Hospital, Markham Hill, Portland, Oreg., on July 29, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUSTIN P. HOPKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2962) for the relief of Justin P. Hopkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Justin P. Hopkins, Arlington, Va., the sum of $2,999.75. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Justin P. Hopkins against the United States for damages sustained by him as a result of his being struck, on January 16, 1945, near the intersection of Hudson Street and Washington Boulevard, Arlington, Va., by a vehicle in the service of the Post Office Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,999.75" and insert "$1,999.75."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "damages sustained by him" and insert "personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZEPHYR AIRCRAFT CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3094) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp. against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim, together with interest thereon, of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp. against the United States because of damage, injury, and losses suffered by the Lenert Aircraft Corp. by the refusal of officials of the War Department of the United States to make a contract with the Lenert Aircraft Corp., which is now known as the Zephyr Aircraft Corp., after a design competition for the procurement of primary training planes, which was projected by circular proposal 39-635, dated March 11, 1939, and in which competition the Lenert Aircraft Corp. submitted designs. Said refusal being in violation of the provisions of paragraph (t), section 10, of act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 788), based upon procedure set forth in paragraphs (a) 2 (i) of said circular proposal 39-635 in that, the Lenert Aircraft Corp., now the Zephyr Aircraft Corp., was the only bidder that offered a new and modern design in accordance with the provisions of said act.

That the officials of the War Department illegally, arbitrarily, and without any reason or authority, refused and failed to make a survey or evaluate the design submitted by the Lenert Aircraft Corp., now the Zephyr Aircraft Corp., either before or after the submission of competitive design; and illegally and without authority entered into a contract for the purchase of airplanes that had been in production for a number of years, instead of a new and modern design.

SEC. 2. The judgment under this act will cover all losses, damages, and injuries to the Lenert Aircraft Corp., including prospective profits.

SEC. 3. Suit upon this claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the passage of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, the form and content of protest, and supporting papers thereof. Proceedings upon the determination of such claim and appeals from the payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the words "claim", strike out "together with interest thereon."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDIE S. LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3135) for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,744.25, to Mrs. Addie S. Lewis, of Everett, Mass., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, Chauncey D. Lewis, and for expenses incurred in connection therewith, as a result of injuries sustained by him when the automobile which he was driving was struck by a United States Army truck, operated by Pvt. Leslie Stewart, attached to the Second Service Command, 546 West Fifty-eighth Street, New York City, on the highway known as the Pulaski Highway in Jersey City, N. J., on May 5, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL OF THE ARMY GEORGE C. MARSHALL

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 243) tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall, and the members of the Army of the United States who have fought under his direction during the wars; and providing that the President of the United States shall cause a medal to be struck to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States of America.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

JOHN NISSELSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 936) for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John Nisselson of 455 Crescent Street, Brooklyn, clerk in charge of contract station No. 44 of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) post office, New York, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $166.86. Such sum represents the amount of money-order funds lost by theft on November 27, 1942. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of said John Nisselson in the sum of $166.86 and the surety on the bond of said John Nisselson is released from any liability on account of such theft.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSIT INVESTMENT CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1266) for the relief of the Transit Investment Corp.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MATTIE LEE BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1316) for the relief of the legal guardian of Mattie Lee Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Mattie Lee Brown, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for death to said Mattie Lee Brown, who died on August 27, 1942, as the result of an Army airplane, piloted by a commissioned officer on an authorized routine training flight, crashing into dwelling house on August 27, 1942, said dwelling house being located in Mulberry, Fla., and occupied by Matthew Brown and his wife, Charity Brown, and their 16-year-old daughter, Mattie Lee Brown, the deceased: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,185."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,185" and insert "$3,185."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O. M. MINATREE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1358) for the relief of O. M. Minatree.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,639.95, to O. M. Minatree, for property damage, personal injuries, and other loss sustained when a vehicle in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army truck on Highway No. 87 approximately 1½ miles south of De Costa, Victoria County, Tex., on November 6, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,639.95" and insert "$1,104.95."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD B. ALDEN AND WALTER E. STROHM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1489) for the relief of Harold B. Alden and Walter E. Strohm.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money available for the payment of salaries to employees at the United States Military Academy the sum of $350 to Mr. Harold B. Alden and the sum of $500 to Mr. Walter E. Strohm, employees of the United States Military Academy, in lieu of such additional compensation as they would have received prior to December 1, 1942, under the provisions of Public Law 873, an act establishing overtime rates of compensation for employees of the field services of the War Department, and for other purposes, if such persons had been designated as of January 17, 1942, by the Secretary of War to receive such additional compensation for overtime work. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Harold B. Alden and Walter E. Strohm for compensation for overtime services for the above-mentioned period: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "of", strike out the balance of line 3, lines 4 and 5, down to and including the word "Academy" and insert "the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTOPHER DANCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1613) for the relief of Christopher Dance.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Christopher Dance, of Westfield, N. J., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Christopher Dance against the United States for loss of his car when it was struck by an Army jeep on April 1, 1943, at Spruce Street, corner of Ninth Street, Roselle, Union County, N. J.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. F. SMOTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1835) for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of W. F. Smothers, the sum of $9,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death and destruction of personal property of the said W. F. Smothers, who was fatally injured, and whose property was destroyed by fire, when a United States Army P-38 plane fell on the house in

which he was living and domiciled, on the 5th day of June 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$9,500" and insert "$5,624."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EAGLE PACKET CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1976) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Eagle Packet Co., a corporation, of St. Louis, Mo., against the United States, for damages for injury to the steamboat *Golden Eagle* and its cargo, on June 14, 1941, when such steamboat struck submerged and unmarked pilings or hurdles in the Mississippi River at Barnett hurdle, mile 113, in said Mississippi River, and beached.

SEC. 2. Such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESLEY J. STEWART

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2029) for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wesley J. Stewart the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injury to said Wesley J. Stewart on April 15, 1943, as a result of an automobile accident caused by an Army vehicle at Avon Park, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,652.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RASTUS L. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2054) for the relief of Rastus L. Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100, to Rastus L. Davis, of Winona, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of 300 watermelons as a result of soldiers from Camp Fannin, Tex., entering and taking away said watermelons on or about the 17th day of July 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVE TOPPER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2062) for the relief of Dave Topper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

HARRY GOLDSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2102) for the relief of Harry Goldstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry Goldstein, Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $35,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Harry Goldstein against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him as a result of his being struck on January 26, 1943, on the sidewalk at the corner of Fifth Avenue and Thirtieth Street, in New York City, N. Y., by a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the sign "$", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "11,000, and to pay the sum of $1,930 to Joseph Mallardi, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by them as a result of being struck by an Army vehicle on the sidewalk at the corner of First Avenue and Thirtieth Street, New York City, N. Y., on January 26, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER as an amendment to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 2, strike out "$11,000" and insert "$5,981."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi."

JOHN W. MAGEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2154) for the relief of John W. Magee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. John W. Magee, of Richmond Hill, N. Y., the sum of $856, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Navy truck at Queens County, N. Y., on October 7, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "856" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "506"; and insert "; to pay Mrs. Florence V. Magee the sum of $776."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "damage", strike out the bill through the figures "1943", in line 10, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof: "and medical expenses sustained as the result of a collision between the car in which they were riding and a United States Navy vehicle, in Queens County, N. Y., on October 7, 1943."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee."

BUNGE CORP., ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2187) for the relief of the Bunge Corp., the Corporacion Argentina de Productos de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal & Ore Corp.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CLIFFORD E. CRAIG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2189) for the relief of Clifford E. Craig.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clifford E. Craig, of Bakersfield, Calif., the sum of $1,732.59. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of any existing claim of the said Clifford E. Craig against the United States on account of personal injuries suffered by him, and damage to and loss of use of his automobile, as a result of his automobile having been struck by an Army vehicle in the city of Bakersfield, Calif., on April 5, 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the sign "$" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert "326.50 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as the result of his automobile having been struck by a United States Army vehicle in Bakersfield, Calif., on April 5, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEO E. BAKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2191) for the relief of Cleo E. Baker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cleo E. Baker, North Hollywood, Calif., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Cleo E. Baker against the United States on account of the death of his wife, Margaret Mary Baker, as a result of a United States Army airplane crashing into their home at 4443 Strohm Avenue, North Hollywood, Calif., on June 6, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHERINE BODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Catherine Bode.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Catherine Bode, New Orleans, La., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Catherine Bode against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her on June 6, 1944, when the car which she was driving was struck by a United States Coast Guard truck on the intersection of Magazine and State Streets, New Orleans, La.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Louisiana", insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JOHN R. BLACKMORE AND LOUISE D. BLACKMORE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2300) for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,000 to the estate of John R. Blackmore; to pay the sum of $6,000 to Mrs. Louise D. Blackmore, of Buffalo, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said John R. Blackmore and for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses of Mrs. Louise D. Blackmore, as the result of being hit by an Army truck at Hamlet, N. C., on November 9, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERMARLE HOSPITAL ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2333) for the relief of Albermarle Hospital; Dr. Z. D. Owens; Dr. W. W. Johnston; Evans Funeral Home; Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton; Duke Hospital; and Ephriam Daniels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $865 to the Albermarle Hospital; to pay the sum of $350 to Dr. Z. D. Owens; to pay the sum of $10 to Dr. W. W. Johnston; to pay the sum of $20 to Evans Funeral Home; to pay the sum of $185 to Duke Hospital; to pay the sum of $1,965 to Esther Pendleton; to pay the sum of $7,500 to the legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton; and to pay the sum of $5,000 to Ephraim Daniels, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injury to Lloyd Pendleton, medical, hospital, nursing, and for the death of John W. Daniels, son of Ephraim Daniels, as a result of a United States Navy airplane crashing near Manteo, N. C., on September 6, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$20" and insert "$40."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$185" and insert "$164.02."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$6,500."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNARAE WEISS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2746) for the relief of Annarae Weiss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money

in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Annarae Weiss, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the sum of $750, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damages sustained by her on April 7, 1943, at Pittsburgh, Pa., when the automobile which she was occupying was struck by a United States Army vehicle being operated by a member of the armed forces: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$750" and insert "$500."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "damages" insert "and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BESSIE M. CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2762) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell, of 58 Mount Pleasant Ave., Roxbury, Mass., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on acccount of an injury sustained by Mrs. Campbell on May 25, 1940, when an Army truck collided with the automobile in which Mrs. Campbell was a passenger, at Washington Street and Roosmore Road, West Roxbury, Mass.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out all after the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$3,676.85; to pay Charles J. Campbell the sum of $212, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, and hospital expenses incurred in connection with his between the car in which they were riding and a United States Army truck in West Roxbury, Mass., on May 25, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER as an amendment to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 2, strike out "$3,676.25" and insert "$2,676.85."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF HARPER THEODORE DUKE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2886) for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rebecca Thomas, of Nashville, Tenn., duly qualified and acting administratrix of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr., the sum of $15,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr., September 21, 1944, when he was struck by a bomber of the United States Army north of Berry Field in Nashville, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated" strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 6 to 10, and on page 2, lines 1 and 2, and insert the following: "the sum of $4,513 to the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr., of Nashville, Tenn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, for the death of said Harper Theodore Duke, Jr., and for the expenses incurred in connection wtih his burial, resulting from the said Harper Theodore Duke, Jr., being killed in the crash of an Army airplane at the Municipal Airport at Nashville, Tenn., on September 21, 1944: *Provided*."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LIONEL COMEAUX AND NEW ORLEANS PUBLIC SERVICE, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3224) for the relief of Mrs. Lionel Comeaux and New Orleans Public Service, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $8,089.78, to Mrs. Lionel Comeaux, of New Orleans, La., and to pay the sum of $1,570.97 to the New Orleans Public Service, Inc., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings to the said Mrs. Lionel Comeaux and damage to streetcar owned by the said New Orleans Public Service, Inc., and medical expenses paid by said company for Mrs. Lionel Comeaux as the result of being struck by a United States Navy bus at the intersection of Dauphine and Frenchmen Streets, New Orleans, La., on May 4, 1944.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$8,809.78" and insert "$2,089.78."

Page 2, line 6, after "1944", insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. M. STRAUSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3303) for the relief of A. M. Strauss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of A. M. Strauss, Fort Wayne, Ind., on account of increased costs incurred by the said individual in the performance of his contract, No. WA-1460, dated February 26, 1942, with the Federal Public Housing Authority, by reason of unavoidable delays on the part of other contractors and the Government in the construction and completion of a defense-housing project at or near Burns City, Ind., and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the amount of, not to exceed $9,279.88. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $9,279.88, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the said claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF THOMAS McGARROLL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Katherine F. McGarroll, as administratrix of the estate of Thomas McGarroll, deceased, late of Jamaica Plain, Mass., the sum of $11,122.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death, on October 23, 1944, of the said Thomas McGarroll from injuries sustained by him when he was struck, on October 20, 1944, on L Street, South Boston, Mass., near the Boston Edison Co., by a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person

violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Katherine F. McGarroll, as administratrix of."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$11,122.50" and insert "$5,926.50."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUGO EFFINGER IN BEHALF OF HIS MINOR SON, WILLIAM L. EFFINGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3496) for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hugo Effinger, of Versailles, Ind., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Hugo Effinger against the United States on account of injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained by his minor son, William L. Effinger, on July 5, 1944, when a United States Navy station wagon from the Crane, Ind., naval ammunition depot, operated by a civilian employee, ran over the child.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,425.75."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "child", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASTER SGT. GERHARD NEUMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3441) to provide for the naturalization of Master Sgt. Gerhard Neumann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon compliance with all other provisions of section 701 or section 702 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (56 Stat. 182–183; 8 U. S. C. 1001–1002), Master Sgt. Gerhard Neumann, Army of the United States, Army serial No. 10500000, may be naturalized pursuant to either of said sections as may be applicable, notwithstanding the fact that at the time of his enlistment or induction into the armed forces of the United States, he had not been lawfully admitted to the United States and was not a resident thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALVADA HIRST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2957) for the relief of Alvada Hirst.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence, and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 875), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136), which exclude from admission into the United States persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony, or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude shall not hereafter be held to apply to Alvada Hirst, wife of an American citizen. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to Alvada Hirst under this act upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "citizen", insert "insofar as the offenses of which she was convicted in Canada in 1923 are concerned."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEVING CERTAIN CLAIMANTS OF FLOOD LOSSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri having made a finding by authority of the provisions of Private Law No. 256 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 11, 1939, that certain dikes constructed in the Missouri River by the War Department (which dikes were thereafter removed) caused the flooding of certain farm lands at or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, in the month of March 1934, with resultant damage to certain claimants' property, and the court having further found and determined the amount of loss suffered by each of said claimants, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following-named persons or their heirs, representatives, administrators, executors, successors, or assigns, the following amounts: Julius P. Kuhnert, $1,538.75; G. M. McCrary, $240; Paul N. Shouse, $2,775; Mrs. C. E. Johnson, $4,235.46; Mrs. A. H. Wilbert, $797.90; G. E. Hutson, $2,127; James D. Kelly, $8,806; W. H. Myers, $693.22; Frank Dougherty, $956.75; H. A. Whitnah, $858.20; N. D. Gasaway, $134.75; Paul Johnson, $206.08; John H. Chapin, $250; L. K. Poos, $692.77; H. F. Chapin, $785.50; Goldie Noland, who is the same person as Goldie P. Noland, $783.17; B. F. Kabel, $497; S. O. Daniels, $2,395; W. D. Shreve, $667.50; Elmer Willis, $1,011.90; Ethel McDuff, $1,426; and Emma Schults, $981.55.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL JACOBS AND BERTHA JACOBS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1911) for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel Jacobs, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $1,000 and to Bertha Jacobs, his wife, the sum of $4,000, for pain and suffering incurred by them as a result of being struck by a vehicle operated by the United States Army, at the intersection of North Avenue and Mount Royal Terrace, Baltimore, Md., on December 6, 1941, at 12:05 a. m.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$600."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$4,000" and insert "$600."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH E. BENNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ROLLA DUNCAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3225) for the relief of Rolla Duncan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rolla Duncan, Helena, Mont., the sum of $50.74. Such sum represents expenses incurred by the undersheriff of Daniels County, Mont., in transporting in July 1938, a prisoner from Scobey, Mont., to Great Falls, Mont., at the request of the said Rolla Duncan who was at that time United States marshal for the district of Montana. Such expense item was disallowed by the Comptroller General in the account of the said Rolla Duncan for the quarter ended September 30, 1938, and the amount thereof paid to the United States by the Aetna Casualty Surety Co., of Hartford, Conn., as surety on the bond of the said Rolla Duncan. The said Rolla Duncan subsequently reimbursed

such bonding company in the amount of $50.74.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "off", strike out the balance of the page; and on page 2, strike out down to and including the figures "$50.74" and insert "$36.34, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred by an undersheriff of Daniels County, Mont., in transporting a prisoner from Scobey, Mont., to Great Falls, Mont., in July 1933: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUIETING TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 504) to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that certain tract of land known as that located but unconfirmed private land claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13 in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749 (see: American State Papers, Gales and Seaton edition, vol. III, p. 465 and the following) and being the whole of section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., as shown on the official plat of said township, approved by R. W. Boyd, surveyor general, Louisiana, July 29, 1852, shall be, and the same is hereby, directed to be granted, released, and relinquished by the United States in fee simple to the owners of the equitable title thereto, and to their heirs and assigns forever, as fully and completely in every respect whatever, as could be done by patent issued therefor according to law.

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall in any manner abridge, divest, impair, injure, or prejudice any valid right, title, or interest of any person or persons in or to any portion or part of the lands mentioned in said first section, the true intent of this act being to relinquish and abandon, grant, give, and concede any and all right, interest, and estate, in law or equity, which the United States is or is supposed to be entitled to in said lands in favor of all persons, estates, firms, or corporations who would be the true and lawful owners of the same under the laws of Louisiana, including the laws of prescription, in the absence of the said interest and estate of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Department of the Interior shall cause a patent to issue for said land and such patent shall issue in the name of the original claimant, as aforesaid, and when issued, shall be held to be for the use and benefit of the true and lawful owners as provided in sections 1 and 2 of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Carl Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl Lewis, of Harkers Island, N. C., the sum of $2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States of America, for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses incident thereto, sustained as a result of his having been wounded by the discharge of a firearm in the hands of a soldier of the Army of the United States at Harkers Island, N. C., on or about August 10, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. W. WOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1481) for the relief of R. W. Wood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. W. Wood, of 1811 D Street NE., Washington, D. C., the sum of $888.90, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for salary not paid while under suspension at Army air base, Key Field, Miss., from October 23, 1943, to January 31, 1944, inclusive, while serving as associate civil engineer and superintendent of construction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$888.90" and insert "$382.41."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "October 23, 1943, to January 31, 1944" and insert "January 21, 1944, to February 27, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CLARA M. FORTNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2267) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise approved, the sum of $8,500 to Harriet Townsend Bottomley, in full and final settlement for damages to her home grounds and property at Old Brookville (Glen Head Post Office), Nassau County, N. Y., growing out of the crash of a naval airplane on May 28, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "settlement", insert "of all claims against the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EUGENIE U. BOLSTAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2430) for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time limitations prescribed in sections 10 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 760, 761, 765, 767, and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad, Denver, Colo., widow of Salmar P. Bolstad, whose death on April 24, 1942, resulted from disease contracted during the winter months of 1926 and 1927 while in the performance of his duty as an assistant veterinarian of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, at a meat-packing plant in Milwaukee, Wis. The claim of the said Eugenie U. Bolstad is authorized to be considered and acted upon by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission under the remaining provisions of law applicable in her case, as if death of the said Salmar P. Bolstad had resulted within the time pre-

scribed by sections 10 and 11 of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, and as if notice of such disease and claim for compensation had been filed within the time prescribed by sections 15, 17, and 20 of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, but only if she files her claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. If the United States Employees' Compensation Commission should determine pursuant to section 1 of this act that the said Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad is entitled to compensation for the death of her husand, she shall be entitled to receive within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act, in addition to compensation payable after the date of the award to her of death compensation, in a lump sum (1) an amount equal to the disability compensation which her husband would have received if he had filed claim for such compensation promptly for total and permanent disability beginning on July 22, 1941, the date of his entry into the United States Army hospital at Denver, Colo., for such disability; and (2) back compensation for the period beginning with the death of her husband and ending on the date of the award to her of death compensation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, after "Colorado", insert "the alleged."

Page 2, line 1, after "1942", insert "is alleged to have."

Page 2, line 17, after "act", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That any compensation benefits which the Commission may award shall commence not earlier than the date of the approval of this act."

Line 21, strike out all of section 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MICHAEL J. McDONOUGH, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2483) for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal representative of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, late of Boston, Mass., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Michael J. McDonough as a result of his being struck, on November 19, 1944, near the intersection of Eighth and L Streets, South Boston, Mass., by a vehicle in the service of Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. S. P. BURTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. S. P. Burton, Baton Rouge, La., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. S. P. Burton against the United States for personal injuries and property damage (excluding certain medical expenses and clothing damage for which she has been reimbursed in the amount of $252.93) sustained as the result of a collision, on September 17, 1943, on Airline Highway No. 61 near Reserve, La., between the car in which she was riding and a truck and semivan in the service in the United States Army.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

At the end of the bill add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. F. FITZPATRICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2510) for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. F. Fitzpatrick, Del Rio, Tex., the sum of $537.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said A. F. Fitzpatrick against the United States on account of damage to his pick-up truck which was struck on March 17, 1943, at the intersection of Gibbs Street and Avenue F in the city of Del Rio, Tex., by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. FRED BAKER AND CRYSTAL R. STRIBLING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3018) for the relief of R. Fred Baker and Crystal R. Stribling.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. Fred Baker and Crystal R. Stribling, Columbia, S. C., the sum of $1,650.50; $350 for the repair of automobile owned and operated by R. Fred Baker and $1,300.50 incurred by Miss Crystal Stribling for hospital bills and loss of salary for 3 months while hospitalized. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of a collision with an Army car from Fort Jackson at the intersection of Laurel and Harden Streets in the city of Columbia, S. C., on January 1, 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "Baker", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "the sum of $350 and to pay Crystal R. Stribling the sum of $1,300.50, both of Columbia, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings as the result of a collision with an Army truck at the intersection of Laurel and Harden Streets, Columbia, S. C., on January, 1, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINCK CIGAR CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3073) for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Finck Cigar Co., San Antonio, Tex., the sum of $6,628.72. Such sum represents an overcharge of customs duties on 400 bales of Havana tobacco imported on January 14, 1944, by the said Finck Cigar Co. The overcharge resulted solely from an error on the part of the customs agent at the port of entry, and the Commissioner of Customs ruled that such error could not be corrected by the Government and the entry reliquidated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection

with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "$6,628.72", strike out the period and the remainder of page 1 and lines 1 and 2 on page 2, and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States representing overcharge of customs duties on 400 bales of Havana tobacco imported on January 14, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIC FISCHER AND ELSE FISCHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3273) for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Else Fischer, of 3721 Newland Avenue, Chicago, Ill., the sum of $1,000, and to Eric Fischer, of the same address, the sum of $265, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage as a result of being struck by a vehicle of the United States Navy, on July 11, 1944, at the intersection of Waukegan and Golf Roads, Morton Grove, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$405.05."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES W. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2306) for the relief of Charles W. Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to Charles W. Anderson, of San Antonio, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered by him when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by an Army ambulance in San Antonio, Tex., on May 5, 1944.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$1,000."

Line 6, after "Texas" insert a semicolon and the following: "to pay Roy Jefferds, San Antonio, Tex., the sum of $500; to pay Gus Klockenkemper, of San Antonio, Tex., the sum of $3,115.08."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "he was" and insert "they were."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSCAR R. STEINERT

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I wish to renew the request made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] earlier in the day and ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next, and when it adjourns on Thursday it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, earlier in the day that same request was made, to which an objection was interposed.

Mr. COX. That has been taken care of.

Mr. GEARHART. In view of the circumstance, therefore, I obtained permission to address the House tomorrow under a special order. Inasmuch as I shall miss the opportunity to address the House if the gentleman's request is granted, I will have to object.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman from California would ask to have his special order transferred to Thursday, it would accommodate the needs of a large percentage of the membership.

Mr. GEARHART. Would it be a great accommodation to the majority?

Mr. COX. I am informed it would be quite an accommodation to a large percentage of the membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for tomorrow be transferred to Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein his remarks on the report of Edna H. Puttkammer, acting supervisor of the Farm Security Administration of Richland County, Wis.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TRUE AMERICANISM AGAINST ROOSEVELT'S NEW DEAL SOCIALISM

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the heart and soul of the Republican Party is located in the Midwest. That statement is the premise upon which my thesis rests. If one does not agree with that statement he will disagree with my thesis. If one accepts that statement he should agree with my arguments and with my conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln was the founder of the Republican Party. He was also the greatest exponent and exemplar of the fundamental principles of the Republican Party. To a very great extent the Republican Party is the elongated shadow of Lincoln and his political philosophy. It has been vulnerable only when it departed from the fundamental principles laid down by Lincoln. If the Republican Party is ever to become dominant again in the affairs of this Nation, it must be baptized anew; it must rededicate itself to the great unfinished task of establishing Lincoln republicanism as our basic national policy, a policy that Uncle Sam must follow if he is to forge ahead in the future as he has in the past.

Accepting the foregoing preliminary statements as self-evident truths, then it seems to me the opening gun of the 1948 Republican Presidential campaign should be fired by a Midwest Republican, one steeped from his youth in the republicanism of Lincoln, and one coming from Illinois, the State of Lincoln. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to offer suggestions and recommendations on the 1948 Presidential campaign, to my colleagues in the House, and to all thoughtful citizens of the Nation regardless of party affiliation.

Mr. Speaker, my first suggestion is that we present to the voters of this Nation a clear-cut issue, one that will divide the voters into two camps, not necessarily along party lines, but rather a division between those voters who approve our American form of government, our American standard of living, our American way of life, and those voters who desire some form of centralized control—call it what you will, socialism, new dealism, communism, or any other form of totalitarianism. It is about time we separated the sheep from the goats. It is about time we gave our American voters an opportunity to choose between true Americanism and Roosevelt's New Deal socialism, between private initiative and Government control, between local control and centralized bureaucratic control. I suggested such a line-up or division in June 1943. At that time I proposed that Roosevelt and Willkie should team up as representing New Deal socialism, and Bricker and Byrd should team up as representing a true American program. My proposal was not taken seriously; it was tossed in the wastebasket by the leaders of both old-line parties, and the American voter was offered a choice between the ill-matched hybrid team of Roosevelt and Truman, and the equally ill-matched hybrid team of Dewey and Bricker.

Mr. Speaker, I have the persistent stubbornness to again suggest that we make the next Presidential campaign a clear-cut battle, with Lincoln Republicans and Jeffersonian Democrats on the one side—for, after all, there is no essential difference between them today—and New Dealers, Socialists, Communists, professional "do-gooders," and professional "give-awayers" on the other side. The American voter is entitled to the opportunity to decide by his ballot, once and for all, whether this Nation is to continue American, in its form of government, in its economy, in its way of life, yes, and in its standard of living, or change over to a totalitarian dictatorship. That is the issue we must present to the voters in the next Presidential campaign, and we should select our Presidential teams with that issue clearly in mind. We do not want ill-assorted hybrid teams selected for the campaign of 1948.

Not once in the last four Presidential campaigns have we had a clear-cut issue. In 1932 the voters expressed their dissatisfaction over conditions by voting against Hoover, not for Roosevelt; although Roosevelt at that time denounced deficit spending, demanded a 25 percent reduction in the cost of government, and insisted upon a balanced Federal Budget. In 1936, in 1940, and again in 1944, neither Landon, Willkie, nor Dewey challenged Roosevelt's New Deal socialism, but each said to the voters, in substance: "I accept Roosevelt's New Deal socialism, but I will do a better job of carrying it forward if you will elect me as President." This "me-too" attitude on the part of the Republican candidates disgusted many real Republicans, and Roosevelt was reelected three times in a row because the opposition to Roosevelt's New Deal socialism had no real leadership. This is the record. We must not repeat it.

THE REAL ISSUE

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States is the repository of the aims, the hopes, the ideals and the aspirations of the American people, even as it is the guide to our rights and our duties as citizens. Its preamble states:

> We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Never has so much been said for so many in so few words. The Constitution vitalizes the division of our Government into the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches, and institutes an intricate system of checks and balances between those branches. It provides for protecting the States against any possible encroachments of the Federal Government. It names, defines, and insures our individual liberties. It makes allowance for changing conditions in changing times through the process of amendment. One hundred and fifty-two years before Roosevelt and Churchill met on the high seas to promulgate the "four freedoms" in the so-called Atlantic Charter, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and the right of petition had been placed in our Constitution in the form now known as the Bill of Rights. Two of Roosevelt's "four freedoms," freedom of the press and freedom of religion, were lifted bodily from our Constitution, and, the other two, freedom from fear and freedom from want, were lifted bodily from the Bible. Roosevelt's "four freedoms" were not new. They had been with us from the very beginning.

However, Mr. Speaker, we must realize today that great as our Constitution has been, and great as it is, the Constitution is only the basis for our American way of life. It is not the American way of life itself. The American way of life is the Constitution as that document is lived. Its governing precept is: "The State is the servant of the people; the people are not the servants of the State"—a basic American truism that Roosevelt's New Dealers overlook entirely.

The State does not, it must not, invade the sanctity of the American home. Americans can buy their own homes or they can rent from others. Americans can buy their daily food from the stores of their choice. Americans can travel to the farthermost parts of our country by air, by rail, by automobile, or by water routes. No one is empowered to dictate which church Americans are to attend. American children are entitled to go to free public schools, supported by taxation. It is their privilege to receive an education unsullied by ideologies foreign to American standards. Private enterprise and the right to work in a job of one's own choosing are also pillars of our self-determined way of life. How different is the circumscribed state-ridden existence of men, women—yes, even children—under the centralized governments of Europe. Is that what we want here?

Mr. Speaker, there is one paramount issue we must face and face now. Since the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt for his first term and up to the present, we have been traveling to the left—and traveling fast. It is generally admitted now that President Truman and Bob Hannegan, the Postmaster General, are playing politics as intensively as ever Franklin D. Roosevelt played politics. The American people must face the fact that under the present administration we are going to continue to travel to the left; we are going to have our economy broken down by strikes and industrial disorders—fomented by radical labor leaders—which have nothing whatsoever to do with wages or working conditions; we are going to have the Communists continue working to overthrow our American system of government, economy, and society, by ballots if possible—by bullets if necessary. The American people must make their choice as to whether we shall retain the system of government, economy, and society, set up by the founding fathers, or whether we shall let those who would steal our liberties from us, get away with their plans. Our situation today can best be described in the words of John Stuart Mill:

> A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if, by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of even a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions—in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it.

So we are face to face with the greatest choice that has confronted the American people since our forefathers had to decide whether to risk their lives and their fortunes in the Revolutionary War. All other issues turn on this one great issue, Shall America remain American, or shall we adopt Roosevelt's New Deal socialism as the basic national policy of the America of tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker, in order to personalize and emphasize the campaign issue, True Americanism Versus Roosevelt's New Deal Socialism, I propose to offer definite suggestions as to the type of candidates we should select for President and Vice President, and also the type of Cabinet members that should be appointed to carry out a program to establish fundamental Republican principles as our basic national policy. In naming candidates for President and Vice President, and also in naming Cabinet officers, I want it clearly understood that I am naming them not as individuals, but as types, representing the kind and quality of men we need to lead us out of the economic and financial morass into which Roosevelt's New Deal socialism has plunged the Nation.

SUGGESTED CANDIDATES AND CABINET OFFICERS

For President, ROBERT TAFT, Ohio.

For Vice President, Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts.

FOR CABINET OFFICERS

Secretary of State, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, Michigan.

Secretary of Treasury, Jesse Jones, Texas.

Secretary of War, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Secretary of Navy, Congressman JAMES WADSWORTH, New York.

Attorney General, Gov. Earl Warren, California.

Postmaster General, John Hamilton, Pennsylvania.

Secretary of the Interior, Alfred Landon, Kansas.

Secretary of Agriculture, Congressman AUGUST ANDRESEN, Minnesota.

Secretary of Commerce, Eric Johnston, Washington.

Secretary of Labor, Congressman EVERETT DIRKSEN, Illinois.

This all-American team, made up as it is of seasoned all-American players, would give this Nation the kind of teamwork necessary to pull us out of the economic and financial morass we are in; and then, in the slang of the football field, we would be able to go places.

Mr. Speaker, I desire now to restate and reemphasize my remarks. I believe the best way to do this is to quote the words of an editorial taken from the September 22, 1945, issue of Abraham Lincoln's home-town paper, the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill. I do this because it was this editorial that impelled me to make this speech, and also because the editorial expresses very effectively the same thoughts I had tried to put across:

A REPUBLICAN CHALLENGE

News dispatches convey that Republicans of Congress have begun to contemplate a 1946 program, political and otherwise. Democratic National Chairman Hannegan scoffs at such preliminaries with the quip that the 1946 campaign will be a battle against reaction. He charges the Republicans with "a desire to revert to conservatism" and "the disastrous postwar economy of the twenties."

In other words, the Republican Party, in Hannegan's asserted opinion, is the party of reaction, while his own, the New Deal or Democratic, whichever it is, is the party of progress and soundness. * * *

The so-called Democratic Party of today is not the traditional Jeffersonian organization that once demanded States' rights and economical local self-government. It is the party of concentered rule, of bureaucratic totalitarianism, of government by directive instead of law, of extravagance, waste, profligacy, and terrific national debt, of apology for things American.

Is it reaction to demand that needless spending be stopped?

Is it reaction to demand the full truth of Pearl Harbor?

Is it reaction to sound a country-wide alarm over a debt that shortly will represent a full, cash value Federal mortgage upon every jot and tittle of property, public and private, that America and Americans own?

Is it reaction for American taxpayers to be enlightened as to how their tax dollars have been, and are being, spent?

Is it reaction to espouse an international policy of world friendship, trade, and interchange, without cutting loose from America's last dollar in appeasement and bribe?

Is it reaction to be proud of this Republic, interested first in its welfare, concerned with the perpetuity of her free institutions?

Is it reaction to want to retire the country's debt, starting now on a long-term retirement plan that will permit of drastically lower taxes and the retention of a free system? * * *

Analytical observers have been studying the Republican opportunity and challenge of the future. Many of them agree that the job ahead far transcends mere partisanship. It has become, finally, an American job; one that demands American-minded devotion, as well as astute guidance and common sense.

Republicans need a sound, militant leadership in Congress and nationally that will meet the present crisis of this Republic and talk fearlessly in terms that Americans had been used to, until the New Deal started to talk down everything theretofore sacred. The party hasn't had this kind of leadership in a good many years.

The opportunity not only is here, it is crying for consummation. Rightly motivated, observers believe, the party could sweep this Nation, in both 1946 and 1948 and for many years thereafter.

But to do so, it has got to prove itself fearlessly pro-American and a defender of republican government. Ours is an oasis of freedom. Unless Republicans meet the challenge literally thrust at them, that oasis will become a mirage.

Mr. Speaker, we must meet this challenge. We must insist upon a clear-cut issue in the 1948 campaign. We must rally all American-minded citizens to the support and preservation of this "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." We cannot, we must not, we dare not fail.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have not had time to think over all the gentleman's candidates, but I should like to have it appear in the RECORD that his selection for Secretary of Agriculture is surely very meritorious. I have served with that gentleman, the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, for 8 years. I do not believe there is a man in America that understands agricultural legislation better and has the knowledge and the heart to do what is good for American agriculture any more than our colleague the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, from the great State of Minnesota. I regret he is not present today to hear your splendid and appropriate endorsement.

Mr. MASON. Again I want to assert very emphatically that the names I named were types of the kind of men we must have at the head of our Government if we are going to be pulled out of this financial and economic mess we are in.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Has the slate of candidates been approved by Pew of Pennsylvania?

Mr. MASON. The slate of candidates has not been approved by anyone because it is not a slate of candidates; it represents the type of candidates I think should be selected. I am not consulting anyone about the type that I want selected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Has the gentleman cleared any of these candidates through Sidney?

Mr. MASON. I have cleared them with no one, not even with the candidates themselves, if you want to call them candidates.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. We have quite a number of men in public office today that were cleared with Sidney, have we not?

Mr. MASON. I am not here to discuss that, I am here to try to get across to the Republicans and Democrats alike that we have reached the place in this country where all American-minded people had better join up to combat these various combinations of isms that at present have an unholy influence in the affairs of this Nation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One of the ways in which we can combat that, would the gentleman say, is by publicity, by remarks on the floor and through the press?

Mr. MASON. I would not say that that would be a very effective way because the remarks made on the floor are quite often misrepresented when they appear in print and the wrong objectives are ascribed to those remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know that the gentleman is speaking on it and calling it to our attention today. I hope he gets some publicity throughout the country on it. My point was that I thought by calling attention to these things here it would perhaps aid in getting rid of some of them.

Mr. MASON. If it receives the right kind of publicity with the objectives that I have in mind, not just the names of persons, then perhaps it will do some good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sure it will. I am quite sure the press will get the right construction of it. Going one step further, do you think we aid in combating those tendencies to which you have so eloquently referred by adjourning over as we did a moment ago from today until Thursday and then from Thursday until Monday?

Mr. MASON. I am not concerned particularly about adjourning for 2 or 3 days at a time if we do not have a schedule before us for action in the House and if the committees have not presented to us legislation to be acted upon in that time.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. MASON. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I would like to assure my brethren that I had no ulterior motive in making the unanimous-consent re-

quest that the House when it adjourns today adjourn until Thursday, and that when it adjourns on Thursday it adjourn to meet on Monday. If there are those of us who have been upset in plans that they have made by reason of that request, I regret having made it. If later the House should see fit to revoke the action taken, I would be very much pleased.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MASON. Yes; I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN I have always had the thought that from the well of the House the people's Representatives should give not only to the people of their own districts, but to the country at large, their ideas about these things we think are harmful to the country. If some Members want to go home, that is all right with me. When I want to go home, and I think my reasons are sufficient, I go, but I do not ask that the House refrain from doing any business. I do not ask that the House adjourn over so that no one can obtain the floor and so that no one else may speak. I just go on about my business and I do what is necessary. I do not subscribe to this proposition of having days in between when no one is permitted to be on the floor. I will say right here and now that today, after this unanimous consent was objected to, that is, that we adjourn over to Thursday and then from Thursday to Monday, I assumed that that was the order of the day. Inasmuch as I am like some other Members and once in a while I have to eat, I went to the House restaurant. I will say to the gentleman that from now, if I can do it, there is going to be a roll call every time there is no quorum on the floor, and there is going to be objection to these requests to adjourn over until some disposition is made of this legislation.

Mr. MASON. That is the gentleman's privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT OVER VACATED

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I wish to put myself right with my friends. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the House revoke the action taken with respect to the adjournment over until Thursday and from Thursday until Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] may address the House tomorrow for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address made by Admiral Bernard at Corpus Christi on Navy Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it the gentleman's understanding that tomorrow you are going to discuss the full employment bill?

Mr. OUTLAND. It is my understanding we were going to discuss the full employment bill tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But not today.

Mr. OUTLAND. I was going to take up a certain aspect of it today; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OUTLAND. I intend to take up some of it now, but I was going to take it up for more general discussion with the gentleman from Michigan tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, it was my intention this afternoon to discuss the subject of Government spending and the full employment bill, and I shall devote as much time as possible to that. Might I say, however, before taking up that topic that I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman who preceded me when he discussed a Republican slate for 1946 and the Republican platform for 1946.

I would like to comment briefly upon the statement made by the gentleman who preceded me. It seems that for the last four elections the American people have not known their own minds. It seems, according to the gentleman from Illinois, there must have been something wrong because Mr. Roosevelt was elected four times in a row. In the United States, Mr. Speaker, we have open and free elections and the American people have the right to choose whom they please. For four consecutive elections, they chose one of the greatest Americans who ever lived, to fill the high office of President. They chose him by resounding majorities. If the American people choose to do that, that is their privilege. It also shows excellent judgment. If they choose to make another decision in 1948, that is their privilege also. I would like to make this observation, however, that if the slate selected by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is picked, I can imagine nothing more conducive to another Democratic victory in 1948, as well as in 1946. Perhaps the local elections tomorrow will throw some light upon this.

I might say also that if the program proposed by the gentleman, which I think came directly from the works of Adam Smith, should be followed in the 1948 Republican platform, I imagine the Middle West will not only be the center of the Republican Party but the last refuge of the Republican Party.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to my good friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I think it is worth while pointing out also that in 1932, 1936, 1940, and 1944 the combined electoral vote in those four elections of the Republican Party would not have elected a President.

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes. I might say further that, in my judgment, one of the reasons why that was so and why it will continue to be so in 1948 is that the Republican Party has been concerning itself only with the issues of the past. They have been attempting to defame the name of a dead President. They have been attempting to magnify and distort the issues of Pearl Harbor after we have had an investigation by the Army and Navy. If the Republican Party would concern itself with the issues of the day, one of which I intend to speak about in a few moments, I think they might get considerably further in the political campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to address myself to the topic of Government spending and full employment, because one of the important issues of the day is that of the full employment bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for us to do some straight thinking on the relationship between Government spending and full employment.

More has been said on this issue than any other debate over the full employment bill—in the press, in letters to the committee, in hearings, and on the Senate floor. Yet apparently there is probably no area in which so much misunderstanding and confusion still persist.

We should first of all be clear as to the role of Government spending under the bill itself. The popular interpretation has been that this is primarily a spending measure—that the provision for Federal investment and expenditure constitute the heart and soul of the bill.

Now if this is a misinterpretation, it is important that we should recognize it as such. Obviously you and I should know exactly what it is that we are voting upon. And just as obviously, the public must be correctly informed as to the nature of this vital legislation now before the country.

The truth of the matter is, that this is no more a spending bill than it is a taxing bill or a monopoly bill or a foreign trade bill or an aid to business bill. Actually, it is none of these.

What the bill does is to (a) state a policy, and (b) blueprint machinery designed to enable Congress to work out a broad economic program—a consistent and openly arrived at program for achieving that goal.

It has frequently been charged of late that there is nothing new in this legislation—that nothing could be done under it that is not now being done without it. That is why I place the emphasis on the word "policy" and the word "program."

In the first place, there is a great deal that is new and unprecedented revolving around the full employment goal established by the bill.

Never before in this country have we written into law the basic human right to work. Never before have we stated as a national economic objective the existence of job opportunity for all who are able to work and seeking work. And

never before have we pledged the resources of the Nation to the realization of that goal.

As a matter of fact, we have never had an over-all national program. We knew vaguely that we wanted good markets for business and farmers, high wages and jobs for workers, lots of foreign trade, stable price levels, freedom from monopoly, and so forth. But we never before recognized so clearly that the key to all of these—the common denominator, as it were—is to be found in full employment.

The bill clearly states that it is the policy of this country to assure continuing full employment. Then it sets up a national budget as the instrument for defining this goal quantitatively, and for appraising the current situation in terms of the goal. This means that the President and his assistants must collect and submit to Congress the best available statistics on the labor force and its productivity, and on the levels of public and private spending necessary to employ such a labor force. Furthermore, the President and his assistants must make the best possible estimates as to how things are going and how far off we are at any given time from the goal—in either direction.

What this amounts to is taking inventory, keeping our finger on the pulse of the Nation, so that we will always know where we stand and where we are headed. It is true that we have collected most of these statistics in the past. But we have never put them together to see what they add up to. We did not look ahead and we did not plot our course. Consequently, we were always being caught off guard and plunged, unprepared, into devastating periods of boom and bust.

The second feature that is new under the bill is the programming procedure—the provision for integrated over-all planning, the framework for a truly national economic policy.

One part of this procedure is the National Budget. This instrument makes possible a closer working relationship and channel of communication between the President and the Congress. And it provides Congress a mechanism for putting together, on one sheet, as it were, the Nation's economic program in its entirety.

Another part of this machinery for program making is the joint congressional committee. The work of this committee would provide a coordinating framework for the work of Congress, as a whole and in its individual committees. It is in the studies of this committee that the over-all national program would originate and be started on its legislative journey through the separate Houses of Congress to the appropriate committees, back again to the floor of both Houses, and, finally, to conference committee. But the program would not only originate in the joint committee. Under its supervision there would be a continuing check on whether the separate pieces of legislation, as they evolved, fitted together into an integrated national program for full employment.

What I want to stress today is that the bill merely designs the machinery for fashioning a program; it does not describe the material out of which that program would be fashioned. Under the bill we in Congress would be dealing with the same issues as before. And we would have the same tools with which to work.

Put together, the goal and the programming provided by this bill add up to a pledge that the Government will do everything in its power to assure full employment. There has been much discussion as to whether or not this promise amounts to a guaranty—whether or not it is feasible for the Government to assure any given level of activity.

All I can say is that if the Government pledges all of its resources, that is good enough for me. Because that pledge rests upon the resources of the world's wealthiest and most efficient nation, and upon the collective intelligence of 140,000,000 very intelligent people.

More specifically, the guaranty is backed by the manifold powers of the Government—its powers to tax and borrow, to regulate and encourage, to inform and spend.

Spending is only one of these instruments of government, but it is obviously one of the most important. For this reason it is pertinent to recognize that there has been a storm of protest over the reference in the bill to spending. This is a topic that is seldom discussed dispassionately. The word "spending" is almost always linked with some emotional term, such as "compensatory," or "deficit," or "unlimited," or "inflationary," or "competitive," or "wasteful." Hence, I propose to examine each of these in turn.

COMPENSATORY SPENDING?

A favorite way of condemning public spending is to label it "compensatory." This is usually done without the slightest move toward explaining the term. It is simply assumed that the adjective is in itself so radical and insidious, that nothing more need be said.

Actually, a great deal can be said for compensatory spending. When the Nation is faced with a serious deficiency in private demand, it makes good sense to close the gap with public spending—especially if the alternative is mass unemployment.

Nevertheless, I want to state categorically that the full-employment bill is not a compensatory-spending measure. It has a much more positive and constructive orientation. Instead of accepting inadequate private demand as a necessary evil, it proposes to find out what is wrong and to do something about it. Instead of compensating, it proposes to correct.

The National Budget provides a mechanism for throwing the spotlight on the weak spots in our economy. And it proposes a procedure by which Congress can make a concerted attack on basic economic difficulties. In the light of the annual appraisal of where we want to go and where we are actually heading, we in Congress might decide that we ought to overhaul the tax system to promote investment and consumption, or attack monopoly to expand output and lower prices, or encourage new and small enterprise, or undertake measures to stimulate consumer spending, or develop our natural resources more fully—or any other of a long list of possibilities.

We would at all times have the total picture before us, and we would have no excuse for not combating the evil at its source.

I would almost be willing to predict that once the whole problem was thrown open in this way, to informed public scrutiny, the people would not permit us to avoid a frontal attack by mere palliative or compensatory measures. The public would demand that the surgeon's knife replace the hypodermic needle.

DEFICIT SPENDING?

The stigma most commonly attached to the concept of public spending is that of "deficit" spending. You know the story—that if we spend, we must borrow to finance these expenditures—which means a continuous net increase in a public debt that is already overwhelming.

Let me state—and again I state it emphatically—that the full employment bill is designed to prevent deficit financing in this country.

Deficits are caused in the first place by war. And it has often been pointed out that the most basic contribution which we can make toward international cooperation and good will and world prosperity is to achieve and maintain full employment in the world's leading industrial Nation. If we are sincere about striving for peace, we must first put our own house in order.

Deficits are caused in the second place by depression. The record shows that when the economy collapses Federal expenditures for relief and unemployment benefits go way up, and fast. At the same time Federal revenues go way down and fast, as the tax base—or national income—shrinks to a shadow of itself.

The only way we can hope to support our enormous public debt is to undertake constructive measures designed to keep national income at a full employment level. We have the choice between productive expenditures which pay for themselves out of the income which they create, or emergency expenditures to sustain workers in unproductive idleness—unless, of course, we prefer to let the unemployed starve.

We have the choice between full employment and an adequate tax base, or unemployment and growing deficits. Is there any doubt as to our proper choice?

INFLATIONARY SPENDING?

Over and over again in this Nation-wide debate over the bill it has been charged that the measure would inevitably involve us in an inflationary spending spree.

There are two implications here.

First, it is suggested that the President and Congress would invariably overestimate the gap, that they would predict too great a deficiency in private activity, and hence authorize too much spending.

However, the essential point is that we have here a measure designed to increase the accuracy of estimates. For the first time Congress will have before it the total economic picture. Certainly taking all factors into account will make for

better estimates, not for worse. Moreover, there would be a constant checking and double-checking of the figures. The appraisal of the current situation would be made not just annually but continuously throughout the year, so that Congress would always have the latest information at its fingertips. This means that if mistakes were made they could be quickly corrected. If we are equipped with a framework or plan any errors can be absorbed through positive action in another direction, rather than by unemployment as in the past.

The objection, however, usually rests upon the assumption that public spending is inherently inflationary regardless of its amount. People sometimes regard it as simply throwing additional money into the economy—and to them it follows that the consequence must necessarily be rising price levels.

What they forget, of course, is that spending is inflationary only if it is not matched by production. This applies equally to public and private spending. They forget that peacetime expenditures by the Government are designed to create output, to put idle resources to work, to increase the standard of living, to make the Nation more productive. Consider any of the purposes for which we spend public funds—whether for good government, or developing natural resources, or improving transportation and communication facilities, or education or housing or health, or financial and technical assistance to agriculture and business, or to stimulate foreign trade—and you will see what I mean.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the whole inflationary argument against the bill is a beautiful case of somersault thinking—of getting completely turned around in logic. Remember, the kind of spending that is being talked about is anti-deflation spending—public outlays intended to keep the total level of activity from falling off. So what some people really fear, apparently, is too much cure. They are so afraid of overdosing the patient that they prefer to do nothing and let him die without meddling. They have not enough confidence in modern therapy to grasp that it is possible to achieve a middle way between too little and too much; or at any rate they would rather not try.

Actually inflation and deflation, like chills and fever, are both symptoms of the same disease, of basic economic maladjustments. And the full employment bill is an attack on both, on the underlying cause of the trouble. It is an attempt to eliminate fluctuations in both directions, to transform our roller-coaster economy into a steady up-hill climber.

UNLIMITED SPENDING?

Another popular way of damning the full employment bill is to chatter about how it lets us in for unlimited spending. We are told that the people would be signing a blank check, exposing themselves to liabilities far beyond their means, and paving the way for national bankruptcy.

Now, in theory, there are—within the far-reaching bounds of the vast resources of this wealthy Nation—practically no limits to what we could spend if we wanted to. If the people decided to spend the whole of the national income collectively, through Government channels, they could do so.

Practically, however, there are very definite limits to that spending, either with the bill or without it. The first safeguard lies in the power of congressional decision. Under the bill, the decision as to how much the Government should spend will rest with Congress just as it always has. We in Congress have at our disposal a whole range of possibilities for influencing the level of productive activity, and spending is only one of these, albeit a very important one. It is up to us to select that tool or combination of tools best adapted to changing times and conditions. The less we choose to do by nonfiscal regulatory devices or by incentive taxation, the more we shall have to accomplish by direct expenditures if we are to make good on the full employment pledge. But the decisions rest with us, acting for the people. In a democracy there is no law that can force the people to spend more than they want to.

A second and equally important limit lies in the responsiveness of the free enterprise system. The sponsors of the bill have expressed their faith in the buoyancy of that system and its ability to provide the bulk of the jobs. But the opponents of the bill seem to have their misgivings about the capacity of free enterprise. They envision the possibility of astronomical deficiencies in private demand that would have to be compensated for by public spending.

We believe in competition and private ownership and enterprise, and attempt to confine the role of government to that of providing a free and favorable climate in which that system can function.

COMPETITIVE SPENDING?

I come now to the most time-honored straw man of them all, the complaint that public spending will put the Government into direct competition with private enterprise.

It is indeed ironic to hear such a charge in a country where Government has done so much to help private enterprise—by giving financial and technical aid to business, by developing natural resources and opening up new industrial areas, by increasing the productivity of the Nation's workers, and in any number of ways.

Let me put it in the words of Maj. Gen. Philip Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, who recently told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee—part 12 of the hearings on full employment bill, page 1092:

> Properly conceived, and constructed at an appropriate time, public works do not compete with private industry; rather, they tend to supplement and stimulate private industry. Extension of streets and water and sewer lines creates new opportunities for home building. Good highways promote the speedy and cheaper dissemination of agricultural and manufactured products. Much manufacturing requires for its efficient operations an abundant supply of uncontaminated water and adequate sewerage for the disposal of industrial wastes. It is no exaggeration to say that the expansion of production which will be needed to assure a continuing high level of national income and to provide abundant jobs will be contingent upon a like expansion of the social overhead.

The General might have added what he has indicated elsewhere, that slum clearance increases urban real-estate values, that irrigation and reclamation projects increase land values and open up new industrial areas, that power projects lower industrial costs, that health and educational and recreational outlays make our workers the most efficient in the world.

Moreover, he was talking only about public works. But this leaves out such direct aids to production as subsidies, credit assistance through RFC, HOLC, bank-deposit insurance, and so forth, Government underwriting of foreign loans, and technical information and assistance to business.

WASTEFUL SPENDING?

Finally, it is charged that the bill would commit the Nation to wasteful spending, to "made" work, and boondoggling, to another WPA.

Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest mistake of all. Because this is precisely what the sponsors of the bill intended to avoid. They felt that emergency expenditures are a drag on the economy, and that the way to eliminate them is to eliminate emergencies. They were convinced that to be truly productive public expenditures must be carefully planned in advance. They knew that individual projects must be integrated into comprehensive over-all plans for regional and community development through the joint efforts of private enterprise, States and localities, and the Federal Government. And they recognized that in order to make their fullest contribution to employment these various projects must be carefully timed in relation to each other and to the national level of activity. This is one of the primary functions of the National Budget.

What the opponents of the bill are proposing is to wait until the crisis hits us, and then to start spending without plan and without purpose other than to make work for the unemployed. They evidently want another WPA with its substandard wages and taint of charity, its hastily improvised projects, its hampering restrictions on materials and equipment designed to spread the work further—that is, those who do not favor outright doles. The opponents of this bill are asking for emergency spending.

I am not manufacturing this statement. Many of these gentlemen have gone on record to the effect that business cycles are inevitable, and that the obligation of the Federal Government is not to assure full job opportunity, but to prevent destitution and to take care of the unemployed with doles or work relief.

Our choice is not between spending or not spending. It is between judicious expenditures now to prevent depression and to increase national income and productivity, or unproductive emergency expenditures later on to keep people from starving.

May I conclude by stating that if money is required in this impending battle against depression and unemployment—and I can think of very few basic reforms that do not call for expenditures—by this bill we will have pledged ourselves to spend that money "to the extent necessary to assure continuing full employment." That is the promise we shall have given. If there are any of you who think that full employment is not worth it—who sincerely feel that unemployment, mass misery, and starvation are preferable to making useful and necessary expenditures designed to stimulate private enterprise, then I urge you not to vote for a pledge that you do not intend to keep.

If this promise is made to the people, it must be made in good faith; it must be kept.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I take it the gentleman does not think this is a partisan issue?

Mr. OUTLAND. It certainly is not a partisan issue. As I have said before here, we have a House steering committee of 116 Members upon which we now have both Republicans and Democrats, and I hope we may have more Republicans, including the gentleman from Wisconsin. We welcome all Members interested in full employment. May I say that I have just done a little study in relation to full employment and the cheese industry, which I wish the gentleman would look at.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sure I would like that. May I call the gentleman's attention to this. It seems to me that some 20 years ago a Republican President, Mr. Hoover, suggested a full employment bill based on accumulating money during good times and spending it for public buildings during bad times, and that its ramifications were not so much different from the present full employment bill, except the way it was put into operation. As I recall it, the Hoover proposal might have had two different objectives that are in the present bill. One of them, the important one, was that it was to be done in cooperation with all the other units of Government.

Mr. OUTLAND. The present bill calls for that, also.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I do not think there was any intention of having Federal domination of the picture, however.

There is one other slight difference there, of course, that they were saving a billion dollars a year at the time, and he wanted to build up a fund. He never was able to build it up or he might have had some money when the depression came. So I do not think on the general thesis anyone can have any great objection to what the gentleman from California says.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman. I am not familiar with the details of the plan that former President Hoover made. But I think that almost all Presidents, regardless of party affiliation, have recognized that our economy has gone up and down and the necessity for planning when times are up for the downs that come. I think, too, that it ought to be reemphasized that this is not simply a public-works bill. This is a bill which attempts to gather information on all phases of our economic system and make that information available to the National Government, as well as State and local governments, and then, on the basis of that, to plan to try to prevent the worst aspects of depression.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I take it for granted the gentleman from California realizes that Wisconsin is a State whose people figure they can be quite liberal, yet they do not want to be in the loony class. They are able to take this social legislation and all legislation in their stride, but when they make a mistake, they back up and do not try to make believe it was good. They just back up and admit it.

Mr. OUTLAND. I have always had a great admiration for the leadership the State of Wisconsin has shown in inaugurating social legislation. I may add also that I have always admired the manner in which the gentleman from Wisconsin has represented the interests of his district. I do hope he will find it possible to join with us in cosponsoring this full employment bill, which is so vital to the people of his district as well as to the people of America as a whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under provious order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] is recognized for 20 minutes.

"HE DAMNS WITH FAINT PRAISE"

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the International Teamster, of which Mr. Daniel J. Tobin is editor, is of more than passing interest, not as a literary gem but as an example of the extent to which partisanship and prejudice, when carried to an extreme, will delude one's vision and warp his understanding.

The article to which I refer is entitled "Republicans Retain Position on Supreme Court" and "damn's with faint praise" the appointment by President Truman of Senator HAROLD H. BURTON as an Associate Justice thereof. It criticises Senator BURTON'S legislative activities, expresses concern over his probable attitude toward labor, denies accusing him of prejudice—without having been so charged—acknowledges his legal qualifications, commends President Truman for his fairness toward the minority party in appointing a Republican to the Supreme Court to replace another Republican who resigned and then concludes with the ridiculous statement that:

> Such fairness was never displayed toward the Democrats when the Republicans were in power.

Saying that:

> The Republican Party has received unusual consideration from both President Roosevelt and President Truman.

And continuing with:

> We hope that the Republican Party will act as though it belonged in this country instead of behaving like a hostile expeditionary force bent on conquest.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is aware that commendation of the President for appointing a well-qualified Republican lawyer and statesman to succeed an outstanding Republican jurist on the high Court, though grudgingly expressed by Editor Tobin, has nevertheless been general in legal circles, in the Nation's press, and even among the rank and file of the Democratic Party itself. But when Mr. Tobin states that "Such fairness was never displayed toward the Democrats when the Republicans were in power," he rises to the stratosphere in imagination and to the fathomless depths in unfamiliarity with American history.

In the past 61 years, the Republicans have been in power 32 years and the Democrats 29 years. During that period there have been 7 Republican Presidents and 4 Democratic Presidents. Thirty-seven men, during that time, have been appointed by these Presidents to the Supreme Court. Twenty-one have been appointed by Republican Presidents and 16 by Democratic Presidents, yet the Republicans, who had 21 appointments, saw fit to honor only 16 of their party, whereas the Democrats, who had only 16 appointments, acquired 21 judicial seats.

Here is the record of Republican Presidents:

President Benjamin Harrison appointed four, namely, Justices Brewer, Brown, and Shiras, Republicans, and Justice Jackson, a Democrat.

President William McKinley appointed one, Justice McKenna, a Republican.

President Theodore Roosevelt appointed three, namely, Justices Holmes, Day, and Moody, all Republicans.

President William H. Taft appointed five, namely, Justices Hughes, Van Devanter, and Pitney, Republicans, and Justices Lurton and Joseph Lamar, Democrats.

President Warren G. Harding appointed four, namely, Justices Taft, Sutherland, and Sanford, Republicans, and Justice Butler, a Democrat.

President Calvin Coolidge appointed one, Justice Stone, a Republican.

President Herbert Hoover appointed three, namely, Justices Hughes and Roberts, Republicans, and Justice Cardozo, a Democrat.

Here is the record of the Democratic Presidents:

President Grover Cleveland appointed four, namely, Justices Fuller, White, Peckham, and L. Q. C. Lamar, all Democrats.

President Woodrow Wilson appointed three, viz, Justices McReynolds, Brandeis, and Clarke, all Democrats.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed eight, namely, Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, Douglas, Murphy, Jackson, Byrnes, and Rutledge, all Democrats.

President Harry S. Truman has thus far appointed one, Justice Harold H. Burton, a Republican.

Mr. Tobin's absurd statement that "the Republican Party has received unusual consideration from both President Roosevelt and President Truman" contradicts itself. If President Truman is right in the present instance, it neces-

sarily follows that President Roosevelt in his 12-year tenure, was to say the least, short-sighted, in not being able to perceive somewhere a Republican worthy to don the judicial ermine. If, on the other hand, President Roosevelt is to be commended for having appointed 8 members of his own party to the Court, then it naturally follows that President Truman's action in naming a Republican is inexcusable unless, indeed, he was under the handicap of not being able to find one in his own party worthy of that honor, for the reason that all of his own party's available worth while legal talent had already been appointed to the Court by his predecessor.

The consideration given to the Republican Party by President Roosevelt was by no means unusual. He merely followed the precedent of other Democratic Presidents by naming none but Democrats to the Nation's highest tribunal.

The promotion by him of Justice Harlan F. Stone, a Republican to the Chief Justiceship can hardly be acclaimed by editor Tobin either as an exemplification of nonpartisanship or as unusual consideration toward the Republicans. Justice Stone was already on the Court having received his appointment in 1925 from President Coolidge; he was the senior ranking member of the Court. The President merely designated him to sit in the Chief Justice's chair and then promptly filled the seat he vacated with another Democrat. Thirty-five years ago however, Republican President William Howard Taft was called upon to nominate a successor to the late Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller, a Democrat. President Taft passed up Justices John M. Harlan and David J. Brewer, two outstanding Republican members who in age and service on the Court outranked all others and nominated for that position, Justice Edward Douglas White, a Louisiana Democrat. President Taft appointed more Justices to the Court than any other Republican President; President Franklin D. Roosevelt, more than any other Democratic President. Of the five appointed by President Taft, three were Republicans and two were Democrats; of the eight appointed by Franklin Roosevelt, all were Democrats.

The action of President Truman in his recent appointment of a Republican to the Court was unusual—not in the sense that Mr. Tobin would have his readers believe—but in the fact that he stands alone among our Nation's Democratic Presidents as the only one who has recognized that judicial merit requisite for high Court service, is not confined exclusively to the adherents of any one political party.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I hope all of you listened to President Truman's radio address on last Tuesday evening. He spoke on a problem which is a real and personal concern of everyone—the problem of wages and prices. It is a problem about which official Washington has been all too slow and hesitant in even recognizing. It is a problem upon whose solution hangs the whole success of the reconversion program. Unless there is willingness to tackle this problem of wages and prices now with a realistic appraisal of its relationship to the total economy, we may as well abandon our hopes for a peace with prosperity.

I hope that the labor-management conference meeting today meets this issue.

The whole answer to the question of what should be done on the wage-price problem was not contained in the President's address.

It should serve, however, and great credit should be given to President Truman for this, to put the problem before the people in its true perspective. I share the President's hope that the country will now start thinking of wages and prices "on the basis of give and take, of fairness to both sides."

Again I hope the labor-management conference take heed of the President's suggestion.

There has been a conspicuous lack of this spirit of fairness and reasonableness particularly with regard to the issue of wages. Wage earners, banded together in their bargaining units—the labor unions—have been subjected to vicious attack for their efforts to improve or even to maintain their purchasing power.

I have followed the negotiations—or the attempt at negotiation—over wages conducted by some of the labor unions with management. I have read the briefs and statistics they have submitted in support of their demands for wage increases up to 30 percent. I am impressed with the reasonableness and justice of their position.

Nowhere in the public prints have I seen evidence of honest rebuttal to their claims by industry; in fact, rebuttal at all by management, on the issues negotiated has been singularly absent.

When President Truman urged a return to free and fair collective bargaining, he might have had in mind a great industrial enterprise whose representatives flouted their contempt for collective bargaining by reading the morning paper while the representatives of its employees spoke for them. This is what happened when the UAW-CIO sat down with General Motors to argue out—to bargain on the issue of a wage increase.

This is the same corporation which spread its plea to give up the 40-hour week in paid advertisements in hundreds of newspapers.

There was nothing in what the President had to say the other night which can serve as a formula to resolve the differences between labor and management on the wage issue. He did make several statements which should be pondered seriously by every individual concerned with the future prosperity of the country.

Talking about wages, he said:

> What happens to wages is important to all of us—even to those of us who do not work for wages.

He then went on to explain the simple economic truism that wages is the basis of purchasing power, and that purchasing power is the basis of prosperity—for industry as well as for the farmer.

This would seem to be such an obvious economic fact that it should not need repeating—nor explaining. The unhappy truth, however, is that labor's demand for higher wage rates has been obscured and distorted in a barrage of name-calling and misrepresentation.

When the President said he believed that industry as a whole can afford to pay substantial wage increases without price increases, he was stating the position of the labor unions, representing workers in the great manufacturing industries.

He was not basing this belief, however, on figures or theories arrived at by the unions, but on figures prepared by his own White House economists.

The President avoided naming any specific rate of increase which industry could pay without piercing price ceilings, but the Government economists were specific and went into great detail to prove that industry's refusal to grant wage increases without price increases was simply an attempt on the part of industry to gouge the American consumer.

This is not a wild statement designed to provoke controversy. It is the only way to interpret the refusal of profit-swollen corporations to improve the wage position of their employees.

This is what the White House economists had to say about wages and profits in 1946.

> On the assumption that half the increases resulting from liberal administration of wage schedules will be reversed, the gross weekly pay of the average worker in manufacturing will fall to $33.96 to 1946, or 28 percent below the April 1945 level.

This report, prepared for use by the Advisory Board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, then pointed out that a money wage of $33.96 in 1946 represents 3 percent less purchasing power than a wage of $26.64 in 1941. When allowance is made for payment of 1946 income taxes, the purchasing power of take-home pay for an average worker with exemptions for one dependent will be $23.95 in 1941 dollars, a reduction of 10 percent from January, 1941.

The OWMR report, which was never officially released but which has been widely reported in the papers, predicted a decline of between $30,000,000,000 and $35,000,000,000 in the total of salaries and wages paid from April 1945 to the spring of next year.

This decline in salaries and wages will be accompanied by a decrease in total national output of more than $40,000,000,000 and sharp reduction in profits and farm income.

The report then states that it is estimated "that 1946 profits after taxes of manufacturing corporations will be over $6,000,000,000, a figure higher than the wartime peak. This estimate assumes an increase in wage rates sufficient to maintain average hourly earnings in each manufacturing industry at the April 1945 level."

The report to OWMR then estimated on the basis of factors which will reduce manufacturing costs in 1946 that industry as a whole could afford to pay wage

increases up to 24 percent, and still maintain a higher profit position than it has ever had before. Industry can pay higher wages—substantially higher wages—without increasing prices, and without loss in profits.

Of course, industry would make even greater profits if wages were not raised and if prices were increased—assuming it had a market for its product. Apparently this is the position that a large section of industry is taking. It is willing to sacrifice the national welfare—and in the long run its own market—in order to get what it can now. It is this kind of economic myopia which lends to depression.

The President said the other night that what happens to wages is important to business, "not only because wages represent an essential item in the cost of producing goods, but because people cannot buy the products of industry unless they earn enough wages."

There is very little evidence so far that industry generally is willing to accept its responsibility, or even to show concern, about the maintenance of markets for its products.

There has been an almost constant blast of criticism and alarm at labor since VJ-day. Strikes have been headlined on the front pages, and viewed with sorrow and alarm on the editorial pages. I certainly feel that strikes are deplorable, are wasteful, and harmful to the country's reconversion effort.

The strikes we read about are the strikes against management. The strikes we do not read about are management's strikes against the national interest, against the workers in the plants, against the consumers in the market place, yes, against the housewives of the Nation.

Despite the strikes, and the threats of strikes—and there have been many more perfectly legal threatened strikes than actual strikes—despite these, I think the labor unions, in their fight for higher wages within the present price structure are taking the most constructive attitude toward a healthy prosperity evidenced by any group in the country.

We have been drifting—at a dangerous speed—toward economic chaos. We are still too close to the full production, full employment economy of the war period for it to be very evident—but the storm signals are up, and we cannot afford to ignore them.

We are not entering, but are already in, the postwar period. We know that we will have to produce more and consume more than we ever had before to avoid the most serious depression in history. We cannot afford not to lay the ground work now for prosperity in the future.

The highest possible wage rates commensurate with reasonable profits is that ground work. It cannot wait until after reconversion, or until as many urge "things are normal again." There is no longer any such condition as "normal." The demands of the postwar period are new; we cannot satisfy them with the normalcy of the black days of the thirties or the listless planlessness of the twenties.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As a former member of the Committee on Agriculture, and a Member who I know had the interest of the farmer at heart, I would like to ask the gentleman if it ever disturbed him to note that at the present time the administration seems to give us a blueprint that we must take a 10- to 20-percent reduction in our farm income at this same that we are talking about these increases of income to labor. I wonder if the gentleman does not feel that that is something that should go straight across the board; that we should maintain these agricultural prices if we are to maintain these other prices?

Mr. HOOK. I am certainly in agreement with the gentleman's stand that we should maintain agricultural prices. But he understands that the national income in the last 6 months has dropped some $20,000,000,0000. The wage scale of the country has dropped, and at the same time the price to the farmer has dropped. That is the very argument I make, that when we raise the wage scale of the industrial workers so that he will have the purchasing power to purchase the products of agriculture, then the products of agriculture will go up. The farmer should have a fair price for his product. I am for an increase in farm income without increased profits going to the middleman and the big boys. Bring it to the farmer and the worker. That is where it belongs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LOCATING THE WORLD CAPITAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, between now and the first of the year, in London, there is likely to be decided one of the vital questions which will help determine whether the new United Nations Organization is a success or failure. That decision will involve the selection of a permanent site for the new peace capital of the world.

It will be recalled that the annual conference of State Governors held at Mackinac Island last summer went on record urging that the new capital of the United Nations be located in the United States. I know that Members of the House and Senate strongly support such a selection. It is generally and properly believed in this country and in many other quarters of the world that the location of the permanent capital of the United Nations in the United States will be a big forward step toward assuring the success and the stability of the United Nations Organization.

In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, it may be of interest to report here something of what has already taken place in London concerning the decision which will determine the permanent site of the new world capital and to report, also, on some of the current activities taking place in that connection.

First of all, I believe it is generally known that early last month the executive committee of the United Nations Organization, meeting in London, voted 9 to 3 in favor of selecting a site somewhere in the United States as the permanent home of the new world capital. There are 14 members of this executive committee; the United States and Canada refrained from voting. Of the remaining 12 votes, the United States received 9 votes with England, France, and the Netherlands voting against a site in the United States.

The next step in this program took place a week ago, Mr. Speaker. At another meeting of the executive committee of the UNO held in London for the purpose of voting on procedural arrangements for the selection of the exact site in the United States which is to be chosen as the world capital and for recommendations on the methods of selection to be made to the meeting of the preparatory commission on November 23, the resistance of England, France, and the Netherlands to an American site was emphatically underscored and reiterated. This time the vote was on approving the procedural steps to be recommended to the preparatory commission. Canada and the United States again refrained out of courtesy from voting.

The same nine nations which had previously voted for the United States voted their approval, but in protest against the selection of an American site and as advance notice that they had not given up the idea of upsetting this decision at the meeting of the full Preparatory Commission on November 23, England, France, and the Netherlands refused to vote. Hence it was by a 9-to-0 vote last week that this second step was taken looking to the eventual selection of an American location for the new world capital.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we are not yet certain that the United States is to be selected as the home of the world capital for the newly created United Nations Organization. With England, France, and the Netherlands combining their strength and their influence, together with their experience and contacts in world intrigue and negotiating, the final result is still in doubt. I regret the necessity for calling attention to this fact, but I feel it is important that the people of the United States be advised concerning this situation.

I feel this rather intensely, Mr. Speaker, because I firmly believe that the United Nations Organization has a greater chance for success and to render a stabilizing and sanity-sustaining service in the preservation of permanent peace if its capital is in the United States than if its permanent headquarters is located in any other location of this whole, vast world. There are several reasons for this which I shall now enumerate. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary in this atomic age of jet-propelled death and disaster to enumerate reasons why it is imperative that the United Nations Organization succeed in its essential mission of peace.

REASONS WORLD CAPITAL SHOULD BE LOCATED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Why does a United States location for the world capital best assure the suc-

cess of the new world organization? There are many reasons and I shall take time today to enumerate just a few:

First. It is impossible completely to divorce the delegates serving as members of the permanent United Nations Organization from the pulls and pressures as well as the incidental influences of the environment in which the world capital is located. This was found true in the case of the League of Nations located as it was in Geneva which traditionally has maintained its neutrality but which by unfortunate accident of geography is located almost in the center of the endless jealousies, intrigues, hatreds, and ambitions which have so lamentably embroiled Europe in war so often. Through no fault of its own, Geneva is not located in an environment of historic peace and that fact in itself was one of the contributing factors to the gradual disintegration of the very noble experiment in world collaboration attempted by the League of Nations.

This time, Mr. Speaker, this experiment dare not fail. As one contributing element toward its success, it is important the world peace capital this time be located here in the Western Hemisphere with its great tradition of peace among sovereign neighbors and with its comparative freedom from the pulls and pressures which have too long and too often plunged Europe into bloody war. There is indeed merit and importance to the suggestion, therefore, that in locating the capital of the United Nations it be placed on a new site in the new world for this new approach to permanent peace.

Second. It is important that all of the great powers, and, if possible, all of the lesser powers, become and remain members of the United Nations Organization if it is this time to succeed. But it is generally conceded around the world, Mr. Speaker, that it is of essential importance that the United States exert continuing leadership and sustaining influence in this organization if it is not to fail. This, I believe, the people of this Republic are determined to do. We have assumed this responsibility and accepted this opportunity. Americans never shirk a duty they have once acknowledged. We shall do our best with full determination to make the United Nations Organization function well and faithfully. To exercise most helpfully this leadership and exert this influence, however, it is imperative that the capital of the United Nations be in the United States—as near the heart of it as possible—so that the full force of our great unselfish determination can function most successfully. To locate this capital across the sea and over the mountains far away from contacts with the United States would be deliberately and recklessly to weaken the influence of the United States in the United Nations Organization.

Mr. Speaker, any student of history recognizes that the United States has not one single selfish cause to serve as a member of the United Nations save only our desire to help perpetuate the peace. We desire no special privileges; we seek no colonial territories, and we have no colonial possessions to preserve; we have no imperialistic designs or desires in either the economic, the territorial, or the political meanings of those terms. I have often said the United States is dedicated to providing a fair chance for a free people within our national boundaries. We have no other goals for any other people anywhere.

Third. This war has demonstrated, among many other things, that the problems of Asia and of Europe are not separable. Simply to focus attention upon Europe and to maintain peace there will not insure a peaceful Asia and a warless world. Likewise, we cannot put a total end to war by concentrating only upon solution of the problems necessary to sustain peace in Asia. The United States is ideally situated with coasts facing both Europe and Asia to serve as the home of a United Nations Organization dealing equally and equitably with the problems of both Europe and Asia. Here there will be no overemphasis of one set of problems as contrasted with the other. Here we have no traditional alliances or enemities to color the neutrality with which the United Nations Organization can approach a problem. Here in the United States the delegates and visitors to the peace capital of the world can come by air or sea with almost equal ease regardless of from what continent or country they originate.

Mr. Speaker, there are other effective reasons, too, why the decision of the nine members of the executive committee voting in favor of a United States location for the United Nations capital should be sustained. In a recent trip through 20 countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa as a member of a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee this summer and fall, I found the officials of many foreign governments enthusiastic in their support of a location in the United States.

I can appreciate the natural desire of the English, the French, and the Dutch to have the world capital located in what they feel is their sphere of influence or near or in their own possessions. They recognize from experience that they can exert greater and more controlling influence upon the destiny of this new organization if they can locate it in The Hague, back in Geneva, in Versailles, or somewhere in the far-flung British Empire. Their reluctance to sacrifice such special position is understandable albeit, I truly believe, unfortunate. In winning a victory by upsetting the tentative decision which would locate the world capital in the United States they might be actually, although unwittingly, contributing to the defeat of the prime objectives of the United Nations Organization.

The fundamental issues of maintaining peace and the basic need for a successfully functioning United Nations Organization are so great this time that the beggar all other considerations, and I sincerely hope the three recalcitrant delegations from England, the Netherlands, and France will not continue their efforts to upset the tentative decisions already reached which would locate the world capital in the United States.

Surely it would not be an auspicious reception which these countries give to the United States in its present and commendable determination to work jointly with other nations of the world in the new world order if they should succeed in collectively slapping us in the face now by bringing about a repudiation of the votes already taken in our favor. Such action would serve only the cause of the die-hard critics of world collaboration who argue that foreign countries care little for our idealism, our influence, and our leadership but they covet hungrily only the protection of our military might and the benefits of our financial generosity. I deplore such a possibility. I trust the people of England, France, and The Netherlands will make clear to their governments that they will not support further efforts on their part to invalidate the vote taken in favor of locating the world capital in the United States but that they should now join the other nine delegations of the executive committee in making an American site the unanimous choice of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, in several recent contacts which I have had with people in London and elsewhere in Europe by telephone and correspondence, it appears that one reason why the English, French, and Netherlands delegations opposed the choice of an American site as the new world capital was that it has been frequently rumored that San Francisco would become the specific location within the United States and that such a location would be too far from Europe, too close to Asia, and too difficult to reach by the many small nations of Europe who will have business to conduct at the world capital. Whether these reports be true or not, and whether these reasons are valid or not, Mr. Speaker, it can now be said authoritatively that neither San Francisco or any other exact American location has been agreed upon either by the delegations of foreign powers or by officials representing the United States.

I have checked these rumors carefully and conclusively. If the United States is finally and firmly chosen as the home of the United Nations capital by the Preparatory Commission on November 23 and the delegates' assembly meeting early in January, as I sincerely hope it will be, the exact determination of the specific site within the United States is a decision which has not been reached and which will not be reached for some little time in the future. Hence, neither objections to nor preference for any specific site within the United States should influence foreign representatives to ignore the broader and more compelling over-all reasons why the United States should be designated as the area in which the new world capital should be built.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In connection with the gentleman's checking on that matter, I wonder if the gentleman is in a position and would care to say what authorities in the State Department have said with regard to the official position of the United States in attempting to influence decision as for one city as against another.

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy that my colleague has brought up that point. I expect to discuss that in detail in the

course of my remarks. I think it is a piece of information to which the country generally is entitled.

THE UNITED STATES OFFERS SEVERAL AVAILABLE SITES

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there are many attractive sites in the United States capable of providing an excellent home for the United Nations capital. San Francisco is one of them. So, too, is Philadelphia, which I understand is soon to send a delegation to London to present its attractions there. Chicago and Milwaukee are two other localities which have extended invitations to the United Nations and, at least in the case of Chicago, I have learned preparations are being made to send a delegation to London to elaborate further upon their invitation. The city of Baltimore is also extending an invitation to locate the world capital in the Maryland metropolis. There may be other invitations, too, which have not come to my attention.

If the decision were to be left to me, Mr. Speaker, I would locate the new world capital in the Black Hills area of South Dakota and the Governors of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota have joined in sending a formal invitation to London inviting the United Nations to select the Black Hills as the site for its new home. I learned on my recent trip overseas that the invitation from our area has attracted much favorable attention and we, too, expect to have a delegation in London shortly to render every assistance possible in enabling the foreign delegations to appraise the great attractions and advantages of a site in the Black Hills. The Black Hills invitation is today indeed among the leading contenders.

It has not yet been definitely determined, incidentally, just how the exact site in the United States will be selected if this Nation is finally chosen as the host country. It is understoood, however, that both President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes have instructed Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., our American delegate to the United Nations, that while the United States is vitally interested in having the world capital located within our boundaries, none of our officials in the Federal Government should take a part in recommending or supporting one American site as contrasted with another. In private conversations with Mr. Stettinius, he has confirmed the fact that he has passed such information along to the executive committee in London. He told me further, "the decision as to the exact location within the United States is still a wide open race with no favorites indicated among the several communities which have extended their formal invitation."

When I first proposed the Black Hills as an ideal location for the world capital in letters sent to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco on April 7 and addressed to Congressman SOL BLOOM and Senator VANDENBERG and later published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I did so primarily with the thought in mind that such a location as we have to offer would best serve the needs and prerequisites of the new peace capital of the world. I still believe this to be the case. But whether the Black Hills is selected or some other community within the United States, I think the decision of the President and his advisors is wise in studiously and completely refraining from attempting to influence the judgment of the delegates as to which location should be selected so long as it is upon American soil and under American auspices where the conditions enumerated earlier in this speech will prevail.

TWO RECOMMENDATIONS TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

I am respectfully making two recommendations in this connection, however, to President Truman and to our Secretary of State. The first is that in view of the failure of England, France, and the Netherlands to join with the other nations in supporting the decision tentatively selecting the United States as the host country—even in their second opportunity to do so—I believe the President should publicly express on behalf of the United States the gratification of this country over the action of the executive committee in voting in favor of a United States location. This has not yet been done and such an expression of gratification in behalf of Americans by President Truman will help to make this tentative decision final.

My second suggestion to the President and the State Department is that they extend to the executive committee of the United Nations through its executive secretary, Mr. Gladwyn Jebb, of London, and to the preparatory commission an invitation asking that the United Nations Organization send a commission of inquiry to the United States to inspect personally all of the sites which have tendered formal invitations so that they can report back to the Organization their personal observations and findings. Such a course should be followed in conformity with appropriate care and caution in a matter so vital as selecting the permanent home of the new world capital. It is inconceivable that a decision as to final specific location would be made until delegations from abroad have carefully and critically examined the advantages and disadvantages of the preferred available sites.

An invitation by the President urging the delegates to name a commission to make personal inspections in the United States and offering to help it with facilities of travel and convenience would be a gracious and a courteous gesture, it would confirm the fact that the officials of our country are desirous of leaving the decision as to exact location in the hands of the representatives of other nations with no open or covert suggestions from us, and it would also tend to make the tentative choice of the United States a firm and final decision by registering our interest in it and our desire as a Nation to do everything possible to help the United Nations Organization select the appropriate site within our Nation.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the President will act upon the two foregoing suggestions. I made them to him in a personal letter sent last Saturday. I believe he will be favorably impressed by the reasons which support them.

It is not my purpose here, Mr. Speaker, to become a special pleader for the ultimate selection of the Black Hills as the site of the new world capital. It might be appropriate, however, to list a few criteria which in my opinion are important considerations to be found in any site which would best serve the purposes of a world headquarters of this distinction and importance.

SEVEN CRITERIA FOR SELECTING A WORLD CAPITAL SITE

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the following factors should be among those receiving consideration when the exact location is being selected for the permanent home of the new capital of the United Nations Organization.

First. It should be in a location in this country which will provide an area which can be internationalized so that complete jurisdiction of the region can be turned over to the United Nations Organization in much the same manner as the District of Columbia is administered by our Federal Government. One of the criticisms heard at Geneva was that the capital of the League of Nations was controlled by Switzerland rather than by the league itself. This time it would seem that what is required is a sort of Vatican City of Peace which will have authority to provide its own police force, its own regulations, and its own local codes of conduct.

Second. The world capital should be the most important and significant institution and attraction in the area in which it is located. It must not be a side show or a secondary attraction of any other activity, institution, or enterprise. Attention of an entire area should focus upon the world capital and its activities. It should be overshadowed by nothing in its general vicinity.

Third. The world capital should be as free as possible from the special foreign policies of any country or the influences of any sovereign state. It should not be dominated or unduly influenced by the particular bias or recommendations of any special segment of the newspaper or radio world. It should be independent from the customs, prejudices, favoritisms, and selfish interests of any area having a special interest in any continent, country, or commercial endeavor.

Fourth. It should be as equally accessible as possible to the countries of all continents and areas. It should especially be in a site which strikes a careful balance between the interests of Asia and Europe.

Fifth. It should be in an equable and stimulating climate in a healthful environment containing appropriate and abundant recreational opportunities.

Sixth. It should offer an opportunity to build an entire community devoted to the work of the United Nations Organization—a new city in the new world dedicated to a new approach to permanent peace.

Seventh. It should be in an area as safe as possible from possible military occupancy if war should recur and as remote as possible from the new scientific weapons of war. In this atomic age, no area is immune from attack but if the world capital is adjacent to mountains,

it is always possible to construct deep underground rooms for the safekeeping of important records or—if deemed advisable—for emergency meetings of the delegates should that become necessary.

Mr. Speaker, there are of course other considerations which will enter into the selection of the exact location of the world capital but I believe the foregoing seven factors are significant elements which must not be overlooked. Wherever they are present, other factors conducive to the construction of an appropriate world capital can be found or will be furnished. Wherever these factors are absent, however, it seems evident that much that is to be desired will be lost in the creation of a city of peace in which the United Nations Organization can function with the maximum degree of success and efficiency.

THE BLACK HILLS SITE OFFERS IDEAL LOCATION

Mr. Speaker, may I point out that the Black Hills area which we people in the heart of America are proposing as the site for the new world capital is rich in the important elements which seem to be required in such a site. It is for this reason that the officials and private citizens of many States and communities in the central part of the United States join in urging careful consideration of what our invitation has to offer.

In summary, it might be emphasized:

First. The Black Hills location will provide as large an area as desired and necessary which can be easily internationalized since much of it is already part either of State or national parks.

Second. In the Black Hills the world capital would become the central attraction and the focal interest point of an area comprising many States and reaching out from coast to coast since it lies midway between our seaboards.

Third. The proposed Black Hills site is free from the pulls and pressures which inevitably become a part of any great metropolitan area. It is dominated by no special segment of radio, press, or other publicity medium. Here the capital city of the world would develop its own publicity media and here the representatives of all the radio systems and newspapers of the world would meet on common ground.

Fourth. The Black Hills area is actually closer in air-miles to more of the important capitals of the world than any other proposed location now being considered in America or Europe.

Fifth. Government health statistics show that South Dakota has the lowest death rate—most healthful climate and environment—of any State in the Union. The Black Hills climate is equable; neither too hot in summer nor too cold in winter, and it is free from fog, insect life, smoke, dust, strong winds, and high humidity.

Sixth. The Black Hills world capital invitation committee proposes that an entire new city be especially designed and constructed in this area which will become to the world's workers for peace what the Vatican City in Rome is to the believers in catholicism.

Seventh. Its central location, far from either coast, or any possible military border makes the Black Hills site immune from military occupancy and comparatively safe from attack by scientific weapons of war. Its vast mountains provide ample opportunity for completely safe underground rooms to the extent, and for any purpose, desired by the United Nations organization.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude, as I began, with the plea that the United Nations capital be located somewhere within the boundary of the United States. Other advocates of other areas may have much to offer. I would be the last to disparage the attractions and the advantages of any American site.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has given a fine summary of the possibilities in the Black Hills. I am wondering if the gentleman will not agree with me that the very fact President Coolidge established a summer White House out there and carried on the affairs of the Nation for 4 months is adequate evidence of the practicability of the whole proposition?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman makes a splendid point. All Americans will recall the long stay that President Coolidge enjoyed in the Black Hills when he had his summer White House there, and President Coolidge said upon his return to Washington that he was able to conduct the affairs of Government fully as well from that point as if he had been located right here on the banks of the Potomac.

Mr. Speaker, I have traveled many miles in many countries, and talked with many men and women about the important problem of where to locate the new world capital, and it remains my sincere personal conviction that the Black Hills country, deep in the heart of America, provides the ideal location and the optimum site for the permanent capital of the United Nations Organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the House Military Affairs Committee, in dropping that portion of the War Labor Disputes Act dealing with strike votes, proposes now to add new and severely repressive sanctions against labor organizations to that act. In so doing it has not only substituted for a bad law a worse one, but has directed against labor repressive restraints which can only serve as an ominous pattern for an attempt to hamstring labor during the period to come.

The bill as reported proposes a novel and vicious penalty against striking unions, and to the existing provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act dealing with political contributions in general elections by labor organizations, it adds a prohibition upon expenditures as well, and extends the scope of the act to political campaigns and primary elections.

It is fair to say that never within the past 20 years has there emerged from a committee of this Congress as vicious and unfair a proposal as H. R. 3937. This bill boldly takes sides in an economic dispute between labor and management on the very eve of a labor-management conference which is addressed to the very problems the bill undertakes to solve.

It emerges not from the House Labor Committee, which has been bypassed, but from the Military Affairs Committee, whose functioning in the field of labor relations during peacetime is not only inappropriate but will surely serve to impair the confidence of the American people in the real function of this committee.

That portion of the bill dealing with labor relations as such can only be viewed as a punitive attempt to destroy unions and collective bargaining. In the first place, labor unions are singled out for special treatment, and there is nothing in this entire portion of the bill which deals with employers.

The bill relieves employers of all obligations under contracts where unions reach such contracts. However, it eloquently fails to relieve unions of any obligations on the frequent occasions when employers violate contracts. The dockets of the War Labor Board are swollen with the records of employers who have defied War Labor Board directives. Millions of dollars are due unions under such directives. The increasing number of employers who have scoffed at the directives of their Government, the large number of powerful corporations who violate labor contracts every day does not impress the majority of this committee at all. Such one-sidedness is unfair.

The measure provides that when a labor organization violates a contract it not only loses all rights under the contract but must go out of business as a bargaining agency for a year, but the bill is quite silent in the case of an employer who violates his contract. If this bill had even a semblance of fairness it should provide that employers who violate contracts be put out of business for a year.

Finally, the bill confers jurisdiction on the Federal courts to hear damage cases against unions and their officers as a result of breaches of the contracts by employees, but the bill does not extend the hospitality of the Federal courts to relieve the real grievances of unions against the disregard of contractual obligations by employers.

The sanctions of this bill apply to a situation in which a no-strike provision is included in the contract. From now on in the light of the savage treatment accorded them in this situation, any union would be foolish to insert a no-strike clause in a contract. To employers bent on evading their collective-bargaining obligations and on destroying unions, the present bill offers a convenient device for provoking strikes as an instrument for draining the treasuries of labor organizations. This legislation will thus not only thrust into permanent quarantine any attempt by labor organizations to renounce the strike weapon through contracts, but it will seriously jeopardize collective-bargaining agreements altogether. In the face of this

punitive expedition by the House Military Affairs Committee against only one of the parties to a collective-bargaining contract, labor unions will rightfully fear any sort of contract in the future, for what assurance have they, in view of the committee's unilateral action, that any breach of a contract by labor organizations will be subject not merely to the ordinary sanctions of law but to special terroristic sanctions designed by Congress?

The very essence of free collective bargaining and of a free democratic system is the conception of equality under the law. This bill torpedoes the conception of equality and seeks to intervene in collective-bargaining relationships on the side of the employer. At any time such a unilateral intervention would be reprehensible. Coming as this bill does at the very time when labor is seeking to improve its living standards and when fair-minded people concede the justice of its position, this bill will inevitably be regarded as an attempt by Congress to intervene on the side of employers to defeat the just demands of labor.

Just as the labor-relations portions of the bill substitute for the unworkable and antilabor strike vote section of the War Labor Disputes Act, an even more repressive regulation of labor, so the amendments embodied in the present bill dealing with political contributions present even greater objections than the existing measure. This bill leaves no area dealing with politics, however removed from an election, in which labor organizations can play a part.

But the attempt to prohibit unions, as the present bill does, from even making expenditures in connection with any meaningful form of political activity is vicious and wholly ill-considered.

We must remember that the members of labor organizations enjoy the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. As this bill is presently amended, severe and repressive prohibitions would be placed even upon the expression of views and the expenditure of funds for the distribution of literature at the meetings of labor organizations in connection with a political campaign.

To attempt to prohibit unions from making political expenditures and contributions is based upon a distortion of the very nature and function of a labor organization. It should be remembered that we are dealing here solely with organizations of people. The members of labor organizations have assembled together in unions precisely because, as Congress has indicated in scores of statutes, they cannot speak or act effectively as individual workers and therefore in order to make their voices heard they must join in mutual action and in common organization. They use their organization to express themselves not only in dealing with their employers but in reaching the public as a whole. The labor organization, in short, is the only meaningful form of economic and political expression which is open to the individual worker. By contrast, wealthy corporate officers can do these things through their own individual resources.

Apart from this basic distinction between corporations and labor organizations, the control of a corporation and its effective voice is responsive to the amount of investment, with the result that participation of a corporation in political activity means participation not as a group of people with equal rights in their enterprise, but as a group in which wealth rather than individual rights determines decisions and actions.

The limitations running against labor organizations on campaign contributions in connection with general elections have now been extended to expenditures in connection with virtually all forms of political activity far beyond and far removed from the general election. It would have been highly desirable for this committee if such matters were within its jurisdiction to have abolished the existing blemish on our democratic American system by lifting the existing restraints upon political activity of labor organizations. Instead this committee has broadened and implemented those restraints. In thus denying to labor organizations the right and power fully to participate in the political life of this country, this committee has effectively denied individual workers the right to make their voices heard as powerfully and as effectively as is possible through the medium of their joint action with their fellow employees, participating in their organization on the basis of equal rights for all, equal voice for all, and without regard to any variations in wealth.

This bill is an ill-conceived attempt by the House Military Affairs Committee to sterilize the exercise by labor organizations of their civil right to strike and to engage in concerted activity. The repressions of the bill indeed are directed at the very fundamental right of freedom of assembly, since labor organizations under the bill may suffer dissolution for violating a collective bargaining contract. Because the bill destroys the right to assemble freely and the correlative rights of labor organizations to function through discussion and the issuance of publications as well as through the classic right of labor organizations concertedly to refuse to work, there can be no question of its unconstitutional character. However, until the unconstitutionality of the measure is declared by the courts, permanent injury may be done in this country by the passage of this bill to free collective bargaining.

The wide scope of the prohibitions of the bill dealing with political activity of labor organizations makes the constitutional validity of these portions of the bill highly doubtful. It does not require a constitutional lawyer to understand that the imposition of penalties on a labor organization for merely spending funds in connection with the basic democratic right to engage in political activity runs afoul of constitutional protections. Both the timing and the substance of this bill condemn it as unwise and as an attempt to divide our people. We have just completed a war which was fought for the very purpose of preserving human liberty and won through the concerted efforts of all our people. It is shocking, with that war barely over, to witness this bold attempt to renounce its premises.

I have been informed by high officers of both the American Federation of Labor and of the Congress of Industrial Organizations that in their belief the action taken on this bill can only lead to chaos. Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, through his legislative representative, Mr. Lewis Hines, tells me that in his opinion this bill if made law would start a wave of strikes unparalleled in our history. Significantly enough Mr. Hines has asked me to tell the House and I quote:

> Labor will not take this action lying down. We feel that the relationship between an employee and his employer is essentially a private matter and any attempt to legislate this matter will result in a breakdown of relationships between the two parties.

Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, has asked me to tell you that his organization with all of its thousands and thousands of members will fight this attempt to gag its membership to the last ditch.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I opposed this vicious legislation and with a number of colleagues on the committee joined in presenting objections in the report to the House. I shall do all in my power to defeat this measure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. CASE of South Dakota) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain arguments for and against universal military training, together with a questionnaire.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, Congress is to be congratulated upon the splendid success attendant upon country-wide observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, established by passage of House Joint Resolution 23, which sets aside the first week in October in each year for this purpose.

Reports made to Mr. Paul A. Strachan, national president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, which organization sponsored the resolution creating National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, show that for the period when publicity on the week began, and continuing through the week following observance, 13,400 physically handicapped were placed through the offices of the United States Employment Service, across country, and Mr. Strachan states he is confident that private placements in industry materially added to that number.

Following issuance of the President's proclamation, Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach, and officials of the United States Employment Service immediately projected a comprehensive program to cover National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

Placements made through the United States Employment Service shows that during the first 20 days of October a gain of 34 percent was registered over the same period in September.

Secretary Schwellenbach states that the increase in placements of handicapped made in October is noteworthy, because it reverses the steadily declining trend of the past 13 months, despite the less favorable labor-market situation prevailing since the Japanese surrender, and that this experience reflects the emphasis given by the Employment Office staffs to handicapped placements, as well as the splendid cooperation by employers to expend job opportunities for handicapped and disabled job seekers.

Secretary Schwellenbach further comments that the October step-up in placements for the physically handicapped occurred in nearly all States. North Carolina, Michigan, Ohio, Arkansas, and California increased their placements by more than 200 each. Six States, with rises of over 100 placements each, more than doubled their September totals. These States were North Carolina, West Virginia, Indiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Montana.

Michigan and California stepped up their placements of disabled veterans by over 200 during the period in question and North Carolina, West Virginia, and Arizona more than doubled the totals of the previous month, with increases of over 100 each.

I know that Congress will be happy to learn that of the placements made during the period in question, 8,100 were for disabled veterans.

Mr. Strachan states that he desires to extend the grateful thanks of the physically handicapped to all Members of Congress, for having made the week possible, and he is sure that the continuing effects of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week will be reflected in USES, and private placement activities in the months and years to come, as understanding of the value and necessity for employment of the handicapped, as well as improved placement methods, themselves, become more widespread and effective.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROE of Maryland, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. MOTT (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1281. An act to provide for the covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on November 2, 1945, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart;

H. R. 1560. An act for the relief of J. B. Grigsby;

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Brothers, Inc.;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor;

H. R. 3281. An act to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix the term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June;

H. R. 3453. An act for the relief of John W. Farrell;

H. R. 3870. An act to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the Harry L. Englebright Dam;

H. R. 4083. An act authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation; and

H. R. 4309. An act to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 a. m., Tuesday, November 6, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HAREORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream-pollution-abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

818. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer; to the Committee on Claims.

819. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

820. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $6,000,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 371); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4566. A bill for the development and control of atomic energy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 4581. A bill to authorize addition of hydroelectric power and make a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir of the project authorized at the Osceola site on the Osage River, in Missouri; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 4582. A bill to repeal that part of section 4, Public Law 761 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, authorizing construction of the Osceola Dam on the Osage River, in Missouri; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 4583. A bill to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 4584. A bill to amend title 15 of the United States Code Annotated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4585. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting or required enlistment of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 4586. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4587. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4588. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who were prisoners of war; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4589. A bill to provide homesteads in the State of Oklahoma for certain veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4590. A bill to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4591. A bill to provide sick and annual leave for war service indefinite substitutes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Congress of the Philippines, expressing the gratitude of the government and people of the

Philippines to the Government and people of the United States for the liberation of the Philippines; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the administration of the national forests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper, zinc, and lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to Federal aid for development of airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 4592. A bill for the relief of the Quality Electric Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 4593. A bill for the relief of Quality Electric Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4594. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Midland Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4595. A bill granting a pension to Mary Quirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4596. A bill for the relief of Victor H. Todd, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 4597. A bill for the relief of John B. Reeves; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 4598. A bill for the relief of Filippo Rusconi and Charles Rusconi; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4599. A bill for the relief of Clifford N. MacLloyd; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4600. A bill for the relief of the estate of Patsy Ann Maheux, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4601. A bill for the relief of William P. Harrington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4602. A bill for the relief of J. B. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under class 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1306. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of R. Lano Barron, 1607 Wethersfield Road, Austin, Tex., favoring H. R. 4384; to the Committee on Education.

1307. Also, petition of Lawrence R. Payne, president, Texas Hospital Association, Dallas, Tex., favoring H. R. 2498; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father of mankind, by whom the meek are guided in judgment, to Thy forgiving mercy and cleansing grace we would bring our jaded lives stained with the defilements of the world and covered with the dust of the road. In the heat of the day, mid all the traffic of the busy ways, we are tempted to reflect in our own attitudes the angry passions of the pressing throng of which we are a part. But, turning to this wayside cross of devotion from the pageantry of passing things, we are ashamed of thoughts that poison the very springs of our being, of actions far beneath our beckoning best, of opinions that are colored by prejudice, and of bitter words that sting the sensitive spirits of others. In the shamed contrition which the splendor of Thy presence brings, may every vileness shrink away from our own souls, and as we stay our minds on Thee help us to help the Nation and to serve the world. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 2, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 5, 1945, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 100) permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WALLACE S. GOURLEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, November 19, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room in the Capitol Building, upon the nomination of Wallace S. Gourley, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Frederic P. Schoonmaker, deceased. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter from Charles Roznarek, president of the Polish-American Congress, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., transmitting copy of an appeal addressed to the President of the United States protesting against domination by Russia in Poland and urging the use of the good offices of the United States Government in the restoration of Poland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry employees of the United States customs service, Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 23, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation appropriating funds for the purpose of sending food to the desperate people of Europe and Asia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A petition of members of the crew of the steamship *Gulf Wax* residing in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to assure full employment and to promote the health and welfare of the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions adopted by Northern Friends Lodge, No. 102, district No. 2, of Leominster, and Gustav V Lodge, No. 118, district No. 2, of Boston, both of Scandinavian Fraternity of America, in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation so as to increase immigration quotas for the Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, in order that they be on an equal basis with other countries; to the Committee on Immigration.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of Chelsea, Mass., protesting against the British white-paper policy on Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—LETTER FROM HENRY W. THIESSEN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Henry W. Thiessen, Hutchinson, Kans., which ably presents his views in opposition to compulsory military training. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter presented by Mr. CAPPER was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUTCHINSON, KANS.,
October 29, 1945.

The Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: As you well know, the public is very much concerned over the present day uncertainties and the trends. This fact has led me to carry on quite a bit of correspondence with various Congressmen at the urgent request of others. Your letter of October 11 is the most intelligent and expresses more the views of the folks back home, than any other letter I have received from the Capital. You have a very keen appraisal of the "grass roots" thought in Kansas.

You may rest assured the people are not ready to cover up the Pearl Harbor incident, and the present administration's apparent failure to uproot militarism, by accepting that age-old evil of peacetime conscription. There is a growing fear that the present administration lacks world leadership.

We hope you will crown your long and successful career by using your good influence in defeating that damnable militaristic spirit and create a leadership that is capable of selling our allies and the world on the idea that war does not pay nor accomplish anything.

Very sincerely yours,
H. W. THIESSEN.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1491. A bill to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 695); and

S. 1494. A bill to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 696).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1532. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain persons as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 697).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3749. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II; with an amendment (Rept. No. 698).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1533. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 699); and

H. R. 1512. A bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 700).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of October 1945, from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

NOVEMBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address or department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Helen Gauntlett	1634 I St. NW., Washington, D. C	Department of Labor, Washington, D. C	$4,300
Virginia Kreamer	3918 10th St. NE., Washington, D. C	do	2,760

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

NOVEMBER 6, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address o department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Alma B. Kidwell	113 Park Blvd. SE	Federal Communications Commission	$1,800

B. WHEELER, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

NOVEMBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Addres	Name and address or department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Alice M. Allen	1604 Q St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	$2,320.00
Emerald G. Devitt	2425 27th St., South, Arlington, Va	do	2,430.00
Parley P. Eccles	4408 First Pl. NE., Washington, D. C	Foreign Economics Administration, Washington, D. C	7,175.00
Herman Edelsberg	2141 Suitland Terrace SE., Washington, D. C	do	7,175.00
Harry J. Evans	3010 Gainesville St. SE., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	7,175.00
F. Preston Forbes	502 Four Mile Rd., Alexandria, Va	Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C	5,180.00
Scott K. Gray, Jr	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	5,390.00
Stella J. Groeper	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,980.00
John W. Nelson	The Delano Apartments, Washington, D. C	do	6,440.00
Martha G. Ray	5909 32d St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,430.00
Lt. George H. Soule	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	2,400.00
L. Evelyn Spicer	1708 Kilbourne Pl. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	3,090.00
Fredk. W. Steckman	4000 Cathedral Ave. NW., Washington, D. C	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	5,600.00
Margie L. Strubel	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,320.00
Allen G. Thurman	9729 Bexhill Dr., Rock Creek Hills, Md	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	7,175.00
Alfred J Van Tassel	1622 Mount Eagle Place, Alexandria, Va	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	7,437.50

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1555. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugene Brodbeck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1556. A bill for the relief of A. Anne Diener; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. BALL also introduced Senate bill 1557, which was referred to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH (by request):

S. 1558. A bill correcting a wage adjustment for Navy Department molders and coremakers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1559. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ellsworth F. Bloodgood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 1560. A bill to amend the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, to extend reemployment benefits to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who entered the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1561. A bill to amend the act entitled "Compensation for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States outside the United States" as amended for the purpose of making the 100-percent earning provisions effective as of January 1, 1942; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1562. A bill to repeal section 1505 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for reference to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy. It is a bill to set up a commission to control atomic energy and, I believe, will meet the major objections which scientists have voiced to the so-called May-Johnson bill, namely, that it would stifle fundamental research by its imposition of strict secrecy and its rigid control by the commission. In the bill I propose the only place where secrecy would prevail would be in the military application of atomic energy, and that would be left to the Army and the Navy to control.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1557) for the development and control of atomic energy, introduced by Mr. BALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, there is pending at this time an amendment which I have heretofore offered to Senate bill 1120, to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies and for other purposes. I hereby modify that amendment to read as set forth in the paper which I send to the desk for reading and printing in the usual form.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment as further modified, as follows:

On page 14, beginning with line 23, strike out all down to and including line 14 on page 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) No reorganization plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving such plan. Each reorganization specified in a plan which shall have been approved by the enactment of such a joint resolution shall take effect on the date of enactment of such joint resolution or on the date specified pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to such reorganization, whichever may be the later date."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a further amendment which I intend to propose to Senate bill 1120, to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, and ask that it lie on the table, be printed in the usual form, and also printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, lie on the table, be printed in the usual form, and also printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. DONNELL is as follows:

On page 19, beginning with line 4, strike out all down to and including line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term 'resolution' means only a joint resolution, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Congress approves the reorganization plan numbered ——— transmitted to Congress by the President on ——— ———, 19—', the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a joint resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan."

On page 19, line 22, strike out "ten" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty."

On page 19, line 24, strike out "ten" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty."

On page 20, line 9, strike out "one hour" and insert in lieu thereof "three hours."

On page 21, beginning with line 3, strike out all down to and including line 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) No amendment to the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to."

On page 21, at the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

"(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of section 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

"(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

"(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

"(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House."

PRINTING OF SURVEY OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE IN THE POLITICAL SYSTEM (S. DOC. NO. 97)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in recent months there has been considerable discussion of the electoral college and the part it has played in the political history of this country. A survey of the electoral college in the political system of the United States has been prepared by Mr. Joseph Jackson. It contains so much interesting information that I believe it should be made generally available. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENCE OF REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution calling on the President and the Department of State to devote their efforts and use their influence with the other nations of the world to secure for the people of the Republic of Lithuania a restoration of their independence and their rights to free and democratic elections.

All lovers of liberty were heartened greatly by President Truman's recent statement, in his Navy Day speech in New York, that the United States believes "in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all peoples who have been deprived of them by force."

The President, it will be recalled, declared:

> We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source.

A little later in his speech, the President asserted:

> We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power.

As all Senators know, the United States never has recognized the successive conquests of Lithuania, together with the conquests of its tiny neighbors on the Baltic Sea—Esthonia and Latvia. We have been consistent in this respect, if in no other.

The history of these tiny republics, carved out of war-beset Europe in 1918 and the years following, has been a particularly tragic one. After much effort, the Lithuanian Republic began to function about 1920, but there was never a year when one aggressor or another on her borders did not menace her safety. Despite these constant fears, the Lithuanians worked vigorously and, by 1940, had attained a certain degree of financial and governmental stability. However, from that time until this, the Lithuanians have been first under the heel of one aggressor, then under the heel of another.

The Russians came in first. Later, they were chased out by the Germans. Then, as we know, the Russians came back. This time it looks as if they are going to stay, unless through the United Nations Organization or some other cooperative device we can obtain for the people of Lithuania the freedom they have so richly earned, and of which they have shown they are capable.

My concurrent resolution is self-explanatory. It is in line with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the now-defunct League of Nations, and all the other noble sentiments our leaders have expressed so confidently and so often in the past. Let us in this Congress lend our voice to deliver what our leaders have so glibly put forth as ideals through the years.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) submitted by Mr. WILLIS was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas in the course of the devastating war against totalitarianism, which has been successfully concluded on all military fronts through the mutual efforts and expenditures of blood and material resources of the United Nations, the political sovereignty and independence of many small peace-loving nations was set aside by armies of occupation; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania was a peace-loving nation which was geographically in the path of three military invasions, as a result of which it lost its government and independence; and

Whereas the independence of the Republic of Lithuania has long been and is still recognized by the United States and many nations throughout the world, which have conscientiously proclaimed their allegiance to principles of liberty and equality and the right of self-determination; and

Whereas the policy of the United States of America as expressed in the Atlantic Charter and affirmed in the official utterances of representatives of our State Department has consistently and unequivocally supported the right of all democratic peoples to elect freely, and without external pressure, the form of government which they desire, and the restoration of sovereignty to those who have been forcibly deprived of this sacred prerogative; and

Whereas recently, on October 19, 1945, United States Supreme Court Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson reaffirmed the policy of the United States in a communication to the Government of Soviet Russia wherein he stated:

"In the indictment of German war criminals signed today, reference is made to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and certain other territories as being within the area of the U. S. S. R.

"This language is proposed by Russia and is accepted to avoid delay which would be occasioned by insistence on an alteration in the text. The indictment is signed subject to this reservation and understanding.

"I have no authority either to admit or challenge on behalf of the United States Soviet claims to sovereignty over such territories.

"Nothing therefore in this indictment is to be construed as a recognition by the United States of such sovereignty or as indicating any attitude either on the part of the United States or on the part of the undersigned toward any claim to redisposition of such sovereigny"; and

Whereas recently, on October 27, 1945, President Harry S. Truman, in his Navy Day address on the foreign policy of the United States, declared: "We believe in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all peoples who have been deprived of them by force. We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western Hemisphere. By the combined and cooperative action of our war allies, we shall help the defeated enemy states establish peaceful democratic governments of their own free choice. And we shall try to attain a world in which nazism, fascism, and military aggression cannot exist. We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power"; and

Whereas the omission of London Conference of Foreign Ministers to concern themselves with the vital issues inherent in this matter would tend to effect a lessening of the public faith in the great moral principles for which the war was fought and would make a mockery of the sacrifices of millions of human lives; and

Whereas a permanent peace can be secured only through a mutual respect and consideration of the basic principles of justice and right as they affect all nations, large and small, rich and poor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States and the officers of the State Department give active support to the principles herein announced, and devote their efforts and influence with the nations of the world to secure to the people of the Republic of Lithuania a restoration of their independence and the right of free and democratic election after armies of other nations have left and Lithuanian refugees have been repatriated to their homeland; be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State use their good offices to place the subject matter upon the agenda of the Conference of Foreign Ministers in London within a reasonable time and to support the principles herein set forth when the matter of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania is considered in said Conference.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship," delivered by him before the class to be admitted to citizenship in the United States District Court at Washington, D. C., on November 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF FREDERICK, MD.—ADDRESS BY SENATOR RADCLIFFE

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Frederick, Md., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE VETERAN LOOKS TO CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Veteran Looks to Congress," delivered by him at the Disabled American Veterans' Convention, held in Chicago on October 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS AT PORTLAND, OREG.

[Mr MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. William O. Douglas, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, at Portland, Oreg., on June 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

VJ-DAY ADDRESS BY MAYOR PATTON, OF KNOXVILLE, TENN.

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered on August 14, 1945, VJ-day, by Mayor E. E. Patton, of Knoxville, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

ATOMIC CONTROLS—ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Atomic Controls," written by Ernest K. Lindley and published in Newsweek of the issue of October 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

A FREE PRESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE JERSEY JOURNAL

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Only Congress Can Free Associated Press From Marshall Field Fetters," published in the Jersey Journal, of Jersey City, N. J., on October 23, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH EMPIRE TRADE PREFERENCES—ARTICLES FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. CORDON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles from the New York Times for November 6, 1945, entitled "New England Bars 1946 United States Imports" and "Canadian Cites British Aid," which appear in the Appendix.]

SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSED AS CAPITAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article recommending the selection of San Francisco as capital of the United Nations, written by Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, Minister of External Affairs of Australia, and published in the San Francisco Chronicle for October 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENTS ON PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S POLICIES AND ON CAPITAL TRANSIT STRIKE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on October 30, I addressed to President Truman a letter, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 30, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you so well know, the Nation today is divided as on few previous occasions on the subject of the future defense needs and requirements of our country. This subject includes, of course, the moot matters of compulsory peacetime military training, possible unification of the armed forces, and organization and coordination of the production front.

In order that we might achieve unity and agreement on these crucial matters in this atomic age, may I respectfully recommend to you that you appoint at an early date a National Commission on Total Defense. This commission would be representative of every segment of American life: Our military, naval, and aerial forces, our three great religious faiths, our educational system, our industry, our labor, agriculture, science, veterans' organizations and other vital groups.

It would be my hope, and I humbly believe, the hope of all America that the top-ranking representatives of these groups come together and meet in executive session.

They could seek and interchange the most expert facts and opinions on all phases of national and international activity affecting our future defense. Then they could report out their findings to you and to the people and the Congress of America.

I fully realize the difficulties involved in such a project but I believe that if such a commission were established and set to work, it might prove the one outstanding instrumentality from which Congress and the American people could receive guidance on our future defense steps. In that way, we might prevent another and worse Pearl Harbor from occurring.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Mr. President, under date of November 1 I received from President Truman a letter in response to my proposal that he appoint a National Commission on Total Defense. This Commission would be representative of every segment of American society and would be convened in order to arrive at some agreement on the problem of conscription. The President's letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 1, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I read your letter of October 30 with a lot of interest, and I appreciate your suggestion very much. However, I am of the opinion that the Congress is the responsible commission to act on this program, and I think the Congress should assume the responsibility.

I have made a suggestion to them in a message on national defense, and several of its different phases, and I am very sure that they will work it out.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

As indicated by the letter, the President replied with admirable promptness. In view of the vast business which devolves upon him and the great pressure to which he is subjected, I particularly appreciate his courtesy and dispatch in responding.

Such qualities are unfortunately missing in innumerable agencies of his administration, such as the OPA, which often consumes several months before acknowledging or answering a simple letter, and even then does so unsatisfactorily.

I can understand and respect the President's point of view with regard to conscription; but I cannot reconcile that view with the act of the President in convening the Labor-Management Conference. If such a conference is necessary, as it is indeed, why is not a similar conference necessary and even more so in the case of conscription?

The Labor-Management Conference is, of course, in large degree, unrepresentative of the parties involved. Only a small fraction of the American people is represented. Of the 36 delegates, not a single one represents the public, whose interests are paramount. Not a single one represents independent organized labor, and of course the great mass of unorganized labor is unrepresented.

On the other hand, the Conscription Commission which I have proposed and about which I spoke on the floor of the Senate several days ago would consist of top-notchers from every important segment of American life.

There is a grave inconsistency, then, in the President's words and actions.

OTHER POLICIES OF THE PRESIDENT

There is not a single Member of this great body who does not bear sincere love in his heart for Harry Truman, the man; but many of us find welling up in our minds increasing dissatisfaction with some of the actions of Harry Truman, the statesman.

The President assembles a labor-management conference in order to achieve some kind of voluntary agreement before Congress finds it necessary to enact remedial legislation. Yet the President refuses to convene a defense commission, and instead urges Congress to go ahead with conscription in the face of a divided Nation.

The President makes a wage speech which goes up the hill and back down again and leaves the situation as badly muddled as before.

The President by inference cracks the whip on Congress on reconversion legislation, although Congress has speedily and faithfully considered much of such legislation and has arrived at its honest decisions.

The President pleads for a program which out-New Deals the New Deal, which, item for item, sounds like a CIO hand-out, "Spend, spend, spend," with never a heed as to where the money is to come from or how it is to be obtained. The President gives no sign that he recognizes that America's day of financial reckoning will be at hand if it continues its wild spending jag.

The President pussyfoots with irresponsible labor dictators who are shamelessly wrecking our reconversion effort.

He makes no move, issues no warning, to the men who are scuttling the chances of our veterans' satisfactory return to civilian life.

I am speaking plainly and bluntly, because these issues are so important and because the Harry Truman we knew here in the Senate was a square-shooting, horse-sense American. I am speaking thus because it is still my hope and the hope of millions of others that the Harry Truman in the White House will reverse his march down the CIO-PAC highway to ruin.

I offer these thoughts to the President in all humility, without rancor, without prejudice. America would indeed have an epic Thanksgiving if Harry Truman were soon to disown the prodigals who have squandered the substance of this Nation for more than a decade.

The people are desperate for sound, statesmanlike leadership in the American way.

THE CAPITAL TRANSIT STRIKE

The bitter fruit of the administration's decade-long coddling and false education of labor is seen in the strike which this morning has tied up the city's life line—transportation. This transit strike is intolerable and outrageous. It is the kind of anarchistic strike which catapulted France over its brink of national catastrophe.

The public has once again been figuratively "kicked in the pants" by irresponsible men. The strikers have thumbed their noses at the Labor-Management Conference. I do not espouse the cause of labor or management in this dispute. I say only that the public has been abused and ignored, and that the public, like Andy, is "regusted."

I believe that the public demands now more than ever before that a law with teeth in it be enacted to prohibit strikes and enforce compulsory arbitration in the fields of public utilities, of transportation, communication, vital foods, vital fuel, and the like.

I say, too, that the employer in this dispute, the Capital Transit Co., has one of the most outstanding records of war service in this Nation, certainly in this city, and that its record should be borne in mind at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an article which appears in Forbes magazines for November under my signature.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKES—LABOR'S ATOM BOMB

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"Atomic force is here to stay, but are we?" asks a Washington editorial.

Of the domestic atom bomb, strikes, one might say:

"If strikes are here to stay,
Good-by, the American way!"

The irresponsible wave of strikes which has already begun can blow the American way of life to smithereens. This is neither idle theorizing nor scare talk. It is hard fact. Already America's reconversion effort has been immeasurably set back by countless unnecessary strikes. Already, hundreds of millions of dollars of employees' wages, of investors' returns, of taxable revenue, of production goods, have been lost forever because of avoidable strikes. Already, whole communities have been strike-paralyzed and forced to breathe the alien atmosphere of class hatred.

CHAIN STRIKES

Why, then, don't we—the people and the Congress—do something constructive to remedy these facts?

Are we going to stand idly by while labor disputes explode ever louder one after the other in chain-like fashion, such as in the recent case in Detroit? There, because the Government approved of three men not being reinstated in their jobs (out of an original 11 men fired because of an assault on a foreman), 2,000 men were "pulled" out of a feeder plant and 50,000 men in the main auto plant were thrown out of work. The indirect effects of that strike were felt in virtually every community in our land.

Are we going to stand idly by while the jobs of returning servicemen are destroyed by strikes, even though everyone professes to want to do everything for fighters?

Are we going to allow our food, fuel, transportation, and communication to be cut off because of a few racketeering labor leaders who want to play the game only in their own selfish way?

How far down Europe's road of strike chaos will we go before we wake up? To "wait and see" any longer is unthinkable. We "waited and saw" all during the war, while a small but potent minority of labor violated the no-strike pledge, causing 14,000 strikes and the loss of 24,000,000 mandays. To mouth sweet generalities of labor-management harmony and not to back them up with iron-bound agreements against

strikes is worthless. Not words, but actions must do the remedial job.

Labor, for years, has muffed the opportunity to clean its own house. It has listened to the siren songs of Government to the effect that it could do no wrong. Now, many of its irresponsible leaders have gone berserk in playing with labor's atom bomb.

It is quite evident that the people and the Government must immediately step in to protect the general welfare. I know that these realistic views will invite upon all those who voice them the accusations of labor baiting and union busting. I, for one, deny both charges with all the vigor at my command. I, like so many others who are fed up with labor's abuses, recognize and want to preserve the inherent right of labor of collective bargaining, together with labor's other socially beneficial prerogatives.

I have been a laboring man myself. I have worked in the sawmills of northern Wisconsin for 15 cents an hour, 10 hours a day. I have been a mediator in labor disputes. I have experienced and understood labor's problems and grievances at first hand. But I do not want labor or any other group to blow this country—this way of life—to pieces. This country does not belong only to labor any more than it belongs only to management; it belongs to all of us.

A 10-POINT PROGRAM

If we are to meet the domestic challenge of full employment and the world challenge of peace, we must absolutely assure industrial peace for this Nation. This is why I have proposed on the floor of the United States Senate the following 10-point public charter for freedom from labor abuses:

1. Request of labor leaders that they themselves come forth with their proposals for legislation which will end the menace of strikes.

2. Reevaluate the entire Wagner Act. That act obviously filled a certain need in bygone years, but it is hopelessly obsolete and even harmful today to the best interests of the American people. It is a segmental act, designed for only one segment of our population.

3. Immediately enact legislation to have compulsory arbitration protect the public interest.

4. Amend the Sherman Antitrust Act to make labor organizations whose members are engaged in interstate commerce subject to that act. Prohibit them from engaging in unreasonable restraints of trade; for example, those restraints designed to compel the hiring of useless labor.

5. Establish the policy of having representatives of the public participate in every labor-management conference.

6. Establish the labor-management-public conferences in Washington on a continuing basis rather than on a one-time basis.

7. Enact any necessary clarifications of the draft law to insure full protection of the reemployment rights of veterans.

8. Insure full protection by law-enforcement officers to all veterans and others who want to take up jobs vacated by strikers.

9. Establish the legal responsibility of unions for all violations of contract in the form of wildcat strikes, etc.

10. Require the full and accurate reporting of union finances and officers in the same manner as we require such reports from corporations.

It is only by measures such as these that we can control the "atomic bomb" of strikes and can protect the paramount rights of the public.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, something occurred earlier in the day about which I desire to comment very briefly. I suggest to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] that he give me his attention, as he might be interested in what I shall say, for I shall refer particularly to some of the remarks he made earlier today.

The Senator from Wisconsin earlier today criticized President Truman for what he termed, as I understood him, lack of statesmanship. To digress for a moment, I cannot recall, Mr. President, that in the lifetime of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt he was criticized for too little leadership. Now for the first time I think on the floor of the United States Senate an attack has been made upon President Truman and he is criticized for lack of statesmanship. A call was made by the Senator from Wisconsin for leadership in the American way. I do not quite understand what is meant by that, but it is not important, Mr. President, and it is not my purpose now to defend President Truman against what I consider to be the undue criticism which was made earlier today. President Truman and his administration will be judged by the American people at the proper time, and in the truly American way.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I prefer not to yield at this time.

Mr. REED. I was about to ask the Senator whether he was referring to the election in 1948.

Mr. HATCH. As I say, I prefer to make my statement brief. In response to what the Senator from Kansas has said, I repeat that the judgment of the American people will be exercised, and it will be exercised in the proper way. I, for one, will be willing to abide by the judgment of the American people, rather than to be influenced by partisan criticism and fault finding.

Mr. President, I wish to mention particularly that part of the statement which I understood to be criticism of the President because he failed to call a conference on conscription. The President was accused of being inconsistent because he failed to call such a conference, but did call a conference between labor and management. It is difficult for me to follow that reasoning. It may be necessary or proper to have a conference on conscription, or perhaps on a multitude of other perplexing problems which today confront the people of America; but certainly there is no inconsistency that I can see in calling together responsible representatives of organized labor and of industry, with representatives of the public, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce to try, by conference, agreement, and accord, to find some solution to the problem of peace in labor-industrial disputes, and to find some formula to settle such disputes peacefully instead of by force and violence. Regardless of the outcome of the conference, whether anything good is achieved or not, I applaud the efforts of the administration to try to bring together these vitally important groups to reach a peaceful, friendly solution. If the President is to be criticized for calling this conference and not calling other conferences, I am reminded that it is said that the first suggestion for the conference came from the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. If the President is to be criticized, so also is the Senator from Michigan and the former Senator from Washington, the present Secretary of Labor.

No, Mr. President, instead of criticizing the President in his efforts to find a peaceful solution, I think every official and every citizen of this country should lend all possible encouragement to the efforts now going on in the city of Washington to find a peaceful method of settling disputes. I have not been too optimistic about the results of such a conference, but certainly I do not wish to say one word or do a single thing which might adversely affect the efforts of those who are now trying. Certainly I shall not criticize, and I hope no one else will criticize, until the conference shall have ended and the final results can be determined on the basis of what has been achieved or not achieved. Even if the conference should utterly fail, if there should be no formula, there might yet come out of the discussions germs of ideas which in weeks or months to come might be productive of great good.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that I did not hear the earlier remarks of the Senator. May I ask who was criticizing?

Mr. HATCH. As I stated in the beginning, as I understood the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], he criticized the President of the United States, perhaps not for calling the Labor-Management Conference, but for being inconsistent because he did not also at the same time call a conference on conscription. I take this opportunity to express my hope that out of the conference now in progress between labor and management some good will result.

If this country is to continue with any measure whatever of domestic peace and prosperity, some method, voluntary or otherwise, of settling disputes fairly, equitably, and justly to all parties, including the public, must be found.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HATCH. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Obviously there is no comparison between calling a conference in an attempt to settle the great questions between labor and management, and calling a conference on conscription.

Mr. HATCH. I could not see the connection.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no comparison at all. It would be interesting to know what those who are constantly critcizing what is being done in the attempt to settle a most difficult question have to offer as a substitute. It is one thing to offer constructive critcism, but it is another thing to offer destructive criticism. It is very easy to destroy and tear down, but those who attempt to destroy, those who attempt to critcize the President of the United States because he is attempting, through the conference in Washington, to settle one of the most difficult and grave problems which confront us, should have something to offer as a substitute.

Mr. HATCH. Let me interrupt the Senator to say that there is no more important question now before us.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. But let those who criticize come forward with something better. Let them introduce legislation and see how far they can get with it in connection with the labor problem at the present time. That is what they ought to do. They ought to have some substitute to offer, rather than rising on the floor of the Senate and criticizing the President.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. I yield now to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and then I shall yield the floor. I should like to hear what the Senator from Oregon has to suggest on this question, because he has been studying the problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall consume only a few minutes.

I wish to place myself on record as sharing the views expressed by the Senator from New Mexico. I believe that the calling of the industry-labor conference offers us the greatest hope for a statesmanlike settlement of the great labor problems which confront the country. It is a constructive effort and I commend the President for it.

I recall the day when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, with his colleagues, introduced what has become known as the Burton-Ball-Hatch bill. That day I released a press statement expressing my views in opposition to the bill, and I suggested, as I had suggested while I was still a member of the War Labor Board, that just such a conference as has now been convened should be held. I also expressed a similar view to the President in a conference with him 2 days before he left for Potsdam. I believe that only through such voluntary action can we hope to have any long-time settlement of procedures for handling labor difficulties which arise. Restrictive legislation is not a satisfactory device for directing the course of a social and economic movement such as the labor movement.

While I am on my feet I wish to compliment the President for what I think was a very statesmanlike speech delivered to the Conference yesterday. I think he put the issues squarely on the table before the parties to the Conference. I particularly wish to commend the statement he made with respect to jurisdictional disputes, because I happen to share the view that unless labor, by voluntary agreement, comes forward with a procedure whereby jurisdictional disputes can be settled without strikes, it is the public duty and obligation of the Congress of the United States to establish whatever court procedures may be necessary to settle jurisdictional disputes by legal sanctions and determinations. I say that because jurisdictional disputes impinge upon the legal rights of people not parties to an economic struggle. I hope that this Conference will keep constantly in mind the very important line of demarcation between the legal rights of parties to labor disputes and the social and economic rights of such parties. In the latter category I do not believe that strait-jacket legislation can provide us with any permanent solution to the problem. However, government does have the responsibility to see to it that parties in an economic struggle which impinges upon the legal rights of groups or individuals, be they labor or employers, must be prevented from the transgressions against the legal rights of others. I believe that the President made that very clear by implication, if not by exact language, yesterday when he told the Conference in effect that some procedure must be found for settling jurisdictional disputes. I wish to commend him for that position and to express the hope that industrial and labor leaders in this country will proceed to act as statesmen in providing voluntary procedures for settling jurisdictional quarrels before it becomes necessary for the Government to use so-called police methods and legal sanctions against such strikes.

SCRAPPING OF CONTROLS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I desire that there appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most thought-provoking editorial from the Washington Post for October 30. Its warning against the capricious scrapping of controls by the War Production Board, at the very time when an orderly conversion to peace is essential if we are to avoid chaotic conditions in American industry, comes at the eleventh hour.

The Senate Small Business Committee, under the able leadership of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], has solemnly warned against this eventuality on several occasions. Even before the surrender of Japan, the committee held hearings, beginning June 15, on the impact of reconversion policies on small business. There the testimony developed that the scrapping of the priorities system might very well result in a wild scramble for critical materials and components in which big business would crowd out smaller firms. Largely as a result of the investigation of the Small Business Committee, the War Production Board set up a system of bottleneck breaking intended to meet this situation. It is too soon yet to report final results, for the system has been in effect only during the last month.

Already the Senate Small Business Committee has had referred to it by other Senators, and has received directly, complaints from small manufacturers regarding their inability to obtain the necessary steel, components, and other materials required to build farm machinery so vitally needed by American agriculture. Hearings which the Subcommittee on Complaints of the Small Business Committee is now holding show a dangerous drop in farm machinery production during the last several months. And, with stoppage due to labor-management difficulties at key points in the industry, farm machinery products might well fall off to a point imperiling next year's planting and harvesting of crops; at the very time when the domestic demands and the humanitarian requirements of UNRRA will be at their peak.

Mr. President, I cannot leave this important topic without reading for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues in the Senate the Washington Post editorial. It reads:

UNSCRAMBLING TOO FAST

It is good news that President Truman is coming to grips with the wage-price dilemma that has arisen out of a haphazard demobilization policy. We hope that the President's radio address tonight will lift a good deal of the confusion that has developed in recent weeks. If the President deals realistically with the relationship of wages to prices, there will be ground for hope that he will also give more attention to the whole broad problem of orderly reconversion.

At present it is all too obvious that reconversion is not proceeding in accord with a well-prepared and comprehensive plan. Some controls are being relaxed with great speed, while others are being rigidly maintained, at least in theory. The most striking example is the retention of the OPA in full regalia while the WLB is in the process of liquidation. Apparently the WLB was put on the skids without much concern for what the effect would be on our general economy. Its policy of holding a check on wages was allowed to slip into discard, and nothing constructive was put in its place. Since wages are the major item in production costs, this tended to cut the ground from beneath the OPA's efforts to maintain price ceilings.

Exhibit No. 2 may well be the overhasty liquidation of the WPB. As WPB expires, our economy resumes a status of partial control that may produce more headaches than complete abolition of restraints would do. One result has been to throw a greater burden on the administration of export controls. In the absence of WPB allocation of raw materials, it was felt that exports should be restricted in order to protect domestic supplies. That has an unfortunate effect on our foreign trade, cutting off supplies urgently needed by other countries or opening markets that we ordinarily supply to the producers of other countries.

One trouble seems to be that agencies have been allowed to follow their own inclinations as to demobilization. WPB winds up its affairs in a hurry because Chairman Krug is eager to leave the Government service; OPA stays on the job because Administrator Bowles thinks it still has important work to do. OSS was ripped apart in order to make room for an intelligence organization which is still in the planning stage; OSRD has been retained, wisely, till a science foundation can be set up under the Magnuson bill. And so on.

Before this drifting carries us further away from a sound reconversion policy, the Administration ought to take a firmer grip on the helm and straighten out its course.

We are fully aware of the clamor for relaxation of controls. But we are far more impressed by the wastages and bottlenecks that are the price of hasty decontrol or partial decontrol. Brains that should be left in the Government service are scattered, organization that should be retained is broken up. It is courting disaster to remove governmental restraints at a time when the normal restraints of a free economy cannot operate or to subject industry and labor to the confusion of uneven relaxation. The country cannot afford to risk loose disintegration of wartime controls.

This, Mr. President, expresses, in considerable measure, my own thinking, and poses the problem before the Congress and the Administration of maintaining those particular controls which are required during the transition period in order to insure an orderly and economically sound shift to peacetime production.

I urge upon the administration the necessity of reconsidering its decision

concerning the War Production Board. When the new organization, the Civilian Production Administration, begins work in November, it must have the resources, both in adequate staffs and workable directives, which will insure American business, and especially small and new business enterprise, the opportunity to compete fairly with large and powerfully entrenched corporations in obtaining raw materials for the manufacture of goods.

THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN GENERAL MOTORS CORP. AND THE UAW-CIO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, in the absence of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who previously inserted in the RECORD part I and sections 1 and 2 of part II of the economic brief presented by the General Motors Department of the UAW-CIO in its current wage negotiations with the General Motors Corp., I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the final section of that brief, as presented to the corporation Friday, October 26.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD following the brief the text of an advertisement inserted in the Nation's press yesterday by General Motors and containing the text of a letter dated October 27, 1945, from C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors, to the UAW-CIO, proposing that the union join with the corporation in urging Congress to amend the Wages and Hours Act to increase the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours.

I further ask to have inserted in the RECORD the reply of Walter P. Reuther, vice president and director of the General Motors department of the UAW-CIO, in which he properly characterizes Mr. Wilson's offer as a proposal to "turn the clock back" and a proposal to enter into a conspiracy against millions of returning veterans and laid-off war workers, to bar the door of job opportunity against them.

I also request that there be printed in the RECORD the statement of Harvey Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, AFL, denouncing the General Motors proposal as an imitation of the notorious so-called American plan that led the Nation back to normalcy after World War I, and laid the basis for World War II.

Mr. President, anyone with any knowledge of modern mass production knows—and I am sure Mr. Wilson knows—that the way to get maximum production is not to stretch out the workweek but to put operations on a three-shift basis. This was the answer given by Walter Reuther when Mr. Wilson first proposed a longer workweek at a National Association of Manufacturers press conference in Detroit October 19. It is the only answer that offers any hope of all-out production in the automobile industry to meet the great accumulated demand for cars in the next 3 years.

I suggest to the Members of the Senate that they study the brief presented to the corporation and submitted to the Senate and the American public by the union. As the junior Senator from Montana has well said, it is now up to General Motors to meet the facts and arguments presented by the union and, unless they can be disproved, to negotiate and reach an agreement with the union on the basis of the economic facts.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURCHASING POWER FOR PROSPERITY—IN THE MATTER OF INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA-CIO AND GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

THE CASE FOR MAINTAINING TAKE-HOME PAY WITHOUT INCREASING PRICES

(Presented by Walter P. Reuther, vice president, director, General Motors department, UAW-CIO)

(Letter of transmittal)

CHARLES E. WILSON,
President, General Motors Corp.,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Herewith is presented part II, section 3 of the brief in support of the demand of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America-CIO for a 30-percent increase in basic wage rates in order to maintain take-home pay without any increase in the price of General Motors products and for other amendments of the agreement between this union and the corporation.

In part I, presented October 19, 1945, we set forth the need of General Motors workers and the entire economy for such maintenance of take-home pay.

In part II, section 1, presented October 23, we presented proof that General Motors can pay the increase in wage rates which we demand, and can do so without increasing the prices of its products.

In part II, section 2, presented October 24, we showed that in the postwar period, when capacity production is assured by the market for cars, the greatly increased volume of output will make it possible for General Motors to pay the increased wage rates and make such large profits as to permit a three-way-profit split among workers, consumers, and investors, resulting in reduction in the price of cars, increased take-home profits for investors and the increased wage rate we have requested.

Now, in the final part II, section 3, we show that General Motors can pay the 30-percent increase in wage rates now.

The corporation now is returning to the production of automobiles, which is even more profitable to General Motors than the highly profitable production of war materials.

War production has improved the financial condition of GM and leaves it well able to meet all reconversion costs, including the cost of maintaining the weekly take-home pay of its workers.

Congress has given GM a 2-year guaranty that puts a floor under its take-home profits in the event its earnings should fall below its prewar average earnings.

Congress has also promptly enacted tax relief for GM. Since GM will get tax relief now, it can, should, provide take-home-pay relief for its workers now.

GM can pay 30 percent higher wage rates now without endangering its reconversion program and will face no difficulty in obtaining new capital for expansion, if needed, from the well-filled reservoir of personal savings which are seeking investment opportunities.

GM can pay 30 percent higher wage rates without increasing prices and still get into profitable production by December 1945, according to the forecasts of production given to the press by GM officials on October 19, 1945. By March 1946 it will be producing cars at a rate 70 percent above its best prewar year and will be making profits far above any it has made in its long history of outstanding profitability.

As a supplement to parts I and II, since it deals with both phases of our brief, I am presenting a United Press report from Washington appearing in the Detroit Free Press yesterday, October 25, 1945. You will note that the findings of Government economists summarized therein support the facts and logic presented in this brief. The findings significantly report that the manufacturing industry can raise wages on an average of 24 percent without raising prices, and that some manufacturers can do better. Automobiles are one of the most profitable industries and General Motors, as we have demonstrated, is a high-profit maker among automobile companies. Therefore, these Government findings further justify the proposals we have made with respect to a 30-percent increase in wage rates and a three-way split of postwar profits among workers, consumers, and investors.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
Vice President, Director,
General Motors Department, UAW-CIO.
OCTOBER 26, 1945.

—

[From the Detroit Free Press of October 25, 1945]

UNITED STATES EXPERTS SAY PAY CAN RISE 24 PERCENT WITHOUT PRICE BOOST—INDUSTRY STILL COULD PROFIT, THEY CLAIM—TRUMAN STUDIES ECONOMISTS' SURVEY

WASHINGTON.—President Truman conferred with the Reconversion Advisory Board on a finding by Government economists that industry can afford to raise basic wage rates at least 24 percent without increasing prices.

Mr. Truman and the 12-man panel discussed the estimate in light of the administration's quest for a new wage-price formula to cure the Nation's reconversion ills.

The President is expected to announce a policy soon.

The economists who prepared the report are from John W. Snyder's Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. They undertook the task at the request of the advisory group headed by O. Max Gardner, former North Carolina Governor.

Statistics submitted to the Board by Government economists said that industry will save 10 percent of its earnings by repeal of the excess-profits tax, 9.5 percent by partial elimination of wartime incentive premiums, and 4.5 percent by reduction of wartime overtime pay.

Their report said this saving could be used to raise wages without reducing wartime profit levels.

They recommended that the average hourly earnings in each industry be restored to the April 1945 rate by early next year.

Even with this increase, they said, industry's total wage bill still will be more than 20 percent below that of last April.

CIO unions in mass-production industries are demanding a 30-percent wage boost to maintain take-home pay at wartime levels.

The Board said that in addition to measurable savings in industrial earnings, certain intangible factors, such as increased productivity, will contribute to industry's ability to pay higher wages.

The report said that the figures did not take into account differences between various industries, regions, and occupational groups.

It did not exclude the possibility of price increases for marginal manufacturers.

It did take into account, however, that civilian goods will be manufactured at a lower profit margin, that there will be a costly labor turn-over and that a high unit-cost may prevail during the early stages of an industry's reconversion to civilian output.

Industry's ability to pay was measured against labor's loss of take-home pay and the prospect that unemployment will total 8,000,000 persons by next April because of war cut-backs and demobilization of the armed forces.

The report estimated that the total decline in wages and salaries will be $35,000,000,000.

—

ECONOMIC BRIEF—PART II, SECTION 3

C. General Motors Corp. can pay a 30-percent increase in wage rates now, and without increasing the prices of its products.

Its peacetime production is more profitable than its war production.

It is well provided with cash reserves and can claim refunds of past taxes from the United States Treasury if its income falls.

It will share in the liberal tax relief for big corporations which Congress is now preparing.

Its financial condition has been greatly strengthened by 3 years of operation on Government contracts.

It can prepare for peace production at minor cost, and has equipped its plants with the finest of new facilities and equipment at public expense during the war.

It can pay 30-percent higher wage rates and still get into profitable production of cars and trucks well before its volume reaches capacity.

1. General Motors stands not to lose, but to gain, by reconversion from wartime production to peacetime production. Its record proves that peacetime production has been, and will be, more profitable to General Motors than war production.

It was shown above that GM net profits after taxes provided the following aggregate returns on its investment in 3-year periods of war and peace:

	Percent of net worth
3 war years, 1942–44	38.7
3 years, chiefly peactime production, 1939–41	53.4
3 peacetime years, 1935–38	53.3

It will be recalled that General Motors, in company with other automobile manufacturers, strongly resisted the proposal that it convert its plants to war production. It said it could not be done. The UAW-CIO insisted it could be done, and eventually the Government directed the industry to do what the union had proposed.

The auto industry went to war reluctantly. The above profit figures show why. It cannot now claim hardship upon being released to go back to the highly profitable production of automobiles and refrigerators. It cannot claim inability to pay higher wages with new highs in peacetime profits immediately ahead of it.

2. General Motors is financially well able to raise wages 30 percent now in anticipation of profitable production within a few months.

a. Although war profits after taxes have averaged less for GM than its extraordinary high peacetime profits, the war has been generous to GM and has greatly improved its financial condition and its ability to pay increased wage rates now, without any increase in prices.

1. GM has been operating during the war in large part with Government plants, costing nearly $650,000,000 of taxpayers' money but requiring no risk or investment on the part of General Motors.

2. Meanwhile, out of war profits, it has written off the value of its own plants liberally.

Book value of property, plant, and equipment Jan. 1, 1942	$851,707,000
Depreciated value at Jan. 1, 1942	403,874,000
Subsequent net additions at cost	114,237,000
Depreciation during 1942–44	225,000,000
Net book value Dec. 31, 1944	299,000,000

In October 1944 Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., stated that the GM $500,000,000 postwar reconversion and expansion plan will be financed in part with funds obtained from these depreciation reserves.

3. Net working capital has increased from $500,000,000 January 1, 1942, to $903,000,000 December 31, 1944, an 80 percent gain that provides GM with increased cash resources in the amount of $403,387,000.

4. During the 3 years of war, 1942 to 1944, dividends paid have totaled $333,697,000 and net worth has increased $196,779,000, a total gain to stockholders of $530,476,000.

5. Other war gains, not reflected in net income of the corporation, include:

Depreciation of war facilities above normal rate	$32,270,000
Write-off of "special tools" in 1944	41,846,000
Write-off of total investment in enemy and enemy occupied countries	48,820,000
Income of foreign subsidiaries not remitted due to exchange restrictions	11,429,000

6. GM reports to stockholders in 1942 give numerous examples of the improvements made to its facilities while operating profitably under war contracts. A recital of a few of these as described by GM shows clearly the value of these improvements for peacetime production:

"At Buick, a newly designed electric welding machine makes it possible to speed up welding of Diesel engine crankshaft balancers from 3 to 36 per hour.

"Armasteel castings supplant steel forgings, save large quantities of vital materials and many man-hours of machining time because there is less excess metal to be removed.

"New multiple spindle drills perform 14 lapping operations simultaneously, superseding single radial drill operation.

"Slide plates originally milled individually were pressed 9 at a time. This process was later improved by stamping the plates on a punch press, using 5 men for the operation instead of 40. * * *

"Electric riveting, replacing the conventional cold hammer method, halves the production time on the riveting operation."

C. E. Wilson told the Truman committee of the United States Senate in 1943 of the corporation's increased production facilities:

"We had about 75,000 machine tools in GM in 1940. We now have under our control 143,774 as of November 8, 1943—85,828 belong to GM—56,708 of them belong to the Government." In addition, he stated that the Government had constructed 12,500,000 square feet of new plant facilities for the corporation as of that date.

The 1942 annual report to stockholders states that $30,743,176 of additions to plant and property in that year are "required for war production but are considered usable after the war." Total new additions of property, plant, and equipment in the three war years for company account were $226,840,000.

b. While the war has been generous to GM, the officers and directors of GM have been generous to themselves.

GM officers and directors received salaries, bonus, commission and other compensation including "allowance for living expenses," during the war years (1942–44) for a total of approximately	$13,500,000
Other employees receiving compensation in excess of $75,000 a year were paid during these 3 years a total of approximately	4,500,000
Total war remuneration of top personnel was approximately	18,000,000

In 1943, 21 top officers received total compensation of $4,926,018, or an average of $234,572 each. This was 46.8 percent more than these same officers received in 1939, when their average compensation was $159,825 each.

Out of the 1943 bonus paid to 3,983 salaried employees, amounting to $3,035,761 in cash and 81,006 shares of GM stock worth $4,212,312, some 50 officers and directors (who approved the bonus) took 25 percent, amounting to $1,793,385 in cash and stock.

Highest paid employee of General Motors is Charles E. Wilson, president. In 1943 he received total compensation of $459,041, an increase of 94 percent over the $236,584 he received in 1939. His 1943 compensation, amounting to $8,847 a week, or $177 an hour, pays him as much for 8 hours as thousands of GM workers are paid for a year's work.

It is this same 459-thousand-dollar Wilson who, in his letter of October 3, calls "unreasonable" our demand for a 30 percent increase in wage rates to maintain the $2,935 take-home pay of the average GM worker.

In 1942, as a result of a suit by GM stockholders, various officers and directors and large stockholders were required to return to the corporation $1,500,000 which they previously had paid themselves as a bonus.

In 1945, presumably in order to avoid a repetition of this embarrassing occurrence, the bylaws of the corporation were amended so that ratification of any action of directors can be obtained in a stockholders' meeting where 30 percent of the outstanding voting stock is represented. A statement issued under regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission reveals that "officers, directors, and their associates" control 30 percent of the GM voting stock. The members of GM's bonus and salary committee in 1944 were Lammot du Pont, chairman; Henry B. du Pont, John L. Pratt, John J. Raskob, and George Whitney.

It is the considered judgment of UAW-CIO that no future refund of bonuses voted to GM officers and directors by GM officers and directors is to be expected. What price democracy among GM stockholders?

3. General Motors can't lose. The United States Government generously protects the interest of GM stockholders through provision for tax refunds that put a floor under profits during the period of transition to profitable peacetime production.

a. In the event of a net loss this year or next, General Motors may claim a refund from the Treasury of part or all of the $200,000,000 of normal income taxes it has paid during 2 years. However, the prospect of loss is remote. General Motors has failed to earn a net income in only 1 year of its 28-year history—1921.

b. In the event GM profits before taxes fall below $220,800,000 during this year or next, it can claim refunds from the United States Treasury up to a maximum of $160,000,000 in 2 years.

4. Congress is promptly providing a bonus to big business through tax reductions. Repeal of the excess-profits tax and reduction of the maximum corporation income tax from 40 percent to 36 percent will undoubtedly be approved, after Senate and House have decided which is to take major credit for this bonus to business.

A measure of the forthcoming tax relief to General Motors is indicated by the following:

	Federal tax paid	Tax at 36 percent rate	Saving to General Motors
1944	$275,400,000	$158,900,000	$116,500,000
1943	258,000,000	160,100,000	97,900,000
1941	275,500,000	177,200,000	98,300,000

It is possible that GM profits at capacity operations in postwar years will rise to $600,000,000 or $700,000,000, as shown above. In this event the tax savings Congress is about to vote to GM are as follows:

Profits before taxes	General Motors tax at present rate	Tax at 36-percent rate	Savings to General Motors
$600,000,000	$412,000,000	$216,000,000	$196,000,000
700,000,000	497,000,000	252,000,000	245,000,000

Under these conditions the tax savings alone will be greater than the corporation's profits after taxes in all but a few exceptional prewar years.

Since GM is to get its take-home profits relief now, it can afford to pay its workers take-home pay relief now.

5. The high rate of profits earned by General Motors on automobile production in the past shows that it will pass the "break-even" point and begin to accumulate profits in December, 1945, before its output reaches 50 percent of capacity.

Analysis of past performance of GM in automobile production shows that it will pass the break-even point, under different assumptions, as follows:

	Break-even point (percent of capacity)	Number of cars
Labor productivity as in 1940, selling at 1942 model prices:		
Material prices 5 percent above 1941: and—		
Present wage rates	25	700,000
Wage rates increased 30 percent	31	860,000
Material prices 15 percent above 1941: and—		
Present wage rates	29	810,000
Wage rates increased 30 percent	40	1,100,000

These estimates make clear that 30 percent higher wage rates will delay by only a short time, possibly a few weeks, the date when General Motors will begin to make a profit and move on to the tremendous and unprecedented profits that are in store for its capacity production soon thereafter.

Forecasts of productivity given by heads of all GM divisions at the C. E. Wilson press conference on October 19, 1945, show that its total output of passenger cars will reach capacity levels by March 1946. Their forecasts also show that by December of this year production will have passed the break-even point of 1,100,000 cars a year, allowing for 30 percent higher wage rates and a 15-percent increase since 1941 in material prices.

6. The General Motors program for reconversion and postwar expansion is not in any respect endangered by increasing wage rates 30 percent without increasing prices of General Motors products.

(a) Reconversion will be rapid. C. E. Wilson's NAM press conference in Detroit, October 19, 1945, disclosed that GM can be making profits 2 months from now while paying 30 percent higher wage rates.

(b) The proportion of the $500,000,000 postwar program that GM claims it will spend for reconverting its plants to the production of automobiles is small. GM has not stated what share is to go to reconversion and what share to expansion. However, the following considerations support the conclusion that the reconversion share is a small part of the total:

(1) GM plants are already adequate for the production of 2,800,000 passenger cars and 500,000 trucks, requiring only retooling from war to peace production. By December 1945, GM claims it will be producing at a rate of 1,150,000 passenger cars per year, which will equal 62 percent of its highest previous production rate, achieved in 1941.

(2) The War Production Board reported May 16, 1945, that the automobile industry would require only $29,000,000 to cover its immediate construction needs for reconversion and $50,000,000 for the tools and equipment required. Even to bring the industry up to requirements for capacity production, the WPB report lists only $200,000,000 for construction and $150,000,000 for tools and equipment. This would indicate no more than $40,000,000 as GM's immediate reconversion costs, and $155,000,000 as an outside figure to prepare it for capacity production.

(c) If, in addition, GM has plans for expansion over and above what it can finance from depreciation reserves, war reserves, and earned surplus, it will have no difficulty in obtaining the additional funds from investors in the capital market.

(1) GM's excellent profit history and its unparalleled prospects of profits at capacity production will enable it to obtain all the capital it wants at a low cost.

(2) The reported fund of $140,000,000,000 of individual savings built up during the war is largely held, as we have shown above, by persons in the upper income brackets who are looking for investment opportunities for their savings. There is not the slightest doubt that all the securities GM cares to offer will be eagerly sought after by the investing public, and a 30-percent increase in wage rates without any increase in prices of GM products will not deter them.

(d) The legend propagated in paid advertisements by GM to the effect that its workers are about to ravage its war reserves and cut off its chances of going forward to conquer new empires in the field of American and world industry is plain propaganda without pretense of plausibility, because—

(1) Our wage demand cannot possibly offset, in cost to GM, the profit expansion it will experience in 1946, or at the latest in 1947.

(2) GM wants the public to believe that the war was fought to create a Santa Claus for corporations with a stocking full of profits to finance expansion programs for the indefinite future.

(3) Within a year after reaching capacity production, GM profits will reach unprecedented figures, in spite of a 30-percent increase in wage rates without any increase in prices. GM itself will then be looking for investment opportunities for undistributed profits, the size of which will dwarf its present war reserves.

Conclusion

The International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America-CIO has justified its demand for a 30-percent increase in basic wage rates in order to maintain take-home pay without any increase in the price of General Motors products and for other amendments of the agreement between this union and the corporation.

We have proved the need of GM workers and the entire economy for such maintenance of take-home pay, if we are to make the transition and full employment for peace on a stable and lasting basis.

We proved that failure of General Motors and other durable goods manufacturers to raise wages without increasing prices will create a false prosperity lasting only a year or two, followed by the worst depression in our history.

We proved that the first step toward a full production and full employment economy in which Americans could have the purchasing power (the wages) to consume 50 percent more than ever before is the increase of wage rates to maintain take-home pay.

We stressed the interest of farmers and businessmen in thus maintaining the market for their products.

We proved that General Motors can pay the increase in wage rates; it can do so without increasing the prices of its products; it can do it now.

We proved that General Motors before the war could have paid substantial higher wages without increasing prices and still have had high profits—even at the relatively low levels of output then prevailing.

We proved that General Motors in the prewar year 1941 received more in profits (before taxes) for each man-hour worked by GM workers than it paid out in wages. The GM workers produced $1.07 for his family and $1.09 for GM stockholders every hour he worked in 1941.

We proved that increased volume of output, together with higher labor productivity in postwar production, will greatly increase GM profits on each hour worked by every GM worker, and therefore will reinforce its ability to pay the increased wage rates without any increase in the prices of its products.

We proved that because of its cash reserves and the equipment furnished during the war at public expense and the many aids and insurances given by the tax laws, the corporation cannot lose. It can pay 30 percent higher wage rates without higher prices and still get into profitable production well before it reaches anticipated capacity production early in 1946. Its first full year of postwar production will be astonishingly profitable.

The General Motors Corp. can and should, in fairness, equity, and the public interests, agree to the union demand that it pay a 30-percent increase in wage rates now and without any increase in the prices of its products.

Further, for the same reasons, the corporation can and should accept the union's proposal of a three-way split among workers, consumers, and investors of the greatly increased postwar profits that can certainly be anticipated.

WALTER P. REUTHER
Vice President, Director,
General Motors Department, UAW-CIO.
OCTOBER 26, 1945.

[From the Washington Post of October 29, 1945]

PRODUCE MORE AND HAVE MORE—A PROPOSAL TO THE NATION, TO ITS LAWMAKERS, ECONOMISTS, ITS FARMERS, ITS INDUSTRIAL WORKERS, ITS BUSINESSMEN

Every thinking American must realize that this country now faces a situation without parallel either during the war or before it.

Before the war we were busy at production of all the things required by a peacetime economy. We maintained a high standard of living, supported the Government with our taxes, exported to foreign countries, and enjoyed imports from them.

Then came the war. Production was stepped up to unprecedented levels and devoted almost entirely to military needs. Production of civilian goods was reduced to the barest necessities.

Now the war is over. We turn again to supplying civilian needs. But today these needs, unfilled for four long years, are at the highest peak of all time. Our Government's tax requirements are no longer the staggering needs of war, but they are still the enormous needs of war's aftermath—many times greater than before the war. There is also immediate, urgent need for all kinds of goods to aid the recovery and rehabilitation of a war-torn world.

The simple fact is that we have a big job ahead of us.

We can't get it done on the prewar basis of work.

We must produce far more now than ever before.

Recognizing these problems, we have made the following proposal:

OCTOBER 27, 1945.
INTERNATIONAL UNION, UAW-CIO,
Detroit, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: General Motors proposes that the UAW-CIO join with it in petitioning the Congress to change the Wages and Hours Act to make the standard workweek 45 hours in place of 40 hours during the postwar reconstruction period. This proposal is made recognizing that the country has a big load to carry in cleaning up the aftermath of the war and that under these conditions we can all have more only if we produce more.

The reason for this proposal to change the law is that the present law putting the penalty of overtime pay of 50 percent on the

extra hours over 40 discourages employers and business generally from planning such extra hours of production, thereby tending to reduce the country to a 40-hour week when the country and the world are demanding more production at lower prices.

With this change in the workweek, we propose that all wage rates be increased approximately 6 percent so that men working 45 hours at the new straight-time rates will make as much money as they do now for 45 hours of work. This proposal would increase the earnings of those working less than 45 hours and would also increase the extra compensation for any hours worked over 45, since such hours would be paid for at time and a half based on the new rates.

Your first impression of this proposal probably will be that it is a reactionary idea, and not in the interest of labor. It is not reactionary any more than working longer hours in the war emergency was. We are sure that it is in the best interests of all the people of our country, and particularly in the best interests of all workmen.

If the 40-hour week was sound prewar and the 48-hour week during the war, the 45-hour week is sound for the immediate period following such a world catastrophe as we have been through. All Americans are expecting an even higher standard of living postwar than we had prewar. This can be accomplished at this time only by producing more, as we now must carry the huge additional tax burden and other expenses growing out of the war. The simple fact is that we have a big job ahead of us. We cannot get it done on the prewar basis of work. We must produce far more than we did in the past.

The workmen of other nations will work for more than 45 hours. In many cases they will have only a bare subsistence living while they are doing it, because of the lack of good tools and machinery, like those supplied by employers in our country.

This proposal has much to recommend.

1. It avoids a substantial reduction in weekly earnings.

2. It prevents inflation and preserves the purchasing power of War Bonds, insurance, social security, and other savings.

3. It does not upset the balance between agricultural workers, salaried workers, and industrial workers.

4. It will produce more goods and services, and the people of our country will have more.

5. It will create more good jobs and the employment of more people. Just as many men and women will be employed in our plants on a 45-hour week as on a 40-hour week. And it will allow the use of our plants for the extra 5 hours when they would otherwise be idle.

6. It will stimulate business activity and create more jobs, and result in the employment of many more people in all related businesses.

7. If our plants could be scheduled to work on this basis, we would produce nine cars where we would otherwise have produced only eight. It will mean that one man out of nine will have a car who would otherwise go without.

We believe that a 45-hour week is necessary and desirable during the period of postwar reconstruction, for the following reasons:

1. During this period our country will be shipping food, materials, and machinery to other countries all over the world to help them rehabilitate themselves and avoid starvation.

2. We still have the extra expense of bringing our fighting men back home and fitting them into civilian work.

3. We still have high taxes, which necessarily are a charge against industry and all producers.

4. To develop and apply technological improvements and to reorganize industry takes time—years, not months.

It is hoped that at the end of this postwar reconstruction period:

1. Our relations with other countries will be on the basis of a two-way street, where we shall get back goods and services for those we supply.

2. The fighting men will be back at peacetime work, and the aftermath of the war will be over.

3. Government expense and the number of Government employes will be reduced and not be such an excessive burden on all producers.

4. Technological improvements—the better ways of doing all the things that are necessary to deliver products to customers—will have become effective.

We can then have a 40-hour week with more leisure time and more goods and services, and can continue to improve the standard of living of all Americans.

Yours very truly,

C. E. WILSON,
President.

WHY WE BELIEVE EVERYONE SHOULD FAVOR THIS PROPOSAL

It would help America to produce and have more.

It would provide for higher wages without the certain necessity of higher prices.

It would help to strengthen buying power, sustain the tax requirements, and maintain the value of war bonds, savings and insurance.

It would be good for the working man, good for the employer, good for the farmer, good for the professional man, good for the housewife.

Good for America.

GENERAL MOTORS.

REPLY OF WALTER P. REUTHER

"The UAW-CIO refuses to join in a conspiracy with General Motors to slam the door of job opportunity in the faces of millions of returning servicemen and other Americans who are seeking and are entitled to work" Walter P. Reuther, vice president of the UAW-CIO and director of the union's GM department, said today.

Reuther referred to the letter C. E. Wilson is reported to have written to the union Saturday proposing that the UAW-CIO join with the corporation in petitioning Congress to amend the Wages and Hours Act to make the standard work week 45 hours instead of 40. Wilson also proposed a 6-percent wage increase with the establishment of a 45-hour week without overtime. Reuther explained that the union had not yet received the corporation's letter and that his reply was based on press reports.

"The American people will never tolerate Wilson's demands to turn the clock back" Reuther said—"we fought and won the war to go forward not backward.

"Having failed in an attempt to get the UAW-CIO to become its partner in a price boosting conspiracy against the American consumers which would have set off the fires of inflation, GM now proposes another deal—a conspiracy against millions of returning veterans and laid-off war workers.

"In both of these attempts at deals with the union GM is evading the real issue before the American people—a 30 percent wage raise without increasing prices—and is insuring economic suicide for itself and our whole peacetime economy.

"The basic fallacy of Wilson's proposal is his assumption that America is facing a manpower shortage as we were during the war—on the contrary, we are facing a manpower surplus.

"We worked long hours during the war because there was such a manpower shortage.

"Even then we didn't abandon the 40-hour week as Wilson tried to make it appear. The 40-hour week does not exclude the possibility of working longer hours when high production and insufficient manpower make it necessary. It simply requires the payment of overtime for hours over 40 a week.

"GM and other corporations tried to wreck the Wages and Hours Act 4 years ago during the period of conversion to war production. Wilson said then that the 40-hour week would be a drag on war production and now he says it will be a drag on peace production.

"He was wrong then, as our production record shows, and he is wrong now.

"Wilson's proposal has already been repudiated by experts in his own field.

"J. A. Livingston, financial writer of the Washington Post, has said that a 45-hour week would work a hardship on returning servicemen by cutting down the number of potential jobs by 11 percent. C. F. Hughes, business editor, New York Times, says that the proposal is "unsound" because we can achieve the same maximum levels of production on a 40-hour week by working a 24-hour-a-day schedule. He said further that the essential factor in achieving maximum production is labor supply—not a long workweek.

"The present estimates of unemployment in 1946 on the basis of a 40-hour week and the volume of production scheduled indicate 8,000,000 will be out of work. Mr. Wilson's proposal would make that number even higher.

"The UAW-CIO and the American people generally join with Senator JAMES E. MURRAY in denouncing the plan as 'unthinkable.'

"This is Wilson's second attempt at a long end run around the union's 30-percent wage demands. The referees of the game, the American people, have called him out of bounds both times.

"It's time Wilson quit sulking under the stands—got back into the game and met his responsibilities to his workers and the Nation by negotiating with the union in good faith on the 30-percent wage-increase issue."

[From New York PM of October 30, 1945]

AFL LEADER BRANDS GM'S PLAN OLD STUFF—BROWN COMPARES IT TO "BACK TO NORMALCY" MOVE AFTER LAST WAR

General Motors' proposal for a 45-hour workweek was denounced yesterday by Harvey W. Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, AFL, who said the plan was similar to the program instituted by American industry after the First World War.

Addressing an IAM convention in New York, Brown said:

"With the slogan 'Back to normalcy' they launched the American plan in industry, the open shop in industry, in an effort, if not to destroy, at least so to weaken the labor movement so that we of organized labor could not effectively accept the challenge of those who were driving us back to so-called normalcy."

He asserted that this "American plan" brought on the depression and World War II.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENT IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate some progress which has been made under the voluntary enlistment bill which was passed by the Congress in September. I am advised by the War Department that in the month of October enlistments in the Army exceeded 55,600. Earlier I had been advised that enlistments in the Navy were exceeding 500 a day. More recently, and in the latter part of the month of October, I received information that enlistments in the Army are exceeding 2,500 a day. I have not had official confirmation of this last-stated figure.

This means, Mr. President, that the American Army and the Navy are fast going upon a voluntary basis, something very much desired in the services, and something that I believe to be very much desired by the country.

After the defeat of Japan the President of the United States announced that inductions under the selective-service law would be placed at 50,000 a month. I am advised that inductions have proceeded at a rate of about 50,000 a month for the Army and 1,000 a month for the Navy. It will readily be seen that under the voluntary enlistment law in the latter months men have volunteered for service in the armed forces by several thousand in excess of the number required under the draft.

The draft was continued on the basis that nothing must be done to prevent return home as early as possible of men who had seen war service, and that was a very sound basis. But it is apparent today that under the voluntary enlistment law more men are going into the services than were required under the draft to prevent the holding of men who had seen service in the days of combat.

It seems to me, therefore, that the time is now at hand when we can suspend other inductions under the draft; and this may be done without interfering with release of those who have already served in wartime. It is my hope that the Army, and also particularly the Selective Service System, will at once take this step, suspend drafting, and thus render unnecessary the enactment of legislation by Congress to end the draft. I trust that they will stop or certainly suspend further inductions, because we are on our way now to an army composed of volunteers and to a navy composed of volunteers, the kind of army and navy this country desires.

Mr. President, there is one phase of the draft to which I want to call the attention of the Senate, and which I think involves an abuse. That is the continued drafting of men with families. Today the Selective Service is inducing into the Army and into the Navy men who have children, indeed, in some cases men who, I am advised, were pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. That seems unwise and unsound from any viewpoint, because the time is coming very shortly, and the Government officials must know it, when these men will be released from the services. How, indeed, Mr. President, can they justify the induction today of men with families, knowing that they will be released a short time later? I must say that unless this practice is stopped, certainly the Congress should proceed immediately with legislation to stop it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator is a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, is he not?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. He is the author of a bill providing for voluntary enlistments into the services.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I introduced a bill to that effect, yes.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator is a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee whose duty it is to initiate legislation affecting the present draft, of which I am very much in favor. Does the Senator have in mind to initiate any legislation dispensing with the draft system?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The thought I have, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma, is that the induction of men under the selective service should be stopped at once. I do not want a repeal of the selective-service law at this time because it gives certain benefits to men in the service.

Mr. MOORE. How does the Senator expect to effect the suspension of the selective service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. By an act of Congress, unless the administrative authorities issue the orders to stop it.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator does not have any hope of that, does he?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the Senator I do have some hope of it, and unless that hope comes into realization shortly certainly legislation will be introduced to suspend the draft.

Mr. MOORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I should like also to inquire of him, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, if he has in mind any legislation on the part of the Senate or the Congress for expediting the demobilization of the men already in the service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to have that question asked, because, as the Senator well knows, since our return here in September the Military Affairs Committee has been very active in expediting demobilization. Certainly the Senator knows of my activities on this subject. For my own part I must say that I am not at all satisfied with it.

When we returned here in September demobilization from the Army was proceeding at the rate of about 25,000 a week. At the middle of this month discharges had been stepped up to more than 280,000 a week. I think it should be in excess of that figure. The point system, of course, as a basic idea, was good for those who had had long service. But we were assured that, regardless of the point system, men who were not needed, and who were in the camps in this country would be immediately discharged. I have grave doubt that that policy has been followed as it should have been. It is evident that it has not been thoroughly carried out.

The second question which has arisen is that of the transportation of men from overseas. The Army and Navy representatives have said to us that men are being transported back home as fast as possible. However, it has been brought to my attention by those who are overseas that many ships are tied up in harbors, particularly in the Pacific, and are not being used. That subject is being inquired into, I may say to the Senator. There has been an improvement in demobilization, but today there are still millions of men in the Army who are not needed, and they should be demobilized.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to make the observation that I have had an opportunity to hear only a very few witnesses testifying before the committee with reference to the effort at demobilization. I know that the Senator receives more letters than I do, probably because of his committee assignment. However, I am receiving letters from every portion of the country, and I cannot help being impressed by the truthfulness of them, notwithstanding the testimony of the Army and Navy representatives with regard to their efforts to use the transportation available to get the boys home.

I have heard the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs make some very strong representations here. It seems to me that the time has come when it is incumbent upon Congress to impose some orders upon the Army and Navy to compel them to use available transportation facilities to hasten the demobilization and return home of members of the armed forces. The members of the Senate have a feeling of futility in attempting to answer the complaints which are made. I do not consider them "gripes." I consider them justified complaints. This country will suffer tremendously from the low morale of men all over the country and all over the world who are being neglected. We hear a great deal from those men to the effect that it is a fine thing to parade the power of the Navy in an exhibition; but it does not set very well with those men, who do not have the benefit of the available facilities for their return home.

I know that the Senator is impressed by the gravity of the situation. In my judgment it is incumbent upon us to do more than merely talk about it and sympathize with the men. I believe that letters of sympathy and agreement, promises of investigation, and things of that kind have about reached the limit. I think it will be a shame if we do not do something more than hear testimony, accept promises, and feel sorry for the Army and Navy representatives who claim to be doing all they can. Let us extend a little sympathy and constructive help to the victims in the outlying portions of the world after the war is over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am delighted to hear that statement by the Senator from Oklahoma. I am in full accord with it. I am sure the Senator knows of my activity in this connection. It is the purpose of my remarks today to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that the time is at hand to act definitely on the subject of demobilization and the question of stopping the draft, since it no longer interferes with the return home of men who have had war service. I think the time is at hand when legislation must be introduced, unless the administrative officials take immediate action through orders that will be carried out.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Does the Senator

from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am very much interested in the comments of the Senator from West Virginia about idle ships in the Pacific which might be used to bring troops home. The Senator from West Virginia is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not. Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia and to the Senate that I have received approximately 20 letters from the Pacific area—from Okinawa, Saipan, the Philippines, and Japan. They all tell the same story of cargo ships returning home empty. I have discussed that subject to a limited extent with War Department officials. There are two points of view. Let me ask the Senator from West Virginia if he has any opinion, or whether his committee has made any investigation of the two points of view. One point of view is that it is impossible, or impracticable, at least, to equip cargo ships for the transportation of soldiers on the return voyage. It is said that there are no accommodations for them, and that bunks cannot be installed. It is not considered desirable to use cots, because it is thought that that would involve a certain hazard. Then there is the question of ordinary toilet facilities and cooking facilities to take care of the soldiers.

Another point of view is that with a moderate amount of effort some of the cargo ships—perhaps not all of them—could be made available to carry soldiers home, particularly from the Pacific theater of war. The boys in the Philippines sent me a copy of the soldiers' newspaper in that theater, in which a colonel at Manila was quoted as having said that with 50 men and 48 hours' work he could place a cargo ship in condition to carry 500 soldiers home.

I have had to make quite an elaborate statement. I did not intend to interrupt the Senator from West Virginia for so long, but I should like to know whether the Senator from West Virginia or his committee has gone into the question of the possibility of utilizing cargo ships to bring soldiers home, instead of having the ships return empty.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, I cannot speak on behalf of the committee; but, speaking individually, as a Member of the Senate, I will say that inquiry has been made into that subject, and we are assured that aircraft carriers, and even large battleships, are being equipped to transport men. I am advised that Liberty ships can be converted at little cost for passenger transportation. Frankly, I am of the opinion that the Army and Navy have been very slow in returning men to this country. I have received information—not from one communication, but from numerous communications—as to the large number of ships tied up at Pearl Harbor, Guam, Okinawa, and the Philippine Islands, lying in port idle, some with steam up. If the administrators of the services will not proceed to discharge the men faster, then legislation to effect that purpose should be enacted immediately.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia further yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. REED. I entirely agree with what the Senator from West Virginia has said. If the administration of the Navy Department and the War Department will not move fast enough, then certainly it is up to the Congress to enact legislation which will compel them to move. The letters which I am receiving from the men in the Pacific theater, some of whom are men from my own home town, whom I know very well, and who are ordinarily moderate and conservative, are tinged with a bitterness which I very much dislike to see. Unanimously those letters tell me that the morale of the men held in the Pacific, who watch vessels go back empty or stand idle in Pacific harbors, is very low. There is a bitterness which is not only unpleasant and unhappy, but dangerous. Certainly every effort should be made to relieve that kind of situation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I am in hearty accord with his views.

Proceeding further upon the subject of demobilization, I desire to read into the record an article from the Harrisburg, Pa., Evening News, of Saturday, November 3, 1945. It is headed "One hundred and forty-six thousand October releases in Third Service Command":

> BALTIMORE, November 3.—More than 146,000 servicemen were discharged during October at Army separation centers of the Third Service Command, it was announced today by Maj. Gen. Philip Hayes. The figure set a record for the area and, as a result, 14 of the smaller separation centers will be temporarily closed, he said. Fort Meade and Indiantown Gap will continue to handle the bulk of the discharges, but the smaller separation points will resume operation within 24 hours, whenever conditions warrant.

Mr. President, it seems unpardonable, to me, that when we are so far behind in demobilization, any separation center is closed, however small it may be. The fact that 146,000 servicemen were discharged within a month in a certain district, the fact that a record was broken by the number of discharges during a month, does not justify the closing of one separation center. There is no such thing as a record in that connection. The number of discharges should step up month by month. We are not depleting the Army and the Navy of their forces. Today there are in excess of 5,000,000 men entitled to be discharged. We are building up an army on a voluntary system at a rate of 2,500 a day, as the war veterans are discharged. I do not see how any officer or any commander can justify the closing of a separation center.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate and of the War Department the fact that when we went into this subject in September of this year there were 26 separation centers, and at the urging of the Committee on Military Affairs and at its direction their number was increased manyfold. We insisted not only that they set up separation centers, but that separation facilities be created in the camps to which the men were returned in this country.

Now to receive information that 14 separation centers or any other number of them are being closed because it is said a record has been broken, is news of an absolutely untenable position on the part of the Army.

Mr. President, I close my remarks upon this subject by somewhat of repetition. The voluntary enlistment law is working. There were some who said it would not work; but the voluntary enlistment law is bringing into the Army and Navy men who choose to serve there. It is bringing them in in great numbers—at a rate that assures strong armed forces of volunteers. It is bringing them in at a rate already beyond the President's call for the draft. If that be so, then enforced service should end at once. It should and because it may now be ended without delaying the return home of one boy, one man, who served in the time of actual fighting.

I make these remarks today in order to call this important subject to the attention of the Senate, to call it to the attention of the services, and to say that unless this situation is remedied, it will become our duty to proceed at once to the enactment of legislation to effect the good end desired.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I am in favor of keeping America strong. The advocates of universal peacetime conscription bottom their argument upon the statement that "We must keep America strong."

I am in favor of keeping America strong; but I am not in favor of converting peaceful America into a military camp and conscripting every 18-year-old boy and taking him from the home, the farm, the school, or college and disrupting millions of homes and lives every year, when it is both unnecessary and undesirable.

If there ever was a time when we needed universal military training, that day has passed. We cannot depend any longer upon the infantrymen or the artillerymen for our defense. The soldier will not fight the battles of the future. The country cannot be defended or made strong by the training of a vast army. You cannot fight bombs with boys. The accumulation and assembling of vast armies would provide a choice target for the robot bomb or the radar-guided, long-range plane carrying destructive bombs.

In advocating universal military training, the military leaders are following the same out-moded policy that they followed after the last war when they clamored for big battleships and large armies and refused to build airplanes and adopt modern weapons and methods of defense.

America has been strong because she has been free. We must keep her so. Nothing could be more destructive to the spirit of freedom and initiative than military dominance. We know something about what that is, and the thousands of American boys scattered over the earth

who have won this war and want to return home to their families and resume their life work or complete their education, understand what it means when they are held overseas on far-away islands, and in military camps, with practically nothing to do, and yet unable to obtain discharges and be brought back home. We cannot escape this condition during war, but God forbid that we shall be saddled with intolerable military dominance in peacetime.

It will be a sad day for this Republic when she deserts her democratic heritage and embarks upon a totalitarian military policy which will inevitably lead to economic fascism, government-controlled business, and the complete regulation of our whole life and activity. It would be the entering wedge to the crushing of the individual and the crowning of national-state socialism. A republic encourages free thought, free expression, and free enterprise. Military despotism does not want the individual to think, and he soon reaches the point where he cannot express his thoughts. The military brooks no opposition and tolerates no criticism. It is the citizens' duty only to obey—which is necessary in war, but is destructive of every impulse of freedom and growth in peace.

My formula for preparedness and keeping America strong may be summarized as follows:

First. A powerful navy.
Second. A mighty air force.
Third. An adequate standing army.
Fourth. A strong national guard.
Fifth. An efficient intelligence service.
Sixth. Continued scientific research.

These are the sources of our power for defense, and they will provide the means for whatever security can be vouchsafed to us by superior force. We shall have to keep abreast of the times in experimentation and invention in all manner of scientific instrumentalities, such as jet-propelled bombs, armadas of airplanes guided by radar, long-range rocket bombs, and the further perfecting of the terrifying atomic bomb. And it must be made clear that we are building all these forces for the definite purpose of preserving a peaceful world for ourselves and all other peace-loving people.

In lieu of the plan for universal military conscription, I suggest the more feasible and desirable policy of utilizing the services of the thousands of surplus officers in the Army and Navy by establishing in our high schools and colleges limited military training along the line of the ROTC units, where drills and setting-up exercises could be instituted and healthful physical instruction given to both boys and girls. In this way, school work would not be interrupted, and boys would still be at home with their parents, would have the benefit of parental instruction and guidance, and would be able to work on the farm or wherever needed, instead of being drafted and carried away to be herded in military camps for a year.

Mr. President, ultimately peace must come to the world by virtue of the spirit and will for peace on the part of the people of the world. It never has been maintained by force alone, and it never will be. America must strive for this will for peace, and I covet for our great Nation the leadership of the world, in this hour of her supreme greatness, both by example and precept, to the end that we shall not fail the 50 nations who have joined us in the United Nations Charter in covenanting, to prevent all future wars. We must make it clear that the force and power which we maintain is solely for the preservation of peace, and that it shall be available for the protection of our allies as well as ourselves.

It is definitely not the time to announce to the world that we have decided to reverse the peaceful policy of our whole national existence, adopt universal military conscription and make of every boy a soldier in peacetime. In this connection I admonish the exercise of trust in the good faith of the nations which have covenanted with us for peace and faith in the God of peace.

I close this statement with the last words of the prepared but undelivered address of the late President Roosevelt:

> Today, as we move against the terrible scourge of war—as we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in this world—the contribution of lasting peace, I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straight-edge of your own confidence and your resolve. And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say: The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

DEMOBILIZATION OF DOCTORS AND DENTISTS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and read.

The resolution (S. Res. 184) was read as follows:

> Whereas on January 1, 1945, with World War II raging on all fronts at its full height, the number of doctors and surgeons on Army rolls was, according to the Secretary of War, 45,511. The same authority reported that on September 1, nearly 4 months after VE-day and about 3 weeks after VJ-day, with all active fighting on both fronts having ceased, the number of doctors and surgeons on the Army's rolls was 45,017. The mere statement of these facts indicates an utter failure of the War Department to make plans for early discharge of unneeded and unnecessary doctors and surgeons. It is agreed that when heavy fighting ceased in the European theater of operations, the necessity for officers in the Medical Corps decreased 80 percent in that theater; and
>
> Whereas from many sources, testimony of undoubted reliability has come to Members of the Senate indicating an incredible degree of incompetency, inefficiency, and general neglect on the part of the Office of the Surgeon General of the Army, in dealing with the return of the doctors and surgeons from the Army service where they are not needed, to communities where the civilian need for proper medical attention is very great; and
>
> Whereas from almost innumerable sources of information has come repeated statements that doctors and surgeons in groups as well as individuals are being held without need for them or work for them to do. The sum total of these statements shocks the confidence of the people in military organizations in general, and in the organization of the Medical Department in particular; and
>
> Whereas as officers in the various types of service have passed through separation centers they have been urged by Army sources to take service in the Reserve Corps. This request has met with fairly good response except for the Medical Corps. It is reported that officers being discharged from the Medical Department are almost universally refusing to accept Reserve Corps commissions. Unanimously, they allege neglect, abuse of power, inefficiency, and incompetency in assigning them for service, and above all, savagely criticize the Surgeon General's policy of retaining them indefinitely to the detriment of both their personal welfare and the loss, to the communities from which they came, of their professional services; and
>
> Whereas these matters have been given widespread publicity, and have been repeatedly called to the attention of the Surgeon General and the Secretary of War. Up to this time no adequate action has been offered to meet the situation; and
>
> Whereas what has been said herein concerning doctors and surgeons in the Medical Corps applies with equal or greater force to dentists. The number of dentists is much less than the number of medical doctors in the service, but the waste of their time and energies, and the deprivation of their service to many communities, is perhaps more acute than in the case of medical doctors; Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States requests the Secretary of War to appoint a board of inquiry, which will proceed promptly and vigorously to inquire into the things complained of; to locate responsibility for the blundering and incompetency plainly exhibited since heavy fighting ceased on all fronts, on the part of those responsible for administration of the Medical Corps; to recommend adequate action with those responsible and to take immediate steps to remedy the injury done to the doctors, surgeons, and dentists as individuals, and to the communities affected through inadequate and inefficient medical service.

Mr. REED. The purpose of the resolution which I have submitted is to direct the Secretary of War to appoint a board of inquiry for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon the incompetence, inadequacy, inefficiency, and altogether bunglesome handling in the Surgeon General's office of doctors and dentists following the ending of the war.

Mr. President, we are in a most unfortunate period. We raised the largest Army this Nation ever sent into war. We fought the war successfully. Our leaders and our men have covered themselves with glory. Since hostilities ceased the demobilization of the Army and Navy has been attended with so many blunders, and has been open to so much criticism that the country in general, as well as the men directly affected, have gotten into a most unfortunate mental attitude. Every one of us—I am sure my experience is no exception—every Senator and every Member of the other House is deluged with complaints concerning the slowness in releasing men of a certain age, a certain condition of dependency, or some one of the various classifications, from the service. I realize that it is impossible in connection with this gigantic task for the high command to establish a demobilization pro-

gram which will satisfy every group and every individual. I hope they will do better than they have done, and that their policy from now on will reduce to some extent the complaints which have been and are being made.

Today I wish to speak about the most shameful episode in the entire personnel history of the war. I refer to the failure of the Surgeon General's office of the Army and also of the Navy, to release doctors and dentists after hostilities ceased. Mr. President, on the day on which the war in Europe ended, the need for surgical and medical attention of the Army as a whole dropped 80 percent, and yet up until September of this year there have been no releases of any significance of doctors, surgeons, or dentists from the armed forces.

In order to show how important is the matter, I may say that normally there are approximately 125,000 physicians in active practice in this country. A greater number of men hold medical licenses to practice, but the number of licensees includes many men who are old, who have retired, who are teaching, or who are in places where they are not actively practicing. The number of physicians who were normally practicing, as I have already stated, was approximately 125,000. The Army took 46,000 of those doctors. The Navy took 14,000 more. That made a total of 60,000, or almost one-half the number of practicing active physicians and surgeons of the country prior to the war.

By taking that many doctors, Mr. President, many communities of the country were almost entirely stripped of men who had theretofore given their time and professional training to active medical practice. Holding those men in the Army when there is no further need of their services is not only doing the men themselves an injustice, but is depriving the communities in every State of the Union of the men who are necessary in order to assure adequate medical attention.

Because I have been active in connection with this matter I am overwhelmed with mail, not only from all over the United States but from all over the world, complaining of the situation. As briefly as I can do so I wish to refer to a limited number of letters which I have received.

For example, here is a letter from Camp Rucker, Ala., in reference to dentists. The letter states:

> There are more than 20 dentists at this camp. That is more dentists than there are patients requiring dental work. In a 2-week period recently there were only 4 patients received at the dental clinic for treatment.

In that camp there were 20 dentists, and only 4 patients were received in 2 weeks.

From Victoria, Tex., comes the following information:

> Foster Field has a military complement of less than 4,000 men. The field received its inactivation orders on October 26. We have 15 dentists, 12 physicians, and 3 veterinarians. None of these men are eligible for discharge under present set-up. In comparison, Victoria County has 50,000 people with 4 active dentists.

From Fresno, Calif., has come a startling statement. Eighteen doctors, 17 of them captains, and 1 a lieutenant colonel, signed a petition addressed to the editor of the Fresno (Calif.) Bee, which contained this statement:

> We are all volunteers, most of us have served over 3 years, and some of us have served overseas. At the present time, there are 5 critical groups of doctors who are retained in the service, regardless of points, and for others 80 points are necessary for discharge, while the rest of the Army has been reduced below that level.

I continue with the statement of the doctors:

> We feel that the Office of the Surgeon General has been flagrant in their disregard of the general public health and welfare and ruthless in misappropriation of the professional talent of the country.

Here is a letter from Lawrenceville, Ill.:

> At this station hospital there are 9 medical officers. The hospital census has not exceeded 50 patients for several months, which gives each 5 patients 1 medical officer.

Then, for a vein of humor, I have a letter from a woman in Iowa whose husband is a flight surgeon in the Philippines. She writes:

> My husband is a flight surgeon stationed in the Philippines. He shouldn't forget how to perform surgery, as he gets plenty of practice cutting. Yes, cutting out whistles from pieces of green bamboo. He has done nothing in the way of medical practice for 3 months.

Mr. President, this has proceeded to such a point that the various State medical associations are taking notice, and some of them are writing urging me to proceed with this crusade to get doctors out of the Army. I have received letters of that kind from Minnesota, Maine, Indiana, Colorado, Michigan, and California.

I wish to read a letter from Indiana particularly, from the Indiana State Medical Society. Then I shall ask unanimous consent that the other letters be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks without reading.

The Indiana State Medical Society writes:

> HAMMOND, IND., *November 1, 1945.*
>
> The medical profession at large should greatly appreciate your activity and interest in their behalf in securing the return of medical personnel from the armed services to their rightful place in society. The innumerable reports that come to me every day of these men being held in separation centers where they are compelled to sit around without any adequate work of any kind to do is shameful. The State of Indiana through our medical association has taken every active step possible in order to hasten the release of medical men, but so far as we can see there has been no appreciable effort from those in authority.

I can support that statement, Mr. President. Ever since I came back from my summer vacation, the 1st of September, I have been urging speed and more speed in the Surgeon General's office, and so far as I can see it has been almost without effect. I resume the reading of the letter:

> It is true that some few men are being released but their number is so small that so far it has made no impression whatever. If these men were being put to a useful purpose or were in some way able to pursue their own type of work we could understand the reason for the delay in releasing them. However, under existing circumstances it is difficult for us to look with very much favor upon the actions of the Surgeon General's Office in delaying the return of these men for so long a time.

Mr. President, I picked up this ball from where the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] had carried it. They started this movement. In a way I have inherited it from them, and I am glad to say that before I offered this resolution today I had conferred with the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from California and had their approval, and their assurance of cooperation. I wish to say that the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from California have rendered a great service to the country, starting last June, when a resolution for an investigation was offered in the Senate. The Senator from Colorado has been especially vigorous and helpful.

Mr. President, I now ask that the letters to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED FROM STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

ST. PAUL, MINN., *October 31, 1945.*

Permit me to thank you for sending me the copy from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dealing with your excellent statements and remarks before the Senate of the United States on October 11, 1945, upon the subject of release of doctors from the armed forces. It is gratifying indeed to the medical profession that we have men like you and Senator JOHNSON, from Colorado, to plead our cause.

PORTLAND, MAINE, *November 2, 1945.*

I think it is a crime that we should have been hampered as we are, and now that the war is over we should not be suffering for medical attention in the State of Maine. The diminution of numbers during the war was to be expected, but it certainly left us in pretty tough shape.

DENVER, COLO., *October 31, 1945.*

We are interested here in Colorado in getting our doctors back just as fast as we can and deeply appreciate any efforts you might be making in their behalf now or in the future.

LANSING, MICH., *October 30, 1945.*

I wish you would send me 25 additional copies of your remarks in the Senate made October 11 regarding release of medical officers in the military service. I wish to distribute copies of your speech to the members of the Council of the Michigan State Medical Society.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *October 31, 1945.*

For a long time those of us associated with medical organizations have witnessed the evident waste of professional talents in the military forces, and this situation has become alarmingly apparent since the cessation of hostilities. On behalf of the 8,000 physicians who are members of this associa-

tion (about one-third of whom are or have been in military service) I wish to thank you most kindly for your interest and action in behalf of a speedier demobilization program. I hope your enthusiasm in this direction will continue at a high pitch and that your efforts will bear real fruit. Leadership of this type is what we definitely need at the moment.

Mr. REED. Shawnee County, Kans., Medical Society states:

TOPEKA, KANS., *September 21, 1945.*

During this war period 29 of our younger, most active physicians have gone into the service and 10 of the remainder have passed away since the start of the war. Our population at this time is more than 100,000 and we have only 51 physicians left, a ratio of 1 to 2,000. Topeka being considered a fair medical center, our hospitals and medical service extend to another 35,000 or 40,000 people, which makes a situation that is very serious. The physicians that are now left in Topeka, although working from 14 to 18 hours a day, find it impossible to answer all of the professional calls that are demanded.

A report from the Army Air Field at Lawrenceville, Ill., states:

LAWRENCEVILLE, ILL., *November 2, 1945.*

At this station hospital there are 9 medical officers. The hospital census has not exceeded 50 patients for several months, which gives each 5 patients 1 medical officer. The total base personnel is about 2,000 men, which gives each 222 men 1 doctor. The Army estimates 4 percent of a command sick at any one time.

A woman from Iowa writes:

MORNING SUN, IOWA, *October 13, 1945.*

My husband is a flight surgeon stationed in the Philippines. He shouldn't forget how to perform surgery, as he gets plenty of practice cutting. Yes, cutting out whistles from pieces of green bamboo. He has done nothing in the way of medical practice for 3 months. Can't something be done about this deplorable situation when doctors are needed so badly in communities back home?

Mr. President, I wish to read a little more from letters which have come to me from individual doctors, or from persons close to doctors. Before I come to that, however, I wish to read a most astonishing letter which I received from a lieutenant commander in the Navy stationed on Okinawa. I read:

Senator CLYDE REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of a request for change of duty. Due to the various channels through which a request of this kind must officially go, it would probably be several months before any action would be taken.

We are a group of 32 medical officers and 300 enlisted men who have been here almost 3 months without a single duty. Theoretically we are a base hospital, No. 22, but actually we have no hospital and never have had. The hospital was never built and we have been sitting here idle all these months. This inactivity becomes very monotonous, and lowers the morale after awhile, and we see no end to it.

Our CO informed us today that our availability list, which was supposed to have gone in several weeks ago, even before the typhoon, had not as yet been sent in.

I would be very grateful to you if you could get immediate action on my request.

Yours very truly,

_____,
Lieutenant Commander,
Medical Corps, USNR.

Mr. President, that affects the Navy, and does not come within the purview of the resolution which I have offered, which asks the Secretary of War to appoint a board of inquiry to go through the Surgeon General's office with a fine-tooth comb, I hope, and discover what is the matter, who is responsible, and what to do about it. Later, after conference with other Senators I may offer a similar resolution affecting the Navy Department. Broadly speaking, my understanding is that the Navy is more backward, further behind, more illiberal in these policies, than is the Army.

Mr. President, it is an outrage that this group of professional men, many thousands of them—true, not many millions, as is the case in dealing with general demobilization—are placed in this situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator said that the Navy was very backward in releasing medical men. The Senator will agree, will he not, that medical men are needed on the various ships, and that they cannot be released until replacements are provided, so long as a ship stays in commission?

Mr. REED. I have more information about the Army than about the Navy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would not that be a fair statement as to the Navy?

Mr. REED. The need for doctors is on a different basis in the Navy as compared with the Army, but I have had protests from dentists and doctors and surgeons in the Navy, whose comments are as bitter as anything the Army doctors have said, perhaps more bitter. The Navy men, both dentists and doctors, leave the impression with me that the practice of the Navy is more to be criticized in this respect than that of the Army. I make that statement upon information coming to me. As I stated a moment ago, I have less contact with the Navy than with the Army.

Let me say further to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have in the armed services one son, two sons-in-law, one grandson, and one grandson-in-law. One of them is in the Navy, the others are in the Army. I have as much concern as any man can have about these things. I have tried to keep myself from getting into such a frame of mind that I would criticize everything and assume everything was wrong. So much criticism of this kind flows into every Senator's office that it would be easy for us to assume everything was wrong. Of course it is not, and I have warned my office staff that we must not allow ourselves to get into that frame of mind.

My desire is to give the Army and the Navy credit for magnificently fighting the war. I give them credit for all to which they are entitled to credit. I think both services are entitled to criticism such as that voiced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] this morning, and particularly the Surgeon General's offices of both the Army and the Navy have been extremely slow. The Army in particular is open to any kind of criticism anyone wishes to make. I do not think the confusion, the irresponsibility, the incompetence, the inefficiency, the inadequacy, which exist, and have existed since demobilization began, in the Surgeon General's office of the Army can be overstated. We are asking that the Secretary of War investigate, in the only way I know of to get at the facts, that is, by a board of inquiry.

The Senator from California offered a resolution in June, and a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs was appointed, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado is a member. It held a hearing in July.

It might be of a little interest in this connection for me to state that last week there came home from Europe one of the finest doctors in Kansas. He has been a leading member of the medical staff of the Kansas University Medical School. I have known him for many years. When I was Governor of the State I had contact with him in his work. He had spent 38 months in Europe in command of an evacuation hospital. For 30 minutes he sat in my office and told me of the incredible blunders, of the unthinkable stupidity, of the lack of centralized authority, of the failure to take responsibility, to a degree that would be unbelievable if it did not come from a source which must be accepted. The Senator from California suggested to me last Saturday that he might call his subcommittee together and hold further hearings. In such event I shall make an effort to bring this doctor back from Kansas because he tells a story which, as I have said, would be unbelievable if it did not come from such an authentic source.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to another matter. The Army, of course, is making a very commendable effort to build up its reserve as men are separated from the service. So far as officers are concerned, I understand that at all separation centers an effort is being made to induce them to enroll in the Reserve. I understand that effort has met with quite a degree of success in all the departments of the Army except the medical service. My information is, and it comes from doctors themselves, that there is almost a complete failure of medical men to give the Surgeon General's office any further control or any future control over them because of the way they have been treated, and their interests and the interests of their communities and their families have been disregarded.

If that be true, and I think it is, Mr. President, I believe it is a most unfortunate thing. I was talking over the telephone the other day with a colonel in the Surgeon General's office, and I said to him, "Colonel, if we were to fight this war over again and you had to recruit a medical corps now, you could not get any doctors except by drafting them. You have abused the doctors in the service to such an extent, you have held them in service so much longer than you were entitled to, you have given them so little consideration, that I do not believe you could get a doctor to volunteer

if it had to be done over again." The colonel said: "I think perhaps you have something there. You may be correct."

Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate unduly. I wish to read some extracts from letters, and then I shall conclude. I do not know how many hundreds of letters I have received on this subject—perhaps thousands. I read a short extract from a letter written by a doctor from the Philippine Islands under date of October 19:

We have seen the great bungling and waste of professional men out here but did not complain. My daily duties have required less than 1 hour daily, as an average since coming overseas.

He proceeds:

Sometimes weeks pass without a really sick patient coming under my care.

I have another letter from Goodland, Kans., under date of October 1, from which I read an extract:

You advised us that you would be as helpful as you could in connection with a discharge for an Enid, Okla., dentist. He has made application for discharge * * * He has practically done no dental work for 3 months. He is very badly needed at home and it seems ridiculous for the communities of this area where there is such a shortage of medical care, including dentists, to be deprived of this service and a man kept in the Army without anything to do.

Mr. President, that could be repeated a thousand times.

May I again compare two problems? The demobilization of the Army as a whole involves millions of men. They break into groups; some want the point system, some want age, and some want dependency, and some want various other considerations to be uppermost and to be given the most credit. But when we deal with these professional men we go beyond the personal question of the man himself. We come back to that all-important question of proper and adequate medical attention for the home community, for all the people of the country. As I previously said, approximately one-half of all the doctors active in practice in the United States were taken into the Army or the Navy. The day combat ceased the need in the Army for medical and surgical attention and work dropped 80 percent. Of the 45,000 doctors in the Army services on January 1 at least 25,000 should have been released from the services by this time.

Mr. President, when my own doctor and friend came home last week from France we had quite a chat. I am very fond of him. I have known him a long time. He is one of the ablest men I know in the medical profession. We began comparing notes. He said the Surgeon General's office never does anything unless someone puts the heat on. "Well, Doctor, let us compare notes," I said. "When first did they start loosening up and letting some of you boys out?" He said, "In July." "Well," I said, "the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] submitted a resolution calling for an investigation in June, and the committee held a hearing in July." My friend said, "That probably accounted for it."

He continued, "Then it slacked up again." I asked, "When did it start up again?" He said, "About the middle of September." I said, "Well, that is after I got back from the summer vacation, and I began to turn on the heat." My doctor friend said, "The situation improved considerably beginning about the middle of September, but since has been going along at a very slow rate." He further said, "There is no answer for this thing except to keep the heat turned on the Surgeon General's office, and unless you gentlemen in Congress do it the doctors will not be out of the service by the end of 1946."

Mr. President, I submit that is a shameful condition.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point extracts from letters I have received which illustrate or confirm what I have been saying.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(From an Army doctor of Coffeyville, Kans.)

I myself have 78 points, over 3 years in the Army, a wife and three children and a private practice waiting for me. I volunteered in August 1942, and since January 1945, have not done one day's duty as a doctor, and from the looks of things over here, such maddening activity will continue. My unit is scheduled to go to Korea, where no more hospital units are needed, so we go to another 3 or 4 months' period of bivouac and inactivity.

(From a medical officer)

I am a medical officer in Germany. During the past 3 months, the hospital has not had more than 50 patients at any one time, and yet they have a staff of 35 doctors, 40 nurses. Why? They cannot qualify to get home due to the stupid barriers they have put up for us.

(From a medical officer from Headquarters, United States Forces, European theater)

OCTOBER 13, 1945.

I am a typical medical officer. I am 44 years old, married and no children. Been in the Army 40 months, overseas more than 10 months, have no citation, still only 55 points. The point system is unfair, in fact damn stupid, and not a true picture of a man's service. There have been medical officers who got five battle stars (25 points) and never left England. Our jobs are finished, and we are just sitting around griping and wasting time.

WICHITA, KANS., *October 25, 1945.*

The Army is overflowing with doctors and no one can understand why it hoards us so. They don't need one-tenth the number they have. Ninety percent of the doctors have nothing to do. It is maddening for some of them. And although the Army proposes to reduce its strength from about 8,000,000 to less than 2,000,000, yet it announces that of almost 60,000 doctors, it will release only 13,000 by next July. Why there should be such disproportion no one can understand, especially when we know from our own experience and from seeing all around us that there is nothing for us to do.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., *October 14, 1945.*

My husband has been overseas 18 months with a Marine division, and for the last 2 months has been on a 3-hour-a-day schedule of dentistry. He was an instructor in a dental college before the war. The physicians attached to the same division also find it hard to work more than 3 hours a day. With the present shortage of dentists and doctors it is ridiculous.

NORTH KANSAS CITY.

The purpose of this letter as stated above is for the welfare of many people both from the home and our industrial district, relative to the urgent need of medical doctors at the present time. As of this date, we have only two doctors left for this entire community containing approximately 20,000 people or more. The population is 40,000, with 100 plants, with 10,000 people on the pay roll, and a suburban territory with eight to ten thousand who depend upon North Kansas City doctors for their welfare.

LAWRENCE, KANS., *October 22, 1945.*

I have been in the service 3½ years and have 75 points toward a discharge. The community in which I live has had a great increase in population and is particularly short of doctors. I am the only trained obstetrician in the community.

PALAWAN, P. I., *October 19, 1945.*

We have seen the great bungling and waste of professional men out here but did not complain. My daily duties have required less than 1 hour daily, as an average since coming overseas. Most of this work should hardly require a doctor's attention since it is minor first aid or records for the most part. Sometimes weeks pass without a really sick patient coming under my care. The doctors at home get no rest and work too hard for their physical strength. There will be many sad-hearted families watching the Navy parade their ships instead of using them to bring weary, homesick American boys home. Perhaps the Navy feels this boost-for-a-bigger-Navy campaign more important than bringing veterans home.

(From an Army dentist)

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIXTH QUARTERMASTER BATTALION,
New York, N. Y.

It has been months since the last combat actions took place. Meanwhile the movement of professional officers back to their home country is progressing at a snail's pace. Few of us have been occupied at our professional work since June, and those who are assigned to function medical units are utilized well less than 50 percent of their time. The writer is now being assigned to a battalion (approximately 600 men). Two others are being sent to units of similar sizes. Organizations of this size rarely, if ever, during wartime were assigned dentists. To add further to the already absurd situation, we were told that since we had less than 50 points we would not be sent home until July, if then. It is common knowledge that our group is the most discouraged in the service.

(From a telegram from a former Hutchinson, Kans., doctor)

HARLINGEN, TEX., *November 4, 1945.*

I volunteered because I was told by Air Surgeon's Office there was dire need for specialists with my qualifications. During entire service have been surplus. Duty assignments have been mainly nonessential administrative. Past 5 months am completely surplus. Answer to request for separation or an assignment in specialty is that none available at present. In 1941 there were eight eye, ear, nose, throat specialists in Hutchinson and today are three, one of whom almost retired due to age. This has caused a critical situation and yet am forced to remain surplus with duty assignment requiring little more than 1 hour daily which could be performed by interne. In 3 days am submitting request for separation under section 3 circular 290 release essential to national health. Reason this has not been initiated sooner is that I believed statement Surgeon General that discharge of medical officers would be expedited and preferred

routine separation. Present fulfillment that promise indicates I will remain in present status for minimum 6 months. My case typical many examples outrageous waste medical personnel to detriment national welfare. Have documentary evidence all above statements. Would sincerely appreciate consideration any feasible action.

GOODLAND, KANS., *October 1, 1945.*

You advised us that you would be as helpful as you could in connection with a discharge for an Enid, Okla., dentist. He has made application for discharge. They are not utilizing his services. He has practically done no dental work for 3 months. He is very badly needed at home and it seems ridiculous for the communities of this area where there is such a shortage of medical care, including dentists, to be deprived of this service and a man kept in the Army without anything to do. We hope you will use your influence in his behalf.

(From an Army doctor)

FORT LEONARD, MO., *October 16, 1945.*

Why are they so stubborn and impractical? When this camp was full and all the training was in progress there were two doctors in the eye, ear, nose, and throat department of this hospital; the last 2 months there were five in the same department—one was released and now we have four with the camp one-third full.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in closing, let me say that I want the Surgeon General's office and the War Department to understand that so far as I am concerned I am in deadly earnest, and I think I speak for the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and for every other Senator on this floor. This morning I talked to several Senators over the telephone about other matters, and when I told them concerning the resolution I proposed to submit they promptly volunteered to add their names as sponsors. I told them that for the purpose of the resolution I would proceed as an individual, but that I thought the Senate was sufficiently aroused over this matter to keep the fires burning.

I hope Secretary Patterson, for whom I have high regard and much affection, will accede to the request to appoint a board of inquiry, and if he does I hope they will locate the blame and take whatever action may be justified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution (S. Res. 184) submitted by the Senator from Kansas will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF IRISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], a resolution adopted by the Irish War Veterans in convention in New York City, October 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas while the war in the Pacific has been over for 2 months, the War and Navy Departments show no visible intention of expediting the demobilization of our huge armed forces; and

Whereas it is now apparent that only positive action by Congress will enable our citizen soldiers and sailors to return to their homes at an early date: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the National Board of Directors of the Irish War Veterans of the United States in ninth annual convention assembled, this 5th day of October 1945, Hotel New Yorker, New York City, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully but firmly requested to immediately take whatever action may be necessary to speed up the demobilization of all service men and women requesting release and return to their civilian pursuits; and be it further

Resolved, That if there are not enough volunteers to carry out the administration's occupation policies in Japan, that the Chinese be permitted to fill the gaps; and if there are not enough volunteers to carry out the administration's occupation policies in Germany, that the Poles, Belgians, Dutch, Norwegians, and French be permitted to take over the voids, if any, created in the American sector.

MORRIS A. BEALLE,
National Adjutant.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 131. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon;

S. 201. An act for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer;

S. 504. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township;

S. 542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz;

S. 559. An act to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service", approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941;

S. 562. An act for the relief of Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc.;

S. 788. An act for the relief of the estate of George J. Ross;

S. 883. An act for the relief of Charlie Tyson;

S. 927. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937;

S. 979. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Lillian Epstein;

S. 980. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. St. Amant, Jr.;

S. 994. An act for the relief of the Central Leaf Tobacco Co., Inc.;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest L. Barlow;

S. 1027. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hibernia I. Conners;

S. 1076. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1102. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945;

S. 1103. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut numbered 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944;

S. 1110. An act for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945;

S. 1119. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 23, 1945;

S. 1134. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102-A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944;

S. 1139. An act for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims;

S. 1183. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising from activities of the War Department or of the Army;

S. 1199. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman;

S. 1219. An act authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.;

S. 1259. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.;

S. 1362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes; and

S. 1420. An act to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 693. An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; and

S. 940. An act to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3256) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the armed forces of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 608. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States;

H. R. 843. An act for the relief of Francis A. Hanley;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1090. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret McWilliams;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Carl Lewis;

H. R. 1192. An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of O. M. Minatree;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 1489. An act for the relief of Harold B. Alden and Walter E. Strohm;

H. R. 1497. An act to amend subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended;

H. R. 1613. An act for the relief of Christopher Dance;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1902. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others;

H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1978. An act for the relief of Jay H. McCleary;

H. R. 2029. An act for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Craig;

H. R. 2191. An act for the relief of Cleo E. Baker;

H. R. 2223. An act for the relief of Catherine Bode;

H. R. 2240. An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes;

H. R. 2267. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;

H. R. 2290. An act for the relief of Mary Galipeau;

H. R. 2300. An act for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albermarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2483. An act for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased;

H. R. 2487. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2543. An act to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation;

H. R. 2544. An act for the relief of Willie Hines;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;

H. R. 2748. An act for the relief of the Dubuque & Wisconsin Bridge Co.;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2826. An act for the relief of Esther L. Berg;

H. R. 2886. An act for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.;

H. R. 2957. An act for the relief of Alvada Hirst;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of Justin P. Hopkins;

H. R. 3018. An act for the relief of R. Fred Baker and Crystal R. Stribling;

H. R. 3028. An act to amend the act of August 17, 1937, as amended, relating to the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in the State of North Carolina;

H. R. 3058. An act to authorize the use of certain lands of the United States for flowage in connection with providing additional storage space in the Pensacola Reservoir of the Grand River Dam project in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3094. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp. against the United States;

H. R. 3135. An act for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;

H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lionel Comeaux and New Orleans Public Service, Inc.;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Rolla Duncan;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll;

H. R. 3441. An act to provide for the naturalization of Master Sgt. Gerhard Neumann;

H. R. 3444. An act to grant the title of public lands to the town of Safford, Ariz., for the use of its municipal water system;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 3730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Star City, W. Va.;

H. R. 3748. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3940. An act to revise and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.," approved April 2, 1941;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh;

H. R. 4180. An act to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce;

H. R. 4350. An act to amend section 3546 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4411. An act to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4428. An act to adjust the rate of dividends paid by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation on its capital stock and to decrease the premium charge for its insurance; and

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1281. An act to provide for the covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert; and

H. R. 3256. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the armed forces of the United States.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the Calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 608. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States;

H. R. 3028. An act to amend the act of August 17, 1937, as amended, relating to the establishment of the Cape Hatteras Na-

tional Seashore Recreational Area in the State of North Carolina; and

H. R. 3444. An act to grant the title of public lands to the town of Safford, Ariz., for the use of its municipal water system; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 843. An act for the relief of Francis A. Hanley;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1090. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret McWilliams;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Carl Lewis;

H. R. 1192. An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of O. M. Minatree;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 1489. An act for the relief of Harold B. Alden and Walter E. Strohm;

H. R. 1613. An act for the relief of Christopher Dance;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others;

H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1978. An act for the relief of Jay H. McCleary;

H. R. 2029. An act for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Craig;

H. R. 2191. An act for the relief of Cleo E. Baker;

H. R. 2223. An act for the relief of Catherine Bode;

H. R. 2267. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;

H. R. 2290. An act for the relief of Mary Galipeau;

H. R. 2300. An act for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albemarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2483. An act for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased;

H. R. 2487. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2544. An act for the relief of Willie Hines;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;

H. R. 2748. An act for the relief of the Dubuque & Wisconsin Bridge Co.;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2826. An act for the relief of Esther L. Berg;

H. R. 2886. An act for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.;

H. R. 2952. An act for the relief of Justin P. Hopkins;

H. R. 3018. An act for the relief of R. Fred Baker and Crystal R. Stribling;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3094. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp. against the United States;

H. R. 3135. An act for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis;

H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lionel Comeaux and New Orleans Public Service, Inc.;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Rolla Duncan;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army; and

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2240. An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1497. An act to amend subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

H. R. 1902. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928;

H. R. 3730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Star City, W. Va.; and

H. R. 3940. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.," approved April 2, 1941; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 2543. An act to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;

H. R. 4180. An act to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; and

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2957. An act for the relief of Alvada Hirst; and

H. R. 3441. An act to provide for the naturalization of Master Sgt. Gerhard Neumann; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 3058. An act to authorize the use of certain lands of the United States for flowage in connection with providing additional storage space in the Pensacola Reservoir of the Grand River Dam project in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3748. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

H. R. 4350. An act to amend section 3546 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 4411. An act to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 4428. An act to adjust the rate of dividends paid by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation on its capital stock and to decrease the premium charge for its insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON THE QUEBEC FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I entered the Chamber promptly at 12 o'clock. I have been waiting for more than an hour and a half to submit a report. I have been away from the Senate for approximately 3 weeks. I have been very patient. I have been entertained by the debate which has taken place, but I desire to submit a report, and I take the floor at this time for that purpose.

Mr. President, the report I am about to submit is not upon a bill or resolution, but upon an international conference in which the United States participated.

The Quebec Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization assembled on the 16th and adjourned on the 31st of October 1945.

The Conference was attended officially by the accredited representatives of 41 nations.

The nations represented were as follows: Commonwealth of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bolivia, Dominion of Canada, China, Cuba, Chili, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Dominion of New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, Syria, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

Observer nations: Member of the Interim Commission, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Other observer nations: Argentina, Byelo-Russian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

In submitting this report I shall quote liberally from the constitution of the Food and Agriculture Organization and from the Interim Commission reports.

The United States was authorized to accept membership in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations by the provisions of Public Law 174, of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 31, 1945.

In the excitement of war, with many special institutions and departments being created to serve the war effort, it is appropriate that an explanation be made of the reasons for the creation and the existence of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. This organization was not created as a war agency, but history may record that it took a war to bring it into being. However, now that the war is over, it may serve many good purposes in the reconversion and postwar period.

Before giving my interpretation of the services which the organization may render our people and the peoples of the world, let me explain somewhat in detail the background and the framework of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, referred to as the "Organization," and for a short title designated as FAO, was suggested and, in fact, created by our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In May 1943 representatives of 44 countries were invited, on the initiative of President Roosevelt, to the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs, Va., United States of America. Among these men and women were some of the best-known world authorities on agriculture, food, and nutrition. The result of their discussions was clear agreement on such points as these:

The world has never had enough to wear.

At least two-thirds of its people are ill-nourished; many face periodic starvation; and this in spite of the fact that two-thirds of the world's people are farmers.

According to available statistics some 2,300,000,000 people inhabit the earth. Two-thirds of the world's population, or over 1,600,000,000 human beings, either reside on or live off of the products of the soil, which, under the constitution of this organization, embraces "fisheries, marine products, forestry, and primary forestry products."

The modern science of nutrition proves beyond doubt that if all people could get encugh of the right kinds of foods, the average level of health and well-being could be raised much higher than it is now.

The modern science of production shows how to produce enough of the right kinds of foods. To do it, farmers everywhere must have the opportunity to use modern production methods. But production alone is not enough.

Foods must be so distributed that the levels of consumption of those who do not have enough are progressively raised. This implies an expanding world economy, in which each nation will play its own part, but all will act together. Only by acting together can nations, in the close-knit modern world, achieve peace, prosperity, and rising standards of living.

On the recommendation of the Hot Springs Conference, the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture was set up in July 1943, to make plans for a permanent organization.

In January 1944, the Commission completed the first draft of a constitution for FAO and forwarded it, together with a report on the suggested structure and functions of the organization, to governments for comment and suggestions.

In July 1944, the final draft of the constitution was sent to the member governments.

Under the terms of the constitution, the acceptance of 20 governments is required to bring the organization into existence. Prior to the calling of the Quebec Conference, more than the required number of governments had accepted the constitution, and the organization was ready for the first conference for the formal organization and vitalization of such constitution.

In order that this report may be more complete, I give the names of the accredited representatives who formally signed the Constitution on the opening day of the Quebec Conference:

Australia: Alfred Thorpe Stirling, High Commissioner for Australia in Canada.

Belgium: Arthur Wauters, former cabinet minister, Minister Plenipotentiary.

Canada: Hon. James G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture.

China: P. W. Tsou, resident representative in the United States, of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of China; president of the Agricultural Association of China; senior adviser to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and the Ministry of Food.

Czechoslovakia: Frantisek Pavlasek, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Canada.

Denmark: Henrik Louis Hans de Kauffmann, member of Danish Cabinet, Minister of Denmark to the United States.

Dominican Republic: Mario E. de Moya, Minister Counselor of the Embassy of the Dominican Republic in the United States.

Egypt: Anis Azer, Minister Counselor, Royal Egyptian Legation in the United States.

France: C. Tanguy-Prigent, Minister of Agriculture; Andre Mayer, vice president, College de France.

Greece: Nicholas Lely, Minister Resident in the United States.

Guatemala: Enrique Lopez-Herrarte, Counselor of the Embassy of Guatemala in the United States.

Haiti: Edouard Baker, Chief of Control of Agricultural and Industrial Enterprises, Department of Agriculture.

Honduras: Julian R. Caceres, Ambassador to the United States.

Iceland: Hon. Thor Thors, Minister to the United States.

India: Hon. Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, Agent General for India in the United States.

Iraq: Hon. Ali Jawdat, Minister to the United States.

Liberia: Frederic A. Price, Consul General of Liberia, New York City.

Luxemburg: Hon. Hagues Le Gallais, Minister to the United States.

Mexico: Manuel J. Zevada, Under Secretary of National Economy.

Netherlands: S. L. Mansholt, Minister of Food, Agriculture, and Fisheries.

New Zealand: Hon. David Wilson, High Commissioner for New Zealand in Canada.

Nicaragua: Alberto Sevilla Sacasa, Chargé d'Affaires, ad interim, in the United States.

Norway: Anders Fjelstad, delegate for Norwegian Government on agricultural affairs in the United States.

Panama: Julio E. Heurtematte, commercial counselor, Embassy of Panama in the United States.

Peru: Juan Chavez, commercial counselor, Embassy of Peru in the United States.

Philippine Commonwealth: Hon. Maximo M. Kalaw, former Secretary of Public Instruction in the Philippine Commonwealth, now a member of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission.

Union of South Africa: Phillippus R. Viljoen, High Commissioner for the Union of South Africa in Canada.

United Kingdom: Roger Makins, C. M. G. Foreign Office (British Embassy, Washington).

United States of America: Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture.

Venezuela: M. A. Falcon Briceno, commercial counselor in Washington.

During the conference, other nations signed the constitution, so that the total number of member nations is now forty-one.

It is expected that still other nations will join the organization just as soon as the provisions of the constitution may be complied with.

For the record, let me set forth at this point the purposes of the food and agriculture organization, as outlined in article 1 of the constitution:

1. The organization shall collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture.

2. The organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend national and international action with respect to—

(a) Scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture;

(b) The improvement of education and administration relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture, and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice;

(c) The conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agricultural production;

(d) the improvement of the processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products;

(e) the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international;

(f) the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

3. It shall also be the function of the organization—

(a) to furnish such technical assistance as governments may request;

(b) to organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist them to fulfill the obligations arising from their acceptance of the

recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture; and

(c) generally to take all necessary and appropriate action to implement the purposes of the organization as set forth in the preamble.

The policy-making body of the organization—FAO—is the Conference, composed of one representative from each member nation. Each nation has one vote in the Conference, which will meet at least once each year. An executive committee of nine to fifteen members will act for the Conference between sessions.

A director-general, in the person of Sir John Boyd Orr, a member of the British Parliament, was appointed by the Conference. Acting under its general supervision and that of the executive committee, which will advise him on matters of policy and administration, he will be responsible for directing the work of FAO. He will be assisted by an international technical staff and by standing advisory committees on which world experts will serve.

In accepting the FAO constitution, member governments agree to report periodically to one another on the progress made toward achieving the organization's purposes. These reports will furnish information on world production and markets and on the effects of national policies in agriculture, nutrition, and food management, forestry, and fisheries. This information will in turn be the basis for proposals for joint action.

Nations will expect advice and information from FAO which will help them to develop their agricultural, forestry, and fisheries resources; to improve their marketing and distribution services, and to raise the nutritional levels and standards of living of their people. In particular, FAO will be concerned with spreading scientific knowledge in all these fields and helping to get this knowledge more widely and effectively used.

The Food and Agriculture Organization is not comparable to most treaties which are made, signed, and ratified and then filed away as historical documents. This organization was created by a written constitution, and such constitution was accepted and approved by joint congressional action embodied in House Joint Resolution 145, approved by the President on July 31, 1945.

By itself, this organization could make only a limited contribution toward freedom from want and the achievement of an expanding world economy. But it will begin its work in an atmosphere of international cooperation and it must be viewed in this setting.

The constitution provides for its becoming a part of the United Nations Organization, where it will take its place under the Social and Economic Council among the other international organization with specialized responsibilities.

FAO will thus work closely with the international organizations concerned with commerce and trade, credit, monetary stabilization, labor, health, education, and other matters vital to the welfare of nations.

The success of FAO will depend in large part on the success of the whole United Nations effort looking toward international security, an expanding world economy, full employment, adequate buying power, and freer international trade.

This organization will operate on a budget of $5,000,000 a year for the first 5 years. For the initial year, however, when the organization is getting started and will have only a small staff, the budget will be $2,500,000.

Member nations contribute on a scale of allocations based on various factors, but no one nation is called on to contribute more than 25 percent of the total expenses.

With respect to the cost to the United States of our participation in this Food and Agriculture Organization, the law provides an authorization of the sum of $625,000 for the first fiscal year, and not exceeding the sum of $1,250,000 annually thereafter as may be required for expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of State.

In due time estimates will be submitted to the Congress and appropriations will be requested to pay our part of the expenses of this organization.

As already stated, a director-general of this organization has been elected.

Also, as stated, the constitution provides for the election of an executive committee consisting of not less than 9 nor more than 15 members.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the names, the countries, and the terms of office of each member of the executive committee.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Quebec Conference elected an executive committee of 15 members to serve from 1 to 3 years each and as follows:

Edouard Baker, Haiti, 1 year.
Dr. G. S. H. Barton, Canada, 1 year.
R. R. Enfield, United Kingdom, 1 year.
E. J. Fawcett, New Zealand, 1 year.
Alfonso Gonzales Gallardo, Mexico, 1 year.
Sir Girja Bajpai, India, 2 years.
Anders Fjelstad, Norway, 2 years.
Darwish Haidari, Iraq, 2 years.
Andre Mayer, France, 2 years.
Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Poland, 2 years.
Newton Castro Belleza, Brazil, 3 years.
Howard R. Tolley, United States, 3 years.
P. W. Tsou, China, 3 years.
P. R. Viljoen, Union of South Africa, 3 years.
Arthur Wauters, Belgium, 3 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The constitution provides that the Conference is to meet at least once in every year.

Thus, the United Nations have created and set up in the world an organization with its own constitution, and such constitution provides that the annual conference shall elect its own officers, regulate its own procedure, and makes rules governing the convocation of sessions and the determination of agenda.

It must be observed that our National Constitution confers on the President the power to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

With respect to the Food and Agriculture Organization, President Roosevelt performed the following acts:

He initiated the movement for the creation of the world institution.

He appointed delegates to attend the Hot Springs, Va., Conference. President Truman submitted the constitution, the result of the Hot Springs Conference, to the Congress for consideration and approval;

He approved the congressional resolution which authorized the United States to accept membership in the organization; and

He appointed a special representative to sign the constitution of the organization.

Hence, it must be assumed and conceded that the said Food and Agriculture Organization was on the part of the United States legally created and entered into and that on our part such organization is now a legal world institution.

I deem it appropriate at this point to place in the record a list of the personnel of the United States delegation to the Quebec Conference.

Without reading it, I ask that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States member: Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture.

Alternate United States member: Howard R. Tolley, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

Congressional advisers: ELMER THOMAS, United States Senate, chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; RAYMOND E. WILLIS, United States Senate, member, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., United States House of Representatives, chairman, Committee on Agriculture; CLIFFORD R. HOPE, United States House of Representatives, member, Committee on Agriculture.

Advisers: Andrew W. Anderson, Chief, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; H. G. Bennett, president, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College; Hugh H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; Homer L. Brinkley, president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; R. E. Buchanan, director, Agricultural Experiment Station, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa; Edward G. Cale, Associate Chief, Commodities Division, Department of State; P. V. Cardon, research administrator, Agricultural Research Administration, Department of Agriculture; Harry Carlson, Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce; A. L. Deering, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Maine; Mordecai Ezekiel, economic adviser to the Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture; Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange; Henry S. Graves, College of Forestry, Yale University; L. Wendell Hayes, specialist on international organization affairs, Division of International Organization Affairs, Department of State; Samuel D. Jackson, attorney at law, Fort Wayne, Ind.; Edward I. Kotok, Assistant Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; Hazel K. Stiebeling, Chief, Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Department of Agriculture; Leroy D. Stinebower, deputy director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State, alternate United States representative, United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture; Anna Lord Strauss, president, National League of Women Voters; Clifford C. Taylor, agricultural attaché, American Embassy, Ottawa, Canada;

Lyle F. Watts, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; L. A. Wheeler, Director, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture; M. L. Wilson, Director of Extension Work, Department of Agriculture.

Press relations officer: Henry Jarrett, special assistant to the Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

Secretaries of delegation: James G. Maddox, special assistant to the Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture; Clarke L. Willard, Assistant Chief, Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

Administrative assistant: Miss Dorothy H. King, Department of State.

Fiscal assistant: Miss Luella Ollis, Department of State.

Secretariat: Miss Emma Andreen, Department of Agriculture; Miss Dolores Chavoen, Department of Agriculture; Mrs. Lois Chavez, Department of Agriculture; Miss Betty Davis, Department of State; Mrs. Mina Hite, Department of Agriculture; Miss Mary C. Lohr, Department of State; Miss Agatha M. Munhall, Department of State; Mrs. Corinne Pickering, Department of State; Miss Catherine V. Shea, Department of Agriculture; Mrs. Lillian Wright, Department of State; Miss Dorothy Zierjack, Department of State; Miss Beth Gage, secretary to Senator Elmer Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In passing, let me refer to the type and standing of the members and delegates to the Quebec Conference.

The permanent chairman was the Honorable L. B. Pearson, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary from Canada to the United States.

The United States representative was the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture.

The Director General was selected from the personnel of the Conference, in the person of the eminent Scottish scientist, and a member of the British Parliament, Sir John Boyd Orr.

The United Kingdom was represented by another distinguished member of Parliament in the person of the Honorable P. J. Noel Baker.

As a rule the several governments sent to the Conference their highest agricultural officials, accompanied by scientists and experts in the fields of agriculture, forestry, and fisheries.

The members of the United States delegation, headed by Clinton P. Anderson, our Secretary of Agriculture, were most efficient, and were accorded every consideration and courtesy that could be shown by the delegates from the other governments making up the United Nations.

The Congress was accorded representation in the Conference by the appointment of two Members from the Senate and two Members from the House of Representatives.

The chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, in the persons of the Honorable JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., of Virginia, and the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, attended the session. They were placed on committees, and they rendered valuable services to the Conference.

From the Senate Hon. RAYMOND E. WILLIS, of Indiana, a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, together with myself, were accorded recognition by being named to appropriate committees where we did what we could to assist in the work of the Conference.

In submitting this report I deem it proper and of interest to set forth for the record the names of the several international and world-wide organizations in which the United States has already accepted membership or which we are now in the process of joining. The list embraces approximately 74 international organizations, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF WHICH THE UNITED STATES IS A MEMBER OR IN THE WORK OF WHICH IT PARTICIPATES

(Following list taken from U. S. Government Manual, first edition, 1945; pp. 204–305)

American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood.

Anglo-American Caribbean Commission.

Bureau of the International Telecommunication Union.

Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union.

Central Bureau of the International Map of the World in the Millionth Scale.

Central International Office for Collecting and Preserving Information Relating to the Liquor Traffic in Africa.

Committee on Experts on the Codification of International Law.

Committee on Cartography of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

Conference of the Ministers of Education of the Allied Governments.

Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense.

Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

Governing Board of the Pan American Union.

Habana Committee on Comparative Legislation and the Unification of Legislation.

Inter-American Coffee Board.

Inter-American Commission for Territorial Administration.

Inter-American Commission of Women.

Inter-American Defense Board.

Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee.

Inter-American Indian Institute.

Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.

Inter-American Juridical Committee.

Inter-American Radio Office.

Inter-American Trade Mark Bureau.

Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees.

Interim Commission on European Inland Transport.

International Boundary Commission, United States, Alaska, and Canada.

International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs.

International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

International Bureau of Weights and Measures.

International Commission for the Maintenance of the Lighthouse at Cape Spartel.

International Commission on Historic Monuments.

International Council of Scientific Unions.

International Criminal Police Commission.

International Fisheries Commission, United States and Canada.

International Hydrographic Bureau.

International Institute of Agriculture.

International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

International Labor Organization.

International Meteorological Organization.

International Office of the Postal-Union of the Americas and Spain.

International Office of Public Health.

International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission.

International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.

International Seed-Testing Association.

International Statistical Bureau at The Hague.

International Sugar Council.

International Committee of Aerial Legal Experts.

International Wheat Council.

League of Nations Advisory Committee on Social Questions.

Narcotics Convention of 1931.

Pan American Committee of the United States.

Pan American Highway Organizations.

Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

Pan American Railway Committee.

Pan American Resources Commission.

Pan American Sanitary Bureau.

Pan American Soil Conservation Commission.

Pan American Union.

Panel of Mediators (inter-American).

Permanent American Aeronautical Commission.

Permanent Commissions of Inquiry Provided for by Treaties for the Advancement of Peace and Treaties of Conciliation.

Permanent Commissions of Investigation and Conciliation (inter-American).

Permanent Committee of Jurists on Civil and Commercial Laws (inter-American).

Permanent Court of Arbitration.

Permanent Inter-American Committee on Social Security.

Permanent International Association of Road Congresses.

Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses.

Peru-Ecuador Boundary Demarcation Commission.

United Nations Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes.

United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The list does not include the United Nations Organization which was developed by and submitted to the nations for ratification by the San Francisco Conference.

In addition to the list just submitted, we have at this time accredited delegates at London who are participating in a United Nations Educational Conference, and at this time we have delegates at Paris participating in a World Labor Conference.

In addition to the foregoing, we have many obligations with respect to international agreements such as the Bryan peace treaties, and the many trade agreements with the nations of the world.

These agreements, treaties, and international organizations with which we have contact, or in which we have membership, makes of the United States a most important world nation.

Before I conclude I wish to submit for the record some of my personal observations, conclusions, and recommendations.

As already reported, available statistics show that we have some 1,600,-

000,000 people securing their living from the land.

To me it is obvious that the other one-third of the world's population cannot either become or remain prosperous while the farmers, the foresters, and the fishermen remain undernourished, have insufficient clothing, are poorly housed, and eke out meager existences.

If persons and corporations in the several nations engaged in the same or similar occupations or businesses can help themselves and promote their private interests through international or world-wide organizations, it is obvious that farmers may likewise profit through the cooperative development of a world-wide organization such as the Food and Agriculture Organization which was developed at the recent Quebec Conference.

However primitive may be the conditions in some parts of the United States, we must admit that our farmers are on a much higher standard than are the farmers in many of the other countries of the world.

At the Quebec Conference, in comparing conditions of our farmers in the United States with the farmers of other countries, we learned that in one of the most populous nations those who actually till the soil are receiving an income of less than $22 annually, which means that the farmers of that country receive approximately 7½ cents per day for their toil while working on the farm.

This low rate of farm income is not limited to one of the most populous countries, but a comparison of incomes reveals that a number of agriculture nations show a similar low rate of wage or income to the farmers who produce the food and fiber for sustaining and clothing the peoples of the world.

The record shows that in our own country the cotton farmers receive an hourly wage only equal to the price they receive per pound for the cotton they produce. When cotton sells for 10 cents a pound the actual cotton farmer receives only 10 cents an hour for his labor.

At the present time, with general wages the highest in history, we find spot cotton of standard grade selling for less than 25 cents a pound. This means that the average cotton farmer, for the kind of cotton he produces, on the average, receives at his farm less than 20 cents a pound, which means that his hourly wage or income is less than 20 cents an hour. The condition of our cotton farmers has been, and will continue to be, a major concern of the Government of the United States.

At Quebec we learned that in another agricultural nation there are villages and towns having populations up to 2,000 people or more which have absolutely no roads or streets. In such villages and towns there are no conveyances of any kind on wheels, and all transportation, of every kind and character, is on the heads or backs of human beings or on the backs of burros.

These instances are not cited as the basis for a suggestion that we should offer any form of direct financial aid to the unfortunate people of such countries. In fact, it may be that such primitive peoples are really happier than if the benefits of our higher civilization were brought to them.

My point is that if the standard of the tropical and subtropical countries can be raised through an increase in the buying power of such countries, then the demand for goods and commodities of all kinds will be comparably increased.

I have in mind two cotton-using countries. These two countries have a combined population of some 1,000,000,000 people, or almost one-half the population of the earth. If the buying power of the peoples of these two countries could be increased so that they could buy one additional pound of cotton clothing, or other form of cotton merchandise, a year, the increased demand for cotton would amount to some 2,000,000 bales.

In the United States our people consume, on the average some 3,000,000,000 pounds of cotton annually. This cotton consumption means an average of some 23 pounds a person. If the peoples of the two countries referred to could have their buying power so increased as to enable them to buy one-third the cotton consumed by our people annually, then the entire cotton production of our cotton States would not be sufficient to supply the demand.

The increase in the buying power of the people of the world will increase the demand for every product in general consumption produced by the people of the United States.

I shall now state another reason for the development of the world Food and Agriculture Organization. All farmers, foresters, and fishermen of all the nations must sustain life or die prematurely from malnutrition or from exposure due to a lack of clothing or housing. Every citizen of every country is entitled to have a chance to develop a home and a chance to make a living for himself and family. Governments and nations have the responsibility of providing so that their nationals may have a chance to live and to survive working at some pursuit for which they are qualified. If nothing more attractive is available, then the citizen should have a chance to live on a plot of ground from which he may, by toil and labor, produce enough food commodities to sustain the lives of himself and family.

No one can deny that every child born into the world should have a chance to live. However, sad to admit, this is not true today.

It is one of the objectives of the FAO, if not the major objective, to develop a plan or plans for recommendation to the various member governments, to the end that, if adopted, each able-bodied citizen residing in the several nations may have an opportunity to exist by producing his own food supply.

Personally, I have attended but three international conferences—one, the Interparliamentary Union, held at Paris in 1927; another, held at Berlin in 1928; and the Quebec Conference, just closed. While my contact with international conferences has been limited, yet, one of my observations has been supplemented by similar observations by a number of persons who have participated in conferences held in many countries other than our own. I refer to the deficiency of American representatives to international conferences with respect to their ability, or, rather, lack of ability, to either read or speak any language other than our own.

At the Paris and Berlin conferences of members of the several congresses of the world, French and German were the prevailing languages used. At the Paris meeting about the only representatives speaking English were those from the United Kingdom, from China, and the United States. However, we were able to secure translated reports of what was said and what happened at the Paris meeting.

At the Berlin meeting the proceedings were in German, and the English-speaking countries were not of sufficient influence to secure a translation immediately of the speeches and actions of the meeting. Fortunately, we had one delegate who could speak German. The present mayor of New York City, at that time a Representative, addressed the Conference in German. Not being able to understand the foreign languages and not being able to secure translations of the proceedings, many, if not all, the other United States delegates have been in doubt all these years as to what was said and done at the Berlin Congress of Congresses.

In the recent Quebec Conference, English was the language used. Of the representatives from the forty-odd countries all save three could speak English. Many of the delegates could speak many languages. On occasions the exact meaning of our English words and phrases was the subject of extensive debate. One delegate from a populous country was able to debate in any language selected by his opponent.

To be an efficient representative of the United States at any international conference the delegate should not only be familiar with the subject matter under consideration, but, in addition, he should be able to read, understand, and speak each of the various languages approved by the conference.

While English was the approved language at Quebec, the next FAO Conference will be conducted in French, Spanish, and Russian in addition to English. The United States representatives to the next Food and Agriculture Conference, as well as the delegates to all international conferences, should be selected very largely with respect to their ability to speak foreign languages other than English. Mere interpreters will not be sufficient.

The interests of the United States are so important that we must not only know what the other delegates say and write, but we must know exactly what the spoken and written words mean—in whatever language they are used.

Other nations have been training personnel for years for the special work of looking after the interests of such nations in world affairs. The time has already arrived for international cooperation, and it seems that the other nations are ready to take their places at the conference table fully equipped with experts trained not only in the subject matter to be considered, but, in addition, trained

and experienced in government, and able to speak the major languages of the world.

Under our Constitution the Congress is the policy-making branch of our Government. I am thoroughly convinced that, as a matter of national policy, the best interests of our country demand that steps be taken immediately to train personnel for the special work of looking after our interests not only at home but abroad. In such training the matter of languages should be given major importance.

On December 13, 1928, some 17 years ago, I introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 4888, having for its title, "A bill providing for the establishment in the Department of State of a Board of Foreign Affairs and a Foreign Service School." At that time, however, our Nation was recovering from the effects of World War I, and instead of looking forward to assume a leading place among the nations of the world, we were receding into isolationism, with a mistaken confidence that we were self-sufficient unto ourselves; and, believing that our people, our property, and our Government were safe and immune from attack, we were preparing our people and our Government to just sit by the road and see the world go by.

As a result of conditions existing and developing at that time, my bill was sent to the morgue to join thousands of other bills prepared and introduced by Senators newly arrived from the hinterland.

As stated earlier in this report, the matter of the administration of foreign affairs is, in the main, the responsibility of the President and the Department of State. The administrative branch of the Government should, in my opinion, sponsor a program for the proper training of personnel to represent our Nation abroad. This suggestion, in the form of a recommendation, is intended to be constructive, for the future, rather than a criticism of our past or even our present foreign representation.

The Government, acting through the State Department, has already an approved course of instruction being given at Georgetown University for the training of candidates for careers in our consular and diplomatic service.

I am convinced that the training of personnel to represent the United States abroad is of sufficient importance to justify the establishment of a special institution to prepare men and women for this class of work.

We have a number of highly developed institutions for the special purpose of training men to protect our interests in times of war.

We should have a comparable institution to train men and women to protect our interests abroad in times of peace as well as in war.

In this connection I am gratified to learn that a former high ranking and most efficient official of our Government shares my opinion of the importance of the necessary efficiency of our representatives abroad.

It has just been announced that Jesse Jones, formerly Secretary of Commerce and manager in chief of our Federal loan agencies, has made a gift of $300,000 to the University of Virginia for the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs.

President Newcomb of the Virginia University, in accepting the gift, stated that the Woodrow Wilson School will be an integral part of the recently established school of foreign service and international affairs.

Representatives of the administrative branch of our Government should, in my opinion, either recommend the creation of a special institution for the training of personnel to represent our country abroad or they should take immediate steps to establish in existing colleges and universities approved courses of study for the training of such personnel.

The work of the Conference was crystallized in a report which sets forth in some detail the work to be accomplished.

The report is too voluminous to be included as a part of my remarks.

However, the report will be printed and copies will be available to those who may be interested in the recommendations made by the Conference.

Mr. President, as a part of my report on the Quebec Food and Agricultural Organization Conference, I ask permission to have printed in the record at this point copy of invitation to a United Nations conference on foods and other essential products.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVITATION SENT OUT BY STATE DEPARTMENT

The Government of the United States of America is of the opinion that it is desirable now for the United Nations and those nations which are associated with them in this war to begin joint consideration of the basic economic problems with which they and the world will be confronted after complete military victory shall have been attained. Accordingly, and as a first step in this direction, the Government of the United States proposes to convene on April 27 at some suitable place in the United States, a conference on food and other essential agricultural products, and hereby invites the Government of ------ to send to that conference a small number of appropriate technical and expert representatives.

The purpose of the conference is to provide an opportunity for an exchange of views and information with respect to the following topics and for exploring and seeking agreement in principle as to the most desirable and practicable means and methods of dealing with the following problems:

Plans and prospects of various countries for the postwar period regarding production, import requirements, or exportable surpluses of foodstuffs and other essential agricultural products, with a view to improving progressively in each country the levels of consumption within the framework of the opportunities and possibilities of an expansion of its general economic activity. Such consideration will be entirely divorced from the question of the provision of relief.

Possibilities of coordinating and stimulating by international action national policies looking to the improvement of nutrition and the enhancement of consumption in general.

Possibilities of setting up international agreements, arrangements, and institutions designed to promote efficient production of foodstuffs and other essential agricultural products, and to ensure for the world adequate supplies of such products with due consideration to the attainment of equitable prices from the viewpoint of both producers and consumers.

Commercial, financial, and other arrangements which will be necessary in order to enable the countries of the world to obtain the foodstuffs and other essential agricultural products which they will need and to maintain adequate markets for their own surplus production.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks copy of text of message from the President of the United States to the delegates of the Conference.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 14, 1943.

MY DEAR MARVIN: In your capacity as chairman of the United States delegation, and as temporary chairman of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, will you convey to the delegates my heartfelt regret that I cannot be present in person to welcome them upon this historic occasion. Urgent matters in the prosecution of the war make it impossible for me to attend; and until we have won the unconditional surrender of our enemies, the achievement of victory must be pressed above all else.

Nevertheless, I hope that later I shall be able to meet the delegates and express to them personally my profound conviction of the importance of the task on which they are about to embark.

This is the first United Nations Conference. Together, we are fighting a common enemy. Together, also, we are working to build a world in which men shall be free to live out their lives in peace, prosperity, and security.

The broad objectives for which we work have been stated in the Atlantic Charter, the declaration of United Nations, and at the meeting of the 21 American Republics at Rio de Janeiro in January 1942. It is the purpose of this Conference to consider how best to further these policies insofar as they concern the consumption, production, and distribution of food and other agricultural products in the postwar period.

We know that in the world for which we are fighting and working, the "four freedoms" must be won for all men. We know, too, that each freedom is dependent upon the others; that freedom from fear, for example, cannot be secured without freedom from want. If we are to succeed, each nation individually, and all nations collectively, must undertake these responsibilities: They must take all necessary steps to develop world food production so that it will be adequate to meet the essential nutritional needs of the world population. And they must see to it that no hindrances, whether of international trade, of transportation, or of internal distribution be allowed to prevent any nation or group of citizens within a nation from obtaining the food necessary for health. Society must meet in full its obligation to make available to all its members at least the minimum adequate nutrition. The problems with which this Conference will concern itself are the most fundamental of all human problems—for without food and clothing life itself is impossible.

In this and other United Nations conferences we shall be extending our collaboration from war problems into important new fields. Only by working together can we learn to work together, and work together we must and will.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD

as part of my remarks copy of address of President Roosevelt before the delegates to the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, June 7, 1943.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It gives me great pleasure to welcome to the White House you who have served so splendidly at the epoch-making United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture.

I use that word "epoch-making" advisedly. The Conference could not have failed to be significant because it was the first United Nations Conference. But it has succeeded even beyond our hopes; it is truly epoch-making because, in reaching unanimity upon complex and difficult problems, you have demonstrated beyond question that the United Nations really are united—not only for the prosecution of the war but for the solution of the many and difficult problems of peace. This Conference has been a living demonstration of the methods by which the conversations of nations of like mind contemplated by article VII of the mutual-aid agreement can and will give practical application to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

You have been dealing with agriculture, the most basic of all human activities, and with food, the most basic of all human needs. Twice as many people are employed in work on food and agriculture as in work in all other fields combined. And all people have, in the literal sense of the word, a vital interest in food.

That a child or adult should get the nourishment necessary for full health is too important a thing to be left to mere chance.

You have recognized that society must accept this responsibility. As you stated in your declaration, "The primary responsibility lies with each nation for seeing that its own people have the food needed for health and life; steps to this end are for national determination. But each nation can fully achieve its goal only if all work together." On behalf of the United States I accept this declaration.

You have gone beyond the general recognition of principles to deal in specific terms with specific tasks and projects.

You have examined the needs of all countries for food and other agricultural products, both as they will exist in the short-run period of recovery from the devastation of war, and as they will exist over the longer run, when our efforts can be fully devoted to expanding the production of food so that it will be adequate for health the world over.

You have surveyed with courage and with realism the magnitude of these problems and have reached unanimous agreement that they can, and must, and will, be solved.

It is true that no nation has ever had enough food to feed all of its people as we now know human beings should be fed. But neither have nations representing over 80 percent of the world's 2,000,000,000 inhabitants ever before been joined together to achieve such an aim. Never before have they set out to bend their united efforts to the development of the world's resources so that all men might seek to attain food they need.

For the short run, you have pointed out steps which have to be taken both in increasing supplies and in maintaining economy of use and coordination of distribution.

In considering our long-range problems, you have surveyed our knowledge of the inadequacy in the quantity and quality of the diet of peoples in all lands. You have pooled our knowledge of the means of expanding our output, of increasing our agricultural efficiency, and of adjusting agricultural production to consumption needs. In the fields of both production and consumption you have recognized the need for the better utilization of the knowledge we now have and for extending still further the boundaries of our knowledge through education and research.

You have called upon your governments individually and collectively to enlarge and improve their activities in these fields.

For the perfection and rapid execution of these plans, you have recommended the creation of a permanent United Nations Organization. To facilitate and hasten the creation of that Organization and to carry on the work you have begun until its creation, you have established an interim commission. The Government of the United States is honored that you have asked that the interim commission have its seat in Washington, and will be glad to take the preliminary action for the establishment of that commission which you have entrusted to it.

Finally, you have expressed your deep conviction that our goal in this field cannot be attained without forward action in other fields as well. Increased food production must be accompanied by increased industrial production and by increased purchasing power. There must be measures for dealing with trade barriers, international exchange stability and international investment. The better use of natural and human resources must be assured to improve the living standard; and, may I add, the better use of these resources without exploitation on the part of any nation. Many of these questions lie outside the scope of the work you have undertaken, but their solution is nonetheless essential to its success. They require, and shall receive, our united attention.

In the political field, these relationships are equally important. And they work both ways. A sound world agricultural program will depend upon world political security, while that security will in turn be greatly strengthened if each country can be assured of the food it needs. Freedom from want and freedom from fear go hand in hand.

Our ultimate objective can be simply stated: It is to build for ourselves, for all men, a world in which each individual human being shall have the opportunity to live out his life in peace; to work productively, earning at least enough for his actual needs and those of his family; to associate with the friends of his choice; to think and worship freely; and to die secure in the knowledge that his children, and their children, shall have the same opportunities.

That objective, as men know from long and bitter experience, will not be easy to achieve. But you and I know also that, throughout history, there has been no more worth while, no more inspiring challenge.

That challenge will be met.

You have demonstrated beyond question that free peoples all over the world can agree upon a common course of action and upon common machinery for action. You have brought new hope to the world that, through the establishment of orderly international procedures for the solution of international problems, there will be attained freedom from want and freedom from fear. The United Nations are united in the war against fear and want as solidly and effectively as they are united on the battle front in this world-wide war against aggression.

And we are winning by action and unity.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a copy of the message from President Harry S. Truman to the Quebec Conference on Food and Agriculture Organization, October 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My thoughts and the thoughts of the people of the United States of America today turn toward Quebec. The first Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is truly a momentous occasion. It is an occasion on which the people of the United Nations begin to cultivate, if not yet to gather, the fruits of victory.

If we had not won our victory through common effort and common sacrifice, a meeting such as this would have been impossible. There would have been no room in the world for candor and decency and mutual helpfulness. Certainly there would have been no room for an international organization dedicated to these two simple propositions: First, that people in all parts of the world can and should have plenty of food and of other products of the farm; and second, that the world's people who draw wealth from the earth and sea can and should enjoy their fair share of the good things of life.

These are high goals. Neither the world nor any single nation has as yet even come close to achieving either. It will take time to reach them. Creation of a Food and Agriculture Organization in itself will not be enough; we must look to the patient cooperation of the family of nations through FAO and other means. But the work you are beginning at Quebec is an essential step forward, and a long one.

The world is watching your efforts for still another reason. The Food and Agriculture Organization is the first of the new permanent world organizations to grow out of the wartime cooperation of the United Nations. Its early stages, for good or ill, will do much to set the pattern for the other world organizations that must follow if we are to succeed in building a foundation for world peace and prosperity.

It is particularly fortunate that your meeting comes at this time, when some of the problems and difficulties that must inevitably follow military victory in so great a war have made themselves felt so keenly. The tasks of repairing the ravages of war and building for a saner future are tremendous. Each day it becomes clearer that in many ways we must work harder to win the peace than we did to win the war. But we know that the peace can be won. One of the major victories can be won at Quebec.

The United States is eager and proud to take its full part in your efforts. The success of this all-important first step in the life of the Food and Agriculture Organization is the primary aim of my country's delegation. Its members comes to this Conference prepared to work together with the delegations of other nations for the good of all and to bear their full share of the responsibility for a successful outcome.

Please convey my best wishes to the delegates of the host Government of the Dominion of Canada and to the delegates from the other United Nations. Much depends on your work during the days ahead. I am fully confident you will accomplish your purpose no matter what obstacles may arise. Working together you cannot fail.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks copy of inaugural address delivered by the newly elected Director General, Sir John Boyd Orr, on October 17, 1945:

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am sure that you will not expect me to make any

long speech today. Any person called to this so very important post on such short notice must feel confused and find it difficult to collect his thoughts.

I would like to say, though, that I do appreciate the very high honor which has been conferred upon me by nominating me to this post, and I assure you that I feel more deeply the very great responsibility one has in accepting it.

I would like, for a few minutes, sir, if you will allow me, to say a few words about the relationship of FAO to world affairs of today. I think most of you will agree that we are now passing through the greatest crisis in the history of our civilization. That crisis has been brought about by the advance of science. In the last 40 years science has advanced more than it did in the previous 2,000 years. Physical science has let loose tremendous new forces into the world. Mr. Chairman, those forces cannot be bottled up; they must either be harnessed to serve the ends of mankind or they will break loose in a riot of destruction.

How those forces are used will affect all nations equally. The world is now so small that any war will be a world war; any prosperity must be a world prosperity. Governments realize this, and they are, therefore, attempting to set up world organizations which will enable those powers of science to be applied on a world scale. It is very fitting, sir, that FAO should be the first of these organizations. It deals with the primary products of land and sea; it deals with food—the primary necessity of life.

Let me say a word about what FAO must accomplish. Each nation has accepted the responsibility, which indeed must be the responsibility of any government, to provide, as far as possible, food and a health standard for all the peoples it governs. But something new has arisen. All the governments have agreed to cooperate in a great world food scheme, which will bring freedom from want of food to all men, irrespective of race or color.

I ask you for a moment to consider what the great results will be. In the first place, disease and misery and premature death, which afflict the majority of the people of this planet, will, to a large extent, be replaced by health, by happiness, and by life.

But other results will follow. If the nations of the world are going to get together to feed the people of the world, they must increase the production of the most important foods. In many cases that production must be more than doubled. This will bring prosperity to agriculture. There should be no slump in agriculture after this war, such as after the last war, and prosperity in agriculture must overflow into other businesses and into world trade.

But, sir, we do these things not because they will bring prosperity, but because they are right. We have now reached the stage, I hope, when we realize that if we put first things first, and do the things which we know to be right, a great many social, economic, and political difficulties will disappear.

There is one further thing which to my mind is the most important of all. In this great world crisis, governments, feeling they must cooperate, find it difficult to cooperate. I am sure the sympathies of every thinking individual must be with the statesmen, foreign secretaries, prime ministers, and so on, who are trying their best, under the most appalling circumstances, to bring order out of world chaos and to offset all the racial hatreds, evil ambitions, and all the evils of the past which, we hope, have disappeared in the war.

Here we have a scheme in which we have agreed to cooperate, a scheme which will bring important benefits to all nations. In cooperating in this world food scheme, based upon the needs of mankind, we will be developing an atmosphere of good will. Governments will thus learn to trust each other, and will see the spirit of the good neighbor beginning to appear in most of the nations of the world.

These are the things which to my mind FAO has set out to do. The great promotion of human welfare, prosperity in agriculture, prosperity in industry, and prosperity in trade, all make contributions to world unity. You say it is a dream. Then, it is the business of FAO to make that dream come true.

These things are easy to say; they are very difficult to do. Those who have been working on these problems for years realize the enormous difficulties which face us. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I am almost tempted to say that if this organization succeeds it will perform a miracle. Well, we are living in a day of miracles. We performed them during the war, and one of the most important of all was getting nations to cooperate for the achievement of the one great end—the mutual benefit of all.

Well, these difficulties have to be faced. The vision we have of the new world which FAO can begin to build must inspire us with the faith, confidence, and hope which will enable us to overcome, one by one, the difficulties which we find.

I hope you do not expect me to speak today about the organization of FAO. It will need a good deal of study, even with all the documents which have been prepared, to make quite sure we step off with the right foot. We dare not delay that organization considering the position of the world, which is so urgently in need of FAO.

On the other hand, we dare not make a wrong step. But there is one thing I would like to say, and that is that we will need a considerable staff to run FAO. Mr. Chairman, there will be no jobs in the ordinary sense of the term in FAO. Anybody who joins this organization—and I hope that any person asked, or any person upon whom the draft falls, will accept service with FAO—will have to make very big sacrifices. They will have to relinquish their own nationality; they will have to become citizens of the world; and they will have to realize that the Hottentots of Africa and the aborigines of Australia are as dear to them as the peoples to whom they belong. They must set aside their present ambitions, and be prepared to give their lives to this great cause.

In conclusion, may I say that I hope all the members of the delegations assembled here feel that they are present at a great, historic occasion. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that 100 years hence the historians of that day will look back on this occasion, this October 1945, in Quebec, and will date the beginning of the new world from this great conference.

I hope that upon their return to their own countries, all delegates will report to their governments that this organization has been launched in a spirit of great good will, and that it has been set on its course to make its great contribution to the promotion of human welfare and to the unity of the nations of the world. I also hope that all delegates will inspire their governments with the enthusiasm which has been generated at this Conference, so that all the nations will put their resources of men and materials at the service of this great organization, which will have the great honor of laying the first stone in the foundation of that great new world which modern science has made possible.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a copy of the closing statement by the Chairman, L. B. Pearson, at the first session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is customary on an occasion like this—the last meeting of a conference—for the Chairman to wind up the proceedings with a few remarks. Those remarks usually fall into two parts. The first includes his thanks for all the help he has received during his term of office. The second sums up the accomplishments of the Conference.

The first part presents no difficulty, apart from my inability to express adequately the gratitude I feel to all the members of the Conference and the secretariat for their cooperation and assistance to me while I have been Chairman. They have made my work easy and I am very grateful.

The second part, however, is not so easy if one wishes to be entirely honest. I have attended many international meetings and listened to the closing speeches of many chairmen extolling the magnificent and imperishable results that have been achieved. I have seen these results embodied in impressive resolutions and I have seen too many of these resolutions remain impressive as words only. I am too confirmed an idealist to become cynical over all this, but I am enough of a realist to be careful when I express my own opinion of the value of what we have done in Quebec.

We have made a good beginning in United Nations cooperation in a vital field—food and agriculture. We have also blazed the way for others in the launching of the first permanent United Nations specialized, functional organization. We have laid down principles of administration and operation which will, I think, be helpful guides for United Nations Organization in other fields. In this respect we have established precedents, and I think they have been good ones.

We have worked hard. The fact that in 2 weeks there have been more than 210 meetings of the Conference and its committees, to say nothing of the informal groups that have assembled here and there and worked far into the night, is a tribute to our interest in the task given us and our industry in trying to do something about it.

Out of all this industry and interest has come FAO and Sir John Boyd Orr, two very good results. To help them both we have drawn up a blueprint for the work ahead. But blueprints must be converted into buildings, recommendations into realities. That is FAO's job. But FAO is, in the last analysis, people and governments. So it remains for us to make this organization a success. I have no doubt of the competence and zeal of the organization itself under its great Director General. I have some fear, however, that the governments, because of apathy or ignorance, may not give FAO the support it must have—may not implement its recommendations or accept its advice. I can only hope that my fears in this respect will be entirely groundless and that, say, 5 years from now, when I take up the long list of recommendations which we have now accepted as a guide for sound action, I will be able to see written after each one, "Action already taken by FAO and its member governments." That, however, will never happen unless FAO gets its message across to the people by every possible method—press, radio, and film. Only if it is made clear to the people what this organization can do will governments give it the backing it must have if it is to succeed.

Our organization is now a going concern. In its first months of life it should, I think, avoid two things: Undue rashness and undue timidity. If FAO too ambitiously tries to run before it can walk, it will crash. On the other hand, if it is too fearful of falling, it will never learn to walk at all. In its work, therefore, it must be at the same time careful and enterprising; imaginative and practical. It must not become a

body with both its feet firmly suspended in midair or one with both its feet firmly stuck in the mud.

Important international progress in the field of food and agriculture has, I think, been made in Quebec. There are, however, implications in the work that we have done here that are more far reaching than those arising merely out of the technical subjects on our agenda. We of the United Nations have taken another cooperative step along the road that leads to peace and prosperity. We have marked another advance in the organizing of the United Nations for concrete, specialized purposes. This approach to international progress and understanding—calling together specialists and technicians who know their jobs and giving them specific jobs to do—is, of course, essentially a nonpolitical and nondiplomatic approach to the solution of international problems. But it is the best approach because it is concerned with the welfare of the individual, not the pride or prejudice of the Nation. It may be that once or twice in our deliberations considerations of international politics and national prestige have raised their embarrassing heads. But this happened on refreshingly few occasions and when it happened we put these complicating and irrelevant issues in their place as quickly as possible.

Specialist, functional conferences are, of course, less exciting than other and more glamorous meetings. We are no Congress of Vienna. True, we have danced once or twice in this hospitable hotel, but we have also marched. There is more construction, thank God, than controversy; more drudgery than drama, about our work. No Hollywood producer of historical romances will ever be able to make much out of the meetings of the committee on statistics or agricultural production. But millions of workers may someday live better lives because of those meetings. That is an objective more desirable to achieve, I suggest, than the altering of a boundary or the policing of an election. Scientific warfare with its shattering finality has made disputes and intrigues over boundaries and regimes as unreal as the chattering of children over the right to possess sand castles. Nevertheless, in a world where science has blown to unrecognizable dust particles all the old concepts of national rights and national security—although some of the admirals and generals may stubbornly refuse to admit this—human welfare remains, or should remain, as always, the first objective of governmental action. We can be proud, therefore, that welfare, not warfare, has been our concern at this Conference and we have, I hope, made our contribution to its promotion.

It will, however, be a negligible contribution unless others are made in more difficult fields. FAO cannot stand alone.

That, among other things, means that the future of FAO is bound up with the present of UNRRA. Our organization is not, and was never meant to be, directly concerned with relief. Our task is long-range reorientation and reconstruction. Nevertheless, I speak with restraint but with a deep conviction made deeper by a visit to Europe this summer—if we do not help Europe and Asia to save themselves from ruin this year, there will be nothing to reconstruct next year.

There is an interdependence to all sound international effort. That is why I, personally, am happy that in every possible way we have emphasized at this conference that the Food and Agriculture Organization is only one of a number of technical organizations that should in some way be linked together and all coordinated for the achievement of peace and progress under the one great United Nations Organization. That is why there has run through all our work the conviction that there can be no prosperity without security. Freedom from want would indeed hardly be worth achieving, even if it were possible, in a world which did not have freedom from war and fear of wars.

That is the central, vital problem that has been in the mind of every one of us in our work here, no matter how technical or how remote from political considerations that work may seem to have been. There is no escape from that problem; now less than ever, when science has made war total and destruction total.

We at this Conference know, and we have shown, what science could do if harnessed to the chariot of construction. Man's fears have, however, harnessed it also to another chariot—that of atomic obliteration. On that chariot race, with science driven by both contestants, all our hopes and fears and agonies and ecstacies are concentrated. If we lose in that contest anything that we have done here or may do elsewhere in London, or Washington, or San Francisco, or Moscow, will have as much consequence as a pebble thrown into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. But if we should acquire some trace of sanity and bring social progress in line with scientific development by subjecting the annihilating forces of science to some sort of social control, which in the last analysis means some sort of international control, then the work we have done at Quebec will have made a worthy and permanent contribution to man's long effort to move upward from the jungle of hatred, suspicion and death, where so many powerful, selfish, and frightening influences even today are working to keep him mired.

Our Conference is now coming to an end, but the work of FAO goes on. It is a hopeful augury for the future that this work was begun in this historic and progressive city; Quebec, where not long ago plans for victory in war were made, and where now plans for victory in peace have been laid. That those plans may be carried forward by FAO with vigor, courage, and imagination is, I know, the heartfelt wish of every member of this first Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which I hereby declare adjourned.

Mr. WILLIS subsequently said: Mr. President, this afternoon the able senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] gave a very inclusive and able report on the meeting of the Food and Agricultural Organization at Quebec. Being also a member of the congressional delegation to that organization meeting, I shall at an early date present some supplementary observations regarding that conference.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 693) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$10,000."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion of last Friday regarding the Pearl Harbor Committee, as it is called, I wish to make a certain addition to the RECORD in the interest of accuracy. In the course of that discussion the chairman of the committee, the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] read a resolution which was offered by me, which had not been agreed to by the committee, but which was held in suspense. I read from page 10352 of the RECORD. The portion first read by the Senator from Kentucky from the resolution offered by me is as follows:

> Whereas determination regarding the significance of missing files—

That is the quotation. To this suggestion the majority leader took serious exception, and somewhat critically he made the following statement:

> I wish to say that the unequivocal statement has been made that there are missing files. So far as the committee knows, so far as the counsel knows, and so far as any individual member of the committee knows, there is no basis for the bald statement that there are missing papers.

When I returned to my office that evening I found therein a memorandum of the same date from the counsel of the committee, the Honorable William D. Mitchell, to me regarding this situation. I wish to read that into the RECORD without reading the names in the interest of not disclosing them at this time, but they are available to any who may be interested, and are available to the members of the committee or to the majority leader. I quote now from Hon. William D. Mitchell:

> Respecting the absence of records of monitoring stations, which had been alerted to catch the "winds" execute message, in the record of proceedings * * * (it is) testified that the logs of all 4 Navy monitoring stations in the United States had been destroyed. He said the Cheltenham's logs were destroyed when that station moved to Chatham; the Winter Harbor log was destroyed to make filing room. He could not say why the other two logs were destroyed, but that a search for the logs had been made in November or December 1943, and again in the spring of 1944, and the logs were then gone.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it that what the Senator from Maine is reading indicates that official documents are missing—at least, the counsel for the committee indicates that official documents are missing.

Mr. BREWSTER. He states that responsible naval officials in charge in this matter have so testified, and there is indicated the absence not only of the records of two stations, which I had stated, but records of four Navy monitoring stations which apparently had been destroyed. They certainly were missing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know what the committee or the individual members have done or the counsel has done, in relation to finding out more facts about these missing records?

Mr. BREWSTER. I gather that this report to me of last Friday resulted from

the question which I had raised in the committee regarding this situation, in connection with the desire I expressed to have an opportunity to examine how these records were kept, and why it was there was not room to retain these records, which had a very considerable importance as being one of the means by which it could be satisfactorily determined whether or not messages that had been received prior to Pearl Harbor, were of significance in connection with the attack. The only way that could be determined would be by examining these records, and finding out whether the messages were there or had never been received. The destruction of the records makes that very difficult.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know whether or not the files were destroyed during a certain period?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what it was my desire to determine. I desired to see how the records were kept, and whether it happened that only these were selected for destruction, or whether it was the general practice. I am considerably embarrassed, I may say, by the fact that the majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and myself are members of the most select and exclusive committee in the Senate, I believe, which is the special committee on the disposition of papers in the executive departments, and whether or not I have condoned the destruction I should like to have determined.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that was one reason why I started to make the inquiry, realizing that the two Senators engaged in the debate were in a way, under our rules, responsible for papers of the various departments. I wonder whether an investigation has been conducted to determine whether or not a congressional order has been issued permitting the destruction of these very important papers. The reason I say "very important" is that the period in question is a crucial period in the history of the United States, and I am desirous of knowing whether these papers, dealing with the recording, are now missing or if any other papers are missing from the files at this critical time in our history. I want to know if missing files include all papers or papers relating only to this inquiry.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that whole situation is being, or should, be very thoroughly explored. I can assure the Senator that the records of this special committee of which I speak and of which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and I are members, are being examined to determine whether or not there has been any official authorization. In any event, I think it is clear that those in charge in the Navy should certainly have called the attention of everyone concerned to the fact that the period in question covers the time prior to Pearl Harbor when there might be a very considerable significance to the messages.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, could the Senator enlighten the Senate as to the right of an agency to destroy papers without an order from Congress?

Mr. BREWSTER. I assume from the existence of this special committee of the Senate—and there is a standing committee in the House with similar jurisdiction—and the fact that from time to time it receives requests from the Archivist for authority to dispose of executive papers that there must be legal prohibition, and certainly there should be administrative regulations covering the preservation of records which have such great importance.

Mr. FERGUSON. The majority leader stated last Friday on the floor of the Senate:

> So far as the committee knows, so far as the counsel knows, and so far as any individual member of the committee knows, there is no basis for the bald statement that there are missing papers.

At the time that was said on the floor, I indicated that as a member of that committee I had knowledge, and I stated my knowledge at that time, and state it again so that the record may be clear that the findings of the boards indicated that there were missing papers. The question now presented, and presented last week, is whether we are as a committee to try this matter de novo or whether we are to try it in an appellate capacity, so that we would only review what had already been put in the record. I then indicated that I had knowledge, and I say again that I have certain knowledge; but with the restrictions of the committee now placed upon individual members, naturally it is impossible to ascertain and bring before the Senate the facts as to what papers are missing or what papers are not missing. The letter from the counsel clearly indicates, and my knowledge clearly indicates, that certain files are missing. I believe that the Senate is interested in the various departments disclosing what files have been destroyed, what has been taken from the files, and under what authority certain papers have been removed from the files of the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is with considerable reluctance that I rise on the floor of the Senate at this particular time for the purpose of engaging in a debate on the investigation of the attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941. I regret that the distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably absent, because they engaged in the debate on last Friday when this question arose. However, in view of the colloquy which has taken place between the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] I deem it advisable to say a few words in answer to the charge which has been made.

Mr. President, when I was appointed as a member of this committee by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. MCKELLAR], I had only one desire, and it has not changed. That is to give to the country the facts concerning Pearl Harbor. I undertake to say that that cannot be done on the floor of the United States Senate. I undertake to say that that was the reason a special committee was appointed to hold hearings, in order that we may unfold the evidence in an orderly manner. That was the reason the resolution was introduced, giving the committee the power to employ counsel and investigators to examine and arrange the evidence, so that when the hearings were started the people of the United States would be able to follow the investigation from day to day with a continuity of thought, and when we finally arrived at a conclusion it would in reality be the verdict of the American people. But some Senators have chosen a different preview on how to proceed in a case of this kind. The reason must be perfectly obvious. For example, today two Senators engaged in a more or less childlike debate about useless papers, and what a committee of the United States Senate shall do or shall not do with respect to logs which were supposedly destroyed 3 or 4 years ago.

Mr. President, the Pearl Harbor attack is an important question. I do not underestimate the seriousness of the investigation of the attack upon Pearl Harbor. But I had hoped from the beginning that this case might be tried in much the same manner that a lawsuit is tried, in an orderly fashion. I had hoped that we might wait until the hearings had started, until the counsel and his advisers and investigators had had an opportunity to pore over all the volumes of testimony and then proceed in a fashion which would be acceptable to everyone. If we should run into the "east wind" or the "west wind," or the four logs about which the Senators have spoken, and it becomes necessary to appoint a subcommittee to investigate further, certainly no one would object to such procedure.

What have we before the United States Senate today? We have before the Senate the statements of two Senators, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], giving the American people the impression that someone has destroyed important records dealing with Pearl Harbor. On what do they base that statement? Is it evidence addressed before the committee? No, Mr. President; we have not even started taking testimony. Hearings will start on November 15. Had the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Michigan wished to be fair, they could have made further inquiry of General Mitchell as to what had been done in connection with the very thing they were talking about. They would have given the Senate all the facts.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield in the interest of a search for truth?

Mr. LUCAS. A search for truth? If the Senator will follow that policy and be fair about this thing, the truth will come out. But the case cannot be tried on the floor of the United States Senate. It cannot be tried in the newspapers, as the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Michigan are attempting to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a memorandum which the two Senators could have found. They find what they want in General Mitchell's office, if it is good for use in the newspapers and upon the floor of the Senate from their view-

point; but they could have found this memorandum, too, if they had asked about it.

The Navy, the Army, and the State Department have been given orders by the President of the United States to give to this committee anything and everything in the files of those departments relating to Pearl Harbor, either before or following the attack.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield.

Up to this time, according to the statement made by William Mitchell, general counsel for the committee, the departments have been completely cooperative, and have not failed to give to Mr. Mitchell everything that he has asked for in connection with this investigation including top secrets. That was his statement before the committee the other day.

Mr. President, I do not rely on the search which was made for those logs in 1943 and 1944, as the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maine are now relying upon it. I am not going to be satisfied with that. I never have been; but I was reluctant to talk about it today. I had hoped that it might unfold as we developed the evidence from time to time.

General Mitchell submitted to the Navy Department the following "Memorandum on 'winds' message": which the junior Senator from Maine would want you to believe is a closed book unless he can personally investigate it. Listen, my colleagues, to this. Among other evidence we must—

1. Have a witness from Navy who will describe the naval monitoring stations, where they were located, how they operated, and when and how and in what terms they were advised to monitor for the "winds" execute message.

Is that the way to proceed, Mr. President? Is that the honorable and fair way to get to the bottom of a situation as serious at this? Is not that the way a fair and unpartial legal mind works? The Navy will produce their witnesses before we get through if the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Michigan will have a little patience.

General Mitchell also wants the Navy to produce—

2. A witness from each station who was in charge of it November 28 to December 7, 1941, and who can be asked where the logs were kept, and what he remembers about the "winds" message.

Would not it be more in keeping with what is just and right to wait another 2 weeks or more to ascertain if we can find those witnesses and take their testimony, and then form our conclusions and deductions as to what happened at that time with respect to the logs.

I am advised that two of the logs have absolutely nothing to do with Pearl Harbor.

General Mitchell also wants—

3. A witness from each station who was in charge at the time the logs of November 28 to December 7 were destroyed or otherwise disposed of, and why.

Obviously, Mr. President, that is what we want; every American wants that; every Senator on the committee wants that. Why cannot we wait? The Senator from Michigan wants to go down and inspect all the State Department files and the War Department files and the files of the President of the United States. If these witnesses fail to satisfy the committee and the Senator from Michigan or any other Senator desire to pursue the inquiry further, as one member of the committee I shall not hesitate to grant to a subcommittee authority to make such further investigation. However, I shall never grant permission to any single member to examine alone these files. I cannot understand why any Member of the Senate would wish to go down and look over by himself, the personal files of a former President of the United States. I simply cannot understand it—any more than I would want to look at the personal files of the Senator from Michigan. Yet that is apparently one of the big things in the Pearl Harbor investigation—the desire to look at personal files.

The memorandum from Attorney Mitchell, which I read, gives an orderly way to proceed. He is getting at the basic facts of the case. He is working at it in a way which should be satisfactory to everyone. This case cannot be tried in the newspapers or on the floor of the Senate; I repeat what I said before.

Mr. President, if the Senators from Maine and Michigan will restrain themselves and be a little patient and let the evidence unfold in an orderly fashion, I undertake to say that everything that is involved in connection with Pearl Harbor will finally come to the surface.

But I say it is a crying shame to attempt to prejudge this case with the American people prior to the time when any evidence has been submitted. Thus far, not a single line of evidence is in the record. Mr. President, with all the emphasis at my command, I repeat that it is not right to attempt to prejudge the case.

Mr. President, I have read the various reports which have been made. I know that in them there are some things that are inconsistent and some things that have yet to be developed. All I am asking for is just an opportunity, a little time—that is all—so that the counsel, in whom we all have confidence, can really develop this matter the way it should be developed. When the time comes, if Senator FERGUSON—the great investigator, who comes here from Michigan with a reputation as a one-man investigator—finds something which he thinks is being covered up, I shall go along with him, as a member of the subcommittee, to take a look at what he wishes to see, and there will be no question that the chairman will have a subcommittee appointed to take a look at it at that time. But we are not going into such things alone.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, discussing this matter, I wish to say one other thing. There have been some executive sessions of this committee. I have been true to what an executive session means, but I wish to serve notice on the Senate now, and I wish to tell the newspaper representatives in the Press Gallery that from now on they can get from me anything that happens in executive session that they wish to have. I do not propose to deny my friends of the press knowledge of the things which go on in executive session, and then pick up the newspaper the next morning and find a distorted story of what actually happened.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say at this particular time. I hope I never have to debate Pearl Harbor again until we can bring in the report. But I am satisfied we shall have it on the floor of the Senate every day. It is an unfortunate thing. We hoped we might be able to investigate this matter in a way that would be satisfactory to the American people, but I fear we are going to come out just where we started, as a result of developments in the last few days.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, without question the attack on Pearl Harbor was the greatest shock to the American people in the history of our country. What happened at Pearl Harbor is undoubtedly the worst naval defeat ever administered to any one country at a given time in the history of governments. History has been writing with rushing pen since that day, and more than a million American boys have lost their lives or have been wounded or are missing in action, and 3,000 and more of them lost their lives at Pearl Harbor. It was such a shock that everyone in the United States wanted to know what happened and who was responsible for the neglect which allowed such a catastrophe to happen to this, the greatest nation on the earth.

There have been three major investigations. Congress was told to bide its time. Congress did bide its time, as patriotic men. At no time before in history did a Congress work so harmoniously in the defense of their country as did the present and the other Congresses which sat during this war. In the meantime, the Navy made its own investigation. Subsequently the Army did likewise. But not until the Congress insisted that they make an investigation did they finally make one. There was also the investigation headed by a Justice of the Supreme Court.

But the majority leader, in introducing his resolution, said he had read the Army and Navy reports. They were not available to Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle. They were available to the majority leader, who walked in and took the reports to himself, and said that he sat up night after night reading the files so that he could then introduce a resolution calling for an investigation which he described so glowingly as one which would be fair and impartial and complete, one which would reach down to the truth, no matter where it came from and no matter whom it affected, living or dead.

Those records were not then available to the Senator from Michigan who, as everyone knew, had a resolution ready to present and was going to present it on the day when the majority leader submitted his resolution. But the records were available to the majority leader; and he told us on the floor of the Senate that he had read them all through the

night and that he found them conflicting. Let me read his own words. In referring to them, he said:

> They were confusing and complicated when compared with one another, and to some extent contained contradictions and inconsistencies within themselves.

Everyone, including my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], knows that the way to confuse an issue is to get the witnesses to give different testimony at different times. Not only would the Navy and the Army not stand on their ex parte hearings, their own testimony, but they sent as an investigator a major, mighty, not in rank, but in power, for he carried with him the orders of the Secretary of War to go all over the world and say to officers everywhere, "You are not only to talk to me; you are to volunteer and make accessible to me all the documents." But it seems that two Members of the Senate at this late hour are not worthy of as much respect and authority as was a major in the Army of the United States when the conflicting testimony was being gathered.

I greatly appreciate the action of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] acting in his capacity as President pro tempore of the Senate, in accepting what was referred to the other day as the result of the minority steering committee. I have the honor of being one of the members of that committee. I believe that in times of stress, if representative government is to live in the world, the minority owes a tremendous responsibility to dig in behind a majority view and find the facts. Our action was not taken without discussion. It was after contemplation and discussion that we decided we would recommend two Senators who had worked with the present President of the United States on a committee of which he was chairman and which did so much to bring him into prominence and enable him to become President of the United States. There never was any conflict on that committee. Its members always had authority from the chairman of the committee to proceed alone, if they wished to, and ascertain the facts in the name of the people.

The question now is, do the President of the United States and the majority follow new rules as compared with those which were followed by the committee when Mr. Truman was striving to rise in the service of his country?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I shall be glad to yield as soon as I am through, and I shall answer any questions—but not until I am through, Mr. President.

Often in a representative government in working for a position they are reaching for, men do things which they do not do when they attain it. All that the two representatives of the minority, who have been denied access to the facts, have asked for is "Give us the right to search for the truth." The counsel for the committee, whom everyone respected, was unanimously chosen.

Mr. President, I should like to say a word about that matter. Of course, counsel is a distinguished man of about 70 years of age at the present time. It is true that he was Attorney General under a Republican administration. It is also true that he was Solicitor General under the Republicans. A man of that caliber was chosen in order to foreclose any thought that important information would be withheld from the minority. But the question now is, Will the minority members of the committee be given the keys to the facts and be allowed to examine into the situation?

I say to the minority members that even if they are given the keys to the facts and are allowed to proceed, by virtue of conflicting testimony which was taken in the past by the Navy and the Army, as well as testimony taken at subsequent investigations, including an investigation in which a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States participated, they must expect to find conflicting testimony in connection with whatever investigation they conduct. So, at the very best, they will be enabled to obtain only an inadequate report. But they will not be able to proceed very far, nor be able to render a satisfactory report, nor will the people of this country believe it to be a satisfactory report, if the minority Members of the Senate of the United States, who have been chosen by a steering committee of the minority party, and appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, do not receive at least as much authority to investigate as that which is given an assistant attorney. Those minority Members do not know to this day who are the assistants to General Mitchell. Yet, those assistants have been given authority to search records. How do we know what are their qualifications to make a search?

A slighting reference was made to the ability of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. It is only by such talent as his that the minority can save this country from being immeasurably harmed by the rushing tide of excitement when the majority party takes things into its own hands. It was that sort of thing in other countries which brought woe and suffering all over the world.

I say to the minority Members: "You will obtain an inadequate report even if you are given the keys, but if you are refused the same authority to go into safes, doors, and vaults, or interview witnesses, as assistant attorneys, my recommendation is that you resign from the committee and tell the majority to run the committee in its own way. The majority will bring out another report, and if it is not satisfactory perhaps someone will change his testimony again. Do not waste any more time on Pearl Harbor."

Mr. President, distinguished as these men are, they have not attempted to try this case on the floor of the Senate. They have merely said in effect, "We cannot get at the facts before witnesses are called, and we want to be prepared because we have a great responsibility."

I am speaking only for myself; but I know something about investigations, conflicting testimony, and the troubles of the minority. I say "If the majority will not give you the latitude that the President gave when he was chairman of the Truman committee; if they will not give you the latitude that they have given to a major of the Army; if they will not give you the latitude that they have given to an assistant attorney of whom you never heard before and whom you never saw, resign from the committee and let the majority make another report."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me that the reference which was made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois to the President of the United States was rather unfair. I do not know what rules have been made by the committee, but I do know that the Congress created the committee for the purpose of going into the matter which it was expected to investigate. I do not think that the committee has asked the President of the United States to participate in making rules for the committee. So the Senator's statement that it is quite evident now that the President of the United States has changed the rules from what they were when he was head of the Truman committee, seems to me to be farfetched and certainly ill-conceived.

Mr. BROOKS. Does the Senator from Utah wish me to answer the statement which he has just made?

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask, What has the President of the United States to do with making rules for a congressional committee?

Mr. BROOKS. The first thing he did was to issue an Executive order forbidding all officers of all armed forces granting any interviews. He denied them the right to talk about, testify, or disclose anything which had come through the cryptoanalytic code, or whatever the term may be. That order has since been changed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, it has been changed.

Mr. BROOKS. But when the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] asked to have it changed so that he could look at the records, the President changed it only in part. The change made by the President—I do not say this with disrespect to the President—was on the recommendation of others that the change be made.

I would merely remind Senators that when the President of the United States was chairman of the Truman committee, the rule to which reference has been made was not in effect. The minority members of this committee have not been allowed, even with an assistant attorney and on their own volition, to search for evidence in connection with the most important hearing in the history of this country, because the President only modified the rule without giving them the same authority that he gave committee members when he was chairman of the Truman committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator indulge me further?

Mr. BROOKS. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Am I not entitled, as an individual Senator, to any privileges which are extended to any other individual Senator?

Mr. BROOKS. Oh my; I am sure that the Senator does not believe that he has

the same right that a member of the committee has.

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I take the position that as an individual Senator, I have the same right on this floor that any other individual Senator has.

Mr. BROOKS. On that side of the floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I want to be fair to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKS. I also want to be fair, but I want to talk about facts.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is quite evident that the Senator wants to be somewhat partisan. My only purpose in rising was to point out that the President has said to this committee as emphatically as he can say to it, that every file under his control is available to the committee.

Now, if I understand correctly, what the Senator from Illinois is sponsoring and advocating is that instead of the committee alone having such a privilege, each member of the committee should have it. As I understand, the committee itself has never asked for such permission from the President of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I did not sponsor the request for permission. The junior Senator from Maine sponsored it, and I will be glad to have him tell the Senator from Utah whether permission was asked or not.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator from Maine was so well answered the other afternoon on this very question that when the discussion had concluded he did not have a leg to stand on.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the Senator's conclusion. I am sure, however, the Senator's interest is in the facts. The facts are—and I think they are undisputed—that the counsel of the committee went to the President of the United States and asked him to modify the order not only to provide that the committee should have access to information, but that individual members of the committee should have similar access, which was the practice obtaining throughout the history of the Truman committee, and the Mead committee as it is today constituted. The President of the United States declined to sign the amended order which had been submitted by the counsel. I have not been inclined to criticize the President too severely because it is my understanding that his refusal was based on advice of the Secretary of the Navy, and the President, as I think is necessary in carrying out his responsibilities, must be guided in a substantial measure by the heads of the various departments.

It is my understanding that there was considerable discussion about the matter, and the President finally said, "Gentlemen, I have given you all the time I can. I will sign the first order which was considered by the Army and the Navy." Curiously enough, it had been considered by them and approved by them, and the President was ready to sign it. The amended proposal had not been considered by them, and the President refused to sign it.

Curiously enough, the committee had never been consulted with regard to either order, and when it was reported back to the committee, the committee unanimously agreed that the Presidential order was inadequate. The committee had already in the absence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], unanimously adopted a recommendation that the Presidential order should be further modified. I trust and expect that the President will sign the amendment to the order which has been submitted by the committee.

That is the precise history of what occurred.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator has little doubt, has he not, that the President will sign the amendment?

Mr. BREWSTER. I have great confidence in it being signed unless the Secretary of the Navy objects, and in that event the President will be in a dilemma.

Mr. MURDOCK. The point I make is that the President of the United States should not be dragged into this controversy because of criticism of some action of the committee, until the President of the United States has first been given the opportunity, as the Senator now says he has, to conform his orders to the wishes of the committee, acting as a committee, and not to the wishes of some individual member of the committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was the counsel of the committee who took this proposal to the President, and it is with me a matter of regret that the President did not understand, apparently, with sufficient clarity, that he was merely being asked to sign an order prescribing exactly the same procedure he had followed throughout his entire experience as chairman of the Truman committee. I feel confident that if he had understood all the implications of the matter, his reaction might have been very different, but I appreciate the fact that he has a good many matters on his mind.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator is in agreement at least with the position I take here today, that certainly before the President is hauled in here and criticized, he should be given an opportunity, as the result of a request emanating from the committee, to conform to the wishes of the committee. Can anyone disagree with that position?

Mr. BREWSTER. He had the request of the counsel of the committee, which was all he acted on in any event. The counsel of the committee proposed the amended order, which would have made it possible for individual members to look into this matter. I assume that represented the opinion of the counsel.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want the facts brought out, and I believe every other Member of the Senate wants the facts brought out. I know the junior Senator from Illinois is a great lawyer and has an orderly mind; I know he has had great experience in the preparation of cases, and he knows, as I know, and as every other lawyer knows, that the way to develop facts is to develop them in an orderly fashion, not have individual Members running off in different directions at the same time in a disorderly way. That is not the method to follow if it is desired to bring order out of disorder and confusion.

I think that if the Senate, and the minority Members of the Senate, are willing to proceed in an orderly way, and do not become too impatient, they can depend on the orderly mind of a former Republican Attorney General to bring out the facts, and they will be brought out, unless Senators want to try them on the floor of the Senate or in the newspapers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to keep the record straight, in view of what the distinguished Senator from Maine said about these orders which went to the President. It is true, as the Senator knows, that General Mitchell prepared the first order which was adopted by the President, and which was acceptable to the majority of the committee, with respect to having the Navy, the Army, and the State give any information we desired.

However, the modified order, about which the Senator from Maine talks, which was also presented to the President of the United States, was the modified order of the Senator from Michigan, who was in Mr. Mitchell's office, and who submitted his modified order to General Mitchell. General Mitchell took the modified order to the President of the United States along with the other order, neither of the orders ever having been submitted to the committee, and the modified order was the one which would permit this individual inspection, this detective work, in connection with private and public papers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield. If I am wrong I want to be corrected.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is wrong in that the majority leader went with Mr. Mitchell to the White House with both these proposed orders of the counsel of the committee and the suggested proposed order which was approved by the counsel of the committee. So that the majority leader, the chairman of the committee, knew exactly what the counsel wanted signed.

I should like now to make clear the distinction between these two orders so that the RECORD will speak the facts. By the way, I have the order which was corrected in the handwriting of the counsel for the committee. The chief part of the order is as follows:

> The State, War, and Navy Departments will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, for such use as the committee may determine, any information in their possession material to the investigation, and will respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed services whose testimony is desired by the committee to testify publicly before the committee concerning any matter pertinent to the investigation.

This was the correction, and as it was corrected the attorney for the committee wanted it signed, namely, that they would

add after the word "armed" the words "or civilian."

Mr. President, today no civilian in the employ of the United States Government can testify, and this goes to the very question the able Senator from Illinois brought up, concerning what is known as the "Mitchell memorandum on 'Winds' message" of November 5, 1945. The people mentioned would be civilians, and therefore, under the order of the President of the United States as it now stands, they would have no right to disclose that information to the counsel or the committee or any member of the committee. So it was suggested by the Senator from Michigan that in order that all the facts might be obtained, after the word "armed" and before the word "services" the words "or civilian" be inserted, so that it would read "armed or civilian services."

It will be noted that this order, as signed by the President in the presence of the majority leader, the chairman of the committee, allows only members of the armed services to testify publicly before the committee. There is nothing about seeing any records, nothing about disclosing anything in advance so that the case might be prepared in an orderly manner.

This was the correction: We would strike out "whose testimony is desired by the committee" and insert this language, which is in the handwriting of the counsel for the committee, "to give information to the committee, its counsel and its members".

Mr. President, Senators cannot cloud this issue by talking about the fact that the junior Senator from Michigan wants to see the private papers of the President of the United States. There is no such desire upon the part of the junior Senator from Michigan.

It has been said by the able senior Senator from Illinois that the junior Senator from Michigan wants to see the personal files, the private papers, of the President of the United States. Nothing should be further from the mind of the able Senator from Illinois than that the junior Senator from Michigan wants to see the private papers of the President of the United States.

I ask now that the able Senator from Illinois explain to the Senate of the United States how any private paper of the President of the United States would be in the Army, the Navy, or the State Department files, or the Archives of the United States Government.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield any further, and I will answer.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have the Senator answer that question.

Mr. LUCAS. I still have the floor. I yielded for a question, but there it resulted in quite a long speech, which is perfectly all right; indeed, it is customary in the Senate. I can even prove that by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who, I note, just entered the Senate.

Mr. President, I am told that there are 40 or 50 or 60 bales of private and public papers which are now in the Archives belonging to the President of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator wishes to be correct; the number is 210.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well; that makes my case better.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very much better.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Maine. There are 210 bales. Think of it, 210 bales of public and personal, private papers in the archives of the President—210 bales—and somebody wants to sit down and go through those 210 bales in order to find out something about Pearl Harbor.

How long would it take one man to go through 210 bales of papers? I am merely a country boy, and I always think of a bale of straw or a bale of hay, and I suppose these bales are about the size of a bale of hay, perhaps smaller, perhaps larger.

I am told those files are not properly indexed or cross-indexed, and that there is only one individual who knows anything about them, and that is Miss Tully. But the Republican Senators are not going to trust Miss Tully, we may be sure, and they are not going to trust the investigators to look at those files. They have to go through these 210 bales sheet by sheet, paper by paper, and read them all, in order to find out something about Pearl Harbor. How long would it take?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will tell me how long he thinks it will take, I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will tell the Senator that after all my study of what has seemed to me the incompetence of the New Deal, I still cannot believe that 210 bales of the papers of the President of the United States have no index. To me that is one of the incredible aspects of this affair. If that is so, it is another instance of a mysteriously missing document.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator talks about this incredible New Deal, and it begins to look as though that may enter into this investigation. He reveals himself when he talks about the incredible New Deal in connection with the Pearl Harbor investigation, Mr. President. The New Deal may have been incredible but the people of America did not think so for four straight terms. I would dislike to talk about an administration being incredible when I think of the one that Roosevelt followed and when I think of the one in 1920 that was in power in the capital of the United States.

No. Mr. President, we ought to be able to get through with this investigation some time. The War Department and the Navy Department probably have their papers indexed, but the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Michigan will not take a chance on some clerk having all the files about Pearl Harbor in the proper place. They will be afraid of some missing file so therefore Senators contend they may have to look through all of them in order to find out what this is all about. Why, we will be here for the next 6 years investigating Pearl Harbor if we permit such a thing to be done, Mr. President. It cannot be done.

What I rose to complain about in the beginning, and I still complain about it, and I agree with the Senator from Maine so far as that goes, is that neither of these orders should have gone to the President of the United States until the committee had passed on them. General Mitchell thought he was doing a favor for the committee. But on the other hand the junior Senator from Michigan should not have prepared any order and submitted it to counsel to take to the President until he submitted it to the committee. Candidly, Mr. President, this is not the way a committee functions.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say. I suppose we will be talking about Pearl Harbor all along. It is a good subject to talk about, and I know it suits Senators on the other side of the aisle. You may be assured that if you continue to pursue the course you are now following, we will be compelled to answer.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I understand I was taken from the floor because of the desire of the able Senator from Illinois to speak.

Mr. LUCAS. I yielded to the Senator for a question. I now yield the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood the Senator desired to answer the question as to why the President's private papers were in the War Department and Navy Department files or in the State Department files or in the Archives of the United States.

Mr. President, it was said that there were 40 or 50 bales of papers, but the number has been increased to 250 bales, or thereabouts, and it has been stated that there is no index to this great file, and that the only person who knows about the contents of the file is Miss Grace Tully. It has been said, Mr. President, that it might take 6 years to investigate this case if we were to look for all the facts in connection with it.

Mr. President, the time of Senators on this committee would be well spent if it required that period of time to make sure that the people of the United States of America had all the facts, and that nothing had been concealed from the people of the United States.

Why all this clamor that we should start the hearings on the 15th or the 16th day of this month, without the facts, when admittedly there are 250 bales of papers? I say to the people of the United States of America, and to the Members of the Senate, that Miss Tully cannot go through these files and ascertain what is pertinent to Pearl Harbor. Miss Tully is not familiar with the actions of the State Department and the diplomacy of the United States. Miss Tully is not familiar with the Army and the Navy records or the State Department records.

Who is Miss Tully? She is not a representative of the United States of America, but of the executors of the estate of the late President of the United States. Who is Miss Tully to say what is material to the evidence, what is material to the facts to be discovered concerning Pearl Harbor? Is that the way to obtain the facts, Mr. President?

I rise on the Senate floor because I believe that there never was a time in my life when a greater problem faced me and faced the people of the United States in connection with ascertaining the truth in this democracy. I say, Mr. President, the time has come when the people must have the truth, no matter how much midnight oil or how much effort of any individual is spent to ascertain it. I think we will not be satisfied to have a clerk, a secretary of the late President of the United States, determine what the people should have. That is not the way to proceed, Mr. President.

In the memo produced by the able Senator from Illinois, the counsel for the committee says:

Among other evidence we must have—

And he is addressing this apparently to the departments—

a witness from the Navy.

Mr. President, the time has passed when the Navy was to investigate itself. The time has passed when the Army was to investigate itself. The junior Senator from Michigan was responsible for submitting the resolution which required the Army and the Navy to investigate themselves. The Senator from Michigan had prepared and was ready to present on the floor a resolution providing for the ascertainment of the facts by means of an investigation. The able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] presented a similar resolution and it was adopted without debate.

Mr. President, as I said before, this is not an investigation by the Army, by the Navy, by the White House, by the State Department, or by any other department. It is an investigation, as I understand it, to be made by a joint committee of the Congress.

Mr. President, there is no desire on our part to see the private papers of the President of the United States, and Senators cannot becloud the issue by making such a suggestion. The private papers of the President of the United States have nothing to do with what happened at Pearl Harbor. But the official papers of the President and all other departments of the United States may, if they are ever brought to light, have something to do with the investigation that is now before the people and the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I concur fully with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in his expression regarding the orderly presentation of the evidence and the necessity for the most careful preparation of the case. It was with that sole purpose in view that we rose here last Friday to inform the Members of this body, who gave us our authority, that in our sober judgment and out of our experience it was impracticable for us adequately to prepare this case under the rules and the procedure being followed. That was the sole object of the discussion here on last Friday. If the senior Senator from Illinois will familiarize himself with that discussion I am sure he will find it perfectly clear that such was the case.

Mr. President, we have been under the mandate of this body for more than 8 weeks to prepare this case, and we have not yet secured from the President of the United States the authority which the entire committee considers to be necessary adequately to investigate this matter, unless the President has within the last 24 hours signed the order.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. When was this order presented to the President of the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not know that it has even yet been presented to him.

Mr. McMAHON. When was it voted to present it to him?

Mr. BREWSTER. Last Thursday.

Mr. McMAHON. Last Thursday?

Mr. BREWSTER. No; wait a minute. Friday morning.

Mr. McMAHON. Friday morning?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. When the Senator says that the committee has been commissioned by the Senate for 8 weeks, the Senator does not want to leave the impression on the Senate or on the country that for 8 weeks an order has been at the White House at the request of the committee for signature by the President, and that it has not been acted upon?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly not.

Mr. McMAHON. So to clear up that possible misunderstanding—the request was ordered by the committee on last Friday morning?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. And today is Tuesday?

Mr. BREWSTER. Tuesday.

Mr. McMAHON. I merely wanted to make that plain.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very glad to have it cleared up if there is any possibility of misapprehension. I have been criticized as too good a friend of the President of the United States, and I certainly should be the last to do him any injustice.

The point of my remarks is that this committee under the control, as has been demonstrated, of the majority, up until 2 weeks ago did not even know of the existence of this order which forbade the disclosure of this information, because that Executive order of August 28 has not even yet been made public. I do not know how long our counsel had known of it, but our counsel was very much concerned because the naval authorities of the United States were refusing to give to him the information he thought essential. Finally he prepared the Executive order, which was under discussion for some unknown period, because the committee had no knowledge of it, or at least I as a member of the committee had none. He circulated it with the War and Navy Departments and finally secured their approval apparently. The Senator from Michigan in the exercise of a diligence which I think was most commendable, learned of it at the eleventh hour, so the order that was prepared suggested the amendments which were taken to the White House about 10 days ago by the chairman of the committee who at some stage evidently became aware of it, and by the counsel. And this order was discussed.

The point which I am making is that the majority of the committee are now demanding that the bill hearings shall start on November 15, when not even yet has the Executive order been signed, which, in the judgment of all of us, is essential to the successful preparation of the case. That is why members of the minority are disturbed. They feel that there seems to be some strange insistence that we must proceed, although when I asked 2 days' delay when the Senator from Kentucky originally submitted the resolution on a Friday, and asked that it might go over until Monday in order that we might look at it, the reply was, "The American people want action." We have had this committee for more than 8 weeks. This is the situation which faces us at present. I suggest that, in view of the importance of this subject, at least until we get the essential Presidential orders to enable the committee to function, we defer the determination of the date when we shall start formal hearings.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator consider that the committee has proceeded expeditiously during the past 8 weeks?

Mr. BREWSTER. No; I do not.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator consider that the counsel who has been selected by the committee has been diligent in the performance of his duties for the past 8 weeks?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the counsel of the committee has been trying to do the best he can. He is a man 70 years of age. A while ago President Roosevelt said that a man that old was ineligible for responsible duties of this character.

Mr. McMAHON. I saw him in the hall today, and he looked pretty good to me.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think he has been doing the best he could. He has had his commission for about 5 weeks.

Mr. McMAHON. He is acknowledged as one of the most competent lawyers in the United States, by the bench, including the Supreme Court, and the bar. Would not the Senator say that that is true?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly that was the reputation which was given us in his regard when he was selected.

Mr. McMAHON. Having argued cases against him in the Supreme Court, I can add my personal tribute to his ability. It is magnificent.

Mr. BREWSTER. I feel that the delay of 5 weeks in getting the Presidential order modified, in spite of the fact that he had the difficulty of dealing with the Army and Navy, is unfortunate. But I am not criticizing him for that. I am simply saying that since that was apparently necessary and inevitable, we should not be rushed into a hearing until we are able to find out a little more about the situation. That is my point.

Mr. McMAHON. As the Senator knows, merely because the hearings start at a certain time, that does not mean that the whole case must be ready for presentation. I am not a member of the committee, but I assume that the hearings could start, and that there would

be plenty of evidence available, which Mr. Mitchell presumably has been gathering during the past several weeks. There will probably be very extensive hearings. A great deal of the material could be presented without running into a blank, as it were, because of the fact that the order has not been signed, or has not been prepared for the President's signature as quickly as the Senators might wish.

Mr. BREWSTER. As we know, the Senator from Connecticut has had very extensive experience in trial work. I venture the suggestion that in any case of importance comparable to this he has never wished to go to trial unless he had a pretty comprehensive view of what the whole case was about, what witnesses were available, and what the final issue was, as he conceived it, as well as the evidence which would support the conclusions to which he was directing the evidence. That certainly was the position of Mr. Mitchell before the committee, and I thought he was quite right. That is what I understood was meant by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] who pointed out how carefully these things must be prepared. He made the suggestion that all this discussion was premature.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not believe that the analogy between the trial of a case and the conduct of an examination such as this holds good in all particulars. Let me tell the Senator why. If one is prosecuting an antitrust case, or defending one, for that matter—but more particularly on the prosecution side—he goes to trial, and day after day he goes forward with the business of trying the case. In both cases there is no opportunity to cease after a couple of days of putting in the evidence he has, in order further to develop the case. But in an investigation of this kind, with such a tremendous amount of evidence, I do not see any difficulty about putting in what evidence we have, which we now know is material, even though we may get some more during the progress of the investigation. I know of no congressional investigation which is not operated in that way.

Mr. BREWSTER. The discussions in the committee—and this, again, is something which has given us a little concern—suggest the idea that once we start we should go through and finish the investigation. There has been considerable discussion of that question, and it has given us some concern. I can recognize the force of what the Senator says with respect to the ordinary course of congressional inquiries. However, it is true that in this case we shall wish to examine many of the witnesses who will appear regarding a variety of documents which have a very great bearing. That is why we have felt that it is so essential that it be determined what documents, messages, and other things will be available. One of the great issues is whether a certain message was received, and whether certain other messages were sent. We feel that before we can go forward profitably with any of the evidence germane to that question, there should be available all possible material bearing on the question. Otherwise we must constantly recall and recur. That is one of the issues. I think the Senator from Connecticut, with his experience, would wish, as we do, to be as adequately prepared as possible before we plunge into the determination of that issue.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to present what seems to me to be a somewhat germane situation which has developed in connection with the Mead committee, bearing on the unfortunate attitude which has developed in the past decade in connection with the various bureaus and departments. There has been a certain attitude of hostility and resistance. No one is more familiar with this than is the Senator who now occupies the chair [Mr. TUNNELL], in the investigations of the committee of which he is a member. Recently this committee, which is now known as the Mead committee, and was formerly known as the Truman committee, has had under consideration a question which concerns the Navy itself. I read from an editorial in the Washington Post of this morning, which I think properly bears at its masthead the title "An Independent Newspaper." I ask that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to read certain passages from the editorial, because it seems to me to be very pertinent to the Senate's consideration of this matter, as well as to the Navy. The title of the editorial is "Comrades in Arms." The editorial reads in part as follows:

COMRADES IN ARMS

The Mead committee hearings of last week produced some disclosures even more sinister and shocking than the details of black-market activities carried on by a few of our naval officers stationed at Pearl Harbor. The "irregularities"—that appears to be the Navy word for it—which took place at the naval base in the handling of foodstuffs and other supplies were in all conscience bad enough. But from the point of view of the public interest and the public's confidence in the Navy as an institution, the system pursued to investigate, check, and punish these irregularities is a good deal worse.

I omit two paragraphs which detail the difficulties, and I come to the nub:

The view of the court martial appears to have been that Commander Blodgett was, after all, a jolly good fellow, as well as a handy man to have on the premises for a luau. And since it was unthinkable that an officer could be other than a gentleman—at least a naval officer—any Marine Corps upstart who made intimations to the contrary must have been just a low bounder unfit for the society of officers and gentlemen. And, anyway, it would be very bad for the morale of enlisted personnel to have their superiors convicted of irregularities.

This sort of mutual devotion is, of course, quite touching in a way; but it also leaves one wondering how many other irregularities have been covered up by it. And the Navy seems to have no sense of the inadequacy of a system under which accused officers are investigated and tried by brothers whose concept of esprit de corps is to hush the whole thing up. When Senator MEAD suggested the establishment of a detached, independent investigating service in the Navy, Admiral Snyder asked if he had in mind "a secret service or gestapo of some kind." Apparently in the fraternal philosophy of the Navy, the reporting of misconduct on the part of commissioned members of the fraternity could be considered nothing but a gestapo trick.

The prestige of the Navy, as Senator MEAD indicated, will certainly suffer a great deal more from this sort of old-school-tie camaraderie than from frank disclosure and punishment of misconduct. The Navy is far too great an institution to be injured by the black-market scandal in Hawaii. It can be terribly injured, however, by a suspicion that it is deliberately covering up the sins of its commissioned elite.

I think those words may well be borne in mind by all the officers, military, naval, and civilian, in any attitude of collaboration with this committee in the investigation of this case. I earnestly hope that the President will shortly sign the Executive order which will authorize every officer in the service of this country to volunteer any information bearing upon this subject, and I suggest that until that order is signed and every officer may know that he is no longer under fear of discipline or court martial if he discusses this matter with a member of the committee authorized to investigate it, we may well somewhat delay our further action in this case.

EXHIBIT A

COMRADES IN ARMS

The Mead committee hearings of last week produced some disclosures even more sinister and shocking than the details of black-market activities carried on by a few of our naval officers stationed at Pearl Harbor. The "irregularities"—that appears to be the Navy word for it—which took place at the naval base in the handling of foodstuffs and other supplies were in all conscience bad enough. But from the point of view of the public interest and the public's confidence in the Navy as an institution, the system pursued to investigate, check, and punish these irregularities is a good deal worse.

A Commander Blodgett, the Mead committee revealed, obtained from a civilian employe in charge of the cold-storage building at the Naval Supply Depot, Pearl Harbor, about 1,500 pounds of meat and 500 pounds of butter and stored them in the refrigerator of the Marine detachment on his station with a label designating them as his personal property. An unnamed admiral was shown to have negotiated the sale of $2,627 worth of meat to a tavern on the islands. Senators MEAD and FERGUSON estimated that the loss to the Government through similar illegal transactions in the same naval district would total at least a million dollars.

In the case of Commander Blodgett, the plunder, if we may call it by so crude a term, was discovered by a Lieutenant Colonel Stickney of the Marine Corps, who reported it to the commanding officer of the depot, a Captain Dowell. The reporting was strictly in the line of the Marine officer's duty. For the performance of this duty, however, he was called a buttinsky, was given a poor fitness report, and was transferred from the depot. Commander Blodgett, on the other hand, after supplying two pigs for a luau, or feast, for the entire legal staff of the naval district, was put through the ritual of a court martial by his brother officers and promptly acquitted.

The view of the court martial appears to have been that Commander Blodgett was, after all, a jolly good fellow, as well as a handy man to have on the premises for a luau. And since it was unthinkable that an officer could be other than a gentleman—at least a naval officer—any Marine Corps upstart who made intimations to the contrary must have been just a low bounder unfit for

the society of officers and gentlemen. And, anyway, it would be very bad for the morale of enlisted personnel to have their superiors convicted of irregularities.

This sort of mutual devotion is, of course, quite touching in a way; but it also leaves one wondering how many other irregularities have been covered up by it. And the Navy seems to have no sense of the inadequacy of a system under which accused officers are investigated and tried by brothers whose concept of esprit de corps is to hush the whole thing up. When Senator MEAD suggested the establishment of a detached, independent investigating service in the Navy, Admiral Snyder asked if he had in mind a secret service or gestapo of some kind. Apparently in the fraternal philosophy of the Navy, the reporting of misconduct on the part of commissioned members of the fraternity could be considered nothing but a gestapo trick.

The prestige of the Navy, as Senator MEAD indicated, will certainly suffer a great deal more from this sort of old-school-tie camaraderie than from frank disclosure and punishment of misconduct. The Navy is far too great an institution to be injured by the black-market scandal in Hawaii. It can be terribly injured, however, by a suspicion that it is deliberately covering up the sins of its commissioned elite.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, being a member of the committee that held the hearing which the editorial describes, I wish to comment for a moment upon it. I think it is timely and just. I think it brings forcefully to the attention of the people what can happen when a certain agency attempts to discipline itself. I think it requires just what is asked for in the investigation of Pearl Harbor. I wish to say that the Secretary of the Navy, a civilian, has cooperated in the particular matter of the black market at Pearl Harbor. It was through his cooperation and it was by virtue of his intervention that a proceeding was had to investigate that court martial.

But, Mr. President, the committee now is required to go further, because the day following the open hearings on the particular court martial in question, another court martial conducted itself similarly in the same proceeding. So now the committee is faced with the proposition that it must again investigate that question, notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary of the Navy not only issued a promotion, but gave a citation to one who disclosed the facts and who had been put out of that particular service so that he could not further ascertain the facts. That officer, now in the marines, had the nerve so far as the Navy was concerned actually to photograph the illegal meat and the tab of the admiral upon it. No such evidence would have been had otherwise, so they felt it was necessary to discipline that officer. But the civilian in the service has stepped in, and, I believe, has sincerely stepped in, to look into this question and, I believe, to follow it down.

This editorial forcibly brings to the attention of the people of the United States the fact that when people or agencies try to discipline themselves, there are errors of judgment; and the people are not satisfied with such disciplinary action.

Mr. President, I think a real service has been rendered by this newspaper in calling this matter to the attention of the country, so that the people may know that all is not well in court martials conducted by the armed services.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MURDOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Kenneth C. Royall, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of War;

Maj. Gen. Edward Fuller Witsell (colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as The Adjutant General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from the date immediately following that upon which Maj. Gen. James Alexander Ulio, the present incumbent, vacates his appointment as The Adjutant General;

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. MURDOCK. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Thursday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 6 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

TO BE EXAMINERS IN CHIEF, BOARD OF APPEALS, UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Leo P. McCann
Otto B. Roepke

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

William Green de Rosset for appointment as records analyst, national headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of records analyst, national headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of $5,160 per annum.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign:

Stuart R. Allen	Richard W Leighton
Joseph P. Andrews	Henry D. Linscott, Jr.
Alton W. Barton	Boyd H. Lewis
Charles W. Bastable Jr.	Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr.
Roger W. Brown	Hood S. McChord
Thomas H. Bruno	Clarence E. McLanahan
Walter J. Buck	Edwin E. McMorries
Frederick J. Byrne, Jr.	James F. Magarahan
Daniel M. Carr, Jr.	3d
Roger E. Clingman	James J. Martin
Robert W. Cooil	Laurens B. Mathews
Charles T. Creekman	Austin R. Murphy, Jr.
William J. Cummings	Earl B. Myer
David Davidson	Thomas L. Nalley
Philip L. Davis	Edward P. O'Neill
Lloyd C. Emerson	Charles C. Puckett
Clyde E. Fulton	Carroll D. Reasoner
Frank J. Gibbons	Abner A. Rissler
Herbert J. Hackmeyer	John L. Ruhl, Jr.
Ralph S. Haefele	Allen B. Sanders
George F. Halla	Walter E. Scott, Jr.
Alan M. Hamerslag	John C. Senter, Jr.
Virgil J. Harris, Jr.	Charles F. Shea
Frank F. Hart, Jr.	Ralph L. Shepard
Harold F. Hayes	Robert M Sipple
James D. Hickey	Millard C. Snyder
Gordon G. Hughes	Robert E. Snyder
James A. Humphreys	Curtis P. Waggoner
Cecil P. Jones	Donald D. Webster
Charles A. Kasdorf, Jr.	Edward H. Wigand
Robert W. Kem	James D. Wilson
William G. Leary	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 6 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

HAWAII

Melae W. Hua, Honaunau.

MINNESOTA

Selmer Oliver Lundeen, Alvarado.
Olive M. Stromgren, Constance.
Kenneth V. Sartain, Osage.
Albert H. Anfang, St. Peter.
Robert J. Ingham, Willernie.

MISSOURI

John Wesley Elliott, Altamont.
Minnie Schleicher, Amity.
Belva Maxwell, Belgrade.
Charles O. Broughton, Bethel.
Lucille Ross, Blairstown.
Lottie Mason, Bois D'Arc.
Alfred G. Krueger, Jr., Bridgeton.
Dora Weber, Bronaugh.
Joseph L. Haw, Caledonia.
Eli V. Van Sickle, Cantwell.
Joe Rogers, Clearmont.
Mary T. Peters, Conception.
William B. Jenkins, Couch.
Nannie C. Kugler, Cross Timbers.
William Sanford Smoot, Downing.
Alma C. Patrick, Duenweg.
Wesley T. Butler, Excello.
Lillian Crow, Farber.
Earl L. Wilegus, Foristell.
Lurla F. Irey, Fortuna.
Ransler M. Hefner, Hartville.
Pearl M. True, Harwood.
Essie L. Glascock, Holliday.
William E. Alexander, Humphreys.
Sarah E. Maxwell, Industrial City.
Walter F. Bamman, Jacksonville.
Juanita A. Drewel, Labadie.

Nina E. Straughan, Leadington.
Hattie B. McKibbin, Lesterville.
Charles E. Yancey, Jr., Liberty.
Maud E. Wilson, Lonejack.
Percy C. Walton, Mineral Point.
Robert L. Hawkins, Monroe City.
Estle C. Butcher, Mount Moriah.
George J. Brown, Myrtle.
Clarence McCollum, New Boston.
Glen F. Watson, Osgood.
John L. Bosch, Pickering.
Myrtle M. Matthews, Plato.
Clayborn J. Crowley, Rayville.
Mattie L. Koontz, Richards.
Margaret M. Rulo, Richwoods.
Mary Slade, Rocheport.
Everett E. Neely, Stahl.
Evelyn E. Fieker, Stotts City.
Sam A. Warner, Vichy.
Russell W. Disharoon, Villa Ridge.
Joshua Fergason, Wakenda.
Thomas H. Sinnott, Wayland.
Ora E. Head, Weatherby.
Marie Maas, Westalton.
Thomas O. Morgan, Whitewater.

NORTH CAROLINA

Annie D. Clark, Oriental.
Frank W. Fortescue, Scranton.

OREGON

Emma B. Rowell, Rickreall.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, with gratitude and praise we remember the tokens of Thy goodness and mercy. Thou standest above conflict and tumult, bidding us be calm and leading us out of clouds into the light. We pray Thee to quicken our powers and to renew in us the image of our Master, whose example is the rule of conduct for all men.

When we listen to His words we are ashamed, and pray to be forgiven our unworthiness. Help us to submit ourselves to the scrutiny of His law, our work to the pattern of His truth, and our hearts to the example of His sincerity. Our need is beyond the help of men; in our limitations we turn to Thee; do Thou support us when the shadows thicken and guide our wandering feet with confidence that the sun of our hope may not be dimmed. Grant us Thy peace, the love of peace, and faith in things unseen, with the vision of that day ever before us when weakness shall grow strong and strength grow kind, and men shall know themselves as the sons of God. In the name of our Redeemer to whom be all glory and honor. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. Federal Security Agency.
4. National Archives.
5. Office of Defense Transportation.
6. Office of Scientific Research and Development.
7. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
8. Selective Service System.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein certain statements and excerpts concerning housing.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the other special orders for today, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a Navy Day address by Admiral P. N. L. Bellinger, commander of the Air Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of the Costello Post of the American Legion.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the constitution of the American Veterans of World War II and include in connection therewith some remarks of my own.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost will be $173. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding, that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY on the full employment bill.

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a newspaper article.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

THEY SAY BRAZIL IS FAMOUS FOR NUTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, they say Brazil is famous for nuts. With legislation now being proposed to guarantee everybody a job whether he wants to work or not; with more jobs today than workers; with the FEPC being pushed hard for passage, compelling people to do what they should be taught to do of their own free will; when a man is forced to join a union against his will if he wants a job; when contracts with no-strike pledges are broken at will; with proposals to create rocking-chair money of $25 a week if the worker refuses to work for $30 per week or $40 per week; when they cut down taxes $6,000,000,000; when money is needed to balance the Budget; after Government workers received the largest increase in wages 2 months ago that they ever received at one time, and now it is recommended that they be increased again 20 percent more; with Congressmen's salaries to be increased 100 percent; with the national debt at $265,000,000,000—Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion they do not grow all of the nuts in Brazil.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the full employment bill.

WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, last week I offered several amendments to H. R. 3937, a bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act. Two of my amendments were adopted, after which the bill was favorably reported by the committee. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I feel we have acted wisely in bringing this whole question of industry, management, and labor to the floor for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have very firm convictions that something must be done, and immediately, in regard to the labor difficulties which confront us on every side. Such strong feelings on my part were responsible for my proposing amendments to the committee bill last week.

On yesterday, President Truman, in addressing the National Labor-Management Conference, had this to say:

> The conference should find a way to peaceful negotiation of new work contracts and the means of insuring industrial peace for the lifetime of such contracts.

He added, as a third conference goal, that "some substitute must be found for jurisdictional strikes." The President also stated, "The Government still must

safeguard our domestic economy. The American people," he said, "never expected anything like the amount of strife which has been threatened" since the war.

And I know that the American people do not like it—especially after the solemn promise by representatives of both management and labor that they would cooperate with their Government through the reconversion period.

He continued.

Also, Mr. Bernard Baruch, elder statesman and the friend of Presidents, said on yesterday:

Labor disputes cannot continue to interfere with production as they do. For years I have had high hopes of collective bargaining and intelligent leadership in management and labor to bring about understanding without interference of Government. Reaction from the war effort has caused much of the unrest, but unless strife ceases soon, Government must take a hand, and a strong one, in the interest of the contestants, the public, and itself. The miracle of American production can save the situation now, as it did in the war, but it must hurry, hurry, hurry.

It seems to me that the time has now come when in accordance with the statement of Mr. Baruch, "the Government must take a hand."

This morning, all Washington is walking because of a transit strike. While I am not fully acquainted with the causes or reasons for this tie-up, newspaper reports state the strike was called demanding a 30-cent-hourly wage increase. The strike was called regardless of the fact, as presented by the Washington Post, that the railway and motor-coach employees have a contract with the transit company which includes a no-strike clause plus an agreement to submit differences to a three-man arbitration board. These provisions have been wholly ignored by the strikers and their contract agreement apparently means nothing to them. In other words, we here clearly find one signer to a contract breaking such contract before its expiration. One of the amendments I have offered to H. R. 3937 would in effect stop such action on the part of any signer to a contract. Surely, Mr. Speaker, sanctity of contract must be recognized and complied with by all parties to a contract, be it an agreement between individuals, industry and labor, or one nation with another.

Let me state that this Nation no longer can afford to ignore the problems of management and labor. Strikes are hitting at the very heart of our reconversion. Employer and employee must assume mutual responsibility if we are to have labor peace in this country. No one believes but that the rank and file of labor are good, patriotic American citizens, but they are not the ones who run their own unions. Unscrupulous labor leaders are today sitting in the seat of the mighty. All too often actions prove they do not have the best interests of their union membership or their country at heart. The time to straighten out these difficulties is now. I hope the bill from our Military Affairs Commitee will receive early consideration and that we discharge our duty to the Nation by attempting to pass fair, equitable, and just legislation which will prove helpful to both labor and industry.

BRIDGE AT ST. FRANCISVILLE, ILL.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday S. 1219 was objected to by one objector. This is a bill to build a bridge across the Wabash River at St. Francisville, Ill. It being an emergency, I have consulted the majority leader and the minority leader, and I now ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill, as the Member who objected has withdrawn his objection and there is nothing else in the way. The bill has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Government.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill passed the Senate unanimously. The bill has a unanimous report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is just one of those little bridge bills, a mere formality as far as the Congress is concerned, more than anything else, and an emergency does exist. Is that correct?

Mr. VURSELL. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for the military and other purposes, the city of St. Francisville, Ill., be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near St. Francisville, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred on the city of St. Francisville, Ill., all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The city of St. Francisville, Ill., is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRIKES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] has just said, I would like to observe that for many years I have watched the Government retreat under the assault of organized outlaws. I have been wondering if it would ever find ground upon which it would be willing to stand and make fight. Frankly, I am beginning to despair.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I think the War Department has made a grievous error in its refusal to date to release American soldiers who have been prisoners of war either of the Nazis or the Japs. Both the Navy and the Marine Corps have adopted the policy of automatic release from the service of any former prisoner of war, regardless of the number of points which he may have. I hope the Army officials will soon take their cue from the Navy and the Marine Corps and follow a similar course. Certainly any soldier who has been incarcerated in prisoner camps run by our opponents in the late war is entitled to an immediate return to his family and his loved ones and an opportunity to resume civilian life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on four subjects, and to include in each instance an editorial.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. RAMSPECK) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a newspaper.

Mr. STARKEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dorothy Thompson.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Apropos of what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] just said, I think there is another thing that is rather serious right now, and that is the high pressure that the Army is putting on the boys to get them to reenlist. I hold in my hand a letter from a young man who claims that a lieutenant colonel has told them that if they had 6 months' service overseas they could enlist for 1 year and would be out at the end of that year. But he said that if they did not enlist for that year there was no telling when they would get out, because the termination of the last war was not until 1921, that the termination of this war might be just as far off and that they might stay in the service for at least 3 years, that they should therefore enlist for 1 year.

This kind of high pressuring has no place in this Nation.

BRANCH 4, SQUADRON V, AAF, ORD,
Greensboro, N. C., November 3, 1945.

DEAR FRANK: Well, I arrived here last night and am processing for overseas shipment. There surely is a rush here. We were told we would be here from 7 to 14 days.

My latest gripe is about the threat or high-pressure system they are using here to secure enlistments. Today we were in enlistment lectures.

In explaining the congressional act and its benefits the lieutenant colonel told us that if we had 6 months or over in service we could enlist for 1 year (I won't have 6 months in until November 21), 18 months, or 3 years. In this way we would be assured of being returned to the United States after our enlistment period, otherwise we are bound for the duration and 6 months, and, as he explained, World War I lasted until the congressional act declaring the war, which was over in 1918, as terminated in 1921. Thus we could stay overseas as draftees for several years unless we would enlist for a definite period.

This does not seem fair as I cannot see why we should be pushed into the Regular Army for even 1 year to gain our freedom. It appears to me to be wrong to use high pressure or threats to gain enlistments and it surely is a threat to tell you that if you don't enlist that you will probably remain overseas for several years as a draftee until Congress gets ready to declare the duration and then still to be bound for another 6 months. Do you feel, Frank, that the only way a present-day draftee has of being sure of when he will get out is to enlist? Would you consider it fair to release one man because he had enlisted for 1 year and keep another man in service because he would not enlist for the same period? It doesn't make sense to me, but then I'm bitter. The GI's really do resent this system. It appears to me that a fair system should be worked out to treat the draftee and the enlistee equally.

Frank, inasmuch as the Army has a civil-service system for civilian employees, and inasmuch as the Government evidently has a surplus of money as shown by tax rebates to the corporations, why can't the armed forces be set up on a volunteer basis, giving the man in the service the same pay status as a civilian employee receives.

Well, as I have gripes, and even when I haven't, I shall continue to write to you.

Your friend,

PVT. WHEELER J. WITTE.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the Commissioner of Agriculture of Georgia.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Evening Sentinel, of Shenandoah, Iowa.

NATION-WIDE STRIKES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it has now come to Washington.

This Capital City, like the rest of the country, is in the grip of a Nation-wide strike to extend the power of certain alleged labor leaders over the lives of the American people.

It must be a disappointing spectacle to the patriotic servicemen on the various fronts throughout the world who are already beginning to wonder what they were fighting for.

To them it must be reminiscent of the old days when Nero fiddled while Rome burned.

This fiddling around with the leaders of this racket, ostensibly attempting to find a cure for this man-made malady, must remind these heroes of the old fellow trying to cure the wound by rubbing salve on the instrument that made it, instead of on the wound itself.

If Congress and the President really want to cure the evil let them remove the cause by repealing the Walsh-Healey Act, the Wagner Act, the Wages and Hours Act, or pass laws to make labor organizations responsible for the damages they do and requiring them to account for the funds they collect or expend.

Let us get back to the Constitution and restore to the American people the first freedom—that is the freedom to work for their daily bread without having to pay tribute.

These young men in uniform who are begging to come home and resume their civilian occupations, take care of their families, or return to school are beginning to wonder why it was that while they were fighting to guarantee the "four freedoms" to the rest of the world, this first freedom, the freedom to work for their daily bread, was lost or destroyed, here at home.

These homesick heroes who fought and won this war on a base pay of $50 a month are beginning to wonder why it is that these labor racketeers, some of whom draw salaries and emoluments of $50,000 a year, or more, could perpetrate those strikes in our defense industries that slowed down production in the most critical periods of the war, thereby costing untold thousands of lives of our brave fighting men, and adding untold billions of dollars to the cost of the war—these brave heroes are now wondering why all these strikes to raise higher the wages of the highest paid laborers on earth, while they are denied the right to come home and work at any price, or prevented from working at all by the rules laid down by these alleged labor leaders when they do get home.

These boys are wondering why these demands to pay a pension of $25 a week for not working, which is more than we have ever been able to get on an average for the bullet-wounded, battle-scarred, service-connected disabled veteran of World War I, World War II, or any other war in which America has ever engaged; and more than the average makes working from sunup to sundown.

It must be heart sickening to the hundreds of thousands of cotton farmers now in the service, as well as to their people at home to read of these demands for a minimum wage scale of 65 cents an hour, when they cannot even get out to join families on the farm who are working, toiling, and sweating in the hot sun at less than 23 cents an hour, while having to pay additional costs for everything they purchase as a result of these artificially high wages paid in the industries that manufacture the things they have to buy.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a cotton farmer just gets 1 cent an hour for his work for each cent a pound he gets for his cotton. Therefore, when he gets 22½ cents a pound for his cotton, as is the case today, he is getting 22½ cents an hour for his labor.

Of course he would get more if it were not for these strikes and the stupid program of the OPA that is preventing the manufacturing of cotton goods, depriving the American people of the necessary articles of cotton goods and causing cotton to pile up in our warehouses.

And as the cotton farmer is a competitor of every other farmer in America—since he can, and does, raise corn, hogs, hay, cattle, sheep, wheat, oats, barley, potatoes, dairy products, and every other farm commodity produced in this country—all other farmers are forced down to his economic level.

Remember these farmers are real Americans. They live close to the soil. They don't even speak a foreign language, as a rule. But their children, their neighbors, and even their livestock can understand what they say; and I predict that the time is not far distant when they are going to make their public officials in Washington understand it.

The farmers of this country have furnished a larger proportion of their sons to this war than any other class of people in the country; and they are not going to be satisfied to gnaw the corn cob of low prices that only pay them 22½ cents an hour for their labor, if industrial laborers are to get a minimum of 65 cents an hour when they work, and a pension of $25 a week when they do not work at all.

Thousands of these servicemen were members of labor unions before they entered the service. They realize that this program will ultimately destroy all labor unions, just as it did in Russia, Germany, Italy, and every other country in which it has been followed, and their right to bargain collectively, as well as their freedom, will be gone.

But what do these top flight labor racketeers care? They will probably be back in Moscow, or in Wales, or engaged in some other business.

Then they will be no more interested in the welfare of the industrial laborers of this country than they are in the welfare of the American farmers, or the American businessmen today.

It is about time for Congress and the administration to wake up, get back to the Constitution, and save this country from the disasters with which it is now threatened here at home.

Let it not be said that while our brave young men were protecting American institutions, and the American way of life from destruction by enemies from without, we permitted them to be destroyed by enemies from within.

A few days ago I quoted on this floor from a speech made in Cleveland, Ohio, by Dr. M. I. Adler of the University of Chicago in which he said:

> We must do everything we can to abolish the United States.

While our young men have been fighting to protect this Republic some of these radicals were then, and are now, fighting to abolish it.

God save this Nation from destruction at their hands.

WHY JOHNNIE DOESN'T COME MARCHING HOME

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a letter which I received from a constituent of mine concerning discharging men from the armed forces. The letter reads:

> DEAR SIR: With all the available air and sea transportation, why are men with 80 and 90 points still waiting in reception centers in Manila as of October 19, 1945? Men with 70 points are eligible for discharge now. Why aren't these men being sent home immediately?
>
> The Army has stated that there is a shortage of shipping space, then why aren't the surplus cargo ships the Navy announced they had being used?
>
> A statement was made by a ranking officer in Manila a few weeks ago that cargo ships would not be feasible to take troops home. Yet the Army moved thousands of troops in the Southwest Pacific by cargo ship while the war was on.
>
> In the Daily Pacifican of October 19, 1945, published in Manila, Lt. Col. C. H. Davidson made the statement that Liberty ships capable of carrying 750 troops home can be readied in 48 hours. All he needed was the assignment of Liberty ships and he could get the job done.
>
> As a taxpayer, I demand that all available transportation, sea and air, including converted cargo ships be used to bring men eligible for discharge home as soon as they become eligible. It is absolutely unfair that men who become eligible for discharge have to wait 60 or 90 days for transportation home.

This inefficiency is causing great hardship and suffering to the relatives of men in the armed forces who are needed at home. Men who have enough points to qualify for discharge. The above letter expresses the feelings and sentiments of most people who have relatives in the armed services.

The Congress should act, and quickly. These men have done their job. They should be home with their families, we should sign the petition to call the Shafer bill to the floor for action.

We should let the Army and Navy Departments know that we want action, speedy and efficient action, and in no uncertain language.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

RECONVERSION

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the real obstacles in the way of immediate reconversion on the part of American industry is the OPA regulation governing cost price adjustments of manufactures and selling prices of retailers. All are agreed that prices to the consumer should not be permitted to soar to unjustifiable heights.

With the apparent objective of the OPA, no fault can be found; however, there is a difference between idealism and reality, between theory and practice. No producer, manufacturer, distributor, or retailer is entitled to unreasonable profits. By the same token, if we are to retain our form of government and free enterprise, then each of these groups must be permitted the cost of the service it renders, plus a reasonable profit; otherwise, the incentive to produce is destroyed.

The large corporation can continue in business for a short time even though it must operate at a loss. This is not true of the small businessman. He and his small company are not in a position to finance their project and operate it at a loss, even for the 6 months suggested by the President in his recent speech. If there was ever a time when the Government discriminated against the small businessman, it is in the formula provided by OPA to determine the sale price of certain commodities. Even though individual company adjustments are permitted, the problem is not solved for many of the small manufacturers. Then there is the retailer, who only receives the commodity and passes it on to the consumer. The OPA edict, backed up by the President's proclamation that these small retailers must absorb price increases allowed the manufacturer, to say nothing about his own overhead, is not only nonsensical but preposterous. This is injustice spelled with a capital.

It seems ridiculous to waste time arguing that costs of production today are not higher than they were in 1942. Everybody knows they are. Note I said costs of production today. I made no reference to what the costs of production will be if demands presently pending for higher wages are acceded to.

Mr. Speaker, like many Members of Congress, the small businessmen in my State, manufacturers and retailers, are urging me to do something now about these conditions and these prohibitions against reconversion. Something must be done and the sooner the OPA recognizes conditions rather than theories the sooner the wheels of industry in the small plants throughout the country will begin to turn.

There appeared in the Blissfield (Mich.) Advance an editorial which is concise and pertinent. It reads as follows:

> MUST WE HAVE PLANNED CONFUSION?
>
> On the subject of postwar price regulation, the New York Times says editorially: "OPA has now issued the regulations governing reconversion price adjustments. These regulations apply to a nonexistent world which has been created by OPA administrators. The facts of business life are completely disregarded. In their place is found a series of yardsticks as to what has been happening in this nonexistent world. OPA recognizes that the 1942 price line which it desires to hold may not be appropriate for every product. It therefore establishes a formula to determine the magnitude of permitted price increases. * * * This formula disregards many of the actual increases in cost which have taken place. The net result of using prices established under it will almost certainly be to slow up reconversion and to force many companies to operate at a loss."
>
> Official planners who now have such a hold on our Nation seem fully convinced that the average American is no longer competent to manage his own production, buying and selling affairs, as in the past. If they manage to perpetuate scarcities for which they are now being blamed, our Nation can look forward to unemployment and restricted production and consumption for years to come.
>
> The future of our whole reconversion program will rest on production and distribution. If production is discouraged, there can be no satisfactory employment. And if the people are restricted in their buying, there can be no satisfactory production, because retail sales are the lifeblood of production.
>
> It is one thing for OPA to work out theories; it is another for American producers and retailers to deal with the facts. It is about time that the men who actually have to supply our Nation with the essentials of life were given more freedom.

HEARINGS ON POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call the attention of the membership of the House that a week today at 10:30 in the morning before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors the long anticipated hearings will begin on the subject of pollution control. I know a great many Members are interested in preventing pollution in the clean waters of the United States and in stopping pollution from becoming more serious in areas where it has already begun.

I hope the Members who are interested in adequate pollution legislation will be at the hearing room a week from today at 10:30 and make known their desires, opinions, and attitudes to the committee handling this very difficult problem. The correction of pollution offers a splendid opportunity in the postwar era to provide jobs and to provide progress in making the United States a greater and better Republic. H. R. 519, which is the bill I introduced early this session to control pollution, will be among the bills considered but all of the bills dealing with pollution will be up before the committee at that time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the announcement of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], to the effect that hearings will be held next week on the anti-stream-pollution bill before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives. I greet the announcement with a great deal of interest because I am a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House. As I recall it, in 1939 that committee conducted rather extensive hearings on the subject of pollution of our rivers, streams, and lakes. I attended every one of those hearings and still remember some of the startling testimony presented to the committee. The situation is an appalling one and cries out for correction. Legislation should have been passed years ago. There is no greater menace to the health of the American people than the pollution of our rivers, streams, and lakes. It ought to be stopped.

We ought to make a start by passing the best kind of legislation that can be enacted. It may not be exactly what we want, but any legislation is better than nothing if it has for its purpose the prevention of the pollution of the waters of this country.

During the hearings in 1939, the late Francis D. Culkin, Congressman from New York State, and one of the distinguished Members of Congress, brought out some interesting facts in connection with a bill that had been passed by Congress in 1938 and which was vetoed by the President in June 1938. During the 1939 hearings Mr. Culkin called attention to the fact of the Presidential veto in 1938, and stated in substance that that bill differed from the "sacred cow bill" that certain proponents wanted the committee to bring out. The committee did bring out a workable, sensible bill. Congressman Culkin stated that a certain individual, not a member of the House or Senate, went down to the White House, and persuaded the President to veto the legislation. This gentleman probably acted with good intentions, but as the late Senator from California, Mr. Hiram Johnson, once said in a speech, he knew a certain place that is paved with good intentions. Mr. Culkin felt that it was a mistake to advocate a veto of that bill because all legislation is the result of compromise.

I will say to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], that I hope the mistakes that the proponents of the antipollution legislation made in 1938, when they advocated a veto, will not be repeated now.

It should be noted that in the Seventy-sixth Congress, 1939 and 1940, antipollution legislation passed the House and passed the Senate, but Congress adjourned before the conferees could agree upon proper amendments to iron out the differences in the two bills. That is a matter of regret because as the years go by, the pollution menace becomes greater and greater, and the need for legislation proportionately becomes more important.

I shall attend these hearings next Thursday and I hope that this Seventy-ninth Congress passes workable legislation which will be signed by the President, and an important step made in the direction of eliminating pollution of our rivers, streams, and lakes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] may have his special order ahead of me and that I may proceed immediately after him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to this request, but does the gentleman intend to ask for additional time for today for himself and for the Member from Michigan?

Mr. OUTLAND. I thought it was agreed we would have 20 minutes apiece.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if we need it we may have 35 or 40 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. How much?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Forty minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may proceed for 20 minutes in addition to the time already granted?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is recognized for 25 minutes.

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from the mother of an American sailor who died at Pearl Harbor. I know of no better way of commencing my instant remarks than by reading that communication to you:

FRESNO, CALIF., *November 1, 1945.*

MY DEAR MR. GEARHART: As you are a member of the Congressional Committee to Investigate the Pearl Harbor Catastrophe, I feel it my duty, as a mother who lost a son on the U. S. S. *Arizona* on that fatal day of December 7, 1941, to write and beg of you your best efforts to reveal all of the truth relative to that tragic affair.

I am sure that you will remember our previous correspondence regarding the deaths of our two boys in this awful war.

I believe that all the parents who lost sons at Pearl Harbor are very eager to know why it was allowed to happen, the cause of it, every fact concerning it.

Had we been on the alert and prepared—and we should have been—many of our boys' lives, mine and other mothers' sons—would have been spared.

Our hearts grow heavier as the anniversary of that tragic event approaches.

May our boys be honored in death by a thorough-going and fearless investigation, one that will reveal the whole truth, is the prayer of a broken-hearted mother.

Very sincerely yours.

By the grace of God, I am going to do what I can to find the answers to that mother's prayer. I am going to do what I can to reveal to the American people the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The more than 3,000 mothers and fathers, wives, sons, and daughters—loved ones of those who died so unnecessarily on that day—are entitled to know the full truth. In recognition of that very great obligation to those fellow citizens of ours who still live on to mourn, the Congress of the United States enacted a resolution erecting a joint committee and imposed upon that joint committee a mandate to ascertain the truth and make it known to the American people—to delve into and ascertain it without fear or favor. The Congress might just as well have said in the text of that document in language familiar to all—hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may. That is what I, as one member of that committee, want to do. That is what I, as a member of that committee, in accepting membership upon it, thought I would be expected to do. But we find that legalistic barriers are craftily and with much ingenuity being raised to prevent us from ascertaining the truth in the only practical way that the truth can be revealed.

A finespun distinction has been drawn between the rights of the committee as such and the rights of the members who composed it. If that rule is not broken down which has already brought the investigation to a halt, this organization which was erected by the Congress will cease to be an investigating committee and can become merely a judicial body that will sit upon the bench and listen to only such evidence as certain people in charge of it shall elect is good for us to hear.

We asked the committee to pass a resolution which would authorize each and every member of the committee to pursue any leads that might come to him, to follow any tips that might be communicated to him, and we put it in legalistic language in order that the minutes might disclose what we desired to do. That motion, which would have granted to each and every individual member the right to investigate, to do all that an investigator is supposed to do, to perform the duties for which the committee was created, was voted down by a vote of 5-to-3. And what was it that the majority members turned their backs upon? All we wanted the members of the committee to do was to declare in this fashion:

The committee respectfully asks that the President approve the following memorandum:

"Memorandum for: The chief executives of all Federal departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"In order to assist the joint congressional committee on the investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack in its desire to 'make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack,' you are hereby directed to give the committee, its individual members, and counsel your full cooperation.

"You are further directed to give the committee, its individual members, and its counsel access to all records, documents, and information in your possession whether of secret or top secret nature, and to advise all your employees to afford the committee members and their counsel the fullest possible cooperation. Their inquiries should be answered fully, and all Federal employees or members of the armed services, past or present, should consider it their duty to volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge concerning the subject of the committee's investigation.

"In addition, copies of any papers required by the committee, its individual members, and its counsel, whether secret or top secret, should be furnished willingly, any present directives to the contrary notwithstanding.

"It is understood that all information so developed and all records and copies of records so obtained by the committee, any individual committee member of its counsel, shall be made available to the committee counsel for the information and use of all other members of the committee."

That was voted down by five members of the committee; three, including myself, the Senator from Maine, and the Senator from Michigan, voting in favor of it.

All that motion would accomplish is to clothe the individual members of the joint committee with the right to pursue any investigations that he saw fit and to follow up any leads or any tips that may come from any person to their logical conclusions and should the preliminary investigation yield anything worth pursuing further, the member, involved will become obligated to immediately call it to the attention of his colleagues of the joint committee and the joint committee as a whole would then determine what the disposition of that evidence was to be. But for some reason yet to be disclosed the majority members of the joint committee were determined that the individual members should not have that privilege. So we are denied it.

I need not report to you, my colleagues of the House of Representatives, that unless that gag rule is lifted and a wiser rule devised through the adoption of some sort of resolution, one such as I have just read, the investigation can never be one which will satisfy the American people and it will not be the kind of investigation they have so long waited for.

There is a great deal of mystery surrounding this Pearl Harbor catastrophy. As a consequence of this widespread confusion and suspicion prevails among the American people, as the chairman of the joint committee remarked upon the floor of the Senate when the joint resolution was under consideration. Is it up to the joint committee to clear away that confusion? Shall its members have the authority to do it?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is aware of the fact, as I am sure all members of the committee are, that as a result of the investigation made by the Army Board which was set up by the Secretary of War, the public has not yet had presented to them the so-called top secret report which contained the conclusions and the evidence which are the real conclusions and the real pertinent evidence relating to this Pearl Harbor disaster. After that top secret report came into the possession of the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, he dispatched Colonel Clausen who spent a year as the representative of the Secretary of War and who went all over the world with power to examine each and every witness who had testified before this Army Board and secured affidavits in the field from officers who had testified and got them to change their sworn testimony before the Board in very important and material particulars. The Navy did likewise. Yet, we as members of this committee are denied the right to even interrogate any officer or member of the armed services or to run down a single lead. We can only take such as the Army or Navy sees fit to give us. I think the gentleman is fully aware of the fact that the program tentatively set up by the committee counsel as the program for procedure clearly indicates that they intend to present the story and the picture of the facts as the Army and Navy want it presented; and that this will not be an investigation and that the members are not investigators and they cannot run down facts because under the present orders we do not have the privilege of having any person in these services or in the executive department to talk to us. I agree with the gentleman that unless this rule is modified and this ban that was placed upon these people by the President is lifted, you cannot ever expect to get a full and complete statement of the facts as indicated and contemplated by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky when he spoke on the floor of the Senate and asked for the passage of this resolution. Does the gentleman from California agree with that observation?

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman is entirely correct. If this unfortunate rule sealing the lips of the FBI, and FCC, and other governmental agencies and forbidding the individual members of the joint committee the right of individual investigation is not raised, no one can possibly have any confidence in any findings of fact or conclusions which the joint committee may arrive at.

In order that it may be made manifest just what a strait-jacket the members have been placed in, let me read the President's order of August 28, 1945, the directive which strangles this investigation. It is:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
August 28, 1945.

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Attorney General, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the Budget, the Director of the Office of War Information:

Appropriate departments of the Government and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are hereby directed to take such steps as are necessary to prevent release to the public, except with the specific approval of the President in each case, of:

Information regarding the past or present status, technique or procedure, degree of success attained, or any specific results of any cryptanalytic unit acting under the authority of the United States Government or any Department thereof.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States.

The only Presidential order modifying even in the slightest degree this utterly indefensible ukase, and, mind you, it does not unseal the lips of the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission, the Director of the Budget, the Director of the Office of War Information or any of their employees, is the following:

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to hold public hearings and make public pertinent evidence relating to the circumstances of that attack, a specific exception to my memorandum dated August 28, 1945, relating to the release of information concerning cryptanalytic activities, is hereby made as follows:

The State, War, and Navy Departments will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigaion of the Pearl Harbor Atack, for such use as the committee may determine, any information in their possession material to the investigation, and will respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed services whose testimony is desired by the committee to testify publicly before the

committee concerning any matter pertinent to the investigation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Approved October 23, 1945.

But let us hurry on with this strange recitation. After the Naval Court of Inquiry had completed its report and the final endorsement was upon it, after the Army Pearl Harbor Board had completed its report and final endorsement was upon it, all of a sudden, simultaneously, in both the Navy and War Departments, apparently by understanding of the two Secretaries, a special investigator was appointed, Col. Henry C. Clausen for the Army, and Admiral H. Kent Hewitt for the Navy, and they were sent all over the world to break down certain of the testimony which some of the witnesses had given during the course of the hearings of the Naval Court of Inquiry and the Army Pearl Harbor Board, mind you, to break down or, failing in that, to soften the evidence these witnesses had previously given. The evidence of tampering with witnesses by this Colonel Clausen and others is replete. We individual members of the joint committee, that is, four of us, want to look into this sordid story of influencing testimony. But this, not withstanding the majority members of the joint committee, slams the door in our faces when we ask the privilege of looking into the facts; to look into the files, and to talk to the people who gave the original testimony and who later qualified it; to talk to those who stood pat, and who to this day have not changed their stories despite the pressure that has been focused upon them.

Once there was a file down in the Navy Department. Now it is gone. Its number was 7003. It could have been the file in which one of the very, very important missing documents, "wind execute; wind activate" it is sometimes called, had reposed.

Strange, this effort to destroy all evidence about the "wind execute" having arrived in Washington on the 5th of December 1941. We were monitoring up and down the Pacific coast, every message that came over the Pacific, at Honolulu, too. The FBI was working everywhere, looking for what it could, tapping wires, if you please, under the direction of the Department of Justice. That message which is missing in the United States, and which a most elaborate effort has been made to destroy all evidence of, strange to say, was monitored all over the world. They got it in Batavia. They got it in Hungary. They got it in Australia and New Zealand on the 4th and 5th—our allies to be—with our code-smashing ciphers, they all had it; but a tremendous effort has been made in the United States to break down the testimony of those who knew about it, who conversed about it, who acted upon it as far as their authority would permit them. No stone has been left unturned in the effort to break them down.

But all this notwithstanding we are denied, by action of the majority members of this joint committee, the right to look into the files, to go down to the Navy Department and look at the file which is 7002, look into the file which is 7004, to draw from the sequence of strange happenings those inferences which reasoning individuals, especially former prosecutors, such as myself and my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], as the facts would justify.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield gladly to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman recalls in connection with the testimony with respect to the so-called wind execute message that the testimony of one Captain Kramer was very vital and important and material, and that Captain Kramer was badgered and beset by a subsequent effort to break down the testimony which he had given under oath, and that Captain Kramer, it is now alleged, is confined at a Washington hospital, confined in a psychopathic ward. Did the gentleman and I get to go to that hospital to try to see Captain Kramer to find out what the facts are with respect to this vital and important witness and to talk to him and to see him? We are denied that right under the order issued by the President; and yet there is one of the most vital and important witnesses who could be brought before this investigating committee, and whole legions of stories have arisen as to the manner in which he was broken down in mind and health subsequent to the testimony he gave. I want to go out to that hospital and see this man, the gentleman from California wants to go out and see him; we want to talk to him. Can the gentleman do it or can I under that order?

Mr. GEARHART. As matters stand, I cannot help but wonder if he would be there if he had not been badgered and grilled as he has been since he gave his original testimony as clear as a bell and at a time when his mind was as clear as any sane man's mind could possibly be.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I wonder if it would be possible that Captain Kramer is getting the same sort of treatment in this country that Tyler Kent received in England.

Mr. GEARHART. We can only wonder; we cannot investigate. Our hands are tied by Presidential orders.

Mr. SHORT. I am surprised they have locked him up; I am surprised he has not been liquidated.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Why would it not be proper immediately to introduce a concurrent resolution and break down this barrier about which the gentleman has spoken?

Mr. GEARHART. The suggestion of the gentleman is, indeed, a timely one, and I think it will be followed.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Unless such a resolution is introduced within the next 24 hours by the Members particularly concerned in this matter, I will introduce one myself.

Mr. GEARHART. I shall be very pleased to consult with the gentleman from Ohio and will appreciate his cooperation in shaping an amendment to the resolution which will correct these evils. I do hope, however, that will not be necessary. I do hope the majority members of this joint committee will have seen the mistake they have made in slamming the doors and barring the way to an open, fair, free investigation. Unless they do, the proceedings will constitute nothing but an inquiry by judges sitting in banc on a bench in a courtroom. It will be anything but an investigation by every member of the 10-man joint committee the Congress intended it should be.

Let me tell you that even though the hands of the individual committeemen are tied, not everybody in our Government suffers from the same disability. The Secretary of State blandly goes down to the Navy and looks over some recently acquired records taken from a captured Japanese submarine, then calls in the press and announces the acquittal of former Secretary Cordell Hull of any participation in or responsibility for having started the war by sending, on November 26, the ultimatum which the Japanese considered so harsh and humiliating that nothing but a resort to war remained.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is aware of the fact that a Col. Rufus Bratton is one of the key witnesses in connection with this investigation. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GEARHART. I agree with that. Col. Rufus Bratton is a very important figure in this investigation.

Mr. KEEFE. And that Colonel Bratton testified at length before the Army board. He testified from memoranda which were made at the time of the incidents prior to Pearl Harbor and he testified clearly and to the point and without equivocation; that thereafter this Colonel Classen at the instigation of the War Department and the Secretary of War went to Colonel Bratton along with all the other witnesses and browbeat him apparently into signing an affidavit a year later in which his testimony is subject to some change. The gentleman and I want to talk to Colonel Bratton. Can we do it under the present rule and order?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be given an additional 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California desire 20 additional minutes?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I do. There is very much more I feel that I should call to attention of the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not, I wonder if by the kind indulgence of the other gentlemen who have special orders I may proceed for 10 minutes after the gentleman from California concludes?

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection on the part of the two Members who have special orders immediately fol-

lowing the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Tennessee may proceed for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I referred a moment ago in passing to the "winds execute" or "winds activate" message, a circumstance which makes it incumbent upon me to explain what the wind messages are and how important they figure in this investigation.

When I speak of Japanese messages, always bear in mind we cracked their codes long ago. We knew everything they were saying to each other. That was true throughout the war and for years before. Away back on November 5, 1941, the Japanese sent out a notice to all the diplomatic agents of that nation in which they were instructed to listen attentively to the news broadcast that came from Japan, the one received in Honolulu at approximately 1 o'clock. They advised that in that newscast there would some day be revealed what the Japanese intended to do in reference to war or peace in the Pacific.

Later on there was another wind message. This has been referred to as the "wind code message." In this message there were contained the code words to which all Japanese diplomatic agents throughout the world were supposed to listen for, and having the code words and hearing the words over the air, they would know what Japan's intentions were.

Finally, on the 3d or 4th of December 1941, came what they called the winds activate or winds execute message. It contained the code key words which had been previously communicated to their nationals. The significant code words "East wind, rain," meaning war with the United States, were heard. The code words "North wind, cloudy," which meant war with Russia, were not heard. So it was peace with Russia. There was a similar phrase in which to announce war with England and the Netherlands Indies—and that was heard. That message came on the 4th and was repeated again on the 5th of December.

That message told the story to Washington, to the President's War Cabinet, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to all American high authorities, just as it told the Japanese, for we had their code, that there would be war with the United States, war with England, war with the Netherlands Indies, and peace with Russia. That is the winds message that there has been such a studied effort to blot from our official files and the memories of our Naval and Army officials, to prove that it was never received in the United States, although it had been received all over the world, in Hungary, Java, Australia, New Zealand, everywhere where radio is listened to.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman might explain where he got that information.

Mr. GEARHART. Where I got that information? I am glad the gentleman asked for that information. I got it from the top secret reports made by high officials of the War Department to the Secretary of War.

Mr. GRANGER. I thought maybe you got it from Drew Pearson.

Mr. GEARHART. Drew Pearson might have gotten it from me in this instance.

I have in my hands a most interesting document, a top secret document, if you please, which is entitled "Memorandum of the Judge Advocate General of the Army for the Secretary of War," in which is contained a brief cutline of intercepted Japanese code messages. It purports to cover the period from October 16, 1941, to December 7, 1941. The American people have not yet been told anything of these. Maybe somebody thinks that these messages are too good for the American people. But that notwithstanding, remember this all of these messages were Japanese messages in the official Japanese code, code messages which American experts "cracked." The information which they contained was in American hands when they were received by the Japanese. In some instances, as in the case of the 14-part messages of December 6 and 7, 1941, our experts decoded the messages faster than did the Japanese nationals for whose confidential attention they were intended.

From these messages I would establish two facts: First, that Mr. Hull does not yet stand acquitted; that he still is one of those who is under investigation, and second, that the Secretary of State was a bit premature when he announced the innocence of his predecessor in office of precipitating the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor with his 10-point ultimatum of November 26, 1941. Though he has access to Navy Department records, an access which is denied to a mere member of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, perhaps he may be further enlightened by a few "cracked" Japanese coded messages to which I will now advert.

Here is a message that the American monitors picked up in Japanese and promptly decoded.

November 5, translated November 5, Tokyo to Washington, of utmost secrecy. Setting November 25 as dead line for signing agreement and urging renewed effort.

The Japs were still hopeful of getting the kind of agreement out of the United States which would render it unnecessary for them to go to war.

Next, I interpolate an American note, dated November 5, which I have taken from the report of the Navy's Court of Inquiry. This is interesting. It is contained in the printed report which has already been given to the public:

November 5: Navy report, fact VII, reveals that Chief of Naval Operations and Chief of Staff write President recommending that no ultimatum to Japan be dispatched "as we were not ready."

Now let us get back to the intercepted Japanese dispatches. This one is illuminating:

November 14, translated November 26. Tokyo to Hong Kong. Stating that should United States-Jap negotiations collapse Japan will destroy British and American power in China.

Again the Japanese indicate that they are still hoping that their negotiations with Mr. Hull will result in an agreement satisfactory to Japan:

November 16, translated November 17. Tokyo to Washington. Referring to impossibility to change dead line of 25 November and to press negotiations with the United States.

Though the Japanese cling to their dead line, they press for an agreement that would make war unnecessary. But they keep an eye on Pearl Harbor, as the following clearly reveals:

November 18, translated December 6. Kita, Honolulu to Tokyo. Bringing Tokyo up to date as to warships in Pearl Harbor and giving course of eight destroyers entering harbor.

Again the Japanese reveal that their first interest in getting an agreement, though a breaking off of negotiations in the event of failure is not entirely out of mind.

November 19, translated November 20. Tokyo to Washington. Advises to present "the proposal" and that "if the United States consent to this cannot be secured, the negotiations will have to be broken off."

But they were so hopeful of securing an agreement in which the United States will recognize Nippon's East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, so they move the "dead line" to November 29.

November 22, translated November 22. Tokyo to Washington. Extends time for signing agreement from November 25 to November 29. Latter is absolute dead line. "After that things are automatically going to happen."

Though there is a threat in that one, it nevertheless shows conclusively that Japan is still striving for an agreement which she could accept.

On November 26, hope begins to fade, as evidenced by the following:

November 26, translated November 28. Ambassadors Nomura and Kurusu to Tokyo. Advising hardly any possibility of United States considering the "proposal" in toto; that if situation remains tense as it is negotiations will inevitably be ruptured, if indeed they may not already be called so. "Our failure and humiliation are complete."

Still more pessimism creeps into the coded reports to Japan. Will negotiations fail? Let me read this one.

November 26, translated November 26. Conversation between Kurusu and Yamamoto, Kurusu stating United States will not yield, that he could make no progress.

So bad are the prospects of securing an agreement with the United States that Ambassador Nomura's thoughts turn to avoiding responsiblity for the rupture of relations if bad comes to worse. Consider his warning and advice:

November 26, translated November 29. Nomura to Tokyo. Stating that great danger responsibility for rupture of negotiations will be cast upon Japan and suggesting plan to avoid this.

Then when the Japanese were in that condition of mind, Secretary Hull presents his ultimatum to Ambassador Nomura. He could not have more effectively "kicked over the apple cart."

When Ambassador Nomura and Special Envoy Kurusu read the drastic stipulations, they knew all hope of securing an agreement that Japan could accept had reach an impasse. The Secretary of State's ultimatum brought the peace discussions to an abrupt termination, though, for reasons of state, some pretention to the contrary was maintained. War was no longer inevitable, it was now imminent. Hull had fixed that.

But the Secretary of State who reads one message says that Mr. Hull has been acquitted of the responsibility of precipitating the Pearl Harbor attack.

Let the genial Secretary of State reconsider his hastily conceived defense of his "old friend" in the light of the decoded Japanese message which I have just read as I hurry on to read, without comment, a number of most significant coded messages, messages which were monitored right up to the moment when the first bomb fell.

They are:

November 28, translated November 28, Tokyo to Washington, stating that in spite of Ambassadors' superhuman efforts United States had "presented a humiliating proposal and Japan cannot use it as a basis for negotiations"; therefore answers will be sent Ambassadors in 2 or 3 days after which negotiations will be de facto ruptured. Ambassadors are told not to give impression negotiations are broken off.

29 November, translated 30 November, Tokyo to Washington, instructing Ambassadors to make one more attempt and giving line of approach.

November 30, translated 1 December, Tokyo to Berlin.

Listen to this one. We picked them up when they were going all over the world. This one is from Tokyo to Berlin, advising Japan's adherence to the Tri-partite Alliance, and that United States on November 26 made an insulting proposal to the Japanese, in effect demanding that Japan not give assistance to Germany and Italy in accordance with the Axis alliance. "This clause alone, let alone others, makes it impossible to find any basis in the American proposal for negotiations," and that the United States in collusion with the Allied nations "has decided to regard Japan, along with Germany and Italy, as an enemy."

Mr. Hull's ultimatum seems to have had some effect upon the Japanese thinking. Maybe the Secretary of State would be willing to give some thought to this one:

November 30, translated December 1, Tokyo to Berlin, stating negotiations with Washington "now stand ruptured and broken" and to give Hitler and Ribbentrop a summary of the developments; that England and the United States have taken a provocative attitude, were planning to move forces into east Asia which would require countermeasures by Japan, that there was extreme danger that war might suddenly break out, and that "the time of the breaking out of this war may come quicker than anyone dreams." This message was to be sent to Rome and to be held "in the most absolute secrecy."

Mind you, high authorities in Washington had read all those messages. Later on they got another message, on the 6th day of December. It was the answer to Mr. Hull's ultimatum, which he declares was not an ultimatum because the insulting provisions were set forth in a "tendered agreement" form. But if Japan signed that agreement, it would have had to humiliate itself by withdrawing from Indochina, withdrawing from China proper and Manchuria, and breaking its alliance with Hitler and Mussolini.

You cannot disguise an ultimatum by putting it in a proposed "tendered agreement" form. Even a child can know what it is. Ambassador Grew, in Japan, immediately interpreted it as an ultimatum, as did everybody in that country. And it was so regarded everywhere, to the four corners of this earth.

And on the 6th came back the answer to that message. It was a curt, insulting reply to Hull's ultimatum. It came in 14 installments. As fast as it arrived we decoded it. We decoded it faster than the Japanese themselves did. Everybody in Washington in position of authority knew that Japan was breaking off peace negotiations with the United States by the time the thirteenth installment arrived. The fourteenth installment came in the early hours of Sunday, the 7th day of December. There were still many, many hours before the first bomb was to fall.

Then came the give-away message from Japan. It was the message of instructions to the Japanese Ambassador, Mr. Nomura, and to the Envoy Extraordinary, Mr. Kurusu. It directed them to present the Japanese reply to Secretary Hull's ultimatum at 1 o'clock. Now every strategist who had been reading these messages, both the Army and Navy officers, immediately interpreted the 1 o'clock directive to mean only one thing—it meant that the first bomb would fall at about 7 o'clock in the morning at Hawaii.

Well, as a member of the joint committee, I think that Mr. Hull is still under investigation along with a number of other people who had those messages on their desks and who were in a position to have sent a warning message to Admiral Kimmel or to General Short and did not do it. Not a word of warning went forth—only a Presidential appeal to the Mikado, a known prisoner of the militarists of Japan, beseeching him to intercede with his war lords to perpetuate the peace. Did he not know that the Navy had been sailing for 12 to 15 days to a rendezvous north of Honolulu? It had been in decoded messages that the Japanese Fleet had left home waters. Did not General Marshall understand that message which all his subordinates understood? If he did, why did he wait until 12 o'clock on Sunday to write out a message and send it, not by the scrambled telephone that was at his right hand which would have brought the admiral in general communication in 3 minutes, not by the Navy short-wave radio which was then available to him, but by commercial radio. He sent the message by commercial RCA radio and it arrived in Hawaii 22 minutes before the first bomb fell, but it was 2 hours after the last bomb fell before it was decoded and delivered to its addressee.

These are a part of the strange, seemingly unexplainable circumstances, which we want to investigate. We want to investigate the reasons and the whys and wherefores of these utterly incomprehensible performances of people, officials of the United States, who, in connection with other matters, have always reacted to circumstances as reasoning individuals. We want the right to investigate these strange circumstances individually and collectively. We want the right to search for evidence everywhere. We want to talk to everybody who knows anything about Pearl Harbor. We want to look at every record. We want to give the American people the truth. Are we asking too much?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman will recall, and I think that he has stated, that the President dispatched his famous message to the Mikado at about 9 o'clock in the evening of the 6th day of December 1941, and that the answer to the ultimatum of November 26 had been coming in and the first 13 parts of it had come in and were decoded by that time. The gentleman will also recall that a reading of the secret testimony of General Marshall and Admiral Stark indicates that neither one of those people under repeated questioning of counsel was able to state where they were on the evening of the 6th day of December 1941. They do remember that General Marshall was out horseback riding on the morning of December 7. Now, I, as a member of this committee, and you, as a member of the committee, want the opportunity to make investigations of those close to those two people to find out where they were on the evening of the 6th day of December when this vital message was coming in. Can we do it with the gag placed upon everybody in those departments under the present order?

Mr. GEARHART. We cannot do it. All we can do is sit in banc on the bench as judges, and from what we have read, hope, through momentarily inspired cross-examination, to bring out the truth which the American people are most anxious to hear.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has mentioned what happened to Captain Kramer. I want the gentleman and the committee to know that at the proper time—and that proper time will be when another individual's relationship with the Army has terminated—that another individual will be available, I feel sure, as a witness to tell the committee that he was at one time railroaded into a psychopathic hospital because he insisted on telling the truth rather than signing a memorandum or an affidavit of untruths prepared for him to sign, as to what happened at Pearl Harbor. He is one of those men who was at Pearl Harbor on the morning of December 7.

Mr. GEARHART. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Is it not true that 1 o'clock in this country is dawn at Hawaii and midnight in Japan?

Mr. GEARHART. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for bringing that out, because in all military maneuvers for 30 years, in which a possible airplane attack upon Pearl Harbor was contemplated, the leader of the attacking forces always determined to attack at the crack of dawn, so that the planes could ride in on the rays of the rising sun, a circumstance which gives the attackers the added protection of poor visibility. The Japanese, who are notoriously without imagination, being familiar with the strategy through operation of their spy system, naturally decided to attack the islands in a manner which Americans had demonstrated in maneuvers was most likely to suceed. So Japanese orders were to attack Hawaii at the dawn and ride in on the rays of the sun.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Does not the gentleman believe, according to the evidence that he as a member of the committee has been able to get to date, that had the military forces and the President acted upon the information they had, we might have been able to get the fleet out of the harbor and get them deployed in such manner that we might have been able to save the lives of a thousand or two thousand men, and save the major part of the Pacific Fleet?

Mr. GEARHART. The high ranking naval official testified that if he had had 2 hours' warning of the attack, not a single one of those slow-moving Japanese torpedo planes would have reached its target. And the tragedy of it all lies in the fact that "Washington knew" but, for reasons yet to be explained, had "no comment" to make.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. If the commanding officers of the Army and Navy activities in Hawaii had had the information that was available hours and hours before the attack was made, is it not reasonable to believe that they, in the discharge of their duty, as they must have known it, would have seen to it that the ships would have been gotten out of the harbor and the attacking planes would have been given a reception that would not have been very satisfactory to them?

Mr. GEARHART. If Admiral Kimmel and General Short had been advised of the orders from Japan to destroy their codes and code machines, if they had been advised of the wind messages, if they had been advised of the 14-part answer to Mr. Hull's ultimatum and the 1 o'clock delivery order, they would have had sufficient time to smashed the attack and thrown the Japanese planes into the seas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a copy of the Italian Military Armistice, together with related papers. I have been informed by the Public Printer that this material will make six pages in the RECORD and will cost $312. Notwithstanding the added cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a serviceman.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to engage in debate on this question at this time, because I have thought a better investigation could be made in the committee appointed for this purpose than in the press and by speeches on the floor of the House and of the Senate. However, I am asking your indulgence, briefly, to comment upon some of the points discussed by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], who has preceded me.

We frequently hear the remark made: Let us look at the record. It will be my purpose to invite your attention to the facts appearing in the record.

The Joint Committee for the Investigation of the Attack on Pearl Harbor was appointed, five Members of the Senate by the President pro tempore of the Senate and five Members of the House by the Speaker of this body. The joint committee within a few days met and organized. On motion of a Republican member of the committee the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was selected as chairman. On motion of another Republican member of the committee, my good friend and distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], I was selected vice chairman of the committee.

One of the first and most important duties to be performed was the selection of a counsel for the committee. It was thought by members of the committee and by everybody who expressed himself on it that we should secure the most outstanding lawyer available in this entire country to serve in the important position of counsel of this committee. After considerable care and attention had been given to the matter, I believe we were fortunate in securing the best available man in the Nation for that important position. We unanimously selected a former Attorney General of the United States, Hon. William D. Mitchell, of New York. He had served with outstanding distinction as Solicitor General of the United States for 4 years under the administration of Mr. Coolidge, a Republican President; he had served with outstanding distinction for 4 years at Attorney General of the United States under the administration of Mr. Hoover; he sat in the Cabinet of the last Republican President we have had in this country for the entire 4 years of his administration. We certainly feel that he is entitled to the full confidence of the people of this country as well as the members of this committee. His appointment was acclaimed throughout the length and breadth of this land with approval by everybody who expressed himself on the subject. Now, to come directly to the point that he occasioned the discussion here today.

In a meeting of the joint committee on November 1 the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], offered two motions or resolutions somewhat similar in character so that the action taken by the committee on the first Ferguson motion was decisive of the questions involved. I invite your attention to the fact that Senator FERGUSON'S motion proposed to do three things: First, to allow officers and employees of the Government to come forward and volunteer any information they might have to the committee or members of the committee. That proposal by Senator FERGUSON was unanimously adopted by the committee. The second thing provided in his motion was to allow members of the committee to get records and documents from the departments and agencies of the Government; and that was unanimously agreed to by the committee. The third point in his motion was to call upon the President of the United States to issue an Executive order providing that each individual member of the committee could go to all of the files and records of all departments and agencies of this Government and examine anything he wanted to whether it had anything to do with Pearl Harbor or not.

Your committee by a majority vote took the position that this is an investigation to be made by the committee and not to have 10 individual investigations made by the 10 different members of the committee. In the interest of orderly procedure it was decided that we should continue the work as provided in the resolution creating the committee and to act as a committee.

The distinguished counsel representing the committee was present and was requested to give an expression of his opinion with respect to Senator FERGUSON'S resolution. He advised that the first two points to which I have referred were acceptable and should be adopted. The committee unanimously adopted them. He advised strongly against the adoption of the third point, stating that all agencies, departments, and officials

of the Government were fully cooperating with the committee and with the committee's counsel and certainly it was not in the interest of orderly procedure to have 10 individual members of the committee going to all the various agencies and departments of the Government examining files and records which have nothing to do with the attack on Pearl Harbor. He advised against the adoption of that provision of the Ferguson motion and the committee by majority vote followed his advice.

Reference has been made here today to certain officers of the Army and the Navy. Counsel at the last meeting submitted for our information a tentative list of witnesses to appear. There are perhaps hundreds of them in this document. Each member of the committee was given one of those documents by the counsel and I invite attention to the fact that every person whose name has been mentioned here today appears on that list as a prospective witness to appear in this investigation.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that anyone should come in here today and undertake to present what the gentleman from California calls evidence. He is referring to the Army board of investigation and the Navy board of investigation and what the evidence in those records appear to be, because not one line of evidence has yet been taken by the joint committee to investigate the attack on Pearl Harbor.

We have agreed to open public hearings on November 15 and everybody who has any information or who can shed any light on this subject will be called as a witness in open public hearings, with the press of the Nation present there to carry the story to the American people. Every document, every paper, everything that will be of any material interest in this investigation is to be produced in the open hearings to be held by the committee charged with the responsibility of making a thorough and complete investigation and presenting its findings in the form of a report to the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, when I was appointed a member of this committee it came as a great surprise to me. I had not sought the appointment, and the day it was made I issued this simple statement to the press:

> I appreciate the confidence of the Speaker in assigning me to this responsible duty. It will be my purpose to find the truth about the attack on Pearl Harbor and to make the truth my verdict.

That is the intention of your committee, and you may rest assured that every effort will be exercised to find the full, whole, and complete truth, and bring it to you.

The SPEAKER. Under previcus order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 40 minutes, or so much of that time as he may desire to consume.

FULL EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and I have asked for time today in order that we may discuss before the House H. R. 2202, the full employment bill, which is now pending before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The impetus to this particular discussion came when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] mentioned on the floor of this House that there had not been the opportunity to ask questions of the authors of the bill the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and myself, after we had appeared before the committee. I repeat the statement I made yesterday, namely, that neither the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] nor I have been requested to return for hearing before the committee. I am certain that I speak for both of us when I say that we are not only anxious and ready but eager to go back and have any questions that pertain to the bill asked of us. I am not sure that we are so eager to have questions asked of us that pertain to things that do not have anything to do with H. R. 2202.

I should like to make certain assumptions and ask the gentleman from Michigan if I am correct in these assumptions at the outset. I assume that he is opposed to the bill; am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That depends upon what construction and interpretation is placed upon it. I am not against full employment or any measure that will aid unemployment.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman for that remark.

In the second place I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that as I proceed I shall be glad to have him break in or comment and ask me any questions that he may wish to, and I should like to have the same privilege when he is speaking after me.

There is another assumption that I should like to make at the outset. Mr. Speaker, the full employment bill is not a bill that goes into all of the ramifications of our economic system. It is not a bill to control or limit labor unions, and I make the assumption, when we are discussing this bill this afternoon, that we are not talking about the so-called evils of organized labor or the good of organized labor or proposed controls for organized labor. We are talking about the full employment bill. If any Member has had to walk to the House of Representatives today to attend this session, I am sorry, and I hope that even if the gentleman from Michigan was not able to take the streetcar from the Methodist Building to the Capitol, that we will limit our discussion to the issue before us, namely, the full employment bill.

One further assumption, Mr. Speaker, and that is this: This particular bill is not a partisan measure. Of the 116 cosponsors in the House there are several Members of the minority party, and we welcome as many more as will join us in pushing this bill.

The problem of unemployment should never be permitted to become a partisan measure. It deals with human suffering, and human suffering is something that bypasses Republican and Democratic lines. So I hope that the issue of partisanship will be kept out of this discussion here today. I hope that we will not go back and make slurring references to the greatest President that America has had in the past 100 years. That is not the issue either. I am trying in these preliminary remarks to narrow down just what it is that we are going to take up today. In order that I may emphasize this point that the bill is not partisan, I should like to give a couple of brief quotations at the outset. Here is one which I think perhaps some of the Members of the minority side will recall. I quote:

> Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise * * *. If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours.

That statement, Mr. Speaker, was made in San Francisco on September 21, 1944, by the Republican candidate for the Presidency, Thomas E. Dewey. I should be glad to have any Member on the minority side make an answer to that particular statement of Mr. Dewey.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I will make an answer.

Mr. OUTLAND. I shall be glad to hear from the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe in the Honorable Mr. Dewey's position if he means the Government should guarantee full employment.

Mr. OUTLAND. That is indeed an interesting answer. Does the gentleman from Ohio have anyone he can suggest that I might quote from, whom he does believe in? Let me anticipate. Here is another quote. This was made at Newark. N. J., September 18, 1928:

> I wish to lay down the proposition that the very prerequisite, the very foundation of economic progress to our industrial and business employees is full and stable employment. A continued surplus of unemployed workers means decreasing wages, increasing hours and fear for the future. To protect labor, to maintain its prosperity, to abolish poverty, we must so organize our economic system as to provide a job for all who have the will to work.

I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that that statement was made by Herbert Hoover. Does the gentleman agree with him?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I think it is the duty of Congress of course to do all it can so that people may have work, but I would suggest that the Government of the United States get off the back of private enterprise, and then we will have work in this country.

Mr. OUTLAND. If the gentleman from Ohio will read H. R. 2202, he will find in the statement of policy this:

> It is the policy of the United States to foster free, competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce, and in development of the natural resources of the United States.

Throughout the bill the emphasis is on private enterprise.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has been talking about the suffering that comes from unemployment, and about unemployment. Does the gentleman know anyone anywhere who thinks it is a good thing to have unemployment or suffering, and are we not just begging the question when we talk about that?

Mr. OUTLAND. I will answer the gentleman in this respect. I know lots of people who lend lip service to full employment, but they will not take concrete steps to try to promote it. I know people who say, "Yes, we must have full employment," but when concrete steps are proposed, whether it be in public works, a tax program, the prevention of monopoly, or anything else of a similar nature, they will vote against those measures. I know people who say, "We must have full employment for the sake of world peace," but when we come up to constructive steps like Bretton Woods they work and vote against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The difficulty, or the trouble, or the unsoundness in the gentleman's statement grows out of the fact that he reserves to himself and those who think with him the privilege of passing judgment and condemning all those who disagree.

Mr. OUTLAND. I think the gentleman from Michigan has passed judgment at least as much as I have on the floor of this House. I may say that I grant him the privilege of passing judgment in his own mind.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I ask the gentleman whether if everyone is in agreement that it is a desirable national objective to have full employment they should not likewise be in agreement on a measure which so states it to be the policy of Congress, and which sets up for the first time some adequate machinery which will enable Congress to grapple with that program with a reasonably rounded set of facts before it when it tries to do so.

Mr. OUTLAND. May I say to the gentleman that I am in complete accord with his statement. I am surprised, I am astounded that every single Member of Congress is not for this bill. As someone said once, we are not going to date the downfall of the Republic from the passing of the full employment bill.

It does two things, which I shall attempt to explain in a moment. It establishes policy and it establishes machinery to implement that policy. I wish the gentleman from Michigan, and I am sure I am anticipating him when his remarks are made, will tell us first of all what is wrong with the policy, and second, what is wrong with the machinery. Then perhaps we can make some constructive changes and we all can get behind a full employment bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Then the gentleman is interested in amendments that the committee might be able to make?

Mr. OUTLAND. I am interested in any amendments which will improve and make a stronger and more effective bill, and I would like to hear what the committee proposes.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to cement that remark of the gentleman in the RECORD so that it would not be changed.

Mr. OUTLAND. I repeat the remark. I certainly am interested in any amendment. I will say this, however: I am not in favor of any amendment which may be put in that might cut the heart out of the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman know of any single Member of Congress who does not sincerely want full employment as nearly as it can be arrived at under the private enterprise system?

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman is asking the same question that was asked a moment ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and I will have to answer him the same way. I think that every Member of this House will say, "Yes, we want full employment." But I think there will be some, and I do not question their motives nor their integrity, but I think there will be some who will not work for constructive means of achieving full employment.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman know of any committee that has worked harder on any measure than the committee now working on this bill?

Mr. OUTLAND. It has not been my pleasure to have appeared before that committee except to make my original statement. I believe that the committee has worked very hard and for a long period of time. I am glad to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] and the other members of his committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood you to say that when it came to a vote that those who opposed this bill would not vote for a constructive measure. That assumes this bill is the only constructive way to provide full employment, does it not?

Mr. OUTLAND. Oh, no. I am glad the gentleman raised that point too for this reason: I think that some of the proponents and opponents of the bill have claimed too much for it. This bill is not a panacea. It is not a cure-all. This bill is not going to solve the entire employment problem in the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes, if I may finish my statement first. I think the friends of the measure have sometimes claimed too much for it. I think the enemies of it have frequently seen too much of a bogeyman in it. But I will say this, that in my judgment and in the judgment of a great many organizations and Government agencies, this bill is a foundation stone upon which we are going to have to build if we are to have full employment. This measure is not going to guarantee it but it is going to be a big step in the right direction.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to say that I was before this committee and enjoyed very much the time I was there, and I appreciated the courteous treatment that I was accorded. But going back to the question of the gentleman from Illinois about amendments, I would like to make this comment with reference to amendments. I am not asking for the gentleman's opinion, but I would like to state my opinion. In my judgment, the bill would be stronger if it specifically provided for the setting up of a definite board or commission which would be held accountable in the public eye for assisting the President in the preparation of the national Budget rather than to leave the bill without a specific provision upon that point. In other words, if it were provided that a board should be appointed by the President, probably with the consent of the Senate, to perform that function, I think it would strengthen the bill in that regard. Does the gentleman care to comment on that? I would be glad if he would do so.

Mr. OUTLAND. I understand the gentleman from California made a very able presentation on that particular point before the committee the other day. I am sorry I have not read his testimony. I shall do so and perhaps comment on it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The only reason I asked the question was to bring out the fact that some of us who are very strong in support of the bill are not devoid of the opportunity to think constructively of ways in which it might be improved.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Did the gentleman hear the address of the President of the United States the other night on this matter?

Mr. OUTLAND. I read it in the paper, but I did not hear it over the radio.

Mr. RIVERS. I understood him to say that the committee of which our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Alabama, is chairman was remiss in its duty for not having reported out this bill. Does the gentleman share that view of the President when he made that statement?

Mr. OUTLAND. May I say in answer to the gentleman that I think that all committees of this House are working hard to report out all bills before them. I have so told the gentleman from Alabama on several occasions. I so stated earlier in my remarks today.

Mr. RIVERS. I certainly felt that way because, as I understood, the gentleman made a statement to that effect. I am glad if the gentleman says I misunderstood him.

Mr. OUTLAND. I will say further that the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the committee, and I may not agree in some respects on this bill, but we have always been able to sit down and talk over any feature of it.

Mr. RIVERS. I think he enjoys the esteem of every Member of Congress on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. OUTLAND. I am sure the gentleman is correct. I agree with him, of course, which fact he must certainly know.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am concerned with the ways and means, the mechanics of the plan, in this bill. I am wondering, in case of a collapse of credit and prices, such as we experienced in 1930, and loss of confidence in the banks, how you are going to reach that situation and supply the money function of the country to implement your program.

Mr. OUTLAND. Your question is, Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. WHITE. That is right.

Mr. OUTLAND. It will be difficult to answer that unless I go into it more in detail than I have time to do now. I would say this: Where did we get the money for 3 years of war? Where did we get the funds to finance relief expenditures during the 1930's?

Mr. WHITE. I would like to answer that question. Due to the collapse of credit and prices that I mentioned, and the loss of confidence, this country found itself $63,000,000,000 in debt and then took on a world war.

Mr. OUTLAND. This country found itself that much in debt, as the gentleman states. I may say this, the only way you get out of debt, the only way you can pay your debts, even pay the interest on them, is to maintain sufficient purchasing power in the country to have an adequate tax base. If we go back to the time when the national income sinks to $80,000,000,000 or lower, we will go deeper into debt. At the same time, we will have to pay for relief, too, unless you want to let the people in this country starve. One way of preventing that is to take constructive measures to prevent a depression in the first place. Is the gentleman one who thinks depressions are inevitable?

Mr. WHITE. We had all the financial mechanics to do the thing, but it failed and failed miserably in the period you are speaking of. What are you going to do to correct that situation?

Mr. OUTLAND. If the gentleman would give me time, I could go on and explain the bill, because it covers those points.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I answer the question as to where the United States got the money to finance this war?

Mr. OUTLAND. Having heard the gentleman discuss the monetary situation on many occasions, I would like to hear his answer to the question. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It got it from three sources: By taxation, by borrowing from private individuals, and by printing money. It printed in excess $70,000,000,000 to finance the war.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. In what way will this bill aid the problem of unemployment without destroying the principle of free enterprise?

Mr. OUTLAND. That question goes to the very heart of the bill, and I think if I may defer answering the gentleman for just a moment, I will lead up to that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does two things. This bill states a series of principles, and then it sets up certain machinery to implement those principles. In the first place, there is a reaffirming of the traditional American principle of free enterprise. I quoted that a few moments ago in reply to one of the questions asked me. That is principle No. 1.

No. 2 is perhaps the most important in the bill, and it is one which we might as well face squarely: Any American who desires to work, who is capable of working, has the right to an opportunity for a job. There can be no equivocation on that point. We cannot weasel out of that. The very basis of American democracy is the right of a man to stand on his own two feet, and make a living and support himself and his family. If we start to say, "No, that is too expensive; that is against free enterprise," we are simply begging the question. The right to an opportunity for a job is one of the most fundamental rights that an American citizen can have.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You stand on that, do you?

Mr. OUTLAND. I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There should not be any restrictions on that right?

Mr. OUTLAND. I know what the gentleman is going to ask.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought you did.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman is going to talk about labor unions. He has talked about them on many occasions. I will say this to the gentleman: Labor unions have made their mistakes, just like American business has made its mistakes. We are anxious to correct the mistakes that both have made, but the standard of living of the working men and women of America has gone upward and upward and is now the highest in the world, primarily because of the principle of collective bargaining; and you cannot get away from it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you stand on your proposition that every man shall have the right to a job if there is one available and he is ready to work?

Mr. OUTLAND. I know the implication back of the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Never mind the implication. You made the statement that you believed it was the right of every American to have the right to work, the opportunity to work.

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask, does the gentleman stand on it without reservation?

Mr. OUTLAND. And in the long run more Americans will have the right to work and more Americans will have a higher plane of living if we stand by the principles of collective bargaining.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry the gentleman will not answer his own proposition.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. OUTLAND. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to ask the gentleman if his formula had been applied at the close of the Revolutionary War when we had all this country to develop, the formula of guaranteeing a job for every person, would we ever have developed America?

Mr. OUTLAND. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that the bill does not propose to do what he said at all. The true principle which the bill establishes is that there is a responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to see that there are continuing job opportunities. This is not essentially a make-work bill, this is not essentially a public works bill; it is much more comprehensive. It gives every possible encouragement to private industry to provide jobs. It states that the Government shall use every resource at its command to encourage private industry to see that jobs are available, but that if after such encouragement has been given there are still men walking the streets looking for work then it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to see that opportunities are provided for them. It does not say that the Government is going to lead every man by the hand, take him to a job; it does not mean that you are going to give every man just exactly the type of work he wants, but it does say that if after every incentive has been given to private industry there are still American men looking for jobs then Uncle Sam has the responsibility of seeing that job opportunities are provided, and I stand upon that point.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has used the word "encouraged."

Mr. OUTLAND. "Encourage." That is right.

Mr. CHURCH. I refer the gentleman to the two sections of the bill where the words "to assure" are used. I refer the gentleman first to page 3, paragraph (e):

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure—

Underline "to assure"—

continuing full employment.

And then on page 2——

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman stop at that point for a moment?

Mr. CHURCH. No, no; let me finish my statement. I further refer the gentleman to section 2, paragraph (b), which states:

All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to be useful, remunera-

tive regular and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure—

Underline "to assure"—

the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right.

The gentleman has talked about "encouraging," the bill uses the words "to assure."

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes; and I may say to the gentleman that I think the word "assure" is a better one. It belongs in there.

I wish the gentleman had gone further. He read only section 3, subparagraph (e). I wish he had gone further and read subsection (f) as well because it is pertinent:

Such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. How does the gentleman justify the title of the bill when none of its proponents even claim it will achieve full employment?

Mr. OUTLAND. The bill (H. R. 2202) has been called the full-employment bill because the preamble states "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment."

Mr. HENRY. But none of the proponents claim it will achieve full employment.

Mr. OUTLAND. No; and as I said a few moments ago I think it is unfortunate perhaps that both the proponents and opponents have looked upon it as so extreme. By itself, it is not going to achieve full employment. No one measure can do that. But it is a big step in the right direction. It is an essential step.

This measures coordinates all of our policies, fiscal and otherwise, and gives us the data necessary for planning for the prevention of mass unemployement. Never before have we taken this first big step. After we have taken this one, the following ones will be easier to determine. This measure, however, is a "must."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. How will the Government assure full employment? I am interested in knowing the mechanics of the thing.

Mr. OUTLAND. I am sure the gentleman will find the answer in what I am about to say as I go into the next phase of my discussion. After the stating of these three parts of policy the bill then goes on to set up what is termed "the national employment and production budget."

It authorizes the President of the United States to call upon all the resources of the Goverment to gather together the essential data regarding production trends, consumption trends and employment trends and, on the basis of that information, to develop a flexible program to meet those trends. It then provides for a joint committee of the House and Senate, which would take the President's message, analyze it and make recommendations back to the Congress.

It does not in any way attempt to bypass the Congress. As a matter of fact the last section of the bill specifically states that, "Nothing contained herein shall be construed as offering or authorizing any changes in existing procedure of appropriations."

That point is sometimes raised and I am sure it is based on misinformation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does that not result in merely setting up a fact-finding body? It does not yet tell us how you can assure these jobs.

Mr. OUTLAND. I doubt if you can put into any one bill the machinery to assure jobs for every one. That is the point I was stressing a moment ago. I emphasized the fact this is a cornerstone, not a cure-all. The bill says that after this message has been given the Congress and after the joint committee has analyzed it, then the Congress will make such recommendations as will tend to assure full employment opportunities. It may be there will be legislation in regard to monopoly, it may be in regard to taxation, it may be that certain specific public works will be recommended and, quite frequently I think it will be necessary to have that planned in advance. It will have to be work which will contribute to the lasting wealth of the Nation, and not something put together as a last minute resort to keep people busy and to keep them from starving.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. On the other hand, if the message shows to the Congress that there is no necessity for the Government to step in, that free enterprise will take care of the people of the country, it will not be necessary for the Congress to do anything?

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman is absolutely correct; but if there is a gap found between those who are able to work and those who are evidently going to have job opportunities, then it is the responsibility of the Congress to step in and make specific recommendations.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have two questions, which might seem unimportant. I would like to know if the gentleman has any information as to how much of a national organization will be needed and what the cost will be to provide the necessary figures and information which would be accurate. We have had here in Washington the greatest aggregation of people that ever gathered under one tent to tell the world how to run itself. Are we going to have a larger aggregation to run this or does the gentleman believe it can be done with any modest expenditure?

Mr. OUTLAND. I may say in reply to the question of the gentleman from California that it may be that during the war emergency we have had a big aggregation of agencies. It is also true that that aggregation of agencies has carried this country through the greatest war in its history and done it well.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I take exception to that, of course. I would say the American businessman has carried us through in spite of those agencies.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thought the gentleman would take exception to that.

The purpose of this bill is to synthesize and so organize our information so that we will take care of our economic problems in such a way that we will not need additional agencies; on the other hand perhaps fewer agencies. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] made a suggestion in that direction which might mean an additional agency. I think if it proved to be a feasible suggestion it might help to eliminate certain duplications and I would join with the gentleman from California in helping to eliminate those things.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Does not the gentleman think the passage of this legislation would have a great psychological effect on the country? The phychology itself would be helpful toward stabilizing employment. I have in mind a few years ago we passed the National Deposit Insurance Act. A lot of people thought the Government put a great deal of money behind that venture. As a matter of fact there was very little Government money in that fund. Right now the bankers say they do not need it, yet they do not want the law repealed. Why? Because of the psychological effect on the taxpayers. They want to keep the law there as a storm celler if things might get bad again.

This bill, as I understand, does in a great measure that very thing. It stimulates confidence in the people; that they are not going to be thrown cut of jobs because of unemployment.

Mr. OUTLAND. That is right. I will say in following up the gentleman's point that one of the biggest factors in my judgment in helping to reduce the industrial unrest that we find in America today would be the passing of a bill of this nature. I think a great deal of that unrest is due to the uncertainty and the fear as to what the future holds, and if Congress would come out and declare a national policy for assuring continuing full employment opportunities, I believe we would see a very wholesome effect upon the Nation as a whole.

Mr. GRANGER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I believe the gentleman has given the impression that the purpose of the Budget is to study trends. The bill, in section 3, provides that:

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session the National Production and Employment Budget (hereinafter referred to as the National Budget), which shall set forth in summary and detail, for the ensuing fiscal year or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate——

Mr. OUTLAND. I hope the gentleman will not read the whole bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not intend to, of course.

After these estimates have been made, then the President shall do what?

The President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for encouraging such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure, particularly investment and expenditure which will promote increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

So would the gentleman say that this is merely a proposition which provides for the study by the statistical bureau that would be set up of trends, and that it is not a concrete program to spend Federal funds?

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman is right. Of course it is. It is a concrete program to have private industry, to every extent possible, provide jobs, and if there is still a gap, then Federal funds should be spent, and I think we should all join in seeing that they are spent to prevent unemployment. The question is, Shall we spend them constructively to prevent unemployment, or shall we spend them on doles and relief after depression has struck.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What provision does the bill, which the gentleman is the author of——

Mr. OUTLAND. It is not the gentleman's bill. It is the bill of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. DWORSHAK. In case where jobs or employment are provided, what provision is there to compel labor to take those jobs? For instance, in Idaho and our Western States for the past 3 years we have had our fruit rotting on the trees. We have had potatoes and other vegetables freezing in the ground when displaced laborers were returning to the West, and were requested by a Democratic governor to accept those jobs under proper safeguards, and they said, "We are not interested in those types of jobs." So instead of employing those men, those American citizens, it was necessary to spend millions of dollars to import labor from Mexico, from Jamaica and elsewhere to fill those jobs which the American citizens refused to accept.

Mr. OUTLAND. I am very sorry the gentleman from Idaho is insisting on bringing in partisan politics. I was hoping that he would not.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It was not partisan. I mentioned that merely to show you that it was not a Republican governor. I wanted to give the gentleman that assurance so that the gentleman could not say I was indulging in partisanship.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman is still playing politics. May I say this, that the United States Employment Service has to certify a person as eligible before he can get unemployment compensation. If he turns down work which in the judgment of the interviewer is work that he could and should fill, he will not get such certification. I am not familiar with the particular instance that the gentleman mentions, but I assume there must be some reason. I will say this, that in California we, too, had to use Mexican labor, but it was not because of any such conditions as the gentleman mentions. We had to bring in other help because the stoop labor which we formerly used was gone, namely, Filipinos, Japs, and others, and the type of work that the Mexicans are doing there has not in the past been done by native Americans.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Picking fruit does not involve stoop labor.

Mr. OUTLAND. No; but the type that the Mexican laborers performed in California was not that particular type.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman from Idaho raises a question about the Western States. My State, about the same size and population as the gentleman's State, Idaho, has similar unemployment compensation bills. In my State we have 45,000 who are eligible to receive compensation and during the month of September do you know how many there were? Three hundred. I dare say he would have that many in his State.

Mr. McDONOUGH and Mr. CURTIS rose.

Mr. OUTLAND. I have only 5 minutes left, and there are two or three points I want to cover. Then I will be glad to yield to both gentlemen.

The impression has sometimes gotten out in regard to the full employment bill that it is simply a measure that is being sponsored by organized labor in the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. A partial list of the more than 40 national organizations that are sponsoring this bill would be very interesting reading for the Members of this House. See if there is anything radical or anything extreme about organizations of this nature, who are backing the bill. The Methodist Federation for Social Service. I wonder if there are Methodists here who knew that. The National Catholic Welfare Conference. The National Grange. The United Christian Council for Democracy. The United Council of Church Women. The United States Conference of Mayors. There is a long list of more than 40 organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a partial list of these organizations at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A partial list of the organizations that have endorsed the bill include the following:

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.
The American Federation of Labor.
The Railroad Labor Executives Association.
The Congress of Industrial Organizations.
The United Mine Workers.
The American Association of Social Workers.
American Jewish Congress.
Americans United for World Organization.
American Veterans Committee.
Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
Business Men of America, Inc.
Central Council of American Rabbis.
Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches.
Disabled American Veterans.
Hosiery Wholesalers National Association.
Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.
League of Women Shoppers.
Methodist Federation for Social Service.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Board of Young Women's Christian Association.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
National Citizens Political Action Committee.
National Conference of Jewish Women.
National Consumers League.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council of Scientific, Professional, Art, and White Collar Organizations.
National Council for the Social Studies.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Farmers Union.
National Grange.
National Lawyers' Guild.
National Urban League.
National Women's Trade Union League of America.
Non-Partisan Council of Alpha Kappa Alpha.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
Synagogue Council of America.
Union for Democratic Action.
United Christian Council for Democracy.
United Council of Church Women.
United States Conference of Mayors.
United Steel Workers of America.
W. I. V. E. S.

Mr. OUTLAND. These organizations are backing the measure because in their judgment it is going to be a most essential step in bringing about greater economic opportunity. May I quote briefly from the testimony before the Senate committee of two noted American religious leaders, the first, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church and president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America:

Freedom to engage in free competitive enterprise is, in the long run, dependent upon another aspect of freedom, namely, the right of the individual worker to a job. A man who cannot get a job is not free.

Christianity believes that men and not things are the goal of social living. It believes in the solidarity of the human family and seeks to put the common good first. It believes in equal rights for all * * *. Democracy likewise insists upon the worth of the human being and recognizes the dignity of man. Speaking therefore as a Christian and an American, I regard the right to work as fundamental.

Then I should like to quote from Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, testifying before the same committee:

The time has, therefore, come to devise ways and means of implementing the individual's right to a job. There is no use in implementing his other rights if we overlook this basic right. The citizen has a right to the things that are necessary for life. For the ordinary wage earner this means a full-time job. In the last analysis, he must look to Government to protect this right for him.

Mr. Speaker, all over America the great church organizations are calling for the adoption of this full-employment bill because they realize it is the necessary first step in assuring continuing job opportunities for the working men and women of America.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman believe this bill will be a stimulant to private enterprise more than if it were not passed? I mean by that, if the bill were passed, does the gentleman believe that private enterprise would strive to provide employment for a larger number of people than if the bill were not passed, in order to provide work for everybody?

Mr. OUTLAND. I may say to the gentleman from California, who I am glad to say is a cosponsor of this bill, that in my judgment the bill will have two effects tending in the direction the gentleman mentioned. One will be that it will have a psychological effect, a moral effect, if you wish, which will be stimulating. In the second place, through the annual Budget and the implementation of that Budget it will be able to furnish business with information which will help business to provide the jobs itself.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the belief of the gentleman that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide a job for each of its citizens? If so, what kind of a job?

Mr. OUTLAND. The question just asked cannot be answered in a moment or two. I understand my time is about up. I will say that in a Nation which calls itself a democracy, which says that human rights come above every other right, and which says that equality of opportunity is a fundamental, the Government has the responsibility of assuring job opportunity for all of its citizens, yes.

Mr. CURTIS. What kind of a job? What kind of a job—the type of a job that an individual wants, or a job?

Mr. OUTLAND. Over the United States, as a whole, the job opportunities should equal or exceed the number of people looking for jobs. I do not think you are going to put every person who wants a white-collar job in a white-collar job. I do not think you are going to put every person who wants to go into Congress into Congress. I do not think you are going to be able to guarantee that an individual can do just exactly as he pleases. You are not going to lead him by the hand from one job to another. But I do say that over-all job opportunities in America for those who are seeking work and able to work should, in the last analysis, be assured by the Federal Government. There is no decent alternative.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a recent treatise on the Mexican Water Treaty as it was interpreted by the Mexican Government in order that the Members of the House may have a knowledge of the interpretation of the Mexican Government as compared with the interpretation that was presented to the Congress at the time the treaty was agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, this extension will exceed the regular two pages by about a page and a half or more. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Hon. W. Stuart Symington, Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, relative to the disposition of surpluses to veterans.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a news release.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of H. R. 2202 may be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks, and I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain papers to which I shall make reference.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I hope the gentleman will agree that the names of the 116 cosponsors go in in connection with the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is no part of my remarks. I do not care to include them. If you wish to do so, you may include them in your remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. I suggest that in view of the fact that each one of them are coauthors and only one Member can introduce a bill under the rules of the House—but I will not insist.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from California, permit me to say this occasion is not of my seeking. It was never my intention to criticize either the gentleman from California or the gentleman from Texas because of any claimed failure to appear before our committee. The only purpose was to call attention to the fact that they had not been back for cross-examination and I assume they will be. That was the understanding when they left.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield at that point, the gentleman will recall I did come back on 2 days before the committee and answered every question, or at least I tried to answer every question, and made myself available to the committee at all times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As always, the gentleman is agreeable.

The gentleman will have ample opportunity to answer questions before we finish the hearings. We will all be glad to meet him there and have him explain some of the propositions he has advanced.

One other thing—no one is responsible for any remarks which may be made by me here today except myself. I do not speak for any sponsors of this legislation nor for any opponents of this legislation nor for any Republican nor for the Republican organization.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. I just want to say that in the remarks I made earlier in the day I was speaking also as an individual and not as chairman of the group. I simply mentioned that incidentally.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a stranger might ask: Why is this bill here? The gentlemen who sponsor this bill would undoubtedly say that it is here because it has become necessary to place purchasing power in the hands of the people. Am I correct?

Mr. OUTLAND. I should like to hear the gentleman proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I get about the same answer that I did a moment ago.

Mr. PATMAN. I would like to answer that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I refuse to yield, Mr. Speaker. I get about the same answer to that as I did when I asked the gentleman whether this was an employment bill for all, or whether it was just a bill to benefit a certain group.

Some Members of the House have appeared before the committee holding hearings on the bill. Some members of the President's Cabinet have appeared. We had the Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith; we had the Reconversion Director, Mr. Snyder; we had Mr. Wallace, and we had Mr. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury. When their attention was called to the fact that a provision of the bill contained language indicating that it was a bill for the purpose of giving to all Americans able to work and seeking work, the opportunity for a job, and when I also called their attention to the fact that, under the terms of the bill and the administrative practices which prevailed, there would be excluded from any employment created by the bill something like 42,000,000 potential American employees, each and every one of them either refused to give a direct answer or gave an evasive answer. I have yet to hear one of the sponsors of the bill make the flat statement that he believes in and will advocate a policy which will give to every American citizen the right to work at a job which he may be able to find without being required to pay tribute. More of that before I finish.

It has been said the purpose of this bill is to place purchasing power in the hands of the average citizen so that unemployment may be avoided.

WHY THIS BILL NOW?

It cannot be successfully contended that at present there is widespread unemployment in this country because of a lack of jobs. There are plenty of jobs, but the jobs are not the kind of jobs employees who have lost their jobs in the war-production industries want or are willing to take.

Three things proponents of this bill tell us cause lack of purchasing power—a

scarcity of jobs, low wages, and lack of consumer market.

There are plenty of jobs, as a Nation-wide survey will show, but, as just stated, employees who have been accustomed to the high wages paid in the war industries just cannot reconcile themselves to taking a job at a lower wage; hence, there is unemployment.

There are several hundred thousand employees out of work at present because of the strikes.

Nor can it be said that present low wages contribute to a lack of purchasing power, because the average wage paid throughout the country today is higher than ever before.

Nor is there a lack of a consumer market. There is a scarcity of consumer goods, accentuated by the shipment abroad of tons of material of all kinds which, if retained here, would tend to lower the cost of living.

To repeat, your attention is called to the fact that during the war years we have had full employment. Generally speaking, everyone who wanted a job has had an opportunity to work. During those years, wages paid have been higher than ever before. At the same time there has always been a consumer's market for everything that anyone could place on the market. We have had full employment. We have had money, many times as much per capita as ever before, with which to buy, and we have had goods, except as food and materials were sent abroad. So that it cannot be that this bill is now proposed to end unemployment or to provide purchasing power at the present time.

The proponents of the bill say that looking toward the future, they anticipate—because there always has been in the past, booms and depressions—they anticipate another depression, and they want, and we all agree with them, that we should cut the tops off the booms and raise the floor of the depressions so that there will not be so much unemployment and so many failures in business, so much suffering among our people. That is all laudable.

When the gentleman inquires as to who is against full employment, of course no one answers. His error in assuming that someone does not want jobs for all grows out of the fact that he assumes that his way, the way of those who agree with him, is the only way to create and maintain employment and prosperity in this country.

Some people believe, honestly, sincerely, and with their whole mind, that the enactment of this bill and kindred legislation will destroy free enterprise, the liberty, the freedom, the opportunity, the prosperity, and the happiness of the average American citizen; that it will destroy our republican, representative form of government.

Yesterday in committee, we listened to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and I will put part of his testimony in the RECORD. I was amazed to hear the gentleman say that private industry could not be expected to and would not provide the jobs in the future; because its primary objective was profit.

When the gentleman from California was making his opening statement, the following occurred, and I quote—and I quote correctly:

Mr. VOORHIS. I am quite frank to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is my judgment that it is too much to expect that private industry can provide full employment for our people. I do not believe, in the first place, that private industry is set up to do that kind of a job. In saying that I do not mean that I do not think that all the jobs could be given by private industry, because I think they might well all be given by private industry, and the closer we approximate that situation the better, in my judgment. But what I do mean is that to expect private industry in America to assume a responsibility for employing all the peope who are ready and able and willing to work is not in accord with the fundamental structure of industry.

* * * * *

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did I hear rightly when I thought I heard you say that business either could not or would not furnish the jobs?

Mr. VOORHIS. What I said was that to expect business to take primary definite responsibility for full employment was unreasonable, so long as we operate on the American system of industry; that business was in business for the purpose of making a profit; that employment was therefore incidental to its operation, and not primary, and that if any responsibility for the over-all employment opportunity of the people was to be taken by anyone, it had to be taken by Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, your answer, briefly, is that in the future we cannot rely upon private enterprise to furnish the necessary jobs?

Mr. VOORHIS. That is not quite what I said, Mr. HOFFMAN.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I misunderstood you.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think I made it quite clear in my statement that it was altogether possible for government to pursue policies which would make all employment private employment. I am not saying that the jobs cannot in overwhelming proportion be private jobs; least of all that I would not want them to be private jobs; but I am saying that in the absence of a worth-while and far-sighted Government program to create a situation in which there will be opportunity for private business to give employment, you cannot place primary responsibility upon business to give the employment on its own motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What you were saying and what the record will show you said, in substance, was that we could not expect private enterprise to assume the responsibility of furnishing employment in the future?

Mr. VOORHIS. Furnishing full employment to all people ready and willing to work, without certain assistance on the part of the Government.

I was amazed that such a statement should be made by any Member of the House, by anyone who believed in our system of government. Then to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], I put in substance this question, I put it in one form or another to Wallace, Vinson, Snyder, Smith. "Is it not true that under the system which we followed in this country prior to the thirties the man who worked with his hands for his livelihood had more of everything, material things, food, clothing, homes, this, that, and the other, more of education, more of opportunity for free worship than any individual living elsewhere—anywhere in the wide, wide world?" And every one of them said "Yes." The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] was very emphatic on that point.

Now, naturally, the question comes to me: If we had the best for over 150 years—under our system, if our way has given the average man, the man in shirt sleeves and overalls, has given to him more of the good things of life—I ask why, why throw it away and experiment with a system which in times gone by in other nations has been shown to be ineffective and to bring about unemployment, business failures, disaster, war and destruction, and the shackling of the liberty of the citizen? I wish those who always want to tinker and play with a system that has been good, as the kid plays with the clock, gets it apart and cannot put it together—I wish they would either tell me why they pay no regard to the lessons of experience or let our system, the vital principles of our government, alone and confine these endeavors to perfecting the details of administration.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I think what the gentleman states is true, that everyone had the good things of life; but the sad thing is they had not paid for it. They were buying on credit, they were buying everything they could. They had it, but they were buying on credit.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means the individual.

Mr. GRANGER. Yes. When the time came that he had to pay for it then is when he got into difficulty.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is not the fault of the system. That is the fault of human nature, that is the fault of greed, selfishness, an example of people spending more than they had—borrowing without thought of the morrow, just as the New Deal has spent, spending money it did not have, borrowing on the future—and then came the pay day; and only a war, with its million casualties and a $250,000,000,000 debt, saved it from an accounting; and the gentleman—I am glad for the gentleman's contribution—he has called attention here to just what happened—is happening—to our Nation by citing what happened to the individual.

It was on October 19, 1932, at Forbes Field, in Pittsburgh, that Candidate Roosevelt, among other things, said:

Now the credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If in some crisis, it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms.

But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy. For over 2 years our Federal Government has experienced unprecedented deficits, in spite of increased taxes.

* * * * *

This simply means that one-third—33⅓ percent—of the entire income of our people must go for the luxury of being governed.

That is an impossible economic condition. Quite apart from every man's own tax assessment, that burden is a brake on any return to normal business activity.

* * * * *

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production.

If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and hence in hordes of the hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain.

Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or as now, in broad cessation of employment.

* * * * *

Now I am going to disclose to you a definite personal conclusion which I adopted the day after I was nominated in Chicago. Here it is: Before any man enters my Cabinet he must give me a twofold pledge of—

1. Absolute loyalty to the Democratic platform and especially to its economy plank.

2. Complete cooperation with me, looking to economy and reorganization in his department.

I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues of this campaign. In my opinion, it is the most direct and effective contribution that Government can make to business.

A statement of fundamental economic truths. How unfortunate that, in tinkering with, in taking apart, our economic system, our constitutional form of government, those principles, those promises, were forgotten by those in control of the majority party.

The Nation, prior to the war, which, as just stated, saved it from national bankruptcy and repudiation, like the spendthrift described by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], found the day of reckoning was at hand. It had spent its money, as I shall attempt to point out, foolishly, wastefully, extravagantly, corruptly, and the unemployment so feared by the proponents of this bill still existed.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. I am just wondering if the gentleman can explain why during the depression years, especially in the city of Detroit, there were many, many people who starved to death and were brought to the hospitals in such condition from starvation that they could not be taken care of.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK], I say I do not doubt his sincerity but I do doubt the accuracy of the people who gave him his information. I doubt the source of his information. If people starved in Detroit, that is news to me. I live over on the west side of the State, the gentleman lives in the northern part of the State. I am sure he will not assert that anyone ever starved in the Northern Peninsula. Does he?

Mr. HOOK. Listen! I was in the city of Detroit and saw the ambulances come to the hospitals with people who were in such starving condition they were beyond help from doctors' care.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK], I cannot question, and I never have questioned, intentionally, the accuracy—unless there were some figures to show it—of any Member's statement. Perhaps he is referring to the period when Frank Murphy, later Governor, now Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was mayor of Detroit and the city went bankrupt. I was not, I am not, personally familiar with conditions at that time.

It certainly is news to me that starving people were taken to the hospitals. I am sure it would be news to the charitably disposed citizens of the city of Detroit to learn that people starved to death there. I am shocked to think, if the gentleman saw these ambulances taking starving people to the hospitals, that he as a lawyer did not make an appeal to the courts in the city of Detroit and secure the relief which, under the law, they could secure. If I saw a man starving—and I think this is true of every other Member of the House—I would take off my shirt or shoes and sell or pawn them to keep him from starving, and so will ever other American citizen. The gentleman from Michigan is the first man, other than those who were in the war areas, I ever know who claims to have seen a starving man being sent to a hospital in order to sustain life.

Mr. HOOK. That is the place they should take them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; they should have been cared for before.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to be courteous, but I must make my argument.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I thought there was maintained a relief roll in Michigan where needy people, no matter what the circumstances of others closely associated with them might be, might appeal and get relief.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Cities, counties, and the State provide all needed relief. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I have never traveled much, I have never been around, but in the southwestern part of Michigan I never heard of anyone starving or going hungry. If we heard that people were not having all they should, either the local charitable organizations, the community chest, the Red Cross, or the aid societies of the church took care of them and were glad to help. What the condition may be in centers of population where the people insist on living where they cannot grow the things they eat, where there are no jobs for which they are suited, I have no knowledge.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As one who was born in Detroit and now represents a part of that great city, I am compelled to challenge the statement of our colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]. If any such thing as that occurred it never appeared in the public press, to my knowledge, and never came to my attention, and I have lived there nearly 60 years.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

Mr. HOOK. I can tell you when it happened. I can give you the circumstances.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not challenge the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK], that people starved to death in Detroit. I simply say it is not so. Such a statement is not substantiated by the facts. Anyone with any information either in Detroit or in this House knows that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is not justified by the facts in making any such statement and I would be ashamed of myself if I made it.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I hope the gentleman will not permit anyone to take him away from this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In reply to the gentleman, may I say that if you give me the time, even if it is midnight, I will get back to the bill and discuss it before I quit.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman was allowed 20 minutes and the gentleman from California 20 minutes. That time was doubled. A while ago the gentleman asked for an additional 10 minutes, which was all right. I am not going to object, but I happen to have time following the gentleman and I would not like for him to take too much time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How much time has the gentleman?

Mr. PATMAN. Thirty minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman want to come in now?

Mr. PATMAN. No. The gentleman may go right ahead. I will be glad to follow him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that he and I have imposed upon the patience of the House many times, sometimes for hours, and neither of us should find fault with the other for asking additional time. As far as I am concerned, when I get through, I am perfectly willing that he shall have 2 hours instead of 30 minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Once more, and then please.

Mr. HOOK. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at the time that the mayor of the city of Detroit came to Washington in the deep

depths of the depression, he gave those facts to the President of the United States and then there was relief brought to the great city of Detroit from the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue my argument.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Seriously, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, briefly, but then please let me go on.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman from Detroit can easily bring proof of his statement to this House if it is true. If you had people starve in Detroit it would be shown on the records of the death statistics that they died from starvation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us start in on the bill. This bill and the interpretation given to it by the members of the Cabinet who have appeared, and by the Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, and the Director of Reconversion, Mr. Snyder, is not a bill to guarantee full employment to everyone.

That was made clear by the testimony of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. So far as I have learned, not one of its sponsors claims that it will give a job to everyone who may at any time be unemployed.

That is why some of us say that its title is a fraud, an imposition upon the public, for many people writing and wiring, insisting upon its passage, fully believe that if it becomes law there will in the future be hung up somewhere a full-time job for everyone, and at remunerative pay under ideal working conditions.

The bill is being paraded under a false label. It is not a cure for anything. It is merely a sedative. Some of its most ardent sponsors say it only provides a remedy for an emergency, a back-log upon which we may rely when people, through overexpansion, speculation—one reason or another—bring disaster upon themselves and their neighbors.

H. R. 2202, WHAT IT IS; WHAT IT PROPOSES TO DO

The bill provides for a Presidential budget to be submitted annually, showing the need or the lack of need for future employment and investment necessary to create full employment.

The budget would also point out necessary useful public works which, by the expenditure of the taxpayers' money, anticipated unemployment could be avoided.

Agreeing that there will always be a need for public works and conceding that we should, in times of prosperity, plan for the construction, in times of depression, of necessary useful public works, this bill is unnecessary because we have a budget, a plan, several of them in fact. Let me name some:

First. For the construction of highways and bridges.

Second. For flood control.

Third. For rivers and harbors.

Fourth. For airports.

Fifth. For post office buildings.

Sixth. For reclamation.

Seventh. The Steagall amendment, which placed a floor under agricultural prices.

Three billion five hundred million dollars have already been appropriated, authorized, or requested for the construction of future public works; these of necessity will give employment.

Why another budget?

Then it provides for a committee composed of House and Senate Members to check over and to determine what sort of public works, what sort of legislation, tax or any other kind of legislation, be passed to aid private enterprise in creating jobs.

The bill provides that, if private enterprise fails to create the necessary jobs to take up the slack or unemployment, the Federal Government shall use Federal money in the construction of worthwhile useful work to create that employment. Thus seeks to avoid the boondoggling days, the waste of money, which occurred in the thirties. That, I think, covers the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman does not mean that the joint committee can solely recommend the creation of public works to provide employment. The joint committee under the terms of the bill can make any recommendations that it sees fit which it feels might aid the situation that has developed or is developing to insure full employment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is correct, and I thought I covered that. The bill provides that the President send down a budget. That is the plan for future employment. Then it provides for the creation of a committee, and then the committee takes the plan and goes over it and recommends either tax legislation, any sort of legislation, or—and it may be "and"—recommends a program of public works. Now are we agreed?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman has covered it now when he says "Tax legislation or any other kind of legislation," but he did not cover it at the outset when he referred solely to public works.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I apologize, but when the gentleman looks at the RECORD tomorrow he will see by the official reporters' minutes that I did mention tax legislation and other legislation. I am sorry the gentleman did not hear me.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not rather ironical that at the very moment we are trying to streamline Congress to simplify the procedure and to cut down expenses, we bring in such a bill as this that would create a new committee or commission at an additional expense to overlap and duplicate the functions of already existing agencies?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is. Especially when there are agencies already in existence which can do the same job.

Mr. SHORT. Do we not have a Committee on Rivers and Harbors to look after navigation and a Committee on Flood Control to look after flood-control projects? There is also a Committee on Public Roads. What are the committees of this House for, and why should we bring in legislation when there is a Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to decide the number of airports we will have in this country?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has called attention to established agencies and anticipated some of the remarks I intended to make.

Mr. SHORT. I did not anticipate such genius.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What the gentleman has said should have occurred to any Member of this House. My question is: Why another budget, when already, as the gentleman has said, we have highways and bridges, rivers and harbors, flood control, airports, post office buildings, reclamation, and no doubt many other agencies, all engaged in Government spending?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I hold in my hand a communication from the Bureau of the Budget dated October 10, showing that as of that date there were already funds available subject to obligation of $1,123,600,000 for public works construction funds, and $46,250,000 for plans and specifications, which are available from appropriated funds or from loans and grants. That was as of October 10. Since that time the House of Representatives has approved a $770,000,000 authorization for airports. The tabulation I have just read from the Budget Bureau does not comprehend all of the funds that are available for public works authorizations. We have also before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds an authorization bill for $98,000,000, but that does not tell the whole story because the Post Office Department has sent up a program to the Congress and it has on the trestle board plans and specifications for a $880,000,000 construction program for post offices throughout the land. Right now before the Deficiency Committee there is a bill which would provide for $99,000,000 of construction for the Bureau of Reclamation alone, and $123,000,000 for construction of flood-control projects.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield any further. I ask that the gentleman put at least a part of the remainder in today after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has finished.

This is a part of what we have been doing, this is what we have already planned for, and this figure is right, I think; in fact, I know it. Three billion five hundred million dollars of public works already planned, and $107,000,000 is either asked for, appropriated, or authorized—they will get it—for planning alone.

On October 18 the message from the President called for—and they are getting it—$50,000,000 for 1946, and in addition contract authorization for $57,500,000 a total of $107,000,000, for planning.

So I say, where do we get the idea that we must have another body and another planning commission when the Congress has already provided for so many? Instead of other agencies planning to spend money, one or two should devote their attention to saving money.

There is one other difficulty. This provides that the President shall send down a budget. Just how difficult that is, permit me to illustrate by calling attention to the attempts of two former Presidents to do that very thing. President Hoover, you will recall, said something about two chickens in every pot and two cars in every garage. You remember? But then it did not come about that way, and because it did not he lost a national election; and ever since, although he was merely trying to clean up the mess left by the First World War, unjustly, unfairly, he has been belittled and abused.

President Roosevelt took a fling at it. Here is what he said, and note these dates. October 12, 1936:

This administration has shown the way because it had the will to do. We have sought and found practical answers to the problems of industry, agriculture, and mining.

On the 14th, 2 days later, he said:

Today those factories sing the song of industry, markets hum with bustling movement, banks are secure, ships and trains are running full.

Again, on the 21st of October, a few days later, he said:

Recovery is with us. Federal revenues are increasing. Emergency expenditures are decreasing. A balanced budget—

Let me repeat that:

A balanced budget is on the way.

He also said:

We planned it that way.

Then what happened? Permit me to read from his second inaugural address—January 20, 1937:

I see millions of families—

This was less than 100 days later than his cheering statements:

I see millions of families trying to live on incomes so meager that the pall of family disaster hangs over them day by day.

I see millions whose daily lives in city and on farm continue under conditions labeled indecent by a so-called polite society half a century ago.

I see millions denied education, recreation, and the opportunity to better their lot and the lot of their children.

Does that sound like some of the arguments we hear in favor of this bill and the conditions which its sponsors say exist and because of which they demand the enactment of this bill?

I see millions lacking the means to buy the products of farm and factory and by their poverty denying work and productiveness to many other millions.

Then he concluded:

I see one-third of a Nation ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished.

President Hoover tried to make a prediction, a budget, if you please, for the future; President Roosevelt tried to describe the country's then condition, tried to make a prediction. Each made the effort. We will admit, I think, that each tried honestly and sincerely and used all the information that was available at that time, and each had the resources of the Federal Government at his disposal.

I asked Mr. Wallace the other day over here in the committee, "What about those predictions—they went astray." And this last one that the President made for emphasis in his fireside chat on March 9, 1937. The other ones were in October of 1936. The President said:

I want to talk with you very simply about the need for present action in this crisis.

You know there has always since the coming of the New Deal been a crisis. The New Deal rode in on a crisis after the last boom which followed the last war. Ever since it came in, for some unaccountable reason, in spite of the expenditures of millions and billions of dollars and the creation of thousands and hundreds of thousands of jobs, that or succeeding crises have been our ever-constant companions day and night. A nightmare, even in waking hours.

The President said:

I want to talk with you very simply about the need for present action in this crisis, the need to meet the unanswered challenge of one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed.

I asked Secretary Wallace here on Tuesday last about those statements. I read those statements to him and I called his attention to Hoover's statement. This is what he said. Mr. Wallace replied:

I would say that, equally with President Hoover, his optimism—

That is, President Roosevelt's optimism—

outran his judgment.

Later Mr. Wallace said:

I would assume that both President Hoover and President Roosevelt, not being bound by the objectives as set forth in this bill, were being governed by the immediate—

Then I saw where the gentleman was getting, and I interrupted him. Perhaps it is regrettable that I did. He said they were being governed by the immediate—what? Probably he intended to mean or to say, "the immediate future, the political expediency." But I cut him off because I did not want him to say that. I said:

Wait a minute. You are not going to go into expediency?

Mr. WALLACE. No; you can help me out, Congressman, if you will.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be delighted to—and I said "out." And there is nothing personal about that, either.

I cite those two examples of how two Presidents, one labeled a conservative businessman—too conservative, reactionary, some say—the other liberal to the extreme, some believed liberal to the extent of being radical—failed, and failed miserably, when they attempted to predict what the future would be as to our economic and business conditions and as to the degree of employment or unemployment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. There have been other candidates for President of the United States who indulged in campaign oratory.

This plan of deficit spending to relieve unemployment has been tried before. A full employment bill was tried in France and it lasted 6 months. It was tried here in the United States in the early thirties. Millions—yes, billions—of dollars were spent to create jobs to relieve unemployment, but unemployment was not ended. Nor was it, may I say, materially reduced.

As an illustration: The AFL gave us figures showing 11,926,000 unemployed in 1932. The CIO said there were 11,652,000. Government spending went into effect, but in 1933 there were 14,000,000 unemployed, according to the CIO; in 1934, 12,000,000; in 1935, 11,000,000; in 1936, 11,000,000; in 1937, 9,000,000; in 1938, 11,000,000; in 1939, 12,000,000.

Yes; we spent billions upon billions of dollars, but the remedy never cured unemployment.

I have been unable to get the figures for 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944, except that estimates from the Census Bureau are as follows—but remember, expenditures for the war, which a few in high positions apparently knew was coming, began long before December 7, 1941:

1940:	
March	7,960,000
December	6,320,000
1941:	
March	5,950,000
December	3,310,000
1942:	
March	3,230,000
December	1,400,000
1943:	
March	1,060,000
December	890,000
1944:	
March	870,000
December	660,000

The figures just given are merely monthly estimates based upon a sample lot of questions asked certain selected groups and then inflated as representative of the whole country.

The figures for the various years made by several agencies are as follows:

Estimates of number of unemployed for month of January in years listed, as set up by organizations and individuals named

	Alexander Hamilton Institute	Robert R. Nathan (President's Committee on Employment Security)	National Industrial Conference Board, New York City	American Federation of Labor	Congress of Industrial Organizations
1929	4,204,000	3,140,000	2,083,000	3,060,000	3,794,000
1930	5,262,000	4,035,000	3,144,000	3,919,000	4,585,000
1931	10,082,000	7,648,000	7,923,000	8,169,000	8,414,000
1932	13,425,000	10,905,000	11,397,000	11,926,000	11,652,000
1933	16,103,000	13,390,000	14,262,000	15,166,000	14,492,000
1934	13,528,000	11,469,000	11,544,000	13,382,000	12,669,000
1935	12,559,000	10,485,000	11,234,000	11,695,000	11,741,000
1936	11,454,000	9,688,000	9,434,000	10,952,000	11,020,000
1937	9,250,000	8,076,000	7,574,000	9,241,000	9,751,000
1938	11,809,000	10,265,000	10,328,000	10,926,000	11,714,000
1939	11,552,000	11,029,000	10,012,000	11,369,000	12,323,000

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. In view of what the gentleman said——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who?

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman feel it might be beneficial if we place in this bill some provisions along the lines suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] yesterday when he said he thought one thing that was lacking in the bill was that it did not set up a board or commission to gather the statistics and information for the Chief Executive?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no. The President has boards and commissions and agencies almost without number. I do not know how many hundreds and thousands of employees there are. We gave him 10 secretaries not long ago and each one of them has a secretary and the secretary has a secretary and so on down the line.

They now have all the employees they need, and the point is this: No man, no group of men can anticipate, can take account, of all the things that you must have if you are going to accurately estimate what is coming, no more than the farmer can anticipate what will happen to affect his crops.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand this bill, it calls for a budget as to jobs—jobs in private industry, and all other kinds of jobs. How can the Government budget something it does not control, or does this bill propose to control all jobs?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. If you will let me go ahead, I will try to pick that up later.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. I think the gentleman is correct when he implies that the formulation of a national productive employment budget would be a very difficult task. I doubt if anyone wants to minimize that task, but because it is difficult, is that the basic reason why the gentleman believes we should not have a full employment bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a moment. I did not say I did not think we should not have a full employment bill. Where do you get the liberty of sticking that in my mouth?

Mr. OUTLAND. I am sorry if I put it into the gentleman's mouth. I am kind of inferring that from what he said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The point I am making is that it is impossible for any group of men to get enough facts together, to weigh them correctly enough, so that they can make an accurate prediction 6 months hence as to the need for jobs.

Mr. OUTLAND. And because it is difficult we should not try it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, not at all. Business has been trying, and business did over a long period up to the coming of the New Deal—succeed to a remarkable degree—far better in fact than in any country that tried the plan the gentleman advocates—there were depressions and there were booms—but business—private employment—did, as you and everyone else will admit, and as the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] admitted yesterday before the Committee, establish here in America the best system that ever existed, and under our Constitution and in partnership with the American workingman together they, employer and employee, farmer and clerk, without the aid of New Dealers, labor racketeers, or organizations or adjusters, made it work efficiently—not perfectly, but efficiently. And so efficiently, as I said before—oh, ask the boys coming back from the war theaters whether they liked the things they found across the sea or whether they want to be at home under, according to some people, our disgraceful, inefficient system. Here is home and most of us love it and are content.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] has mentioned the tremendous amount of Federal obligations for public works. The gentleman from Michigan has spoken of that as amounting to $3,500,000,000. The gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] called attention to the small attendance of Members here today caused by the strike. Does the gentleman think if the President in the so-called National Budget provided for in this bill misestimates the so-called size of the laboring forces available that strikes could bring about many changes in the estimates and affect his accuracy in estimating the laboring force?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Every Member can answer that question for himself.

The real purpose back of this and other kindred bills and legislation heretofore adopted, as interpreted and administered by the last and the present administrations, is to give to the Federal Government increased opportunity for the exercise of arbitrary power.

This bill, H. R. 2202, to my mind, is just a part of a sort of jigsaw puzzle. You put the things all together, the things we have in the books and the things that are proposed, and instead of being part of a plan to create jobs through Federal enterprise, some of us believe it is part of a plan, whatever may be the purpose or intent of those who advocate it, that will result in Federal control, statism, regimentation. Why do I say that? Because experience over the past few years demonstrates that very thing. That is one reason why some of us fear this bill.

We have as a companion to this measure the 25–26 bill, which, for 26 weeks, would pay $25 a week to those who are out of jobs, and who are found by the United States Employment Service unable to find a suitable job. Another part of that plan in the minds of some is this demand of the Chief Executive that this unemployment service, which the Congress the other day said should go back to the States, is to be retained by the Federal Government.

Now, what do you have? If you put those two together, the payment of the $25 for 26 weeks and the unemployment board determining who gets the $25 per week in the hands of the Federal Government, you have the Federal Government in a position to give to some 8,000,000 unemployed and that is its estimate—$25 a week for 26 weeks—when the Federal Employment Service comes along and says he cannot find what? A job? No. No. "A suitable job."

Eight million unemployed drawing $25 a week is $200,000,000 per week and, for 26 weeks, it amounts to $5,200,000,000—a tidy little sum capable of effective use around election time. And don't forget that long ago a Democratic committee of the other body found that money appropriated for charitable purposes was used down in Kentucky to corrupt the voters.

If you will read the newspaper articles by Mr. Stokes, who has been going around the country, you will find that, while many have been thrown out of jobs, there are, in almost every instance, and I know it is true in the rural sections of Michigan, jobs waiting.

Jobs waiting? You will find that the refusal to take the jobs, where available, grows out of that very very human characteristic of wanting to get all we possibly can, each and all of us, for as little as we may be required to give in return. For example, in Willow Run some 30,000 employees were out of jobs. The most of them went back to the places whence they came. That was a fine solution. Some of them who had saved their money started in small business, some bought little farms to take care of themselves in the American way. But there were others who were thrown out of employment, men and women who had been working in war production factories, getting $1.50 and more an hour. They operated power presses. They worked with machines. They conceived the notion they were skilled workers. They were not. Some of them pushed a button and the press went up and down or the material went through the machine. That is all they did; they were not skilled workers. They did not do any more than the man who followed the plow between the plow handles and clucked to his team or sat on a tractor and drove it. They would not dig, and I am not criticizing them for it, perhaps we would all do the same thing—they would not take another job which I might say was dirtier.

Where is the factory worker who has been working in a nice, clean, well-lighted factory building who wants to step out in the barnyard in the spring and haul out the fertilizer, standing maybe up above his ankles in the dirt and filth? Nobody wants to make that change. Where is the man making $1.50 an hour who wants to work for $1 or for 75 cents an hour? That is what is the matter.

We have had a war and the boys who went across and could not stay home made their sacrifices, and we who stayed at home do not want to make any sacrifices because of that something within us which impels us to want more each day than we had the day before, which drives us on, ever on, to a higher standard for ourselves and those we love and for our children whose future we wish to make easier than was our own childhood. That is the thing that makes America.

That is the thing that has led us to where we are, that has brought us prosperity and this liberty and this freedom which we enjoy.

But there always comes a time to all of us when we have to begin to go back; we all have to begin to go back in health, in comfort, as we grow older and sometimes that comes to folks in the prime of life, and we just have to get along on less than we had before. To me one of the finest things that any American can show is that willingness to sacrifice at the moment for the future good, for the good of those who follow and come after us, to take a little less and make some sort of sacrifice for the welfare of coming generations.

I hear so much talk about this increase in wages, just as though a manufacturer or businessman could profit if he went out of business. It cannot be done. I can see why a man wants more but there must be some place from which it can come before the increase can be paid. Under this bill, if private enterprise fails, it does not matter whether it fails because of OPA, one purpose of which was to get low-priced goods into the hands of the consumers, yet the effect of its rulings was to wipe the low-priced goods off the market, as you who have been keeping track of the situation know. In spite of that, I say, the businessman wants to go on. He wants to provide jobs. Internecine union strife is not the fault of the businessman, it is not the fault of the factory operator. Is it the fault of Mr. Higgins who closed his shipyards in New Orleans the other day because of jurisdictional strife between two great unions, is it his fault that men are out of work? His plants were worth according to the papers, $40,000,000. I have no idea that Higgins is going to starve to death if he never gives a job to another employee. I have no doubt but that he wants to go ahead and provide hundreds, yes, thousands, of jobs if he can, if he is permitted to do it without sustaining a loss. Perhaps he is like the Ford organization which during the war adopted the policy of foregoing the opportunity of making even one cent of profit, turning it all back to the Government.

I wonder how many Members of this Congress if they were in the position of Henry Ford, Sr., or Henry Ford II, would continue day after day, week after week, month after month, to bargain with Frankensteen, and Reuther, and Thomas, to take the abuse of labor leaders so-called, in order that they may keep their factory gates open and provide jobs? Many of us would just toss our hat in the street and say we were going here, there, or some other place, that we were through. Only a high degree of patriotism and self-sacrifice keeps some of those men trying to operate their factories.

And that is not the only law which creates and fosters unemployment. There is this National Labor Relations Act. Passed for what? To lessen the causes of labor disputes, yet ever since it went into effect in 1935 labor disputes have increased in number and in severity. And so have strikes. Collective bargaining is not the present purpose of the strikes. They bring collective pressure to bear, they fight among themselves.

Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, according to the press today, offered a suggestion that labor appoint a czar to settle their internal disputes; someone with authority to say, "Now, as a member of this union, or as an affiliated union of a parent body, you go so far and quit." "You do thus and so." There must be a head somewhere. There must be a boss some place, and if it is not the sovereign American people, then they will have to have some subordinate official.

Labor organizations at present are irresponsible. Too many of them have no regard for their pledged written word. They are a law unto themselves. They have no respect for their fellow citizens, their fellow workers; for the law. They will violate their agreement with the employer. They will disregard their duty to the people. They disobey the orders of their own officers. They riot and some of them, by their lawlessness, invite civil strife.

This administration has granted so many special privileges to labor, to labor politicians, to labor racketeers, to Communists within the Government employ and in positions of authority in the unions, that the law is openly defied.

It is apparent to the average citizen that there is a corrupt political alliance between some union racketeers and politicians and some administrative agencies. There is no other explanation for the tenderness—yes, for the support—given by law-enforcing officials to the violators of the law.

What have we now? What have we here in the city of Washington under this Wagner Labor Act, which was unjust to employers, which Lewis and Murray and Green have all branded as unjust, being misinterpreted, misadministered, or misapplied, as being on occasion a foe to their particular unions. You have today right here in Washington methods and procedure which smack of communism, where many engaged in operating a public transport system, with practically no warning, in complete disregard of the convenience, the health, and the welfare—and, may I add, the safety of the citizens of Washington—just sit down in their meeting hall and refuse to work.

In Michigan, back in 1937, we had some of the same organizations pulling the switches which deprived the fire department, the city waterworks, and the hospitals of light and power. Now who is there who will attempt to justify the extreme selfishness, the utter disregard of his neighbor's rights, to say nothing of his convenience and well-being, the conduct of those who in these cities strike and walk out, sit in a chair or go home and go to bed, and leave women and children and public employees to get to their work as best they may?

The point I am making is that this unemployment bill, while it pays lip service to private enterprise, in the end is just a part of that jigsaw puzzle or plan which, instead of letting private enterprise carry on under laws that are fair and just, kills more than a half million small businesses.

It was the President, you will remember, who said:

> In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

This administration lacks, as does the Congress—that is, you and I—the inclination or the courage to deal with the situation as we know it should be dealt with. So we have here in Washington today—now—a demonstration where the political ally of the last administration, the political friend of this administration, clearing through Sidney, stops the transportation system of the city and the business of the Government itself cannot be carried on efficiently. If they will turn off the light, shut off the water and the power as they did in Michigan, and, as they have, interfere with the food supply coming in from Baltimore on the trucks, it shows to all the low standard to which the administration has fallen. And the Congress—I will not repeat it. You know the thought.

Some time, and the day, I think, is not so far distant, we will have to deal with this situation and drastically, too.

Now I want to come back to the thing about which I asked my colleague from California. This bill says that all Americans shall have the right to an opportunity to work. There are 54,000,000 workers, employees, in the United States of America. Twelve million at the outside belong to the unions; forty-odd million do not belong. I asked Mr. Wallace and some of the other gentlemen who appeared, Mr. Vinson and the rest of them—I asked each and every one of them, I think—in substance this question: I said, "Do you think it is just, do you think it is right from a legal or a moral principle for the Congress of the United States, the representatives of all the people, to take the tax dollar of all the citizens and create a Federal job so that there will be an opportunity for employment and then by Federal regulation, under the National Labor Relations Act, and the decisions of the NLRB and the courts, refuse to the 52,000,000 whose money has been taken for that job, and to the men who are returning the opportunity to work at the jobs which we have created by the expenditure of the tax dollar"?

Now, you know the answer they made? It was just the same as the answer of the gentleman from California, no answer at all. There never has been and there never will be an adequate answer because there is none; there is none that any man who believes in right and justice or our system of government can make to that question except to say that every man in this country of ours should have equality of opportunity. That is one of the reasons why I think this bill is not, as it is written, a good bill.

There are many other points. You establish Federal jobs and immediately, in my judgment, you establish a system of competition with private enterprise. You go ahead and you raise wages when, with all due respect to the administration supporters, with all due respect to Mr. Reuther and to Sidney Hillman and to Philip Murray, who published those two books, and who say in them that you can increase wages 30 percent without

any increase in cost of the product that you can increase wages without increasing the price of the finished product—with all due respect to those gentlemen, I just do not believe it, any more than I believe that when you add two and two and one you get four. Keep on here in America raising wages and what will happen? Keep on continuing to give money to other countries to rehabilitate and reestablish themselves for what? As our competitors. Then what becomes of your American jobs? What becomes of the market for employees; what becomes of the jobs when you establish them abroad by boosting the cost here so that the price of the finished product is higher than what it is when it is made over there by their workers and brought back and sold here? There will be fewer jobs here—our markets will be flooded by goods made abroad by workers paid less than employers are forced to pay here.

THE BILL WILL NOT CURE, BUT WILL ENCOURAGE UNEMPLOYMENT

Perhaps the majority of us want more for less. We want less work; we want higher wages, higher salaries, bigger profits. Ambition and the desire for better living is one of the greatest forces creating progress. If practiced in moderation and with justice toward our fellow men, no harm will result.

Carried to extreme, as we have it today in the strike of the street car employees, which has tied up traffic here in Washington, it is an evil thing.

The strikers who paralyzed transportation here in Washington this morning are not only desirous of a higher wage, of a betterment in their working conditions—both laudable—but they are extremely selfish. They disregard, throw out of the picture, the welfare of those upon whom they must depend for their future livelihood.

They and others who are demanding higher wages—and no opinion is expressed as to the justice or the injustices of such demands—forget that, if the general public does not support their demands, does not purchase of the employers for whom they work, they will be out of jobs—and perhaps permanently.

This bill, by holding out to the dissatisfied—and the most of us are dissatisfied about one thing or another—opportunities for Federal jobs under easier working conditions and with higher wages than can be paid for similar services in private industry, will tend to increase labor disputes, labor turn-over, unemployment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I have listened to all this debate. The hardest workers in America have not been mentioned. They are the ones who are being discriminated against even by the policy we have, and would be further discriminated against by the passage of this law, the farmers of the Nation. I represent cotton farmers. I have been a workingman myself all my life. I have never seen anybody doing harder work than cotton farmers working in the hot sun, hoeing, plowing, and picking cotton. Yet the cotton farmer gets 1 cent an hour for his work for every cent a pound he gets for his lint cotton. Today, as I pointed out, he is making on an average of 22½ cents an hour, yet in everything he has to buy, he is paying for this vast spread between his income and the income of the industrial wage earner.

All farmers are competitors of cotton farmers. A cotton farmer can grow anything that is grown in your district, corn, wheat, hogs, cattle, dairy products, anything. Therefore, all farmers naturally gravitate to the economic level of the cotton farmer. So, if this kind of legislation continues, it is going to reduce the farmers of this Nation to peonage, if it has not already done it.

One more thing, I see a cry out here to put unemployed men on an unemployment pension roll at $25 a week. I have been a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation ever since it was created. I have been chairman of it for over 14 years. A pension of $25 a week for people who do not work is more than we are paying the battle-scarred, bullet-wounded, service-connected disabled veterans of the First World War, the Second World War, and every other war in which we have been engaged, on an average.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about a veteran without a leg?

Mr. RANKIN. A veteran without a leg? There is a young man in my town who got a leg shot off in the closing days of the last war. He suffered terrifically. For a long time he drew $42.50 a month. I finally got it boosted up a little.

Here they are proposing to pay men for not working, not only more than the cotton farmer gets for working, but more pension than the disabled veterans who fought the battles of this Nation in time of war, and sustain its institutions in time of peace, are now drawing as compensation for service-connected disabilities received on the battle fronts of the various wars through which we have passed.

While we are at it, we might turn the pitiless sunlight of publicity upon this proposition, and let us be reasonable about it, because I can tell you right now you can listen to all this howling over the radio by men like this fellow Adler, that said the other day, "We must do everything we can to abolish the United States." You can hear all these radicals and read all this stuff they send to you through the mail. But I want to tell you now the hard-working, sound-thinking businessman, the farmer, the little merchant, the man who owns a hotel or a filling station, the people, as I said, who support the Nation in time of peace and fight its battles in time of war, are not in favor of Congress stepping in and making this kind of discrimination that would drive the farmers of this Nation to the level of peonage and discriminate even against the men who were wounded in this or any other war.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. Does the gentleman agree with me that the pledge that will be made under the provisions of paragraph (e) on page 3 of the bill in question could develop into a pledge that Uncle Sam himself would be financially unable to keep?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, of course, because in spite of all the provisions in the bill which pay lip service to private industry, and that is stressed there, and the aid to private industry as coming through legislation or in some other way—I do not know what—if private enterprise fails, and it will if government continues to hamper and destroy. The Federal Government intends through deficit spending to create jobs by the construction of public works. That means financial ruin.

I agree with the gentleman that it will fail if the Federal Government continues to hamper business the way it has and to hamper industry the way it has. This bill pledges the Federal Government to spend whatever sums may be necessary in public work to create a sufficient number of jobs to end unemployment. I asked some of the witnesses if the Federal Government is to create the jobs—put it this way—of what avail is it to take the taxpayer's dollar and to start a Federal project creating jobs for the unemployed unless you have some assurance that those for whom the jobs were created will take them and work at them and not do as some do now, violate their contracts of employment and walk off and quit whenever they feel like taking a holiday?

Now, to get back to this bill. Let me restate it. The bill is not a bill to provide employment for all Americans—just jobs for union men in good standing. It is not a bill to give a job to the farmers, to the businessmen when unemployed.

It is a bill primarily devoted to the purpose of taking care of industrial workers who belong to the large unions. Under the practices of the last and the present administration and the provisions of the law now existing, it is that and only that. It is to take care of a very small segment—12,000,000 or less—of the great body of 54,000,000 workers. With that kind of legislation I cannot go along. Because it is vital let me say it again.

There is neither legal nor moral justification for a policy which takes the taxpayer's dollar, uses it to create a Federal job, then denies to the unemployed citizen the right to take and work at that job for the support of himself and his family unless and until he pays a union initiation fee, subsequent dues and assessments.

The statement of the principle is to show that it is unjust in a free republic; a denial of the citizen's right to earn a livelihood.

The nonunion man gets just as hungry, just as cold, needs shelter just as much as does the union man.

The present bill, interpreted and administered as are other Federal laws, would deny to the majority of the unemployed the right to work. True, the bill in words contains no such prohibition. Nevertheless it is there.

Unless there is equality of opportunity for employment, I will not support any plan providing for the expenditure of the taxpayer's money.

H. R. 2202

A bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Full Employment Act of 1945."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that—

(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States.

(b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right;

(c) In order to carry out the policies set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation; (2) foster and protect the American home and the American family as the foundation of the American way of life; (3) raise the standard of living of the American people; (4) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (5) contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise; (8) strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations, it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States;

(d) In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure;

(e) To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment; and

(f) Such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

THE NATIONAL PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT BUDGET

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session the National Production and Employment Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "National Budget"), which shall set forth in summary and detail, for the ensuing fiscal year or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate—

(1) the estimated size of the labor force, including the self-employed in industry and agriculture;

(2) the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, required to produce such volume of the gross national product, at the expected level of prices, as will be necessary to provide employment opportunities for such labor force (such dollar volume being hereinafter referred to as the "full employment volume of production"); and

(3) the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government (not taking into account any increased or decreased investment or expenditure which might be expected to result from the programs set forth in such Budget).

The estimates and information herein called for shall take account of such foreign investments and expenditure for exports and imports as affect the volume of the gross national product.

(b) The extent, if any, by which the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is less than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, shall for the purposes of this title be regarded as a prospective deficiency in the National Budget. When there is a prospective deficiency in the National Budget for any fiscal year or other period, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for encouraging such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure, particularly investment and expenditure which will promote increased employment opportunities by private enterprise, as will prevent such deficiency to the greatest possible extent. The President shall also include in such Budget such recommendations for legislation relating to such program as he may deem necessary or desirable. Such program may include, but need not be limited to, current and projected Federal policies and activities with reference to banking and currency, monopoly and competition, wages and working conditions, foreign trade and investment, agriculture, taxation, social security, the development of natural resources, and such other matters as may directly or indirectly affect the level of non-Federal investment and expenditure.

(c) To the extent, if any, that such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure as may be expected to result from actions taken under the program set forth in accordance with subsection (b) of this section are deemed insufficient to provide a full employment volume of production, the President shall transmit a general program for such Federal investment and expenditure as will be sufficient to bring the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, up to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production. Such program shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate additional non-Federal investment and expenditure. Any of such programs calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private concerns under contracts awarded in accordance with applicable laws, except where the performance of such work by some other method is necessary by reason of special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law.

(d) If the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is more than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both.

(e) The programs referred to in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall include such measures as may be necessary to assure that monopolistic practices with respect to prices, production, or distribution, or other monopolistic practices, will not interfere with the achievement of the purposes of this act.

(f) The National Budget shall include a report on the distribution of the national income during the preceding fiscal year, or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate, together with an evaluation of the effect upon the distribution of the national income of the programs set forth in such budget.

(g) The President may from time to time transmit to Congress such supplemental or revised estimates, information, programs, or legislative recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable in connection with the National Budget.

PREPARATION OF NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 4. (a) The National Budget shall be prepared in the Executive Office of the President under the general direction and supervision of the President, and in consultation with the members of his Cabinet and other heads of departments and establishments.

(b) The President shall transmit to the several departments and establishments such preliminary estimates and other information as will enable them to prepare such plans and programs as may be needed during the ensuing or subsequent fiscal years to help achieve a full employment volume of production.

(c) The President may establish such advisory boards or committees composed of representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, and others, as he may deem advisable for the purpose of advising and consulting on methods of achieving the objectives of this act.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the National Budget, to be composed of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, and Finance, and seven additional Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Labor, and Ways and Means, and seven additional Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation of the joint committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a study of the National Budget transmitted to Congress by the President in accordance with section 3 of this act; and

(2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1 of each year, its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget, together with a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year a general policy with respect to such National Budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of

the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena, or to testify when summoned, under authority of this section.

(e) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments.

(f) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

RATE OF EXPENDITURES

SEC. 6. (a) The President shall review quarterly all Federal investment and expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which the current and anticipated level of non-Federal investment and expenditure warrants any change in the volume of such Federal investment and expenditure.

(b) Subject to such principles and standards as may be set forth in applicable appropriation acts and other statutes, the rate of Federal investment and expenditure may be varied to whatever extent and in whatever manner the President may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring continuing full employment, with due consideration being given to current and anticipated variations in savings and in investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

AID TO COMMITTEES

SEC. 7. The heads of departments and establishments shall, at the request of any committee of either House of Congress, furnish such committee with such aid and information with regard to the National Budget as it may request.

INTERPRETATION

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed as calling for or authorizing—

(a) the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government;

(b) the use of compulsory measures of any type whatsoever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower;

(c) any change in the existing procedures on appropriations;

(d) the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the National Budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act; or

(e) the disclosure of trade secrets or other information, the publication of which might have a harmful effect upon the firm or person supplying such information.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, may I comment on one point raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]? The point was raised that this bill does nothing for the small businessman and nothing for the farmer. Unless the farmer has a market for his goods, and unless the businessman can sell to a customer, he is not going to get by in his job; and unless there is something that the cotton grower can sell and the corn raiser can sell, and unless there is somebody to buy the goods from the merchant, America is not going to be prosperous. This bill is beneficial not only to the industrial worker, but to the farmer, the laborer, the veteran, and businessman alike.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not insist just now as I have not spoken one word thus far on my time.

I will be glad to yield after I have spoken a few words. In a short time I will yield to any Member of the House.

In a short time I will yield to any Member of the House who wants to ask me a question after I have had an opportunity to proceed in answer to some of the major points that have been urged against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there has been more misunderstanding about this bill than any bill within my knowledge since I have been a Member of the Congress in the past 17 years. There has been more misinformation that is being put out about this particular bill than I have ever known in my 17 years as a Member of this great body. People are condemning this bill in a way and in a manner that they should not condemn it, and the gentleman from Mississippi was a fair example of it a while ago. He thought this was a bill, evidently, from the statement he made, that would give people a certain amount of money for not working, and he made the statement that it was giving them more than disabled veterans of World War I and World War II.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not say the bill did that.

Mr. PATMAN. Just a moment.

Mr. RANKIN. Do not misquote me.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not misquoting the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes, I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. PATMAN. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. RANKIN. I said there is a cry or a demand for a bill to give unemployed men $25 a week.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman then is not talking about this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I was talking about the demand coming from the same source. It is not in this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I am very glad that I yielded to the gentleman because the inference was that he was talking about this bill. Now it is clear that he was not talking about this bill. I am glad to get that information. It is not coming from the same source either.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I said that so far as the other proposition is concerned that 65 cents an hour was all out of line with farmers' income.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, since it was not about this bill, I hope the gentleman will not insist and take up my time.

Mr. RANKIN. But as to the $25-a-week proposition, I did not say it was in this bill, but I said there was a demand for it coming from the same source.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to get it clear that the gentleman was not referring to this bill and I will again add it is not coming from the same source. But information that it just as erroneous as that has gone forth about this bill. I repeat, there has never been a bill that has been so misrepresented as this particular legislation. It is very difficult to get anybody to say that they are against employment opportunities for the people. Why should they be against it? They should not. You know, we provide mighty good jobs for a few people. We have three and a half million Federal workers. They have been hardest hit of any group during the war, but they have had employment. We have patent rights given to big corporations, which give employment at big pay. We have monopolistic business and industrial institutions and concerns which do the same thing. We make it possible, through the climate that Congress creates, for millions of people to have good jobs, what might be called soft jobs, with health, retirement, hospital benefits, and everything else. So why should we not give a little consideration to that poor fellow, to that small-business man who is not within that group? Why can we not do just this much for him, just a little planning against what has happened in the past every 10 or 15 years since this great Government of ours was organized? If we do not have vision and foresight to plan for the future, this democracy is not as great as many of us think it is. The answer is, We do have that vision.

POINTS URGED AGAINST BILL

Let us consider some of the points that have been made in opposition to this measure. First, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] said a while ago that President Roosevelt made an awful mistake in 1932, and I agree that he made a statement which later on proved to be not 100 percent correct. But it was honestly and sincerely made. In 1936, when the veterans of World War I were getting their $2,000,000,000 paid out on June 15, everybody thought additional prosperity was in the offing, and that we would have good times. Optimism which was justified. President

Roosevelt, basing his statement upon that fact, gave out an optimistic statement, to which the gentleman referred a while ago. But President Roosevelt did not have at his elbow a board such as is set up by this bill that would have given him the correct information and which would have prevented him from making that mistake. That is one of the best arguments for this bill, because the people who are to have charge of administering this proposal would have told him, "No, Mr. President. Don't go too far, because there are brakes being put on; restrictive credit brakes through the Federal Reserve; double reserve requirements of banks, and reduction in public works, and those brakes are so strong that your statement might be incorrect."

If we had had just such an organization as is set up under this bill to guide the President, he would not have made that mistake, neither would other governmental agencies made the mistake of putting the brakes on too fast.

PRESIDENT HOOVER'S STATEMENT

On the other hand, there was President Hoover, and we will assume he was just as sincere, when he said in 1928, "We are going to have two cars in every garage and two chickens in every pot," and things like that. You remember those statements. We will assume he was absolutely sincere. But, of course, the people wound up with two mortgages on every home, a vacant garage, and instead of having two chickens in every pot, they did not even have a pot to cook in. So they were just out in the cold. If President Hoover had had a great organization like this at his elbow to advise him, "Mr. Hoover, you are going too far. We have coordinated all the statistical information and other available information from all governmental, financial, and private agencies and here is the outlook," doubtless Mr. Hoover would not have made that serious mistake.

So the argument that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], made, that he considered so devastating to the argument in support of this bill, is one of the greatest arguments we have for the adoption of this bill.

WHY ANOTHER BUREAU?

Now, about the other arguments that have been made against this bill, "Why another bureau? Why another budget?" We have a budget. Yes. It is a budget, but not a coordinated budget; not a budget that takes into consideration the things that are so vital to so many of the American people—that is, jobs. That budget does not do it. We had a law a few years ago that was known as the National Planning and Resources Act.

That agency had the right to do many of the things we are asking be done here, and had more power than we are asking for here; but a little rider placed on an appropriation bill that came here one day abolished the National Resources and Planning Board, and we wrote a stump speech into that amendment which told the Chief Executive of this Nation: "You leave that job alone until Congress tells you further to go into it." So, since we have told the Chief Executive that he would be going outside his jurisdictional authority if he were to attempt anything like this, I do not believe it is a proper argument to make that he has the power now. The first charge would be that the Chief Executive was usurping the power that Congress told him in plain language he had no right to assume. So this bill, H. R. 2202, gives the President the power that you have heretofore specifically taken away from him by language written in an appropriation bill.

Quite a lot of people say: "I am for full employment, I am for having jobs for everybody," but they do not do anything about it. You have seen these "Yes, but" people: "Yes, I am for it, but"—But! But! And the "buts" just push it clear off the board, and when you get through you have not got anything left. Yes, for it in general, but against the particular proposal presented. Now, I want to ask you who oppose this bill in all sincerity—there is no pride of authorship in this bill on the part of the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], who is joint author with myself and 114 other Members of the House; we have no pride of authorship—write your own bill. We do not care what it is; write your own words; we are not going to quibble about words; but write these things into it: That we must establish a policy; that we are against mass unemployment in this Nation. And then write these words into it—words that will cause that particular policy to be administered to the best knowledge and ability of the people charged with that duty. That is all we want you to do. Is not that asking little enough? Certainly it is. So write your own language.

POLITICS

Now I want to ask my Republican friends here to suggest a plan. You know a little clean politics is a good thing, clean partisanship is fine, clean debate is always very wholesome. I am one who believes in politics and I am one who believes that an American citizen who does not believe in politics is not the best kind of American citizen. I can give you, I believe, a good reason for this. Woodrow Wilson said that our Government is a democracy established upon the will of the people, upon the will and the wishes of the people. That is a good definition for a democracy and for a democratic government. How are you going to keep that government established upon the will and the wishes of the people except through politics? The citizen who says he is opposed to politics is in a way saying he is opposed to the people's ruling; that is what it amounts to. The only alternative is dictatorship or some form of regimentation. He cannot therefore be the best American citizen and not be for politics, because our Government is founded upon politics. So let us have clean politics. We do not want bad or corrupt politics or business; no, we want clean politics, and clean political squabbles and debates are always wholesome when any question comes up so great as this one. Where so much misrepresentation and misinformation is going out to the people of the country, I welcome it. So, I ask our Republican friends to stand by their promises since their candidate last fall whom they supported went out before the American people and said, "If you elect me our people will be for jobs, for full employment, for giving people opportunities to work," a statement that is stronger than the language in this bill. Since he went to the people upon that promise is it not logical to assume that the ones who sought office with him and who supported him and asked the people to vote for him and who were themselves elected or reelected should come out and say, "Now, we want to carry out those promises of our defeated candidate"? He was defeated, but principles live after candidates are defeated. Do not say now, "We are against this full-employment bill which you have introduced, H. R. 2202, we are going to be just 'aginners' and never offer anything." You know that is the least help anybody can offer, to be against a thing and never give any reason, just to be against everything that is proposed. So I ask the Republican leaders to consider getting up a remedy of their own. If you get up a good one I will be for it, others will too; so get up your own, do not be just "aginners." Say, "We are against H. R. 2202, but we are offering to bring you some kind of a full-employment bill that is better, and here is our bill." Bring it out and let us see it. That is what I think we should do. I do not think we should just speak against it and never offer any remedy.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] a while ago spoke about the farmers. I know he has a great interest in the farmers. It so happens, I suspect, that I am one of the very, very few Members in this great body who at one time has been a farmer in the field himself and knows something about everything that the gentleman from Mississippi does. I have a great interest in the farmers. I represent an agricultural district, and about the only interest I have is agriculture. But how can the people who are residing on the farms have good times if we do not have purchasing power in the hands of the people who buy what the farmer produces? Therefore it is in the interest of the farmer to create job opportunities for people, and good wages. Yes; I believe in good wages and I believe in good prices. Without good wages and good prices you might just as well kiss this national debt good-by; it can never be paid; I mean, with honest dollars. Of course, we could just pay it with worthless money. There is only one way we can pay this huge national debt of two hundred and sixty-two billion, and that is to have a national income that is high; one hundred and fifty billion or two hundred billion a year, otherwise we cannot pay this national debt. If we go back to the income of 1932 we find that the national income of all the people that year was $39,963,000,000; not enough to pay the running cost of our Government and amortize the national debt over a reasonable period of time and make the payments thereon. We would go back to poverty, distress, and misery again.

AGAINST DEFICIT FINANCING

This bill is planning against that. This bill is planning again deficit financing. It has been charged on the floor repeatedly that the Roosevelt administration

brought deficit financing to the country. That is not correct. You could not have anything else but deficit financing with a $39,000,000,000 income. You would starve the people to death. So we are planning against deficit financing. We are planning a way in order that the people can live decent lives, have job opportunities, where every person who is anxious and willing to work can have a job. Those are the people we are pleading for. If we have hard times again in a few years like we invariably have after every war—and after every war in the history of the world we have some inflation—then we will go down to the bottom of the depression again. But now we are going on without action, and we are sensible people, or supposed to be. We know it has happened every time in the past. Boom and bust. Would we not be very unwise, indeed, if we were to sit idly by and say, "Yes, we know it has happened, boom and bust; we know it has happened in the past; we know that a few rich people can go in during the panic and buy everything that the poor people have for a song, and not even have to sing the song; we know that will happen, for it has always happened, but we are not going to take any steps toward correcting that situation. We will just consider it is going to happen anyway." I do not think the people expect us to do that. I think the people expect us to plan against something that has happened after every war in the history of this Nation.

I know that this bill has been referred to as appropriating a lot of money and paying people a lot of money for jobs. It does not do any such thing. It has been referred to as a bill that would guarantee a job for everyone. There is not a word of truth in that statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say to the gentleman that he has given me encouragement and hope. When I listened a moment ago to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I felt pretty blue and despondent. He indicated a fatalistic attitude by showing that great Presidents had made wrong predictions and pointed out a sorry but inevitable state of things, saying, "We have always had depressions, we must always count on them." God forbid.

The gentleman is talking about planning—proper planning. Everybody is talking about planning, but some deride it and others base hope upon it. There are some folks who want business to do the planning. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, looking back over American history, if business did not do some planning before 1837, before 1857, before 1873, before 1893, before 1907, and before 1929? Look what was the result of such planning. Did not business do planning at that time?

COST OF PLAN

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely.

The question has been raised here as to what it will cost to have a few people coordinate the facts and the information to keep the Executive and Congress advised as to future job opportunities as proposed in H. R. 2202. I am going to answer that by saying it would be just as logical and reasonable if the question should come up, shall we meet here in the House tomorrow or shall we not, for some Member to arise and say, "How much will the ink cost to take down the proceedings of this body during the debates tomorrow if we meet?" It would be just as logical to use that illustration in view of the great good to come to millions by spending such a small amount.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. In connection with the question of cost, you set up the plans here for the submission of a budget. Assume that this is already a law and there comes to this House next year a message from the President in which he analyzes the situation which confronts the country and says, "By reason of the fact that the Congress abolished the excess-profits tax we find that business is taking those earnings that would have come to the Government and using them to expand and create jobs. We also find the purchasing power has increased because the Congress abolished certain income taxes, and we find that the people who benefited by that are now spending their money. Therefore, there is nothing now to indicate that it is necessary for the Government to step in to alleviate any unemployment, because we do not have any unemployment." That is a saving.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. I do not anticipate that we need anything to be done during the next few years while we have all the purchasing power, but let us plan against not tomorrow, not next year, but the next decade, the next two decades, or the next three. This is over-all planning against what has always happened after every war. It is proposed that plans will be made against inflation as well as unemployment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman has made the statement that this bill does not provide that the Federal Government guarantee full employment.

Mr. PATMAN. I made that statement, yes. Find the word "guarantee" in there.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What about section 2 (e) on page 3:

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer that question. The gentleman has asked a good question there. It is an intelligent question and I think I should answer it. I will do my very best to answer it.

That is right. Whenever we do everything we can for business, private enterprise comes first; that is the kind of business I am for. I am not for the Government being in private business. After we have done all that, let us throw a half a billion dollars' worth of public works into the mill, let us build some highways, and let us build some post offices, and create some jobs to take up the slack. That is what Mr. Thomas Dewey said he was for, that is what Mr. Hoover said he was for, that is what the great people of this Nation say they are for.

COORDINATION

If we have no coordination and we throw all the rivers and harbors improvement measures in at the same time with post offices and all kinds of public works, we might have a boom and inflation and everybody have jobs for a few months, and then everybody be out of a job; so why not have coordination provided for in this bill and say, "No, we do not want everything thrown in this way; we need only just enough that the post-office buildings will be enough to make up for it, or something else." But there is planning involved here, that is all, just planning against mass unemployment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the meaning of the words "to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment"?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; I am for it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If that does not mean that the Government is assuring full employment, what does it mean?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman overlooks the fact that this is just a recommendation. I am afraid the gentleman does not understand the bill. Let me tell him what the bill is. The bill does not authorize any appropriation, it appropriates no money, it makes no money available. It creates a commission of planners whose duty it is to plan against what has happened after every war, so as to try not to have it happen after this war. Then after they have planned and conferred with the Executive, they submit a report to carry out what the gentleman has said. Then Congress has got to pass on it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Then the gentleman contends that the words "assure" and "recommend" are synonymous?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know in that instance. I would not say offhand. The gentleman has probably given it a great deal of thought and I have not. But I want to say that this is not an authorization. It appropriates no money. It is to set up the machinery to plan against mass unemployment or ruinous inflation and make recommendations as to how it can be prevented. Then Congress will take the bill and decide for itself—after adopting amendments which it might see fit to adopt—whether or not those recommendations will be accepted. What more protection can the people and the taxpayers have than that?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It so happens there is one people in the world that operates on a budget. It is supposed that it operates on the basis of statistics available to it. The men who gather those statistics are just as good statisticians, I understand, as there are any-

where in the world. I refer to Russia. I should like to ask the gentleman what has been the experience under the Soviet regime in the operation of their economy on the basis of statistics?

Mr. PATMAN. Do not think for a moment that this is any Russian scheme, Dr. SMITH. It does not compare with Russia at all. Russia, I understand, has the work-or-starve law. If you do not work, you cannot eat. They pick out particular jobs for particular people. There is nothing in this bill like that. Russia stands for education. Are we communistic because we stand for education?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes so that I may answer further questions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I think you are getting off the subject just a little bit. I only referred to the matter of the Russian people basing their operations of their economy upon statistics, and I would like to know whether their statistics really work out?

Mr. PATMAN. We base part of our economy upon statistics, but what I object to is that they are not coordinated statistics.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Just a moment. I have made a study of the methods of operation of the Russian economy on the basis of their statistics. I want to say that the thing which makes the Russian economy click is not statistics but the knout and the concentration camp.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman does not think the sponsors of this bill want concentration camps. I have never heard of such a thing.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is my opinion that this bill anticipates regimentation and the concentration camp.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, the gentleman is entirely mistaken. He is entirely mistaken. That shows the gentleman has no conception of this bill at all. Let me say that there are a lot of people in this country that every time you bring up a subject which they are against will say, "That is communistic." They will say, "That is communism." They want to condemn it with a phrase.

In other words, they want to say something that might take a few words or a few hours perhaps to explain and condemn the thing with a phrase. It is a very popular thing to do nowadays. But I have noticed, and I am not referring to the gentleman from Ohio, that there are too many people in this country who are trying to hold up communism as a bad thing in the world, but never say anything about fascism. I am against both. But one of the earmarks of fascism is to condemn communism. But do not say anything about fascism. That is the way it started in Italy. That is the way national socialism, which was fascism, started in Germany, because the people were taught to hate communism, and all at once fascism was the only savior and it rushed in to take over the job. So I hope these people who say so much about communism, which I hate and oppose, and which I am against everywhere on earth—but I am also opposed to fascism—I hope we will not try to make the alternative in this country as they did in Italy and Germany, the question of fascism or communism. We do not want either. We want the kind of government we have, the finest and best Government on earth, established upon the will of the people.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Of course, I agree with the gentleman. I am against fascism and also communism. But the gentleman is talking about the value of coordinated statistics. Does not the gentleman also want to emphasize the importance of accurate statistics in considering this measure?

Mr. PATMAN. Why, certainly. We want the most accurate statistics it is possible to obtain.

Mr. CHURCH. Then referring to section 2 (b) on page 2, and as the gentleman knows, I have been anxious to obtain definitions and accurate definitions of these words:

> (b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right;

Who will determine all those things so so that those statistics will be accurate—that the work will be useful, remunerative, regular, and so forth? Who will determine that? Will the individual himself do that?

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman is placing too much emphasis on words. We are not particular about words. Write your own words. Write your own remedy. Present it to the committee. Present it to the House. If these words are not good, put in, some words of your own. There is nobody going to quibble over words on this great problem. But do this: Establish a legislative policy, and this bill establishes a good one. Then, after you establish the legislative policy, put provisions in the proposal that will permit the administration of that policy if enacted into law. Then when we have a plan, come back to Congress elected by the people and say, "Here are plans to prevent a boom or a depression which we have always had after every war. We want the Congress to adopt it." Then the Congress can shoot it full of holes if it is entitled to be. Congress can defeat it. Congress can place any limitation or rider on it which it wants to. How can you ask for less than that?

Mr. CHURCH. You cannot coordinate inaccurate statistics.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, the gentleman knows we will always have inaccurate statistics, just as we have inaccurate statements on the floor of this House, but do not condemn by reason of an exception. We want the best statistics we can get. We will have to make arrangements to get them. But they will not be perfect. Human beings will administer this law. Human beings usually make some mistakes. So let us not insist upon a bill that is perfect. No. It is not perfect. But do you offer anything better? If you do, what is it? Bring it out and let us see what it looks like.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the individual himself settle the question as to whether or not he has finished his schooling?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no. The gentleman is quibbling over words again. We are not insisting upon this language. We are insisting upon principles. We are trying to prevent happening what has happened after every war. We have had 15,000,000 men and women in the armed services, an average of 35,000 from every congressional district in the United States of America. Thirty-five thousand. Those men went forth to battle. They offered and gave their lives to protect this country and to save it. Two hundred and fifty thousand of the finest and bravest men on earth did give their lives for this country of ours in World War II. Do you not think it is our duty to the other 15,000,000 men and women to do just a little planning against what has happened after every war, in order to protect those men and women? It is our duty to do it. We will be failing to perform the duties with which we are charged if we fail to draw upon the powerful experiences of the past, and to correct them and to prevent what has happened always after every war. So, if this is not the remedy, bring out your remedy. Are you for it or are you against it?

Mr. CHURCH. I am for all the employment we can get.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. That is a fine pious phrase. What is your remedy to prevent the deflation that has always occurred after every war?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman know of any statistics showing the percentage of times that politicians have been right and wrong in their promises?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope we never have to spend our time doing that.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What percent of laws enacted work out the way their authors intended they should?

Mr. PATMAN. No. I hope we never have to devote our time to it, because we would be spending our time in an idle manner. Here we can spend our time in a useful way and carry out the obligation we owe to those men we sent to war and to the other people who stayed at home and did their job. We are called upon to do that. We have got to do something, because we know that just sitting idly by has never done it in the past. It has always failed. We know that, so, knowing that, what is our duty as Members of Congress? To sit idly by again and let the same thing happen, or to take action? If you believe in action, what is your remedy? This is the remedy that is proposed. If this is not a good one, propose your own.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman asks what the remedy is. The first step in any remedy of this type is to bring the legislation out of the committee, of which I think the gentleman is a member.

As long as the committee keeps the legislation in the committee there is not much that the House can do about it. The gentleman is an influential Member of the House, he belongs to the majority, he has plenty of votes to control; why take time discussing this to half a dozen Members on the floor when they cannot do anything about it?

Mr. PATMAN. We are trying to bring the bill out. The gentleman, however, is mistaken when he says I am a member of the committee. I know he is just misinformed. He is always very accurate, although there are more than a half dozen present.

Mr. MICHENER. I stand corrected.

Mr. PATMAN. But even if I were a member of this committee, I do not know that my vote would determine it; but I ask the members of the committee as well as the Members of this House: Do you want the same thing to happen to our country after this war that has always happened after every war? We have experiences of the past to guide us. Let us profit by those experiences of the past and provide against this horrible thing in the future after this, the greatest of all wars in history.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WAR CASUALTIES

Mr. PATMAN. This war has caused 55,000,000 casualties in the world. It is the greatest war of history because the sun never set upon the American soldier during the time the war was in progress. They were scattered all over the world. Yes; they did the most wonderful job the soldiers of any country ever did in the history of the world. We had 1,000,000 casualties among our own troops; a large number, yes; we are sorry we had one, but considering the fact that we had 15,200,000 in uniform at one time or another, do you not think we are the luckiest Nation on earth that we had only 250,000 men killed? Why, certainly we are. The other nations suffered 54,000,000 casualties of which a large number were killed. Why was our casualty list low? It was because our public debt was made high; that is why.

SPENT MONEY SAVED LIVES

We did some planning when we went into this war, our leaders planned to save the lives of these boys regardless of the cost in money and materials. We can replace the money and materials but we cannot replace one human life that is lost. So by spending—we spent money, lots of it—we never sent a man to face an enemy, to destroy the enemy, where a machine instead could be sent, regardless of the cost of the machine. Our public debt, therefore, went up high but our casualty list stayed down relatively low; so therefore we had planning, saved the lives of millions of our boys and saved millions of casualties compared with other countries. Why can we not in time of peace provide against what we know has been the horrible thing that has occurred after every war in our history? May I say, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, if we do not do that the time will come when this Congress will be blamed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next after the disposition of the legislative business on the Speaker's table and special orders heretofore entered, to reply to the very able address of my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on the full-employment bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

THE CENSUS BUREAU AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to the able address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Let me point out that with regard to statistics you will find from reading the hearings that witnesses from the Census Bureau, the Assistant Director as well as Mr. Cept, the Director of the Census, stated that the Census Bureau has figures and statistics that are right up to the minute and have them worked out to a science. As a matter of fact Census Bureau officials claim their statistics on labor unemployment has been so perfect, so accurate, so scientific, in showing the number of unemployables in the United States previous to the war that both the CIO and the A. F. of L., the two large unions in the Nation, are now using Census Bureau figures instead of trying to estimate unemployment for themselves.

In my office I have several new volumes of plans issued by the National Resources Planning Board. They made voluminous studies during the many years of their existence before Congress in its wisdom, in my opinion, withdrew the appropriation for its continuation. The National Resources and Planning Board never found one solution or one iota of a plan for removing the unemployed from the relief rolls of the Nation—except to scrap integral parts of private enterprise and spend more borrowed money for public-works projects.

Would the committee provided by the bill under discussion hire the same gang of planners? National Resources Planning Board findings are still in my office. Not one plan was found to take the unemployed off the relief rolls, and they were not employed until 1939 and 1940, when, in preparation by our own country for war and the lend-lease material program, put men and women in America to work. Never at any time has this New Deal administration in Washington had any plan for removing men from the relief rolls except by spending public money. At the present time, as I stated earlier in the day, the money already available or obligation for construction and detailed plans for the fiscal year 1946 amounts to $1,123,600,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. There is $46,250,000 available for plans. In addition to that, as I pointed out earlier in the day by the week almost, there are supplemental estimates and deficiency estimates that will add to this construction program that will increase it, in my estimation, to $3,000,000,000.

As always, there has been no solution or no coordination and no hope of planning to put people to work except the public works program. It is laudable that at this time there is no leaf-raking program. Nothing has been sponsored by the National Resources Planning Board—and, I predict, by the Board that is proposed by the gentleman's bill—that will ever come to any further conclusion except as the National Resources Planning Board did to have deficit spending of public funds.

I will insert in the RECORD at this point the list of estimated funds above referred to:

Estimated funds available for obligation for construction and detailed plans, fiscal year 1946

[In millions of dollars]

Agency and appropriation title	Construction	Detailed plans
I. DIRECT FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION		
Tennessee Valley Authority:		
Appropriations	$14.5	$0.5
Corporate funds	12.0	-------
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	10.1	-------
Veterans' Administration: Hospitals and domiciliary facilities	136.0	-------
Federal Security Agency:		
St. Elizabeths Hospital:		
Building for storeroom	.6	-------
Building for mental patients	1.9	-------
Federal Works Agency:		
Public Buildings Administration:		
Advance studies for building construction	-------	.1
Construction of public buildings	17.7	-------
Construction of public buildings, act of Aug. 25, 1937	13.2	-------
General Accounting Office Building	5.3	
General office buildings, District of Columbia	3.5	-------
War Department Building	.5	-------
West central heating plant	1.4	-------

Estimated funds available for obligation for construction and detailed plans, fiscal year 1946—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Agency and appropriation title	Construction	Detailed plans
I. DIRECT FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION—con.		
Federal Works Agency—Continued		
Public Roads Administration:		
Access Roads (national defense)	$35.0	
Inter-American Highway	4.0	
Public lands highways	.3	
Flight strips	1.0	
Inter-American Highway (Costa Rica)	1.6	
Bureau of Community Facilities:		
War public works	4.6	
Virgin Islands public works		$0.15
National Housing Agency: War housing	7.2	
Department of Agriculture: Forest roads and trails	6.0	
Department of Commerce:		
Development of civil landing areas	9.3	
Development of air-navigation facilities	18.2	
Defense landing areas	19.2	
Department of the Interior:		
Bureau of Indian Affairs:		
Construction, irrigation systems	.5	
Construction, roads	1.6	
Construction, buildings and utilities	1.5	
Bonneville Power Administration:		
Construction, operation, and maintenance	15.8	1.2
Bureau of Reclamation:		
General fund, construction	47.4	1.0
Reclamation fund, construction	6.7	
Colorado River Dam fund	7.6	
Water conservation and utilization projects	4.9	
Fort Peck project	.4	
Missouri River Basin		3.2
Bureau of Mines: Synthetic liquid fuels	3.8	
National Park Service:		
Roads and trails	.3	
Blue Ridge, Natchez Trace, and George Washington Parkways	1.3	
Physical improvements	.2	
Salaries and expenses and regional offices		.1
Alaska Railroad: Appropriated fund	1.0	
Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons: Buildings and equipment	1.5	
Department of State:		
Foreign Service buildings fund	1.0	
International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico	1.1	
War Department:		
Flood control:		
General	36.3	16.4
Mississippi River	26.0	
Sacramento River	2.1	
Rivers and harbors	24.5	
Engineer service, Army (continental United States)	150.0	
The Panama Canal, maintenance and operation	8.8	.4
Navy Department: Bureau of Yards and Docks, construction (continental United States)	176.0	
Total, direct—Federal construction	843.4	23.05
II. FEDERAL LOANS AND GRANTS		
Federal Works Agency:		
Public Roads Administration:		
Federal-aid highway system	50.7	
Federal-aid secondary and feeder roads	11.0	
Elimination of grade crossings	12.0	
Strategic highway network	15.7	
Surveys and plans		6.2
Bureau of Community Facilities:		
Public works advance planning		17.0
Department of Agriculture:		
Rural Electrification Administration	[1] 190.0	
Farm Security Administration, water-facilities loans	.8	
Total, Federal loans and grants	280.2	23.2
Grand total, direct—Federal, loans and grants	1,123.6	46.25

[1] An additional $100,000,000 was already obligated but unexpended as of June 30, 1945.

Source: Program Coordination Unit, Oct. 9, 1945.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the special order granted the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. GRANT of Alabama) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. RAMSPECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert; and

H. R. 3256. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the armed forces of the United States.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert; and

H. R. 3256. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the armed forces of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 7, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 a. m., Wednesday, November 7, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream pollution abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

821. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 4343. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4603. A bill to provide for the licensing by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation of marine radiotelegraph operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4604. A bill to direct the discharge of all members of the armed forces whose actual service has exceeded 2 years and who make application to be discharged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4605. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4606. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 391. Resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the report on the Arkansas River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 4607. A bill for the relief of Margaret Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4608. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary D. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4609. A bill for the relief of Jerome Dove; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, King Eternal, through the complicated conditions of this day, out of Thy treasury do Thou bring knowledge, new and old, for our guidance. In the midst of the troubled, crowded questions, stand forth, blessed Lord, in the demonstration of Thy power; put Thy check upon all clashing of wills and give Thy inspiration unto all things good.

O Thou whose justice weighs the motives and the purposes of men, harken to the fervent, yearning hopes of the American people. Preserve us from the useless striving against the inherent rights and privileges of men who love and obey Thy law. Give us to understand that through our obedience to well-organized society will come a larger and a freer life. In the moments and actions of men, breathe upon them the sanctity of the obligations which they owe to the welfare of our homeland. Through Christ our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 693) entitled "An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. WHERRY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. Selective Service System.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

JULIA T. DOUGLAS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 392) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Julia T. Douglas, sister of Lorraine T. Moore, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Lorraine T. Moore.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I voice the true sentiment and feeling of every Member of the House of Representatives and the people of the country when I convey to our beloved colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, our hearty congratulations and felicitations on this, the occasion of his eighty-second birthday, and our best wishes for many happy returns of the day and many years of continued good health and happiness and distinguished public service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a treatise by the Mexican Government on the Mexican Water Treaty, which request I made yesterday, as appears on page 10455 of the RECORD.

The Public Printer informs me that it will take seven pages and cost $364. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding, the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

TUSKAHOMA, CAPITAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, since it is more or less a settled fact that the seat of the United Nations will be located within the confines of the United States and an area of security, accessibility, and beauty is most to be desired, I wish to offer the name of Tuskahoma, Okla., for careful survey and serious consideration as the capital of the world.

In these dawning days of the atomic era, our instincts are to pull our precious things close to our bosom and we should look to the interior of our country for a place to locate our world capital. Tuskahoma is in the very heart of the Nation, near the geographic center of the United States. It is about equidistant from our east and west coasts and from our northern and southern borders.

It is in an area transversed by the pure waters of the Kiamichi River, protected on the north by the Potato Hills of the Ouachitas and on the east by the majestic Kiamichis, approached from the west over rolling prairies and from the south through fertile valleys. The sunshine is clear, the rainfall gentle and adequate and the temperature pleasant 12 months of the year. Dogwood and redbud bloom in season and pines, cedars, holly trees, honeysuckle and magnolias are ever green. Wild life is in abundance. The people who inhabit this earthly Eden though they represent all races and religions of the world, have never been infected with radical isms that plague other sections of our country. This is virgin territory unravished by the world. We in Oklahoma have always suspected the Almighty of keeping this spot for some special purpose and now we are inspired to offer it to the world as the seat of international government.

Tuskahoma was the capital of the old Choctaw Nation and their ancient council house has recently been rehabilitated. It would be fitting indeed to put the world capital here in one of the last centers of the Indian government, to show this country's first inhabitants that we have tried to use well this land we took from them.

In cooperation with Hon. Ben P. Choate, State representative from Pittsburg County, who gave birth to the idea, our State planning and resources board is compiling data and making maps of the Tuskahoma area preparing to submit the information to the locating board of the executive committee for the United Nations Organization now in session in London.

My Oklahoma colleagues, Congressmen STIGLER and RIZLEY, join me in endorsing the proposal that Tuskahoma be selected as the site of the world capital.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include therein resolutions of the Milwaukee Common Council.

DEMOBILIZATION OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I stated on the floor of the House that I felt the War Department had made a grievous error in not permitting the immediate release of any soldier who

had been unfortunate enough to be a prisoner of war, regardless of the number of points which he now has. I am happy to tell the House that late yesterday afternoon I received a call from an appropriate official of the War Department informing me that the War Department would from now on release any soldier who had been unfortunate enough to be a prisoner, either of the Nazis or the Japs for 60 days or more. Such soldiers will be released at once regardless of the number of points they have. While I believe this step should have been taken long ago, nevertheless the War Department should be commended for now making it possible that these unfortunate soldiers should have the opportunity to immediately return to their families.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. VURSELL (at the request of Mr. MASON) was given permission to extend in the RECORD a speech by Mr. VURSELL made at Chambersburg, Pa., to the Franklin County Republican Club on November 2, 1945.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the futility and frustration facing the Pearl Harbor inquiry, as reported yesterday, should not cause surprise.

The New Deal from its very inception has used its power, tactics, and majority of votes to turn investigations for the truth into suppressions of the truth when they concerned its secret faults and vices.

To find the beginning of this practice you may examine the hearings, the majority and minority reports of the select committee of the House to investigate the source and nature of charges made by Dr. William A. Wirt of a deliberately planned revolution in this country. There you will find that as early as April 1934, a similar sheer majority of votes, by the same tactics, according to the minority report deliberately suppressed the obtaining of such information.

It is this suppression of the truth from the American people by the Democratic Party that has caused our present political, social, and economic chaos. It is no wonder that the public, lately, has begun to scoff at congressional investigations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from letters from servicemen.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Lithuanian bishops.

Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. CANNON of Missouri asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of other special orders today I may proceed for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday at the conclusion of other special orders I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN C. SPEAKS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I announce the passing of Gen. John C. Speaks, a former Member of this House from the capital district, Columbus, Ohio. This venerable soldier and statesman passed away yesterday at the age of 86.

His passing is a great loss to the State of Ohio and to the Nation which he served so loyally and well.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I served with General Speaks for 10 years. I regarded him as one of the finest Americans I ever met. He was a soldier, a statesman, and a gentleman.

The servicemen of the last war never had a better friend in Congress than General Speaks.

We Members on this side of the aisle, who knew him, join in expressing our profound sorrow at this sad news of his passing away.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his kind words.

DISCONTINUING THE DRAFTING OF YOUNG MEN

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Congress passed a law that would encourage voluntary enlistments in the armed forces. The reports I have received in the last few days show that more than 3,000 men are voluntarily enlisting in some branch of the armed forces. This brings up the point of how long we should continue selective service. If sufficient men volunteer for the military to meet their needs and for replacements why is it necessary to continue drafting men for military service? The selective service law was passed to get men to fight the war. We even lowered the age limit to 18 years. The war is now over. It seems to me the Military Affairs Committee of this House should take immediate steps to stop the further drafting of men. These drafted men are taken for the duration plus 6 months—just how long is the duration?

Married men with families are being drafted. Essential farm help is taken. We must remember that after World War I it took nearly 3 years for the Congress to declare the war was over.

The armed forces prefer volunteers, at least I hope they do. Now men are going into some branch of the military of their own free will, enough to meet all the present needs of the military. Some early action must be taken to stop the further drafting of men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

WHY JUNK B–29 AIRPLANES?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have received telegrams and other messages from Wichita, Kans., the airplane capital of the Middle West, protesting the junking of 16 almost completed B–29 airplanes that have been declared surplus by the War Department, or one of it branches.

The Boeing Airplane Co., of Wichita, Kans., did a wonderful job in building more than 1,500 of these great warships that were so effective against the enemy in the Pacific. They were built in record time.

Now, some board of the War Department ordered that 16 planes, some of them 80-percent complete, be cut up with flame torches, and torn to pieces and disposed of as junk. The value of these planes in uncompleted condition is approximately $9,500,000.

I quote from one of the messages I received from a prominent businessman:

> Waste and expense in time of actual warfare are often expedient and understandable, but wanton disregard for the people's money and safety of the Nation is neither expedient nor understandable.

He says further:

> These planes might be used for transport duty with a bit of modifying. Your influence is urgently solicited to make use of surplus materials rather than junk them.

Mr. Speaker, here is the irony of the situation, while the Government is junking uncompleted airplanes on the ground as "surplus," more than 100 B–29 airplanes are in the process of completion in Seattle right now.

To the average citizen and taxpayer that kind of performance does not make very good sense. It does look as if these great giant planes—built at enormous cost must have some value other than going to the junk heap.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

REPEAL SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, following the thought expressed by the gentleman from Nebraska, it does seem to me that two things confront the Congress which sooner or later—and I believe sooner—should have the attention of the Members. One is the stopping of the draft, the other is getting the men out of the Army and getting them home. The process of demobilization is entirely too slow. Something should be done about it through pressure from the Congress or some source to get it speeded up.

We can stop the operation of selective service on almost the certain knowledge that the Army will be able to secure enough men under the provisions of volunteer legislation recently passed.

Certainly the great number of men who are volunteering under the more attractive provision of the bill, added to those of the Regular Army and to those who will remain in the Army for some time before being released from the service, will adequately take care of our present military needs.

There is no need of drafting 50,000 additional young men each month, taking men from business and off of the farms who cannot possibly be replaced, into the service, disrupting and delaying their education. It is regrettable that the administration which has the power in both Houses of Congress does not ask for the repeal of selective service at once.

In addition to this legislation the bill introduced by the gentleman from New York, Congressman REED, to release all men who have served for 18 months should be passed upon favorably by the Military Affairs Committee and passed by the Congress. We are lowering the morale of the Army and the American people by refusing to act to stop the draft and to speed up demobilization. Young men are being kept in the Army at greater expense to the Government and greater expense to them in their future.

It is unfair and bad economics to keep the young men in the Army for one or two more years, depriving them of an education when they have already spent 1 or 2 years in the armed services. This cannot be justified on any grounds and neither can the continuance of selective service be justified.

Members of Congress should act on this matter without further delay in such a convincing manner that the Chief Executive might join with us.

Under permission of the Speaker, I want to insert in the RECORD some letters bearing on both of the subjects I have discussed. I am withholding the signatures of the writers, all of whom are from my district.

ROBINSON, ILL., *November 1, 1945.*

Hon. C. W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I urge that you Congressmen do something immediately about the sending of boys overseas now, who have already served 2 or 2½ years in the military service, due to the fact they were kept in the States and have not acquired the number of points required for discharge.

Many of these boys were taken out of college. Isn't 2 years long enough to retard their education or career now that the war has ended? Why take 3 years of their life at the time they should get back?

Please do give this your thought and due consideration, and act upon it.

Yours truly.

ST. MARIE, ILL., *October 29, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Why do they keep on drafting the farm boys that are left? My last boy has been put in I–A. He figures he will have to go any time and is losing all interest in farming.

We have a large tractor combine and are combining about 300 acres this fall. If they take him, we are through farming as I am an invalid and haven't been farming for 12 years myself.

Another son of mine, who is on a 400-acre farm, is in I–A also.

Can you do anything about this?

Yours respectfully.

EFFINGHAM, ILL., *November 1, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As our Congressman and the representative of this district, I am appealing to you in behalf of our son, who is in the service of the Coast Guard and has been for nearly 3½ years. He enlisted in July 1942 and has been overseas now since July 1945.

He has been stationed at Okinawa since his arrival overseas and has been in the two terrible typhoons which hit that island.

From all indications his work or duties do not seem essential. It seems to be just a matter of killing time. Why does the Navy or Coast Guard keep men in the service, practically playing around when they could be finishing their education as our son planned to do before he went into the service?

Our son does not have high points despite the fact he has been in the service nearly 3½ years. It seems a shame to waste a young man's life at duties not seemingly essential, especially now that the war is over, when he craves to finish his education before he gets too old and desires making something of his life.

Therefore, I am writing you and asking that you please use your utmost influence and power to bring the boys having 3 years' service home and discharged as soon as it is humanly possible.

Why not let the 3-year servicemen come home and new enlistments take their place?

My son hasn't been home now for three Christmases. He desires to come home so bad this year and we would like to have him very much ourselves.

A great many of the servicemen have been writing their Congressmen for help in being brought home and discharged and it seems to us the Army, Navy, and the Coast Guard are just holding the boys in the service so some of the officers can hold their jobs.

Hoping you may give this your most earnest consideration and use your full authority to enforce this, I am,

Yours sincerely.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a poem.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters that he received from GI's overseas.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan object?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman withdraw his objection to permit me to make a statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very well. I withdraw my objection for the moment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that I objected to the House adjourning over from yesterday until Monday for this reason: I have a bill which I introduced on the 19th of September providing for the immediate discharge on their own application of men who have served in the armed forces continuously for 18 months, or who have dependents at home to look after, or who desire to return to school and complete their education. I realized that I was going to have to get the bill to the floor of the House by petition.

There is the greatest resentment over the country among the fathers and mothers, as well as among the men in the armed forces themselves, at this delay, unnecessary delay, in getting the men out that I have ever known.

In order for me to be able to file a petition to bring that bill to the floor of the House the bill had to be introduced

for 30 legislative days. Yesterday was the twenty-eighth, today is the twenty-ninth, and tomorrow will make the thirtieth legislative day. As far as I am concerned I shall not object to adjourning over from tomorrow until Monday, at which time I expect to have the petition on the desk; and I hope to get enough signers on that petition the first 3 or 4 days to bring the bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I just want to say to the House that I have no desire to interfere with any speeches any Member wants to make, but we have a lot of faithful employees in this House who seldom get a chance to be off. Sunday is Armistice Day, which will be celebrated on Monday. There will be no legislative program. Many Members would like to make arrangements to go home in order to make speeches. I hope the gentleman from Michigan might find it convenient to deliver his speech either on today or tomorrow so that we can adjourn over from tomorrow until Monday.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact there is a petition now on the Clerk's desk, two of them, in fact, Nos. 7 and 8, which will accomplish some of the things the gentleman wants to. As I understand the situation, when it does get before the House the bills may be amended to take care of just the things the gentleman wants done.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I have signed both of those petitions, but I think my bill meets the situation a little better than they do. I am going to file a petition in the well of the House on Monday next and I hope to get enough signers in the first 3 or 4 days to bring it before the House, at which time it will pass, in my opinion, by 10 to 1.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I have not the slightest inclinatoin to inconvenience anyone. If the majority wants to assume the responsibility of inaction when strikes and work stoppages are preventing the carrying on of the Government's business here in Washington, the Nation's Capital, where hundreds of thousands of Federal employees cannot get to their jobs—I repeat, if you want to assume the responsibility of letting that go on, it is something I cannot prevent the majority doing.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I may say to the gentleman there is no legislation dealing with that situation ready for consideration and if we are in session on Friday it will not be considered at that time; therefore I hope the request may be granted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, still reserving the right to object, I have dropped into the hopper today a bill authorizing the transit company to hire employees and authorizing the Army and Navy to let servicemen work on those cars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls for the regular order. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has called for the regular order. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object unless I can ask a question.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia stated that there is no legislation pending before the Congress so that we might help this country prevent a lot of these strikes. But that is not the point. There ought to be legislation pending, there should have been legislation passed in the last year, and because there is not you on the majority side are responsible for not having that legislation before the House a long time ago. Any condemnation for these strikes ought to be laid upon the majority for not doing what it should have done a long time ago.

Now, if the gentleman wants to make his request to adjourn over, I am perfectly satisfied for him to do it at this point.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I did not say there was not any legislation pending. I said there was not any legislation ready to be considered this week.

Mr. RICH. Well, you should have had it ready a long time ago. If you want to make the unanimous-consent request, I will not object.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We passed the Smith-Connally Act. The gentleman and I voted for it. I know I did. We voted to override the President's veto and it did not work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course, it did not work. Why did it not work? Because of misinterpretation and maladministration. That is what was the matter. The administration carried on under that bargain it had for political support with the unions and it seized industry; but that did not do one single thing to curb union power.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that I have a bill that has already been reported out from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation now pending before the Committee on Rules which, if brought to the floor and passed and made a law, would enable ex-servicemen to work without having to pay tribute to anyone.

That would do more to break these strikes than all these conferences that they are having down here by a few representatives of the minority workers of this country.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STARKEY. Is it the opinion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the veterans are coming back here to break down the standards of the American worker?

Mr. RANKIN. No; it is my opinion they are coming back here to serve the country they fought for, and they resent being driven from their place of work by a few labor racketeers.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time because I wanted to read a letter that came to me from one of the GI Joes who is now stationed at Kastel, Germany. It was written October 15, 1945, and it reads:

KASTEL, GERMANY, *October 15, 1945.*

DEAR FAMILY: This is not one of my ordinary letters home. This is a special letter which I would like you to send in entirety, in original form, to my Representative in Congress. This letter concerns the case of one football player, named Trippi, formerly Sgt. Trippi, and two Georgia Senators, named Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. GEORGE.

I haven't been in the Army so long, only a year and 10 months, nor do I have many points, only 48. However, of my time in the Army I have more than half of it overseas, and concerning my points, I earned 15 of them by being awarded three battle stars while serving with the combat engineers in Belgium and Germany. Of course, I realize, and readily admit, that that is no startling record but—but Trippi had 41 points and he was discharged (according to the enclosed article from Stars and Stripes) because of surplus and hardships. How my heart goes out to this man for the "hardships" he must have endured during his Army career in the States—in God's country.

I don't imagine those two Senators are finding it difficult to explain their actions to their fellow politicians, but I would like to see them explain it to some of the guys in my outfit, that were in my outfit when we came overseas, that is. Yes; I would like to see them tell a boy named Gladder about the hardships Trippi endured—Gladder was killed at Vianden when he attacked a machine-gun emplacement alone, after he had already knocked out one—or let them tell Scouten about hardships—Scouten isn't in the Army anymore either—he's a civilian, but he was discharged because he is entirely paralyzed in one side as the consequence of a wound received at Remagen. I could name a lot more, too, but that is enough that my Congressman will understand. My friends and I over here aren't bitter about these things, though—not much we aren't.

Still, I want my Congressman to understand that it isn't Trippi we care much about. He's negligible and not worth thinking about. The guys we want called to task are those two Georgia Senators and other men that helped them in their disgraceful project.

Sincerely.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying anything about Mr. Trippi. I believe that he is not to be censured because of the fact that he was requested to be taken out of the Army so that he could play football. I do not think he personally had anything to do with it. I do not think he should be censured and I am not criticizing anybody now, but I want you to know what the GI Joe over in Germany wrote so that his Congressman would take recognition of the fact, and I am just giving recognition to that GI Joe because I think he wants it, and he wants it in the RECORD here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article that was placed in the Stars and Stripes be included in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

SENATORS HELPED TRIPPI

WASHINGTON, October 14.—Georgia's two Senators—RICHARD RUSSELL and WALTER F. GEORGE—admitted today they had talked with Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in an effort to speed the discharge of 41-point Sgt. Charley Trippi, former University of Georgia football star.

Trippi was declared surplus and released yesterday by the Third Air Force. Today he was on a vacation with his wife and 7-month-old daughter prior to reenrolling in the university. Trippi was a backfield star in Georgia's 1943 Rose Bowl triumph and entered the Army after his sophomore year.

RUSSELL defended his efforts on Trippi's behalf, saying: "I was glad to try to help Sergeant Trippi secure a discharge from the Army, as I have tried to help thousands of other boys. Trippi had been in the service nearly 3 years, and if he had not been the star player of the Third Air Force football team his discharge would not have been mentioned."

GEORGE added: "Trippi's discharge was fully justifiable. Anybody would agree who was familiar with the circumstances."

Trippi's release on a surplus and hardship basis brought continued editorial protests today from Tampa, Fla., newspapers.

The Tampa Tribune asserted, "The highest political pressure was brought to bear on the War Department to gain the star's release," while the Times charged, "Powerful Georgia politicians, who want a Rose Bowl team this year—not next" brought pressure on the War Department.

Trippi said yesterday he probably would play football for Georgia this season. Last year, as a member of the Third Air Force Gremlins, he was named on the Associated Press All-American Service Team.

Mr. RICH. May I say further that I do not believe we ought to interfere with the Army in the way these boys are taken out of the service. I think the Army officials here in Washington are trying to do the right thing. Many of us criticize them because they are not doing it fast enough. There is just one thing about that, too. The Army is doing, I think, everything they can, and the Navy as well, to let these boys out. Sometimes they make mistakes, but with the needlings they are getting here from the floor of Congress I think they are going to try to work it out so that they get the boys back home where they want to be just at the very earliest possible moment.

I am going to divert from that now for a moment and take up the question of the full employment bill hearings that we are having over in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. We have been having those hearings since a long time before the Congress came back from its recess, and that committee has reported certain legislation. May I say for the chairman of the committee [Mr. MANASCO] that nobody in the House of Representatives is working any harder than he is to try to bring out this legislation, but he is giving those who are in favor of the legislation an opportunity to be heard and is giving those who are not in favor of the legislation an opportunity to be heard. He is hearing witnesses all the time. We have heard them from 10 o'clock in the morning until almost 6 o'clock at night.

Today we had before us the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwellenbach. You know that Mr. Schwellenbach certainly must have his hands full now. I cannot understand why he came up to the committee this morning. It seems to me that with the strike we are having in Washington on the bus lines and trolley lines he could have served this country better if he had stayed in his office and tried to settle the strike and refused to come become our committee, for he would be of more service to the country. Notwithstanding that, I think he wanted to serve, so I am not criticizing him for that. But so many implications arise lots of times that men need protection, men need consolation, men need guidance, so that when they do do something they will not be criticized for everything they do. Lots of times when the Congress gives them orders to come up they feel that that might be a command to come up here before a committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. The point I want to make is this. In my business, if anything happens that the plant shuts down, I get over to that plant and drop everything else in order to get that plant in operation so that the men will have jobs and be earning wages, and we will be producing merchandise. That is what we want to do in this country today, produce things. We want to get this country back on its feet. If we do not, it will be a terrible winter that a lot of people not only in this country but in Europe will have to endure. The Secretary of Labor ought to be down there trying to settle those strikes and he ought to try to get the wheels of industry turning. He ought to get every man that wants to work on the job. Those who do not want to work should not be put on relief. Goodness only knows we have millions of jobs today in this country, more than we have workers. It is up to the workers today to take a job. Any man who has a job and will not work should not be getting rocking-chair money.

They say they are not getting as much money now as they got when they worked overtime and got time and a half and double time for it, that they are not getting as much in the pay envelope. We know that, but I tell you that the GI Joes who are coming back here did not get any more when they returned than they did when they started. We have to think of those fellows. We have to think today of everybody in this country. These labor unions that are driving to take care of their people are doing it to the detriment of all the other people in this country. It is not right. It is not right that they do it to the detriment of the boys who have served this country and tried to keep our form of government and tried to keep us where we have liberty and independence.

If we do not watch out, the subversive elements that are working through these radical labor leaders today are going to take away the liberty and freedom of this country. That is the danger. It is not the question of whether they get 20 percent or 30 percent more in wages. It is a question of what they are going to do to overthrow this Government. That is a vital and necessary thing that every man, woman, and child in America must recognize and recognize at this time. If you do not assert yourselves, and if you do not do something, God save America, because your liberty is going to be taken away from you and the freedom that your fathers handed down to you, the freedom that those who wrote the Declaration of Independence wanted us to keep, not only for ourselves, but for our posterity, will soon vanish. That is the point I make to you now. I hope it will drive home to every citizen of the United States and especially to Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALBOT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am in 100-percent accord with the statement made today as to the menace of the OPA. I believe it is the greatest danger this country has.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein

some telegrams from business people touching this subject.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have about 150 of those telegrams; so do most of the other Members. If the gentleman needs any additional ones to insert in his speech, I will be glad to lend him a few.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I will use good judgment in what I insert, but it is a protest of the business people against the ruinous methods of the OPA.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter he received from a member of the grand jury of White Plains, Westchester County, N. Y., and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 4 minutes.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to be one of those who had the opportunity to listen to the testimony of the Secretary of Labor, former Senator Schwellenbach. I see no reason to criticize him in any way. I appreciate all that the gentleman from Pennsylvania said about what the Secretary should do, but I do not believe that any one man holds the solution to our problems in his hands. I heard the Secretary before the Committee on Labor speak in favor of the increase of the minimum wage. Again, this morning he impressed me as being deeply concerned about present conditions and as a person who is endeavoring to do everything he can to solve our problems. In my judgment, the responsibility for the present situation does not rest upon the Secretary of Labor or any other one agency, although some of them, such as the NLRB, have done not a little to bring about the trouble we are now in. In my humble judgment, the responsibility for the present conditions rests in the first place upon the administration for misinterpreting and maladministering some of the laws we passed, one of which was referred to earlier in the day, the Smith-Connally Act, which never was given a fair interpretation and which never was fairly and justly administered. But back of that, this Congress is responsible for what is happening and what has happened because, knowing as we have known, the things which were being done throughout the country when the administrative officers failed us, we have sat here day after day, week after week, and month after month—yes, for 2 years—and failed to adopt obviously needed measures to avoid what any man could see was coming. It was more than 2 years ago that the Hobbs bill went over to the other end of the Capitol and it has been buried there ever since. We have sat here and failed to take effective action. Now, what have we? What has the Nation? We all know, as President Coolidge told us years ago when he was Governor of Massachusetts, that no one has the right to strike against the Government.

Here in the United States Capital we have hundreds of thousands of Government employees. It is absolutely necessary, if this Government is to function, if the Army and Navy are to proceed with demobilization and get the men out of the service, that the Federal employees in Washington get down to their places of business and get back to their homes when their day's work is done. There is no argument or reason which can justify any group of men or any organization, corporate or otherwise, in interfering with the activities of the sovereign state—the Government of the United States.

What do these employees do here? According to all press reports in Washington papers, they have a contract with the transit company. They violate that contract in at least one or two respects, and without adequate notice to the company or the public—I speak not of the duty they owe the company; I am talking about their duty to the public and to the Government which protects them—their Government—without adequate notice they walk out or they sit down and they refuse to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BULWINKLE]. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They refuse to go about their daily tasks. What is the result? The whole transportation system of this city is tied up. Hundreds of thousands of people who work are deprived of the means of getting to their work. You say, What would you do? I suggest, very humbly, that the Congress really do something about it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman just recently referred to the well-known fact that the so-called Smith-Connally Act had never been enforced by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Properly enforced.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Under that act it is specifically provided that there shall be 30 days' notice of any labor dispute before any strike can be called. Failure to give such notice and to wait such 30-day period renders the union liable to the United States Government for personal injuries and damages. The Federal Government has been definitely injured in this strike by failure to function as it should function, yet I have heard of no efforts made or any expectation on the part of the Government to enforce the Smith-Connally Act by a suit against that union.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. I predict that you will not hear of any.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield further, I have never heard of any suit being brought by the Federal Government under that act, although there have been many cases where strikes have been called without notice.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no question about it, and the reason is plain, at least to me. There has been a political tie-up between the politicians in office and the labor politicians who want special favors, and the trading has been carried on for the last 8 or 10 years, ever since the sit-down strikes began in Michigan on the last day of December 1936.

Just carrying on that suggestion by the gentleman from Virginia, this morning I drafted a bill which I dropped into the hopper, which makes a declaration of policy. In brief, it is that no one shall have the right to interfere with the operations of the Federal Government, and that the Capital Transit Co. be authorized and directed to step out forthwith and employ a sufficient number of individuals to operate its transportation system so that Federal employees engaged in Federal business can keep the Government in operation; so that the Army and Navy can move along in the discharging of men who are entitled to be discharged.

The time for fooling around with those who have no regard for their solemn agreements, no consideration for their fellow workers, who for the advancement of their own interests prevent thousands getting to their daily tasks on time has ended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICA AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include copies of the circulating statement of United States money; also some excerpts from a couple of magazine articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, America today is at the crossroads, in fact our civilization is at the crossroads.

We are going through an ordeal testing whether or not constitutional government, human liberty, and free enterprise shall endure.

I know some Members of Congress will take me to task when I speak in favor of free enterprise, because of my attitude on the power question; so I will speak of that briefly to begin with.

I am not exaggerating when I say that I have done more for the development of the water power of this Nation than any other Member of this House, that I have done more for rural electrification than any other Member of this House. The power business is a public business. Electricity is now a necessity of our modern life; and it has to be handled by a monopoly. You cannot have four or five concerns supplying electricity to any one

community, for the overhead would eat them up.

In addition to that, the water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government; and I have no apology for my fight for the last 15 years to develop that water power and see to it that it is distributed to the people of the country at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

I stand for that policy today, and shall continue fighting for it as long as I am in public life or until we get electricity to every home in America at those rates, and until we electrify every farm home in the United States at those rates.

But, Mr. Speaker, I was very much alarmed on yesterday listening to the speeches made on the so-called full employment bill, and especially after I read the bill, because in my opinion there runs through this legislation the element of totalitarianism that America wants to avoid. I know they will tell you—those wild-eyed fanatics who are going up and down the country arguing that we should "abolish the United States"—they are going to tell you that a totalitarian government is more powerful and more efficient than a republic. Let us see about that.

The United States, with its free enterprise system did more to win this war than all other elements combined. The United States was able to develop an industrial machine to produce the materials of war. It was the United States that developed what they call the proximity fuze, radar, the atomic bomb, and that vast Army, Air Force, and Navy that brought victory to the Allied cause. All that was done under our system of free enterprise.

I am getting tired of hearing men get up on this floor and using the word "Fascist" toward those of us who still believe in the American system of constitutional government and free enterprise. I have heard the Communists and their fellow travelers refer to the white people of the South as Fascists and refer to the businessmen of this country as Fascists until I am tired of it. We were fighting fascism in this war, and we destroyed it, and nobody on earth contributed more to that end than did the white people of the South whom they are now trying to smear by calling them Fascists; and nobody contributed more to that end than did the businessmen of this country whom they are now trying to smear with that sinister appellation.

But I want to draw the line between communism and free government, between communism and free enterprise. Communism and fascism are merely different symptoms of the same disease. One of them is the chill and the other is the fever of a dying civilization.

Remember that we do not owe anyone a living in this country, except the disabled or the aged. Let me repeat that: We do not owe anyone a living at the expense of the Federal Government, except the disabled or the aged; but we do owe to everyone the duty to see to it that he has a right to work for a living, that he has a right to earn his own living. That is what free enterprise and free American institutions mean. Are they getting it?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. And he ought to do a good day's work for the pay he receives?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. There are Members who talk about passing a full employment bill, then point to these conferences now going on here in Washington where there is a group of labor leaders drawing salaries greater than the members of the Supreme Court of the United States, and representing less than one-fifth of even the industrial laborers of the country, no farmers at all, none of the unorganized people, none of the businessmen. They are gathered down here, encouraging this strike that is paralyzing the transportation system in the city of Washington.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman did not mean to say that the businessmen are encouraging it?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I say they do not represent the businessmen. The businessmen are not encouraging it.

Some men refer to communism as democracy. Why, there is not any more democracy in Russia or in any other communistic country than there was in the days of the totalitarian monarchies before the birth of Christ.

Let us draw a line down this aisle here. I want to show you where we are driving, and I am going to give you the remedy. I have very little respect for a man when he gets up and criticizes and does not offer a remedy for the conditions that he berates.

Let us draw a line down this aisle. On one side of the aisle is communism. Communism is based on atheism, the atheistic teachings or Karl Marx, whose hatred for Christianity is well known to all students of history.

On the other side of the aisle is free, constitutional government, based on the philosophy of Christianity, which has been the controlling impulse of this world for 1,900 years. On the communistic side is totalitarianism, dictatorship, and regimentation. On the other side is free government—democracy, if you please—liberty and free enterprise.

On the communistic side, as I said, is regimentation, the taking away of everything that a citizen may own, his factory, his farm, his home if you please. The individual becomes the slave of the state. Go into a communistic country today and what do you find? You find the farm land has been taken. They are trying to farm it from Moscow or from the capital of the country. In 1931 they levied a tax of so many bushels of wheat on all the farmers of the Ukraine. They had a short crop that year and the Government took it all, and four, five, or six million people starved to death in their own homes in that area.

Do you want that in Kansas, in Iowa, Mississippi, or Pennsylvania? If so, then join the Communist Party, and throw up your hat when Professor Adler, of the University of Chicago, gets up and says that "We must do everything we can to abolish the United States," as he did in his speech in Cleveland, Ohio, the other night.

On the other side of that line what do we have? We have free government, constitutional government; not dictatorship. We have also the right of free enterprise and the right to own your home, your land, your factory, your property, human liberty and the right of free speech. That is what those boys up there in uniform in the gallery thought they were fighting for in this war, and so far as I am concerned that is what they were fighting for, and I am going to do my best to see that they get it, as long as I am a Member of this House.

On the communistic side you have strife, degeneracy and decay. On the other side you have progress, peace and prosperity.

Let me show you the vast difference between those ideologies. The ideology of communism, based on the doctrine of Karl Marx, harks back, if you please, more than 1,900 years and carries us back into the dark ages of the pre-Christian era. Do you want that substituted for the Constitution of the United States? If so, then continue to vote for these totalitarian measures that would undermine and destroy everything that we have fought for, and that our forefathers fought for, and everything that we told these boys they were fighting for in this war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I have heard radio commentators berate the gentleman from Mississippi because he was not for the things that were for the best interests of the GI Joe and the serviceman. I want to say here and now right before the gentleman that I do not believe any such thing. I would like to make my remarks concerning those men stronger, but I dare not. I would like to say that the radio commentators who say anything about the gentleman from Mississippi, and his desire to do all that the GI's want for their own best interest and the best interest of this country, ought to be prohibited from going on the air and the people of this country ought to stop them.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I do not have to apologize to anybody for my attitude on veterans' legislation. I have been a member of the Veterans' Committee ever since it was created. I have been its chairman for 14 years. I have been the author of more legislation for the benefit of the ex-servicemen and their dependents than any other Member of either House. I took all the criticism and the punishment for opposing the Baruch provision of the economy bill that stripped a lot of disabled ex-servicemen of their incomes and drove them to their graves with broken hearts, because they knew it took away from their widows and orphans every single dollar on which to live.

When the soldiers' pay bill was up, it was my amendment and my fight that

raised the base pay of those men in this war to $50 a month for the first time in history.

Today we are working on amendments to the present law for increased aid to these ex-servicemen. I leave my case not with these script writers who are complaining that the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am a member, is calling for their scripts, not in advance, but after they have spouted it over the radio. I leave my case with those thousands and millions of servicemen who have been taken care of as a result of my efforts in this House.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman not believe that the fellows who are criticizing the Committee on Un-American Activities are the ones that the people of this country should investigate and look after, because the committee and those who are interested in establishing that committee want to preserve our Constitution and our democratic principles and ways of life that make for liberty and freedom?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes. I read the other day about this Professor Adler, of the University of Chicago—and he is a fair representative of that bunch of crackpots—going around over this country saying—and this is his exact language which he used in a speech at Cleveland, Ohio, the other night: "We must do everything we can to abolish the United States."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not that the same thing that was brought forth here in January of 1942 when they put a petition on the desk of every Congressman asking that we join up with Union Now to surrender our sovereignty?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not think that Union Now proposition was quite that bad; but it was so bad we could not swallow it, but this speech of Adler's is the worst I ever saw or heard It is the worst that has been preached from a public platform in this country since the days of Benedict Arnold.

Of course, they want to destroy the Committee on Un-American Activities. Did you ever know a time when the bootleggers, the thieves, and the housebreakers and other criminals did not want to get rid of the grand jury? Of course they want to get rid of us because this Committee on Un-American Activities is trying to preserve American institutions from destruction at their hands. We are not going to be intimidated by anyone. We are going to keep our investigators on the job so that your children and your children's children may enjoy the same benefits we have enjoyed of liberty under a free government.

Let us get back to this economic situation. That is what I rose to speak about.

They talk about this bill which, in my opinion, would put on another WPA in a more or less glorified form. Whenever you assure people that you are going to pay them whether they work or not they are not going to work. Even my energetic friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], if he could have got the same amount of money for doing nothing that he has got for the hard work he has done, he would be the best fisherman in Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I believe in work. I want to work, and I want everybody else to work.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has been trained that way; but suppose they had caught him young and trained him the other way? That is just human nature.

Let us see what this measure proposes to do. I want to get back to what I said on yesterday. I represent cotton farmers, men who contributed more of their sons to this war than any other class of people under the American flag; I mean, the white cotton farmers of the South. I repeat that, and I will tell you why. We have down there a divided population. Where that population was equally divided, they took about four whites to one Negro. They did not consider cotton a necessity, so they stripped the white cotton farmers and never left a boy on the farm who could go to war as a rule. Those people are working, toiling in the hot sun, raising cotton now at 22½ cents a pound. They get 1 cent an hour for their work, on an average, for every cent a pound they get for their lint cotton. That means they are getting 22½ cents an hour, while these men who put on the strikes during the war and slowed down production and cost the lives of thousands of American boys are now demanding that we raise them to a minimum of 65 cents an hour, or practically three times what these men are getting who are tilling the soil.

They were getting an average of $1.02½ cents per hour in manufacturing industries in August 1945, according to the report of the Labor Department.

Cotton farming is work. It is not standing up or sitting down and throwing a switch or punching a button; it is throwing a hoe or following a plow or picking cotton in the hot sun.

Every farmer in America is a competitor of the cotton farmer. I want to bring that home to you. A cotton farmer can grow anything. He is a competitor of every corn farmer in America. You fellows in Iowa and Illinois talk about your corn fields. I have been through both those States, and I never saw finer corn than I have seen in my home county every year since I can remember. My county produces a million bushels of corn a year. We can grow just as good wheat as you can grow in Kansas. My district is now one of the leading dairy districts of the South. We have a gentle climate and a fertile soil that yields to the husbandman every product of a temperate zone. We have a 9-month grazing season. We have a semitropical climate which does away with the necessity for heavy barns. We have an abundant rainfall equally distributed throughout the year that keeps our pastures green. We have an abundance of dry feed—cottonseed, meal, and hulls—a thousand pounds to every bale of cotton right on the farm. We can literally take over the dairy industry if we want to, and if this discrimination against us continues, that is probably what will happen.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say that the people of Iowa are not jealous of the people of Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that.

Mr. JENSEN. We want you to get along in the finest way that you possibly can under the American system, as we know it.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. I hope the gentleman did not think I was criticizing Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, absolutely not. I just want you to know the people of Iowa are certainly not jealous of the people of Mississippi. As long as the people of Mississippi will fight for the same principles as the people of Iowa will fight for—that is, representative, Christian, constitutional Americanism—we will get along.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, that is what we are fighting for now.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish there were more like the gentleman from Mississippi who is now addressing the House. I wish there were more of your kind in America.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. We people in the agricultural States have a common interest.

Mr. MICHENER. I only wish to make one observation. I was out of the hall for a few minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. MICHENER. Then I came in. If I had not known the gentleman, I would have wondered for a time whether he was from Florida or California. He has qualified for citizenship in either place and a member of the chamber of commerce, also.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; and Michigan, also. I will come around to Michigan in a moment.

Mr. JENSEN. And you are welcome in Iowa any time you want to come there.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. And we will take you up in Pennsylvania as long as they keep the Un-American Activities Committee alive to keep this country free.

Mr. RANKIN. Keep those storm cellars open. I may have to hunt one.

Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that the State of Michigan is a great producer of sugar beets. Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi, and other Southern States, can grow the finest sugarcane in the world. They are direct competitors. You take hogs; you take sheep, and wool and barley, and every other agricultural product that can be grown in the North and it is grown in the South and will be grown to a greater extent in the South if we are held down to this economic level of 22½ cents a pound for cotton under an economic situation that justifies 65 cents or 70 cents.

Your farmers will be forced down to the economic level of the cotton farmers just as surely as the sun shines.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where is all this cotton?

Mr. RANKIN. I am getting to that in a minute. The only reason that this cotton is being held down is this crazy OPA program. They are preventing the manufacture of cotton goods, while the American people are begging for them. The other day they brought some cotton bedspreads down here to a store in Washington and let it get out. There was almost a riot of the women getting down there to buy them. Why, you cannot buy a white shirt in Washington. You cannot buy cotton underwear in Washington. Your wife cannot buy sheets for her bed. Meanwhile, the OPA is keeping the cotton mills from manufacturing these things and the cotton is piling up in our warehouses while many industrial workers are refusing to work and demanding that their wages be raised all out of line with that of the farmers of this country. Now your farmers are making just about what my farmers are making. Remember that. They are on the same economic level or will be soon.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi knows that this OPA which the administration has inflicted on us put the price on sheets of about $1.31 and then takes your southern cotton to Spain under a $20 a bale subsidy and pays them $2.40 to manufacture the same sheets to give away for relief.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I did not know that.

What I am trying to tell you is that the OPA is a system of totalitarianism that is wrecking the American farmer, beginning with the cotton farmer.

As a result, your wheat and corn is held down far below its economic value. When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] takes the floor again to discuss this matter I should like to have him discuss it in the light of what is happening to the cotton farmers of Arkansas and Texas.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel, as he expressed it yesterday, that if these advocates of a full employment bill would show equal energy toward maintaining parity for the farmers of the United States they would not have any fear whatsoever about giving every man a job who wanted one?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], one reason I have fought so hard for rural electrification is to carry to these farmers light, hope, encouragement, and inspiration to stay there and struggle along to make a living. I have not made it sectional. You can go into any State in this Union among the farmers and they will refer to me as the Father of Rural Electrification, because I have tried to spread it over every State in the Union.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Now, there is the place where you and I differ, because you want the Government to do this and I want private industry to do it; I want it done by the public utilities of this country who have given the greatest service to the people of this country and have reduced their rates, have never faltered in furnishing current and power to everybody who wanted it, with the exception of a few out in the country districts. They are gradually going out there. There is the only place I differ with the gentleman. I want to see these utilities extend and go out and furnish that power. If you will let them alone, they will do it.

Mr. RANKIN. The reason the gentleman from Pennsylvania disagrees with me is that he is not informed on that subject. Twelve years ago, when I started this drive, there was only 1 farm out of 10 in this country that had any electricity at all. Ninety percent of the farmers of Germany, 90 percent of the farmers of Japan, 94 percent of the farmers of Italy, 94 percent of the farmers of France had electricity. Sixty-five percent of the farmers in New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, had electricity.

Mr. RICH. We are talking about the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes. The Government is getting back every dollar, and, as a result of my fight, I have even reduced rates in Pennsylvania and every other State. One of my greatest contributions to American life has been my fight for rural electrification.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again about cotton?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I want to get back to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. Get off the power issue. The hearings before the Smith committee, which extended over several weeks, disclosed that while price regulation was to get the low-priced garments into the hands of the low-income families of the country, it had practically the opposite effect. In my district, for instance, in November of last year, the merchants did not have any work shirts or overalls; they were short on children's underwear—all sorts of common cotton garments, low-priced garments. The reason was the regulation of the OPA which prevented the manufacturers from producing that stuff.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman tell us what became of his cotton? Why did it not go into the garments that my folks want?

Mr. RANKIN. Simply because the OPA would not allow the manufacturers to manufacture it for that purpose. For that reason I opposed the creation of the OPA. I told you then what would happen. The quicker we abolish it and get back to fundamental economic principles, the better off this country will be, because it is bound to come, or this country will collapse into communism or totalitarianism of some kind.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that there are 560,000,000 pounds of wool hanging over the wool growers of this country and the OPA is prohibiting the manufacture of better woolen fabrics by the textile mills of this country, and at the same time is permitting the finished product to come in from England and selling at $20 and $25 a suit.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, this policy is driving the farmers of this Nation toward peonage. I am opposed to it. I want to get back on the "beam" so to speak. And, remember, the farmers of this country are entitled to every consideration we give every other class of our citizens.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Briefly.

Mr. RICH. In reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan in regard to wool, practically all the wool in this country of the clip for this year is being held by the Government. The greatest part of the clip for last year is being held by the Government. The people of this country can buy foreign wool for about 15 to 20 cents a pound less than they can buy the domestic wools, yet the Government is holding this domestic wool, and we are going to have to take a big loss unless something is done about these rules and regulations.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; now they are trying to hold, as I said, the incomes of the poor farmer down to this economic level of 22½ cents an hour, and that affects the economy of the entire Nation. The result is that the man in the factory is getting two or three or four times as much as the man on the farm. Yet these men in the factories are paralyzing the country with unnecessary strikes, keeping the boys returning in uniform from going to work, keeping legislators from going to their offices, keeping down the increased production of things that everybody needs.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to go back for a minute to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan as to this cotton crop. We raised the greatest cotton crops last year and the year before last that have ever been raised in this country, yet we are unable to get cotton goods. There must be a supply of cotton somewhere; where is it?

Mr. RANKIN. It is in the warehouses.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In the warehouses, but where?

Mr. RANKIN. All over the country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But who has control of it?

Mr. RANKIN. Much of it is owned by private individuals, a good deal of it is controlled by the Government. The private owners will not sell it, or do not want to sell it, because if they did they

would have to take a loss. If the farmers were getting as much for their labor as the industrial workers—and I am referring now to these men in Detroit, Mich., who are striking, I am referring now to these men in Pittsburgh, Pa., I am referring to men in St. Louis, Mo., and New Orleans, La.—if, as I say, the farmer were getting as much for his work as these men are they would be getting from 60 to 75 cents a pound for their cotton; and wheat, corn, hogs, land, and lumber would rise in proportion and you would have the greatest era of prosperity in the agricultural areas of this country that has ever been known.

Prices in a free economy are based upon two things: the volume of a nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. Wherever the circulating medium is small in amount or the velocity is slow you are going to have a depression.

When America was discovered all the governments of Europe were on a gold standard. The amount of gold known to be in existence was small, and the supplly was diminishing. Prices were going down gradually all the time and there was stagnation all over Europe. That was one reason for the search for a route to a new world, or for a new route to India.

When America was discovered a new and almost unlimited amount of gold was poured into the gold reserves of Europe, causing an expansion of the currency. Prices began to rise, industry took on new life. Art, literature, and everything else began to thrive, and Europe leaped forward into an era of prosperity the like of which the world had never seen.

During the late 1920's we found ourselves in the same condition. We were in a money panic. Unfortunately, we had some money-changers in control of the Federal Reserve System at that time. Let me show you what they did, and let me show you the situation now.

In 1920 we had in circulation $5,698,214,612. At that time wheat was $2.50 a bushel because you had no OPA; at that time cotton was from 35 to 40 cents a pound because we had no OPA; at that time corn was $1.75 per bushel, let me say to the gentleman from Iowa, because we had no OPA to hold down the price. At that time the farmer was paying good prices for the things he bought, but he had the money to pay it with. We had not started on this road to serfdom that totalitarianism and communism lead to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. We know now since research has been made that every time the cotton farmer or any other farmer loses a dollar in the price of the products that he sells the national income suffers to the extent of $7.

Mr. RANKIN. Why, of course.

Mr. JENSEN. So every time your cotton farmers and my farmers sell below a reasonable price, the laboring men suffer and everybody suffers to the extent of $7 for $1.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice every once in awhile I am attacked by the Washington Post, which is a compliment to me. But the owner of the Washington Post, Eugene Meyer, if you will remember, got to be head of the Federal Reserve System and squeezed the currency, drove it down to where farm prices went below the cost of production and we plunged into a panic. I am told that he speculated on the exchange and made $4,000,000 with which he bought the Washington Post, and now attempts to browbeat the Congress with it. If any of you doubt that, I invite the Ways and Means Committee to search his income-tax record for the last 15 years and see if that report is true.

I see there is a book out by Barney Baruch on how to make money on the stock exchange. Anybody who can hang around the White House as he has done for the last 25 years and do a little speculating can get rich. If he can find out what is going on inside the White House, I do not care whether Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, or Truman is President, he can amass a fortune.

What we want to do is to get down to some sound, fundamental economics and that is what I am trying to preach to you today.

By 1930 they had squeezed this currency down from $5,698,000,000, or $53.01 per capita, in 1920 to $4,426,000,000, or $35.90 per capita, in 1930. That is when the crash came.

We passed a law giving the President the right to issue $3,500,000,000 in currency, with a gold reserve behind it. I was the author of that bill. Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma was the author of it at the other end of the Capitol. We finally put it on as an amendment to another measure, but instead of carrying out its purposes, a policy was begun of borrowing from the rich and giving to the poor through the WPA and other agencies, just what I am afraid this bill to which the gentleman from Texas was referring will lead if it is passed and becomes law.

This is encouraging the people, if you please, to be out of work. All of these strikes are absolutely unnecessary. Every man in America who wants a job can get a job if there is not some labor racketeer standing between him and that job.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, Russia, Germany, Japan, and Italy had full employment after they had a dictatorship.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. JENSEN. And everybody had a job, but what kind of a job did they have, and at what pay?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. They had full employment, but they did not have full pay and they did not have a full life. They did not have any liberty at all, and have not yet. If we want to have a totalitarian system where free men will be regimented then I am wrong; but if we want to maintain free American enterprise and carry on the glorious progress that we have made for the last 150 years, then I am right in my contention that we should not adopt anything that even looks like a totalitarian policy, but carry on our system of free enterprise under a free constitutional government.

A policy of currency expansion through the Federal Reserve System was begun in 1933.

Now I want to show you where our farmers are being gypped.

In 1930 we had $4,426,493,631 in circulation. That was on the 31st of July 1930. On the 31st of July 1945, 15 years later, instead of having $4,426,493,631 in circulation, we had $27,107,824,101, and we have more than that now. If we had let the law of supply and demand, the economic law, apply, then wheat, corn, cotton, cottonseed, barley, hay, and other farm products would have gradually risen to that level along with the advances made in industrial wages and industrial prices. But instead of that they were held down by the totalitarian policies of the OPA. The American people are denied the use of goods that can be produced from the cotton grown throughout the South. Today you cannot even get these products. I doubt if you can get a pillow slip in Washington. As a result they are driving the farmers of this Nation down, and I do not care whether they are in Minnesota or Mississippi or Iowa or Nebraska; they are driving the farmers gradually down towards a system of peonage. It is the road to serfdom, the most dangerous road that the American people could follow today.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi is entirely right. I have seen the OPA hold down the price of butterfat in my immediate community in Minnesota to the extent where herd after herd of good dairy cows have been sent to market simply because those farmers could see no reason to sit there twice a day, 365 days a year, milking cows without a little profit to themselves.

Mr. RANKIN. A man called me from home a day or two ago and he said, "The farmers do not realize it yet, but if this thing continues it is going to ruin not only the farmers in this section but it is going to ruin the farmers throughout America."

I am pleading today for those men who till the soil and for those merchants, lawyers, bankers, hotel men, filling station operators and hundreds of other small businessmen, and thousands of others, millions of others, who depend absolutely upon the prosperity of the farmers around them for their livelihood and for their own prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the circulation statement of United States money for July 31, 1930.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Circulation statement of United States money—July 31, 1930

Kind of money	Total amount [1]	Money held in the Treasury					Money outside of the Treasury				Population of continental United States (estimated)
		Total	Amount held in trust against gold and silver certificates (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Reserve against United States notes (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Held for Federal Reserve banks and agents	All other money	Total	Held by Federal Reserve banks and agents [6]	In circulation		
									Amount	Per capita	
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*		
Gold coin and bullion	[2] 4,516,509,645	3,488,481,530	1,541,571,679	156,039,088	1,742,020,102	48,850,661	1,028,028,115	671,949,528	356,078,587	2.89	
Gold certificates	[3] 1,541,571,679						1,541,571,679	539,649,140	1,001,922,539	8.13	
Standard silver dollars	539,959,520	495,437,420	490,285,647			5,151,773	44,522,100	6,414,295	38,107,805	.31	
Silver certificates	[3] 489,026,247						489,026,247	107,741,028	381,285,219	3.09	
Treasury notes of 1890	[3] 1,259,400						1,259,400		1,259,400	.01	
Subsidiary silver	310,950,253	6,056,844				6,056,844	304,893,409	25,157,125	279,736,284	2.27	
Minor coin	125,989,826	4,227,526				4,227,526	121,762,300	4,526,615	117,235,685	.95	
United States notes	346,681,016	3,269,321				3,269,321	343,411,695	55,554,012	287,857,683	2.33	
Federal Reserve notes	1,703,754,685	2,086,225				2,086,225	1,701,668,460	381,405,308	1,320,263,152	10.71	
Federal Reserve bank notes	3,184,042	22,400				22,400	3,161,642	7,082	3,154,560	.02	
National bank notes	696,553,428	23,712,691				23,712,691	672,840,737	33,248,020	639,592,717	5.19	
Total July 31, 1930	8,243,582,415	[4] 4,023,293,957	2,031,857,326	156,039,088	1,742,020,102	[5] 93,377,441	6,252,145,784	1,825,652,153	4,426,493,631	35.90	[7] 123,309,000
Comparative totals:											
June 30, 1930	8,306,564,074	[4] 4,021,936,763	1,978,447,640	156,039,088	1,796,239,235	91,210,800	6,263,074,951	1,741,086,979	4,521,987,972	37.31	121,212,000
July 31, 1929	8,693,315,134	[4] 3,828,315,224	1,769,132,245	156,039,088	1,675,180,779	227,963,012	6,634,132,255	1,917,269,708	4,716,862,547	39.34	119,906,000
Oct. 31, 1920	8,479,620,824	[4] 2,436,864,530	718,674,378	152,979,026	1,212,360,791	352,850,336	6,761,430,672	1,063,216,060	5,698,214,612	53.01	107,491,000
Mar. 31, 1917	5,396,596,677	[4] 2,952,020,313	2,681,091,072	152,979,026		117,350,216	5,126,267,436	953,321,522	4,172,945,914	40.23	103,716,000
June 30, 1914	3,796,456,764	[4] 1,845,575,888	1,507,178,879	150,000,000		188,397,009	3,458,059,755		3,458,059,755	34.92	99,027,000
Jan. 1, 1879	1,007,084,483	[4] 212,420,402	21,602,640	100,000,000		90,817,762	816,266,721		816,266,721	16.92	48,231,000

[1] Includes United States paper currency in circulation in foreign countries and the amount held by the Cuban agency of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

[2] Does not include gold bullion or foreign coin other than that held by the Treasury, Federal Reserve banks, and Federal Reserve agents. Gold held by Federal Reserve banks under earmark for foreign account is excluded, and gold held abroad for Federal Reserve banks is included.

[3] These amounts are not included in the total since the money held in trust against gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 is included under gold coin and bullion and standard silver dollars, respectively.

[4] The amount of money held in trust against gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 should be deducted from this total before combining it with total money outside of the Treasury to arrive at the stock of money in the United States.

[5] This total includes $25,416,806 of notes in process of redemption, $36,813,823 of gold deposited for redemption of Federal Reserve notes, $28,372,795 deposited for redemption of national bank notes, $1,900 deposited for retirement of additional circulation (act of May 30, 1908) and $7,694,659 deposited as a reserve against postal savings deposits.

[6] Includes money held by the Cuban agency of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta

[7] Revised in accordance with 1930 Census enumeration.

NOTE.—Gold certificates are secured dollar for dollar by gold held in the Treasury for their redemption; silver certificates are secured dollar for dollar by standard silver dollars held in the Treasury for their redemption; United States notes are secured by a gold reserve of $156,039,088 held in the Treasury. This reserve fund may also be used for the redemption of Treasury notes of 1890, which are also secured dollar for dollar by standard silver dollars held in the Treasury. Federal reserve notes are obligations of the United States and a first lien on all the assets of the issuing Federal Reserve bank. Federal Reserve notes are secured by the deposit with Federal Reserve agents of a like amount of gold or of gold and such discounted or purchased paper as is eligible under the terms of the Federal Reserve Act Federal Reserve banks must maintain a gold reserve of at least 40 percent, including the gold redemption fund which must be deposited with the United States Treasurer, against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. Lawful money has been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for retirement of all outstanding Federal Reserve bank notes. National bank notes are secured by United States bonds except where lawful money has been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for their retirement. A 5 percent fund is also maintained in lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States for the redemption of national bank notes secured by Government bonds.

Mr. RANKIN. I want every one of you to read it.

Now, let us see what is going to be the remedy. You have more than $27,000,000,000 in circulation now. I have the last report in my pocket, I keep it there, but I use this one of the 31st of July. The last one was issued on the 30th of September. It shows that we have $27,825,000,000 in circulation. All right, what are you going to do? I know a certain element of these money changers who are international financiers, are more interested in their holdings in foreign countries than they are in your prosperity and mine. They are going to insist on a deflation of the currency. I was surprised to hear Members of the Congress get up here and talk about inflation, the threat of inflation. Why, the poor fellows did not know it, but we already have inflation. We have over four times—more than six times—as much money as we had in 1930. We already have inflation. Now, what are we going to do? If they begin to deflate that currency, what will happen?

We have a national debt of about $300,000,000,000. The only way in God's world you will ever pay that debt is to let prices rise to the level of your money supply multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. You cannot do that by raising the price of steel or raising the wages of the steelworkers and leaving the farmers down in the ditch. So you have to do one of two things: You have to take away these artificial restrictions that should have been taken away the day the war closed and let farm prices rise to their economic levels; you have to tear from the industrial plants of the Nation the greedy hands of the labor racketeers, who are not interested in the prosperity of the country so much as they are in their own power, and let economic prices level off and adjust themselves. In that way there will be enough national income to carry on this Government and pay the interest and the sinking fund on the national debt.

But you let these long-distance patriots, who want to abolish the United States in order to set up a super world government to be financed by us, do away with your national sovereignty; you let them get control and see what they do to this money. They will immediately begin to withdraw from circulation and drive the currency down and down and down, and with it will go prices and with it will go the national income, until you plunge into economic chaos.

Then what will happen? You think those boys that are being held in uniform today, those young men who went out and fought and won this war, are going to stand for that? Do you think they are going to pay a $300,000,000,000 debt on a $20,000,000,000 income? Do you think they are going to pay a debt made on $27,000,000,000 of circulation with $4,090,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 in circulation? Do you think they are going to take the last crumb of bread from the mouths of their wives and children to pay the national debt? If you do, you do not know human nature.

I will tell you what will happen. You will have some fellow rise up, probably out on we will say the Wabash, somewhere out in the center of the country. They will call him a long-haired agitator. He will say, "If I am elected President of the United States I will repudiate those bonds." There is your danger. Just as surely as the night follows the day, if you let Eugene Meyer and the crowd he trained with in the twenties do exactly what they did then and drive the currency down and down until farm prices go below the cost of production, breadlines stretch down the streets of your cities, and a wave of suicides sweep over the land, if you do that then you will have some man rise up and say, "Why should we continue to pay this? Make me President of the United States and I will wipe it out."

He will probably be elected. It happened in a State once. A man ran on a program of repudiating some bonds, over 100 years ago, and he was elected. He repudiated them, and they never were paid. If you should do that, then there would go the credit of your country, then there would go the confidence in your country, then there would go everything,

all the confidence that we have built up and cherished throughout 150 years. What is your alternative?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Everything the gentleman has said is substantiated by the record and by the pages of history because no nation has ever been destroyed by commodity inflation. Every nation that has been destroyed has been destroyed because of currency inflation and finally causing the currency value to be deflated.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman means deflation.

Mr. JENSEN. I mean deflation.

Mr. RANKIN. Your danger is not inflation. You have inflation now. Your danger is deflation. Well, you say, what is your remedy? You cannot keep these men who have had this money issued to them from bringing in these Federal Reserve notes and having them retired and taking up the bonds to back them. I will tell you my remedy. As I said, I have no right to criticize the condition unless I do have a remedy. In the first place, I would get rid of the OPA and put a stop to this stuff and let prosperity spread over the country, so we might all enjoy it equally. I would stop saying to these boys, "You have to see somebody and pay tribute before you can work." I would see that they are permitted to work without having to pay tribute. I would pass a law to provide that we would stabilize the currency at a certain amount—$27,000,000,000 perhaps might be a little too high. We might want it at $25,000,000,000 or we might want it at $20,000,000,000, or at some other figure. But whatever the amount agreed upon, we would say that it is going to be stabilized at that point. Then every time one of these fellows brought in his Federal Reserve notes and retired them, we would issue an equal amount in United States notes with a gold reserve behind it, which would be just as strong, or even stronger, because it is all based on the credit of the Government.

I said that to a Member of the House yesterday. He thought it was horrible and he said, "There are no United States notes in circulation now." There are $346,681,016 of United States notes out now which were issued by Abraham Lincoln during the War Between the States. They have been in circulation ever since.

They are legal tender. You have to take them just as you would a silver dollar or a gold dollar or a silver certificate or a Federal Reserve note.

In that way, we can stabilize the currency, maintain prosperity, and pay the national debt, and stop this punishing the farmers of the Nation, and put a stop to the harassing of every little businessman who is trying to meet his obligations, pay his debts, feed his family, and keep his concern going.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point that I may insert this circulation statement of July 31, 1945.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Circulation statement of United States money—July 31, 1945

Kind of money	Total amount	Money held in the Treasury					Money outside of the Treasury				Population of continental United States (estimated)
		Total	Amount held as security against gold and silver certificates (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Reserve against United States notes (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Held for Federal Reserve banks and agents	All other money	Total	Held by Federal Reserve banks and agents	In circulation [7]		
									Amount	Per capita	
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*		
Gold	[1] 20,152,384,359	20,152,384,359	18,032,476,219	156,039,431		[4] 1,963,868,709					
Gold certificates	[2] 18,032,476,219	[2] 15,165,124,550			[3] 15,165,124,550		2,867,351,669	2,815,444,500	51,907,169	$0.37	
Standard silver dollars	493,943,028	365,099,871	338,305,227			26,794,644	128,843,157	1,937,230	126,905,927	.91	
Silver bullion	1,574,598,299	1,574,598,299	1,574,598,299								
Silver certificates	[2] 1,911,753,968						1,911,753,968	181,020,868	1,730,733,100	12.39	
Treasury notes of 1890	[2] 1,149,558						1,149,558		1,149,558	.01	
Subsidiary silver	829,646,457	15,056,896				15,056,896	814,589,561	14,694,310	799,895,251	5.73	
Minor coin	305,836,436	5,917,901				5,917,901	299,918,535	4,062,806	295,915,729	2.12	
United States notes	346,681,016	2,574,068				2,574,068	344,106,948	22,351,592	321,755,356	2.30	
Federal Reserve notes	23,954,743,200	86,261,817				86,261,817	23,868,481,393	729,407,270	23,139,074,113	165.61	
Federal Reserve bank notes	527,366,848	1,126,515				1,126,515	526,240,333	5,184,480	521,055,853	3.73	
National bank notes	120,695,195	663,850				663,850	120,031,345	599,300	119,432,045	.85	
Total July 31, 1945	48,305,894,838	22,203,683,576	19,945,379,745	156,039,431	[5] 15,165,124,550	[6] 2,102,264,400	[6] 30,882,466,457	3,774,642,356	27,107,824,101	194.02	139,716,000
Comparative totals:											
June 30, 1945	48,099,399,687	22,202,300,287	19,923,737,751	156,039,431	15,239,071,695	2,122,523,105	30,491,765,456	3,745,511,973	26,746,253,483	*191.59	*139,601,000
July 31, 1944	44,852,075,459	23,030,294,743	20,683,841,735	156,039,431	16,007,907,630	2,190,413,577	26,497,714,821	3,798,362,189	22,699,352,632	*164.18	*138,262,000
Oct. 31, 1920	8,479,620,824	2,436,864,530	718,674,378	152,979,026	1,212,360,791	352,850,336	6,761,430,672	1,063,216,060	5,698,214,612	53.21	107,096,000
Mar. 31, 1917	5,396,596,677	2,952,020,313	2,681,691,072	152,979,026		117,350,216	5,126,267,436	953,321,522	4,172,945,914	40.23	103,716,000
June 30, 1914	3,797,825,099	1,845,569,804	1,507,178,879	150,000,000		188,390,925	3,459,434,174		3,459,434,174	34.93	99,027,000
Jan. 1, 1879	1,007,084,483	212,420,402	21,602,640	100,000,000		90,817,762	816,266,721		816,266,721	16.92	48,231,000

[1] Does not include gold other than that held by the Treasury.

[2] These amounts are not included in the total, since the gold or silver held as security against gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 is included under gold, standard silver dollars, and silver bullion, respectively.

[3] This total includes credits with the Treasurer of the United States payable in gold certificates in (1) the gold certificate fund Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, in the amount of $14,505,169,813, and (2) the redemption fund for Federal Reserve notes in the amount of $659,954,737.

[4] Includes $1,800,000,000 exchange stabilization fund.

[5] Includes $136,000,000 lawful money deposited as a reserve for postal savings deposits.

[6] The amount of gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 should be deducted from this amount before combining with total money held in the Treasury to arrive at the total amount of money in the United States.

[7] The money in circulation includes any paper currency held outside the continental limits of the United States.

NOTE.—There is maintained in the Treasury—(i) as a reserve for United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890—$156,039,431 in gold bullion; (ii) as security for Treasury notes of 1890—an equal dollar amount in standard silver dollars (these notes are being canceled and retired on receipt); (iii) as security for outstanding silver certificates—silver in bullion and standard silver dollars of a monetary value equal to the face amount of such silver certificates; and (iv) as security for gold certificates—gold bullion of a value at the legal standard equal to the face amount of such gold certificates. Federal Reserve notes are obligations of the United States and a first lien on all the assets of the issuing Federal Reserve bank. Federal Reserve notes are secured by the deposit by the Federal Reserve bank concerned, with its Federal Reserve agent, of a like amount of collateral consisting of such discounted or purchased paper as is eligible under the terms of the Federal Reserve Act, or gold certificates, or direct obligations of the United States. Each Federal Reserve bank must maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. Gold certificates deposited with Federal Reserve agents as collateral, and those deposited with the Treasurer of the United States as a redemption fund, are counted as part of the required reserve. "Gold certificates" as herein used includes credits with the Treasurer of the United States payable in gold certificates. Federal Reserve bank notes and National bank notes are in process of retirement.

*Revised figures.

Mr. RANKIN. I want every one of you to read it and compare it with the one I put in for July 31, 1930—just 15 years to the day before that. You will see what I am talking about.

We should be on a rising tide of prices for everything. But they tell you it will not do for the farmer to get too much for what he raises. But industrial labor, or their alleged leaders, put on a strike among the highest paid laborers in the world. Then they call a conference of men who represent less than one-fifth even of industrial laborers to settle it, and keep out the farmers and independent businessmen and everybody else in the Nation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In reference to these policies of the OPA, I think that the RECORD should show that when the OPA was extended for a year last June there was a motion offered to extend it for

only 6 months, which would have put an end to it by now. That motion lost by only 86 votes.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir. And if we had done that, the wheels of every cotton factory in America would be running full time. Cotton goods would be manufactured; cotton would be going up; wheat would be going up; corn would be going up; hogs, land, lumber, barley, and everything that the farmer has to sell would be going up; and our farmers would enjoy an era of prosperity the like of which they have never known.

I regret to take issue with some of the Members on my side, but I have a responsibility in this House. I am here representing not only 260,000 people in my own district, but indirectly representing 130,000,000 people. It is my conscientious duty to point out these things. I say to you now that, unless we get back on the "beam" and stop flirting with totalitarianism, we are likely to wreck this country. But if we will get back to those great fundamental principles that Jefferson and Washington and Adams and the other great men who founded this Republic advocated, we will not only save this country, but we can lead the world along the paths of peace, progress, and prosperity into a more glorious civilization for all mankind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has again expired.

CIVIC ELECTIONS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, of course, I want to talk to my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not believe the gentleman from North Carolina has any of his friends on his side present today to talk to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman will find out before I get through.

I have been in this Congress some time. Usually, in the off-year elections, Members on the other side of the aisle will rise and proceed to tell what a wonderful election they had yesterday, no matter how small the town may have been which elected a mayor.

Mr. Speaker, in order that we may keep the record straight, let me remind those gentlemen that the city of New York went Democratic yesterday by a plurality of 685,000 in this off year; that Cleveland, Louisville, Pittsburgh, Boston, and many other cities and towns went Democratic.

I know how you gentlemen feel after all those other years. It is pretty hard on you, but you have to take your medicine, and you have to sit in sackcloth and ashes for a little while.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I am rather surprised that my good and distinguished friend from North Carolina glories in the success of the American Labor Party in New York yesterday, which had attached to it as a tail what was left of Tammany and the Democratic Party.

Mr. BULWINKLE. So the gentleman is surprised at that? I know that the gentleman is surprised because O'Dwyer won. He thought because Governor Dewey went out and took the stump that the Republican ticket would carry New York, and you see what happened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 131. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon;

S. 201. An act for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer;

S. 504. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Cosby & Skipwith's report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg land district, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township;

S. 542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz;

S. 559. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service," approved October 27, 1943, so as to make provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941;

S. 562. An act for the relief of Klau-Van Pieterson-Dunlap Associates, Inc.;

S. 788. An act for the relief of the estate of George J. Ross;

S. 883. An act for the relief of Charlie Tyson;

S. 927. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937;

S. 979. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Lillian Epstein;

S. 980. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. St. Amant, Jr.;

S. 994. An act for the relief of the Central Leaf Tobacco Co., Inc.;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest L. Barlow;

S. 1027. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hibernia I. Conners;

S. 1076. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1102. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945;

S. 1103. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944;

S. 1118. An act for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945;

S. 1119. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945;

S. 1134. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102-A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944;

S. 1139. An act for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims;

S. 1183. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising from activities of the War Department or of the Army;

S. 1199. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman;

S. 1219. An act authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.;

S. 1259. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.;

S. 1362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes; and

S. 1420. An act to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 a. m., Thursday, November 8, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full employment bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream pollution abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

822. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $2,000,000, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 372); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

823. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report (list No. 1) reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 70 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by his immediate predecessor, Attorney General Biddle, and a report (list No. 2) of the cases of 182 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 392. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses to Julia T. Douglas, sister of Lorraine T. Moore, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1188). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4610. A bill to authorize the painting of the signing of the United Nations Charter for placement in the Capitol Building; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4611. A bill concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States and on the international air transport routes from the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4612. A bill to enable and to expedite the business of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4613. A bill relating to vacations for persons employed on Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Roads.

H. R. 4614. A bill to provide for vacations to employees of the Post Office Department on the same basis as for vacations to other Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 4615. A bill for the relief of Aycock Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4616. A bill for the relief of the Maryland Sanitary Manufacturing Corp., of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 4617. A bill for the relief of Theodore A. Lindenmeyer, Blair, Nebr.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1308. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Mrs. Miriam Boyker, Mrs. Mary Tracy, Mrs. Charles Duren, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Driscoll, Mrs. Bernice MacLaughlin, Mrs. Lillian H. Garland, Mrs. Lowell Brockway, and Miss Minnie Holt, of Portland, Maine, for enactment of legislation embodying the principles of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1309. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Colorado State Federation of Labor, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of S. 101 and H. R. 2232; to the Committee on Labor.

1310. Also, petition of the grand jury of Westchester County, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to recommendations for legislation to protect labor and the general public; to the Committee on Labor.

1311. Also, petition of Chabot Citizens Coordinating Council of Vallejo, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement for a redress of grievances existing between We, the People and the National and Federal Public Housing authorities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father, lover of our souls, for this moment of the far look we lift our eyes from the swiftly moving scenes about us to the eternal verities by which we live. Give us, we beseech Thee, strength for our burdens, wisdom for our problems, and insight for our troubled times. As by Thy hand in mournful autumn winds Nature shakes off her stricken vesture only to be clothed upon with a new splendor now on the way, so by Thy spirit, even in bitter blasts of adversity, strip us of all that thwarts Thy will in us and through us and clothe us with the garments of love and service. Planted by the springs of hidden rivers, may we be as trees which bringeth forth fruit in their season and whose leaves are for the healing of the nations. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 6, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 131. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon;

S. 201. An act for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer;

S. 504. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township;

S. 542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz;

S. 559. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service," approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941;

S. 562. An act for the relief of Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc.;

S. 788. An act for the relief of the estate of George J. Ross;

S. 883. An act for the relief of Charlie Tyson;

S. 927. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937;

S. 979. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Lillian Epstein;

S. 980. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. St. Amant, Jr.;

S. 994. An act for the relief of the Central Leaf Tobacco Co., Inc.;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest L. Barlow;

S. 1027. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hibernia I. Conners;

S. 1076. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1102. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945;

S. 1103. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944;

S. 1118. An act for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945;

S. 1119. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945;

S. 1134. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102-A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944;

S. 1139. An act for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims;

S. 1183. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising from activities of the War Department or of the Army;

S. 1219. An act authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.;

S. 1259. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.;

S. 1362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes; and

S. 1420. An act to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On November 6, 1945:

S. 1281. An act to provide for covering into the treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States.

On November 8, 1945:

S. 131. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon;

S. 201. An act for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer;

S. 504. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg land district, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township;

S. 542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz;

S. 559. An act to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service", approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941;

S. 562. An act for the relief of Klau-Van Pietersom—Dunlap Associates, Inc.;

S. 788. An act for the relief of the estate of George J. Ross;

S. 883. An act for the relief of Charlie Tyson;

S. 927. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937;

S. 979. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Lillian Epstein;

S. 980. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. St. Amant, Jr.;

S. 994. An act for the relief of the Central Leaf Tobacco Co. Inc.;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest L. Barlow;

S. 1027. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hibernia I. Conners;

S. 1076. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1102. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945;

S. 1103. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944;

S. 1118. An act for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945;

S. 1119. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945;

S. 1134. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102-A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944;

S. 1139. An act for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims;

S. 1183. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising from activities of the War Department or of the Army.

S. 1219. An act authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.;

S. 1259. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.;

S. 1362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes; and

S. 1420. An act to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD ON OPERATIONS UNDER THE PROPERTY REQUISITIONING ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report of the War Production Board covering operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, as amended, for the period from April 16 through October 15, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 6, 1945.*

(The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

TERMS OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 940) to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada, which was, on page 2, line 1, to strike out all after the word "provided", down to and including the word "purpose", in line 6, and insert "without expense to the United States."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to move that the Senate concur in a House amendment. In explanation, I will say that this measure relates only to the district of Nevada, fixing the terms of court there. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. It passed the Senate and went to the House, where it was amended in this respect: The Senate bill provided that the quarters in Elko, Nev., should be furnished by the local citizens until such time, in substance, as different arrangements might be made through the court administrative officer. The House struck out that provision and inserted in lieu thereof that the quarters in Elko should be maintained without expense to the United States. The Senator from Nevada advises me that the amendment is perfectly agreeable to him, and he is very desirous of having the legislation enacted so that the terms may be fixed. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hart	Overton
Bali	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Huffman	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Knowland	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Taylor
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McMahon	Vandenberg
Cordon	Magnuson	Wagner
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Morse	Willis
Ferguson	Murdock	Wilson
George	Myers	Young
Guffey	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Ser ate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETITIONS

Mr. WALSH presented the following petitions, which were referred, as indicated:

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of citizens of Haverhill, Mass., relating to the establishment of a homeland for Jews in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Liberty Lodge, No. 132, Scandinavian Fraternity of America, of Brockton, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase immigration quotas for Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark in order that they be on an equal basis with other countries; to the Committee on Immigration.

A resolution adopted by local No. 253, United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America (CIO), of Boston, Mass., favoring the immediate dissolution of the so-called House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS OF FIFTH DISTRICT OF KANSAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the Fifth District of Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled at Wichita, Kans., on October 19, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the brewers are receiving grains and sugar to manufacture intoxicating liquors; and

Whereas it has been scientifically proven that alcoholic liquors are detrimental to the health of American people and welfare of the American home; and

Whereas homemakers are deprived of necessary sugar for domestic use: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Fifth District of Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled at Wichita, Kans., October 19, 1945, That the Federal Government restrict the use of sugars for such purposes.

Signed by the resolutions committee:

Mrs. FLOYD TURNER.
Mrs. W. H. VON DER HEIDEN.
Mrs. ROY E. THOMAS.

To the Committee on Education and Labor:

Whereas the Government in this recent emergency has built housing projects near manufacturing plants at a great cost; and

Whereas these emergency housing projects are to be dismantled and discontinued; and

Whereas a great number of people are now badly in need of housing facilities and equipment: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Fifth District of Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled at Wichita, Kans., October 19, 1945, That the Federal Government should take steps to utilize such housing projects in such a way that deserving and needy people could benefit therefrom And that it is the desire of the women of the Fifth District that these projects be not ruthlessly destroyed or exploited, but that they should serve a worthy purpose.

Signed by the resolutions committee:

Mrs. FLOYD TURNER.
Mrs. W. H. VON DER HEIDEN.
Mrs. ROY E THOMAS.

RESOLUTION OF FIFTH DISTRICT OF KANSAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Fifth District of Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs, held at Wichita, Kans., on October 19, in which that organization goes on record as in favor of making use of housing facilities and equipment which heretofore have been used as housing facilities in some of the large cities of Kansas. I am in accord with the recommendation of the organization that such facilities should be utilized as projects so as to enable deserving and needy people to benefit therefrom. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution and that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Government in this recent emergency has built housing projects near manufacturing plants at a great cost; and

Whereas these emergency housing projects are to be dismantled and discontinued; and

Whereas a great number of people are now badly in need of housing facilities and equipment: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Fifth District of Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled at Wichita, Kans., October 19, 1945, That the Federal Government should take steps to utilize such housing projects in such a way that deserving and needy people could benefit therefrom, and that it is the desire of the women of the Fifth District that these projects be not ruthlessly destroyed or exploited but that they should serve a worthy purpose.

Signed by resolutions committee:

Mrs. FLOYD TURNER.
Mrs. W. H. VON DER HEIDEN.
Mrs. ROY E. THOMAS.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—STATEMENT BY LEWIS G. HINES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Lewis G. Hines, legislative representative of American Federation of Labor, has made public an able and convincing statement on the subject of compulsory military training. He takes a strong stand against compulsory military training in peacetime. I ask that this statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

(By Lewis G. Hines, AFL legislative representative)

President Truman asked Congress this week to enact immediate legislation providing for 1 year's compulsory military training for all American young men.

If labor were convinced that such legislation is essential to the Nation's defense, we would support it. But we are not so convinced. Therefore, the American Federation of Labor opposes any hasty action on this proposal.

We would like to know, first of all, does America face any immediate threat of war? If so, from what source? If not, why do we need to compel our youth to give up a year of their lives to military training? Never before in its history has America resorted to universal conscription in time of peace. What is the urgency now?

The American people have been led to believe that the United Nations were determined to banish future wars by world organization to keep the peace. Are we ready to admit that this effort is doomed to failure already? We have been assured that the power of Germany and Japan to make war is being totally destroyed. Is aggression then likely from any other nation? Now is the time to find out so that we can deal with it before we get caught by surprise.

One argument advanced by those who favor universal military training is that it would discourage any nation from making war on us. But European countries have had conscription for many, many years and it has not prevented wars.

Future wars will be fought according to new patterns The atomic bomb, jet propulsion and other discoveries may make large armies a liability, instead of an asset. The national defense must be planned in terms of the future. We should have a large Air Force, a large Navy, and the finest scientific research organization in the world. These can be adequately manned by voluntary enlistment if service in the national defense is made attractive enough.

America's greatest weapon is its capacity to outproduce any other nation in the world. Plans should be made now to convert our production facilities to war needs without delay if a war emergency develops in the future.

If this program is followed, America will remain invincible and safe from foreign aggression, without having to subject the nation's youth to the undemocratic experiment of compulsory, universal military training.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1466. A bill authorizing rehabilitation on the island of Guam; with an amendment (Rept. No. 705);

S. 1467. A bill to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations, of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 702);

S. 1492. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building numbered 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 703);

S. 1493. A bill to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields; without amendment (Rept. No. 704); and

S. 1545. A bill to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy, with an amendment (Rept. No. 706).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 875. A bill for the relief of Nannie Bass; without amendment (Rept. No. 707).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler; without amendment (Rept. No. 708); and

H. R. 4018. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Hudson; without amendment (Rept. No. 709).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones; with an amendment (Rept. No. 714);

H. R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Josephine Benham; with an amendment (Rept. No. 715);

H. R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Candler Cobb; without amendment (Rept. No. 710);

H. R. 2686. A bill for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood; without amendment (Rept. No. 711);

H. R. 3198. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 716);

H. R. 3249. A bill for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly; without amendment (Rept. No. 712); and

H. R. 3790. A bill for the relief of Genevieve Lund; without amendment (Rept. No. 713).

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR NAVY AND MARINE CORPS—REPORT OF NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill (S. 1405) to authorize the President to retire certain officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 701) thereon. I ask that a statement of the provisions of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report will be received, and the bill placed on the calendar.

The statement presented by the Senator from Massachusetts will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. WALSH is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PROVISIONS OF S. 1405

This is a bill to authorize the President to retire certain officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

During the war, laws governing separation from the service by retirement, except in cases of physically incapacitated officers, were suspended by the Congress. Those voluntary retirement provisions of law before the war, such as retirement in the discretion of the President after 40, 30, or 20 years, respectively, of service were suspended administratively.

Every officer of the Regular Establishment, whose services could be employed in any capacity whatsoever, was employed during the war in an effort to conserve personnel in the interest of the critical manpower shortage in war industry.

The Appropriation Act for the fiscal year of 1941, approved June 11, 1940, suspended the involuntary retirement of officers adjudged by the then existing selection boards as only fitted, rather than most fitted, under the provisions of the Personnel Act of June 23, 1938. The act of June 30, 1942, suspended all provisions of the Personnel Act of June 23, 1938, regarding permanent promotions and retirement. As a consequence, there are many officers on the active list of the Navy today, particularly in the higher ranks, whose services can no longer be efficiently employed. In order to make the necessary readjustment in the active list of the Regular Naval Establishment, the subject bill will authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convene boards composed of senior naval officers to review the records of officers and make recommendation concerning their retirement.

Among other provisions, the bill authorizes enlisted men of the Fleet Reserve and retired enlisted men who served in commissioned grades on temporary promotions during the war to have the highest rank or rating held during the war upon their release to inactive duty. This same highest rank or rating is provided for Reserve officers on release to inactive duty and to retired officers and men on return to inactive status, and to officers and men of the Regular Navy when subsequently retired. Retired pay is based on the highest rank or rating held. Provisions are made for voluntary retirement after 20 years' active service, at least 10 years of which must have been active commissioned service, for Regular or Reserve officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

The bill, in order to make possible the advancement of young officers, also lowers the current statutory age of retirement from 64 to 62 for all officers below the rank of fleet admiral with the proviso that the President may defer the age retirement of not to exceed 10 such officers for special assignment until they reach the age of 64 years.

The recent war has emphasized the necessity for youth and vigor in maintaining the Navy and Marine Corps at peak performance under the strain of combat. World War II has conclusively demonstrated that alert and youthful officers are absolutely essential in the successful prosecution of any war.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of October 1945 from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 8, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

APPROPRIATIONS

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave	District of Columbia government	$3,970

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Acting Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURPLUS PROPERTY,
November 1, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 318, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Surplus Property Subcommittee (S. Res. 129) of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Surplus
Property Subcommittee.

Surplus Property Subcommittee, Senate Military Affairs Committee

Name of individua	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Kurt Borchardt	6007 34th Pl. NW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	$7,240
Mabel Graham	1474 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	2,320
Hilda Hamilton	705 18th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	2,830

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1563. A bill for the relief of Ferris Ruggles; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1564. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Shadrick Ponca;

S. 1565. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Joe Brushorne; and

S. 1566. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Wilma Brandon Irving; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1567. A bill to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to provide for service of process on agents or employees of (nonresident) persons, firms, or associations conducting a business in the District of Columbia for which a license is required; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1568. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make camping equipment available to certain organizations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1569. A bill for the relief of Gwynn C. Triplett and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1570. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co. of Oklahoma City (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1571. A bill for the relief of Hazel Echo Knutson; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1572. A bill to provide sick and annual leave for war service indefinite substitutes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of James H. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1574. A bill to incorporate the Reserve Officers of the Naval Services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1575. A bill to insure the preservation of technical and economic records of domestic sources of ores of metals and minerals; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1576. A bill to facilitate filing and settlement of veterans' claims, and for other purposes;

S. 1577. A bill to facilitate settlement of claims, and for other purposes; and

S. 1578. A bill to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MORSE) introduced Senate Bill 1579, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. CONNALLY introduced Senate bill 1580, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to preserve the status and perquisites of officers of the United States Army detailed to duty in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. WILEY):

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Library.

(Mr. KNOWLAND introduced Senate Joint Resolution 115, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to suspend further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES ON SECURITY COUNCIL OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill relating primarily to the power and authority, the tenure and salary of the United States representative on the Security Council of the United Nations Organization. It also deals with representation on other agencies of the Organization. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization, and I submit a report (No. 717) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill placed on the calendar.

DESIGNATION OF DECEMBER 15 AS BILL OF RIGHTS DAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution designating the 15th day of December as Bill of Rights Day. The Bill of Rights became a part of the Constitution on December 15, 1791, when Virginia became the eleventh State to ratify it.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 115) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the 15th day of December of each year as Bill of Rights Day, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. REVERCOMB submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 1199

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to correct an error made apparently by the Printing Office in printing Senate bill 1199. Instead of the word "which" the word "while" was used. That is the sole purpose of the concurrent resolution. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives in signing the enrolled bill (S. 1199) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman be, and the same is hereby, rescinded, and that the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to reenroll the said bill with the following change, namely: On page 2, line 1, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the word "while" and insert in lieu thereof the word "which."

TERMINATION OF RATIONING OF BUTTER, OLEOMARGARINE, FATS, OILS, AND MEAT

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 185), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Whereas the United States military services and other Government agencies have

recently released for public consumption in the United States 100,000,000 pounds of high-quality creamery butter; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to sell 8,000,000 pounds of creamery butter in foreign markets; and

Whereas 100,000,000 pounds of creamery butter added to current commercial stocks and expected production during November and December 1945 will provide at least 150,000,000 pounds of creamery butter for each such month; and

Whereas 150,000,000 pounds a month is more than enough to provide for all unrestricted domestic civilian consumption of high-quality creamery butter during November and December and provide for an adequate year end carry-over; and

Whereas the production of butter begins to increase in December, due to seasonal factors, and continues to increase monthly for the ensuing 6 months; and

Whereas civilians will have the entire United States butter production available for their use during 1946, with the exception of very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas oleomargarine, which is used for the same purpose, is in surplus supply; and

Whereas there will continue to be sufficient fats and oils available to produce supplies of oleomargarine equal to the demand for it; and

Whereas the current civilian allocation of other fats and oils, including lard, is at the highest rate since the initiation of fats and oils rationing; and

Whereas shortening, salad, and cooking oils are being produced in quantities greater than at any time since regulations were imposed and in quantities greater than those produced prior to the war; and

Whereas the supply of raw materials needed to produce shortening, salad, and cooking oils will continue to be sufficient to maintain this production; and

Whereas the production of lard, one of the chief fats and oils, will be substantially increased beginning not later than November 1, due to the seasonal increase in hog slaughter; and

Whereas the availability of supply is now sufficient to provide as much fats and oils as has ever before been consumed in this country during a peacetime period; and

Whereas the total domestic production of fats and oils, including lard, during 1946 will be available for civilian consumption, except for very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas meat supplies in the United States at the present time are admittedly available at the annual rate of 159 pounds per capita and will continue to be available at this rate for the remainder of the year; and

Whereas meat supplies in this quantity are greater than were ever before available in the United States during any prewar period; and

Whereas meat supplies will be available during 1946 at a rate far in excess of the quantity consumed at any previous time; and

Whereas the supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese are abundant; and

Whereas the military has ceased purchasing poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese; and

Whereas the large supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese will supplement the supplies of meat available for civilian consumption in the United States; and

Whereas the continuation of rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat is causing hoarding, maldistribution, and disruption of normal marketing; and

Whereas the expense of continuing rationing is no longer warranted; and

Whereas industry is capable of reestablishing normal distribution of these commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than November 15, 1945.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 186), which was referred to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy:

Whereas the United States has developed an atomic bomb which has been demonstrated by actual use to be far more destructive than any weapon of war heretofore known to man; and

Whereas the destructive force of this new weapon is of such great magnitude that its use might quickly destroy great cities and whole nations of people, irrespective of their guilt or innocence and without regard to their status as participants in warfare; and

Whereas the possibility of the use of the atomic bomb as a weapon or instrument of war threatens the peace of the world and the continuance of civilization; and

Whereas the peoples of the world have demonstrated at the San Francisco Conference and elsewhere that they favor whatever measures are necessary to achieve a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the common interests of all mankind imperatively require that effective measures be taken to prevent the use of the atomic bomb as a weapon or instrument of war; and

Whereas the present position of the United States makes it appropriate for this Nation to assume the leadership in the development of such measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate (1) that the President should immediately enter into negotiations with other nations with a view to reaching an agreement which will prohibit the use of the atomic bomb as a weapon or instrument of war and with a view to implementing such agreement so as to provide an effective means for preventing the use of the atomic bomb for such purposes, and (2) that it should be the policy of the United States, in its participation in the United Nations Organization, to promote and encourage the use of the powers and facilities of that Organization effectively to prevent the use of the atomic bomb as a weapon or instrument of war and further to aid the plan and purpose set forth in the United Nations Charter to aid in securing and making permanent peace among all the nations of the world.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON BILL PROVIDING FOR SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for the printing of 500 copies of the hearings on Senate bill 292, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes. This is a bill which is concerned with the sale of surplus ships of our merchant marine. Much interest has developed in this matter, and there have been so many requests for copies of the hearings that it is necessary that more be printed in order to supply the demands which are being made.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 187), submitted by Mr. RADCLIFFE, was received and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 500 additional copies, parts 1 and 2, of the hearing held before said committee during the current session on S. 292 entitled "A bill to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes."

PAYMENT OF ACCUMULATED OR ACCRUED LEAVE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave, which were, to strike out all after enacting clause and insert:

That the act entitled "An act making provisions for payment of employees of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, for accumulated or accrued annual leave when ordered to active duty with the military or naval forces of the United States," approved August 1, 1941, as amended April 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 200), is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Any person who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall have performed active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or in any of their respective components, may, while on terminal leave pending separation from or release from active duty in such service under honorable conditions, enter or reenter employment of the Government of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia (including any corporation created under authority of an act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress), and, in addition to compensation for such employment, shall be entitled to receive pay and allowances from the armed forces for the unexpired portion of such terminal leave at the same rates and to the same extent as if he had not entered or reentered such employment.

"(b) Any such person who, prior to the date of enactment of this section, entered or reentered such employment without having used all accumulated and current accrued leave to which he would have been entitled as a result of such service had he not entered or reentered such employment, shall upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he would have been entitled while on terminal leave for the unused portion of such accumulated and current accrued leave had he not entered or reentered such employment.

"(c) Any such person who, while on terminal leave from the armed forces, performed or shall hereafter perform services for the Government of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia (including any corporation created under authority of an act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress), for which he would have been entitled to be paid had he regularly become employed

or reemployed in a civilian position prior to performing such services, and had he not been receiving pay and allowances from the armed forces for the period during which such services were performed, shall, if he has not otherwise been compensated for such services, be entitled, upon application therefor filed with the General Accounting Office, or, in the case of a person performing such services for a Territory or possession, filed with the appropriate agency or officer of the Government of such Territory or possession, to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the compensation he would have received for such services had he been regularly employed or reemployed and had he not been receiving pay and allowances from the armed forces.

"(d) Any such person who enters the employment of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, shall upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he is entitled for the unused portion of his accumulated and current accrued leave.

"(e) No waiver effectuated prior to the date of enactment of this section of any right to receive any payment to which a person would otherwise be entitled under this section shall operate to deny such person entitlement to such payment."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the adjustment of the compensation of certain members or former members of the armed forces of the United States who, before the expiration of their terminal leave, have performed, or shall hereafter perform, civilian services for the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the president pro tempore appointed Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. HART conferees on the part of the Senate.

COLORADO RIVER-RIO GRANDE WATER TREATY WITH MEXICO (S. DOC. NO. 98)

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, recently the Mexican Senate confirmed the so-called Colorado River Treaty between Mexico and the United States.

One of the important elements of the Mexican legislative history of the Colorado River-Rio Grande Water Treaty is the report given to the Mexican Senate by Engineer Adolfo Orive Alba, executive chairman of the National Irrigation Commission of Mexico, one of the negotiators of the treaty, whose position corresponds approximately to that of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation in our country.

I hold in my hand a translation of the statement made by him concerning this treaty, and, in view of its great importance historically, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMBIGUITIES IN COLORADO RIVER-RIO GRANDE WATER TREATY

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter which is self-explanatory, dated November 7, 1945, written by myself to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
November 7, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,
The Department of State.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You have, of course, seen the reports made to the Mexican Senate by the Mexican negotiators of the Colorado River-Rio Grande Water Treaty. For your ready reference, we are enclosing a translation of one such official statement which has just reached us. This is by Engineer Adolfo Orive Alba, executive chairman of the National Irrigation Commission of Mexico, one of the negotiators of the treaty, whose position corresponds approximately to that of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, in our country.

You will note that the interpretation of the treaty, relative to the Colorado River, with respect to quality of water and "extraordinary drought" is diametrically opposite to the interpretation given the American Senate by the American negotiators and the State Department. As to salinity, Engineer Orive Alba says, The water must be of good quality," and speaks of Mexico's "undeniable right to receive waters of good quality," whereas your Mr. Clayton and Mr. Tipton, negotiators for the United States, said that the Mexican negotiators plainly understood that Mexico was obliged to take whatever water the United States delivers, even though it may be so saline as to be unusable for irrigation purposes, and that memoranda were exchanged between the negotiators to indicate that intent. Other witnesses for the treaty supported that interpretation. (Hearings of Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Clayton, p. 110; Tipton, pp. 322, 323, 324, 338, 342, 343; Stone, pp. 1487–1488; Giles, 1504; Wallace, 1536; Bashore, 1726–1727; Acheson, 1764–1766).

As to extraordinary drought, the Mexican negotiator reports:

"The amount guaranteed to Mexico can only be reduced in cases of extreme drought and only if extraordinary drought should bring about a reduction of all consumptions in the United States."

Your negotiator, Mr. Clayton, reported to the American Senate that—

"The drought does not have to occur simultaneously in all portions of the basin. It is sufficient if it occurs in any portion and results in the curtailment of usage" (p. 106).

Mr. Tipton said the matter was left open (p. 1085).

Obviously, the treaty does not express a meeting of the minds. This was virtually admitted, as to extraordinary drought, by Mr. Tipton (pp. 1088, 1089). Has the State Department attempted to clarify these points, and with what result?

So long as these ambiguities in the treaty are permitted to exist, the development of the Colorado River in the United States will necessarily be adversely affected by the uncertainties so created. One of the main arguments for the treaty was that it put an end to uncertainties which impeded development of the use of water in the United States.

At another point, reference is made in the enclosure to the National Irrigation Commission's detailed study, from the technical point of view, of each of the clauses, of each of the phrases, and even of the words of the treaty, with the interpretation which the National Irrigation Commission officially gives to them. In view of the diametrically opposite interpretations already disclosed, it would appear wise to see the balance of them. Has the State Department obtained this detailed study? If so, we respectfully ask an opportunity to examine it, together with the other portions of the Mexican legislative history of the treaty which you may have obtained.

Respectfully,

SHERIDAN DOWNEY.

BURNING THE BOOKS AGAIN!—ARTICLE BY JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Burning the Books Again!" by John Haynes Holmes, published in the Progressive of November 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AFTERMATH OF THE WAR—ARTICLE BY MILTON MAYER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "You Pays Your Money," by Milton Mayer, published in the Progressive of November 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS IN MEMORY OF WOODROW WILSON—LETTER FROM JESSE H. JONES TO PRESIDENT NEWCOMB

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated October 23, 1945, from Jesse H. Jones to President John Lloyd Newcomb, of the University of Virginia, concerning the establishment at the University of Virginia of a School of International Affairs in memory of Woodrow Wilson, which appears in the Appendix.]

CLOSING OF THE HIGGINS INDUSTRIES—STATEMENT BY ANDREW J. HIGGINS

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Andrew J. Higgins, president, Higgins Industries, Inc., entitled "Give Me Liberty!" published in the press on November 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROMOTION OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE—WILL OF A MARINE LIEUTENANT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Manchester Union of November 5, under the heading "Marine hero's bequest to better labor-capital relations revealed," which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWPOINTS OF SERVICEMEN—EDITORIALS FROM YANK NEWS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from Yank News, one entitled "Tap Roots," from the issue for October 11, and the second entitled "The $64 Question," from the issue of October 18, which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY W. L. MALLON BEFORE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by W. L. Mallon, of Newark, N. J., president of the National Automobile Dealers Association, before the House Small Business Committee on November 8, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOSPITAL AID—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hospital Aid," published in the Washington Post of November 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

BLUE DISCHARGES—EDITORIALS FROM THE PITTSBURGH COURIER

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD

editorials from the Pittsburgh Courier dealing with "blue" discharges, which appear in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in the November 4 issue of the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., there appeared a very commendable editorial dealing with the action taken by the United States Senate last week in adopting the Overton amendment to the pending bill. In my opinion, the editorial expresses the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the river valleys throughout the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP UP THE GOOD FIGHT

Due to the vigorous fight made by Senator OVERTON, and the support given him by his valley colleagues, an amendment exempting the War Department's civil functions from provisions of the reorganization bill has been included in that measure. The Senate vote for inclusion was 36 to 18.

The exemption specifically protects the Corps of Engineers and is intended to prevent transfer of flood-control and navigation projects to any other agency of Government, something Washington political bureaus have long wanted to do.

That the supporters of the Overton amendment were greatly encouraged by the backing given them by the people of the river valleys which would be seriously affected by such a change, goes without saying. It is necessary, however, for that backing to be maintained and, if possible, increased.

The reorganization bill will probably get final Senate action this week and then go to conference. The Overton amendment must be sustained by the House and Senate conferees. The good fight which has been made must be kept up. The people of the valleys should continue to make their sentiments known up until the very moment that final action is taken on the reorganization bill.

Army engineers have had American rivers and harbors under control for 125 years. They have saved the valleys again and again. They have used them to train officers who became really great wartime leaders. One was Robert E. Lee. Another is Douglas MacArthur. There have been many.

A system which can produce men like that doesn't need any change. Let's make sure there won't be any.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand that the unfinished, pending business is Senate bill 1120, known as the reorganization bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is; and the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment, as further modified, proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], beginning on page 14, line 23, as a substitute for section 4 (a).

Mr. MURDOCK. It is my hope that we can dispose of the reorganization bill today. I trust Members of the Senate will continue their presence, and that before the session is over today we shall have disposed of the bill.

LABOR—AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the deplorable situation in which organized labor, management, and the public find themselves in this critical period emphasizes the failure of government, and in particular the Congress, to discharge its responsibility in the public interest. On the 14th of this month, the war will have been over 90 days, and we have not yet made any substantial headway toward reconversion to a peacetime economy. Disastrous strikes in the ranks of organized labor are growing day by day. Reconversion plans of practically every important industry have been brought to a standstill by these strikes which have, in turn, shut down innumerable other businesses and thrown hundreds of thousands out of work. Many groups of key workers, such as the elevator operators in New York, and transportation and communication employees, have tied up business in general, all to the inconvenience of the people and the destruction of public morale.

Union labor has indeed been shortsighted in its demands upon management at this time because it is too early in the reconversion period for management to determine whether or not it can survive and meet the demands that are being made. It is foolhardy for organized labor to paralyze production by strikes and thus destroy industry's ability to comply with the very demands made upon it.

Labor proceeds on the fallacious and unsound argument that there will be a continuation of the false prosperity generated by war and that industry is therefore justified in making large wage increases on the basis of past and anticipated future earnings. No management that respects its responsibility to its investors, its employees, and the public can raise current production cost until current earnings for such purpose are in sight. To borrow money to be repaid at a future date on anticipated earnings is one thing, but to raise current operating expenses against the possibility of future profits is quite another thing. Mr. Truman offers the unsound suggestion that business raise wages now sufficiently temporarily to satisfy the situation, and if at the end of 6 months, operations show a loss, then bring the matter to the Government control agencies; and although nothing is promised, business is assured that its problem will be considered. The kindest thing that can be said of this suggestion is that it is "economic asininity." Such political reasoning puts the cart before the horse.

It would have been much wiser and it would have displayed a great deal more business sagacity and demonstrated a much deeper understanding of the situation, and certainly it would have inspired the respect of the public, had organized labor joined with industry in this early period of reconversion to reestablish production, freedom of prices, and removal of other governmental restraints and controls. If labor had withheld its wage demands until the wheels of industry had once again commenced peacetime production of consumer goods so necessary and desirable to fill the great backlog of orders that has accumulated during the war years, and the processes which made it possible to pay higher wages had become operative, I have every confidence that the industrial strife into which the country has been plunged would have been avoided. In this respect, the leadership of labor has failed. This, however, is not surprising when the factors that have made possible our present-day so-called labor bosses are analyzed and understood. Such failure is understandable when the conduct of the administration and its advisors is reviewed. It has been the policy of the administration's pseudo economists to encourage labor to make premature demands. The result has been wholesale strikes and a freezing of the productive forces of the country at the expense of the general welfare, mounting unemployment, inflation, and a continued lowering of living standards.

The President's willy-nilly radio address of Tuesday night, October 30, was filled with inconsistencies, irrelevant and unjustified attacks upon the Congress, and unsound economic observations. In effect he declared that the administration was washing its hands of the whole affair. The speech had all the earmarks of being written by diversified pressure groups who were politicians and not economists. The soft and timid pleadings that labor and management should be good boys and sit across the table in the spirit of good fellowship and settle their differences with generosity and magnanimity for the position of the other fellow, are platitudes with which no one can quarrel, but such a weak leadership is indicative of either the voice of inexperience or the deliberate shirking of a difficult responsibility.

This week, the President's so-called Labor-Management Conference is in session to devise a plan or formula for the adjustment of labor disputes. A wage which industry can afford to pay and which will be acceptable to labor is essential to industrial peace and prosperity. It is, of course, obvious that there is no formula or fixed plan by which wages may be determined. The only place the answer can be found is in production and profits, which are the only factors that measure the ability of industry and business to pay wages. Wages constitute the largest share of the national income. They cannot be fixed in advance of a determination with some reasonable degree of certainty as to what our earning ability will be.

The President says that the reduction in take-home pay is caused by shorter hours, down grading of job classifications, and the loss of time and a half for overtime. The President is mistaken. These are not causes, but rather results caused by the termination of the war. During the war, labor sold its product directly or indirectly to the Government under war conditions, and was paid from the pocketbook of the Public Treasury. Today labor and the administration must understand that labor must be marketed in a free market at a price which private enterprise can afford to pay,

measured only by the profit that can be derived from the production of labor.

The administration fails to understand that wages, prices, production, competition, marketing, and business advantages are questions of hard and unyielding economy. They must be settled on sound economic principles if freedom of private enterprise is to continue in America. They are not problems that are settled by brotherly love. Business in a free economy is not a Sunday school picnic. On the contrary, it is the legitimate striving for competitive advantages. Because of this characteristic of a free economy, it is necessary for Government to establish by law legal procedures that will guarantee the maintenance of such rights and privileges for all.

For more than a decade, however, the administration policy has been one that frankly declared its purpose to destroy business, industry, and private enterprise, and to substitute a controlled economy and promote the supremacy of unionized labor. By virtue of such policy unscrupulous labor bosses, drunk with power and greed, have sifted their way to the top of a great many unions. These so-called labor bosses not only control most of unionized labor but they have controlled Government policy-making and the enforcement of such policies. Presently the people are victims of an administration which, while mouthing the platitudes of a free economy and the preservation of private enterprise, lacks the courage, foresight, and apparently the ability to do those simple things necessary to reestablish the economic forces that will promote and maintain this American heritage.

During the early business development of this country we saw industrial racketeers, unhampered by any rules of law, climb to the pinnacle of financial power. The attitude of "the public be damned" was much in evidence. The ruthless destruction of competitive rights was a part of the business day. Conspiracies to control and monopolize trade and commerce became a business policy of those who ruled by sheer power of financial position. The oppression of labor, the subordination of public officials and even the National Government, were not outside the self-made code of these business bandits. The result was public revulsion, and out of that came a demand upon the Congress that the unrestrained power of the great predatory interests be curbed by law. Thus was born the Interstate Commerce Act, the Sherman antitrust laws, the Clayton Act, the Elkins Act, and other similar legal restraints upon the activities of business and industry. Through the years these early basic laws have been enlarged and strengthened by such laws as the Robinson-Patman Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Communications Act, the Federal Power Act, the Civil Aeronautics Authority Act, and a host of other laws to regulate and control the conduct of business and industry.

Today we suffer the same economic peril at the hands of labor racketeers as that once foisted upon the country by the uncontrolled business monopolist. The growing disgust of the people with the dictation of some of the unrestrained union bosses, unless the Congress recognizes its responsibility, will soon equal the white heat of hate that was generated against the unconscionable acts of the business tycoons of the last century. The responsibility of the Congress to protect the public interest against the onslaughts of organized labor now is as impelling as it was to protect the country against the greed and avarice of certain so-called business leaders.

There is, however, a significant difference between the days of uncontrolled capitalism and the problem now presented by labor. Certain business and industry leaders became ruthless because of a negative attitude of Government. Labor unions have become ruthless as the result of affirmative action of the Government. In 1935, at the dictation of the selfish forces that controlled the executive policy of Government, a subservient Congress enacted the unilateral National Labor Relations Act, and thus organized labor became clothed with special rights and privileges to prey upon our social, economic, and political institutions. Through the instrumentality of this legislation and the interpretations placed upon it by a Labor Board whose majority personnel was handpicked for its known bias in favor of CIO unions, and whose rulings were affirmed by dominated and subservient courts set up through the willful abuse of the appointive power, unscrupulous labor bosses have been raised to such positions of power that they now control the economy of the country. Prosperity or depression is within their discretion. How long this situation will continue is dependent upon the political courage of the Congress.

The National Labor Relations Act was presented to the Congress on the theory that it guaranteed collective bargaining. In practice, however, we know now that it has failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was enacted, but on the contrary has served to enslave the rank and file of labor and to punish industry and business.

The first move of the Board, assisted by the courts, was to strike down the paramount obstacle to a nationalized labor movement, by removing the authority of the States to deal with their local labor problems. This was done by creating the legal fiction that the term "interstate commerce" is all inclusive. Elevator operations in a building housing firms that engaged in interstate commerce were held to be within the purview of the Labor Act. Service employees of a building housing workers manufacturing articles used by firms that, in turn, engaged in interstate commerce were held to be covered by the act. Employees of an electrical power company which, under contract, sold at the plant electric power used by a lighthouse that threw its beams across State lines were held to be subject to the Labor Act. With such complete breaking down of the accepted and established concept of interstate commerce, there was developed a collectivist control of both employer and employee, the avenue was opened for national labor racketeering, and the States were deprived of jurisdiction of matters of purely local concern. With this newly developed, centralized Federal authority, there came into being the power by which the labor bosses may order men back to work. Who are these labor bosses who strike terror to the hearts of Presidents, and cause Members of the Congress to tremble in their presence? Where do they derive the power to order men to work or not to work as whim or caprice may dictate? From such centralized power there has arisen a Petrillo, the Italian-born master of the slaves of the musicians unions of America. This union dictator forbids high-school students the right to broadcast a radio program, orders radio programs canceled at will, orders broadcasters to hire or fire musicians, orders the number of employees to be doubled if radio programs are to be continued on the air, and orders the levy on the manufacturers of musical records of a special income tax payable to Petrillo's union. Backed by this centralized control, the union racketeers, in partnership with Government agencies, have made it possible for the boss of the automobile workers to order strikes, to order sit-downs, to order slow-downs, and to order walk-outs throughout the entire automobile industry, and to demand—not request or negotiate for, but to demand—30-per cent, 40-per cent, or 50-per cent increase of wages for the entire industry. Within this centralization of power there has arisen an O. A. Knight, who asserts himself as boss of all the refinery workers of the Nation, and who orders strikes and demands blanket wage increases for the entire industry with the flourish of an ancient potentate.

Within this centralization of power there has been developed the so-called industry-wide bargaining, which places every individual member of organized labor in bondage to the few labor bosses and labor racketeers who have rough-housed their way to the top union jobs. No longer may management in a particular plant bargain with the employees of that plant with respect to wages, hours, and working conditions. Such is done for them by the head of the union on an industry-wide basis. By such procedure the individual workers have lost their personal rights to bargain with respect to their own wages, working hours, and working conditions. Through this centralization of labor relations, the rights of the individual have been surrendered to the labor bosses at the top. Business and industry by force of law, as interpreted by the courts, are thus forced to accept the terms laid down by these unrestrained labor bosses or else be forced into bankruptcy by strikes, walk-outs, or slow-downs.

Violence and strong-arm methods have become accepted as common union practice. Within the ranks of some unions it is reported that goon squads are created and taught the art of rough-and-tumble fighting for rioting purposes. These private armies appear on the picket lines, identified by uniforms or distinctive headgear, with loaded walking canes, brass knuckles, or other instruments of brutality. These tactics have also been condoned by the courts. Who can fail to remember the decision of the

United States Supreme Court in the New York truck drivers' case which refused to interfere with the sluggings and beatings by union pickets of farmers who chose to drive their own trucks with their own produce to market on the flimsy ground that when such thugs acted as union members, under union orders, they were no longer amenable to the Federal anti-racketeering law as individuals, and thus, according to the minority views of the court, "common-law robbery became a harmless pastime."

Another step in this sad saga of raising the labor bosses and labor unioneers to the pinnacle of dictatorship was the action of the Labor Board in destroying all local and independent unions, thus clearing the way for the establishment of units of national unionism, in most cases CIO unions. The law books are filled with decisions of both the circuit courts and the Supreme Court of the United States sustaining the orders of the Labor Board holding that the mere existence of so-called independent unions was prima facie evidence that they were dominated by management within the meaning of the act, and must therefore be disestablished. In numerous cases, union dues checked off by the employer under contract and paid to the independent union by the employer were required to be refunded to the employees at the expense of the employer, although the union had spent the money for its own benefit. Such forcing of all members of organized labor into nationalized unions has made it possible for the union bosses to set up and maintain a government within a government in which its subjects are the victims of taxation without representation. As observed by the Supreme Court in Case Co. against Labor Board, "Congress has seen fit to clothe the bargaining representative with powers possessed comparable to legislative bodies, both to create and restrict the rights of those whom they represent." In a subsequent opinion involving the mediation of a dispute between management and railroad employees, the court said: "The railroad world is like a State within a State." In cases arising in Texas and Florida the courts have stricken down the right of the States to regulate union organizers by requiring them to be licensed, the same as are all other citizens who engage in solicitations within the State.

Under the reign of the Labor Board an employer has lost the right to discharge individual employees without the consent, or at least the acquiescence, of the union. In a recent case involving the complaint of a union arising out of the discharge of an employee, the United States Supreme Court announced the principle that, under the authority delegated to the Labor Board by Congress, an order of the Board reinstating the employee with back pay is a matter of administrative discretion and is not a matter for review of the courts, and such order may therefore not be affirmed or reversed by the courts. Thus, the Labor Board becomes the supreme court on all matters which may be said to be within its administrative purview under the act. Time forbids reference to dozens of other cases that exemplify the unilateral application of the Labor Act, but those cited are indeed sufficient to demonstrate that the existing labor-management crisis is due in large part to the failure of the Congress to correct the evils of this discriminatory law.

In my opinion the Congress acted unwisely when it withdrew from the citizens of this country the legal right to apply to the courts for injunctive relief against the actions of labor except in cases of violence and the destruction of property, regardless of how unfair, inequitable, or ruthless such action may be and without regard to what destructive effect such union activity may have upon business and industry or the public interest. In one of the early cases reaching the Supreme Court of the United States, it was held that abuse, falsehoods, insults to customers, calling them unfair, Fascist, and so forth, by pickets of a union that had no employees in the business, and who were picketing a business where no labor dispute existed, could not be enjoined. In this particular case the business was a restaurant operated by the owner and his family who served as cooks, waiters, and dishwashers. The union sought to require the owner to engage union employees for these various categories of work. The court commented that under the labor policy of this Government the action of the union was a part of the give and take of labor relations.

The Congress has affirmatively exempted the so-called labor bosses and the unions from the purview of the Federal antitrust laws. By such action the Congress has discriminated against the citizens of the country as a whole in favor of labor as a class. The Supreme Court, however, has upheld the constitutionality of such congressional action. In the so-called Anheuser-Busch case a deliberate and premeditated conspiracy of union members, accompanied by overt action to destroy the business of the Anheuser-Busch Co., was held to be a legitimate activity of union organizations. The majority opinion of the Court points out that the Congress has said that such activities shall not be held or considered to be a violation of any law of the United States, and shall not be punishable as criminal under the Sherman Act.

Again, in Allen Bradley Company against Local Union No. 3, involving an alleged conspiracy of union officials to obtain and maintain a monopoly in the field of electrical workers in the city of New York, it was held that labor unions acting alone cannot under any circumstances be held to have violated the Sherman antitrust law, irrespective of the effect of their action, although it would be otherwise if acting jointly with business groups.

Another decision along the same line involving the truck-drivers union in the city of Philadelphia, may be found in the case of Hunt against Crumboch. This case, incidentally, involved an alleged conspiracy of the unions to fix prices.

In Detroit, the automobile workers union—CIO—has announced a conspiracy to destroy the business of General Motors, Chrysler and Ford plants unless the demand for 52 hours of pay for 40 hours of work is promptly met. The destruction is to be accomplished, according to union spokesmen, by complete shutdown of the plants of each company in turn until all three have been brought into submission. Under the law the union bosses are at liberty to carry this conspiracy into action. Only the Congress can safeguard the public interest by making these union bosses amenable to the same law as are other citizens.

During the war, the Government, through the War Labor Board and other Government-control agencies, placed in the hands of the unions and union bosses two of the most effective instrumentalities ever devised for expanding and maintaining their control of the rank and file of labor. I refer to the standing policy of the Government to require the inclusion of the closed-shop and check-off provisions in all labor contracts. Such action of Government agencies was in direct violation of a long-standing labor policy of the United States, expressed by the Congress in early railway labor legislation and later in the present Railway Labor Act, both of which prohibited the closed shop and check-off provisions being included in labor contracts. The closed shop, the check-off, and the right of the unions to close membership in their organizations, make it possible for union officials to create and maintain a complete monopoly in the field of labor. Under the law, the nonunion member and the public are helpless. With the closed shop, the check-off and the closed union, the labor boss becomes entrenched in his supremacy of power and with such power he becomes daring and dangerous.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, at the close of the last calendar year 50 percent of all workers under labor agreements, or a total of approximately 10,000,000 workers, were bound by either closed-shop or union-shop agreements. Under the closed-shop agreements, employees must be members of the appropriate union at the time of being hired, and must continue to be members in good standing throughout their period of employment. Practically all closed-shop agreements require the employer to hire through the union, thus destroying the right of the employer and employee to negotiate directly with each other concerning employment. Under the union shop agreement, although the employer is permitted to hire new employees, all workers so hired must become members of the union within a specified time. Most union shop agreements provide that union members shall be given preference in hiring, so that in effect union-shop agreements differ very little from the closed-shop agreement.

Although the figures are not available to date, it seems safe to estimate that not less than 12 million organized workers are now subject either to closed-shop or union-shop agreements.

At the end of the last calendar year approximately 4½ million workers were subject to check-off agreements. This was an increase of 2 million workers over the previous year. With the tools of the closed shop, the union shop and the ammunition of the check-off, supported by a Labor Board whose record shows that

85 percent of all labor cases handled by it have been decided against the employer and in favor of the complaining unions, the labor bosses have been able to build a labor oligarchy that now has gone berserk with power.

The present Nation-wide strikes that have frozen the productive forces of the country impose a heavy responsibility upon the Congress. The administration can no longer be counted upon to cope with the situation. The President's address of October 30 demonstrates that he is a captive of the CIO labor government. His proposals closely parallel what the CIO segment of labor really wants, namely a controlled economy.

It is the responsibility of Congress promptly to blast out the log jams that are impeding the free flow of trade and commerce. My position on price control is too well know to restate it here, but I do not think it can be too often pointed out that production is necessary in order to solve our immediate problem, and we cannot attain production until incentive prices prevail. The continued delay of production and a further dwindling of available consumer goods are bringing upon the Nation a serious inflation. For almost 4 years we have been out of the production of consumer goods; we have been engaged in producing only waste in the manufacture of war materials for destruction on the battle fronts.

On January 1, 1941, we had approximately $8,700,000,000 in circulation against a reasonably balanced supply of consumer goods. As of October 1, 1945, there were $27,800,000,000 in circulation against a completely depleted inventory of consumer goods. This tremendous expansion of our currency has in the main gone into the pockets of the wage earners of this country who were engaged not in the production of consumer goods but in the production of war waste. We are faced with a purchasing power of $27,800,000,000 and no goods to purchase. It does not take an economist to understand the inflationary danger of this situation.

To increase this great purchasing power by raising wages another 15 to 25 per cent before the production of consumer goods is under way, is only to irritate an already bad condition.

The most serious bottleneck to a restoration of our productive forces at the present time, aside from the stoppages of work brought about by strikes, is a continued control of prices below production cost. The radio industry, for example, reports 35,000 men out of work because they cannot obtain radio parts. The parts manufacturers say they cannot be produced at OPA ceilings. Thus, the employees of the parts manufacturer, the radio manufacturer, the wholesaler, the retailer, the salesman and repairman are all idle. The same condition exists with respect to small electrical motors without which hundreds of businesses are shut down. Innumerable examples might be cited as proof of the destruction being wrought by OPA price control. Yet the Government propaganda that we must hold the line against inflation is being accepted by a docile public. The economic truth is that a removal of price control would release a flood of production so great that prices would automatically be curbed. There is no other way to return prosperity to this country. The administration will be driven to it sooner or later, and the sooner the better.

A few of the larger industries that have created war reserves have been willing to dip into surplus to start production, with the hope that Congress would not permit a continuation of the strangulation tactics of OPA, but the hundreds of small businesses that will furnish the backbone of the 50 to 55 million jobs needed for prosperity in America cannot afford to take the hazard and consequently stand idle. Good business management dictates that it is unwise to diminish accumulated reserves by manufacturing and selling at a loss.

Mr. President, we hear the oft-repeated promise of the administration that controls will be removed as speedily as production is in balance with demand and the danger of inflation is passed, but just how simple do we have to be to fail to understand that production cannot and will not balance demand until the obstacles that prevent production are removed? I therefore urge upon the Congress as its first responsibility the removal of price control as an aid to production. Whatever temporary inflationary result may be suffered by the public will be insignificant compared to the inflationary pressure suffered by reason of the present $28,000,000,000 purchasing power against frozen production.

The next and equally heavy responsibility of the Congress is courageously to write into the labor laws a fair and just labor policy. Concretely, I propose to the Congress the following:

First. Impose upon labor unions a legal responsibility for carrying out the provisions of labor contracts by making unions liable in civil damages. Unions that strike in violation of their contracts should be denied the right of collective bargaining for a specified period.

Second. Labor unions and labor union executives should be made subject to the antitrust laws and Federal antiracketeering laws applicable to other citizens and corporations.

Third. Outlaw the closed shop and union shop, and prohibit the check-off unless pursuant to the separately given consent in writing of each employee affected.

Fourth. Require union elections and public audits at stated intervals. Elections should be conducted in accordance with prescribed procedure that would insure free elections and prevent coercion. The annual audit should be made by public auditing firms. A reasonable publication should be required and a copy filed with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Fifth. Expenditure of money on behalf of any candidate, directly or indirectly, in either a primary or general election or for other political activity, by any labor union, affiliated or sponsored organization, should be prohibited.

Sixth. Collective bargaining should be confined to the smallest employee bargaining unit practicable, but in no event larger than the employee group of any separate plant, shop, or other establishment.

Seventh. Unemployment compensation to which any Federal contribution is made should be denied to any individual on strike.

Eighth. Jurisdiction of the courts should be enlarged sufficiently to permit review of findings of fact by the Labor Board and review of remedies prescribed by the Board. Equity jurisdiction should be restored to the courts to grant injunctive relief against improper labor activities.

Mr. President, I have tried to show the development of the labor laws and tried to point out the weaknesses that are inherent in them, as well as in their administration. I believe that this is not a partisan issue, and, regardless of partisan considerations, I think the people of this country believe that legislation is essential for the general welfare, for the general public, and for the rank and file of labor. It is not a partisan issue and it cannot be properly and effectively legislated upon from a partisan standpoint. There is pending now, in a committee of the Senate, a bill which I understand was introduced by two Republican Senators and one Democrat so as to give it the character of nonpartisanship. No law could be enacted by this Congress without the majority party supporting it, and the responsibility for failure to enact legislation rests squarely upon the majority party of this Congress. I plead with the Senate and with the Congress, for the general welfare of all the people of this country, to enact legislation such as has been suggested in the pending bill before the Senate, amending it so as to include the provisions I have suggested here.

ADDRESSES BY THE PRESIDENT ON WAGES AND PRICES AND TO THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this place in the body of the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States over the radio on October 30 last on the subject of wages and prices and also the address delivered by the President of the United States on November 5 last to the members of the labor and management conference.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator include in his request the printing of the Executive order which was appended to the President's radio speech of October 30 and referred to by him in that speech. It seems to me it should be included at the same time.

Mr. HILL. I shall be very happy to modify my request so as to include the Executive order referred to by the President in his address, and I shall obtain a copy of the Executive order and have it printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the addresses and the Executive order were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS OF OCTOBER 30 ON WAGES AND PRICES

Fellow citizens, on August 18, 1945, 4 days after the surrender of Japan, I issued Executive Order No. 9599 which laid down the guiding policies of your Government during the transition from war to peace.

Briefly stated these policies are:

First, to assist in the maximum production of civilian goods.

Second. As rapidly as possible to remove Government controls and restore collective bargaining and free markets.

Third. To avoid both inflation and deflation.

Those are still our policies.

One of the major factors determining whether or not we shall succeed in carrying out these policies is the question of wages and prices. If wages go down substantially, we face deflation. If prices go up substantially we face inflation. We must be on our guard, and steer clear of both these dangers to our security.

What happens to wages is important to all of us—even to those of us who do not work for wages.

It is important to business, for example, not only because wages represent an essential item in the cost of producing goods, but because people cannot buy the products of industry unless they earn enough wages generally.

What happens to wages is also important to the farmer. The income he earns depends a great deal on the wages and purchasing power of the workers in our factories and shops and stores. They are the customers of the farmer and cannot buy farm products unless they earn enough wages.

The fact is that all of us are deeply concerned with wages, because all of us are concerned with the well-being of all parts of our economic system.

That is a simple truth. But like all simple truths, it is too often forgotten. Management sometimes forgets that business cannot prosper without customers who make good wages and have money in their pockets; labor sometimes forgets that workers cannot find employment and that wages cannot rise unless business prospers and makes profits.

Like most of you, I have been disturbed by the labor difficulties of recent weeks. These difficulties stand in the way of reconversion, they postpone the day when our veterans and displaced war workers can get back into good peacetime jobs. We need more of the good sense, the reasonableness, the consideration for the position of the other fellow, the teamwork which we had during the war.

It has been my experience in public life that there are few problems which cannot be worked out, if we make a real effort to understand the other fellow's point of view, and if we try to find a solution on the basis of give and take, of fairness to both sides.

I want to discuss the wage problem in just that spirit, and I hope that all of us in the United States can start thinking about it in that way.

Let me begin by putting labor's position before you. I do not think all of us understand how hard a blow our industrial workers have suffered in the shift from war production to peace production.

You do know that sudden total victory caused millions of war workers to be laid off with very short notice or none at all. While we hope to overcome that condition before too many months have passed, unemployment is hardly a suitable reward for the contribution which veterans and war workers have made to victory.

Several months ago I urged the Congress to amend the unemployment compensation law so as to help workers through the difficult months of unemployment until reconversion could be effected. The Congress has not yet passed that legislation.

The responsibility for that is solely up to the Congress, and specifically I mean the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. I hope that this committee will fulfill its obligation to the people of the Nation, and will give the Members of the House an early chance to vote on this important legislation. We must all recognize that legislation which will help sustain the purchasing power of labor until reconversion is completed, benefits not labor alone but all of us—business, agriculture, white-collar workers, and every member of our economic society.

I am sure that the workers of the Nation, those who depend upon manual labor for a livelihood, also feel a deep concern about full employment legislation which is now pending in the Congress. It is essential that the Congress speedily adopt some effective legislation which embodies the principles underlying full employment.

The American people are entitled to know now that this Government stands for prosperity and jobs—not depression and relief. Passage of a full employment bill will give the American people this assurance.

The responsibility for the damaging delay in enacting this legislation is definitely at the door of the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments of the House of Representatives.

I am also sure that the workers of the Nation feel the same way about what is now happening to the United States Employment Service in the Senate and in the House. During the next year, millions of workers will have to look to efficient and centralized employment offices to find jobs for them anywhere in the country. The United States Employment Service has done so much during the war, and can do so much during the months ahead if it can continue to operate as a Nation-wide and unified organization, that I hope the Congress, for the time being, will keep this great public service under Federal management.

But quite as important as these problems of unemployment is the fact that the end of the war has meant a deep cut in the pay envelope of many millions of workers. I wonder how many of you know that many war workers have already had to take, or will soon have to take, a cut in their wartime pay by one-quarter or more. Think of what such a decrease in your own income would mean to you and to your families.

Now, how does it happen that pay envelopes are being cut so deeply? There are three reasons.

First, there is the present decrease in the number of hours of employment. During the past few years of war, millions of workers were asked to put in abnormally long hours of work. Now that the need is past, the 40-hour week is being restored.

The change-over from a 48- to a 40-hour week means a decrease in take-home pay, the amount in the pay envelope. That decrease is much more than just the loss of 8 hours' pay. Workers have been receiving time and a half for overtime—for all the hours they worked over 40. That overtime pay is now gone in the change to a 40-hour week. The result has been a decrease of almost one-quarter in the workers' weekly pay.

Second, weekly pay is being cut because many jobs are being reclassified to lower paying grades. The individual worker will feel these particularly when he changes from one job to another, starting at the bottom of the grade.

Third, the pay envelopes of workers will be thinner because millions of workers who were employed in the highly paid war industries will now have to find jobs in lower-wage, peacetime employment.

These three factors added together mean a drastic cut in the take-home pay of millions of workers. If nothing is done to help the workers in this situation, millions of families will have to tighten their belts—and by several notches.

It has been estimated that, unless checked, the annual wage-and-salary bill in private industry will shrink by over $20,000,000,000. That is not going to do anybody any good, labor, business, agriculture, or the general public.

The corner grocer is going to feel it, as well as the department store, the railroads, the theaters, and the gas stations—and all the farmers of the Nation.

It is a sure road to wide unemployment.

This is what is known as deflation, and it is just as dangerous as inflation.

However, we must understand that we cannot hope, with a reduced workweek, to maintain now the same take-home pay for labor generally that it has had during the war. There will have to be a drop. But the Nation cannot afford to have that drop too drastic.

Wage increases are therefore imperative—to cushion the shock to our workers, to sustain adequate purchasing power, and to raise the national income.

There are many people who have said to me that industry cannot afford to grant any wage increases, however, without obtaining a corresponding increase in the price of its products. And they have urged me to use the machinery of Government to raise both.

This proposal cannot be accepted under any circumstances. To accept it would mean but one thing—inflation. And that invites disaster. An increase in wages, if it were accompanied by an increase in the cost of living, would not help even the workers themselves. Every extra dollar that would be put in their pay envelopes under those circumstances would be needed to meet the higher living expenses resulting from increased prices.

Obviously, such a juggling of wages and prices would not settle anything or satisfy anyone. A run-away inflation would be upon us.

When inflation comes and the cost of living begins to spiral, nearly everybody suffers. Wage increases, under those conditions, would defeat their own purpose and mean nothing to labor. White-collar workers would find that their fixed salaries buy less food and clothing than before. Farmers' incomes would shrink because they would have to pay so much more for what they buy. Increased earnings would mean nothing to business itself. War bonds, insurance policies, pensions, annuities, bonds of all kinds would shrink in value, and their incomes would dwindle in buying power.

Therefore, wherever price increases would have inflationary tendencies, we must, above all else, hold the line on prices. Let us hold vigorously to our defense against inflation. Let us continue to hold the price line as we have held it since the spring of 1943. If we depart from this program of vigorous and successful price control, if we now begin to let down the bars, there will be no stopping place.

After the last war, this Nation was confronted by much the same problem. At that time we simply pulled off the few controls that had been established and let nature take its course. The result should stand as a lesson to all of us. A dizzy upward spiral of wages and the cost of living ended in the crash of 1920—a crash that spread bankruptcy and foreclosure and unemployment throughout the Nation.

If these twin objectives of ours—stability of prices and higher wage rates—were irreconcilable, if one could not be achieved without sacrificing the other, the outlook for all of us—labor, management, farmer, and consumer—would be very black indeed.

Fortunately, this is not so. While the positions of different industries vary greatly,

there is room in the existing price structure for business as a whole to grant increases in wage rates.

And if all of us would approach the problem in a spirit of reasonableness and give-and-take—if we would sit down together and try to determine how much increase a particular company or industry could allow at a particular time—I think most businessmen would agree that wage increases are possible. Many of them, in fact, have already negotiated substantial wage increases without asking for any increase of prices.

There are several reasons why I believe that industry as a whole can afford substantial wage increases without price increases.

First, the elimination of the time-and-a-half for overtime has reduced labor costs per hour

Second, the increase in the number of people needing jobs is resulting in a downward reclassification of jobs in many industries and in many sections of the country.

There is a third reason for believing that business can afford to pay wage increases—namely, increased output per hour of work or what is generally called increased productivity. While increased production rests ultimately with labor, the time will soon come when improvements in machinery and manufacturing know-how developed in the war can certainly result in more goods per hour and additional room for wage increases.

As a fourth reason, business is in a very favorable profit position today, with excellent prospects for the period that lies ahead. Again, that is not true of all companies. Nevertheless throughout industry and in every branch of industry profits have been and still are very good, indeed.

Finally the Congress at my suggestion is now considering the elimination of the excess-profits tax. Provision has already been made in our tax laws to enable corporations whose earnings drop below their normal peacetime level to recapture a high proportion of the excess-profits taxes which they have paid during the preceding 2 years. These and other provisions of the tax laws were designed to reduce to a minimum the risks entailed in reconversion—and that is precisely what they accomplish. They also add to the ability of industry to increase wages.

However, there are important limits upon the capacity of industry to raise wages without getting price increases. Let me put industry's position before you.

Industry has many risks and problems ahead that labor must recognize. For many companies wartime products which were very profitable will have to be replaced by civilian products, which will not be so profitable.

There are also problems of reconverting plants, of developing new sources of supply, new products and new markets, of training inexperienced workers, of meeting increased costs of raw materials and supplies. All these will mean, at the beginning, lower volume and higher unit costs.

These problems and difficulties are particularly true in the case of small business—which is the backbone of the American competitive system.

I have said that not all companies can afford these wage increases. I want to make clear, further, that there are companies where wages and even overtime pay continue high, and where no suffering will be caused to the workers during reconversion.

Labor must recognize these differences and not demand more than an industry or a company can pay under existing prices and conditions. It has a stern responsibility to see that demands for wage increases are reasonable. Excessive demands would deny to industry reasonable profits to which it is entitled, and which are necessary to stimulate an expansion of production. We must not kill the goose which lays the golden egg.

Labor itself has a responsibility to aid industry in reaching this goal of higher production and more jobs. It must strive constantly for greater efficiency and greater productivity—good work done, for good wages earned. Only in that way can we reach the mass production that has brought this country to the front of the industrial countries of the world.

Labor must constantly find ways within its own ranks of cutting down on absenteeism, reducing turn-over, avoiding jurisdictional disputes and "wild-cat" strikes. Labor and management must adopt collective bargaining as the effective and mature way of doing business.

The extent to which industry can grant wage increases without price increases will vary from company to company and from industry to industry. What can be paid today when we are on the threshold of our postwar production will be different from what can be paid next year and the year after, when markets have been established and earnings have become apparent. Both management and labor must keep on exploring these developments and determine from time to time to what extent costs have been reduced and profits have been increased, and how far these can properly be passed on in the form of increased wages.

Let me now turn to the question of just how wages are to be increased. Many people have asked the Government to step in and decide who is to increase wages and by exactly how much. I have, indeed, been criticized because I have not steeped in to lay down the law to business and labor. My refusal to do so has been deliberate. Curiously enough, the same people who urge me to use Government wartime machinery of control to determine wage adjustments have on other occasions been the first to point out that the continued intervention of Government must spell the end of our system of free enterprise.

I am convinced that we must get away as quickly as possible from Government controls, and that we must get back to the free operation of our competitive system. Where wages are concerned, this means that we must get back to free and fair collective bargaining.

As a free people, we must have the good sense to bargain peaceably and sincerely. We must be determined to reach decisions based upon our long-range interest.

Let me emphasize, however, that the decisions that are reached in collective bargaining must be kept within the limits laid down by the wage-price policy of the Government.

This policy was described in the order of last August which I have already mentioned.

Briefly, it allows management to make wage increases without Government approval, but requires Government approval before the wage increase can be reflected in higher price ceilings. That is still the policy of the United States.

To guide labor and management in their interpretation of this Executive order, I have today issued an amendment—which I hope everyone of you will read carefully in your newspapers tomorrow—amplifying the order and setting forth three classes of cases in which wage increases may be granted even though price-ceiling increases may result.

They are all situations where wage increases are necessary, irrespective of price consequences. They will not cause many price increases.

In addition, the amendment makes two points of importance which I wish to emphasize here.

The first point has been true all along, but it has not been generally understood. If management does grant a wage increase, it is not prevented from coming in thereafter and requesting Government approval to have the wage increase considered for purposes of a price-ceiling increase. Whether such approval is sought before or after the wage increase is given, it receives the same consideration.

The second point is new and is very important. It is something which I am sure will help industry get over this very difficult period of readjustment. In cases where no approval of the wage increase has been requested by management, or even where a request has been made and denied by the Government, industry will not be asked by the Government to take an unreasonable chance in absorbing such wage increases. After a reasonable test period which, save in exceptional cases, will be 6 months, if the industry has been unable to produce at a fair profit, the entire wage increase will be taken into account in passing upon applications for price ceiling increases.

The Office of Price Administration will have to give its prompt consideration to all applications for price increases.

That is your Government's wage-price policy. For the time being, the machinery that administers it will remain the same as during the war.

But, as you know, I have called a conference here in Washington of the representatives of management and of labor. It will start next week. One of their jobs is to recommend machinery for mediating or arbitrating differences whenever collective bargaining fails to work.

I hope the American people recognize how vital this conference actually is. Out of it can come the means of achieving industrial harmony and a new approach to human relationships in industry.

Until that machinery can be worked out, I urge upon labor and upon management the necessity of getting together on their problems. Public opinion will not countenance refusal on the part of either management or labor to proceed in a peaceful, free and democratic manner to arrive at just conclusions.

This is a time for proving the lessons we have learned during the war, the lessons of fair play, of give and take on a democratic basis, of working together in unity for the future. We all have a common aim, which is prosperity and security, and a just share of the good things of life. We can help attain this aim if we sit down at the conference table and iron out our troubles together. There is no room in our economy for unfair dealing or for greedy individuals or groups on either side who want their own way regardless of the cost to others. The people will not stand for it. Their Government will not stand for it.

The country is entitled to expect that industry and labor will bargain in good faith, with labor recognizing the right of industry to a fair profit, and industry, recognizing labor's need to a decent and sustained standard of living—and with both of them realizing that we cannot have either deflation or inflation in our economy.

The country, on the other hand, should be patient and realize that many of the parties are out of practice in collective bargaining. The point at which the people of the country are entitled to become impatient, and to consider the need of Government action, is when one of the parties fails to bargain in good faith or refuses a reasonable offer of conciliation or arbitration.

I know that this is not an easy way to solve the wage problem, but it is the sound way. It is the American way. I am convinced that if labor and management will approach each other, with the realization that they have a common goal, and with the determination to compose their differences in their own long-range interest, it will not be long before we have put industrial strife behind us. Labor is the best customer management has, and management is the source

of labor's livelihood. Both are wholly dependent on each other, and the country in turn is dependent on both of them.

Americans have always responded well in times of national need. There are no easy answers, there is no simple formula, for solving our difficult problems.

I have boundless faith in the common sense and ultimate fairness of the American people. Given unity of purpose and a determination to meet the challenge of the times, there is nothing too difficult for them to accomplish. They have performed miracles during the war. They can, they will, surmount the difficulties which face them now on their road to continued peace and well-being.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 9651—AMENDING EXECUTIVE ORDER 9599, PROVIDING FOR ASSISTANCE TO EXPANDED PRODUCTION AND CONTINUED STABILIZATION OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY DURING THE TRANSITION FROM WAR TO PEACE, AND FOR THE ORDERLY MODIFICATION OF WARTIME CONTROLS OVER PRICES, WAGES, MATERIALS AND FACILITIES

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes of the United States and particularly the Stabilization Act of 1942 as amended, and for the purpose of carrying out the guiding policies of Executive Order 9599 of August 18, 1945, and amplifying the provisions of part IV thereof, Executive Order 9599 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following part VI:

"VI

"1. The Stabilization Administrator, designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 9620 of September 20, 1945, shall approve, under section 2 of part IV of this order, a wage or salary increase falling into any of the following three classes in any case in which such increase has been found by the National War Labor Board or other designated agency to be necessary to correct a maladjustment or inequity which would interfere with the effective transition to a peacetime economy:

"a. Increases where the percentage increase in average straight time hourly earnings in the appropriate unit since January 1941 has not equalled the percentage increase in the cost of living between January 1941 and September 1945.

"b. Increases necessary to correct inequities in wage rates or salaries among plants in the same industry or locality, with due regard to normal competitive relationships.

"c. Increases necessary to insure full production in an industry, designated by the Stabilization Administrator, which is essential to reconversion and in which existing wage rates or salaries are inadequate to the recruitment of needed manpower.

"The Stabilization Administrator shall continue to approve wage or salary increases approved by the National War Labor Board or other designated agency in cases in which such increases satisfy standards in effect prior to August 18, 1945.

"The Stabilization Administrator may define additional classes of wage or salary increases which the National War Labor Board or other designated agency is authorized to approve as necessary to correct a maladjustment or inequity under section 2 or part IV of this order.

"Nothing in the foregoing shall be construed to require the National War Labor Board or other designated agency to approve any wage increase unless, in its judgment, the increase is necessary, on the facts of the particular case, to correct a maladjustment or inequity which would interfere with the effective transition to a peacetime economy.

"In making findings under this section the National War Labor Board or other designated agency shall be subject to directives issued by the Stabilization Administrator under the authority conferred by Executive Orders 9250 and 9328 or other applicable Executive orders.

"2. Nothing in this order shall be construed to prevent an employer from putting a wage or salary increase into effect and thereafter applying for approval of such increase, under the standards of this order, so that it may be used as the basis for seeking an increase in price ceilings, or for resisting otherwise justifiable reductions in price ceilings, or, in the case of products or services being furnished under contract with a Federal procurement agency, for increasing the costs to the United States.

"3. Notwithstanding the fact that a wage or salary increase has not been approved in accordance with this order, the Price Administrator shall, after the expiration of a reasonable test period, which save in exceptional cases shall be 6 months after the wage or salary increase has been made, take such increase into account in determining whether an increase in price ceilings is then required under the established standards governing increases in price ceilings."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 30, 1945.*

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS OF NOVEMBER 5 TO THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Members of the labor-management conference, in a radio broadcast to the American people last Tuesday night, I said:

"I am convinced that if labor and management will approach each other with the realization that they have a common goal, and with the determination to compose their differences in their own long-range interest, it will not be long before we have put industrial strife behind us. Labor is the best customer management has, and management is the source of labor's livelihood. Both are wholly dependent on each other, and the country in turn is dependent on both of them."

This conference has been called to provide a Nation-wide opportunity to fulfill that objective. Representatives of labor and management are meeting here at this conference table to discuss their common problems and to settle differences in the public interest. Here is the democratic process in action—in its best form.

On this conference have been based many high hopes of the American people. Their eyes are turned here in the expectation that you will furnish a broad and permanent foundation for industrial peace and progress.

I want to make it clear that this is your conference—a management-labor conference—and not a Government conference. You have not been chosen by me or by any Government official. You have been selected by the leading labor and industrial organizations in the United States. There has been no interference by Government in that selection.

By the very nature of the task before you, you appear here not as representatives merely of the organizations which chose you, but as public-spirited citizens who, during the deliberations, will consider the interests of all groups of our people. Each of you is now a member of the team which the American people hope will recommend definite policy in the field of industrial relations. We must begin with the firm realization that every citizen in our Nation has an identity of interest and a great stake in the maintenance of industrial peace and in the development of mature and effective ways of achieving it.

The time has come for labor and management to handle their own affairs in the traditional, American, democratic way. I hope that I can give up the President's wartime powers as soon as possible, so that management and labor can again have the full and undivided responsibility for providing the production that we must have to safeguard our domestic economy and our leadership in international affairs.

Your Government, although it is acting as your host, has no hand in the direction or the recommedations of this conference. It has no vote.

This is your opportunity to prove that you can come to understanding and agreement without political or governmental pressure. The outcome of this conference rests with the representatives of management and labor. But—as in all other public affairs—the outcome also rests with the American public who, by their interest and concern, can be a constant reminder that arbitrary selfishness and a refusal to see the other fellow's point of view have no place in these meetings.

Our country is worried about our industrial relations. It has a right to be. That worry is reflected in the Halls of the Congress in the form of all kinds of proposed legislation. You have it in your power to stop that worry. I have supreme confidence in your ability to find a democratic way to compose industrial difficulties.

Under the patriotic pressure of a desperate war crisis, management and labor have performed a miracle of production for 4 years—working together voluntarily but under a measure of Government control. Those controls must soon disappear. Many have already gone. And yet as soon as the first ones were taken off, industrial strife appeared. Some of it was expected by the American people in this period of adjustment. But I am sure that they never expected anything like the amount of strife which has been threatened. And I know that the American people do not like it—especially after the solemn promise by representatives of both management and labor that they would cooperate with their Government through the reconversion period.

I make no effort to fix the blame. I have tried to lay fairly before the people the position of labor and the position of industry. They both have problems—grave and worrisome problems. But they are not insoluble problems. Essentially they are problems of adjustment to the drastic changes brought about by three and a half years of war.

The important thing is to remember that those problems—and their solution—cannot be allowed to stop us in our struggle to reconvert from war to peace. For until we successfully reconvert our productive capacity, we cannot hope to proceed toward our goal of full employment and an increased standard of living. If labor and management, in an industry or in a company, find that they cannot come to agreement, a way must be found of resolving their differences without stopping production.

Finding the best way to accomplish that result without Government directive to either labor or industry—that is your job.

There are many considerations involved. At the basis of them all, is not only the right, but the duty, to bargain collectively. I do not mean giving mere lip service to that abstract principle. I mean the willingness on both sides, yes, the determination, to approach the bargaining table with an open mind, with an appreciation of what is on the other side of the table—and with a firm resolve to reach an agreement fairly.

If that fails, if bargaining produces no results, then there must be a willingness to use some impartial machinery for reaching decisions on the basis of proven facts and realities, instead of rumor or propaganda or partisan statements. That is the way to eliminate unnecessary friction. That is the way to prevent lock-outs and strikes. That is the way to keep production going.

We shall have to find methods not only of peaceful negotiation of labor contracts, but also of insuring industrial peace for the lifetime of such contracts. Contracts once made must be lived up to, and should be changed only in the manner agreed upon by the parties. If we expect confidence in agreements made, there must be responsibility and integrity on both sides in carrying them out.

Some substitute must be found for jurisdictional strikes. Business simply cannot stop, life and property just cannot be endangered, merely because of some internal

disagreement between factions of labor, in which management can rightfully have no part and no interest. There can be no moral or economic justification for stopping production while rival organizations contend with each other. Labor has a particular interest in this matter—for nothing is so destructive of public confidence in the motives of trade unionism as a jurisdictional strike.

On the other hand, management too often has looked upon labor relations as a stepchild of its business, to be disregarded until the controversy has reached a point where real collective bargaining becomes very difficult—if not almost impossible. It happens all too frequently that in the actual process of collective bargaining, delaying tactics are practiced with the result that there is no real bargaining. There can be no justification for such tactics at the present time, or in the future.

If this conference can recommend answers to the public demand for machinery to prevent or settle industrial disputes, it will have made vast progress toward industrial peace. It will have laid a foundation for an era of prosperity and security.

The whole world now needs the produce of our mills and factories, everything stands ready and primed for a great future. But situations and circumstances can change rapidly. Our unparalleled opportunity may not long remain open. We must have production—vast production. We must have it soon.

In order to have it, labor and management must work together to expand the economy of our Nation—as they worked together to protect the safety of our Nation during the war. If we get the production that we need, the production which our resources and industrial skill make possible, the present problem of wages and prices will be easier to solve. Production means employment. It means economic health. It means higher wages and lower prices. It means the difference between strength and prosperity, and uncertainty and depression.

The men in this room direct a cross-section of American industry, and lead American labor of all opinions. But you will fully succeed only if labor and industry as a whole will willingly accept your decisions, and will adopt the convictions developed out of this conference.

The American people know the enormous size of your task. But the stakes are enormous too. If the people do not find the answers here, they will find them some place else. For these answers must and will be found. The whole system of private enterprise and individual opportunity depends upon finding them.

When industrial strife becomes widespread, all of us lose the things we need—the wages that labor wants, the earnings and dividends that businessmen and investors want, the products that the consumers want. No realist can expect the millennium of a perfect no-strike, no lock-out era at once. But continued production and an expanding industry—unhampered as far as humanly possible by stoppages of work—are absolutely essential to progress.

That is the road to security at home and to peace abroad. We cannot fail in our efforts to move forward on that road.

THE ATOMIC BOMB—STATEMENT BY DR. HARLOW SHAPLEY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dr. Harlow Shapley, director of the Harvard Observatory, dealing with the matter of the atomic bomb and what we are to do if we are to avoid the practical extinction of mankind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Harlow Shapley, director of the Harvard Observatory, the Nation's best-known astronomer, and the holder of more than a score of medals and awards, including the Pope Pius XI Prize of Astronomy, recently made the following statement:

"The future, if it is to be made safe for civilization, is one in which narrowly national interests diminish and world-wide responsibilities increase." He spoke, Dr. Shapley explained, as a "hybrid of scientists and citizens" who would "describe what I see," and who found what he sees, "isn't nice." "Our leading American scientists," he continued, "especially our physicists, are almost pathologically conservative and cautious by nature and training. We should keep that in mind when we see the names of physicists by the score, and even hundreds, who are daily holding meetings protesting against legislative inanity, against the futility of saber rattling, and pointing to the necessity of "one world" or none. They are trying to tell you the following facts: We reached the solution of the explosive release of atomic energy first, but by a narrow margin. Atomic bombs are so revolutionary when coupled with rocketry, radar control, and the like, that they make obsolete both those philosophies and those techniques of warfare and of national defense which heretofore prevailed. The effectiveness of destruction has been increased by a factor of 10,000,000 to 1. The city-killing missiles in a few brief years from now may arrive from any direction and from any distance on the surface of this planet, and arrive with accuracy and arrive with anonymity. A tremendous navy is not necessary to propel them, and a billion 18-year-old boys marching around with guns would avail nothing.

"NO DEFENSE

"There is and can be no effective defense against the atomic bombs—only against the source of the bombs. These sources are human, and the solution we seek must be on the human, not the mechanical, level. The crisis created by use of atomic energy has been sudden for slow thinkers," Dr. Shapley declared. "Now mankind faces a nightmare future or the necessity to work and realize all the dreams of progress and advancement which have inspired man for uncounted generations. Should man and all that man has accomplished wither in the atomic fires just because we have no adroitness in international relations because we say that although miracles may be possible in the physical sciences they are not possible in social relations and international affairs? The alternative, the way to realize the aspirations and dreams of mankind," Dr. Shapley contended, "is for the policymakers of the great nations to recognize that the planet is too small for competing nationalities; too small because of the potentialities of tomorrow, the brain power of man, his desires for life, friendship, and happiness are all too large and important for competing nationalities. The challenge to mankind rings like the heavy call of destiny. This is not a matter of partisan politics and this issue cannot be maneuvered around the 1946 elections. This is for independent citizens; this is for independent thinkers, and the time is now."

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, it will be recalled that on October 24 I submitted a resolution calling for the creation of a world republic. Frankly, Mr. President, I was somewhat disappointed at the reaction which took place. I was not especially disappointed so far as the Senate was concerned as I did not expect Members of the Senate to accept my resolution as eagerly as an Idaho mountain trout rises to an attractive dry fly. However, I thought it was rather startling that the press gave the resolution such little publicity. I think that the resolution is an important one. Every Member of the Senate will recall—and I do not recall it too fondly—that when I first came to the Senate members of the press asked me to go out on the Capitol steps and sing a song for them. I did so in order to oblige. They put my picture in every newspaper in the United States, including the New York Times. When I submitted the resolution calling for the creation of a world republic, I received very little mention in the newspapers with regard to the matter. In one Washington newspaper, in particular, I noticed a reference consisting of one sentence. It said in effect that another new Senator, TAYLOR, of Idaho, had introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a world republic. Next to the statement was a two-column-wide picture of a man who had beat his wife on that same day.

I have no particular object in bringing this matter up. I do not know what moral I am trying to get across, whether the civilization about which I am anxiously concerned is worth saving, or what the particular point may be which is involved. Nevertheless, I am going ahead with my proposition and continue to the best of my ability. I am trying to familiarize the people with it by writing personal letters, and sending out copies of the resolution with solicitations of its support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter I am addressing To Whom It May Concern, dealing with the subject matter of the resolution to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Whom It May Concern:

This is a letter to you from Senator GLEN TAYLOR, of Idaho.

"To whom it may concern" may seem a rather dull way to start a letter which poses the question, "What are we to do if mankind is to be saved from an atomic war which well may destroy our civilization?"

With that all-important question before us, it seems to me that when I address myself to "Whom it may concern," that should mean every civilized human being. Some uncivilized Eskimos, native tribes of the Congo, and a few others might escape the consequences of an atomic war.

Some of the rest of us might escape death only to eke out a miserable existence in a world so ruined and hopelessly destroyed as to throw mankind back into another era comparable to the Dark Ages.

What are we to do about it?

Frankly, I know of only one way to do anything that needs to be done, and that is get busy doing it. Never mind if there are those who say it cannot be done. Faith and hard work can accomplish practically anything.

Perhaps my own experiences may account for my optimism, but I also know that without faith I would never have come to this hour where I find myself in the position of being called upon to help in the solution of

the most difficult crisis ever to confront mankind.

I am going to recount, briefly, my own story in the confident hope that it will inspire others to aid in accomplishing what many say is impossible. The creation of a world government with sufficient power to prevent wars and save humanity from the anguish and ordeal of a world-wide atomic war.

My father was a minister. I was raised on a small farm in northern Idaho; the twelfth of thirteen children. I rode horseback, or more often walked, 6 miles each day to obtain what formal education I enjoy.

My father's failing health forced me to strike out for myself at the age of 15.

I secured a job with a dramatic stock company and traveled over the West as an actor and manager until 1937.

As owner and manager of my own company I was hit a double blow in 1930 by the depression and the advent of talking pictures. In my travels I observed at first hand the suffering and privation of the people during those trying years. Indeed I too suffered hardship and actual hunger at times. I became deeply interested in the study of economics and political science.

A determination grew within me to do something—all that was in my power—to see that never again should the people of America go hungry in the midst of plenty.

In the fall of 1937 I established residence in my native State with the object in mind of running for office. Six months later I announced for Congress. I am sure that I was the only person in the world who had faith that I would eventually achieve my ambition.

While I may set my sights on seemingly impossible goals, I try to be practical in attaining them. I had to work with the tools at hand. At the time I had a cowboy band so I used the band to campaign. We would go into a community with our sound truck, start entertaining on Main Street, attract a big crowd, and then I would make my talk. I didn't enjoy doing this but I had to have publicity and lots of it or give up. I had no political organization. I came out fourth in a field of nine candidates in the primary. I had proven to myself that my theatrical background was not an insurmountable handicap.

In 1940 I announced for the Senate to fill the unexpired term of Senator Borah. Using the same tactics, I was nominated over strong opponents. Because I had not come up the hard way through long years of service in the party ranks the leaders of my own party refused to help and while Roosevelt carried the State by 25,000 majority and the entire State ticket was elected, I was defeated in the general election by 15,000 votes. A terrible beating in a State with a small number of voters.

The press was sure I was through. The politicians were happy. War came. I secured a job as a sheet-metal worker in a war plant. I ran again in 1942, was nominated in the primaries and again defeated in the general election but by only 4,000 votes. That was the end. Political experts and the press were certain no man could survive such a series of defeats. I returned to my war-plant job.

In 1944 I tried for the fourth time. I spent $60 for campaign literature. That was all I could afford—no newspaper ads, no radio talks, no band. My opponents spent thousands of dollars. I won the nomination, defeating the incumbent Senator by 216 votes. In the general election I defeated the Governor. I was finally elected United States Senator.

Despite the repeated use of the pronoun "I" this is not written boastfully, but rather to give courage to those who might think that their efforts cannot count for much in this great struggle to bring about a real brotherhood of man.

To bring action on this resolution, the people of America must raise their voices, thus making known their determination to end wars. If you know any Senators contact them personally. Write personal letters to your Representative or Senator.

Write to the President, to James Byrnes, the Secretary of State; to Edward R. Stettinius, our delegate to the United Nations Organization. Write to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee urging them to report the resolution (S. 183) out favorably. Write to your newspaper. All such letters from the people will have influence and effect. It is the only way. Try and get others to do the same.

Is all this a big job? The effect not worth the effort?

Before I went out to campaign in 1944 I wrote 3,000 letters in longhand, to everyone I knew in the State of Idaho. For every letter I wrote my opponents were spending many dollars.

Send for as many copies of this resolution as you can possibly distribute.

Your life and your children's life may depend on how earnestly you do your part toward establishing a world government capable of maintaining peace.

I have attended many meetings with the men who made the atomic bombs. They know what mortal danger we face. They are working ceaselessly to arouse the American people. I, myself, am working as many hours as I can stand. I ask and expect no less of you.

H. G. Wells, the noted historian whose predictions of things to come have proven remarkably accurate in the past, had this to say just recently. "The end of everything we call life is close at hand and cannot be evaded. There is no way out, around, or through the impasse. It is the end."

You can just pretend the situation does not exist and go on living as usual, or you can accept H. G. Wells' gloomy prophecy and prepare for the end, or you can do as many others are doing, including the scientists and myself. Refuse to admit that world government is a dream and start doing something about it. Personally, I like the slogan of the Army Service Forces; the men who built bridges under gunfire, landing fields on swamps, and the Burma Road. Here is their motto: "The impossible we do immediately; the miraculous takes a little longer."

They did it for war. We must do it for peace or perish.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, it is proposed to strike out beginning with line 23, down to and including line 14 on page 15, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. (a) No reorganization plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving such plan. Each reorganization specified in a plan which shall have been approved by the enactment of such a joint resolution shall take effect on the date of enactment of such joint resolution or on the date specified pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to such reorganization, whichever may be the later date.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to be heard further upon the amendment. In view of the importance of the issues involved, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Huffman	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Knowland	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Taylor
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McMahon	Vandenberg
Cordon	Magnuson	Wagner
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Morse	Willis
Ferguson	Murdock	Wilson
George	Myers	Young
Guffey	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AMENDMENTS TO GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3749, to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, commonly known as the GI bill of rights.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I simply want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the procedure now suggested is typical of the way Congress has been dealing with the subject of reorganization. In my opinion it is indicative of the interest the Senate of the United States, at least, takes in reorganization. The other day the debate on the reorganization bill was interrupted, and the bill was displaced by the Pearl Harbor discussion. Today the Senator from Colorado comes forward with a bill amending the GI bill of rights and asks unanimous consent to displace the reorganization bill in order to take up the GI bill.

In this instance, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado is wholly justified in asking that the unfinished business be laid aside in order, as I understand, to clarify the GI bill of rights respecting the question of loans and other subjects contained in the bill. Certainly I would be the last Member of the Senate to object to the immediate consideration of that legislation. When I reserved objection I did so only to call attention to the apparent lack of interest of the Senate of the United States in reorganization. It is hard to keep a quorum present. I predict now that unless Congress is willing to allow the President of the United States some latitude respecting reorganization, reorganization will simply be hopeless.

Mr. President, I do not object to the request made by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not think we

ought to set aside the pending bill for another bill. I object to the request of the Senator from Colorado. It seems to me that the reorganization bill is of very great importance. I think we ought to consider it or not consider it. If we are not to consider it today, perhaps it ought to go over until next week, when a greater number of Senators will be present. But if we are to consider it this week, I think we should consider it now, and not set it aside for any other measure.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator from Colorado came to me and asked if I would object, and he assured me that not more than 30 minutes would be required to dispose of the bill he has in charge. I do not know, and neither does any other Senator, how long a time will be required. On the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Colorado that not more than 30 minutes would be required, it was agreeable to me temporarily to suspend consideration of the reorganization bill to take up the other bill. However, Mr. President, I shall insist that immediately on the disposition of the GI bill—unless the Senator from Ohio insists on his objection—consideration of the reorganization bill be resumed and continued.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, under those circumstances I object to setting aside the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill cannot be considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized, regardless of what the views of the Chair are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Chair please recognize me so that I may ask the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] to yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] does not wish to be discourteous. Before the Senator from Ohio makes his final decision in the matter I should like to say to him that so far as I am personally concerned, next week would be soon enough to consider the bill amending the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. However, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is very much interested in veterans' legislation, and who has always led in veterans' legislation in the Senate, will be compelled to be absent from the Senate next week. He is very anxious to dispose of the bill before he leaves.

So far as the 30-minute limitation is concerned, I do not know how long a time will be required to dispose of the bill. It was unanimously reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Finance. Amendments may be offered from the floor. I know of one or two, but I do not believe they will be controversial. I do not believe it will take long to dispose of them. Unless something unforeseen arises, not very much time will be consumed. But if it develops that more time will be required, and if considerable debate arises, any Senator may at any time call for the regular order. and the GI bill will have to be set aside.

It is important that this measure be enacted soon, because it liberalizes the loan provisions to some extent, which is necessary, and also liberalizes the educational features of the GI law. So far as I am concerned, and I am sure so far as the committee is concerned, with the exception of the Senator from Georgia, next week, or when we finish with Senate bill 1120, would be satisfactory.

I hope the Senator from Ohio will withdraw his objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that if the bill is taken up in this way, under the procedure proposed, it may be set aside at any time by calling for the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I am very much interested in the amendments to the GI bill of rights. We considered them in detail in the Senate Committee on Finance. They are very important amendments. though I do not think they are so important as the bill now before the Senate.

The Senate may not appear to be taking a great interest in the theory of the pending bill, but Senators take a very active interest when it is proposed to transfer a bureau or agency from one department to another. Another reason why there is no apparent interest is that the present discussion involves a constitutional theory in which individual Senators apparently have not a great deal of interest.

Under the circumstances, and with the understanding that if consideration of the other bill is not concluded in an hour or so we may call for the regular order, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding that upon resuming the consideration of Senate bill 1120 after the bill amending the GI bill of rights has been disposed of, the pending amendment, offered by myself, will be the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Missouri will be the pending question.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the second sentence of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of extending benefits to veterans and dependents, and to the extent he deems necessary, to procure the necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking, pursuant to existing statutes."

SEC. 2. Section 200 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is further authorized at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe to furnish necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid full-time representatives of such organizations, with reimbursement on an actual cost basis."

SEC. 3. Section 302 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized and directed to establish, from time to time, boards of review composed of five commissioned officers, two of whom shall be selected from the Medical Corps of the Army or Navy, or from the Public Health Service, as the case may be. It shall be the duty of any such board to review, at the request of any officer retired or released from active service, without pay, for physical disability pursuant to the decision of a retiring board, board of medical survey, or disposition board, the findings and decisions of such board. Such review shall be based upon all available service records relating to the officer requesting such review, and such other evidence as may be presented by such officer. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony either in person or by affidavit, and the officer requesting review shall be allowed to appear before such board of review in person or by counsel. In carrying out its duties under this section such board of review shall have the same powers as exercised by, or vested in, the board whose findings and decision are being viewed. The proceedings and decision of each such board of review affirming or reversing the decision of any such retiring board, board of medical survey, or disposition board shall be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, and shall be laid by him before the President for his approval or disapproval and orders in the case."

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph 1 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and who either shall have served 90 days or more, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or traniing under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability, shall be eligible for and entitled to receive education or training under this part: *Provided*, That such course shall be initiated not later than 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later: *Provided further*, That no such education or training shall be afforded beyond 9 years after the termination of the present war."

(b) Paragraph 2 of part VIII of such regulation is amended to read as follows:

"2. Any such eligible person shall be entitled to education or training at an approved educational or training institution for a period of 1 year plus the time such person was in the active service on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, but in no event shall the total period of education or training exceed 4 years: *Provided*, That his work continues to be satisfactory throughout the period, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution: *Provided further*, That wherever the period of eligibility ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such quarter or semester has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester."

(c) Paragraph 3 of part VIII of such regulation is amended to read as follows:

"3. (a) Such person shall be eligible for and entitled to such course of education or training, full time or the equivalent thereof in part-time training, as he may elect, and at any approved educational or training institution at which he chooses to enroll, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept or retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution finds him qualified to undertake or pursue: *Provided*, That, for reasons satisfactory to the Administrator, he may change a course of instruction: *And provided further*, That any such course of education or training may be discontinued at any time, if it is found by the Administrator that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution, the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory.

"(b) Any such eligible person may apply for a short, intensive postgraduate, or training course of less than 30 weeks: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall have the authority to contract with approved institutions for such courses if he finds that the agreed cost of such courses is reasonable and fair: *Provided further*, That the limitation of paragraph 5 shall not prevent the payment of such agreed rates, but there shall be charged against the veteran's period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which the cost of the course bears to $500.

"(c) Any such eligible person may apply for a course of instruction by correspondence without any maintenance allowance: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall have authority to contract with approved institutions for such courses if he finds that the agreed cost of such courses is reasonable and fair: *Provided further*, (1) That the provisions of paragraph 5 shall not apply to correspondence courses; (2) that one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such course shall be charged against the veteran's period of eligibility; and (3) that the total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses for any veteran shall not exceed $500: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to preclude the use of approved correspondence courses as a part of institutional or job training, subject to regulations prescribed by the Administrator."

(d) Paragraph 5 of part VIII of such regulation is amended to read as follows:

"5. The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution, for each person enrolled in full time or part-time course of education or training, the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, as are generally required for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution: *Provided*, That in no event shall such payments, with respect to any person, exceed $500 for an ordinary school year: *Provided further*, That no payments shall be made to institutions, business, or other establishments furnishing apprentice training on the job; *And provided further*, That any institution may apply to the Administrator for an adjustment of fees and the Administrator, if he finds that the customary charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, may provide by agreement for the payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the actual cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction, and not exceeding $500 for an ordinary school year, inclusive of all charges and supplies; and may in like manner readjust such payments from time to time in consideration of increased or decreased enrollment and available contributions to meet such costs, whether from public or private funds."

(e) Effective on the first day of the first calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, the first sentence of paragraph 6 of part VIII of such regulation is amended to read as follows:

"6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding 30 days in a calendar year."

(f) Paragraph 7 of part VIII of such regulation is amended to read as follows:

"7. Any such person eligible for the benefits of this part, who is also eligible for the benefit of part VII, may elect either benefit or may be provided an approved combination of such courses: *Provided*, That the total period of any such combined courses shall not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility."

SEC. 5. Section 4 of Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as added by section 402 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That returned books, supplies, or equipment may be turned in to educational or training institutions for credit under such terms as may be approved by the Administrator, or disposed of in such other manner as may be approved by the Administrator."

SEC. 6. (a) The proviso in paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That no course of training in excess of a period of 4 years shall be approved except with the approval of the Administrator, nor shall any training under this part be afforded beyond 9 years after the termination of the present war."

(b) Effective on the first day of the first calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein and for 2 months after his employability is determined, each veteran shall be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended: *Provided*, That the minimum payment of such allowance, plus any pension or other benefit, shall be, for a person without a dependent, $105 per month; and for a person with a dependent, $115, plus the following amounts for additional dependents: (1) $10 for one child and $7 additional for each additional child, and (2) $15 for a dependent parent: *Provided further*, That the rates set out herein shall not be subject to the increases authorized by Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944: *And provided further*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement in writing showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such written statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the maintenance allowance of such person to an amount considered equitable and just."

SEC. 7. The second sentence of section 500 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Any such veteran may apply within 10 years after the termination of the war, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the guaranty by the Administrator of not to exceed 50 percent of a loan or loans for any of the purposes specified in sections 501, 502, and 503: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000."

SEC. 8. (a) The first sentence of section 500 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows: An amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed shall be paid to the lender by the Administrator out of available appropriations for credit upon the loan at the time the loan is closed."

(b) Section 500 (c) of such act as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Loans guaranteed by the Administrator under this title shall be payable under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That the liability under the guaranty, within the limitations of this title, shall decrease or increase pro rata with any decrease or increase of the amount of the unpaid portion of the obligation: *Provided further*, That loans guaranteed by the Administrator shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding 4 percent per annum and shall be payable in full in not more than 25 years, or in the case of loans on farm realty, in not more than 40 years. The Administrator is authorized and directed to guarantee loans to veterans subject to the provisions of this title on approved applications made to persons, firms, associations, and corporations and to governmental agencies and corporations, either State or Federal. Any loan at least 20 percent of which is guaranteed by the Administrator under this title may be made by any national bank, or Federal savings and loan association; or by any bank, trust company, building and loan association, or insurance company, organized or authorized to do business in the District of Columbia; without regard to the limitations and restrictions of any other statute or regulation with respect to: (1) ratio of amount of loan to value of the property, (2) maturity of loan, (3) requirement for mortgage or other security, or (4)—if guaranteed in full—dignity of liens."

SEC. 9. Section 501 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "on unimproved property owned by him", and paragraph (3) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(3) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property or the construction cost does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal."

SEC. 10. Section 501 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any application for the guaranty of a loan under this section for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, or improvements

in residential property owned by the veteran and used by him as his home, may be approved by the Administrator if he finds that the proceeds of such loan will be used for such purpose or purposes."

SEC. 11. Section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 502. Any application to be made under this title for the guaranty of a loan to be used in purchasing any land, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, supplies, or implements, or in repairing, altering, constructing, or improving any land, equipment, or buildings, including the farmhouse, to be used in farming operations conducted by the applicant involving production in excess of his own needs or for working capital requirements necessary for such operations, or to purchase stock in a cooperative association where the purchase of such stock is required by Federal statute as an incident to obtaining a loan on which a guaranty is sought, may be approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs if he finds—

"(1) that the proceeds of such loan will be used for any such purposes in connection with bona fide farming operations conducted by the applicant;

"(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

"(3) that the ability and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

"(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal."

SEC. 12. Section 503 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 503. Any application made under this title for the guaranty of a loan, the proceeds of which are to be used for the purpose of engaging in business or for the purpose of pursuing a gainful occupation, whether full time or part time, or for the cost of acquiring for such purpose land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, tools, inventory, stock in trade, or for the cost of the construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of any realty or equipment used for such purpose, or to provide the funds needed for working capital, may be approved on a secured or unsecured basis by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs if he finds—

"(1) that the proceeds of such loan will be used for any of such purposes in connection with bona fide pursuit of such business or gainful occupation by the applicant;

"(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such business or occupation;

"(3) that the ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such business or occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such business or occupation; and

"(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal."

SEC. 13. Section 505 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any person who is a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, as provided in section 500 hereof, and who is found by the Secretary of Agriculture, by reason of his ability and experience, including training as a vocational trainee, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, shall be eligible for the benefits of such act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant."

SEC. 14. Title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 506. The Administrator may approve the guaranty of a loan the purpose of which is to refinance any indebtedness of a veteran which is secured of record on property to be used or occupied by the veteran as a home or for farming purposes, or indebtedness incurred by him in the pursuit of a gainful occupation which he is pursuing or which he proposes in good faith to pursue, or any delinquent taxes or assessments on such property or business, provided it is found that—

"(1) Such default or delinquency occurred not later than 10 years after the termination of the war, and

"(2) such refinancing will aid the veteran in his economic readjustment.

"SEC. 507. (a) With respect to matters arising by reason of this title as now or hereafter amended and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator may—

"(1) sue and be sued in his official capacity in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal;

"(2) subject to specific limitations in this Act, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of principal or interest or any portion thereof, security or other provisions of any note, contract, mortgage or any lien instrument, with respect to which a loan guaranty certificate, or an insurance contract, has been issued;

"(3) pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, such certificate or contract;

"(4) pay, compromise, waive or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption;

"(5) purchase at any sale, public or private, upon such terms and for such prices as he determines to be reasonable; and take title to property, real, personal or mixed; and similarly sell at public or private sale, exchange, assign, convey, or otherwise dispose of any such property; and

"(6) complete, administer, operate, obtain and pay for insurance on, and maintain, renovate, repair, modernize, lease, or otherwise deal with any property acquired or held pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That the acquisition of any such property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction of, on, or over such property (including power to tax) or impair the rights under the State or local law of any persons on such property.

"(b) The powers by this section granted may be exercised by the Administrator without regard to any other provisions of law not enacted expressly in limitation hereof, which otherwise would govern the expenditure of public funds: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this section if the amount of such contract exceeds $1,000.

"(c) The financial transactions of the Administrator incident to, or arising out of the guaranty of loans pursuant to this title, and the acquisition, management, and disposition of property, real, personal, or mixed, as incident to such activities and pursuant to this section, and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

"SEC. 508. (a) Any loans which might be guaranteed under the provisions of section 503 hereof, when made or purchased by any financial institution subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia, may, in lieu of such guaranty, be insured by the Administrator under an agreement whereby he will reimburse any such institution for losses incurred on such loans up to 15 percent of the aggregate of loans so made or purchased by it.

"(b) Loans insured hereunder shall be made on such other terms, conditions, and restrictions as the Administrator may prescribe within the limitations set forth in this title. The Administrator may fix the maximum rate of interest payable on any class of non-real-estate loans insured hereunder at a figure not in excess of a 3 percent discount rate or an equivalent straight interest rate on nonamortized loans.

"(c) The Administrator shall pay the same amount on each loan insured hereunder as he would be required to pay under the first sentence of section 500 (b) hereof if the loan were guaranteed rather than insured."

SEC. 15. Section 1505 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1505. In the event there shall hereafter be authorized any allowance in the nature of adjusted compensation, any benefits received by, or paid for, any veteran under title III of this act shall be charged against and deducted from such adjusted compensation; and in the event a veteran has obtained a loan under the terms of this act, the agency disbursing such adjusted compensation shall first pay the unpaid balance and accrued interest due on such loan to the holder of the evidence of such indebtedness to the extent that the amount of adjusted compensation which may be payable will permit."

SEC. 16. Title VI of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 1506. Persons who served in the active military or naval service of any government allied with the United States in World War II and who at time of entrance into such active service were citizens of the United States shall, by virtue of such service, and if otherwise qualified, be entitled to the benefits of titles II, III, IV, and V of this act or of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, in the same manner and to the same extent as persons who served in the active military or naval service of the United States: *Provided*, That any such benefit shall not be extended to any person who is not a resident of the United States at time of filing claim or to any person who has applied for and received the same or similar benefit from the government of the nation in whose active military or naval service he served.

"SEC. 1507. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1503, any person while on terminal leave, or while hospitalized pending final discharge, may be afforded the benefits of titles II and III of this act, or vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, subject to all conditions thereof except actual discharge. This section shall be effective from June 22, 1944."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not propose to make any extended statement in explanation of the pending bill. The committee report contains a detailed analysis of the bill, section by section, and reference to that report will indicate the specific changes made in existing law.

However, I wish to make some preliminary remarks and mention briefly questions of major importance touched on in the bill as reported from the Committee on Finance.

Experience under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 has disclosed that there are some weaknesses in that

law, in fact some defects, that need corrective legislation. To put the matter frankly, there have been serious complaints, not as to the administration of the law but as to inadequacies which prevent a proper application of the benefits that Congress intended to extend to the veterans. As a matter of fact, it will be recalled that when the Congress enacted the Readjustment Act it was recognized that by reason of the subject matter it was contemplated that only through trial and error could a statute of that kind be made completely effective.

In my opinion, the original GI bill was over-sold. That is, the veterans and the country were led to believe that greater benefits than were actually provided in the bill would be available to veterans. The original GI bill and the amendments now proposed to that measure do not provide a "feather bed" for the veteran; but they do give the veteran who wishes to help himself an opportunity to do so. The bill now pending provides for educational possibilities and for modest loans; but I think it would be a mistake for the veteran and for the country to get the idea that this legislation does everything that the veteran should have done for him and that it completes our obligation to the veteran and his family, because it does no such thing. It has very specific limitations.

As a result of complaints and suggestions from various sources, there have been introduced in the Senate many bills which proposed to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, and they were considered by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation. The pending measure, House bill 3749, was passed by the House in the form of a complete redrafting of the act. The Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation of the Finance Committee took the House bill along with the other proposals, and after extended hearings wrote a new bill. It is my belief that the pending bill, as reported by the Finance Committee, will go a long way toward simplifying and strengthening the administration of the law.

Most of the suggestions for amendment were directed to titles II and III of the act, which deal with education and training and loans. It is under these two titles that most of the experience has been obtained, because these are the matters which are particularly close to the veteran after leaving the service; he is interested either in continuing his education, or in preparing for his adjustment in business, industry, agriculture, or in obtaining a home. I believe the amendments in the law recommended by the committee will materially aid veterans in attaining these objectives.

In the case of education and training the principal amendments are, first, an increase in the amount of subsistence allowance from $50 to $65 a month in the case of veterans without dependents, and from $75 to $90 in the case of veterans with dependents; second, elimination of alleged discrimination between service persons based upon age; third, provision for short, intensive courses, and for the use of correspondence courses under adequate safeguards; and, fourth, a revised formula for extending assistance to public institutions having inadequate fees.

With respect to loans, the bill reported by the Finance Committee has the following purposes: First, in the case of farm-and-business loans, the purpose for which guaranteed loans may be made was extended to include working capital, additional supplies, construction, and repairs, and so forth—in short, almost any type of normal activity; second, in the case of all loans the maximum term was increased from 20 to 25 years, and on farm loans from 20 to 40 years, and the time within which veterans might apply for loans was increased to 10 years after the war, instead of 5, as at present; third, the guaranty of loans for delinquent indebtedness, now limited to loans on residential property, was extended to cover all types of loans, principally to take care of business; fourth, restrictions were removed from national banks and other institutions subject to Federal control, to permit them to participate in loans under the act; fifth, a simplified form of group-loan insurance was included in the act as an alternative to the existing guaranty of loan; sixth, finally, and probably one of the most important changes proposed by the committee, there is the authorization of Government-guaranteed loans based on "reasonable" rather than "reasonable normal" value of property. It is believed that this will remove one of the most disturbing factors in the administration of the loan provisions. The use of the word "normal" has been found to be wholly unsatisfactory in the present state of the real-estate market.

I may add there, Mr. President, that the Finance Committee and the subcommitte considering this measure very reluctantly decided to eliminate the word "normal", but we felt that under present circumstances, with present going prices, unless the word "normal" were eliminated, no homes or farms would be purchased by veterans.

Other amendments approved by the committee covered persons who served with allied governments, those on terminal leave, limited deductions from any future adjusted compensation to apply only to loans, and authorization of Army and Navy review boards to review action of medical survey and disposition boards.

With these brief observations, Mr. President, I urge that the bill be passed without delay. I shall, of course, be glad to answer any questions with respect to matters which I have not covered in this statement.

Mr. President, I should like to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received today, signed by Mr. Edward E. Odom, Solicitor for the Veterans' Administration, with respect to the cost of the original GI bill and the cost of the bill as now proposed to be amended.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1945.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation, Senate Committee on Finance, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In accordance with your oral request the following estimates of costs are furnished on (1) S. 1767, Seventy-eighth Congress, which became the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944; (2) H. R. 3749, Seventy-ninth Congress, "An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II," as it passed the House; and (3) H. R. 3749 with amendments recommended by the Senate Committee on Finance.

In the report to the Bureau of the Budget on the enrolled enactment, S. 1767, Seventy-eighth Congress, which became the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, the Veterans' Administration gave the estimated expenditures under the act per unit of 1,000,000 persons in service at $509,000,000. With an estimated number of persons in service being 15,000,000 the total estimated cost was $7,635,000,000. In making such estimate it was emphasized that "any estimates must depend upon so many undeterminable factors that they may be subject to variations upward or downward." Some of the then unknown factors which would affect the ultimate cost were cited, (1) the total number of persons serving in the armed forces during the war period; (2) the length of the war; (3) the future character of the war and rate of discharge; and (4) the postwar economic situation with special reference to opportunities for employment. It was stated that to the extent returning veterans can promptly reenter industrial and other pursuits whether employed by self or others, the potential cost would be reduced.

H. R. 3749, as passed by the House, increased the subsistence allowance to veterans while enrolled in and pursuing a course other than a course in a correspondence school from $50 to $60 per month if the veteran is without a dependent or dependents, and from $75 to $85 per month if he has a dependent or dependents. The estimated cost of this increase is $10,500,000 for the first year affecting approximately 90,800 veterans. It should be borne in mind that the bill as passed by the House did not provide any increased allowance for part VII cases. Aside from the change of rate of subsistence allowance, the only increase would be the wide-open loan guaranty provisions under title III. It is not possible to furnish an estimate on such provisions, but it can be stated that without supervision the cost could be very much larger than the estimate furnished on Public Law 346. The increased cost would be offset by the lender sharing the loss.

H. R. 3749, as reported by the Committee on Finance, would (1) increase the rates of subsistence allowance under title II, "Education of Veterans," under Public Law 346, from $50 to $65 per month if the veteran is without a dependent or dependents and from $75 to $90 per month if he has a dependent or dependents, and (2) would provide for the payment of the foregoing subsistence allowances in the cases in those persons with service-connected disabilities receiving vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, March 24, 1943, with a provision for minimum rates of pension, plus such subsistence allowances starting with the $105 for a veteran without a dependent or dependents, $115 per month for a veteran with a dependent plus the following amounts for additional dependents: (1) $10 for one child with $7 additional for each additional child, and (2) $15 for a dependent parent. The estimated cost for the first year in the service-connected cases under Public Law 16, is $8,914,000, affecting 33,500 veterans; the estimated cost for the first year under title II of Public Law 346 is $15,699,000, affecting 90,800 veterans. The total estimated costh for the first year would approximate $24,813,000, affecting 124,300 veterans. The changes in title III of Public Law 346, as provided in H. R. 3749, as reported by the committee would not materially increase the

estimated cost for that particular title of the original act.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD E. ODOM,
Solicitor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Mr. Odom has estimated, or it has been estimated, that the cost of the original bill would be approximately $7,635,000,000. Mr. Odom has this to say about the amendments we are offering today:

The estimated cost for the first year in the service-connected cases under Public Law 16 is $8,914,000, affecting 33,500 veterans; the estimated cost for the first year under title II of Public Law 346 is $15,699,000, affecting 90,800 veterans. The total estimated cost for the first year would approximate $24,613,000, affecting 124,300 veterans. The changes in title III of Public Law 346 as provided in H. R. 3749 as reported by the committee would not materially increase the estimated cost for that particular title of the original act.

Mr. President, it is difficult to estimate what the costs of such legislation will be. My own estimate is that the total cost of the GI bill of rights as now proposed to be amended will be in the neighborhood of $9,000,000,000, but that is not much more than a guess. Probably it will be somewhere between $8,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the report of the Finance Committee on House bill 3749.

There being no objection, the report (No. 698) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, having considered the same, report favorably theron with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Experience under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, since its enactment on June 22, 1944, has shown that in some respects the act requires liberalization or clarification. Various bills have been introduced both in the Senate and in the House to make changes in the act. The bill H. R. 3749, which your committee is reporting, passed the House in the form of a complete redraft of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 but actually amending only certain sections of titles I, II, and III.

Your committee held hearings on this bill and, after considering the suggestions made at the hearings on this and other bills on this subject pending before the committee, has reported a substitute for the House bill which it recommends for immediate enactment. The substitute does not rewrite the entire Readjustment Act but proposes only to amend it in the particulars in which your committee saw need for amendment, and other sections in the act were left untouched.

It is believed that the bill as reported by the committee will go a long way toward meeting suggestions for amendment made at the hearings and elsewhere. It will facilitate administration and will, in important respects, liberalize benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and particularly the education and loan provisions, which, in practice, have proved to be difficult in some respects.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS

Procedure

Section 1: This section amends section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act so as to make permanent the authority of the Administrator under that section to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the "present war and 6 months thereafter."

Section 2: This section adds to section 200 of the act an authorization for the Administrator to furnish necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid representatives of veterans' organizations, with reimbursement on an actual-cost basis.

Section 3: Section 302 (a) of the act authorized the establishment of boards of review to review findings and decisions of retiring boards. The amendments made by the committee in this section extend this authority to review findings and decisions of boards of medical survey and disposition boards. A change in language broadens the class of those who may apply to include any officer released from active service.

Education and training

Section 4: This section amends part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as added by section 400 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, in the following respects:

(a) Paragraph 1 is amended to eliminate the requirement that veterans show that education was interrupted by service, extended the time from 2 to 4 years to initiate a course, extended the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war, and strikes out the age limitation. The House bill also contained the extensions of time referred to.

(b) Paragraph 2 is amended to strike out the references to a refresher or retraining course so that the veteran will be provided approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years.

(c) Paragraph 3 is amended in two important respects: First, a new subparagraph (b) is added providing for short, intensive courses under contract with approved institutions, with authority to pay more than the pro rata customary charges and limiting the period of education and training accordingly; second, a new subparagraph (c) is added which provides for instruction by correspondence courses, subject to contracts as to rates and charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veteran's period of eligibility. The total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses is limited to $500.

Both of these latter amendments were contained in the House bill, although the correspondence-school provision was stated in somewhat different form and without adequate control as to rates or as to limitations of eligibility.

(d) Paragraph 5 of the present act, insofar as it seeks to permit adjustment of fees of public institutions, has not proven satisfactory in practice. Attorneys general of several States have questioned the authority of the State to accept payments under the law of the State, within the limitations of the present paragraph 5. The committee amendment will permit the Administrator to make an adjustment of fees in such cases if he finds that the customary charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans. The Administrator will be able to do this by agreement with each institution on an over-all plan and based upon a showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program.

(e) The House bill increased the subsistence allowances under paragraph 6 from $50 to $60 per month in the case of veterans without dependents and from $75 to $85 per month in the case of veterans with dependents. The committee has increased these amounts to $65 and $90, respectively, effective on the first day of the first calendar month after date of enactment.

(f) Under paragraph 7 of the present law a veteran eligible for the benefits of part VIII (education and training) and part VII (vocational rehabilitation) may elect which benefit he desires; but once having made the election, he is bound. The committee amendment permits the right of election, together with authorization of an approved combination of courses, with the proviso that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period of limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility. It also removes an inequality as to disabled veterans.

Section 5: This section adds a proviso to section 4 of Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, which was added by section 402 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to the effect that returned books, supplies, or equipment may be released to educational or training institutions for credit or disposed of otherwise by the Administrator, without regard to limitation on the disposition of surplus property generally.

Section 6: Under the present law relating to vocational rehabilitation (Public Law 16, 78th Cong.) no course of training in excess of a period of 4 years may be approved. Consequently, if a course of training extends beyond 4 years the veteran cannot take advantage of the course, even though he is willing to stand the expense of the course beyond the 4-year period out of his own pocket. This section will permit the Administrator to approve such courses. The period of time within which training may be furnished is also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII.

This section also contains an amendment constituting a complete redraft of paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation (1) (a), as amended (Public Law 16, 78th Cong.). The amended section would provide that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of subsistence allowance speciel in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended (the education provisions). It would establish a minimum rate of $105 for a veteran without dependents, $115 with a dependent, and $10 additional for a child and $7 for each additional child, and $15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount payable cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability. The effect of the committee amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with low rate of pension.

Loans

Section 7: This section permits a veteran to apply for guaranty of a loan within 10 years after the termination of the war. The existing law limits the loan features to 2 years after termination of the war or 2 years after separation from the military or naval forces, whichever is the later date, but in no event more than 5 years after the termination of the war. The House bill extended the 2-year limitation in existing law to 6 years but in no event more than 8 years after termination of the war.

It is appropriate to point out here an important difference between the House bill and the bill reported by your committee, as relates to loans. Under the House bill, by amendments to section 500 (a) and elsewhere in the Readjustment Act, the lending agency and the veteran were in effect permitted to make their own bargain, and the loan is automatically guaranteed 50 percent by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

This would afford no protection either to the veterans or to the Government. Your committee did not accept this plan and has retained the basic principles of the existing law with such changes as may be necessary in section 500 (a) and in other provisions which will be noted, to liberalize and clarify the law. At the same time, there is preserved the guaranty principle of the existing act instead of the House provision, which is in effect a contract of indemnity, with the lender and the Government sharing the loss pro rata.

Section 8: Section 500 (b) of the act now permits the Administrator to pay interest for the first year on that part of the loan guaranteed by the Administrator. Your committee believes that an authority to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year will bring about simplification of administration and has amended the law accordingly.

Section 500 (c) is amended to extend the maturity limitation from 20 to 25 years generally and in the case of loans on farm realty to 40 years; and removes present restrictions which preclude national banks, Federal savings and loan associations, and District of Columbia banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, and insurance companies from participating in loans to veterans eligible for guaranty under the act. The laws of the various States quite generally permit such loans by State institutions.

Section 9: The purpose of the changes made in section 501 is to make clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan purposed to finance the construction of a home on that lot. The present text of the act, which specifies that construction is permissible "on unimproved property owned by him," raises a question as to whether that was intended. The related change, striking out the words "including the value of the unimproved lot," is necessary because it will be proper to look at the cost of a lot purchased with the proceeds of the loan rather than the value of that lot. Of course, it does not preclude guaranty of a loan for the purpose of constructing a building on a lot owned by the veteran.

The word "normal" has also been stricken from the text of section 501 (a) (3) (and as well from the corresponding sections related to loans for farm or business purposes) for the reason that a great deal of uncertainty and confusion appears to have resulted from the meaning of the phrase "reasonable normal value." It is desired by thus eliminating the word "normal" to clarify the intent of Congress to permit lending under the act to be predicated on appraised valuations that are reasonable in the light of present-day cost factors; and, while protecting the veteran from overinflated prices, to permit evaluation upon a more realistic basis.

Section 10: The reference to payment of delinquent indebtedness, taxes, or special assessments has been stricken out of section 501 (b) and carried forward into a new section 503, so that the provisions thus stricken out will be applicable on a broadened basis to farms and business as well as to homes.

Section 11: The changes made by this section in section 502 are designed to broaden the present language of the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose. For example, under the present act the farmer cannot finance the construction of a new barn. Under the changed language that would be permissible.

The changes in the subparagraphs of this section are merely formal to conform them with the changes mentioned above, except for the striking out of the word "normal" which is referred to under section 501 (a) above.

Section 12: Section 503 of the act likewise has been altered to eliminate the unduly restrictive effects of the present language of the act. The amended language will permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially under a guaranteed loan. Under the present act, for example, a store cannot be modernized or altered with the proceeds of a guaranteed loan. Stock in trade cannot be acquired, nor working capital provided. The usual business loan is a character loan rather than a strictly secured loan. The amendment will permit such loans to be granted.

The changes in the subparagraphs are merely formal, except with respect to the elimination of the word "normal" in 503 (4), explained above under 501 (a) (3).

Section 13: This change in section 505 (b) makes clear the right of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the basic eligibility of a veteran applying for loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act. It eliminates the necessity of referring each case to the Veterans' Administration for such determination.

Section 14: This section adds three new sections to the existing law:

Section 506: This supplants the clause eliminated in section 501 (b) and serves to broaden the refinancing of existing indebtedness so that the Readjustment Act will thus serve to supplement fully the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, so as to aid veterans to refinance indebtedness with respect to which their delinquency might be attributable to loss of income during their period of service or to the difficulty of readjusting themselves economically in their postservice life. With respect to home or farm financing, delinquent indebtedness, to be eligible, must be evidenced by a lien of record. With respect to business indebtedness it must have been incurred in connection with a business in which the veteran will be engaged subsequent to the issuance of the guaranty.

Section 507: The powers at present vested in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs are inadequate to enable him to perform the functions required of him under the present act. This new section is added in order to enable him efficiently to conduct those functions. The new section also recognizes the right of private lenders to resort to the courts for a determination of their rights in matters arising out of contracts of guaranty under the act.

In short, section 507 is designed to permit the Administrator to handle matters arising by reason of this title (title III); to sue and be sued; to pay, or compromise claims arising because of a loan guaranty certificate or insurance contract; to pay, compromise, waive, or release any other rights, titles, claims, etc.; to take title to property and to sell, assign, convey, or otherwise dispose of such property; to complete, administer, and maintain or repair, or otherwise deal with property which he may be required to hold pursuant to this title.

Section 508: Section 508 adds to the act a plan which will permit the Administrator to insure loans for business purposes on a plan similar to that provided for modernization and repair loans under title I of the Federal Housing Act. Such insurance is to be issued in lieu of a guaranty and is to be issued direct to the lending institutions under an arrangement which will give them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage on the aggregate of all loans made by them to veterans for the purposes specified in section 503. Such insurance may be issued only to supervised lending institutions or to financial institutions which may purchase such loans from the original lending institution.

As loans of the nature covered by this provision will be, in the main, short-time loans, which are high-cost loans to a lender, it is thought proper to authorize a higher interest rate on such loans as are non-real-estate loans than the 4 percent per annum rate prescribed for all loans which are guaranteed under this act. The proposed 3 percent discount rate, when applied to loans amortizable on a monthly basis, will be an approximate equivalent of 5.54 percent per annum on a straight interest basis.

The new section 508 (c) prescribes that on each loan included in the aggregate insured under this section the Administrator shall pay at the outset the same flat 4 percent amount that is payable on guaranteed loans under the proposed amendment to section 500 (b).

Miscellaneous

Section 15: Section 1505 of the present act provides that in the event that veterans are given any allowance in the future in the nature of adjusted compensation, any benefits received under the Readjustment Act will be charged against and deducted from such adjusted compensation. In addition to the fact that your committee believes that such a sweeping provision is unfair to the veteran, it is actually affecting educational provisions, because the effect of this section is appraised by a veteran when he is making selection of an educational institution. Your committee believes that in no event should this section be applied except in connection with loans and has, therefore, amended the act to exclude other benefits from the deduction required.

Section 16: This section adds two new sections to title VI of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act:

"(1) Section 1506 will extend to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied Governments, and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service, the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16; to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied Nation concerned.

"(2) By reason of the fact that the benefits of the existing law are limited to persons who have been 'discharged or released' from active service, persons on terminal leave, and persons being hospitalized pending final discharge may not take advantage of the educational and loan provisions or vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16. Your committee sees no reason why persons occupying this temporary status should not be afforded an opportunity to apply for and receive such benefits, and section 1507 so provides. The section is made effective from June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Title: The title of the House bill does not adequately express the objectives of this legislation, in that it refers to provision only for readjustment allowances, and the committee has amended the title to read simply: "An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to state that inasmuch as the committee amendment is in the nature of a substitute for the bill, any amendment intended to be proposed should be submitted prior to action on the committee substitute.

Are there any amendments to be offered to the committee amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment which I ask to have stated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Was I correct in understanding the Chair to state that proposed amendments should be offered prior to final action upon the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator was correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have an amendment which is now lying on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 67, line 12, after the word "charge", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That no maintenance and allowance shall be paid in such cases under title II of this act or Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the amendment has not been cleared with either the subcommittee or with the main committee. But in preparing a report on the bill we discovered that under the provisions of the bill as reported from the committee it might be possible for certain veterans to receive assistance in two ways. The object of the amendment which I have offered is to assure that veterans will receive only one assistance payment. I am sure the committee would be in favor of the amendment, although it has not yet been submitted to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

That section 1505 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is hereby repealed.

Strike out lines 3 to 14, inclusive.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was hoped that the senior Senator and junior Senator from Oregon would be able to appear before the Finance Committee and present their points of view in regard to several features of the GI bill. However, the bill is now reported to the floor at such an early date that we have not had an opportunity to present the points of view which we wished to present to the Finance Committee when the bill was under consideration by the committee. Therefore, I feel that because of the points of view which we entertain, it will be necessary for me to discuss the bill at some length in regard to certain proposed amendments which I think should be incorporated in the bill if my understanding is correct that they are not already included in the bill as now reported to the Senate. The first amendment is the one which has just been read by the Chief Clerk, proposing that section 1505 of the GI bill be repealed. The amendment is really S. 1562, introduced on November 6 by my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] in behalf of both Oregon Senators. Of course, that amendment really was——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The subcommittee and the full committee eliminated section 1501 in its application to everything except loans. The committee did not eliminate it with respect to loans for the very good reason that loan contracts might be outstanding under the original section 1505, and the desire was not to change the contracts.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his statement, because he has answered exactly the inquiry which I wished to propound. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill in the form in which the Senator reported it to the Senate today Because of the fact that the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Oregon have some bills pending before the Senate dealing with veterans' matters, I want to make certain before we proceed to vote upon this bill that the principles of the veterans' legislation which the Oregon Senators have pending before the Senate are encompassed in the bill in its present form. I think perhaps that time can be saved if the Senator will answer a series of questions which I wish to propound in regard to proposed veterans' legislation which the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Oregon have introduced.

As I understand the Senator from Colorado, the bill which the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] introduced in behalf of both Senators from Oregon the other day proposing to repeal section 1505, has, in principle, been approved by the Finance Committee save and except as to its application to loans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator why, in his opinion, it could not be repealed in its entirety.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There was some objection raised in the committee to repealing the section in its entirety. It was objected that because loans had been made already on the basis of section 1505, that fact should be taken into consideration because section 1505 was the law of the land. Contracts had been entered into, and the committee did not wish to change the law and leave those contracts hanging without protection of the law we had already enacted.

There is also another good reason for not repealing the section. If a soldier should obtain a loan on a business, to purchase a home or otherwise, and defaults on the loan, and later Congress enacts some sort of an adjustment pay bill, it would seem that the veteran should not be given an advantage over other veterans who had not defaulted, or who had not received any loans. The veteran who has defaulted on a loan should not be put upon the same basis with other veterans who have not made loans or who have not defaulted on loans.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Colorado help me with the meaning of section 1505 in its present form as it is applied to the educational provision of the bill? I refer to a problem we are having in the present application of the GI law as to tuition charged by institutions in some States. The Senator is aware of the fact, I am sure, that there is a great variation in charges, and under the present application of the law, it seems to me, many State institutions are being discriminated against unfairly, and the taxpayers of the States accordingly, because many private institutions charge a much higher tuition than State institutions. Then, too, the practice varies between State institutions as to so-called State resident and out-of-State fees.

Take my own State of Oregon, for example. The tuition for State resident students is relatively low. A higher tuition is charged for out-of-State students. Yet State institutions in many other States charge a much higher State fee than Oregon which they are allowed to collect, of course, for veterans enrolled under the GI law. In California, for example, these fees are higher for both State and out-of-State students. We have already found in the administration of the educational provisions of the GI law that the giving of the educational benefits to the veterans—and certainly they are entitled to them—is resulting in additional costs to the institutions far in excess of the low State fees of some States. I was told by the executive secretary of the State system of higher education in Oregon, for example, that they have had to put on extra help in the offices to keep separate books for these veteran accounts. The additional teaching costs, extra equipment, and housing costs are placing a very heavy burden on many of our State schools, and their State fees for resident students are not high enough to meet the costs. Hence Senator CORDON and I have offered Senate bill S. 1562 to make it possible for the State schools with low fees to charge larger fees to meet this cost without the veteran having to stand the costs by way of future bonus deductions.

In order to make certain that the pending bill covers the principles of our bill S. 1562 I wish to ask if I am correct in my understanding that, under the bill as the Finance Committee now reports it to the Senate, tuition charged to veterans, so long as it does not exceed the $500 limit, will not be deducted from any future adjusted compensation the Congress hereafter may award to veterans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct; it will not be deducted. Section 1505, according to the amendment of the committee, eliminates that deduction completely so far as education is concerned, and that is applied now only to defaulted loans.

Mr. MORSE. Now I ask the Senator whether under the bill in its present form there would be any limitation on a State institution to charge a fee in excess of the fee charged resident students, nonveteran?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We do not enter into that in any way, except that we give the Veterans' Administration the authority to make contracts with institutions of learning, and in that way they are placed more or less on an equality basis.

Mr. MORSE. I think I understand it, but in order to make the matter perfectly clear to my own mind, let me press this further question. Let us assume the hypothetical, that an institution of higher learning in the State of Oregon should decide, under the new bill, if enacted, to charge a veteran a fee of $300 because on a survey they find that State institutions in many other States in the West are charging a fee that high. There is nothing in the bill which would

prevent Oregon institutions from charging that fee if it were approved by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall read the language to the Senator. It is found on page 54 of the bill. It is as follows:

> That any institution may apply to the Administrator for an adjustment of fees and the Administrator, if he finds that the customary charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, may provide by agreement for the payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the actual cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction, and not exceeding $500 for an ordinary school year, inclusive of all charges and supplies; and may in like manner readjust such payments from time to time in consideration of increased or decreased enrollment and available contributions to meet such costs, whether from public or private funds.

That gives the Administrator the right and authority to contract with these institutions, and adjust the very troublesome tuition problems with the institutions.

Mr. MORSE. On the basis of this explanation given by the Senator from Colorado, I withdraw the proposed amendment, and I should like to thank the Finance Committee, in behalf of both Senators from Oregon, for the consideration they gave to the suggestions incorporated in our bill, S. 1562. The Senator from Colorado has made clear to me that the bill now reported by the Finance Committee incorporates within it the bill S. 1562, which Senator CORDON and I introduced the other day in an endeavor to equalize tuition practices under the GI bill among State and private educational institutions.

I wish to ask the Senator from Colorado a further question. I am sorry to seem to press on this matter, but because I have received so many complaints in my mail in regard to the present functioning of the GI law, I wish to make certain, before I vote on the bill now pending before the Senate, that some of the weaknesses of the law are in fact corrected. If we are to vote this afternoon, time will not permit me to make the study I should like to make of it and I had no idea that this bill was going to be advanced on the schedule of the Senate for consideration and vote today.

I introduced some months ago a bill which proposed to eliminate from the GI law educational restriction as to age. My bill is S. 850. Does the revised bill put into effect the principle of that bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; we eliminated the age restriction. We also eliminated the requirement under existing law that the veteran must prove that his educational program has been interfered with because of his service. We take it for granted it has been interfered with, and that restriction has been entirely removed from the law; in fact, both restrictions have been removed.

Mr. MORSE. It happened to be both those restrictions which my bill, previously introduced, sought to remedy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We had the Senator's bill before us, and that point was discussed, and the restriction was eliminated. The Senator from Oregon helped us eliminate it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to be clear about it. Let us suppose this hypothetical, that a veteran who never intended before the war to prepare himself for one of the professions and will probably frankly admit that he never intended to go to a professional school decides, however, as a result of his war experience, that he would like to be a lawyer, or a doctor, or prepare himself for some other profession by attending some professional school. He may be 29 years of age, or older or younger. Is there anything in the bill in its present form which would restrict such a veteran from starting a professional school training in medicine, law, engineering, dentistry, or any of the other professions, and completing the regular course of training under the provisions of the GI bill as now proposed by the Finance Committee in the pending legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is no restriction in the bill, except that there is an over-all limitation of 4 years. That is the only limitation. A veteran who has never attended school, who has never even attended kindergarten, under the bill as reported by the committee could start going to school, and the question of the interruption of his educational process is not a question at all, under the committee bill.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator be so kind as to direct my attention to the page and line of the bill which so provides?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On page 50, beginning in line 6, the Senator will find the answer to his question.

The age limit is entirely eliminated. The Senator will note that that is not there at all. It is left wide open, as I have indicated, with the single exception of the provision as to the 4 years.

I wish to call the Senator's attention to another thing. Under existing law a veteran cannot even start a course which might take more than 4 years. Under the committee bill he can start any course, but he can get paid only for the 4 years under the law. That is the limit he can get. If it takes 6 or 7 years and he wants to pay the rest of the tuition himself, he can do so under the committee bill. That was not possible under the original law.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for the explanation. It is perfectly satisfactory to me. Again I wish to commend the Committee on Finance for putting this provision into the new bill. It incorporates my bill, S. 850, which of course pleases me very much.

I have one more question, and then I shall be through for the present. The two Senators from Oregon also have pending before the Senate a bill, S. 977, which seeks to remedy the very serious housing condition which exists in practically all the institutions of higher learning in this country, so far as veterans are concerned. I do not desire to take a great deal of time to discuss the merits of the bill at this time, particularly if I can get some information as to whether or not there is anything in the GI bill as now proposed by the Committee on Finance which incorporates the housing program of S. 977. If there is not anything in the pending bill which will remedy the housing situation, then I shall have a conference with my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon, and discuss the advisability of offering Senate bill 977 as an amendment to the pending bill. Housing for veterans is a very serious problem all over the country, insofar as providing veterans with actual educational opportunities is concerned.

I state to the Senate that it is true that several thousands of veterans have this fall been turned away from educational institutions because the towns in which the institutions are located have not been able to provide the veterans with housing facilities. I am sure other Senators as well as the Senators from Oregon have received a great many letters in regard to this problem. I suppose we have received more than our share because of the fact that we introduced Senate bill 977. I have received letters from college presidents, boards of trustees, veterans' organizations, chambers of commerce, and various other community groups pointing out that there has been a very serious break-down in administering the educational offerings of the GI bill of rights as it is now on the books, because of inadequacy of housing. Obviously it does not do any good to offer the veterans education unless we provide them not only with the educational facilities in which they can obtain the educational instruction but also with community facilities of housing so that they can live on the campuses with their families and secure the type of education under family conditions that they are certainly entitled to receive from this Government.

Mr. President, I think the matter is so serious, so far as the veterans are concerned, that while we are considering the present GI bill we ought to complete the job once and for all by taking the necessary steps in regard to housing as well as the other steps proposed in the amended bill. So I ask the Senator from Colorado if there is anything in the bill he is sponsoring today which seeks to provide the administrative machinery, and the funds with which to assure veterans that the necessary housing will be provided them immediately along some such lines as are set out in Senate bill 977?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will say to the Senator that the committee did very seriously consider the bill offered by the Senators from Oregon, Senate bill 977, and the committee decided that the subject matter provided for in Senate bill 977 should come up in separate legislation.

There are housing bills now pending before the Congress and in other committees, and we thought the provisions contained in Senate bill 977 should be considered in relation with the other proposals which have been made.

The committee, however, did increase the payments to veterans attending school from $50 to $65 a month for single veterans without dependents, and from $75 to $90 a month for veterans with dependents. That was done partly because of the increased cost of housing at educational institutions.

Mr. President, one of the troubles connected with housing is that there is no building material available and there is no labor available for building houses at the present time. Of course, no matter what legislation we might enact now, it would not relieve the housing situation. But the housing matter is of tremendous importance not only to the students but to returning veterans, who want to find a place to live for themselves and their families. The committee felt that so long as other committees were giving study to the housing problem we, perhaps, should not dip into it in a piecemeal fashion and simply lift out one small part of it and take care of the distressing situation respecting housing for veterans who wish to attend school. For those reasons the committee did not incorporate in the pending bill the bill introduced by the Senators from Oregon, Senate bill 977, but we did consider it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's viewpoint and the viewpoint, apparently, of the Finance Committee in regard to this problem, but I respectfully disagree with the decision the committee reached on S. 977. Giving the veterans more money for subsistence—and certainly they deserve more money for subsistence, irrespective of the need for providing for higher rentals—will not result in their obtaining living quarters in the present housing emergency. I say that because of the physical fact that the houses simply do not exist in these communities where the veterans wish to attend school. They are just not there. It is necessary not only to give them more money but to provide them with housing facilities. Our bill S. 977 does authorize funds for building housing facilities.

In this fall term which is now in progress we find educational institutions all over the country saying, "We cannot accommodate all the veterans who want to go to school." Just day before yesterday I received a letter from the director of veterans' work in the State of Oregon. He pointed out in the letter at some length that this veteran housing problem is one of the most vitally important emergency needs of our whole educational program under the GI bill of rights.

In many institutions, after January 1—and it is now nearly the middle of November—the second school term will begin. I say most respectfully to the Senate that unless we take action on the housing problem now along the lines of S. 977 so that the educational institutions of the country can proceed immediately to build living quarters for veterans, there will be in January and February, when the second school term begins, many veterans who are not going to be able to go to school because they cannot be housed. Temporary quarters could be built out of available surplus war housing projects if this Congress could act now and not put this matter off.

Mr. President, I recognize that there are other housing bills pending, but I do not know of any other housing bill pending which seeks to provide the machinery that is set out in Senate bill 977 for the immediate relief of veterans who want to go to school insofar as authorizing colleges and local governmental units to obtain Federal funds for veteran housing.

The two Senators from Oregon had a very interesting series of experiences last week, in fact for the past 10 days, in their attempt to secure some surplus war houses for educational institutions. I see the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on his feet. I may say to him that much of what I now say applies also to educational institutions in the State of Washington. In fact just today I had a conference with a member of the board of regents of the University of Washington, and he, too, is deploring the great shortage of housing facilities for veterans at that great institution, the University of Washington.

If necessary I could parade before the Senate, but I think Senators will take my word for it, because the mail itself which comes to other Senators will verify what I am saying—I could parade before the Senate a great volume of mail from educational institutions all over the country saying that sufficient housing does not exist for veterans with the result that they are being denied their rights under the GI bill of rights.

The Senators from Oregon have been trying to obtain for the institutions in the State of Oregon, and, incidentally, for the colleges in the entire Pacific Northwest, some temporary housing. There are thousands and thousands of units of temporary housing in this country that could be made available to veterans immediately if we could cut through some of the red tape in our various Government agencies here in Washington which makes it almost procedurally and physically impossible to get an immediate and quick release of those houses. That goes for the Army, the National Housing Administration, and the Surplus Property Administration and several other agencies that claim some interest in these homes. It is unbelievable the channels one must go through if one starts out, as we did a few days ago, to try to secure the release of some housing at Richland, Wash., and some housing at Vanport, Oreg., for educational institutions. The encumbrances which are placed in one's way are manifold. I think it is the duty of the Senate to impress upon the administration the need for officials in those agencies to get their heads together and agree upon some simple procedure whereby these houses can very quickly be declared surplus and the red tape cut so that those houses can be made available for veterans who want to attend educational institutions. These war houses should be made available to colleges at nominal prices, because the depreciation of the houses is going to be very great and the purpose to which they will be put will be to serve veterans. Hence I say that these war houses ought to be made available to educational institutions at a nominal charge. There is no excuse for our agencies to make it so difficult to get quick release of these surplus houses.

It now takes weeks to get any action out of these agencies handling surplus houses. If they need new legislation to clarify their powers then let them so inform us. But delays in making them available to veterans cannot be longer tolerated.

So I say that if now we were to pass the pending GI bill, which contains some very excellent educational provisions for veterans, excellent, that is, if it were possible for veterans to take advantage of those provisions, and not to take the necessary time that it will require for us to pass at the same time an adequate housing bill, we will make a great mistake. Therefore I may in a few minutes offer S. 977 as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oregon will not do that. If he could remedy the deplorable housing conditions which exist by offering his amendment it would be worth while, but I am certain he would not thereby accomplish the purpose or the objective he has in mind. I feel certain he could not accomplish that purpose by adding the proposed amendment. It is not quite so simple a matter as that. A deplorable housing shortage exists in every city and in every community throughout the whole country, and of course that shortage prevails in institutions of learning just as it prevails elsewhere in the country. I do not think the educational institutions in Oregon are suffering any more than similar institutions are suffering elsewhere. The condition is Nation-wide.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am not speaking for the institutions in Oregon alone. On the basis of the support I have received from universities all over the country I think I can truthfully say that Senate bill 977 is supported by most of the institutions in which a housing shortage exists all over this country. The administrators of those colleges think S. 977 would work. They think it would supply them with the remedy they need to accommodate their increasing educational population. However, I am glad to have the Senator's views on the subject, and I shall desist at least for the moment in presenting the bill as an amendment until I talk to my senior colleague.

Mr. President, I close my remarks by saying that I think if we do not consider the subject of housing in connection with the GI bill now pending, that the Finance Committee ought to proceed immediately to consider as its next item of business the veteran housing finance proposals. It should consider the bill offered by the Senator from Oregon, S. 977, so we can implement and put into effect the GI bill insofar as its educational provisions are concerned by giving the veterans the housing they need.

I think we need to investigate what is necessary to be done to short cut the procedure and red tape through which one must wind his way in a number of departments in order to have surplus housing actually declared surplus and delivered to the institutions of higher learning which need it. Under the present procedure one might conclude that the agencies of government have deliberately

gone about to see how many barriers they can put up to stall for time and delay, and to make it impossible for these institutions to obtain housing quickly. The need for these surplus houses is immediate. In my judgment we have a right to say to the agencies now in conflict over jurisdiction, "You must agree upon a quick and simple procedure, so that one does not have to wait for weeks for action on surplus houses." When one gets into this problem he seems how simple it is in fact if the surplus property people would only use some common sense. It ought to be only a matter of hours—and I say that advisedly—to declare houses surplus and make them available to governmental institutions and educational institutions of the country for just such purposes as this veterans' bill seeks to accomplish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator knows that all the things which he has suggested so far as the use of surplus housing is concerned can now be done by agencies which have been authorized by law to do the very things which he suggests.

So far as legislation is concerned, I invite his attention to the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency handles housing legislation. It is working on the problem at the present moment, and I believe that very shortly it will have some legislation to present to us. The problem is bigger than the veterans' educational problem. It affects all of our people everywhere. It is national in scope, and should be handled by special and separate legislation. At least, that is what our committee thought. I hope the Senator will not ask us to incorporate his very splendid amendment in this bill.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator thinks it is easy to get surplus houses for colleges under existing red tape, I suggest he join the Senators from Oregon in their attempt to get some of the surplus housing. I think I can give the Senator a practical demonstration of the fact that under the present procedure we cannot get it either in time to meet emergency needs or on such terms as make it feasible for the colleges to use the houses. I think the Surplus Property Board should clarify this matter without further delay. If the veterans are not provided with these houses the responsibility is clearly that of those in charge of surplus property and upon the administration which permits them to handle this matter so inefficiently.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from California wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have an amendment at the desk, but I should like to ask a question. I wish to make certain that the Senator who is presenting the bill to the Senate for the committee feels sure that the section relating to persons on terminal leave takes care of the situation. I was prepared to offer an amendment to cover this subject. The legislative counsel thought that the amendment should be inserted at another place. I refer to the provision under which persons might take advantage of the educational provisions while they were on terminal leave. The present law prohibits that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The matter to which the Senator refers will be found in section 1507, on page 67. The provision which the committee inserted goes a little beyond the provisions of the Senator's amendment. It makes the provisions of the bill apply also to loans and to other features of the bill in addition to the educational features.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only thing I wished to make certain was that the provision which the committee has written will protect those who are on terminal leave. I wish to make certain that it is not necessary to insert that provision in earlier sections. Does the Senator believe that the one section is all-inclusive?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The section is all-inclusive, and not only takes care of the veteran on terminal leave, but also the veteran who is hospitalized and awaiting discharge.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I should like to offer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California a question. What is the basis for the Senator's statement that the present law prohibits a man on terminal leave from going to an educational institution?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It prohibits him from taking advantage of the educational provisions while he is on terminal leave. I have had the question up with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because he has not been finally discharged, and the present law requires discharge.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the present law requires that the person be discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. It has been held that when he is on terminal leave he is not actually discharged from the service, and would have to await his discharge before he could take advantage of the educational privileges.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Along that line, I wish to point out to the Senator from California that one of the other barriers to either taking employment or going to school while on terminal leave is the question of pay. I have been conferring with the Attorney General for some weeks on that question. Day before yesterday I received a letter from him in which it was stated that after some investigation it was determined that under the so-called Lane Act a person may receive his terminal pay in a lump sum, thereby freeing him so that he may go to work for the Government or for a corporation.

Of course, the question of discharge enters into the educational features, but the act to which I have referred means something to many who are not actually discharged, and who could not otherwise take another job for the reason that they were being paid by the Government. The Veterans' Administration has been notified of the opinion of the Attorney General.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Washington has done a very excellent job in bringing this question to the attention of the Attorney General, because that was one of the problems which the veterans were facing.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, line 17, in the committee amendment, after the word "space", it is proposed to insert a comma and strike out the word "and"; and in line 18, after the word "facilities", it is proposed to insert the words "and stenographic assistance."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this is a short amendment. It can best be understood if I read the paragraph as it would read if the amendment were adopted. The amendment to section 200 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 would then read as follows:

> (c) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is further authorized at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe to furnish necessary space, suitable office facilities, and stenographic assistance for the use of paid full-time representatives of such organizations, with reimbursement on an actual cost basis.

My amendment merely adds "and stenographic assistance." I understand that it is now the practice in the Veterans' Administration to furnish such assistance to the veterans' organizations which need stenographic assistance in order to do the work which they are doing. This amendment would merely continue the present practice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question. I ask the Senator from Colorado if, in the consideration of this question, the committee considered the fact that the purpose of the bill is to assist the veteran to obtain an education? The purpose of the amendment which we are now considering is to extend the opportunity to a greater number of veterans. Under the present law the educational institutions must be approved by the administrator of the Veterans' Administration. Such approval is given by him upon the recommendation of various State commissions established by the Governors in the various States. My question is this: The amendment involves an extension of time. That means that younger persons will be seeking the educational advantages provided by the law. Has the committee given consideration to the question whether there will be room in institutions which are approved for the increased number of veterans over the longer period? The last thing in the world that we wish to do is to hold out to the veteran the hope that he will be able to get an education if there is not

room for him in any approved institution. The only alternative for the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration is to increase the number of institutions, which would mean more fly-by-night institutions, which would not give the veteran the education to which he is entitled.

I know that today in my own State most of the institutions of higher learning are full to the doors, and will continue to be as the boys who are now on leave come home. Has the committee given consideration to the question whether there will be room in the institutions for the additional number of veterans, with younger persons seeking to use the facilities as they become of age?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will say to the Senator that, while the committee hopes that there will be room, there is not very much that we can do about it. We cannot build educational institutions. About all we can do is to provide for the veteran's tuition, books, and subsistence, and then hope that State institutions or private educational institutions will find a place for him. The bill does not undertake to build or provide educational institutions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that; but I know that the Senator does not wish to hold out to the veteran the hope that he will be able to get an education, if lack of room in approved institutions will prevent him from obtaining it. We may have the same problem in this connection that we have had in connection with discharges. When the number of points necessary for discharge was reduced, the men thought they were going home, and then discovered that they could not go home. There is danger of the same condition in connection with the educational problem.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that no remedy was sought for the condition and situation to which he has referred, but there was consideration of the general problem and there has been consideration of it by the Veterans' Administration. The same is true as to housing. There are inadequate and insufficient numbers of houses in which to house the student bodies, particularly the veterans, at many educational institutions. Many of the educational institutions themselves are becoming somewhat overcrowded. Of course, it is estimated that there may be a million or more than a million men who, after leaving the armed forces, will seek some form of training in educational institutions. Of course, they will be scattered all over the country. While there will be some overcrowding, it is hoped by the Veterans' Administration, I think, that they will be able to take care reasonably well of the problem of institutional capacity to take care of veterans.

This question is particularly acute, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, in the case of housing. It is also acute in many cases insofar as the capacity of the institution itself is concerned. That was one of the reasons why we did not believe it wise to take away all power of the Administrator to make contracts with educational institutions in cases in which they insist that they do not have the means or the funds to enable them to furnish educational opportunities to an increasing number of returned veterans, without making an additional charge to the veterans. We relieved the veteran from liability for the additional charge, and we left it in the hands of the Administrator himself to make some payments to institutions beyond what the institution charged resident students, let us say, because it is thought that in that way many of the educational institutions may increase their capacity and their teaching forces and may be able to take care of more veterans than they otherwise would be able to take care of.

However, during the next 4 years we shall have an acute problem both with respect to housing and with respect to the capacity of the institutions, particularly those which are chosen by large numbers of returned veterans. Probably that will be true in almost every State, because a great many of the veterans will desire to go to the State university, let us say, or into the State educational system for the completion of their education or training. It is one of the things that we cannot fully meet in an entirely satisfactory manner at the moment. But the veteran is free to make his own selection of the institution which he will attend. He may with the permission of the Administrator, of course, even change his selection of an institution.

The Administrator is approving practically all the institutions in the country which also are approved by the approving bodies of the States concerned. While we have sought to limit and to restrict the fly-by-night institutions which may spring up merely for the purpose of getting the money the Government is providing the veterans, the Administrator has ample authority to permit special training courses and postgraduate courses, short-term courses, and short-period courses.

All in all, it is felt that while the pinch of the housing problem and of the lack of capacity in many educational institutions will perhaps be felt in the months immediately ahead, gradually it will eliminate itself as we get a little further away from the period of actual hostilities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia will agree with me that there is a serious shortage of teachers and that the shortage will continue to exist during the next few years; and, of course, as these institutions fill up and as the number of students in them increases, the burden on the teachers will become greater.

What we wish to do, as I see it, is to give the heartiest and strongest support to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to encourage him not to weaken in his stand against approving fly-by-night schools. The pressure on him will become greater and greater to approve institutions of less and less educational value. What we do not want to do by extending the period of time for the veterans to obtain an education is to deceive the veteran by allowing him to be entered in schools of very inferior caliber which may have been approved by the Veterans' Administrator under tremendous pressure.

I bring up this subject because I think it will be of the utmost importance in the years to come that we support the Veterans' Administrator to the very best of our ability.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the Senator is quite correct, and his observations are wise and timely.

By extension of the time in which the veteran may complete or pursue his education and by extension of the time within which he may become a home owner or farm owner or go into business—that is, extension of the period in which he may obtain a loan—we have sought to avoid or prevent the very congestion which the Senator points out is likely to occur. Particularly we have had in mind the extension which would result from the provision offering a loan to a veteran or aiding a veteran to obtain a loan during a longer period, rather than requiring him to obtain the loan within a very short period of time. We thought definitely that requiring the loan to be made within a very restricted period had a tendency to bring about inflation in the value of homes or farms.

Of course, there are many unsolved problems with respect to veterans. But this bill will answer a great many of them; and, particularly, the Administrator will have the power, under the bill, to make some payments to institutions of learning, over and beyond payments made by resident students, because it is recognized that their teaching forces are reduced and it is recognized that the institutions themselves will have to expend a considerable sum of money in order to meet the increasing demands by virtue of the education of veterans.

As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from Oregon, we have eliminated any age restriction, so that the veteran may enter a school of his own choice or may take training of his own choice, under the safeguards contained in the bill, regardless of his age and regardless of whether he had been attending an educational institution prior to the time of his induction into the service.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I listened to the colloquy between my colleague and the Senator from Colorado with reference to the serious housing situation which exists at educational institutions. In view of the fact that the bill refers only to the education of veterans of the present World War, and most particularly because the bill was introduced on the 7th of May of this year, I regret that the Finance Committee felt that Senate bill 977 was not a matter for its consideration. Mr. President, this is the first information which either my colleague or I have had that the committee felt that that bill was not within its province. As a result, we have not had an opportunity to present it to another committee or to urge its consideration. So here we are now, with our men returning by the

thousands, and registering or attempting to register at institutions of learning by the thousands, and being turned away for lack of housing. It seems that we must now substantially start again to clear up the housing situation. It is a situation which prevails in every State of the Union and, I believe, at every educational institution that is receiving applications in any number from the returning veterans.

Do I correctly understand that the Finance Committee feels that Senate bill 977 is not a proper matter for its consideration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, we consider that such legislation should be handled in a bill by itself, and that it should not be a part of the so-called GI bill.

Mr. CORDON. I understood the Senator from Colorado to say in answer to my colleague——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to finish——

Mr. CORDON. Pardon me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We also call attention to the fact that there is a committee, namely, the Banking and Currency Committee, which handles housing, and that the shortage to which the Senator refers, which is most deplorable, affects the people of the United States generally, whether they wish to go to school or whether they do not wish to go to school. There is a great shortage of building material and a serious shortage of labor in the building trades. The housing problem is being considered by another committee, and the veterans' aspect of it represents only a part of the total subject. It is rather hard to segregate the two.

Mr. CORDON. The measure I have in mind is intended only to provide funds with reference to housing projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is not a question of funds; it is a question of being able to purchase necessary material, and being able to hire workers. There are plenty of financial resources, private resources, in all the cities of Oregon, and in the other cities of the Nation which could furnish money for the building of houses if it were possible to obtain necessary building material and workers. But there is a housing shortage which goes far beyond any housing shortage connected with educational institutions.

While the situation is deplorable, I do not think the Congress should deal with it in piecemeal fashion. We should take up the housing problem in separate legislation. The veteran who wishes to go to school and the veteran who does not wish to go to school should be taken care of at the same time. The proposal of the Senator from Oregon takes care only of the veteran who wishes to go to school. The veteran who wishes to work is left without any housing whatever.

VISIT OF MISS AMERICA TO SENATE GALLERY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention of the Senate to the fact that there is sitting in the Senate gallery a very charming young American who is now on a Nation-wide bond sales trip and has up to the present encountered remarkable success in the sale of Victory bonds.

As Senators know, every year a contest is held in Atlantic City for the purpose of deciding who shall be Miss America for the current year. When the contest was held this year, among many attractive and beautiful competitors, Miss Bess Meyerson, of New York City, was chosen to be Miss America of 1945. She is now engaged in a trip across the continent in selling Victory bonds. She has honored us by visiting us and is now sitting in the gallery. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate rise and greet her at this moment. I may add that the Treasury Department has informed me that she is doing a remarkable job in the sale of Victory bonds.

(In response to Mr. BARKLEY's suggestion, the Members of the Senate rose and applauded.)

AMENDMENTS TO GI BILL OF RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3749), to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wish to make a further observation. As I understand the Senator from Colorado, the committee feels that Senate bill 977, referring as it does only to housing for veterans who are attending educational institutions, should not be considered separately, but should be considered in connection with any other housing legislation which may currently be considered. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is my personal opinion. I think that the entire matter of housing should be considered as one problem, and should not be separated and broken down into fragments. I think that we should not enact legislation at this time with regard only to veterans who may wish to attend school, but that we should enact legislation with respect to veterans who wish to obtain housing, whether they may desire to go to school or not.

Mr. CORDON. In that event, while I regret that the committee did not consider the bill, and I frankly assert that in my opinion, that such consideration would have come within its province, I understand that the committee is entitled to have a different view with regard to the matter. But under those circumstances, certainly the committee would not object to being discharged from further consideration of Senate bill 977 and having the bill referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; we would welcome such action.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of Senate bill 977, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know with what the bill deals. Does the bill deal with anything except housing?

Mr. CORDON. It deals with housing and extra tuition for discharged veterans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It deals with subsistence allowances. It is a proper matter for our committee to consider, and we have dealt with it in the pending legislation.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have an opportunity to examine the bill before I consent to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Oregon. If the bill covers only the subject of housing, I have no objection.

Mr. CORDON. It deals also with subsistence.

Mr. GEORGE. We have dealt with that subject in the pending bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, because the problem is important, and because it should have immediate consideration, I hope my colleague [Mr. MORSE] will agree to eliminate any question of subsistence in the bill and have it refer solely to housing, and thereby get the bill before a committee and obtain for it consideration.

Mr. GEORGE. If the bill refers only to housing I have no objection to it being referred to the appropriate committee for consideration. It is not conceivable to my mind how the housing problem of veterans could be handled alone. Generally speaking, housing would have to be constructed upon private property. It is not conceivable to me how a housing program for veterans alone——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, it is quite evident that the Senator from Georgia is not familiar with the bill because the bill contains a provision simply for extending credit to institutions of learning on an especially reduced interest rate so that such institutions may provide what they find to be necessary in the way of housing in order to take care of the returned GI's who attend such institutions. The provision is simply one for special loans.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not see how institutions of learning could take advantage of that kind of a bill. However, I have no objection to the Finance Committee being discharged from further consideration of the bill if there is eliminated from the bill everything which pertains to subsistence, so that the sole purpose of the bill will be to deal with the housing problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may introduce a new bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have asked unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to take snap judgment on a piece of legislation of this character. I object to the committee being discharged at this time from further consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] that he introduce immediately an amended form of the bill and have it referred. The bill should eliminate what it is contended should not be before the Finance Committee.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois. The

present bill has been before the committee for some time. The committee evidently does not care to consider it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I am in complete agreement with the senior Senator from Oregon. I assert to the chairman of the Finance Committee that I most certainly hope, because of my great respect for his judgment, that he will give the bill S. 977 close scrutiny in view of his objection to the request of the senior Senator from Oregon that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill.

I have been very shocked to discover at this very late hour that all the work which the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Oregon have done in our attempts to clear the channels for an early hearing on this bill has apparently been in vain. I thought the bill had been receiving the consideration of the Finance Committee for the past several weeks and now I discover that the committee knows little about it. I shall look forward to an early hearing on the bill in keeping with my requests for such a hearing. In fact I regretted that we could not have such a hearing before the summer recess was taken. I urged it then. I fully expected it would be considered carefully by the committee in connection with the pending bill.

I repeat what I said earlier in my remarks, namely, that if Senators really want to do something for the veterans besides make speeches about what they would like to do for them, their cooperation in enacting Senate bill 977 would be of very great benefit to veterans and to America's educational institutions.

I assert to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] that when he talks about the impossibility of building at the present time, and the scarcity of building material, if I could obtain a hearing on this bill I am sure I could demonstrate to the Senator's complete satisfaction—he is a very fair-minded man—that the representatives of the institutions of higher learning would convince him that they are in position in many localities to provide veterans with housing at the present time if the provisions of Senate bill 977 were enacted into law by the Congress of the United States. We have removed in the bill the obstacles which confront institutions in providing housing. College presidents tell me that they can construct buildings on their properties if they were given financial assistance in doing so. S. 977 provides the financial arrangements which will enable the colleges of America to build adequate housing for veterans. This Senate cannot justify delaying action either on S. 977 or the problems which it seeks to solve. If the educators agree, as they do, that the bill will enable them to build houses, let us hear them on it. I tell the Senator from Colorado that delay cannot be justified on the ground that even if S. 977 were law, houses could not be built anyway.

That is a question of fact. All I am asking is that if the bill is to stay in the Committee on Finance, the committee extend to us the courtesy of a very early hearing on the bill, which we have been seeking. If, however, the Finance Committee feels it should be considered along with other housing bills by the Committee on Banking and Currency, then I hope the Finance Committee will offer to discharge itself from consideration of the bill, so that the Senators from Oregon can proceed to complete what we think is a very important job in the interest of the educational institutions and in the interest of the veterans.

I shall wait until the chairman of the Finance Committee studies S. 977 and then join with my colleague again in repeating the request for unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Finance. I trust that after the distinguished Senator from Georgia has had an opportunity to study the bill and communicate with other committee members in regard to it he will either withdraw his objection or proceed to give us a hearing. I think that either the Committee on Finance should proceed with early hearings on the bill or should extend to us the privilege of having it heard before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Finance has held hearings on Senate bill 977. We held hearings on housing and all related legislation. We had 5 days of hearings on the proposed legislation, and heard everyone who had anything to say about it. The committee acted upon some very important provisions of Senate bill 977, and we acted upon them almost to the full extent recommended by the two Senators from Oregon in their bill. So it is not quite fair to say that we have not given this matter any attention, that we have not held hearings, because we have done so. However, I do hope that the Senators from Oregon will revise their bill and will present it to the Committee on Banking and Currency, because we have already acted with respect to part of the provisions.

Mr. MORSE. The only difficulty is that the two Senators, the authors of the bill, had a great deal of material which they wished to introduce to the Finance Committee if they could have had opportunity to appear before the committee in response to a communication which the junior Senator from Oregon sent to the committee, in which he informed the committee that we did have material we would like to have the committee consider. We did not know the committee was going to consider the matter along with the bill now pending before the Senate without getting our views. I therefore renew my request that at a very early date the committee give favorable consideration to the request of the two Senators from Oregon that they be given an opportunity to appear before the committee and present to the committee such material as we have, if the committee wishes to retain jurisdiction over the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly the committee will do as the Senator requests.

Mr. MORSE. I was completely confident that the Senator from Colorado would desire to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We do not want to be a dog in the manger in any respect.

Mr. MORSE. I know it is the Senator's desire in all these matters, once we get them out on the floor of the Senate, to find out what the difference of opinion is.

I wish now to comment on the suggestion made by the Senator from Massachusetts. I think it is well to point out that many of our educational institutions are somewhat congested, but it is also true that many of them are now going forward with expansion programs. I do not think that even in the immediate future we are going to find such congestion as will make it impossible to give the veterans the educational opportunity which the GI bill, in its revised form, seeks to offer them.

Of course the alternative would be to keep age limitations in the law, and we would then say to the veteran, "We are not going to give you educational opportunities, because we are not ready to go forward with an expansion program large enough to give you the opportunity." That, of course, is unthinkable. If it should be true that the educational institutions could not presently accommodate the veterans who need education and seek it, we should see to it that they are given the funds necessary to enable them to expand their programs in order to provide the facilities necessary to make it possible for veterans to get their education, without any age limitation.

Let me say on that point, further, that I am not sure we appreciate the great reformation which is taking place in American education. The educators of the country recognize that they are going to have to reform in many major ways what has been considered traditional educational policy. I am sure that they will find that on most campuses in the United States the student bodies can be enlarged by considerable percentages under existing facilities. I would say offhand, by way of understatement, that there are few educational institutions in this country which cannot enlarge their student bodies immediately by 25 percent through a more efficient and effective use of the facilities they now have.

Educators generally recognize that they have been guilty of maintaining what in the educational world is called "luxury schedules," and that the facilities at many of the institutions are not used a goodly number of hours a day. I mean that they are not used to full capacity and efficiency. In the past 20 years I have had some interesting experiences in building college schedules. Senators would be surprised at the small percentages of the facilities of institutions sometimes used in the afternoon periods because of the fact that students prefer classes in the morning hours, if they can get their work all scheduled in the morning hours. Many classes are scheduled in the afternoon but in most institutions more could be scheduled and larger classes could be taught.

I say, therefore, that I do not think we should hesitate for one moment to remove the age limitation, and to hold out for the veterans of this war the promise, and deliver on the promise, that we will make available to them those educational facilities necessary for them to

get the education the bill seeks to provide them.

I say that because I think the educators of the country are going to have to meet the obligation the bill places upon them to do two things, first, to take the steps necessary in curricula building and in scheduling to see to it that all their facilities are used to the maximum extent possible, including early evening classes; second, that they also take the steps necessary to recommend reasonable expansion of the educational institutions of this country, so that all veterans can be provided with the services we seek in this bill to give them.

Mr. President, that is not going to result in waste, because I think we should all recognize that in the changing era of the immediate future we are going to find that these patterns of adult education which are being set now pretty much by this veteran educational program are going to remain as a permanent part of our educational system. Whatever facilities we do build by way of an expansion program will not be wasted facilities, but will be needed to meet the larger adult education needs of this country for years to come.

I know of no better investment which States, communities, and the Federal Government can make with tax dollars than to invest them in educational facilities, so that our people can ever become more and more enlightened free men and women.

My attention has been called to the fact—and I direct this question to the Senator from Colorado—that the bill as now proposed does not provide for business courses for veterans. I have not had an opportunity to check it in sufficient detail to make certain, but one of my colleagues on the floor of the Senate a few minutes ago asked me to make inquiry as to whether or not the bill makes it possible for approved or so-called accredited business colleges to take advantage of the so-called GI bill and allow veterans to take business courses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it gives the veteran free choice as to whether the course he picks is a business course or otherwise. The only limitation is the $500 overall tuition fee, and the book provision.

Mr. MORSE. If the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration decides that "X" business college offers an approved and accredited course which he thinks merits sending veterans to it, he can enter into a contract with that business college to send veterans to it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, with the limitation of $500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The committee feels that what is provided for by the amendment of the Senator from California is being done by the Veterans' Administration under the present laws and regulations, and there is nothing in the bill which prohibits it. But we can take the amendment to conference, if the Senator desires, and the Senator in charge of the bill is not offering any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from California to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I wish to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment at the proper place it is proposed to insert the following:

That title I of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by adding at the end of such title a new section as follows:

"SEC. 106. In any case in which a person has died or shall hereafter die as a result of personal injury sustained, or disease contracted, or of preexisting injury or disease aggravated, in line of duty in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, his surviving widow, if any, shall be eligible for benefits under this act to the same extent and under the same conditions as the deceased person would be if he were living and had been separated from the service under circumstances entitling him to such benefits. No such widow shall be entitled to receive any benefits under this act after she shall have remarried, except that the remarriage of any such widow shall not in any way affect the guaranty of any loan under title III of this act made prior to the date of such remarriage."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I will say to the Senate that this amendment provides that the widow of a serviceman killed in the war or who has died or shall hereafter die as a result of injuries sustained or disease contracted in line of duty shall be entitled to the same benefits under the GI Act as would the serviceman himself if he were living.

I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that I did not appear before the committee and discuss the amendment simply because there seemed to be some mix-up. My office had called the committee, and I was to be informed when I could appear before the committee. I did not realize that the hearings had closed. But I have discussed the proposal with some members of the committee. I discussed it also with the War Department and with the Navy Department, and I am sure there will be no objection to it. It would probably involve only a minimum number of young women who were married during the war years, whose husbands were killed, and who probably might not want to remarry. Under the amendment they would be afforded the opportunity to go to school, to make loans, to buy homes, and obtain some of the other advantages and benefits under the GI bill of rights. Many of these young women have small children, and they have to take the place of their husbands who were killed in the war, and provide for the support of their families.

My proposal provides that upon remarriage, of course, these benefits will stop. I can really see no objection to the amendment. I think it is something we owe not only to the men who died in the war, who gave everything, but equally to their widows and families. I hope the committee will have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the committee gave consideration to the amendment presented by the Senator from Washington to provide benefits to the widows of the veterans who were killed or who died from disease during the war. We also gave consideration to another amendment, which was in the form of a bill offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], Senate bill 487, which would extend the benefits to the children of veterans. The committee decided that the benefits of this legislation should be confined to the veterans themselves and should not at this time be extended or expanded. Reluctantly the committee rejected the amendment of the Senator from Washington which was his bill, S. 866, and also the bill offered by the Senator from Montana, S. 487, and did not include them in the pending bill. I hope they will not be included in the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Colorado will not confuse the two proposals. The Senator from Montana proposes that the benefits be extended to the children of those who died in the war. My proposal is somewhat different from that. If my amendment were embodied in the bill the only recipients of its benefits would be young women who take the places of their husbands who died in the war. They have actually become the heads of the households, the heads of the families. Many of them want to buy homes. Many of them are unsettled. Many of them followed them in the service around the country. A great many of them have children. The men were killed, and although in some cases there may have been something left for their wives, the widows still should be entitled to such help as is provided in my amendment. Some of them, of course, will remarry. The amendment will involve a very small number. We will have to take care of them somehow, some way, in the future, and I think we might well give them opportunities for education and for buying homes, if they want to settle down, and help them to help themselves. I can see no better way to do it than to place such an amendment in the act. If we go further and deal with children and other relatives, of course we run into much more difficulty. But, as I interpret the situation, it would only apply to, and the only applicants would be those who step into the shoes of the men who were killed.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote the amendment into the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, of course under existing law, under other provisions of the law, not under the GI bill of rights, widows receive pensions and children receive remuneration from the Federal Government. If we are to extend such benefits it ought to be done in those laws instead of in the pending measure.

I hope the Senate will not approve the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is still open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, while we are speaking of veterans, and of building homes and places of residence for veterans, I desire to read into the RECORD two letters. I think we should also consider the matter the veterans being brought home so that when they come home we can properly provide for them.

I think the following is very interesting:

HEADQUARTERS, SEVEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH RAILWAY OPERATING BATTALION,
APO 75, October 26, 1945.

Memorandum No. 77.
To all concerned:

This was a memo placed on a bulletin board in the Pacific:

1. Dissemination of information.

(a) The following is quoted from memorandum, Headquarters, AFWESPAC, Office of Chief of Transportation, dated October 25, 1945, for information and guidance of all concerned:

"The Chief of Transportation directs that officers, enlisted personnel, and civilian employees refrain from divulging or offering any information whatsoever, repeat, any information whatsoever, to any newspaper, magazine, periodical, or public relations officer at any time, repeat, at any time.

"Strict and implicit compliance with this matter is enjoined upon everyone."

That was No. 1. On the same memo I read as follows:

2. Theater schedule:

(a) The following films will be shown at this organization's theater on dates indicated:

The Big Sleep, October 27.

And I know the boys were interested in what I next read, as follows:

Sing Your Way Home, October 30.

By order of Lieutenant Colonel Donnelly:
RAYMOND J. MCCARTHY,
Captain, TC, Adjutant.

The foregoing was founded upon what I now read:

HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, WESTERN PACIFIC, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF TRANSPORTATION,
APO 707, October 25, 1945.

To all personnel assigned COT:

1. The Chief of Transportation directs that officers, enlisted personnel, and civilian employees refrain from divulging or offering any information whatsoever, repeat, any information whatsoever, to any newspaper, magazine, periodical or public relations officer at any time, repeat, at any time.

2. Strict and implicit compliance with this matter is enjoined upon everyone.

For the Chief of Transportation:
J. B. CARROL,
Colonel, T. C., Executive Officer.

Mr. President, these memoranda indicate that the boys are under strict orders not to talk about anything in relation to getting home. I think that is very significant, and I believe that the Congress should know about these orders.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What were the dates of the two publications? Were they subsequent to VJ-day?

Mr. FERGUSON. One is dated the 26th of October 1945, and the other the 25th of October 1945. So I take it that these memoranda were not solely for security purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 3749) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes."

ASSURANCE OF WORK OPPORTUNITIES FOR VETERANS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have engaged in considerable discussion concerning veterans' rights today. I think there is one portion of the veterans' problem which the Senate and all agencies of Government have neglected. We have talked about the veteran who wants to go to school, about the veteran who needs housing, and other phases of the subject, but to a great extent we have neglected, I think the veteran who comes home and wants to get a job and go back to work. I refer particularly to the 6,000,000 veterans of this war who had no professions, no trades, and no jobs before they went into the service, and who now come back not wanting to go to school, not wanting perhaps to exercise any other rights under the GI bill of rights, but only to get a job. At one time we set up an agency to deal with that situation. It was unfortunately placed under the same man who headed the Veterans' Bureau, General Hines. What happened was not the fault of General Hines. He had too much to do in the Veterans' Bureau. As a result the Retraining and Reemployment Administration shriveled, so to speak, on the vine in the Veterans' Bureau. President Truman did a wise thing recently in transferring that agency to the Department of Labor. I think that agency should be revitalized and given every opportunity to integrate the job problem for the veterans, particularly those who had no jobs before they went to war.

So Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] I now introduce a bill to establish a Veterans' Job Act and integrated national program for assuring maximum work opportunities and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, foreign trade, private agencies, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

I had expected to make a statement concerning the bill on my own behalf, as well as on behalf of the two cosponsors, but the hour is late and I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill for the study of the Senate at this time, to have it properly referred, and to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1579) to establish a Veterans' Job Act and integrated national program for assuring maximum work opportunities and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, foreign trade, private agencies, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Veterans' Job and Integrated National Program Act of 1945."

SEC. 2. In order that there shall be maximum work opportunities and careers for veterans without displacing other workers, the National Retraining and Reemployment Administration established under title III of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration") is authorized and directed to formulate a veterans' job and integrated national program which shall be designed—

(a) to explore and foster the development of the unused industrial, business, service trades, scientific, agricultural, fishing industries, foreign trade, and educational opportunities within the economic fabric of the American way of life of free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital;

(b) to foster the optimal utilization and development of national resources in all geographical areas;

(c) to cause studies to be made toward perfecting of airway, highway, and transportation media, and to promote inland waterways and coastal development to the end that methods of distribution may be improved and provide additional employment for veterans and others;

(d) to foster scientific research in order to develop new industries, new processes, new techniques, new trade routes, new business ventures, and new professional opportunities for veterans and all the people;

(e) to provide training and education to equip veterans for the new jobs, professions, and businesses accruing from the programs set up under this act;

(f) to conduct long- and short-range program planning designed by forestall veterans' unemployment in rescessions or depressions;

(g) to coordinate in conformity with a veterans' job and integrated-national program those functions of various Federal Government agencies concerned with or engaged in handling veterans' programs and problems relating to employment, business, training, and education;

(h) to assist and cooperate with State, community, and private agencies concerned with veterans' employment, business, training, and educational questions;

(i) to suggest uniform patterns of participation for State, community, and private agencies;

(j) to develop sufficient modern scientific vocational and avocational service centers in the communities or counties throughout the

United States, its Territories, and possessions, to insure veterans adequate informational and counseling facilities, such centers to serve as a standard for all the people;

(k) to utilize the loan provisions now available or to be made available, the services and facilities now available or to be made available to implement the operation of this act;

(l) to integrate all veterans' programs with employment needs for the purpose of reducing to a minimum through employment the aggregate costs of weekly veterans' readjustment allowances;

(m) To facilitate the establishment of necessary and useful new enterprises in the various communities of the Nation which will insure the fullest possible economic development of all our Nation's peacetime resources in order to stimulate an ever-expanding national economy.

SEC. 3. Upon formulation of the veterans' job and integrated national program provided for under section 2, the Administration shall (a) to the extent that the activities contemplated thereunder are authorized by existing law, take such action as may be necessary to place such program into effect, and (b) shall transmit to the Congress its recommendations concerning legislation necessary to carry out any activities contemplated under such program which are not authorized under existing law.

SEC. 4. (a) In formulating and carrying out the veterans' integrated national program under this act, the Retraining and Reemployment Administration is authorized to exercise all the powers conferred upon it by sections 302 and 303 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944.

(b) Section 302 (a) of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 is hereby amended by striking out "(except the Veterans' Administration and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs)."

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I also ask unanimous consent to have the statement I had planned to make in connection with the bill printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On my own behalf, and on behalf of Senators JOHNSON of Colorado, and MORSE of Oregon, I am introducing for study a bill to establish a veterans' job and integrated national program to assure maximum work opportunities and careers in a free competitive economy. This would be done through the combined efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, foreign trade, the service trades, private agencies, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

In introducing this bill, no interests are represented and the purpose of this integrated national program is to assure maximum work opportunities and careers for veterans without displacing other workers This would be done by revitalizing the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, which was created as a separate executive agency during the war and which has been transferred to the Department of Labor. It is our aim to give that Administration the tools it needs to do the job already at hand and to charge it with certain responsibilities to accomplish these objectives.

We believe that this bill meets an urgent need and to the best of our knowledge it does not conflict with or duplicate any pending legislation. This effort to create a veterans' job and integrated national program is designed, first, to enable the veterans to recapture the time and opportunities they lost while serving their country in the armed forces; secondly, to enable them to work in jobs, businesses, and in the professions on equitable terms with those who remained at home during the war; and, thirdly, to enable the veterans to become permanently more self-reliant and self-sufficient in their assimilation into civil life.

This program is designed also to be self-liquidating. Not only will it show a profit to the veterans in work opportunities and careers, but it will show an immediate profit to the taxpayers of this Nation by reducing the veterans' unemployment readjustment allowances, which are costing the taxpayers now $2,000,000 each week.

It is highly significant that at the peak of the critical manpower shortage, just before the German surrender, those payments to unemployed veterans were costing the taxpayers $615,000 each week. It is obvious that the weekly expenditures to unemployed veterans which total at present $2,000,000 each week will tend to rise sharply as 11,000,000 of our men and women in uniform are shortly discharged. Fifty-one million dollars has been paid out up to date and the Veterans' Administration estimates that $1,000,000,000 will have been paid out through the fiscal year of 1947. This expenditure to unemployed veterans would increase also in proportion to the number of workers made idle by mounting disputes in industrial relations. We can look back upon a reminder that during the depression following World War I there were 1,500,000 veterans currently unemployed. As early as 1943 the Department of Commerce pointed out that, in 1946, we could produce the same amount of goods that we produced in 1940 and still have 19,000,000 workers inemployed. An uneasy situation is facing us now, and that is why we urge an immediate study and passage of this act to create this integrated national program.

The press, the radio, and the veterans themselves are complaining that the veteran is getting the run-around when he seeks information concerning work opportunities, careers, business, and the other thousand and one things which any veteran asks after having been out of touch with the civilian world for months and in most cases several years. It is only natural that the veteran would feel that he gets the run-around. The crisis of suddenly handling millions of our returning service people has thrown upon our Federal, State, and community agencies a load which they are unprepared to handle. One of the purposes of this veterans' job and integrated national program is to coordinate all of the many and varied Federal activities available to assist the communities in organizing their information or veterans' service centers by giving them information which they seek.

The Federal Government has not issued an index and guide to the various Federal activities concerning veterans' affairs which can be used by those workers and counselors who are trying to serve the veterans in the field offices of Federal, State, community, and private agencies. There are approximately 8,000 communities which are seeking information and need a coordinated Federal plan to serve as a pattern and guide to assist them in the proper organization of their community centers. In some communities they have set up separate centers of their own. In other communities where there is a United States Employment Service office the public-spirited citizens have taken space adjoining it or in a nearby building. In other communities the citizens' committees use space donated by one of the veterans' organizations. In any and every case, the communities are in dire need of information about Federal activities concerning veterans' affairs which is coordinated and organized before it is given them.

We are now in the position we found ourselves in the early days of the Republic when each community had its own postal system and established its own postal rates. Until recently our educational systems differed considerably in each State and community. The communities need veterans' information which is prepared for national consumption and guidance just as much as weather information which is coordinated and supplied by the Federal Government. When the veteran was sent off to war he was given all the latest information to equip him for battle. He was likewise directed to the points where there was likely to be some fighting. Likewise it is now our duty to afford the veteran the best organized information available as to where he is likely to find the most favorable work or career opportunities. In assisting the communities and the States in the administration of their programs they seek organized material concerning:

1. Information and referral service.
2. Registration and placement in job, business, or professional opportunities in the particular community, other communities, States, or foreign fields.
3. Advisory interviewing in connection with placement or referral.
4. Educational and vocational guidance.
5. The latest scientific methods available in matching abilities to jobs, professions, businesses, and careers.
6. Training.
7. Rehabilitation.
8. Social, economic, and health service.

The veteran has made a down payment on his future. It is our responsibility to pick up where the armed services have left off. That is our responsibility in enacting this veterans jobs and integrated national program.

In the general dislocation and unemployment attending reconversion and possible recessions the veteran will become increasingly a special problem if we do not make their affairs a matter of special attention now. As an example of how veterans may be floundering in a whirlpool of labor-force currents, I cite an excerpt from a report concerning the general labor force appraisal by M. P. Catherwood, commerce commissioner of New York State, who is also chairman of the Reconversion Service Agency. He reported to the Governor of New York on the 22d of last month that a recent State-wide survey showed there were 200,000 jobs available in the State of New York and at the same time there were 175,000 persons receiving unemployment compensation. He referred to this as a "dangerous inconsistency" and stated the figures "indicated the importance of bringing jobs and job seekers together." He further commented that aggravation of this condition could "seriously impair the reconversion functions of the State."

The administration of a veterans job and integrated national program act will give the appropriate agencies of Government better machinery to offer practical measures in composing the inevitable controversies between veterans' organizations and organized labor concerning the general employment of veterans. We do not predict that this program will solve all the problems to the satisfaction of the veterans' organizations, organized labor, or industry. But we believe that this program will provide a vehicle behind which all groups can put their strength toward fulfilling their obligations to the veterans and toward stimulating fuller employment for others as well as for veterans.

This program can help serve as a prime mover of an ever-expanding economy. However, if it does nothing more than merely simplify methods of assisting the assimilation of veterans smoothly into civil life, it will have paid enormous dividends by freeing them of the feeling that they are obliged to group themselves into a separate segment of our economy. Applications for unnecessary unemployment compensation alone will make it difficult for us to adjust our national budget. We can do much now, in these days of demobilization, to avoid the repetition of the

unfortunate experience of the abuses of power exerted by the Grand Army of the Republic in the reconstruction period following the Civil War. We have in the 20,000,000 living veterans of our wars a potential force for constructive good.

Twenty million living veterans are the direct concern of most of the families of our Nation. We need that potential power of the veterans to keep our Nation strong and secure. After World War I we all became apathetic to our national security and the spirit of our veterans was allowed to disintegrate. All of this encouraged the enemies of our form of government to prepare for war and to attempt to destroy us.

Who knows? The fate of our Nation may well rest with our decisions now. High military authorities state that peace may not last 10 years unless we remain strong to engineer our breathing spell into a permanent world structure for security. Our foreign observers are disturbed and report that the United States faces a dilemma. Many soldiers are returning disillusioned; in some cases the very nations they helped to free are regarding our troops as interlopers. It is a dangerous phenomenon. Our money alone will not buy the respect and support of other nations.

It is predicted by many authorities on world affairs that the United States may well abdicate its present world leadership. The eyes of the world are upon us in peace as they were in the global war of survival. The 45 smaller members of the United Nations look to us as a main hope.

In the course of history every nation preceding us which had attained world leadership reached its zenith and subsequently lost its position of leadership. We can now demonstrate to the world that we can do in peace what we did in war. If we put our own house in order promptly we are more likely to retain the leadership we have retained in this war at such cost of lives, blood, sweat, tears, and treasure.

In setting forth arguments in favor of this veterans' job and integrated national program bill, I am drawing freely from the speech delivered in the Seventy-ninth Congress on August 1st by my distinguished colleague, Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado, when he introduced a resolution proposing to create a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to conduct a thorough investigation of all veterans' affairs to the end that there shall be a veterans' integrated national program. In his speech, delivered prior to the Japanese surrender, Senator JOHNSON emphasized that this program was imperative. Now that we are striving to make the abrupt adjustment from total war to total peace, the need for the program here proposed is not only imperative, it is most urgent.

Directly upon the unconditional surrender of Germany and Japan came the unconditional requirement of this Government to provide real and practical facilities for the quickened assimilation into civilian life and a peace economy of our returning veterans. The size of that responsibility is measured by the impressive total of fifteen millions of men and women who have served our Nation in the armed forces in this war; over one-third of them either never worked before or have no particular job to return to now. They have no lasting security and they must find work.

Never before in our Nation's history have we had such a great number of veterans and workers for whom we are obliged to provide retraining, rehabilitation, or employment.

In this war of survival, 90 percent of the people of the United States relied upon 10 percent of the people to actually fight the battle. With the return of the 10 percent, most of whom will now become veterans, shall we leave any stone unturned to make the progress into civil life easier for them?

History offers a negative example. Following the last war the returning veterans were compelled to deal with nine different agencies of the Federal Government, and that experience was confusing and embittering to all. Today, the veterans' situation is even more complex, for there are threefold as many Federal agencies concerned with various phases of veterans' affairs. In addition, State, municipal, and private agencies organized to work out veterans' problems are daily increasing in number. These well-meaning endeavors are alarming in that they involve duplication and triplication. There is no coordinated program to weld into a cohesive, organized pattern the activities of these many agencies; nor is there a thread of increasing national purpose in all these tangent activities. The moment has come when these efforts must be integrated. Today's conditions demand that we rise to the highest possible level of organizational responsibility.

Perhaps this task has as its most critical obligation the well-being and human reconversion for peace of the 6,000,000 young men and women who have no peacetime experience as adult citizens, no vocational and professional background as civilians, and whose future as citizens calls for education, employment, and a happy adjustment to their community life. To fail this group of tomorrow's citizens means to have failed the country itself. It is no criticism of existing agencies that we have not solved this problem. Let us examine the situation.

The 10 percent of our citizens who went to war was trained and equipped by the best organizational methods known to science. That organizational genius gave us the Army, Navy, Air Force, tools and strength of atomic power beyond the capacities of any other people. Now that same 10 percent has earned the right to this same organized procedure for reestablishing a successful peace.

It has commonly but erroneously assumed that the Veterans' Administration is charged with the solution of all veterans' problems. That agency is solely concerned with the hospitalization, vocational education, loan guarantees, and compensation after discharge from the armed forces. Various other departments and agencies of the Federal Government are concerned with employment, vocational guidance, aptitude testing, job placement, farm advice, farm loans, home loans, business loans, advice on going into business and the professions, and other veteran assistance, including how to get the veteran his former job back, such as Selective Service.

Now the fact that many agencies are so engaged means that there is a grave danger that many veterans—especially the 6,000,000 reaching adulthood—can lose their way, or be misled, or suffer the tragic consequences of a poor start in their race for success. A veterans' job and an integrated national program bill is necessary for them.

There is an important difference here, between what Woodrow Wilson in 1918 termed "gratuities of a grateful Government" and that contribution of a grateful Government which has been earned by the veteran. Veterans have earned certain rights and privileges. These are recognized on the statute books of the Government of every State. But the final obligation to these men and women who won the war the hard way is to assist them in being productive citizens who will not require gratuities.

Our veterans' program must be integrated nationally to assure this 6,000,000 a place as citizens, and to assure the entire 15,000,000 veterans that their opportunity as citizens in the various communities does not set them apart as a class. An integrated program should have as its end the establishment of all veterans on a sound basis morally, socially, and economically, so that none may need to trade on his status as a veteran. These men and women were citizens before they were soldiers, and it is to the best interests of this country that they lay down their arms and live their lives without regret for having served in the war.

Most communities are pleading for information, guidance, and advice in conducting their veterans' information and service centers so that they may speed the readjustment of returning service men and women either to employment or to education interrupted by the war. In many cities the labor unions, industry, the churches, political factions, the businessmen, and social workers have laid aside their differences to form a truly unified democratic veterans' service center. They envisage a time when, after accommodating the veteran, these centers will emerge as an eventual service to all the people in making all lives in the community more profitable. They see that in turn these well-equipped centers will enrich the community itself. With Federal leadership backed by the integration and better organization of all facilities to dispense constructive information, the Nation itself will be enriched and made stronger.

George Washington in his Farewell Address said: "It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great Nation to give to mankind the example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."

Our veterans will number among the leaders of the next generation and can become the future backbone of the Nation. Our veterans are selected from the cream of the crop of 139,000,000 people. Physically, psychologically, and educationally they are the finest essence of our people. Yet, after the last war most veterans required two decades to find themselves. We can turn our national clock ahead and avert this unhappy time loss for them by affording to them the information they need to make themselves more self-sufficient and more certain of their importance as citizens and leaders.

In our American bloodstream we have the strain of the most vigorous and daring of all the races of man who have come to our shores, making us the most powerful Nation on earth. If we are to remain a great Nation and take the lead in setting a standard among nations and peoples, we must first of all put our own house in order. Our first job is to back up with proper organization our veteran human resources just as we applied scientific organization to our armies, Navy, air forces, planes, tanks, food, medicine, guns, and atomic bombs. The development of a favorable climate of opportunities for 6,000,000 veterans who have heretofore not been employed or have no particular jobs to return to constitutes in itself a specific problem in which the Senate and the Congress are vitally interested as well as the homes.

The science of organization is one of the many unique contributions America has given the world in war and in peace for the benefit of mankind. If we apply this same science promptly to the readjustment of our veterans it will prove to be our Nation's best insurance. It will go far in securing our economic stability, our prosperity, our peace, and the peace of the world. It will demonstrate to our fellow Americans and to the world that our social engineering, our form of democracy, and the American experiment work. What we find by experience that we can do for the veterans and war workers, we can do for all the people. This program can well serve as the pilot operation of social engineering and one of the most important milestones in all human history.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of Bernard M. Baruch to Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF BERNARD M. BARUCH TO GEN. OMAR N. BRADLEY

Work for all—both veterans and civilians—is the No. 1 essential in any effective handling of veterans' problems. This is one highlight of a report on veterans' matters submitted by Bernard M. Baruch to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, newly appointed Veterans' Administrator, and released today.

Outlining the tremendous difficulties General Bradley faces, Mr. Baruch warned, they are being aggravated by "the fact that the human side of demobilization is being neglected tragically.

"Solution of the veterans' problems does not—cannot—proceed alone. During the period when our soldiers and sailors will be shedding their uniforms, six to eight million workers in strictly war industries will be shifting jobs or homes. The ultimate goal of any veterans' program must be to restore the returning soldier and sailor to the community—socially, economically, and humanly. This cannot be accomplished except as part of the larger program embracing the whole of human demobilization. One terrible danger of failure may be to set the veteran off from the rest of the Nation, cherishing the grievance of having been wronged at odds with fellow-Americans, his feelings an explosive fuel ready to be ignited by some future demagogues.

"The very first need in the present situation," Mr. Baruch declared, "is to end the 'no man's land' of neglect of the human problems of the changeover from war to peace."

He urged specifically, the immediate naming of a vigorous, imaginative "Work Director" to act as a "single, unforgetful mind" to make certain "that the human side of demobilization is not forgotten." The post of "Work Director" as a "special authority to give its entire attention to the problem of bringing jobs to all workers," was originally proposed by Mr. Baruch and John M. Hancock in their Report on War and Postwar Adjustment Policies on February 15, 1944. The concept was enacted into law by Congress in the creation of the post of Administrator of Retraining and Reemployment—a position at first set up on a part-time basis and more recently left unfilled.

On veterans' matters, Mr Baruch urged General Bradley to set up three different committees: One, to make an impartial study and public report, aiming at the complete transformation of the Veterans' Medical Service; a second to make a similar study of nonmedical matters of the Veterans' Administration to simplify and decentralize its procedures; and a third, to work with Congress in making an intensive review of all existing GI legislation in need of amending. Their immediate studies made, Mr. Baruch would have the medical and nonmedical committees established on a permanent basis to serve as continuous reviewing bodies, reporting periodically to the public through General Bradley.

To summarize Mr. Baruch's principal recommendations:

I. Name a vigorous, imaginative "Work Director" immediately to vitalize the post of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator to accomplish its original purpose of seeing that the human side of demobilization is not forgotten.

II. A clean-cut division within the veterans' agency between medical and nonmedical matters, creating a new Veterans' Medical Service, under the head of an outstanding medical man.

III. Name a small, fast-working, independent committee to make an impartial study of every aspect of veterans' medical care, to submit a public report of recommendations for completely transforming the new veterans' medical service to one that provides a challenge to all that is progressive in medical practice.

IV. Substantial increases in salaries of doctors, nurses, and technicians in the new medical service; promotion on professional ability and skill against waiting in the line of seniority; freeing doctors and needless paperwork through more efficient hospital administration; ample opportunities for doctors to grow professionally through postgraduate and refresher studies and through effective ties with centers of medical education and skill; ample research facilities and encouragement of research by veterans' doctors.

V. Name a small, fast-working committee of impartial experts to review all the nonmedical aspects of the Veterans' Administration, simplifying, modernizing, and decentralizing its procedures and cutting down delays in payments of all kinds.

VI. Overhaul the so-called GI bill of rights, particularly in regard to loans, whose provisions should be made effective over 10 years instead of 2, the guaranty percentage raised and working capital provided.

VII. AN INCENTIVE TAX OF 25 PERCENT LESS THE NORMAL RATE BE GIVEN VETERANS OPENING NEW BUSINESSES, THIS DIFFERENCE TO BE APPLIED TO THE PAYMENTS ON THEIR LOANS UP TO $25,000

Another point emphasized strongly by Mr. Baruch is the need to end the run-around being given veterans in many communities by seeing to it that "in each community there is only one place where veterans need go—in dignity not charity—to learn all of their rights and how to get them." Such "all-in-one centers" would aid in decentralizing the operations of the Veterans' Administration in giving veterans the personalized advice they need in making their plans, in easing the handling of every veteran's problem. Seeing that such centers are set up is one of the tasks of the Work Director.

"We have here a matter in which there is no question of what our people would like to see done," Mr. Baruch adds. "What is at question is our competence to carry out obligations which all of us recognize and wish to see fulfilled. We must not fail the veteran, for then we fail ourselves. We fail our Nation with its heritage of greatness, which is the challenge to all the world. We must show that our political and economic system, which met the test of war so magnificently, can be turned as effectively to the solution of the human problems in the return to peace."

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 16, 1945.*

Gen. OMAR N. BRADLEY,
Director, Veterans Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL BRADLEY: It was with gratification that I heard of your appointment as Veterans' Administrator.

At the suggestion of President Roosevelt I had been studying the problems of the veteran and related questions of human demobilization. What I learned filled me with deep concern. You have asked for the results of my findings. Herewith I submit a number of the more important recommendations for immediate action.

Your excellent appointment has been hailed as foreshadowing a thorough-going shake-up of the Government's handling of veterans' matters. What is not generally appreciated, is the tremendous scale and difficulties of your task, how many of the veterans' keenest problems go beyond the authority of your office.

With their families the 12,000,000 veterans of this war make up one-fourth of the entire population. Measured in numbers alone, this is three times the number of veterans of the last war. Already more than 2,250,000 have been discharged from the armed services. More than 1,250,000 of these have suffered some disability. Another 545,000 are reported in Army and Navy hospitals in this country and abroad. More disabled veterans are receiving payments, thus far, than the total for the last war.

SWIFT REFORM NEEDED

With the surrender of Japan you must prepare now for discharges in the millions. Reorganization, modernization, and expansion of the Veterans' Administration cannot be delayed. Unless there is prompt, corrective action, the disillusionment and bitterness that have spread among some veterans and their kin will steadily worsen. Aggravating your difficulties is the fact that the human side of demobilization is being neglected tragically.

Solution of the veterans' problems does not—cannot—proceed alone. During the period when our soldiers and sailors will be shedding their uniforms, six to eight million workers in strictly war industries will be shifting jobs or homes. The ultimate goal of any veterans' program must be to restore the returning soldier and sailor to the community—socially, economically, and humanly. This cannot be accomplished except as part of the larger program embracing the whole of human demobilization. One terrible danger of failure may be to set the veteran off from the rest of the Nation, cherishing the grievance of having been wronged, at odds with fellow-Americans, his feelings an explosive fuel ready to be ignited by some future demagogs.

END HUMAN NO MAN'S LAND

There now prevails a no man's land of neglect of the human problems of the changeover from war to peace. The very first need in the present situation is:

I. A vigorous, imaginative work director, to vitalize the post of Administrator of Retraining and Reemployment to accomplish its original purpose of making certain the human side of demobilization is not forgotten.

This is beyond your own authority. I emphasize it because until this post is effectively filled, you will be hampered in the execution of your own responsibilities. So will be every other administrator of the many aspects of demobilization.

The concept of work director can be briefly summarized. Between the many agencies involved in the demobilization there exist all sorts of twilight zones or gaps of responsibility, innumerable overlappings or conflicts of authority. We wanted to avoid the human problems falling, uncared for, between the agencies. Therefore, the Report on War and Postwar Adjustment Policies, which I prepared with John M. Hancock, recommended that there be a single, unforgetful mind to unify all of the forces of the executive branch dealing with the human side of demobilization and to develop a comprehensive program for meeting these problems working with Congress. This work director, as we called him, later was given the official title of Administrator of Retraining and Reemployment. We considered this post so important. we recommended that it be filled by a man of such outstanding caliber as to command the immediate confidence of the country.

Unfortunately, although 18 months have passed since the issuance of our report on February 15, 1944, and almost a year since Congress created the necessary office, an effective program of human demobilization still is lacking.

Among the things for which you should be able to look to the work director are:

REVIEW DEMOBILIZATION PLANS

1. To maintain a running review of the plans for demobilizing the armed forces, discharge procedures and policies of both the Army and Navy, harmonizing and integrating their programs with the whole of the change-over to peace.

RELEASE DOCTORS, HOSPITALS

2. Specifically, in this connection, to see that any faults in discharge procedures are promptly corrected, as the too loose use of the label "psychoneurotic" in medical discharges in the past; also, to make certain that doctors, nurses, and hospitals are released from military service in proportion to the discharges of wounded and reductions in troop strengths. Otherwise, how are the Veterans' Administration or the communities to carry out their responsibilities to the wounded?

ONE CENTER TO A COMMUNITY

3. To see to it that in each community there is only one place where veterans need go—in dignity, not charity—to learn all of their rights and how to get them. This was one of the more urgent recommendations in our postwar report. In too many communities veterans still are being given the runaround from agency to agency. Where such all-in-one centers have been established, as in Bridgeport, Conn., Richmond, Va., or Los Angeles, Calif., they have eased the handling of every veteran problem, medical care, benefits, loans, employment. A network of such centers would contribute greatly to any plans of yours for decentralizing the Veterans' Administration.

JOBS AND TRAINING

4. To develop a unified, detailed employment and training program, anticipating as far as practical the needs of both veterans and displaced war workers. This would include settling the conflict in interpretation over section 8 of the Selective Service Act on seniority rights (or request Congress to clarify the law); other seniority problems; special programs for the disabled; adequate job placement machinery for all workers; personalized job guidance, particularly for veterans who have never worked before; working with both labor unions and business groups in relaxing barriers to employment, such as initiation fees, apprenticeship rules, etc. This is especially important in those fields such as construction, which can provide a greater number of jobs in peace than during the war.

COMBAT BOTTLENECKS

5. While rationing, priorities, and other restrictions remain in force, this work director should see that veterans obtaining loans to start businesses receive the materials and commodities they need. The work director must not be content simply because a regulation has been issued but should see that it works.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS

6. To step up and coordinate the artificial-limb program, unifying the work of all agencies, so that all amputees are given the best possible limbs immediately and replacements provided for those who have received inferior limbs. Many of our wounded still are being fitted with legs and arms known to be inferior because production of newer types is slow; procurement has lacked drive and organization. Not until last January were the manufacturers of artificial legs brought together to develop standardized specifications. The committee on prosthetic devices of the National Research Council, now energetically pushing the improvement of designs for artificial legs and arms held its first meeting only last March. Root of the delay has been that no one administrator took full responsibility for organizing and driving through a completely worked-out, artificial-limb program.

WHAT VETERANS SHOULD KNOW

7. To develop an effective program for informing veterans of what they need to know. They should be reached while still in service and after their return to civilian life when their problems are actually upon them. Many agencies must share in this program; the work director should take the leadership, coordinating the efforts of all.

Those are only a few of the tasks of the work director, whose scope covers the human problems of both veterans and war workers. His duties are more completely outlined in our postwar report and in the legislation creating the office of re-employment and retraining. You may find yourself compelled to move into some of those gaps, dealing directly with these matters.

CREATE NEW MEDICAL SERVICE

Turning to the Veterans' Administration I would recommend:

II. A clean-cut division in the Veterans' Administration between medical and nonmedical matters, creating a new veterans' medical service under the head of an outstanding medical man.

Until now veterans' medical care has been too much subordinated to the legal and fiscal matters connected with benefits of all kinds. It must be freed from the thumb of the lawyer and benefit-payer. Lifted to a level of autonomous independence, its primary emphasis should be the quickest and fullest recovery of the veteran and his or her return to society as a self-supporting, self-respecting citizen.

Various suggestions have been made as to the form this new veterans' medical service should take. None of these details of organization are as important as is the choice of the man who is to head this service. Even a good man and an autonomous service, by themselves, are not enough. A complete transformation of veterans' medical care is needed.

IMPARTIAL MEDICAL STUDY

III. A small, fast-working, independent committee should be amended to make an impartial study of every aspect of veterans' medical care, formulating recommendations for completely transforming the Veterans' Medical Service into one that provides a challenge to all that is progressive in medical practice.

This committee need not attempt a single, huge study but could take up successively the many different problems, reporting its findings as it went along. Its work should be organized to supplement—not delay—any immediate reforms that the new Medical Director will wish to put into effect. Its immediate studies completed and made public through you, some such committee should be established on a permanent basis. It would serve as a continuing review group, reporting regularly to the public through you on the progress in improving veterans' medical care; recommending any additional measures that may become necessary; making certain the latest scientific techniques are properly instituted as soon as proven.

I urge that reports of this committee be made public because of the sharp, prolonged criticism of veterans' medical care. An independent sifting of the charges that have been made and announcement of reforms to correct whatever faults may be found is necessary to restore the confidence of the public, including the veterans and their families. Many of the measures you will wish to adopt will require public understanding and support. Fully publicizing your new medical program also will immediately raise the prestige of the new Veterans' Medical Service. This is so necessary if sufficient numbers of new doctors of high quality—so sorely needed—are to be attracted to the service.

MERIT NOT SENIORITY

Recruiting now, good doctors is of such importance in any program for improving veterans' medical care, I would recommend:

IV. Substantial increases in salaries of doctors, nurses, technicians, and others in the new medical service; a promotion system based on professional ability and skill, against waiting in the line of seniority; freeing doctors of needless paper work through more efficient hospital administration; ample opportunities for doctors to grow professionally through postgraduate and refresher studies and through effective ties with centers of medical education and skill; the establishment of ample research facilities and encouragement of research by veterans' doctors.

Among the matters which should be included in the impartial study by the medical committee are:

PSYCHIATRIC NEED GREAT

1. A psychiatric program, both immediate and long-range. This is, perhaps, the field where there is the widest gap between need and established medical facilities. Already several hundred thousand so-called psychoneurotics have been discharged from the armed services. (One out of every four or five appearing before Selective Service was rejected for some type of mental disease or nervous defect.) Yet in the entire country there are reported to be only about 3,500 trained psychiatrists, many of them in the service. Included in any long-range, psychiatric program should be plans for training a vastly greater personnel over the years; stimulated research; and a Nation-wide network of outpatient clinics, since most psychoneurotic ills can be treated without hospitalization. As an immediate measure, quick training programs can be given, following the example of what the Army has done in the war.

2. Establishment of a system of internships and residencies in veterans' hospitals.

3. In place of the present medical organization so largely geared to hospitalization, to develop a more flexible system of medical care which will include greater emphasis on outpatient clinics for veterans who do not need hospitalization; more extended use of local physicians and medical facilities; rehabilitation centers, sheltered workshops, and other modern developments.

NEW HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

4. Revise the program of future veterans' hospital construction to allow for this new flexibility and for the goals of the new Veterans' Medical Service, with modern research facilities and with veterans' hospitals located so that closer contact can be maintained with established medical centers. Veterans' hospital construction must be integrated with new civilian hospital construction.

5. Shatter the hopeless defeatism that now prevails in the treatment of veterans who have been paralyzed through wounds to the spinal cord or key nerves. With the best modern care, it has been demonstrated, many patients now discarded to hopeless invalidism can be enabled to move about on their own and even become self-supporting.

6. Determine how to insure that the latest scientific and medical techniques are introduced in the treatment of every ailment.

LIAISON WITH MILITARY

7. Effective liaison between the new Veterans' Medical Service and the medical branches of the armed services. At present no liaison worthy of mentioning exists. Among the benefits would be the prompt funneling into the Veterans' Service of the latest medical advances developed during the war; the timing and organization of all medical discharges; coordinating medical records so that unnecessary duplication in records and examination can be eliminated. While the new Veterans' Medical Service is being reformed, you may want to devise a program by which the wounded will be kept under military medical care for a longer period. Arrangement could be made to give these wounded any necessary veterans' benefits.

REDUCE "PENSIONITIS"

8. Examine the present pension system, both in administration and legislation, to

eliminate or reduce deterrents to full recovery or incentives to malingering, while still retaining just compensation for disability. I am informed by many doctors that in certain cases benefits do the patient more harm than good, by encouraging so-called "pensionitis." No veteran should be deprived of any pension or benefit rightfully due him. But surely a system can be developed which will give the veteran his just allowance and still not hamper his physical recovery. Perhaps no aspect of veterans' medical reform is more important. Many so-called psychoneurotics could be left mental cripples for life, as if victims of botchy surgery, by an unwise pension and benefit system. This matter profoundly affects the whole of veterans' medical care in that it tends to breed cynicism and defeatism throughout the organization.

9. Study the problems raised by distinctions in medical care between disabilities which are service-connected, and those which are non-service-connected.

10. The Veterans' Administration's part in the artificial limb program. One thing I would like to see done is to have a continuous, progressive, limb-replacement program, since designs will steadily improve. A contact system should be set up now for all amputees—15,000 at present. This will speed replacements and aid in checking on the performance of various types of limbs, contributing to research and improvement.

DECENTRALIZE VETERANS' AGENCY

On the nonmedical side of the veterans' agency I would recommend:

V. That a similar, small, fast-working committee of impartial experts be named to review all nonmedical matters to formulate recommendations for simplifying, modernizing and decentralizing the operations of the agency.

This committee should go into the speeding of payments of every kind while still protecting the public interest. Doubtless, you have seen complaints of delays in settling death claims and disability pensions; of veterans who have protested that they were forced to leave school because their checks for living allowances did not come through. The enormous volume of veterans' laws needs codifying; the mass of regulations simplifying. I would turn this committee loose on each and every program in your agency. One looming problem will be the peacetime conversion of the life insurance held by veterans. With its $136,000,000,000 of face value policies, the Veterans' Administration runs the largest insurance business in the world.

Once this committee had completed its immediate tasks, I would have it set up as a permanent group constantly reviewing and simplifying procedure. In operations of such magnitude there must be an unceasing battle against creeping red tape and needless paper work.

OVERHAUL GI RIGHTS

VI. The so-called GI bill or rights should be overhauled, particularly regarding GI loans, whose provisions should be made effective over 10 years instead of 2, the percentage of guaranty raised and working capital provided.

Congress is quite alert to the need for such changes, and I believe swift corrective action can be had if you use your executive ability to bring together the best thoughts of the executive branch on these matters with those of the Congress. I would suggest, therefore, that you name several persons to make an extensive study of all the numerous features of veteran legislation that need amending and to work with Congress on this whole matter.

As an example of how loosely drawn some features of the GI law are, under the act each enlisted veteran is authorized to borrow for either the purchase of a home or farm or to go into business, but this must be done in 2 years. The Government will guarantee $2,000 of such loans. Let us say, the unguaranteed portion is another $2,000, or $4,000 in all. If one-half the 10,000 eligible veterans take advantage of it, that means $20,000,000,000 of borrowings. Think of that pressure going into the market for homes, farms, or businesses in 2 years. What a harvest high-pressure salesmen will reap unless the time is extended.

Spread over 10 years, the GI loans can serve as a stabilizing force, humanly as well as economically. Many veterans may prefer attending school before buying a home, farm, or business. Others, who plan on going into business, will have a better chance to succeed if they first gain experience by taking a job in the particular line.

For veterans really to be helped into business, the present 50-percent guaranty on business loans is too low. In New Jersey, a 90-percent guaranty is provided by State law. Much of the red tape that has proven so frustrating to veterans can be reduced by devising a system by which loans are made virtually automatic on approval by the local bank.

PROTECT AGAINST INFLATION

Extending the time limit of veterans' loans to 10 years will go far to relieve restrictive effect of the requirement in the present law forbidding loans where the purchase price is above reasonable normal value. This provision was put into the bill to guard veterans against purchasing properties at inflated wartime levels, only to have to repay these debts in deflated dollars. In wartime markets it is not easy to find properties that have not become inflated above their reasonable normal value. Over a 10-year period, market values should tend to be more normal.

GI TAX INCENTIVE

It is no benefit to the veteran to give him a loan he cannot repay, chaining him to debt like a galley slave. At current tax rates few new enterprises could be made to pay for themselves in any reasonable period. I would recommend to the Congress:

VII. That an incentive tax of 25-percent less than the normal rate be given veterans opening new businesses, this difference to be applied in repayment of their loans up to $25,000.

I feel this special tax incentive for veterans necessary because, with the pressures for inflation that now prevail, it would not be safe to embark on too drastic a general tax reduction at this time.

ONE HOME LOAN PLAN

With home loans, veterans are finding the law confusing in that two different methods for home financing are embodied in the law, each having certain advantages. The best in both plans should be merged into a single arrangement which comes closest to meeting the needs of the veterans, with a flat 4 percent interest rate, payments spread over equal monthly installments, sound appraisal, and mortgages fully guaranteed by the Government. The entire program should be administered by the National Housing Administration. This would relieve the veterans agency of one of its many enough jobs. The scale of possible veteran home borrowing may be quite large and should be unified with other housing programs.

Some of the educational provisions need tightening, as providing adequate protection against fly-by-night trade schools which may spring up to exploit the veteran. In some States so-called second injury laws are proving an obstacle to the employment of disabled veterans. This should be corrected.

STUDY ADDITIONAL BENEFITS

The matter of additional benefits for veterans and their families could be made part of this legislative study. I know it would come as a shock to the American people to learn that we have not treated our veterans as generously as some other countries have theirs. A study comparing the GI provisions of the United States, Britain, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and Australia, has been prepared for me and I shall send it to you.

The question of including merchant seamen under veterans' benefits could be part of this legislative study.

NO SUPER SALESMANSHIP

One final recommendation of great importance—veterans must be protected against super-salesmanship designed to sell them everything and anything. It is most necessary that in each community the veteran be able to get proper advice in making his plans, in borrowing money and its expenditure, in deciding on education and employment. It was my hope that the all-in-one centers in the communities would fill this need. If not, it should be provided in another way.

In conclusion, I extend to you my best wishes and whatever assistance I can be in the future. In many ways the success in meeting the problems of the returning veteran will be the acid test of our democracy. For we have here a matter in which there is no question of what our people would like to see done. What is at question is our competence to carry out obligations which all of us recognize and wish to see fulfilled. We must not fail the veteran—for then we fail ourselves. We fail our Nation with its heritage of greatness which is the challenge to all the world. We must show that our political and economic system which met the test of war so magnificently can be turned as effectively to the solution of human problems in the return to peace.

Sincerely yours,

B. M. BARUCH.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. REES of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for the remainder of the afternoon. I have an appointment at the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURE CONFERENCE HELD AT QUEBEC, CANADA, OCTOBER 16 TO NOVEMBER 1, 1945.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, on Tuesday the able Senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, made a valuable and comprehensive report of the proceedings of the meeting of the International Food and Agriculture Organization at Quebec from October 16 to November 1, inclusive. It is my obligation, as the other official representative from the Senate, also to make a report upon that Conference. I shall

discharge this duty, not by making a detailed report, as was so splendidly done by the Senior senator from Oklahoma, but by supplementing his report with some other experiences, and by some observation relative to our country's obligations incurred in international relationships, drawn from this Conference.

"Peace sits uneasy, amidst the hungry, the sick, and the homeless." This statement, made in the opening plenary session of this organization, set the theme for all the proceedings. Food is a subject of which every person of the world is conscious three times a day. The production of food demands the employment of nearly two-thirds of the people of the world. The comfort, the physical level, and the prosperity of every nation are based on the standard of food production in each country in the world. The conclusion is simple but inexorable, that if we are going to raise the living standards of the nations of the world, if we are going to maintain anything like permanent peace, we shall do this only by lifting the standards of agriculture throughout the world.

This conclusion is so self-evident that it is almost axiomatic that if we can have international cooperation in any part of our civilization, it should be found in the production of food. Our own Nation, as fortunate as we are, cannot be safely isolated in the matter of food. As long as there is a threat to our agricultural industry through the importation of products with prices such as 6 cents a pound for cotton raised in India, and a cent a pound for fish produced in Iceland, or vast surplus of wheat, the prosperity of our own Nation is insecure. The solution is quite plain. Only as we can encourage an elevation of the standards of living in other countries with an attendant increase in the cost of agricultural products in those countries will our own agricultural economy be safe. The prosperity of the United States is geared to the prosperity of the agricultural groups within our borders.

The International Food and Agriculture Organization was conceived in our own country and was initiated by a meeting of representatives of 44 nations held at Hot Springs, Va., in May 1943. The objectives developed at that meeting were referred to an interim commission which held many sessions in Washington and formulated the purposes of the organization. The commission also drafted a constitution. In July of 1945 the Congress of the United States approved this constitution and voted that the United States would become a member of this organization.

The initial session of the meeting at Quebec witnessed the signing of this constitution by 30 nations, more than the required number to bring the organization into being as a duly constituted body.

Four other nations signed the constitution before the final adjournment of the Conference, and 8 others have accepted the constitution, so a total of 42 nations are now members of the International Food and Agriculture Organization, which will function in collaboration with the United Nations Organization established under the San Francisco Charter.

At this point I should like to make an observation which may have some bearing on the future policy of international organizations. The first meeting called to consider the Food and Agriculture Organization, held at Hot Springs, was marked by an attempt to maintain the strictest secrecy over deliberations on a subject in which there was universal interest. Members of the press were excluded from its sessions; no Members of Congress were permitted to attend, and those who sought admission were given to understand that their presence was not welcome. This policy created a suspicion that there might be some sinister motive behind the organization. Perhaps this secrecy was thought necessary because this was the first segment to be developed of the broader international program to follow, and it might have been thought that the guinea pig would survive better in an atmosphere of quiet and seclusion.

There was a striking contrast in this respect in the Conference held at Quebec. This Conference was attended by a considerable group of representatives of the Department of Agriculture from our own Nation, as well as representatives from other nations, by four duly appointed Members from the Congress of the United States, by heads of the important farm organizations of this country, and by representatives of many important groups, as well as by a large body of newspaper writers. All the committee and panel meetings were open to the public. Expressions of opinion and advice were invited from every interested person. This method of bringing everything into the open created a spirit of good will and cooperation and made the Conference successful. Our State Department would do well to maintain the freedom of information and discussion in international affairs which was permitted at Quebec.

I am sure my colleagues and the people of the country generally will be interested in a brief description of the mechanics of the operation of this international organization, which will probably be a pattern for other similar organizations. The early sessions of the Conference were attended by all the delegates and all the advisers, experts, and public writers. The agenda proposed by the interim committee was adopted, the temporary officers were elected, and delegates from the several nations presented their views in these opening sessions. On the third day of the meetings provision was made by the rules adopted for the breaking down of these plenary sessions into suborganizations in which different phases of the work could be discussed and policies outlined and recommendations set up. Two commissions known as Commission A and Commission B were established, and a chairman and a secretary for each commission.

It was the function of Commission A to outline a policy and program for the Food and Agriculture Organization.

It was the function of Commission B to consider questions of organization and administration.

Commission A was divided into six committees:

(a) On nutrition and food management;
(b) On agriculture;
(c) On forests and forest products;
(d) On fisheries;
(e) On marketing;
(f) On statistics.

Commission B was divided into four subcommittees:

(a) Rules of procedure;
(b) Budget and finance;
(c) Administrative arrangements;
(d) Constitutional and diplomatic questions.

These main committees were then divided into panels in which the problems in which the organization was interested could be discussed in complete detail. For example, the agriculture committee was divided into nine panels, each covering a phase of the problems to be considered. Altogether 20 panels and 10 major committees were in session throughout the Conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks an outline of the organization of the commissions, committees, and technical panels of the first session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, AND TECHNICAL PANELS OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

COMMISSION A

I. Nutrition and Food Management Committee.
II. Agriculture Committee:
1. Rural social welfare.
2. Education, extension, and exchange of technical and scientific information.
3. Production research and techniques (plants and animals).
4 Soil resources development and conservation (irrigation, drainage, erosion control, salinity control, range management).
5. Integration and coordination of agricultural programs and policies (national and international).
6. Credit, cooperatives and related matters.
7. Industrial needs for agriculture (especially machinery, fertilizer, and pesticides).
8. Special needs for war-devastated countries.
9. Special needs for countries in tropical and subtropical regions.
III. Forestry:
1. Rural welfare.
2. Forest policy and management.
3. Forestry research and education.
4. Living standards.
5. Forest products and industry.
6. Marketing and statistics.
IV. Fisheries Committee.
V. Marketing Committee.
VI. Statistics Committee:
1. Nutrition and food management.
2. Agricultural production.
3. Agricultural marketing.
4. Forestry and fisheries.
5. Statistical organization.

COMMISSION B

I. Rules and Procedure Committee.
II. Finance Committee.
III. Administrative Arrangements Committee.
IV. Constitutional and Diplomatic Questions Committee.

Mr. WILLIS. When these panels had concluded their discussions, which were carried on very meticulously in view of the desire for exact language expression and for definite recommendations, their conclusions and recommendations were reported to the general committees. The general committees coordinated the findings of the panels, and after further discussion set up reports which were given to Commission A and Commission B. These two commissions reviewed the reports of their committees and reported them to the plenary session on the closing days of the Conference, and the final session of the Conference was for approval and comments on the work of the Conference.

Each morning the United States delegation held a meeting and reports were received from the panel and committee discussions by appointed rapporteurs. In these conferences members of the delegation who were responsible for decisions in the committees, reported the pending issues and received instructions as to the position of the delegation on the issues. The final reports of the committees therefore had the approval of the delegation.

The discussions in the panels and subsequently in the committees were based on the survey of food and agriculture problems made at Hot Springs, and later coordinated by the interim commission. Manifestly these covered a wide field. These problems were shaken down in more concise form, and the final result was the definite recommendations which were made to the director general and executive committee for the work of the organization in the months ahead.

While the immensity of the problems outlined might well confound the organization in accomplishing definite objectives, these two accomplishments can be definitely set down as a result of the Conference:

First, nations can get together about a council table, relate their problems, exchange their views, and offer cooperative recommendations for their solution.

Second, a world-wide survey of the problems of food and health and housing can be made through the agency of statistical sources and bureaus and through the several departments of agriculture maintained throughout the world. Technical advice and material aid may be exchanged with each other in solving a problem that is universal. These functions alone, without doubt, will promote the advancement of agriculture in each nation, promote a better standard of living, and set an example of practical results to be accomplished through international cooperation.

The International Food and Agriculture Organization can accept as a blueprint for its operations the findings of this Conference. It can select the recommendations which seem likely to be most fruitful of results, and thus demonstrate to the nations what can be accomplished through international cooperation. One is very easily encouraged to believe that sufficient results will be accomplished to make the investment and the effort worth while.

The financial stake of the United States in this international organization is 25 percent of the total budget of $1,250,000, each year after next July 1. The immensity of the task indicates that a much greater financial outlay will be needed in later years. But the decision as to that matter can be made as the organization demonstrates its usefulness. Certainly our present stake is small in comparison with the benefits which may be hoped for.

There was one aspect of the Conference in which your representative was especially interested. That was to what extent did the United States Government delegate its functions as a Nation to an international organization, and does the adoption of such a policy set us on a road by which we may later be led to a weakening of our national prestige. Your representative was very jealous and observant in this field.

In order to secure practical accomplishments it is necessary for a government to delegate to administrators the functions outlined by the legislative bodies of the member countries. It was interesting to note that the discussions and the recommendations for the solutions of these problems emanated from people who, without much actual experience in the production of food, have become career men in their study of the policies and principles involved in administrative agriculture. Someone rather humorously noted that there were about 700 experts and 7 dirt farmers at the Conference, which is a ratio of 100 advisers to 1 producer. However, the men who had been chosen to represent our Nation referred the problems to the whole body of representatives and advisers, and conscientiously endeavored to work out methods which would ultimately react to the best interests of those most vitally affected in the production and consumption of foods.

The permanent organization was established by the unanimous election of Sir John Boyd Orr, a member of the British Parliament, as the director general. His administration will be supported by an executive committee of 15 members from 15 different nations, as follows:

Edouard Baker, Haiti, 1 year.
Dr. G. S. H. Barton, Canada, I year.
R. R. Enfield, United Kingdom, 1 year.
E. J. Fawcett, New Zealand, 1 year.
Alfonso Gonzales Gallardo, Mexico, 1 year.
Sir Girja Bajpai, India, 2 years.
Anders Fjelstad, Norway, 2 years.
Darwish Haidari, Iraq, 2 years.
Andre Mayer, France, 2 years.
Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Poland, 2 years.
Newton Castro Belleza, Brazil, 3 years.
Howard R. Tolley, United States, 3 years.
P. W. Tsou, China, 3 years.
P. R. Viljoen, Union of South Africa, 3 years.
Arthur Wauters, Belgium, 3 years.

The home of the organization will temporarily be in Washington, D. C., and permanently in the same site as that to be selected for the United Nations Organization.

Your representative was jealous to see that the powers which the Congress delegated to the International Food and Agriculture Organization through the approval of the constitution of the Organization were not abused. The preamble of that constitution states the purposes of the Organization as follows:

> The nations accepting this constitution, being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions, securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products, bettering the condition of rural populations, and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy, hereby establish the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, hereinafter referred to as the "Organization," through which the members will report to one another on the measures taken and the progress achieved in the fields of action set forth above.

Your representative sincerely believes that no action of this Conference transgressed the powers delegated to the Conference as outlined in this preamble and more particularly limited in the subsequent constitution.

There were, however, certain debatable issues raised which never reached more than the discussion stage, and there was evidence of certain philosophies which other nations might try to inject from time to time into the International Food and Agriculture Organization. It will be wise for the delegates to future conferences to be always on the alert that no violence to American principles is undertaken by international organization. For example, there arose from time to time the issue of food from the standpoint of the consumer and from the standpoint of the producer. This brought up the question of controlled production quotas and recommendations for marketing and credit insitutions, which polices will be left wholly to the member nations on the recommendation of the Organization.

Another policy which was quite largely in the forefront throughout the meeting was the relation of nutrition and health to food and agriculture. While nutrition and health are most important and are deserving of international attention, it is debatable whether this field should be combined with the production of food, when considered purely from its economic aspects. Agricultural improvement is primarily a movement for increasing the production capacity of agriculture and for the orderly distribution and marketing of that production, while the field of nutrition and health is deserving of separate attention. The subjects are related and are not necessarily in conflict, but both are deserving of the emphasis of individual consideration.

Another interesting incident of the Conference which has a bearing on the broad subject of international relationships should be related to this body. That was the refusal of the Russian delegation to accept membership in the Organization on the part of its country. The Russian delegation attended the sessions of the Organization and of the committees and participated in the discussions. The Russian members maintained the most courteous and interested attitude toward all the proceedings, and they gave no reason for their failure to

enter into full membership except to say that they had no authority to sign the constitution, and that their Government desired to examine more carefully the obligations and the rules of the Organization and observe its workings. This may have some important implication at the present time when the world is anxious to have all nations join together in peaceful solution of the problems causing friction between them. The reason for their refusal to join which most naturally suggests itself is that Russia is a nation growing out of great tribulations. She is moving with cautior toward the goal of international understanding, but she still does not want to open the books of her country's economy and her domestic needs to all the nations of the world.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption at a convenient time?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. If this is a convenient time, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Other than deciding to locate the principal office of the Food and Agriculture Organization at the same place where the United Nations Organization is to be located, was there any attempt at Quebec to articulate the Food and Agriculture Organization with the United Nations Organization?

Mr. WILLIS. I think the only other discussion was as to the question of language. It was proposed that the English language be used as the official language of the Conference. The French insisted very determinedly that French also be used. It was finally concluded that both French and English would be used at the Conference, but that the official language would be the one later adopted by the United Nations Organization.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. I believe the Senator also referred to the permanent location. The permanent location is to be the same as the permanent location of the United Nations Organization. Beyond that, I could detect probably no correlation of the Food and Agriculture Organization with the United Nations Organization. It can go on, even if the United Nations Organization fails. It has great possibilities of usefulness, even if we do not succeed in our other avenues of international cooperation.

Mr. AUSTIN. But does not the charter of the Food and Agriculture Organization contain the necessary provisions for ultimate articulation of that Organization with the United Nations Organization?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; it would be preferable that it go along in cooperation with the United Nations Organization.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to ask the Senator if the subject of immigration of farm labor was discussed or brought up at the Quebec meeting.

Mr. WILLIS. A discussion of migratory labor occurred. There was no discussion of relocation of labor, as I recall. Such matters, however, would come to the member nations only as recommendations of the Organization, and the determination of policy would be left wholly to the member nations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to hear that statement from the able Senator. The question was prompted by the discussion which took place on the floor of the Senate earlier, and also by the report of the United Nations Food Conference which met at Hot Springs, with which the Senator is familiar.

Mr. WILLIS. I recall that discussion. I assure the Senator from West Virginia that I had his protest in mind when I listened to his discussion. I found at Quebec that many issues raised by various nations in expressing their views never reached the stage of being approved at all by the Organization. They formed the subject only of preliminary discussions.

Mr. President, we should find no fault with Russia for failure to join in this Organization which should only be entered into freely and confidently by the member nations. There was no resentment expressed toward Russia by any of the delegates. Perhaps there was some disappointment that she was not ready yet to join, but there was a confident feeling that within a brief space of time, after the operations and purposes of the Organization are fully demonstrated, she will also join this international effort to raise the standard of living throughout the world.

Peace sits uneasy amidst the hungry, the sick and the homeless.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield so that I may propound a question to the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The question pertains to Senate bill 1120, and I ask the able Senator from Utah to turn to the bottom of page 14 of the bill. The language beginning in line 23 of that page reads as follows:

> The reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect, in accordance with the plan, upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to the Congress, during which the Congress shall be in session without adjournment sine die, but only if during such 60-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating that the body so resolving does not favor the reorganization plan.

My question is this: If a resolution of disapproval is submitted after the plan has been transmitted to the Congress, will such resolution go to a committee, or will it be acted upon finally by this body after its submission without reference to a committee?

Mr. MURDOCK. Immediately upon its submission it will be referred to a committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator believe that 60 days is insufficient if the resolution is to be referred to a committee? In other words, the Presidential message embodying the plan is received. We know that immediately no resolution would be offered without study being made of the plan, and that would require some time. The resolution would be referred to a committee for study, and later it would be reported back to the Senate for action.

While I am entirely imbued with the idea that a time limit should be fixed, if the plan is to come before this body, be referred to a committee for study, and subsequently be returned to the Senate for discussion, consideration, and action, it seems to me that a 60-day period is too short a time. I had hoped that after the message had been received by the Senate, if a resolution objecting to the plan should be offered on the floor of the Senate, action upon it would be taken without reference of the plan to a committee. Does the Senator feel that that could be done?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the proper procedure would be to refer the resolution with reference to the reorganization plan immediately to a committee. Certainly it would then become the responsibility of the committee to which the resolution had been referred to examine the plan. Of course, at some time during the 60-day period the committee would report the plan to the Senate with a recommendation. I cannot agree with the Senator that 60 days is too short a time if we really want reorganization. I think the time is ample. If we extend the time beyond the 60-day period I think that consideration of the plan would be delayed and little if anything would be accomplished.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As the Senator well knows, I am very much in favor of reorganization. I served as a member of the subcommittee handling the subject, and helped report the pending bill to the Senate. But since the bill has come to the floor of the Senate I have been very much impressed with the idea of automatic legislation, and believe that a time limit should be fixed. I refer specifically to an experience which we are having at the present time under a law dealing with the disposal of surplus property. In connection with that law a 30-day automatic action is imposed upon any property announced by the Surplus Property Director as being surplus. What has happened? We are dealing with steel plants. Hearings are being held today, and tomorrow the time expires. I think that situation is very unfortunate. I hope that more time will be provided, or that some provision will be placed in the pending bill whereby it may not be necessary to refer a resolution of rejection to a committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that what is sought by the Senator from West Virginia is contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in behalf of himself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I do not know what the distinguished Senator from Utah thinks of the amendment, but it seems to me that it offers a great improvement over the

procedure prescribed in the bill. The resolution would be referred to a committee. The committee would have 10 days in which to consider the resolution, and then the resolution would automatically come up as a special order of business before the Senate itself. So we are confronted with the fact that whoever moves affirmatively or negatively does not have to make a motion to take the matter away from the committee and have it considered by the Senate. It seems to me that if we place that kind of a provision in the bill a 60-day period of time would be sufficient.

Mr. MURDOCK. I assert that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan in behalf of himself and the Senator from New Jersey had been thoroughly thought out, it probably would expedite consideration of a reorganization program. But under the Ferguson-Smith amendment a motion to set aside the pending business could be made by any Senator, and thereby exclude debate on the resolution pertaining to reorganization.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Michigan told me that that was a mistake, that he had not inserted in the amendment the provision that the time should be divided equally between both sides.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator has referred to one defect. The other defect is one to which I invite attention, namely, that a Senator could move to set aside the pending business and debate the motion until the whole period of time had expired, thereby excluding entirely any debate on the resolution with reference to reorganization. I would be in favor of the Ferguson amendment if the matter had been completely thought out. But in my mind, the answer to the Senator is this: The provisions of the bill with reference to the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives in regard to this question have been well considered. They have been agreed to by the House of Representatives, and, in my opinion, it would be very difficult to expedite the procedure to any greater degree than they would be expedited by the provisions of the bill itself, without doing considerable violence to the rules of the two Houses.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I make the suggestion to the able Senator to consider what I have said, because the provision for rejection can easily be made utterly worthless and entirely futile if reference of the resolution must first be made to a committee.

I am a member of the committee together with the able Senator from Utah. The question came very pointedly to me upon consideration of a similar provision for rejection in the surplus-property disposal bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. In answering the Senator with regard to the surplus-property disposal fault, I would say that for 30 days the two Government agencies which are to dispose of surplus property in the case of steel plants have been twiddling their thumbs and waiting for the expiration of the period of time fixed by the act. If we were to have 60 days in which to consider the matter, we would probably allow 40 or 50 days to pass, and then at some time during the last 10 days we would take the matter up. In my opinion, in regard to the disposal of surplus property as well as in reorganization, the Congress of the United States must make up its mind that sometime authority will have to be vested in the executive department. We cannot handle the disposal of surplus property, and neither can we handle reorganization. If we are unwilling to allow the executive department to proceed, and if we do not repose some confidence in them, we will never get anywhere.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. With respect to the surplus property disposal bill, let me tell what actually occurred. The 30 days have elapsed, and hearings, involving many witnesses, were not started until November 5. The time will expire November 10. Today, as the Senator knows, hearings are proceeding, and the time will expire Saturday.

I do not desire to hold up action upon reorganization or upon surplus property disposal, but a time limit should be placed upon the committee, after the reference is made, to bring the matter back to this body so that we can act with thought and care. If that is not done, it will not be necessary to have any provision that the Senate is to pass upon the plan finally, because it will work out just as I see it working under the Surplus Property Act: it will be totally futile, a complete evasion of what the Senate supposed would be done under the bill.

I hope the Senator will consider this suggestion, so that either the plan of the Senator from Michigan will be adopted, or the Senate will proceed at once to consider the rejection resolution, if one is offered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the subject matter of the amendment which we are to consider further at this time is in my judgment of such extreme importance, that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hart	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Huffman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Butler	Knowland	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Carville	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McMahon	Vandenberg
Connally	Magnuson	Wagner
Cordon	Maybank	Walsh
Donnell	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Moore	Wiley
Eastland	Morse	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wilson
Ferguson	Myers	Young
George	O'Daniel	
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I regretted the necessity of a quorum call at this late hour, but in my judgment, the subject matter upon which the discussion is now to enter is of such outstanding importance, is so fundamental, and has within it such possibilities that every Member of the Senate who can consistently be here should be here to consider it.

Before entering upon the discussion I shall ask that there be read from the desk the amendment which has been proposed by me, as it has been modified, and as it has now been printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 14, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 14 on page 15, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. (a) No reorganization plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving such plan. Each reorganization specified in a plan which shall have been approved by the enactment of such a joint resolution shall take effect on the date of enactment of such joint resolution or on the date specified pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to such reorganization, whichever may be the later date.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the discussion now concerns itself with the amendment which has just been read by the clerk. In order that the issue presented by the amendment may be clear and unmistakable it is necessary briefly to outline portions of the committee amendment, which constitutes the bill before the Senate, and briefly to comment upon the amendment just read, before proceeding with the discussion.

The committee amendment, termed as it is the Reorganization Act of 1945, is divided into two titles. The first title contains several sections, the important and material portions of which, as I see them in this discussion, I shall attempt to outline.

Section 1 makes it obligatory upon the President to examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and to determine what changes therein are necessary to effect certain defined results. These results, it will be noted, are set forth on pages 9 and 10 of the bill, and I think it is of some importance to realize at least in substance their nature, and the very broad generalizations, the lack of particularity, the lack of preciseness, the lack of definiteness which characterizes these results which the President is to ascertain are those for which the changes proposed are necessary.

The first of these results is illustrative. It is "to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace." I submit that in this, the first of the results to which I have referred, there is no definiteness, no certainty, no preciseness. The language is general, "to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace." The President is required to examine into the organization of all Government agencies to determine what changes are necessary to

attain the result of facilitation of "orderly transition from war to peace."

The second of the results which he is to consider is the reduction of expenditure "to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government." I submit that here again there is lack of certainty, definiteness, and preciseness. It is a broad generalization, the result of reduction of expenditure "to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government." Not only is that a result which is indefinite in statement, but it is one with respect to which different individuals and different minds may well differ, and as to the attainment of which different minds, different judgments, and different individuals may differ.

The third of the results which he is to examine into in order to determine what changes are necessary to effect it is an increase in the "efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable."

Again, Mr. President, there is no definiteness, no certainty, no preciseness. The result is stated only in broad terms of generalization, a result with respect to which one person may come to one conclusion and another may arrive at a different conclusion.

The next result is the grouping, coordination, and consolidation of agencies and functions of the Government, "as nearly as may be, according to major purposes." Again, there is no standard, no definiteness, and no preciseness.

The fifth of these results is the reduction of the number of agencies "by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and by abolishing such agencies as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government." Again there is the broadest generalization, the broadest lack of definiteness, and the broadest lack of preciseness.

The sixth of these seven results is the elimination of "overlapping and duplication of effort." Again, one mind may conclude that a certain operation may involve an elimination of that type. Another mind may conclude that there is a distinctiveness between the functions of respective departments or agencies, and that no overlapping exists with respect to a particular one.

Finally, the seventh of the results to which the bill refers is provision "for making currently and continuously, subject to the limitations contained in subsection (d) of section 4 hereof, such adjustments in the Government establishment as may be necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency." Again, there is a lack of preciseness, definiteness, and certainty.

Mr. President, I mention the lack of definiteness, certainty, and preciseness not in the spirit of criticism, but for a very important legal and constitutional reason to which I shall refer a little later. As I say, up to this point, the bill provides that the President "shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary" to produce the seven results to which I have referred.

I shall omit what I regard as not essential to my point. Section 2 provides certain restrictions upon the reorganization plan, to which reference will later be made, and which is mentioned in section 4 of the bill—restrictions primarily involving the matter of the time for which any agency or any function may be extended under the reorganization, and a prohibition against the creation of a new function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to Congress—not a provision that a new function shall not be created for any specific department, but simply that no new function of government not previously created for some department shall be created by the reorganization.

Section 2 further contains prohibitions against the transfer to any other agency of any executive department or all the functions thereof—as, for illustration, the Department of State.

Section 2 also contains a prohibition against the divestiture of any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, as provided in subdivision (h).

Finally, there is a prohibition against increasing the term of any office beyond that now created by law for such office.

I have mentioned these various preliminary matters in the bill because of the contents of the next section. Section 3 of the bill provides in substance that whenever the President, after investigation, finds that a transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition of an agency or function, as specified in the section, is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes, which I have called results, of section 1, he shall prepare a reorganization plan to bring about any reorganizations as to which he has made findings hereunder.

It will be observed that the requirement of section 3 is simply that in order for the President to be obligated to prepare a reorganization plan, he is required only to find that the transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the seven purposes or results which are outlined and stated in section 1 of the bill, and which, as I have indicated, are in the broadest general language, not precise, not definite, and, as I shall submit in a few moments, not constituting a legal standard by which to justify this legislation, on the ground that it is the mere creation of a duty to exercise Executive power.

As I have indicated, the bill provides that when the President finds, not all of these seven results, but any one of them—for example, if he finds that the changes which he advocates will provide for making currently and continuously such adjustment in the Government establishment as may be necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency—he is then authorized to prepare a reorganization plan. The limitations upon that plan are as indicated in section 2, to which I have already referred.

The bill then proceeds with various other items, and we come to section 4, which specifies that the reorganization described in the plan which the President shall have transmitted to Congress—

> Shall take effect, in accordance with the plan, upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to the Congress, during which the Congress shall be in session without adjournment sine die, but only if during such 60-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating that the body so resolving does not favor a reorganization plan.

There is a provision with respect to the opportunity to send back a resolution referring the reorganization to the President with a request for specific changes. There is nothing obligatory upon the Congress; but if during the 60-day period either House of the Congress shall adopt a resolution referring the reorganization plan back to the President with a request for specific changes, the running of the 60-day period, to which the Senator from West Virginia has referred, shall be stayed.

We pass on, then, from the various matters of definition, and so forth, to title II. I shall not burden the Senate at this time with the contents of title II, for it is a matter of procedure with respect to the adoption of a negative resolution to the effect that either House does not favor the reorganization plan. It has to do with limitation on debate, limitation of time within which a committee may consider the resolution, and so forth.

Briefly stated, therefore, the bill means this, as I see it—and I think it not only means it as I see it, but the language of it is specifically to that effect: First, that after the President finds these various broad generalizations, or any one of them—for illustration, if he finds that the adjustments which he wishes may be necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency—he then does what? He does not present to the Congress mere recommendations, but he prepares a reorganization plan. That is step No. 1 by the President. Then what does he do? I invite attention to page 13, line 2, where it is provided that he shall transmit such plan to the Congress. That is the second step. Then, on page 14, in section 4 of the bill, it is provided that the reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect unless Congress does something; or, stated conversely, shall take effect if Congress does nothing.

So we find these three steps in the bill, with this negative provision by which Congress, after the President has prepared the plan and after he has transmitted it to the Congress, will have retained to it by the bill the power to say, "No; we will not go ahead." Either House of Congress can disapprove it; but the bill provides that if Congress does nothing, the plan suggested by the President shall take effect.

Mr. President, my amendment, which has been read from the desk, is short. It is exactly the opposite of the corresponding part of the bill, insofar as constitutional grounds are concerned. My

amendment provides, not that the plan shall take effect if Congress does nothing, but that no reorganization plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving such plan—affirmative action to be required on the part of Congress, by both Houses of Congress, if you please, before the reorganization plan shall take effect, and also requiring the signature of the President of the United States before the reorganization plan shall take effect.

The concluding sentence of the amendment merely relates to the time when the reorganization is to take effect, and it harmonizes with subdivision (b) of section 4 of the committee amendment.

So we are confronted with the following problem at this time: The committee amendment, in other words, the bill before the Senate for consideration, provides for the creation of a law which would set aside in many instances—certainly in some instances of very great importance—laws already enacted by Congress, and it would set them aside without having Congress act or pass anything or do anything with respect to the action so setting aside the previous law. We could sit here for 60 days with our eyes closed, and sleeping—physically sleeping—after the plan came to us; for, under the provisions of the bill, the plan would become law even though not a Member of the Senate or a Member of the House of Representatives heard a solitary word or gave a single, solitary thought to a single comma, semicolon, or word in the bill. That is the provision of the bill in the particular to which I now refer.

My amendment requires the taking of affirmative action by Congress as a condition precedent to the creation of legislation. Therefore, the difference between the committee amendment and my amendment is that in the case of the committee amendment a plan prepared by the President would become law without the taking of any action by Congress, whereas under my amendment no proposal submitted by the President would become law unless and until Congress had first affirmatively resolved that it should become law.

I call attention to the fact that if my amendment is adopted it will be necessary to change the procedure specified in title II of the committee amendment. I have not read title II this afternoon, but the procedure provided in title II of the committee amendment is designed to cover the plan under which the Congress may merely prevent a Presidential proposal from becoming law, whereas my amendment, as will be observed, requires that Congress act affirmatively in order that the plan may become law. Therefore, Mr. President, it is obvious that title II of the bill itself will be inappropriate and not conducive to bringing about the desired result if my amendment is adopted. Accordingly, I have presented a procedural amendment which has been printed. In my opinion, it will cover the procedural situation in the event the amendment which is now the order of business, namely, my amendment, is adopted. It is my understanding that at this time other amendments which have been submitted by other Senators are also designed to provide proper procedure.

Mr. MURDOCK rose.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I was wondering whether the Senator would have any objection to having both of his amendments considered together. It seems to me that if his amendment to section 4 is adopted, we then would have to consider the procedural amendment which he has submitted, which the Senator says should, in that event, be enacted or adopted in place of the corresponding provision contained in the bill. Accordingly, it seems to me that, from a parliamentary standpoint, action on the bill would be expedited if the two amendments offered by the Senator were considered together.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the judgment and thought of the distinguished Senator from Utah, but in my opinion it is not advisable to confuse the two issues. There may be Senators who will favor one plan of procedure—the Ferguson-Smith plan or some other plan, the plan of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] or my plan. At this moment I am not undertaking to argue the question of their respective merits. I shall be glad to do so if and when my amendment is adopted. But to my mind it is advisable to concentrate upon the specific amendment to which I have referred, the one which contains the requirement for the taking of affirmative action by Congress before a plan shall become the law.

I have stated, Mr. President, that therefore we are not considering at all the procedural amendment which I have proposed, and I shall not discuss it at this time. We are considering solely the substantive amendment which has been read from the desk by the clerk. My amendment is based on two propositions, and they are separate and distinct. One Senator may accept one of them and another Senator may accept the other. There will be no inconsistency in doing so. But a Senator does not have to accept both of them in order to arrive at the conclusion that the amendment I have offered, which is now under consideration, should be adopted.

The first proposition I present is that section 4 (a) of the committee amendment—the one which provides that the reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect unless Congress does something; I shall call it the negative provision—is opposed to sound public policy. Mr. President, that question is not the constitutional question. I am not raising there the constitutional question, and no Member of the Senate need necessarily agree with me upon the constitutional question in order to agree with me upon the question of sound public policy. So the first of the two propositions on which I base advocacy of my amendment is that section 4 (a) of the committee amendment is opposed to sound public policy.

But I also make a second point. I make it very earnestly, and to my mind the debate on the second point revolves around a question of profound importance, not merely to other Senators and to me, not merely to the distinguished Presiding Officer who sits in the chair this afternoon, not merely to those within the sound of our voices, but to all those who shall follow after us in the United States of America. The second proposition I make is that section 4 (a) of the committee amendment violates the Constitution of the United States.

So, Mr. President, I shall address myself to these two propositions: First, that section 4 (a) of the committee amendment is opposed to sound public policy, which is a distinct, separate point, and second, the proposition that section 4 (a) of the committee amendment violates the Constitution of the United States.

My proposition with respect to sound public policy might have many illustrations. I shall indicate briefly, if I can, several grounds upon which I base the point that a procedure by which a measure may become law without the taking of any action on it by Congress is opposed to sound public policy. In the first place, such procedure enables laws to be created without having any thought whatever devoted to them by Congress. As I indicated a short time ago, under such a plan Members of Congress could physically sleep for 60 days here, or for as long a term as Rip van Winkle slept, if they preferred, without taking any action and without devoting any thought to the subject matter of the reorganization plan; yet the reorganization plan which would have come from the White House would go into full force and effect, not as a regulation, but as a law of the United States of America binding on every citizen of this country—past, present, and future.

So I say that such a procedure, which would make it possible for laws to be enacted and created without having any thought whatever devoted to them by Congress, is for several very substantial reasons contrary to sound public policy. When other Members of the Senate and I were elected to this body, we came here with our constituents thinking, at any rate, that we were going to devote our thoughts, our work, our efforts, and our time to the matters of legislation or other duties which might come to us. Yet under the proposal of the committee amendment, every Member of the Senate could absent himself from the Senate for the full length of time specified, namely, 60 days, but the plan would become law, and no Member of the Senate would have devoted any of the time, thought, or consideration which his constituents expect him to devote to such measures. I say that is opposed to sound public policy.

The second reason why such procedure is opposed to sound public policy is that every exercise of such procedure is a precedent toward permitting other legislation to be created without thought or action by Congress. If we accept a reorganization plan and approve it by simply sleeping through 60 days and taking no action, it is not a very long step for someone to say, "Well, the Office of Education knows more about education than does the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Let us fix up a blanket authority

under which the Office of Education can make our laws with respect to education." Then we Members of the Senate would sit here, sound asleep—drawing our salaries, but not thinking—and such bills would become laws. It is not such a far step to say that the Department of Agriculture knows more about agriculture than does the Senator from Ohio who comes from a city in Ohio; that the Department of Agriculture knows more about a certain proposition than does the Senator from Utah; that the Department of Agriculture knows more about a certain matter than does the average Member of the Senate; and that therefore the Senate should give to the Department of Agriculture blanket authority to frame legislation on agricultural matters and send it to the Senate, and if the Senate does not see anything wrong with it, without having had the benefit of preparing and considering it, and if the Senate does nothing about it, it should become the law.

I assert that the exercise of such a procedure would be a precedent in permitting other legislation to be enacted without consideration or action by Congress, and that it would be opposed to sound public policy.

There is a third reason why the proposal is inconsistent with sound public policy. Congress would feel less responsibility if it should have merely a power, which it might or might not exercise, in disapproving a measure which had been proposed by someone who was not a Member of the Congress, and which would go into effect in the absence of congressional action, than would be the case if Congress were compelled to find affirmatively that the measure was a desirable and proper one. I suppose that any distinguished Senator from any one of the 48 States who knew that someone not a Member of Congress had prepared a measure and was sending it to Congress to be disposed of, would only look it over and ascertain if anything was wrong with it. I undertake to say that that by no means represents the responsibility which rests on the Members of this body who are required to frame legislation. If they shall be required to accept proposed legislation which has been framed by someone else, or by some bureau of the Government, I assert that the resultant depreciated feeling of responsibility on the part of Members of the Congress would be opposed to sound public policy.

Mr. President, there is a fourth reason why the suggested procedure is opposed to sound public policy. Instead of being moved by a constant realization that before a measure is enacted into law the proponents of the measure should be required to prove that it is a worthy one, that requirement would not exist so far as Congress is concerned. The Congress would be asked under the proposed procedure to rely largely on the presumption of correctness in a measure prepared by another department of Government. If we, as Senators, acting on our responsibility to determine that a bill before us is a proper one, require the proponents of the bill to prove to us that it is a proper bill for the Congress to enact, such procedure is more wholesome from the standpoint of sound public policy than is a procedure under which we would not have the obligation of convincing ourselves or our colleagues that the preponderance of affirmative proof has been furnished that the measure is a good one.

There is another reason why the legislation by inaction, so-called, is contrary to sound public policy. It tends to encourage laziness and slothfulness on the part of Members of this great legislative body. It is very obvious that if we are not required to give consideration and affirmative action to bills, human nature being what it is, laziness and slothfulness will develop over a period of years or decades in the Congress of the United States. That will be the inevitable result if others than Members of Congress are allowed to prepare proposed legislation and send it to the Congress, and we do not have to do anything at all in order that it may become law.

Closely akin to the last point is another reason why this type of so-called legislation by inaction is opposed to sound public policy. This type of procedure tends to discourage initiative on the part of Congress. Under such procedure we will be sitting here without the necessity of sharpening our wits, without the necessity of laboring on the problem, and without the necessity of doing anything except to sit. In fact, if this bill were to be enacted, we would not even have to sit here, for we could go home and proposed legislation could still become law. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] could return to Michigan, and I could return to my home in Missouri. Every Member of this Senate could lock the doors of his office and go home, and the bill would become a law. I assert that such a procedure would tend to discourage initiative on the part of Members of Congress.

The final reason which I present with respect to why this type of procedure, this so-called legislation by inaction, is opposed to sound public policy is that it strongly tends toward a surrender to the Executive of the thinking of Members of Congress with regard to legislative measures, and would make of Congress a mere rubber stamp. In recent years we have heard much about the assumption of authority by the executive department over the Legislature. I assert that that tendency has not been confined to recent years. In a book on the Constitution of the United States, the author of which is Hon. James M. Beck, former Solicitor General of the United States, I find the following sentence which was written possibly as early as 1924 and published in 1933. I am not certain as to the year in which he wrote it, but it reads as follows:

> The system of governmental checks and balances has been destroyed by the persistent subordination in the practical workings of the Legislature to the Executive.

Mr. President, back in 1939 there came before the Congress a reorganization bill which was subsequently enacted. I read only a few sentences from the report of the Special Committee to Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government, submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I may say that the House of Representatives provided for a type of so-called negative legislation under which a proposed reorganization plan would have gone into effect unless Congress had provided otherwise. Legislation would have taken effect without Congress doing anything. Here is what the Senate committee said on page 4 of its report:

> The House bill provides a negative, unorthodox, and unprecedented procedure with drastic regulation of debate. Under the terms of the House bill a reorganization plan submitted by the President becomes operative if Congress does not act.

The Senate committee bill proposed an affirmative plan whereby Congress or the House of Representatives—I am not sure which, but at any rate an affirmative plan under which congressional action should be taken. The report presented by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] said in part as follows:

> Under the Senate committee bill, a reorganization plan becomes operative upon affirmative action by the Congress and it is required that such action must be taken by a vote in the respective Houses not later than 20 days after submission of a joint resolution for approval of the plan, thus preventing defeat of the proposal by dilatory tactics either in committe or on the floor of either House.

The point I wish to make is that the Senator from Virginia said that the House bill which presented the negative plan, provided a negative, unorthodox and unprecedented procedure with drastic regulation of debate.

I read further from the same report:

> Under the House proposal, these recommendations might become effective without as much as a vote in Congress.

I pause to invite attention to the fact that that language expresses exactly the situation which confronts us today, in the month of November 1945.

I repeat:

> Under the House proposal, these recommendations might become effective without as much as a vote in Congress.

I also invite attention to the further language of the distinguished Senator from Virginia as contained in the report:

> Functions of Government are the policies of Government adopted by Congress. Without making an issue as to the propriety of abolition or amendment of functions of Government in this manner, it is obvious that the importance of such a delegation of authority to the President is so important that Congress should at least act affirmatively and directly, as contrasted with the negative procedure and drastic debate limitations set forth in the House bill.

It is true that the Senate and the House reached an agreement on the Reorganization Act of 1939 which was not in accord with this statement of the Senate committee on the problem.

I also invite attention to the further language found on page 5 of the committee report:

> The Senate committee submits that as a fundamental principle of Government—

And I call attention specifically to this language—

> Congress should retain the right of direct and affirmative vote upon changes of functions or policies of Government and other vast potential powers which may in effect

be exercised by the Executive under this proposed legislation.

That was the opinion of a committee of the Senate on a reorganization bill passed by the House, embodying this negative plan of legislation, so-called, only 6 years ago, and presented by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who occupies his seat in the Senate with such distinction.

So, Mr. President, for the reasons which I have indicated, I maintain that the proposed committee amendment, that is to say, the bill which is presented here by the distinguished Senator from Utah, is opposed to sound public policy.

Then I proceed to the second point, namely, that section 4 (a) of the committee amendment, that is, the one which refers to the inaction, to a bill becoming law without action, violates the Constitution of the United States. To my mind there is no impropriety in quoting the Constitution of the United States, which we all swore to support when we took our oaths. The pending bill violates the Constitution of the United States because it constitutes a delegation of legislative power to the President.

I call attention to what some Senators who were present a few days ago heard, but I repeat it at this time in order that those who were not present may have their attention called to it. I refer to the report on the pending bill by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, composed of distinguished lawyers. I think every member of the committee is a lawyer, a man of ability and distinction. This is what the Committee on the Judiciary, in its report on this very bill, Senate bill 1120, has to say upon the question of delegation of legislative power. On page 3 of the report it is said:

> In an effort to achieve the practical objectives of reorganization of the executive branch, this bill provides that part of the legislative power of the Congress shall be delegated to the President, and that the action of the President—

Listen to this—

> taken in the exercise of the legislative power so delegated, shall be the law of the land unless it be set aside by a resolution passed by a majority vote of either House.

Then, continuing, the report of the Judiciary Committee says:

> Such a delegation of legislative power does not operate to deprive either House of the Congress of its constitutional right to have no change made in the law relating to organization of the Government without the assent of at least a majority of its members present and voting.

I pass to the next sentence:

> Under this bill either House of the Congress, upon seeing precisely how the President proposes to exercise the general power delegated to him by this bill, will have, in effect, its own independent right to veto the Presidential action; and thus to retain the essential authority vested in it by the Constitution.

Then on the next page the report says:

> It seems apparent that the President will make large use of the Bureau of the Budget in exercising the legislative power respecting reorganization which this bill delegates to him. The bill, therefore, contemplates the use of trained and experienced administrators in drafting the proposals for change.

Then finally, in the very next sentence:

> In delegating certain legislative power to the President, this bill exempts from the exercise of such power the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General and certain independent regulatory agencies.

So, Mr. President, the committee itself time and time again, not by inadvertence, but intentionally, refers to the fact that the bill does constitute a delegation of legislative power to the President.

The bill itself proves that the committee was right in the statement. It shows the three steps I have indicated, first, that the President prepares the plan; second, the President transmits the plan; and, third, that the plan takes effect if nothing is done by Congress or one of its two Houses. In other words, the President will have legislated, and the committee recognizes that fact time and time again by pointing out that a legislative power is delegated by the bill to the President.

The distinguished Senator from Utah so courteously and clearly presented the other afternoon his views upon this question of legislative power that I am sure we all appreciated the very fine quality of his discussion. He argued, in substance, that the power which the President will exercise in this matter is not legislative power, that no legislative power is delegated to him. I am sure it was an embarrassment to the Senator from Utah, or at least some disability to him, that the committee for which he spoke and of which he is a distinguished member has itself time and time again, as I have indicated, called what is proposed to be done a delegation of legislative power.

The Senator from Utah contends that the bill sets forth standards for the action of the President, and that in carrying out the provisions of the bill he is therefore employing executive and not legislative power. I shall try to be as brief as I can with respect to this subject matter of standards. We all recognize, of course, that, as the Supreme Court has said in decisions, one of which I have here, it is entirely possible for Congress to delegate the performance of certain ministerial acts to other persons, provided standards are laid down. So far as I am aware, however, nowhere does the Supreme Court say, as does the Committee on the Judiciary, that legislative power can be validly delegated to anybody by Congress.

What are the standards which are set up? There are standards in the Interstate Commerce Act, there are standards in the Radio Commission Act, there are standards in the Tariff Commission Act, it is true, which have to do with matters of fact-finding, rules laid down to be followed by these respective bureaus or commissions, as the case may be. But what are the standards set up by the pending bill which must govern the President?

I shall not read all the provisions again, but Senators will remember that in order that he may prepare and transmit to Congress a plan of reorganization, under the bill, it is only necessary for him to find that the transfer or consolidation "is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a)."

That and the other provisions which I have read this afternoon are couched in the broadest possible language, with no definition, nothing concrete, nothing specific. They are indefinite. He need find, not all seven of them, but only one of them. If he finds that the reorganization will "facilitate orderly transition from war to peace," or if he finds that the adjustment may be necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency, he is entitled to transmit the reorganization plan to Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under that language, could the President's action ever be questioned as to why he transmitted a particular plan?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not know whether it could be questioned or not, so far as the reason is concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator thinks the standards are clear enough to indicate what he should or should not have in mind?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not; I do not think the standards are clear enough or definite enough. I shall not burden the Senate this afternoon with reading the Schechter case, to which I referred in my previous remarks, and which to my mind is so closely in line with the case now before the Senate. The Schechter case is reported in Two Hundred and Ninety-five, United States Reports, at page 495, where the Court passed on the act which Congress enacted in the attempt to prescribe some type of standard, certain provisions, namely, that the associations or groups which apply for a trade code impose no inequitable restrictions; second, that the code is not designed to promote monopolies, and third, that the code will tend to effectuate the policy of title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act.

We find in title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act language of the same general quality of indefiniteness that we find in the reorganization bill now before us. I now quote from the decision of the Supreme Court, which in turn was quoting from the act itself:

> It is there declared to be "the policy of Congress"—
>
> To remove obstructions to the free flow of interstate and foreign commerce which tend to diminish the amount thereof; and to provide for the general welfare by promoting the organization of industry for the purpose of cooperative action among trade groups, to induce and maintain united action of labor and management under adequate governmental sanctions and supervision, to eliminate unfair competitive practices, to promote the fullest possible utilization of the present productive capacity of industries, to avoid undue restriction of production (except as may be temporarily required), to increase the consumption of industrial and agricultural products by increasing the purchasing power, to reduce and relieve unemployment, to improve standards of labor, and otherwise to rehabilitate industry and to conserve natural resources.

Mr. President, I submit, as I have indicated, that in point of indefiniteness the Schechter case illustration is very close indeed to the case of the pending reorganization measure. What did the Court say, as I quoted the other day? It spoke about the delegation that was attempted to be made, I believe, to trade or industrial association. The Court said:

> Such a delegation of legislative power is unknown to our law and is utterly inconsistent with the constitutional prerogatives and duties of Congress.

It said also in the sentence just before that:

> Could an effort of that sort be made valid by such a preface of generalties as to permissible aims as we find in section 1 or title I?

Then the Court said:

> The answer is obvious. Such a delegation of legislative power is unknown to our law and is utterly inconsistent with the constitutional prerogatives and duties of Congress.

The device was also used in the situation which brought on the Schechter case, that is to say was used by Congress of requiring the President to make certain findings. That is the plan set forth in this reorganization bill. He must find that these things will produce efficiency and economy and so forth, as I have indicated.

I call the attention of the Senate to the language of the Supreme Court in the Schechter case, page 538, which is applicable to the case now before us today. This is what the Court said:

> While this is called a finding, it is really but a statement of an opinion as to the general effect upon the promotion of trade or industry of a scheme of laws. These are the only findings which Congress has made essential in order to put into operation a legislative code having the aims described in the declaration of policy.

As Senators will remember, the Supreme Court of the United States in the Schechter case determined that the law was unconstitutional and void because of the delegation of legislative power to the President. I say that a delegation of legislative power is always void. There is no possible validity for delegation of legislative power. The case which I mentioned the other day of *O'Neal* v. *United States* (140 Fed. (2d), p. 912), says:

> In carrying out the constitutional division of the powers, it is a breach of the fundamental law for Congress to transfer its legislative power to the President.

It has no power to do it. And in the Panama case, to which reference was made both by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and myself, Two Hundred and Ninety-three United States Reports, this language, which I must again call to the Senate's attention, by Chief Justice Hughes, was used:

> The Constitution provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.
>
> Quoting article I, section 1, of the Constitution:
>
> And the Congress is empowered "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" its general powers.

Then the Court continues:

> The Congress manifestly is not permitted to abdicate, or to transfer to others, the essential legislative functions with which it is thus vested. Undoubtedly legislation must often be adapted to complex conditions involving a host of details with which the National Legislature cannot deal directly. The Constitution has never been regarded as denying to the Congress the necessary resources of flexibility and practicality, which will enable it to perform its function in laying down policies and establishing standards, while leaving to selected instrumentalities the making of subordinate rules, within prescribed limits and the determination of facts to which the policy as declared by the legislature is to apply. Without capacity to give authorizations of that sort we should have the anomaly of a legislative power which in many circumstances calling for its exertion would be but a futility. But the constant recognition of the necessity and validity of such provisions, and the wide range of administrative authority which has been developed by means of them, cannot be allowed to obscure the limitations of the authority to delegate, if our constitutional system is to be maintained.

So, Mr. President, this measure is invalid. It clearly violates the Constitution of the United States. It violates it on the basis of the very language used by the Committee on the Judiciary itself, in its report wherein time after time and sentence after sentence the committee itself has said that what is done is to delegate legislative power.

I referred the other day, and I shall not go into detail respecting it, to the fact that the report of the committee at page 3 argued that the delegation by the bill of legislative power "does not operate to deprive either House of its constitutional right to have no change made in the law without the assent of at least a majority of its Members present and voting." I pointed out then and I point out again that this statement of the committee is not correct, for instead of requiring a majority to approve the change, the bill requires a majority to disapprove the change, that is to say unless a majority favor disapproving the change, the change is agreed to and approved. In other words a change takes place without the requirement that a majority favor it.

So, Mr. President, I submit that this measure, delegating as it does, legislative power, as was conceded by the committee time after time, is unconstitutional and void as violative of section 1 of the Constitution which reads:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I do not regard this question of constitutional law as one of minor importance. To my mind we are here confronted with something of major importance. We have heard on all sides and have for years of the assumption of authority by the Executive, of the Executive reaching out and grasping for authority. Yet if we pass this bill we will ourselves be giving the authority to the Executive. We will be undertaking to pass it out of our hands. The criticism of the public may properly be directed not solely to the Executive for suggesting it, but the censure of the public may properly and should properly be placed upon the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States for voluntarily undertaking to abdicate not merely the legislative power which is vested in them but a duty and a responsibility.

I observe in the book The Constitution of the United States by James M. Beck a quotation from a man—I am referring to Montesquieu, the great French philosophical historian—who is thus characterized by an encyclopedia which I hold in my hands:

> Of all the early writers on the science of comparative politics and history he easily stands first on account of the actual excellence of the work done, the originality of thought which he constantly displays and the deep and lasting influency he had upon the thought of his own day and upon succeeding generations.

This is what Montesquieu said:

> When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the same monarch or Senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner.

Senators, we are confronted with a grave question. I am sorry the Senate is not crowded this afternoon with Members of this great body. For us to do this afternoon or tomorrow or at any other time voluntarily what the committee itself referred to as a negative, unorthodox and unprecedented procedure, would to my mind constitute a gross violation of our duty as Members of the Senate, because, Mr. President, you and I, each of us has taken upon himself a solemn obligation to support the Constitution of the United States.

I shall not again read from the committee report. I have cited it again and again to show that these distinguished men, members of the committee, lawyers every one of them, have conceded time and time again by their own language that the bill provides that a part of the legislative power of Congress shall be delegated to the President. By that very statement the committee itself concedes the legal proposition that the bill is unconstitutional, null and void.

In conclusion, I summarize the two grounds upon which I propose this amendment, which requires, very simply, that no reorganization plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving such plan. Someone may say, "It is not practicable to do that. We cannot get a resolution through if we are to carry out the reorganization in that way." In the first place, let me say that I do not know of any attempt which Congress has made thus far to carry it out in that way. To my mind it is entirely possible that the power vested in Congress can be effectively exercised in the reorganization of our Government. If we are able to pass bills creating various bureaus and commissions; if we were able to give authority to the President under the War Powers Act, not to legislate, but to establish various bureaus, certainly we ought to be able to undo what we have done, or to

change it. I am not convinced that we are impotent to act in the premises.

Let me read again two sentences. I think there are good reasons for repeating them:

> If, in the opinon of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular, wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance, in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can, at any time, yield.

Those are the words of George Washington in his Farewell Address. Let there be no change by usurpation. As I indicated the other day, he might well have said, Let there be no change by voluntary abdication of the powers, duties, and responsibilities of Congress. We cannot do it legally.

A few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] asked me, in substance, whether or not the constitutionality of this bill could be questioned. I said I did not know. I said so having in mind the fact that the other day it was stated, I believe by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], that the question might arise as to whether or not the courts might hold this to be a political question, upon which the courts would not enter. I am not here this afternoon undertaking to say whether the courts would or would not make such a finding. However, I say two things: First, that with the billions of dollars of expenditure involved in the vast governmental organization, and with all sorts of contingencies arising from time to time, I see no reason in the world why, sooner or later, the question of the validity of such an act could not properly come before the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the second place, I undertake to say that even if it were impossible ever to challenge the validity of the act because it was a political act—which, incidentally, I do not think it is—that would not relieve us from our obligation under our oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I undertake to say that if we do not, if we go down the road of surrendering to the President of the United States the right to say what shall go into legislation, we shall regret it. I have no objection to the President merely preparing and submitting a plan; but I undertake to say that if we give him the right to say what shall go into legislation, submit it to Congress, and have it take effect without our even waking from our sleep, we shall be performing an act of abject abdication of the powers and duties vested in us. It is an abdication which we cannot legally make.

Answering the question of the Senator from Michigan, if the question should ever come before the courts, I am unable to prophesy, of course, what the Supreme Court of the United States might do. It would be the height of folly and impudence for me to undertake to prophesy the action of one of the other coordinate branches of our National Government. To my mind, if the Constitution means what Chief Justice Hughes said it meant in 293 United States, and again in 295 United States; if the Constitution means that legislative powers cannot be delegated, and if the five distinct statements in the committee report before us are correct in saying that this proposal involves the delegation of legislative power, I undertake to say that the Supreme Court would be fully justified in declaring such an act unconstitutional, null and void, just as it had the courage to do in the instance of the National Industrial Recovery Act in the Schechter case.

I advocate that before such a reorganization plan shall go into effect Congress shall take affirmative action. I do so on two grounds, and I shall mention them in conclusion in just a moment.

First, let me say that I am not opposed to reorganization. I think it is entirely proper that there should be reorganization of the agencies of the Government. I should like to see a proper reorganization of those agencies. I should like to see it brought about in accordance with the Constitution of the United States; but to my mind the bill is unconstitutional. Furthermore, section 4 (a) of the committee amendment is opposed to sound public policy, a point entirely separate and distinct from the constitutional point.

The first proposition is that section 4 (a) of the committee amendment violates the Constitution of the United States. In my opinion the bill should not receive the support of the Senate. As I have indicated, these grounds are separate and distinct. One man may say, "I agree that it is opposed to sound public policy." He would not necessarily have to go along with me to the next step. To my mind it is uncontrovertible and cannot be doubted that the bill is unconstitutional. In my opinion, it is appropriate for every Senator who believes that section 4 (a) of the committee amendment is opposed to sound public policy to vote for my amendment, regardless of whether he agrees with me that section 4 (a) is unconstitutional. In my opinion, under our oath of office, it is obligatory upon each of us who believes section 4 (a) to be violative of the Constitution of the United States not to vote for the committee amendment with section 4 (a) remaining in the bill.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that my amendment would make the bill constitutional.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, being a member of the Judiciary Committee, and being on the subcommittee which had the bill before it, I wish to say that I agree with much of the argument of the Senator from Missouri. In fact, I worked diligently to have the same amendment adopted in the subcommittee. It became apparent that it was impossible to obtain such an amendment. I shall vote for the pending amendment because I believe that the method of affirmative votes by both Houses is the correct method by which to legislate.

As I have stated, I voted to report the bill, not because I am in favor of the bill as it is written, but merely to get it out of the subcommittee, because I am a firm believer in reorganization. I believe that no more important question faces us than the question of reorganization of our Federal Government, cutting it down to a size which will enable it to function effectively.

I wish to explain that when I was unable to obtain the affirmative method, the next best thing in the committee was to have the bill in such shape that if one House should vote against the reorganization, the reorganization would not become law. Under the 1939 law we had the example of the House of Representatives voting overwhelmingly against allowing a reorganization bill to become law, but the Senate voted in favor of it, and it became a law by one vote.

Mr. President, that is contrary to our form of government. That is the one-house form of government which for all practical purposes exists in England.

Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind that the method now proposed by the Senator from Missouri is the correct one. For the Senate to say that reorganization cannot be obtained unless Congress abdicates its powers is not in accord with the principles of a democracy.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the method of maintaining the established form of government as proposed by the Senator from Missouri. Ours is one of the few nations on the face of the globe that require the affirmative vote of the representatives of the people before a matter may become a law of the land; and, as we know, the most sacred thing to the people of the United States is equal justice under law, not justice under Executive order.

Mr. President, I believe all of us should vote for this method. We should try it. We should enact a bill under which the President could send to Congress a reorganization proposal and then we should try out the regular method of passing legislation by affirmative vote of both Houses of the Congress of the people of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that in the year 1939, during the consideration of a reorganization bill then before the Congress, an amendment substantially the same as the amendment now submitted by the Senator from Missouri was offered. That amendment was presented by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Its provisions were exactly the same as those of the amendment now submitted by the Senator from Missouri, namely, that the reorganization plan could go into effect only if it received a majority vote of both Houses of Congress, by means of the passage of a joint resolution.

I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the debate which preceded that amendment. The debate is interesting. I also wish to call his attention to the fact that a number of Senators who are on the majority side today were also on the majority side then and voted in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Montana—notably, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from

New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. That amendment was adopted at that time by a vote of 46 to 44. Subsequently it was reconsidered. The vote for reconsideration carried by a margin of one vote. When the amendment was voted on, upon reconsideration, it was defeated by a margin of one vote. So the Senator will find that this subject has previously been discussed, and in the debate many interesting points are made. I merely wish to call his attention to the fact that the subject has previously been before the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for the information.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it is quite evident that we should not take a vote on this amendment tonight. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] wishes to offer an amendment as a substitute for it. Therefore, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

WAR DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth C. Royall, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of War.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the postmaster and Army nominations.

RECESS

Mr. MURDOCK. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, November 9, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 8 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Herbert E. Gaston of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

Robert Tenbrock Stevens, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

Chester C. Davis, of Missouri, to be a member of the Advisory Board, to represent the public, in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, vice William H. Davis.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Civil Engineer John J. Manning to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from the 1st day of December 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 8 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

WAR DEPARTMENT

Kenneth C. Royall to be Under Secretary of War.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Edward Fuller Witsell for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, as The Adjutant General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from the date immediately following that upon which the present incumbent vacates his appointment.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from October 1, 1945

Lester Atchley Sprinkle, Cavalry.
Robert Walker Grow, Cavalry.
Joseph William George Stephens, Quartermaster Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Richard Kerens Sutherland, Infantry.
Emil Watson Leard, Infantry.
Terrill Eyre Price, Cavalry.
Walter Frank Adams, Infantry.
William Henry Kasten, Finance Department.
William Alexander, Field Artillery.

To be first lieutenants

George Sterling Brown, Jr., Field Artillery.
Grant Renne, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.

Veterinary Corps

Jack Glendon Fuller to be a colonel, Veterinary Corps.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Lt. Col. Clyde Pickett to Adjutant General's Department.
Lt. Col. Christopher Columbus Strawn to Quartermaster Corps.
Maj. Lawrence Leroy Skinner to Quartermaster Corps.
Capt. Hugh Mackintosh to Quartermaster Corps.
Capt. Victor James MacLaughlin to Quartermaster Corps.
Capt. Joseph Reisner Ranck to Quartermaster Corps.
Lt. Col. Robert Taylor Strode to Finance Department.
Capt. Gardner Wellington Porter to Finance Department.
First Lt. Richard Giles Stilwell to Infantry.
Second Lt. Edward Johnson Dravo to Infantry.
Second Lt. John Edwin Murphy to Air Corps.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Harold Napoleon Gilbert
Edward White Smith
Thomas Francis Farrell

To be brigadier generals

Dominic Joseph Sabini
Kenneth Shearer Sweany
William Washington Vaughan
Clifford Cameron Nutt
James Brian Edmunds
Norman Everard Hendrickson
Glen Clovis McBride
Robert Cutler
Ken Reed Dyke
Henry Parkman, Jr.
Erik Henning Nelson

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Agnes M. Mairose, Adelanto.
Elnora R. Martin, Alcatraz.
Harry O. Comstock, Brockway.
Zetta I. Leinberger, Broderick.
Don O. Rice, Bryn Mawr.
Elizabeth L. Clary, Coachella.
Marjorie E. Stover, Crannell.
Roy W. Mitchell, Cutten.
Myrtle A. Garaventa, Davenport.
Enoch B. Quinn, Dutch Flat.
Alice R. Scheiber, El Dorado.
Eva L. Thompson, Fawnskin.
Bernyce M. Spencer, Fetters Hot Springs.
George O. Athey, Forestville.
Gladys I. Leidy, Hammonton.
Frieda C. Albiez, Hayfork.
Van R. Majors, Heber.
Mildred Chapman, Keddie.
Laleah M. Hinson, Keyes.
Marjorie M. Morrison, Korbel.
Margaret E. Marlatt, La Vina.
Mary A. Wallace, Littlerock.
Pauline E. Stambaugh, Locke.
Flora Ann Clark, Lucerne Valley.
Grace V. Telleson, Miramar.
Albert R. White, Monolith.
Thomas Sawkins, Montague.
Albert A. McKenzie, Monticello.
Hazel M. Robinson, Oro Grande.
Blanche D. Schlegel, Pine Valley.
La Verne Friberg, Richvale.
Myrtle H. Williams, Rockport.
Robert Le Beuf, Rodeo.
Dorothy M. Durham, Ryde.
Rosabelle A. Hill, Samoa.
Marian E. Sager, San Luis Rey.
George E. Guenther, Shafter.

Clarence L. Scheiber, Shingle.
Oliver W. Holland, Terra Bella.
Moses R. Saunders, Trinidad.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mary J. Charron, Hebronville.

UTAH

Stella M. Peterson, Redmond.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 8 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Elsie W. Kibby to be postmaster at Bradley in the State of Michigan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Calmly our souls look up to Thee, O God, and pray that Thou wouldst reveal unto us riches unseen. The wealth of character does not consist of the things we possess, but, rather, in the motives that sway our actions and the ideals toward which we press. Thou who art the deliverer of the captive and the comforter of those who mourn, enter Thou into the chambers of all hearts and whisper, "Peace be unto you."

Thou whose mercies are boundless, who art the fountain of all truth and the wellspring of power, we pray, not that our tasks be lessened but that our shoulders be strengthened. When we are called to carry heavy burdens or follow a path of monotonous routine, grant that we may not miss the way nor hesitate to serve. Touch the desires behind our thoughts, the inclinations behind our resolutions, for out of these spring the issues of life.

We invoke Thy blessing upon our land and our people; keep us free from a blundering contentment and cold indifference. Live in us, speak through us, and secure us against the failures of yesterday and the fears of tomorrow. In the holy name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 16, 1945:

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth C. Stone;

H. R. 476. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y," approved June 14, 1933, as amended;

H. R. 656. An act to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class post offices in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan;

H. R. 1565. An act for the relief of Inglis Construction Co., a corporation;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Michael C. Donatell;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ora R. Hutchinson;

H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil, and others;

H. R. 1958. An act for the relief of L. A Williams;

H. R. 2317. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia M. Kiser;

H. R. 3081. An act for the relief of August Svelund;

H. R. 3150. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1939;

H. R. 3373. An act authorizing the reconstruction of the Spring Common Bridge on Mahoning Avenue across the Mahoning River in the municipality of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; and

H. R. 3871. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas.

On October 18, 1945:

H. R. 1765. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the agricultural byproducts laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts.

On October 23, 1945:

H. R. 2690. An act to amend the Bonneville Project Act.

On October 26, 1945:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended.

On October 29, 1945:

H. R. 1465. An act for the relief of the State of California;

H. R. 2668. An act to transfer Ben Hill County, Ga., from the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia to the Americus division of the middle judicial district of Georgia;

H. R. 239. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark;

H. R. 240. An act for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks;

H. R. 390. An act to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924;

H. R. 1104. An act to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; and

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis.

On October 31, 1945:

H. R. 1563. An act for the relief of N. Owen Oxley and the legal guardian of Lamar Oxley, a minor; and

H. R. 3220. An act to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes.

On November 6, 1945:

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

H. R. 3281. An act to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States district court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June;

H. R. 1560. An act for the relief of J. B. Grigsby; and

H. R. 3870. An act to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the "Harry L. Englebright Dam."

On November 7, 1945:

H. R. 4083. An act authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution providing for the enrollment of the bill (S. 1199) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 940. An act to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1036) entitled "An act to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. HART to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee of the House:

NOVEMBER 6, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority, which committee was established by House Resolution No. 102 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by the passage of House Resolution 83 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. It is only the extreme pressure of work that causes me to take this step in resigning from this committee.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 83 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may put it in the body of the RECORD if he wishes today inasmuch as we have no program; he may extend them at this point if he desires.

Mr. RILEY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include a speech made by Rear Adm. Norman M. Smith, president of the University of South Carolina. I am afraid this may exceed by a few hundred words the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I beg to insert the following address of Rear Adm. Norman M. Smith, president, University of South Carolina, on universal military training, which I believe will be of interest to the readers of the RECORD:

TALK BEFORE MEETING OF CLERGYMEN AT FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, COLUMBIA, S. C., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1945

This is my first appearance before a gathering of first-line orators. It took me 2 days to get up enough courage to accept your invitation, so kindly bear with me—an amateur in the speaker's field—while I give you some facts and try to tell you why a peacetime universal military training program is essential to the future welfare of our country and why such a program should be authorized now.

After a lifetime spent on my country's business, I believe I have some light on this important issue and that it is my duty to pass it on to men like you who are outstanding in your community—men who reach and influence for good so many of our citizens.

The clergy are our most peace-loving citizens, yet that does not mean that they are pacifists or isolationists or conscientious objectors. They hate war. All the more reason for preventing it. Yet, as a matter of fact, they do not hate war any more than members of the armed forces.

My friends among the clergy love their country just as fervently and would come to its defense as quickly as any other citizen for they wish to maintain its religious freedom and other democratic ideals.

As President Roosevelt so aptly expressed it, "religion is the foundation of democracy." Long has it been the custom of those desiring victory to have prayer and ask for divine guidance before going into battle. Take our own history. You well know that whenever our fighting man has gone into battle he has had the spiritual guidance and moral influence of the clergy and religion. The clergyman has played an important role in all of our battles, beginning with our first skirmish of the Revolution at Westminster, Vt., on March 13, 1775, quickly followed at Concord and Lexington April 19, 1775, Ticonderoga May 10, 1775, Bunker Hill June 17, 1775. As a result, on July 29, 1775, Congress made its first official recognition of the Army's Chaplain Corps. That corps had its one hundred and seventieth anniversary last July.

From a small beginning the Chaplain Corps, both Army and Navy, has increased its personnel and scope of duties with other branches of the armed services. They have rendered outstanding service and produced heroes in all of our wars.

Here are some statistics on our Second World War:

Today the Army has approximately 8,000 chaplains, two-thirds of whom are overseas; the Navy has about 2,600, most of whom have been at sea. Practically all of these have finished the chaplains' schools. In fact, by the end of 1944 about 6,000 of the Army chaplains had attended the school. They require training the same as others in the various branches of the service, in order to promote the well-being and security of the chaplain himself. Instruction and practice in defense against chemical warfare, first aid, sanitation, and personal security prepare him to guard against dangers of camp and battlefield and to take simple measures that may save his and other lives on the battle front.

For this war, the records show that in the Army up to July 1, 1945, religious services have been held 172,739 times. The attendance was 12,682,000.

Communion and sacramental occasions, 110,100. Participants on these occasions, 1,997,800.

Guardhouse and hospital visits, 120,700.

Pastoral functional occasions, 1,091,000.

Pastoral contacts—persons reached, 8,061,000.

Civilian functional occasions, 35,000. Persons contacted, 2,844,000.

The chaplains for the Army have been chosen from more than 30 different denominations. While there are more Protestants than Catholics, there are more Roman Catholics than any other denomination. The Baptists and Methodists run a close second.

Casualties for the Army

Battle deaths	54
Nonbattle deaths	53
Declared deaths	1
Died in enemy's hands	3
Missing in action	3
Wounded in action	194
Held by the enemy	30
Repatriated	16

Casualties for the Navy

Killed in action	12
Killed in accidents	6
Missing in action	2
Wounded	28
Held by enemy	1

Eight hundred and seventeen Army chaplains have received 1,116 decorations, which include the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Silver Star, Silver Star Oak Leaf, Air Medal, Purple Heart, Purple Heart Oak Leaf, Soldier's Medal, Bronze Star Oak Leaf.

I have no record of the decorations won by chaplains of the Navy.

It might be interesting to know that the Baptists have more than their share of wounded in the Navy, but there has been no Baptist Navy chaplain killed.

It may surprise many of you to learn that in the Army the chaplains have won more distinctions in proportion to their numbers than any combat unit, including the Air Force.

I would like you to know that in a watertight compartment of each lifeboat and life raft are testaments and specially prepared religious booklets.

Of course, you are familiar with famous exhortations from chaplains. For example: "Put you faith in God and keep your powder dry"; "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition."

Pages of current publications are telling stories of thousands of incidents of heroism. None are more thrilling than that of the four chaplains—two Protestant, one Catholic, and one Jewish on board a transport, who gave their life belts to four men without them. The official Army record begins: "Greater love hath no man" and reads: with utter disregard to self, having given away their life jackets, to four men without them, they stood hand in hand, praying to the God they served for the safety of those men who were leaving the stricken ship on all sides of them. This is the picture engraven on our minds and hearts as the ship disappeared beneath the waves.

So today, as always, in the same spirit of consecration and with the same intimate association, clergymen carry their spiritual offices and ministrations to the men of the armed services.

Last week the papers were filled with reports of the investigations held to fix the responsibility for the crushing blow at Pearl Harbor. An accusing finger was pointed at several. But President Truman went direct to the root of the question and placed the blame exactly where it belonged when he said that "the people of the United States are responsible." Certain Congressmen winced. But you and I know, had we been prepared, there would have been no Pearl Harbor.

The principal preparedness program that has always been sidetracked is universal military training. With it, we know that our great tragedies would not have occurred. We have tried all kinds of panaceas. Why not try something real?

Remember, any law can be repealed—even the Volstead Act.

So I am anxious to bring to you a message. This is a plea for your understanding and cooperation that you might help to secure a program—a program, which, more than any other, would help to maintain world peace.

A universal military training program.

We wish to remain at peace with the other nations of the world.

We wish never again to send forth our youth to war.

We wish to preserve our way of life.

In that, we are all in agreement.

How are we going to accomplish this?

After Gen. George Washington, who for 11 years commanded our armies in the field, became President, he endeavored to secure universal military training.

He said: "It should be laid down as a primary position and basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a portion of his property, but even his personal service, for the defense of it. * * * A plan for training would make us formidable to those who would otherwise become our enemies."

He was anxious for the Federal Government to establish a training program and that it be undertaken in each State.

Thomas Jefferson was for a military training program.

It is such a simple, direct way to meet the problem.

Yet the idea of Washington and other early leaders was not accepted.

I believe the idea was not accepted then because so many of our early settlers came to this country to escape conscription—to escape being forced into an army during the primitive wars of conquest which many of the feudal barons and princes were continually carrying on.

I think that this early prejudice has been handed down, until it has become a fetish with many.

So Washington's plan was rejected.

Jefferson had no better success, but in hopes of avoiding war he placed an embargo on shipping. A financial panic followed and our vessels rotted at their moorings.

Each generation has had one or more wars.

And still we hesitate.

Came World War I.

Which we fought to banish wars from the face of the earth.

In 1919 our armed forces, the American Legion, and other patriotic organizations came out strong for a universal military training program.

But, instead, we refused to back with force or even to become a member of the League of Nations.

Our battleships were cut up and sold for junk; our armed forces reduced to a shadow.

Time and again during the intervening years—between World War I and II—pleas have been made for a military training program, only to be turned down because of vociferous minorities. Congress will respond to loud public demand.

Fortunately for us, during the horse and buggy days, we have had friendly nations on our borders and a wide expanse of ocean on our shores. Our allies have been able to hold the enemy until we were partially prepared.

For lack of proper training our great wars have been fought mainly by civilian armies. The hasty and frantic preparation, with its needless waste and sacrifice, has added to the frightful cost in property and lives.

Future generations will not grieve for the loss of our loved ones, but they will continue to bear the frightful costs of avoidable wars.

Lack of preparedness were simple invitations for Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, and their followers to let loose their trained hordes, armed for aggressive conquest.

In the words of St. Luke: "A strong man armed keepeth his castle, his goods are at peace."

So, we lock our barn; we put our money in vaults; we employ fire departments, patrolmen, watchmen, and constables to secure adequate protection against local thugs and criminals. We take out fire, endowment, and life insurance.

Yet, we, the richest and most powerful country in the world, fail to provide adequate protection from international gangsters. For where your treasury is, there will your heart be also. For me, it's my country.

Many of us remember well how we protested the Jap encroachment in Manchuria, and when, with the League of Nations we protested against the Italian invasion of Ethiopia.

No heed was given to our protest.

High sounding words unbacked by preparedness were entirely ignored. And so in the late thirties the Jap deliberately dropped bombs on our warship *Panay* in Chinese waters and strafed our men as they ran for shelter.

We hung our head with shame that we could not demand respect for our flag.

Primitive warfare is a thing of the past. Now it is a rapid mechanical operation, where distances are fast disappearing.

Training is more necessary now than ever that our youth may learn to use the modern implements of war—gas masks, tanks, television, automatic firing, flame throwers, radar, submarines, aircraft, amphibious vehicles, high explosives, mines, grenades, bazookas, rockets, war vessels, and atomic bombs.

Thousands of men have been sent to their death in battle without knowing their weapons and without proper training to fight or even protect themselves against the trained enemy.

To me, one of life's paradoxes is:

If we want to build a bridge we employ an engineer.

To make our will we ask advice of a lawyer.

When we are sick we send for a doctor.

In fact, whenever there is much at stake in our personal affairs we seek, take, and pay for advice from an expert in each particular field.

But when we come to a problem which involves the very life of our Nation, many of our intelligentsia send out questionnaires or take polls among all hands and record the votes and answers of even the most ignorant and present a finding to a public-minded Congress.

Why, it is worse than visiting the Witch of Endor.

I find, though, that it is the opposition to our experts who put out the questionnaires. Sometimes they are sent out by the most reputable organizations. But it seems to me that those who prepare the questions are either ignorant on the subject or deliberately prepare questions in such a fashion that the answers may be interpreted as they wish.

We have experts in high places in our government. They are responsible citizens whose interests are our interests. Their advice should be taken, and their action should be supported.

Representative ANDREW MAY, of Kentucky, and Senator CHAN GURNEY, of South Dakota, introduced the Gurney-May bill in the last session of Congress. The bill is still under consideration.

It provides for military or naval training for all able-bodied male citizens who attain the age of 18 years, by which, and I quote, "the reservoir of trained manpower built up at such enormous expense during the present war would not be permitted to grow empty again as after World War I, but should be perpetuated for the peace and security of future generations."

Such a training system should be inaugurated as soon as practicable after the cessation of hostilities in order to utilize material resources and training experience which will otherwise be lost.

I will not attempt to quote the bill, which is quite long and goes into considerable detail to amply care for its operation and to protect the interests of our youth. I will tell you in general some of its resulting benefits and how it will work.

First, I would like to say that the proposed universal military training is in no respect similar to the European system of compulsory military service and an immense standing army. Most of the nations of that continent and South America require from 1 to 4 years of compulsory service with their regular Army or Navy. After this service, they are subject annually to further compulsory training and to the call of the Minister of War of each nation.

Our prime purpose for universal military training is to establish a national policy for world security and national defense, to which all would contribute. To exempt any group would cause the program to break down.

The only alternate course is a large standing Army and Navy. This is not in accord with our democratic life. It would be too expensive and impractical to maintain with only volunteers.

In addition to attaining our prime object of world and national security, there are many benefits that would be gained by the Nation and by the trainees.

The youth of today have, if anything, too much idleness, too much freedom. The war effort has removed restrictions and directive help for many, and materially reduced it for all. A universal training program would provide needed discipline and encourage perseverance, develop habits of promptness, precision, democracy, fellowship, honesty, loyalty, good sportsmanship, teamwork, morale, love of country and determination to keep it free.

Many go through life unhappy and dissatisfied with their chosen and, for them, unsuited profession. Much of this unhappiness could have been avoided if they had had a year's training experience and the opportunity it afforded for the trainee to choose his course of study or future from his enlarged horizon.

The objection raised by many educators is that there will be a year wasted to those who wish to go to college and a corresponding delay in entering their chosen profession, claiming that they may forget how to study and find it harder to take up where they left off.

Even if it were a slight handicap to some, it would affect all hands and would be a trifle as compared with the loss of our national security and civilization.

Many of our most successful men in all professions have had interruptions in their education in order to work and earn money to carry on.

In fact, I think you would find that a larger percentage of those who had to work their way through college with interruptions have been successful than those who didn't.

A year of universal training is a liberal education in itself, where one may gain knowledge in navigation, accounting, ministry, supply, medicine, or in some of the many engineering fields.

In fact, the best thing that ever happened to me was my failure to pass the first entrance exams to the Naval Academy, which kept me out of college 1 year and delayed my entrance to Annapolis for 2 years.

The program will take thousands of boys off the street during the let-down after the war and from the ranks of unemployed.

They will get sunshine, fresh air and healthy development, with proper instructions as to how to maintain a healthy body.

Each year many thousands of requests are sent out asking for charity that a poor boy or girl may have a few weeks' sunshine.

I have some interesting Army statistics. I will mention a few.

In February 1943, 4 percent of those examined had tuberculosis. Many of those rejected did not even know they had it.

In 1943, of the selectees examined, 19.5 percent had eye trouble.

For the first 1½ years the Army inducted, treated, and cured about 125,000 individuals with highly contagious diseases.

Since January 1942 the Army has provided approximately 3,500,000 pairs of needed spectacles.

In the first 2½ years, with approximately 9,100,000 recruits, the Army has furnished 10,272,000 extractions, 39,403,000 fillings, and 1,396,000 dentures. A large percentage of these would never have been taken care of except that they were in the Army.

Now as to training approximately 1,000,000 young men, above 18, each year would receive training in the branch of service they select.

Those finishing high school before 18 may, on parents' approval, enter training as early as 17.

The Army and Navy have learned from actual training experience with a million young men since 1940 how best the training can be accomplished to the best interest of the Nation and the young men.

After 1 year of training, the men will go into the Army Reserve or Navy Reserve for 5 years.

Training will be conducted by Regular service officers and Volunteer Reserve officers.

This is purely a 1-year training program and no trainee or reservist could be sent out of the country except in time of war, nor could they be recalled for further training except by an additional act of Congress.

The beauty of this program is that in case of war, there will always be a large number of men in training or recently finished training and many who need only a short refresher course and international bandits will know that a strong man is armed.

In regard to training for the Navy:

It is impracticable to give any training of value unless the training period is for one

continuous year. It is designed to prepare the individual to be a specialist and a part of the entire naval force. He must learn to function as a part of the ship's crew. To illustrate, a messboy may also be used as an ammunition passer or a member of a gun crew.

Which brings to mind a story which Captain Simmons of Charleston tells.

He was in command of a cruiser at Pearl Harbor when the Japs struck. In the early morning hours, in pajamas, he rushed to the bridge. Presently he sent a messenger to tell his mess attendant to bring him his raincoat. The Filipino boy sent word back:

"Tell Captain I too damn busy."

He was a member of a gun crew busily firing at the Jap planes.

The Navy training is intensive and thorough. Mechanical, electrical, and other technical tasks are intricate and cannot be taught in short, interrupted periods.

For 3 months the recruit will be sent to the Navy training station nearest his home, for his boot or basic training.

Finishing his apprentice seaman course, he is assigned for 3 months on his secondary course, where he specializes in one of the many specialties required by the Navy.

Regular quotas of trainees will be assigned to each of these schools.

For the third 3 months these specialists will be on operational training as a team, similar to our present precommissioning work.

For the last 3 months they will be on board a warship, where the trainee will learn his part in a ship's crew.

This duty may be on board any character of craft—air, surface, or submarine.

The Marine Corps' first 6 months' training follows pretty closely that of the Navy. But for the last 6 months the trainee enters as a part of the regular Marine force, to become proficient in his specialty, either for air, ship, or shore duty.

The Army recruit will receive training in all the various functions of an Army in combat. This includes basic, specialized, and advanced training.

The basic training in all the programs will first include mental and medical examinations, screening to ascertain the capabilities and preferences of each individual.

During the entire training special attention is given physical fitness and medical care. Also to selecting and classifying all who show leadership and ability to become officers.

The war is won. Another great tragedy has ended.

We owe undying gratitude to our gallant youth who poured out their lifeblood on foreign soil.

For lack of preparedness, today cross on cross stand row on row, not only in Flanders field but even on tiny atolls of the far Pacific.

Peace remains to be won. Let's look abroad.

Bitter hatred against the United States is rampant in Germany.

Leland Stowe wrote: "The Nazis say that America is Germany's worst enemy. The Germans will never forgive her. They swear that one day they will avenge themselves against the United States."

From Goebbels' propaganda factory, where the manufacture of the deadly propaganda brick without straw was perfected, there has gone forth the Nazi slogan of the "stab in the back by red America."

German agents have done their work well in South America, where the legion has already taken root.

Suspicion has been aroused in Latin America, where one hears the slogan: "Germany lost a whole war after winning most of the battles. But she never lost a peace."

Contrast this with the old familiar saying that America never lost a war and never won a peace.

In the Far East, we have to win, or win back the favor and trust of the countries overrun by the Jap. The Jap, too, had a slogan: "Asia for the Asiatics." They are planning for 100 years.

In countries which they occupied they had a special technique of their own. They would encourage chaos, robbery, and lawlessness and allow it to run riot until the natives would beg the Japanese to take over and restore law and order, during all of which time they would continually spread stories of the atrocities of the white man.

With all of this confronting us we must promote peace among nations with ideas entirely different from ours. Wherein wants, needs, and conceptions differ so radically, and we are handicapped by the different languages, where misunderstandings can so easily occur.

We must work in good faith and honest endeavor, but we must also be prepared for any emergency.

During the fighting we had a single purpose in mind—to win.

Today we are in a morass. At home, labor has thrown overboard her promise not to strike. Accusations and countercharges are in the air. Selfishness and greed are on the march. Propaganda is rampant. Washington is bombarded by those who have an ax to grind. Today, more than ever before, we must rally behind our leaders and give them our full cooperation and our full support.

Should war come again, we will not be so fortunate as to have our allies hold off the enemy until we are ready.

We will be struck first.

Then, with the tremendous strides made in science, civilization will cease.

Once again we are shouting our altruism. But to the old refrain: "We want no territory; we want no indemnity," there has been added another verse: "We must give away the atomic bomb."

Those who give voice to such sentiments must know that there are and will be nations, friends and foes, whose private national conduct will be secret to us.

We do not hurt our friends' feelings when we lock our barn or engage a watchman. Neither does such precaution encourage us to rob our neighbors.

Until we reach that low ebb in wealth and civilization where we covet that which is our neighbor's, we will have no desire to go to war, no matter how well prepared we might be.

From our early conference that brought forth the Atlantic Charter, down through that at Potsdam we have done our utmost for world security—agreed, promised, and obligated ourselves to the limit.

The others of the world have obligations too, which we expect to be observed.

You and I know that in this world there are those who may forget.

We wish to be well enough prepared not to have to apologize if we have to invite their attention to some neglect.

It remains for us to show our friends and those who can only understand force that we are determined to see that world obligations are observed and that we are prepared to back the program with more than money and words.

Before the peace conference meets let's place in the hands of our peace representatives the law covering universal military training and all else they need to secure a just and lasting peace.

Let our watchwords be "Eternal vigilance."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the extreme importance of the problems having to do with atomic energy and the atomic bomb, some of the Members of the House have felt it would be worth while for all Members to have an opportunity to hear from some of the most outstanding scientists in this field. It has been arranged for those scientists to address the Members of the House this afternoon and to answer any questions that may be asked by Members at 3 o'clock in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building.

The bipartisan group that has arranged this meeting hopes that as many Members as possible will avail themselves of this opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. GOSSETT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of Mr. Wilson, president of General Motors Co., in answer to a statement of Mr. Reuther of the CIO.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the retail dealers of automobiles, large and small, are apparently the next group of businessmen to be put on the chopping block of the OPA.

Along with more than 200 other Members of Congress, I attended the committee meeting being held by the Committee on Small Business set up by this House for the protection of the small businessmen in this country.

Holding these meetings will not solve the problem. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] who heads this committee, in my opinion has the authority by committee action to stop this further price-fixing scheme of the OPA, at least until adequate hearings can be held. I am informed that the price percentages of the retailers are in keeping with the percentages they were receiving prior to the OPA regime. Under the law, OPA is specifically prohibited from violating established business practices. These small businessmen, and others, who will be the victims of the OPA order demand more from their representatives than registering their names at a meeting. They demand, and are entitled to, immediate action by the

Congress which will stop the OPA from putting many of them out of business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts of letters that have come to him within the past few days from men in the armed service and their families.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article that he prepared for a magazine on the subject of cost of absorption.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by C. A. Hawley, Grant County auditor, Ephrata, Wash.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include copies of correspondence.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have just come from a meeting which was held over in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building where the representatives of retail automobile dealers are busy stating their protests against the ruinous policies of the Office of Price Administration. This is not the first meeting that has been held under the dome of the Capitol since the Office of Price Administration started. There have been numerous meetings by other groups.

This meeting today means one thing to me, and that is if we continue the OPA we are going to ruin the small businessmen. So, in order to keep the record straight, may I say that last June I was one of those who voted to abolish that outfit so that the administration might give us a better agency to do the work that is not being done at the present time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the OPA is ruining the cotton farmers of the South and the farmers of the country generally.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

AUTHORIZING INCREASE IN THE PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 393, Rept. No. 1189), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4421) to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 394, Rept. No. 1190), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2788) to amend title 28 of the United States Code in regard to the limitations of certain actions, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments there to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, attended the meeting in the caucus room at which the automobile dealers protested the proposed action of the OPA, which would force them to pay more for cars while holding down the price. P. T. Barnum was said to be the greatest showman America ever produced. It was he who said that the American people liked to be humbugged. Houdini was a great magician. He made you see things that were not there. But both of them lived before the day when the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, came on the scene. Like the open-mouthed customers who gazed in amazement at Barnum's Jumbo, at Houdini's saw which ripped through a living woman, I, too, watched the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the friend, supporter, and advocate of OPA and all its works, stage his show when the auto dealers read their protests against his pet's proposed action which would ruin their business. Now he is holding this meeting—a good show well attended, and more power to him. But he is on the Committee on Banking and Currency. That committee fathered the OPA. Has kept it alive. Blocked every effort to make it behave. Congress made the OPA, made it operate. He can take it apart and put it together again so that it will work. Now it may not make very much difference to the automobile salesmen over there what happens after they are out of business, but I do not believe that the gentleman from Texas is going to be able to fool the people all the time. An irresistible body has come in contact with an immovable object. The OPA and the dealers down in the honorable gentleman's district who are being put out of business do not quite agree on what should be done. It seems the gentleman may be caught in the middle, come election time. I hope he does not get as tight and effective a squeeze as OPA puts on the businessman. Permit me to read a letter written when I saw the crowd in the caucus room. I read:

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1945.

To the Automobile Dealers Attending the Wright Patman House Small Business Committee:

Your protests are justifiable. The New Deal and the OPA have caught up with you. Many a small businessman has been liquidated before your case was called. You were rather indifferent because you were not affected, or, more accurately, thought you were not.

If the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, who is an influential member of the Banking and Currency Committee, from which OPA derives its powers—which, by the way, have been so disastrously misused—and those Senators and Congressmen who appeared today in the House caucus room are in earnest and will exert their power, they can clean up OPA at any time they desire.

Now, do not be misled. OPA is the creature of Congress. Congress is responsible for what it does. Congress can make it behave. If it does not, Congress can take it apart any time it gets ready to do so. I introduced a bill to kill it.

If you are put out of business, no one but your elected Representatives here in Congress are at fault. Conferences, hearings, committee meetings, and talk will not alone get results.

My suggestion? Get your finger in the buttonhole on the lapel of the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN'S coat. Do likewise to your own Representatives and Senators and insist that they take action now. You won't care after you are out of business.

Most humbly, respectfully, and with apologies,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and include tables of wages from the United States Government Printing Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago we had a meeting of the Joint Committee on Printing, at which time the Public Printer, Mr. Giegengack, submitted changes in rates to be paid to a number of employees over there, approximately 2,000 of them, and to increase their wages over $500,000. That would not be so bad, but they did away with the incentive system; they did away with the piecework basis that under the Kiess Act the Joint Committee on Printing threw out of the window. They were paid more money for doing more work, which is the proper way to do, so that people who want to do more can earn more. They kicked that piecework system out, and I think we did the Printing Office an injustice. I think the Members should study this chart. I asked for the wages paid in other cities for comparable work, and that will be displayed in this chart. But I cannot understand why the Joint Committee on Printing would eliminate something that has been installed in all businesses in the country for the benefit of people who want to work. What we have got to do in this country is to have people do more work and get more pay.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
PRINTING OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., November 6, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RICH: Supplementing my letter of October 26, in reply to yours of October 15, I am enclosing a chart showing the negotiated wage rates in the Government Printing Office approved October 15, 1945, under the Kiess Act, as compared to the scales for like trades in cities selected by you.

The following table is also submitted for your information, as requested:

Division	Number of employees	Percentage of increased cost
Composing	1,195	8.41
Presswork	509	8.49
Platemaking:		
Photoengravers	21	10.18
Electrotypers	60	11.05
Stereotypers	25	11.12
Bindery	427	9.56
Maintenance:		
Carpenters	23	7.54
Electricians	36	7.59
Machinists	38	7.22
Pipefitters	12	7.55
Total	2,346	

I trust this gives you all of the information you desire; but if it does not, will you please let me know, as I shall be happy to serve you.

Very truly yours,

A. E. GIEGENGACK,
Public Printer.

Negotiated wage rates, Government Printing Office, approved Oct. 15, 1945, compared to scales in indicated cities

	Government Printing Office	Washington, D. C.	New York City	Chicago	Detroit	Philadelphia
Hand compositors (book and job)	(40) $1.57	(37½) $1.5293	[1] $1.6125	(37½) [2] $1.754	(40) $1.565	(40) $1.35
Typesetting machine operator:						
Book and job	1.57	1.5293	[3] 1.6375	1.754	1.61	1.45
Newspaper		1.828	(37½) 1.807	(36¼) 1.84	(37½) (3)	(37½) 1.405
Pressmen (book and job):						
Platen	1.43	(40) 1.195	(40) 1.44	(40) 1.475	(40) 1.25	(40) 1.26
Cylinder	1.57	1.2825	1.563	1.475	1.48	1.38
Web:						
Under 46-inch:						
Single roll		1.42	1.698	1.625		1.54
Double roll			1.744	1.80		1.62
Over 46-inch	1.67	1.47	1.744		1.555	1.62
Offset:						
Under 42-inch		1.3825	1.5625			
Over 42-inch	1.67	1.4475				
Newspaper		(37½) 1.547	(37½) 1.847	(37½) 1.585	(38.3) 1.7862	1.433
Photoengravers:						
Book and job	1.75	(37½) 1.7333	(37½) 2.029	(37½) 1.693	(40) 1.725	(37½) 1.8933
Newspaper		1.76		(37½) 1.796	(37½) 1.76	1.84
Electrotypers:						
Book and job	1.62	(38) 1.58	(40) 1.85	(40) 1.775	(40) 1.61	(40) 1.70
Newspaper						
Stereotypers:						
Book and job	1.62		(40) 1.85	(37½) 1.6437		(37½) 1.38
Newspaper		(37½) [3] 1.40	(37½) 2.00	(40) 1.414–1.815	(40) 1.46	1.38
Bookbinders	1.50	(40) 1.25	(40) 1.50	(40) 1.333–1.3575	(40) 1.35	(40) 1.14
Electricians	1.57	(40) 2.00	(40) [4] 1.80	(40) 1.85	(40) [3] 1.50–1.85	(40) 1.875
Machinists	1.57	1.50–1.80	[3] 1.475	1.70		1.90
Carpenters	1.57	1.775	[3] 1.35	1.775	(40) 1.50	1.58
Pipefitters	1.57	1.875	[3] 2.00	1.85	1.75	(35) [2] 1.75

	Pittsburgh	Baltimore [4]	Richmond	Kansas City	San Francisco	Buffalo
Hand compositors (book and job)	(40) $1.38	$1.20	(40) $1.15	(40) $1.325	(40) $1.463	(40) $1.37
Typesetting machine operator:						
Book and job	1.38	1.20	1.15	1.335	1.463	1.37
Newspaper	1.559	(36.7) 1.45	1.40	(37½) 1.46	1.507	1.472–1.627
Pressmen (book and job):						
Platen	(40) 1.255	(40) 1.00	1.05	1.185	1.381	1.14
Cylinder	1.33	1.20	1.05	1.265	1.456	1.265
Web:						
Under 46-inch:						
Single roll			1.05	1.38	1.606	1.415
Double roll						
Over 46-inch	1.435					
Offset:						
Under 42-inch	1.355	(40) 1.275	1.25			
Over 42-inch	1.68	1.40				
Newspaper	(37½) 1.3854	1.444	(40) 1.3175	1.278	1.466	1.42
Photoengravers:						
Book and job	(37½) 1.687	(37½) 1.633	(40) 1.438	(37½) 1.625	(37½) [1] 1.613	(37½) 1.533
Newspaper	1.725	(40) 1.662	1.5325	1.70	1.576	1.722
Electrotypers:						
Book and job	(40) [4] 1.25	[4] 1.175	1.3225	1.375		1.38
Newspaper						
Stereotypers:						
Book and job	(37½) 1.39	(40) 1.275	1.3225	1.31	(40) 1.538	1.38
Newspaper	1.391	(38.3) 1.33	1.1933	1.31	1.538	1.38
Bookbinders	(40) 1.12	(40) 1.05	(40) 1.00–1.15	1.22	1.456	1.10
Electricians	(40) 1.875	(40) 1.725	(40) 1.50	(40) 1.65	(40) 1.70	1.75
Machinists	1.50				1.53	
Carpenters	1.75	1.4375	1.15	1.50	1.50	1.60
Pipefitters	1.75	1.65	1.50	1.70	1.75	1.75

[1] Rejected.
[2] Goes to $1.815 on Mar. 3, 1946 (36¼ hours).
[3] Now negotiating for higher rates.
[4] Very few union members in printing trades.

NOTE.—Numbers in parentheses represent hours in workweek. In most instances, however, overtime is paid after the normal workday at time and one-half and Saturday work is twice the scale.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of the annual speech of President Ismet Inonu, of Turkey, before the Turkish National Assembly.

OPA ORDER TO AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of Congress, I spent a good part of the morning over in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building attending a meeting wherein the automobile dealers of America protested against an order of the Office of Price Administration which would alter and change the existing practices of doing business in the automotive industry. The order proposes to force a reduction in the established commissions which dealers charge in the sale of automobiles.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives in creating the OPA did not intend that such organization was to be authorized to change existing and accepted policies of doing business.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, when we passed what is now Public Law 383 of the Seventy-eighth Congress we specifically inserted legislation to prevent the OPA from exercising its authority to destroy and disrupt existing business practices and to use its power in an effort to remake the American business community in accordance with its own theories, prejudices, and programs. Subsection H of section 2 of this act reads as follows:

> The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, or changes in established rental practices, except where such action is affirmatively found by the Administrator to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear to me that OPA is clearly out of step both with the law creating it and the spirit of Congress in passing price control legislation when OPA supports its present order against automobile dealers. Such order assuredly "compels changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution established in any industry." Such order is not necessary to "prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act." It is an illy concealed, completely unnecessary, economically unsound effort to ignore established practices in order to fix a price program which is out of harmony with sound principles of cost accounting and business procedure.

Congress created OPA in an effort to hold the price line and to keep people from raising prices unjustifiably. It was not intended that OPA should try to disrupt existing commissions and business practices which automobile dealers have had down through the years. Such action is not anti-inflation, Mr. Speaker; it is anti-business and anti-American and one more example of how the bureaucrats, gone mad with power, try to put their meddlesome fingers in the affairs of American business operating under the American system.

Mr. Speaker, we have just won a war against totalitarianism and centralized planning. In time of victory, let us not adopt the techniques which brought our enemies to defeat and disaster. New Deal bureaucrats must not be permitted to do to private business in America what the Nazis did to the businessmen of Germany. OPA must be prevented from operating in spheres from which it was intended to be definitely barred by the law creating it.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order which I have for today be transferred to Thursday, November 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include sundry telegrams against the OPA automobile plan.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on four subjects.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a statement made by General Wainwright with reference to his treatment in a Japanese prison.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the statement he made this morning before the Select Committee to Investigate and Study Problems of Small Business.

EXTENSION OF AIR SERVICE IN THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter to the Postmaster General signed by several Congressmen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in the city of New Orleans today, there is in process a very important hearing of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Witnesses are being heard from all parts of the lower Mississippi Valley in reference to the extension of air service in that area. Some thirty-odd Members of the House, all from Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, and east Texas, have signed a letter addressed to the Postmaster General urging his cooperation with the Civil Aeronautics Board for the purpose of extending the air service in this section of the country. We hope that the moment these hearings are concluded the CAB will carefully and sympathetically weigh the entire matter of the extension of the air service in the lower Mississippi Valley and will so extend the service that every little town in that area will be able to obtain air-mail service within the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I set forth a copy of the letter which was sent to the Postmaster General, including the names of all of the Congressmen who have expressed their interest in this important matter:

OCTOBER 12, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT E. HANNEGAN,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HANNEGAN: We, the undersigned, being Members of Congress from the southwestern part of the United States, including the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, and east Texas, hereby petition you to actively interest yourself in the establishment of air-mail pick-up service in the general area of Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, and east Texas, covering the small towns in this area. We believe that there is an active need for air-mail pick-up service in this area, and that the interest of the entire Nation will be served by the establishment of such service. We are, therefore, asking you to personally interest yourself in this matter, and when the hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board are held in New Orleans, La., on November 4, 1945, we ask that your Department make an active request of the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant the service and to establish air-mail pick-up as being needed and economically justified.

We will appreciate your advising us just what action you expect to take in the hearings to be held at New Orleans, La., on November 4.

Respectfully submitted.

OVERTON BROOKS, Fourth, Louisiana; LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Third, Texas; TOM PICKETT, Seventh, Texas; ALBERT THOMAS, Eighth, Texas; T. G. ABERNETHY, Fourth, Mississippi; W. F. NORRELL, Sixth, Arkansas; HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., Seventh, Louisiana; ARTHUR WINSTEAD, Fifth, Mississippi; JOHN E. RANKIN, First, Mississippi; FADJO CRAVENS, Fourth, Arkansas; PAUL H. MALONEY, Second, Louisiana; J. W. TRIMBLE, Third, Arkansas; J. M. COMBS, Second, Texas; OREN HARRIS, Seventh, Arkansas; LUTHER PATRICK, Ninth, Alabama; BROOKS HAYS, Fifth, Arkansas; A. LEONARD ALLEN, Eighth, Louisiana; F. EDWARD HÉBERT, First, Louisiana; JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Third, Louisiana; E. C. GATHINGS, First, Arkansas; WILBUR D. MILLS, Second, Arkansas; C. E. McKENZIE, Fifth, Louisiana; WRIGHT PATMAN, First, Texas; JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Second, Mississippi; CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tenth, Tennessee.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, along with some other Members of the House I appeared this morning before the Select Committee to Investigate and Study Problems of Small Business and made a statement, which I ask unanimous consent to include in these remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EARL C. MICHENER, OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

NOVEMBER 8, 1945.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in behalf of the automobile dealers and salesmen of the State of Michigan, I want to thank you for your interest in the welfare and, in this case, the very life of a certain group of small businessmen.

I have received literally hundreds of telegrams, letters, and telephone calls from automobile dealers in my district who realize that if the contemplated directive of the OPA is put into effect, which requires the automobile dealers to absorb the increased cost of production of automobiles, a large percentage of the local dealers will be ruined financially and thrown out of employment. I am not arguing as to the sales price of automobiles because I am not sufficiently advised. I am arguing that no particular part of the automobile industry should be compelled to bear the complete increased production costs.

No segment of our industry has been hit harder by war necessities than the automobile dealers and, by the same token, no group of our citizens has more patriotically responded to Government regulations and wartime restrictions. The time has come, however, when this particular group must not be asked to carry the burden farther. With them it is not a question of desire or compliance. It is a case in many instances of financial ruination.

I am advised that OPA is withholding its directive until a complete hearing can be held before this committee and the true facts established. Automobile dealers are not asking for subsidies or gifts. They are only asking for fair, impartial and equitable treatment. I feel sure that they will receive such consideration at the hands of this committee.

The importance of this question is best expressed by the fact that hundreds of desperate automobile dealers have come all the way to Washington to present their case, as evidenced by this meeting.

Mr. Chairman, my presence is required at a meeting of the Rules Committee, and I thank you for your consideration.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I expect to file a petition in the well to bring out my bill to permit the discharge, upon his own application, of any man who has served 18 months continuously in the armed forces, or who has dependents at home to look after, or who desires to return to school.

I understand that in response to this demand there have been some changes in the point system, and order issued for the discharge of former war prisoners. I am afraid that all the perfumes of Arabia could not sweeten the point system to where it would meet the situation.

I have had letters from every battle front in the world where we have soldiers, sailors, or marines, I have had letters from every State in this Union, and, it seems to me, from every congressional district, favoring my bill; but I have yet to receive a single protest against it.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report of the War Production Board covering operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, as amended, for the period from April 16 through October 15, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 6, 1945.*

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important message and contains some very important information. I ask that the entire statement be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long is the report?

The SPEAKER. The report is very short. It consists of one page.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(The report of the War Production Board is as follows:)

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE REQUISITIONING ACT OF OCTOBER 16, 1941, AS AMENDED FOR THE PERIOD FROM APRIL 16 THROUGH OCTOBER 15, 1945

I. GENERAL BACKGROUND

This report covers the operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941 (Public, No. 274, 77th Cong.), as amended by title VI of the Second War Powers Act (Public, No. 507, 77th Cong.), and Public Law 104 (78th Cong.), and by Public Law 378 (78th Cong., 2d sess.), for the period from April 16, 1945, through October 15, 1945. The President's report of October 29, 1942, to the Congress on the operations under this act for the period ending October 16, 1942, summarized the provisions of the amended act and recorded the delegations of responsibilities and authorities thereunder made by Executive orders to departments and agencies of the Government. The President's report of June 11, 1943, to the Congress summarized the operations under this act for the period ending April 15, 1943, and noted the changes in the authorities thereunder. The President's report of November 17, 1943, to the Congress summarized the requisitioning operations of both the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture, and noted the change in the previously reported delegations of authority and responsibility. The President's report of May 12, 1944, to the Congress summarized the operations under this act for the period ending April 15, 1944, and noted the change in the delegation of authority and responsibility. The President's report of October 27, 1944, summarized the operations under this act for the period ending October 15, 1944, and noted the extension of the expiration date of the act of October 16, 1941, from June 30, 1944, to June 30, 1945. The President's report of May 12, 1945, summarized the operations under this act for the period ending April 15, 1945.

II. SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS

Three requisitions, initiated by the War Department and approved by the War Production Board, were served during this 6-month period by the War Department. Two of these requisitions were for tinplate, and the third was for feathers and down. One requisition for pepper was also served by the War Department after approval by the Department of Agriculture.

On June 30, 1945, the act of October 16, 1941, was amended by Congress in Public Law 102 (79th Cong.), to extend its expiration date from June 30, 1945, to June 30, 1946.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) received permission to extend her own remarks in the RECORD and include a bill which she contemplates introducing.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each some extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include some extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 40 minutes.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE COMMISSION—UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I returned from the meeting at Quebec, Canada, which resulted in the establishment of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. This is the first permanent organization to be set up by the United Nations. It is significant and fitting, I think, that this first organization should deal with the basic and fundamental problems of mankind—food and agriculture.

I desire at this time to make a few observations and comments concerning this important Conference. As most of you know, this Conference is an outgrowth of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture held in Hot Springs, Va., in May 1943. That Conference was attended by representatives of 44 countries, and at its conclusion it recommended that there be set up a United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture. Each of the United Nations appointed a representative on the interim commission. Mr. L. B. Pearson, now the Ambassador from Canada to the United States, was elected chairman. The interim commission prepared a constitution for a permanent United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. That constitution was submitted to the member governments for comment and suggestions and was completed in its final form in July 1944. At the first session in Quebec on October 16 the organization was formally brought into existence when the constitution was signed by the accredited representatives of 30 governments. The purpose of the organization is set out in a very few words in the preamble of the constitution, which reads as follows:

The nations accepting this constitution, being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions, securing improvements in the efficiency of the production of all food and agricultural products, bettering the condition of rural populations, and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy, hereby establish the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The American delegation to the Quebec Conference was headed by Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, the other members being as follows:

Deputy member: William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, Washington.

Alternate member: Howard R. Tolley, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, Washington; member of the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture.

Congressional advisers: ELMER THOMAS, chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington.

RAYMOND E. WILLIS, member, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington.

JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., chairman, Committee on Agriculture, United States House of Representatives, Washington.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE, member, Committee on Agriculture, United States House of Representatives, Washington.

Advisers: Andrew W. Anderson, Chief, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington.

Paul Appleby, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, Washington; member of the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture.

H. G. Bennett, president, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Okla.

Hugh H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

Homer L. Brinkley, president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Lake Charles, La.

R. E. Buchanan, Director, Agricultural Experiment Station, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

Edward G. Cale, Associate Chief, Commodities Division, Department of State, Washington.

P. V. Cardon, Research Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

Harry Carlson, Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, Washington.

A. L. Deering, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

Mordecai Ezekiel, Economic Adviser to the Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange, Washington.

Henry S. Graves, College of Forestry, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

L. Wendell Hayes, specialist, Division of International Organization Affairs, Department of State, Washington.

Samuel D. Jackson, former United States Senator from Indiana.

Edward I. Kotak, Assistant Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill.

Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, Bethesda, Md.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, Denver, Colo.

Hazel K. Stiebeling, Chief, Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

Leroy D. Stinebower, Deputy Director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State, Washington alternate member of the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture.

Anna Lord Strauss, president, National League of Women Voters, Washington.

Clifford C. Taylor, agricultural attaché, Embassy of the United States of America, Ottawa.

Lyle F. Watts, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

L. A. Wheeler, Director, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

M. L. Wilson, Director of Extension Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

Press relations officer: Henry Jarrett, special assistant to the Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

Joint secretaries: James G. Maddox, special assistant to the Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

Clarke L. Willard, Assistant Chief, Division of Internationl Conferences, Department of State, Washington.

Administrative assistant: Miss Dorothy H. King, Department of State.

Fiscal assistant: Miss Luella Ollis, Department of State.

Secretariat: Miss Emma Andreen, Department of Agriculture; Miss Dolores Chavoen, Department of Agriculture; Mrs. Lois Chavez, Department of Agriculture; Miss Betty Davis, Department of State; Mrs. Mina Hite, Department of Agriculture; Miss Mary C. Lohr, Department of State; Miss Agatha M. Munhall, Department of State; Mrs. Corinne Pickering, Department of State; Miss Catherine V. Shea, Department of Agriculture; Mrs. Lillian Wright, Department of State; Miss Dorothy Zierjack, Department of State; Miss Beth Gage, secretary to Senator ELMER THOMAS.

The first plenary meeting of the Conference was held at 4 p. m. on Tuesday, October 16. The final plenary meeting was held on Thursday, November 1. Thus, the Conference was comparatively short as international conferences go. Notwithstanding this, a very great deal of important work was accomplished. This was due, in part, to the splendid work of the Interim Commission in the preparations which it made for the Conference, and also to the earnestness of the members of the Conference and the serious atmosphere in which its business was conducted. I was very much impressed by the character and ability of the delegates representing the various countries. Among them were ministers of agriculture, able and distinguished diplomats, noted scientists, and last but not least, farmers and representatives of farm organizations.

At the first plenary session Mr. L. B. Pearson, Ambassador from Canada to the United States and Chairman of the Interim Commission, was chosen as temporary chairman. At a later session he was elected as the permanent Chairman of the Conference. Too much cannot be said of the contribution which Mr. Pearson made to the success of the Conference. He was an able presiding officer who saw that the business meetings of the Conference were conducted with smoothness and dispatch. In addition, his wisdom, leadership, and tact were instrumental in bringing about harmony and understanding between the conflict of views and personalities which are inevitable in a meeting of this kind. His closing statement at the Conference, which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday, November 5, is a masterly expression of practical idealism and statesmanship. I wish it could be read by every Member of Congress.

It might be of interest to describe the Conference organization. Each member country had one delegate and one vote. Most of the larger countries like our own were represented by large delegations composed of specialists and technical advisers. Some of the smaller countries had only two or three representatives in all. I do not know the exact number of those who attended the Conference as representatives of the various countries, but it must have been something over 200. In addition, there was the secretariat of the interim organization, plus the necessary clerical staff brought by each delegation. There were perhaps 100 representatives of the press and radio, although not all of them were there during all of the time.

The Conference organized two commissions, commission A, which dealt with questions of policy and programs, and commission B, dealing with organization and administration. These commissions were broken down into committees and some of the larger committees were further divided into panels.

Dr. P. R. Viljoen, of South Africa, was elected by the Conference as chairman of commission A, and Mr. Andrew F. Jelstad, of Norway, and Mr. David Wilson, of New Zealand, as vice chairmen. Mr. Henrik de Kauffman, of Denmark, was elected chairman of commission B, and Mr. Alberto Sevilla Sacasa, of Nicaragua, and Mr. Anis Azer, of Egypt, were chosen as vice chairmen. The committees which were set up by commission A and the chairmen thereof were, as follows:

Nutrition: André Mayer, of France, vice president of the College of France.

Agriculture: Dr. E. S. Archibald, of Canada, director, experimental farms service, Canadian Department of Agriculture. Because of the size and importance of this committee, two vice chairmen were elected. Mr. P. V. Cardon, Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, and Mr. S. L. Louwes, Netherlands Director-General of Food Supply.

Forestry: Dr. Henry S. Graves, United States professor emeritus, Yale College of Forestry.

Fisheries: Mr. Thor Thors, Minister of Iceland to the United States.

Marketing: Mr. H. Broadley, United Kingdom Ministry of Food.

Statistics: Mr. Josue Saenz, of Mexico, Director-General of Statistics.

Four committees were set up in commission B, as follows:

Rules and Procedure: Dr. Arthur Wauters, of Belgium, Chairman of the Belgian Food and Nutrition Commission.

Finance: J. B. Brigden, of Australia, Financial Counselor of the Australian Legation in Washington.

Administrative Arrangements: K. S. Sie, of China, Director of the National Bureau of Agricultural Research.

Constitutional and Diplomatic Questions: Sir Girja, Shankar Bajpai, Agent General for India in the United States.

As already stated, in the case of some of the larger committees there was a further subdivision into panels. For instance, in the Committee on Agriculture, the largest committee of the Conference, there were nine panels, as follows:

First. Rural Social Welfare.

Second. Education, Extension, and Exchange of Scientific Information.

Third. Production Research and Techniques.

Fourth. Soil Resources Development and Conservation, which will include irrigation, drainage, erosion control, salinity control and range management.

Fifth. Integration and Coordination of Agricultural Programs and Policies, including national and international.

Sixth. Credit Cooperativess and Related Matters.

Seventh. Industrial Needs for Agriculture, including machinery, fertilizer, and pesticides.

Eighth. Special Needs for War Devastated Countries.

Ninth. Special Needs for Countries in Tropical and Subtropical Regions.

As the work of the Conference proceeded the panels agreed upon recommendations for a program and submitted the same to the committees. The committees, after a thorough discussion, made their recommendations to the Commission under which they were working. The Commission, in turn, after full discussion, adopted or modified the recommendations of the committees and submitted their reports to the Conference where they were approved and accepted.

Contrary to the policy in effect at the Hot Springs meeting in 1943, all of the meetings of the Conference, including meetings of the panels, committees, and commissions, were open to the press and the public.

In the American delegation there was a full, free, and frank discussion of all questions before the Conference. The delegation met each morning at 9 o'clock for an hour, at which time reports were had for the members of the delegation serving on the various committees and procedure and policies were discussed. I am happy to say that although there were at times differences of opinion there was always a final harmonious agreement on each question presented.

The same can be said for the Conference as a whole. There were occasionally in the committees rather sharp differences of opinion but in every case these were finally resolved in a harmonious way. I consider this quite remarkable in view of the fact that more than 40 countries were represented and there were involved many differences of language, viewpoint, racial and cultural backgrounds. The fact that it was possible to reach agreement indicates that there can be no fundamental difference of opinion between peoples on such vital subjects as food and agriculture.

During the early days of the Conference there was fear expressed that differences might arise because of the varying viewpoints of producers and consumers, or that there might be a conflict of views between those who were looking at the matter from the standpoint of the agricultural producer and those whose primary interest was in the field of nutrition. Happily, those conflicts never developed for the very good reason that, fundamentally, there is no real conflict of interest between producers and consumers when the question of food is concerned. During the early sessions of the Conference, opportunity was offered delegates representing the various countries to present to the Conference the particular problems of their countries and their views and suggestions as to what such an organization as FAO might accomplish. It might be of interest to quote briefly extracts from some of these speeches and I call attention particularly to the similarity of viewpoint and thought running through all of them. First, let me quote briefly from the speech of our own distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, a former Member of this body:

The Government of the United States of America lends its wholehearted support to the work we are here about to begin. In my country—as in yours—we are much aware of the need for international assistance in adjusting our agriculture to the new world situation which peace has brought about. Both in the immediate job of correcting wartime maladjustments and in the longer-range task of developing higher levels of production and consumption we cannot begin the work too soon.

* * * * *

Our work here is basic and preparatory to the building of a lasting peace. What we are proposing to do here will help lay the economic and social foundations essential to an enduring international structure. Until such foundations are established any hope for more than a moderate measure of harmony in a world so recently at odds with itself is wishful thinking.

If we do our work well here we will have established a framework in which we can work together to raise the levels of living in the common neighborhood of our world. Moreover, we will have advanced toward our ultimate goal—a harmonious community of nations. That is the goal toward which we must proceed unfalteringly, however trying the disappointments and however discouraging the disagreements which may lie ahead.

* * * * *

At this Conference we are laying one of the foundation stones of lasting peace. My country is proud to be one of the original members of FAO and eager to bear its full share in the great task that faces all of us here.

On the same day Mr. S. L. Mansholt, Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food for the Netherlands, expressed himself as follows:

It is my conviction that the birth of FAO comes at a most opportune moment. The work which FAO takes on its shoulders can be decisive for the whole future of the world. If FAO is successful it may be possible that the standard of living in the whole world will reach for the first time a level of which humanity need not be ashamed. The far-seeing men who initiated the organization have, perhaps for the first time, made clear to everybody the intimate relationship between nutrition and agriculture, the well-being of which is interdependent. At the present time both, and in particular nutrition, are sorely in need of attention. There will be no security for agriculture if ways and means are not found for a better nutrition throughout the world.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, delegate from India, in a most interesting discussion of the problems of his country, spoke as follows:

We have, roughly, 600,000,000 acres of land in India, of which a little over 200,000,000 are cultivated, and another 170,000,000 are supposed to be cultivatable. But the stark fact today is that of the 400,000,000 people about 30 percent do not get enough to eat. That means, roughly, 100,000,000 of the population. And the other fact, no less harsh and significant, is that the annual income per caput is in the neighborhood of $22. So you will readily understand, there is not enough food and there is not enough purchasing power.

* * * * *

Now, what, exactly, are our needs? First, Mr. Chairman, is the procurement of mechanical appliances which are suitable to the small-scale agricultural economy of our country. The average holding in India is only 5 acres, and we do not, unfortunately, possess the magnificent farms, whose boundaries stretch to the horizon, which I have seen in the vast prairies of Canada and in the Middle West of the United States. So we have to evolve something which would meet our needs.

The next is the need for trained technical men. There I am not suggesting that we need a large-scale importation from other countries. We have men in our country who are capable of learning and profiting by what they learn. Our essential need is the opportunity abroad in the more advanced countries, in order that personnel may be trained in sufficient numbers. Then we need an exchange of scientific and statistical information. Lest you consider it to be one-sided, may I say that we shall have something to contribute, though probably in the exchange we will take more than we give.

Last, but not least, Mr. Chairman, we need concerted effort by the nations of the world to make sure that the cultivators, the tillers of the soil, have fair prices and a stable price for what they produce, because unless their power to purchase is definitely improved there is no such thing as world prosperity.

The member from Australia, Mr. H. V. Evatt, Minister of State for External Affairs, spoke as follows:

Knowledge of the facts is a most necessary first step toward improvement in the nutritional status of member nations. Australia is satisfied also that this knowledge will also contribute materially to the necessary change-over in the world outlook of agricultural exporting countries from policies of restriction of production and trade, to those based on the needs of an expanding economy. These policies are clearly necessary to supplement the domestic measures to be taken

by all countries if freedom from want in the most adequate sense of that term is to be achieved.

Listen to this from the member from Norway, Anders Fjelstad, Delegate of the Royal Norwegian Government on Agricultural Affairs in the United States:

The flight from the land to the cities is basically caused by low prices for agricultural products, which in turn do not allow satisfactory wages for farm labor. During the time between the two great wars, a change in prices occurred to the disadvantage of agriculture, the final effects of which are now obvious to all. Our immediate task is to have this state of affairs rectified. All political parties in Norway agree that the income of agriculture should be brought to the same level as that of other industries. This adjustment has to be done in intimate relation to financial and economic development as a whole. The problem might not be as difficult as suspected on the basis of previous deliberations. Investigations have shown that an increase in the prices of agricultural products by, for example, 10 percent, would only make an increase of about 2 percent in the living cost to the industrial worker. Besides, if agriculture is put in a position to pay better wages a favorable reaction would follow in other trades by the increased purchasing power of agriculture.

And from Poland, that nation which has suffered so grievously, came the voice of Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, formerly Premier of the Polish Government in London, now Deputy Prime Minister of Agriculture and Agricultural Reform in the present Polish Government at Warsaw:

Yet, for the sake of humanity's communal well-being, we have to tackle the problem of how best, in the long run, to prepare and to put into operation organized means of international cooperation toward raising the standard of living, improving nutrition, and distribution of foods, toward betterment of agricultural production and its financial returns, toward an exchange of the achievements of science and agricultural technique, and, above all, toward an all-round improvement in general living conditions of the rural working masses.

And this from the delegate from the United Kingdom, Philip J. Noel Baker, Minister of State in the Foreign Office at London:

Last Wednesday night my predecessor in office, the leader of our delegation to Hot Springs, Richard Law, said on the broadcast to the British people: "The food and agriculture meeting which started yesterday in Canada is as important as the meeting of foreign secretaries that we had here in London the other day." I venture to hope that it will be a good deal more important. That is the view of the Government for which I speak. We believe in FAO. We are determined that now and hereafter it shall succeed. We are confident that its success will mean much to our generation and to all the succeeding generations. * * *

* * * * *

"There is only one way to get rid of the intolerable shame of recurring wars, and that is by building up a system of institutions by which the causes of international conflict may be removed. The United Nations have pledged themselves not once but often when victory was not yet in sight, to create that system and to make it come to life. Already the first of their organizations, UNRRA, of which our Yugoslav friend has spoken, has met with some success in the face of almost unimaginable difficulties—getting magnificent results in its vital short-term work."

* * * * *

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in times to come the letters "FAO" will mean not only Food and Agriculture Organization, but also, for the whole business of food production and food consumption, they will stand for this: "Freedom, abundance, and order." Abundance must be the object which is forever in our minds. Before the war the goddess of plenty was knocking at the door and we shut her out. We must do that no more.

Continuing, Mr. Baker particularly stressed the need for: First, close integration of FAO with other United Nations organizations; second, presenting the Director-General with an outline of the first year's program which is not only scientifically sound but provides for direct action within the year; and third, the encouragement of a balanced type of production that would both improve nutrition and help food producers. In concluding, he said that it was most necessary to kill the idea that there was conflict between consumers and producers.

It was necessary for the Conference to break considerable new ground in the establishment of procedure since this is the first of the international organizations established by the United Nations. It was recognized that whatever might be done at this meeting in the way of organization and procedure would be considered as a precedent for other similar United Nations organizations.

One troublesome question was that of language. After some discussion early in the session, English was adopted as the language for this Conference with the proviso that whatever arrangement might finally be made by the United Nations organization with respect to language would govern in the future. Later in the session, however, the question was reopened and the Conference adopted the following resolution: "That, pending the adoption by the United Nations of rules governing the use of languages, the FAO shall employ two languages, namely, English and French, in its proceedings and documentations and shall adopt, English, French, Spanish, Chinese, and Russian as its official languages." This means that from now on and until the question is settled by the United Nations organization, FAO will use two working and five official languages. I am advised that this is the procedure which was used at the San Francisco Conference. Undoubtedly, the General Assembly of the United Nations, at its first meeting, will take some action on the language question and, under the resolution adopted at the Quebec Conference, this will be binding upon FAO.

Another question which occasioned some considerable debate and discussion in the Committee on Constitutional and Diplomatic Questions was the relationship between FAO and other intergovernmental organizations having the same or similar objectives and purposes. The two principal organizations of this character which were discussed are the International Institute of Agriculture in Rome and the Comite International du Bois which is a forestry organization composed in the past partly of governments and partly of private forestry organizations. However, it was stated at the Conference that at the present time the active membership of the organization has been taken over by governments.

Pursuant to the recommendation of the Committee on Constitutional and Diplomatic Questions, the Conference adopted a resolution relating to the International Institute reading as follows:

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE

The Conference, recognizing the undesirability of duplication of work of international organizations in the same fields, recommends:

1. That those Governments which are members both of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter called "the Organization") and of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome (hereinafter called "the Institute") acting through the Permanent Committee of the Institute, call a session of the General Assembly as soon as possible, but not later than June 30, 1946.

2. That the Permanent Committee of the Institute be requested to prepare a scheme to be approved by a majority of votes in the General Assembly, as follows:

(a) A protocol shall be concluded and signed by signatory and adhering governments to the Convention of Rome of June 7, 1905, by which the affairs of the Institute, including its Annex, the Centre International de Sylviculture, shall be wound up, as from a date to be determined by the protocol.

(b) The Permanent Committee shall be empowered by the protocol and shall be instructed accordingly by the General Assembly (i) to wind up the affairs of the Institute, and (ii) to transfer the library, archives, and property of the Institute to the Organization, which will decide their location.

(c) The protocol shall further provide that, in the execution of the provisions of the international conventions which attribute functions to the Institute, the Organization shall be substituted for the Institute, and governments which are not signatories of or do not accede to the protocol, shall be notified thereof, and shall be invited to cooperate in the execution of this proposal.

3. That the United Nations require in peace treaties with enemy countries now under occupation that those countries carry out the provisions of the protocol.

With reference to the Comite International du Bois, the Conference adopted the following resolution submitted by the Committee on Constitutional and Diplomatic Questions:

COMITE INTERNATIONAL DU BOIS

The Conference, being desirous of avoiding overlapping and duplication of effort among international organizations, recommends:

1. That those governments which are members both of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (hereafter called the Organization) and of the Comite International du Bois (hereafter called the CIB) call a session of the Permanent Committee of the CIB as soon as possible, but not later than June 30, 1946, with a view to making the necessary arrangements under article IX of the statute of the CIB for:

(a) The winding up of the affairs of the CIB; and

(b) The transfer of the library, archives, and property of the CIB to the Organization, which will decide their location.

2. That FAO carry on such of the activities of the CIB as are consistent with the purposes of the Organization set forth in its constitution.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am anxious to know if the institute at Rome has any physical properties? Do we own any buildings there? Who owns the buildings? Do they have property there that has to be disposed of?

Mr. HOPE. I am not definite about that, but it is my understanding there is a building or buildings. There is quite an extensive library and some valuable files. Otherwise I do not know of any property.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Where will the national headquarters of the FAO be located?

M . HOPE. The headquarters will be located wherever the United Nations headquarters is located. Temporarily the headquarters will be in the United States.

Getting back to the International Institute of Agriculture and the Comite International du Bois, it is anticipated that since a majority of the governments which are members of the two organizations in question are also members of FAO, that the recommendations made in these resolutions will be carried out as rapidly as the procedure outlined permits and that the functions of these organizations as far as they fit in with the program of FAO will be taken over. Likewise, the library, archives, and other property of the organizations will be transferred.

The conference also adopted resolutions recommending that FAO achieve the closest possible relationship with the United Nations and the specialized agencies which may be established in connection therewith. It also directed the director general, with the approval of the executive committee, to examine the question of relationship between the organization and other intergovernmental organizations having related responsibilities, and to consider the methods by which cooperation might be achieved between the organization and nongovernmental international organizations which might be of assistance to the organization in achieving its fundamental objectives, particularly the improvement of the standard of living of all workers. A number of other resolutions were adopted, having for their purpose the tying in of this organization with the United Nations Organizations and such new subsidiary United Nations Organizations as might be set up.

Washington is designated in the Constitution as the temporary seat of FAO with the understanding, as embodied in the rules of the organization, that the seat of FAO shall be at the seat of the United Nations as soon as the latter question is decided. This rule was adopted with the understanding that the seat of the United Nations will also be the seat of its economic and social council with which the work of FAO will be closely associated.

The final report of the Credentials Committee showed that 40 nations had adhered to the Food and Agricultural Organization, of which 36 were represented at the Conference. Those 36 were as follows: Commonwealth of Australia, Dominion of Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Haiti, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Dominion of New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela, Syria, Belgium, Colombia, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Norway, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Cuba, Lebanon.

The following members were not represented at the session: Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, and Paraguay.

Accredited observers were sent by the United States of Soviet Russia, Argentina, by the Byelo-Russian S. S. R., and Ukrainian S. S. R. It was a matter of regret that the U. S. S. R. did not see its way clear to sign the Constitution and become a member of the Organization. It should be said, however, that that nation was represented at the Conference by a large delegation and that its members sat on the various commissions and committees of the Conference and took an active part in the discussions and in general took much interest in the proceedings. No published statement was made by any representative of the U. S. S. R. as to its attitude on the matter of adherence but at the eighth plenary meeting on October 27, the chairman of the Conference made the following statement:

> This morning I had a conversation with the head of the Soviet delegation. He assured me that his Government has the same objectives and sets for itself the same tasks as FAO, that it endorses the idea of international cooperation for the improvement of agricultural production and the bettering of the food situation of the United Nations.
>
> The Government of the U. S. S. R. feels, however, that the organizational forms of FAO still require study. It has also become necessary for the Soviet Union to consult those of its Republics which are large producers of agricultural products and agricultural raw materials.
>
> For these reasons the U. S. S. R. is abstaining from becoming a member of FAO at this time, and its representatives will continue to attend the first session of FAO only as observers.
>
> I know that I am speaking for every member of the Conference when I say that it is our earnest hope that the Government of the U. S. S. R. will soon be able to accept the constitution of FAO, which is the first of the specialized organizations to be set up by the United Nations. The U. S. S. R., as an indispensable member of the United Nations, and as one of the nations which has already ratified the UNO Charter, will be greatly interested and concerned in the work of FAO. We hope, therefore, that it will not be long before it expresses that interest by accepting all the rights and obligations of full membership in our organization.

At the plenary session on October 27 there occurred what was, undoubtedly, the most important action taken by the Conference, the election of a director-general, and an executive committee of 15 members, 5 to serve for 3 years, 5 for 2 years, and 5 for 1 year, thereafter all members being elected for a term of 3 years. The procedure followed by the Conference was to elect all 15 members and determine the terms of each by having the chairman draw 15 pieces of paper from a hat, 5 of which had 1 mark, 5, 2, and 5, 3. Pursuant to this drawing the following were declared elected for the terms set opposite their names:

Sir Girja Bajpai, India, 2 years.
Edouard Baker, Haiti, 1 year.
G. S. H. Barton, Canada, 1 year.
Newton Castro Belleza, Brazil, 3 years.
R. R. Enfield, United Kingdom, 1 year.
E. J. Fawcett, New Zealand, 1 year.
Anders Fjelstad, Norway, 2 years.
Alfonso Gonzales Gallardo, Mexico, 1 year.
Darwish Haidari, Iraq, 2 years.
André Mayer, France, 2 years.
Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Poland, 2 years.
Howard R. Tolley, United States, 3 years.
P. W. Tsou, China, 3 years.
P. R. Viljoen, South Africa, 3 years.
Arthur Wauters, Belgium, 3 years.

As Director-General of the Conference, Sir John Boyd Orr was selected for a term ending on December 31, 1947. The Conference also adopted a recommendation of the general committee to the effect that the Director-General shall receive a salary of $18,000 annually with a representation allowance of $10,000, with the proviso that the salary and allowance might be adjusted to take account of any exemption from taxation accorded the Director-General by way of diplomatic privilege, or otherwise, and any variation in his cost of living resulting from a change in the seat of the organization. The chairman then presented the Director-General, who responded in a speech outlining briefly his views as to the objectives, purposes and program of the organization. The following extracts from that speech may be of interest:

> Let me say a word about what FAO must accomplish. Each nation has accepted the responsibility, which indeed must be the responsibility of any government, to provide, as far as possible, food and a health standard for all the peoples it governs. But something new has arisen. All the governments have agreed to cooperate in a great world food scheme, which will bring freedom from want of food to all men, irrespective of race or color.
>
> I ask you for a moment to consider what the great results will be. In the first place, disease and misery and premature death, which afflict the majority of the people of this planet, will, to a large extent, be replaced by health, by happines, and by life.
>
> But other results will follow. If the nations of the world are going to get together to feed the people of the world, they must increase the production of the most important foods. In many cases that production must be more than doubled. This will bring prosperity to agriculture. There should be no slump in agriculture after this war, such as after the last war, and prosperity in agriculture must overflow into other businesses and into world trade.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Here we have a scheme in which we have agreed to cooperate, a scheme which will bring important benefits to all nations. In cooperating in this world food scheme, based upon the needs of mankind, we will be developing an atmosphere of good will. Governments will thus learn to trust each other,

and will see the spirit of the good neighbor beginning to appear in most of the nations of the world.

These are the things which, to my mind, FAO has set out to do. The great promotion of human welfare, prosperity in agriculture, prosperity in industry, and prosperity in trade, all make contributions to world unity. You say it is a dream. Then it is the business of FAO to make that dream come true.

I think it is apropos at this point to say a few words about the new Director-General. I had never met him before this Conference. His name is not particularly familiar to Americans. He does, however, have a world-wide reputation as a scientist in the field of nutrition, and in his country he is widely known as a scientist, a humanitarian, and a practical farmer. He served with gallantry in the British Army during World War I and is a member of the British House of Commons, representing the Scottish universities.

I must confess that in the beginning I questioned the advisability of giving this most important position to a citizen of a consumer country and to a man whose work and reputation had been mainly as a nutritionist and scientist. I doubted whether any man with that background had the knowledge of agricultural production and the sympathetic understanding of producers' problems, especially in the surplus-producing countries, which the Director General should possess. I can say frankly, however, that after becoming acquainted with Sir John Boyd Orr and after talking with men who have known him for many years my doubts have been entirely dissipated. I am thoroughly convinced of his fairness, of his interest in the producer, of his knowledge of all the broad problems of food and agriculture, of his great ability, and his zeal to do the big job that has to be done. I am impressed with his spirit of consecration—and I am sure that is the right word—with which he has approached his great task. One of the most impressive moments of the Conference occurred at the beginning of the last plenary session on Thursday when he made his declaration of loyalty to the organization as follows:

I solemnly undertake to exercise in all loyalty, discretion, and conscience, the functions entrusted to me as an officer of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; not to seek or accept from any other authority instructions in regard to the performance of my official duties, and to discharge those duties and regulate my conduct with the interests of the organization alone in view.

Accompanying this declaration was the statement that every officer and employee of the organization would be required to subscribe to the same statement before entering upon his employment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What percentage of these expenses, including this $18,000 salary, does the United States pay?

Mr. HOPE. I shall be glad to answer the inquiry of the gentlewoman from Illinois as to the contributions to the expenses of the organization which will be made by the various member nations, and I shall secure permission later to insert in the RECORD a statement showing the contributions payable by each of the member countries for this year and next year.

Under this arrangement, the contribution of the United States will be 25 percent of the total budget of $2,500,000 for the current fiscal year, and $5,000,000 for succeeding fiscal years.

That would mean our contribution would be $625,000 this year. The next largest contributor this year is the United Kingdom with $375,000. Following that is China with $162,000; France with $142,000; Canada, $126,000. The proportions are somewhat different for the second year as to a number of member countries, but for the United States it will again be 25 percent.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It has always seemed to me this was nothing but a way to get the secrets of the United States farmers away from them and give them to foreign countries in order that the Russians and the English and the rest of them would have cheaper food at the expense of the American taxpayers. During your visit at this organization, could you tell us any advantage we are going to get out of this?

Mr. HOPE. I shall be glad to point out what I think are some of the advantages which will accrue to this country and to every country. I am getting to that right now. What can an organization like FAO do to bring about the common objective of adequate nutritious food for all the world's people and fair prices and income to the people who produce that food? That part of the report of the Conference covering this subject comprises 100 large mimeographed pages. It is divided into six sections: Nutrition, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, markets, and statistics. It contains hundreds of separate recommendations which it is obviously impossible to enumerate here. I hope the report will soon be available and I commend it to anyone interested in food and agriculture as a document well worth studying. It will serve as a guide and a landmark for the programs to be undertaken by the organization. I can only indicate in a very brief way the general nature of those recommendations.

Before doing that, however, I should perhaps point out that FAO itself cannot carry out, and must not be expected to carry out, most of the recommendations made in the report. That will have to be done by the member countries, in many cases, however, under the guidance and direction of FAO. The chief function of FAO, as I see it, is to act as a clearing house for information and statistics relating to the production, marketing, and consumption of the products of our farms, forests, and fisheries. It will be a clearing house, but something more in that it will attempt, not only to clear and exchange information, but will also assist member nations in making the best practical use of the information. In the field of agricultural production, for instance, the great need in some of the less developed countries is for information regarding seeds, fertilizers, insecticides, machinery, and hand tools. On a long-time basis those countries need information on soils, livestock improvement, irrigation, drainage, farm credit, and so forth. That information is available from countries which have a highly developed agriculture. Those countries can make it available to FAO. But that probably is not enough. Someone familiar with the subject matter must carry the information to the places where it is needed and must teach it to those who can, in turn, pass it on to farmers generally. Under those circumstances, it is proposed that FAO should send out small working or demonstration parties, either from its own staff or borrowed from countries where the information is available. The same procedure could be followed with reference to problems relating to nutrition, forestry, or any similar activity.

The more advanced countries will have different problems. It was noticeable at the Conference that the greatest interest, particularly as far as the western countries were concerned, was in the subject of markets. Here again FAO can perform a great service as a clearing house for information because, after all, the most critical problem for both producers and consumers is the economic adjustment of international markets. This is basic to the whole question of eliminating surpluses in some countries and feeding the hungry in others. Only an international organization having a working relationship with governments and other international organizations can deal with that situation. However, in marketing there are many problems which are strictly national, even local, such as transportation, storage, processing, insect infestation, and grades and standards. In the case of most of these problems an interchange of experience, information, and methods is bound to be helpful.

The very fact that agriculture is in different stages of development in various parts of the world and that no two countries have exactly the same problems makes an international approach much more necessary and effective. Under FAO we are making a mass attack on the twin problems of overproduction, so-called, and undernourishment, something which has never been done before and something which must be done if we are to make progress toward a well-fed world and a prosperous agriculture.

As to our own Nation, it seems to me the matter of greatest interest lies in what FAO can do in bringing about better methods of marketing, both national and international. Those are our great unsolved problems. It does not follow, however, that there would not be direct benefits in the field of production and conservation on our farms, in our forests, and in our fisheries. We have made great advances along some lines but there is much which we can learn even from countries which may be backward in other ways.

It is my opinion that the first FAO Conference was a success. It did what it set out to do. It established a world-wide organization of 40 countries which it is hoped will be expanded as time goes on. It created the machinery. It will

now be up to the director general and the executive committee to put it into action. Upon their shoulders rests a great responsibility. However, the final responsibility is not upon them but upon the member governments because without their cooperation this organization can do nothing. It is their creature and its success or failure is in their hands.

The fact that representatives of 40 nations with many divergent interests were able to get together at Quebec and agree so well upon objectives and organization is a good augury. Surely, if there is any one subject upon which the nations of the world ought to get together it is upon this great fundamental, basic subject which directly affects every one of us. If we can get together on this we have taken long strides toward collaboration in other lines, even to the great and final objective of putting an end to human warfare.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems to me quite obvious from your last recitation that what you are going to do is give away our trade secrets in agriculture, the way we operate our farms; you are going to give machinery to those countries, and, of course, they will produce more. So how can you say you are going to limit production? I never heard such a flagrant case of giving away American rights. I do hope that other industries will take note that this is just a step in collaboration. I suppose the day will come, and I think it is only fair that it should come, when we give away our trade secrets in the chemical industry, the automobile industry, and all the rest of them.

Mr. HOPE. I have never been aware that we had any secrets in this country, as far as agricultural production is concerned.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Well, then, use the word "know-how." Take our hybrid corn, or anything else you want. We have all kinds of methods in our farm research work. Our county agent gets them. He passes them on to the Federal Government, then the Federal Government gives them to Russia or England. It is a complete case of giving away our country. For my part, I think it absolutely abominable that Congress should stand for it.

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentlewoman that in the past there have been a great many interchanges of information between nations. We have gotten a great many of our important crops in this country from other countries.

I might mention a crop in which the State of Illinois excels, soybeans, which we secured from Manchuria. If we adopt the theory of the gentlewoman from Illinois, then we should never have secured any soybeans from Manchuria, because that would be a trade secret which they were entitled to keep.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I imagine that when we got it we bought and paid for the seed. That is something entirely different.

Mr. HOPE. No. The idea is exactly the same, we learned that the Chinese were producing soybeans. We learned how they are producing them. We have adopted them in our own country. In the Southwest, where I live, we have a very valuable crop in grain sorghums, which we secured from South Africa. We have developed them and acclimated them, and they have been of very great benefit to our Nation. I might go on and mention Turkey wheat from southern Russia and alfalfa from Turkestan to mention two more crops we grow in Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I wish to say something further in reply to the gentlewoman from Illinois. Let me call attention to a statement made at the Conference by the delegate from India who called attention to the fact that in his country there were 400,000,000 people of whom about 30 percent have never had enough to eat. He stated that the average annual income in that country is $22 per year, a country with a per capita income of $22 per year does not afford a market for any products agricultural or otherwise. Our market outlets are in the richer countries where the average standard of living is high. Anything which will increase the standard of living of a country such as India will certainly be of benefit to the entire world and will increase outlets for our surplus production.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Then the gentleman would argue that since they do not have any movies, public transportation, or automobiles, we should up and give them our secrets of how to produce automobiles, how to make movies and all the rest of it. If it is fair for one it is fair for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the session of the House today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of that committee, but in view of a discussion about the matter that I heard in the cloakroom a few moments ago I think that until the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] or some member of the committee on this side of the aisle are present the request should not be granted.

Mr. MAY. The only thing is the Secretary of War is on the witness stand and I wanted to have him continue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will not the gentleman withhold it just a few minutes until the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] can be consulted?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the floor leader what the program will be next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is Armistice Day. As I understand it, we will adjourn from today until Monday. Of course, there will be no legislation on that day.

At the present time I know of no legislation to be considered next week.

If the full-employment bill comes out of committee and it is possible to bring it up in the House, every effort will be made to have it considered next week. I do not want to be definitely bound by the statement there will be no legislation next week, but I know of none now.

Mr. MICHENER. It is not the purpose of the majority leader to call up these bills now on the calendar for which rules have been granted?

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of no bill on the calendar for which a rule has been granted that will be on the program for next week.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he just made and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a news story from the Ottumwa (Iowa) Courier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it must be apparent by this time that the Army and Navy are not going to straighten out the demobilization muddle they have created. Congress should take immediate action. I think it is high time that the facts be told so the people will understand the demobilization situation.

Many seem to think Congress is responsible for the demobilization plans and their execution. The fact is that the Army and the Navy each made their demobilization plans without consulting Congress and they are executing them as they see fit. Altogether too much favoritism is being shown. Too many cases of the release of star football and baseball players, with administration Senators' support, are being brought to light.

Congress cannot give orders to the Army or Navy. It can act only by passing laws. The President, in his capacity as Commander in Chief is the only one who can give orders to the Army and the Navy and we have not heard of him issuing any orders, so he apparently approves of the way demobilization is being handled.

Many bills have been introduced to speed up demobilization but they have all been kept bottled up in committee. The administration has a majority in both branches of Congress and a majority on every committee. Through this majority it is enabled to determine what bills are reported to Congress for action. This majority cannot dodge the responsibility for keeping these bills in committee and thus prevent action by Congress.

Many Congressmen want to pass legislation which would get the boys released and returned to their homes but are prevented from doing so because the majority has prevented the proposed legislation from even being considered.

Many people are inclined to blame Congress as a whole for the existing situation and I think it well to state the facts so the people will know that the Army and Navy are responsible for the demobilization plans and the manner in which they are being carried out and the majority party is responsible for preventing any action by Congress. Criticism of Congress as a whole is not justified but should be directed to the administration majority which has prevented Congressional action.

Why is it that great numbers of ships and planes are left idle while a claim of lack of transportation to get the boys home is made? Why does the Navy use large numbers of ships in Navy Day celebrations while hundreds of thousands of our boys are left in foreign lands awaiting transportation home?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I state that I have received numerous letters criticizing very extremely the action taken whereby many of our warships spent weeks in preparation to celebrate Navy Day and at the same time hundreds of thousands of American boys were waiting for a chance to come home. Why are not every one of our naval ships used to help bring these boys home?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. There are many, many boats that are not warships that are tied up in ports which we all know about.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy that the gentleman, speaking as he does authoritatively as a Member of the House Appropriations Committee, which deals largely with military defense matters, is making it crystal clear to the country that the present status of demobilization, whether it be commendable or one which should be criticized is completely the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government. Congress has taken no action of any kind one way or the other. If the demobilization program is considered a success, commendation should go to the White House and to the War Department. On the other hand, if the demobilization program is considered to be in an unfortunate situation, then the criticism should also go to the White House and the War Department.

I had a caller in my office yesterday commenting on General Marshall's recent speech in which he intimated that the Congress was responsible for what he called the disintegration of the American overseas forces. I do not know whether they have disintegrated or not, but if they have disintegrated certainly the responsibility for that goes to the Chief of Staff and the Commander in Chief, because the Congress has taken no action of any kind on that subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Why must the boys remain overseas awaiting transportation while the Army transports 650 German horses to the United States? Why did a Liberty ship bring only 47 soldiers home when it had no cargo and carried 15,000 tons of sand for ballast? Why a big cargo plane was used to fly a group of officers of MacDill Field, Fla., to North Dakota to shoot pheasants; engine trouble developed and the plane landed at my home town of Terre Haute, Ind., and another large cargo plane was flown from the field in Florida to Terre Haute to take the officers on to North Dakota.

Transportation was available to get the boys overseas, against the threat of attacks from above and below the water, but now with these threats removed, a claim of lack of transportation facilities is made. It should be easier to get them back home than it was to get then overseas.

We know that many of the boys were put in the Army and the Navy as a result of laws passed by Congress; then why does the administration majority refuse to let legislation come before Congress which would get the boys out of service and returned to their homes?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for his keen observations in reference to this inefficiency that is causing great hardship in so many homes and families throughout the Nation. All of the Members of Congress have received appeals from men in the armed forces for release from the Army. I have many of them. I have one here that I think is rather pertinent and to the point, especially in reference to the remarks of the gentleman.

I would like to read the contents of this letter addressed to me, which states:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I realize the Government is being besieged by floods of protesting letters and that pressure is being exerted from so many different quarters that the representatives are having a troubled time. But, I think you should know that the men in the services are having a bad time listening to all the promises thrown at them with that fact that they are here, and to all indications will be here for one long time.

If you would believe the Army or Navy officials you may feel that the serviceman is only concerned with getting home and his griping is only of a minor nature. There is no denying the men think mostly of going home, but the disgust with which the slow attempts at demobilization are regarded, make us wonder if anyone gives a damn if we ever get out. The Navy, the brassbound, power happy Navy, is the slowest of all.

The handling we have received at the hands of rank conscious Navy men has forced us, under the emergency of war, to swallow resentment and accept a pig's life. Believe me Sir, we are treated as pigs and not fit members of human society. So when you have the situation where the men are forced to accept this intolerable military rule for week after week, month after month, we begin to hate those happy civilians, "our friends and neighbors", who selected us to defend them and who would now let us stay out here and rot. Can anyone be surprised that the men are bitter?

Military efficiency is a myth. Did not civilian production genius supply the Forces with an overwhelming supply of superior equipment? Does Pearl Harbor reflect military efficiency?

We all left home, came out here to sweat the thing out and we licked the Axis. We all feel we have contributed to the country's security at this time and now we think the job is done. The peace rests with the statesman, not a show of power by a bunch of homesick guys. Who has the right to deny us or freedom now that it is over?

Are we being unfair when we say, we want out, now.

This letter comes from the naval air base on the island of Guam. I appreciate the time the gentleman has given me, but I thought this was apropos of what the gentleman says, and it certainly shows lack of consideration for the men who won the war for us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from one of the boys saying a survey of his outfit was made and that 30 percent wanted to remain in service. I wonder why the Army and Navy have not made a survey to determine how many want to remain in service and how many want out. Surely this would be a common sense approach to the problem. It would seem the Army and Navy would want this information before attempting to make plans. They certainly need this information. Such a survey might show a sufficient number want to remain in service to supply all that are needed. If it did, then all who want to be released could be released and the draft could be stopped at once. If in addition to those who wish to remain, we make service in our armed forces attractive, it will be unnecessary to keep our boys from getting the education they desire or prevent those who wish to enter the professions and business from following that course in a free economic order, or prevent husbands and fathers return to their families.

The Army reports that voluntary enlistments are averaging 1,200 a day and the Navy reports enlistments of 500 a day and that these enlistments are supplying all replacements needed.

When we look at the way demobilization has been handled we must think of the old saying, "There are three ways to do a thing; the right way; the wrong way, and the Army-Navy way." Congress should step in and take this whole matter in charge. Demobilization is not a war problem. It is a peacetime American home problem. It involves the home because these men are members of a family unit that requires them in social and economical affairs of both the home and the community. Now that the war is over they belong at home. It is not a part of our American philosophy for the military to pass upon these vital problems of the peacetime American home.

I yield to no one in recognizing more than I do, the magnificent job that has been done by the Army and Navy in winning the war. However, it is these boys in the ranks who have done the fighting and who have brought the victory and who are now entitled to be released without long delays. They have

had excellent leadership but the question now is not the conduct of the war but rather the conduct of demobilization.

However well the heads of the Army and Navy have brought to a successful conclusion their military and naval campaigns, the same vigorous enterprise has not been put into practice in demobilization. They do not seem to understand the seriousness of the problems that confront those in the services, or their families, or the problems of American home life, including that of education, one of the most sacred institutions in our republican form of government.

Here is one letter I received which is signed by forty Indiana boys:

Hon. NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Representative from Indiana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is a letter from a group of GI's hailing from Indiana, who are now, and have been for over 2 years in the Pacific. We are plain fellows calling upon the Congressmen of Indiana to help us get something we have all fully earned.

Every man who has signed his name below has more than 67 points, 27 months overseas, 17 months service in combat zones, and 3 years in the Army. Each man has turned in an unblemished service record, and all of them have accomplished their duties in a commendable manner.

The object of this letter is to lay our case before you in a hope that by doing so you will be moved to aid us, and by doing it for us you will be doing it for all the veterans in the Pacific Theater.

In order to best present the problem, we have enclosed letters written by other soldiers in this sector and addressed to the Daily Pacifican, the principal Army newspaper in Manila. The thoughts that they express are held by 99 percent of the troops here.

The duty of returning the Pacific veterans to the homeland has obviously been bungled. Whether this was because of incompetency in method, policy, machinery, or individuals, we, in our lowly positions, are unable to ascertain. But since thousands of us hold the same opinion, it is without logic that we are wrong.

These letters are typical, and were not chosen for their excellence, nor close proximity to our own convictions. They reflect admirably the basic opinions of the soldiers in the Pacific.

Deep in their minds is another thought: "There should be an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of the situation."

The greatest issue in our lives at the present moment is our getting back to the States and rejoining our families. This is such an all-important factor, measured in the human element, that we cannot begin to impress you with its magnitude.

Yes, we are "Dreaming of a White Christmas", but we are doing it with a grimness that can be done only by men who have suffered violations of great trusts. We have accomplished our mission. America's war is won. Now it is principally your mission to get the American fighters home.

We will be indebted to you gentlemen in Congress for all of our lives, if you will only take up the "banner" where we must leave it. Get us home, please.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I want to commend the gentleman for calling the attention of the House to this letter, which is similar to a large number that all of us have received. I am just wondering if the Army and the Navy could not assist everyone by giving special consideration to hardship cases and those men, and women, too, who are eligible to return under existing regulations. These boys who have served so faithfully should be released immediately. It seems to me that would relieve the situation from the military standpoint, for the parents of this country, and for the dependents of those in the service, and the boys who should be released.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. It would be a great help, of course.

I wish time would permit me to read all the letters I have received. They tell of many rank injustices and really make your blood boil. Some of the cases are pathetic. No doubt every Member has received similar letters. It can be safely said that the way demobilization has been handled has done more to wreck the morale of those in the armed services and more to damage the prestige of all the services than anything else.

Mr. Speaker, demobilization should not be a military football to be kicked here and there. The future of these men and their families is at stake. These men have won a war; they are human and deserving of the greatest consideration and best treatment. Probably we should not be too severe on the officers in charge of demobilization. They probably act to the best of their ability, having been trained and educated to fight wars, not to understand the delicate shade of American life, but, Mr. Speaker, many of the men in the services say they have lost confidence in the Army and Navy manner of handling demobilization and they look to Congress to initiate common-sense legislation to force an orderly, just, demobilization and to regulate the armed forces in time of peace.

How long do we expect these men who have gone out and in the greatest conflict of all time, through miserable hardships and deprivations, beat to the earth two savage enemies—how long do we expect these men to tolerate the present demobilization set-up on a purely technical continuation of the war? They know the enemy has been beaten; they did it. Surely you should agree that it is time that Congress assumed the responsibility of regulating our welfare and laying down a pattern for discharging these deserving men without military red tape or personal favoritism.

As I said before, many are inclined to blame Congress as a whole for failing to act, but all Members of Congress should not be censored. Congress can act only through a majority. We of the minority cannot force action because there are not enough of us. It is the administration majority which is holding up congressional action and they cannot dodge the responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion if we are going to retain our prerogative of representatives of the people we should act at once, and I beg the present administration, acting through its majority in Congress, to permit the many bills on demobilization to be brought before Congress for consideration and passage. Bills of such importance, affecting the welfare of those serving in our armed forces and their families and the welfare of our Nation, should not be kept bottled up in committee.

Among the many pending bills is one introduced by me, H. R. 4585.

Again I ask that these bills be reported to Congress for action and I warn you now that the American people, including those in the armed forces and their loved ones, will hold the majority party responsible if action is not had on these bills.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In addition to the legislation that is necessary there are thousands of men who have sufficient points to get out, but the transportation facilities have not been efficiently handled between here and Europe and between here and the islands. Even if we do not pass any legislation there is that to consider. The majority, through the Military Affairs Committee and the Committee on Naval Affairs, ought to make it a point of issue with the two departments and insist that transportation be provided. I favor the legislation also.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. There is no question but that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I know, however, that expediency requires immediate orders to the Army and Navy, especially to the Navy, to bring these fellows back from the front.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is absolutely right. As you understand, Congress cannot order the Army and Navy to do anything. We can only pass a law, and by that law control what they do.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman has placed the responsibility where it belongs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The responsibility belongs with the majority who is holding the bill in committee.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is where it belongs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The way demobilization has been handled, including transportation, amounts to a national scandal.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman should be commended for placing the responsibility for the lack of action squarely where it belongs, and that is upon the shoulders of the majority group here in the House of Representatives. The gentleman and I both realize as members of the minority that it is impossible for the minority, regardless of how much they may wish to do so, to do anything whatever on this matter unless the majority sees fit to permit such action.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on this week end the heads of

the American, British, and Canadian Governments are meeting to discuss the problem of atomic energy.

I have asked for this time in order to express the hope that out of that meeting will come an act of statesmanship commensurate with the needs of the world today.

The fundamental values of life as we have known them are severely threatened in this era by blind and terrible forces. Millions of people throughout the world have been killed in the most terrible war in history. They are plagued by fears of unemployment, want, and poverty. They are plagued by confusion, hopelessness, and, as if those were not enough, the scientists have unlocked the secret of the tremendous storehouse of energy contained within the atom and have brought within the reach of man the fundamental power of God's universe.

This is the time, Mr. Speaker, when we have been confronted with the danger of giving away to inordinate fear. In my opinion, we have our choice between giving away to that fear or a search for the fundamental truths of life in the only place they can be found, namely, in the teachings of the Christian religion. We have but two alternatives. Either we shall revitalize the religious faith to which we profess allegiance, and make it a guiding principle of our actions, or else we will confess that the blind forces I mentioned a moment ago have conquered us and that we are incapable of bringing that faith to bear upon the problems we face.

Jesus said, "I come that ye may have life and that ye may have it more abundantly." That life is in the grasp of the peoples of the whole world today as a result of the release of atomic energy, among other factors, but there are forces at work that would deny that the people ever know that new life. These forces would condemn them, instead, to death.

Never before in history has the world been devastated as it was in World War II. That devastation has not been merely physical. It has included a breakdown of governmental institutions in nation after nation. Only a handful of nations have escaped, and only one major nation has come out of the war unbombed, with its governmental and productive powers unimpaired. Add to this the exclusive possession of the most terrible weapon man has ever imagined, the atomic bomb, and it is easy to see that the responsibility for the future of humanity rests with absolute certainly upon the shoulders of this our own country. There is greater hope in this fact for the world than could possibly be the case if such power rested with any other nation besides our own.

But the future depends directly upon two factors. First, what will be done to control the atomic bomb; and second, how resolutely will the United States, as the predominate power of the world, continue to be true to her own ideals. To the arousing of America's faith in the chance to build a firm peace through America's faith and the faith of other nations, this speech of mine is wholly dedicated.

But I want, first of all, to read a portion of a column written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, published in the papers only a few days ago. Here is what he said:

> The people of this country had better realize now—before it is too late to do anything about it—how far we have drifted into accepting the supremely defeatist idea that, while paying lip-service to the organization of peace, we are in fact in a race of armaments. It has, of course, been nobody's—or at least almost nobody's—deliberate intention to engage in a race of armaments. We have drifted into it by a series of isolated decisions of which no one in high places seems to have foreseen the whole consequences.
>
> How far this is Russia's fault, Britain's fault, or our own, no honest man can say; what matters is that the thing is happening, that we are all being sucked into a conflict, and that we are not now using a fraction of our power and influence to avert it. Let no one deceive himself: we art drifting. We are drifting toward a catastrophe.

I shall not try to discuss all of the things that Mr. Lippmann may have had in mind, but only three outstanding ones, the first of which lies, in my judgment, squarely upon the doorstep of Congress. For world stability, the restoration of hope and confidence, will depend, in large measure, upon how well this Congress does the job of assuring our country of full and increasing production, a high level of national income, and, above all, maintenance in the hands of the humble consumers of the country of a sufficiency of buying power to offer a market for all they can produce.

The American market is by all odds the most important market in the whole world, and upon America's doing these things will depend not only the peace and happiness of our people but the prosperity of large sections of the world.

In the second place, our attitude toward other nations struggling against fearful odds to retain for their people the maximum amount of freedom at the same time they attempt to find an answer to the elemental problems of food, clothing, and shelter is a matter of tremendous moment. This great Nation among all the nations is by far the most likely to give the leadership in which hope for mankind is to be found. That leadership must be first of all a leadership for freedom. In this connection I welcomed what President Truman had to say in his Navy Day speech, as I believe it was welcomed by the small nations all around the world. But there remains the question as to how far we will understand the problems that the other people face, and how sympathetically we will realize that they have got to meet those problems in accordance with the situation as they find it. The implication of some speeches that have been made and some articles that have been written has been even to question whether the British people had the right to elect the Labor Party to power and whether, having done so, they should expect from us the same friendly and cooperative attitude as would otherwise have been the case. And there has, it seems to me, been too little expression of profound encouragement in this country over the outcome of the elections in France where the forces of totalitarianism suffered a substantial set-back at the hands of political parties which, though standing to the left of America's present position are unquestionably committed, one of them by its vigorous official pronouncements, to the freedom of the individual, the protection of his religious liberties, and democratic institutions of government.

The peoples of the world are in a desperate plight. America's leadership depends upon her position being very clear that she stands not for reaction but for orderly progress toward a better and fairer world. It depends on understanding in this country of the inescapable logic of the British people in freeing themselves from utterly unnecessary future national debt by nationalization of the Bank of England. The establishment of puppet regimes committed to dictatorship we must resist, but what we must not resist but encourage instead is a fairer distribution of the farm lands of the world, the growth of cooperatives among the people, the giving to formerly exploited people of something like the hope that this country has itself afforded the people of the Philippine Islands. It must be clear to all the world that American leadership means progress and a better world, never an attempt to force other nations into a pattern which under present circumstances cannot meet their problems.

But mankind lives today under a shadow which darkens consideration of even such important matters as I have been discussing. I refer, of course, to the shadow of the atomic bomb. One of America's most eminent scientists, one who, incidentally, had most to do with the production of the atomic bomb, recently made the following four significant statements in a motion-picture newsreel: First he said that 40,000,000 Americans could be killed in a few moments of atomic-bomb attacks, even in a war that America might ultimately win. Second, he said that there is, and in his judgment can be, no military defense against atomic-bomb attack. Third, he told us once again as the scientists have been telling us from the beginning, that there is no real secret for the United States to keep. And, finally, he told us what is the obvious simple truth, namely, that world good will and a world authority to enforce peace and to control the frightful terror which the atomic bomb otherwise presents is the one hope of safety of the American people along with all the others in the world. And so I come back to where I started from—merely to point out that the future safety of our children simply cannot be found in the world today by the building of military power and that unless that military power is dedicated under understandings with other nations in the world simply to the cause of preservation of peace, it can become a positive danger to the very nation that it professes to protect.

No, Mr. Speaker, the hour has come when either we shall return to an allegiance to fundamental religious principles and take them as a guide for our action, or we shall face the necessity of confessing that this generation has failed more miserably than any generation in the history of the world. For the road

forks here and now where we stand today. One fork leads through increasing nationalism, mounting jealousy, suspicion, and fear to a full scale race for military supremacy and ultimately to an atomic war. The other fork leads through increasing international understanding, greater efforts on the part of the nations to work out underlying problems, forthright discussion of the problem of the atomic bomb and the establishment of a world authority with sufficient strength to keep the peace and in which there shall be a veto power in the hands of no nation on earth.

These are times when nothing else than bringing all nations under a single rule of law far stronger than any yet forged can save mankind. The borders of defense in an atomic age are the world itself. Only in understanding and in law can safety be found for any nation. Over and over it has been testified that the only defense against atomic bombs is to attack first. Does anyone believe America would do that? Does anyone want her to?

It is my belief that the laws of God will prevail regardless of the will of man.

It is my belief that there are open before us today ways in which by earnest constructive effort a world can be built in which humble people will not only be safe but relieved of want and poverty. But unless the trends of the present hour are reversed there will be instead an armament race in weapons of war including atomic weapons which can only end in a terrible war. At the very root of those trends lies one thing—secrecy, a secrecy involving at the moment our country in connection with the atomic bomb, a secrecy involving the other greatest power in the world, namely, Russia, covering many things besides military ones. We know that there can be no secret kept for long. Even the know-how of manufacture will be world property in another 5 years. Then follows universal suspicion and fear, a universal concern in every nation over how terrible the weapons are which other nations possess.

The military leaders as well as the scientists all agree that there is no defense against atomic weapons except to use them first. In a few brief years all major nations will have them. Every one of them will know the others have them. Every one will know they can only defend themselves by using them first. Some nation will do so. Whatever nation that is will have so sinned against God that no parent in that country will dare so much as whisper the name of Christ to a child again.

What then, Mr. Speaker, can we do? Is the situation one of complete darkness and hopelessness? I believe not.

There are two great factors in the world peace problem today. They are the United States and the Soviet Union. As for our country the outstanding features of our position are again two. First, the record of the United States in international relations which is on the whole so good a record and one upon which other nations, especially small nations, have felt they could rest so much hope; and, second, there is the preponderant power of the United States, an actual and potential power greater in proportion to that of other nations in the world, than has perhaps ever been possessed by any single nation in many centuries.

As to Russia, one of the principal factors, if not the principal factor, is found in the barriers of secrecy and lack of freedom which surround that nation. The peace of the world may be disturbed from various quarters, but it cannot be destroyed except by action of either the United States or of the Soviet Union. All the balance of the world is either too devastated, too weak in resources, or too backward in development to constitute a serious factor. If the peace is broken at any time in the foreseeable future, it will be either because these two nations, or one of them, fails to do the things it ought to do. How could World War III come? It could come through misunderstanding and disillusionment as to the possibility of peace. Our own press is filled with talk of war preparation. Meanwhile, we worry and wonder what goes on in Soviet Russia. No doubt the Russians do likewise as to us. What is the basic problem in regard to Russia? It is what the rest of the world does not know. The one worst thing about Russia, the one thing that makes understanding difficult, the one place where Russia is tragically at fault, lies in the pall of mystery that surrounds her, the impossible barrier that she puts around herself and within which none can move but the secret police follow them.

Is it possible that there can be found hope in solving these problems at once? Is it conceivable that the whole world longs for peace and would welcome a bold, truly great move on the part of the United States to get it, an unmistakable demonstration that this Nation will use its power for peace—not for war? Is it possible that the fact that these two elements of secrecy standing side by side suggest the answer? I am going to be so bold, Mr. Speaker, because I feel the very future of mankind hinges on the outcome of these things, to suggest that out of the discussion between the heads of this Government, and the British and Canadian Governments, there should come something like the following: That these three great nations, temporarily the sole possessors of atomic bombs, propose to the other nations of the world the setting up in connection with the United Nations Organization, if you will, but with no veto power this time anywhere, a world authority composed of scientists, technicians, and engineers from every nation. Let the United States propose that with every nation submitting to such a world authority, it will share the economic benefits, yes, and the military knowledge of atomics, but on one condition, and only one, namely, that each nation becoming a part of this world authority agree that to that authority it gives the right of unlimited inspection, of unlimited surveillance and effective control of every factory, mine, laboratory, and other facility in those nations where military weapons might be made; that they agree, further, to accord to this international military organization composed of scientists, technicians, and engineers, the duty to police the world so that no atomic weapon can be manufactured or possessed by any nation except only the international authority itself, in whose hands it would be dedicated to the cause of keeping peace. Thus, Mr. Speaker, and only thus, could there be an end to the suspicion, to the fear that otherwise will enable the breeding of an unlimited race in the production of atomic weapons, the race in armaments, different from any race that ever went on before, for the basic reason that everybody knows there is no defense except offense and which, therefore, must only end in a disastrous war.

Someone may ask, Would Russia agree to this? I do not know, but I believe she would. I do not believe any nation could afford not to agree for if any nation did refuse it would in effect become an outlaw nation, outside of the greatest law of peace the world has known, a nation justly to be regarded with fear and suspicion by all the rest.

Meanwhile the United States would have given the greatest demonstration of devotion to peace ever made in all the history of mankind. It would be those nations that refused this challenge rather than ourselves who would be condemning the world to the danger of atomic war. I do not believe knowledge of such a situation could be kept from the people of any nation for long. I believe they would begin to realize what their Government's attitude was doing to them, and they would know that all the rest of the world was pooling together its knowledge of atomic energy and that a trial of strength against the entire world would be suicidal. Neither the Soviet Union nor the other nations could afford to stand in such a position. No; the danger from other nations, whatever it does or does not amount to, can itself be removed as a danger to world peace by the taking of the one possible right action by the United States in this hour of solemn destiny and decision. I do not ask the United States to give something away. I only ask that the United States purchase in the few months and years that remain to her of sole possession, perhaps, of this great weapon, the one priceless possession which she could purchase in honor of the men who lie dead in this war, namely, a structure that can keep the peace.

Here in our country within the next few months will be decided the question that will last through the centuries, the greatest question of all time, perhaps. I submit with all the earnestness and forcefulness at my command that when there is entrusted to any people on this earth the fundamental power of God's universe, not just a new weapon of war but the very fundamental cosmic force that lies within the basic structure of all things, when that power is unlocked and entrusted to man it becomes perfectly obvious that either it will be dedicated to the welfare of humanity and we will have the courage and the willingness to live without fear even in a dangerous world on the basis of a decision to dedicate it freely to the welfare of all mankind, or else we suffer inevitably the consequences of failure to obey a law that lies deeper by far in the nature of all things than the kind of laws we enact here.

A great act of clearly unselfish leadership, an act commensurate with the fundamental principle of the life of Jesus Himself, is all that can end the armament race that already threatens, all that can save humanity from the tragic fate that otherwise it faces. I covet for my country the honor of doing such an act. In the excitement of the past few weeks, in the pride of victory, there may be some things that we have forgotten.

God of our fathers, known of old—
Lord of our far-flung battle line—
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

The tumult and the shouting dies—
The Captains and the Kings depart—
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding, calls not Thee to guard,
For frantic boast and foolish word,
Thy Mercy on Thy People, Lord! Amen!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Governor Lehman.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

L. W. FREEMAN

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate Concurrent Resolution (S. Con. Res. 41):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives in signing the enrolled bill (S. 1199) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman be, and the same is hereby rescinded, and that the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to reenroll the said bill with the following change, namely: On page 2, line 1, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the word "while" and insert in lieu thereof the word "which."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am sure this House is always pleased to be educated, and I am especially pleased when it is done by one of my distinguished colleagues from the State of Illinois.

On the floor here, last Monday, my friend of the opposition, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable NOAH MASON, of the Twelfth Illinois District, gave us a sharp lecture on the political facts of life and the immediate needs of our country.

What the country immediately needs, it appears, is a Republican slate of candidates for 1948.

I can understand the Republicans' concern about 1948. If I were in their shoes, I would be worried, too.

But there is not much point in jumping the gun, and I would suggest that they are being a bit premature.

They might first get a platform on which to run, and then try it out in 1946 to see if it would support anybody. I should think they would be pretty tired of these jerry-built platforms that let them down with such a bang.

After 14 years of unparalleled world crisis, with all kinds of domestic and foreign problems to be solved, with the fate of civilization itself at stake, we are now promised a Republican platform at long last.

I understand some of our friends here in the House are hatching it, and I hope they are not sitting on a porcelain egg. All I say is, knowing the temper of the American people, that something good had better come out of so much cackle.

The gentleman from Illinois, I fear, was trying to prepare us for the worst in his lecture here the other day. He took all of us severely to task, Republicans and Democrats alike.

None of us, it appears, has done anything right since 1932—and as for his own party, the Congressman certainly ought to know. But I think he takes too black a view.

During these past 12 years the Republicans have a perfectly dismal record, it is true, but it should be possible to salvage a little something from the wreckage.

Of course, he does nothing to help matters along when he goes out of his way to take a slap at Wendell Willkie, one of the great Americans of our generation, airily dismissing him as one of "Roosevelt's New Deal socialists." That is no way to repair party unity.

And what does the gentleman from Illinois mean when he speaks in disparaging terms of "the ill-matched hybrid team of Dewey and Bricker"?

Which one is the hybrid? Is it Governor Dewey, the titular head of the party? And is Dewey's man Brownell also a hybrid, or perhaps something worse?

This kind of something is not designed to help Tom's chances of remaining in the limelight and returning to Albany next year, particularly in the light of the perfectly disastrous showing of the Republicans in the New York City elections last Tuesday. The Republican Party there showed itself feebler than it has been for years.

What is this—a revolt in the party just when all the boys in the back room are trying to get together?

I am afraid they are not going to thank my colleague from Illinois for his gratuitous remarks which, unfortunately, have been all too well publicized.

From his address we learn other interesting things. Again I quote:

The heart and soul of the Republican Party is located in the Midwest.

That is news. It will be news not only to heavy contributors in Wall Street, but to those of us who always thought that the heart and soul of the Republican Party lay in its passionate desire to get back into power anywhere it could—not only in the Middle West, but wherever it might possibly squeeze through by deluding a few voters.

We are also told that the GOP is the "elongated shadow of Lincoln."

"Elongated" is no word for it. It is pure shadow, a pale and unsubstantial ghost moaning of the glories that were and never again will be.

So desperate is the situation, in the opinion of my colleague, that he not only constitutes himself a one-man nominating convention for the Presidential elections of 1948 but goes on to give his candidate a complete Cabinet, as if he is not capable of choosing one for himself.

And what an interesting Cabinet it is—both for the names included and those ignored.

Let us start at the bottom and work up:

Secretary of Labor, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman EVERETT DIRKSEN. Let us call this a gesture of courtesy from one Illinoisan to another, though I doubt if the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman DIRKSEN, will be too well pleased. Labor is not his field. He certainly deserves a much higher post for his able work as a member of the House Appropriations Committee. He should merit the Treasury post.

And why overlook such demonstrated friends of labor as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], who would certainly show the workingman his place in the Republican scheme of things—and fast.

Then comes Eric Johnston, formerly head of the United States Chamber of Commerce, as Secretary of Commerce.

Here, too, I doubt if Mr. Johnston is the man for my colleague from Illinois, especially if he hopes, as he says, to wipe out everything that has been done since 1932 and turn the clock back at least to 1928.

Although something of a patent-leather liberal, Mr. Johnston has spoken out for some rather progressive measures that are anathema to the Republican Old Guard, and could hardly be expected to sit silently by as the machine creaked and bumped along in the old ruts.

No; I do not think Mr. Johnston is the best choice for their purposes.

Rather, if I may, I would like to offer the suggestion that their best man for the post is Herbert Hoover, whose credentials as a member of the Old Guard have never been challenged.

Personally, I was shocked—and I know many good Republicans were also—to see a former President of the United States, a senior statesman of the party, given such a brush off and so lightly consigned to the dust bin.

It was positively insulting, and there was no excuse for it, even on the narrowest grounds of self-interest.

The Republicans, I say, cannot afford to ignore Herbert Hoover and his clique,

for if and when the voters decide to return to the Republican fold, Herbert Hoover will be the symbol of the party.

And in light of his experience, he would make the best Republican Secretary of Commerce since Herbert Hoover. If the opposition wishes to survive and preserve some semblance of party unity, it just has to play ball with the great engineer, always loyal to himself and his party. He could help create jobs, too, for no man in history has done so much to promote the selling of apples and the general distribution of applesauce.

And I ask you, What is the point in passing over Hoover and coming to rest—in fact, coming to a dead stop—on Alf Landon?

Believe it or not, Alf Landon is proposed as Secretary of the Interior. His qualifications are, I suppose, that he comes from the interior, and I am sure it is fervent prayer of millions that he will remain there. More circumspect Republicans have never forgiven him for the terrible debacle of 1936, and here they are saddled with him again. No wonder so many in the party are confused and disgruntled.

And not only is the party to be saddled with the little "sunflower" from Kansas, but with his campaign manager as well, John D. M. Hamilton, who is to be Postmaster General, and dispense all patronage.

If that does not send cold chills down many a spine, I do not know what will. Mr. Hamilton is being rewarded, I presume, because he managed to carry two States for his boss in 1936. And, considering what he had to work with, I confess it was quite a feat.

But what about Herb Brownell? Is he not any good? Has he not some claim on Republican gratitude?

These amateur king-makers had better watch their step if they value their health and political hides. Brownell still sits in the driver's seat of the well-oiled Republican machine and does not intend to be pushed around. I hope no heads have to roll because of my colleague's rather aimless speculations.

Treason has to be an overt act and cannot properly be extended into the realm of pure phantasy, such as naming a Republican Cabinet for 1948. But I can well understand why Herb Brownell and Governor Dewey are so sore.

Now we come to an equally serious and tangled matter—Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Secretary of War. The general would probably make a good Secretary, but has he been consulted? Is this really the height of his ambition? Has the appointment been cleared with Colonel McCormick, Cissie Patterson, Cousin Joe, William Randolph Hearst, and Gerald L. K. Smith—staunch Republicans all, who insist that General MacArthur is a "natural" for the Presidency in 1948, the answer to their long and fervent prayers for "the man on a white horse"?

These people undoubtedly feel that to promise him appointment as Secretary of War is only a cheap political maneuver to dish the general out of the Presidency—and I fear they will regard my friend's open-handed generosity as actually a demotion for MacArthur, and they will not be disposed to put up with it.

I should think the Republicans had enough trouble without getting into such as these, which could so easily be avoided if they would only learn to keep their peace. I can certainly sympathize with their leadership—driven frantic, as it is, by so much back-seat driving.

Only backseat driving can explain the fact that in this hypothetical Republican Cabinet the most critical and influential post is given to a Democrat, Mr. Jesse Jones, who is proposed as Secretary of the Treasury. It is not so strange that a raid is made on the Democratic Party to get some real talent.

But it is strange that so many deserving Republicans were overlooked. Are none of them good enough to be Secretary of the Treasury? Even if they are not, I can think of a number of men of large affairs who have been pouring money down the Republican rat hole for years and certainly expect some slight return—Joe Pew, for example, or some of the Mellons and du Ponts, who together contributed almost $200,000 to get some steam into the campaign for the little "man in the blue serge suit."

Are the Republicans now so rich that they can afford to insult such large contributors?

Is it wise, I ask, to kill these geese who lay the golden eggs?

And now we come to the true inwardness of the matter—to the fire that has caused all this smoke, all these headaches and heartburns.

Who do you suppose is going to be the next Republican Vice President, if any?

The Republican Party is filled with old and faithful wheel horses who have been doing their best for years to pull their battered Noah's Ark off the mud flats where it has been stuck so long. Each and every one of them is panting for the recognition they deserve. Yet the Vice Presidency goes to a newcomer, a comparative unknown—Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts.

I do not know the answer, but it must be the magic—the black magic—of the name.

And as chief in this realm of pure fantasy, this new and more wonderful Alice in Wonderland, we are offered—I must confess—an excellent choice, one to tickle the funnybone of millions.

I think the Cabinet that has been listed could be headed by only one man, one of the distinguished Members of the other House—Senator ROBERT ALPHONSO TAFT, of Ohio. No one has worked harder and with greater effect to return the party to the principles of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. His record on this score is unimpeachable, and he can be trusted to carry on, come what may. He is not one of those to change with every shifting wind. If he goes off on the starboard tack, he stays there as a matter of principle, even if it means going on the rocks. He lays the straightedge of his opinion against all problems and, once set, everybody knows that you simply cannot budge him, and he made up his mind about most things long ago.

For their purposes, as I say, the Republicans could have made no better choice, though I should add a word of caution that there is much grumbling about it among the more restless rank-and-file and considerable annoyance among the Hoover, Landon, Dewey, Bricker, Vandenberg, Warren, and Stassen crowds.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. THOM. I might say there is very strong sentiment in Ohio for former Governor Bricker for the Presidency, and I am surprised that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has put him out of the clear and not even mentioned him for the Presidency.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. He is just one of many. But this, I presume, can be put down merely to envy of Senator TAFT and what my colleague calls his all-American Cabinet. As you can see, it is certainly all-something, and I hope the Republicans go through with this slate.

We Democrats could not ask for more.

And just to help the Republicans along and show my good faith, I am even willing to contribute a slogan to their campaign:

"Join the hodge-podge lodge,
And go daft
With TAFT."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the mayor of Antwerp, Belgium.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized.

H. R. 2202, SO-CALLED FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time on last Tuesday at the conclusion of a speech by my friend the able and distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. At that time I stated it was my intention to reply to an address he had just concluded, in behalf of H. R. 2202, the so-called full employment bill which bears his name and which has sometimes been referred to as the Murray-Patman full employment bill. Let me say that I have the very highest regard for my colleague from Texas, and in the things to be said I do not intend to reflect in any way on his integrity, character, or patriotism. I do not believe him to be the father of this bill that bears his name.

In his address of last Tuesday, my distinguished friend from Texas implied that all opposition to this bill was partisan in character, that opponents of this legislation have substituted name calling for argument, that opponents of this bill were, in fact, against full employment, and that a righteous concern for our Nation's sacrifices in war requires full support of his bill.

In view of these erroneous assertions and implications, in view of my membership on the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments,

which committee has been hard at work on this legislation for some 2 months, because of widespread discussion and misunderstanding of this legislation, and because of its great importance, I feel it my duty to speak briefly at this time, concerning this measure.

Mr. Speaker, our committee's consideration of this bill has been full, fair, and nonpartisan. Our sole concern is the general welfare of this country. To ask a man, do you favor full employment, is an insult both to his intellect and character. All of us favor full employment. We are for full employment just like we are for God, home, and country. Ninety-nine percent of those who now lambaste our committee and demand immediate and favorable action on H. R. 2202 have never read the bill and have no idea what the bill means. That patriot who cried, "Oh, liberty, liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name" was by no means a fool. Many of those who profess to be great humanitarians do their cause untold harm. Those who believe in American democracy, as I am sure do all Members of this body, would not want full employment for today if it meant no employment for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2202 is an unemployment bill. The title of H. R. 2202, as well as the title of S. 380, heretofore passed by the Senate, is in the following language:

> To establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

Again, section (e) on page 3 of H. R. 2202 is as follows:

> To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment.

This bill by its express provisions and by its clear implications commits this Government to a positive guaranty of full employment to all persons at all times. For this Government to assure full employment is, of course, to guarantee full employment. Would anyone contend for a moment that Government assurance is not a Government commitment and a Government guaranty? This bill not only guarantees full employment, but provides for a complete inventory of the national resources and employment prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, and then for Government appropriations sufficiently large to provide jobs for those who might be unemployed in the following year.

Mr. Phil Murray, president of the CIO, in a frank statement supporting this bill, said, among other things:

> I am sure this bill is not the last word, but the first. We in the CIO regard the Murray-Patman bill as minimum legislation.

In other words, this bill is simply the ground work for gigantic and comprehensive over-all Government planning and expenditures. If enacted and if carried out according to its provisions and implications, this bill would require regimentation and would result in bureaucracy far greater than that ever known heretofore in this country, even in time of war. Full employment, as guaranteed in this bill, if at all possible, is possible only within a completely regimented economy. Full employment, as guaranteed in this bill, is possible only under some form of totalitarianism. This bill, as written, is a highway into national socialism.

To become more specific, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 2202 because it is economically unsound, psychologically unsound, and philosophically unsound.

First, a few observations concerning the economics of the proposed bill. None of the experts testifying in behalf of this bill cared to discuss the national debt, or the effect of this legislation thereon. None of them would even estimate how large a debt we might safely carry without impairing the credit and solvency of this Government. They all stick to glittering generalities. All agreed, however, that even in normal times we would have millions unemployed. Assuming a minimum average of 3,000,000 unemployed, to provide 3,000,000 additional Government jobs would probably cost not less than $3,000 per job per year, or a total of $9,000,000,000, as a conservative estimate.

We all know that henceforth the interest on our national debt will run between five and six billion dollars per year. We all agree further that henceforth and forever we must maintain the strongest military establishments on the face of the earth, which will entail great expense. Again, we have a sacred obligation to our returning veterans, both able and disabled, which we cannot and will not seek to evade. If we should add this guaranteed full employment cost onto our other current financial obligations, there would be no escape from extensive deficit financing. The only possible way to meet such staggering obligations would be through inflation. Like my good friend from Texas, I abhor the prospects of continuous or extended inflation. We all know the perils and penalties of such inflation. The time might well come, and soon, in this America of ours, unless we proceed with caution and wisdom, in which one could not carry enough currency in a tow sack to pay for a package of cigarettes. No financial Houdini can escape the stern realities of debt. We cannot afford an annual minimum of $9,000,000,000 added onto our other fixed obligations.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this bill is psychologically unsound. Even the threat of its enactment is now hurting our reconversion program. Farmers and businessmen all over America are crying for help. Crops are rotting in the field and shops remain idle. Some of this is due to the widespread illusion held out by this bill that come or go what may, a benevolent government will take care of you. This bill may be, as some of its sponsors contend, just a pious declaration of principles. To pass laws saying we favor full employment or that we believe a man has a right to seek useful employment is a ridiculous and dangerous quibble with words. Whether or not this bill means what it says, it will certainly create the impression throughout this country that our Government is going to guarantee every person a job. Certainly our Government should be the last institution on earth to deal in hypocrisy and false promises.

Again, were it possible to guarantee every person a job, to guarantee everyone security from hunger and want, would such be desirable? Would not such guaranteed security rob the average American of his finest attributes, initiative, thrift, resourcefulness, self-reliance, pride in achievement? To empty a man's backbone, even if you fill his stomach, is to do him an irreparable injury. Moral and spiritual values are, after all, our greatest source of strength and security.

Most opponents of this bill believe, of course, in government planning. They believe such planning should be far sighted, rather than shortsighted. They believe that we should have all the security possible within the framework of a virulent and solvent democracy, but under the inevitable planning and regimentation envisioned by many of the proponents of this bill, the individual would certainly become just a pawn of a totalitarian government. Moral and spiritual decay would then precede total economic collapse.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the entire philosophy of this bill is repugnant to our concepts of democratic government and to our ideals of freedom. In this country we should never permit anyone needlessly to suffer from conditions for which they themselves are not responsible. Even under our veterans laws we deny pensions to disabled veterans whose disability is the result of their own wrongdoing. Still, under this bill, our government would guarantee to every person a job, regardless of their wrongdoing. Our Government does not owe every man a job. If such a program were undertaken, the question would then arise, what kind of a job, under what conditions, at how much pay. Many of us conceive a proper course for this Government to be an avoidance of extremes. We must have planning, to be sure, we must have regulations, to be sure, but to carry planning and regulations to the extreme would be to change our philosophy of government. The true function of government is to write the rules of fair play and then to enforce those rules as an impartial referee. We should not have so many rules and regulations that it would require a coach and referee for every player on the team.

Of course, we have a great many people in this country who would like to see democracy destroyed. We have a lot of others who simply don't care what happens to anyone else so long as it doesn't happen to them. It's a sort of depravity which becomes fatal when widespread. It's the Louis XIV philosophy of "after us, the deluge," or "to the devil with future generations." It is the spirit of "eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow ye may die." Since the beginning of time such a spirit has meant death and destruction to both men and nations.

The fact that democracy has disappeared, or practically disappeared, everywhere else in the world except in this land of ours, should put us all the more

on guard. That brings me back to the name-calling that has grown out of debates on this legislation. My colleague from Texas condemns those who referred to this as communistic legislation. A member of the President's Cabinet who testified for this bill in glittering generalities and who refused to discuss its details or to roughly sketch a blueprint of its commitments and operations, referred to the opponents of this legislation as coming largely from the Union League Club. He also referred to them as "intellectuals." In his speech of last Tuesday, the gentleman from Texas told us of his farming background. He, along with the Cabinet member, wished to classify the opponents of this bill as members of our false aristocracy. If the gentleman wishes to compare antecedents, I am willing. He didn't come from any farther back in the country than did I. In fact, some of my folks haven't got to town yet. All of my forbears have been farmers and laborers. All of us have been poor. We have all lived on the wrong side of the tracks, so to speak. We have all belonged to the have-not classes of America. We have had no money, but we have had what is of greater value—pride and confidence in American citizenship. For myself, I have known hunger in days gone by. Most of the opponents of this bill would prefer going hungry in the future than seeing American democracy sold down the river for a mess of pottage.

Since some of the gentlemen have tried to classify and catalog both proponents and opponents of this legislation, I should like to observe that while many able, sincere, patriotic gentlemen are wholeheartedly for this bill, I have not heard of a pink or a red individual or organization in this Nation that is not enthusiastically supporting this legislation. The pinker and redder they are the louder they cry for its enactment. That makes me all the more suspicious of the purposes and intentions of some of those who are so anxious for the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I loathe and fear communism, fascism, nazism, and many other isms. We do not want them stealing into this Government through the back door or through any of the windows. We do not want them coming in surreptitiously under the guise of guaranteed full employment or any other cloak that might conceal their real identity.

The gentleman from Texas concluded his remarks on Tuesday by a reference to the terrible casualties of World War II. The only real sacrifices made in this war were by those who served in the armed forces and their families. For many of them the war will never end. These sacrifices were made in the defense of American institutions and ideals. They were made in the destruction of barbarian regimes that had no respect for God or man. These sacrifices should make us love America more and cause us to serve America better. Let us work to preserve in peace the things we fought to preserve in war. In all the things we do here let our only concern be for the peace, prosperity, and happiness of the American people. Let us examine with care any proposed legislation that would make revolutionary changes in the American way of life. Otherwise, gentlemen, we will wake up one sad morning to find that American democracy was just a glorious experiment.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. I compliment the gentleman. I think he has made one of the finest statements on this so-called full employment bill. I think the people are entitled to know some of the provisions of this bill. There are several things about this bill that disturb me. I think if the bill is passed in its present form it would wreck our system of private enterprise. I think it will enslave the workingmen of this country, contrary to the opinion of a lot of people. But I want the gentleman's opinion on this so-called Federal budget. Do you not think that if the President is transmitting his budget to the Congress in January, which would not take effect until July, at the beginning of the next fiscal year, if he were to predict that 4,000,000 or 6,000,000 or 8,000,000 people would be out of work in November of the following year that that statement in itself would not accelerate or precipitate a depression, but it would cause all the people of industry to reduce their inventories and it would scare purchasers and they would start tightening up their belts immediately, and immediately it would throw millions of Americans out of work. Then the Federal Government under this bill would have to take those people and put them on Federal public works projects. Anybody knows that when you get a man on a Federal project it is almost impossible to get him off it.

Mr. GOSSETT. I agree with the gentleman fully and share his views on this bill. I yield to my colleague, a member of the committee.

Mr. HENRY. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he as a member of the committee heard any members of the President's Cabinet or any proponents of this bill claim that the bill in and of itself would achieve full employment?

Mr. GOSSETT. No, they rather denied that it would.

Mr. HENRY. Then my second question is, Do you consider the title of the bill an honest title?

Mr. GOSSETT. If the title of the bill is an honest title, I certainly think you could not pass any more dangerous and pernicious piece of legislation.

Mr. HENRY. Then my third and last question is: Reference was made to paragraph (e) on page 3 of the bill. Do you not consider that an unlimited pledge on the part of the Federal Government to make expenditures and investments to whatever extent may be necessary to create full employment.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is unquestionably a guaranty of jobs to everybody to be paid for out of the Federal Treasury, regardless of deficit financing or the effect on the national economy.

I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I congratulate the gentleman from Texas on his very remarkable address, which was one of the best I have ever heard made on the floor of the House. I think it is timely. I think it is both the challenge and the answer to the question which is before this Congress at this time. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman is most kind and generous. His praise is appreciated.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PATTERSON. Do you mean to cast aspersions on the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and the Senate Members who voted favorably on this bill and the 100 Members of this House who are coauthors of the bill, as having something the matter with their intellectual ability and also as not being true Americans, along with the President of the United States and most of his Cabinet members?

Mr. GOSSETT. I tried to take care of that in original statement. My answer to that is, "God forgive them; they know not what they do."

Mr. PATTERSON. In other words, you include the President of the United States? In other words, you say that the President of the United States knows not what he does when he favors this bill?

Mr. GOSSETT. I do not think he has studied this bill or knows what this bill will do. He, like all of us, is for full employment.

Mr. PATTERSON. I think he has just as much idea as you do.

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

Mr. MANASCO. As a matter of fact, the President and the majority leader never have come out for any particular bill. The President's letter is in our committee file and it will be in the hearings. He said he just wanted some legislation. He did not say he was for H. R. 2202, S. 380, or H. R. 4181.

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman is correct and I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. PATTERSON. Did not the Senate pass the bill over to us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that of all of us who sat in the committee hearings for 5 or 6 weeks and listened to extensive testimony for and against and have given the bill most study, there were only 2 Members out of the 15 Members present yesterday who favored this bill as it is written.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think the gentleman is correct. I would not want to make a positive assertion, but I think that is correct.

Mr. JUDD. By a vote of 8 to 7, the committee voted to instruct a subcommittee to, in effect, strike out everything after the enacting clause and bring in an entirely different bill. So that instead of approval of the original bill, as our action has been represented to be, it was in reality a disapproval of that bill. Is that not a correct statement?

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman is quite correct. The gentleman's interpretation of that is just as mine. The committee most thoroughly disapproved of H. R. 2202.

Mr. JUDD. I am saying that because I was one of those who voted to appoint the subcommittee, in the hope that we could get something that will be wholly honest and candid and will make clear to the people, if there are those who do not know it already, the fact that Congress recognizes fully that it has an obligation to do everything within its power, consistent with its other obligations, to create a sound national economy, with the highest possible level of employment. Congress always has recognized that and it does today. That kind of a bill I am for. But this bill contains pledges and guaranties and uses such words as "assure," which no witness was able or willing to define so that I could know just what it involved. Some of us who voted for the subcommittee to prepare a new bill, could not possibly approve the language in the present bill. I wanted that to go into the RECORD.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I think the gentleman is making an extremely valuable and able speech. I wanted to testify my personal gratitude to him. I also wanted to inquire what value a piece of legislation of this kind can have in an intelligent reconversion program.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think it would be obstructive of an intelligent reconversion program. I think it is already hurting the reconversion program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to compliment my colleague from Texas on the masterful speech he has just made and tell him that I thoroughly agree with him. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Throughout the history of the universe, does the gentleman know of any countries which have ever made a success out of full employment—I do not mean to insinuate that that full employment was paid by adequate compensation, but just full employment, outside of Communist Russia and Nazi Germany? Is there any country throughout the history of the world that has ever made a success in guaranteeing full employment, outside of those two countries, under those two regimes?

Mr. GOSSETT. Nazi Germany and Communist Russia are the only two countries of which I know that ever had full employment, and I would not say they have made a success of it. One of my friends back from Russia recently said he did not see a smile on the face of a single worker in the Soviet Union.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it not a fact that under those two regimes, as I heard the very worthy gentleman who now occupies the Speaker's chair say, after a visit to those countries, especially the one that is still existing under that system of government that has guaranteed full employment it was only a form of slavery.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. We are being urged and high-pressured by every known method to report this bill out. At the same time, many of the proponents of this bill are urging the Military Affairs Committee to make further studies of the disposition and use of the atomic bomb. Does not the gentleman think that a bill of this type, which in all probability would change our system of government for years and years to come, should be studied very carefully by our committee? Some men say words mean nothing, but I have seen many Executive orders issued, where the use of a single word would change the entire meaning of the Executive order. Does not the gentleman think that we should give a lot of study before we report back to the full committee, and that then the full committee should do a lot of studying on this matter?

Mr. GOSSETT. I think this bill as written, according to its express provisions and implications, would be just about as dangerous as the atomic bomb.

Mr. MANASCO. It would remove any necessity for the Congress of the United States, would it not?

Mr. GOSSETT. It would probably eliminate the Congress within a very few years. Legislative bodies are surplusage in totalitarian regimes.

Mr. MANASCO. Personally, I think that is the intention of some of the people who are back of this bill. I do not refer to any Member of Congress, but some of the backers of the bill.

Mr. GOSSETT. I agree with the gentleman fully.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made a splendid address. I should like to ask him if there is very much practical difference between the doctrine that the Government owes everybody a job and the doctrine that the Government owes everybody a living?

Mr. GOSSETT. I see no substantial difference.

Mr. CURTIS. And that is not what has made us a great Nation, is it?

Mr. GOSSETT. Not at all. Quite the contrary is true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of November 4, 1945, entitled "The Responsibility of Victory."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN]. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL, H. R. 2202

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is correct, the sponsors of this legislation from the President on down are public enemies No. 1, they are the worst people on earth, they are communistic, they are trying to destroy the Government of the United States, they are trying to enslave the people; in fact, they are the bad men of the world. I am glad the gentleman made the speech because it shows that even people who have heard testimony about the bill for weeks do not comprehend what the bill is all about. I am glad to know that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] as demonstrated by their statements, do not yet understand this bill. I am going to tell them something about it and insert a copy of the bill so anyone can read its exact provisions and determine for themselves that it is being misrepresented.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Not until I have made my statement; then I shall be pleased to yield to anyone who wants to ask me a question, stay here as long as anyone wants to stay and do my best to answer all questions.

Mr. MANASCO. I just wanted to make it clear at that point that some of the proponents likewise do not seem to know anything about the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] even inferred that I was not the author of the bill. For his information I may say that this bill was carefully studied for a period of months and whether it is to my credit, or my responsibility, or my fault, I sat in on the framing of this bill and some of my language appears in it.

COCONSPIRATORS TO DESTROY COUNTRY

Every word in the bill was written by Members of the Senate and of the House, it was written right here on Capitol Hill in the offices of the Senators and the Representatives. The bill was introduced in the Senate and also introduced in the House. One hundred and sixteen of us who are House Members are coconspirators in this great conspiracy to destroy our country, 116 of us are authors of this bill and the others, along with myself, are what the gentleman from Texas would have you believe are such bad men. I am not asking them to share the responsibility, I am willing to bear it all, but I just want you to know that there are some other bad men in the House besides myself.

WHAT IS H. R. 2202?

I want to call your attention to this bad bill, this H. R. 2202. What is it? It is to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuous full employment in a free competitive economy. Communism? No; we hate communism, we are against it; that is the reason we do not want the kind of government that Russia has. The people over there, if they are suffering, it is because they do not have a free-competitive economy, a free-enterprise system. We want to preserve what we have. You cannot do it and have these disastrous booms and depressions every few years and after every war.

This bill is Government planning, that is what it is. What is the object of this legislation that is so destructive?

The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States.

Does that sound communistic?

Next:

All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right.

EVERY FASCIST AGAINST BILL

We have fixed the policy. That policy does not sound communistic. Where is there any communism in it? May I say that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] said that all Communists were for this bill. I will add, too, I do not say every person who is opposing the bill is a Fascist, but every Fascist is fighting this bill. Every Fascist in America is opposing this legislation.

The bill states further:

In order to carry out the policies set forth in subsection (a) and (b) of this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation—

Is that communistic?—

(2) Foster and protect the American home and the American family as the foundation of the American way of life—

Is that communistic?—

(3) Raise the standard of living of the American people—

Is there anything bad about that?—

(4) Provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans—

Is there anything bad about that?—

(5) Contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise—

Is that communistic or bad?—

(8) Strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations, it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States.

You know that you seldom reach a goal of 100 percent. Suppose the city of Wichita Falls said, "We want a 100-percent Christian city or a 100-percent sanitary city here in Wichita Falls," would the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] say that is hypocrisy because they will never have a 100-percent Christian citizenship or a 100-percent clean city in Wichita Falls? The people should be commended for working toward these desirable goals, they should be commended for putting down a stake and saying: "We are going to work to that goal and try our best to do it."

We will not have 100-percent perfection, no. We have a law against murder. It does not stop all murders. No. We still have murders. We have laws against theft. Will that stop stealing? No. We will always have stealing.

We will never have 100-percent full employment, maybe, but that does not keep us from working to that end, to give people not money out of the Treasury, but work, and any inference that this is money out of the Treasury is a wrong inference. There is no purpose here in H. R. 2202 to give money to people for not working or for working either, for that matter.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

This is to provide job opportunities for people who are able to, anxious, and willing to work, an opportunity not to be on the Government dole but an opportunity to work for a decent living. That is all this bill asks for.

Now, let us see what this awful board that is going to revolutionize our system of government must do. This Joint Committee on the National Budget will be composed of Members of the House and Senate. All right. What will they do? They will have meetings. These so-called communistic Members of the House will meet and they will meet for the purpose of carrying out this bill. What will be their function?

I will read from page 9 of the bill:

It shall be the function of the joint committee (1) to make a study of the National Budget transmitted to Congress by the President in accordance with section 3 of this act; and (2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1 of each year, its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget, together with a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year a general policy with respect to such National Budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget.

That is the part that destroys our country. That is the part that the gentleman says is repugnant to our ideals of freedom. That is the part that is going to enslave the people. All right.

I turn over to page 10. Who is going to pay this enormous amount of money that is going to break our Government and throw us into bankruptcy?

The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

There is where you are going to break your Government. You are going to appropriate so much money here, but all the cost of the legislative branch is about 1½ cents per person per year in the United States including salaries of Members and all other legislative expenses. You are going to break the Government by taking the money out of that huge fund to pay the expenses of this joint committee. That is the bad organization that is proposed here that is of such an atomic nature that is calculated to destroy our country.

NO GUARANTY OF JOB

The gentleman mentioned one thing that I want to comment on. May I say here that the gentleman said that this bill guarantees a job. I take issue with him. I will ask him, in the extension of his remarks, to cite one word in this bill where it guarantees any person a job. There is no job provided for any particular person. It is not contemplated. It is intended to cultivate a climate, an atmosphere, for business institutions and free enterprise whereby they will employ people and give opportunities not to be idle but to work and make a livelihood for themselves and for their families.

On page 12 this bill is going to destroy the country. It says:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as calling for or authorizing—

(a) The operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government.

Where is the man who says that it takes over all business? It says here it cannot take over any business.

(b) The use of compulsory measures of any type whatsoever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower.

Where is the person who says it makes you work, like Russia and other countries? It says here, "You shall not do that."

(c) Any change in the existing procedures on appropriations.

It allows us to take a few pennies out of the House fund and the Senate fund to pay the expenses of that committee; that is all. It does not take money from any other source. It does not increase our national debt.

(d) The carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the National Budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act.

This bill does not take from the Treasury of the United States one penny on earth, except House and Senate funds, and I challenge any Member of the

House to put in his remarks any statement in this bill to the contrary. He cannot do it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield when I have completed my statement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman challenged any person to contradict him. Will he yield for that purpose?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman said he would yield when he had completed his statement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman challenged anybody here——

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; to put in his remarks in the RECORD. The gentleman can put his remarks in the RECORD to answer that, and I hope he will.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I do not want to yield. That is the reason I said I hope that any person who takes issue with me will put in his remarks in the RECORD a statement that will contradict it, if he can. But I say that he cannot. But wait until I get through with my main statement and then I will yield anyway.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not insist on breaking into my speech until I have finished my statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. PATMAN. That is not very good sportsmanship.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in order to show the gentleman from Texas that I am a better sport than he is, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. I will withdraw my remark and apologize to the gentleman for making that unkind remark.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota withdraws the point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. There is no personal feeling in this matter between me and any person in the world. I am not falling out with them because they take another view. I do not do that. I have tried lawsuits for a long time, and I know how to differ with people and not get mad at them. I am not mad at people because they take the other view, not at all, but I am just explaining my side.

ARE WE GUILTY OF HYPOCRISY?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] said:

> Certainly our Government should be the last institution on earth to deal in hypocricy and false promises.

Think about these false promises I have read to you. Are they not terrible? Are you not surprised that Members of Congress would believe anything like that?

SECURITY FROM HUNGER OR WANT

Again—

And I am reading from the gentleman's statement—

> were it possible to guarantee every person a job, to guarantee everyone security from hunger and want, would such be desirable?

Question mark. In other words, he is questioning whether or not that would be in the interest of the country if you could give everyone security from hunger and want. I say that if you can give them an opportunity to work and provide themselves with security against hunger and want it is a desirable thing, and there should not be any question mark after it, none; but there is a question mark after this.

The gentleman says further:

> Would not such guaranteed security rob the average American of his finest attributes, initiative, thrift, resourcefulness, self-reliance, pride in achievement?

You mean to say because a person is given an opportunity to work in a ditch for a dollar a day or any other sum to provide himself against hunger and want that that would destroy his initiative? Why, certainly the very asking of the question answers itself. He would still want to do better. I think the gentleman's whole argument is just as logical as those statements there.

I want to say something about something else that has been said here in this debate, about planning. I want to say, too, that we planned against this war. I am glad the gentleman mentioned about the planning in World War II. You know, we had vision, our military leaders had vision, and by recommending to Congress good things just as we want done here in times of peace this Congress was able to appropriate money to make it possible for us to spend money and use materials and save human lives. That was vision. All right, let us have vision in time of peace. Suppose we had had the vision of the people who were against any kind of preparedness, we would be under Jap domination and German domination and control today; but by reason of somebody having vision this country was saved, and where there were 15,200,000 men and women in the armed services of this Nation, an average of 35,000 from each and every congressional district, out of that number, representing a major part in this World War, we came out—we lost lots of lives, yes, but compared with other nations, few. There were 250,000 men lost. Had it not been for the lack of vision on the part of a lot of people who were disturbing this country and keeping it in an isolationist mood we would not have lost half that number.

So let us not put our heads in the sand when we are looking forward after the greatest war in all history, when we know history teaches us, and if we do not draw upon the experiences of the past and the knowledge of the past we are not sensible people, when we know that after every war we have had in this country there has been a boom and there has been a bust, there has been an inflation and there has been a deflation. I will yield to any Member who says it has never occurred after any war. No Member will ask me to yield because it has always occurred. Knowing that to be true, as sensible people are we going to sit idly by and do nothing to stop it? We will not have the sense that our people expect us to have if we do not try to do something calculated to stop these horrible examples of the past that we know have always occurred. Then shall we be called communistic because we do it? Is President Truman a Communist? Was President Franklin D. Roosevelt a Communist? Was Tom Dewey, the Republican candidate, a Communist last fall when he came out for full employment? Was Herbert Hoover a Communist when he came out for full employment? You are calling a lot of people Communists when you condemn them because they are trying to draw upon the experiences of the past and prevent these horrible things from happening in the future.

DODO BIRD

This is Government planning. I know that at one time there was a bird they called the dodo bird. It could fly very rapidly through space, but it always flew backward. The reason was that it did not care where it was going. It was not interested in seeing where it was going, but it was only interested in seeing where it had been. Now, we do not want to be dodo birds. We can see back into the past. We should try to provide against the disasters that overtook us in the past because we have the knowledge. In order to provide against them, we must plan against them. This is what this bill is, to draw upon the experiences of the past and try to help the people in the future and try to prevent the horrible things from happening that have always happened after every war.

REGIMENTATION

We are told that this bill is regimentation. Where is the regimentation? Are these few Members of the House and Senate getting together here in the Capitol backed up by a small amount of money from our contingent funds going to regiment the country? That is what our enemies say. But it is not a very logical argument and certainly is not supported by any kind of reason. All we want is this legislation, and President Truman expressed it in my words when he said that all we want is a policy, a legislative policy, a statement by Congress to the effect that we are going to prevent, if possible, booms and busts after this war and that we are going to prevent inflation and thus prevent deflation. That is what this bill proposes to do, to stop inflation as well as deflation. Next is to write into the language of the bill provisions that will permit that legislative policy to be carried out. I agree 100 percent with that.

COMMITTEE CAN INTRODUCE OWN BILL

If the members of that committee have pride of authorship and want to introduce another bill, they are welcome to do so. I do not care. It often happens that after authors of bills popularize them other Members seek the authorship.

All I want is some kind of legislation written. I am thinking of this country and of its future and of its people. I am thinking of what they are liable to have to go through if they have to go through what they have always had to go through after every war in the history of our country. Are we going to stand for that? Why should we? Are we going to sit here and say we cannot do a thing about it? Panics are man-made. Depressions are man-made. Let men now provide against panics and against depressions. That is what this bill proposes to do. Further, it proposes a goal for us to work toward, to do our best—not to guarantee a job. There is not a word in this bill to that effect and there never will be. It is not to do that, but to make plans and provisions whereby employment opportunities will be offered, not to idlers, not to loafers, not to convicts, not to people who violate the law necessarily, but to give law-abiding citizens who just want an opportunity even with their hands to work and earn money for their livelihood, for themselves and their families. Where is there any communism about that? That is the question. Where is there any communism in that? I venture to say that before this bill passes the House of Representatives 95 percent of the Members of the House will vote for it. I know there is a great deal of misunderstanding, just as was expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], which shows they have not given the study and serious thought to this comprehensive measure that was contemplated. If they will just do that, we will have no trouble about getting the bill out.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. In just a moment I will.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include H. R. 2202 and certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix in two particulars and to insert therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman referred to a misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] and the gentleman from Alabama. I want to make this statement. I have heard your statement and the statements of all the proponents. After hearing all those statements I do not think anyone could come out understanding the bill just exactly like the gentleman does. The gentleman does not think that the word "assure"——

Mr. PATMAN. The statement has been made—does the gentleman admit the word "guarantee" is not in the bill?

Mr. MANASCO. Why, certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman admits it is not in there?

Mr. MANASCO. Certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, we start from there.

Mr. MANASCO. What the gentleman wants us to do is to get the committee together and get some dictionary to find out what the word "assure" means.

Mr. PATMAN. Why quibble about words when people are unemployed. There will be millions of veterans unemployed. This Congress is vulnerable. Are we going to send men to war to face death, and then let them come back and not even provide employment opportunities for them, if it is within our power?

Mr. MANASCO. If you do not mean you are going to assure everybody a job out of the Federal Treasury, why do you not suggest that we strike that section from the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. There is no section in there that provides that. It does not appropriate a dime of money. You cannot give men Government jobs out of the Treasury without appropriating money.

Mr. MANASCO. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. The gentleman admits there is no money provided. You cannot give anybody a job out of the Treasury unless you appropriate money. Therefore, this is a planning bill. This will bring back to Congress a plan to prevent deflation and to prevent inflation, the planning committee paid out of the contingent fund of the two Houses.

Mr. MANASCO. We lead people to believe that it will provide jobs out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman certainly cannot mislead the people. The people are intelligent and have honest minds. They make mistakes like everyone else, but they correct them. The mass mind is both intelligent and honest.

Mr. MANASCO. I have not made any effort to mislead them.

Mr. PATMAN. People are well informed and they will continue to be well informed. By just putting out the phrase that you are going to give 100 percent employment, you are not misleading the folks.

Mr. MANASCO. If that is what you have in mind, there is no need to pass any legislation, because the President already has all the authority he has under this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. I take issue with him. That is incorrect. If the President were to come here with a recommendation of that kind, do you know what the critics would say? They would say, "Turn back 2 years to the appropriation bill." There this House and the Senate wrote in specific language abolishing the only power that the President had to do what the gentleman suggests, and told him in so many words to leave that subject alone until the Congress had authorized it. This has got to be done in order to give him that power. Secretary Vinson fully covered that point in his testimony.

Mr. MANASCO. In other words, the Congress itself was the enemy of the country 2 years ago?

Mr. PATMAN. There was no issue up at that time. Our boys were fighting. We were thinking about the war. We were not thinking about unemployment. It was put in there and nobody in particular paid any great attention to it. If the gentleman's views prevailed, it would be put in there today.

Mr. MANASCO. But now, of course, we want to kid these poor boys who are coming back.

Mr. PATMAN. You cannot kid these boys. If you think you can, you are mistaken again.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman made a speech the other day, and in his speech again today, and used an expression that I do not think he means. The gentleman said, "Words do not mean anything."

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I did not intend to say that words do not mean anything. But as far as this bill is concerned it is not a question of words. It is a question of legislative policy. I do not care what kind of words you use to express it. Use any words you want to, just so you create a legislative policy and a plan to carry out that policy.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman would not argue that the word "assure" as used in the title and also in the body of the bill does not mean "guarantee," would he?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope it means "to assure," to create a climate, to give the man who wants to work with his hands or his brain an opportunity to earn a living. The purpose and object of this bill is to create an atmosphere for free competitive American enterprise to give people jobs.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. I heard the distinguished gentleman refer to the costs involved in this bill in terms of pennies. I also notice that the gentleman in reading the bill inadvertently slipped over subparagraph (e) on page 3. Would he explain just what that paragraph means if it does not talk about expenditures?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he inadvertently overlooked something himself? But I quote from page 3, subparagraph (e):

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment.

Mr. HENRY. What does that mean?

Mr. PATMAN. Wait a minute. Let us read a little further:

Such investment and expenditure—

I am talking now of this part the gentleman did not read. Listen. I helped write this; this is a part of my own language. I know it is there; I put part of it in there myself—

Such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

Does not the gentleman like that language? Why, certainly; it is fine language.

Mr. HENRY. How much of a pledge is that in dollars and cents?

Mr. PATMAN. Dollars and cents? We do not know, we might want——

Mr. HENRY. It is unlimited, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. No; it is sharply limited; for you cannot get a penny until you go to Congress and present your plan; and the Congress of the United States has got to approve that plan and authorize the expenditure of that money. There is not a dollar of money provided in this bill to get people to work or not to work.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to me there is just one point in all this discussion. First, the gentleman from Texas has suggested that this bill outlines a laudable objective. My question is this: If this bill were enacted as the gentleman advocates, would it authorize appropriations to carry out and effectuate the objective?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman asks a very fine logical question there; it is an intelligent question. The gentleman would infer from what has been said here that it would authorize appropriations. I do not mean to say that the gentleman does not always ask intelligent questions, but from what has been said here you would think that this bill would authorize it. The answer is found on page 12, section 8:

INTERPRETATION

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed as calling for or authorizing—

(c) any change in the existing procedures on appropriations; or

(d) the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the national budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act.

Mr. MICHENER. Then it is not the intent——

Mr. PATMAN. It is not the intent to authorize a dime or a penny; it is not the intent to give any person a particular job. The intent of this is planning, using a little vision and seeing if we cannot prevent what has happened after every war in the history of the civilized world. Is it wise, sensible, or sane for people to sit idly by and say we should not try to stop the disaster that has always overtaken the people after every war, and this was the greatest of all wars?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. CURTIS. It seems to be the philosophy of this bill is only the philosophy of the Fascists and the Communists; and I was somewhat surprised when the gentleman stated that every Fascist in America was against this bill. I would like to have him name some of them.

Mr. PATMAN. The Committee on Constitutional Government represents a lot of them. There is this fellow Gannett, a big chain newspaper publisher and his working partner, this fellow Pettingill, a renegade Democrat, and this fellow McClure, who spent 2 years over in Italy studying fascism under Mussolini, who is working with them, and Edward Rumley, their wheel horse, an exconvict who was convicted for dealing with the enemy—Germany—in World War I.

Mr. CURTIS. Which Gannett does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. PATMAN. The chain newspaperman of Rochester, N. Y., I believe.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman identify the other men?

Mr. PATMAN. Pettingill, who used to be a Member of this House.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman classifies him as a Fascist?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I do; the No. 1 Fascist in America.

Mr. CURTIS. Name some more.

Mr. PATMAN. This fellow McClure, who studied fascism 2 years under Mussolini. Get your Who's Who in the library and look into his biography. You will find there where he brags about it. He likes it. There is all that bunch of fellows who are with him fighting this bill. The Communists are not sincerely for the bill. The Communists are for confusion. They do not want jobs. They want so much misery and distress that they can get into power through "bum's rush" tactics.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. As coauthor of this bill I have heard this debate from start to finish and I would like to have some of the gentlemen who have referred to the coauthors or to those who support this bill as Communists to be more specific. I am not in that class and I rather resent being referred to in that category. I just want to ask a question. The distinguished gentleman from Texas spoke against the bill. Let me ask if it is not a fair interpretation of the express language of the bill itself, referring to section 2, subdivision (a), and subdivision (e) on page 3, and subdivision (f) on page 3, that the only time this bill would come into play would be after private enterprise has failed?

Mr. PATMAN. After giving private enterprise everything it wanted and then if they fail we would build post offices, we would improve rivers and harbors, we would go on to useful public works—not leaf raking—and we would do it through a coordinated program. We would not throw it all in one year. The object of this bill is coordination.

Mr. DOYLE. May I compliment the gentleman on his speech, and I would like at the same time to throw out the challenge to any opponent of the bill to point out to me where a fair reading of the sections I have referred to causes them to conclude differently than I do; in other words, that this bill will not come into play under any circumstances unless the system of free enterprise in our great Nation fails in the matter of full employment.

Mr. PATMAN. There are a lot of people, you know, who are against everything. They are for everything that is good, but they are against what is proposed to remedy a situation. They are against the evils, but they are against the measures that are proposed to correct the evils. It is the same situation the isolationists assume before the war.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. On the subject of coordination and holding back works projects, would the gentleman give the President or the Board authority to withhold appropriations to build post-office buildings under the terms of this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Not unless the Congress told him to do that. The object of this is to have the Board report to the Congress. This committee might say, "Mr. President, we have got too much money in circulation. You better stop building these post offices." The President could not do that. He would say, "If the Congress authorizes me to do it I will do so."

Mr. Speaker, this committee would report to the Congress its findings and say, "We want the Congress to pass a joint resolution suspending the building of those buildings until they are needed," and if the Congress voted for it I say the President should have the power to do it.

Mr. MANASCO. I thought the gentleman said this bill would authorize that.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has misinterpreted or misunderstood what I said.

Mr. MANASCO. That is open to discussion on both sides.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Texas issued a challenge to

anyone in the House to show where money out of the contingent funds of the House and Senate which might be expended in connection with this bill had no connection whatsoever with the Treasury of the United States. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I would like to ask the gentleman if the money in the contingent funds of the House and Senate grows on trees?

Mr. PATMAN. No. I will answer that. Of course, the money comes from the Treasury to the contingent fund of the House and the Senate. But in connection with that statement I said that the entire cost of the entire legislative branch of the Government of the United States as set up by the Constitution of the United States amounts but to 1½ cents per person per year, and this legislative branch that is supported by so little money is certainly not going to bankrupt this Nation by taking part of this money to set up that joint committee. That is the point I attempted to make, but I certainly did not intend to say that this is not Treasury money. It is Treasury money, but the amount is insignificant compared to the $7,000,000,000 a month war cost, or a public debt of $262,000,000,000.

AN EXACT COPY OF H. R. 2202

For the information of the Members, I am inserting herewith a full and complete copy of H. R. 2202. A careful reading of this bill will disclose that it cannot contemplate any of the bad things its opponents charge. Our opponents are giving excuses for not supporting it; they are not giving good reasons.

It is as follows:

H. R. 2202

A bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Full Employment Act of 1945."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that—

(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States;

(b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right;

(c) In order to carry out the policies set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation; (2) foster and protect the American home and the American family as the foundation of the American way of life; (3) raise the standard of living of the American people; (4) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (5) contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise; (8) strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations, it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States;

(d) In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure;

(e) To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment; and

(f) Such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

THE NATIONAL PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT BUDGET

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session the National Production and Employment Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "National Budget"), which shall set forth in summary and detail, for the ensuing fiscal year or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate—

(1) the estimated size of the labor force, including the self-employed in industry and agriculture;

(2) the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, required to produce such volume of the gross national product, at the expected level of prices, as will be necessary to provide employment opportunities for such labor force (such dollar volume being hereinafter referred to as the "full employment volume of production"); and

(3) the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government (not taking into account any increased or decreased investment or expenditure which might be expected to result from the programs set forth in such Budget).

The estimates and information herein called for shall take account of such foreign investments and expenditure for exports and imports as affect the volume of the gross national product.

(b) The extent, if any, by which the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is less than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, shall for the purposes of this title be regarded as a prospective deficiency in the National Budget. When there is a prospective deficiency in the National Budget for any fiscal year or other period, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for encouraging such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure, particularly investment and expenditure which will promote increased employment opportunities by private enterprise, as will prevent such deficiency to the greatest possible extent. The President shall also include in such Budget such recommendations for legislation relating to such program as he may deem necessary or desirable. Such program may include, but need not be limited to, current and projected Federal policies and activities with reference to banking and currency, monopoly and competition, wages and working conditions, foreign trade and investment, agriculture, taxation, social security, the development of natural resources, and such other matters as may directly or indirectly affect the level of non-Federal investment and expenditure.

(c) To the extent, if any, that such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure as may be expected to result from actions taken under the program set forth in accordance with subsection (b) of this section are deemed insufficient to provide a full employment volume of production, the President shall transmit a general program for such Federal investment and expenditure as will be sufficient to bring the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, up to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production. Such program shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate additional non-Federal investment and expenditure. Any of such programs calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private concerns under contracts awarded in accordance with applicable laws, except where the performance of such work by some other method is necessary by reason of special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law.

(d) If the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is more than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both.

(e) The programs referred to in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall include such measures as may be necessary to assure that monopolistic practices with respect to prices, production, or distribution, or other monopolistic practices, will not interfere with the achievement of the purposes of this act.

(f) The National Budget shall include a report on the distribution of the national income during the preceding fiscal year, or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate, together with an evaluation of the effect upon the distribution of the national income of the programs set forth in such Budget.

(g) The President may from time to time transmit to Congress such supplemental or revised estimates, information, programs, or legislative recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable in connection with the National Budget.

PREPARATION OF NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 4. (a) The National Budget shall be prepared in the Executive Office of the President under the general direction and supervision of the President, and in consultation with the members of his Cabinet and other heads of departments and establishments.

(b) The President shall transmit to the several departments and establishments such preliminary estimates and other information as will enable them to prepare such plans and programs as may be needed during the ensuing or subsequent fiscal years to help achieve a full employment volume of production.

(c) The President may establish such advisory boards or committees composed of representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, and others, as he may deem advisable for the purpose of advising and consulting on methods of achieving the objectives of this act.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the National Budget, to be composed of the chairman and ranking minority members of the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, and Finance, and seven additional Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Labor, and Ways and Means, and seven additional Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation of the Joint Committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the Joint Committee—

(1) to make a study of the National Budget transmitted to Congress by the President in accordance with section 3 of this Act; and

(2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1 of each year, its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget, together with a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year a general policy with respect to such National Budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The Joint Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena, or to testify when summoned, under authority of this section.

(e) The Joint Committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments.

(f) The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

RATE OF EXPENDITURES

SEC. 6. (a) The President shall review quarterly all Federal investment and expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which the current and anticipated level of non-Federal investment and expenditure warrants any change in the volume of such Federal investment and expenditure.

(b) Subject to such principles and standards as may be set forth in applicable appropriation acts and other statutes, the rate of Federal investment and expenditure may be varied to whatever extent and in whatever manner the President may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring continuing full employment, with due consideration being given to current and anticipated variations in savings and in investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

AID TO COMMITTEES

SEC. 7. The heads of departments and establishments shall, at the request of any committee of either House of Congress, furnish such committee with such aid and information with regard to the National Budget as it may request.

INTERPRETATION

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed as calling for or authorizing—

(a) the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government;

(b) the use of compulsory measures of any type whatsoever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower;

(c) any change in the existing procedures on appropriations; or

(d) the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the National Budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act.

(e) the disclosure of trade secrets or other information, the publication of which might have a harmful effect upon the firm or person supplying such information.

VIEWS OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN ON FULL EMPLOYMENT

The following statement on full employment is from the message of the President of the United States to the House of Representatives on Thursday, September 6, 1945:

5. FULL EMPLOYMENT

I am confident that, with the cooperation of American industry, labor, and agriculture, we can bridge the gap between war and peace.

When we have reconverted our economy to a peacetime basis, however, we shall not be satisfied with merely our prewar economy. The American people have set high goals for their own future. They have set these goals high because they have seen how great can be the productive capacity of our country.

The levels of production and income reached during the war years have given our citizens an appreciation of what a full production peacetime economy can be.

They are not interested in boom prosperity—for that only too often leads to panic and depression. But they are interested in providing opportunity for work and for ultimate security.

Government must do its part and assist industry and labor to get over the line from war to peace.

That is why I have asked for unemployment compensation legislation.

That is why I now ask for full-employment legislation.

The objectives for our domestic economy which we seek in our long-range plans were summarized by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt over a year and a half ago in the form of an economic bill of rights. Let us make the attainment of those rights the essence of postwar American economic life.

I repeat the statement of President Roosevelt:

"In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

"Among these are:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops, or farms, or mines of the Nation.

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

"The right of every family to a decent home.

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

"The right to a good education.

"All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

"America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world."

I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress on some of the subjects included in this enumeration of economic rights.

Most of them, in the last analysis, depend upon full production and full employment at decent wages.

There has been much discussion about the necessity of continuing full employment after the war if we hope to continue in substantial degree the prosperity which came with the war years. The time has come for action along these lines.

To provide jobs we must look first and foremost to private enterprise—to industry, agriculture, and labor. Government must inspire enterprise with confidence. That confidence must come mainly through deeds, not words.

But it is clear that confidence will be promoted by certain assurances given by the Government:

Assurance that all the facts about full employment and opportunity will be gathered periodically for the use of all.

Assurance of stability and consistency in public policy, so that enterprise can plan better by knowing what the Government intends to do.

Assurance that every governmental policy and program will be pointed to promote maximum production and employment in private enterprise.

Assurance that priority will be given to doing those things first which stimulate normal employment most.

A national reassertion of the right to work for every American citizen able and willing to work—a declaration of the ultimate duty of Government to use its own resources if all other methods should fail to prevent prolonged unemployment—these will help to avert fear and establish full employment. The prompt and firm acceptance of this bedrock public responsibility will reduce the need for its exercise.

I ask that full employment legislation to provide these vital assurances be speedily enacted. Such legislation should also provide machinery for a continuous full-employment policy—to be developed and pursued in cooperation among industry, agriculture, and

labor, between the Congress and the Chief Executive, between the people and their Government.

Full employment means full opportunity for all under the American economic system—nothing more and nothing less.

In human terms, full employment means opportunity to get a good peacetime job for every worker who is ready, able, and willing to take one. It does not mean made work, or making people work.

In economic terms, full employment means full production and the opportunity to sell goods—all the goods that industry and agriculture can produce.

In Government terms, full employment means opportunity to reduce the ratio of public spending to private investment without sacrificing essential services.

In world-wide terms, full employment in America means greater economic security and more opportunity for lasting peace throughout the world.

These goals and the machinery to carry them out are set forth in legislation now pending before the Congress on which extensive public hearings have been held. The country justifiably expects early action along these lines.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY VINSON

I am inserting herewith a statement that was made by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Fred Vinson, before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the full employment bill, October 31, 1945. This statement is so clear, concise, logical and unanswerable, I am inviting the Members' attention to it, and I hope they carefully read every word the Secretary said:

It is as follows:

The war has taught us many things about our economy.

It showed that when the people of the United States set their minds on doing a big job that job will be done, and the whole resources of this great country will be mobilized for its accomplishment. Winning the war was, obviously, all important. So we did our best to call into service every human and material resource which the country had at its command and put it to use either directly for the war effort or for the maintenance of the civilian economy.

The war also revealed the tremendous productivity inherent in our economy. Our gross national product increased from $89,000,000,000 in 1939 to $199,000,000,000 in 1944. Some of this, of course, represented an increase in prices; but the product of the country, expressed in real terms, increased by about 75 percent.

We learned other important facts about our economy too, in winning the war. We discovered that as a consequence of our all-out effort, unemployment disappeared. There were more employment opportunities than people seeking work. The job sought the man, rather than the man the job.

We discovered that as a result of the effective use of our resources during the wartime period, the real standard of living of the civilian population was higher in 1944 than it had been before the war, despite the fact that nearly one-half of our production was for war purposes.

The No. 1 problem which confronts the people of the United States here at home right now is how to apply the economic lessons of the war to the peace. Now at first glance, it might appear that there would be hopeless disagreement in this country on how this can be done. But a more careful study will convince thoughtful men that there are important fundamentals upon which all can agree.

In fact, there are two fundamentals upon which the American people already are agreed. The first is that our economic problems must be solved within our system of free enterprise. The second is that the most important of these problems is to maintain full employment.

Mass unemployment is the source of most of our social and economic evils; it is the greatest menace to economic security in this country. We cannot periodically condemn 10,000,000 unemployed to bear this burden. We cannot declare these men and women industrial surplus and dispose of them in that way. That is not the American way of doing things.

I do not subscribe to the pessimistic view that unemployment is inevitable and that any effort to prevent it is a threat to free enterprise. Our people want to keep the economic system under which this country achieved leadership. They know it offers the best hope of continued economic progress and higher standards of living. They will never abandon this system so long as they can cherish this hope. The only threat to free enterprise in this country can come from mass unemployment. Our task is to remove this threat by meeting the problem.

And, let me make this clear: Unemployment is not the fault of business. Businessmen do not want to stop production or to lay off men. They know that profits come from production. So long as they can find markets they are prepared to employ labor and to produce goods. It is only when the demand falls off, when goods cannot be sold, that they close down or reduce their force. Give American business the markets, the demand for the output, and we will witness a new miracle of production that will surpass everything we have seen before. Unemployment is not the fault of business. On the contrary, business like labor is the victim of depression.

It is equally clear that unemployment is not the responsibility of business. When demand falls off, businessmen have no alternative; they must cut production. If they persist in producing goods for which there are no markets, they will incur losses that may force bankruptcy. In general, when businessmen produce efficiently, when they sell at fair prices, and when they pay good wages, they have done all they can do and they are entitled to profits from production. Business cannot assume the responsibility on unemployment.

Now, the fact is that somewhere there must be a responsibility on unemployment. There can be no vacuum, no void of responsibility on the most important domestic problem confronting the American people. When we face the issue we must admit that all of us have a responsibility to see that our economic system works; to see that there are opportunities for jobs for men and women willing and able to work. This is a responsibility of all the people, and we must look to the Government, acting for all the people, to meet this responsibility.

There is nothing revolutionary in recognizing this responsibility. In every deep depression the Government has found it necessary to deal with unemployment. In 1921, during the crisis of that year, President Harding called the Conference on Unemployment, which met under the chairmanship of Herbert Hoover. In 1931 in the midst of an even greater crisis, Congress passed the Employment Stabilization Act, establishing a board composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Labor. The whole experience of the 1930's is concrete evidence that the Government must deal with the problem and that it cannot abdicate this responsibility.

During depression we are conscious of the need for Government action, but as soon as we have prosperity we seem to forget it. In 1928, in the midst of the great boom, Senator Wesley Jones, of Washington, introduced a bill for a reserve of public works to be constructed during depression. The bill was killed, according to the Senate committee report on S. 381, because it was deemed unwise to mention depression before a Presidential campaign. That same year Senator WAGNER introduced the employment stabilization bill. It was a bill to provide for the advanced planning and regulated construction of public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for aiding in the prevention of unemployment. This bill, which could have been so helpful when the crash came in 1929, lay dormant for three vital years. It was only in the midst of the deepest depression of our history, when it was too late to take measures that might have prevented the catastrophe, that we realized what should have been done. When the bill was finally passed in 1931, it was in emasculated form.

The Employment Stabilization Act did not provide for a comprehensive program on unemployment. It was not concerned with many types of measures that can be taken to prevent a great depression. It dealt exclusively with the planning and timing of public works as a means of providing employment during depression. It was enacted during a great crisis when public works could do no more than alleviate the mass unemployment that already existed. This could be done under the act, and this was done as far a possible.

As a matter of fact, John Garner put a bill through in 1932 authorizing expenditure of $2,200,000,000 for public works. This bill followed the principles established in the Employment Stabilization Act. The money was to be used only for the construction of public works previously approved by Congress or the Executive, except for $70,000,000 for post offices in the smaller communities. The bill was vetoed by President Hoover. In 1933 Congress passed another bill authorizing $3,300,000,000 for public works. The construction so authorized was undertaken through the PWA.

The Employment Stabilization Act never contemplated the submission of a national budget with recommendations to deal with prospective depressions. It only provided for plans to arrange the construction of public works in a manner which would assist in the stabilization of employment. The timing of public works is a useful part of a program for dealing with prospective unemployment. But by itself, it is entirely inadequate. Under any circumstances, it would not be possible to do anything now under this act, for these functions, which had been consolidated with those of the National Resources Planning Board, were abolished by Congress in 1943.

The full employment bill is a logical development of the act of 1931. It recognizes the continuing responsibility of Government to see that there are enough job opportunities. It provides for a national budget that will show the amount of production necessary to maintain full employment, and it requires estimates to be made of the prospective demand for this production. Such a national budget will be transmitted by the President to Congress each year and will be considered by a joint congressional committee which will report to the Senate and the House of Representatives its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget.

This procedure seems to me the commonsense and dollar-wise way to deal with the problem of unemployment—through prevention rather than through relief. The first step is to get the facts and place them before those who have the responsibility for dealing with the problem.

The argument has been made that if the National Budget calls attention to a prospective deficiency or excess of demand, depression or prosperity will start at once. The evidence does not bear out this view. We don't get prosperity or depression merely by predicting it. If we could, we would never

have had the crisis of 1929 to 1933. Businessmen were assured time and time again that prosperity was just around the corner. Businessmen act on the prospects for demand for their products from their customers. When demand falls off they stop production. A national budget that recognizes a prospective deficiency in opportunities for employment and carries recommendations for dealing with the problem can give increased confidence to businessmen to continue with their investment, their production, and their employment.

In spite of the oft-repeated statement that the Government cannot make accurate estimates of the type required by this bill, I want to go on record as stating that the Government is in a position to make reasonably good estimates. In dealing with the tax and savings programs during the war we had to make estimates of prospective income and expenditure. From these estimates we developed a program to reduce and limit over-all expenditure to the available supply of consumer goods. Nobody claims that the statistical data we now have are perfect. They can and will be improved under this bill. Estimates on the National Budget will be made after consultation with business on the basis of data provided by business.

I have seen some doubt cast as to the competence of the Government to prepare a national budget on the ground that the Government has not done very well in estimating its expenditures and receipts. I should like to comment briefly on the receipts side of this criticism, since the estimate of receipts is a statutory responsibility of the Treasury Department. In the 6 years before the war, from 1935 to 1940, the average error between estimated and actual tax receipts averaged about 6 percent. In 4 of these 6 years, the error was 5 percent or less. Now this is not a bad record, because it is more difficult to estimate tax receipts than it is to forecast business conditions. We estimate tax receipts by starting with an estimate of business conditions. An error of 6 percent in tax receipts is probably comparable to an error of 3 percent on national income.

It is the estimate of national income and its components that is significant for purposes of the proposed National Budget. An error of 3 percent would represent a difference of not more than 1,500,000 jobs from the number actually employed. In dealing with the problem of preventing mass unemployment, an error of 3 percent could not impair the usefulness of the National Budget. In practice, the problem will not be the elimination of minor errors of estimate; the real problem will be to see whether a deficiency in demand is developing in the construction, equipment, and durable goods industries which generally precedes a great depression. The National Budget will be submitted annually, but quarterly reports will be made to Congress taking account of changing conditions.

The National Budget will compel the attention of Congress and the executive departments to the problem of employment. But it would be a serious mistake to assume that the submission of a budget can of itself prevent mass unemployment. The responsibility of the Government does not end there. The important thing is to take the positive steps that will facilitate and encourage an expansion of consumption and private investment whenever this becomes necessary to prevent a great depression.

There is no reason for assuming that the remedy that will be recommended, when a deficiency in employment opportunities appears, will be Government spending. There will be times when changes in our tax policy will be needed to help maintain employment and production. There will be times when changes in credit policy will be needed. There may be times, of course, when because of a decline in private construction, the proper remedy will be an expansion of public construction. We should be ready to proceed promptly with the construction of necessary and useful public works whenever there is a falling off in private construction.

This bill is not a spending bill. It does not authorize any expenditure. Whatever legislation may be recommended in the National Budget in connection with the maintenance of employment will go to Congress and will be subject to the same procedures as now. In fact there will be the additional opportunity of having the joint congressional committee on the National Budget give to the Congress its report on the policies that should guide Congress in dealing with legislation relating to the National Budget.

In addition to the specific criticisms of the bill which I have discussed, there are certain broad objections offered by some—and apparently believed by many more. I call these objections the Union League Club objections because they find their most enthusiastic supporters in the stuffy environs of the most exclusive clubs. But they deserve to be held up to critical and public analysis where their merits can be evaluated.

The most pervading of these Union League Club arguments is the defeatist attitude with respect to our economic system. Mr. William L. Kleitz, vice president of the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York City, for example, told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that depressions are inevitable under the free-enterprise system. Such depressions, of course, will be only minor inconveniences to Mr. Kleitz. I should like to put myself on record as dissenting from the view that the free-enterprise system makes such periods of unemployment necessary for those less able to bear them. I have greater faith in the vigor of the free-enterprise system than that, and I know that you gentlemen have also.

It is a false dilemma which gives us the choice between full employment and a free society; and those who tell us that depressions are the price we pay for freedom are doing no favor to the cause of freedom. The system of private enterprise has enabled the United States to outproduce every other country in the world, and to win this most destructive of all wars with a minimum loss of American lives and a maximum reliance on the products of industry. I am sure that the system of free enterprise will also enable us to win the peace, if its friends will stop insisting that it must produce depressions to realize its natural destiny.

The second of these Union League Club arguments is that a full-employment policy is expensive and that relief is cheaper. For example, Mr. Rufus Tucker, the chief economist of the General Motors Corp., told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that the taxpayers "may (he said only 'may') have a moral obligation to keep any citizen from starvation," but that this obligation can often be fulfilled more cheaply in other ways than by providing jobs. I am sure that you will agree with me that this is an excessively narrow view of the problem. Ignoring altogether its callous disregard of the feelings of the unemployed, it errs even on the side of expense, for it treats only the symptoms of unemployment and makes no attempt to effect a cure. It is like the view taken by a doctor who prescribed that a poor patient should wear a truss all through his life because the doctor feels that an operation would be unduly expensive or bothersome.

Lastly, some of the club intellectuals believe that a pool of unemployed helps to keep labor in its place, and is conducive to the profitable operation of the enterprises with which they are connected. Naturally, these persons seldom express their opinions for the records.

In addition to the three broad currents of opposition to the full employment bill which I have just mentioned, there are other persons whose opposition is based on the honest belief that the adoption of some policy or policies which they particularly advocate will result in the attainment of the objective of continuing full employment. To the extent that these people are right, there is room for the consideration and adoption of their policies within the broad framework of the full-employment bill.

Finally, I want to emphasize again that this bill is in complete accord with our system of free enterprise. It does not authorize the Government to operate any plants or factories or productive facilities. It does not authorize the use of any compulsory measures in determining where people are to be employed. Every businessman remains free to run his business as he always has. The Government's sole function is to exercise the necessary foresight in dealing with prospective developments that affect employment and to take such measures as are authorized by law to prevent a deficiency or excess in demand. The whole spirit of this legislation is not to coerce industry but to provide an environment in which industry can realize its enormous potentialities for production and employment.

The full employment bill makes no assumption with respect to the general character of our economic problems at any particular time. The bill specifically provides that the National Budget shall make recommendations for the control of inflation whenever this shall be necessary as well as recommendations for achieving and maintaining full employment. There is nothing inflationary in this bill.

Some opponents of this bill have leveled most of their attack on an alleged promise to provide every man and woman with a job. The bill does not do this. It merely recognizes the Government's responsibility to see that there are enough opportunities for productive work to employ all men and women willing and able to work. The chance to earn a living is so fundamental a human right that it cannot be denied by quibbling or by the equivocal use of words. In a modern industrial society the opportunity to work is the very basis of the inalienable and God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

There is no class of sectional interest in this bill. It is truly a national bill to promote the general welfare by protecting the national economy. Of course, it is in the interest of labor to have an adequate demand for our production so that there will be sufficient jobs for all men and women willing and able to work. But it is no less in the interest of agriculture and industry. The farmers of this country know that unemployment in American industry means low prices and the accumulation of surplus crops. They know that a sound postwar farm program must start with plenty of jobs and good wages in industry so that our workers can consume the foods and materials which our farmers can produce in abundance and businessmen know what depression means to them—reduced output, losses and even failures. The maintenance of production and the profits of business depend upon an adequate demand for output. Such a demand requires the prevention of mass unemployment.

Some people seem to think we cannot afford full employment. There is a confusion of thought here. It is unemployment that we cannot afford. The unemployment of the 1930's cost us in lost income far more than the war; and this cost was not distributed among all the people on an equitable basis. It was concentrated in large part on the unemployed worker and the depressed farmers. We cannot afford another depression like that.

If we put our full resources to work, we can increase our production of consumer goods by 50 percent above the 1940 level and our production of capital goods, including

construction, by more than 100 percent above the 1940 level. This chart, based on a Commerce Department study when Jesse Jones was Secretary, shows in more detail what full employment means to business. My own review of the facts, when I was Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, has convinced me that we can and must increase consumption by 50 percent and expand construction and investment by 100 percent above prewar levels. We cannot let one-fourth of our resources go to waste. As Secretary of the Treasury, I say that it will be much harder to balance our budget and to service our national debt if we drift into another great depression.

There is no doubt in my mind that we can prevent mass unemployment if we decide to deal intelligently with this problem. I have said it before and I shall say it again, "Depressions, like wars, are not acts of God. Man makes them. If we make them, we can unmake them. We must create, in peace, a new prosperity and a greater opportunity for jobs than has existed before."

We shall not solve the problem of unemployment by ignoring it. We must not repeat the error of 1921 and 1931 of trying to deal with this problem when it is too late. This is a bill that should be enacted promptly. In my opinion, it is an urgent bill, not because we need it to deal with mass unemployment now, but because we need it now to deal with the threat of depression when it does come.

I want to read one paragraph on this point:

"When business again declines men will be laid off and the problem of unemployment may again become serious. It will then be too late for any measures except relief for the unemployed unless we now address ourselves to the task of preventing, or at least reducing, these extreme fluctuations of business activity. Prevention as contrasted with relief is possible only through foresight."

This is a statement as timely now as when it was made by the committee headed by Owen D. Young and appointed by Herbert Hoover as Chairman of the President's Conference on Unemployment in 1921.

In my opinion the full employment bill enables us—yes, requires us—to deal with the problem of unemployment while there is still time, before it is too late.

I speak for the President of the United States when I tell you that he regards full-employment legislation as the basic framework upon which a large share of our efforts to solve the central problem of full production and full employment must rest. He is most anxious that the legislation be enacted at the earliest possible moment.

SECRETARY WALLACE'S STATEMENT ON FULL EMPLOYMENT

October 30, 1945, the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, testified before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives, in support of the full employment bill, H. R. 2202, and I urge the Members of the House who have any doubt about the objects or intentions of this legislation to carefully read Secretary Wallace's statement. It is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Expenditures Committee, I am glad to be here and to have the opportunity of discussing with you this problem of full employment.

In the newspapers and magazines, and on the air, and in the proceedings here in Congress, I have noticed an almost universal agreement that full employment is the No. 1 postwar objective for this country. I have seen this conviction growing for 2 or 3 years now, but, even so, I am a little surprised at how nearly unanimous we are now. There are some differences of opinion, really rather slight, in respect to definitions and statistics. There is considerably more disagreement about ways and means. But hardly anybody is willing today to take a position that full employment opportunity is undesirable or even that it is not substantially attainable in a free economy.

Most of us feel very definitely that it will be sheer folly to risk another major depression if we can find any possible way of avoiding it. Some people have frogotten how close we came to real disaster in the early 1930's, but most of us remember quite clearly and realize that mass unemployment simply will not be tolerated again. This free and self-reliant people simply will not stand for another great depression—not after seeing with their own eyes the production and employment they can achieve if they get together and decide what they want to do.

In addition to this general realization that unemployment on any considerable scale would be a deadly threat to our institutions, and especially to our free-enterprise system, I think there is also a healthy and correct appreciation of the fact that world peace depends in large part on our success in maintaining full employment here.

So there we are, and the problem is how to go about the job of maintaining the condition of full employment opportunity. I have approached this legislation, H. R. 2202, in this spirit. As you know, I have been thinking about the problem for a good many years, and especially since about 1938. Then last winter this bill came along and it matched my ideas of how to attack the job very well. I therefore wholeheartedly endorsed it.

The end of the war came sooner than most of us expected. It brought the need for immediate consideration and adoption of a program for governmental and private action to get us out of the war economy—a program to get us through the transition period and into peacetime condition where a man who is able and willing to work will have a real opportunity to earn a living.

I feel strongly that this bill is the necessary first step and that it is needed as the first step toward working out the kind of a long-range program we want, and is also urgently needed for a successful transition.

I hope it will be passed as promptly as orderly procedure will permit, especially since some of the factors that are operating toward recovery are strictly temporary, and it will take some time to get our longer-range machinery functioning.

As I look around and read the papers and the reports and contemplate the management-labor conference that is coming up in a few weeks, I am more and more impressed with the urgency of the situation. The difficulties that are so prominent in the headlines have their roots, I believe, in fear of the future—in lack of confidence in our ability to create and maintain a condition where workers and employers alike will have enough opportunities to earn their livings whether in the form of wages or in profits.

I hope I can share with you some of this feeling of urgency. The Director of Mobilization and Reconversion has estimated that unemployment may reach eight millions in the first quarter of 1946, even allowing for several million withdrawals from the labor force. It will reach some such numbers because our economic machinery simply can't operate quite fast enough to build up peacetime employment as rapidly as demobilization of war industry and of the armed forces will proceed.

There will be a turning point, perhaps in March or April, from which we can move in one of two directions. We can recover, perhaps rather rapidly, if we have industrial and economic peace and confidence in the future. The recovery might even be too fast or too hectic; prices might get out of hand before production comes up to meet the demand and then we would have an inflationary boom that surely would end in another collapse. So I think we must have a unified, coordinated economic program to keep us on the highway even if we do get into a boom late next year.

On the other hand, it is by no means certain that we shall snap out of this critical period. It depends upon a whole set of economic and social factors, including among other things industrial peace, social tolerance, and general confidence. Confidence is essential to the other conditions. I am not now talking about vague, unreal, or visionary things at all; I am talking straight bankers' language, based on economic realities, when I use the term "confidence."

If, when the turning point comes, a wave of fear should sweep the country, then it is quite possible that conditions would not improve but would get worse and we would sink into stagnation and depression.

It is by no means certain that the accumulated backlog of demand and the presence of accumulated purchasing power will actually pull us out of the critical period if there should be widespread lack of confidence in the ability of management and labor to get together and in the ability of the Government to do its part. Here again confidence in the future is the key.

Now this turning point is coming along very soon and I urge as strongly as I can that we take appropriate action in time. By appropriate action I mean such legislation and administrative measures as will demonstrate that we take our responsibilities seriously, that we are working as hard as we can on the job, and that we intend to succeed. For such action, H. R. 2202 is the necessary first step. I want to explain why I think this in more detail.

There are three elements in the problem as I see it. First we must have confidence in the future and that confidence must be justified—not mere unthinking optimism.

Second, in order to create such confidence we must have better coordination in Government—better administration and better legislation in matters that affect the economic activity of the country. This economy is now so large and so complex, it is so closely tied to the economic and political development of the rest of the world, and the Federal Government necessarily will occupy and affect such a large part of our total economy—that we simply cannot afford to muddle along and take a chance on another collapse.

We must modernize our administrative and legislative procedures. We must coordinate our handling of expenditures for public investment and for public services, our regulatory activities, and our necessary revenue-raising measures. We must coordinate our fiscal activities, the control of credit and the handling of the tremendous debt structure. We simply cannot any longer work at cross purposes in these various fields—all of them fields where the Federal Government of necessity will have a major impact for good or ill on the workings of our private economy.

So I note that a general understanding that we are going to coordinate our governmental job better than we have done in the past is a positive requirement for general confidence in where the country is going.

In the third place, confidence will not be justified and coordination will not be effective unless we move promptly to the development of a program for legislative and administrative action. Everybody has ideas about what the Government should or should not do. It is amazing how some people say in one breath, "keep the Government out of business—let business alone," and in the next breath propose a series of actions that they want the Government to take. But it will be necessary for us to take various forms of action, and my point is that we have no assurance of success except by bringing together the various measures that affect the

economy in the various ways I have suggested, unless we construct a reasonably unified and coordinated and complete program.

So there we have three elements or stages in our attack on the central problem—confidence, coordination, and a program. If this bill had not been proposed, and if we were sitting here analyzing the situation, we might well write up such a set of specifications.

As I examine H. R. 2202 it fits these specifications very well.

First it states the central objective—full employment opportunity in a free competitive economy—in terms that are generally understood and widely agreed upon. This objective is unquestionably first in the hearts of almost all our people—all, I think, except a few who have special axes to grind. The mere recognition of this great national objective in plain and simple terms is to step in the right direction toward the necessary confidence.

Next the bill recognizes clearly and simply the responsibility of the Federal Government toward this objective. There can be no possible question but that the people of the United States will hold their Federal Government responsible for the attainment of their great central objective. They will hold their elected representatives and their duly designated administrative officials responsible, and they will form their own judgment as to how well we have discharged our obligation. If we fail, or in the degree to which we fail, they will be the judge of how well we have provided the necessary leadership and how wisely we have directed the resources of the Federal Government toward our declared objective.

The actual language of the bill is properly clear and definite on this recognition and responsibility. It says in plain English that the responsibility is to assure the existence at all times of sufficient opportunities.

Finally, the bill sets up a procedure in the executive branch and in Congress that seems to me very well adapted to the formulation and constant improvement of a program for economic action to move toward and maintain the objective of full employment opportunity in a free competitive economy. The procedure set forth is very simple and very businesslike. It is closely parallel to the well-established procedures that have been found necessary in the successful conduct of a private corporation with its president and its board of directors. The bill calls upon the President to submit annually a statement of the situation and of where the country seems to be headed as respects employment and production; and a program for administrative action that he proposes to take in the circumstances thus described; and a program of recommended legislative action.

The making of such an annual statement and preparation of such a program and its revision as situations develop and conditions change would be a powerful influence toward better administration in the executive branch. It would compel the various agencies to consider their own requirements and intentions in the light of the total. It would compel an accounting at periodic intervals of the success of their work. It would be a powerful device in the direction of efficiency as well as effectiveness throughout the whole Federal executive establishment.

The bill finally sets up improved machinery in Congress for the same purposes of coordination and unification of effort. This is a natural development in our legislative history and there can be no question but what it is badly needed to cope with the tremendous problems that will confront the Senate and the House in the future and that I think will be simply unmanageable under current procedures. The machinery set up in the bill is very simple—the joint committee of the Senate and the House large enough to include the heads of the major committees concerned but not large enough to be unwieldy. This committee is directed to receive the President's National Budget message and program and to consider it, calling witnesses or utilizing its own staff as may be found necessary or convenient; and then to report a joint resolution to the Senate and the House for public debate, revision and adoption as the agreed upon statement of the situation and of governmental needs and intentions.

I can think of nothing more healthy and more conducive to a rational and prudent approach to these complex problems of the future by the Members of the Senate and the House and by the various committees. It is not another complication—it is a simplification. It would strengthen the hand of every standing committee. It is not too much to say that such a procedure would enable these committees to do their jobs in the face of legislative requirements of the future.

So it seems to me that the H. R. 2202 matches the specifications for the kind of basic legislation we need as the first step toward a program for full employment opportunity in a free competitive economy. It sets up the objective; it states the responsibility of the Federal Government; and it establishes a procedure that is well adapted for the purpose.

It is the minimum that we must have to start with in order to provide the confidence which is the essential basis of a healthy private enterprise and to make possible the coordination of effort toward the unified objective and to equip us with the procedure under which the Administration and the Congress can develop step by step an economic program for unified action toward the agreed-upon objective.

Whatever the Congress finds it wise to adopt in the way of basic legislation for this purpose, I will do my best to help make that legislation work. But I hope you will give us in the administration a clear and definite authorization to do our job, such as H. R. 2202.

I don't know what modifications or amendments you are considering, if any, but I definitely hope you do not weaken the bill. Let me emphasize again the underlying importance of confidence throughout the business world, both to employers and to labor. It is confidence alone that will give us the healthy flow of purchasing power which is the lifeblood of the private-enterprise system. It is confidence alone that will activate the accumulated savings and get them used to satisfy accumulated needs and wants.

The way to build this general confidence is to state in clear and simple legislation written in plain English that we are going to do the job; that we do recognize the responsibility and that our responsibility is to assure opportunities for our workers and our businessmen and our farmers and our professional people to earn a decent living. Any weakening of this commitment would tend to defeat the purpose.

Let us tell the people that we really mean it. Let us also tell them that we recognize the difficulty of the task; that we recognize that in order to discharge this responsibility we must set up new and improved procedures in the executive branch and in the legislature and that we must go on from there to work out a practical program of unified action.

Let me describe a little more specifically what sort of a program of positive action we can work out under H. R. 2202.

I want to say to begin with that I firmly believe a program can be worked out that will provide sufficient employment opportunity in a free competitive economy, without departing from our traditional concepts of individual liberties, including private enterprise; and this can definitely be done without imposing tax burdens or other fiscal practices that would defeat the purpose. Specifically, I believe it can be done without jeopardizing the integrity of our fiscal system.

It can be done without continuing deficits in the Federal Treasury if we want to do it that way. The money we need to balance expenditures can be obtained by taxation rather than by borrowing if that is the policy that seems wise to Congress in the future. Such tax revenues, of course, would have to be obtained from sources where it would not reduce private expenditures so much as to be self-defeating. If we take a dollar of taxes out of the active flow of purchasing demand, we reduce somebody's expenditure and somebody's sale at the cash register by the same dollar. So if we decide to raise enough revenue to balance the Government's expenses, it is perfectly clear that we will have to hunt around and find sources of revenue that will not cripple or strangle the active flow of purchasing demand at the cash register.

The bill you are considering does not specify any single policy in this respect, and I think this is wise. We have yet to solve the problem of finding and taxing idle dollars without reducing unduly the profit incentive. We do know that when a dollar is saved it is withdrawn from the flow of active purchasing power and nobody can make any money out of it until it is spent or invested or until somebody else spends or invests a dollar that had previously been saved. We do not know exactly how much private enterprise will want to borrow and invest nor exactly how much it should and can borrow and invest year by year without getting ahead of its market. We do not know whether the amount that business will want to borrow and invest will be equal to the amount that individuals want to save and lend.

If private business doesn't care to invest year by year as much as individuals want to save, then it is simple arithmetic to figure out that somebody else will have to provide the outlet for the people's savings. Otherwise, the total flow of active purchasing power at the cash register will not stay up where it ought to be and full employment and full production will not be maintained.

If this should turn out to be the case—if business doesn't provide the opportunities for useful investment of the people's savings—then I expect the people will see no reason why they should not provide their own outlet. I expect they will provide such outlet for themselves through their Government by investing the money in useful public projects.

This would add up to what we are accustomed to term a deficit in the Government budget, although in private business strictly comparable operations are not termed deficits when they are balanced by additions to the capital account. A manufacturer does not write off a new factory during the year in which it is built. There is no more reason why the Government should write off a dam or a highway in a single year.

In all these matters it is clear that the future holds many uncertainties and therefore I think the Government's budgetary policy should be left for future Congresses to determine under the conditions they face in the future. We have just come out of a long period of fiscal disturbance and perhaps we still face several years of extraordinary fiscal requirements. The bill specifies that taxation and revenue raising shall be considered as a part of the program as, of course, they should be. That is as far as I think we should go at this time.

President Truman on September 6 submitted an extensive list of items on which he felt that governmental action is needed in order to steer a steady course through the reconversion period and into a satisfactory postwar economy. He said, "The major objective, of course, is to reestablish an expanded peacetime industry, trade, and agriculture, and to do it as quickly as possible." Then he listed the major fields of action for the consideration of Congress in line with

his constitutional duty—and as you know legislation for full employment was among the items.

As I look down the President's list of far-reaching, needed measures, many of which are not yet even in draft form as far as I know, and as I contemplate these extensive areas of needed action, many of which are not covered at all or are very inadequately covered—I am impressed again and again with the sheer impossibility of handling these complex problems unless we first equip ourselves with the machinery set up in H. R. 2202. In addition, at the risk of unecessary repetition I say again that the whole success of this or any other program for the critical time that lies immediately ahead as well as for the long range—I say that the whole success of such a program depends on creating and justifying a feeling of confidence throughout the land.

The President's list in his message of September 6 contained 21 main headings and I hope you have noted how each item relates to and affects the others and how therefore we should consider them each in relation to the whole of our activity—and therefore how urgently we need the bill which you have before you.

Now what is the difference between such a listing of items and a program for action under the full-employment bill?

The difference is that in constructing the program, specific measures for action on each item would be proposed or described and their effects would be estimated and their relations to other parts of the program would be set forth. Then the joint committee would consider the report and the recommended measures and the estimates. They would change such parts as they found needed change and then report the joint resolution for debate on the floor of each House. The joint resolution would be debated, fully and freely and publicly, and adopted by a record vote. Finally, the specific measures contained in the final program would be drafted and considered by the various standing committees.

In this manner we would work out a program, the parts of which would fit together. As conditions changed and the success of each measure was proved out or disproved in practice, revisions would be made from time to time to improve the result.

It is very closely parallel to the well-established techniques of management in business. A scientific management approach to a business problem usually contains three steps: (1) setting the objectives, (2) allocating the responsibility, and (3) setting up procedures to discharge the responsibility. The procedures begin by setting tasks and quotas; then a coordinated set of processes or machines or operations would be designed and placed in action. Finally—just as a corporation publishes a quarterly report on its operations—there would be a periodic check of the results whereby the performance could be measured and the efficiency of the whole program could be gaged. This is what, as I read it, is done by H. R. 2202.

Summarizing briefly, I am in favor of H. R. 2202 because I believe it is an essential step in creating and justifying the confidence that is essential to the successful operation of our private enterprise system.

I favor the bill because it would set up a procedure for better coordination in the executive branch and in the Congress and I feel that such better coordination is absolutely necessary in dealing with the huge and complex problems of the postwar world.

I favor the bill because it is the only practical way I see whereby we can construct and operate a unified program of governmental action on the scale that clearly will be necessary in the future.

For these very reasons, I would be strongly against any attempts at weakening or watering down this legislation. Such weakening would strike at the very foundation of our work—it would tend to weaken the confidence which is its essential objective. I think we must say clearly and plainly and flatly that we are going to do this job.

Likewise, I would view with strong disfavor attempts to limit or restrict the action programs and measures which future Congresses may find desirable under the circumstances that then exist. I think we should leave the future Congress entirely unfettered to use whatever means they find necessary or desirable under the Constitution.

I would also view as very weakening or restricting any attempt to divide the joint committee, or to limit its scope of consideration, or to relieve it of the necessary duty of reporting its findings back in the form of a joint resolution for open debate in each House and before the people of the country.

Finally, I have said and would emphasize again that a positive program of action is necessary, and that it can be constructed without doing violence to our traditions and our institutions, and without ruining the financial soundness of the country—provided that we agree on the objective of the program, and that we face the responsibility squarely, and that we adopt procedures that will make it possible for us to discharge that responsibility.

All these things add up to my strong support of H. R. 2202. I believe firmly that we can accomplish this task—I see that we must accomplish this task—and I urge that our time is limited and that the need is great.

Give us a good strong legislative authorization and let us get to work.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR SHOULD HAVE BEEN DEMOBILIZED LONG AGO

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to observe through the press releases the War Department finally decided to discharge men from the armed forces who were captured and incarcerated in the prison camps of the Nazis and the Japanese. Of course, they should have been discharged long ago. They certainly performed their share of service. To keep men on active service after they had suffered the punishments in the prison camps of the enemy was about the most unreasonable and inexcusable thing the War Department could do. These American prisoners of war did not even accumulate points while in prison. I have been trying for several months to convince Army officials that these, of all servicemen, were entitled to be discharged.

Let me call your attention to another thing that seems manifestly unfair and that is, that boys who served in prison camps of either the Nazis or the Japanese, are given no credit toward promotions. Men who served long periods of time in the prison camps came out with the same rank as they had when they were captured. For example, a second lieutenant from my State was captured by the Japanese more than 3 years ago. He has been released and is discharged as a second lieutenant. His friend, who was a second lieutenant 3 years ago, served for a considerable period of time in the Pentagon. He is now a lieutenant colonel. I am not criticizing the lieutenant colonel, not for 1 minute, but I do feel that men who have been required, through no fault of their own, to serve in the prison camps of either the Nazis or the Nipponese are certainly entitled to a little more consideration, not only with regard to discharges but also with respect to rank as members of our armed forces.

PAYMENT OF ACCUMULATED OR ACCRUED LEAVE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. REES of Kansas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. DOUGLAS of California, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 1 week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, November 12, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream pollution abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday, November 14, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in room 446, Old House Office Building, to consider H. R. 3976, H. R. 4109, H. R. 4179, and private bills.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 393. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4421, a bill to increase the permanent authorized

enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointment in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 1189). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 394. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2788, a bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code in regard to the limitations of certain actions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 1190). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. House Joint Resolution 265. Joint resolution to provide for proceeding with certain river and harbor projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war; without amendment (Rept. 1191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4457) for the relief of Larren N. Harris, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4618. A bill to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4619. A bill for protection of cotton and cottonseed production from the pink bollworm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4620. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAVAGE:

H. R. 4621. A bill to establish a Veterans' Job Act and integrated national program for assuring maximum work opportunities and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, foreign trade, private agencies, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4622. A bill repealing the profit-limitation provisions of the act known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4623. A bill to eliminate the income limitation for eligibility for pension for non-service-connected disability in the case of persons who have a service-connected disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 4624. A bill to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents, for taking action in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto, for preventing proof of acts abroad with respect to the making of an invention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 4625. A bill to authorize a program for the construction of county agricultural buildings through assistance in planning and financing such projects in counties where agriculture is a predominant industry thereby providing centralized housing and facilities for Federal, State, and local offices engaged in administering agricultural and related programs concerned with the welfare of the farm population; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4626. A bill relating to the application of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code to prisoners of war and others in the Philippines during Japanese occupation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4627. A bill relating to sales of surplus property to veterans; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4628. A bill to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4629. A bill to establish a veterans' job act and integrated national program for assuring maximum work opportunities and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, foreign trade, private agencies, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4630. A bill to incorporate the Reserve Officers of the Naval Services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 4631. A bill to establish a veterans' job and integrated national program for assuring maximum work opportunities and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy through the concerted effort of industry, agriculture, labor, foreign trade, private agencies, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; to the Commitee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4632. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John W. Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 4633. A bill for the relief of John B. Clausen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4634. A bill for the relief of Claud Cathcart; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4635. A bill for the relief of J. R. Mahon; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4636. A bill for the relief of W. B. Lacy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4637. A bill for the relief of T. L. Truitt; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4638. A bill for the relief of B. E. Truitt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4639. A bill for the relief of C. LeRoy Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4640. A bill for the relief of Gladys Hastings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SAVAGE:

H. R. 4641. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4642. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4643. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4644. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4645. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4646. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 4647. A bill for the relief of Albert R. Perkins; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

1312. Mr. GRAHAM presented a petition of 53 members of the Grace Evangelical and Reformed Church of Harmony, Pa., protesting the passage of H. H. 3293, to provide for the national security, health, and public welfare, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, help of the ages past, hope for the years to come, in the secret place of the Most High, in the hush of this moment, closing the door of prayer upon the outer world with its tumultuous and unpredictable events, in the white light of Thy holiness, we know ourselves for what we are, petty and proud creatures who seek their own wills and whims in spite of the polished courtesies and noble professions with which we come to Thee. Cleanse the inner fountains of our hearts from all defiling foulness and from the secret sin of pretense. Touch our lips with live coals from Thy altar of devotion. Fit us to faithfully protect the Republic from outward aggression and from inner selfishness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 8, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 8, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1281) to provide for covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Phil-

ippine funds in the Treasury of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) providing for the reenrollment of the bill (S. 1199) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMING VISIT OF THE BRITISH PRIME MINISTER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives has asked me to inform the Senate that on next Tuesday at 12:30 p. m. the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Hon. Clement Attlee, will be present in the Hall of the House of Representatives and will deliver an address, not to an official joint session but to the Members of the two Houses of Congress, and that we as Members of the Senate are invited to be present. I make this announcement in the hope that Senators will arrange to be in the Senate Chamber next Tuesday so that we may go informally to the House and hear Mr. Attlee's address to the Members of Congress.

SANCTITY OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before we get into the business of the afternoon, I desire to comment very briefly upon the significant fact that the President's Labor-Management Conference occurs simultaneously with the Washington transit strike which temporarily jeopardized the community life and business of the Capital of the United States. I wish to underscore the important fact that the latter emphasizes and high lights one of the paramount obligations of the former, namely, to find a way to prevent strikes which violate collective-bargaining contracts.

This sort of irresponsibility cannot much longer persist, Mr. President, if collective bargaining itself is to grow into new strength through equity. The true friends of collective bargaining will be among the very first to realize that mutual and equal responsibility under collective-bargining contracts must be established upon firm and dependable foundations if free collective bargaining itself shall deserve to persist. Otherwise these contracts are a travesty upon the word. Congress confronts this precise challenge at this moment.

Mr. President, the Washington transit strike illustrates my point. It appears to be in violation of at least two clauses of the contract between the company and the union. One of the clauses provides against interruption of service during the life of the contract. Another sets up arbitration for the settlement of agreements which are not reconciled by the collective-bargaining process. Under the general terms of the contract, section 6 reads as follows:

> It is further agreed that during the period covered by this contract the service upon and operation of the lines of this company shall not be interrupted or interfered with by either party.

In other words, Mr. President, a free collective-bargaining contract which was freely entered into and written pursuant to a voluntary acknowledgment of the workers themselves was not binding upon the members of the union who signed it. It ceased to be a contract except at the option of the union. It became a one-way scrap of paper.

I do not pass upon the merits of the actual controversy. I pass only upon the fact that the union had agreed to a peaceful process of settlement of such controversies as a part of a free collective bargaining contract with the employer. This agreement was broken in spirit if not in letter. The public suffered; the public business suffered; but the biggest casualty was the integrity of free collective bargaining itself.

Unfortunately the transit strike is not an isolated episode. It is entirely too typical of an unfortunate trend. The friends of free collective bargaining will do their best to stop this trend before it invites excessive reprisal. The existing situation is intolerable. These are really so-called wildcat strikes which labor union leadership itself condemns. I am not talking about wages; I am not talking about hours; I am not talking about working conditions. I am talking about honor; I am talking about contractual integrity; I am talking about the good faith by which men live.

It is this sort of thing which President Truman obviously had in mind when in his recent discussion of labor-management relationships he said:

> We shall have to find methods not only of peaceful negotiation of labor contracts but also of insuring industrial peace for the lifetime of such contracts.

That is the point which I am emphasizing, Mr. President, and it seems to me that it is the primary fundamental of our industrial problem of the moment—

> But also of insuring industrial peace for the lifetime of such contracts.

The President continues:

> Contracts once made must be lived up to, and should be changed only in the manner agreed upon by the parties. If we expect confidence in agreements made, there must be responsibility and integrity on both sides in carrying them out.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am heartily in accord with what has just been said, and I wish to observe that the statement the Senator has read from the President announces no new philosophy of law or of integrity, and there is no reason why it should not apply in industrial disputes the same as it does in every other relation of human life.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his comment. Obviously I am in total agreement with his observations.

Mr. President, the Labor Management Conference will have fully justified its existence if it can recommend an answer to this one, great, basic friction in labor-management relationships. Collective bargaining contracts, backed by practical penalties, must be made inviolable within their own life and terms.

Fortunately, this problem is frankly faced by the agenda of the present conference, and it is to the everlasting credit of the major leaders of organized labor that they agreed to this agenda. They recognize the problem to which I address myself, and I know of nothing more important than that the agenda of this conference, which is signed officially by the high leaders of organized labor, contains these two proposals which are to be canvassed by the conference:

> 1. Adherence by both parties to a policy of responsibility for living up to the letter and spirit of all collective agreements and effective measures to carry them out.
>
> 2. Consideration of action needed by unions to control their members for conduct in violation of agreement.

Mr. President, I repeat, this is an agenda subscribed to by the leaders of organized labor themselves, "to control their members for conduct in violation of an agreement, and action needed by management to control their officials and supervisory force who engage in violation of an agreement."

Mr. President, these questions go to the core of our greatest current problem. There can be no stabilized economic life on the American industrial front until successful answers to the problem, until dependable labor contracts, are produced.

The implications are utterly far-reaching. Until employers can depend upon the validity of their collective bargaining contracts for the term of their existence, healthy expansion plans are impossible. Until employers can depend upon the terms of a collective bargaining contract for the period agreed upon, it is impossible for them to figure with workers on a basis of maximum liberality to the workers, because the employers will always be hedging against contingencies. Until employers and employees are equally responsible for the faithful performance of collective bargaining agreements within their own life and terms, collective bargaining cannot hope for the dignity which it deserves. Let us not forget that far more collective bargaining contracts are kept than are broken. But this is all the more a reason for outlawing the exceptions to the rule.

Mr. President, one word more. I had some small part in the inception of this Labor-Management Conference. I am not among the cynics who already consign it to the graveyard. On the contrary, I still believe that men of good will who, in the long run, must sink or swim together, whether they like it or not, will find some common answers to their common problems—and I hope

particularly for an answer to the particular problem to which I have referred.

The official agenda for the conference reproduces several sentences from my letter of July 30, 1945, to Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach. I want to read those sentences into the RECORD as defining my attitude toward both the Conference and its problems. I am reading the quotation on the front of the official agenda, a quotation from my letter of July 30, 1945, to the Secretary of Labor:

I am wondering whether there may not be an analogy between the two problems (peace abroad and peace at home) to the extent that the method by which we are solving the one could be the approach which might promise to solve the other. When the delegations of 50 United Nations met at San Francisco their ideas were miles apart in many instances. After intimate and friendly consultations, in which each frankly faced the problem of the other, we came finally to a unanimous agreement, despite repeated crises which were supposed to be insurmountable. It was a triumph of the council table. Men of good will resolved their differences for their own and the common welfare's sake. We quit warring with each other in order to stop our common enemy—war itself.

Is it impossible to apply this formula at home in respect to these vital industrial relationships? Responsible management knows that free collective bargaining is here to stay and that progressive law must continue to support it and that it must be wholeheartedly accepted. Responsible labor leadership knows that irresponsible strikes and subversive attacks upon essential production are the gravest threats to the permanent success of labor's bill of rights. The American public knows that we cannot rebuild and maintain our national economy at the high levels required by our unavoidable necessities if we cannot have production peace instead of disruptive war on the industrial front. American Government knows that social statutes are futile except as they largely stem from mutual wisdom and mutual consent.

Mr. President, for this last reason it is particularly important that the Labor-Management Conference should succeed. I continue to hope it may find an effective voluntary formula, or that it may point the way to practical and effective statutes to put collective bargaining contracts on a basis of total and complete responsibility for all concerned. There can be no other way.

NOMINATION OF CHESTER C. DAVIS TO BE MEMBER OF ADVISORY BOARD IN OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall not be present next Monday or next Tuesday, and it is desirable that the nomination which I shall presently send to the desk be acted upon by the Senate.

From the Committee on Finance, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Chester C. Davis, of Missouri, to be a member of the Advisory Board to represent the public, in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, vice William H. Davis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1581. A bill relating to the computation of retirement pay of personnel of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1582. A bill to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1583. A bill for the relief of William Zagorski; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1584. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

S. 1585. A bill for the relief of Richard T. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

CLARA E. WASHINGTON

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, a few months ago Cosby F. Washington, a long and efficient and faithful employee of the Senate Restaurant, died. I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution providing relief for his widow, and I ask that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee. I sincerely hope the resolution will be adopted.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 189) was received and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Clara E. Washington, widow of Cosby F. Washington, late an employee of the Senate Restaurant, a sum equal to 6 months' basic compensation at the rate he was receiving from such restaurant at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PROPOSAL TO HOLD THE 1948 OLYMPIC GAMES IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I had a call last week from a fine group of Washington high-school students who are very much interested in sports. They appealed to me to assist them in their efforts to have the Olympic games held in the Nation's Capital in 1948. In connection with their appeal they presented me with a short letter signed by representatives of various high schools in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 31, 1945.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The undersigned committees of the District of Columbia high schools are making this appeal to you as one who has taken a vital interest in the progress of the Nation's Capital.

The purpose of this appeal is to enlist your efforts in obtaining the Olympic games of 1948 to be held in the District of Columbia.

We are sure that you are in sympathy with this movement as through the medium of the Olympic games the United States will influence other nations to obtain a broad point of view of our interest in this committee rather than their possible conception that we are only interested in the material concepts of life. Should the youth of America through your noble efforts obtain the Olympic games in the Nation's Capital, it would undoubtedly reveal to the nations of the world that the United States as a cosmopolitan population consisting of all nationalities and religions desire to work and live peacefully under the standards of Old Glory.

The opportunity to engage in competitive sports with the nations of the world will ably assist in the encouragement of good sportsmanship, and perhaps accomplish results that statesmen and diplomats have failed to accomplish in the past.

We respectfully hope that you will use your considerate efforts in our mission, knowing full well of your accomplishments in the interest of the District of Columbia. We trust that you will have many more years of health and happiness. We remain,

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL JOHN FRESCHI,
Langley Junior High School.
RALPH TASH,
Calvin Coolidge High School.
JOANNE SCHLOSBERG,
Woodrow Wilson High School.
AUDREY JAFFEE,
Woodrow Wilson High School.
MAX SAMAKOW,
Central High.
BERTHA JONES,
Georgetown Visitation Convent.

UNITY OF COMMAND OF THE ARMY AND NAVY—STATEMENT BY LT. GEN. J. H. DOOLITTLE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this morning Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle appeared before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the question of the consolidation of the Army and Navy under a single department of the armed forces. General Doolittle made such a challenging, constructive, and statesmanlike presentation that I wish it might have been possible for every Member of the Senate to hear it. He made what might be termed a historic statement, which will live through the years and will be referred to and used by men for guidance in the days to come.

I should like to have consent to have the statement of General Doolittle printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks, and I so request.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my privilege to have had two types of experience intimately related to the problem of military organization now before this committee. First, in order of time, was my service as a member of the board organized in 1934, under the chairmanship of Newton D. Baker, which had before it most of the problems now being considered by this committee. Second was my service in the war, as Commanding General first of the Twelfth, then the Fifteenth and finally of the Eighth Air Force.

I should like to speak first about the Baker Board proceedings. After careful and conscientious deliberations it concluded that unity of command of the Army and Navy was not required, and that, not only should the Air Corps remain in a subordinate position, but that the office of Assistant Secretary of War for Air, established in 1926, tended to

make that position less subordinate and should therefore be abolished. I was the lone dissenting member. I felt then and still feel a sense of personal defeat in having failed to convince those earnest and conscientious men. Basically, the trouble was that we had to talk about air power in terms of promise and prophecy instead of in terms of demonstration and experience. Fortunately this committee does not function under the same handicap.

It would be well if any man considering the questions now before this committee could read the Baker Board report from cover to cover. It is not long—75 pages—but those 75 pages are the most convincing of object lessons as to the dangers of complacent satisfaction with things as they are and the life-and-death importance of vision and foresight in estimating the potentialities and dangers of warfare to be waged in the future.

I am going to quote briefly from the Baker Board report, not to make the surviving members of that Board wince, but to point up this object lesson.

It had been urged before the Board that there be a unification of the Army and Navy and a certain amount of common training. The Board turned down this suggestion and said:

"Unity of command has been assured in all operations ashore, including the defense of the coast against actual attack. It is far better that (the Army and Navy) should be free to concentrate on their normal and customary missions rather than to adopt a system based upon occasional and short-lived joint operations, especially since these can be met by the adoption of principles insuring coordinated action" (p. 22).

I have no doubt the members of that Board honestly believed that "coordinated action" through some kind of committee meetings like the Joint Army-Navy Board was just as good as a unified command—that is, they believed it until the first Sunday in December 1941.

Numerous Air Corps witnesses before the Baker Board argued that foreign air power was a threat to the United States and its outlying possessions, that domestic air power must be developed to meet that threat and attack it at its source and that a coordinate air arm was necessary for that purpose. The committee wholly disagreed in language which might well bear the subtitle "Pearl Harbor, Here We Come." The report said:

"Proposals are sometimes advanced to the effect that, with land or floating bases an air force superior to our own could launch a decisive attack against some vital area in the United States. These proposals cannot be accepted as a possibility under the present stage of air development (p. 13).

"The 'air invasion of the United States' and the 'air defense of the United States' are conceptions of those who fail adequately to consider the effect of ocean barriers and other limitations" (p. 15).

Various nonflying witnesses pointed out that in the Navy airplanes were part of the fleet and went along with the fleet and it worked very well and that in the Army airplanes ought to be part of the Infantry and go along with the Infantry serving as long-range artillery and a sort of Air Cavalry for reconnaissance purposes. Air Corps officers, however, stated that the principal functions of air power were first, to defeat the enemy air, and, second, to deal body blows at the sustaining sources of the enemy's war power with masses of bombers capable of traveling whatever distances were necessary to reach the vital industrial regions. They might as well have saved their breath. The whole conception upon which the Eighth Air Force, the Fifteenth Air Force, and the Twentieth Air Force were to strike at the industrial heart of the Axis was rejected. Such a conception overstrained the imagination, for the first B–17 was not to be produced for yet another year. "Ridiculous," said the Board, "the Air Corps is an arm of the Infantry." They said it in these words:

"The ideas that aviation, acting alone, can control the sea lanes, or defend the coast, or produce decisive results in any other general mission contemplated under our policy are all visionary, as is the idea that a very large and independent air force is necessary to defend our country against air attack (p. 14).

"Our primary needs in military aviation are adequate air forces with our Navy to assist in blocking approaches by sea, and adequate air forces with our Army to assist in repelling an invading force, which the Navy does not overcome, and to participate in land campaigns (p. 17)."

And then in closing, the committee paid its respects to those whom it called the Air Corps agitators, and sought to tie the country into a 10-year straitjacket. The committee said:

"This committee is the fifteenth committee or board which, during the past 16 years, has studied the Army Air Corps. It is the hope of this committee that the present study may be accepted as the basis for the development of the Army Air Corps for the next 10 years and thus terminate the continuing agitation and uncertainty which has been so detrimental."

Ten years from the date of that report expired on 18 July 1944. On that date, thanks to the scrapping of the Baker Board report and substantially every idea in it, the Army Air Forces comprised some 13,000 B–17's and B–24's and American industry was producing these heavy bombers at the rate of 15,000 a year for the United States and its allies. On this date the combined bomber offensive against Germany had been under way for a year and a half and the enemy was being pounded by the four-engine bombers, which the Baker Board would have outlawed, at the rate of 78,000 tons of bombs per month.

I am told that it has been strongly urged that the whole problem now before this committee be turned over to a composite military and civilian board like the Baker Board. If delay is the objective, such a suggestion will attain it. If sound, prompt action is the objective, the experience of the Baker Board indicates that you may get something less than wisdom.

Where did we get those 13,000 bombers with which we were hitting Germany in July 1944? It wasn't easy. It began with an experimental B–17 in 1935. This plane crashed on the take-off of a demonstration flight and nearly carried with it to destruction the Air Corps project for a striking force of heavy bombers. But, providentially, this plane has demonstrated so many fine qualities before it crashed that a squadron of 13 was authorized in 1936. Sixty-five were recommended by the Air Corps but only 13 were authorized. They performed well. The Air Corps, then only an auxiliary branch of the Ground Forces, repeatedly begged for enough of them to make a striking force, but when the war broke out in Europe we had only one more squadron. The official War Department policy during the intervening years was one of producing only little planes to give close support to the ground forces. In 1937 the Air Corps requested 60 more B–17's; 26 were approved, this was cut down to 20; then the whole project was cancelled. The low point in this history of failure to recognize air potentialities came on October 5, 1938, when this wholly unsound policy resulted in a directive excluding four-engine bombers from the Budget for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941. This directive was issued 2 weeks after Munich and less than a year before Hitler invaded Poland. It sought to foreclose any heavy-bomber program through the year of Pearl Harbor. Fortunately, this prohibition was later lifted. But with all the efforts that could be expended we had on the day of Pearl Harbor only some 200—less than 5 percent of the force that was later marshaled against Germany. The Eighth Air Force alone sent out 10 times this many on a single mission.

I do not mention these facts in bitterness or even in criticism. The men who made these decisions were exercising their best judgment in the light of their sincere beliefs. They are not the men who so skillfully directed this war.

My own minority report at the Baker Board hearings stated:

"I believe that the future security of our Nation is dependent upon an adequate Air Force. This is true at the present time and will become increasingly important as the science of aviation advances. I am convinced that the required Air Force can be more rapidly organized, equipped, and trained if it is developed as an entirely separate arm."

This was 11 years ago. It has stood the test of time. I still believe it unreservedly.

I invite attention to these facts to assist you in answering this question: To obtain proper development of air power, is it desirable to place the Air Force in a position subordinate to another component having another major preoccupation, or is it better to place it on a status of equality with the land and sea forces?

The Air Force has proved itself to be the only arm that can operate independently. Air action must take place first, and the enemy air must be destroyed or neutralized before successful ground or sea operations can be launched. In future wars it is quite likely that the initial air action may be decisive and the side having lost the air war may well see fit to capitulate.

As an illustration of air action, initially entirely independent of land or sea action, I would like to speak of the operations of the Eighth Air Force from operating bases in England.

The basic mission of the Eighth Air Force was to fatally weaken the military economy of Germany—to destroy the will and ability of the enemy to wage war. In the historic words of the Casablanca directive, it was "the progressive destruction and dislocation of the German military, industrial, and economic system * * * to a point where * * * their capacity for armed resistance is fatally weakened." That is the underlying concept on which all strategic operations of the Eighth were carried out. It is the charter of the separate military operation—the air war—which the Eighth, together with the Fifteenth and the RAF Bomber Command, exploited to the fullest, unaided by land operations until June 6, 1944, and in concert with the ground armies thereafter.

After the commencement of land operations, the Eighth engaged in tactical operations in cooperation with the Ground Forces from time to time to aid the Allied armies to advance or to assist in stemming enemy attacks. Although the basic job of the Eighth was strategic, they joined the Ninth in their job of ground cooperation whenever necessary. This was, generally—

1. To prepare for a major operation.
2. To break a stalemate.
3. To avert a catastrophe.
4. To exploit a victory.

In addition, the Eighth engaged in a number of purely defensive operations, also diversionary from its main offensive objectives. Notable among these were the antisubmarine campaign and the attacks against "crossbow" installations in defense of the United Kingdom. (This was the bombing of

buzz-bomb and rocket sites, supply dumps, factories, and experimental stations.)

It soon became obvious that if we were to stay in the bombing business, we had to destroy or neutralize the German Air Force. This has since become one of the basic precepts of war. "No offensive ground, sea or, air operation can be successfully carried out without first gaining control of the air."

We started in the middle of 1943 to destroy the German aircraft and aeroengine factories. This program reached an all-time high in February 1944 when a week of good visual bombing weather permitted us to temporarily break the back of the German aircraft industry.

As the number and range of our escort fighters increased, we were then able to destroy the German Air Force in being. When attrition became greater than production and the Hun adopted a policy of strict conservation, we knew that the air battle was won.

Outstanding among the operations of the Eighth was the complete destruction of the German oil industry in conjunction with the Fifteenth Air Force and the RAF Bomber Command. The Eighth undertook the destruction of the seven large synthetic plants in central Germany, the large plant at Politz on the Baltic, and the twenty-odd refineries of Germany. The Fifteenth concentrated on the Silesian plants and the major refineries of Rumania, Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, while the RAF began the destruction of the 10 Ruhr plants.

From May 1944 to April 1945 the three air forces dropped more than 200,000 tons on synthetic plants, refineries, and benzol plants—555 separate attacks were made on 133 targets. In addition, over 35,000 tons were dropped on reserve oil depots and dumps supplying the German Armies, Navy, and Air Force. Of this gigantic total, the Eighth made 222 attacks on 66 producing plants and dropped 67,000 tons of bombs and sent another 15,000 tons into depots and dumps. The result of this combined effort was devastating, for by the 1st of April 1945 every known active synthetic plant and major refinery in Axis-held territory had been attacked and every one of these had been put out of production at one time or another. Production at one time was reduced to 7 percent of normal. First strategic and then tactical reserves were used up. Then the mobility of the great Wehrmacht was impaired to the point where our troops had an overwhelming advantage—out of all proportion to numbers and equipment.

In the closing weeks of the war enemy communications, particularly transportation, were placed on top priority. Transportation was, by now, the key to the enemy's entire military economy. Without rail transport, particularly after road traffic was virtually eliminated by the oil attacks and by fighter strafing, products in the chain of manufacture would be unable to move from source to factory, or from factory to depot to final military use. It was a strategic system the strangling of which finally put Germany out of the war.

The Eighth, together with the RAF Bomber Command, the Ninth Air Force, and the Second Tactical Air Force, undertook and accomplished the complete isolation of the Ruhr by cutting a vital bridge or viaduct on every line in a wide arc from Bremen in the north, down the Weser River, through Bielefeld, and curving to the Coblenz area in the south. Every yard, line, and railroad center of any importance was subjected to heavy and continuous attack, and at the same time canal traffic from Central Germany and the northern ports into the Ruhr were likewise given a terrific mauling. Very shortly after this the Ruhr was entirely cut off by Allied land forces.

I have cited a few of the outstanding accomplishments in which the Eighth participated—actions in which air power demonstrated its ability to bring about the collapse of the enemy. It would seem that Von Runstedt's conclusion is probably correct—that dislocation of Germany's railroad system by air attack was one of the main reasons for her loss of the war, yielding precedence only to the loss of air superiority and the destruction of her oil supplies.

That, gentlemen, was the air power of heavy bombardment as it was applied against Germany.

I have statements from senior German air and ground commanders giving their opinion as to the part air power played in winning the war. I can read these if you wish, but all say substantially the same thing—that when Germany lost control of the air she lost the war. This was equally true in Japan.

The same pattern was applied against Japan by the B–29's. I saw Hiroshima and Nagasaki and from them I know what the atomic bomb can do. I saw Tokyo, Osaka, Kobe, and Nagoya and from them I saw what massed air power could do even before the scientists developed the atomic bomb. The Navy had the transport to make the invasion of Japan possible, the ground forces had the power to make it successful, and the B–29 made it unnecessary. Air invasion is no dream of the visionary, as the Baker Board labeled it, and air defense is a problem which this country must solve, and solve correctly, at its deadly peril.

You, gentlemen of the committee, are concerned with organization. What are you making an organization for? There is only one answer: To avoid war if possible and if this is not possible to win the next war promptly with a minimum loss of precious American lives. This is the whole purpose and function of the organization you are about to create.

Where did the Baker Board go so pitifully wrong? Not through any lack of knowledge of organization, not through any defect of understanding of the machinery of Government. They went wrong because they were unable to take their minds off the last war and focus it on the next. They developed a war machine to fight the trench warfare of 1918 and not to meet the blitzkrieg of 1939.

And so it is worthwhile to examine some lessons we have learned.

The first lesson is that you can't lose a war if you have command of the air and you can't win a war if you haven't. For this country that is a good thing. If successful war making depended upon masses of men, this country would be at least fourth down the list of the world powers. If it depended upon world girdling colonies, possessions, and sea bases, we should definitely have to take a secondary position. But when it depends upon technological progress, mass production, and men capable of intelligent use of intricate machines, we are in a field where America can be second to none if it will. It will take vision and it will take money. You gentlemen can supply the vision; and the money it will take will be a small fraction of what the last war has cost and an even smaller fraction of what the next one will cost if this country is unwilling to pay the premium on the insurance policy which a strong air force, free to develop air power to its fullest, represents.

The second lesson we have learned comes from the late sage of South Bend, Ind.—"The only defense is a sound attack." Much thinking about that word "defense" has been foggy and the fog must be dispelled. Politically we are a defensive Nation, but militarily we can never be. We will not turn aggressor or provoke a quarrel; but when we are in a fight, we must carry the fight to the enemy and not sit behind our borders and wait until he brings devastation upon us. We must have striking power—and striking power in mass and at long range. It much be power that knows no barriers of land or water. It must be air power.

The third lesson concerns the map. For 400 years the Mercator's projection has been a good practical way of showing the important facts about geography. That is because the polar regions, which are hugely distorted and enlarged by the Mercator's projection, were too cold for men to live in or travel through on the ground and the polar seas were frozen over and hence blocked off to ships. But the Mercator's projection won't do any longer, because air in the polar regions has substantially the same consistency that it has in Washington, D. C., and aircraft can fly through it just as easily as they can fly anywhere else. Anyone who is thinking of the defense of this country or of its vulnerability to attack has got to start with a polar projection.

And here I would like to explode another fallacious notion: That land-based air should fly over the land only and sea-based over the sea—that upon reaching the coast line one should relinquish and the other take over. Such curtailment of mobility is untenable to air thinking and to effective air operations. When ground or sea transportation comes to the shore line it is stopped, but the airplane doesn't know whether it is over land or sea and the experienced airman doesn't much care.

Furthermore, all land-based air must be under one agency. We cannot efficiently split our forces. General Kenney's testimony clearly pointed this out.

Carrier-based air should remain under Navy control.

Within the last few days four B–29's flew from Japan to Washington nonstop. A plane now building has more than twice the range of the B–29. Any country of northern Europe or Asia is within range of any city in this country by such a plane flying through the Arctic air frontier of the United States. We have no monopoly on aircraft of that range and capability; indeed we have recently been told that the Japs had developed a long-range bomber which flew 10,306 miles nonstop on an operational test. The airfield on Hokkaido from which the B–29's took off for Washington was built by the Japs as a base from which to bomb the United States. What we have today in the atomic bomb someone else will have tomorrow. What we have tomorrow in the plane I have just described someone else will have the day after tomorrow. No ships can interpose their steel hulls and 16-inch guns between us and that attack. No force tied to the ground can counterbalance its threat. It is a threat of air power and it must be met by air power.

The recent war was won by teamwork. Teamwork between Allied Nations, teamwork between the suppliers and the users, the people at home and the people in the field, and teamwork between the various arms and services, teamwork between the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

No single service won the war. The Navy fought magnificently as did the ground army and the air army. We cannot pay too high credit to our gobs, our doughboys, and our airmen.

The smooth functioning of the field team was the direct result of having unity of command—one supreme commander in each theater of war.

I have seen the contention made that you can have effective unity of command in the field in wartime without having unity of control in peacetime. I believe this is wrong and I believe that, even worse, it is hypocrisy. When a war is over the commands in theaters of operations are, of course, liquidated and nothing remains except the home organization. If there is no unity there, there is no unity at all. It is the form of the home organization that will control the training, the tactics, the doctrine, the thinking, and the habits of the men whom we will train to fight the next war if it comes to us. If

they are trained in two departments, we will have the same make-shifts and fumblings in attempting to get a required unity of command in theaters of operations that we had at the outset in the war just past; and we will have commanders who still do not understand the two arms of the service in which they were not fundamentally trained. How do you obtain men who are able in the crisis of war to produce effective teamwork with their brothers of the other two services under a single commander? The answer is: You train them in peacetime to act with their brothers of the other two services under a single commander. How do you train leaders who, in the crisis of war, will be able to direct the cooperative efforts of three services with a sound knowledge of the capabilities and limitations of each? The answer is: You train them in peacetime in an organization where those three services function under a single direction and you give them experience on a command staff which, by virtue of the breadth of its responsibilities, compels them to think in terms broader than that of their own basic service.

Americ.. is tired of war. Our people don't want to think of another war. The thought is unpleasant and we incline to put unpleasant things out of mind. In spite of this the fact remains: The only way we can avoid war is to be prepared for war.

We therefore want the most economical national defense organization which is adequate to our requirements—which will assure our security—the safety of America.

This means a small, but adequate, ultramodern, highly mobile, readily expandable establishment, using the most effective and efficient equipment. We need high-performance defensive fighters and we need long-range bombers, long-range escort fighters, and long-range air transports.

We may expect, in the future, to have airplanes with sufficient range to go to any part of the world and return to bases in America. The enemy, also, may have such aircraft and our defense fighters must be able to intercept them before they reach our shores so that even an initial sneak attack is doomed to failure. This is our first line of defense.

Air, due to the facility and speed with which we can move through it and the inherent limitations of land and sea, is the medium through which the weapons of the future will travel. Air is now the first line of offense and defense. It will become increasingly so in future as the speed and range of our aircraft increase and new air weapons are developed. This is particularly true when we consider the certain future use of the polar regions.

Here I would like to indicate the necessity for continued fundamental research and the development of new offensive and defensive weapons. Particular emphasis should be given to the development of jet propulsion, electronics, and atomic energy. Luckily many purely military developments will have a commercial application and thus assure our national position in industry and world trade.

In a word our defense establishment, while small enough to be within our means to support it, must be adequate for its purpose. Economy is the watchword of our warweary people. Expenditures for national defense must be kept within reasonable limits. We must select the military equipment for the present and future according to its ability to do the job and our ability to finance the project. We should studiously avoid building any equipment that is not required and should not produce any large amount of equipment that we feel will be ineffective in the near future.

It is my earnest conviction that the most sound, efficient, and economical defense establishment can be achieved only through:

1. A continuation of fundamental research.

2. The establishment of an autonomous Air Force coequal with land and sea.

3. A single department of national defense which will coordinate the activities of the three component services.

A special committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, established to study and recommend on the best and most efficient peacetime and wartime military organization, visited the senior commanders in every war theater and in their report of April 15, 1945, recommended a single department of national defense with ground, sea, and air coequal.

They found that over 90 percent of the senior Army commanders and almost exactly half of the senior naval commanders favored the proposal. All of the top-ranking Army commanders: Generals of the Army Marshall, Arnold, MacArthur, and Eisenhower, and in the Navy Admiral of the Fleet Nimitz and Admiral Halsey favored a single department of national defense with coequal Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The board itself was composed of four members, two generals and two admirals. The two Army members and the younger Navy member strongly recommended a single department. The dissenting member was an elderly retired admiral who prefaced his minority report general remarks with this statement:

"The present organization of the War and Navy Departments are the result of over 150 years' experience."

We must realize that methods of warfare have changed, that today's methods and equipment are not the same as they were 150 years ago and that tomorrow's weapons will be different from today's. We must anticipate the future. The most advanced ideas of 150 years ago no longer apply. This is the type of retarded military thinking that held the development of military and commercial aviation back during the period between World War I and World War II, as exemplified by the Baker Board report referred to earlier in this statement.

This all seems so obvious that it becomes expedient to analyze the thinking and determine the reasons for the objections of the opponents of an autonomous Air Force and a single department of national defense.

It has been said that the posts of Secretary for National Defense and Chief of Staff of the armed forces are too big and important for individuals to hold, that they would tend to establish "empires." This, to me, is ridiculous. They would merely streamline our effort, eliminate useless duplication, and stop bickering.

The President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, in addition to his manifold other duties, has to resolve all major differences between the services. It is fairly obvious that two properly selected individuals—a Secretary and his Chief of Staff—putting their full time on this, under the President's direction, could do the job better and actually take some work off the President, thus giving him that much more time to spend on his multitudinous other duties.

It has been stated that: "Any step that is not good for the Navy is not good for the Nation." This puts Navy welfare and expansion on a par with national welfare and expresses the fundamentally fallacious thinking behind the reasoning of the group who still think of the Navy as the first line of defense. The Navy is only one of the agencies which are charged with our national security.

We must not permit any misguided individual or group, however sincere, to interfere with the establishment of the most efficient, effective, and economical military organization that it is within our capabilities to set up. We must not permit pride of organization and misplaced confidence in any outdated weapon to interfere with this Nation's future welfare.

Every dollar spent on national defense should be so allocated as to give the greatest possible return in national security.

An autonomous air force and a single department of national defense would eliminate useless duplication and waste. It would cut down the existent war-expanded defense organization to the greatest extent consistent with national security. It would tend to assure the equitable distribuion of available funds according to actual military value. There would be more money spent on the new, the modern, the necessary, and less on the outmoded, the obsolete, and the obsolescent. No unnecessary airplanes, carriers, or battleships should be built. It is to be hoped that through this means America would be secure, the public protected, and every defense dollar properly invested.

FROM WAR TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD E. STASSEN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "From War to Peace," delivered by Hon. Harold E. Stassen at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political Science, New York City, N. Y., November 8, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLUMBUS DAY ADDRESS BY FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Columbus Day radio address by Supreme Knight Francis P. Matthews, on Friday, October 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE—EDITORIAL FROM ATLANTA CONSTITUTION

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unemployment Knows No State Boundaries," published in the Atlanta Constitution of October 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOBILIZATION OF ARMY AND NAVY

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a member of the naval forces stationed in Guam, a letter from a member of the military forces stationed in France, and a letter from the father of a boy in the Navy, criticizing methods employed in demobilizing the Army and Navy, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED SUBSIDY PROGRAM FOR ALUMINUM MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION—FAIRMONT ALUMINUM CO.

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated October 22, 1945, from the Fairmont Aluminum Co. to W. Stuart Symington, Surplus Property Administrator, dealing with surplus aluminum plants and facilities, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION—LETTER FROM WILLIAM GREEN

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, commenting on the hospital construction bill, S. 191, with particular reference to the provisions for an advisory board.

I urge Senators to read this letter and to give Mr. Green's recommendations the most careful consideration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., October 31, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: I am pleased to learn from press reports that the Committee on Education and Labor has agreed to report favorably S. 191, the Hospital Construction Act, introduced on January 10 by Senator HILL and Senator Burton. The objectives of the bill are in accord with the health and social-security programs endorsed by the American Federation of Labor. We congratulate the sponsors and the committee on carrying such legislation forward.

Our representatives participated in the extensive hearings held on this bill by the committee and we are pleased to learn that certain amendments which we recommended then have been acted upon favorably.

From the information presently available it would appear that the bill has been extensively revised and that it has been considerably improved. We are disturbed, however, by the report that the amended bill still contains provisions which appear to us as being of very doubtful wisdom. It is reported for example, that the Federal grants to States, political subdivisions, and nonprofit associations for the construction of hospitals are to be made under the administrative direction of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. With this we are in accord. Witness the fact that we proposed just such an arrangement in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill (S. 1050) which the American Federation of Labor has sponsored. We understand, however, that in S. 191 the Surgeon General is to be aided by an advisory council in which the public has only a minority representation. We believe that in any such program public representation should be at least equal to—if not greater than—representation drawn from professional and technical groups.

Further, it is reported that in the amended bill the advisory body consisting of part-time people is not merely advisory but actually has power to control and even to overrule the Surgeon General. There were such provisions in the original bill and it would appear that there are such in the amended bill. This is unsound legislation since it places the control of public funds outside of public officers. The American Federation of Labor vigorously advocates the use of representative advisory bodies but it has never asked and does not believe in any proposal to place final public control of public funds anywhere except in the hands of responsible public officials. The American Federation of Labor believes firmly in the wisdom of the constitutional provisions that the executive power shall be lodged in the President and his subordinates. This makes for responsible Government in our democracy. Anything contrary to it would weaken or destroy the democratic processes we have labored and fought so hard to preserve.

Our reports on the provisions of the amended bill indicate also that the deficiency with respect to providing for the maintenance of hospitals and health centers in poverty-stricken areas has not been removed. Since the burden of so much of the evidence presented at the hearings on this measure dealt with the close relation between poverty and illness it seems to us imperative that the bill should be amended to provide for maintenance of health facilities in areas of proven need. Otherwise the program will tend further to concentrate construction of hospitals in areas of lesser need.

We shall want to study very carefully the amended version of S. 191 when it is available. I hope, therefore, you will give careful and sympathetic attention to the questions I have raised and will take such steps as are necessary to assure that there is opportunity for full and careful consideration of the bill when reported out to the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

W. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

PROPOSED PAY INCREASES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND OFFICIALS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, as one who before has warned of the ever present dangers of inflation in the Nation at this time, I cannot let the present occasion pass without commenting upon the latest administration proposals, of which we have all read in the press, to raise up to 100 percent the compensation of Government employees and officials.

The President's proposals, as brought here last Friday by Civil Service Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming, are not too significant from the inflation standpoint, if considered alone, but when considered against the broad backdrop of the other inflationary proposals of this administration they take on very great significance.

I believe the proposals to raise salaries indiscriminately in all branches of the Government are particularly inappropriate—even dangerous—at this time.

The proposals, for example, were made on the very eve of the opening of the Labor-Management Conference now in session. They can have no effect other than to spur organized labor to greater demands for greater wage increases. I believe that labor should have increases, but I do not want the inflationary pressures to be raised one whit higher than is absolutely warranted by all the factors that must be considered. The President, by publicizing his views that Members of the Congress should have 100 percent salary increases, for example, no doubt gave a talking point to many labor leaders who would be more than gratified if they knew that they could get only a 30-percent increase in wages.

Likewise, by coming out for a blanket increase in white-collar Government salaries, the President set the pace for other groups who will be demanding blanket increases all up and down the line.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that there are many inequities in pay in the Federal service, especially in the lower brackets, and I am now, as I always have been, in favor of seeing to it that the Federal salary scales approximate those paid for comparable laborers in the private field.

But, Mr. President, you and I know that there are concomitant benefits that accrue to persons working for the Federal Government which do not accrue to the millions of other plain citizens throughout the Nation. In a time of depression, Federal salaries are not lowered as quickly as wages and salaries generally. Our whole history as a nation proves this. Furthermore, there is a greater degree of security to be found in working for Uncle Sam in the various bureaus than can be found elsewhere. A person can be very mediocre indeed and hold down a job in the Federal service in the average or lower-than-average ranges; whereas if he were working elsewhere he would be under threat of competition for his job.

I do not believe that the Truman request for higher Government pay was well-timed, coming along with the effort to reduce Government income. It certainly was ill-timed from the standpoint of the Victory loan drive now in progress. Millions upon millions of Americans who will be asked to invest in Government bonds this month will wonder if a great percentage of their money is to go into useless political patronage measures, or whether it is to be used to get a dollar's worth of service for a dollar's worth of investment in government. The millions who ponder present administration measures which tend to make the dollar lose its value will accept this proposal as further evidence that we are in for more and more thriftless spending of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I need not go into detail about the plight of millions of Americans who have been living on fixed incomes during all the recent years when we were being told that this administration was holding the line but when, nevertheless, the purchasing power of the dollar was going down, down, down. Those millions—white-collar workers, persons living on pensions, persons living on incomes from investments, persons living on annuities—all know that the cost of living has risen far beyond what the Government has admitted through its official indexes. The more thoughtful among them know, also, that the present administration is continuing the profligate spending of recent years, and this utter lack of regard for money has caused much of the needless increase in the cost of living. They are wondering today if we in Congress are going to acquiesce once more and allow hundreds of millions—yes, billions—of dollars to be frittered away.

As every economist knows, Mr. President, money spent on Government salaries is not productive money in the usual sense. Bureaus do not turn out goods and many of them turn out very few services, considering the appropriations they obtain.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] recently pointed out that we now have more than 3,500,000 Federal employees in this and in foreign countries. That is the greatest number in the history of this free Nation and even more than the number on the pay roll a year ago. We have been assured that this number is being cut rapidly, but we have heard such assurances again and again in past months while the number remained constant.

Since President Truman's accession to the highest office of our land he has used the word "economy" many times in his published speeches, but thus far, I am compelled to admit sadly, he has exhibited little apparent comprehension of what the word means. This latest proposal—to raise Government salaries up to 100 percent—seems to reveal that his conception of what constitutes economy is far different from that of the average citizen.

If we are to carry out these and other proposals sent to the Congress by Presi-

dent Truman, I know that we will long delay the time when Government expenses can be kept within the Government income.

I do not attack the idea, Mr. President, of specific pay increases for specific Federal agencies. I have not closed my mind to voting for further increases for many types of Federal employment, as I voted for increased pay for postal clerks and carriers and bonus for low-paid Government clerks. I speak merely against the blanket increases proposed by the President, and I speak to show that this is but another hole which the administration is digging in its much-vaunted dike to hold back the flood of inflation.

In reality, greater and greater numbers of our citizens are coming to an understanding that this administration is promoting inflation day by day, by its activities, while talking as if it were trying to keep down the cost of living. Just how long this kind of talk can fool a majority of the voters, in face of the clear actions which tend to promote inflation, remains to be seen. I think it will not be successful much longer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Government Pay Raises," taken from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT PAY RAISES

President Truman's request for a flat 20-percent salary increase for classified Federal workers follows by only a few months the passage of a pay-raise bill that partially compensated them for prospective losses of overtime pay with a return to the 40-hour week. Last July the basic salaries of classified employees were increased on the average 15.9 percent by gradations starting at 20 percent. Moreover, in-grade promotions made further additions to salaries, raising average annual straight-term earnings by 21 percent. Now it is proposed to add another 20 percent to the new basic rate. This would bring average increases in basic pay since last July well above the 30-percent estimated rise in living costs since the outbreak of the war and more than offset recent losses of overtime pay. We have no doubt that any such sudden boost in pay for Federal salaried employees would be regarded as a precedent justifying the extreme demands now being made by workers in private industry for increases in basic rates of pay to offset in full the loss of overtime pay.

There is unquestionably need for a complete overhauling of Federal classified salary scales, but it should be done with a view to establishing fair rates of pay for a group of employees whose jobs are relatively secure. The position occupied by these white-collar employees differs in many important respects from that of manual workers who have been the chief beneficiaries of wartime inflation of earnings. The Government ought to set a good example for private industry in dealing with salaried workers. Treatment should be fair and generous; and if it develops that any group of Federal employees is underpaid by comparison with individuals of equal ability in private employment, adjustments should be made. However, there is no present need to apply any fixed formula or flat rate of increase such as 20 percent to all classes of Federal employees from the lowest to the highest grades. * * *

Federal salary revisions should be undertaken with long-range objectives in mind, not with the intention of influencing postwar private wage policies during the reconversion period. For that reason it is unfortunate that the President has made his request at a time when public interest is concentrated on wage controversies.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as further modified, proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], as a substitute for section 4 (a), beginning on page 14, line 23.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had desired to make a few remarks on the pending bill, but I understand the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is obliged to leave shortly, and I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the word "plan," in line 6 on page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. (a) The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect, in accordance with the plan, upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to the Congress, during which the Congress shall be in session without adjournment sine die, but only if during such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of this substitute is to provide that any reorganization plan submitted by the President to the Congress shall be operative 60 days thereafter unless a concurrent resolution is adopted, rejecting the plan submitted by the President. That is practically identical with the language which was contained in the House bill which was passed on the same subject. Further, it is practically identical with the last reorganization bill which was passed, which required the passage of a concurrent resolution of rejection in order to make inoperative any plan which the President might submit.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that under the substitute offered by me, the following language on page 15, beginning with line 6, is not deleted and would still be operative:

Provided, That if during such 60-day period either House of the Congress shall pass a resolution referring the reorganization plan back to the President with a request for specific changes, the running of such 60-day period shall be stayed until such time as the President shall reaffirm his approval of the plan as transmitted, or shall retransmit the plan with changes; and if he shall retransmit the plan with changes, it shall be deemed to be a new reorganization plan.

That part of that particular section remains as reported by the committee.

I wish to state at the opening of my remarks that I have changed my position on this question, and I wish to give my reasons for doing so. When the last reorganization bill was before the Congress in 1939 I voted for an amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] which was similar to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], providing that no reorganization plan could be made effective as recommended by the President unless affirmative action were first taken by both branches of Congress. My reasons for changing my position on this question are these: Present conditions are vastly different from those existing in 1939. Today there are nearly four times as many Federal employees as there were in 1939. I believe there are nearly four times as times as many bureaus, departments, and agencies of the Government as there were in 1939.

I am convinced, after 12 years of study on the subject of reorganization, that the only way to get a worth-while, honest-to-goodness reorganization is to abolish bureaus and agencies of the Government and reduce the number of personnel wherever possible, rather than merely to shift one bureau to another. I think the only way to accomplish that is to give the President the power to do it, after exempting the quasi-judicial agencies of the Government. Give him the power to reorganize the executive branches of the Government, subject, of course, to the right of Congress to reject any plan by concurrent resolution adopted by both branches.

I believe that one of the greatest domestic problems confronting our country today is that of reorganizing the vast and bloated bureaucracy which was already great before the war, but which has grown to unprecedented proportions during the war. Today in the Federal service there are 3,600,000 employees, scattered throughout the length and breadth of this land, as well as outside the country. They are located in every nook and corner of America. Every little town, every county seat has 5, 6, 8, or 10 branch bureaus of the Government.

This civilian army has great political power. More than a half million of the three and a half million Federal employees are located outside continental United States, so I will not include them, although they are on the civilian pay roll and should be subject to reorganization. I think we can justly say that each of the 3,000,000 employees located in this country can control two or three votes. So we have a vast voting army of seven, eight, or nine million votes which can be cast one way or the other to protect existing jobs.

Since this debate has been in progress there has been on the wall of the Senate a chart which shows the tremendous lengths to which the Federal bureaucracy has gone. For example, in the executive office of the President there are 13 principal component parts. In the 10 major departments authorized by law there are 499 bureaus and agencies. I am speaking of the large bureaus and agencies, and not the small ones. In the 23 major war agencies which were created by Executive order there are 284 bureaus, and each head of a bureau is

constantly trying to increase his personnel. Under the civil-service regulations the salary of the head of a bureau is increased in proportion to the number of employees under him.

There are 26 independent agencies which are not responsible to any of the main departments of the Government. Those 26 agencies have 265 main bureaus and agencies under them. So today we have 1,141 component parts of the great bureaucracy which has been created.

Mr. President, I am convinced that President Truman desires to accomplish an effective reorganization of the Government. He desires to reorganize the Government so that money can be saved, so that overlapping and duplication of activities can be eliminated, and so that the Government may function more smoothly and more economically. Not only is the cost of this bureaucracy great; but, including the salaries of employees outside the United States, the civilian pay roll totals $9,000,000,000. Nine billion dollars is spent on salaries and wages of the civilian personnel of the Federal Government. When I came to the Senate in 1933 the total cost of Government was only $4,000,000,000.

I talked to the President about this matter because I wanted to know his attitude; I wanted to know whether he could convince me that he desired in his heart to effect a reorganization of the Government if he had the power to do so. He did convince me that he desires to do it.

Mr. President, we may as well be frank about the matter. I have heard it said on the floor of the Senate, "Let Congress reorganize." But the only way to reorganize the Government is to give the power of reorganization to the President and then depend upon him to accomplish it, and hold him to a strict accountability.

I took a great interest in reorganization when I served as Governor of Virginia. I made it one of my primary concerns when I was serving in that capacity. When I came to the Senate in 1933, I continued my interest in that line of activity. In 1935 I submitted a resolution, which was adopted, establishing a committee on reorganization. That committee received an appropriation of $25,000 for the purpose of developing a plan. The committee employed the Brookings Institution, which I think is the best authority on governmental organization in the country. We employed that institution to aid in preparing for Congress a comprehensive plan of reorganization; and it was done; but nothing was accomplished. We could not get through a single bill for reorganization, because governmental bureaus are constantly lobbying in Congress against any effort to reduce their powers.

So, Mr. President, I am here today for the first time, I think, during the years I have served in the Senate to say that I have changed my opinion; I have changed my position. I may be called inconsistent; but I am doing it in the desperate hope that there may be some way to accomplish a reorganization of the Government, the vast bureaucracy of which, I think, imperils the very foundations of our democracy.

The money question is merely one part of the problem. The $9,000,000,000 which we are spending for the services of the civilian employees is merely one part of it. The other part is the duplication of activities in Washington. A businessman must go from one agency to another before he can get an answer to his questions or before he can find out what he wants to know. Businessmen come to Washington. Frequently they must go to Baltimore, and sometimes they must go to Chicago, because many agencies have been moved out of Washington as there was not enough room for them here. Perhaps they must go to New York. All of that takes time. It is irritating and conflicts with their business requirements.

So, I am here to say frankly that I have changed the opinion I formerly held. I know that Senators who do not agree with me will read, as they have done, the statements which I made in 1939 in favor of practically the same plan as that which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] now proposes; but, regardless of whether I am charged with inconsistency, I am offering this amendment as a substitute for the Donnell amendment because I want the President to have the power to effect the reorganization and I want the Congress and the people themselves to hold the President to a strict accountability for the use of that power, and because I am so desperately anxious in some way to have a reorganization of the great bureaucracy, which has been built up in the Federal Government, so that there may be a reduction of personnel, an avoidance of conflicting and overlapping activities, and a saving of great sums of money to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since I have been in the Senate I do not know what work has been done in the committee in the way of formulating and presenting to the Senate a reorganization plan. I do not remember that any reorganization plan has been presented to the Senate. I do not understand why the Senator's committee did not present a reorganization plan, because I think a reorganization plan can pass the Senate, regardless of the opposition of bureaus or agencies.

Does the Senator know of a case of a bill to reorganize any substantial part of the Government having been presented to the Senate itself?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the committee could never even agree upon a plan.

Mr. TAFT. Then, it seems to me that must be the fault of the committee. Today the Committee on Banking and Currency is taking steps toward the reorganization of the housing agencies of the Federal Government. Our subcommittee has held hearings. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced a bill providing for the coordination of all the housing activities of the Government. It was done temporarily under the Overman Act. We propose to make it permanent. We held hearings as to what the relationship should be and how far the Government's housing activities should be under the Housing Administration or whether they should be separate. Those were important questions of policy which determine the whole housing policy of the United States Government. We ought to determine it and we propose to determine it. We did bring in that bill setting out the housing policy of the Government and coordinating the housing bureaus and agencies of the Government.

I think we can do the same thing in other fields. I do not think there is any evidence to show that a similar effort has been made in other fields. I do not refer to an attempting to reorganize everything at once, but I mean the taking up of one thing at a time and presenting it to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator was not in the Senate when that effort was made. We made a determined effort. I certainly made every effort I was capable of making to bring about reorganization.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think any plan was presented to the Senate itself.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Ohio that it would be perfectly absurd to present one complete plan for the reorganization of the entire Government.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and the President will not do it, either; I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. But according to the idea just enunciated by the Senator from Ohio, the Committee on Education and Labor would consider the reorganization of agencies dealing with labor, and the Banking and Currency Committee would consider and bring in a plan for the reorganization of the Government's housing activities, including the Housing Administration about which the Senator from Ohio has spoken; and there would be no end to it all.

The reorganization now proposed must be effected with consideration given to other agencies and departments, because there are a number of subjects, let me say to the Senator, which affect any number of departments or agencies. For instance, as to housing, about which the Senator has spoken, 22 units now are engaged in housing activities. Twenty-seven agencies are engaged in work having to do with standards and inspection; 29 are engaged in the field of statistics; 24 are engaged in map-making; 16 are engaged in education; 14 are engaged in surplus-property disposal; 14 are engaged in the field of safety provisions; 27 in labor relations; 16 in water power and power; 10 in veterans' aid; 20 in conservation of natural resources; 24 in rehabilitation; 22 in insurance; 21 in transportation; 93 in Government lending; 37 in foreign trade; 45 in investigations; 8 in pensions and annuities; 37 in public health; 27 in employment and unemployment matters; 305 in national de-

fense; 6 in public buildings; 64 in business relations, and 44 in agriculture.

But under the plan of the Senator from Ohio, bills relating to those various subjects would go to different committees; they could not be considered by one committee as a whole, and that, in my judgment, is essential if we are to achieve, a reorganization of the Government, which will be administratively possible, and at the same time effect any economy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I see no reason why the whole plan should not go to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, if that is what the Senate wishes to do. This bill proposes a radical change in the rules of the Senate. We can change the rules of the Senate. We must not say that because some rules of the Senate prevent an effective consideration of these matters, therefore we must turn the whole matter over to the President. If that is what prevents it, we may amend the rules ourselves, and I see no difficulty in doing so.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has just said he would not advocate one omnibus bill.

Mr. TAFT. No; I would not. But obviously the plan must be worked out with an over-all approach. As the Senator has said, it is perfectly proper that the President recommend, in the first instance, an over-all approach. Today we are preparing to enter a new era following the war, and I say it is not only the right but the duty of the Congress to set out the over-all, skeleton organization. I have no objection, within certain limits, to delegating power to the President to shift bureaus. But merely because we are unwilling to change our rules I do not think we can excuse ourselves for saying that we must turn the whole matter over to the President of the United States and abandon our legislative functions.

Mr. BYRD. We had such a situation for a long time, and no harm was done by it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has referred to the saving in expense. The Senator will remember that in 1939 the plea was made to allow the President to reorganize the Government. We gave him 2 years in which to reorganize the Government. He presented a number of plans, such as that of consolidating the Federal Security Administration, the Federal Works Agency, and the Federal Loan Agency. Bureaus were moved and consolidated within those agencies. Does the Senator know of 1 cent having been saved by such consolidation?

Mr. BYRD. I believe in justice to President Roosevelt—and certainly I criticized him severely for his failure to economize in Government expenditures—it should be said that the last reorganization bill upon which we acted was passed in 1939. There was certainly no opportunity to reorganize during the time when we were preparing for war, nor subsequently when we got into the war. I believe that President Truman is far more economy minded than was Mr. Roosevelt. I believe that President Truman is far more desirous of economizing and bringing about efficiency in the administration of the Government than was the late President Roosevelt.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator point to 1 cent which was ever saved by any of the consolidations which were brought about?

Mr. BYRD. I agree that nothing was saved. However, the proposed reorganization will be undertaken by a President who had no responsibility for the plans previously submitted, and I am hopeful that the new plans will be designed to accomplish efficient administration of the Government along economical lines.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. REED. I merely wish to make a remark in illuminating past history.

In 1939 the only votes which were cast on this side of the aisle for the reorganization bill were cast by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself, the junior Senator from Kansas. The Senator from Ohio and I were in favor of the 1939 reorganization plan.

Mr. TAFT. I voted at that time for the Wheeler amendment to the bill which was similar to the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. It was defeated by one vote. I understand that the position of the Senator from Virginia with regard to the matter has changed since then.

Mr. BYRD. Not only has the position of the Senator from Virginia changed but conditions have changed. We have a far more difficult question of reorganization now than we had in 1939. We have four times as many employees now as we had then, and we now have seven or eight times as many bureaus as we had in 1939.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that the Government should be reorganized. I doubt whether very much money will be saved by a reorganization of the Government, but I will concede that in the case of the housing reorganization, which was accomplished under the wartime act, and therefore only temporary, duplications were removed and contradictions in policies were eliminated. But I see no reason why reorganization cannot be brought about in the same way that other measures of a legislative character are effected. Why should not the President study the matter, present a plan to the Congress, and let Congress determine the method by which the plan shall be adopted?

I believe that we should change our rules. It seems to me that the difficulty in connection with reorganization plans is in the power provided with which to amend them. Taking an over-all plan and incorporating in it an amendment to eliminate this and eliminate that, upsets the entire theory on which reorganization should be accomplished. When the President submits a plan, let us say "Yes" or "No" to the plan as a whole. In so doing there would be involved a perfectly reasonable exercise of the powers of Congress. I see no reason why Congress should not say "Yes" or "No" with regard to a reorganization plan in the same way that it says "Yes" or "No" with regard to any other policy which is proposed by the President of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. I know that the Senator from Ohio has been extremely diligent in regard to all the matters which we are discussing, and I do not recall that I have ever differed with him before on a question of this nature. He has done a magnificent job along these lines, but I emphatically differ with him on this occasion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to interrupt the Senator merely to state that I concur with the remarks which he made a few moments ago in regard to the temporary reorganization bill which was passed in 1939. The Senator and I were both members of the special committee which considered the subject, the chairman of which was the present Secretary of State Byrnes. We worked a long time on the matter. We held exhaustive hearings. We reported what we thought was the best bill we could agree upon at that time, but it was an imperfect bill at best. Its effect was temporary. As the Senator has said, war was imminent. We were in the fever of a world war in which we had not yet entered, but in which we were trying to take steps to defend our country. Reorganization of the Government took place to some extent. The reorganization was not so extensive as it probably should have been even in abnormal times. But that is water over the dam, and there is nothing that we can do about it at this time.

I agree with the Senator that regardless of the technical and theoretical ability of Congress to reorganize, we know that it has never done so, and the chances are that it will not do so. Separate committees consider the reorganization of separate agencies. They look through a porthole at those agencies rather than look at their relationship with other agencies the reorganization of which must be handled by other committees.

It is all very well to talk about amending the rules. But for several months we have had one committee handling the subject of reorganizing the Congress, and the committee has not yet been able to make a report. So I agree with the Senator that authority must be given to the President. He must be held responsible, and if authority is given to him he should exercise it to the fullest extent of his power.

I may also add that I agree with the Senator's amendment. Whenever the President presents a plan to Congress, its acceptance or rejection should not depend on the action of one House alone, because we do not legislate by the action of only one House of Congress. Provision should be made for the reorganization becoming effective at the end of a specified period of time, which we have generally agreed upon as being 60 days, unless Congress affirmatively, by action of both Houses, rejects the plan. For that reason I support the amendment which has been offered by the Senator

from Virginia. I am glad to do so, notwithstanding that someone may accuse him of inconsistency. We know that by and large consistency is frequently the hobgoblin of small minds. Whatever may be the faults of the Senator from Virginia, no one may ever accuse him of having a small mind. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this proposal would bring about the most important change in the rules of the Senate that has occurred since I have been a Member of the Senate. However, it is not considered by the Senator from Virginia or by the Senator from Kentucky as being any obstacle to the passage of the bill. Title II is devoted almost entirely to changing the rules of the Senate. I think it is a most important provision of the bill. It involves the exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate. If we can accomplish a reform of the Senate by changing its rules, very well.

Mr. BYRD. I do not object to changing the rules of the Senate for appropriate reasons. I am looking at the matter as a businessman would look at it. I am looking at it from the standpoint of being the president of a company. The president should have the power to reorganize under certain restrictions. I do not pretend to compare the President of the United States with the president of a company except to say that the President of the United States is the executive head of the Nation. He is made so by the Constitution of the United States. He already has great power in respect to the establishment of bureaus and commissions. President Roosevelt had great power when we first entered the emergency. He had great power during the war. After all, the President is the executive head of the Nation just as the Governor of a State is the executive head of the State. If there is to be any worthwhile reorganization at all, it must come from either the President in the case of the National Government, or from the Governor in the case of a State government.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, does the Senator take the position that the proposed delegation of power would be a delegation of legislative power or executive power? Are we delegating legislative power? It seems to me that is the whole question.

Mr. BYRD. It seems to me that we are.

Mr. SMITH. That is what troubles me with the Senator's argument.

Mr. BYRD. Many times we have delegated legislative power. I would say that more than half of the bureaus shown on the chart on the wall were established by Executive order. They were not established by Congress. It has been done time and time again, and will be done time and time again in the future. I want it done in such a way that it will be of some benefit to the country by reducing bureaus and agencies, instead of giving the President power, as all Presidents have been given power in the past, to create new agencies and bureaus.

Mr. SMITH. I am in accord with the distinguished Senator's position of giving the President the initiative in presenting an all-over plan. I think that is sound; but what troubles me is that the Senator objects to the Donnell amendment, which simply gives the Congress the affirmative right to legislate. If we do not adopt that amendment, I cannot see why the distinguished Senator should object to the bill reported by the committee, of which I am a member, which simply says that one House and the President shall not be able to act legislatively unless the other House is also in accord. That is the only thing I am troubled about by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I think that the procedure prescribed by the bill itself is even worse than the Donnell amendment, because if one House can reject a plan submitted by the President and if there should be a Democratic President and a Republican House, then everything that the President proposes could be rejected. I prefer the Donnell amendment rather than the provision which gives one House the right to reject a reorganization plan submitted by the President.

Mr. SMITH. I prefer the Donnell amendment. I think it provides the proper way to legislate by positive action. I do not understand the distinguished Senator's amendment which simply provides what the original bill contemplated, namely concurrent action of both Houses in order to veto a reorganization plan. That is, one House alone could not block the proposal, and the President's plan could go into effect if he had the support of only one House. One House alone could prevent a veto of the plan. That is what troubles me. I think that such a procedure would be complicated and difficult.

Mr. BYRD. I can understand the fear of the Senator, but I have been a Member of the Senate for 12 years, and, while I do not claim that I have done more than any other Senator with respect to reorganization, I have given a great deal of thought to the subject, and I am thoroughly convinced that from the standpoint of practical operation—and after all it is a realistic question—there is no way to effect reorganization except through action by the President.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will yield, I desire to pay tribute to him for what he has done. I have followed his activities very closely, and I am entirely in accord with what he has done in the direction of economy. I am thinking now of a constitutional way to bring about the desired result.

Mr. BYRD. Let me call attention to another thing. The Government bureaus have enormous power. They have the power of political life and death over Members of the House and Senate. They can deny a Member of Congress things in his district and defeat him and do the same thing in the case of a Senator. They cannot do that with the President of the United States. They are appointed by him, and they cannot threaten him. But they can join together and say "We will defeat a certain proposal before Congress," and, in my humble judgment, there is no power on the part of the Congress that can prevent them from doing it.

Mr. SMITH. I merely want to be sure of what is in the mind of the Senator. Does he take the position that if the President and the House of Representatives agreed to a bill, which means that the House would not veto it, it would become a law even though every Member of the Senate opposed the particular program presented by the President?

Mr. BYRD. I think action ought to be by concurrent resolution and that rejection should be by both Houses of Congress. It is a realistic question that confronts us. I think there is a great deal in what the Senator says, and I voted on that same reasoning 6 or 7 years ago. But what was done at that time? Nothing. I want to see something done. This may not be quite the way to do it but I think it is constitutional. While there are objections to it, we are faced with the dilemma, and we must do something. I make this prediction, that if this reorganization bill is not passed nothing in the way of reorganization is going to be done by Congress. If the Senator will recall that prediction in a year or two from now, I think he will find that I am right.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I, too, want to see this reorganization bill pass. The only thing I am debating with the Senator is whether his amendment should be adopted which would permit a reorganization plan to go through even though one House disapproved. I think both Houses ought to have an opportunity to express themselves on any reorganization plan which might be submitted. I think that lies at the very fundamentals of our Government.

Mr. BYRD. We must expect mistakes to be made, but the power that rests in a concurrent resolution by both Houses of Congress to reject may protect Congress from some very vital and bad mistakes. That is the way I see it, looking at it realistically.

Mr. SMITH. I thoroughly agree that the Congress should be able to protect itself.

Mr. BYRD. If the President should transmit to Congress a reorganization bill, under the Donnell amendment, the bureaus could organize against it. I know something about Government organizations; something of the power of those who hold public office. In my State of Virginia there is a larger percentage of Federal employees in proportion to population than in any other State in the Union, and I know I am taking my political life in my hands when I urge as strongly as I do urge that the personnel of Government bureaucracies should be reduced from three and a half million to less than a million. I think that number is too great, but it would be much better if it were a million instead of three and a half million.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the distinguished Senator and I also take my political life in my own hands when I assume a similar position.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator recalls that in the act of 1939 the Federal Security Administration was consolidated with the Federal Works Agency and the Federal Loan Agency. If we had cut out the restriction which the committee amend-

ment contained, does not the Senator think those three reorganizations would have gone through?

Mr. BYRD. Let me say to the Senator they represent a very small part of the 1,141 bureaus. When fully 600 or 700 or 800 of them ought to be abolished, then we get into real trouble. It may be that they will agree, but I do not know.

Mr. TAFT. As I view it, there was only one of the various proposed reorganizations which would have been defeated under the committee plan or that would not also have been defeated under the other plan, to put it the other way, and that involved the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Board. That certainly was a question of policy. I think most people feel that it was a mistake to destroy its independence in that reorganization plan. One House defeated it and the other did not, so it went through; but all the other plans—and they were very extensive—would have gone through regardless of whether we had the committee bill or the other bill.

Mr. BYRD. The answer to the Senator is found in what he said some time ago. I do not believe that those plans were accepted. I think practically nothing was done under any other reorganization proposal; but when the Senator cites what Congress did, I do not think that is parallel to this situation. When this bill is passed, I contemplate that there is going to be a real reorganization of the Government, and if I did not think so I would not be for the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am interested in the difference, the very slight difference, between the two amendments—the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], on the one hand, and the substitute now offered by the Senator from Virginia, on the other. As I view it, the Senator from Virginia is certain that his amendment, if adopted, provides adequate machinery under the rules for this specific purpose to guarantee that the Congress can within the limitation prescribed of 60 days obtain the desired action.

Mr. BYRD. I may say to the Senator that that is in the bill.

Mr. CORDON. And the Senator is satisfied it is adequate for the purpose?

Mr. BYRD. I think it is perfectly adequate.

Mr. CORDON. If that be true, in the case of the Senator's substitute, as I view it, if there be a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House who are opposed to the reorganization plan as it is submitted, although it is a majority of just one, then there is a guarantee that they can get action within the 60 days, and therefore they override the presidential reorganization plan.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. Then, under the Donnell amendment, if we have a majority in favor of the plan, though it be a majority of but one in each house, they can confirm and ratify the plan. The Donnell amendment requires affirmative action by joint resolution, which has the force of law. The Senator's substitute merely requires nonaction. I was going to say it required silence on the part of both Houses, but I suspect that neither House is silent very long. But the substitute simply provides that nonaction would result in ratification. So that in truth the difference between the two plans comes down to this, that under the Senator's substitute, if a resolution be offered to reject and there is a tie in either House, then it loses, and the value to those who are desirous of following the plan which the Senator proposes is what little value rests in the possibility that there will be a tie in one House or the other. Is not that a fact?

Mr. BYRD. I cannot follow the Senator's reasoning entirely. He is becoming pretty technical when he predicts there is going to be a tie. My position is that the President should have the power to reorganize. If he makes a vital mistake, a bad mistake, a mistake which will do injury to the country, under the amendment I propose, Congress can reject the plan. That is my position.

Mr. CORDON. Of course, Congress would reject any plan if there were a mistake, if it so desired, and a majority of each House agreed.

Mr. BYRD. On any reorganization plan which may be advanced, many splendid and able men will differ.

Mr. CORDON. Of course.

Mr. BYRD. Because they happen to have transactions with one particular agency, or because it happens to be important to their State, or for some other reason, they may think that one agency is far more important than any other agency.

Mr. CORDON. If I may present one other observation on my point of view—and I hope the Senator will understand that I am discussing the two amendments—the amendment of the Senator from Missouri and the substitute offered by the Senator from Virginia, and not the plan offered in the bill, under which action by one House may be determinative of the question—under the plan proposed by the Senator from Missouri a majority of one in each House can ratify a reorganization plan, or, failing to get a majority in either House, ratification fails and the plan is rejected. Under the Senator's substitute a majority of one in each House can, by resolution, defeat the plan.

Mr. BYRD. It can defeat any other legislative proposal.

Mr. CORDON. So that in the last analysis the difference between the two rests in what little value comes, under the Senator's substitute, by virtue of the chance that there might possibly be a tie in one House or the other in a vote on the question.

Mr. BYRD. Let me answer that suggestion. There is now ample law empowering the President to recommend. He has the right at any time to send a message to the Congress and recommend anything he pleases, and he is required by the Constitution to make recommendations at specific times. All the Donnell amendment does is to have him recommend. He can do that now. We do not have to pass a law asking him to do it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we follow the course the Donnell amendment proposes, then certainly there is little use in wasting the time of the Senate discussing reorganization at all. As the able Senator from Virginia has pointed out, the President now has exactly the same right as he would have under the Donnell amendment. I think the Senator from Oregon is also losing sight of the fact that under the Donnell amendment there is absolutely no limitation as to time. A plan can be submitted to Congress, no action is taken, and the thing can drift along for 2 or 3 years and nothing more may happen.

Mr. CORDON. As I understand, the Donnell amendment carries the same provision, requiring the committee to report a resolution of ratification, that the bill would require.

Mr. MURDOCK. Suppose no resolution were offered, the proposal would lie here interminably, without any action at all, and reorganization would not take place.

Mr. CORDON. It occurs to me that there is little force in an argument that no resolution would be offered, particularly as long as my distinguished friend, the Senator from Virginia, is a Member of the United States Senate. There will be a resolution offered, and once it is offered, the machinery and the mechanics of the Donnell amendment substantially would fit in, exactly the same as those of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. The net result is that the only value that comes under the substitute plan lies in the possibility of a tie, and for that little we lose the certainty we have under the Donnell amendment, that we have cured any question of unconstitutionality in the matter of delegation of legislative power.

Mr. BYRD. No question has ever been raised about the last reorganization plan.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I did not quite understand the statement that the two amendments were the same, because as I read them, if the Byrd amendment shall be adopted, and a resolution is submitted, while 90 out of 96 Senators absolutely may be opposed to the plan of reorganization, yet if a majority of one in the House of Representatives is for it, it will go into effect. That is the effect of the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Whereas under the Donnell amendment there must be a majority of one in both Houses. So also in the case of the committee amendment, there must be a majority of one in both Houses. But under the Byrd amendment, we can all be opposed to it, but we have absolutely deprived ourselves of any power to raise any objection. Is not that a correct statement of the proposal?

Mr. BYRD. The correct statement is that the Byrd amendment provides for rejection by concurrent resolution. That is exactly what it is. No one has ever suggested that it is anything else. When

I submitted the amendment I explained that if it were adopted there could be no rejection of a Presidential plan unless within 60 days a concurrent resolution were adopted by both Houses to reject it.

Mr. TAFT. The difference is not a difference of constitutionality.

Mr. BYRD. I never made such a statement as that.

Mr. TAFT. The point I am trying to make to the Senator from Oregon is that the difference is a difference of fundamental substance, as to whether the Senate can reject a plan.

Mr. BYRD. So far as my position is concerned, there is no difference at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator a general question, inasmuch as he is my favorite authority on economy in the Senate. Does the Senator think that a tremendous job of demobilization of civilian personnel could occur without any reorganization?

Mr. BYRD. I do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there any sign of such a demobilization at the present time?

Mr. BYRD. Not up to this time, I regret to say to the Senator. In the month of September the Federal personnel were reduced by only 158,769, out of 3,600,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Since there seems to be no disposition to demobilize under existing circumstances, why then is the Senator so sure that the present President and the present administration are suddenly going to spring into activity just as soon as this bill is passed?

Mr. BYRD. I have never said I was so sure. I said I believed and hoped President Truman would do a real job of reorganizing. I am not sure of anything. I have been a Member of the Senate 12 years, and I have discovered it is very bad policy to be sure of anything. I am not sure of what the Senate may do under certain conditions. I am not sure what the House of Representatives may do under certain conditions. But in my considered judgment—for I have changed my position in this matter; I agreed with those on the other side the last time—I believe this may expedite reorganization, and do more than gloss over it, and if that comes to pass it certainly will be the accomplishment of something we have been working for.

The Senator has referred to the number of employees. Let me give the facts.

The Agriculture Department has 91,136 employees. The number was reduced by 4,393 in September. The Commerce Department has 35,089, and instead of decreasing during the month of September, the number was increased by 318. The Interior Department has 44,524 employees, and the number was decreased in September by 531. The Justice Department has 26,243 employees, and there was a decrease of 596 in September. The Labor Department has now 36,629 employees; an increase of 30,283 in September is because the War Manpower Commission was transferred to the Labor Department. The Navy Department, not counting WAVES and the SPARS and all the thousands of others in uniform doing clerical work, has in this country 649,425 civilian employees.

The Post Office Department had 441,257 employees in September, an increase of 53,995.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Who is the Postmaster General? Does the Senator recall?

Mr. BYRD. The State Department in September had 15,354 employees, an increase of 4,164, which includes some of the personnel of the Office of War Information and the Office of Inter-American Affairs which were transferred to the State Department.

The Treasury Department has 93,636 employees.

The War Department has civilian personnel in this country totaling 975,317.

In that connection the War Department has 733,000 civilian employees outside continental United States. It has 733,000 not in uniform, scattered from one end of the world to the other. That is in addition to the 975,317 it has in this country.

The Committee on Fair Employment Practice has 60 employees.

The Foreign Economic Administration has 6,931.

Next on the list is the Office of Censorship. It has been abolished. That is about the only agency I know of which seems to have been completely abolished. Some of the other agencies have been transferred. Its abolishment resulted in a saving of 4,700 employees.

The Office of Defense Transportation has 1,409. That has been transferred.

The Office of Price Administration in September had 45,492 employees.

The Office of Strategic Services, 2,008.

Selective Service System, 17,662.

The War Manpower Commission has been transferred to the Labor Department.

The War Production Board, 8,625.

The War Shipping Administration, 5,361.

I shall not read the figures for some of the smaller agencies.

The Federal Security Administration, 30,701, an increase of 333 during September.

Federal Works Agency, 20,628.

General Accounting Office, 13,783.

Government Printing Office, 6,904.

Maritime Commission, 9,608.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 14,124, an increase of 562 during September.

Veterans' Administration, 74,093, an increase of 1,083 in September.

Making a total civilian personnel in this country of 2,757,208, and 733,792 outside continental United States doing civilian work, in addition to all the armed forces; making a grand total of 3,491,000 as of the 1st day of October.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Michigan that that demobilization has been nothing like as fast as it should be. We have complained about the War Department demobilizing the soldiers slowly, but demobilization has been much slower in the civilian services of the Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I assure the Senator that I did not and I do not intend to be facetious about the matter. It merely occurs to me that there is existent a tremendous opportunity to economize in civilian Federal personnel, and there seems to be not the remotest sign of any disposition whatsoever to proceed in that direction. I am wondering why the Senator thinks that the mere passage of a reorganization bill is going to change that disposition? I think the Senator will agree with me that there never will be any economy in the matter of Federal personnel until there is the disposition at the top to proceed in that direction.

Mr. BYRD. In reply, I will say that I think the passage of the reorganization bill will certainly stimulate such reduction. Title I provides:

(2) reduce expenditure to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and be abolishing such agencies as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government;

(6) eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort—

And so forth and so on. Mr. President, important as it is to reduce the personnel for the purpose of economy, I think it is equally important in some way to prevent the duplication here in Washington of the different bureaus, and to lift the terrific burden thus placed upon the business of the country which must deal with the Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I totally agree with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. That can only be done by passage of the reorganization bill. The bill puts it up to the President of the United States, who then has a mandate and direction from the Congress to do the things I just mentioned, to simplify the Government, to eliminate overlapping, and reduce personnel.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Congress have the power to reduce the personnel in governmental agencies by reducing the appropriations? Will not a reduction in appropriations end such a situation and bring about a reduction in personnel?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that we have the power, but it is one of the most difficult things in the world to do. I will make a statement about it at this moment. The appropriation bills come before the Congress at different times. They are dealt with by subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, each of which has a specific appropriation with which to deal We should not attack, for instance, the De-

partment of Agriculture and say that it must reduce its personnel by 10,000 or 20,000 unless simultaneously we consider reducing the appropriations for the personnel in the other departments. As the Senator well knows, appropriations do not come before the Congress in one measure. Numerous bills are prepared, after hearings by subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, and reported by the committee. I do not criticize the Committee on Appropriations. It is doing its work the best way it can, but each subcommittee deals with particular items. One subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations deals with the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, and that is reported by that committee. Another subcommittee deals with the appropriation bill for the State Department, and so on. Never at any time can the Senate or the House obtain a full picture of appropriations, and as to how they will affect the conduct of departments not covered by the bill under consideration. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that I will join with him in any effort he may make, but it is very difficult to reorganize the Government and reduce the personnel by means of a reduction in the appropriations for salaries.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I did not make the observation as a criticism directly of what we are undertaking to do by way of reorganization, but I do say that Congress should investigate the extreme cases, particularly the one which has been referred to by the able Senator from Virginia, namely, that of the War Department, which has more than 700,000 civilian employees beyond the continental limits of the United States at this time. I see no reason why the Appropriations Committees and the Congress cannot look into and inquire into the need and necessity for such large-scale employment. On that basis the appropriations can be reduced. I well appreciate—we all know it, for it is a matter of common knowledge—that almost every agency of the Government always undertakes to increase personnel and build up its power and influence. That is the way bureaucracy is growing in this country. In its final analysis, Mr. President, the responsibility rests upon Congress, which actually does have the authority and the responsibility for controlling the purse strings of the Nation.

While I am making these remarks I want to congratulate and commend the able Senator from Virginia for the contribution he is making in his labors in the Senate toward bringing about economy and more efficient administration in government by undertaking to have Government departments and agencies reorganized.

Let me make a further observation: With the burden of debt now resting upon this Nation as a result of the great cost involved in the world conflict in which we have been engaged, if we are ever again to have a stabilized economy, the time must come when we shall bring into balance income into the Treasury and outgo from the Treasury. We shall never be able to bring them into balance and reduce taxes to the point where they should be, or bring about a balanced Budget and operate on a cash basis, until the Congress is willing to assume the responsibility of meeting its full duty in connection with appropriation bills and reduce expenditures which are needless and wasteful.

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with the Senator. I wish to make one reference to the War Department employees. As I understand, they were paid from lump-sum appropriations made for the prosecution of the war. Such appropriations were not earmarked, so it would be very difficult for Congress to do anything about them until after the emergency is over.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, the Senator does not believe that the suggestion as to Congress doing the job is practical. I understood the Senator to say that there were 1,141 organizations created by Executive order.

Mr. BYRD. No; I did not say that. I said there were 1,141 in all, and that a great many were created by Executive order. For example, there were 364 in the war agencies. I should say that possibly a majority of them were created by Executive order.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, I assume that they could probably be disposed of by Executive order.

Mr. BYRD. My understanding is that the power of the President under the Reorganization Act has now expired. I ask the Senator from Utah if that is not true.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true. It expired several years ago.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is it the Senator's position that the President could not now dispose of those agencies?

Mr. BYRD. I think he could probably dispose of the agencies which were created by Executive order.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is what I am getting at. Would not the pending bill, in effect, give the President the right to dispose of the remainder of them?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure the Senator is correct. If and when this legislation is passed, the President will be given the power to reorganize generally, to transfer agencies from one department to another, and to make such corrections as would be conducive to less expense and greater efficiency. However, there are some limitations with reference to departments. The President could not abolish a department, nor could he remove all the functions of one department to another department. But as to agencies and other establishments of the Government, except as we propose specifically to exempt certain agencies, he would have great latitude in reorganization, transferring, and coordinating.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator from Virginia was not referring to the War Department or the Navy Department as being among the 1,141 agencies?

Mr. BYRD. No. I am talking about the bureaus.

Mr. TUNNELL. There is no reason why this bill should be considered as in any way opposed to the views of anyone who really desires a reorganization of Government agencies and a reduction of expenditures. As I understand the Senator from Virginia, what he is asking for has a greater chance of success.

Mr. BYRD. I am advocating it for that reason. I think that is the only way to obtain an effective reorganization of the Government.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator believes that this plan would be feasible, and that other plans would not be feasible. He believes that under his plan there would be not only a possibility, but a probability of reduction.

Mr. BYRD. I think so.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was very much interested in the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the statement of the Senator from Delaware. I join the Senator from Arkansas in his commendation of the distinguished Senator from Virginia. In my judgment the Senator from Virginia has given more time and attention to the subject of economy and efficiency in the executive department than has almost any other Senator. He now tells us that as a result of the long study which he has devoted to the question he has completely changed his mind as to the practicability of Congress accomplishing a reorganization. I hope that Senators on this side of the aisle, especially, will not only commend the Senator from Virginia for the great work which he has done, but will follow up their commendation by voting for his amendment as a substitute for the Donnell amendment.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thought that in my questions there was the implication that I favored the very cause which the Senator from Virginia was advocating. I wish to add my words to those of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. The statement which the Senator made was in the nature of a reassurance. As the Senator in charge of the bill, I am very happy to have the Senator make that statement. The same observation applies to the statement of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure the Senator did not get any impression from what I said that I do not favor the reorganization bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, no.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do favor the pending measure, but I wish to consider any amendments which may be offered. My purpose is to get a reorganization bill which, when administered, will effect reorganization and bring about efficiency and economy in Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure that is the Senator's purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am in favor of the objectives of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it is my hope that Senators on this side of the aisle will follow the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Virginia and support his amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate what the Senator from Utah has said. I do not think I deserve it, although I have done what I could along this line.

Let me make one further observation, and then I shall take my seat. As I have previously said, the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government is a function of the Executive. The Executive prepares the Budget each year. He has a vast control over the various departments of the Government. His Budget advisers and those from whom he receives information with respect to the Budget furnish him with a great deal of inside information which it would be most difficult for Members of Congress to obtain.

There are in the Senate quite a number of former governors. The distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. HOEY] was one of the ablest governors. I wish to appeal to Senators who have been governors, and see whether or not they will agree with me in the statement that there has been no real reorganization in States which have not had the powerful leadership of the governors. That is certainly true with respect to the States of which I have knowledge, and I have studied the government organization of practically every State in the Union. So far as I know there has not been a single worthwhile reorganization of a State government in which the chief executive of the State did not take a leading part after receiving certain powers and authority from the legislature.

When I speak of reorganization I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not mean transferring bureaus here and there. I do not mean changing the names of bureaus. I mean an honest-to-goodness reorganization, a reorganization which eliminates overlapping activities and unnecessary personnel, and not merely a reorganization which involves transferring one bureau to another and then saying that there has been a reorganization.

This problem must be considered as a whole. It cannot be considered piecemeal. There is no way by which Congress can accomplish a reorganization without considering it piecemeal, unless we establish a special committee, change the rules of the Senate, and have all the reorganization bills referred to one committee. Under the present rules of the Senate, a bill relating to the Department of Labor must be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. A bill relating to the State Department must be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and so forth. Each committee operates independently, and without the over-all picture, which is absolutely essential in order to effect a comprehensive, worthwhile reorganization of the Federal Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Huffman	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	Knowland	Taylor
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Cordon	McMahon	Wagner
Donnell	Magnuson	Walsh
Downey	Maybank	Wheeler
Eastland	Mead	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Willis
George	Morse	Wilson
Guffey	Murdock	Young
Gurney	Myers	
Hart	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee and attended several hearings of the subcommittee while the pending bill was under consideration. Due to circumstances which I could not control, I was not present at the later meetings of the subcommittee, nor at the meeting of the full commitee when several of the present committee amendments were adopted and the committee's report was prepared for submission to the Senate. I regret that fact, Mr. President, because I find myself in disagreement with some parts of the bill as it has been reported to the Senate.

I desire to associate myself with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in everything which he has said. I give him my assurance that if there is any inconsistency in the position which he takes today and the position which he took 6 or 7 years ago, it reflects only credit upon him. If we cannot learn by experience and by things which we have actually seen; as he has seen them, our condition is hopeless.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has offered an amendment. Upon the amendment he made a vigorous constitutional argument. It seemed to me, however, that in the course of his remarks concerning the constitutional question which he was raising he adopted a rather defensive attitude. No Senator needs to defend himself for raising a constitutional question in this body. Certainly we are all interested and should be interested in the constitutionality of any proposed legislation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I desire to make it perfectly clear that there was no intention whatever on my part to place myself on the defensive in asserting a constitutional question. I appreciate the Senator's comment, but I regret that he has reached the conclusion that I was proceeding defensively. To my mind, we are confronted with one of the most important questions that have come before the Senate during the current year. I am proud to stand here affirmatively, and not defensively, and assert that this bill violates the Constitution of the United States.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Regardless of whether the position of the Senator is affirmative or negative, I received the impression that he rather apologized for raising a constitutional question, for which I thought no apology was necessary.

However, Mr. President, if the argument of the Senator from Missouri is carefully considered, I think it will be found that the constitutional question he raises is not such a grave question after all. I think if the argument the Senator from Utah made a few days ago is considered, it will be found that so far as the constitutional provision is concerned, there is not a great deal of difference as to the Constitution or as to how it has been interpreted by the courts.

There is much difference, however, as to how that interpretation should be applied to the pending bill. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Missouri made it very clear that he believed the bill to be entirely constitutional provided the standards it set up were sufficient. I

think that is correct, is it not? There being no response, evidently it is. So, after all, then, the argument comes down to whether the standards set up in the bill are or are not sufficient. That is a matter upon which many minds might differ and many courts might differ, and probably will differ. To me there is not much question about the standards in the bill. The question of delegation of legislative power is not involved at all. The question is as to the sufficiency of the standards.

Mr. President, Congress has the power to pass a bill requiring reorganization by the executive branch of the Government under sufficient standards and limitations, and without provision for the return of the plan to the Congress at all. No constitutional question is involved as to that right.

Senators who are debating and worrying about the constitutionality of the pending measure might, in my humble judgment, far better concern themselves with the realistic, practical problems which have confronted this Nation since 1802.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from New Mexico refers to the realistic, practical problems which have confronted this Nation. He agrees thoroughly with what the distinguished Senator from Virginia said, that the only way to reorganize, the only way in which the practical problems of reorganization can be settled, provided the provisions are constitutional, as the Senator believes them to be, is by the executive branch of the Government doing it, and not through action of the legislative branch. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. HATCH. I was about to say that in my opinion that is the only way, in effect, in which reorganization can be brought about.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to have the Senator's view in that regard, because I am thoroughly in accord with what the Senator from Virginia stated in connection with the changing of the government of Virginia. Having been a governor myself, well do I know the almost impossible situation which results when it is left to the legislature of a State to reorganize the State government, or to the council of a city to reorganize the city government. I am very appreciative of the fact that the Senator from New Mexico so thoroughly agrees.

Mr. HATCH. Let us look at the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri for a moment—I presume I have a correct copy of the amendment—and see just what kind of legislation would be enacted, what we would have if his amendment should be agreed to. The amendment provides:

> No reorganization plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving such plan. Each reorganization specified in a plan which shall have been approved by the enactment of such a joint resolution shall take effect on the date of enactment of such joint resolution or on the date specified pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to such reorganization, whichever may be the later date.

Mr. President, I state and I reiterate that if this amendment shall be agreed to it will nullify every provision of the bill which we are asked to pass. If the amendment shall be agreed to the bill will confer no authority on the President of the United States which he does not now possess. If the amendment shall be agreed to it will grant no authority to Congress which the Congress does not now possess. Adopting the amendment would absolutely nullify the entire legislation. It is a futile, idle gesture to pass a bill authorizing the President to reorganize the Government and then say that the Congress must by joint resolution approve the plan, for the President can now adopt a plan for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, he can submit it to the Congress, and Congress by appropriate bill or by joint resolution can adopt it. I yield now to any Senator who cares to dispute that point with me.

Mr. President, a joint resolution is a legislative act. It requires a majority vote in both Houses, and requires the signature of the President of the United States. We might just as well say, "Mr. President, reorganize the executive branch of the Government, and then we will pass a bill approving or disapproving the plan." We will have accomplished absolutely nothing by all the committee hearings, by all the debate in the Senate, and by the arguments in the House, if the Senator's amendment shall be agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, does the Senator construe the amendment of the Senator from Missouri as absolutely leaving authority to either House?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator was here long before I became a Member of the Senate——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina speak a little louder so that we on this side may hear?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly. I was about to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether he remembered what happened in the Congress of the United States when President Hoover was the President and there was a Democratic Congress, at which time Mr. Garner, later a distinguished Speaker of the House and still later Vice President, was the leader of the majority in the House—whether he remembered that in those days of 1931, 1932, and early in 1933 there could be no agreement between the legislative and executive branches of the Government because of the differences between the parties. I am wondering what effect such an amendment would have if there were an overwhelming Republican House and a Democratic Senate, taking into consideration the fact that under our Constitution in this body we serve for 6 years and in the House of Representatives the Members are elected every 2 years. I think the division of political parties in those days had a great deal to do with furthering the depression and retarding recovery in this country. I ask the Senator whether that could not happen again if the amendment of the Senator from Missouri were agreed to in connection with the reorganization of the Government.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from South Carolina of course speaks with authority. It could happen.

Mr. MAYBANK. I remember so well what happened in my State because of the division of political opinion in the Congress of the United States. The people in my section of the country were forced to suffer because in one House there was a Democratic majority and in the other a Republican majority. If such a situation should occur again, I fear, if this amendment were adopted, the result would be equally unfortunate so far as reorganization is concerned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish again to stress—and I can not get away from the thought—the absolute futility of our action if we should adopt the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. There has been argument on the floor of the Senate about ability to reorganize the manifold and many bureaus and agencies of Government, and we are asked actually to pass a foolish, futile bill, which would not even amount to legislation.

I am sure the Senator from Missouri did not realize the import of what he was doing when he offered the amendment. He says he wants to have the Government reorganized. Every Senator on this floor rises and proclaims, "Oh, I want reorganization, we must have reorganization", and then is asked to vote for what would kill reorganization.

Mr. President, the thing for the Congress of the United States to do first of all is to determine the question, Do we want to reorganize the Federal Government? Do we seriously, honestly, and sincerely want to adopt an effective, workable reorganization plan? That is the first question to determine. Every person answers that in the affirmative.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator will agree that one of our former distinguished colleagues, now President of the United States, sent a special message to the Congress on the subject. Certainly he knows something about reorganization, certainly he was in this body when the amendments and the bills before the committees of which the Senator from Virginia spoke this morning were pending there. Above all, that is the one thing he wants, and I have confidence in him, and I have confidence in the statements the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made here today about conversations and agreements. I do not see how anyone could better reorganize the Government than the present President of the United States, a former member of this body, with his experience.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. That brings this thought to mind: Who most severely criticize the executive branch of the Government? Who go out on the stump and on the platforms throughout the country condemning the executive branch of the Government and condemning bureaucrats? I have heard Members of this body and Members of the House of

Representatives on the hustings declare, "I am going to Washington to drive the bureaucrats out of Washington."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. And in many instances those who do so vote for appropriations to keep the bureaucrats in office. Am I wrong in that statement?

Mr. HATCH. The responsibility for the mess, if we call it such, in which the executive branch of the Government is today rests first of all upon the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. With the possible exception of some emergency war agencies, is it not true that every bureau in the departments in Washington has been created by legislation of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. HATCH. And the Congress creates those bureaus without any regard to the over-all picture in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. And as soon as Congress creates a bureau and the President appoints someone to head it, Congress then begins to denounce him as a bureaucrat because he heads a bureau.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. May I call the Senator's attention to the fact that since the latter part of 1941, for more than 4 years, the President has had over-all and complete power to reorganize the bureaus in any way he chooses, to abolish bureaus, to combine them, to do everything that is provided in the pending bill, and if he has not done it, the responsibility is on the President of the United States and not on Congress.

Mr. HATCH. I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that he has been sitting in the Senate of the United States, and the Congress has been in session almost constantly for several years, and there has been nothing to prevent the Senator from Ohio or the Congress from presenting a plan to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. Has it been done?

Mr. TAFT. But the Senator was accusing Congress and relieving the President of all responsibility, when the President has had complete power, the very thing he now insists he must have, and he has had such power for 4 years.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator was not accusing the Congress and the Senator was not relieving the President at all. The Senator from Ohio evidently had not listened to what I said. I said, and I repeat, that the vast over-sprawling bureaucracy which has been set up was created by the Congress, and every time we create a bureau we do so without regard to the over-all picture and we only pile confusion on confusion, until the net result is chaos, such as exists today. That has been our responsibility without regard to Democrats or Republicans, without regard to whether a Democratic or a Republican President was in the White House. It has been going on since this Nation was founded, regardless of which party was in power. I am making no political argument. I am trying to present the idea that if we want the executive branch of the Government to be reorganized we should pass a measure which will enable reorganization to be accomplished.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think perhaps the Senator heard the Senator from Virginia state not long ago that a very large number of bureaus have been created by Executive order; that they always would be and they always had been; and that as a matter of fact Congress cannot be blamed for creating very many of them. I only quote the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. HATCH. A large number were created. A large number were created by reason of the war. Many of them were created by Executive order under authority granted by the Congress in the first instance. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio a question. Does he think the President has the power to create a bureau, to confer a function, without authority from Congress?

Mr. TAFT. I answer the Senator by saying I do not think he has, but he has done it. He did it in the case of the distribution, for instance, of subsidies for school children. Admittedly he had no executive power to do that. We have had presented on this floor over and over again instances of the President creating bureaus by Executive order. I questioned his power; others have questioned his power; but nothing has been done. The FEPC was set up without any authority of any kind from Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to recall to the Senator from New Mexico the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] submitted amendments to appropriation bills to eliminate some of the agencies created by Executive orders, and in most instances the amendments were overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Georgia, however, had my support.

Mr. MAYBANK. In those particular instances he did; yes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what good does this kind of argument do? Absolutely none. We all recognize the problem. Regardless of which side of the Chamber our seats may be, we all recognize the problem. The problem is here; and, as I said in the beginning, every Member of Congress, in the House and in the Senate, condemns the bureaus and demands reorganization. Now we have something before us that does at least bear the possibility, and it may be only a possibility, of bringing about an effective reorganization. And then we are confronted with, and perhaps about to adopt, an amendment which would absolutely kill the bill which we are proposing to pass. I do not think it behooves any of us to talk too much about inefficiency and about red tape and about waste and extravagance. Sometimes I think Congress itself is most inefficient. Certainly it is most wasteful in its time and extravagant in the language sometimes used in debate.

Mr. President, without any hesitation, I say, again, as I said before, that the primary responsibility for reorganizing the executive branch of the Government does rest upon the Congress. Ours is the first responsibility, and it is a responsibility which we ought to discharge. If I believed for one moment that the Congress of the United States could or would reorganize the executive branch of the Government I would say, "Let us do away with this bill altogether and proceed with our task now"; but, Mr. President, that task has been before Congress, as I said, since 1802. It has been before the country. Thomas Jefferson, I think, was about the first person to call attention to reorganization. He said in 1802:

> Our predecessors have endeavored, by intricacies of system and shuffling the investigator over from one officer to another, to cover everything from detection. I hope we shall go in the contrary direction, and that by our honest and judicious reformations, we may be able, within the limits of our time, to bring things back to that simple and intelligible system on which they should have been organized at first.
>
> Let us deserve well of our country by making her interests the end of all our plans and not our own pomp, patronage, and irresponsibility.

Mr. President, I read now from testimony given before our committee by Hon. Lindsay Warren, an able and efficient Member of the House of Representatives for a number of years, a man who is always jealous of the powers and the responsibilities of the Congress, a man who had charge in the House of the reorganization bill passed in 1939, and who, I think, as a student of government, and its actual workings, is perhaps more familiar with the subject than any of us. He came before our committee wholeheartedly supporting this bill and opposing the reservations and exemptions which would take away power from the President. He called our attention to a committee report in the House of Representatives on the question of reorganization, in which it was stated:

> The committee soon found that, without a total abandonment of their other representative duties, it would be impossible during the present session to examine all the departments in a satisfactory manner. * * * The public interest demands a rigid and more general investigation.

I say today that the public interest demands a most rigid and general investigation of the departments.

Continuing the report says:

> Economy does not consist in withholding supplies which the public safety demands, but in limiting the appropriation of public money to proper objects, and in insuring that it is disbursed with fidelity.

That committee in the House found that without totally abandoning all their representative duties they could not effectively undertake the task of reorganizing the executive branch of government. That was a report made by a select committee of the House of Representatives in 1841 to provide a means of reducing the civil list, either by rearrangement of duties or otherwise.

More than 100 years ago a committee of the House of Representatives said that it was totally impossible for Congress to work out a reorganization of the executive branch of government. It was true then, and it has been true ever since. It is true today. If it had not been true, if Congress could have effectively reorganized, would it not have been done? The argument is made that Congress should reorganize the Government agencies. A conclusive answer to that argument is the fact that for more 100 years Congress has not reorganized them, and I venture the assertion that if this amendment, or any other amendment by which Congress is required to reorganize the executive branch of government is adopted, another 100 years will pass by and the job will still remain undone. Members of Congress will continue to go about the country proclaiming to high heaven the evils of the bureaucrats.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I was interested in the statement which the able Senator from New Mexico made with respect to what the Congress attempted to do back in 1841—more than 100 years ago. I think it is a fair observation to make that certainly at that time Congress was not so busy as it is today, and certainly the problems with which Congress was dealing in 1841 were as 1 to 100 compared with those with which it must deal today. At the same time the bureaus must have been very small as compared with the great sprawling bureaucracy which exists in the executive department of Government today.

If in 1841, after an exhaustive examination, Congress reached the definite conclusion that it did not have the power, the time, or the facilities to bring about a real reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, it seems to me to be futile and useless for the Congress of today, with all the duties resting on its shoulders and with the many bureaus created in the Government as a result of the war, as well as those created before the war, even to undertake such a task.

The only individual who can do it is the President of the United States. If the President follows the suggestion made by the Senator from New Mexico when he read what the great Jefferson said, and does the job in a careful and economical way, it will be done properly. I have every confidence that the present President of the United States will do it that way. He has asked for this power. There is an opportunity for the Congress to give him the responsibility and see what he can do with it, holding him to strict accountability, as the able Senator from Virginia has suggested.

Mr. HATCH. I am glad that the Senator from Illinois mentioned the fact—it has been mentioned before—that the President has declared his intention to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, the thing for which we have all been contending. In the face of that request, if the Congress fails to enact legislation necessary to give him that power, or if we hamstring, cripple, and tie him by the amendments which we adopt and the exemptions which we make, and as a result the executive branch of the Government is not reorganized, where will rest the blame? Where will rest the responsibility? Certainly it will not rest on the President of the United States. If that happens, Senators who propose amendments limiting and restricting, and Senators who are responsible for exceptions and exemptions should not dare to say that the President failed in his responsibility. Let them be honest and forthright enough to say, "I did not trust the President of the United States. I had no faith in his ability to reorganize the executive branch of Government. I tied his hands. I helped to make the exemptions, and the responsibility rests upon me." Let Senators dare to tell their people that that is what they have done.

Mr. President, I mentioned the question of exemptions. Already there are included in the bill 12 or 15 exemptions. I know of other exemptions which will probably be asked. I have had long-distance telephone calls from New Mexico, and I have received telegrams and letters from more than one department, urging that a little branch bureau here or there be exempted. I do not wish to be misunderstood. These communications do not come from the departments themselves. However, already pressure is definitely being brought from some source on Members of Congress to exempt certain agencies. We are told, "Oh, yes; reorganize everything else. Do a thorough job, but do not lay your unholy hands on my department."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the Senator's last statement, I do not know that I need to ask him the question which I had in mind. If agencies of the executive branch of the Government which are seeking exemptions are lobbying among Members of Congress, it strikes me as being somewhat unusual. I wonder what the reason behind it is. Certainly if a department or agency is operating in the manner in which Congress intended it should operate, and is giving the American taxpayer full value, the President is not going to interfere with that kind of an organization. I believe it has been stated on the floor of the Senate that certain individuals employed in some Government bureaus or agencies are lobbying among Members of Congress in an effort to save the organizations with which they are connected. I wonder why. If they are operating the type of organization which should be operated, with honesty, efficiency, and good housekeeping, so to speak, they have nothing to fear. If they are giving the taxpayers of America full value, I do not know why they should fight the reorganization bill, and there is something wrong about those who are here lobbying, if they are doing so.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the question of exemptions and exceptions, I do not care to "pass the buck" to the President of the United States. However, I have stated that in my opinion he is the only one who can do the job effectively. If I pass to him the responsibility, certainly I am not going to vote to tie his hands. The exemptions already made were made without rhyme or reason. Even the exemption as to quasi-judicial agencies is not complete. Remember that when we write the bill, supposedly we are laying down a pattern for the President to follow. When we write the bill giving broad authority, and exempting only 10 or 15 agencies, or whatever the number shall finally be, we are saying to the President of the United States, "These are the ones which we do not want you to touch." In effect we are saying, "These are the only ones. You are perfectly at liberty to reorganize all the others, and we recommend that you do so." When the situation is considered from that standpoint, no Senator would vote for the bill in that light.

The exemption of quasi-judicial agencies does not touch the National Labor Relations Board. Is it not a quasi-judicial agency? Probably an amendment will be offered exempting it, and probably a great many Senators will say, "That is one of the quasi-judicial agencies which we do not wish to exempt." But that would be a violation of the very rule which was established. It may be that under the general terms of the bill it is already exempted, but perhaps some Senators do not want it exempted.

That is where we find ourselves when we go into the question of exemptions. How about The Tax Court, a judicial agency—not a quasi-judicial agency, but a judicial agency? It is not exempted by the bill. What a ludicrous thing it is to draft legislation in this way and say that we are going to exempt agencies which are partly judicial in character, but not one which is altogether judicial? And this is the Congress which wants to reorganize the executive branch of Government. Mr. President, the very exemptions in the bill, and the pattern which is laid down, demonstrate the absolute incompetency of Congress to reorganize the executive branch of Government.

The able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] eloquently pointed out why the Army Engineer Corps ought to be exempted. Perhaps he was correct. However, in the Interior Department is the Bureau of Reclamation, with its corps of engineers. It is not exempted. It means just as much to the West as does the Army Engineer Corps. Does the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill wish to say to the President of the United States, "We forbid you to touch the Army Engineer Corps, but go ahead and do away with the Bureau of Reclamation?"

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, is the Senator propounding that question to me?

Mr. HATCH. It was, shall I say, a rhetorical question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I very vainly argued, with all the vigor I could, that we should not adopt such an amendment, and that to adopt an amendment exempting the Army engineers would merely be an invitation to exempt others. However, the Senate proceeded to include it in the bill as one of the "sacred cows."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question. I gather from his argument that he believes that we should give complete power to the President to reorganize, without any review or check-up by the Congress. Does he feel that we should make no exemptions? The distinguished Senator is a member of the Judiciary Committee, as I am. I am troubled by the points which he raises. I am wondering how far he goes in the position which he is now taking?

Mr. HATCH. I can answer that question very readily. I do not think there will be any difference between the Senator from New Jersey and myself on that question. I repose the utmost trust and confidence in the President of the United States, Mr. Truman. I count him to be my warm personal friend. I believe in his integrity; I believe in his sincerity; I believe in his ability. But, Mr. President, the responsibility for reorganization of the executive branch of Government we should not impose altogether upon the President of the United States. As the Senator from Virginia said, mistakes are going to be made; I do not care who may be President.

But by adopting the amendment which the Senator from Virginia has proposed as a substitute for the Donnell amendment, the Congress can amply guard and protect itself against any error or mistake of vital importance. I am for that proposal. I am for having the Congress retain that power, and I wish to have Congress exercise it if the occasion should arise, and regardless of who may be occupying the office in the White House.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, it would be possible for the President of the United States and the House of Representatives, let us say, to agree on a certain program. It might be that a majority of the Senate, of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is such an able Member, would be opposed to that program. Under the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, if the Senate were opposed to the program it would not be possible for the Senate to express its opposition, because the House of Representatives would not be willing to go along on a so-called veto. In other words, one branch of Congress and the Executive could legislate for the United States of America.

Mr. President, I do not question for a moment the integrity of the President——

Mr. HATCH. No, Mr. President; I make the distinction that that is not legislation.

Mr. SMITH. That will be my next question.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator from New Mexico take the position that we would not be delegating legislative authority?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am not concerned about the technical question of delegation of legislative authority. I have read a number of Supreme Court decisions on that subject. Frankly, I am a little confused about when legislative authority is delegated and when it is not, and I think the courts sometimes become a little confused.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico for the meaning of his statement that he is not concerned with the delegation of legislative power. In that connection I ask him if he is not a member of the Judiciary Committee which issued the report which in sentence after sentence repeatedly states affirmatively that the pending bill makes a delegation of legislative power.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me reply to the Senator; I do not wish him to misunderstand my position. I said I was not concerned with the technical question whether this might be considered a delegation of legislative authority. I do not care what the Senator calls it and I do not care what the Committee on the Judiciary said about it. It is either a delegation of legislative power or it is not. I have the utmost respect for my own committee, but whatever the committee calls it does not make it one thing or the other.

Let me say that the Senator from Missouri has quoted the report of the Judiciary Committee several times; he seems to rely absolutely upon the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on the question whether the proposal is a delegation of legislative power and therefore unconstitutional. If he is willing to follow the action of the Judiciary Committee in that respect, certainly he should not insist upon his own amendment, because the Committee on the Judiciary expressly repudiates that by the bill which it reports to the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I find no place in the report of the Committee on the Judiciary in which it repudiates its statement that this is a delegation of legislative power. I challenge the Senator to point out one solitary sentence or word in which it makes such a repudiation of its position.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. Of course, I agree with the Senator that the committee recommends this bill. It answers or undertakes to answer in one or two sentences the proposition as to whether the bill should be supported. But at no place does it even inferentially indicate that this is not a delegation of legislative power. Mr. President, I say that concession by the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is a member, has strong weight with me as a Member of the Senate. The fact that that distinguished group of lawyers and Senators concedes time after time in the report that this is a delegation of legislative power is highly persuasive in making me believe that it is.

If I may add one or two other sentences, let me say that yesterday and also a few days ago I undertook to indicate also that the bill itself amply corroborates the committee in the statement that it is a delegation of legislative power. I draw the conclusion that inasmuch as it is a delegation of legislative power, therefore it is unconstitutional, under the language of the Supreme Court of the United States, on page 425 of Two Hundred and Ninety-third United States Reports:

> That Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President is universally recognized as vital to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from New Jersey on the question of legislation and his description of the provision of a veto, as I may call it, as being legislation, that in my opinion it is not legislation. Certainly, if it were legislation, neither branch of Congress could act without having action taken by the other branch.

As I said the other day on the floor of the Senate, the vital legislation which gives life to the reorganization program is the legislation we now propose to pass. If it is good legislation and if it is constitutional, everything that is done under it is lawful and constitutional, and the power which we reserve is purely the power to protect against possible injury. That veto power is not legislation in itself.

Now, let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I do not wish in any way to belittle the argument he has made with reference to the unconstitutional nature of the proposal, but I am quite sincere when I say that the courts themselves vastly differ and there is much confusion as to what does amount to a delegation of legislative power. According to the universal rule, as the Senator himself pointed out in arguing against the standards set up in the bill, if the standards are sufficient, the power we now propose to delegate can lawfully be delegated. Of that I have not the slightest doubt. Therefore, I am not going to take my time or the time of the Senate by arguing abstruse, abstract propositions of constitutional law upon which none of us will be able to agree and upon which the courts themselves might not agree. I have heard many constitutional arguments made on the floor of the Senate with which, in large degree, the courts disagree.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico and the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that a three-judge district court, in the case of *Isbrandtsen-Moller Co.* v. *United States* (14 F. Supp. 407, 412, S. C.; 300 U. S. 139), passed on the sufficiency of the standards set up in the 1932 Reorganization Act and held that they were within the Constitution. That case went to the Supreme Court of the United States; but, due to the fact that the question had become moot in

the meantime, the Supreme Court did not decide it.

So the only authority we have today, so far as I have been able to ascertain, emanating from a Federal court sustains the standards set up in the 1932 act, and anyone who will take the time to compare the standards set up in the 1932 act with the standards proposed to be set up by the pending legislation cannot help but agree that the standards proposed to be set up by the pending legislation are so much more specific and particular than were the standards set up in the other act that there can be no question, in my opinion, about the constitutionality of the bill we are now considering.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have already taken more time than I intended to take. As I said, I think we are extravagant, wasteful, and inefficient here because we talk too much, and I am just as guilty as is any other Senator. However, on these technical points we become worried and bothered. We strain today at the gnat of constitutional construction, but we swallow the camel of overloaded, over-duplicated, inefficient, wasteful, and extravagant bureaus in the executive branch of government. I do not wish to keep on straining at gnats and swallowing camels.

There is only one fear I have in regard to this bill. My only fear regarding it is not that of granting power to the President and reserving to ourselves, as we do under the proposal made by the Senator from Virginia, the right of veto, if necessary. I am not afraid of abuse of power by the President. What worries me is that the President may not exercise the power we actually grant and give. That is the danger, Mr. President; that is the reality we face.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Missouri will be defeated. I hope that many of the exemptions now provided in the bill will be stricken from it, and that we will send to the President a bill giving him the power which is necessary and rely on our own judgment, our own integrity, and the integrity and judgment of the other branch of the Congress to protect against any abuse or dire disaster.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I am through; but I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I merely wish to ask a question.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. When the Senator from New Mexico said a moment ago he was afraid the President would not exercise the power——

Mr. HATCH. I should have said I am afraid of that possibility.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I was sure of that. Does not the Senator feel that not only is President Truman a very conscientious and very able and efficient man, but that he is especially interested in this special matter and he would make every possible effort to accomplish the desired reorganization? I know that the Senator from New Mexico thinks so. It may be that certain problems will force themselves upon him which would prevent him from making such a reorganization, but I do not know of anyone who would make a greater effort to try to carry out reorganization than would President Truman under the pending bill and I hope the sound amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will prevail. President Truman is handling wisely and successfully as difficult problems as have confronted any President in our history. Instinctively he is deeply interested in taking advantage of such an opportunity to economize and to promote efficiency by certain much-needed reorganization. But unless circumstances develop which would absolutely prevent him from doing so, I feel that there is every reasonable prospect that the President will carry out in a satisfactory manner all of the power which may be given to him under this bill, which I hope will pass with the Byrd amendment.

Mr. HATCH. I am most happy that the Senator from Maryland interrupted me and made the remarks which he has made. I do not wish to have interpreted what I said as indicating any lack of confidence on my part in what the President wishes to do. I have absolute confidence in him, and I know that he is tremendously interested in the subject of reorganization. When I said that there was danger of a nonexercise of power, I said so in the light of things which I know will take place. I know the pressure which will be brought upon the President. I am aware that no President of the United States can know intimately all the details connected with the vast bureaucracy which we have created. I know that he will have to rely upon others. I know that pressure will be brought upon him, as it has been brought here in this Chamber. I know that technical arguments will be made and that prohibitions will be asked for. There will be those who will say to the President, "Don't touch me, Mr. President," just as similar demands have been made upon us. I assert that perhaps various influences will be exercised to such an extent that there will not be obtained the effective plan which is so desperately needed. I know that with the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, and other measures designed continually to tie the hands of the President, there will be no reorganization at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to direct a few remarks solely to the question of the machinery which the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee will be allowed to use in its effort to obtain the facts with relation to what happened prior to, at the time, and following the attack upon Pearl Harbor.

I have ascertained that some of the press releases have not made clear the question involved before the committee. Therefore, for the sake of accuracy, I should like to place in the RECORD the facts so far as they relate to the machinery of the committee.

I shall not discuss the questions of fact with regard to what happened. I merely address myself to the subject of the machinery of the committee because I believe that the Senate and the people of the United States wish to know what machinery is available and what machinery we are to be permitted to use in an endeavor to obtain all the facts. If the committee is to be crippled, if it is to go into the investigation on crutches, the Congress of the United States and the people should be informed.

Mr. President, on the 28th day of August 1945, the Army Board and the Navy Board released reports with reference to what they had found in compliance with a certain act which had been passed by the Congress. Congress had directed the Army and the Navy to make an investigation into the question of Pearl Harbor, and they subsequently submitted reports. At that time it was made clear upon the record that there had been certain omissions. There were certain records which had not been considered and which had not been released to the public. So it became apparent that not all the facts had been disclosed.

On the 28th day of August, the same day to which I have referred, the President of the United States issued an Executive order which read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 28, 1945.

Restricted.

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Navy, the Attorney General, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the Budget, the Director of the Office of War Information:

Appropriate departments of the Government and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are hereby directed to take such steps as are necessary to prevent release to the public, except with the specific approval of the President in each case, of—

Information regarding the past or present status, technique or procedure, degree of success attained, or any specific results of any cryptanalytic unit acting under the authority of the United States Government or any department thereof.

That order was signed "Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America."

Mr. President, that order clearly prevented any person in the Government divulging any information in relation to Pearl Harbor other than that disclosed in the reports. So when the reports stated that there were top secrets, indicating that certain facts were not to be disclosed to the public, the order forbade disclosure because it contained the words "degree of success attained." Naturally such information would be indicative of the "degree of success attained."

Mr. President, that matter was not called to the attention of our committee.

On the 6th day of September the Senate agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, and it was said at that time that we would be able to function with the full cooperation of the President of the United States. It was said that we would receive all information which we might request. But, Mr. President, this restricted order was not brought to the attention of the committee.

On or about the 23d day of October 1945—many weeks after the committee had started to function as a joint committee—it was merely by coincidence

that the Senator from Michigan happened to be in the office of the counsel of the committee. It was called to the attention of the Senator from Michigan at that time that the order to which I have referred was dated August 28, 1945. Counsel had upon his desk, and showed to the Senator from Michigan, the following memorandum:

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to hold public hearings and make public pertinent evidence relating to the circumstances of that attack, a special exception to my memorandum dated August 28, 1945, relating to the release of information concerning cryptanalytic activities is hereby made as follows:

The State, War, and Navy Departments will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, for such use as the committee may determine, any information in their possession material to the investigation, and will respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed services whose testimony is desired by the committee to testify publicly before the committee concerning any matter pertinent to the investigation.

Mr. President, at that time I read the memorandum and conferred with the counsel for the committee. I understood from it that the counsel would not be permitted to have any of the evidence and no member of the committee would be authorized to have any of the evidence. The joint committee was authorized to subpena the witnesses before them and then as a committee of the whole get the evidence as indicated in the memorandum.

There was nothing said about civilians being authorized. It will be noted that the second memorandum makes a specific exception to the memorandum of August 28. The memorandum of August 28 specifically enjoined any civilian in the State Department, any civilian in the executive branch, any civilian in the Justice Department, any civilian in the Bureau of the Budget, or any other department from giving any evidence in relation to this matter.

So I suggested at that time, and it was agreed by counsel, that it would be well to make a modification, and counsel then in his own handwriting wrote in certain words. After the word "armed" the words "or civilian" were inserted. Then we struck out the words "whose testimony is desired by the committee" and after the word "to" we inserted the words "give information to the committee, its counsel, and its members" and "and to testify publicly before the committee concerning any matter pertinent to the investigation."

Mr. President, why was it proper to make that modification? It was for the reason that if we were to conduct an orderly hearing before a committee we should at least have some idea in advance what the witnesses know, so as to be able chronologically to present the matter to the people of the United States. Having that in mind, I was of the opinion that the committee, its counsel, and any member, should have information as to what the witnesses knew before they were brought before the committee in a public hearing, so that again we would not have confusion upon confusion. As I said before, I repeat, I am concerned solely now with the machinery by which we are endeavoring to obtain facts in this particular case.

Mr. President, next day I was advised by the assistant counsel, Mr. Geselle, that the President refused to sign the order as it was proposed to be modified so as to give this right to the committee, its counsel, and its members, and to permit civilians to disclose any facts pertinent and relevant to the inquiry.

I then believed that the matter was so important that I should take it before the committee as a whole, and ask the committee's aid in the endeavor to provide machinery which would enable us to function better and not be crippled in our endeavor to get the facts for the two Houses and for the people of the United States. So I took before the committee as a whole this proposed order and memorandum. Before I read this, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD the memorandum as corrected by counsel and the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORIGINAL SUGGESTION OF COUNSEL WITH SUGGESTED CHANGES OF SENATOR FERGUSON WITH WHICH COUNSEL CONCURRED AND TOOK TO WHITE HOUSE BUT WHICH THE PRESIDENT DECLINED TO ACCEPT

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to hold public hearings and make public pertinent evidence relating to the circumstances of that attack, a specific exception to my memorandum dated August 28, 1945, relating to the release of information concerning cryptanalytic activities is hereby made as follows:

The State, War, and Navy Departments will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, for such use as the committee may determine, any information in their possession material to the investigation, and will respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed or civilian services to give information to the committee, its counsel, and its members and testify publicly before the committee concerning any matter pertinent to the investigation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Approved October 23, 1945.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be kept straight, let me say that I took this before the committee of the whole:

Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

In executive meeting, Tuesday, November 1, 1945.

That was the day when we had the meeting.

The committee approved the following by unanimous consent of the members present.

I believed at the time that there would be no doubt about the adoption of this proposal, and therefore I drew it as if it were a minute of the meeting. This is the pertinent part, and I should like to have it in the RECORD:

That for the purpose of enabling the committee, its individual members and counsel to perform the duties and responsibilities vested in them by the Congress of the United States, by virtue of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session; and

That for the further purpose of removing any restrictions, fears or inhibitions which may exist on the part of past or present Federal employees and members of the armed forces, in order that they will feel free to make available to the joint committee, its individual members and counsel any information in their possession material to the investigation:

The committee respectfully asks that the President approve the following memorandum:

"Memorandum for the chief executives of all Federal departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

"In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to 'make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading to or following the attack,' you are hereby directed to give the committee, its individual members and counsel your full cooperation.

"You are further directed to give the committee, its individual members and its counsel access to all records, documents, and information in your possession, whether of secret or top secret nature, and to advise all your employees to afford the committee members and their counsel the fullest possible cooperation. Their inquiries should be answered fully and all Federal employees, or members of the armed services, past or present, should consider it their duty to volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge concerning the subject of the committee's investigation.

"In addition, copies of any papers, required by the committee, its individual members and its counsel, whether secret or top secret, should be furnished willingly, any present directives to the contrary notwithstanding.

"It is understood that all information so developed and all records and copies of records so obtained by the committee, any individual committee member or its counsel shall be made available to the committee counsel for the information and use of all other members of the committee."

Mr. President, on the same day I proposed not only that, but I proposed that instead of merely asking the President to issue a directive correcting his former order or directive, the committee itself, if we were not successful in having the order altered, should permit the individual members certain rights, and what I now read into the RECORD was drawn and proposed to the committee. It will be noted that this relates only to the machinery for getting the facts, not to the facts themselves:

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE GUIDANCE OF COUNSEL AND MEMBERS OF THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

In executive meeting Thursday, November 1, 1945, the committee approved the following rules of procedure by unanimous consent of the members present.

That was anticipating that it would be adopted without a dissenting vote—

That for the purpose of giving full effect to the order of the President of the United States, approved October 23, 1945, that "the State, War, and Navy Departments will make available to the Joint Committee on the In-

vestigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, for such use as the committee may determine, any information in their possession material to the investigation"; and

That for the further purpose of enabling the committee, its individual members and counsel to perform the duties and responsibilities vested in them by the Congress of the United States to "make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events and circumstances leading up to or following the attack made by the Japanese armed forces upon Pearl Harbor"; and

By virtue of the authority vested in the committee by Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session:

The committee approves and adopts the following rules of procedure:

1. The State, War, Navy, and any other department or agency will make available to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, to its counsel, or to any of its individual members any information and records they shall at any time request, and will respectively authorize any employee or member of the armed and civilian services to give full information and records to the committee, its members, or counsel, and to testify publicly at the request of the committee, its counsel, or any committee member concerning any matter which the committee, its counsel, or any individual committee member may deem pertinent to the investigation.

The second paragraph is as follows:

All information so developed and all records and copies of records so obtained by the committee, its counsel, or any individual committee member shall be made available to the committee counsel for the information and use of all other members of the committee.

Mr. President, the first resolution, in which I asked the President to alter his order, was voted down by a 5-to-3 vote.

The second resolution, which I have just read, which would authorize the committee to avail itself of the order already entered by the President altering his August 28 order, was voted down by a 5-to-3 committee vote.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the vote on the two resolutions was along what would be called party lines. The three minority members present voted for the two resolutions; the majority members present voted against the two resolutions.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] proposed a resolution—I do not recall whether he did so after or before my two resolutions were voted upon—which would have specifically allowed the Senator from Maine, accompanied by the committee's counsel or any of the committee members, to examine files in the War Department or in the Navy Department, or in the Federal Communications Commission. To be accurate—and I want accuracy in the RECORD—the War Department was not mentioned at that particular time, but the Navy Department was, and file No. 7001, at least a record where there should be a file 7001 in the Navy Department, and certain records of the FCC at monitoring depots in the United States, were mentioned.

The motion made by the Senator from Maine that he be permitted specifically to see those files was rejected by the same vote in the committee.

Mr. President, at that time the committee had no right, or at least its counsel had no right, nor did any individual members, to see or talk to any witnesses. The only right they had was to call witnesses and put them on the stand. To avoid confusion and to compromise, at least, with the request made by the Senator from Michigan, there was drawn up and adopted by unanimous vote the following:

The Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack respectfully asks that the President approve the following memorandum:

"Memorandum for chief executives of all executive departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

"In order to assist the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack in its desire to make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack and to supplement previous directives and arrangements for full disclosure to and cooperation with the joint committee, and to add to the protections given in that provision in section 3 of the concurrent resolution creating the joint committee, which reads as follows:

" 'SEC. 3. The testimony of any person in the armed services, and the fact that such person testified before the joint committee herein provided for, shall not be used against him in any court proceeding, or held against him in examining his military status for credits in the service to which he belongs.'

you are directed to authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, whether in the armed services or in a civilian status, and whether or not called to testify before the joint committee, if interrogated by the committee or any of its members or counsel, to volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge bearing on the subject of the committee's investigation, and whether or not so interrogated, to come forward voluntarily and disclose to the committee, or to any of its members or its counsel, any information such persons may have on the subject of the inquiry which they may have any reason to think may not already have been disclosed to the committee."

Mr. President, the committee as a whole made that request, and the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], signed a letter and sent the request, which shows that it was signed by him, to the President of the United States.

Let us go back and analyze what the committee was trying to do. The senior Senator from Kentucky, when he drew Concurrent Resolution No. 27, had at least some suspicion that men in the armed services and in the employ of the Government would be timid at least in coming forward and giving testimony, for he inserted these words in his own resolution:

SEC. 3. The testimony of any person in the armed services and the fact that such person testified before the joint committee herein provided for shall not be used against him in any court proceeding, or held against him in examining his military status for credits in the service to which he belongs.

Mr. President, that was the directive of the Congress of the United States, which took the precaution to say to all potential witnesses that their testimony would not be held against them or affect their military status, and it could not be used against them in any court.

It was then the desire, as I believe it is now the desire, of the Senate and the Congress to get all the facts and to remove every millstone, every obstacle in the way of obtaining the facts. The entire committee asked the President of the United States for his cooperation, and asked him to direct those in authority—and I read the exact words:

You are directed to authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, whether in the armed services or in a civilian status, and whether or not called to testify before the joint committee, if interrogated by the committee or any of its members or counsel.

Mr. President, we sent that down to the White House I think on the following day; it is dated the 2d day of November, 1945.

Yesterday the committee called a meeting, at which it was indicated that the President had signed an order or a directive, a copy of which I have obtained. It was released through the White House news bureau to the press sometime yesterday morning. I shall read it in its entirety, and then I shall comment upon what the President did with the order which the entire committee unanimously adopted, which was a compromise with the idea of the Senator from Michigan, but yet would be of some aid and assistance in developing the machinery by which we could obtain all the facts.

I read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 7, 1945.

Memorandum for the chief executives of all executive departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Section 3 of the Concurrent Resolution creating the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack reads as follows:

"SEC. 3. The testimony of any person in the armed services, and the fact that such person testified before the joint committee herein provided for, shall not be used against him in any court proceeding or held against him in examining his military status for credits in the service to which he belongs."

In order to assist the joint committee to make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack, you are requested to authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, if they are interrogated by the committee or its counsel, to give any information of which they may have knowledge bearing on the subject of the committee's investigation.

You are further requested to authorize them whether or not they are interrogated by the committee or its counsel to come forward voluntarily and disclose to the committee or to its counsel any information they may have on the subject of the inquiry which they may have any reason to think may not already have been disclosed to the committee.

This directive is applicable to all persons in your departments or agencies whether they are in the armed services or not and whether or not they are called to testify before the joint committee.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

That was signed by the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman.

Mr. President, instead of the President following the suggestion of the entire committee, unanimously made, the President now only puts in the document:

You are requested to authorize—

Leaving in the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the head of any other department,

the sole discretion as to whether or not he would allow any man or any woman in the services of the United States to give the information referred to in the directive.

Mr. President, we had requested that the counsel or any member of the committee be authorized to talk to certain witnesses, and at least ascertain what was in their minds. I am speaking of the unanimous consent order. All members of the committee voted for it. At least it would be of some assistance. But the full committee voted down the request to allow individual members to examine any paper in the Government files.

Mr. President, one can draw all the red herrings he pleases across the path. It has been said that the only thing certain members of the committee wanted to do was to look into the private papers of a deceased President of the United States. I say that no member of the committee had any desire to look at the private papers of anyone. The sole desire was to obtain the facts from the official papers.

In two instances in this document the word "requested" is used instead of "directed." When that document was brought to the committee there was no suggestion that there had been any alteration in the form of the order submitted. It was read, and I immediately noticed that the words "or any member" were omitted. It could not be said that it was in compliance with our request. On a further detailed examination, which I have made on the floor of the Senate, I find that it not only varied in that respect, but also varied in the use of the word "requested", instead of "directed."

It also varied in another respect from the form which was submitted. It will be noticed that we put this language in the unanimous consent directive:

> And to add to the protection given in that provision in section 3 of the concurrent resolution creating the joint committee which reads as follows:
>
> "SEC. 3. The testimony of any person in the armed services, and the fact that such person testified before the joint committee herein provided for, shall not be used against him in any court proceeding, or held against him in examining his military status for credits in the service to which he belongs."

In other words, we wanted the President to add to the protection which the Congress wished to afford. We do not find that language in the paper signed by the President of the United States on November 7. In other words, this is merely a request, not to allow anyone to examine files, but to allow the counsel and the committee as a whole, while in session—and that is the only way a committee can act as a whole—to talk to certain persons.

When we discovered that the order was not as requested, the President was contacted and a new order was prepared and submitted, in the exact language upon which we had previously agreed.

Yesterday the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] gave a statement to the press. At least it is claimed that he was the source of it. The headline in the Post is as follows:

> Truman permits volunteers to aid Pearl Harbor probers.

Reading from that dispatch:

> Senator SCOTT LUCAS (Democrat of Illinois) pointed out that the White House had been under a misapprehension in signing the first memorandum and had not included the instruction to the Government personnel to volunteer information.

I then looked at the New York Times report, and found this statement:

> But Senator LUCAS (Democrat of Illinois) said that Mr. Truman interpreted the order as permitting individual committee members to look into the Government files.

I wish to read that again, because I cannot conceive that such a mistake could be made.

> But Senator LUCAS (Democrat, Illinois) said that Mr. Truman interpreted the order as permitting individual members to look into the Government files. Mr. LUCAS said that the President struck out words permitting volunteering of information to individual members. Mr. Truman was asked to correct this and agreed to do so, Mr. LUCAS added. That would leave committee members barred as individuals from going through the Government files, but would permit Federal employees to volunteer information to them.

Mr. President, in reading the document which the President of the United States signed, I noticed nothing to the effect that he omitted the part with respect to volunteering. The only thing he omitted, and the real thing that he omitted, was in the use of the word "requested", instead of "directed." He did not add to what the Congress did in trying to protect witnesses in the investigation. He did not allow any individual member to ask any witness any questions whatever, and, so far as the original order was concerned, it prohibited witnesses from communicating in any way with any member of the committee.

Mr. President, there are men in the armed services and in other branches of the Government who would like to talk to members of the committee. They would like to give them some facts. I believe there is a mistaken impression as to what the President intended to do. I heard the conversation with the President of the United States. There was a request that he sign the paper without scratching out any part of it. The order was submitted as I have read it.

I wish to explain to the Senate why I asked for a continuance of this matter from the 15th of November until the 23d. Yesterday when I made that motion I was not permitted to talk to any member of the Army or Navy, or any officer of the State Department, or any other witness. We do not have all the exhibits. I have had the privilege of seeing four volumes of the Navy Department files. In a few days their return was requested, before I had time to read them. If we are intelligently to bring this matter to the attention of the people of the United States, every Senator ought to know what he is talking about before he examines any witness. Not having the right to talk to any witness, being expressly forbidden to do so by orders of the President of the United States, although that privilege was requested by the entire committee, I asked for a continuance because in good faith I did not believe that we could adequately obtain for the people and the Congress all the facts. My request was rejected by a straight party vote. I hope that politics can be kept out of this investigation. It is no place for politics. The desire is to obtain machinery so that all the facts may be disclosed.

Yesterday the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] renewed his motion that he be permitted to examine the records in Navy files 7001 to 7003, and that he be permitted to see what, if anything, had happened to certain FCC files.

Again the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] voted with the Senator from Maine, the Senator from Michigan, the Representative from California, and the Representative from Wisconsin, making a tie vote of 5 to 5, thus prohibiting the Senator from Maine or any other member of the committee from looking into any file, so far as the records were concerned, or talking with any of the witnesses.

In order that I might obey the order of the President of the United States, I telephoned this morning to find out whether or not the President had signed the order which the committee had unanimously agreed upon and submitted to the White House yesterday. At 10:30 it was said that the President had not signed the order. At 12:12 I telephoned and talked to a Mr. Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins said that the President had not yet signed the order. At 1:05, when I was in the Senate Chamber and endeavoring to obtain the floor, I was informed that the President had not signed the order. At about 1:30 the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] came to my desk and showed me a memorandum which was signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator say he talked to a man in the White House by the name of Hopkins?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. What is his first name?

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not obtain it. I talked first to Mr. Ayers, and he told me he would switch me to a gentleman in the press-relations department. I do not mean to infer at all that it was Harry Hopkins to whom I talked. I wish to clear the record in that respect.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say that my office took up the matter with Mr. Samuel Rosenman, at the White House, at about 10 o'clock this morning, and found out that the order had not been signed. So I gathered that it was a matter primarily in his charge and responsibility; at least, that was my information.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, here is the memorandum which now has been signed by the President:

> Memorandum for the chief executives of all executive departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff:
>
> With further reference to my letter of November 7, 1945—

That is the one I read—

addressed to the above executives, you are requested further to authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, whether or not they are interrogated by the committee or its counsel, to come forward and disclose orally to any member of the joint congressional committee on the investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack any information they may have on the subject of the inquiry which they may have reason to think has not already been disclosed to the committee.

This does not include any files or written material.

O. K.
H. S. T.

I take it that the initials "H. S. T." are those of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, that memorandum is not a compliance with the request of the entire joint committee representing both Houses of Congress. The memorandum is not a directive. It is a request, as I said. I know it to be a fact that one of the members of the committee was approached by a man in the services who said to him, "As soon as you get a certified copy of the order, then I am willing to talk to you." But, Mr. President, what right would any member of the committee have if he took a certified copy of that memorandum and tried to get the information on the basis of it?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, is it not clear from a reading of what the President terms his letter of November 7, which I take it is the so-called order which was signed yesterday, that the memorandum now referred to is in further reference to that letter, so it is in the nature of a supplement to the letter of request addressed to the members of the Government departments? If that is correct, is it not also clear that the final sentence which has been added to the communication, namely, "This does not include any files or written material," may almost inevitably and very naturally be interpreted by every member of the Government as meaning that he is not to give any information regarding any files or written material, since the earlier part of both the order and supplemental letter refers to giving information? Now the President adds at the end of the memorandum, "This does not include any files or written material." It seems to me almost impossible for any layman, certainly, to read the letter without concluding that he is forbidden to give any information regarding any files or written material. Does not the Senator think that is correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, certainly that is the way the ordinary person would understand it. The memorandum is specific in language. It begins as follows:

With further reference to my letter of November 7, 1945, addressed to the above executives, you are further requested to authorize—

And then ends by saying:

This does not include any files or written material.

In other words, Mr. President, if a matter is in the mind of an individual and is not contained in a file or in written material, he would then feel he was authorized to divulge the information. Mr. President, why is there quibbling over words? Why has the language of the entire request been changed? I think each and every one of the Members of the Senate should ask that question. Why all this quibbling over these words?

Let me read this memorandum as any layman would interpret it. What does the letter authorize? We notice that the President left out the words "any of its members" or "to any of its members" in the letter of the 7th of November. Then the President says this in the memorandum:

To authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, whether or not they are interrogated by the committee or its counsel, to come forward and disclose orally to any member of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack—

What is he permitted to do? It is this—

any information they may have on the subject of the inquiry which they may have reason to think has not already been disclosed to the committee.

The reference is only to such information as they have reason to believe has not already been disclosed to the committee. Notice how narrow and how restricted the language is, even forgetting for the moment that the committee members cannot see any files or any written material—although I take it, Mr. President, that the great mass of evidence in this case must be in the form of written memorandum; it must have been placed in files, because the Government, as a rule, not as an exception, functions by means of written memorandums.

Therefore, I again review the situation, Mr. President, because I wish the Senate to know the restrictions which have been placed around this committee in advance of the taking up of this most important matter. The committee has voted down the request to postpone the hearings for 1 week, namely, to the 23d of November. The hearing will start on the 15th of November. With these restrictions, Mr. President, it is my humble judgment that it will take twice as long to try the case and it will add confusion upon confusion, because the members of the committee will not have before them the information they will need in order to bring out the facts in chronological order.

So I think the time has come when all of us should know exactly what we should expect. It is my hope and desire that there can be another meeting of the entire committee, that it can have issued an order which will be of at least some value, as we suggested before, and that the committee will not be further restricted in its efforts to obtain the evidence for the people of the United States on this most important subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I sincerely regret the necessity of parading again before the Senate a rehash and reiteration, practically, of what was said here last Friday in discussing the action of the joint committee with reference to procedure. I do not know just what the Senator from Michigan or any other Senator has in mind to accomplish by these reiterations before the Senate as to what the committee has or has not done. I would hesitate to believe or to state that it is for the purpose of discrediting the investigation in advance, by creating an impression that unfairness is to be practiced by the committee or by a majority of the committee, or by attempting to create the impression that the committee is to be gagged and denied an opportunity to obtain all the facts in regard to the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Whatever may be the motive, Mr. President, of course the effect among those who desire to discredit the investigation in advance—and there are in this country some persons who do desire to discredit it in advance—is to offer to that element of our people, however large or small it may be, an excuse for the belief and the assertion, before they know what is to be revealed, before there has been a single day's hearing by the joint committee, that, after all, this is not to be an honest investigation made in good faith to determine the facts, whatever they may turn out to be.

Therefore, I think it is most unfortunate that, first, the impression is attempted to be created here that the committee itself has been unfair or has sought to gag itself in regard to obtaining the facts, and now, today, by implication, if not by direct statement, that President Truman is charged in effect with attempting to gag the committee by reason of his action in signing the documents which have been placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I do not intend to consume very much more of the time of the Senate by reiterating what was said in the Senate last Friday. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] placed various matters seriatim in the RECORD as if he were laying a foundation for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States in connection with the action of the committee in determining what it would or would not do. He was as meticulous in putting those matters into the RECORD according to date and number as if he had been making a record for appeal to some court. I assume that he wishes to have the Senate and the country understand all that has been attempted by him and his colleagues in the committee. I raise no objection to a reprinting of those matters in the RECORD which were printed in the RECORD last Friday. All of them, except the modifications which the President issued on the 7th of this month and today, were put into the RECORD last Friday.

Without reading them again, allow me briefly to recount what happened. On the day when the War and Navy Department reports were issued on their investigations with regard to Pearl Harbor, the President issued his directive of August 23. It was a very proper directive. He issued it in the performance of his duty as President of the United States in order to protect the cryptanalytic code messages which were coming in constantly and being intercepted by the departments, and which were bearing current information day by day, almost

up to the minute, from various parts of the world. In order that those messages would be protected and the information in them not be given to the public, which might result in the Government being deprived of an opportunity to continue obtaining the information which the Secretary of State was using in dealing with delicate matters all over the world, the order was issued on the 28th of August before any person had thought of submitting a resolution for a congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor. That was about 10 days before the resolution was agreed to by the Senate on September 6. It had no connection whatever with the Pearl Harbor investigation. The order was issued for the protection of the Government of the United States in obtaining secret information which it needed, and which it felt was vital to its interests. That Executive order, or directive, remained in force without modification until the 23d of October.

In the meantime the committee had met and had chosen counsel to make necessary preparations, and investigations and examinations of files necessary in order that he might be in a position to examine witnesses and conduct the examination and investigation which was to be held later. As I said last Friday, I shall not go into those matters and put them into the RECORD.

As chairman of the committee, I wrote to the President, the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of War, and requested that arrangements be made so that the committee's counsel could have someone to whom he might go in order to obtain information without cruising about Government buildings and going up blind alleys here and there. I asked that there be designated in each department and at the White House a person from whom counsel could obtain papers and all the information which he desired. The President, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of War promptly responded by giving the name of a person in each Department and at the White House who could be contacted by the counsel in obtaining the information which he wished to have.

The Navy Department was somewhat meticulous, in view of the order of the 28th of August, which perhaps had more relationship to the Navy than to any other department, because it was largely through the Navy Department that the cryptanalytic messages were being received. The Navy Department was still a little hesitant, as I have said, and a little fearful that they might in some way divulge facts which would result in a discontinuance of the information which they were obtaining from all over the world through the use of the so-called cryptanalytic decoding method.

Mr. Mitchell, the counsel, came to me as chairman of the committee and said that he desired to ascertain if the President would not modify the order of August 28 so that there would be no difficulty in obtaining all the information which he desired to have, and so that neither the Navy Department nor any other department of the Government would have any fear that in giving such information they would be violating the order or the directive of August 28.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have never quite understood why issuance of the order of August 28 was not necessary while the war was on, but that it became necessary after the war was over.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not go into that matter, and if I did so probably the Senator from Ohio would not understand it after I had explained it. It was necessary for the order to be issued. It is not necessary to explain why it was necessary to do so. The Secretary of State, the State Department, and the President of the United States thought that it was necessary, and I think that it was necessary, although my word will have no weight with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I was merely wondering why it was not necessary that such an order be issued during the war, when it became suddenly necessary after the war was over.

Mr. BARKLEY. While the war was in progress other methods were being used by which the Government of the United States was being protected against the disclosure of secret information. At any rate, the President of the United States thought that it was necessary to issue this directive. When Mr. Mitchell indicated that he would have a freer hand if the President would modify the order of August 28, he and I went and talked with the President. At my request the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy were present. The matter was discussed at that meeting. In the meantime, counsel had drawn a directive which he thought was adequate to assure him everything which he needed, regardless of the order of August 28.

The Senator from Michigan conferred with the counsel and suggested an alternative order. The order which was drawn by the counsel provided a modification of the August 28 directive to the extent that the departments and agencies of the Government should give to the committee which Congress had set up, a joint committee, all the information that it might request. The Senator from Michigan wanted the modification enlarged so as to include each individual member of the committee, and provide that each individual member of the committee would be authorized by the modification of the President's directive of August 28 to go into any department, examine any files by himself, and examine anything which he saw fit to examine. Such was the alternative order which was drawn up at the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan and taken to the White House by Mr. Mitchell, the counsel of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to invite attention to Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, which was submitted on September 6, 1945. That resolution informs me for the first time that the committee had no right, under the order to which reference has been made, even to consider the resolution which was offered by the Senator from Michigan which would permit any individual member of the committee to go unaccompanied to a department and seek information in any files. I read from section 4 (a) of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27:

> The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress (prior to January 3, 1946), to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

In other words, we are acting as a committee under the instructions of the Senate of the United States, and, in my humble opinion, there is absolutely nothing in the resolution which would give the committee power to approve a resolution within the committee itself directing and authorizing any individual member of the committee to do what the Senator from Michigan has sought to do through his resolution.

Furthermore, Mr. President, while I am on my feet and discussing this matter, I wish to say that there has never been a time in the history of the Senate, according to some who ought to know, notwithstanding the many statements which have been made with respect to the Truman committee, when a single individual member of a committee was designated to hold hearings unless approval had been given definitely by the committee The chairman of the Truman committee and the chairman of the Mead committee have always designated the individual Senator who held hearings in connection with a matter which was under consideration. The one thing for which the Truman committee and the Mead committee have been criticized, so far as private conversations in the Senate are concerned, was that they permitted an individual Senator to hold, so to speak, a side show of his own in some section of the country without another member of the committee being present to assist in taking care of the situation.

What the Senator from Michigan is attempting to do is to import into the Senate the practice which he followed in the State of Michigan, that of having a one-man investigation, and overturn and upset the rules and precedents of the Senate which have been in effect for many years.

In my humble opinion, it will not be possible to find a record of a committee at any time in the history of the Senate giving to any single individual the power the Senator from Michigan is seeking to have in connection with his resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not yield at the moment. I will yield after making an observation.

I do not know anything about the practice indulged in by the Senator from Michigan in Michigan when he was judge

there. I have heard a good deal of newspaper comment about what they called a one-man grand jury. I do not know whether that was justified or not, and I do not care to comment on it. I do not know what the Senator from Michigan did, or whether he was a one-man grand jury. I do not care about it. I do know what he is trying to do here; that is, have the President of the United States modify an order previously issued by him so as to allow individual members of the Senate, as the resolution was offered, without any authority from the committee, or without even consulting the committee, to arm themselves with that modification and go to any department and examine any file they might desire to see. That is the form in which the memorandum was offered in the committee asking the President to modify his order of October 23.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I concur in what the Senator from Illinois has said with reference to authorizing a single member of the committee to hold hearings. I have served on a good many investigations since I have been a Member of the Senate, and some very important ones. I assisted to quite an extent in the Teapot Dome investigation carried on by my colleague, Senator Walsh, of Montana, and likewise I carried on the investigation of the Department of Justice. I was a minority member of the committee.

In all my experience with any investigating committee, I have never known of any one member of a committee not being permitted to go and look over the files in any department of the Government of the United States. This is the first time I have ever known anything of that kind being questioned. I think it is very unfortunate that the question should be brought up, because I feel we should have confidence enough in the Members of the Senate and in the members of committees, so that any member of a committee should be permitted to look over any files he might desire to examine.

I call attention to the fact that in the Daugherty investigation I sent for files myself, I asked for files from the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Daugherty. He refused to give them to me. I have forgotten the ground he stated, but at any rate he refused to give them to me. When he did so, the President of the United States, Mr. Coolidge, called him in and asked for his resignation, and Mr. Daugherty was eliminated from the office of Attorney General. After that time, when the new Attorney General was appointed, every single file I ever asked for, as a minority member of the committee, was furnished to me.

I think what is happening now is very unfortunate. I think, possibly, it is giving the country the wrong impression. I cannot conceive any member of any committee asking for files and being refused them.

As I have stated, my colleague, Senator Walsh, of Montana, was a minority member of the committee investigating the Teapot Dome situation. I know of my own personal knowledge that he got from the Department, and from officials in the Department, information which he afterward used, and if he had not been permitted to do that, and if I had not been permitted to do it, I am sure there would have been a complete failure of the investigation of the Department of Justice.

I can conceive of possibly a little different situation in this case, because there might be some secret files of the Department with reference to certain things which they might not want investigated unless there were more than one member of the committee present, but certainly there could not be any question as to most of the files.

It seems to me we are reflecting on individual Members of the Senate when we say we will not trust one Senator to examine any files he may desire to see. Certainly it has not been the practice in any committee of this body on which I have ever served not to let an individual member look over the files in any department of the Government.

I am sure that no man who has served upon any committee with me, investigating railroad finances, or anything else, has not always felt free to go and look at files. I have not followed closely the matter now under discussion, I came in late and heard only the last part of the debate, but as I understand, the committee itself finally suggested that any member of the committee could look at the files. I may be wrong.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan, but after that I shall not yield further until I conclude my consecutive statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure the Senator will permit me to make one comment, in view of his statement that he was not informed as to what the junior Senator from Michigan may have done in his own commonwealth in the course of his very brilliant career as a circuit judge.

I ask the Senator to permit me to testify that the junior Senator from Michigan is probably the most fearless and effective searcher after truth the Middle West has seen in all its jurisprudence. I should like to testify that he pursued his investigations, in spite of every obstacle, with a courage and efficiency which produced astonishing results which no one had anticipated could possibly be disclosed, and if the efforts the able junior Senator from Michigan made in his capacity as an investigator in Michigan can be the criterion by which to judge the activities of the committee when the Pearl Harbor investigation comes to its ultimate conclusion, I can assure the Senator from Kentucky that at least the people of Michigan will be satisfied that a job has been well done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no desire to dispute what the Senator from Michigan has said, but granting all that, I feel compelled to say that all virtue and all honesty and all righteousness do not repose in the bosom of the junior Senator from Michigan. There are other Senators in this Chamber and other Senators on this committee who are just as fearless and just as sincere in trying to obtain the truth with regard to this matter as any other Senator on the committee can possibly be, regardless of his previous record as an investigator.

I was trying to recount what had happened. Mr. Mitchell and I went to the White House. We discussed this matter with the President, with the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of War. The counsel presented two alternative modifications to the President. He declined to sign the one which gave to committee members individually the right to go into the departments and examine papers which they might want to examine. He refused to sign that, and he gave his reasons. He had a right to refuse. He had what he thought, and what I think, were just grounds for declining to do that. But he did sign the other order, which lifted the ban which had been imposed by the order of August 28 insofar as the committee set up by the Congress of the United States was concerned, against obtaining all the information available and having access to all the papers which were pertinent to the inquiry in regard to Pearl Harbor.

Following that modification all the departments of the Government have without hesitation and without exception, turned over to Mr. William D. Mitchell, a former Attorney General, former Solicitor General of the United States, a distinguished lawyer, a man of outstanding character and integrity, who has no political motive to serve in the remotest degree in what he does here, all the information and all the papers for which he has asked.

Notwithstanding that, the Senator from Michigan offered his memorandum in the committee the other day asking the President to modify his order of the 23d of October, which did not include the right of individual members, on their own, to go to the departments themselves and examine the files. We voted it down, unfortunately, by a party alinement. I do not know which party is more responsible or more blameworthy in a situation like that, where men decide according to party lines. It is unfortunate, but all the blame for dividing on party lines does not allocate itself to the majority. The minority is just as much to blame for making it a political matter, if it is a political matter, as the majority. It is unfortunate that the opinions of the members of the committee divide as to the propriety or the necessity of asking the President, by a modification of his own order, to give individual members the right to go into the files often unaccompanied by anybody else, and that is what the order provided for.

As I said the other day, the Concurrent Resolution, No. 27, authorizes the committee to set up subcommittees. It may turn out that it will be necessary, in the process of the hearings, to appoint subcommittees, but I do not remember any committee on which I ever served in which subcommittees were authorized, where a subcommittee of only one was

ever appointed. Subcommittees are supposed to be made up of at least two, and whenever they are appointed, there is generally a member of the majority and a member of the minority. Usually subcommittees consist of three members. No matter which party is in power, the majority controls. Nobody ever disputed that, no one ever thought of anything else before, except that when the concurrent resolution reached the House of Representatives, the minority Members caucused on whether they should demand that there be equal membership for both parties, notwithstanding nothing like that had ever been done in the history of the Senate or the House of Representatives. It is easy to see how, if that were done, and there were party divisions, the committee could never do anything by majority vote. It would always be a tie vote, and the committee would be stymied from the beginning. Fortunately the House did not agree to that suggestion, and the usual practice of the majority party having a majority of the members of the committee was adopted, and there was no complaint about that in the Senate, and no effort was made to change that rule.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that the committee counsel has the right to investigate all the records which are now sought to be investigated by individual members of the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. He has. He has not only the right, but he has exercised it, and he has not been denied anything. He has brought many of the records to the Senate Office Building, where he and his corps of assistants are working, and the minority members of the committee have had access to them and have taken them out, with the cooperation of Mr. Mitchell. In fact, they have taken out so many of them that majority members have not had a chance to see some of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Kentucky believe that any member of the committee distrusts the committee counsel?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not say that any member of the committee distrusts the committee counsel. Evidently somebody is dissatisfied with the information he is getting from the departments, although he has repeatedly told us that he has not been denied anything that he sought in any department since the order of October 23.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it not be possible for any committee member to obtain such data through the committee counsel?

Mr. BARKLEY. It not only is possible but it is being done every day, and in most cases by the minority members of the committee who go to his office and get it, and they have the right to do so. They have asked for these things, and Mr. Mitchell has turned over to all of them who have come to his office everything they have asked for. They have even taken it out of his office and taken it home with them, and to their offices. They are doing that every day.

Mr. TAFT. Why not, may I ask?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not say they should not. But they are doing it.

Mr. TAFT. But they are being deprived of the right to prepare a case.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. They are being deprived of the right——

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not yield to the Senator. I announced that I would not yield until I had made a consecutive statement. But inasmuch as the Senator has interrupted me anyhow I will let him finish his statement.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is avoiding the issue. The question is whether a member of an investigating committee can listen to people who have a story to tell, can develop the facts, can look at the files and find the information on which the examination and cross-examination of witnesses can be based. So long as Senators are obliged simply to wait until counsel has some documents he is willing to turn over to them they cannot possibly perform their duties. That is the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio is not charged with the responsibility of determining whether we can perform our duties or not. The committee will act upon that, and will act in good faith. And when the investigation has been completed and all the facts have been revealed, as they will be revealed, in an orderly way by the committee through the agencies which it has chosen and will choose, no honest or sincere man in America will have any ground to complain as to the methods by which this committee has proceeded with its work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether it was not the purpose of the committee in employing counsel to enable him to work up a case?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator from Ohio wants to answer that question. I will yield to him if he wants to.

The committee is endeavoring to adopt a method of practical procedure, and is trying to work out an orderly way by which this investigation can be conducted. If the Senator from Michigan by an amendment of the Presidential order were himself permitted to go to a department, or if the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Kentucky and the five members of the House of Representatives were given such permission, and each one of them was boring around separately like a termite [laughter] to find out something—I am not making an invidious comparison, but it is an illustrative term—if each was boring around separately, and if I had any suspicion of the Senator from Michigan and I had learned that he had been in the department and he had scoured around for a lot of papers, the natural thing for me would be to go down and scour around behind him to see what he did and what the other Senators did. And they would want to scour behind me, and all of them individually would be active in going to the departments, and we would not get started on the hearings until Christmas 1948.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is it not rather unusual for members of a committee to ventilate their differences before the Senate? I have been here for 9 years, and I do not know of a single instance when such a thing has been done. I want to say that when a few months ago I voted for the resolution creating the committee I did so reluctantly, because I felt then as I feel now, that what would result would be a ventilation of politics and nothing else.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I join the Senator from Michigan in trying fervently to keep politics out of this case.

Mr. TAFT. I want to ask the Senator a question. The Senator from Louisiana asked why such a thing as this has not happened before in 9 years. That has been answered by the Senator from Montana, that never before has a committee tried to hamper the activities of its individual members.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not only never before, but not even now has the committee or the President of the United States tried to hamper any member of the committee in getting the facts. The fact that the President of the United States has not been willing to issue an order to all the departments that individual Senators in their individual capacities are to be allowed to go through the departments, is not done to handicap the committee. The committee can transact its business in an orderly way.

Mr. President, the general counsel matches ability with any of the members of the committee, certainly as a lawyer he does, and as a patriotic American citizen he does, and in experience he matches any member of the committee in any field in which he may operate. The American people have the greatest respect for him as a lawyer and as a man. He has gone about his duties in an orderly way as a lawyer, and without regard to politics. Since the order of the 23d of October he has received the cooperation of all departments in obtaining information.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I asked that I be permitted to continue.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wanted to know why for days he has failed to have delivered to him certain papers requested, if he is receiving the cooperation of the departments. I think he would testify to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what papers the Senator has in mind, but I imagine that in the multiplicity of all the papers in all the departments and in all the bureaus and in all the divisions and agencies arcund Washington that have had anything to do with the war, it would be utterly impossible, no matter how diligent they might be, to deliver to Mr. Mitchell all the papers he might request in a day or in some instances within a week. As fast as he has been able to obtain them he has made them available to every member of this committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It has been more than a week. Mr. President, the test seems to be that the majority of the committee is satisfied that counsel can merely request that the various departments furnish the data. In other words, this is to be an investigation by Congress by having the various departments investigate themselves. That is the way it stands at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that is an absolutely inaccurate and unfounded statement and description of the way the matter stands at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not yield further. I did not interrupt the Senator while he was speaking. I yielded to him for a question, but instead of asking a question he made a statement. If he wants to ask me a question I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to ask a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know how many times the counsel, General Mitchell, has been in any department or looked into any file? Can the Senator answer that?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I have not taken a census of the movements of General Mitchell. I have not followed him around like I was suspicious of him. I have not followed him around to count his steps or find where he has been. I have sufficient confidence in him to believe that he will go wherever his duty requires him to go, and he will do it both day and night and on Sundays, as he has been doing it for the last 5 or 6 weeks, trying to get this case ready to present to the committee.

Mr. President, the other day these different memoranda were offered in the committee and they were voted upon. It does not make any difference whether the two resolutions offered by the Senator from Michigan were voted on first or whether the motion made by the Senator from Maine was voted on first. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] described the procedure accurately the other day. When the motion of the Senator from Michigan was pending, during the discussion of the relevancy and the propriety of that motion, the Senator from Maine asked that consideration of it be suspended while he made a motion that he be authorized instanter, in person, forthwith, to go down to some department to find something he said was missing, on the theory, I think, that if it were missing, and no one else could find it, he could, or at least, if it were missing, he could ascertain that it was missing.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have mentioned the Senator's name. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish, when the Senator mentions that fact, he would also add that I suggested that the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, who is chairman of the committee, assign someone to go with me as a guardian, to make sure that I did not misconduct myself. Every time I have made such a request I have added that proviso. I wish the Senator would not emphasize too much my individual demands.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator finally suggested that someone go with him, but he did not suggest it at first, when we were discussing the motion of the Senator from Michigan and the Senator interrupted to submit his motion and ask that we vote on it, and that the other matter be laid aside until we could vote on his motion. He did not then suggest that he be accompanied by anyone. Later he did. When he finally made his motion and put it in writing and it was voted on, it carried the suggestion that he individually be permitted, along with someone whom the chairman might name—either a member of the committee or of counsel—to go along with him to examine the files. But, of course, we could not grant that authority to the Senator from Maine without granting it to every other member of the committee who might wish to have such authority.

Mr. BREWSTER. Most of them seemed to be much less eager.

Mr. BARKLEY. Most of them were less eager to do a private detective job, and more eager to conduct this investigation in an orderly way.

During the proceedings of last Friday, November 2, the committee unanimously agreed to ask the President to modify his order of October 23. In substance, the only difference was that we requested the President to modify his order so as to permit persons in the departments, whether in the armed services or in a civilian status, to volunteer to give to the committee, its counsel, or individual members of the committee, information which they might think they had, which had not been disclosed. The Senator from Michigan complains about the language in the order signed by the President this morning, which I shall read. The latter part of it reads as follows:

> Any information they may have on the subject of the inquiry which they may have reason to think has not already been disclosed to the committee.

That is the precise language contained in the Senator's own resolution, which he offered last Friday, and which was voted down by the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the language in the resolution, or in the form of order which we unanimously agreed to ask the President to sign. It is found on page 10352, in the third column, at the end of the order which we agreed to submit to the President and ask him to sign. The same language is found there, and the Senator from Michigan had not complained about it in the committee or elsewhere.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to read this language in the letter of November 2, 1945, signed by the Senator from Kentucky:

> You are directed to authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, whether in the armed services or in a civilian status, and whether or not called to testify before the joint committee, if interrogated by the committee or any of its members or counsel, to volunteer any information of which they may have knowledge bearing on the subject of the committee's investigation.

Is that in the order signed by the President?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall read the order signed by the President. It will speak for itself. The language which I quoted is in the order which we submitted. The Senator has not read that language. It is in the last paragraph.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There were two parts in the form of order which we submitted. One related to giving information if interrogated, and the other related to volunteering information. The President merely permitted them to volunteer, but did not say anything about being interrogated, and then limited witnesses so that they could not give any of the files or written material.

Mr. BARKLEY. The only substantial difference between the order which we requested the President to sign and the two orders which he signed, which must be read together, is that he used the word "requested" instead of "directed," and that he did not reiterate or requote section 3 of the resolution which I submitted, which it was not necessary to do anyway, because the resolution speaks for itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. He omitted an entire clause, and limited the order so that witnesses could not speak about files or written material.

Mr. BARKLEY. The resolution speaks for itself. The Senator from Michigan places his interpretation upon it. He has the right to do so. Others will do the same.

Mr. President, I wish to read what the President actually did. The President's position from the beginning, when we submitted these alternative directives to him, was that he did not feel justified in modifying his order so as to permit individual members of the committee to make individual investigations into the files and documents of the Government. In the order which we requested the President yesterday to sign, nothing was said about that. Our request was that the President sign a directive which would remove any possible ban or any possible fear on the part of any Government employee, whether in the civilian service or in the armed services, in volunteering information to the committee or to its individual members or its counsel, whether such employee were called to testify or not, or whether he were interrogated or not. Such an employee might be located somewhere where no one knew anything about the investigation, and if he had some information which he thought was pertinent to the issue and which had not been disclosed, he would be at liberty to disclose it. All

these resolutions provide that the information must be information not previously disclosed. Even the resolution offered by the Senator, and the one agreed upon by the committee, contained that provision. In the case of a Government employee, the ban would be lifted, if there was any ban against his volunteering information to the committee. Of course, there was no ban against anyone not in the Government service coming forward at any time and giving any information he wished to give, without the President doing anything about it. It was not necessary to issue an order to that effect.

The President had the right to issue his order in his own language. He did not have to sign on the dotted line. He did not have to take the language of a suggested order sent to him by the committee, even though unanimously agreed to. He had the right to write his own order and his own modification. I submit to the Senate and to the country, if the country is interested—and I suppose it is—that what the President has done is exactly what we asked him to do, that is, to permit those in the Government service to volunteer to give to the committee, its counsel, or individual members of the committee, any information which they might have.

This is the order which the President issued on the 7th of November, day before yesterday. It is headed:

Memorandum for: The chief executives of all executive departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

He quotes section 3 of the concurrent resolution. It is not necessary to read that.

In order to assist the joint committee to make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events leading up to or following the attack, you are requested to authorize every person—

When the President issues a request to the head of a department, I do not know that it is very much different from a directive. I suppose that any Cabinet officer has enough respect for a request of the President to honor it and abide by it, whether it is in the form of a request or in the form of a directive. At any rate, the President modified what we had submitted to the extent of substituting "requested" for "directed." I believe that under any ordinary interpretation such a request is a demand. He said:

You are requested to authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, if they are interrogated by the committee or its counsel, to give it any information of which they may have knowledge bearing on the subject of the committee's investigation.

You are further requested to authorize them whether or not they are interrogated by the committee or its counsel to come forward voluntarily and disclose to the committee or to its counsel any information they may have on the subject of the inquiry which they may have any reason to think may not already have been disclosed to the committee.

That is the exact language which was in all the resolutions considered by the committee.

This directive—

In the last paragraph he uses the word "directive"—

This directive is applicable to all persons in your departments or agencies whether they are in the armed services or not and whether or not they are called to testify before the joint committee.

That order was signed by President Truman day before yesterday. When the committee met yesterday I received from the White House this order signed by the President. I assumed, because I had not been advised to the contrary, that it was in the language prepared by the committee and submitted with the request that it be signed. Upon examining it I found that it was not in that language because it omitted reference to individual members of the committee. I took it upon myself, while the committee was in session, to talk to the President about it. He was under the impression that the order which we submitted in effect did what he had declined to do a few days ago, that is, issue an order authorizing individual members of the committee to make individual investigations and searches among the files. When he was assured that it did not do that, and that there was no such intention, he indicated his willingness to agree to it. It was submitted to him. He has drafted his own language, to do the exact things requested, but to take care not to authorize the thing to which he objected, namely, authorizing individual members of the committee to conduct individual investigations. Today he has signed this order, which is a modification of the order which he signed on the 7th of November:

Memorandum for the chief executives of all executive departments, agencies, commissions, and bureaus, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

With further reference to my letter of October 7, 1945—

That is the one which I have just read—

addressed to the above executives, you are requested further to authorize every person in your respective departments or agencies, whether or not they are interrogated by the committee or its counsel, to come forward and disclose orally to any member of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack any information they may have on the subject of the inquiry which they may have reason to think has not already been disclosed to the committee.

That is, again, the exact language of the resolution offered by the Senator from Michigan and agreed to by the committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator read the conclusion of the order?

Mr. BARKLEY. I had finished reading it, except the last sentence, which is as follows:

This does not include any files or written material.

That was the position taken by the President from the start. We never asked in our resolution, and the resolution which was agreed to in the committee, to which there was no objection in the committee—and it was sent to the White House—did not provide, that individual members of the committee should have the right to obtain papers and files or written material. It authorized those in the Government service to come forward and volunteer to any member of the committee information which he might have. That did not mean that he could go through the files, remove them, and submit them to any individual member of the committee. That was never contemplated. No one ever expressed such a view.

So the mere sentence in the President's memorandum, included so that there might be no misunderstanding, providing that employees of the Government may volunteer information which they may have, which they think has not already been disclosed to the committee or its counsel, does not include provision that such employees may bring records of the Government departments and present them to the members of the committee. Such a procedure would be utterly preposterous and unreasonable, and certainly it would not contribute to the orderly procedure of the investigation.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Michigan moved, in the committee, that the hearings be postponed until the 23d day of November. When we employed or appointed our counsel and authorized him to select a staff, we asked him how long he thought it would take before the public hearings could be begun. He said that in view of the mass of material to be gone through, he did not see how it could be done before the 10th of November. At that time there was some complaint within the committee about the length of time it would require and about the delay in beginning the open hearings on the attack at Pearl Harbor. Finally we discussed back and forth the matter of having the committee make a trip to Pearl Harbor, and we abandoned the idea of going there.

Then Mr. Mitchell or his assistants or cocounsel said he could be ready on the 12th or 15th of November, the 12th being next Monday and the 15th being next Thursday. There was a vote on the question of fixing the 15th as the date for the beginning of the hearings. As I recall, there was a yea-and-nay vote in the committee on that question. There was not a vote against beginning the hearings on that date. There were six votes in favor of beginning the hearings on the 15th. Two Senators, the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maine, declined to vote or to participate any further in the proceedings that day, because they had been unsuccessful in the motion they had made before the committee. They did not participate, and they announced that they were not certain that they would participate any further. They did not participate in that vote. But one of the members of the minority, a member from the House of Representatives, voted to fix the beginning of the hearings as of the 15th day of November.

There was no vote against that. So the vote in the committee was six to nothing, with two members voting "present."

Yesterday, when we met again, we discussed this matter for nearly 3 hours. We discussed the whole matter, including procedure, the rules which would govern the examination of witnesses, and all related matters. All those points were agreed to in the committee without objection. We again asked Mr. Mitchell when he would be ready to proceed and how long it would take to complete the testimony which he would be ready to begin on next Thursday. He reiterated that the counsel would be ready to begin on next Thursday and that they already had sufficient testimony assembled and a sufficient number of witnesses ready to be brought in to consume the committee's time for 3 or 4 weeks. In other words, there is enough testimony now available to consume the time of the committee, as he said until the 15th or 20th day of December.

In view of that record and showing, in view of their readiness to begin next Thursday, the committee did not feel it would be wise to put off the hearing until Thanksgiving week, when sufficient testimony was already available and ready to be produced to consume the time of the committee, sitting morning and afternoon, until the 15th or 20th of December. So the committee voted down the Senator's motion to postpone the beginning of the hearings.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, when the hearings have begun in public, as they will be, every bit of testimony that will be brought forward, whether it be documentary or oral, whether it be from civilians or from men in the services—from whatever source it may come—will be made public, it will be heard in public, and I think when the public hear the testimony and digest it and observe the methods adopted in its production they will be entirely satisfied with the course the committee is going to pursue in trying to bring forth all facts available from every possible source, regardless of the consequences, in connection with the unfortunate episode which brought us into the world war.

Now I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think it might be well to state for the RECORD at this point, in view of the subject matter the able Senator has been discussing, that Mr. Mitchell also told the committee that he was now having prepared mimeographed copies and photographic copies of every exhibit, including top-secret exhibits, which will be produced before the committee during the next 3 weeks of testimony, and that those exhibits would be in the hands of the committee 3 or 4 or 5 days in advance of the appearance of witnesses on the witness stand, in order to give the committee a real opportunity to study the documents before that time. After all the exhibits have been produced and after all the testimony has been taken, if there is any question whatever which remains unsolved, or if there are any loose ends to be picked up at that time, I, as one member of the committee, wish to have the Senate and the country know that I shall insist that a subcommittee be appointed to run down any material or pertinent facts which may remain unexplained. I think that is the orderly way to proceed, and I think that is the way the committee is proceeding.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. Mitchell said to the committee that this program is not complete or exclusive, but it is based on the evidence and the testimony he has been able to assemble. He said it would take the time of the committee until the 15th or 20th of December, and that when that was concluded or at any stage during the process of its presentation if the committee felt it was desirable to obtain any other information on any subject not fully covered by the testimony which will be adduced, or when it has all been sworn to and submitted, then the committee could take stock of the situation and could obtain any other information, from any source from which it might see fit to obtain it, in order that the record might be completed.

The resolution gives the committee the right to issue subpenas and to call for the production of documents before the committee—by force, if necessary. So we do not have to relegate to the Members of the Senate the matter of having documents produced or subpenaing witnesses to appear before the committee. The committee has the right to subpena witnesses or to call for the production of documents because the Senate has given it that right. I can assure the Senate and the country that in any case in which the committee desires further information on any phase of this subject, if it is necessary to issue a subpena or to compel the production of documents in order that the committee may have the full information, the committee will have the cooperation of the entire committee, and especially will it have the cooperation of the chairman of the committee. There is nothing about this record, nothing about this unfortunate episode, that I desire to conceal, and nothing that I am making an attempt to conceal; but I feel most profoundly that if our committee is to enjoy the confidence and credit of the people of the country it must proceed with some dignity, it must proceed in an orderly way, it must proceed in such a way as to give the committee as a whole the right to have the confidence of the American people. I do not believe anything should be done or said which would foredoom the investigation by means of creating any prejudice on the part of the American people or the American Congress that the committee and every member of it is not just as anxious and just as sincere in the effort to obtain the facts as is the Senate as a whole or the Congress as a whole or any individual member of the committee.

I have not been willing and I am not now willing to cast any doubt upon the integrity or good faith of any member of the committee. Certainly I am not going to say in advance that the members of the committee do not enjoy or should not enjoy the confidence and esteem of the body which authorized their selection or of the distinguished presiding officers who selected them in this body and in the other body, and I am not going to do that until I am forced to conclude, which I hope will be never, that there is a desire on the part of any member of the committee to shun any part of his duty or to shun the throwing of the white light of publicity upon these entire transactions, or any desire that anyone who is guilty of any misconduct, whether willful or negligent, shall be shielded or have in any way mitigated his censure because of any lack of performance of his duty. I hope the same rule may apply to the committee as a whole and to every member of it.

Mr. President, I regret having been compelled to take the time which I have taken in discussing this matter. I hope that when we start the hearings there will be no further occasion to parade any internal differences between the members of the committee as to how we shall proceed. I hope that we will do a good job and do it in a way which will be in accordance with the dignity of this body, as well as the other body of the Congress, and in a way which will satisfy the American people as to the good faith which may be exercised in withholding any facts which it may be necessary to refrain from disclosing.

I ask the Senator from Michigan if he put into the RECORD the order of the 7th of October, and the one of today. I do not wish to have them inserted if they are already in the RECORD.

Mr. FERGUSON. They are both in the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I certainly share the sentiments which have been expressed by the Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, to keep this investigation on the plane upon which it was placed in the original statement which he made before this body when submitting his resolution. His remarks were in a very lofty tone, and I think they were an inspiration to both the Senate and the country as a whole.

For 7 weeks we have endeavored to arrive at a solution of our difficulties. It was only with the most profound reluctance that we presented to the Senate what seemed to us to be essential with relation to the difficulties which had developed and which seemed to us to hamper the conduct of a complete investigation.

The Senator from Kentucky spoke rather eloquently about the position of the majority and the minority, and stated that the minority had no monopoly on patriotism and intelligence. With that statement we are certainly in accord. The only distinction between the majority and the minority, in respect to this particular situation, is that the majority are investigating themselves while

the minority are conducting the long-established function in connection with Anglo-Saxon parliamentary government of investigating the actions of those in administrative control. I submit that when the majority exercises their undoubted power to repress or restrain the minority, they assume a very serious responsibility. It is to that situation that we have directed our attention.

In dealing with the particular issue before us as embraced in the various orders which have been discussed it seems to me that the issue is greatly simplified. The committee, after careful consideration for many weeks, upon learning of the Presidential order which has seemed somewhat extraordinary in denying to the members of the executive department the right to disclose information to Members of Congress, it being fully recognized as being very extraordinary, sought finally to have the order modified. The counsel for the committee prepared an order. Subsequently the committee, after very careful consideration and deliberation in several meetings, decided upon a draft of a supplemental order which the President would be requested to sign. The supplemental order was drafted by the counsel of the committee who has been highly and properly praised. The draft received the unanimous approval of the committee after it had been given careful consideration.

As the distinguished majority leader has said, the supplemental order was designed so that any person in any department of the United States Government who has or thinks he has any information may not only be permitted but encouraged and adjured to come voluntarily before the committee as a whole, or before the committee counsel, or before any individual member of the committee, and reveal what he knows. That was the purpose of the modified order which was submitted to the President by the unanimous approval of the committee.

We now come to the important part of the situation. The President declined to sign the supplemental order. About 2 hours ago the President signed a modified version of the order. It seems to me that it must be very clear that either the amended Presidential order gives the same authority as the one which was submitted by the committee, or that it does not. If it is the same as the committee order, why could not the President or his advisers yield to the representations of a committee of 10 Members of the Congress of the United States in requesting him to sign the supplemental order in the form in which it was submitted? If, on the other hand, he proposed to make changes in the order, which was done, why would it not have been in order for a discussion to have been held by the Executive advisers before the changes were made?

None of us needs to be under any delusions that the President of the United States can take time to study this involved question. He necessarily must depend upon the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and Mr. Samuel Rosenman, who apparently has been the White House adviser in connection with this matter, and ascertain in consultation with, let us say, Mr. Mitchell or with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], whether or not a modification of the order might be developed which would be agreeable to all concerned. That would seem to be a proper deference to be exhibited between the two great branches of this Government.

A serious question might be raised as to whether the Congress or the committee might not exercise its authority independently, and whether or not the President of the United States has any right to order, direct, or limit any member of this Government in furnishing testimony to the Congress when the Congress is exercising its proper authority in connection with an investigation of this character concerning not only legislation of the past but legislation of the future.

The only opinion I care to express upon a preliminary reading of the modified amended order—and it is very unfortunate as I believe—and as I have pointed out that these differences have arisen—as issued by the President is that it seems to have been designed—and here I make no reference to the President because I think we must recognize that he could not himself have done this—with devilish ingenuity, and leaves employees of the executive department in serious doubt as to what they are supposed to do. I refer in particular to the final language of the order, which is extremely ambiguous, and reads as follows:

> This does not include any files or written material.

I shall not challenge the good faith of whoever drew that order. It was certainly not the President of the United States. However, no language could have been more nicely calculated, if it was so designed, to leave the executive employees of the Government in confusion as to how far their authority was to go. Practically all questions associated with this matter are concerned with files, and material, and information therein contained. The addition to the order of the words which I have read would certainly cause any employee of the Government to be in very serious doubt as to whether he has a right to give any information concerning files of written material. I do not say that the language was designed for that purpose, but the danger is that such an interpretation may be very easily applied. The result is that today the committee is far less advanced than it was before the order was issued. I could wish that this matter had been discussed with the counsel of the committee, Mr. Mitchell, or with the distinguished majority leader who himself, so far as I am advised, was not consulted, but who did, as he stated, take it up with the President yesterday and asked him to sign the order after it had been agreed to by the committee following very careful consideration. I assert that whoever took the responsibility of advising the President with regard to the change to which I have referred assumed a most unfortunate responsibility under the circumstances in this case. I can only hope that further deliberation may lead those responsible to accept the committee order in the form in which it was sent down to the President after a unanimous vote of the committee.

I share the hope that we may go forward and develop all the facts, as that is obviously what the people of the United States desire to have done.

The distinguished majority leader has suggested that perhaps an appeal was being prepared for the Supreme Court. I may say that the final court of appeal in this matter will be the people of the United States. Sooner or later they will have full opportunity to manifest their own views as to whether or not this case is being adequately explored. Then it will be possible to resolve the entire situation in accordance with the democratic principles under which this Government is supposed to function.

RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH DIVISION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the Thirty-seventh Division, which is now in the Philippines. The Thirty-seventh Division is the Ohio National Guard division. Many of the men of that division have been in the Army for more than 5 years. They have been abroad for more than 3 years. The Thirty-seventh is one of the most distinguished combat divisions of the Army. It is still in Manila. It includes 17,000 men, all of whom have points enough for discharge, but apparently the War Department has not succeeded in moving them from the Philippines to the United States.

The Thirty-seventh Division have been serving overseas since May 26, 1942. They saw action in New Georgia, in Bougainville, in Luzon. They were one of the first two divisions to enter the city of Manila. Their time in combat equals if it does not exceed that of any other combat division in that theater. Their casualties have been high. In the recent interrogation of General Yamashita he stated that among the Japanese of his command the Thirty-seventh Division was one of the most feared and highly respected combat divisions in the Pacific. The commander in chief never failed to recognize the high combat efficiency of the division when difficult tasks were to be performed.

Despite cessation of hostilities, and the fact that the division have been promised return to the United States their return has been constantly postponed. Other divisions which have seen shorter service have been put ahead of them. Even a good many replacement units have actually been returned to the United States.

I took this matter up with the War Department, and received a letter dated November 1 from General Reber stating that the Secretary of War asked him to let me know that the Thirty-seventh Division is at present scheduled to sail for the United States about the middle of November. Today a radio broadcast from Manila states that their departure is again postponed. They do not know when they are going to leave or when they are to be back in the United States, or whether they can possibly be home in time for Christmas.

The men of this division feel very strongly that discrimination has been

shown because they were a National Guard division, because the general commanding them was one of the few National Guard officers who retained command of his division. They believe they are being discriminated against by the authorities in charge. I do not know whether there is any basis for that feeling or not. I have received telegrams from officers and men of entire battalions of the division. Apparently the feeling in the divison is extremely strong, and I should like to bring to the attention of the public and of the War Department the fact that I think an injustice is being done, and that the men of this division should be placed on the list for immediate return to this country. They have a priority over any other division now in the Philippines, or in that theater, and I trust that they may be returned to the United States at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, what does the War Department reply to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. They assured me, when I took the matter up 3 or 4 days ago, that the division would be returned. Now we have this broadcast from Manila saying that their departure is further postponed. I do not know what the excuse is. I hope I may receive one.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to see if we cannot arrive at some agreement by which we can vote on the so-called Byrd amendment on Tuesday. We do not contemplate a session tomorrow, and inasmuch as Monday will be a holiday, since the 11th of November, Armistice Day, will fall on Sunday, we will not attempt to meet on Monday, and it is my purpose, at the conclusion of business today, to move a recess until Tuesday.

I do not wish to ask consent to fix a time for voting on the bill finally, but I should like to have a time fixed for a vote on the pending Byrd amendment. If the Byrd amendment, which is a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], should be agreed to, it would dispose of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri by being substituted for it. If the substitute should be defeated, then a vote would come on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

I wondered if we could not agree on an hour to vote Tuesday on the Byrd amendment, which is the pending proposal, then on the Donnell amendment, if the Byrd amendment should be defeated.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as the inquiry made by the senior Senator from Kentucky relates in part to the amendment which I have submitted, and also in view of the fact that I desire to be heard on the Byrd amendment, I should like to state that I do not feel I could agree to a time being fixed for voting on the Byrd amendment. I wish to be heard rather extensively on Tuesday in regard to that amendment, and it is impossible for me to anticipate the length of time the discussion might require, so I cannot agree.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might say to the Senator that on Tuesday we will be expected at 12:30 to join the House of Representatives in the House Chamber to greet Prime Minister Attlee. I imagine we will be back in the Senate Chamber by 1 o'clock. I thought that if we could agree to vote at, say, 3 o'clock or 3:30 on the Byrd amendment, that would give any Senator ample time to discuss it before the vote. Such an arrangement would be acceptable to the Senator from Virginia. That would give at least 2 or 2½ hours for discussion of the amendment before a vote would come.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the desire of the majority leader to fix a time, but in view of the extreme importance, as I see it, of the issues involved, both in the Byrd amendment and my own amendment, I respectfully decline to consent.

DEMOBILIZATION AND TRANSPORTATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution, and I request that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The resolution authorizes that committee "to make a full and complete study and investigation of the general over-all plan or plans for demobilization and transportation of military personnel to the United States from overseas, and the practical application of such plan or plans, with particular emphasis on, first, the conditions existing at embarkation points in Europe, north Africa, and the Pacific; second, the duration of waiting periods at such ports before shipping is available; third, the amount of shipping being used to return said members to the United States; and fourth, whether an additional amount of shipping is available and should be used to speed up such return."

Mr. President, on several occasions since we reconvened on September 5, I have found it necessary to speak here in the Senate on behalf of enlisted men and junior officers in our armed services. Because I did intercede in their behalf, I have been kept quite well informed of their points of view in both the European and Pacific theaters of war through the medium of their letters, voluntarily written to me.

Since early fall the undertone which runs through the letters relative to the lack of shipping space available in both the Atlantic and Pacific has grown until it is now a head-tone. It is the principal, dominant factor in virtually every letter or radiogram that comes to me. While they vary in form and details because of conditions at individual camps, they all come down to one statement, namely, "We do not believe that the heads of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are doing all that they can to make shipping available for our transportation home."

Several days ago I received a letter from a young officer friend of mine who, by the way, is not eligible for immediate return to the United States and is not considering it. He is attached to one of the Army ports of embarkation in the Philippines. This young man told me that he was having difficulty controlling his men, because he had been ordered to have them work on Liberty ships, which have been converted to troop carriers, and were being used to carry Japanese prisoners of war from the Philippines to Japan. The young officer said the enlisted men on the base there were planning to strike, if such is possible under Army discipline, and work only on those ships which were actually to be employed in returning our own GI's to the United States. He also sent me the front page of the Daily Pacifican for Saturday, October 27. The lead story in this I wish to read. This newspaper is printed by the Army in the western Pacific and goes to Army, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel out there. The main headline reads: "High-point guards for homebound Nips." The subhead is: "PW escort drawn from replacement depot." It is dated from Manila, and I quote from it:

> Guard details made up of returnees from replacement depots here are being used to escort Jap PW's to their homeland, it was revealed in a letter received by the Pacifican yesterday. The fact that such details were being used was confirmed last night by officials of the Replacement Command, who said that the details were usually made up of volunteers.
>
> The letter to the Pacifican was written by a technical sergeant, a member of a 14-man detail that left the Twenty-first Replacement Depot on October 16 and was taken aboard the Liberty ship *George Norris*, bound for Davao, Mindanao, to pick up Jap prisoners. According to the writer, the *Norris'* destination from Davao was Kure, Japan, where the prisoners were to be discharged.
>
> Officers at the Replacement Command said that orders for the use of men in replacement depots as guards for returning PW's "came down from higher headquarters" through Military Police Command. The men selected, they said, are preferably former military policemen, if any are available. If there are no MP's on hand for this duty at the replacement depots, infantrymen are used.
>
> Volunteers are chosen if they can be obtained, it was stated. Otherwise, qualified men are selected. The men remain on the ships after the Jap prisoners are unloaded and eventually go with the vessel to a west-coast port. How many such details have been used was not made clear.
>
> Lt. Col. D. C. Haney, G-3, Replacement Command, said that movement by way of Japan is almost as quick as a direct voyage from Manila to San Francisco. He also said that since there are only a few of these guards aboard such vessels, they therefore have "rather good accommodations."
>
> It was also pointed out that low-point men, or men who had only been at the depot a few days, were generally assigned to the guard details—this in answer to a question brought up by the letter's statement that all the men involved had 90 points or more.
>
> The sergeant's letter reads: "There comes a time in every man's life when he really needs a buddy. Well, there are 14 GI's out here aboard the Liberty ship *George Norris* who need a real buddy and need him badly and right now.
>
> "We 14 are from the Twenty-first Replacement Depot—released from our various outfits to be sent home. We are all 90-point or higher men—one has 97 points.
>
> "On Tuesday, October 16, we were rushed down to the dock area, issued carbines, and taken aboard the *Norris*, a ship that is bound

for Davao, Mindanao, to pick up Jap prisoners. From there we go to Kure, Japan, to discharge the prisoners.

"This ship is slow, as you know, and it will be next year sometime before we get home. Is this the way we men, who have come such a long way out here, are going to be treated? Twenty-eight months on islands such as Tulagi, Emirau, and Luzon, 90 and more points, and this is what we get.

"Why all the shipping priority for WAC's, divisions, etc.? The War Department came out with the point-demobilization plan, didn't they? Then the highest point man is the only one who should get priority. The Thirty-eighth Division just left, taking 60-point men back, and here we sit rotting and sweating with 90 to 97 points.

"Please bring this to light. If not to help us, to help the Joe behind us."

On the front page is a picture of five members of the Eight Hundred and Twenty-first Engineer Aviation Battalion busy building bunks in the Liberty ship *Otto Mears*, converting it in the field for use as a troop transport. The caption says—

The men are building bunks in one of the holds which will berth approximately 160 troops; 70 volunteers from the battalion helped to speed the job after their regular day's work. By so doing the men, all of whom are eligible to go home on points, got the Liberty, the first to be converted in Manila, ready 24 hours ahead.

Incidentally, in the public forum, known as the Mail Bag, are two letters, one from a first sergeant and one from a private, both extending their heartfelt thanks to a Lieutenant Colonel Davidson, under whose guidance permission had been secured to convert these transports there at Manila. Also on the front page of the paper is an Associated Press story from San Diego that a recently discharged Army major asserted the transport which brought him home had 16 empty beds in cabins and a hold space for 300 men. Still another story headlines "Union charges Victory ships haul playboys," and tells of the transfer of 55 Victory ships to 12 steamship companies for private operations while the American servicemen cannot be sent home for discharge for lack of shipping space.

I read from the letter of my young friend:

It is absolutely true that they refitted three Libertys to take some of those dirty rotten Japs home. The GI's wonder why they could not have used the three ships for our troops. They would have provided space for 1,500 men.

In his next paragraph he states:

Two Liberty ships—the *Walsh* and the *Van Loon*—will be en route to the United States soon with air corps ammunition. Can you imagine returning ammunition to the States when the ships could be partially reconverted out there and troops sent home?

I feel that volunteers could be obtained to discharge these ships here and the space made available for troops.

He adds:

There may be a good excuse for all of this, so maybe I should not be too critical.

Perhaps that last sentence was added for my benefit but in the majority of letters I receive, there is no such caution expressed. They openly state what is happening in the Pacific. Many contend that what they term "unnecessary and serious congestion of personnel at ports of embarkation" is increasing rather than decreasing. Oversupply of incoming and outgoing men at other camps and senseless local wartime military regulations, invoked by local or area commanders, makes waiting still more difficult. Along this line, I recall a previous letter I had from my young officer friend, who said although they were walking in mud over ankle depth, the commanding general was personally inspecting the motors of all their jeeps and if any had mud on them, even though fresh mud, although they might have just driven the machine, they were confined to quarters or put in the brig or whatever a commanding general does.

There is no question that morale is bad. Extremely bad. And when morale is down, many undesirable situations arise.

Mr. President, it is evident to me that our men in the Pacific have lost faith in their service leaders and may even lose faith in the strength of this body. I can readily understand this. If I were eligible for discharge from the service, if I had been in the Pacific for 2 or 3 years and then saw Liberty ships hauling Japs back to their home ahead of transportation for myself and my friends, if I knew ships were going out with vacant bunks and holds, if I read charges in the newspaper such as those contained in the paper I have just referred to, my morale would be down, too. Not only are these the conditions that the boys face daily over there, but many of them with 80 and 90 points, can look around and see others with 100 and 110 points still sitting on one of those islands.

Yet they can read in the newspaper that day before yesterday the Army decided to release 50-point men who are home on furlough, and plans to drop the entire list to that figure in the next few weeks. I am afraid that if I were in that situation my morale would not be low—it would be completely buried.

So far I have spoken merely of the Pacific, but there are many, many complaints also from the Atlantic and the European theater, and I want to read a telegram I received from a mother in Wyoming:

We received the following letter from my son:

"DEAR MOTHER: I am now in a camp down on the Mediterranean Sea and about a thousand miles closer to home. I did have hopes of being in the States some time in October, but from all appearances I may be here for quite some time and possibly even moved back. The Army big shots are so d—— smart on this side that they must have close to a million men almost to the point of rebellion. I myself read in the papers almost every day where men with 80 points or better have all been released or are in the States awaiting discharge, and that men with 70 points or better are on their way home and many are already there. These statements are all propaganda for the people at home and must be put out by men who are annexing fortunes and the holding up of the number of men leaving Europe is entirely to their benefit."

I continue to read from the boy's letter:

"My own case is like so many. My old outfit on the whole had 70 points or better so the order comes in for 86 of us to be transferred to the sixth convalescent hospital and to come to Rimes, France. After arriving in Rimes we were processed, clothing, shots, and what not, which took about a week and could have been done in 2 days at the most. Now the order comes in that six of us are to be transferred again to 494 Collecting Company, we join this company and are with them for a week and the orders come in for us to move to Camp Calais about 20 miles from Marseille, France, where we are to stay about 3 days to 3 weeks and be sent directly to the States. Now the rub comes; we arrive in this camp only to find thousands of men here, most having 80 points and many more ranging clear up to 104 points and men with 80 or less are not even supposed to be in the camp. As yet we haven't received any further orders so I guess we will be here for quite some time just hanging around catching colds at night and gradually going nuts. If this d—— outfit would only ship the outfits out as they come in instead of transferring these men all around 5 or 10 times and going through miles of paper work time and again we would all be home in quite short order, but every time an outfit comes in here completely ready, records perfect, some smart boy says send that 79-point man to some other outfit and then the whole outfit is held back a week or so getting their records straight again. Also the outfit that receives this 79-pointer must start and clear all their records again and 9 times out of 10 will find it puts them overstrength or some other fault and must transfer some other poor soul and thus the circle carries on and the months roll by and the people at home read the papers saying we are all at home. But wondering why the Government is still shipping millions of tons of supplies overseas when there is only the army of occupation left to feed and clothe. I only wish that I could tell our Congress and the American public what we see go on over here day in and day out and also have the power to show them real proof of these matters. I still have no mailing address so please hold your letters, etc."—October 23d we received the following letter:

"DEAR MOTHER: I am still sitting in this D camp and it is beginning to look like we never will be released. I haven't the least idea just what is the hold-up, first they say it is on account of storms, then no ships in port or the longshoremen are striking and there is no one to unload the cargo. If this is the case and they need men for the job I am sure that there is at least 30,000 to 50,000 troops here who would gladly do the work just to take up time and bring their own shipment closer. I have been reading and hearing about shipments so long now that I am sick of such, thus will change the subject, but will try and keep what hopes we have left up. We have no lights in our tents so I am writing in a Red Cross room as you can see. It is very small and I should guess there are about 7 or 8 thousand men looking for some place to pass the time and most seem to be trying to enter this one small building. To give you an idea of the size it is about half as large as the old CCC barracks. I still have no address so don't write. Love—"

The mother concludes:

DEAR SENATOR: I fully realize I am no different from many other mothers—

She is. Mr. President, as the result of a serious accident about 6 weeks ago, this fine woman is unable to walk, or even to stand.

DEAR SENATOR: I fully realize I am no different from many other mothers in like circumstances with respect to their sons overseas and ask for no special favor but it would seem that with boys overseas 2 years with 77 points or over who have five battle stars and a Presidential citation for their unit, something could be done to get them back home and I

would most assuredly appreciate it if you will use your influence to assist in this matter. Assuring you of my appreciation for anything you can do, I am yours very sincere.

Mr. President, I have another letter which I received 2 days ago. It is from a United States Navy submarine base in Subic Bay, the Philippines. It reads in part, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Having noticed your particular enthusiasm for prompt demobilization of servicemen, I should like to keep you posted so that you may better champion our cause.

I have just arrived here on October 14, 1945, from the States. With 1,200 other enlisted men, I spent 81 days, from July 26 to October 14, in arriving at my destination. I carried my sea bag and personal gear across the gangplank exactly 27 times. I was in Pearl Harbor when the war was over and for about 4 weeks after. On September 26, approximately, we passed the Uluthi group of islands where upward of 200 cargo and merchant ships were anchored. On October 2, we came into a bay near Guiuan, on the island of Samar, where 150 ships, approximately, were idle at anchor, being slowly disposed of. It was 3 days before we disembarked and we understood from other sailors aboard another transport that they had been living aboard their troop transport, at anchor in the harbor, for 27 days and still weren't able to debark. This was due to the receiving station being so full of men that couldn't be disposed of. At Tacloban on the isle of Leyte, just 40 miles away, there were upward of 200 cargo and merchant ships in the bay at anchor. Here again the receiving station was very crowded with men waiting to be transferred home, men with over 44 points, up to 55 in more cases than one. Many CB units, here for years, are still carrying on, and a mighty fine job they are doing, too. At Manila, on October 12, I saw the same sight, upward of 250 cargo and merchant ships lying idly at anchor. Subic Bay apparently is not a rendezvous for apparently dormant merchant ships. * * *

Here at the submarine base, Subic Bay—well, 50 men came to this assignment, men who like myself volunteered probably for the Navy, but certainly volunteered for submarine service—active duty aboard a submarine. Now what do we get? Ten months of schooling and preparation for various jobs. We get out here and we are transferred from active duty to submarine repair unit. No questions asked. What are we doing? The Seabee units are running equipment, and we are furnishing the common labor. I myself am loading bags of cement onto a truck from morning till night. Make no mistake, this is no personal letter of hardship or complaint. This is a report of observation. Personally, I just got here and haven't even seen all the scenery; but, I do object to the Navy's attitude. This is a new base. It is not necessary that this base be completed to prosecute the war against the enemy. However, the Navy seems to be insisting that they get it built up, apparently while they have plenty of men, supplies, and ships to haul the supplies. I strongly object to the attitude, provided I am correct in my opinion. This attitude is the using of men in a manner which is actually conscripted labor. I certainly approve of conscription to fight the enemy, but not conscripted labor to make the United States the almighty nation; that is against my wishes as a citizen. As a taxpayer I'll be glad to bear my share of the load to send civil engineers over here to build whatever is necessary.

Mr. President, it is hard for me—in fact, it is impossible—to believe that everything is as it should be on these two fronts. There is a break-down somewhere between Washington and Europe and Washington and the Pacific, and I want an investigation. I do not want a normal routine investigation. I want a special investigation, designed not only to get the job done but to build some faith back into the hearts of our service boys and to let them know that we in the United States Senate realize our responsibility and are determined to help iron out some of the kinks. I know that such an investigating committee will have the full cooperation of the Army and Navy here in Washington, but I want to see it so conducted as to be down to earth and factual, and at the same time give our boys confidence again in their military leaders here in Washington and the people at home. I want an investigation that they know will be genuine and complete—one that will allow them to express their thoughts and one that our enlisted men will understand.

Boys have written me that it does no good to send a couple of Senators and a group of high-ranking Navy or Army officers into their area, for these boys feel—and I quote from one of their letters—"such a group will see only one side of the picture—that would be the side that the area commander wants them to see." I want this investigating committee to be so arranged in its personnel that it will eliminate this feeling and make it possible for Pvt. John Doe to express his feelings as thoroughly and completely as some general; yet I want the committee to be small enough that it will not unnecessarily deprive our boys of transportation.

I have sent the resolution to the desk, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I have spoken of this matter to the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. WALSH], and he is entirely in accord with the resolution.

To my way of thinking the committee should not only be accompanied by a high-ranking military officer, but should go a little further and seek to include in its investigating group a representative GI from the Army and one from the Navy actually in the Pacific or Europe, together with two former noncommissioned enlisted veterans, one to be selected by the American Legion and the other by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. These enlisted men should be selected because of their knowledge of service administration, shipping, and supplies. They should be given full authorization of the committee members so that they will not be hampered by individuals of higher rate or rank, when they are investigating records or questioning witnesses; and upon their return to the United States and the completion of their report they should immediately become eligible for discharge. In brief, these enlisted men should be placed in a position where no retaliation whatsoever can be taken against them for any actions or for any statements they may make in connection with the investigation. This should apply to everyone appearing before the committee. The committee would then be in a position to talk to men of all rates and ranks in all embarkation areas. They could study the handling of shipping and screening of personnel, not only from the viewpoint of the Senate, but also from the viewpoint of the boy with 80 points, a private first class stripe on his arm, and a strong desire to return to his home in the United States. GI's will talk to GI's when they will not talk to officers; and I feel that the value of such an investigation rests largely on getting the viewpoint of the men who are today writing to us concerning these undesirable situations.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wyoming was gracious enough to call my attention to his purpose in submitting this resolution, and to show it to me, and indeed, to permit me to make some suggestions. I believe that the resolution is very timely, and I wish to commend the Senator for his vision and his interest in the men of the service in urging that every possible effort be made to get the boys back home as soon as possible.

The Committee on Naval Affairs has already made some inquiry and investigation in connection with this question, as has the Committee on Military Affairs. However, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming gives the whole procedure a certain dignity and importance, and is in the nature of a mandate from the Senate to go into the question, especially in regard to transportation, to see if the problem cannot be solved to the end that the boys may be returned home more expeditiously.

I and other Senators have received letters similar to those received by the Senator from Wyoming. I myself have sent many of them to the Department, and have had many reports relating to them. There seems to be an especially desperate, unhappy, and uncomfortable situation existing in the case of boys who are off the beaten track, away from the main channels of transportation. A study should be made in an effort to provide some means of transportation for them.

I understand that the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Rather than wait for action by the Committee on Naval Affairs on the resolution I propose, on Tuesday morning next, to call a meeting of the committee and start at once an investigation along the lines of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming, to the end that further study may be made and deep concern may be evidenced in an effort to find a solution to this problem, so that the Army and Navy authorities may understand to what degree we are being pressed by these lads to get back to the place about which they are thinking morning, noon, and night, namely, home. I welcome the submission of the resolution. It will be beneficial, as I have said, in giving the work of the committee a certain dignity and importance, as compared with the ordinary perfunctory investigation. It will be an investigation ordered by the Senate, with the Senate behind it. I feel certain that we shall be able to go to the very depths of the problem and find a solution which will be helpful in giving relief where, God knows, it is much needed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs will also look into the matter of transferring from the Troop Transport Service the Victory ships. I heard the Senator from Wyoming speak about Liberty ships being used for the transportation of Japanese prisoners of war. I have received some information to the effect that Victory ships were no longer to be used for the transportation of our own boys back home, the Victory ships being faster than the Liberty ships. I am informed that some of these ships are tied up at docks in the United States. I do not know how accurate the information which I have received is. Therefore, I am requesting the committee to look into the question.

I am also informed that some of the Victory ships have been placed in the freight service between the Americas, when it would have been much better to use Liberty ships for that purpose and keep the faster Victory ships in the transport service for our troops.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the observation of the Senator from South Dakota is very apppropriate and timely. I should say to the Senator that before his own committee—the Committee on Military Affairs—2 weeks ago I asked all of the five naval officers who were present, but particularly the transportation officer, "Do you say now that every available ship is being used for the purpose of transportation?" The reply was, "Yes." I am sure the Senator recalls that.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; I recall it.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator also recalls I am sure, that there was evidence that the Navy Department was remodeling aircraft carriers so as to make them available for the transportation of troops.

However, the resolution embracing all the things we have talked about, and others, too, will have the effect of at least bringing a little cheer and hope and sunshine into the lives of these boys by letting them know that we are alert to their problem, that we are striving in every possible way to help them, and that we are putting upon the Navy and the Army all the pressure which Congress can put in a sincere effort to aid them.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, permit me to comment further that possibly the Victory ships have not been under the control of the Navy. Probably they have been under the control of the Maritime Commission, and therefore the Navy was correct when it said that every available ship under its control was being used for troop movements.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. During the last week the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, of which I am chairman and which is considering a bill relating to the disposition of surplus ships, had before it representatives of the Maritime Commission. The subject of the disposition of surplus ships has been under consideration by the subcommittee for several weeks, and we have had numerous discussions with Admiral Land regarding it. We have emphasized again and again—I certainly have done so in my conversations with him—that everything should be done in order that Victory ships, Liberty ships, C-ships, and any other ships under control of the Commission may be available for the transportation of servicemen back to the United States. Admiral Land says he realizes that. He is in close touch with the situation and is trying to cooperate in every possible way with the Army and the Navy. The Maritime Commission is constantly trying to increase facilities for the transportation of the troops. I know Admiral Land and the Maritime Commission have these matters constantly in mind and are trying to do everything they can do to secure the expeditious transportation of the troops.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, we cannot impress too much upon them the seriousness of the problem and the need for greater and greater effort.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with the Senator. Only a few hours ago I talked to Admiral Land about the matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Wyoming for submitting the resolution. I did not know it was to be submitted today. I also wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts, for assuring us that the committee will proceed next Tuesday morning to consider the resolution. His assurance is typical of the very fine leadership which he gives in his committee. I say that the resolution should be welcomed by the high naval officials in Washington as one which should prove to be most helpful to them in correcting practices in the field which I am sure they do not appreciate exist. There are certain practices in connection with both the Navy and the Army demobilization program insofar as the activities of high Navy and Army officials out in the field are concerned—high officials I say, but still subordinate to the policymakers in Washington and to the Congress—which the policymakers in Washington need to know about and which they can learn about through just such an investigation as the one the Senator from Wyoming has proposed. I hope that at a very early date next week the resolution will be reported to the Senate and will receive a vote of approval of the Senate, so that the men in officers' uniforms in the Pacific and the Atlantic—in fact, in some posts here in this country—will be awakened to the fact that, after all, it is the Congress of the United States that is the final determinator of the naval and military policies of this country. Some of the arbitrary conduct of which certain officers have been guilty—as I said today in a communication to the Secretary of the Navy—must be prevented from repetition in the future.

I wish merely to cite one case about which I wrote to the Secretary of the Navy today, because the Senator from Wyoming has seen fit to quote from letters he has received from some servicemen—letters which apparently were sent directly from the servicemen to the Senator from Wyoming. I wish to tell him that apparently that is a dangerous practice for the servicemen to participate in. The attitude of many Navy and Army officials is that in our democracy servicemen should not report demobilization inefficiencies to Members of Congress. I know of a case of a seaman who did not even send me a communication; but his father did. His father is a distinguished judge. This family lost one boy in the service. As a result of that loss, the mother is ill and on the verge of nervous prostration. If I ever saw a hardship case which justified special consideration from the Navy, this case is one. So the father wrote to me. I sent him a telegram, and at his request I also sent a wire to the commanding officer, asking for an investigation of the case. I have every reason to believe that what the boy reports to his father as happening did happen, but in order to make perfectly certain I have requested the Secretary of the Navy to give me a report on it. As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee I deeply resent the type of conduct which this boy reports his commanding officer was guilty of when he received my telegram. I think the time has come when the Congress of the United States should make very clear to some of our officers in the Army and in the Navy that wearing the uniform of the United States does not give them the prerogative to exercise abusive, arbitrary, and tyrannical powers over their men. When a Senator of the United States sends a wire to a commanding officer and politely and respectfully asks him to investigate the facts and circumstances of hardship in an individual case, that commanding officer has no justification for calling a seaman before him and castigating him because a Senator of the United States is intervening in order to get the facts about his case.

Mr. President, I think there is an obligation resting upon us to see to it that some of the bad practices which we are hearing about in the voluminous mail we receive from men in the services and from their relatives are stopped. I think the policymakers in the Navy and the Army here in Washington not only have the power but have an obligation to see to it that there is a housecleaning in the Army and the Navy of any officers who are indulging in abusive practices in denying discharges to deserved cases or who are guilty of demobilization inefficiencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming will be received, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 188) was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the general over-all plan or plans for demobilization and transportation of military personnel to the United States from overseas, and the practical application of such plan or plans, with particular emphasis on (1) the conditions existing at embarkation points in Europe, north Africa, and the Pacific; (2) the duration of waiting periods at such ports before shipping is available; (3) the amount of shipping being used to return said members

to the United States; and (4) whether an additional amount of shipping is available and should be used to speed up such return. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress; to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. In carrying out its duties under this resolution, the committee is authorized to use the services of one member of the American Legion and one member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to be nominated to the committee by such organizations, respectively, and to request the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to detail such officers and enlisted men as may be necessary. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION — NOMINATION OF CHESTER C. DAVIS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day, from the Committee on Finance the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] reported the nomination of Chester C. Davis, of Missouri, to be a member of the Advisory Board, to represent the public, in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, filling the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. William H. Davis. It is very desirable that the nomination be acted on, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the nomination at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The legislative clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until next Tuesday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 9 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Earline Jarman, Cuba, Ala., in place of D. S. Ward, declined.

Melford G. Cleveland, Randolph, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Arthur A. Burgess, Winfield, Ala., in place of R. G. Carpenter, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Mervyn H. Gallagher, Doheny Park, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONNECTICUT

Page D. Guptill, Essex, Conn., in place of W. J. Collamore, deceased.

GEORGIA

Dewey T. Clements, Pineview, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ILLINOIS

Louis Mini, Dalzell, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sylvia A. Bash, De Soto, Ill., in place of E. B. Mueller, resigned.

Laurence A. Clark, Poplar Grove, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1942.

Eschol A. Houtchens, Raritan, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruby Maxwell, Table Grove, Ill., in place of M. G. Baily, removed.

KANSAS

William D. Trump, Ellsworth, Kans., in place of L. A. Daniels, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Claude C. Badeaux, Garden City, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William M. Jones, Heflin, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Marie C. Vachon, Sabattus, Maine, in place of M. C. Thorpe, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Estelle L. Grady, Glen Arbor, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Boyd L. Havens, Hope, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Christina Meyers, Rothbury, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSISSIPPI

Nan H. Thomas, Benoit, Miss., in place of F. M. Storm, retired.

Roy Scott Barber, Lake Cormorant, Miss., in place of R. S. Barber, resigned.

Jesse L. Pace, Pace, Miss., in place of B. H. Curd, deceased.

Joseph A. Bishop, Sarepta, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSOURI

Morris S. Major, Mountain Grove, Mo., in place of T. C. Short, transferred.

NEBRASKA

Irma M. Davis, Weston, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW YORK

Walter Sweazey, Myers, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Maud M. Humble, Oswegatchie, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH CAROLINA

Treva Wakefield, Guilford, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

Milton Pete Toffier, Dewar, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Doris C. Turner, Harden City, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

W. Lynn Norman, Mangum, Okla., in place of H. H. Wileman. Incumbent's commission expired Feb. 18, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

Nellie E. Flaherty, Morea Colliery, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Timoria E. Warnick, Nuremberg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anna Nock Kristofeck, United, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TENNESSEE

Walter M. Craig, Andersonville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Eugene F. Roberts, Decatur, Tenn., in place of A. D. Ward, transferred.

UTAH

Arthur H. Reeve, Hinckley, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frederick C. Hoyt, Orderville, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Emma P. Heesakker, Combined Locks, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bonnie P. Clark, Gilmanton, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Laura A. Guenther, Knowlton, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Margaret E. Ingham, Lynxville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ambrose Sheedy, Suamico, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 9 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

Chester C. Davis to be a member of the Advisory Board, to represent the public, in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Harvey C. Heath, Enterprise.

James C. Campbell, Grant.

ARKANSAS

James Luther Whitfield, Casa.

DELAWARE

Homer W. Pratt, Kenton.

IDAHO

Alvin R. Lund, Harrison.

ILLINOIS

Lillie Doyle, Durand.
John D. Lopp, West Salem.
Richard C. Bell, White Hall.

IOWA

Earnest T. Hannah, Hansell.

LOUISIANA

Rester E. Richardson, Bogalusa.
Eunie E. Sisson, Bonita.
Michael J. Lawton, Harahan.
Vinnie A. Ramey, Welsh.

MARYLAND

Rebecca E. Slaughter, Brooklandville.
Frank T. Crouch, Chase.

NEW JERSEY

Eleanor M. Busch, Almonesson.
Lena B. Elwell, Beachwood.
Mary Pettibone, Brant Beach.
Doris Brown, Bridgeboro.
Ray N. Gerew, Cape May Point.
Marian E. O'Rourke, Cedar Brook.
Isaac S. Luttman, Dayton.
Frank F. Rogers, Deal.
Helena Katherine Himmler, Deans.
Chester B. Moore, Deerfield Street.
Paul W. Robinson, Dividing Creek.
Florence N. Watson, Edgewater Park.
Beatrice A. Curtis, Erlton.
Elizabeth Hamilton, Fieldsboro.
Wilbert W. Arnold, Greenwich.
Samuel M. Lear, Harvey Cedars.
Deborah E. Butcher, Heislerville.
Taylor W. Hance, Holmdel.
Paul F. Brady, Kirkwood.
Edward J. Meskill, Lambertville.
Emilie J. Burnett, Liberty Corner.
Charles S. Toop, Lincroft.
Josephine M. Schmidt, Magnolia.
Pearl S. Richman, Malaga.
Wilma B. Clayton, Marmora.
Jennie Rumford, Masonville.
Charles J. Gaskill, Newport.
Elsa Maxwell, New Vernon.
Rebecca Reisman, Norma.
George T. Osborn, Osbornsville.
Earnest A. Oakley, Pequannock.
Christina V. Richardson, Port Reading
Mary C. Myers, Quinton.
Victor E. Heineman, Ridgefield Park.
Elizabeth E. Church, Rio Grande.
Max Wurtzel, Rosenhayn.

NORTH CAROLINA

Richard L. Folger, Dobson.
Pauline D. Rary, Jonesville.
Carrie Walker Inskeep, Roaring Gap.
Nora Lane Boyce, Tyner.

NORTH DAKOTA

Doris M. Larson, Lignite.

OHIO

Vane Wagner, Clayton.
Gertrude Deming, Rootstown.
Daphne G. Sherer, Union.

OKLAHOMA

Charles H. McMullan, Blackwell.
Pearl M. Alder, Burlington.
Edward S. Wilson, Byron.
Claude W. Hanna, Grove.
Joseph Charles Taylor, Kingfisher.
Daisy A. Stilley, Mannsville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Luther C. Davis, Georgetown.
Kathryn T. Blanchard, Moultrieville.
Joe F. Mason, Seneca.

VERMONT

Ruth E. Curtiss, Williamstown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and everlasting Father who knowest the impulse of every human heart, we praise Thee for Thy daily blessings which are our richest portion. In those days when hopes were high and peace was cherished, we neglected all but self; we humbly beseech Thee to forgive our hesitation, our wavering wills, and our failures through the years of ease. In these times of great peril, when the world is still threatened with the stain of blood, hear us, lest in a dreading shadow of fear we may lose the glorious victory of peace, symbolized by the sacrifices of him who rests in yonder tomb and of those beneath countless crosses on the world's fields of conflict.

Gracious Lord, give Thy protecting grace and wisdom to our President that he may fulfill the exacting obligations of his high office. The tasks are hard and heavy on the hands of men in council, whose privilege it is to be pathfinders for peace. O give Thy benediction of contentment and comfort to our returning veterans, that they may look beyond every settling gloom and see the vision of faith and good will established among men. O sustain us all in our holy dreams until the souls of men find their rest and security in our Redeemer, arrayed in garments of peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 8, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On November 8, 1945:

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor;

H. R. 3453. An act for the relief of John W. Farrell; and

H. R. 4309. An act to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

On November 9, 1945:

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert;

H. R. 3256. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the armed forces of the United States; and

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II.

JOINT MEETING OF HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE HON. CLEMENT R. ATTLEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce that the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honorable Clement R. Attlee, will visit the Capitol on tomorrow and will be received by the Members of Congress at a joint meeting of the two Houses in the Chamber of the House of Representatives at 12:30 p. m.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on tomorrow for the Speaker to declare a recess, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, about what time of the afternoon will this occur?

Mr. RAMSPECK. At 12:30 p. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC HEARINGS, JOINT COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement and present a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack has agreed to begin public hearings in the Senate caucus room on November 15, 1945, which will probably require several weeks, and it is contemplated that morning and afternoon sessions will be held.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. COOPER, of Tennessee; Mr. CLARK, of North Carolina; Mr. MURPHY, of Pennsylvania; Mr. GEARHART, of California; and Mr. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, all members of this committee, during the period of the public hearings be granted leaves of absence from attending sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCE FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3749) an act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair

hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. RANKIN, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a report of the Review Committee on Deferments of Government Employees and a short message of the President of the United States.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith some remarks made by His Holiness Pope Pius XII.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix and to include an editorial from the New York Times.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I publicly criticize an administrative agency of the Government, but it is now apparent not only to Members of Congress but to the people of the country that the administrative agency charged with the responsibility of the disposing of surplus war property has, up to this time, made a miserable failure. Whether this is because of indifference, incompetence, or something worse, I do not know. The plain fact is, however, that nobody is satisfied with the results so far obtained.

I am reliably told that there exists among the top personnel of the Surplus Property Administration a disinclination to follow the plain intent of Congress, particularly insofar as it applies to the priority rights of purchase of material by World War II veterans; also the priority rights for sale or lease to health and educational institutions under section 13. States and local municipalities up to date have been given no priorities whatsoever; instead, special consideration has been given to the award of contracts to a few big business concerns. Cases can be cited where States and their subdivisions have been denied the right to bid.

Materials for disposal have been so lumped as to give junk dealers an advantage over State, city, and municipal purchasing agents.

I am also reliably informed that there is an immeasurable amount of surplus material which the owning agencies are just too disinterested to declare surplus, thereby permitting much of it to become rusted, waterlogged, weather-beaten, and wasted.

Congress cannot sit idly by and permit a continuance of such deplorable administration by an agency of the Government. It is our duty to protect the American public, and the hard-earned money of taxpayers bought these goods. I know it was not the intent of Congress that any firm or individual should be permitted to profit specially in the disposal of surplus war material.

I am thinking seriously of proposing that a special committee of the House make an investigation and quickly submit to the House a report with recommendations.

COCONUT FATS AND SUGAR

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the OPA has taken the ceiling off of coconut oils. There is a great deal of it in this country. What is the result? The result is a 400 percent increase in the price. The candy makers of this country are suffering and kicking about that condition. There is a shortage of sugar in the country today. I think it is about time that some of the sniping at the OPA should cease and we should cooperate with them to try to keep the prices down to some extent so that the people can pay for such commodities.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all other business on the calendar and any other special orders I may be permitted to address the House today for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative program of the day and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include an editorial and a short letter.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Lawrence Sullivan.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include quotations and a newspaper item.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Justice Harold Burton, of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of OPA policies.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Reader's Digest.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an editorial.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject Peacetime Conscription; the Promise Is Security; the Record Is Disastrous.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article showing the spread of communism.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

REPORT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope from time to time to report to the American people on the state of the Union—not all of it, but just small segments of it. My report is going to deal with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. So I want to make my additional report to the American people this morning. I want to report to them that a bill has been pending in the Congress

since last January, authorizing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and up to date the only tangible result that has come has been lip service on the part of the administration, administration spokesmen, and administration leaders everywhere. This is not politics—just facts.

Mr. Speaker, there have been other bills similar to this bill that was introduced in January, presented to Congress. Bills have been introduced in the Senate and bills have been introduced in the House, but nothing has happened.

Do we face a repetition of what happened in the year 1941? I fear that something is wrong. In 1941 the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives held long and extensive hearings. The bill was reported out of the committee by a two to one vote, but nothing happened. This was in the Seventy-seventh Congress, which died in December 1942. Since then, so far as administration efforts are concerned, the seaway has been like an Egyptian mummy.

Of course, the secret of the present delay is found in another legislative body over at the other end of the Capitol. Over there it is reported that there is delay in appointing a subcommittee to conduct hearings on the project. The gentleman who is supposed to appoint the subcommittee is reported to be in no hurry because he is busy with the atomic bomb. That is just the trouble. Unless somebody decides that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is to have the right of way, then it will still continue to be an Egyptian mummy.

I do not like to give this report to the American people, but facts are facts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

WE MUST GUARD AGAINST IMPORTATION OF INFECTED MEAT SUPPLIES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the livestock industry of this country has for many years been deeply concerned with respect to the importation of live cattle, meat supplies, and meat products from foreign countries which may be infected with disastrous and dangerous disease, not only to our livestock but to the consumers of this country.

The American people are indebted to the American National Live Stock Association and to the livestock producers of this country for their effectiveness and the efforts they have made to prevent and safeguard the people of this country from the importation of livestock or dressed meats from countries where foot-and-mouth and other infectious diseases are prevalent, except that such meat be carefully inspected. Now that the war is over we may anticipate efforts on the part of countries where surplus beef is produced to ship their products into our markets.

During the war, countries in South America, Africa, and Asia shipped meat to England and other places where regulations were not as strict as ours. It has been discovered that disease through meat products has made its way into some of England's domestic herds. This experience should be a warning to our own country to be even more careful and more rigid with respect to our regulations concerning importation of livestock and meat products.

Not only the livestock industry but all industry and all people of our country would be adversely affected if the foot-and-mouth disease or any other dangerous or contagious disease prevalent in South America and other countries should infect the livestock of America.

So it behooves this Congress and those who are in charge of the administration of our laws dealing with this problem to be ever watchful against any pressure that would in anywise weaken our efforts to prevent the spread of these dangerous diseases in our country.

The American Veterinary Medical Association is familiar with this problem and has given it most careful study. That association adopted a resolution with respect to this problem. It is worthy of the consideration of every Member of this Congress. It reads as follows:

Whereas through the highly efficient efforts of veterinarians working in close cooperation with livestock producers, our country has been placed in a most enviable position with regard to the health and condition of our livestock herds and flocks; and

Whereas this condition has been made possible only at great sacrifice to our livestock producers and at great cost to both State and Federal Government; and

Whereas one of the greatest contributions that veterinarians and the livestock industry of this country can make to the war effort is to insure a continuing ample supply of meat, meat products, and dairy products to our armed forces and our civilian population; and

Whereas all industries and people in our country would be adversely affected by a disastrous or dangerous disease becoming epizootic in our livestock for as agriculture goes so goes the Nation; and

Whereas any step lessening the safeguards applying to importations of live animals or dressed meats or unsterilized meat food products from countries where foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, surra, or contagious pleuropneumonia or other equally dangerous diseases exist would constitute a grave hazard to our livestock industry and to wild animal life, and to our present and future food supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Veterinary Medical Association do most earnestly and sincerely appeal to the Congress of the United States and to all Federal and State officials to strengthen present laws and regulations pertaining to imports from such countries and we most emphatically warn against the calamity that undoubtedly will result if there is any lessening of the embargo provisions of the present law.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday of this week following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 25 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MY ROAD TO VICTORY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, of all the articles I have ever read describing courage, none surpasses that written by First Sgt. Garnett W. Shipley, who lost an arm and a leg in this war. The article is entitled "My Road to Victory." It brims over with courage. I ask unanimous consent to make it part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

MY ROAD TO VICTORY

(Article by disabled veteran, kin of York hotelman, widely published in press)

The war has ended for those of us who came through reasonably sound and whole—and to those of us who died before returning.

But to those of us who only died in part—who left behind a part of our physical beings as hostages to Mars—victory is yet to come.

I came back minus one arm and one leg. I know it will be many long, weary months before my stumps will have healed sufficiently to be fitted with artificial limbs. And there'll be many long weeks after that before I learn to use the artificial limbs well enough to get about again.

And all along the way now—and afterward—I'll have a constant battle against the maudlin sympathy and pity of well-meaning relatives and friends. But I'll conquer all that, and my V-day will come.

Probably I shall be unable to do the same work that I was doing when I came into the Army, but some day I shall be an independent, self-sustaining community member and well able to support myself and family.

I am unusually fortunate in having an understanding wife. We have been married 4 years, and for more than 3 of those years I have been in the Army.

When I first returned from more than 2 years' overseas service so badly maimed my greatest anxiety was, "How will my wife take this? Will she understand and help me fight or will she smother me with sympathy until I lose all self-respect and wallow in self-pity?"

It was foolish of me to have given myself a moment's worry on that score, for she met me with the same old beautiful smile of welcome and treated me as if I were the same as before, except for slight temporary illness.

She consults me about family matters and acts as though my opinion and decisions were of paramount importance—and I love it.

There are many amputees here at McGuire General Hospital who feel as I do—that our victory shall be won only when we can take our places again as men among men. And most of us who feel that way will do it. All we ask of you is that you do not make the going more tough by your pity or passing the hat.

To be sure, there are some of us who revel in that sort of thing—they'll be the ones you see in a few years from now on street corners or outside of crowded buildings, trying to look pathetic in faded uniform or service

ribbon, holding out apples or pencils for you to pay for without taking.

But the amputee who chooses that road does so only because his soul has already long been earmarked as a petitioner for alms. That's what he was at heart long before he lost his arm or leg.

But for those of us who think like men and want to walk and act like men, there's only one road, the road of independence in a world of freedom and democracy. And that will be my road to victory.

THE SMALL BUSINESSMEN'S COMMITTEE AND THE AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the flagrant treatment the automobile dealers and salesmen received last Thursday when they attended the hearing before the House Small Business Committee, whose chairman is the Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas.

These men came to the Capital from various sections of the country to attend this hearing and to present their views concerning an OPA price regulation which has been drafted and which will make it practically impossible for them to carry on and serve the public in the usual manner.

The committee was to hear from the representative of the dealers' association, as well as individual dealers, and it was expected that representatives of OPA would be there to try and defend their price-fixing policy.

After the president of the dealers association testified and a lot of time was wasted in presenting the names of all interested Congressmen the committee adjourned to hold an executive session and agreed to meet the next day at 10 o'clock. This was just one of the cunning devices used by the chairman to get rid of the dealers and salesmen who had come to Washington for he knew full well that business would not permit, nor was there room in Washington for them to remain over until the next day.

They came to Washington to hear the testimony of the OPA; to have the OPA tell them why they regulated to cut their commissions by about 50 percent. In other words, they wanted to hear Chester Bowles tell his story.

The chairman put on a good show that day, as is his usual custom, trying to make believe that he was interested in the dealers. He always is interested while in committee, but on the floor of the House the New Deal as well as the OPA has no stronger defender than they do in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and Mr. Bowles should explain to the men in this branch of the automobile industry why they were not called in and consulted before the price policy directive was drafted. Of course, the OPA action was in line with New Deal procedure. When the businessmen raise their voices in protest they are granted a public hearing. In other words, they are invited to Washington just to let them get it off their chest, when they should have been called in prior to the issuance of the directive, when they could have considered the facts presented by the industry, rather than drafting directives which express the ideas or satisfy the whims of so-called experts who were never heard of until they hit a chair back of a mahogany desk.

The only reason the committee called for an executive session was to save face. Had the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, given this large group of businessmen the respect and consideration due them, he would have asked the Speaker of the House for unanimous consent to sit throughout the day. There was nothing important in the House that day and such a request would have been granted. These requests are seldom refused.

Then the committee could have listened to individual dealers as well as to representatives of the OPA, and while it is extremely unlikely that their arguments could have influenced the OPA to change the directive, it would have shown courtesy and good faith on the part of the committee. The hearing could have been concluded in a single day and the dealers could have gone home feeling they had their day in court. This shabby treatment by this committee is, however, comparable to OPA's dealings with businessmen in every line.

It remains for the chairman of this committee and the OPA to explain to the businessmen of the country how they can justify this kind of action.

Now, I understand, an announcement has gone out today by the House Small Business Committee that a hearing will be held tomorrow, and that Chester Bowles and other OPA witnesses will testify. Of course, the dealers and salesmen have now returned home and will not be here tomorrow to take part in the hearing or to offer arguments to the stand to be taken by the OPA. If these businessmen get any information about what transpires they will have to get it from the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, last June the House voted to extend the life of the OPA for another year. Had the House adopted the Republican-sponsored resolution to limit the life of the OPA to 6 months, which was defeated by only eight votes, reconversion would have advanced much further than it has under the arbitrary rulings and interference by the OPA.

AUTO DEALERS' PROGRAM AGREED UPON AND SATISFACTORY TO ALL CONCERNED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the automobile dealers were well satisfied with the treatment they received. We were working with them and working with representatives of the OPA and we agreed on a program. That agreed program was carried out. At the request of the Committee on Small Business the OPA has for the present suspended the order which it expected to issue regarding the matter that we were inquiring about. The dealers were well pleased, well satisfied, and I am sorry the gentleman has seen fit to criticize the action of the committee that has been working so satisfactorily, pleasing both sides.

GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE ONE OF VETERANS' GREATEST BENEFITS—34,942 IN EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT QUALIFIED

Officials of the Veterans' Administration, including Administrator, Gen. Omar Bradley, are genuinely concerned over the attitude that is being shown by veterans of this war toward their national service life insurance as they return to civilian status.

A recent check-up of Veterans' Administration records indicates that four out of five men separated from the armed forces are giving up their life-insurance policies by failing to continue premium payments. This is deplorable and should be stopped at once.

CHEAPEST, SOUNDEST, AND BEST

A war veterans' Government life-insurance policy is one of the finest benefits he receives by virtue of his service to his country in time of war. Government life insurance undoubtedly costs less than it can be purchased for from any other source, and it is the soundest and best protection it is possible for a veteran to obtain. It is backed by the greatest institution in the world—the Government of the United States.

MAY CONVERT IN WHOLE OR IN PART

A veteran may convert his term insurance, the kind of insurance carried during the war, to an ordinary life policy or a 20-payment life policy or a 30-payment life policy. If a veteran does not desire to carry the full $10,000, he may reinstate any part of it he desires in multiples of $500.

If a veteran cannot carry the whole $10,000 now, it would be a good idea for him to reinstate and convert as much as he can possibly carry at this time, and increase it if possible later on.

There is only one objection, which is certainly a minor one, that is ever urged against this insurance; that it is paid off in monthly installments to the wives, children, or parents instead of in a lump sum. In a large number of cases this is preferable. It is really no valid objection, and even those who object to it should not fail to reinstate their insurance on that account, because it is reasonable to assume that Congress will change this provision in the future and allow a lump sum, if desired, the same as now allowed in Government life-insurance policies that were issued to veterans of World War I.

Veterans of World War II have a great asset in the privileges afforded through national service life insurance. Only veterans of World War II will be permitted to carry this life insurance.

Every serviceman in this war, before he is discharged, if possible, should arrange for the continuance of this life insurance. Every veteran of World War II

who has been discharged should immediately, if he has not already done so, make arrangements to continue this life insurance.

BIGGEST INSURANCE ORGANIZATION IN WORLD

Since October 8, 1940, the date of the enactment of the National Service Life Insurance Act, more than 18,100,000 applications have been received in the Veterans' Administration, aggregating over $141,000,000,000 of insurance—total for all private insurance companies, $145,000,000,000—on the lives of approximately 15,200,000 service men and women, an average of 34,942 in each of the 435 congressional districts in the United States.

It is regrettable that most World War II veterans have permitted their life insurance to lapse.

If the lapse has not been longer than 3 months, the insurance will be reinstated if the applicant makes an affidavit that his health is as good as at the time of lapse, and 2 months' premiums are paid.

During the first 6 months after discharge the 3-month requirement is waived.

If the lapse is older than 3 months, the applicant still pays only 2 months' premiums, but must also successfully pass a physical examination.

ADVANTAGES

The advantages of national service life insurance may be clarified by high-lighting its main features in the following paragraphs:

First. Issued at the net premium rate, calculated for payment on a monthly basis, in accordance with the American experience table of mortality and interest at the rate of 3 percent per year. No additional charge is calculated in the premium to cover the cost of the provision for waiver of payment of premiums during total disability occurring prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday.

Second. Low cost because—

(a) The premium does not include any charge to cover expenses of administration, which are borne by the Government.

(b) The excess mortality cost and the cost of the waiver of premiums on account of total disability when death or total disability is traceable to the extra hazard of the military or naval service are also borne by the Government.

Third. There are no restrictions as to residence, travel, occupation, or military or naval service. The insured may live where he likes, go where he will, or engage in any type of occupation without altering the terms of his contract. The ordinary commercial practice is to charge extra premiums for hazardous occupations, such as mining, construction, employment as policemen or firemen, and many others, or, in some cases, to eliminate coverage altogether.

Fourth. The proceeds of a policy, except where commingled with other funds or converted into another form of property, are exempt from taxation and are not subject to the claims of private creditors of the insured or of the beneficiary.

Fifth. Under the provisions of Public Law 118, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 2, 1945, all 5-year level premium term policies—issued on or before December 31, 1945, and not converted to permanent policies before that date—were extended automatically for an additional period of 3 years. The premiums actually chargeable for such additional period are the same as during the original 5-year period. This means that all such 5-year level premium term policies may be continued in force without any increase in the premium rate for a period of 8 years after the insurance was originally made effective.

Sixth. Five-year level premium term policies which have lapsed may be reinstated under the following conditions:

(a) Within 6 months after separation from service or within 3 months of lapse—whichever is later—by the payment of only two monthly premiums and submitting statement that the applicant is in as good health as he was on the date of lapse.

(b) At any other time before the expiration of the term period by paying only two monthly premiums and submitting satisfactory evidence of good health—medical examination.

Seventh. Converted policies may be reinstated at any time by the payment of all back premiums with interest and the submission of satisfactory evidence of health generally under the conditions as described above for term policies.

Eighth. After 1 year's premiums have been paid, converted policies have guaranteed cash, loan, paid-up, and automatic extended insurance values. There is no surrender charge.

Ninth. National service life insurance is mutual insurance. All premiums paid on this insurance and all interest earned thereon are deposited and covered into a separate trust fund in the United States Treasury, designated as the "National Service Life Insurance Fund." The Government derives no profit whatever from its administration and acts in the capacity of trustee of the fund for the sole benefit of the policyholders and their beneficiaries.

The private life-insurance companies are doing an excellent job acquainting veterans of World War II with the benefits of Government insurance and encouraging them to keep it.

The War and Navy Departments and the Veterans' Administration are urging veterans to keep their policies and making every effort to acquaint the veteran with the exceptional value of national service life insurance and to encourage him in every way possible to keep this insurance.

FREE BOOKLETS AVAILABLE

Any veteran who desires full and complete information on reinstating or converting his life insurance should obtain copies of Insurance Form 1535 on Continuance of National Service Life Insurance—Information for Veterans of World War II, and Supplement to Insurance Form 1535 on Continuance of National Service Life Insurance—New and Liberal Features. The request for these booklets should be made to the nearest Veterans' Administration field office. In our district it is Dallas, Tex.

The Honorable Frank T. Hines, former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, made the following statement concerning life insurance:

Life insurance is a most effective agency of thrift and one of the wisest and best ways, especially for a man of ordinary means, to safeguard the future of his family.

PROBLEMS OF VETERANS

If any veteran of World War II, or a veteran or the dependents of any veteran of any war, who resides in our congressional district, desires my assistance on any problem concerning Government insurance or any other benefit or privilege granted by the Federal Government, it will please me very much to be called upon, and I shall make every effort to be helpful.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in each to include excerpts, communications, or articles.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post of November 3, 1945.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled, "Ever Hear of the Praying Mantis?"

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in six instances on the situation in Lithuania.

PLENTY OF JOBS BUT NONE TO FILL THEM

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Is it common sense or nonsense to do the most important things first? We have millions of jobs going begging with no one to take them or, I should say, no one who will take them; yet those who will not take jobs today are clamoring for the full employment bill to be passed, along with the majority leader of another legislative body.

Why should the Government create jobs when there are more jobs now than can be filled? Is it sensible or senseless? You know the answer. It is deception of the first magnitude. Let the Congress pass legislation to curb strikes, legislation giving labor, management, and the public equal rights. That is the sensible thing to do that will aid reconversion and get this country started in the right direction.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S DECLARATION OF BANKRUPTCY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration has filed a declaration of bankruptcy. It has declared its total incapacity to solve the economic situation in this country. It has put pressure upon everyone it could reach to pass the so-called full employment bill and unemployment insurance bill. Both bills are designed to keep people out of regular private employment and to prevent reconversion. Both bills are designed to prevent the production and manufacture of goods and farm products necessary to prevent inflation.

Why do we have the Truman administration trying to prevent reconversion?

ARMISTICE DAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article I wrote at the beginning of the Disarmament Conference in 1921.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AIR ACCIDENTS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us feel very depressed over the recent accident that took one of the former Members of this House. KARL MUNDT and I had the pleasure of seeing Jack Nichols over in Cairo and we found that he was doing a very fine piece of work for the country in his contacts with the other nations and the people with whom he was working. I regret his death infinitely, even as you do.

This catastrophe brings home to us here in this House the fact that there are entirely too many accidents in the air these days. I want to urge that all those who have to do with the Air Forces reconsider some of their demobilization plans and see to it that the requirements for men on the ground, the mechanics of air transportation, be most carefully reconsidered. We must not permit laxness in the mechanical safety in the various branches of our air services, especially if this be due to lack of adequate manpower.

We should also urge the civilian lines to be particularly careful and certainly we should protect our servicemen from carelessness due to insufficient number of mechanics servicing our planes.

Mr. Speaker, I speak with very deep feeling in this matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

THE LATE JACK NICHOLS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Oklahoma delegation in the House, as well as his many other friends, were shocked to get the recent news of the death of our former colleague, Jack Nichols, who was killed in an airplane accident in Asmara, Eritrea. It seems only a few days ago that Jack, as he was called by all who knew him, was among us, tirelessly working for legislation in the interests of the advancement of aviation, and especially of safety measures which would give our aviation companies additional opportunity for progress.

Our former colleague for whom his hosts of friends in many parts of the world mourn today, was elected a Member of the Seventy-fourth Congress and reelected continuously until 1943, when he resigned to take up his work with the Transcontinental & Western Airline. TWA at that time was planning to expand into the international field and they prevailed upon our colleague to direct this new enterprise. It was in his capacity as international director that Mr. Nichols was sent to the Near East to attempt to arrange for airline traffic rights for his company through that area. He had been working with Cairo, Egypt, as his headquarters, and had flown many thousands of miles to the various countries involved in his negotiations throughout that area.

Jack Nichols came up the hard way. Born in Missouri 49 years ago, he had to struggle for an education. He studied law in the office of his brother, Clark, to whom he was very much devoted and with whom he later became associated in the practice of law. He soon became known as one of the best trial lawyers in the State of Oklahoma.

He came to Congress imbued with the hope of making some contribution, not only to the Nation's domestic problems but also to the problem of getting the country's house in order from the standpoint of preparedness on land, on sea, and in the air. In fact, he was widely known as an aviation enthusiast. It was as chairman of a special committee to investigate airplane accidents that he perhaps made his greatest contribution. The report of his committee, which included specific recommendations to the Congress, was one of the most thorough reports ever made by any special committee. It will long be remembered as a masterpiece. It proposed a pattern for Congress to follow that was a forward and progressive step in the field of aviation. The Nichols investigation and report no doubt saved many lives and had Congress followed the suggestions made, it would have no doubt saved many other lives that have since been lost in airplane accidents. It is ironical that Jack Nichols should have met his death in such a sudden and tragic manner after having spent years both in Congress and out to prevent airplane accidents.

Although our departed colleague was widely known to the general public for his work on behalf of aviation matters, we of the Oklahoma delegation knew him as a tireless worker for any enterprise for the benefit of our State. He cooperated to the fullest during the dark days of the depression in bringing assistance to our people. He was known and generally recognized as a sincere, courageous hard-working Member of Congress and was vigorous in his demands that everything possible be done for the benefit of our people.

Not only was he an able lawyer and a successful legislator, but he possessed an unusual sense of humor, and was recognized as a gifted and polished speaker. During the past several elections the Democratic Party was fortunate to have him available. He was always ready to go and to give of his best when these calls came and his voice was effective in many States, as I am sure many of you will recall. However, Jack was always an American before he was a partisan, and his consistent record for support of measures in the national interest is one which his friends and constituents were justly proud.

But it was the warm human element, the appeal of his smile and his friendly voice and handshake, that made him so beloved by his friends here in his own beloved Oklahoma. Jack had friends by the thousands, because he was genuinely fond of his fellowman. He was interested in the problems of the folks that he met and would give of his time and energy to helping the unfortunate at any time of the day or night.

Jack came to the House directly from the people and during his eight years in Congress established himself as an able and an effective leader. He never lost the common touch, was the direct representative of each and every one of his people. Never have I known a Member here who would take more time or patience in an effort to work out the problems of those who had matters before any branch of the Federal Government than he. The poorest and most humble citizen in his district received that same degree of courtesy as did the wealthiest or most powerful political figure in the State. I recall that he once told me he usually answered the letters written in longhand with a pencil before those written to him on a typewriter. He explained that he felt those who took the pains to write him a letter with a pencil had a problem which vitally affected them and really needed help, while those who had office help to write a letter on a typewriter usually could obtain assistance they needed without his aid.

Jack served as an infantry soldier in the First World War and spent a brief time in an officers' training camp, although he did not get his commission. He had hoped that he could be of service in the military in the Second World War, and offered his services to the War Department on the same day that he voted for the draft law, but received a letter from President Roosevelt requesting that he remain in the House.

After leaving the House, Jack returned for frequent visits and had been in Washington much of the time and was in contact with his many friends. His passing will leave a vacant spot in our lives that will not soon be filled.

On behalf of the Oklahoma delegation I desire at this time to offer our deep and heartfelt sympathy to his devoted family and legion of close personal friends and business associates. Oklahoma and the

Nation will miss him. Those who mourn his untimely passing today will have the consolation of knowing that the world has been made better and happier because of the unselfish, big-hearted life and character of our departed friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Jack Nichols is a personal loss to me. Those of us who served with Jack Nichols in this body will always remember him for his geniality, but as a legislator will always remember him for his ability, his courage, and particularly his loyalty. If there is one trait that I like to see a human being possess it is the trait of loyalty, and then courage. Loyalty and courage in a legislator are important elements for a legislator to possess, in the interest of the people whom he serves. These two outstanding traits that appeal to me and my fellow men in our journey through life, to wit, loyalty and courage, our late friend, Jack Nichols, possessed to an outstanding and very noticeable and impressive extent. We who knew Jack Nichols, will miss him very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the distinguished floor leader for his very appropriate remarks.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to join with the other Members of the House, particularly the Oklahoma delegation, in expressing my deep regret and feeling of personal loss in the death of Jack Nichols. It was a pleasure to have served with him, to have participated in the Oklahoma delegation meetings with him, and to have observed the courageous and effective fighting spirit that Jack Nichols always had when issues demanded a strong position.

As the gentleman from Oklahoma has so wisely said, the thing that Jack Nichols made his greatest effort in was to try and bring about greater safety in air operation.

How ironic it is that at the end of his career, that was marked with so much progress in the aviation field in this country, he was to lose his life in such effort to bring about further progress.

He was really a pioneer in overseas aviation. The work that he did in the past several months will undoubtedly mean that the American flag will fly through the air in many, many far off points in the world because Jack Nichols and other men like him were willing to take the time, and take the risks, and the hazards to bring about this progress for the United States.

The people of Oklahoma, the Members of Congress who have served with him, and the Nation have lost a good friend and a patriotic American. His service and help will be greatly missed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. It is indeed sad that a man who has devoted his ability and energy for years to bring about safety in air transportation should himself suffer and give up his life in an airplane accident Jack Nichols was a member of the Committee on Rules. I had a splendid opportunity to observe his activities. I can truthfully say that I do not know of any man in the House who has been more energetic, more loyal, and more devoted to the causes he advocated and in which he believed.

He was appointed as chairman of a special committee to investigate the many casualties that unfortunately occurred in airplane accidents due to what he believed was negligence and defective construction of airplanes and frequently due to the recklessness and disregard of regulations by pilots. As chairman of that committee he made a report to this House that I am sure will be appreciated and recognized for many years as an outstanding, concise, and efficient report of the conditions disclosed as a result of the investigation. Some of the recommendations of the committee brought about changes in the regulations that have lessened the number of certain types of accidents, thereby saving many lives.

I knew Jack Nichols well, and in him the country loses an outstanding, loyal, patriotic, and sincere citizen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. In 1934, along with Jack Nichols and 98 others, I was elected to the House. There were 100 in that group of the Seventy-fourth Congress. Twenty-six of those 100 yet remain in the House of Representatives. The new Members of the Seventy-fourth Congress formed a little organization at the beginning of the term, and Jack Nichols was one of the officers. He was a good legislator. There were many of us who did not always agree with him, but he could always be found fighting for those things in which he believed.

Some have expressed regret that he should have died in an airplane. Of course, we would all have preferred that he live to serve many more useful years in the cause of aviation, but it could be that he died as he would have wanted to die—in an airplane.

I think Jack Nichols made a very considerable contribution to the cause of aviation. I join with others in expressing my regret that his useful career has been brought to this untimely end.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to learn of the death of our friend Jack Nichols, and know that we will miss him in the days to come.

I learned of his mission to the Near East from his associates several weeks ago and think that it was a fine tribute to his ability that he was selected for such an important mission.

Mr. Nichols was sent to Cairo by the TWA air lines at the request of our State Department. His company had been awarded a certificate to fly through that area by our Civil Aeronautics Board and the President. The State Department is the agency authorized to negotiate for transit and traffic rights for our air-line companies. Most nations have their air lines operated by the government and it was felt that the nations in the Near East should understand that this American operation would be by a private corporation, and TWA was asked to send someone over who could explain fully the future plans of our aviation companies.

We all know how important it is in our planning for the future that we be adequately represented by our commercial institutions in that section of the world. It was felt by our State Department that an air line which would give our businessmen direct access to that important territory would result in greatly increasing all of our commercial enterprises there, and Mr. Nichols therefore was a spokesman for the American system of private enterprise throughout that area.

A number of members of the House visited with Jack in Cairo, and found that the officials of the various governments throughout that area had formed a very high opinion of him. A group of us ate breakfast with Jack in Cairo recently.

As a result of the work of Jack Nichols as chairman of a special committee to investigate air crashes he was instrumental in saving the lives of countless thousands of air travelers. I feel that during the last few months of his life, Jack had done the most important work he had ever done. We have a right to be proud of him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I knew Jack Nichols from the time he came to Congress. I was associated with him many, many times. I always admired him for his straightforwardness and for his zeal and energy in trying to do things the best he could. Jack Nichols never undertook anything unless he could follow it up and bring it to a final conclusion. He was zealous and energetic. I never saw a fellow in my life who had more enthusiasm when he started to do something. He was everybody's friend. I think Jack Nichols had as many friends in the House of Representatives as any man I know of. If he had differences with people, he was always desirous to adjust those differences. In his work he was one of the most genial and finest companions that one could have. The loss of Jack Nichols is a great one. In the work that he was trying to do, certainly no one has given more to aviation in his time than Jack Nichols. When he was placed on that committee to try to discover why accidents occurred he was diligent in trying to discover the reasons for airplane accidents. He traveled all over the country. He enjoyed that work. He was diligent in trying to see that accidents did not happen. It seems so strange that he should have been in a plane when he met his untimely death. I certainly

have lost one of the finest companions and friends I have ever made since I have been in Washington. I shall regret very much the passing of Jack Nichols.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying a simple and humble tribute to the memory of our departed former colleague and my personal friend, the late Jack Nichols. I was shocked beyond expression when I received the sad and unwelcome news that Jack had been killed in a plane crash Wednesday, November 7, in Egypt. In his untimely and tragic death, Oklahoma has lost an outstanding citizen, the field of aviation has lost a great leader, and I have lost a true friend. I was associated with Jack in public life and have known him and his brother, Clark, since they came into prominence in Oklahoma. Through the years I have valued his friendship greatly and shall ever remember him as a man of his word and a gentleman unafraid. To his loved ones and to his many friends who mourn his passing I extend my deepest heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to hear of the passing of Jack Nichols. I liked him. He was a good fellow and he was interesting and energetic. The last time I saw him was in the Chicago Airport in 1944. He told me then he had taken on a new job and what he had in mind. And I am sure that Jack died in the work to which he had devoted his whole life. I always want to think of him as a good fellow who went after things and generally got them. In the untimely passing of Jack Nichols, aviation has lost a leader and I have lost a friend.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I join the friends of Jack Nichols in expressing our regret over his untimely death. It so happens a few days before he left on the trip which resulted in his death I visited with him in his office for a while and he told me about the trip. It is also a peculiar coincidence that during the last week I was reading the final report made by the select committee which he headed dealing with air accidents. I was impressed with the many splendid suggestions made by that committee dealing with the question of safety in air travel. That committee, under the leadership of Jack Nichols, contributed very greatly to the improvement of aviation. I think his work will live long after he is gone. I regret his untimely death.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I knew Jack Nichols well. I served with him on the Rules Committee. There is not much I can add, but I do want to take this opportunity to pay my tribute of love and respect to the memory of a good friend, a splendid legislator, a fine gentleman, and a good citizen. We will all miss him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful and appropriate tributes that we have just listened to from several of his former colleagues who knew him best will long be remembered and deeply appreciated. As chairman of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress and on behalf of each of them, some of whom are unable to be present here today, as well as on behalf of the thousands of Oklahoma people who knew and loved Jack Nichols, let me say that from the bottom of our hearts we appreciate the kind words from his friends.

The Oklahoma delegation has unanimously passed a resolution which I submit herewith for the RECORD.

The Members of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress have learned with deep sorrow of the untimely death of Hon. Jack Nichols, formerly Representative of Congress from the Second District of Oklahoma, in an airplane accident in Asmara, Eritrea.

We, who have served with him during his membership in the House from January 3, 1935 to June 3, 1943, feel a deep sense of loss both personally and for the Nation. We recall his tireless and effective efforts in behalf of the people of Oklahoma and the Nation and shared in the distinction that he brought to the State through his leadership and fighting spirit.

His sponsorship of the Special Committee on Aviation Accidents and the record his committee made in helping to give the Nation the world's best record on civil aviation safety was a great achievement. Undoubtedly thousands of lives were saved, not only in civil aviation but in military aviation as well, because of the thoroughness and diligence of his work on this special committee.

His membership upon the important Rules Committee of the House, and his leadership in fostering legislation necessary for the preparation of this Nation for the eventualities of war added much to his contribution to his country.

We realize that he was further engaged in work for America in assisting in the establishment of world-wide American aviation lines at the time of his death and we appreciate his willingness to take this risk and hardship for the promotion of the air lines of this Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress adopt this resolution as a mark of our esteem and respect for our late colleague the Honorable Jack Nichols, and request that this resolution be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that copies be sent to the members of his family as an official expression of the delegation.

JED JOHNSON,
Chairman.
VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Secretary.
MIKE MONRONEY,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Jack Nichols under these circumstances sounds a warning to the American people. It would be a double tragedy if we let it be said that he died in vain—that we failed to heed the lesson his sacrifice has brought.

We have reached a new period in world affairs. The airplane has become a common vehicle of transportation in times of peace, as well as a weapon of destruction in time of war. It must not be neglected again.

I remember in 1921, when Gen. "Billy" Mitchell, who was sacrificed by the brass hats of those days for advocating a strong air force, arranged to attempt to sink from the air the *Ost Friedland*, the largest battleship captured from the Germans during World War I. The ones in charge of that program set that demonstration for the very day Congress had set to vote on the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill. They knew that not a Member of the House could witness it under those circumstances. That demonstration was in a class with the demonstration of the atomic bomb, so far as its revelations were concerned.

They brought the *Ost Friedland* out, and General Mitchell came over and dropped his bombs. The first time he missed it. The next shot went down by the side of it and knocked a hole in it as large as an ordinary house, as someone expressed it.

The vessel turned over on its back. The next shot hit right on top of it, and they never saw the *Ost Friedland* again. That was 20 years before the attack on Pearl Harbor.

In the face of that marvelous demonstration General Mitchell was persecuted and driven from public life. He was humiliated and we were left without any air force. There is where you should begin your Pearl Harbor investigation.

As a result of that, we were not prepared, from an air standpoint, to enter this war.

Now, the very thing that Jack Nichols was trying to demonstrate should be impressed upon the mind of every public man in America—that is, that we are living in an air age. We are going to have to have the strongest air force on earth. I am speaking of the United States of America. If Jack Nichols were here today, he would say the same thing.

Jack Nichols was with me in Hawaii in 1937, and he heard me point out the fact that we had an insufficient air force in Hawaii; that those 16-inch guns implanted in that island would only shoot, at the outside, 16 miles. I pointed out that airplanes from a carrier could shell that island at any time, which they did 4 years later.

Not only must we have a military air force but we are going to have to support civil aviation in order to keep trained men. That is one thing Jack Nichols had in mind in his fight for civil aviation here in the House.

Again, you are not going to have peace in this world until American airplanes and airplanes from other countries can go anywhere in the world and return.

You are not going to have peace in this world until you have a free press with ingress and egress to every section of the globe. When that is done, with the start we have, America can help maintain peace among the nations of the earth and incidentally protect American soil against all hazards.

That is one thing that Jack Nichols had in mind. Let it not be said that he lost his life in vain but let his tragic death be an inspiration to the American

Congress to see to it that this country is never caught without an adequate air force again.

He was my friend, and I join in mourning his untimely passing.

Peace to his ashes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I feel a deep personal loss in the death of my friend, Jack Nichols.

I cannot here recount the many deeds great and small that endeared him to the multitude of friends who feel his loss. His deeds of friendship, his deeds of kindness, his deeds of charity, his deeds of good will, were too numerous.

He was a man of strong spirit.

He never straddled a fence. He went all the way. He was a bold fighter, a generous winner, a game loser, a man who possessed every trait of good sportsmanship.

His was a rare gift. Few men can be an equally good winner or good loser in a contest, but it was ever so with him.

To know him better was to like him more. I knew him well—knew his faults, and he had his for he was human; knew his virtues and they were strong and they were many.

Knowing him thus well and certainly, I think it a tribute of the highest, just to say what speaks out of my mind and heart—that I was always proud to be his friend and know that he was mine.

RIGHT OF THE ARMED FORCES TO TAKE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT WHILE ON TERMINAL LEAVE

Mr. RAMSPECK submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if this report represents a unanimous agreement on the part of the conferees, and I also wish the gentleman would explain what differences it contains from the original House bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. This is a unanimous report on the part of the conferees of both Houses.

The only change made in the bill by the conferees as compared with the bill when it passed the House is to make certain that the term "armed forces" includes the commissioned personnel of the Public Health Service and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey. That is the only change we made. I believe that the original bill we passed in the House by unanimous consent did include such a provision but the Senate had some doubt about the positiveness of the House provision and we therefore wrote that section in the bill to make the intent of Congress certain.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Act entitled 'An Act making provisions for payment of employees of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, for accumulated or accrued annual leave when ordered to active duty with the military or naval forces of the United States', approved August 1, 1941, as amended April 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 200), is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 2. (a) Any person, who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall have performed active service in the armed forces, may, while on terminal leave pending separation from or release from active duty in such service under honorable conditions, enter or reenter employment of the Government of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia (including any corporation created under authority of an Act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress), and, in addition to compensation for such employment, shall be entitled to receive pay and allowances from the armed forces for the unexpired portion of such terminal leave at the same rates and to the same extent as if he had not entered or reentered such employment.

"'(b) Any such person, who, prior to the date of enactment of this section, entered or reentered such employment without having used all accumulated and current accrued leave to which he would have been entitled as a result of such service had he not entered or reentered such employment, shall upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, or the Federal Security Administrator, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he would have been entitled while on terminal leave for the unused portion of such accumulated and current accrued leave had he not entered or reentered such employment.

"'(c) Any such person who, while on terminal leave from the armed forces, performed or shall hereafter perform services for the Government of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia (including any corporation created under authority of an Act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress), for which he would have been entitled to be paid had he regularly become employed or reemployed in a civilian position prior to performing such services, and had he not been receiving pay and allowances from the armed forces for the period during which such services were performed, shall, if he has not otherwise been compensated for such services, be entitled, upon application therefor filed with the General Accounting Office, or, in the case of a person performing such services for a Territory or possession, filed with the appropriate agency or officer of the Government of such Territory or possession, to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the compensation he would have received for such services had he been regularly employed or reemployed and had he not been receiving pay and allowances from the armed forces.

"'(d) Any such person who enters the employment of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, shall upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, or the Federal Security Administrator, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he is entitled for the unused portion of his accumulated and current accrued leave.

"'(e) No waiver effectuated prior to the date of enactment of this section of any right to receive any payment to which a person would otherwise be entitled under this section shall operate to deny such person entitlement to such payment.

"'(f) As used in this section, the term "armed forces" includes the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, and the commissioned corps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and their respective components.'"

And the House agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An Act to provide for the adjustment of the compensation of certain members or former members of the armed forces of the United States who, before the expiration of their terminal leave, have performed, or shall hereafter perform, civilian services for the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
GLEN H. TAYLOR,
THOMAS C. HART,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The only difference between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference is the inclusion in the conference substitute of language which makes it clear that for the purposes of the section added by the bill to the act of August 1, 1941, as amended, the commissioned personnel of the Public Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be considered a part of the armed forces.

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

There was no objection.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and also to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from pointing out to the House with profound hopefulness that the proposal which this morning's press reports to have been made by the British Prime Minister with regard to the control of the atomic bomb follows in most of its fundamentals the proposal I made in the House in the speech I delivered here on Thursday last.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Postwar Economic Policy has just filed its eighth report to the Congress—and I should like to say in passing—that this eighth report, like its seven predecessors, has been a unanimous report. The report is entitled "Economic Reconstruction in Europe." It deals with the subject of the foreign economic situation and the part America should play in that foreign economy. We think it is a very splendid report. It represents many months of hard work. It considers a number of subjects on which you will be called upon to act before this Congress is over. Busy as we know you are yet we are going to ask and hope that when this report reaches you on Wednesday—we had hoped it might reach you today but we have had some trouble getting it printed—you will take time from your arduous duties to read it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Gladly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I ask the gentleman to do this because I wish publicly to thank the chairman and the other members of the committee for their patience with me and the great number of suggestions I had to make, and their granting of the time I required of the committee to go over those suggestions. I wish also to agree with the chairman that this is a unanimous report and one of great importance to the country.

Mr. COLMER. I wish to say in response to the gentleman from California that no man contributed more to this report than the gentleman from California, especially in view of the fact that he was not among the original seven men who made the trip; notwithstanding this, his contribution was a splendid one. But Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of the efforts and contribution made by the entire membership of the 18-man committee, and likewise to express publicly the appreciation of the committee of the efforts of our staff director, Marion Folsom, and our special consultant, William Y. Elliott.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, to include in one an article by Sumner Welles, in another statements from a letter received by a former employee of his, and in the other to include a speech delivered by himself yesterday on UNRRA.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in regard to irrigation within the State of Arizona.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Globe entitled, "Make It the Hub of the World." This editorial is along the lines of hearings to be held soon by the preparatory commission of the United Nations Organization, showing that historic Boston would be the most natural and logical place for the headquarters of the United Nations Organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMISSION ON THE ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
November 12, 1945.

DANIEL D. O'CONNELL AND ALMON B. STEWART—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

The House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the bill (H. R. 1303) for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart.

The measure would provide for the payment of the sums of $544.16 and $1,732.22, respectively, to Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart, of Bangor, Maine, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by them by the failure of George E. Glunt, of Altoona, Pa., to pay them for labor and material furnished by them as subcontractors on a contract for the construction of an airways communication station at the Bangor, Maine, airport.

It appears that in September 1941, the Government, acting through the Civil Aeronautics Administration, contracted with George E. Glunt for the erection of a prefabricated steel-frame watch-house building at Bangor, Maine. After the contract was awarded to Mr. Glunt, he sublet the work of installing the foundations and the piers to the claimant O'Connell for the sum of $544.16, and entered into a subcontract with the claimant Stewart to furnish the labor and materials in erecting the building at actual cost, plus 15 percent. The bill of the claimant O'Connell was in the amount of $544.16 and the bill of the claimant Stewart was in the amount of $1,732.22. Although Mr. Glunt was paid the amount due him under his contract,

he disappeared without paying anything to the subcontractors.

While it is to be regretted that the claimants have sustained a financial loss, in the absence of any privity of contract between the claimants and the Government, and in view of the fact that the Government has already paid for the work performed, I am not aware of any reason, either legal or moral, which would require the Government to reimburse the claimants for their losses and, in effect, to act as an insurer of the subcontractors.

Accordingly, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
November 12, 1945.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large on the Journal, and, without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] conferred with me a few minutes ago and made a suggestion which aroused my immediate interest and favorable response, as the result of which I conferred with the Speaker and our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], the acting minority leader on the floor at the present time. Today is Armistice Day. On November 11, 1918, the actual Armistice Day of World War I took place. During that war our land forces were led by a man whose name will occupy the foremost pages in history. Through the divine province of God he is still with us. He was the commander in chief of the Army of the United States during World War I, which he led with such fine judgment and valor so as to bring about the great victory that came to our country in that war. It is only proper and fitting, the Speaker and the distinguished acting minority leader agreeing, that the House of Representatives should on this day convey to that great American, that great warrior of World War I, our profound feeling of respect and admiration that this body holds for him, which expression would be symbolic and representative of the feelings of Americans throughout the entire country.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to send to that great military leader of the last war, that great American, Gen. John J. Pershing, an appropriate message from the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A NATION PERISHING WITHIN

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, amid the turmoil, strife, and national upheaval that now exists throughout the land, I think it is time for the voices of the membership of this House to be heard. We are now going through a period in which there should be harmony akin to that of a love feast existing among our people—much to the contrary our whole economic system is torn to threads. We have just concluded one of the most horrible wars known to the civilized world and instead of maintaining here at home a spirit of universal peace, of good will, and of comradeship, from one to the other, that a befitting environment may await our returning heroes, what does the threshold of their homeland hold out to them? There must be a deep underlying cause; there is such cause. We must all know that throughout the world a spirit of revolution exists.

To my sorrow, I must admit that such a spirit of revolution is actively at work among a minority group in this country, who even though constituting a minority, is a very active and productive one.

Let us for once be realistic in viewing the picture as it exists, and let us take off the colored glasses and throw on this shameful spectacle the searchlight of truth.

In July 1945 the gang that designates themselves the Communist Party of these United States, held a secret convention in New York City—their haven. Through leakage, the press was able to pick up some of their proceedings.

Under a New York date line of July 27, 1945, Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune Press Service, stated as follows:

> A prediction by Soviet Dictator Stalin that the United States faces an economic crisis in the postwar period evoked loud cheers at the opening of a secret convention of American Communist leaders yesterday. The cheers swelled to gleeful shouts as speakers envisioned a Soviet America within 5 years, based upon an overturn of the American system of government due to a workers revolution.

Let us evaluate: Why should Stalin predict an economic crisis? Why should the delegates predict an overthrow of our form of government and be able to name the medium through which it would be accomplished? There is no informed person that will be honest with himself that will deny that the CIO is the working organization of the Communist Party. I do not lay this charge to all the members of the CIO, for it has many members who are just as loyal and just as good American citizens as I. I refer to the leadership that controls the action of the organization and the membership.

Do you have to look far to see the workers revolution in progress? Look about you in any direction. Also, consider for a moment where all these strikes are coming from. The great majority of them are by CIO unions. I will say this, in my opinion, the leadership of the A. F. of L. is strongly American and I do not think it has ever done anything with a view of weakening or destroying this country. No person that will think and be fair will deny that these widespread strikes are following the planned and blue-printed course laid down by that gang of un-American Communists to overthrow this Government.

Let me ask why the Department of Justice has not seized the complete files of that gang? How long are we going to repose in dreamland and let a gang like that lay plans and avow to overthrow our Government, and we remain in silence? Their acts without question constituted mass treason while we were engaged in all-out war with a foreign enemy. Have we done anything about it? Let us see: This same CIO gang came in here with three pieces of legislation they have been demanding that this body enact into law. Let us analyze this legislation and see if it comes from the same source.

Will anyone deny that the CIO and the Communists are the main proponents and sponsors of the so-called full employment bill, the bill to fix the minimum wage at 65 cents per hour, and the bill to pay $25 per week to those unemployed. If you question these assertions, I will ask you what badges the gang of approximately 300 wore as they marched about the Capitol Grounds trying to intimidate the Congress into passing this legislation. You know they wore a badge carrying the words, "CIO Delegate." You further know there were very few of them that could speak more than broken English except the Negroes they brought along with them. What papers have been the most vehement in their demands that we pass these measures? You know as well as I, the Daily Worker and PM, both printed in New York and both Communist papers. As a member of a committee holding hearings on one of these bills, I have received hundreds of letters demanding immediate favorable action, and more than 99 percent of them are from New York and Brooklyn, the hotbed of these rats. Can you tell me why all these letters should come from the section where these Communist papers have circulation? The question answers itself, why should we kid ourselves?

Let us measure the result of these bills were they enacted into law. First the full employment bill, in effect, promises a job to all who are not taken care of by private enterprise. The next makes mandatory a 65-cent minimum wage, and the other provides for $25 a week for those unable to find employment that suits them. To put it in practical language, and as the bills will be understood by the public, they say, you need not look to private enterprise, we will give you a job, as you know the Government does not require much of you, and we will guarantee you 65 cents an hour, and if you do not want to work at all we will just give you $25 a week to do nothing. A gracious Government. No one can believe this is sound or safe legislation. The publicity these bills have received has done more to break down the morale of people who should be at work than anything that could have been done. You must not lose sight of human psychology, it is the greatest force that exists. The psychological effect of even having these measures up for consideration has been to cause the great mass of people, who should be at work, to subconsciously say—there is no need for me to work, the Government will take care of me. All this during a time when there is more work that must be done if our

Nation is to be sustained and march forward, than has ever been in our Nation's life, more work than all our people can do.

Who, for one moment, would seriously contend that all these strikes throughout the land are for any purpose other than to break down our system of free enterprise? Why, in the name of God and all sources of common reason, the working class cannot understand that our system of free enterprise is all that ever kept their standard of living above that of the countries that have no such system, is beyond me. Those in Europe who have embraced totalitarian forms of Government now yell in thundering tones that our capitalistic system has failed, and from the other side of their mouth call on us for grants or loans, never to be repaid, in the sums of billions, with the assertion that if we do not let them have this money they are going to perish. All this after we have paid the greater portion of their war expense. I ask you, how does this make sense?

Every line of history of every nation discloses that when government takes over business, the people suffer. We are the guardians of the people of this Nation, and if we continue to bring the free enterprise of this country into Government operation, we will reduce the people of the Nation to peasantry, to a state of serfdom and slavery, all in the name of feeding them from a Government spoon.

The Government cannot do business. It does not try to do business, it plays politics and the two are incompatible.

I will let figures speak for themselves: During the First World War the Government operated the American railroads and allied agencies, paying no taxes to the Government, and had a net loss of $1,922,000,000; this, of course, was from the funds of taxpayers.

During the war just closed, under private operation the railroads and allied agencies paid into the Federal Treasury in taxes, excluding pay-roll taxes, $4,247,000,000, and after paying such taxes had a net profit from such operations of $2,917,000,000.

The railroads paid into the Government $3,172,000 in taxes daily during the war. The difference in the business efficiency of businessmen and the Government over this short period was exactly $9,086,000,000.

The true measure of the worth of a dollar is what it produces. You can readily see from the above that unless the Government ceases to shackle and penalize every effort of business initiative in this country, nothing but poverty and suffering can await your children and mine.

What would have been the plight of the world today had it not been for the ingenuity of the American businessman. Those countries who say our system has failed had the manpower, at least one of them had the natural resources, but where did their fighting equipment come from? Straight from the factories operated in America under the free enterprise system.

How does our war debt compare with those countries:

During the war period our national debt increased $207,781,190,660.46. That of the United Kingdom, at current rate of exchange, $60,481,000,000. That of Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, $17,400,440,000.

No one will deny that our natural resources were drawn on more heavily than that of any other nation.

Now let's see why we should, in the face of all this, hand out grants or loans to those countries to the tune of billions.

We were generous enough to furnish the greater portion of funds to establish a Bank for Reconstruction and Development under the Bretton Woods agreement. The purpose of this bank was to make loans to such countries for reconstruction.

Who has approved this agreement? No one but the United States and El Salvador. More than a year has passed since the Bretton Woods conferees drafted their pact, but still those countries wanting us to open the Treasury further to them have not approved it. Why, do you suppose? Could it be that it is known that no one ever bothers to pay us back and it is thought the bank would expect payment in a businesslike manner?

Personally I think it is high time this Congress again takes the reins of control and try to save what there is left of our American form of government.

We continue to throw money at everything that will take it, and at times it looks like we really hunt some place to squander some. Even a drunken sailor sometimes gets to the bottom of his pocket.

It seems that sight has about been lost of the fact that we are going to have thousands of disabled veterans to take care of, which constitutes a duty on this Nation and her people that cannot be shirked. A returning veteran gets $20 per week unemployment compensation, and they are trying to high pressure Congress into providing $25 per week for those who enjoyed high industrial wages while our boys were fighting for $50 per month. And in addition they are trying to put over on the American taxpayer the further sum of $200 for transportation home for those who drew the high industrial wages.

I think we had better take a recess on trying to play Santa Claus to the world, and hope to retain enough resources to give to our fighting men at least medical care and subsistence where they are unable to work. It seems that he has just about become the forgotten man, even before he gets home. If we do not quit this wild spending and nourishing inflation he most certainly will be the forgotten man.

While thinking of these strikes, think for a moment of our boys who have lived in foxholes, mud and mire, faced machine-gun fire, and the pangs of hunger, and who have not seen their loved ones for years, standing on a foreign shore looking across the briny deep with visions of home, loved ones, and friends, while men on strike held up their ship and passage home. Think of them pulling into port at New York amid the glory of beholding again the beauty of their homeland, tired from years of battle and a long voyage, to be met by a bunch of strikers who had lived at home in peace and at high wages, who not only refused to unload their ship, but booed and hissed at them while they were so engaged. No brute has ever done a more reprehensible thing, and all this while our Government has appeased their conduct to such extent as to amount to acquiescence.

Just think for a moment, you American people, these are your sons receiving this sort of treatment. How long are you going to stand for such outrages?

I again state that the Congress is the only bulwark between the people and a totalitarian despotism. There are only two means of tearing down a democracy: One by actual physical revolt and the other by destruction of the Nation's economic structure. We are heading rapidly toward the latter. If we do not cease throwing money at everything that will catch it, and stop this effort to increase wages in all our industrial centers, thereby expanding the margin between a balanced and an unbalanced economy, we are going to produce an inflation that will completely wreck our economy—one that will destroy not only the value of the dollar, the savings of our thrifty citizens who have sought to provide for themselves through hard work and sacrifices that they may have a small backlog for old age, but also the value of the insurance of millions which constitute the only hope of food and raiment of thousands of potential widows and orphans.

Gentlemen, it is easy now to make speeches with promises of taking care of every class citizen by some fantastic governmental policy, and it is rather productive of votes on these election days that have a way of coming along occasionally, but let me tell you there is an end to this thing, it cannot go on forever.

The God-fearing Christian peoples of the earth are now taking a terrible beating, and seem not to realize it. Mark this statement to be read by your children as a part of the work of this Congress, when the history of this Nation will have an ugly story to tell. When the democratic fiber is eaten out of our national life and we reach that era to which we are fast approaching, and from which this Congress only can save us, you will not only find our freedom and liberty gone, but with it will be the culture and Christian civilization that honest toil, devout prayers, and the zeal of love of freedom have wrought through the long years that have passed since the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers. History will disclose that among people in whose hearts Christ and his teachings have lived, no dictatorship has ever established itself. Christian philosophy and democracy go hand in hand, one begets the other, but where love for Christ has perished democracy withers and dies. Point to me a nation that embraces Christian religion that has ever lived under the whip of a dictator. When anti-Christians take over the balance of power, the black heart of totalitarianism begins to beat. I say again the peoples of the world who love, and live by, the teachings of Christ, are, in this world upheaval and left-wing swing, taking a terrible beating.

To those of you who are inclined to appease the sponsors by bringing in "just a bill," I want to say this. The true sponsors of this legislation are out for the kill regardless to price. If we bring in a bill even with a number and an enacting clause, they will amend it to meet their every demand. This is a known fact, and when this is done, remember the responsibility is yours. Now, you may not know this, but it is the purpose and plan of the sponsors of this bill in any form it comes to the floor to offer as an amendment that damnable Fair Employment Practice Committee bill and when they do, it will be germane as each bill deals with employment. Now to you Members from the South, and from any section of the country that disapproves that dictatorial destructive legislation, I say to you, if you assist in getting this so-called full employment bill to the floor and the FEPC is added and becomes law, the responsibility is at your door and you must accept it whether you support the legislation on the floor or not. It will be your baby. I hope the constituents of every Member of this House will follow the course of this legislation.

In this connection I want to say to those who have decided to force us into passing this legislation by holding us here until the holidays, that I have never been driven into anything. I will meet you here on Christmas Day and debate it all day if you wish to. My first duty is to my country and if to perform this duty I must forego a few days at home among friends, just this I will do. We all know we are not doing anything here and I personally resent the attempt to force us into doing the bidding of the CIO. The letters I am getting from that gang demand it passed by Thanksgiving, so you are a little behind. Why can't a reasonable, realistic approach be made to any matter by intelligent men. It is said we must enact this measure before Christmas. Yet it is true that it cannot become operative until 1947, and some of its most ardent sponsors admit this. Why the rush and excitement? The answer is simply that its sponsors are afraid of its weakness.

I hope no one will accept my remarks about the CIO as a broadside at labor. So to do would be to distort the facts, to aim a false finger of accusation at labor. The A. F. of L. is a truly American organization and if you do not agree with all their acts, you must yet admit this fact. No more loyal group is included in our American citizenry than those men making up the railroad brotherhoods. The American public should bow in respect and thanks to them for the masterful job they did during the war. No strikes, no strife. I will also frankly say in some cases they were so underpaid until had it not been for the war they should have struck. No group of men in America contributed more to the war effort than did they by a good job magnificently done.

The American Federation of Labor is conscious of the communistic activities in this country, and in proof of this statement, I quote from a speech of Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, that was made in New York City a few months ago:

> The struggle will be long and bitter if any group in the United States attempts to make the American people a nation of fuehrer-worshippers, goose-stepping, totalitarian robots.
>
> Today, despite the allegiance of the overwhelming percentage of the American people to the democratic way of living, there is evidence of a trend to totalitarianism in small but influential groups. The growing reliance of the Executive on directives and government by decree is but one evidence of this impatience with our traditional, representative method of doing things.
>
> Another evidence of this trend is the gullibility with which some respectful sections of the community have accepted the brand of political and economic eyewash sold by the American Communist.
>
> Admiration of communism before the war was confined largely to a handful of party members and its lunatic fringe of intellectuals. Today the penetration of communism has reached alarming proportions.
>
> Labor unions, church organizations, cultural bodies have adopted the ever-changing party line. But most disquieting is the Communist penetration of conservative business groups. Interests close to some of our largest banking institutions have become fellow travelers, strange as it may sound.
>
> American communism can thrive best in a totalitarian atmosphere. Every move to concentrate greater power in the hands of government meets with a chorus of American Communist approval, and since it is generally agreed that big government is the enemy of economic voluntarism or free enterprise, and since communism in America today is completely behind the growing tendency toward total control over the Nation's industrial enterprise, those in business who soft-pedal communism are, in effect, digging their own graves.
>
> Today there is a shrinking of democratic processes and a continual enlargement of the role of the Government as a final arbiter. Before it is too late it is time we all demanded a priority on initiative, a priority on freedom, and the willingness to think things through, without the help of some ghost writer in one of the countless Government bureaus.
>
> Newspapers and radios which permit the skillful penetration of pro-Communist columnists and commentators are unwittingly preparing the day when their properties will be completely controlled, if not owned, by the growing, ruthless bureaucratic elite whose ultimate goal is nothing short of total control.
>
> Unless we think clearly and plan intelligently now, while the war is on, we may find ourselves with military victory on our hands but unwittingly encumbered by the enemy's social philosophy.

It is seldom as much truth is said in as few words as is said in Mr. Woll's remarks.

Again let me ask the American people not to place at the door of labor the fault for and responsibility of all these strikes. Place the blame where the blame lies—right in the heart of that un-American gang, the Communist Party.

As a whole, the press and radio have done and are doing a fine job of reporting to the American people. However, there are some columnists and commentators who are, for some reason, sponsoring the activities and purposes of the American Communists. Of course, we expect this of the Daily Worker and PM, and such commentators as Walter Winchell. The are others who for reasons known to them and not to me, who are pushing the cause of a totalitarian state in our country. In his column of September 29, 1945, Thomas L. Stokes branded we Members of the House who have declined to support FEPC, the full employment bill, the 65-cent minimum wage, and the $25-a-week dole as the "Southern wrecking crew." I feel honored to be designated as a wrecker when such fool legislation is the subject of my wrecking activities. Who is Tom Stokes to tell me how I should vote, how I should represent the people who entrusted me with a part in the destiny of their Nation? What people have ever seen in Stokes anything to cause them to seek his leadership. At the most he can only be a volunteer savior of the people. He took the position we were wreckers because we did not vote just as the President said vote. If he believes in one-man rule, then why does he remain in America? He had as well advocate the abolition of Congress as to say we had to vote just as the President ordered us to vote. I respect the President personally and in his lofty position, but to me my duty is as sacred as his, and no one will direct my vote except my own conscience.

These self-styled do-gooders call themselves progressives and we who dare to disagree with them Fascists. The only fundamentals from which real national progress will ever spring is the expansion and advancement of Christianity and education. With all their cries for increased pay for industrial workers, when have you ever heard one of them raise his voice for increased salaries for the teachers of the Nation; the most shamefully underpaid class in America today. Furthermore, their work is closer tied to real Christian progress than that of any other group. They are not concerned in real progress, but in putting over their philosophy of government to the detriment of all freedom-loving people. They feel they can work their trade more effectively on an uneducated people.

I guess this could well be called an omnibus speech. However, the many things I have and will discuss are all one integral part of a plan and cause, whether designedly so or not, that will destroy this Nation and throw it into the dark shadows of poverty, slavery, and serfdom, and into a totalitarian state, with all its pains and torture for what once was a free people.

Let us analyze for a moment what is now going on:

A wage increase for industrial labor is being advocated. At the same time the position is taken that the price of the manufactured article cannot be increased. Automobile dealers have through the war period held their business together when they could get no cars to sell, in many instances at a loss. Now OPA takes the position that their commission must be reduced. An effort will soon be made to reduce farm prices. All this is so flagrantly inconsistent until if it is not by plan and purpose, then the least you could say, it is childish. No Nation can prosper and go forward without a balanced economy, and one does not have to be smart to know this.

When I see what we have permitted to rise among us—men refusing to work and by so doing leaving our battle worn and homesick heroes stranded in foreign

ports, the past rises before me like a dream. I see our boys on foreign soil march down the fields of glory to do and to die for the eternal right. I see them on all the glory fields, in all the hospitals of pain—on all the weary marches. I see them in the wild storms and under the quiet stars in mid ocean. In the ravines running wild with blood—in the furrows of old fields—on deserted battlefields unable to move, wild with thirst, the life ebbing slowly away, among the withered leaves. I see them pierced by balls and torn with shells in the trenches, by forts, and in the whirlwind of the charge, where men become iron, with nerves of steel, in the prisons of hatred and famine; but human speech can never tell what they endured.

I see those who shall never return and who now sleep beneath the shadow of the clouds, careless alike of sunshine and storm, each in the windowless palace of rest. Earth may run red with other wars—they are at peace. In the midst of battle, in the roar of conflict, they found the serenity of death. There is nothing we can give those who fell under the fire of battle—but tears. But to those who were blessed to walk out of the fires of that living hell with life throbbing in their breasts, we can give more than cheers. We can quit tearing down all they fought to protect. We can quit playing Santa Claus to all who have a vote to give, that enough of our National resources may be preserved to help to reestablish them, to keep from their doors the pangs of hunger they suffered for us.

I would like to say in the words of that great statesman, Winston Churchill:

Woe betide those public men who seek to slide into power down the slippery slope of vain and profligate undertakings. This is no time for humbug and blandishment, but for grim and stark facts and figures, and action to meet immediate needs.

You hear all this talk by the stay-at-home left-wing intelligentsia that the soldiers will hold us guilty if we do not have a new world waiting for them on their return. The brave new world is to be already waiting for them when they disembark. * * *

But this is not what the boys are looking forward to.

They are not looking for a new world constructed behind their backs by politicians who seek their votes. Most of them have lived long enough in uncomfortable proximity to another world to be thinking of that. * * *

They do not regard themselves as slumbred serf-population chased into battle from a land of misery and want. They love their country and the scenes of their youth and manhood and they have shown themselves ready to die not only in defense of their material satisfaction but for its honor.

Let us analyze further the real effect of these three laws on the operation of the food producers, that is, the farmers of this Nation. First the full employment bill says, I will give you a job, and the Minimum Wage Act steps up and says, it will not be less than 65 cents per hour, and then the unemployment compensation bill says, if you do not want to work I will give you $25 per week to do nothing. In the face of such governmental policy I ask you where the labor is coming from to produce the food to feed the people of this Nation. Farmers simply cannot meet such governmental competition.

To expose a cause and its effect without a remedy is to engage in the use of vain words. Now, what is the remedy? It rests in the bosom of the American people. Those who are rapidly tearing down the framework of this democracy are accomplishing their purpose by being permitted to control the destiny of the Nation by the exercise of a minority vote that is the balance of power. Through this means the CIO gang has set up an empire within an empire, and what should be the smaller is consuming the larger. Our Nation is perishing within itself.

There can be no doubt that people who love democracy and the glory of its freedom, liberty and justice are yet in the majority by great numbers. If they will engage themselves in the active political life of the Nation they can save it. If they will use their ballots with the same degree of accuracy our fighting forces used the bombs and bullets in charging the enemy, they will crush that un-American gang and again we will have a Government of, by, and for the people, instead of, by, and for a favored few. A Government where every citizen by his own ambition and effort may become President or a man of wealth, as in the past. A Government where a man is a man, and not a number to be tortured by one mad in his own power; one occupying the position of the master of man's soul, to direct his every thought.

Detroit recently proved what concerted action can do. The CIO and its Political Action Committee attempted to force onto the people of that city their own "Frankenstein" as mayor. Detroit is a stronghold of the CIO, but by concerted action the decent people defeated the CIO's "Frankenstein" by more than 50,000 votes.

It is amazing to me how the love of public office and fame causes some people to yield to the demands of those who claim to hold control of the electorate, and forfeit their right to speak from deeply within, the full convictions of their own souls.

I have previously spoken on this floor of the great work which is being performed by the stalwart citizens of the great State of Minnesota in their determination to preserve the American way of life. I refer to the Minnesota People's Political Action Committee.

I hold in my hand a copy of the declaration of principles of that patriotic organization wherein it enumerates the tendencies in our Government that threaten to rob us of the blessings and opportunities of our American heritage. The menacing tendencies which it points out are these:

1. The increasing demand that business of the Nation be turned over to politicians to administer and manage.

2. The accompanying growth of bureaucracy with its withering effect upon individual initiative, ambition, and character.

3. The continued belief in high places that public spending is a panacea for domestic problems.

4. The centralization of government in Washington with its usurpation of the rights of States and communities.

5. The idea that the Government ought to support all citizens, regardless of their willingness to support themselves.

These tendencies, in full measure, are embraced in the Murray-Patman full employment bill.

And let me read you the concluding paragraph of this inspiring and constructive document:

The Minnesota People's Political Action Committee opposes embarrassment and intimidation of those who make the laws of the land. We seek to improve the making of laws by substituting the good of the whole public for the interests of special blocs and groups. We will with all our power and influence protect the independence and political self-respect of those who make laws.

This pledge is heartening to every Member of Congress and every other citizen of our country who wishes to preserve free government in our Nation, unhampered by threats, intimidation, and coercion. You, who have seen the hordes of CIO delegates who have thronged the halls of Congress in the last month, will be heartened by these words. Those of you, who, like myself, are cognizant of the fact that our constituents are being flooded with lying propaganda and misrepresentation in behalf of the Murray-Patman full employment bill, will be glad to know that this threat to our Government is not unchallenged.

I congratulate my colleagues from Minnesota on having an organization within the borders of their State which disseminates honest information and has organized for the purpose of supporting its representatives who have the courage to vote for the interest of all the people and stand out against intimidation. I say to you, as I have said to my colleagues from Minnesota, that the preservation of the American way of life necessitates the spreading of this great movement into every State, into every county, township, nook, and corner of our great land. The farmers and rural citizens of Minnesota who are giving of their time and substance to this movement are no less patriotic than the colonials of 1776 who left the plow handles to grasp the musket in defense of their liberties. They have the blessing and good wishes of every sound-thinking Member of this Congress, of every citizen who stands for and believes in democratic processes of government, and may success attend their efforts.

In the words of one of the orators of old, I say in full truth, "I would rather go to the forest, far away, and build me a little cabin—build it myself—and daub it with clay, and live there with my wife and children; and have a winding path leading down to the spring where the water bubbles out, day and night, whispering a poem to the white pebbles, from the heart of the earth; a little hut with some hollyhocks at the corner, with their bannered bosoms open to the sun, and a thrush in the air like a winged joy—I would rather live there and have some latticework across the window so that the sunlight would fall checkered on the babe in the cradle—I would rather live there, with my soul erect and free, than in a palace of gold and wear a crown of

imperial power, and feel that I was superstition's cringling slave and dare not speak my honest thought."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. First, may I say that I am glad there are a number of members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments present to hear the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia. I am also glad to commend the gentleman for his sincerity and his constant attendance during the hearings of that committee. The members of that committee ever since the middle of last August have been diligently studying the subject of employment and having hearings on the three different bills on so-called full employment. May I ask the gentleman if the remarks he has just made do apply to all three of the so-called full employment bills, H. R. 2202, S. 380, and H. R. 4181 now pending before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I include them all, and I include any bill with a number and an enacting clause, if it does not have another scratch on it, pertaining to that legislation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman said he was making an ominous speech, in which he referred to the position of the farmer. I wonder if the gentleman thinks the farmers of this country are better off when the wages of the city workers are high or when the wages of the city workers are low. What is the gentleman's position with respect to that?

Mr. GIBSON. I am in favor of a high wage, but I am not in favor of a wage destructively high. For example, if we put into effect a 65-cent-minimum wage it will be impossible for the farmer to compete with that wage. You may answer that he would not be included in that legislation, but he would fall in the shadow of its terror, for this reason: A man could go to town and get a job at 65 cents an hour, and he would not take a job on the farm unless he could make that much money. Therefore, these people who seem to think they can legislate glory into the soul of man will find the Nation hungry if we do not stop some of this foolishness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE LABOR PROBLEM IN AMERICA

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written and said in the past weeks and months on the oppressive labor problem which hangs so heavy on this Nation that it is difficult to conceive that anything worth considering could be added. I am certainly not so vain as to believe that I have devised the solution.

I know also that it is not necessary that I say anything further either in this congressional hall, or elsewhere, to make clear my position on the present administrations and policies of organized labor in America. I think I have made my convictions on these points abundantly plain. I cannot go with organized labor along the paths it has charted in recent years, and I want to say with all the emphasis at my command, that I do not intend to go along. Its way is not my way, and I earnestly believe it is not America's way.

I am presuming to address the Congress again today on this subject because in my judgment the situation has become so acute and fraught with perils, not only for the future of our Nation, but for the world, that it seems intolerable to me that the Congress shall longer delay to take immediate and forceful action to restore our industrial relations to a just and righteous balance in the interest of all.

OUR NATIONAL LIFE IS PARALYZED BY STRIKES AND THREATS OF STRIKES

At the very threshold of the postwar world of which we have talked so much and made such hopeful plans our entire economic life is paralyzed with strikes and threats of strikes. The storm clouds gather more ominously with each day that passes. Construction of homes and business improvements are held up. The country waits for automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, radios, tools and appliances while labor stubbornly ties up production. Unemployment mounts while jobs go vacant. Our returning sons and daughters from the armed services can find no employment without the payment of tribute to labor racketeers. Everything for which we fought and sacrificed and dreamed is being consumed in the fires of industrial strife set by ruthless men who would destroy the Nation, if necessary, to obtain their selfish ends.

If America fails to order her postwar house and achieve a full and vigorous economic life with jobs for all, with apportunities for all, and a decent way of life for all, then the world-wide effort toward well-being and enduring peace is almost hopelessly prejudiced.

It is not necessary to repeat what we all know and believe—that lasting peace can come only through the cooperative efforts of all nations. It is likewise not inaccurate to say that the leadership of this Nation in that effort is indispensable. And it inevitably follows that if we cannot soon restore national cooperation and solidarity that we most assuredly cannot discharge our responsibilities to the world order of decency, vigor and tranquillity which we seek to establish.

I HONOR THE LABORING MAN AND ENDORSE A PROGRAM OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

I wish to make it plain at the outset that I honor the laboring man in his calling. I salute him for the magnificent achievements he made in the national emergency. I further wish to make it plain that I have no quarrel with the idea of full employment as a basis for a sound economic life in this Republic. I favor every intelligent effort to make the opportunity for profitable employment available to all who seek it. My quarrel is only with the "plunder barons," rich and power intoxicated with war-exacted tribute and prestige, the so-called labor leaders who have taken the Nation by the throat and, irrespective of the rights and well-being of the country which nurtures them, are determined to crush the life from all those who oppose their lawless resolutions.

ORGANIZED LABOR IS OUT OF HARMONY WITH AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

I charge that union labor in America, with but few exceptions, is totally out of harmony with American democracy. The foundation stone, the very essence, of the form of government which justifiably, we believe, is the finest in all the world, is the equality of all men and the sacred guaranty of liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I submit that the fact is inescapable that the trends of organized labor in the past decade have been away from these tenets of a free, democratic society.

No; union labor is not democratic. Bolstered by a labyrinth of legal pillars erected by an indulgent Government in its behalf, it has become fascistic, dictatorial, compulsory. Membership in organized labor is no longer voluntary. There is no free opportunity to work in American industry. Either the worker succumbs to the labor monopoly, pays whatever monstrous tribute is exacted of him as a condition of employment, surrenders his political and personal independence, or he and those dependent upon him for support are foreclosed.

Union labor is not democratic in its organization or in the conduct of its affairs. Its governing bodies and officials do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. No thinking man can deny that organized labor is boss-ruled—that union membership has little, if any, voice in the shaping of union policies, political actions, or economic programs. By and large so-called union elections either for the selection of officers, for the consideration of strike and walk-out actions, and in all other matters are farcical and fraudulent. Powerful and autocratic labor czars administer this totalitarian and subversive government within a government by intimidation and coercion and by keeping those they pretend to lead in ignorance and servility.

ORGANIZED LABOR IS A MONOPOLY AND HAS BECOME ITSELF BIG BUSINESS

I have said that organized labor has now become a monopoly. Time was when membership in labor unions was voluntary—a workman might or might not join as he saw fit, without being deprived of the right to earn his bread in the call-

ing of his choice. Time was when those responsible for the management of industry could obtain the labor necessary for their operations on a free market. They were permitted to trade either with the union or the nonunion groups. Those conditions do not exist today and have not existed for a long time. Organized labor is literally a monopoly, with the power to wreck the havoc on society that any tremendous monopoly possesses.

The inevitable corollary to this proposition is that organized labor has also become big business. Under the emergencies of war, and again aided by a cooperating government, organized labor was able to expand to almost unbelievable proportions and to collect rich rewards from its members. Many of the large unions have now purchased their own expensive office buildings in some of our great cities, and nearly all have great financial resources. They are no longer the forlorn and downtrodden elements of our citizenry, but are among the rich and powerful.

In this country we have found that it is essential to the public welfare that big business be placed under a measure of social controls to check their aggrandizement at the expense of our citizens. Yet, in organized labor we have the anomaly of a gigantic business which has the power of life and death over the public in its food, transportation, fuel, and all of the commodities and services necessary to support life; and under the laws we have passed and under the decisions of our highest courts, they are almost irresponsible and free from control. I cannot conceive that even labor's most zealous advocates could defend such a monstrous condition.

LABOR'S LEADERSHIP IS RUTHLESS AND UNCOOPERATIVE

But the most serious aspect of the problem, as I view it, is that labor's leadership is ruthless and uncooperative, lacking in real patriotism and a decent sense of responsibility for the public welfare. No matter how divergent our views may be as to methods of solving the vast problems of peace, economic health, and reconstruction, all agree that the basic outline of the master plan and the moving spirit of any successful attempt to solve these problems is cooperation. Cooperation among nations, among groups within nations, among classes, of every race, color and creed, among individual citizens is vital. If we find the better world we seek, cooperation and a sacrificial spirit are indispensable. In these categories I charge that labor leadership is wholly deficient.

I do not discount the individual patriotism of the rank and file of labor. Labor's sons and daughters have served the Nation and the world with a heroism and devotion at least equal to that of the sons and daughters of the people in other walks of life. Neither do I discount their work and sacrifice at home which helped achieve the glorious victory. But I do charge that labor leadership speaks and acts as though no other considerations exist outside the obtaining of the arbitrary objectives laid down by themselves.

Labor has apparently forgotten, or ignores the fact, that its meteoric progress of modern times has come about through the weight of a sympathetic public opinion. The character of the American people is generous and friendly. When the facts of the distress of the laboring man and the malpractices of his employer were made known to the people they rallied to labor's support and made possible the enormous improvement in his compensation, his conditions of work, and his standard of living which have come about. When labor penalizes the group which befriended its cause, it is not only guilty of ingratitude, but of foolhardiness. The force which made labor strong will rise and destroy it. Labor's leadership would do well to ponder these considerations.

UNIONS CANNOT SURVIVE ON GAINS ALONE

For very surely unions, or any other groups, cannot survive on gains alone. It is tragic both for labor and for the Nation that it so completely ignores the lesson learned by ownership and management in past years. The reckless age of the "robber barons" in this Nation has brought about regulations and restrictions upon business from which it has never fully recovered. A similar fate awaits any group which seeks selfish interests alone.

It is my view that labor unions have utterly shirked, and are now shirking, the social responsibility that is theirs by reason of the privileges that have been accorded them, and most particularly by reason of the enormous power they now wield. It is unjust and intolerable that organized labor shall concern itself only with its organizational aims and objectives and the sole personal welfare of the members of the unions. In our society the privilege and liberty of any individual ends where it infringes upon the privileges and liberties of other citizens. The same rule applies to groups and classes, and it applies to unions. If they are to dwell with us and accept the benefits and privileges of our form of government, then they must discharge also their responsibilities to the general welfare of the community and all who compose it.

It is very apparent that unions and their leaders have not accepted or discharged this responsibility, and are not doing so now. I insist that the day of reckoning has come, and that it is our duty to the people of America to compel the acceptance of this just responsibility and the honoring of this inescapable obligation on the part of union labor.

To adjust this condition obviously requires a thorough housecleaning in the unions, both of attitude and of leadership, and I am completely impatient with the idea that a labor organization can reform itself from within. Labor has had every opportunity for self-reformation and has utterly failed to bring it about. The best hope for reformation lies in pitiless publicity of abuses, and, more important for us here, in the enactment of just and workable regulations for the conduct of union affairs.

THE UNORGANIZED CITIZENS OF AMERICA DESERVE CONSIDERATION

And, finally, I want to raise a voice for the great majority of plain American citizens who are unrepresented by organizations and by powerful Washington lobbies. I submit to you that it is our duty to represent them here, to give just consideration to their needs and desires, and afford them protection where they need it.

I am speaking now of the vast multitudes of our people in the small towns, in the villages, on the farms and ranches, and on the wooded mountainsides of my own country. I am speaking of the millions of low-paid and unorganized workers in our great cities. I am speaking of the small businessmen, country merchants who run their stores with the labor of their own families and perhaps one or two beside; I am thinking of country editors and printers, mechanics, professional men; of town and county and village employees, of those who repair our roads in all weathers, fight our fires, haul our refuse; I am thinking of the stenographers in the offices, the delivery boys, the women who work in domestic service, who take in laundry and do the great variety of unpleasant tasks of the world in order to keep body and soul together in their distressed, and most often, fatherless families. I am thinking particularly of the small town and country school teachers. I am thinking of farmers, owners of small tracts and ranches, of tenant farmers and farm laborers, of woodcutters and all the sturdy throng of plain folk who really make America great.

These are the people who made the real sacrifices of war. They sent their sons and daughters out to the deadly hazards of the world's far-flung battle lines, and who faithfully worked at home with slight, if any, increase in income, and were compelled to buy the necessities of their burdened lives on an inflated market; who nevertheless bought war bonds to the limit of their ability and contributed their ill-spared mites to every worthy cause that called.

These are the good and deserving Americans whom I never can and never shall forget. But I say to you that their voices have been lost, and their interests forgotten and neglected, in the hideous bedlam set up in the Nation's Capitol and in these Halls and corridors by the raucous and selfish cries of special interests.

My conviction is unshakable that we have punished and penalized these rank and file, unorganized citizens of America by yielding to, and coddling, and trembling in fear before, the demagogs of organized labor. For it is the great group of average citizens who are squeezed when organized labor starts its outrageous and baseless industrial brawls and holds a pistol to the head of the Nation to increase their already extravagant privileges. These are the people who are marooned when transportation breaks down, who shiver with cold when fuel is cut off, whose babies cry for milk and life's necessities when vital strikes are called, who pay the pushed-up prices for vital commodities to absorb the pyramided and skyrocketed wages wrested by union tyrants.

Let us address ourselves to our task vigorously and fearlessly. Let us honor our sacred obligation and oath of office

and act honorably and firmly on behalf of the whole body of America's citizenship.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter and resolution from the American Legion, seventh district, Department of Wisconsin, that pledges support to his bill to eradicate cancer and infantile paralysis.

THE LATE JACK NICHOLS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I feel a deep personal loss in the death of my friend, Jack Nichols, and I request that my remarks appear in the RECORD at the point where tribute was paid to him today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 25 minutes.

BILL TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF PEACE AND GOOD WILL

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill (H. R. 4648) to create a Department of Peace and Good Will to be administered by a Secretary of Peace and Good Will in the President's Cabinet. I believe this bill will appeal to the peace-loving people of America and the world, and I do not know of any more appropriate time to introduce it than on the anniversary of Armistice Day. The text of the bill is as follows:

Whereas, Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur in his immortal address when Japan surrendered, issued a solemn warning that if the world is to be saved it must turn from war to peace and added this meaningful declaration: "We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the last 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh"; and

Whereas military leaders have done their part magnificently and it is now the time for peace leaders to take over; and

Whereas we are at the crossroads of decision and America must decide whether to stand for the things that make for peace or the things that make for war; and

Whereas if we are to have a world of peace, training for war must become subordinate to training for peace and the minds of men must turn from the things that kill to the spiritual things mentioned by General MacArthur that cure and heal; and

Whereas, the invention of the atomic bomb has forced all nations to a realization that hereafter the peoples of the world must live together amicably or they will die together and civilization will perish from the earth; and

Whereas we will never have a world of peace until we work as zealously for peace as we have worked for victory in war; and

Whereas there could be no better way to dramatize America's purpose to lead the world to the haven of peace than by the creation at this time of a permanent department of the United States Government dedicated to that purpose whose head shall be a member of the President's Cabinet: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a new department of the Government of the United States to be known as the Department of Peace and Good Will, which shall have for its purpose the activating of the forces of good will and mutual understanding throughout the world and the fostering of amity among nations.

SEC. 2. The head of the new department shall be Secretary of Peace and Good Will and he shall have the same salary and official status as other members of the President's Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill as an antidote for the resurgence of militarism which is taking hold in certain sections of our country and which is manifesting itself in such antisocial, un-American proposals as forced military training and the regimentation of the youth of our land.

In a broader aspect I have introduced it as a means of implementing the advice given by the great commander. Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur, who warned that war has become so destructive that unless nations turn from wars and find a common denominator of peace "Armageddon will be at our door."

In a still broader aspect I have introduced it because the war is over and we are turning a new leaf in the history of the world and unless America, which led in the war, now leads in establishing a firm and enduring peace, it will fail miserably in its duty to humanity and to civilization.

LIGHT IS GROWING DIMMER

I think that all observers who have discerning minds have noted with sinking hearts that the light that shone through the Atlantic Charter and the San Francisco Conference is becoming a little bit dimmed. Powerful influences are at work, including the compulsory military training propagandists, that are insidiously nullifying the San Francisco Charter. The prospect for world peace is growing dimmer and dimmer as the world loses sight of the lights on the highlands and slips back into the welter of militarism. If we are to have the peace which we have been talking so much about, we must reverse this situation and we must train for peace and not for war. We must work as hard to win the peace as we ever worked in the darkest days of 1941 to 1945 to win the war and we must begin now. It is a Herculean task that is ahead of us and time is precious.

NO GOVERNMENT AGENCY NOW TO IMPLEMENT PEACE

One way to help in winning the peace is to dramatize our purpose by the establishment of a department of peace and good will. Why not? With our Nation professedly committed to the creation by earnest efforts of a new world of peaceful relations between man and man all around the earth, we have no governmental agency to implement that endeavor—not one. Let us examine the scroll of governmental establishments and see what we have:

First. A War Department—function to destroy and kill.

Second. A Navy Department—function to destroy and kill.

Third. An Office of Scientific Research and Development—function to invent the instruments that destroy and kill.

And so on.

I would not eliminate or depreciate any one of these. In the present posture of world affairs we must have, and must continue to have until peace is secure, an adequate Army and Navy. But after we have committed our leadership, as we have in a thousand solemn ways, toward bringing about a new and better world, patterned even though imperfectly on the plan of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, is it unreasonable to expect that we shall inaugurate this new era of peaceful endeavors and make our Government responsive to our professions by adding to the roster of our governmental activities a new department of peace and good will to protect and conserve the great human values?

LAISSEZ-FAIRE ATTITUDE WILL NOT SUFFICE

Some may ask, "What about the State Department? Why cannot it act as a department of peace and good will?" The answer is that the State Department will never serve the purpose. It operates along the lines of laissez faire, and no laissez-faire attitude is ever going to win the fight for world peace. We need a fighting department that can bring more activity to the solution of the problem than the State Department can under its traditions and authority. We need a department that can and will reach out around the earth and propagandize for peace; a department that can and will get in touch with the moral and spiritual forces of the world; a department that can and will contact and activate and unify the forces in all lands, which alone by common purpose and united action can make the permanent peace of the world a blessed reality. It is a tremendous fight we are up against, but we must win it—or else Armageddon.

KILL, KILL, KILL

When I said a moment ago that the light that shone so brightly but yesterday through the Atlantic Charter and the San Francisco Conference is growing dimmer and that the prospects for peace are slipping with growing pressures for peacetime conscription and regimentation, my mind reverted to the many days of hearings our Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations recently held, with stellar chiefs of the Military and Naval Establishments and the Office of Scientific Research and Development as witnesses.

If you will search through the pages of those voluminous hearings with a fine-tooth comb you will not find that any of the great leaders of these activities ever gave the slightest thought to any ideas of peace. When I asked them whether the prospect of successful operations of the San Francisco Charter had any bearing on their views as to the necessity of future war appropriations they acted as if they did not know what I meant. Kill, kill, kill was the burden of their testimony. How to secure the forces and the instruments to wreck and ruin cities and destroy human lives en masse was the main theme of official testimony. The great genius of these military master-minds was concentrated on the re-

finement and development of the means of human slaughter. Many of the witnesses speculated on whether potential enemies, Russia being mentioned in particular, was equipped with this or that device or military resource, all of which speculation tended not the least toward peace but rather toward generating international suspicion and distrust, the spawn out of which come feuds and wars. I am not blaming these military leaders for their attitude, and their bent of minds. War is their profession.

WHAT WE NEED NOW IS PEACE LEADERS, NOT MILITARY LEADERS

What we need now, however, is not military leaders but peace leaders. Building a vast peacetime Military Establishment is not in keeping with our motives for world cooperation. The military leaders have done their part magnificently, but it is now time for peace leaders to take over and carry on. The military leaders of our country—and by that I mean the leaders of all of our forces on land and water and in the air—have laurels enough to rest on. They have won the greatest war in history in record time and without one major mistake from the moment the first gun was fired until the last. They are entitled to and will receive the lavish encomiums of our countrymen and the praise of historians until the last book is written.

AT THE CROSSROADS

But now we have come to the crossroads. The road to the right leads to peace; the road to the left leads to war. At this crossroads there should be a shift of directing personnel. Our course should now be along the peaceful road to the right instead of the militaristic road to the left which leads to forced military training, regimentation, international hatreds, and more wars. If we militarize our country to the *n*th degree we will invite another war and will throw into the discard the San Francisco Charter, on which the hopes of humanity rest.

HELL NOT THE VESTIBULE OF HEAVEN

If we start a competitive race of armaments, with all of the distrust, suspicions, and hatreds such a race will bring, we will lose every prospect we ever had of leading the way to a peaceful world. Hell is not the vestibule of heaven.

If we are to realize the world's dream for peace a Department of Peace and Good Will can be of great value and assistance in charting our course from this crossroads where we are now, into the far-away future. "Military leaders for war; peace leaders for peace" is a sound maxim. If we do not find these peace leaders who will measure up in peace to as high a stature as our military leaders have shown in war, America and the world will be lost.

"What does matter," said Mrs. Roosevelt recently, "is that we develop friendly understanding throughout the world."

With that sentiment I thoroughly agree and if a Department of Peace and Good Will is established it will aid in developing that friendly world understanding envisioned by the widow of the late President.

LET'S TALK IN TERMS OF SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS AND CHURCHES

Let us call peace leaders into action under the aegis of the new department and then let us see whether these peace leaders can do their part as well as our military leaders have done theirs. If they can, the future of the world will be assured.

The problems of the future can best be solved by persons of a peace psychology instead of by persons of a war psychology. We need to cease talking in terms of implements of war that will most effectively kill and maim the most people and to begin talking in terms of hospitals and schools and churches, the things that elevate the spirit and lift humanity to a higher plane.

Those things and not wars will make for a better world. If all the countries would accept the Sermon on the Mount as their common denominator there would be no more wars, and troubles between nations would cease. Let us suppose as a specific instance that a tense feeling has developed between nations A and B, and that those countries are on the verge of war. Let us suppose further that an epidemic breaks out among the children of nation B and that it gets beyond control. Then let us suppose that the statesmen of nation A say: "Instead of spending untold billions of dollars and sacrificing innumerable lives in waging war on nation B we will spend the equivalent of the cost of one little Mosquito boat in manufacturing serum and sending it to them, so that the lives of their little ones will be saved."

If that should happen, do you suppose there would be the least likelihood of those nations going to war?

There was substance as well as inspiration in General MacArthur's statement that the problem is "basically theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character." With the atomic bomb and other frightful engines of destruction coming out of the laboratories the time may be approaching when humanity, as a sheer means of saving itself, will have to give heed to the scriptural injunction: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another."

Something like this thought was expressed a few days ago by Anthony Eden, Foreign Secretary in Britain's wartime government, when he said: "Unless the nations of the world are willing to work constructively together for peace, there will be an explosion which will blow all of them to smithereens."

MILITARISTS' WRONG APPROACH

The militarists have a wrong approach to national security. They imagine that a goose-stepping population and a vast military establishment are a guaranty of security. That theory was shot to death on a hundred battlefields of the late war when Germany's crack legions were utterly routed by the untrained troops recruited from American farms and factories, and when Germany's vaunted impregnable defenses fell before the American advance like a house of cards. Excessive militarization, especially in this atomic age, may indeed weaken instead of strengthen a nation, for all other countries become suspicious and distrustful of a nation that arms to the teeth, and it is entirely conceivable that some relatively small nation, if it should regard American war preparations as a menace to its safety, might become jittery and in a surprise move drop atomic bombs on some of our cities that would lay them low and at one stroke paralyze our national defense. The best approach to national defense lies in the cultivation of peaceful, friendly relations with all nations and peoples, just as we did successfully in 150 years of our national history. It is still true, as it ever will be, that it is righteousness and not bristling bayonets that exalteth a nation. We had better be building the foundations of our national security in the hearts of men.

AN APPEAL TO CHRISTIANS

The bill I have introduced is a measure which all Christians can get behind and support. To them it should be a challenging call to the colors, for we cannot sink the world into a mire of militarism and at the same time preserve the great human values and Christian ideals. In the very dawning of a new era, which we fondly hope and pray is to embrace the whole world and to encompass all time, it would seem like an anachronism to maintain a full-panoplied Department of War and no Department of Peace.

MAKING AMERICA A REAL GOOD NEIGHBOR

The passage of this bill by the United States Congress would be notice to the world that when we said we wanted to be a good neighbor in the family of nations we meant it. Other nations are reported to be much confused by our militaristic preparations and are finding it difficult to reconcile our plans for forced military training and regimentation with our protestations for peace. To those doubting Thomases in the family of nations the passage of this bill and the creation of this Department of Peace and Good Will would mean that we are going all-out for peace and that we are not for peace with our tongues in our cheeks. In the recent war we voluntarily assumed leadership among nations in emancipating enslaved people from tyranny and oppression. Are we now going to fail humanity by refusing to accept the moral leadership that is necessary to translate the fruits of victory into a peaceful world of the future?

I hope that every person in America who wishes to do his part in ushering in a peaceful world will write to the Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., and request a favorable report on this bill, H. R. 4648, and at the same time send letters expressing interest in the bill to the Representative in Congress from his district and the United States Senators from his State.

REMEMEER THE HEROIC DEAD

Before long the hearts of our people will be wrung by the saddest of all spectacles in the aftermath of war—the mournful procession that will bring our beloved dead from their temporary graves in foreign countries to their final resting places in American soil. Three hundred thousand of the finest in our

land gave the last full measure of devotion fighting for our flag in foreign theaters of war, and the bodies of these men will be brought back and committed to the home soil of the communities from which they sprang—earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust. Funeral corteges will soon wend their sorrowing way to almost every locality in the United States, and all of the pent-up grief of fathers, mothers, wives, and sweethearts will break forth in a new deluge. The millions of our people who will be touched by the poignant grief of this panorama are going to say to the statesmen of our time, "We serve notice on you now that this must not happen again. We expect you to build firm foundations of enduring world peace and we will hold you responsible if you do not."

When we give our consideration to this bill to create a Department of Peace and Good Will let us not forget our obligation to keep faith with the heroic dead.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address and in the other to include an editorial.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, from Pearl Harbor day to VJ-day, many big problems confronted the Government every day. These problems were solved in a satisfactory manner and the Huns and the Japs were thoroughly defeated. However, we have had since VJ-day and will continue to have for months to come many, many stupendous problems that must be solved in our getting back to a workable basis as a Nation. One of the big problems to be adjusted is the disposal of surplus property.

Reports from all parts of the country indicate that people do not feel that surplus property is being made available to them as rapidly as possible. They see a large depot with huge stocks of Army matériel and equipment. To their casual inspection, the stocks apparently remain the same from week to week. So they come to the conclusion—erroneous in most cases—that the Army, which has the most property for disposal, is hoarding its supplies, keeping them from the public.

One of the chief reasons for this misconception, I believe, is the lack of knowledge among the general public as to just how the armed services dispose of their surplus property. Consequently, a brief résumé of this method might be in order.

First, I think it might be well to establish the fact that the Army does not sell surplus, with the exception of small lots and salvage and scrap. When property is determined by supply control experts to be surplus to its needs, the War Department releases it to various agencies such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for disposal.

These disposal agencies have complete charge of selling the surplus. However, they are not prepared to undertake its care and handling, so the Army retains the property in storage at its depots until the disposal agency orders it shipped.

That arrangement has laid the War Department open to a great deal of unjustified criticism. People see the huge stocks piled up in depots without realizing that perhaps a great portion of the stocks actually belong to a disposal agency.

Actually, the bottleneck lies with the disposal agencies which have not moved the surplus. Reorganization of the agencies, of course, has been a large factor in the delay in the sales. Now that organization is more firm, however, sales programs can undoubtedly be worked out and followed rapidly.

Let us examine the testimony, however, to see just what the War Department has done on this surplus property.

The amount of property which the War Department released as surplus increased rapidly with the ending of hostilities. Hearings before our committees have indicated that up to August 1, the Army had released nearly $3,000,000,000 worth—original cost; and in both August and September, another billion dollars' worth was added, bringing the total on October 1 to nearly $5,000,000,000.

This is property which the War Department reported to the various disposal agencies for sale to civilians, or for other dispositions.

Here are the figures to show what is happening in consumer goods, the type of primary interest to housewives, farmers, and retailers:

Up to August 1, the Commerce Department, the disposal agency at that time for consumer goods, had been given surplus property costing $288,000,000 by the Army. The disposal agency had sent the Army shipping orders for only $142,000,000 worth.

Testimony indicates that in August, the Army declared $398,000,000 worth to the Department of Commerce. In that month, the War Department was directed to ship only $21,000,000 worth.

In September, the Army declared $292,000,000 worth of consumer goods. In that month, the War Department was ordered to ship only $38,000,000 worth of this type property. The backlog of consumer goods awaiting shipping orders at the end of the month had reached $765,000,000.

At the rate consumer goods were removed from the Army's hands in September, it would take almost 2 years just to clean up the backlog—assuming that the Army halted all further declarations of surplus.

Let me cite some specific examples. From the 1st of May to the 15th of October, the War Department declared 63,324 motor vehicles surplus. In this same period, only 23,459 were sold. From September 15 to October 15, sales totaled only 8,584 trucks, 1,936 passenger cars, and 374 motorcycles.

We all know the tremendous difficulty in building a sales organization and system for handling such diverse equipment as becomes surplus at the end of a great war. The task is made more difficult by the fact that much of the equipment is not of civilian design and some is used and therefore not readily salable. These factors must be recognized—along with the growing backlog of unsold surplus—if we are to appraise the speed at which war goods are moving into the civilian economy. With the reorganization of the disposal agencies now effected, we should see a more rapid disposition of this surplus, particularly consumer goods.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

824. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 in the amount of $5,000 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 374); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

825. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the fourteenth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 375); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

826. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of a proposed resolution to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 715. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude; with amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1097. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. IZAC: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1117. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss; without amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. IZAC: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1438. An act to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States naval service a career, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2556. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BIEMILLER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4412. A bill to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of California: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4413. A bill to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4489. A bill to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning. Pursuant to House Resolution 60 (79th Cong., 1st sess.), submitting its report on economic reconstruction in Europe (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4648. A bill to create a Department of Peace and Good Will; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4649. A bill to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 4650. A bill to compute pay and allowances of persons promoted, while prisoners of war, from the date the promotion was made effective for purposes of seniority and precedence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK (by request):

H. R. 4651. A bill to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 4652. A bill to provide credit for past service to substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to extend annual- and sick-leave benefits to war-service indefinite substitute employees; to fix the rate of compensation for temporary substitute rural carriers serving in the place of regular carriers in the armed forces; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 4653. A bill to exempt totally disabled veterans of World War I and of World War II from the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4654. A bill to exempt transfers of property to the American National Red Cross from the District of Columbia inheritance tax; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution favoring action by the United States looking to the restoration of Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. J. Res. 272. Joint resolution to declare December 7, 1945, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in, and as the date of the termination of, the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation designating December 15 as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. J. Res. 274. Joint resolution directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate all aspects of costs of essential consumer necessities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4655. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4656. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain persons as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4657. A bill for the relief of P. W. Woodyard; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4658. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Lillie Smith; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4659. A bill for the relief of Robert Cathcart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4660. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser and Ensign Joseph Lanser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4661. A bill for the relief of Richard J. Krebs; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1313. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of County Veterans Service Officers Association of Wisconsin; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1314. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Indiana Academy of Science, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of H. R. 4006; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as we come with a new day to the altar of prayer, we thank Thee for all that is highest and best in the life of the nations with whom we joined hearts and hands in the desperate struggle against evil, now by Thy sustaining might ended in triumph for Thy eternal truth. Especially do we think with gratitude of that gallant land nearest our own shores, across the sea once a barrier, now but a bridge. From barbarous tongues hast Thou molded our common speech until it rings like iron and shines like cloth of gold, giving a glorious setting to Thine ancient word and preserving Thy written revelation in simplicity and grace. For the world's sake, strengthen the cords which bind us, not only by a common speech but also because we drink at common springs of culture and literature and Christian idealism and share a common loyalty to institutions which foster freedom of person and of speech and the royal dignity of the human spirit. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 9, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United

States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia before the expiration of such leave.

The message also announced that the House has disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RANKIN, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 940. An act to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada; and

S. 1190. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of W. L. Freeman.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have just received word that the House of Representatives desires the Senate to be there at a quarter after 12 o'clock. I think we should have a quorum.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bilbo	Hoey	Revercomb
Brewster	Huffman	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Carville	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McMahon	Tydings
Cordon	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Donnell	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Mitchell	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Green	Morse	Willis
Guffey	Murdock	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hart	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD,] the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN IN THE HALL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, following the introduction of a resolution by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] in reference to the death of his colleague, the Senate will recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock. We will recess before we go to the House Chamber to hear the address of Prime Minister Attlee, and not return here, so that when we leave, the Senate will be in recess until tomorrow. Therefore it will not be necessary for Senators to return to the Senate Chamber unless they desire to come back in a body.

DEATH OF SENATOR THOMAS OF IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the purple curtains of eternity have once again parted to receive the soul of a veteran Member of this distinguished body.

Since last we met here my colleague, Senator JOHN THOMAS, has been called back to the bosom of the Creator.

We have all known for some time that Senator THOMAS was putting up a courageous battle against the odds of advancing years and failing health, yet the news of his death came as a shock. He fought the good fight to the end. He was a man of strong will and fighting spirit. His is a typically American story.

He was born in humble circumstances in the great State of Kansas. His life was one of struggle to achieve success in the business world and later in the field of politics. He has served the people of Idaho in some public capacity almost since the day Providence directed his path to our State in 1909. Idaho has bestowed honors on JOHN THOMAS over a long period of years.

During the past few months Senator THOMAS was unable personally to carry on the affairs of his office. Nevertheless, all routine business has been efficiently taken care of by his daughter, Mrs. Mary Peavey. She is a splendid example of American womanhood, a credit to her illustrious father and the State of Idaho. I am sure that my departed colleague would wish that I should take this opportunity to call attention to her faithful devotion and the service she has rendered.

When I learned of Senator THOMAS' death I called his residence, and his 11-year-old grandson answered the telephone. There was an unmistakable sob in the lad's voice. I believe the fine family relationship that existed between our departed friend and those who were closest to him is a testimonial to his character and fundamental human qualities that makes any words of praise seem utterly inadequate.

Tomorrow we will return the earthly remains of JOHN THOMAS to his home in Gooding, Idaho, where he will find his final resting place in a beautiful green valley that was but recently part of a vast expanse of purple sage. The winds of approaching winter will carry pure driven snow down from the lofty peaks of the Sawtooth Mountains to blanket him softly in his last sleep. Spring rains will bring a carpet of green bedecked with mountain flowers to conceal so well the freshness of the newly turned earth that visitors will see no difference between one plot of ground and all the others. But neither the covering snows of winter, the constant washing of showers, nor the fading caused by bright summer suns, will erase the name of Senator JOHN THOMAS from a secure and exalted place in the history of our pioneer State and the Nation.

Mr. President, at this time I offer the resolution, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 190) as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN THOMAS, late a Senator from the State of Idaho.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in just a word, for the time being, I wish to express the deep sorrow which is felt by all the colleagues of the late Senator THOMAS on this side of the aisle in the loss of a very dear friend and a very cherished colleague.

Senator THOMAS represented Christian character in about as fine a fashion as I have ever seen it in this life. He lived with a shining integrity which was the hallmark of his private life and his public service. He was quiet, modest, and unassuming as he moved among us, yet he constantly left his influence upon the labors of the Congress.

He had our confidence, he had our affection. He represented in his lifetime the great American saga of self-made opportunity, in building himself from the lowest levels of opportunity to the highest levels of service.

Mr. President, Senator THOMAS was a great citizen, a great Senator, a great American, a great friend. We shall miss him deeply.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolving clause the President pro tempore appointed the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, as a further remark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

(Following the recess, the Senate proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address delivered by Rt. Hon. Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain, to the Members of the two Houses of Congress. For Mr. Attlee's address, see today's House proceedings, this page.)

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 13 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Arthur J. Mellott, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas, to fill a new position.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Alden Harry Waitt (lieutenant colonel, Chemical Warfare Service), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. William Nichols Porter, whose term of office expired May 30, 1945.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Oswald S. Colclough to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

Capt. George L. Russell, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our guide even unto death, whithersoever we go or whatsoever we do, abide with us. We pray Thee to renew our wills and cleanse our motives that we may serve Thee with patience and obedience, in strict truthfulness and honor. Be Thou the good shepherd to those who know not the way; be the light of unbelievers, and the teacher of those who are ignorant. Strengthen us with the loyalty of an unsullied conscience that we may ever withstand scrutiny and draw us all nearer the peerless manhood of the Perfect One. Blessed Lord, be with the idle and the unemployed; subdue all restless clamor and turbulence of selfish strife, melting all discord into harmony.

Compassionate Father, again the Congress is in sorrow; a splendid public servant has fallen. The solemn pace moves on to the heavenly home. Assure the sorrowing loved ones that He who made us will order all things aright. In the name of Him who was acquainted with grief. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 190

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN THOMAS, late a Senator from the State of Idaho;

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator;

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased;

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian on tomorrow.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, the following proceedings were had:

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m., the the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore and its Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

COMMITTEE OF ESCORT

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints the following members of the committee to escort our distinguished visitor into the Chamber: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On behalf of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort our distinguished guest into the Chamber the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

At 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargé d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Right Honorable Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada.

The Right Honorable Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Right Honorable Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain.

The Right Honorable Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege and an honor, to present to you the Right Honorable Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain.

ADDRESS OF THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. ATTLEE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States, I should wish, first of all, to thank you, sirs, on the great honor you have done me in inviting me to address your House in joint session. During the war you were addressed on two occasions by my predecessor, Winston Churchill [applause], a great war leader, whose words and actions in the most critical times of that long-drawn-out contest brought courage and hope to millions all over the world.

For 5 years I had the privilege of serving under him as a colleague. No one knows better than I do the resplendent services which he rendered to the cause of freedom.

Last week in the House of Commons, as leader of the opposition, in emphasizing the importance of furthering in every

way our friendly connections with your great country, he wished me, on behalf of the whole House, the utmost success in this visit. [Applause.] Sirs, in democracies great men are the possession of the whole people. Speaking here today, I cannot but remember that great statesman, President Roosevelt. [Applause.] I should be expressing, I know, the feelings not only of the people of Great Britain but of the Commonwealth and Empire in paying tribute to his great services not only to his own country but to humanity. It was a sorrow to us that he was not able to visit Britain, where we should have given him a welcome that would have expressed all that was in our hearts.

In the struggle against the forces of tyranny, the names of these two men, Churchill and Roosevelt, together with that of Generalissimo Stalin, will ever be linked in achievement.

I was glad to meet President Truman for a brief moment here in Washington when I was returning from the San Francisco Conference, and I had the advantage of observing and admiring his courage and statesmanship at Potsdam where with him and Generalissimo Stalin we sought to deal with some of those problems which the ending of a great war produces. Sirs, in what spirit shall we approach these high matters?

On Sunday at Arlington, I stood with President Truman and the Prime Minister of Canada at that impressive service of Armistice Day. I know that in the minds of the President and myself were remembrances of when we both were fighters in the First World War. We little thought then on November 11, 1918, that we should witness another world war. I do not think that either of us then thought that we, out of the millions of our fellow soldiers, would be called to shoulder the great responsibilities of high office. Yet I am sure there was present in our minds last Sunday the same thoughts we had years ago—regret for lost comrades, gratitude for our deliverance, and the resolve to do what in us lay to spare others the ordeal which we have endured. We have ended this Second World War, deadlier, longer, and more terrible than its predecessor. We should none of us be here today unless all the Allies had done their part, unless the unequaled fighting forces and matchless industrial scientific resources of the United States had been thrown without reserve into the pool. We rightly today pay tribute to all the Allies. There is honor enough for all; for those who fought in the west and in the east, in the air, on the land, and on the sea, for those who fought in the formed units of the great states, for those who served in the resistance movements of so many countries, and for those who stood firm when their homes were bombed. All contributed fighters and workers alike, but the greatest contribution was made by those with the greatest resources—the United States of America, Russia, and the British Commonwealth and Empire. [Applause.] Twice in a generation the countries of the British Commonwealth and Empire came instantly to the help of Great Britain, and none made a greater contribution than Canada, whose Prime Minister I am happy to see with us today. [Applause.]

We were fortunate in finding great political leaders. We were fortunate too, in the men of outstanding ability who planned our resources and our campaigns and who led our navies, armies, and air fleets in battle. Standing here, I would like to pay a special tribute to the Combined Chiefs of Staff. I would like to recall many of the leaders in the field, but I must content myself today with three names of great men—one in the west, two in the east—General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, and Admiral Nimitz. [Applause.]

Speaking here today when all our enemies have been beaten down, my mind goes back over those 5 years in which I served in the British War Cabinet. I recall so vividly those anxious days of 1940 after Dunkerque. How anxiously we awaited the arrival of ships carrying rifles and ammunition from America which gave us at least something in our hands to fight the invader whose threat was so imminent. I recall that wise and generous provision of lend-lease. I recollect 2 years before the event General Marshall unfolding to us in the Cabinet room his conception of the invasion of Europe. Then I remember so well the tremendous strength of the United States of America, slowly at first and then swiftly developing to take the weight from those who had borne the burden in the early years of the war. Today the United States stands out as the mightiest power on earth. And yet America is a threat to no one. All know that she will never use her power for selfish aims or territorial aggrandizement in the future any more than she has done in the past. We look upon her forces and our own forces and those of other nations as instruments that must never be employed save in the interests of world security and for the repression of the aggressor.

When I was last here I was taking part in the San Francisco Conference, a conference summoned by President Roosevelt with wise prescience while war was still raging in order that as soon as victory was secured we might have an instrument ready to hand for the prevention of all wars in the future.

We have gone through a horrible destructive war. You here have lost great numbers of the flower of your young men. So have we in Britain. So have all the countries that have been engaged in this great struggle, but you have been spared the destruction of your great cities, you have not had in America the spectacle of hundreds of thousands of broken homes, you have not had great masses of people driven from their habitations, wondering where to lay their heads. You have not had the work of centuries of human endeavor destroyed in a few short hours by attacks from the air. But I know that you are fully conscious of the tragic folly of war. There was a time, a time that I remember when we in Britain enjoyed the same immunity. Wars might devastate the Continent but we were safe behind our moat, the inviolable sea. Those days are past. Defensive frontiers, mountain barriers, the seas, and even the oceans are no obstacle to attack. The old discontinuity of earth and sea has been replaced by the continuity of the air. In our atlases that show the division of land and water, of the countries and States, there should be a blank page to represent the air, to make our children realize that these old and historic divisions do not exist in the element in which men now move. If not now then in a few years the devastating weapons which are at present being developed may menace every part of the world.

It is in the light of these facts and in particular in the light—the terrible light of the atomic bomb—that I have entered into discussion with your President in order that we may get together with all the nations of the world and consider what kind of a world it is necessary to have if civilization is to endure and if the common man in all lands is to feel secure.

But in facing world problems, as we must, it is a great mistake, in my view, to think exclusively of war and the prevention of war. We have to think rather of the best means of building up peace. Speaking last week in London, I said that the foundation of peace lay in the hearts of men, and I hold it true that the more the citizens of the world can get to know each other the less likely are we to have the emotional condition in which war is possible. We have been fortunate in this war to have welcomed to our shores so many citizens of the United States of America. Many friendships have been made, many misunderstandings have been removed, which arise almost inevitably because, knowing each other only from a distance, we can see each other only in a distorted way. All the differences are emphasized. The underlying likeness is obscured, but the British soldier and the American soldier, when they came to close quarters, soon found how much they had in common. I hold, therefore, that our United Nations Organization, in which I profoundly believe, must be something more than an agreement between governments. It must be an expression of the will of the common people in every country. Perhaps I might assist today in removing some misapprehensions. I come before you as the Prime Minister of Great Britain, speaking for my country, but in accordance with our constitutional practice, I am also a party leader, the leader of a majority recently returned to power in the House of Commons. I wonder how much you know about the British Labor Party. We are not always very well informed on the politics of other countries. I doubt whether, in fact, very many British citizens know the exact difference between a Republican and a Democrat. You have heard that we are Socialists, but I wonder just what that means to you. I think that some people over here imagine that Socialists are out to destroy freedom, freedom of the individual, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press. They are wrong. The Labor Party is in the tradition of freedom-loving movements which have always existed in our country; but freedom has to be striven for in every generation, and those who threaten it are not always the same. Some times the battle of freedom has had to be

fought against kings, sometimes against religious tyranny, sometimes against the power of the owners of the land, sometimes against the overwhelming strength of moneyed interests. We in the Labor Party declare that we are in line with those who fought for Magna Carta, and habeas corpus, with the Pilgrim Fathers and with the signatories of the Declaration of Independence. [Applause.]

Let me clear your mind with regard to some of these freedoms that are thought to be in danger. In the ranks of our party in the House of Commons are at least 40 practicing journalists. There are several clergymen, many local preachers, plenty of Protestants, some Catholics, and some Jews. We are not likely therefore to attack freedom of religion or freedom of the press; and as to freedom of speech, believe me, as leader of our party for 10 years I have never lacked candid critics in my own ranks and I have been too long in the opposition not to be a strong supporter of freedom of speech. We believe in the freedom of the individual to live his own life but that freedom is conditioned by his not cramping and restricting the freedom of his fellow men. There is and always will be scope for enterprise, but when big business gets too powerful so that it becomes monopolistic, we hold it is not safe to leave it in private hands. Further, in the world today we believe, as do most people in Britain, that one must plan the economic activities of the country if we are to assure the common man a fair deal. One further word. You may think that the Labor Party consists solely of wage earners. It is our pride that we draw the majority of our members from the ranks of wage earners, and many of our ministers have spent long years working with their hands in the coal mines, the factory, or in transportation. But our party today is drawn from all classes of society, professional men, businessmen, and what are sometimes called the privileged classes. The old school tie can still be seen on the Government benches. It is really a pretty good cross section of the population.

You may ask why do people from the well-to-do classes belong to our party? May I refer to my own experience—40 years ago as a young man studying law, just down from Oxford University, I visited for the first time my constituency, Limehouse—a very poor district in east London. I learned from it first-hand the facts of poverty in our great cities. I became convinced that we must build our society on a juster foundation. The result was that I joined the Socialist movement and eventually after many years of striving I find myself Prime Minister of Great Britain. The reasons that impelled me to join the labor movement are the same that actuated so many of the members of my party, especially the great number of young men from the fighting services.

What is our attitude toward foreign affairs? We believe that we cannot make a heaven in our own country and leave a hell outside and we believe this not only from the moral basis of our movement which is founded on the brotherhood of man, without distinction of race or creed, but also from an entirely practical standpoint. We seek to raise the standard of life of our people. We can only do so by trading with the rest of the world and as good traders we wish to have prosperous customers. The advance in methods of production so strongly exemplified in the United States results in an immense output of goods and commodities of all kinds. We in our turn show the same results on a smaller scale. Yet there are hundreds of millions of people living in the world at a standard of life which is the same as they have had for a thousand years. There is ample room in the world for the products of the great industrial nations like yours and ours to raise the general levels throughout the world. We like you believe in an expansive economy and we can see no reason why the need being so great there should be any undue rivalry between us. We believe that the foundations of peace must be world prosperity and good neighborliness. That where science has placed such potential abundance before the human race we should collaborate to take advantage of it rather than scramble and fight for larger individual shares which only results in an immense increase in poverty. We recognize that our immediate task is not easy. Many a man in Britain returning from the war finds his home blitzed and his business ruined. He has to start afresh and it is a tough proposition.

As a country we are just like that man. We went all out to win the war and now have to start afresh. Like him we are facing the future with courage and a determination to win through. We have not stood up to our enemies for 6 years to be beaten by economics.

I look forward to an era of an increasing cooperation and friendship between the United States of America and Great Britain—not as being an exclusive friendship but as a contribution to the knitting together with all peoples through the United Nations Organization in the bonds of peace.

In our internal policies each will follow the course decided by the peoples' will. You will see us embarking on projects of nationalization; on wide all-embracing schemes of social insurance designed to give security to the common man. We shall be working out a planned economy. You, it may be, will continue in your more individualistic methods. It is more important that we should understand each other and other nations whose institutions differ from our own. It is essential if we are to build up a peaceful world that we should have the widest toleration recognizing that our aim is not uniformity but unity in diversity. It would be a dull world if we were all alike.

In a town there may be a great diversity of character and habit among the townsfolk. To some of my neighbors I may be drawn closely by ties of relationship or by old memories; for others I may have more sympathy through sharing their religious convictions, although perhaps I am estranged by their political views. Yet I may be on good terms with all of them and in close friendship with some. I hope to see a world as orderly as a well-run town, with citizens diverse in character but cooperating for the common good. In the British Commonwealth and Empire we offer an example of many nations, some of which have reached, others of which are approaching, full self-government. Even during the war India was given the opportunity of taking complete charge of her own affairs, and in the Colonial Empire eight or nine new constitutions have been adopted or are being worked out—all based on the extension of democratic principles. I hope that there will be ever closer friendship between our great democracies. We have much in common. We have the language of Milton and Shakespeare, of Burke and Chatham, of Lincoln and Jefferson. We have the memories of comradeship in a great adventure. Above all things, we share the things of the spirit. Both of our nations hold dear the rule of law; the conception of freedom and the principles and methods of democracy; and, most vital of all, we acknowledge the validity of the moral precepts upon which our whole civilization is founded. Man's material discoveries have outpaced his moral progress. The greatest task that faces us today is to bring home to all people before it is too late that our civilization can only survive by the acceptance and practice in international relations and in our national life of the Christian principle we are all members one of another. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock p. m., the Prime Minister of Great Britain retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Prime Minister of Canada retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m. the Speaker declared the joint meeting of the House and Senate dissolved.

Thereupon, the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.

PROCEEDINGS OF JOINT MEETING ORDERED PRINTED IN THE RECORD

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on

Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

This country has pledged itself to do all that is reasonably possible to alleviate the suffering of our war-torn allies and to help them begin the task of restoring their economic productivity. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is one of the most important instrumentalities for accomplishing this great task.

As I stated in my message to the Congress on September 6, 1945, the 47 nations of the Council of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration determined at their third meeting in London last August that contributions beyond those originally made would be necessary if we expect to complete the minimum tasks assigned to UNRRA. The Council recommended, on the motion of the United States delegate, that each member country, whose territory had not been invaded by the enemy, should contribute an additional amount equal to 1 percent of its national income for the fiscal year 1943.

In accordance with this recommendation, the United States' share would be $1,350,000,000, matching our original contribution authorized by the Act of Congress of March 28, 1944.

The original contributions of all the member nations have been applied principally to the activities of UNRRA in providing relief and rehabilitation assistance to the countries of eastern and southeastern Europe, and to the care of United Nations' displaced persons stranded in enemy territory. UNRRA, of course, does not undertake relief or rehabilitation responsibilities in either Germany or Japan.

The invaded countries of northwest Europe, comprising France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Norway, by and large, possess sufficient resources in foreign currency and credit to acquire their own essential imports from abroad. Direct assistance to northwest Europe is, therefore, not being furnished by UNRRA.

Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Albania, on the other hand, not only have suffered greatly at the hands of the enemy in the course of the war but they are almost entirely without foreign exchange or credit resources. Consequently, to date they have been the chief objects of UNRRA's activity.

UNRRA has undertaken a limited program of $50,000,000 in Italy to provide for the health and care of children and expectant or nursing mothers.

Italy, since her participation in the war as a cobelligerent with the United Nations, has contributed substantially in both manpower and facilities to the Allied victory, becoming, at the same time, one of the most severely contested battlefields of the war. The destitution and needs there are appalling. Italy has virtually no foreign-exchange resources and without the aid of UNRRA the country might well lapse into starvation.

UNRRA has also assisted in the care and repatriation of millions of Allied victims of Axis aggression who were deported to and enslaved in Germany. It has initiated a preliminary program of assistance to China.

By the end of this year UNRRA anticipates that all the funds which will be made available to it from all sources in accordance with the original contributions will have been spent or encumbered. The flow of supplies purchased with these funds cannot last beyond the early spring.

The end of the war with Japan has made it possible to estimate the magnitude of the relief requirements of China and other Far Eastern areas. Reports on the European harvest of 1945 reveal a serious shortage of all types of foodstuffs.

China presents the largest of all the relief responsibilities which UNRRA now faces. With inadequate supplies and resources, it has struggled bravely for 8 years to combat the enemy as well as the ravages of famine, disease, and inflation. Other programs are required for Korea and Formosa, two areas of the Far East which are now being restored to the peaceful ranks of the United Nations after decades of Japanese oppression and extortion.

UNRRA proposes the extension of aid to Austria. This proposal is in accordance with the Moscow and Potsdam Declarations by the major powers to the effect that Austria should be treated independently of Germany and encouraged to resume the free and peaceful role which it played before being invaded by Hitler's legions.

A limited program of aid is also intended for the Soviet Republics of White Russia and the Ukraine. These areas constituted the principal battlefields in the struggle between Russia and Germany. They were the scene of some of the worst German atrocities, devastation, and pillage.

The recommended additional contributions will hardly suffice to permit UNRRA to meet the most urgent and immediate needs for relief and rehabilitation for which it is responsible. We hope to fulfill a substantial part of this contribution through the use of military and lend-lease supplies which have become surplus since the surrender of our enemies.

I know that America will not remain indifferent to the call of human suffering. This is particularly true when it is suffering on the part of those who by sacrifice and courage kept the enemy from realizing the fruits of his early victories and from bringing his military might to bear upon our own shores.

UNRRA is the chosen instrument of 47 United Nations to meet the immediate relief and rehabilitation needs of the invaded countries.

UNRRA is the first of the international organizations to operate in the postwar period, one which the United States originally sponsored and in which it has played a leading part. Apart from purely humanitarian considerations, its success will do much to prove the possibility of establishing order and cooperation in a world finally at peace.

I, therefore, request the Congress to authorize a new appropriation of $1,350,000,000 for participation in the activities of UNRRA.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 13, 1945.*

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 940. An act to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada; and

S. 1199. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of W. L. Freeman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 4 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. STIGLER, until November 20, 1945, on account of official business.

To Mr. BENDER, for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

THE LATE JOHN THOMAS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 395), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN THOMAS, a Senator of the United States from the State of Idaho.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow and regret that we learned of the passing of the senior Senator from the State of Idaho. The other body has lost one of its distinguished Members and the State of Idaho one of its most illustrious citizens. For more than 35 years, JOHN THOMAS had served his city, his State, and his Nation in many capacities and always with devotion and loyalty. He was actuated by fundamental American ideals in his service to his fellow men. He was zealous in his championship of those principles which have elevated our country to its present position.

Mr. Speaker, Senator THOMAS' life exemplified what can be accomplished by an American under our system of government. As a businessman and as a public official, he gained distinction and was eminently successful because he had faith in our American way of life. Idahoans are proud of this typical American, and they will cherish the splendid contributions which he has made to the development of our State and the entire West. His colleagues in the House, as well in the Senate, deplore his untimely passing, and they extend condolences to his daughter and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Idaho has lost one of its most useful and illustrious citizens, Senator JOHN THOMAS, of Gooding.

A neighbor of ours in describing her late husband said, "He was a good husband, a good father, and a good businessman." Idaho's senior Senator [JOHN THOMAS] was all three of these—and more, he was a good citizen and a good statesman.

Senator THOMAS was one of the sterling characters that are the backbone of America. He brought to the Congress the vision and foresight in dealing with Government affairs and formulating legislative policies gained by a lifetime of experience and useful service in business and in public affairs.

A farm boy, teacher, school superintendent, recorder of the land office, mayor, stockman, banker, national committeeman, and Senator.

Senator THOMAS, in his long and useful career, did much in building up Idaho and adding to the wealth of his adopted State.

Senator THOMAS was of that conservative school of thought among our national statesmen which has done so much to preserve and protect our national heritage and build up a sound and stable national economy.

Senator THOMAS died as he had lived—faithful to his trust as United States Senator, in harness, still working, still planning for a bigger and better Idaho and a strong and stable Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral of the late Senator THOMAS of Idaho: Mr. WHITE, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HALLECK, and Mr. ROBINSON of Utah.

THE LATE JAMES W. MOTT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 396), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES W. MOTT, a Representative from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad lot to announce the death of our esteemed colleague, JAMES W. MOTT, Representative from the First District of Oregon, which occurred yesterday in the naval hospital.

Our colleague was the ranking Member of the Oregon delegation, having been elected to the Seventy-third Congress and serving continuously with great distinction since that time. He was a member of the important Naval Affairs Committee of the House. He was also a member of the Roads Committee and the Select Committee on Postwar Policy. Jim, as he was affectionately known to all of us, was a keen student of naval affairs and military policy. During the trying war years he had devoted himself to his official duties with great zeal and untiring energy, which without question took a heavy toll on his general health. With steadfast loyalty to our country and through his desire to perform his full part as a member of these important committees during the war years, he traveled over much of the world in securing first-hand information on the important problems with which he had to do. No man in the Congress has devoted himself with greater zeal, untiring energy, and faithful service than did our beloved colleague. It was my good fortune to have served with him for many years in the Oregon Legislature and during all my service here in the Congress. In his passing I deeply feel the loss, not only of a devoted fellow Member of this great body but a close personal friend through long years of association.

JAMES W. MOTT was born in Clearfield County, Pa., November 12, 1883, and by a queer coincidence, his passing was on the anniversary of his birth. At an early age he moved to Salem, Oreg., with his parents, Dr. William S. and Willetta M. Mott. He received his education in the public schools of that city, the University of Oregon, and Stanford University. In 1909 he was awarded a bachelor of arts degree from Columbia University in New York. He received his bachelor of laws degree from Willamette University in Oregon, in which State he began active practice of law in 1917, serving in 1920 as city attorney for Astoria, Oreg. In 1918 he enlisted in the United States Navy and subsequently has been a close student of the naval affairs of our country. He was elected to the Oregon Legislature in 1922 and reelected in 1924, 1926, and 1930. In 1931 he was appointed by the late Gov. Julius L. Meier as Corporation Commissioner of Oregon, where he served with distinction. He was elected to the Seventy-third Congress and has been reelected for each successive Congress, being the dean of the Oregon delegation at the time of his death.

Representative MOTT was married in 1919 to Miss Ethel L. Walling, who survives him, together with three lovely daughters, Frances Anne—Mrs. John L. Sullivan; Dorothy May—Mrs. Benjamin M. Whisenand; and Beverly Jane.

Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiments of every Member of the House in extending to the family of our late colleague our deep sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great sense of shock that yesterday afternoon about 3 o'clock I learned of the passing of the dean of our delegation in the House of Representatives, Hon. JAMES W. MOTT. I have known Jim for many many years. When I came here as a new Member of this body JIM MOTT did everything in his power, and even went far outside his normal line of duty, to help me. When I came to Washington as a new Member he turned his office over to me for my use until I was assigned an office and otherwise has helped me greatly. So I say again that it is with a feeling of deep personal loss that I have learned of the passing of JIM MOTT.

Jim, as we all knew him, led a life devoted to public service. He started his career as a city attorney. He was in the Navy during the First World War. Later he served several terms in the Oregon House of Representatives, and was then appointed Corporation Commissioner for the State of Oregon. He was elected and reelected many times to the Congress of the United States as a Member of this body. He was elected from his district several times by the largest majorities ever given a Member of Congress from the State of Oregon.

As the senior minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, JIM MOTT has given outstanding service to his country. Always a hard fighter and a determined seeker after facts, he contributed much to our victory in the war just ended by his long and determined battle for adequate naval strength for our country. The greatest thing I can say for our departed colleague—something I know to be true of JIM MOTT because I knew Jim well and intimately—is that JIM MOTT through all of his public service and during his service here in this body never compromised with what he believed to be right. That was the rule of his life and the rule of his action as a loyal and devoted public servant. I can think of no higher tribute to pay any man than to say that about him, as I do of JIM MOTT. We mourn his loss. His loss is a great one to the State of Oregon. He will be sorely missed, I know, in this body, where he was so highly respected.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of JAMES WHEATON MOTT was untimely, and a great loss has come to Oregon and to the Nation. Sincere of purpose, with a straightforward attitude which openly bespoke his position on all questions, JIM MOTT was never one to avoid any issue. Among the many good things that may be said of JIM MOTT, one is that he dared to speak. In thinking of him, I recall a scene that took place in Roseburg, Oreg., in 1940, during the meeting of the Oregon Republican Club. At that time Jim was being censured somewhat by his many friends and supporters in Oregon for the stand he had taken on several national issues. The talk grew, and it seemed that perhaps Jim had erred, until on the last day of the session of the State convention, at which several hundred people were

gathered, I shall never forget the dignity with which JIM MOTT arose and told the assembled audience that he realized he had been criticized even by his own friends for his actions, but there was one thing he never did, and that was to explain any vote he ever made in the Congress. For the next 30 minutes Jim gave the best talk I ever heard concerning his understanding of the responsibilities of one who is in the public service, and how he had devoted many years of his life in an endeavor to act according to his highest conception of statesmanship. Before he had finished talking, I am sure that all who were present were in agreement that his years of service had not been given in vain, for as I looked around me, I saw the respect and admiration which lighted the faces of everyone who listened. Again he had made a stand for the high principle which had characterized his life and his work, and again he had won.

I loved JIM MOTT, and I revere his memory.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, with profound sorrow we heard yesterday the sad news of the death of our beloved colleague, the Honorable JAMES W. MOTT, of Oregon.

His death leaves a vacancy in this body which will be difficult to fill. JIM MOTT was a friendly man, a man of high character and high purpose. A tireless worker, he gave his great talents to the service of his State and his country. He was a man of strong convictions and with the courage to fight for those convictions. He personified the high type of public servant required for America to successfully combat the difficult problems and obstacles which lie in our path as we march forward over the untraveled road of the postwar world.

He was the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. His fine mind and keen intellect helped materially to build the mighty American Navy of today. He believed in a strong Navy to keep America safe and worked tirelessly toward that praiseworthy objective. His exacting service during these war days undermined his health and hastended his untimely death.

He was one of the leading members of the Roads Committee and had been prominently identified with legislation to increase the internal strength of our country by building good roads everywhere in the United States. Previously he had served with credit and distinction on the Public Lands Committee which handles so many of the problems identified with the building of a stronger western country.

Fully appreciative of the high statesmanship of his service, admiring his fine character and personality we, his friends and associates, pause a moment to pay tribute to a great American. To his good wife and family goes the warmest sympathy of all of us who have been privileged to enjoy the friendship and companionship of JIM MOTT. We shall miss him here, and we hope in that other land to which he has departed he will find everlasting peace, happiness, and contentment.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost an outstanding statesman; the State of Oregon has lost a most effective advocate; the Congress has lost an inspiring leader; the Navy has lost one of its most courageous champions; the Committee on Naval Affairs has lost its beloved ranking minority member; and I have lost an intimate friend.

JIM MOTT has passed into the great unknown. The grim reaper has taken him from our ranks to the quiet and peaceful reward which he so richly deserved.

He was the honored and respected dean of the Republicans on the Naval Affairs Committee. He was largely responsible for the completely nonpartisan character of the committee's work and actions—a nonpartisan character rarely, if ever, attained by committees of Congress.

He was more than a close colleague to me—he was my partner in what was once a most unpopular crusade, the fight for a strong and powerful Navy.

Of course, there were those of us who disagreed with him on political philosophy and certain controversial issues. But we always respected and admired his high principles and ethics and his keen sense of justice.

We always knew that his penetrating mind would detect any flaws in our proposals. He demanded facts and logic. His passion for specificness and accuracy would not tolerate broad and vague generalities.

He was a man of deep convictions—and a man who would fight for those convictions to the very last ounce of his strength, no matter how unpopular his stand might be. He was loyal to a fault.

JIM MOTT was frank and honest. There was never any question as to where he stood on an issue. He met issues quickly and squarely. He never dodged them.

Perhaps the greatest testimonial to his greatness was his ready willingness to admit any mistakes, whether his or his party's—and to move with dispatch to correct any mistakes. Such was the greatest proof of his integrity.

The void created by his untimely passing will long pervade the meetings of the Naval Affairs Committee. Yet he would not have us mourn. He would have us carry on in the courageous manner he exemplified in life.

In his death we find some consolation in knowing that when the grim reaper calls for us to cross the Great Divide, our friend will be on the other side to welcome us into peaceful eternity.

To his wife and family we express our deepest sorrow. May they find some solace in the fact that so many share their grief.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are heavy and our spirits are deeply depressed as we again suspend our deliberations to acknowledge the touch of the Almighty Father who has taken from us our friend and coworker, the Honorable JAMES MOTT, of Oregon.

On yesterday, he was full of good cheer and courage, making plans for his convalescence which would permit him to resume his duties with us. Those plans were built not only about his family and his home, to which he was constantly devoted, but also about his work in connection with problems relating to the Navy. After an elapse of the necessary time in which to regain his strength, it was his purpose to spend some time in the far Pacific area in a study of naval matters. But now he is gone and has been called to a higher task in which there is no pain nor suffering, no sorrow, and no tears.

JIM MOTT was senior minority member on several committees of the House and his absence will be keenly felt by all of his associates. I can testify that this is particularly true with the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, on which he served for so many years with tireless effort and with great credit to his country and his constituency. For years prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, he foresaw the imminence of trouble with Japan and, because of his efforts and his influence, the military installations on the Pacific coast were well under way and in operation before the blow was eventually struck.

His attitude toward the manifold and difficult presentations made by the Navy Department to the Congress always had a particular appeal to me. Not one to accept these representations of the Department with acquiescence and obeisance, he inquired into the justification and merits of the proposals with meticulous care, to the end that, being convinced of their worthiness, he was the better able to advocate those measures when they eventually reached the House for consideration. His talents, both as an inquirer and an advocate, were seldom matched by those who have been associated with him. As time moves along in it inevitable course, those of us who must assume the burden which has been so untimely lifted from his shoulders, will come to realize more and more the value of his keen mind, his wise counsel, his ready wit, and his matchless courage as we grapple with the momentous problems of the future.

Even as we pay tribute to JIM MOTT'S superior quality as a public servant and a statesman, it is equally fitting that we voice our appreciation of his personal attributes as a man. Never one to become aroused in anger, his voice was always gentle and his heart filled with human kindness. Even above his interest in his work in the Congress, there came his love for and his devotion to his family. He was tremendously proud of his children, delighted to describe their traits and their accomplishments, and constantly devoted to his kind and lovable wife.

To them, who have so suddenly lost a husband and a father, goes our genuine sympathy and understanding. To the people of Oregon, who have lost the service of this noble public servant, goes our deep regret. To Jim, himself, goes our

solemn, sincere, and considered expression, voiced in the best of naval sentiment and tradition, "well done."

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, for 9 years I have had the pleasure of serving with the gentleman from Oregon. And during the past 3 of these years we have been drawn more closely together than is the usual lot with colleagues of this body. We have served together on the Naval Affairs Committee and on several subcommittees and I deem it one of my most fortunate experiences to have had JIM MOTT as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Congested Areas which I had the honor to head.

In our various investigations we traveled together nearly 50,000 miles, slept in the same room on many occasions, shared the same food even to the extent of eating K rations during a snow storm on the outskirts of a German political prison camp while investigating German atrocities as the representatives of Congress.

Jim's persevering and searching cross-examination of witnesses, his insistence on refusing to believe until all doubt was removed, made him one of the most valuable and sound investigators this House has produced. I recall our going together, just the two of us, through the infamous prison camp at Dachau a few hours after the German guards were killed or captured. We found the gas chamber outside of which were stacked perhaps two or three thousand naked corpses. Together we manipulated the valves through which the gas entered the chamber. And then exploring the compound further, we found three banks of earth where apparently those entitled to die by bullets were periodically lined up and shot. The ground was red with the blood of countless victims. Jim knelt down, examined the gory mass and then, rising, said: "I've seen enough." It was this thoroughness and persistence that marked him among his fellows.

But there was another side to JIM MOTT. Conscientious in the extreme, kind even to a fault, he has rendered to the people of his district a service beyond my power to describe. While we here know we have lost a dear friend of long standing, his constituents as well as the people of this country must realize they have lost a man devoted to the best interests of the land he loved so well.

To his bereaved family and to his people of Oregon we offer our deepest sympathy.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, We are all sad of heart today because JIM MOTT has gone. Mr. MOTT succeeded Representative Willis Hawley, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and one of the authors of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. He defeated Mr. Hawley in the primary and naturally he entered Congress under vary auspicious circumstances. He was a militant, dynamic Republican, and soon became well known in Congress. With an affable personality, unlimited energy, well educated, and endowed with native ability, he was always an influence in Congress.

Coming from that section of the country "out where the West begins," he was a persistent advocate of everything that pertained to the development and betterment of the great Northwest. Every legislative proposal dealing with mining, irrigation, power, lumber, stock-raising and agriculture had his particular attention. He early became interested in the Navy and Navy projects, especially in his section of the Nation. He was very successful in these endeavors and many a law is now on the statute books because JIM MOTT wanted it that way.

He was not in the best of health during recent years. However, this fact was not generally known. He kept incessantly at the job and was a great believer in looking after the things in which his constituents were individually interested. Our offices were on the same corridor and I saw him often and conferred with him frequently. In short, he was a successful and fearless representative of his people, and I am sure he will be greatly missed in his State. By the same token, the Congress has suffered a great loss.

I extend to his splendid wife and family my genuine sympathy.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, JIM MOTT is gone. In the passing of JIM MOTT the people of the congressional district which he served so long and so faithfully, the people of the State of Oregon, and the people of the United States have lost a great American. It was with profound sorrow that we heard the news of his untimely passing at the Naval Hospital yesterday afternoon. It was my privilege to have served with Jim as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs of this House. We knew him as an outstanding lawyer, a steadfast American, standing firm for the principles in which he believed. Jim joined the Navy during the First World War, and the Navy always shared a big place in his heart. The success and the make-up of Uncle Sam's Navy today can, it is truthfully said, be credited to the work of JIM MOTT as much as to the work of any one man. There seems so little that one can say or that one can do in a time like this. But we do know that Jim has left an indelible impression on this body and on the America of his generation. We hope that it will be a great inspiration and a great consolation to his widow and to his family to be sustained by the thought that this old world is a better place for all of us for JIM MOTT having been with us these many years. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it was with great and profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of my good friend and colleague, JAMES W. MOTT, of the State of Oregon. JIM MOTT and I came to Congress as Members of this House back in 1933. It has been my privilege to serve with Congressman MOTT in this House and on the Committee on the Public Lands from that time until now. JIM MOTT came to the Congress well equipped. He was a good parliamentarian, gained from his experience in the legislature of his own State. He had a keen mind and a fine grasp on public affairs and the importance of the development of the great Northwest. JIM MOTT did yeoman service to his own State of Oregon and to the entire country. I extend my sympathy to his fine family whom it was my privilege to travel with from San Francisco through the Panama Canal on one of the Army transports. JIM MOTT was a congenial companion and a fine man. We all regret his passing.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, one must know a man to well understand and appreciate him. I knew JIM MOTT only casually until last May, when he and I were among those named to make an investigation of the atrocity camps in Germany. We traveled on the same airplane and visited not only the horror camps in Germany but many of the military installations in France, England, and Belgium. Our acquaintance ripened into a warm friendship. He was an agreeable companion and a man of fine integrity and high ideals. He loved his country and his family with a rare devotion. I shall miss him, and I am sure I speak for all the Texas delegation in expressing to his family and friends our deep and abiding sympathy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with his colleagues in paying tribute to JAMES W. MOTT. He and I served for many years as members of the Committee on Roads. He was among the leading spokesman for highway construction in the United States. His familiarity with highway problems enabled him to be among the leaders in formulating highway legislation. While I knew of his work on the Committee on Naval Affairs, I was more familiar with his activities in behalf of roads. He was vigilant in behalf of highway construction in the national forests and in the national parks.

Our lamented friend was widely informed, not only with respect to roads and naval affairs, but with regard to the problems of Government generally. He was courageous and aggressive in the advocacy of the programs and policies for which he stood.

JIM MOTT was faithful to his district and to the great West from whence he came. He believed in the development and the utilization of the natural resources of the country. He served with me on the Committee on Flood Control for some time. He was among those who early advocated national flood control. He took a leading part in promoting and supporting measures for national flood control. He was known as a proponent of a large and powerful Navy.

He leaves a record of distinguished public service.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that other Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on the death of JIM MOTT at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I remember very well the first time I met JIM MOTT. It was early in 1934. He remarked that Kipling was wrong when he said: "The East is East, the West is West and never the twain shall meet," for said he, "Our problems are so similar we must and will play ball together."

We have; over the years our interests have been more common than many might think.

I knew him as intimately as I do or have any man in Congress. We did have so many things to talk about which involved the welfare of our constituents and the country that we often remarked how good neighbors we were.

Our friendship grew stronger as the years grew longer, and it is very difficult for men to realize that he has gone.

No words of mine can measure the loss which the State of Oregon and the country has sustained. It has been no easy task for a Republican to achieve such signal recognition as has been accorded JIM MOTT over these last few years. It is distinctly a reward and recognition of appreciated merit when our friends in the majority take a man of the minority to their bosom as they did our departed friend.

I think Jim had as many friends across the aisle as he did on our side. He was a fearless, pugnacious fighter for what he thought was right. He pulled no punches. He played no partisan politics when issues were vital. He let the chips fall where they might. When he championed a cause, it was his country's—not his party's—and everybody knew it, and felt the genuineness of his enthusiasm, loyalty, and determination.

The regret we all feel at his loss only emphasizes the need for more such men as he in Congress. He was a fearless fighter, never counting the cost to him, personally, so far as votes were concerned. Did the issue involve right or wrong, he was for what he believed to be right, whatever it cost him.

JIM MOTT was a statesman with the qualifications of character which lifted him high above those who play party politics to serve selfish interests and for personal aggrandizement.

No pressure group could change his convictions. No threat of opposition to him personally could deter him from doing what he believed to be right.

I know of no greater tribute I could pay my friend—

E'en as he trod that day to God,
So walked he from his birth
In simpleness and gentleness and honor
And clean mirth.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join other Members of the House of Representatives in payment of a sincere tribute to our beloved colleague, JAMES W. MOTT, ranking Member of the Oregon delegation.

Jim, as we affectionately knew him, contributed something of cheer and helpfulness to all who came in contact with him. He was a real friend. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Naval Affairs Committee of the House. He was in the Navy duing the last World War. A keen student of naval affairs, his conduct and discussions made us feel that we could rely on his guidance as minority chairman of the committee. He will not meet with us again and his absence will be keenly felt; yet his influence, his leadership, his untiring loyalty, his matchless courage will ever remain with us—an inspiration to all.

JAMES WHEATON MOTT was born in Clearfield County, Pa. Sixty-two years later, on the date of his birth, November 12, he was called to that Great Beyond. His record here is closed, but those who may study it in the future will find in that record a career of intelligent and constructive statesmanship useful to our Nation, to his beloved State, and highly appreciated by his constituents.

We, his colleagues in Congress, pay our humble tribute to JIM MOTT, our friend—in the words spoken for an outstanding hero—"This was a man." The world and we who knew him have been made better because he lived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral: Mr. ANGELL, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to these deceased colleagues, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday, November 14, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in room 446, Old House Office Building, to consider H. R. 3976, H. R. 4109, H. R. 4179, and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Subcommittee on Brand Names and Newsprint will hold an open hearing at 2 p. m. Wednesday, November 14, 1945.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Wednesday, November 14, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to continue hearings on the stream-pollution control bills, H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4662. A bill relating to the deferment under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, of registrants regularly engaged in agriculture; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4663. A bill to provide that judges of the District Court for the District of Hawaii shall hereafter be appointed to hold their offices during good behavior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana (by request):

H. R. 4664. A bill to provide for the adjustment of repayment contracts, cancellation of irrigation charges, and amendment of certain provisions of the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 464), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and for other purposes, Flathead irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4665. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1890, commonly known as the Sherman Antitrust Act, as amended, so as to exempt therefrom the activities and operations of mutual news gathering cooperatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4666. A bill relating to the taxability of retirement annuities received by certain retired State, county, and municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4667. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the New York Port of Embarkation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 4668. A bill to release married men from the armed services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4669. A bill to amend the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, to provide for the coinage of gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 397. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate and study the disposition of surplus property to veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 398. Resolution to provide for expenses of the investigation authorized by H. Res. 397; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Res. 399. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate and study the disposition of surplus property to veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 4670. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna B. LeBlanc; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 4671. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4672. A bill for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 4673. A bill for the relief of Minnie Jenkins Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4674. A bill for the relief of Maj. William T. Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4675. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche E. Boyt; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1315. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of members of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic of Northern California, urging support of Senate Joint Resolution 50, which authorizes the acquisition of Temple Heights, Washington, D. C., for a recreation center for Government employees during the war and

for erection of a Civil War memorial thereafter; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1316. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the Armistice Day Committee of the City of Detroit, favoring the joint observance of Armistice Day as Armistice-Victory Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1317. Also, petition of the Michigan Association of Lutheran Men's Clubs, opposing the naming of October 31 as National Arthritis Day because it is the historic date of Luther's Reformation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1318. Also, petition of Bearl V. Pittenger Post, No. 119, American Legion, Department of Michigan, favoring legislation to provide for the granting of accumulated leave to enlisted personnel in the armed services on the same basis as it is now granted to commissioned officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1319. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic of San Francisco, urging the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 50; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our thoughts are sobered by the vastness of our commission as we are here called to engage in an enterprise which reaches to the ends of time and affects all men and all lands. Create in us, we beseech Thee, the strength and splendor of loyalties which cannot be shaken and of those integrities of the soul which shall be our support in any confusion and our light in any darkness.

Grant Thy consoling grace to the bereaved family of that one who in this Chamber for so long served faithfully and well his State, his Nation, and his fellow men. We think tenderly of him this day and cherish his memory as the mortal habitation of his choice spirit is being carried across his native land to the soil of the State he honored. Thanks be to God that such have been, though they are here no more! Leaving an enduring record of public devotion and the benediction of a noble character, now that for him the busy world is hushed, vouchsafe to him, O Lord, light and peace and joy as he mounts from glory to glory in the life everlasting. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 13, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On November 9, 1945:

S. 979. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Lillian Epstein.

On November 10, 1945:

S. 542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz;

S. 1076. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1102. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945;

S. 1103. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944;

S. 1118. An act for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945;

S. 1119. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945; and

S. 1134. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102–A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. James W. Mott, late a Representative from the State of Oregon, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR SENATORS ENGAGED IN PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning the Joint Committee to Investigate the Attack on Pearl Harbor will begin open public hearings. The hearings will probably last for several weeks and it is contemplated that the committee will sit morning and afternoon. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate members of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], be excused during the public hearings on that subject from attendance at the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ARTHUR J. MELLOTT TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, notice is hereby given that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, November 21, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room in the Capitol Building, upon the nomination of Arthur J. Mellott, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the District of Kansas, to fill a new position. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message received yesterday from the President of the United States relating to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which, in view of the fact that it was read in the House yesterday, will without objection be printed in the RECORD without reading and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

This country has pledged itself to do all that is reasonably possible to alleviate the suffering of our war-torn allies and to help them begin the task of restoring their economic productivity. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is one of the most important instrumentalities for accomplishing this great task.

As I stated in my message to the Congress on September 6, 1945, the 47 nations of the Council of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration determined at their third meeting in London last August that contributions beyond those originally made would be necessary if we expect to complete the minimum tasks assigned to UNRRA. The Council recommended, on the motion of the United States Delegate, that each member country, whose territory had not been invaded by the enemy, should contribute an additional amount equal to 1 percent of its national income for the fiscal year 1943.

In accordance with this recommendation, the United States share would be $1,350,000,000, matching our original contribution authorized by the act of Congress of March 28, 1944.

The original contributions of all the member nations have been applied principally to the activities of UNRRA in providing relief and rehabilitation assistance to the countries of eastern and southeastern Europe, and to the care of

United Nations' displaced persons stranded in enemy territory. UNRRA, of course, does not undertake relief or rehabilitation responsibilities in either Germany or Japan.

The invaded countries of northwest Europe, comprising France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Norway, by and large, possess sufficient resources in foreign currency and credit to acquire their own essential imports from aboard. Direct assistance to northwest Europe is, therefore, not being furnished by UNRRA.

Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Albania, on the other hand, not only have suffered greatly at the hands of the enemy in the course of the war but they are almost entirely without foreign exchange or credit resources. Consequently to date they have been the chief objects of UNRRA's activity.

UNRRA has undertaken a limited program of $50,000,000 in Italy to provide for the health and care of children, and expectant or nursing mothers.

Italy, since her participation in the war as a cobelligerent with the United Nations, has contributed substantially in both manpower and facilities to the Allied victory, becoming, at the same time, one of the most severely contested battlefields of the war. The destitution and needs there are appalling. Italy has virtually no foreign exchange resources and without the aid of UNRRA the country might well lapse into starvation.

UNRRA has also assisted in the care and repatriation of millions of allied victims of Axis aggression who were deported to and enslaved in Germany. It has initiated a preliminary program of assistance to China.

By the end of this year UNRRA anticipates that all the funds which will be made available to it from all sources in accordance with the original contributions will have been spent or encumbered. The flow of supplies purchased with these funds cannot last beyond the early spring.

The end of the war with Japan has made it possible to estimate the magnitude of the relief requirements of China and other far eastern areas. Reports on the European harvest of 1945 reveal a serious shortage of all types of foodstuffs.

China presents the largest of all the relief responsibilities which UNRRA now faces. With inadequate supplies and resources it has struggled bravely for 8 years to combat the enemy as well as the ravages of famine, diseases, and inflation. Other programs are required for Korea and Formosa, two areas of the Far East which are now being restored to the peaceful ranks of the United Nations after decades of Japanese oppression and extortion.

UNRRA proposes the extension of aid to Austria. This proposal is in accordance with the Moscow and Potsdam Declarations by the major powers to the effect that Austria should be treated independently of Germany and encouraged to resume the free and peaceful role which it played before being invaded by Hitler's legions.

A limited program of aid is also intended for the Soviet Republics of White Russia and the Ukraine. These areas constituted the principal battlefields in the struggle between Russia and Germany. They were the scene of some of the worse German atrocities, devastation, and pillage.

The recommended additional contributions will hardly suffice to permit UNRRA to meet the most urgent and immediate needs for relief and rehabilitation for which it is responsible. We hope to fulfill a substantial part of this contribution through the use of military and lend-lease supplies which have become surplus since the surrender of our enemies.

I know that America will not remain indifferent to the call of human suffering. This is particularly true when it is suffering on the part of those who by sacrifice and courage kept the enemy from realizing the fruits of his early victories and from bringing his military might to bear upon our own shores.

UNRRA is the chosen instrument of forty-seven United Nations to meet the immediate relief and rehabilitation needs of the invaded countries.

UNRRA is the first of the international organizations to operate in the postwar period, one which the United States originally sponsored and in which it has played a leading part. Apart from purely humanitarian considerations, its success will do much to prove the possibility of establishing order and cooperation in a world finally at peace.

I, therefore, request the Congress to authorize a new appropriation of $1,350,000,000 for participation in the activities of UNRRA.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
November 13, 1945.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR CHANDLER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a copy of a letter dated October 30, 1945, addressed to the Governor of Kentucky by the Honorable Albert B. Chandler, then a Senator from that State, submitting his resignation as a Senator, effective November 1, 1945, which will lie on the table.

REFERENCE OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will refer to the appropriate committees, as in executive session, certain nominations received yesterday from the President of the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, November 14, 1945, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 940. An act to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada; and

S. 1199. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of W. L. Freeman.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 12, 1945.*

[The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report (list No. 1) stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 70 aliens whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by former Attorney General Biddle, and a report (list No. 2) showing all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 182 aliens whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by Attorney General Clark, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Immigration.

ACTS OF LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a volume comprising the acts of the first special session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, January 11, 1945, and the acts of the first regular session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 12 to April 15, 1945 (with an accompanying volume); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Printing.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

A letter from Deputy Executive Chairmen of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, relating to the inclusion of uranium in a list of strategic and critical materials, transmitted to the Senate by the Board on January 2, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER OF PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting for the information of the Senate, a letter from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, two certified copies of an amendment made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Charter of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation (with accompanying papers); ordered to be filed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Jane Armington, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the return of the United States Employment Service to the States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Mr. and Mrs. Frank Wagner, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted at the sixty-first annual meeting of the Indiana Academy of Science, Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 4006) authorizing the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Benjamin Harrison; to the Committee on the Library.

A petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying revision of certain amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 69, to provide for the preparation and publication as an official document of railroad cost scales or tables and related information; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A telegram from the Committee for Relief to Austria and Germany, signed by O. R. Hauser, chairman, Milwaukee, Wis., embodying a resolution adopted by 3,500 Americans in mass meeting assembled in Milwaukee, Wis., favoring communication with Germany and Austria be restored so as to permit the collection of food, clothing, and medical supplies for Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the American Slav Congress of Western Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa., praying the immediate appropriation of $550,000,000 for the relief of the stricken people of liberated Europe; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution adopted by the Suffolk County Christian Endeavor Union, of Boston, Mass., favoring recall of the President's personal representative to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Women's Union Club, of Fall River, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the executive board of Local No. 11, United Packing House Workers of America, of Boston, Mass., relating to America's foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PEACETIME COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter from Rev. L. R. Templin, of Winfield, Kans., and a report of the Central Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church, Salina, Kans., relating to peacetime compulsory military training.

There being no objection, the letter and report were received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINFIELD, KANS., *November 8, 1945.*

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: I am sending you a copy of the section of a report on world peace, dealing with the matter of universal military training, passed by the Central Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church in its recent session. The conference covers the west two-thirds of the State, has a few more than 100,000 members, and in the recent session was represented by the ministers and lay members who are leaders in the conference. Your continued support of a reasonable program that will help build the atmosphere in which world peace can be maintained will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

L. R. TEMPLIN,
Minister, Secretary of the Central Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church.

We view with grave concern the proposal that we should abandon one of the basic policies of our national life and introduce into our American economy the principle and practice of peacetime universal compulsory military training. It is an impressive fact that the first step which led Germany, Italy, and Japan on the road to tragedy was the initiation of such a program for their youth. The people of the United States of America would be well-advised to beware of starting down the same bitter tragic road.

We believe that it would be a much wiser policy if we should set ourselves to conserve the health of all of our people, make certain that every American youth has the advantage of a first-class regiment of physical training and basic general education, in order that we may develop a body of citizens with vigorous bodies, sound minds, and characters disciplined for the responsibilities of citizenship.

We would respectfully urge that our Government throw its influence back of the proposal that the United Nations, by international agreement, abolish all universal compulsory military training throughout the world, and seek through the rigid control of the manufacture and distribution of implements and munitions of war, coupled with the development of juridical processes for dealing with international tensions and conflicts of interest, and progressive reduction of the armed establishments of the various nations, provide the means effectually to prevent the breaking of the peace of the world by any power or group of powers.

We therefore recommend that the Central Kansas Annual Conference express its judgment that the United States of America should not introduce universal peacetime compulsory military training.

We therefore recommend that the secretary of the Central Kansas Annual Conference of the Methodist Church be instructed to communicate with the representatives of the State of Kansas in the Senate and House of Representatives, urging them to vote against any proposal for the introduction of peacetime compulsory universal military training at this time; and that they support every measure that, in their judgment, will strengthen the cooperation of the United States of America with the other United Nations in harmony with the principles expressed in the Atlantic Charter and the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations. (From a report on world peace adopted by the Central Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church, Salina, Kans., September 26–30, 1945.)

PRICE CONTROLS BY OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD copies of a letter from myself to Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and a telegram to me from Mr. H. H. Mack, of the Mosby Mack Motor Co., of Topeka, Kans.

The letter expresses the fear that Mr. Bowles, in his zeal to hold the line on prices, is pursuing a policy that is likely to retard production and thereby increase the inflationary pressure, rather than retard it.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram presented by Mr. CAPPER were received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 13, 1945.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I am enclosing a copy of a telegram I have just received from Mr. H. H. Mack, Mosby Mack Motor Co., of Topeka, Kans. I believe it is self-explanatory.

I realize the difficulty, and even some danger of immediate inflation, in releasing price controls too suddenly. But I would like to suggest that if the retention of controls is retarding production, later on it may be more difficult and more dangerous (from the inflationary angle) to release these controls.

I am sure that you do not believe the way to solve the problem and prevent inflation is to continue price controls indefinitely. The best answer to high prices is an increased supply of goods. When that supply approaches the demand, the price problem is on its way to a sound solution, in my judgment.

I am aware that you are in closer touch with this situation than I am, but at the same time I feel that every effort should be made to eliminate price controls at the earliest possible moment. And the longer it is postponed, the harder it will be to let go.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

NOVEMBER 10, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

As a merchant of automotive equipment and other heavy goods we are finding there is no supply of goods because OPA price regulations won't permit manufacturers to make them at a profit. This situation is becoming alarming. It is our sincere belief that the manufacturer and all others who have any part in distribution of goods to the consuming public will have to have a proper compensation that will more than equal cost and leave something for a profit or the whole scheme is going to bog down. I also observe that the public is anxious to buy the things they need and are willing to pay a fair price for them. Any further delay caused from sidestepping the facts is doing much more harm than good. The Congress of the United States is the only hope the people have left.

H. H. MACK,
MOSBY MACK MOTOR CO.,
Topeka, Kans.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1902. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928; without amendment (Rept. No. 718).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1516. A bill to amend section 12 of the Bonneville Project Act, as amended; without amendment.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4407. A bill reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 719).

From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 304. A bill to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 720);

H. R. 697. A bill relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 723);

H. R. 2543. A bill to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation; without amendment (Rept. No. 724);

H. R. 3709. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters; with an amendment (Rept. No. 721); and

H. R. 4127. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty", approved March 17, 1882, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 722).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1189. A bill to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 725);

S. 1212. A bill to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 726);

S. 1278. A bill to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 727);

H. R. 2874. A bill to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to authorize any corporation formed under authority of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of such code to specify in its bylaws that a less number than a majority of its trustees may constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 728);

H. R. 3636. A bill relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish; without amendment (Rept. No. 729);

H. R. 3867. A bill to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies; without amendment (Rept. No. 730);

H. R. 3868. A bill to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 731);

H. R. 3873. A bill to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 732);

H. R. 3979. A bill to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 733); and

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross; without amendment (Rept. No. 734).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 845. A bill for the relief of Mabel Fowler; without amendment (Rept. No. 735).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2310. A bill for the relief of James A. Brady; without amendment (Rept. No. 736);

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton; without amendment (Rept. No. 737);

H. R. 2335. A bill for the relief of Albert E. Severns; with an amendment (Rept. No. 738); and

H. R. 2835. A bill for the relief of James Lynch; with an amendment (Rept. No. 739).

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2810. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley; without amendment (Rept. No. 740).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1586. A bill for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 1587. A bill to provide for the immediate release of all fathers from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1589. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain lands situated within Fort William Henry Harrison to the State of Montana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1590. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1591. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. TAFT) introduced Senate bill 1592, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. KILGORE) introduced Senate bill 1593, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 1594. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary Davis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McMAHON (by request):

S. 1595. A bill for the relief of the estate of Warren Gilbert Dugan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1596. A bill to amend the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, to provide for the coinage of gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act.

In connection with the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the League of North Dakota Municipalities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the resolution will be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1593) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act, introduced by Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. KILGORE), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The resolution presented by Mr. YOUNG was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted certain legislation commonly known as social-security legislation, by the terms of which a fund is created by deduction from the wages of employees and by payments by employers, by which employees reaching certain ages may retire from active work and receive the benefits by way of monthly payments from the social-security fund; and

Whereas such legislation as enacted by the Congress does not include public employees and no provision is made by law for the creation of any retirement or pension funds for people in the service of municipalities and other public employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the League of North Dakota Municipalities, That we jointly and individually urge our Senators and Representatives to present, and, if possible, procure, an amendment to the social-security laws of the United States, to the end that public employees may be included therein and may receive the same benefits therefrom as people engaged in private employment.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
CURTIS OLSON,
Mayor, Valley City; Chairman.
A. G. PORTER,
City Attorney for La Moure, Kulm, and Edgeley; Member.
M. W. GACKLE,
Mayor, Kulm; Member.
L. E. CORRELL,
City Auditor, Casselton; Member.
C. L. FOSTER,
City Attorney, Bismarck; Member.

APPLICATION OF CAPITAL GAINS TAX—LETTER FROM RUDOLF CALLMANN AND PAUL TILLICH

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a few months ago I sponsored legislation to close up a loophole in the tax laws which permitted certain classes of aliens to escape payment of taxes. This proposal has been pending, not being pushed by me due to the fact that the Treasury Department has said it will take care of the matter under regulations which they have issued. I am waiting for a report from them to see how well they have accomplished their job.

The measure which I introduced has apparently been taken advantage of by a few bigots who would spread dissension in the United States by applying a class and racial angle where it is totally unwarranted. This effort I repudiate and deplore. I, therefore, should like to have inserted in the RECORD, following my remarks, a letter addressed to me under date of November 9, signed by Paul Tillich and Rudolf Callmann which bears upon the subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 9, 1945.*

The Honorable BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is written on behalf of two major national organizations of refugees from nazism in the United States, the American Federation of Jews from Central Europe, comprising 40 organizations of immigrants throughout the country, and Selfhelp of Emigres from Central Europe, a nonsectarian organization.

As you may be aware, your proposal to apply the capital gains tax to persons residing in the United States for extended periods on temporary visas has been used as a springboard for groundless attacks in some newspapers directed against the refugees in this country as a whole. Knowing your splendid record as an enlightened and fair-minded legislator, we realize that these attacks are completely at variance with your purpose in sponsoring this proposal. We, therefore, feel that you will be interested in our views on the matter.

May we assure you that the principle underlying your proposal, to close a possible loophole in our existing tax laws, has the full approval of our organizations.

This legislation would affect few, if any of our members, or of the refugees generally, because the overwhelming majority of the 250,000 refugees in the United States entered as quota immigrants and are, therefore, subject to the capital gains and all other taxes. We, nevertheless, have an interest in the matter since misinterpretation of these facts may reflect unjustly on the new Americans.

They pay their taxes with the same good will and spirit of gratitude to America that they feel in serving in this country's armed forces and performing all other civic duties. Their interest in this matter is identical with that of every American that all who enjoy the privilege of living in this country shall meet the obligations entailed in that privilege.

Respectfully,

RUDOLF CALLMANN,
President American Federation of Jews from Central Europe, Inc.
Dr. PAUL TILLICH,
President Selfhelp of Emigres from Central Europe, Inc.

A CHANCE FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Chance for Peace," delivered by him before the Cincinnati Foreign Policy Institute on November 9 at Cincinnati, Ohio, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACETIME COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of peacetime compulsory military training, delivered by him at the Central Teachers College, Stevens Point, Wis., on November 8, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF THE USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY—BROADCAST FROM PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast in which he participated, from Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., on November 11, 1945, on the subject The Control of the Use of Atomic Energy, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BATTLE FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the topic The Battle for Peace, delivered by him on the program Congress Speaks, on November 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MINIMUM WAGE RATES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding Senate bill 1349, the minimum-wage bill, made by him before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on October 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESETTLEMENT OF PALESTINE—ADDRESS BY HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR.

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the former Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., at a dinner given in his honor by B'nai B'rith, on November 7, 1945, at the Hotel Astor in New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMISTICE DAY ADDRESS BY EDWARD M. SCHEIBERLING

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on Armistice Day, November 11, 1945, by Edward M. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO MOUNTAINS BY JANE MARIE SURFACE

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "I Love Mountains," by Jane Marie Surface, from the Washington Sunday Star of November 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR UNIONS AND POLITICS—EDITORIALS FROM THE FAIRMONT (W. VA.) TIMES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials entitled "Labor Unions and Politics" and "Political Education," published in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times for October 23 and October 13, 1945, respectively, which appear in the Appendix.]

TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN WARRIORS—EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT TIMES

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tomb of the Unknown Warriors," from the Detroit Times of November 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELATION OF WAGES AND PRICES—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drop Anchor but Full Speed Ahead," published in the Philadelphia Record, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hart	O'Daniel
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Buck	Huffman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Taft
Carville	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Tunnell
Connally	McClellan	Tydings
Cordon	McKellar	Vandenberg
Donnell	McMahon	Wagner
Downey	Magnuson	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is a member of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho, and is therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from

North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PAYMENT FOR ACCUMULATED OR ACCRUED LEAVE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Act entitled 'An Act making provisions for payment of employees of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, for accumulated or accrued annual leave when ordered to active duty with the military or naval forces of the United States', approved August 1, 1941, as amended April 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 200), is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'Sec. 2. (a) Any person, who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall have performed active service in the armed forces, may, while on terminal leave pending separation from or release from active duty in such service under honorable conditions, enter or reenter employment of the Government of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia (including any corporation created under authority of an Act of Congress, which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress), and, in addition to compensation for such employment, shall be entitled to receive pay and allowances from the armed forces for the unexpired portion of such terminal leave at the same rates and to the same extent as if he had not entered or reentered such employment.

"'(b) Any such person who, prior to the date of enactment of this section, entered or reentered such employment without having used all accumulated and current accrued leave to which he would have been entitled as a result of such service had he not entered or reentered such employment, shall upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, or the Federal Security Administrator, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he would have been entitled while on terminal leave for the unused portion of such accumulated and current accrued leave had he not entered or reentered such employment.

"'(c) Any such person who, while on terminal leave from the armed forces, performed or shall hereafter perform services for the Government of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia (including any corporation created under authority of an Act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress), for which he would have been entitled to be paid had he regularly become employed or reemployed in a civilian position prior to performing such services, and had he not been receiving pay and allowances from the armed forces for the period during which such services were performed, shall, if he has not otherwise been compensated for such services, be entitled, upon application therefor filed with the General Accounting Office, or, in the case of a person performing such services for a Territory or possession, filed with the appropriate agency or officer of the Government of such Territory or possession, to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the compensation he would have received for such services had he been regularly employed or reemployed and had he not been receiving pay and allowances from the armed forces.

"'(d) Any such person who enters the employment of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, shall upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, or the Federal Security Administrator, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he is entitled for the unused portion of his accumulated and current accrued leave.

"'(e) No waiver effectuated prior to the date of enactment of this section of any right to receive any payment to which a person would otherwise be entitled under this section shall operate to deny such person entitlement to such payment.

"'(f) As used in this section, the term "armed forces" includes the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, and the commissioned corps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and their respective components.'"

And the House agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An Act to provide for the adjustment of the compensation of certain members or former members of the armed forces of the United States who, before the expiration of their terminal leave, have performed, or shall hereafter perform, civilian services for the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
GLEN H. TAYLOR,
THOS. C. HART,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DOWNEY. I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator explain the question at issue in the conference report?

Mr. DOWNEY. There is a law which prevents any civil-service employee or anyone else from receiving two salaries from the Government. Military personnel and commissioned officers are now coming back who have the right of terminal accrued leave. Many of them desire to go back to work immediately for the Government. The bill allows them to draw their military terminal-leave pay while also drawing civilian pay.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, it permits them to draw civilian pay even though on terminal leave? Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is a better expression of it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. The conference report incorporates certain amendments which Members of both Houses thought were necessary.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, would the report amend the law in any other respect so that a civilian Government employee may draw two salaries from the Government?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; it would affect no one except the military personnel on terminal leave.

Mr. WHERRY. And aside from the technical differences, the meat of the matter is that a person who returns from military service and is discharged, who has terminal leave accruing, can at the same time draw a check from a Government agency for civilian service?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. MILLIKIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

"FOUR FREEDOMS" AWARD TO GEN. MARK W. CLARK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution, a letter and statement made in connection with the annual "four freedoms" award to Gen. Mark W. Clark. First is the resolution adopted by the Italian-American Labor Council, next a letter from President

Truman on the occasion of the presentation of the annual "four freedoms" award to General Clark, then a biographical sketch, containing General Clark's military record, and last a statement of principles by the Italian-American Labor Council.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALIAN-AMERICAN LABOR COUNCIL ANNUAL "FOUR FREEDOMS" AWARD

Resolution in appreciation and recognition of his—

Magnificent leadership of the historic battles for human liberty and justice—the glorious struggles in the valleys and mountains of Italy which culminated in the full liberation of her people from the cruel yoke of nazism-fascism;

Sympathetic understanding of the intense devotion of the Italian people to democracy and freedom and the great courage and discipline displayed in their long difficult fight against Fascist and Nazi tyranny;

Inspiring the self-reliance and lifting the hopes of the heroic forces of Italian resistance by active encouragement and appropriate esteem of their vital contributions to our common victory over our common enemy, and, thereby

Symbolizing and dramatizing to the entire world America's loyalty and services to the "four freedoms" and her determination to achieve a new creative relationship between the liberty-loving and peaceful peoples of the United States and the new Italy as an unshakeable pillar of international security and a dynamic force for the progress and happiness of all mankind.

The Italian-American Labor Council herewith resolves to present to Gen. Mark W. Clark, United States of America, the annual "four-freedoms" award.

LUIGI ANTONINI,
President.
JOSEPH PROCOPIO,
Secretary.

COLUMBUS DAY, 1945.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 1, 1945.

Mr. LUIGI ANTONINI, *President,*
Italian-American Labor Council, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ANTONINI: It is especially fitting that the Italian-American Labor Council has selected Columbus Day as the day for the presentation of its annual "four-freedoms" award to Gen. Mark W. Clark.

General Clark has rendered superb service in the liberation of the Italian people. Soldier, statesman and humanitarian, he deserves the thanks of all people of Italian blood in this country for all that he has done for the beloved homeland and for those liberated from the heel of the oppressor.

Columbus had vision and courage when he fared forth on the voyage which gave the world two new continents. I have full faith that Italians of the present day will face the heavy task of rehabilitation with the same faith and courage. Please extend to General Clark my hearty congratulations and my warmest greetings to all who gather in his honor.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

MARK W. CLARK

Mark W. Clark was born in Madison Barracks, N. Y., on May 1, 1896, and following graduation from the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., with a bachelor of science degree, was appointed a second lieutenant of Infantry on April 20, 1917.

PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to first lieutenant on May 15, 1917; to captain on November 7, 1919; to major on January 14, 1933; to lieutenant colonel on July 1, 1940; to brigadier on August 4, 1941; to major general on April 17, 1942; to lieutenant general on November 11, 1942; to general on March 19, 1945.

SERVICE

He first served with the Eleventh Infantry at Chickamauga Park, Ga., until April 1918, when he sailed for France with this regiment, and served at the front until June 1918, when he was wounded in action. He was with the supply section of the General Staff, First Army, from August 1918, until April 1919, taking part in operations at St. Mihiel and in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. His next assignment was with the Service of Supply of the Third Army at Antwerp, Belgium, between April and June 1919, when he joined the Supply Division of the Third Army at Coblenz Germany. He returned to the United States 1 month later.

He served at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., at the United States disciplinary barracks, in August and September 1919, then moved to Fort Snelling, Minn., with the Forty-ninth Infantry, and to Fort Crook, Nebr., with a part of this regiment in October 1919.

During 1921 he was detailed on a chautauqua tour for the Adjutant General's Department and entered the office of the Assistant Secretary of War, Washington, D C., in October 1921 for a 3-year tour of duty. He then enrolled in the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., and following graduation in May 1925, was assigned to 3 years' duty at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., with the Thirtieth Infantry. He served at Fort D. A. Russell (now Francis E. Warren), Wyo., in headquarters of the Fourth Brigade from April 1928 until May 1929, when he was assigned as instructor of the Indiana National Guard at Indianapolis, Ind.

He enrolled in the Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in August 1933 and was graduated from the 2-year course in June 1935. He then was assigned to the Seventh Corps area headquarters, Omaha, Nebr., as Deputy Chief of Staff for the Civilian Conservation Corps, until June 1936. One year later he was graduted from the Army War College, Washington, D. C., and assigned to Staff of the Third Division, at Fort Lewis, Wash. In March 1940 he was assigned as an instructor at the Army College, Washington, D. C. He was ordered to duty with the staff of General Headquarters, at the Army War College, Washington, D. C., in August 1940 and he was assigned as chief of staff of the Army Ground Forces, with headquarters in Washington, D. C., in May 1942.

In June 1942 he became commanding general of the Second Corps and the following month was named to command the ground forces in the European theater of operations. In November 1942 he was announced as deputy commander in chief of forces landing in north Africa and in January 1943 assumed command of the Fifth Army. In December 1944 he was made commanding general of the Fifteenth Army Group in the Mediterranean theater of operations. In June 1945 he was made commander in chief of the United States Occupational Forces in Austria.

DECORATIONS

For World War bravery when wounded in action, he was awarded the Purple Heart.

In November 1942 he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with the following citation:

"Mark W. Clark, lieutenant general (then major general), Army of the United States. As deputy commander in chief of the Allied north African force, he rendered distinguished service to the United States Army in connection with the planning and organization for the operations in Africa. As deputy commander of the Allied north African force he carried out a vitally important and hazardous mission to Algiers by submarine and conducted with conspicuous success important negotiations with French officials. In all of these duties he displayed outstanding characteristics of leadership, sound judgment, and soldierly qualities to the honor of the Army of the United States."

He received the award of the Legion of Merit in 1943, with the following citation:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service. As Deputy Chief of Staff, General Headquarters, United States Army, and as chief of staff, Headquarters Army Ground Forces, he displayed tireless energy, great resourcefulness and military attainment of a high order in solving with sound judgment, perplexing problems, and assisting in the training of units of the Army Ground Forces. As commanding general of the Second Corps, by his tact, professional efficiency, and leadership he laid the ground work in the European theater for a vast organizational housing and training development for the United States Army Ground Forces. His exceptional military judgment, common sense, devotion to duty, and loyal services were of inestimable value to the theater commander."

ITALIAN-AMERICAN LABOR COUNCIL STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

1. The Italian-American Labor Council, organized on December 20, 1941, is a national body composed of representatives of AFL and CIO affiliates, and bona fide independent labor unions in whose ranks there is a substantial number of American workers of Italian origin.

2. The Italian-American Labor Council is dedicated to the promotion of democracy, social justice, and sound national unity in our country.

3. It strives to crystallize amongst Americans of Italian descent a virile devotion and loyalty to the ideals of America. Toward the achievement of this end, the Italian-American Labor Council organizes educational and cultural activities in response to issues of national and international character affecting the life of the American people.

4. The Italian-American Labor Council endeavors through its activities, especially in the ranks of American Labor of Italian extraction, to foster the cause of good citizenship and good unionism. We believe that the two are inseparable and supplement each other.

5. As an organization devoted to the ideals of freedom and justice, we hold that a victory for democracy anywhere strengthens democracy everywhere and that a setback for democracy anywhere is a defeat for democracy everywhere. We, therefore, dedicate ourselves to the energetic cooperation between the democratic labor forces of our own country and the genuine democratic labor movements of other lands. In this connection, we are particularly interested in the closest cooperation with and in fostering the growth of the bona fide democratic forces in Italy. Because of our kinship with the people of Italy, we are especially desirous that the ranks of real Italian democracy triumph over all elements and types of totalitarian aspiration, philosophy, and practice—over all forces that have as their goal the imposition of a one-party system in any shape, manner, or form.

6. During the war our slogan was: America's victory is Italy's freedom. Our country has won the war. The Italian people are now free from Nazi-Fascist domination. It is now our task to win the peace. We must transform the fruits of military victory into wholesome and just political, economic, and social gains—into the full realization of the "four freedoms" for the American people, the people of democratic Italy, and all mankind. Through its moral and material contributions to the victory over the common enemy, the new, the democratic Italy has earned its

right to a place of honor and esteem among the free nations of the world—as a full-fledged member of the United Nations.

7. Towards the attainment of this goal it is indispensable that the resurgent democracy in Italy be encouraged and strengthened by the democratic forces of our country. The Italian-American Labor Council pledges its warmest solidarity and help in the rebuilding of a free trade union movement as a bulwark of Italian democracy. We pledge our wholehearted moral and material assistance to all proponents of true democracy in Italy. A really free and democratic Italy is a mighty cornerstone of the edifice of international security and an enduring and just peace in Europe and throughout the world.

8. The Italian-American Labor Council believes that the development of ever firmer friendship and solidarity between the freedom-loving American and Italian people can prove only mutually advantageous and enhance the welfare of both peoples. Such sound and lasting Italo-American friendship is conducive to the enrichment of human culture and progress and the reinforcement of world peace and prosperity.

9. In this spirit the Italian-American Labor Council will continue to protect and defend the rights of our American population of Italian descent against the assaults of the bigots and all other anti-American elements. It will aid the loyal Italo-Americans in fulfilling most energetically their duties and in enjoying more fully their rights as citizens of the United States. These activities of the Italian-American Labor Council are to be conducted in the spirit of our devotion to the struggle against all discrimination and prejudices growing out of differences in race, color, creed or national origin among the people of our country. These activities are to be conducted in the interest of true national unity and vital American democracy.

10. Let us build Italo-American friendship as a powerful pillar of world peace and democracy!

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN FROM OVERSEAS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a radiogram from members of the Thirty-seventh Division, now stationed at Manila. I presume other members of the Senate have received a similar radiogram. It is as follows:

MANILA, *November 9, 1945.*

Request following situation brought to attention proper authorities: We of the Thirty-seventh Division some with 42 months overseas and all with 60 or more points are awaiting shipment home from Philippines while a division with one-half our overseas time has already departed. It is further contemplated sending thousands of noncombat troops home from Philippines ahead of the Thirty-seventh and we vigorously protest spending our fourth Christmas overseas.

MEMBERS OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH.

I have also received a longer telegram from the enlisted men of the Second Battalion of the Fourteenth Infantry Regiment, Thirty-seventh Division, dated November 11, 1945, from Manila, as follows:

We feel that we have a justifiable case which should be brought to attention of War Department and public. Here are the facts in regards to our division. The Thirty-seventh Infantry Division has been serving overseas since May 26, 1942, total of 41 months. During this period division saw action on New Georgia, Vella la Vella, Bougainville, and Luzon. Total time in combat equal to if not exceeding that of any other combat division in this theater. Our long record has been excellent in all campaigns. Casualties were high. During interrogation of General Yamashita, commander of the Japanese armed forces in the Philippines, he brought out the fact that among the men of his command the Thirty-seventh Division was one of the most feared and highly respected combat divisions in the Pacific. Officials in this theater command never failed to recognize high combat efficiency of this division when difficult jobs were to be done. We were called on to participate in some of the most bitterly contested actions. Now despite the cessation of hostilities we feel that higher Army authorities in this theater have extended their obvious prejudice against this division by repeatedly postponing plans to return the division on dates announced by both General MacArthur's headquarters and the War Department. One official date and other dates which we read in newspapers have already been postponed. In our place two other divisions, the Forty-third and Thirty-eighth, have already returned to the States. The Thirty-eighth and other divisions have been given higher priority over the Thirty-seventh and have less time overseas and in combat than the Thirty-seventh. Furthermore, service troops in replacement depots have priority over our combat division. The Thirty-seventh has 17,000 men in it all of whom are eligible for discharge and all of whom have been promised that they will be home for Christmas. We feel that the return of the veterans of this division to the United States is being jeopardized and delayed by the unfounded personal animosity entertained for this division and its commanding general, the only National Guard division commander to have held his command throughout the war, by the Regular Army clique that has dictated policies in this theater since beginning of war. Is it asking too much that this injustice caused by petty Army practices be brought to the attention of the public? In view of your position and your reputation for the baring of facts we members of this battalion have decided that you are the most capable person who has the courage to publicize this situation.

Respectfully,

ENLISTED MEN OF THE SECOND BATTALION, FOURTEENTH INFANTRY REGIMENT, THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY DIVISION.

Mr. President, I hesitate to criticize the Army and the Navy concerning the delay in returning to the United States men in the armed forces. In all the contacts I have had with Army and Navy officials they have stated they have been doing everything they could to have the men brought back to this country. But I am receiving numerous letters from young men in the service overseas, and from their families at home—and I presume other Members of the Senate are receiving similar letters—particularly from men in China, in Okinawa, and in other places. I have a letter from a man in Great Falls, Mont., dated November 5, 1945, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I don't imagine there is a damned thing you can do about this situation but I thought it would do no harm to refer it to you just in case you might.

My foster son has been in the services for 3 years, 2 of which have been in the Pacific area. The following is from his last letter to me:

"In spite of all the statements made by Army and Navy officials and Congressmen, the shipping situation in this area (Philippines) is damned poor. There are still men in the replacement pools with 90 and 95 points. The replacement camps are all overcrowded, many men having been in there over a month. They fool a lot of the people at home by lowering the points to 60 to make them believe things are moving fast. But they can't fool us over here. Even if the point score was 40 we would still have to wait for a ship to take us home. As usual the Air Corps is getting the cream with all their 70-point men and some 60-point men back in the States. As an illustration of how much time we have on our hands, I have read seven books in the past few days. Maybe I wasn't brought up right, but this lazy man's life doesn't agree with me in the least."

Doesn't it impress you as being such a hell of a waste of a young man's life? He is just about 22 and should have been through college by this time. It strikes me that the Navy might be better engaged in bringing the chaps home than going on parades all over both our coast lines. Another thing, is there an ulterior motive in keeping the boys there? Are we going to fight in China? Why are our ships being used to transport Chinese troops? Read the excerpt from this letter on the floor of the Senate and ask these questions, and you will be well rewarded with servicemen's loyalty. They look on you as their champion of their causes. Think of the effects this situation is having on their physical and mental state. It's high time something was done about it.

Yours very truly.

Mr. President, I have also received a letter from members of Local Union No. 1095, United Mine Workers of America, dated November 7, 1945, from Red Lodge, Mont., as follows:

DEAR MR. WHEELER: In behalf of the soldiers who have fought and bled to bring this war to an end, and whereas these men have not been able to get passage home, to which they are rightfully entitled to: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Local 1095 of the United Mine Workers of America urge all locals and districts of the United Mine Workers of America and the honorable President of the United States, as well as the honorable Senators and Representatives of our Nation, that they do all in their power to get all available transportation to bring these soldiers home from foreign shores. We demand immediate action for these soldiers who have waited months for a ship to take them home.

Sincerely submitted.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE, LOCAL 1095.

I have also received a letter from a newspaperman, dated November 6, 1945, from Billings, Mont., as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: Being a father of two boys still in the armed forces, I am seeking some information and am turning to you in hopes you can furnish it.

What I want to know is why the Army is holding the Twentieth Air Force on the Island of Guam. My information is the force there has been doing nothing for the past 2 months or more. If your office does not have the information available, would you kindly pass this on to the proper authorities.

Very truly yours.

These are only samples of hundreds of letters which I am receiving from servicemen in China, the Philippines, and Okinawa, as well as from their parents. They wonder why they are not being sent home, notwithstanding the fact that they have the necessary number of points. I am told that living conditions on Okinawa are appalling and that there is no excuse for keeping such a large number of men there when living conditions, the food situation, and other conditions are so unsatisfactory. I hope the military authorities will take some action in the immediate future to hasten the

return of these young men to their homes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I have received many letters on the same subject. I was particularly impressed by a letter which I received the other day from a young officer in the Philippines. He personally was not affected, but he complained bitterly about the forgotten men in the replacement pool, some of them with more than 100 points, who sit around with nothing to do. He said that he felt ashamed to go among them, because they had been through the entire Pacific campaign. Apparently they were in a backwash, and forgotten. Such a letter from a soldier who complains about the treatment given other soldiers means more than a letter from a man who is himself trying to obtain his release. This man was not asking for anything for himself, but he said that something should be done about the replacement pools.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. The other day I received a letter from an Army officer along the same lines. He said that, so far as he was concerned, he was not affected in the slightest degree, but that the boys in the Philippines who have been through combat service and who have the necessary number of points should be taken care of. He also said that he was ashamed to go among them.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator realize that many of the replacements have been taken from hospitals? Instead of going back to their divisions, the men are sent to the replacement pool, and have become practically forgotten men.

Mr. WHEELER. It seems to me that there is no excuse whatever for the way the boys have been jockeyed around. Furthermore. in the War Department and other departments officers and others serving in the United States are doing absolutely nothing. In some places there are 50 or 60 men where 3 or 4 men could do the job. Not only does that involve an expense to the Treasury but it has a demoralizing effect upon the men themselves. In my judgment the Army and Navy are doing themselves a real disservice by not returning servicemen to their homes more quickly, particularly when the men have the necessary number of points and are sitting around doing nothing.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to know what the Senator thinks about the utilization of all the shipping facilities available for bringing the men home.

Mr. WHEELER. I believe that all the available facilities should be used. This morning I received a letter to the effect that a CIO union had adopted resolutions saying that they would refuse to unload ships unless the ships were being used for the purpose of bringing soldiers home.

Mr. MOORE. I know that the Senator has received many letters from the men themselves, who claim to know, to the effect that many ships are lying at anchor in the Philippines and in the Chinese area of the Pacific, and are not being utilized. Yet we are told by the Army and Navy that everything that can be done is being done. Like the Senator, I do not wish to make any charges of bad faith against the Army or Navy. But the situation has reached such a point that the morale of the men themselves and of the people is being affected. They have begun to doubt the integrity of the Army and Navy in the statement that everything possible is being done to demobilize the armed forces and bring the men home.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree 100 percent with the Senator. Every statement I receive from the Army or Navy, and every statement in the press, is to the effect that they are doing everything they possibly can. But at the very time when those statements are issued I receive letters from men in China, in the Philippines, and in Europe, saying that, as a matter of fact, everything possible is not being done, and that they are being held there without reason. They are losing faith in the Army and Navy, and they are blaming Congress because of the fact that they are not getting back home. They think we are derelict in our duty when we do not do something to force the Army and Navy to bring them back.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not true that we should be doing something?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course. Frankly, with the complaints coming from the men, saying that we ought to take some action, I believe that the Congress should take action.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yesterday the Committee on Naval Affairs had a very interesting meeting concerning the subject now under discussion. There appeared before the committee Admiral William M. Callaghan, Director of Naval Transportation, who has to do with bringing soldiers and sailors home from abroad. He stated that more than 500 ships had been refitted and commissioned for the express purpose of transporting soldiers and sailors from abroad. He further stated that from November 1 to June 30, 1946, the transportation service contemplated bringing back from abroad 4,443,000 soldiers and sailors. Breaking down the figures, it is expected that 1,450,000 will be brought back from Europe, 10,000 of whom were sailors; 203,000 from India, 3,000 of whom were sailors; and 2,790,000 from the Pacific, 1,430,000 of whom were sailors, coast guardsmen, and marines. Admiral Callaghan further stated that should more ships be commissioned and assigned than are now being used it would mean that fewer Navy men would be transported from abroad. He stated that the plan worked out by the transportation service permitted the use of as many ships as the traffic will bear without impairing the chances of Navy men to be brought back home on the same basis as Army men.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to have that statement. As I stated, I have been very hesitant about criticizing the departments, and I have not criticized them on the floor of the Senate. But I am becoming weary of receiving letters from servicemen who are criticizing Congress because of the fact that we have not done anything. The men ask, "Why do you not make the Army and Navy do something about it?" Frankly, the letters are becoming so bitter that they are very disturbing. The men are not only becoming angry at the Army and Navy but they are becoming angry at their own Government. In my judgment, the situation which exists is very dangerous.

One serviceman asks, "Why is it that parades of ships are being held along the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast? Why are not some of those ships being used to bring the men back? They were used to bring us over here. Why are they not being used to bring us back?" In my judgment, it was a mistake to advertise big parades of ships in New York Harbor and other harbors when the men overseas could not get back.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The evidence also showed that five or six carriers have been in use for some time in transporting men from overseas. Several cruisers are also in use. The point that was urged by Admiral Callaghan was that if more ships and carriers were put into the service, fewer Navy men with a sufficient number of points for discharge would be able to get home. In other words, they would be detained in the service as operators of such ships if a larger number of ships were used. That is one of the reasons why the number of ships has been fixed at a little over 500 for that purpose. In short, if the number of ships were increased, many of the men in the Navy, who are as much entitled to get out of the service as are the men in the Army, would not be able to obtain their discharge.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree that they are entitled to be released. Perhaps I am mistaken, but I do not understand, and the men do not understand, why ships should be used in great parades, instead of being used to bring the men home. It seems to me that there is not much excuse for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have stated, the Navy is using as many ships as it can. Another point made by Admiral Callaghan was that during the war three and a half years were required to carry the men overseas to fight, and that less than 10 months will be required to bring them back.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know the admiral, but certainly many of the men overseas ought to be brought back. I should like to have the admiral write to the men giving his explanation, because they are certainly dissatisfied.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Maj. Gen. W. F. Paul, Assistant Chief of Staff for Personnel, who is in charge of plans for demobilization, testified for approximately an hour this morning before the Committee on

Naval Affairs. I suggest that all Senators read his testimony. He has just returned from overseas. I think his testimony shows conclusively that the Army are doing everything they can do and are weighing every possible factor. The most gigantic task which has ever confronted the Army or the Navy and our shipping facilities has been the demobilization of 12,000,000 men scattered all over the world, to do it in a systematic way, and to treat everyone equally. It is an impossible task. I think a study of General Paul's testimony will amply repay the Members of the Senate. I think the explanation is conclusive in showing that they are doing everything within their power. I hope all Members of the Senate will read General Paul's testimony.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to read it, and I am glad to hear the explanation. But I say that the explanations which have been made heretofore have not satisfied the men who are overseas. They do not care what an admiral says to the effect that those in charge are doing everything they can, when at the same time in many ports numerous available ships are to be seen. I call attention again to the case of the Thirty-seventh Division. I have received from that division communications stating that soldiers with 80 or 90 points are not being sent home, whereas numbers of soldiers with far fewer points are being returned to their homes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder whether the Navy is considering the tremendous amount of space available on the hangar decks of aircraft carriers. I happen to know that 1,900 troops were put on the hangar deck of a carrier to go into combat. I do not see why 1,900 others cannot be brought back on that carrier, which now does not even have to carry any planes at all. It seems to me that the problem can be solved by using both large carriers and small ones. Some say that the decks of carriers are cold, but we must remember that in numerous instances blowers have been successfully used to heat large terminals. It seems to me that the proper use of aircraft carriers in the present situation is one way of solving the problem.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to confirm what the distinguished senior Senator from Montana has said about communications from servicemen overseas. I also have received letters and other messages from the men themselves, as well as from their parents, relative to the demobilization and discharge of men in the naval service. I have in my office a letter which I should like to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks. I shall send for it immediately and shall give it to the reporter. It comes from the parents of a young man whose home is near my home town. He has been in the service for almost 5 years and has 90 points; yet for some reason he cannot get transportation back to the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VESTA, NEBR., *November 7, 1945.*

Senator WHERRY,
Alexandria, Va.

DEAR SIR: We are writing in regards to our son, Maj. Charles H. Ziegler, O-313609, in the Fifty-eighth Quartermaster Base Depot on Okinawa. Redeployment there has been held up for reasons we, the public, do not know. There are men with over 100 points who have not received orders as yet. Charles has 90 points, 2 years overseas, in two theaters of war, and almost 5 years in the Army.

We ask your help in relieving this situation.

We send our greetings to you and your family.

Yours truly,

DR. AND MRS. CHAS. ZIEGLER.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I know there is much to be said regarding the problems confronting the Navy. Another letter which I have received states that a convoy of more than 100 ships was assembled at the port of Manila for over 10 days, but nothing was done to load the ships, and as of the date of the letter the ships were still there. So I have submitted the letter and I have made these remarks to confirm what the distinguished Senator has said relative to the delays in discharging the boys from the service.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

HOARDING OF DOCTORS AND DENTISTS BY THE ARMY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am going to talk again about the scandalous situation in which the Army, in particular, and also the Navy are holding doctors and dentists in the service without any possible justification. The tortuous trail of finding out from the Army why it is holding doctors and dentists in virtually every camp in the country, above the actual needs of the service, leads close to the Secretary of War. It has been exceedingly hard to get candid and correct information from any Army sources on this point. In relation to this phase, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], chairman of the Military Affairs Subcommittee, in investigating this matter under Senate Resolution 134, had this same difficulty, and he said:

> As chairman of the subcommittee, I sought some explanation of this apparent great waste of medical power, but must admit I was engulfed in an impenetrable fog in an attempt to elicit facts of any conclusion from the military authorities.

I have had the same experience. It is the most difficult and disheartening task I have ever undertaken in my public life to get the truth in this scandalous situation, out of any of the sources available to us. I finally decided to try the Office of the Secretary of War. Surely, I thought, the final authority in the War Department will be more candid than the lower levels of authority. About October 11, I received from Fort Riley, Kans., a letter which contained the following:

> As of today, there are 43 dentists assigned to Fort Riley, with real work for no more than 12 of them.

On October 12, I wrote the Secretary of War quoting that statement and asking him if he would be good enough to cause a prompt investigation of this matter and advise me of the facts. On November 5, the Secretary of War reported the following:

> Your constituent is correct when he says that there were 43 dental officers assigned to Fort Riley at the time his complaint was made. I should like to point out, however, that the total strength of the post at the time was 25,165. There was, therefore, 1 dental officer for each 585 men. This is not considered excessive inasmuch as Fort Riley operates a separation center in addition to its other activities.

The Secretary of War gave me additional information which is not pertinent to this question. I could only assume from the report of the Secretary of War that his office was satisfied with the situation at Fort Riley, and thought I ought to be; that there was no waste of doctors and dentists at that post. I made public my request of October 12, upon the Secretary of War, for an investigation of the Fort Riley situation. It was handled freely by the Kansas newspapers.

While the letter of the Secretary of War was on its way, I received additional information concerning the situation at Fort Riley. Mr. President, I charge the Senate to consider carefully what I am about to say, because it indicates a disgraceful condition in the War Department. Following the receipt by me of this information from the Secretary of War, after his investigation and after his report to me that everything at Fort Riley seemed to be proper, I received the following information from Fort Riley:

> Your first letter—

That is my first letter—

> in the newspapers created quite an uproar here. The wires were plenty hot, and by noon of the next day six dentists had orders to move, three to Fort Logan, Colo., three to Fort Leavenworth, and another was sent to Camp Grant, Ill. The next day another dentist was sent to Fort Leavenworth. Two more dentists eligible for release were put through the separation center. All the dentists were finally removed from the separation center.

In reading the answer of the Secretary of War one cannot find a syllable in it which would indicate that the dentists at Fort Riley should be reduced immediately by 25 percent. Mr. President, that is a scandalous situation.

Preceding the incident to which I have referred I discussed the situation relative to the dentists with a doctor in the Army with the rank of colonel. I mentioned a certain camp with reference to which I had informaton that at that camp there was an excessive number of dentists. He said to me in effect, "Well, you may get those fellows moved out of that place, but that is all you will accomplish. When somebody complains about an excessive number of dentists in a particular place, they move a number

of those dentists to some other place." I assert, Mr. President, that the removal of excessive and surplus dentists from a place where they are not necessary to some other place where also they are not necessary is an evasion of candor, truth, and good administration. I have cited a case which is absolutely in point. Whoever is responsible for it has brought disgrace upon the Army and the Navy.

Mr. President, in order that the Senate may have the situation clearly before it, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks my letter of October 12, 1945, to the Secretary of War, and his reply of November 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 12, 1945.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In connection with the great volume of discussion of the situation in the Surgeon General's Department of the Army, in relation to the number of doctors and dentists being kept in the service, I beg to advise that I am in receipt of a letter from one of my constituents near Fort Riley, Kans. This definite statement is made:

"As of today, there are 43 dentists assigned to Fort Riley—with real work for no more than 12 of them."

I cannot give you the name of my correspondent because of their fear of reprisal from the Surgeon General's office.

I shall be most happy if you will cause a prompt investigation to be made of this situation, and advise me at, I hope, your early convenience.

With my best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

CLYDE M. REED.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 5, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REED: This is in further reply to your letter of October 12, addressed to the Secretary of War referring to information supplied by one of your constituents regarding an alleged excessive number of dentists at Fort Riley, Kans.

Your constituent is correct when he says that there were 43 dental officers assigned to Fort Riley at the time his complaint was made. I should like to point out, however, that the total strength of the post at that time was 25,165. There was, therefore, one dental officer for each 585 men. This is not considered excessive inasmuch as Fort Riley operates a separation center in addition to its other activities. I believe figures showing some of the dental work accomplished at Fort Riley during the month of September will answer your constituent's claim that there is work for only 12 dentists at that post:

Dentures constructed	381
Dentures repaired or rebased	85
Permanent fillings inserted	5,372
Teeth extracted	1,423
Teeth replaced by bridges or dentures	2,854

I trust that the foregoing will enable you to answer the inquiry of your constituent.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to acquit Secretary of War Patterson and Under Secretary of War Royall of any knowledge on their part of the disgraceful situation to which I have referred. I do not believe that either of those eminent gentlemen would tolerate such conditions if they knew them to exist. I will assure the Senate that after today I shall make sure that Secretary of War Patterson and Under Secretary of War Royall are fully advised of the disgraceful situation to which I referred, and which I honestly believe applies to at least two-thirds of the Army posts of this country. It is my firm belief that 10,000 doctors and dentists are being held at Army posts in this country when there is no earthly use for them at those posts.

Mr. President, these men are professional men. They left their practice to enter the military service. They did so for patriotic reasons. In illustration of what those civilian doctors meant, allow me briefly to refer to the facts.

It is well known that with certain notable exceptions the Army medical service is, in quality, an inferior service. With the exception of a few brilliant practitioners, no man stays in the medical service of the Army in peacetime who is qualified to be a successful practitioner.

The other day a member of the faculty of one of the important medical schools of the country came into my office. We engaged in conversation relative to the subject which I am now discussing. He said:

I have been on this particular staff for 15 years. I have watched the graduates of every graduating class. The Army gets only the culls. It gets not only the inferior men to start with, but those men, after getting into the Army, have no opportunity to improve, and usually they do not improve.

So what takes place? There seems to be an anomalous situation involved. The medical attention given to the men in the Army and in the Navy during the recent war was the best that the men of any army or any navy had ever received. How could such excellent medical care have been given with an inferior medical staff? Mr. President, I have it from official sources that at the beginning of the war there were about 1,200 doctors in the regular medical establishment of the Army. Each of those men was subsequently assigned to administrative work. The magnificent service which was given to the men in the Army was given entirely and supervised entirely by civilian doctors who had been brought into the service. The best talent in Harvard Medical School, in Johns Hopkins, in the Mayo Clinic, in Northwestern University, and other great schools and hospitals was called upon to enter the service. Even my own Kansas University sent an evacuation hospital unit, which served during the war under the command of a Kansas University faculty member. Every one of the doctors connected with the evacuation hospital were Kansas men, and none of them was from the Regular Establishment of the Army.

During the Army's maximum strength it had approximately 46,000 doctors. With the exception of men who were engaged in administrative work, all those doctors had been civilian doctors. What is their reward now? They are now under the command and authority of the Regular Army staff, the personnel of which is engaged in administrative work in which, for once in their lives, they can command medical men who are far superior to them in the medical profession. I do not have any basis, except that of pure presumption, for the statement that this situation is one in which the doctors in authority may be venting some kind of spleen or grudge upon the superior medical men who are temporarily in the service. Those superior men left their civilian practices and wish to return to them. They are serving no purpose in the positions which they now hold. Presently I shall read some glaring examples of the situation. As I have already said, the most scandalous personnel situation in connection with our whole war effort has been embodied in the abuse of these professional men who left their practices to go forth to do a magnificent job.

Mr. President, since this matter has been given wide publicity I have received a flood of letters, telegrams, cablegrams, and radiograms not only from various parts of the United States but from all over the world. I wish to refer to a few cases and will do so as briefly and as concisely as I can.

I have before me a communication from George Field, which is at Lawrenceville, Ill. The communication is from a doctor who is an officer there in the Medical Corps. He states that the capacity of the hospital is 120 beds and that the average number of patients in that hospital is 44. For those 44 patients there have been assigned 9 doctors and 8 dental officers. The doctor states that those 44 patients include some prisoners of war and some civilians. He continues as follows:

The same exists throughout the States in air bases that are now outmoded but are being kept alive to provide commands for our top-heavy rank-conscious "junior birdmen."

Another letter of special interest which I received came from a group of doctors at the Woodrow Wilson General Hospital at Staunton, Va. I read from it as follows:

WOODROW WILSON GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Staunton, Va., November 7, 1945.

Yesterday the surgeon for the Third Service Command, at the request of the Surgeon General, called all doctors in this hospital together and attempted to appease us for not yet being released from the service. He admitted that the Surgeon General had promised to have 13,000 doctors out of the service by December and stated that so far only 5,500 have been discharged. He pleaded with us to have patience and we would probably (?) all be out by March 1946.

From the far-off Philippines I have this letter:

There is no shortage of doctors anywhere in the Pacific areas. There's a surplus in any field you care to mention. Doctors are sitting around in large groups in replacement centers "rusting away"; no assignments are provided for them. For them, there's just nothing to do. I myself was unassigned and idle for 10 weeks—an "essential" specialist. If one cares to check on this he might speak to Colonel Hall of the Surgeon General's office, who has recently been in these islands. Colonel Hall "found" whole units of doctors sitting around in replacement depots, literally "lost" by headquarters.

I read now from a letter written to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] by one of his constituents who sent me a copy of the letter:

I am 46 years old, have been in the Army almost three and one-half years, and have a wife and 4 children, 74 points, and still am unable to get out. I have put an application in for release through military channels, to the procurement and assignment in Washington, but at the rate in which the Army gets things done, it will take this application approximately 3 months to be acted upon.

I have another letter from a Medical Corps captain, which reads:

After 3 years in the Army I can only say that two out of every three Army doctors never did a day's work in all their army career. I volunteered but you'd have to use a team of horses to get me to join up again after my discharge. * * * Now that there are no more battle casualties there is no excuse in the world for keeping in service 6 doctors for every 1,000 troops.

I might say here, Mr. President, that there are 125,000 doctors in active practice in the United States. A greater number of men than that hold certificates to practice medicine, but many of those who hold licenses are retired or are in ill health or are in teaching positions; so that there are 125,000 doctors in active practice. The Army took 46,000 and the Navy took 14,000, a total which represents practically one-half of the number of doctors in this country. So long as the war was actively on, so long as battle casualties were coming in nobody begrudged the wounded soldier every attention that could be given him. If it took one doctor or one surgeon to every wounded man, all well and good, but when May 12 came the need for doctors in Europe decreased abruptly 80 percent. There were no more battle casualties. The wounded had been sent to the United States. It may interest the Senate to know that the last wounded man from Europe was brought to the United States and put in a hospital here in July. This is November, and yet the doctors are being held in Europe by the thousands, although they have nothing to do there. It is the most disgraceful thing that I have ever encountered in my public life. There is much bypassing of Members of Congress, including myself. We are given the run-around. We can get no information. We can get no honest, candid, or correct answers as to what the actual facts are. The situation is so disgraceful that the board of inquiry called for under the resolution which I submitted should be set up, and I do not know that the proceedings should be permitted to stop there. If that board of inquiry does not find that there ought to be a considerable number of courts martial for whoever is responsible for this disgraceful situation, then I shall always have the feeling that the board of inquiry did not do its full duty.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to reaffirm what the Senator has stated regarding the treatment of doctors. I think there are many more doctors in the Army—I do not know so much about the Navy—than are required for the present needs of the Army and they are apparently being deliberately kept in the service.

I have in mind the case of a doctor from Drew Field and McGill Field, Tampa, where there is a hospital with 135 patients and 15 doctors. This particular man finally, after considerable effort, was declared surplus. He has done no work for approximately 60 days. He is 44 years old, and has been in the service 3½ years. He was finally declared surplus at this particular field, but was transferred to the Army Ground Forces Command for reassignment somewhere else.

Apparently the Army Medical Corps is refusing to recognize the usual requirement that in hardship cases discharges shall be granted. I have the case of a doctor which certainly presents a hardship case, a man whose oldest son is paralyzed, whose wife has to carry him around to a large extent, and now his wife is also sick, and they have hardly enough money to live on; yet, apparently, the Army Medical Corps takes the position that hardship cases do not apply to doctors.

So I agree with the Senator from Kansas that there should be an investigation, and it seems to me that a very high proportion of the doctors now held should be released.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution.

Let me refer to a hardship case. I have a letter from the wife of a captain in the Medical Corps which reads in part:

My husband was in Africa, Anzio, and on into Germany, and has 78 points, also a fine Army record as convoy surgeon and Ninety-ninth Infantry surgeon through the Ardennes and crossing of the Rhine. He has applied for a hardship release because we have a 9-month baby boy with a tumor on his spine causing paralysis. Baby requires constant care as he can't sit up or lift his head. He weighs 26 pounds, and I weigh 97 pounds. * * * Surgeons can't operate on baby, and give him about a year to live.

Mr. President, that doctor has not been able to get a release on a hardship basis. I promise the Senate that tomorrow the Surgeon General's office, or whoever is responsible for that case, is going to have to account to me for ignoring or refusing to give consideration to a case of that kind, where the doctor is within 2 points of the required 80 points and is desperately needed at home.

I think, perhaps, Senators will get a smile out of the letter, part of which I am about to read. It came from a medical officer on Leyte, who says:

Am well into my fourth year at the garbage can and latrine, and my third year overseas—longer than a peacetime Army tour of duty. It is becoming increasing difficult to waste time and avoid becoming a neurotic. Seems like my self-control is stretched to the breaking point. If there were only something I could do—it is this eternal waiting and waiting for some unknown date. I dream of the day when I can escape the Armys enforced idleness and again have the privilege of working. The officers here chipped in and imported a thousand pesos worth of native whisky from Cebuloy Banca. A few of them seem to successfully kill time by remaining in an alcoholic stupor, but that is difficult for me because my constitution isn't rugged enough to take it.

Mr. President, this letter comes from a captain stationed at Fort Stevens, Oreg.:

At the present time I am assigned as battalion surgeon to headquarters and headquarters harbor defenses of Columbia and attached to the station hospital, Fort Stevens, Oreg., to which four medical officers are assigned to duty. The average total patients per day in the hospital for September was 11; October, 8; and thus far in November, 4.

Mr. President, those illustrations can be repeated indefinitely. Not only urging, begging, or pleading, but threatening, we are unable to get action upon cases of that kind. Either the Surgeon General denies his authority, or evades us on the merits of the case. This is so plain that there can be no difference of opinion as to the facts existing.

The administration of the Medical Corps of the Army and the Surgeon General's office, including the present administration, up to this hour, is dishonest, is disgraceful, it is incompetent, it is inadequate, it calls first for a board of inquiry, and then probably some courts martial.

I wish to give another illustration. I shall read now from a letter signed by 10 medical corpsmen at Camp Breckinridge, Ky., dated the 8th of November 1945:

Recently, 20 battle-tested medical officers, most of whom have at least five battle stars and at least one medal awarded in combat, were transferred to the station hospital at Camp Breckinridge, Ky. The situation which exists in this hospital is apparently universal, and we think it is worthy of note.

On the 8th of November, there were approximately 124 patients in the hospital. They represented the usual types of patients drawn from a small group of relatively healthy young men. This hospital on the 8th of November had 35 medical officers assigned to its staff.

Let me repeat, there were 124 patients in the hospital. Why should anyone have to call the attention of the Surgeon General and the Army authorities to cases of that kind? Why should I have to take the floor of the Senate week after week, why should I have to write letters, why should other Senators have to worry and bring this matter to the attention of the Army authorities, when the situation is so disgraceful that it should be corrected if the Army, the Surgeon General's office, has any self-respect, any integrity, left?

Mr. President, as I pointed out a moment ago, the magnificent record made in the care of Army personnel over all the world is due to the work of the civilian doctors, not the regular Medical Corps of the Army. All 1,200 of the latter went into administrative work. As the Army is being demobilized, as officers go through the separation camps, the Army is making an effort, and a proper effort, to induce as many officers as possible to enroll in the Reserve Corps. I am informed, without any definite figures, that that effort is successful in all branches of the service except the Medical Corps. Enough of the officers going out are enrolling in all the branches of the service except the Medical Corps.

Mr. President, the feeling on the part of the doctors, and a justifiable feeling, is so bitter that not a single doctor as he leaves the Army service, where he has made such a magnificent record, is willing to give the War Department or the Surgeon General's Office any further authority over him. I am informed that universally, perhaps unanimously, the doctors are refusing.

I have been visited a number of times recently by men from the War Department, some of them from the Surgeon General's office. I have been happy to talk with them about this matter. A colonel came to see me Saturday and I said to him, "Colonel, if you had to fight this war over, if you had to set up another Medical Corps such as was set up at the beginning of the war, you would have to draft every doctor from civil life. Not one of them would volunteer for service." The colonel replied, "Senator, unfortunately that is true, and it is the most important thing in this whole situation." This bitterness is universal throughout the medical profession against the way these men have been mistreated, have been kept idle, are now being kept in the Army without any use for them at all.

Some things have been said here this morning about the Navy. I do not want the Navy to think that because up to this time I have paid most attention to the Army I am going to overlook the Navy. Just as soon as this situation in the Army gets under control I shall follow the same course with the Navy. I do not think the Navy is very much better in this respect than the Army. I think these conditions are disgraceful. They put a tarnish upon the reputation of the War Department and the Navy Department and every man who has any responsibility, direct or indirect, near or remote, for the continuation of this unjustified, unnecessary, disgraceful situation.

DELAY IN RETURN OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, believing that it may aid in the effort which will be made to try to correct a bad situation, I wish to read into the RECORD a letter from a soldier at Leyte, whose name, for obvious reasons, I shall not disclose. In this letter the writer calls attention to the confusion and delay experienced at the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot at Tacloban, headquarters of the armed forces in the Pacific under General MacArthur, where it was announced that the number of returnees to be embarked at Tacloban would be 38,300 in October, when actually during that month only 8,262 men were sent home. The letter, which is dated November 1, 1945, reads as follows:

TACLOBAN, LEYTE, P. I., *November 1, 1945.*
Hon. C. DOUGLAS BUCK,
United States Senator for Delaware,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am sending you the following information so you can compare existing conditions in an overseas theater with the statements of the War Department:

1. Headquarters, armed forces in the Pacific, General MacArthur commanding, announced the number of returnees to be embarked at Tacloban, Leyte, during October would be 38,300. The Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot, disposition center at Tacloban and outlet for ground and service personnel in the Philippines excepting Luzon, shipped 8,262 men between the 1st and 31st of October. This date, the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot has 12,133 men awaiting transportation, the break-down of the number of days they have been waiting as follows: 10 to 15 days, 1,561; 16 to 20 days, 2,801; 21 to 25 days, 4,186; 26 to 30 days, 1,780; 31 to 35 days, 735; and 36 to 38 days, 1,070.

2. The Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot is made up of four battalions of four companies each. A cadre of approximately 1,000 men are trained and equipped to receive, quarter, process, and ship 1,000 men a day. Since its activation June 28, 1945, it has shipped 28,979 men as of October 31.

3. The Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot, built to accommodate about 10,000, housing over 15,000 on October 14, received a restraining order from Headquarters, Replacement Command, closing the depot to all returnees under 38 years of age and having less than 90 points. This restraining order is still in effect, keeping out of the depot approximately 6,000 men eligible under October War Department releases, i. e., men with 70 points and men over 35 years of age, and approximately 4,000 men now eligible under November War Department releases, i. e., men with 60 points. Current movement directives assigning shipping space to the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot provide approximately 8,000 spaces for the month of November.

4. Recent news dispatches from Hawaii state that because of surplus shipping there, men with 60 points, eligible in November, were being sent home in October.

5. Recent news dispatches from headquarters, armed forces in the Pacific, announced that the Thirty-first Division would be shipped to the States about October 31, taking with it all of its men with 60 or more points. In the last 2 weeks of October, the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot has received 600 men from the Thirty-first Division, all having 90 points or more. These men are at the bottom of the depot's list, the policy being first in, first out. Their shipment from this depot is unlikely in the next month. The headquarters that ordered these high-point men to this depot, army forces in the western Pacific, also ordered 2 ships, the *General Aultman* and the *General Langfitte*, previously assigned to the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot, to go to Davao to load part of the Thirty-first Division.

6. This same headquarters, responsible for providing transportation, ordered the return to the States of the *Cape Newenham* empty on August 7. This ship's capacity was approximately 1800. At that time there were more than enough men in the depot to utilize that space. A daily report by radio informs this headquarters of the number of men awaiting transportation.

7. At present the Army port director at Tacloban is converting 4 cargo ships to haul prisoners of war to Japan. The ships are the *W. L. Gable, Edward Everett, M. Stewart,* and the *R. L. Stevenson.* The goal set for the return of prisoners to Japan is December 15. The War Department, however, in authorizing the conversion of such ships for United States returnees set requirements for heating, refrigeration, water supply, and sanitary facilities so high that the work involved makes the conversion impractical. Thousands of servicemen traveled all over the Pacific in invasion convoys on ships where none of the above facilities was adequate. It was accepted as a military necessity then. It would be now.

The above statements are facts. I leave the opinions that can be drawn from them to you. My only interest in stating them to you is because you could not know otherwise.

Respectfully yours.

BENEFICIAL RESULTS FROM DIETING

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a constituent of mine in Louisiana by the name of J. W. Reily, and to the communication was attached a letter written on November 25, 1917, by Mr. William B. Reily, who was the founder of a large coffee concern in my State. I ask the indulgence of the Senate while I read both these letters, because they are interesting, and because of the sound advice contained in them.

It might be that many of us would be greatly benefited personally should we follow the prescription suggested by Mr. Reily in the letter I am about to read.

The letter is as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *November 9, 1945.*
Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I believe that it would be good policy to be liberal with food for Europe, and continue to maintain rationing in this country.

It makes life much more interesting to be sacrificing for something or somebody, and I dare say that in the United States more trouble results from overeating than starvation.

Am enclosing you an article written by my father 28 years ago and reaffirmed 10 or 12 years ago on this subject.

Everybody shuns responsibility of world leadership. Perhaps we can accept the role of being the servant of all and looking out for "No. 1" at the same time.

Many a rich man can give away a great part of his income without any sacrifice whatever. Perhaps countries can do the same thing and for its own good.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. REILY.

Mr. President, attached to that letter is a copy of a letter written by Mr. William B. Reily on November 25, 1917, as follows:

TO OUR GOOD FRIENDS: About 400 years ago there lived in Italy a good and wealthy man named Cornaro.

At 40 years of age his health gave way. His physicians advised him to arrange his wordly affairs promptly as he had not much longer to live.

Cornaro, however, had no idea of dying. He figured the thing out for himself and decided that his trouble was overeating. (At that time no one paid any attention to what or how much they ate.) He began to diet, reducing his food to 12 ounces of solid food a day.

At 85 years of age he wrote a letter to his friends telling of his wonderful health and how dieting had enabled him not only to cure himself but had helped him to enjoy every minute of his life.

At the age of 92 he wrote a second letter, and at 96 he wrote again, saying that his every faculty was perfect; his hearing, his eyesight, and his sense of humor were still as they were when a boy. He could write for hours without trouble. His letters were later compiled into book form and are still being published. He died at 103 years of age.

His book can be purchased at any good book store, The Life and Letters of Luigi Cornaro.

Thomas A. Edison tells that his grandfather read this book and practiced its teachings; that he lived to be over a hundred years old. He had seven sons, each of whom practiced this principle of dieting, and that they lived an average of more than 90 years. Mr. Edison himself has practiced the same all his life and gives credit to that for his great

vitality. It is said he has worked 4 days and nights without a let-up.

In 1892, at 32 years of age, I had a nervous breakdown, as the doctors said, from overwork. After taking medicine of all kinds and getting no better, I decided that my ailment came from overeating and not from overwork. I cut out all medicine and began to regulate my diet. Today, at 58, I feel younger and as lively as I was at 48, and I expect to be just as active at 80 as I am now at 58.

As a famous physician once said, "Most men dig their own graves, and with their teeth."

This letter may reach some man whom it will help, and, if it does, it will be worth many times the time it has taken you to read it.

Just try this plan of living: "Do unto others as you would have them do to you." Eat little and drink a moderate amount of our good coffee every day, and your life will be a useful and happy one—not only yourself but everyone around you being benefited. Your doctor bills will dwindle and cease, and you will thank me as long as you live for having given you this thought.

Sincerely yours,

WM. B. REILY.

To that letter is a postscript dated February 20, 1936, by Mr. Reily, as follows:

P. S.—Today, at 76, I believe in the above more firmly than I did at 58, when the foregoing was written.

W. B. R.

There is a further postscript to this effect:

P. P. S.—Mr. Reily passed away on August 17, 1942—age 83 years, 5 months, 11 days.

RELIEF OF THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I am now introducing a new and greatly improved version of the general housing bill of 1945.

The housing shortage now facing the country is critical to the point of an emergency. However, it should not be dealt with by emergency legislation. We have had emergency legislation on housing, and on other subjects, for too long already. It is high time that we stop improvising, get a true perspective of the whole problem, and work out a sound, long-term solution.

This is particularly true of housing, because the housing problem has been with us for many decades—and it will continue to be with us until all of the American people are decently housed. The returning veterans, who are becoming part of our civilian population, cannot best be served by a housing program which sets them apart from the rest of the country. They can best be served by being treated as citizens and civilians—by a sound, long-term housing program which is addressed to their needs and to the needs of the country as a whole.

For a decade and a half the Banking and Currency Committee, and other committees, have been dealing with a variety of housing problems—many of which are common to times of prosperity and of depression, of peace and of war. We have proposed, and the Congress has approved, many good and successful bits of housing legislation. But the time is long overdue when we should fit these fragments into a unified whole—into a consistent national housing policy reflected in a consistent program.

Toward this end a committee of the Senate commenced, about a year and a half ago, a thorough investigation and study of the whole postwar housing problem. It combined this with a study of the existing housing activities of the Government, their relationships to one another, and their respective purposes. This committee contained representation from the Banking and Currency Committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Postwar Committee—these being the three committees of the Senate primarily concerned with postwar housing matters. This study, which went on for more than a year, resulted in a comprehensive and excellent series of recommendations. To carry out most of these recommendations, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana and I introduced a comprehensive housing bill, S. 1342, on August 1, 1945.

Since the introduction of this bill the interest in it has been very widespread. Since then, also, the two sponsors of the bill have joined with the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio in the task of perfecting the bill, broadening its provisions, and dealing with certain important subject matters which had been omitted.

In consequence of our work and deliberations, we are introducing a new general housing bill today. I can honestly say that almost no legislation within my memory has received such careful and continuous study, prior to its introduction, by a group of Senators who may fairly be called representative.

For these reasons, and following the hearings to be held upon this bill, which I am sure will result in further improvements, I hope that the Senate will be disposed to act upon it favorably and speedily, and that the House will follow suit.

Our total housing need is pressing and enormous. It is estimated that, exclusive of farm areas, we ought to build about 1,260,000 units of housing a year for the next 10 years. Of these, about 420,000 units will be required for the upper income groups who can pay more than $40 a month, on the average, for their housing. About 480,000 units will be needed for the middle income groups, who can pay, on the average, between $20 and $40 a month for their housing. And about 360,000 units will be needed for the low income groups, who can pay, on the average, below $20 a month for their housing.

As to the upper income groups, who can pay more than $40 a month, no additional housing legislation is needed. They can be served under existing legislation, which in fact is perfected by this bill.

I feel that the needs of the middle income groups can be served by the new programs of FHA insurance provided in the bill. The FHA now has more than $2,000,000,000 in unused insurance authorizations, and another $1,000,000,000 of insurance authorization is carried under the "yield insurance" provisions of this bill. This $3,000,000,000 is enough to cover more than 600,000 units of housing—even at $5,000 a unit. I hope that a large proportion of this insurance will be used to serve the middle income groups. If so, it can take care of their needs for a year or so. Then, of course, we shall need to increase the authorizations for FHA insurance.

For the low-income groups, the public housing assistance provided in the bill is contemplated to cover 125,000 units a year for a 4-year period. This, however, can be accelerated by the President, where employment conditions or housing conditions so justify. While the public housing provisions are short of the total need in that area, I think that they will go a long way toward meeting the need.

Taken as a whole, therefore, I believe that the bill is well designed to stimulate the total required volume of residential construction, and to stimulate the $7,000,000,000 or so per year in housing investment, mostly private, required in order that housing may contribute its full share toward full employment and prosperity.

We must remember also that the research and urban redevelopment provisions of the bill, along with the provisions for a very large volume of housing on the farms and in rural areas, will also help to attain these goals.

Since most of the benefits under the bill will come from reducing costs through insurance without expenditures by the Government, the total annual assistance provided by the Government, under all the programs will be only $133,000,000 a year when the program reaches its peak after 5 years. I think that this is a relatively small sum when compared with our national capacity, or when compared with the benefits that will flow from a realistic and tremendous effort to clear away our slums and provide decent housing for all the American people.

The need is pressing and enormous, and we should respond to the need without equivocation or delay.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1592) to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution, introduced by Mr. WAGNER, for himself, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. TAFT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks a reasonably brief summary of the purposes and provisions of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER UPON INTRODUCTION (BY HIMSELF, SENATOR ELLENDER, AND SENATOR TAFT) OF THE GENERAL HOUSING BILL OF 1945

The bill being introduced today by Senator ELLENDER, Senator TAFT, and myself represents many months of work and deliberations. Our agreement on it emphasizes that the housing situation has become so important and critical as to require a nonpartisan approach and prompt action by the Congress.

The bill is most comprehensive. Despite every effort at succinctness, it has 11 titles covering all phases of housing. Thus, the bill sets forth for the first time in our his-

tory a clear-cut national housing policy and objectives, as well as providing for practical methods for attaining these objectives. It deals with the preliminary and underlying phases of technical research, market analysis, and periodic housing inventories, as well as with the ultimate actual construction. It provides for the varied needs of our urban and rural areas alike, and for those of moderate and low income, as well as for those higher in the income scale. It carefully defines the respective spheres of action of the Federal Government and of local communities, and of private enterprise and public endeavor; and, in both cases, it weights the balances effectively in the direction of the sharpest possible expansion of the area of operations of private enterprise and of localities. It concentrates on the encouragement and protection of home ownership, and at the same time pays full heed to our rental housing needs. It bears constantly in mind the needs of our returning veterans. It guarantees that at the Federal end, at least, there will be a unification of activity and purpose, a harnessing of responsibility, and a simplicity of organizational pattern that will eliminate many of the deterrents and obstacles which have hindered housing and related community development in the past. And, with all this, the bill nevertheless manages to cover all the various tag ends invariably present in programs of this comprehensive nature, including the bringing up to date of our legislation on the disposition of war housing and the provision of a variety of perfecting amendments to all of our basic existing Federal housing legislation.

Taken as a whole, the bill represents recognition that a decent home for every American family can be attained, and therefore must be attained, in a nation as wealthy and resourceful as the United States. It provides a rounded and integrated program toward this end.

POLICY PREAMBLE

At the very outset the bill, in a policy preamble, would establish as the keystone of the national housing policy that private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total housing need as possible and that governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve still more of the total need. Complementary to this basic policy, the preamble declares as a further national policy that governmental aid to clear slums and provide adequate housing for those whose incomes are so low that they could not otherwise be served shall be extended only to those localities which estimate their own needs and demonstrate that these needs cannot fully be met otherwise.

TITLE I—UNIFIED NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Following the establishment of this policy, the bill proceeds to consolidate the basic housing functions of the Federal Government into a single agency, upon which the responsibility for attaining the national housing objectives and effectuating the national housing policy can be focused in clear-cut manner. In so doing, it does not disturb the basic permanent pattern already established by the Congress, involving three major operating units in the housing field, but it does gather together these units—the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the United States Housing Authority—into a single agency under one policy-making head.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, LOCAL HOUSING STUDIES AND PLANNING

Having provided the necessary organizational pattern for operations, the bill immediately concentrates on providing the aids necessary to enable private enterprise and localities to do as much of the total housing job as possible. Toward the end of better equipping private enterprise and localities to meet more of the housing need by their own efforts, the bill authorizes a program of housing research, and of encouragement of local community study of housing needs and markets and improvement in local planning. For research it authorizes $12,500,000 to be appropriated for a 5-year program. For local housing and planning studies it authorizes $25,000,000 in Federal funds to be appropriated, on an equal matching basis with the communities, for a 5-year program. Thus, $50,000,000 would be devoted to this latter purpose, and the sponsors believe that this will be adequate to enable communities throughout the Nation to study and plan comprehensive housing endeavors to clear their slums and to redevelop their deteriorating areas in accord with long-range plans. The bill also provides advance loans for this same planning purpose, from loan funds otherwise available under the bill for project purposes. Thus, the sponsors have no concern that the aggregate funds for study and planning will be inadequate. If more funds are needed, they can be increased in the light of experience after the 5-year program gets under way.

TITLES III AND IV—PRIVATELY FINANCED HOUSING FOR MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES

The bill then concentrates upon enabling private enterprise to expand its activities in the so-called middle market or "no man's land" of housing, by building upon and strengthening the FHA system so that families that can pay between $20 and $40 a month for rent can be reached in a greater volume.

The first main plan for this middle-income privately financed housing sets up a special plan for small home ownership with FHA insurance. This plan raises the amount of principal obligation eligible for insurance from 80 percent or 90 percent of the cost of the housing to 95 percent, thus reducing the down payment required of the middle-income family to 5 percent. To make the terms more favorable, it extends the period of amortization from 20 or 25 years to 32 years. It also reduces the maximum interest rate allowable under the statute from 5 percent to 4 percent. It provides additional insurance protection to promote the flow of capital on these more favorable terms. Considerable thought was given to fixing the maximum statutory interest rate at 3½ percent under this plan. I hope and believe that this rate will be obtained in practice. However, it was felt that the rate should not be set so low at the commencement of the program as to cast doubt upon the likelihood of obtaining a free and immediate flow of funds all over the country for this plan. This plan also includes firm commitments to builders, up to 85 percent of the cost of the house, so that they may undertake construction in volume, before finding owner-occupants, and thus achieve savings and better planning. This plan is limited to houses where the principal loan is not more than $5,000, which means about a $5,300 house. This makes it clear that the plan is designed to serve middle-income families. The monthly cost to the occupants under this plan will be sufficiently below those thus far obtained in volume to reach well into the middle market for those who can pay between $20 and $40 a month.

The second main plan of the bill for these middle-income families to be served by private enterprise provides for FHA insurance of private financing for mutual home ownership or rental projects. In this case the insured mortgage may be as high as 95 percent in the case of mutuals or public instrumentalities, and 90 percent in other cases. The 95 percent insured mortgage at the long term and the low rate would be available for mutual or cooperative housing undertaken by labor groups or other groups. It would also be available if a public corporation or instrumentality wanted to get the benefit of such FHA-insured private loans to provide middle-income housing. The amortization period is extended to 40 years. The maximum interest rate is fixed at 3½ percent. I hope that the actual rate obtained will be closer to 3 percent. Consideration was given to fixing the maximum rate at 3 percent, but there was concern that this would not promote the free flow of capital in volume all over the country for this purpose quickly. As a matter of fact, the monthly cost to the middle-income occupants per dwelling unit will be less than a dollar and one-half more under a 3½-percent rate than under a 3-percent rate. Additional insurance benefits are written into the plan in order to assure lending on these more favorable terms. It is estimated that, in typical urban areas, this plan will result in mutual or rental housing at monthly costs to the occupant getting as low as $30 a month, which is the very center of the middle market.

In order to assure an adequate mortage market for this last-mentioned plan, the Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to make loans and to deal in and underwrite mortgage lending under this plan, so that this Government Corporation in accord with the purposes for which it was established will reinforce these operations and assure their success.

The bill also strengthens the already existing housing tools of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and the Federal Housing Administration, so as to enable them to service our general housing needs and our returning veterans even more effectively. In the case of the Bank Administration, it does so, first, by expanding the lending powers of the Federal home-loan banks and of federally-chartered savings and loan associations so as to permit them to participate more effectively in the servicing of our overall and varied housing needs; secondly, by improving the insurance protection provided by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and, at the same time, reducing the costs of such protection; and thirdly, by generally perfecting the methods of operations of all three of these types of housing agencies and institutions. Similarly, the bill contains perfecting amendments with respect to all basic phases of FHA's home financing program, including its title I modernization and improvement program, its home ownership program, and its rental housing program.

TITLE V—DIRECT PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN HOUSING FOR MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES

As another plan for privately financed housing for families of moderate or middle income, the bill establishes an FHA insurance system to encourage financial institutions, such as life insurance companies, savings banks, or other large aggregates of capital, to make direct investment of their own funds in large scale housing projects. The bill seeks to accomplish this through a "yield insurance" system, under which the direct investor would be able to insure the return of its capital at a 2 percent annual rate, and to insure a 2¾ percent annual yield on its outstanding investment, in exchange for assuming the obligation to invest money in housing projects on a 50-year basis at an annual return upon outstanding investment ranging from 3¼ to 4 percent.

TITLE VI—URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

In order to encourage private enterprise to participate, along with public endeavor, in the clearance of slums and blighted areas and the preparation of land for redevelopment, the bill sets forth a 5-year program of Federal aid to localities for land assembly, clearance, and preparation for redevelopment. This is sometimes called "urban redevelopment." The essence of this plan is that Federal and local aid will be combined to bring the cost of acquiring this land and preparing it for redevelopment down to the point where its re-use for various purposes

will be feasible. These various re-use purposes will include, in accord with master plans of the localities, privately financed housing for upper and middle income groups, public housing for low income families, and commercial redevelopments and open spaces. Of course, the aid under this plan extends only to the acquisition and preparation of the land, and the write-down of its cost to its re-use value, and does not extend to the various building undertakings that will be put upon the land as it is redeveloped.

For this plan, the bill provides $500,000,000 in temporary Federal loans to localities, which are designed to get the land-assembly and clearance projects started, and which must be repaid in full within 5 years. The bill also provides a 5-year program, at the rate of $50,000,000 a year, in permanent Federal loans in connection with these land-assembly and clearance projects. These loans, too, must be repaid in full with interest, in not more than 45 years.

The write-down of the land to its reuse value is to be accomplished by Federal and local subsidies, with the requirement that the local contributions must equal at least 50 percent of the Federal contributions base. For the Federal contributions, a 5-year program is set up, with authority to contract for $4,000,000 of annual contributions (such annual contributions to run for not more than 45 years) in each of the 5 years. Thus, at the end of 5 years, the Federal Government would be committed at most to $20,000,000 in annual contributions. This, together with local contributions, would be enough to cover about $1,500,000,000 worth of land acquisition and preparation for redevelopment. It is estimated that this would cover about one-tenth of all the slum and blighted areas throughout the country. It is estimated that a program of this size might generate six or seven billion dollars' worth of rebuilding activity.

TITLE VII—LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

The bill also resumes and expands the low-rent public-housing program, undertaken before the war under the United States Housing Act. The bill provides a 4-year program of Federal annual contributions for this purpose, authorized at the rate of $22,000,000 a year, so that at the end of the 4-year period the Federal Government would be committed to an additional maximum of $88,000,000 in annual aid to help reduce the rents on low-rent public housing undertaken by local housing authorities. This would provide, over the 4-year period, about 500,000 additional units of low-rent public housing. This title also provides for a rehabilitation program to supplement new construction.

TITLE VIII—RURAL HOUSING

The bill also provides for a substantial program of rural housing, to help low-income families on the farm and in the other rural areas to attain decent housing. This part of the bill contemplates cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the National Housing Agency. This part of the bill takes two approaches—first, low-interest loans by the Department of Agriculture for housing for those on the farms who can be helped in this way; and second, the bill provides a system of annual contributions of $5,000,000 a year for a 5-year period, coming to $25,000,000 a year at the end of the fifth year, to enable farm families of very low income to obtain decent housing and gradually to move toward home ownership. This part of the rural-housing program could be operated through local-housing agencies, under a variant of the established public-housing program, which adapts it to the special needs in rural areas.

TITLE IX—DISPOSITION OF PERMANENT PUBLIC WAR HOUSING

The bill also provides that, with preference to the families of veterans, the permanent public war housing built during the war and now owned by the Federal Government may be sold to communities for local low-rent housing at a price consistent with such reuse. This will put to the best possible use such public housing now owned by the Federal Government, and will assure that the disposition of this housing does not have an unfavorable impact upon real estate or upon private enterprise.

TITLE X—CONSTANT INVENTORY OF HOUSING

A final important provision of the bill is that, at least once a year, the National Housing Agency shall make a complete inventory of the whole housing situation, including progress made toward attaining the goal of a decent home for every American family, including estimates of whether housing production is playing its full role of contribution toward an economy of full production and full employment, and including a requirement that the National Housing Agency at least once a year transmit to the Congress all this information along with its recommendations as to what additional housing tools and machinery are necessary to achieve these goals.

TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

This title contains a few standard miscellaneous provisions of no general interest.

EMPHASIS UPON VETERANS' NEEDS

It should be stressed that, throughout, the bill takes special cognizance of the acute needs of returning veterans and their families. Reasonable preferences for veterans and their families are provided in many sections of the bill. More important, it is only through a comprehensive housing program which looks at the picture as a whole and is based on economic reality that we can evolve sound attention to the housing needs of our veterans in their varying economic circumstances and bring these veterans more rapidly into their full participating role in our civilian economy.

TIME OF HEARINGS

Hearings upon this most important bill have been set for November 27 before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The nature of the sponsorship of the bill, and the tremendous Nation-wide concern about it, bodes well for its speedy passage.

Mr. WAGNER. As chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I am inviting Senators ELLENDER, CHAVEZ, and LA FOLLETTE, of the Senate Education and Labor Committee, to participate in the hearings on this bill because, as members of the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment of the Senate Postwar Committee, they took part in the extensive investigation conducted by that subcommittee and in the formulation of its report which was of so much assistance in the preparation of the bill which I am introducing today on behalf of myself, Senator ELLENDER, and Senator TAFT.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the housing bill which has just been introduced will prove once again to those who mistakenly regard the Senate as a forum for disagreements that Senators can work together and reach agreements when vitally important issues are at stake.

I regard the housing problem as perhaps our most important single postwar economic and social issue. Its wise solution will have an important bearing upon our living standards, our social contentment, and our economic prosperity.

That is why I take such particular satisfaction in the introduction of this bill jointly by the distinguished senior Senator from New York, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, and myself. We have worked long and laboriously, during open hearings and in executive session, to evolve and perfect this housing bill.

I believe that it is a fair bill—fair to every interest and group, including private enterprise, public officials, and others who have a legitimate and progressive interest in providing decent housing for the American people.

I believe that it is a practical bill, steering a middle course, avoiding the evil of trying to go too far, and at the same time avoiding the even greater evil of being afraid to go far enough.

I believe that it is a forward-looking bill, looking to the future rather than the past, and based upon the realization that our inherited housing standards are not good enough for the richest and most powerful Nation in the world.

I believe that it is a thoroughly workable bill in all its aspects.

I believe that it is an imperatively necessary bill—necessary at once because of the critical housing shortage and because of the economic problems of investment and employment which confront us in staggering proportions.

I believe that it is a bill which has immense popular interest, and which will win ever-increasing support as its purposes and provisions are more clearly understood.

I believe that it is a bill which will not be defeated by reaction or misrepresentation.

I have prepared a detailed explanation of the bill, section by section. In view of the amount of interest in it, Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks this detailed explanation which I now send to the desk for that purpose.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF GENERAL HOUSING BILL

POLICY PREAMBLE

The purpose of this policy preamble is to set forth succinctly our national housing objectives as established by the Congress and the basic underlying principles to be followed in attaining these objectives.

Section 1: This section provides a short and convenient form of citation to the bill, "General Housing Act of 1945."

Section 2: This section, as the policy preamble to the bill, sets forth this country's primary housing objectives. In so doing it stresses the Nation's interest in housing production and related community development because of the basic contribution they can make both (1) toward improving the health and living standards of the people, and (2) toward an economy of full production and full employment. Thus the policy preamble calls attention specifically to the need for housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious cumulative housing shortage, to eliminate slum and blighted areas, to realize as soon as feasible the goal of a decent living environment for every American family, to redevelop communities so as to advance the growth and wealth of the Nation, and to enable the construction industry to make its full contribution toward an economy of full production and full employment.

The keystone of the national housing policy established by the Congress in this pre-

amble to facilitate the attainment of these objectives is that private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can and that governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve still more of the total need. As a complementary policy the section states that governmental aid to clear slums and provide adequate housing for those whose incomes are so low that they could not otherwise be served shall be extended only to those localities which estimate their own needs and demonstrate that these needs cannot fully be met by reliance solely upon private enterprise and without such aid.

So that the responsibilities and activities of the Federal Government may be properly geared and best adapted to contribute effectively toward the attainment of the national housing objectives, the section establishes as an additional underlying policy that the main functions of the Federal Government in housing and related community development shall be consolidated for unified and efficient action at the Federal level.

Section 3: This section sets forth in summary outline the basic content of the various titles of the bill.

TITLE I—NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

This title consolidates the basic housing functions of the Federal Government into a single agency, upon which the responsibility for attaining the national housing objectives and effectuating the national housing policy can be focused in clearcut manner. In so doing, the title does not disturb the basic permanent pattern established hitherto by the Congress, involving three major operating units in the housing field, but it does gather together these units and their functions and activities into a single agency under the same policy-making head.

Section 101: This section establishes a National Housing Agency for the purpose of achieving the unified and coordinated activity in executing the national housing policy, and of promoting the economy and efficiency, specified in the policy preamble set forth in section 2.

Section 102: This section provides for a single Administrator as the head of the agency, to be appointed by the President with Senate approval, and to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The section transfers to him (in addition to such other functions as he may obtain from other provisions in the bill) the main policy functions, powers, and duties under Federal war-housing legislation which are now vested in the Administrator of the temporary, wartime consolidation of housing agencies effectuated in 1942.

The section also provides for an official seal for the agency.

Section 103: This section provides for three constituent units representing the three basic "task forces" or "action" agencies which are to carry into operation, under the general coordination and supervision of the National Housing Administrator, the national housing program. These three constituent units would be known as the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Federal Public Housing Authority; and each of them would be headed by a Commissioner appointed by the President, with Senate approval, and receiving compensation, respectively, at the rate provided under present law for the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administrator, and the Administrator of the United States Housing Authority.

Section 104: This section sets forth specifically the functions vested in each of the three Commissioners. It places in the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner the functions, powers, and duties of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; and the Board of Directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. (As a practical matter, this vests in the Commissioner only the functions of a single board since by law the members of the Home Loan Bank Board are automatically also the Board of Trustees of FSLIC and the Board of Directors of HOLC.)

The section vests in the Federal Housing Commissioner the functions, powers, and duties of the Federal Housing Administrator and places under his jurisdiction the Federal National Mortgage Association (which was chartered by FHA for the purpose of assuring a secondary market for FHA insured mortgages and is now under the jurisdiction of the Federal Loan Agency which owns its capital stock).

In the Federal Public Housing Commissioner are vested the functions, powers, and duties relating to the public-housing activities of the Federal Government. These include the prewar public-housing functions consisting of (1) the low-rent housing and slum-clearance program authorized by the United States Housing Act of 1937, and (2) the non-farm-housing projects of the Farm Security Administration already transferred to FPHA under the temporary wartime consolidation of housing agencies. They include also all of the public war-housing functions (exclusive of those transferred to the National Housing Administrator under section 102 and those relating to War and Navy Department housing located on military or naval reservations).

Section 105: This section provides for the transfer to the National Housing Agency of all property and personnel held or employed in connection with the administration of any function being transferred to the Agency.

Section 106: This section is a technical provision providing for the transfer to the National Housing Agency of all unexpended portions of appropriations and authorizations heretofore made available for the functions being transferred to the Agency.

Section 107: This section provides for the preservation of all rights under existing obligations and contracts made in connection with any of the functions being transferred to the National Housing Agency, and for the continuance of all rules and regulations issued in respect of any such functions until modified or repealed by appropriate administrative action.

Section 108: This section vests in the Administrator and the Commissioners the usual administrative powers necessary for efficient operations, such as powers relating to appointment of personnel, travel, purchase of supplies, etc.

Section 109: For purposes of sound and efficient administration, this section authorizes the Administrator and the Commissioners to delegate to subordinate officers such of their functions, powers, and duties as may be found desirable.

Section 110: This section is a technical provision authorizing the appropriation of the moneys necessary for administrative expenses of the Agency.

Section 111: This section calls for an annual report to the Congress on the operations of the Agency, with which would be submitted the reports required under present law from each of the three major operating units being consolidated into the Agency.

Section 112: This section sets forth the usual provision with respect to the authority of heads of Government agencies or units to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the performance of the functions vested in them.

Section 113: This section sets forth as the effective date of title I, the date of the appointment of the Administrator and the three Commissioners provided for in the title. It further provides that on such date Executive Order 9070 providing for the wartime consolidation of housing functions shall cease to be effective.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, MARKET ANALYSIS, AND LOCAL PLANNING

The purpose of this title is to authorize a program of housing research and of encouragement of local community study of local housing needs and markets and of improvement in local planning, toward the end that private enterprise and localities will be better equipped to meet more of the total housing need through their own efforts.

Section 201: This section authorizes the National Housing Administrator to make, in cooperation, where feasible, with other Federal and local governmental agencies, studies, and reports with respect to (1) building materials and methods of production, design, and construction, and zoning laws and other codes and regulations, for the purpose of developing sound housing standards and reducing housing costs; and (2) the improvement of employment and investment opportunities in house building, better methods of home financing, and other matters affecting housing and related community development. The section authorizes an appropriation for these purposes of not to exceed $12,500,000 over an initial period of 5 years.

The section further authorizes the National Housing Administrator to encourage localities to make studies, surveys, and plans with respect to their own housing needs, markets, and development, and to provide them (where requested and needed) with technical advice and guidance for these purposes.

Section 202: This section authorizes the National Housing Administrator to provide local public bodies with financial aid for the making of the studies, surveys, and plans specified in section 201. Any such financial aid would be on a matching basis, with the Federal aid limited to 50 percent of the cost of such studies, surveys, and plans. The section authorizes for this purpose the appropriation of not to exceed $25,000,000 over an initial period of 5 years.

Section 203: This section provides that, where a local public agency undertakes studies, surveys, and plans of the character described in section 201 in preparation of land assembly or low-rent housing projects for which Federal assistance is authorized by this bill or the United States Housing Act of 1937, loan assistance may be made to such agency to aid in financing the cost of such surveys, studies, and plans and other necessary work in the preparation of the projects. Such loans would be made on the condition that they would be repaid with interest out of any funds which become available to the local agency for the undertaking of the project involved.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING AIDS TO PRIVATELY FINANCED HOUSING

The basic purpose of this title is to strengthen the already existing housing tools of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and the Federal Housing Administration so as to enable them to service the moderate income groups and our returning veterans much more effectively than they are able to under present statutory provisions. Thus, this title is intended appreciably to broaden the area that private enterprise could serve. Toward this end, the title provides for improvements in the operations of federally chartered savings and loan associations, the Federal home loan banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Housing Administration.

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION OPERATIONS

Section 301: This section expands the lending powers of federally chartered savings and loan associations so as to permit such associations to participate more effectively in

the servicing of the over-all and varied housing needs of this country. This section would:

1. Authorize Federals to participate in the FHA insurance program without restriction. (At present Federals are not authorized to make home-repair or modernization loans insured by FHA unless they are also secured by first mortgage; or home-mortgage loans insured by FHA unless the dwelling is within a 50-mile radius of the home office; or, except to a limited extent, rental-housing-project loans insured by FHA under its section 207 program. The section, in removing these restrictions, would remove them also with respect to mortgages which FHA has made a commitment to insure.)

2. Permit Federals to participate without restriction also in the Federal home-loan-guarantee program for veterans provided by the GI bill of rights. (Under existing law Federals may not make second-mortgage loans to veterans even though such loans are fully guaranteed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, nor may they make home-repair loans guaranteed by such Administrator unless they are also secured by first mortgage.)

3. Authorize Federals to participate, either individually or jointly with other home-financing institutions, in the yield-insurance program for direct investment in rental housing provided under title V of this bill.

4. Provide a clarifying amendment required to remove an ambiguity in the present law as to the lending powers of Federals with respect to homes. Under present statutory language, a federally chartered association may make real-estate loans only on first liens of not more than $20,000 on homes or combination of homes and business property within 50 miles of its home office, except that not over 15 percent of its assets may be loaned on first liens or other improved real estate without regard to these limitations as to amount and location. Under this wording there is doubt whether homes (and combination of homes and business property) are included within this 15-percent provision, and the purpose of the amendment would be to make it clear that they, as well as commercial properties, are included.

FEDERAL HOME-LOAN BANK OPERATIONS

Section 302: The purpose of subsection (a) of this section (which, together with sections 303 and 304, is designed to improve Federal home-loan bank operations) is to remove present restrictions relating to participation by the bank system and its members in the FHA insurance, and the Veterans' Administrator guarantee, programs. Specifically, it would permit such banks to accept as collateral for advances to their member home financing institutions any loan insured or guaranteed by the FHA or Veterans' Administrator. As in the case of those FHA insured mortgages which are eligible as collateral under the present statutory provision, such advances would be authorized in amounts not exceeding 90 percent of the unpaid principal of the loan being used as collateral. (Under present law, home-loan banks may not accept as collateral for their advances loans insured by FHA under its title I home repair and modernization program; rental housing mortgages insured by FHA under its sec. 207 program; or home loans with more than 20 years maturity insured by FHA under its sec. 203 program. Nor may they presently accept as collateral home repair loans to veterans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administrator, or second mortgage loans guaranteed by such Administrator. In removing these restrictions, this subsection would, where FHA insurance is involved, remove them also with respect to mortgages which FHA has made a commitment to insure.)

Subsection (b) of this section would encourage and facilitate the making of home loans with longer than 20-year maturities by Federal home-loan bank members by authorizing the banks to make advances to such members on home mortgage loans (whether or not FHA insured) with maturities of up to 25 years as contrasted with a present limitation of 20 years.

Section 303: This section would enlarge the base for issuance of debentures by the Federal home-loan banks (to obtain funds to make advances to members) by including in such base Government obligations owned by the banks. The original legislation establishing the bank system provided for the issuance of debentures in a maximum amount based upon collateralized loans made to member institutions, including loans collateralized by obligations of the Federal Government held by the members. The debenture base, however, was not made to include investments made by the banks directly in Government obligations. This situation would be rectified by this section.

Section 304: This section would amend the present statutory provision requiring semi-annual examination of the Federal home-loan banks by FHLBA so as to require only annual examination. Under this amendment, FHLBA would still have the power, as at present, to examine the banks at any time, but would not be required to do so more than once a year. This change, therefore, while preserving all essential authority, would make possible substantial savings both in money and personnel.

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION OPERATIONS

Section 305: This section, together with section 306, provides for certain basic changes in the financial operations of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. When FSLIC was established in 1934, its entire capital stock in the amount of $100,000,000 was provided by HOLC, and the statute providing for such capital subscription required that FSLIC pay to HOLC an annual dividend at a rate equal to the interest rate on the bonds issued by HOLC to provide the funds for the subscription. The bonds so issued bore an interest rate of 3 percent, so that this has determined the amount of the annual dividend to HOLC to date. However, these 3 percent bonds have been refunded, with the result that the cost to HOLC on its capital subscription to FSLIC is now less than the amount the statute requires FSLIC to pay in dividends to HOLC. Subsection (a) of this section would correct this situation by providing that henceforth such dividends shall be in line with the current cost to HOLC on its borrowings.

The purpose of subsection (b) of section 305 is to strengthen the insurance protection afforded by FSLIC by authorizing, but not requiring, the Treasury to purchase FSLIC's debentures. In this way, there is better assurance that FSLIC will at all times be able to meet its insurance obligations without undue difficulty. The subsection limits the aggregate amount of debentures that the Treasury might thus purchase to three times FSLIC's capital stock, reserves, and surplus.

Section 306: This section would, in line with FSLIC's experience with respect to losses and income in its 11 years of operations, reduce the premium chargeable for FSLIC insurance from one-eighth of 1 percent (of accounts insured plus creditor obligations) to one-twelfth of 1 percent. This change in premium rate would become effective as of July 1, 1946.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT LOANS

Section 307: This section, together with the remaining sections in Title III, is designed to effect improvements in FHA operations with respect to all three of its present insurance programs, including home modernization and improvement loans, home mortgage loans, and rental housing mortgage loans. Section 307 itself expands FHA's title I modernization and improvement insurance program by authorizing it (1) to insure loans under this program with maturities of up to 5 years, as compared with a present limitation of 3 years, and (2), in the case of multifamily houses and institutional and commercial properties, to insure loans of up to $10,000 in amount (as compared with a generally applicable $2,500 maximum) and 7 years in maturity. At the same time, there would be eliminated from the title its special war housing provisions (insurance of loans of up to $5,000 in amount and 7 years in maturity for home modernization and improvement which would assist the war effort).

INSURANCE OF EXISTING HOMES

Section 308: This section eliminates two limitations on FHA insuring activity with respect to mortgages on existing homes. Under the present statute, the aggregate amount of mortgages on existing dwellings that FHA may insure (using mid-1939 as the base date) may not exceed 35 percent of the total amount of FHA insured mortgages. Also, under the present statute FHA would not be able to insure mortgages altogether on existing properties after July 1, 1946, unless the property has previously been covered by an insured mortgage. Both these provisions are eliminated from the statute by this section.

ENCOURAGEMENT AND PROTECTION OF HOME OWNERSHIP

Section 309: The purpose of this section is to encourage home ownership and afford necessary protection to those undertaking such ownership. It would do so: (1) by authorizing a maximum maturity of 25 years with respect to home mortgages on new construction generally, instead of limiting such maturity to newly constructed single-family, owner-occupied, homes costing $6,000 or under; and (2) by permitting the lapsing of principal and interest payments, and extensions of maturity, where the mortgagor, because of unemployment, economic conditions, or misfortune beyond his control, is unable to meet his mortgage payments. In the case of this latter provision, the period of maturity could be extended up to 1 year at any one time or up to 3 years in the aggregate.

Section 310: This section permits a pro rata refund of insurance premium where the mortgage is paid off within a premium year. Under the present statute, such refund may be made only if a new mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of the payment of the one previously insured.

TIME EXTENSION FOR VETERANS

Section 311: This section is designed to protect those veterans and their dependents who have been unable to keep up their mortgage payments during the period of military service. It authorizes the FHA to consent to the modification and extension of the maturity of any such mortgage, so long as the extended maturity within which the mortgage is to be amortized does not exceed the unexpired term of the mortgage plus a period equal to the period of military service. In effect, this permits the FHA and the mortgagee to accord to the veteran by voluntary agreement the same relief which he could obtain by court action under the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, but without the expense and delay attendant upon such action.

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS WITH RESPECT TO HOME OWNERSHIP

Section 312: The purpose of this section is to provide protection hitherto lacking to the small home owner against defects in construction, faulty materials, or workmanship, and violation by the building contractor of his contract obligations. Under this section the principal contractor would, as a condition to FHA insurance, be required to provide adequate warranty against such defects or

breach of contract of which he is notified within 1 year following the completion of the dwelling.

Section 313: This section reinstates a recently expired authorization to FHA to include certain foreclosure costs among the insurance benefits in the case of mortgages covering homes of $6,000 or under. The purpose of this reinstatement is to insure continued participation by lending institutions in the financing of low-cost homes on the most favorable terms possible to the moderate-income home owner.

RENTAL HOUSING INSURANCE

Section 314: This section would in effect reinstate FHA's section 210 program which was stopped in 1939 and under which FHA was authorized to insure mortgages of up to $200,000 in amount on housing projects or developments constructed for either rental or sale purposes. The basic differences between the plan of operations under section 210 and under FHA's section 207 program were (1) the concentration of section 210 on the small sized project or development; and (2) the statutory requirements present in the case of section 207 projects, but absent in the case of section 210 housing, calling for the formation of special, limited dividend, corporations and for FHA controls over management and operations.

Section 314 would reinstate the section 210 program by appropriate amendment to section 207 rather than by a reenactment of the old section 210 itself. It does so by making inapplicable to section 207 mortgages not exceeding $250,000 in amount (as compared with the previous $200,000 limitation in sec. 210), the statutory requirements calling for the formation of special corporations and for FHA controls over management and operations.

Section 315: This section provides for three basic improvements in section 207 rental housing operations:

1. It perfects the present provisions with respect to the amount of project cost that may be covered by the mortgage loan. The two basic limitations provided in the present statute are: (i) That the loan may not exceed 80 percent of project value, and (ii) that it may in no event exceed the cost of the completed physical improvements. However, in defining "costs" for the purpose of determining the portion thereof that may be covered by the mortgage loan, certain items such as taxes, financing charges, utilities, and other expenses are excluded. In order to facilitate the evident intent of the act to permit the insurance of a true 80-percent loan, and on the basis of experience under FHA's title VI war-housing program, this section would amend the statutory definition of project "value" and "costs" so as to include certain of the presently excluded cost items.

2. It authorizes insurance of mortgages up to $50,000,000 in amount (as compared with the general limitation of $5,000,000) if the housing project is undertaken by a Federal, State, or municipal instrumentality, or a limited dividend corporation formed under, and restricted by, Federal or State law as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, or methods of operation. It would also make inapplicable to these projects the statutory limitation that the mortgage loan may not exceed the cost of the completed physical improvements; that is, land costs may be included so long as the total amount of mortgage loan does not exceed 80 percent of project cost. These amendments are intended to make possible, assistance under the FHA-insurance program to large rental-housing projects contemplated under State urban-redevelopment laws.

3. It would substitute a maximum cost limitation of $1,500 per room for the present limitation of $1,350, and in this way permit greater flexibility.

Section 316: This section would permit FHA to charge a maximum fee of 1 percent (of the mortgage loan) to cover appraisal and inspection costs on rental-housing projects, as compared with the present maximum of one-half of 1 percent. This would enable the FHA to recover its actual cost of processing in certain cases where the application for insurance is withdrawn before the loan is insured.

Section 317: This section eliminates the present statutory requirement that where FHA takes over a rental housing project as a result of default of the mortgagor and, through its efforts, ultimately realizes a profit on the transaction, such profit must be turned over to the mortgagor. It is not believed that the defaulting mortgagor corporation is entitled to such a gratuity but that such profit, if any, should accrue to the insurance fund to offset losses incurred in other cases.

TITLE IV—PRIVATELY FINANCED HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF LOWER INCOME

This title recognizes that there are income groups which can and should be served by private enterprise rather than by public housing endeavor, but whom private enterprise would not be able to serve under existing programs even when strengthened by the provisions of title III. It, therefore, provides, in the case of both home ownership and rental housing, for a supplementing of the existing systems of FHA mortgage insurance with special aids for families of lower income who require more favorable terms than such existing systems offer. Thus, it would effectively complement title III in appreciably broadening the area which private enterprise can serve.

Section 401: This section points out specifically that title IV is not designed to supplant or alter any of the existing systems of mortgage insurance under FHA, but only to supplement them with special systems for families of lower income who require more favorable terms than can be offered under FHA's existing programs.

FHA SUPPLEMENTAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR HOME OWNERS OF LOWER INCOME

Section 402: This section, together with section 403, provides the supplemental system of mortgage insurance for individual family homes. It authorizes, in order to assist lower-income families who could not be served under the existing FHA program, a combination of a 95 percent loan, 32-year maturity, and a maximum 4 percent interest rate. This supplemental program would be limited to mortgages not exceeding $5,000 in amount, or a lesser amount when the Administrator finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability. In order to stimulate building activity in this low cost home field, the section authorizes firm commitments to builders of such housing (i. e., the insuring of the temporary loans necessary during the construction process) in amounts up to 85 percent of appraised value as compared with the generally applicable limitation of 80 percent.

Section 403: The purpose of this section is to provide increased insurance benefits to the mortgagee lending institution in order to encourage participation by home financing institutions in this supplemental program. Under the provisions of the section, the mortgagee would receive complete insurance against loss subject only to a deduction in an amount equivalent to one-half of 1 percent of the unpaid principal, thus substantially reducing the possibility of loss resulting from default in interest or from foreclosure expenses that the mortgagee assumes under the existing FHA home-mortgage insurance program.

FHA-MUTUAL OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING

Section 404: This section, together with section 405, sets forth the special supplemental program needed for large-scale housing projects for families of lower income. The program involves a combination of a 90-percent loan, 40-year maturity, maximum interest rate of 3½ percent, and provision for lapsing, when necessary, of principal or interest payments, and extensions of amortization period. Also, in order to encourage and make possible home ownership for those families of lower income who could undertake such ownership only under some plan such as mutual ownership housing, the section makes this liberalized combination of mortgage terms available for projects undertaken by nonprofit mutual ownership housing corporations, with the additional liberalization (since home ownership is involved) of insurance of 95-percent loans. This additional liberalization is further made available to rental projects undertaken by Federal, State, or municipal instrumentalities, or State-regulated limited dividend corporations, to take care of those families of lower income who could not be served even under the 90-percent rental housing or the 95-percent mutual ownership loan plans provided in this section.

Section 405: In order to attract participation by lending institutions, this section increases the insurance benefits under the section 404 program, again to 100 percent insurance against risk, less only a deduction of one-half of 1 percent of unpaid principal, and obtainable by transfer of the mortgage itself to FHA.

Section 406: This section follows the pattern established in 1938 when the National Housing Act was amended so as to provide for the present program of FHA insurance of 90 percent, 25-year, mortgage loans on new owner-occupied homes costing $6,000 or under. As a corollary measure, the Federal National Mortgage Association was created to assure a market for such mortgages if the market already established for FHA insured mortgages should prove inadequate for this new, higher ratio, longer term, mortgage note.

Similarly, section 406 provides that if at the outset there should fail to be an adequate market for FHA insured mortgages on housing projects for families of lower income eligible for mortgage insurance under sections 404 and 405, the Federal National Mortgage Association may provide such a market. In doing so, it would follow the pattern prescribed in sections 404 and 405 with respect to mortgages taken up by private financing institutions.

TITLE V—DIRECT PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

This title recognizes that, while the encouragement of home ownership is a fundamental objective in our national housing policy, nevertheless there is a large segment of our population which, because of income, mobility, custom, or local conditions, requires or prefers rental housing. The section also recognizes that up until now the provision of such housing, particularly for families of moderate income, has been inadequate and that such inadequacy has in very large part resulted from a reluctance on the part of institutional investors to make direct investments in such housing.

The title, therefore, provides for a special program of yield insurance, to be administered by FHA, designed to encourage direct investment in rental housing for families of moderate income by guaranteeing to those making such an investment to the extent of 100 percent of project cost, a minimum return (exclusive of amortization) of 2¾ percent per annum on outstanding investment until such time as only 10 percent of the original capital investment remains unamortized. As in the case of FHA's existing insurance programs, a self-sustaining program made possible by appropriate premium charges, is contemplated.

Section 501: This section places the proposed yield insurance program under the jurisdiction of FHA, and as a title VII to the National Housing Act, which title would consist of 13 sections, Nos. 701 through 713, and provide as follows:

"Title VII—Insurance for Investments in Rental Housing for Families of Moderate Income."

Section 701 of the proposed title VII provides the general authority to FHA to insure (and to make commitments to insure) a minimum annual return to the investor, consisting of (1) 2 percent of the original capital investment (as amortization on such investment), plus (2) a 2¾ percent yield on the portion of the investment still unamortized as of the particular year involved.[1] Such insurance may be provided only for the period during which more than 10 percent of the original capital investment in the project remains unamortized (or, in effect, for not more than 45 years).

Section 702: Subsection (a) sets forth as the basic requirements for eligibility for yield insurance (1) that there be a need for the project in the locality to serve families of moderate income at the rentals proposed, which need is not adequately being met by private enterprise without yield insurance; (2) that the project be economically sound and afford reasonable assurance of stability and economy both in construction and operation; and (3) that the dwellings be properly designed and available for families of moderate income at rentals within their capacity to pay.

Subsection (b) of this section provides the usual clause as to incontestability with respect to any insurance contract undertaken by FHA under this title.

Section 703: This section fixes the premiums and fees that may be charged in connection with the yield insurance program. It authorizes first an annual premium charge of not more than one-half of 1 percent of the investment outstanding for the particular year for which the premium charge is payable. It authorizes also reasonable fees (but not in excess of one-half of 1 percent of the estimated capital investment) for FHA examination and inspection of the project during construction.

Section 704: This section, which relates to the rents that may be charged for the dwellings in the project, requires approval of the rent schedule by FHA. The yield insurance plan provided under this title does not make the 2¾ percent minimum yield guaranteed by FHA, also the maximum the investor is permitted to derive on his investment. This is specifically recognized by the provisions of this section which provide for FHA approval of rent schedules so set up as to allow the investor a yield of 3¼ percent on outstanding investment. At the same time, however, FHA must also find that the rentals provided in the schedule are no higher than necessary to meet the needs of the families of the incomes proposed to be served.

Section 705: This section provides that in those years, if any, in which the project yields revenues more than sufficient to provide a 3¼-percent yield on outstanding investment for that year, one-half of such additional earnings may be retained by the investor as a further return on his investment, but only to the extent that this does not result in a return for that year of more than 4 percent on outstanding investment. For the purposes of the insurance contract the balance would be regarded as being applied to accelerating the amortization of the capital investment, one effect of which would be to reduce the life of the insurance contract. The section provides, however, that in the event the project has had operating deficits in preceding years (which deficits are not covered by the insurance under this title), the excess earnings are to be applied, first, to the reimbursement of such deficits, and, second, to the payment of any premium charges previously waived because of such deficits.

Section 706: This section provides for the submission of annual financial and operating statements to FHA for its approval. The FHA is authorized to make such submission and approval a condition precedent to the payment of claims for insurance benefits.

Section 707: This section provides for cash payment of properly proved claims for insurance benefits.

Section 708: This section is designed for the situation where a project continues to operate at a loss for a substantial period, thus requiring special action. It provides that if the aggregate of the amounts paid as insurance benefits to the investor should ever equal or exceed 15 percent of the original capital investment, FHA is to have the right to take over the project against issuance to the investor of debentures having a value equal to 90 percent of the portion of the capital investment still unamortized. Conveyance to FHA at the option of the investor is authorized if the aggregate of the operating deficits (to the extent they are not made good) should ever equal 5 percent of the original capital investment. In either case the debentures issued would bear interest at not to exceed 2¾ percent per annum, have a maximum maturity of 40 years, be fully guaranteed by the United States, and have the same tax-exemption privileges as debentures issued by FHA under its mortgage-insurance programs.

The section also sets forth the necessary provisions for the temporary management and disposition of any projects taken over by FHA under this section.

Section 709: This section vests in the investor the right to terminate the written contract at any time upon written notice to FHA, and it vests in FHA the authority to prescribe the conditions under which it has the option to terminate the insurance contract. The section further authorizes an adjusted premium charge in the event of termination.

Section 710: This section creates a special insurance fund (Housing Investment Insurance Fund) as a revolving fund for meeting the payment of insurance benefits, and also of administrative expenses incurred in connection with the program, and allocates $10,000,000 to set up such fund. All income derived in connection with the program is to be deposited in the fund and all expenses, whether in payment of insurance claims or of administrative expenses, are to be paid from the fund. The faith of the United States is pledged to the payment of all approved claims for insurance benefits in the event the fund fails to make any such payment when due.

Section 711: This section provides that no real property acquired by FHA under the yield insurance program shall be exempt from local taxation simply because of such acquisition.

Section 712: This section provides for the issuance of such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable for carrying out the yield insurance program, including such rules and regulations as may be necessary with respect to maintenance and inspection of project records, or as may be necessary for effecting appropriate changes in the insurance base in the event of capital improvements or additions to the project on the one hand, or sale of or damage to part of the project on the other.

Section 713: This section sets forth the definitions of the basic terms used in the title. Through these definitions, the section provides that the yield insurance program is open to any individual, group or association, or other legal entity qualified to undertake the construction and operation of the type of project that may be assisted under the title. Through these definitions, also, the section makes appropriate provision for cases where the investor has a leasehold rather than a fee interest in the land on which the project is constructed. The definitions also indicate that a project may include such community and commercial facilities as are necessary or desirable.

* * * * *

Section 502: This section amends two provisions of the National Housing Act which were intended at the time of their enactment to be applicable to FHA's insurance programs generally, so that such provisions will by explicit reference be applicable to the yield insurance program. The provisions affected are section 1 of that act, which sets forth the general administrative powers of FHA, and section 4, which provides for cooperation by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in providing the funds necessary for the proper administration of FHA's various insurance programs.

TITLE VI—LAND ASSEMBLY FOR PARTICIPATION BY PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN DEVELOPMENT OR REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

This title authorizes a program of limited Federal aid to local communities to enable them to undertake positive and comprehensive steps for the clearance of their slum and blighted areas, so as to make such areas available for redevelopment, with the active participation of private enterprise, in accordance with sound planning principles. Two basic forms of assistance are authorized:

1. Loans, both temporary and long-term (but not in excess of 45 years in any event), to finance necessary project costs to the extent funds for this purpose cannot otherwise be obtained, and at an interest rate designed to return to the Government the cost to it of the funds it obtains to make the loans; and

2. An annual subsidy where necessary to enable the land in the slum or blighted area to be made available for redevelopment at prices consistent with proper and sound land use and planning, the payment of which subsidy is made subject to a variety of restricting provisions designed to delimit sharply the conditions under, and the amounts and periods for, which it may be made.

The title places the administration of this program of assistance for land assembly and clearance under the jurisdiction of the National Housing Administrator and requires adherence by him to the following cardinal principles in his administration of the program:

1. That any project assisted be directly related to the improvement of housing conditions in the locality;

2. That Federal assistance be confined to purposes of land assembly and clearance, as distinguished from actual redevelopment of the area;

3. That every project assisted be a local undertaking, locally planned, locally ap-

[1] It is to be noted that the insurance is only of a yield on the capital investment itself. The insurance does not cover against the improbable situation of deficits in expenses of operation (i. e., the amount, if any, by which operating expenses in any year exceed the revenues of that year). Should the gross revenues in any year actually be less than the aggregate operating expenses, then the actual return to the investor (exclusive of the 2 percent amortization return) in effect would be an amount equal to the difference between (1) 2¾ percent of the outstanding investment, and (2) the deficit in operating expenses for the year. However, section 703 provides that in any such year the insurance premium shall be waived to the extent of such operating deficit, and section 705 provides that in any subsequent year in which there are excess earnings, such excess may be applied to make up such operating deficit (to the extent it has not been previously made up).

proved, and designed to serve local needs in every sense of the term;

4. That the plan for redevelopment shall afford maximum opportunity to, and require maximum reliance upon, private enterprise;

5. That there shall be local financial cooperation and participation to the fullest extent consistent with the ability and resources of the locality, and, in any event, in an amount equal to at least one-half of the portion of project costs that is used as the base for setting the amount of Federal subsidy;

6. That adequate provision be present for the rehousing of the families displaced by the clearance of the area; and

7. That Federal participation, whatever the form, be strictly limited to rock-bottom minimums.

Section 601: This section sets forth the general purpose of the title and declares it to be to encourage private enterprise to participate more extensively in the development or redevelopment of slum or other areas. Such encouragement would be in the form of aid to localities for the acquisition and preparation of land for redevelopment in part by private enterprise on terms comparable to the aid extended in connection with slum clearance under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

Section 602: This section sets forth the definitions of the basic terms used in the title. Through these definitions, the section provides that no area selected for redevelopment would qualify for Federal aid unless it involves either the clearance of a slum area or the development or redevelopment for predominantly residential uses of a deteriorated or deteriorating area or a defunct subdivision or other open land whose development is necessary for sound community growth. Through these definitions also, the section limits Federal assistance to the furtherance of such purposes as: (1) the acquisition of the land in the area requiring redevelopment; (2) the removal of existing structures; (3) the provision of the utilities essential for the new land uses contemplated; and (4) the making of the land available for redevelopment at prices consistent with its proposed new uses. Aid under this title to assist the construction of any of the buildings contemplated by the redevelopment plan is expressly barred. Still another effect of the definitions is to require a redevelopment plan for the project area and contiguous land sufficiently complete to indicate its relationship to definite local objectives, and to indicate also the proposed new land uses and building requirements.

Section 603: The purpose of this section is to assure that aid to projects under this title will be based upon local determination of need and maximum reliance upon private enterprise. Accordingly, it provides that any contracts for financial aid under the title may be made (1) only with a duly authorized local public agency and (2) only if the redevelopment plan is approved by the governing body of the locality or other local public body designated in accordance with local law. Moreover, such approval must include findings that the redevelopment area could not be made available for redevelopment by private enterprise alone and without the Federal aid sought; that the plan will afford maximum opportunity to privately financed development or redevelopment; and that the plan is based upon a local survey and conforms to a comprehensive plan for the locality as a whole.

Section 604: The purpose of this section is to assure that all projects assisted will (1) actually conform to the locally approved redevelopment plan, and (2) be consistent with the interests of the locality as a whole. The section, therefore, provides that as a condition to Federal assistance, the local public agency must agree to obligate those to whom it sells or leases the land in the project area, to devote the land to the use specified in the redevelopment plan, actually to begin the building of their improvements within a reasonable time, and to give preference in the selection of tenants to families displaced by the project. The section further requires that there be feasible and satisfactory methods for both the temporary and permanent relocation of the families who have been living in the redevelopment area and who are displaced as a result of the clearance of the area.

Section 605: This section, together with section 606, sets forth the forms and degree of Federal financial assistance for land assembly and clearance projects. Section 605 itself provides for assistance in the form of loans by the National Housing Administrator. The loan provisions are premised on the expectation that the definitive financing of the cost of the project will basically be accomplished by reliance upon private capital. The section, therefore, authorizes the National Housing Administrator to make such temporary loans as may be necessary prior to definitive financing (which must be undertaken not later than 5 years following the date of the first such loan for the acquisition of land), and it authorizes permanent loans (1) for only such part of the project area as the local public agency leases for redevelopment, and (2) only to the extent that loans payable from the rentals from such leased land cannot be obtained from other sources at sufficiently low interest rates. Any loans made under this section (whether temporary or definitive) must bear interest at not less than the rate specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 20 years or more at the date the contract for the loan is made (the "going Federal rate"), and the permanent loans must mature within a period not exceeding 45 years from the date of the definitive bonds.

To provide the funds necessary to make these loans, the section authorizes the National Housing Administrator to issue and have outstanding at any one time obligations in the aggregate amount of $500,000,000 from which amount, however, only $50,000,000 in outstanding definitive loans may be made by the Administrator on and after the date of enactment of the title, which limit is to be increased by further amounts of $50,000,000 at the beginning of each of the second, third, fourth, and fifth years from the date of such enactment.

Section 606: This section provides for the subsidy assistance that may be provided by the National Housing Administrator in those cases where such assistance is necessary if the land in the project area is to be available for proper use and soundly planned redevelopment at prices consistent with such use and redevelopment.

In recognizing the need and providing for this subsidy—"annual contributions"—the section also recognizes, and immediately provides, that it must be strictly limited to the amounts and periods necessary to carry out the purposes of the title. In no event may the annual contributions be made over a period exceeding 45 years; nor may the maximum amount payable for any particular year exceed an amount equal to 1 percent above the going Federal rate applied against the difference between (1) the costs involved in connection with the project and the undertakings relating thereto, and (2) the new capital, or re-use, value of the land in the project area after its clearance. Also, there is excluded from this subsidy base any part of such costs as are met by any cash or other local donations received in connection with the project. And in no event may the subsidy base—for all federally assisted projects in the community considered in the aggregate—exceed two-thirds of such costs less the new capital or re-use value of the land in the project area.

As a still further limitation on the amount of Federal subsidy and the period over which it may be made, the section provides that if in any year the receipts derived from the project exceed expenditures and charges, such excess must be used for purposes which will effectuate a reduction in subsidy in subsequent years or to repay subsidies made in previous years. Also, at any time after 10 years following definitive financing of project cost, the Administrator has the right to substitute for the payment of subsequent annual contributions a single lump sum payment equal in amount to the capitalized value of such contributions.

In addition to these various provisions designed to strictly limit the amount and period of Federal subsidy, the section further contemplates that the plan of Federal annual contributions be utilized to reduce the Federal loan assistance needed. Toward this end, it provides that payments under the annual contributions contracts may be pledged as security for borrowings by the local public agency, a provision which will facilitate the financing of project costs by private capital at the lowest possible interest rate.

The section authorizes the National Housing Administrator, upon enactment of the title, to enter into contracts providing for annual contributions aggregating not more than $4,000,000 per annum, which limit is to be increased by further amounts of $4,000,000 at the beginning of each of the second, third, fourth, and fifth years after the date of such enactment. Tied in with this authorization is an acceleration clause, which is also made applicable to the loan authorization provided in Section 605, under which any parts of either of such authorizations may be made available at earlier dates than provided in these two sections, upon a determination by the President that such acceleration is necessary to make land available to meet acute shortages of adequate housing, including housing for servicemen and veterans, or to stimulate employment and business activity. The funds necessary to make these annual contributions are to be made available by appropriations of the Congress, and the faith of the United States is pledged to the payment of the annual contributions contracted for pursuant to the provisions of the title.

Section 607: The purpose of this section is to assure that the aid provided for land assembly and clearance under the program provided by this title, which program is predicated on maximum opportunity to privately financed redevelopment, will be comparable to the aid made available under the United States Housing Act of 1937 for land acquisition for public low-rent housing projects, and, in this connection, to assure also that the financial aid provided in this title will not result in a double subsidy for public housing. The section, therefore, provides (1) that the obligations issued by the National Housing Administrator to obtain funds for loans under this title are to be guaranteed by the United States just as are the obligations issued by the Federal Public Housing Commissioner to obtain funds for loans for low-rent housing and slum clearance; (2) that certain provisions contained later in the bill (at section 704) designed to facilitate the local enlistment of private capital to finance substantially the entire cost of low-rent housing projects at very low interest rates shall also apply to land assembly projects undertaken under this title; and (3) that the obligations issued by local public agencies to finance the cost of land assembly projects shall have the same tax exemptions as obligations issued by local public agencies for low-rent housing. The section assures that the financial assistance under this title shall not result in a double subsidy to low-rent housing which would give it an advantage over private housing development, by providing that any land in the project area made available for low-rent housing must be paid for by the agency undertaking the housing project.

Section 608: This section is intended to assure that the locality will bear its fair share of the cost of any project assisted under this title and that it will call upon the Federal Government for aid only to the extent necessary. Toward this end, the section provides:

1. That no Federal financial assistance, either in the form of loans or annual contributions, will be given to a community for its land assembly and clearance projects where the write-down in property values is such that the new use value of the land comprising the project area becomes less than 50 percent of the costs involved in connection with the project and undertakings relating thereto (exclusive of the cost of the old buildings destroyed and their demolition), unless the difference is made up by contributions from the locality;

2. That in any event the local community must itself participate financially to the extent of at least one-half of the portion of project costs that is used as the base for setting the Federal subsidy. Such local participation may take the form of: Direct reduction of project costs or expenditures, by contributions made in cash or its equivalent; public improvements and utilities necessitated by the project or of direct benefit to it; or periodic assistance increasing project revenues and so decreasing the need for subsidy.

Where a locality undertakes more than one project with Federal assistance, these two requirements relate to such projects considered in the aggregate.

Section 609: This section, designed for the protection of labor standards, requires prevailing wages to be paid to those employed in the development of any land assembly and clearance project assisted, makes the kick-back statute applicable to all such projects, and requires monthly reports by all contractors used on the project to the Secretary of Labor as to the number of persons employed by them, the aggregate amount of their pay rolls, the total manhours worked, and expenditures for materials.

Section 610: The purpose of this section is to give to the National Housing Administrator the technical powers necessary for the proper performance of his duties under this title. In this connection, it states that he shall appoint a director to carry out the provisions of the title under his general supervision.

Section 611: This section authorizes the sale of any Federal real property surplus to the needs of the Government and within the area of a land assembly project, to the local public agency undertaking the project at a price equal to its fair value for the use specified in the redevelopment plan.

TITLE VII—AID TO LOCALITIES FOR LOW-RENT HOUSING

This title provides for the resumption of the public low-rent housing and slum clearance program needed to serve those families whose incomes are so low that private enterprise, even with the improved aids provided in this bill, cannot hope to service them. In so doing, the title sets forth various provisions calculated to assure complete consistency with the basic objectives of primary reliance upon private enterprise to do as much of the total housing job as possible; increasing emphasis on community responsibility and local initiative; concentration upon the needs of veterans and their families; enlistment of local capital to do the whole job of financing the capital cost of low-rent housing projects; rehabilitation, where in order, of existing dwellings; and a general tightening up with respect to the amount and period of Federal annual subsidy to achieve low rents. The title also contains a miscellany of technical and perfecting amendments to the United States Housing Act of 1937 that the 8 years of operations under it have indicated to be desirable.

LOCAL DETERMINATION OF NEED; TENANCY ONLY BY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Section 701: This section sets forth, at the very outset of the title, the governing principle that aid shall be extended under the title to those localities which assume community responsibility and initiative in estimating their own needs and demonstrating that private enterprise alone cannot do the whole job. Toward this end, the section requires that, as a condition of Federal financial assistance, the local public agency must submit an analysis of the local housing market showing not only that there is a need for low-rent housing which cannot be met by private enterprise, but also that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed project and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and existing structures) a substantial supply of decent housing. Thus, the section establishes as basic national policy that, even with respect to a sizable segment of the area which private enterprise cannot now serve, every opportunity is to be given to it to sharpen its tools and extend its servicing capacity downward in the income scale.

As further assurances of attainment of basic aims, the section provides that the governing body of the locality must approve the provision of any low-rent housing to be assisted by the Federal Government; that, as indicated by actual investigation, every family admitted to the project must have been ill-housed or displaced by a slum-clearance project (this requirement, however, does not apply to servicemen or veterans); and that every family admitted is actually one of low-income. Also, after admission, periodic examination must be made of the incomes of the families living in the project so that, if such income increases to the point where the family can obtain decent private-housing accommodations at rentals within its means, it will be required to move from the project.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

Section 702: This section guarantees preference to servicemen and veterans where appropriate in the administration of the low-rent housing program. Specifically, as between applicants equally in need, it requires that preference be given to the families of servicemen and veterans. The section also provides that low-rent housing projects may serve veterans and servicemen without families and other individuals requiring low-rent housing.

COST LIMITS

Section 703: This section is designed to end certain discriminations and inequities resulting from present cost limits on low-rent housing assisted by the Federal Government. Experience has indicated that existing provisions, which place a ceiling on dwelling unit, as well as on room cost, and which provide for higher cost ceilings for cities of more than 500,000 population, are inadequate or faulty in that: (1) a limitation on cost of the entire dwelling unit hampers the provision of housing for the larger-sized family of low income and so discriminates against such families; and (2) the reason for higher ceilings for our large cities—the higher construction costs in such communities—is equally applicable to our large metropolitan districts even though the central city in the district may by itself have a population of less than 500,000. The section, therefore, eliminates the limitation on dwelling unit cost (but not the limitation on room cost, so that the essential limitation on construction costs is still retained in the act), and makes the higher ceiling for large communities applicable to cities in metropolitan districts of over 500,000 population as well as to any city which itself has that population.

Because of special cost problems in Alaska, the section also has special provisions permitting higher costs in that Territory if found necessary.

LOCAL FINANCING

Section 704: The basic purpose of this section is to amend the financing provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to make possible 100 percent definitive financing of low-rent housing projects by local capital and thus in effect limit Federal lending assistance for low-rent housing to the temporary interim financing necessary prior to the issuance of definitive bonds. Essentially, this section provides that, in the event of a substantial default by the local public agency in its covenants to FPHA of a nature which would entitle the FPHA to suspend or terminate the payment of its annual subsidies to the local agency, such project is to be conveyed to the FPHA (subject to the right of the local public agency to reconveyance upon a satisfactory curing of the default), and FPHA would continue to make annual contributions to the project. This would assure both (1) that the project will continue to operate as a low-rent housing project, and (2) that those who have furnished the capital funds for its construction in reliance upon the continuance of its low-rent character, and the making of annual contributions therefor, during the entire life of the loan, will have their investment adequately protected. With this assurance there is every reason to anticipate that local capital will be willing to undertake the job of furnishing 100 percent of capital cost in long-term loans and to do so at very low interest rates.

In recognition of the special security features that would attach to local public agency bonds as a result of this provision, and in order to facilitate substantially the flow of private capital into the public low-rent housing field, the section also provides for an amendment to the Banking Act so that national banks, and (to the extent permitted by State laws) State member banks of the Federal Reserve System, would be able to purchase in larger amounts, and to underwrite, local public agency bonds so secured. Without this amendment, investment in such bonds by these banks would be subject to the same restrictions as are applicable to local housing authority bonds which are now issued without these special security features; that is, they could not be underwritten by such banks and could be purchased for the banks' own account only to the extent of 10 percent of unimpaired capital and surplus.

In addition to substantially reducing the need for Federal loan assistance, the section also adds new limitations with respect to Federal subsidy assistance. It does so by providing: (1) that in any year when the receipts derived in connection with the project assisted exceeds expenditures and charges, the excess must be used for purposes which will reduce subsequent annual contributions; and (2) that contracts for loan and annual contributions based on one "going Federal rate" may, in the case of a change in such rate, be amended so as to base the loan interest rate, and maximum contribution payable, on the new rate whenever this would promote economy and be in the financial interest of the Federal Government.

Other financing provisions contained in the section:

1. Reduce the maximum loan period from 60 years to 45 years in the case of projects where the annual contributions are limited by statute to a 45-year period;

2. Reduce the minimum interest rate on Federal loans made for projects where the maximum loan and annual contribution period is 45, rather than 60, years, from the applicable "going Federal rate" plus one-half

of 1 percent to simply the "going Federal rate";

3. Relate the going Federal rate (which determines the minimum loan interest rate and the maximum annual contribution rate) to the interest rate on Federal obligations with a maturity of 20 years or more rather than 10 years or more. (Experience has indicated that by considering as the going Federal rate interest on obligations with the relatively short maturity of 10 years, changes in such rate result in many instances, not from a change in the cost of money to the Federal Government, but simply from the irrelevant factor of the particular maturity of the most recently issued Federal bonds.) Also, under this section, the governing rate is the one as of the date of Presidential approval of the contract for loan or annual contributions, rather than the date the contract happens to be signed by FPHA and the local public agency;

4. Adapt the statutory language with respect to FPHA's borrowing authorization to the changes in FPHA's lending program that would result from the provisions of this title, by relating the gross amount authorized ($800,000,000, which amount is not increased by this bill) to the amount of obligations that may be outstanding rather than to the aggregate amount that the FPHA may issue exclusive of refunding obligations; and

5. Authorize FPHA to make development loans for capital improvements or additions to low-rent housing projects subsequent to original construction or acquisition.

REHABILITATION

Section 705: In order to conserve the existing housing supply and to assist in the use, when financially feasible, of existing buildings instead of new construction for low-rent housing, this section authorizes a program of Federal aid for the rehabilitation of existing dwellings located in neighborhoods where the spread of blight can be prevented or arrested. The maximum amount of loan and rate of annual contributions for a particular project under this program would necessarily be somewhat larger in amount than for new construction—that is, the maximum amount of Federal loan could be in an amount equal to the cost of the project and the maximum annual contribution rate could exceed the maximum rate authorized on new construction by 1 percent of development cost. On the other hand, such assistance would be limited to 30-year periods as compared with the 45-year periods authorized with respect to new construction. Also, where appropriate, the section authorizes assistance for the leasing and rehabilitation of existing dwellings as distinguished from their purchase and rehabilitation. No special loan or annual contributions authorization is provided for this program.

Section 706: In order to make adequate provision for the special problems present in the case of projects undertaken in the Territories, dependencies, or possessions of the United States, this section authorizes a higher rate of annual contribution in the case of land and utility projects; that is, projects consisting of the provision of adequate land space and sanitary facilities for existing dwellings. As in the case of the rehabilitation program, a rate higher by 1 percent of development cost is authorized.

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL PROGRAM

Section 707: This section increases FPHA's annual contributions authorization. It authorizes additional contracts, which may be entered into upon enactment of this title, providing for annual contributions aggregating not more than $22,000,000 a year, which limit would be increased by further amounts of $22,000,000 at the beginning of each of the second, third, and fourth years following such enactment. The section also provides that the President may accelerate the availability of this authorization in the event it is necessary to meet acute shortages of housing for low-income families, including families of servicemen and veterans, or to stimulate employment and business activity.

In providing this additional authorization, however, the section limits the period over which the annual contributions may be paid to 45 years as contrasted with the present authorization of 60 years. Also, the section limits the use of this additional authorization to the provision of not more than 500,000 dwelling units involving new construction without further authorization from the Congress.

Section 708: This section provides technical amendments to the United States Housing Act of 1937 most of which are required as a result of the substantive amendments to that act provided in this bill. One provides a needed refinement of the existing provisions of that act relating to the equivalent elimination of substandard dwellings.

TITLE VIII—HOUSING ON FARMS AND IN RURAL AREAS

While assistance to families of low income in rural areas is authorized under the present provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, the special and different problems attaching to housing in such areas require special provisions for such housing. This title, in making these provisions, recognizes the intimate relationship between farm housing and the entire farm economy and so provides for assistance by the Department of Agriculture rather than by the Federal Public Housing Authority where only low-cost loans are necessary. Also, with respect to those instances where resort to FPHA's program of annual contributions is necessary, the title calls for very close relationship between that Authority and the Department of Agriculture. The title also recognizes that, in the case of farm housing, provision for ultimate ownership of the farm housing by the family assisted is to be facilitated wherever feasible, and that, in other respects also, such as the repayment of loan assistance, the provisions with respect to farm housing must be attuned to the farm economy.

Section 801: The National Housing Act in its present form authorizes FHA insurance with respect to farm housing only where there is involved construction or repairs calling for the expenditure of at least 15 percent of the mortgage proceeds for materials and labor. The purpose of this section is to extend the usefulness of this farm housing provision by eliminating the requirement with respect to construction and repairs and so permitting FHA insurance where only purchase is involved.

Section 802: This section authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farm owners in the United States, and in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, to provide decent farm dwellings for such owners, their tenants, share-croppers, or laborers. Such loans are explicitly limited to farm owners who cannot elsewhere receive the necessary credit on terms comparable to the terms provided in this title. They may be made for periods not in excess of 40 years, must bear interest at 3 percent per annum, and be repaid in installments. In recognition of the irregularities present in connection with the receipt of farm income, the section authorizes a system of variable loan repayment under which larger payments would be collected in periods of above-normal production or prices so as to permit the reduction of payments in periods of subnormal production or prices.

Section 803: This section authorizes loans by the Secretary of Agriculture to farm owners or groups of farm owners to provide adequate housing for seasonal agricultural workers. Such loans would be made under the same general terms and conditions as provided for the loans authorized in section 802, and must be capable of being repaid within the useful life of the housing. The Secretary is authorized to require as a condition to loan assistance under this section that the availability of the housing provided with such assistance shall not be a justification for decreasing the prevailing wage to the occupants, and that, if the housing is rented, the rent shall not exceed an amount approved by the Secretary.

Section 804: This section provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is to obtain the funds to make loans under sections 802 and 803 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum and in such amounts as may be annually provided by appropriation.

Section 805: In order to facilitate the provision of decent farm dwellings, this section authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish without charge (or at appropriate charge) technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information. The section authorizes the Secretary and the National Housing Agency to cooperate in research and technical studies in the rural-housing field and also authorizes the Secretary to utilize (through the Agricultural Extension Service) the facilities of State agencies and educational institutions in furnishing the services and information authorized by this section.

Section 806: This section simply provides the various administrative and related powers necessary in order that the Secretary of Agriculture may administer the program authorized in the preceding sections.

Section 807: This section requires that the Secretary of Agriculture give preference to veterans in administering the provisions of the title.

Section 808: The purpose of this section is to authorize assistance to rural families of low income comparable to that furnished to urban low-income families under the United States Housing Act of 1937, where such rural families cannot obtain decent housing within their means by loan assistance alone. The section calls for the enactment of an additional title, specifically relating to rural housing, to the United States Housing Act of 1937, consisting of eight sections numbered 201 through 208:

"Title II. Rural Housing"

The proposed section 201 authorizes and directs the FPHA, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, to develop and undertake a program to assist local public agencies in providing housing in rural areas for families of low income who could not otherwise obtain decent housing. The section provides that, before housing is constructed on a farm with assistance by FPHA, it must obtain certification from the Department of Agriculture: (1) that the family income is less than the amount necessary to enable it otherwise to obtain decent housing; (2) as to the normal earning capacity of the farm, which would indicate whether the farm owner can meet the payments required; and (3) that construction of a dwelling on the farm is consistent with the program of the Department. The section also provides that there shall, as far as practicable, be a system of variable lease payments so that credits may be established by higher payments by the farm owner whenever possible, to permit appropriate decreases in payments in years of below-normal production or prices. It provides also that, in this rural program, as in the urban low-rent housing program, preference be provided to families of servicemen and veterans.

In order to make the program available to families of low income in the case of farms included in reclamation projects of the Department of the Interior, the section also authorizes assistance in the case of such farms in cooperation with the Department of the Interior similar to the cooperation required with the Department of Agriculture.

The proposed section 202 is simply a technical one authorizing the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to utilize their employees and facilities to assist in the development of the program authorized under this title.

The proposed section 203 provides that assistance may be extended under this title for the provision of nonfarm housing (with sufficient land for home gardens) for rural families of low income, provided that the housing will be so located that sources of employment will be accessible to the families to be housed.

The proposed section 204 requires that the lessee of any farm house assisted under the title is to be given an option to purchase the house, and, that in exercising such option, he shall be entitled to credit for lease payments made by him or his predecessors which were applied toward amortizing the cost of the house. The section authorizes similar options, when appropriate, with respect to lessees of nonfarm houses in rural areas.

The proposed section 205 authorizes FPHA loan assistance to local public agencies to finance the provision of rural housing for families of low income. Such loans may not exceed the cost of the housing, must bear interest at a rate not less than the "going Federal rate" (the rate on the most recently issued Federal bonds at the date of Presidential approval of the loan contract with a maturity of 20 years or more), and be repaid within a period not exceeding 45 years. The section provides no additional loan funds for this program but simply makes available to FPHA for this purpose its general borrowing authorization under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

The proposed section 206 is the section that provides for the annual subsidy (annual contributions) necessary so that the local public agency assisted may be able to make the housing available within the means of low-income rural families. Such annual contributions must be strictly limited to the amounts and periods necessary. In no event may they be made for a period exceeding 45 years; nor may the contribution to be paid for any year exceed the difference between (1) the estimated annual costs to the local public agency with respect to the housing, and (2) the estimated receipts to the local public agency from the lease payments from the families housed, which payments are required by the section to at least be equal to the average of the annual principal payments which would be required to repay the cost of the house over its useful life. Such contributions, moreover, may be reduced or terminated when no longer needed, and in the event the local public agency has in any year an excess of receipts over expenditures, the amount of such excess must be used for purposes which will reduce subsequent annual contributions. The section further provides that appropriate increases shall be required in the lease payments in the event of increases in ability to pay.

A special annual contributions authorization for rural housing is proposed by this section, under which FPHA is authorized, upon enactment of the title, to enter into contracts for such contributions aggregating $5,000,000 per annum, which limit is to be increased by further amounts of $5,000,000 at the beginning of the second, third, fourth, and fifth years after the date of such enactment. The President is authorized to accelerate the availability of any part of this authorization in the event such acceleration is necessary to meet acute shortages of decent housing for families of low income in rural areas, including families of servicemen and veterans, or to stimulate employment or business activity.

The proposed section 207 defines rural areas for the purposes of the operations of the title and, in so doing, relates such definition to Bureau of the Census designations.

The proposed section 208 ties in this proposed new title II of the United States Housing Act of 1937 with the present provisions of that act, which are to become Title I.

Section 809: This section includes the technical amendments to the United States Housing Act of 1937 made necessary by the addition of this new rural-housing title.

TITLE IX—DISPOSITION OF PERMANENT WAR HOUSING AND OTHER FEDERALLY OWNED HOUSING WITH PREFERENCE TO SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

This title is designed to bring up to date the legislation already enacted by the Congress with respect to the disposition of permanent war housing, and other Federally owned housing held by the Federal Public Housing Authority under the United States Housing Act of 1937. In so doing, it establishes the cardinal principle of preference to servicemen and veterans.

Section 901: This section sets forth the general proposition that permanent war housing, and other Federally owned housing held by FPHA under the United States Housing Act of 1937, shall be disposed of consistently with the postwar need and with preference to the families of servicemen and veterans.

Section 902: This section provides that, when the President finds that any permanent war housing provided with appropriated funds is no longer needed for war purposes, and the local governing body finds that it would be in the best interests of the community or of the families of local servicemen and veterans to make such housing available to families of low income, the National Housing Administrator may authorize the sale by FPHA of any such project to a local public agency for low-rent housing purposes. The proceeds from any such sale would be handled in the manner provided in the Lanham Act with respect to war housing, which sets forth the provisions relating to the time for covering balances into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Families of veterans and servicemen would have the same preference in admission to war housing projects sold under the provisions of this title as is provided in section 702 with respect to low-rent housing projects assisted by FPHA.

So that Federal projects sold under this title may serve the purposes intended, the price of the project may consist of the payment of all of the net income from the project during its useful life.

This section makes clear, however, that none of its provisions are to be construed to prevent the sale of permanent war housing at its fair value on a home ownership basis wherever feasible.

TITLE X—PERIODIC INVENTORY OF HOUSING NEEDS AND PROGRAMS

This title provides for a periodic inventory of the needs and programs in housing and related community development toward the end of bringing to the attention of the Congress the most effective action to achieve our national housing objectives and policy.

Section 1001: This section provides that such inventory shall be made by the National Housing Administrator, and shall be presented to the Congress not less than once a year, in a comprehensive report including: the most current estimates of our housing needs for all income groups and areas; the rates of employment and investment in housing and related community development, as compared with the rates required for the construction industry's part in full production and full employment; nationwide progress in meeting these needs and requirements; and recommendations as to any additional specific programs and action needed to carry out the national housing policy and achieve the national housing objectives.

Section 1002: This section provides that, in the preparation of the report and recommendations, the National Housing Administrator shall cooperate with and seek the advice of appropriate Federal and local officials and of representatives of the various groups interested in housing and community development as producers and consumers.

TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

This title simply contains two standard provisions generally contained in enabling legislation.

Section 1101: This section contains the standard provision providing that the provisions of this Act shall control in the case of inconsistency with other legislation.

Section 1102: This is the usual separability clause.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, last July a subcommittee appointed by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to consider the housing situation in the postwar era made a report, which is a matter of record in the Senate. At that time the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced a bill which carried out some parts of the report, but not all, and in one or two respects, perhaps, was in some conflict with it. I stated at that time that I would endeavor to work with those Senators in order that I might join in a comprehensive housing bill to deal with the housing situation in somewhat closer line with the report submitted by the subcommittee.

Today the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has introduced the bill. He, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and I, with a number of representatives of various bureaus, have been working steadily since our return, in an endeavor to redraft the bill and perfect it. I have joined with the Senator from New York today in introducing the bill. It is probably the most comprehensive housing measure ever proposed in this country, or perhaps any other country. It may be criticized for being somewhat too comprehensive, because it covers over 100 pages, and six or seven different phases of the housing problem.

The bill endeavors, in the first place, to implement the proposal of our report that we undertake to stimulate and encourage the construction of a million and a quarter homes a year during the next 10 years in order to fill up the lack of housing, and to replace that which is beyond repair.

Since that time the housing situation has become even more serious and of greater public importance. Veterans returning from abroad find that they are wholly unable to provide themselves with homes, or, in many cases, to obtain even rental quarters. The Housing Administrator estimates that by the time demobilization is completed there will be probably 3,000,000 more families in the United States than there are family units in which they may live, requiring a doubling up, which is certainly not conducive to the public welfare or the comfort of the people. So that it is important that a start be made as soon as possible on a comprehensive housing program.

Mr. Snyder has removed the restrictions on building materials, and I think the provision of building materials is

proceeding with reasonable speed, although in my opinion the policies of the Office of Price Administration are retarding the growth of the building-material business. I do not believe price controls on basic building materials should be removed, but I do think that the present policies should be more liberal in order to encourage the construction of homes.

We have to meet the veterans' problem, and it is impossible to meet it. There is a certain amount of temporary housing which can be moved to the points where the veterans wish to have it, but I think the total number of such units is well under 100,000, and, as I have already stated, there will be a shortage of some 3,000,000 homes. The only thing to do is to stimulate in every way possible the construction of homes and to bring them within the financial means of those who wish to obtain them.

This bill provides a general reorganization of the housing agencies under a single National Housing Administrator. That proposal is a controversial one, but the committee has done one of the reorganization jobs which it is now proposed shall be delegated to the President. I think that would be unnecessary, if other committees would work as this committee has worked. I think the bill provides a sensible, logical consolidation of the Government's housing program in such a way that it can be coordinated under one head, yet leaving very substantial autonomy to the FHA, to the Federal home-loan banks, and to all other public housing authorities, so that each one will be able to conduct its own affairs, but under the general coordinating control of the National Housing Administrator.

The problem of housing is fundamentally one of cost. The need for public housing and the difficulty of providing decent housing and getting rid of the slums arise largely from the fact that today the cost of housing is such that a large number of people, a very large proportion of the population, is unable to pay, within their income, the rent which must be paid for new housing units, or to buy the houses if they wish to buy them. The great problem is to get the costs down, and I hope the ingenuity of the American people and of industry will result in bringing that about. We have tried to stimulate it.

One of the new things in the bill is an extension of the FHA to provide a special class of houses. The FHA Administrator is to determine, in each locality, the cheapest house that can reasonably be built, maintaining proper standards. When he determines that, the bill provides a special class of FHA insurance. It is provided that the FHA may insure mortgages up to 95 percent of the appraised value of the property, but not exceeding $5,000, running as long as 32 years, reducing the amortization charges, which are an important factor in rent, and that they may insure mortgages at not more than 4 percent, whereas today they usually do it at 4½ percent. The foreclosure provisions are somewhat easier; that is, the FHA insurance assumes some part of the burden of foreclosure, if that is necessary. The bill also includes a firm commitment to builders up to 85 percent of the total cost of the house. So there will be an incentive to builders to construct the cheapest type of house, instead of building the $10,000 or $12,000 house, which is somewhat easier to sell, and on which there is a larger profit per unit.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there a $5,000-a-house valuation limit at some point in the bill?

Mr. TAFT. The provision is that the special terms to which I have referred apply only to houses involving a mortgage loan of $5,000 or less. This would set the maximum cost of the house at $5,300. Of course, the ordinary FHA insurance covers houses costing $6,000, up to a 90 percent mortgage, and beyond that, over $6,000, up to an 80 percent mortgage. That seems to be adequate. We are trying here to write a special provision for the cheapest possible type of house, so as to give an incentive to private industry to build such houses, and to develop the art of building houses within the means of many millions of people.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I received a message this morning from the Governor of Michigan, who, speaking for himself and for the Michigan Planning Commission and the Michigan Housing Commission, asked the question whether the $5,000 limit may not be raised to $7,500, because in their opinion the purpose to be achieved by the bill which the able Senator defines cannot be adequately reached in our area except at the $7,500 ceiling. What would the Senator's comment be on that suggestion?

Mr. TAFT. I would wholly disagree with the Governor of Michigan. A $7,500 house can be built under the FHA perfectly well. It can be built with a mortgage of about 85 percent, which the FHA will insure. That should take care of any ordinary house of the $7,500 class.

The purpose is to develop cheap houses which people can rent and pay for. I suppose that today the incomes of 40 percent of the people of this country are such as to make it impossible for them to buy $7,500 houses. Such houses are beyond their means. They would have to pay for a $7,500 house an annual rental of approximately $750, which means that they would have to have incomes of about five times that amount, or at least $3,500 a year. So that the desire to build $7,500 houses is with the view of serving people with incomes of $3,500 a year. That is not the problem in this country. The problem is to build houses for people who have incomes of $2,000 or even $1,500. The terms we propose are probably not entirely sound. The Government is taking a greater chance, perhaps, than a straight insurance proposition, what the normal FHA character of contract would ordinarily provide. But we feel that it is important to develop this cheapest type of housing. The man with a $1,200-a-year income probably cannot be provided for except under public housing. We feel it is important to develop a type of housing which individuals in the $1,500- to $2,500-a-year class can buy.

So I should say that so far as this very special provision is concerned, this special inducement to builders to reach down into the low-cost housing is concerned, it should be limited to $5,000. In fact, we have provided that the FHA Administrator may make it lower in lower-cost places. For instance, Detroit is a high-cost place and the $5,000 limit would apply, but in Texas it may well be possible to build $3,500 or $4,000 houses, under which circumstances the Administrator is given power to say that he will apply the special provision in Texas only for $3,500 or $4,000 houses.

Mr. President, the bill contains also a general provision for the FHA insurance of mortgages to mutual associations where a large number of people set up a special project and undertake a mutual ownership of it. That also is new in this particular bill as against the other bill.

We have continued in the bill the yield insurance on rental housing.

We have also made some other provisions which ought to make it somewhat easier for people who wish to invest in rental housing to proceed to invest in that type of housing. Personally, I think that residential housing is an excellent investment for institutions and many others if it is properly guarded, if it is properly protected, and if proper costs are allowed for repairs for upkeep.

We have continued the urban redevelopment section and rewritten it, providing Federal assistance to any city which undertakes to accumulate land in slum areas and makes plans for the disposition of such land, not only for public housing but for private housing and for other purposes.

We have continued in effect the public housing provision which was in the original bill, which contemplates a public-housing program of 125,000 units a year for a period of 4 years. That is a direct subsidy.

I have heretofore explained why I think that under all the circumstances of the case some public-housing program is necessary; why I think it is the best method, and perhaps the only method, of reaching the very lowest income group in this country, and I think I have explained why I feel that we have an interest in seeing that there is provided for every family in this country at least a minimum shelter, of a decent character, which will enable the American family to develop.

Finally, I think we have provided that the existing permanent war housing may be transferred to a community at its request, or to local agencies within a community for additional low-cost housing.

Mr. President, I was very glad to be able to join in the bill with the Senator from New York and the Senator from Louisiana. In a bill of this length there are bound to be many details with which I do not agree, and some to which the

other two Senators do not agree. We propose to hold extensive hearings, as a result of which the bill may be modified; in fact I hope it will be, because I am sure that improvements can still be made in the program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. In the Committee on the District of Columbia there is pending a bill (S. 1152), which has been referred to me for drafting. That bill, in substance, makes it possible for a veteran who is a minor to borrow in the District and also makes it possible for building and loan associations to loan on housing. My question is: If the National Housing Act should be enacted, would supplementary legislation in the District and in the States be necessary, if in the District of Columbia and the States it was desired to go beyond the terms of the National Housing Act and make it easier for a veteran to borrow?

Mr. TAFT. That question has several different points. So far as public housing is concerned, the Federal Government undertakes no public housing. If any State wants public housing the initiative is with the State. It must pass the law. It must ask for the housing. So the District of Columbia, like a State, requires public housing legislation. The legislation may be different in any State. So far as loans to veterans are concerned, that is covered in the GI bill of rights, and under the general FHA law, and it requires no local legislation.

So far as building and loan associations are concerned, this general bill deals with the authority of Federal building and loan associations to make various loans on housing, liberalizing the present provisions of law so they may easily participate in this housing program. I think probably separate legislation is needed which deals directly with the authority of the District of Columbia building and loan associations. So that should be supplemental.

So far as the rights of GI's who are under 21 are concerned, I would suppose that was also a matter of the local law and would require local legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I regret I was necessarily absent and did not hear the speech made by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], nor have I heard the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] at any length, but as one who is vitally interested in the veterans' housing problem, including that phase of it which relates to educational institutions, may I make inquiry as to whether the bill under discussion incorporates the bill of the Senators from Oregon, S. 977, which was before the Senate for discussion the other afternoon in connection with the GI bill? I understood at that time that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] said he would have no objection to S. 977 being transferred to the Committee on Banking and Currency if title III were stricken from the bill. The Senators from Oregon gave assurance that title III would be stricken, in view of the provisions of the new GI bill as to increased cash allowances for rentals. However, I think it would be a great mistake to proceed to vote on any housing bill unless it encompasses also some relief to the veteran in need of housing at our institutions of higher learning.

My inquiry is whether the bill the Senator is discussing seeks to do anything about the housing problems at the universities?

Mr. TAFT. Not so far as I know. Of course, the Senator understands that, so far as the temporary housing is concerned, that is dealt with, I believe, in the present appropriation bill which is now under consideration in the Appropriations Committee making available the money to enable all the temporary housing to be transferred.

Insofar as the construction of housing at universities is concerned, I see no reason why it cannot be done under the general provisions of this particular bill. I went into that in connection with Yale University. I see no reason why under the FHA mortgage plan it is not possible for universities to build dormitories with FHA mortgages and receive all the benefits of the FHA provisions.

We have in the bill a provision as to public housing that there should be a priority for veterans. There is no such provision, I think, on FHA. But I do not think they would have any difficulty. However, I may say that there is no reason why the Senators' bill should not be considered at the hearings. Hearings are going to begin, I think, this week or perhaps next week. I think it will be very easy to deal with the veterans' situation at universities in this bill or in a separate bill, if the Senator desires.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio very much.

I should like to say, so long as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is on the floor, that I certainly hope the Finance Committee will transfer, without further delay, S. 977 to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I understand that that meets not only with the approval of the Senator from Colorado but also with the approval of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the committee. I would prefer to have it done that way rather than to submit a motion to discharge the committee because I think that S. 977, in view of the position taken by the Finance Committee on the new GI bill, ought to be transferred without further delay to the Committee on Banking and Currency, where it can be considered with all of the other housing bills.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Bridges	Chavez
Austin	Buck	Connally
Ball	Bushfield	Cordon
Barkley	Byrd	Donnell
Bilbo	Capper	Downey
Brewster	Carville	Eastland
Ellender	Lucas	Saltonstall
Ferguson	McClellan	Shipstead
Fulbright	McKellar	Smith
Green	McMahon	Stewart
Guffey	Magnuson	Taft
Gurney	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Hart	Millikin	Tunnell
Hatch	Mitchell	Tydings
Hawkes	Moore	Vandenberg
Hayden	Morse	Wagner
Hickenlooper	Murdock	Walsh
Hill	Myers	Wheeler
Hoey	O'Daniel	Wherry
Huffman	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Wilson
Kilgore	Radcliffe	Young
Knowland	Reed	
La Follette	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratification over the fact that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], acting for the Postwar Committee, has agreed with representatives of the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Banking and Currency on a revised housing bill which has been introduced today by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], on behalf of himself, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

I express my particular appreciation to the distinguished Senators who have worked on the bill. I know they have given great effort and much labor to it. I have not read all the details of the bill, but I know it provides a most comprehensive program for housing throughout the United States, a program which is very badly needed at this time.

Today in the great city of Birmingham, Ala., there is a fearful shortage of housing. Veterans returning from the battlefields are unable to find any kind of decent house or place in which to live and to which to bring their families to live. Not only will the bill meet the compelling need for additional homes, but it also will provide much employment.

I know with what earnestness the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] have worked on the bill. I am delighted, and I congratulate those Senators and the committees concerned.

BRITISH TRADE RESTRICTIONS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I desire to present for the RECORD a letter received by the Cedar Rapids Engineering Co., of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, from the Engineering & Manufacturing Co., Ltd., of Tel-Aviv, Palestine. Prior to the World War, the Cedar Rapids Engineering Co. had a world-wide business in engineering machinery. Previously I have placed in the RECORD a letter which I received from it, indicating its inability to sell to former csutomers who reside in British possessions, because of the fact that such firms are now required to purchase from British sources.

I ask that the letter from the Engineering & Manufacturing Co., Ltd., which apparently is a firm of engineering machinery brokers, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING CO., LTD.,
Tel-Aviv, October 2, 1945.

CEDAR RAPIDS ENGINEERING CO.,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

DEAR SIRS: We wish to acknowledge receipt of your circular letter of September 18, informing us that export restrictions on your equipment to this country have been relaxed.

Unfortunately the restrictions at our end have not been lifted and in fact at the moment although we have a considerable number of applications for your goods outstanding with the Palestine Government, none have been passed owing to the fact that the Government says that they are short of dollars and that we should order from suppliers in Great Britain.

We have endeavoured to obtain the assistance of the American Consulate, but we understand that they are not able to do anything. It is presumed that after the negotiations between the representatives of the British and American Governments have been concluded, the position may change. However, this is not yet known.

Yours faithfully,

ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING CO., LTD.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE SITUATION IN GERMANY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a few days ago I received, from Germany, a letter from a major who is a veteran of the last war. Today he is serving with the occupation forces in Germany. He is a man of very substantial discernment and of a very substantial position in my State. His observations are worthy of note because of the balance of his judgment and because he did not go into the Army with any attitude other than that of service to his country. In reading his letter I shall omit the salutation and the address, as well as several other references to his locality, because I should prefer not to identify him. I shall also omit certain words which might be denominated as strong language, and I shall designate them only as "blank." The substance of his letter is as follows:

I am one of about seven that are being left behind at HQ ———. The rest are going to ——— Berlin. I am trying to dodge that. Until the 15th we will continue to have our offices here——— then move over to the IG Farben building at Frankfurt. When I see these undamaged places—almost always owned by Farben or some other big company—I think of a statement of Arthur Kipgen, vice president of the Esch Steel Co., in Luxemburg. I asked how it happened that their plants were not damaged though they were turning out steel for the Germans. He merely stated that Mr. ——— was a good friend of his.

Because this is a statement of rumor, I shall not mention the name of the official which is set out in the letter, in view of the lack of proof.

The letter continues as follows:

Just what is our plan for the occupation of Germany, and toward Germany? I certainly got no inkling of it from Truman's 12 points. Our denazification policy is quite likely to make martyrs of these ———, and about all that we are doing is to put some of the Nazi principles into reverse, with other men in the drivers' seats. That may be a sort of justice, but it is not lessening the probability of the next war. Besides, I do not think that we fight wars to try to bring about individual justice. (I sure ——— did not come into this ——— thing because of any of the bunk ——— thought up.)

Why in the name of heaven can't we work out our definite foreign policy? I know that it is difficult, but back of our actions there should be a purpose. If the Nation does not have a national foreign policy, then our commercial interests will adopt one for us, without our knowing the terms. We just came through such a situation, and I think that Berg's book shows what part of it was.

If we are going to establish, extend, and develop our markets in other parts of the world as a national policy, then we should adopt a national policy to keep us out of trouble, or else get us into it. Those persons, businesses, and so forth, engaging in that development should do so with the definite understanding that we either are, or are not, going to use any national or governmental influence or pressure. We should have a policy under which loans are to be made both to countries in which such markets are to be developed, and as to such loans generally. It seems to me that the business of making Government loans to foreign nations and to businesses engaged in foreign activities is something that should receive some consideration and action. Should we not have some very definite policy in regard to such? But perhaps we do have and I just do not know what it is.

It is one thing to have a positive foreign policy and quite another one to have a negative one.

I just read Truman's 12 points the other night. Seems to me that the "donkey" is slipping a little. Wilson had 14 points. Someone must have just prepared that junk for the next campaign. But seriously, No. 1 seems silly. Why shouldn't we take what we need in the Pacific where we paid for it with blood? Why should we not maintain the advantage we have so dearly bought? If we do not keep it someone else will pick it up. No. 2 is either a slap at Russia, a warning of trouble ahead, or else we will have to back down right at the start—or engage in some international insincerity. As to No. 3—how are we to know that the changes are in accord with the wishes of the people—how about Esthonia. These DP's who fled to German slavery rather than be taken to Siberia—rather than live under the Russian system—would not certainly agree that the change was in accordance with the wishes of the Esthonian people. No. 4 sounds nice, but just what yardstick is to be used to determine when a people is prepared for self-government, and who is to be the judge?

While No. 5 may look good from our point of view, just why should we insist upon governments being democratic? Why cannot they choose the kind or type they want? While it is possibly true that a democratic nation is less likely to engage in aggression, how does this statement square with our leaving Hirohito in the saddle? How, too, are we to expect Russia to help in setting up a truly democratic form of government? Perhaps they have changed the definition of democratic government, but to me it is not possible to have what we think of as democratic government without individual rights of ownership of property.

What No. 8 means I have no idea—assuming that it means anything at all.

No. 9 seems to be a 1945 revision of the Monroe Doctrine. Possibly it was meant as a warning to Russia, but if so it was ill-advised, the timing was bad, and the taste that it has left is far from good. The ultimate reaction to that will probably be for Russia to say, "Well and good. We will say the same thing about Eurasia," or at least a large part of it.

No. 10. I seem to be a little hazy as to just what "economic collaboration" is, but if it has anything to do with at least a reasonably friendly exchange of economic goods and services, then we are not even practising it over here in Germany where several countries are just running their little empires in their own ways with almost no exchange of economic goods.

It may be that the whole 12 points were intended as a unit—and the hub of the thing was No. 12. But if so then we had best get down to some limitation and definition of this or we will remain where we are. I do not as yet feel ready to adopt the British idea of keeping garrisons all over the world, yet it seems that we are headed in that direction rather than in the direction of any international police force, in the conception we have generally had of that term. Perhaps it is just better to have us as the ward policemen in certain areas and England in others.

I have been interested in watching UNRRA. It is a marvel of disorganization. The teams that came in early and worked in the DP camps did a good job. They deserve credit. They were largely British, Dutch, and French. Now that a lot of the work has been done there seems to be a lot of confusion and not so much work being done. I really believe they are as Snafu as ECAD. They do not know how many teams they have or where they are. I live in the same house with the two head men of the public-health work. One is loaned from our Army.

My own work has been to get lands—

And so forth. Here I omit reading a statement because of identification—

and other lands controlled by the Army, and which are not needed by us for any purpose, back in production. Another part of my work has been to see how the land settlement and land consolidation agencies are functioning and what the set-up is in each part of the American zone.

I found that one of the extreme cases was in the Wiesbaden area where one owner held title to approximately 300 separate tracts which when consolidated into three fields of equivalent total area gave him the three fields together, the largest of them being about 20 acres.

They do this work on a Gemeinde basis, somewhat equivalent to a Township, and the process is very much desired by the owners. They find that it increases production from 20 to 30 percent. The cost formerly was paid largely by the German Government, but now it is set up so that the farmers themselves pay the cost. This is handled by an organization which is known in some parts of the country as "Feldbereinigung," and in other parts as the "Bauern Kultur Amt."

The other agency that I have been studying some is the land settlement agency "Bauern Siedlung." It is the same all over Germany and they have first option to buy up any land offered for sale. They then combine small tracts and sell them out to able operators. It is really quite a set-up. I have rather full details of these offices in most of the parts of the zone.

One thing that is rather interesting is that the demand over here is more for consolidation of land than for the splitting up of it. Of course most of the large estates were in the eastern part of Germany. There were some more in the area now held by the Russians between Hannover and the Elbe. The chief objective seems to be to get at least fields of 2 to 3 acres in size.

It is probably most fortunate for Germany that they are largely in the oxen stage of farming, as the ox or cow can serve for two or possibly eventually three purposes.

I wish you had time to come over here and have time to get out and see not only the extent of damage that has been done to German economy, but also the conditions that will exist by the time a few months roll

around. It is not that I am sorry for them. I am just ashamed that we are doing and permitting some of the things we are doing and permitting.

Had been hoping to be home by Xmas, but that hope seems to be slipping. At least I am all of the time, every time they send around a card, saying that I want out now. So far I do not seem to have received favorable consideration for that purpose.

Just heard that they are contemplating the building of a lot of army barracks here to house our troops. Why we should do that is beyond me unless they think they should replace those we destroyed in order that Germany may not be inconvenienced if she wants to train for WW III. If the DP's are disposed of there will be plenty of Kasernen. Something should be done for the poor Baltics. There are a lot of well educated, English speaking, talented Baltics that we could well take in our country rather than a lot of others that have gone there in the past few years.

I shall not read the last two paragraphs of the letter because they are personal in nature.

Most sincerely yours.

I have read the letter, Mr. President, because of my personal acquaintance with the writer and because he is a skilled observer and a man of high integrity. By his letter it is evident that he is a man whose experiences up until the present time have caused him to become very caustic indeed about many of the policies which he sees being pursued in our occupation of Germany.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], proposed as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], as modified, inserting certain language in lieu of section 4 (a).

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as indicated by the announcement of the Chair, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has offered a substitute for the amendment I have offered to section 4 (a) of Senate bill 1120, a measure providing for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

I rise to oppose the substitute which the Senator from Virginia has offered. I am deeply conscious of the importance of the subject matter the consideration of which we are to resume this afternoon. I am conscious, first, of the importance of the reorganization of the agencies of the National Government. I read with interest and with full concurrence the statement in the report of the Committee on the Judiciary that—

A reorganization of the executive branch is more imperative today than ever if we are to put this vast structure on a modern and workable basis and effect economy, efficiency, and simplification in its administration.

Mr. President, I also realize that far beyond the importance of this particular measure and far beyond the importance of the question of the reorganization of the agencies of the National Government is the importance of the fundamental principles which are involved in this discussion, principles which go to the very foundation of the theory of government on which the United States of America exists today. I note that in the case of Panama Refining Co. against Ryan, which has previously been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Utah, who already has so courteously and efficiently discussed the various phases of this bill, the Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through the tongue of one of the great jurists of our Nation, former Chief Justice Hughes, then said regarding the question before the court:

The question is not of the intrinsic importance of the particular statute before us, but of the constitutional processes of legislation which are an essential part of our system of government.

Today, Mr. President, in this discussion in the Senate of the United States we are confronted with a bill which is intrinsically important because of its subject matter, namely, the reorganization of the agencies of the National Government. I adopt the language of the Supreme Court which I have recited when I say that the pending measure, together with the amendments which have been proposed to it, refers to "constitutional processes of legislation which are an essential part of our system of government."

This afternoon I shall discuss the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. In connection with it I shall discuss the bill itself, insofar as it relates to the portion covered by the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. In connection with both of them, I shall discuss the amendment I have offered, for the three must be considered together in order to determine the proper course of procedure to be adopted by the Senate regarding what I believe to be an exceedingly important and momentous question.

I digress to pay a word of tribute to the Senator from Virginia, who not only has served his own State as its chief executive with distinction and honor to himself, and satisfaction to the people of his State, but who likewise, by his singular and outstanding devotion to matters affecting the reorganization, the efficiency and the economy of our government, has become known from one end of the Nation to the other. Consequently, it is with some feeling of trepidation that I undertake to oppose the views which are expressed by so able, so distinguished, and so outstanding a member of the Senate as the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Virginia. Yet, Mr. President, to my mind the issues here are so clear and so unmistakable that there devolves upon someone the duty of stating them, analyzing them, and presenting the point of view which I shall present this afternoon.

Both my amendment and the Byrd substitute relate to section 4 (a) of the committee amendment, which is now pending before the Senate. Therefore, let us examine the substance of section 4 (a) of the committee amendment, let us examine my amendment, and let us examine the Byrd substitute for my amendment.

Section 4 (a) of the committee amendment follows a section which provides when the President shall prepare a reorganization plan. It further provides that he shall transmit such plan to the Congress of the United States. I am speaking now of section 4 (a) in the committee amendment itself, the measure to which both the amendment of the Senator from Virginia and the amendment which I have submitted apply. Section 4 (a) of the committee amendment then provides, in substance, that the reorganization specified in the plan which the President submits to the Congress shall take effect unless either House of Congress adopts a resolution stating that it does not favor the plan. Mr. President, that is the section of the committee amendment to which both the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia and the amendment I have offered are opposed. The amendment which I have submitted provides—and I quote from my own amendment in advance of that of the distinguished Senator from Virginia because of the fact that his is offered as a substitute for mine, and in the logical sequence, therefore, mine should first be brought to the attention of the Senate:

No such reorganization plan submitted by the President to the Congress of the United States shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving the plan.

That means that both Houses of Congress shall first affirmatively approve the plan; and then, under my amendment, the President, after the approval of Congress has been given, shall sign the joint resolution before the plan shall take effect.

So, Mr. President, up to this point we have the committee amendment—the bill itself—to which these amendments apply, and which provides that the reorganization specified in the President's plan shall take effect unless either House of Congress adopts a resolution that such House does not favor the plan; and then we have the contrary amendment, the one which I have submitted, providing that no such plan shall take effect until there shall have been enacted a joint resolution which will require the action of both Houses of Congress and the signature of the President approving the plan.

We have before us also the Byrd substitute which provides, in substance, that the reorganization plan submitted by the President shall take effect unless both Houses of Congress adopt a concurrent resolution that Congress does not favor the reorganization.

So there have been presented three proposals, namely, the committee amendment itself which provides, as I have indicated, that after the time specified in the amendment has expired, the plan shall take effect if in the meantime Congress has done nothing; the amendment submitted by me, which provides that after the plan comes before the Congress it shall not take effect until there

has been enacted a joint resolution approving the plan; and the Byrd substitute which provides that the reorganization plan shall become operative or effective unless both Houses of Congress shall adopt a concurrent resolution that Congress does not favor the reorganization.

The Senator from Virginia has frankly stated that he has changed his position since 1939 when there was enacted a statute with respect to reorganization. Mr. President, I am not criticising the distinguished Senator from Virginia, because he has a perfect right to change his views. When a man frankly, honestly, and courageously stands on the floor of the Senate and announces without equivocation his change in view, I undertake to say that no one is justified in attacking him solely because of his change of opinion. I do assert, however, Mr. President, that at this time when an issue of such significance is before us, one which goes to the very foundation of our Government and of our Nation, we are entitled to examine with care the reasons which now animate the Senator from Virginia, and the reasons upon which he based his judgment, contrary to that of today, back in 1939.

Last Friday the Senator From Virginia spoke as follows:

I wish to state at the opening of my remarks that I have changed my position on this question, and I wish to give my reasons for doing so. When the last reorganization bill was before the Congress in 1939 I voted for an amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] which was similar to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], providing that no reorganization plan could be made effective as recommended by the President unless affirmative action were first taken by both branches of Congress.

I may add, Mr. President, that in 1939 the Senator from Virginia showed the sincerity of the position which he then took by voting not only once but twice for the Wheeler amendment, first upon the original consideration of the amendment, and again upon its reconsideration.

On Friday last the Senator from Virginia proceeded with regard to his reasons for changing his position since 1939, as follows:

My reasons for changing my position on this question are these: Present conditions are vastly different from those existing in 1939. Today there are nearly four times as many Federal employees as there were in 1939.

He continued as follows:

I believe there are nearly four times as many bureaus, departments, and agencies of the Government as there were in 1939.

He then said:

I am convinced, after 12 years of study of the subject of reorganization, that the only way to get a worth-while honest-to-goodness reorganization is to abolish bureaus and agencies of the Government and reduce the number of personnel wherever possible, rather than to shift one bureau to another.

Continuing, the Senator from Virginia said:

I think the only way to accomplish that is to give the President the power to do it, after exempting the quasi judicial agencies of the Government.

In continuing, the Senator said:

Give him—

That is, the President—

the power to reorganize the executive branches of the Government, subject, of course, to the right of Congress to reject any plan by concurrent resolution adopted by both branches.

I pause, Mr. President, to invite attention to the fact that although the distinguished Senator from Virginia refers to a period of 12 years of study on his part of the subject of reorganization, when the bill of 1939 was before the Senate he had already devoted 6 years of study to the same problem. His conclusion as expressed to the Senate at that time was diametrically opposite to that which he expresses today.

It will be observed with what emphasis the Senator from Virginia referred to the changed conditions as expressed in his remarks last Friday. It is of interest to note also that in those remarks he further emphasized a change in conditions, as follows:

Not only—

Said the Senator from Virginia—

has the position of the Senator from Virginia changed but conditions have changed. We have a far more difficult question of reorganization now than we had in 1939. We have four times as many employees now as we had then, and we now have seven or eight times as many bureaus as we had in 1939.

The Senator from Virginia further stated that the Federal Government has in this country 3,000,000 employees, each of whom, in the opinion of the Senator from Virginia, can control two or three votes.

Continuing, the Senator said:

So we have a vast voting army of seven or eight or nine million votes which can be cast one way or the other to protect existing jobs.

The Senator stated further as follows:

The Government bureaus have enormous power. They have the power of political life and death over Members of the House and Senate. They can deny a Member of Congress things in his district and defeat him and do the same thing in case of a Senator. They cannot do that with the President of the United States.

I pause in order to comment upon the fact that if it be true—and from the Senator's statement I have no doubt it is—that the Federal Government has 3,000,000 employees located in this country, and if it also be true that they constitute a vast voting army with seven or eight or nine million votes which can be cast one way or the other to protect existing jobs, there is no reason why those votes could not, in certain circumstances, all be cast against the President of the United States as well as against the Members of Congress. It is true, of course, that there may be instances in which the votes would be cast only against the Members of Congress and not against the President of the United States; but with a vast voting army of eight or nine million votes, I undertake to say that it is not entirely accurate to state, as did the Senator from Virginia last Friday, that these bureaus cannot defeat the President of the United States just as they can defeat the Members of Congress.

The Senator from Virginia stated further as follows:

It is a realistic question that confronts us.

Mr. President, I conclude my analysis of the reasons stated in the Senator's own language, with the very significant interrogation made by the distinguished Senator who sat for a while in the chair as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL]. He interrogated the Senator from Virginia as follows:

As I understand the Senator from Virginia, what he is asking for has a greater chance of success.

To this observation the Senator from Virginia replied:

I am advocating it for that reason. I think that is the only way to obtain an effective reorganization of the Government.

I have quoted rather extensively from the remarks made by the Senator from Virginia last Friday. I believe I have given to the Senate a substantially correct synopsis of the mental processes as stated by the Senator himself on the floor of the Senate which caused him to change his position diametrically this year from what it was 6 years ago. From the remarks made by the Senator from Virginia and quoted today, it is obvious that in changing his position from what it was in 1939 he was moved first by his belief in the great need for a reorganization, a belief, Mr. President, which I share with him, and without the benefit of the vast fund of knowledge which he possesses. I take it upon the very facts he has given us, and the facts which from current knowledge we all know of, that there is great need for reorganization. He is moved by that belief.

In the second place, he is moved by his view that the vast increase in the number of Federal employees since 1939 has caused an important change in conditions. Then he is moved by his belief that if under present conditions there be left to Congress the responsibility of providing for reorganization by legislation, reorganization will not occur. Indeed, the Senator from Virginia indicates a feeling of desperation as a major contributing cause toward his change of position. Said he on last Friday:

I have changed my position. I may be called inconsistent; but I am doing it in the desperate hope that there may be some way to accomplish a reorganization of the Government, the vast bureaucracy of which, I think, imperils the very foundations of our democracy.

Added to these remarks of the distinguished Senator is his belief, as indicated in his statement, that President Truman desires to effect a reorganization of the Government, and it is the view of the Senator that President Truman is far more economy-minded than was the late President Roosevelt, and is far more desirous of economizing and bringing about efficiency in the administration of the Government that was the late President

Roosevelt. So the Senator from Virginia concludes—and I quote his language of Friday last—

The only way to reorganize the Government is to give the power of reorganization to the President and then depend upon him to accomplish it, and hold him to a strict accountability.

I digress for the moment to point out that the Senator does not explain how, under either the committee amendment or the Byrd substitute. The President would be held to the strict accountability to which he refers.

In 1939 there was enacted a reorganization bill which, as the Senator from Virginia said last Friday, required the passage of a concurrent resolution of rejection in order to make inoperative any plan which the President might submit. The Senator correctly says that his substitute amendment of the present time is practically identical with the 1939 bill.

The Senator from Virginia opposed the 1939 bill, which is the same as his pending amendment. In 1939 the Senate bill which was proposed, and the Wheeler amendment which was proposed, were the same, in effect, as the amendment which I have offered to Senate bill 1120, and the Senator from Virginia favored the Senate bill in 1939 and the Wheeler amendment that year. His position in 1939 was, as I understand from the report which he himself submitted to this body from the Special Committee to Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government, based on what he considered underlying and fundamental principles.

I call attention to the fact this afternoon that the Senator from Virginia does not now base his present change of position on the ground that the principles which in 1939 he supported and regarded as fundamental were wrong. He makes no contention to that effect. He is basing his change of position mainly, if not entirely, on the fact that by the adoption of his substitute, thereby leaving the matter to the President with only a negative power of disapproval retained by Congress, there is a greater probability of obtaining reorganization than if my amendment were adopted.

At no point in the Senator's argument does he assert or imply, even remotely, that the principles upon which he acted in 1939 and which are the principles on which my amendment is based are unsound.

Mr. President, let me quote one of the principles upon which was based the report presented by the Senator from Virginia in 1939 in opposition to the plan which he now advocates, and in advocacy of the plan which my amendment advocates. He said:

The Senate committee submits that as a fundamental principle of government, Congress should retain the right of direct and affirmative vote upon changes of functions or policies of government and other vast potential powers which may in effect be exercised by the Executive under this proposed legislation.

This retention of the right of direct and affirmative vote is what the amendment which I have offered provides and makes obligatory and is what the Byrd substitute now offered to the Senate omits.

Let me read further what the Senator reported to the Senate in 1939 with respect to the House bill, which is the plan which his substitute amendment now prescribes. I call attention to page 4 of the report which he presented, This is the report presented by the distinguished Senator from Virginia on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the Executive Agencies of Government, which was ordered to be printed on March 6, 1939. I read:

The House bill provides a negative, unorthodox, and unprecedented procedure with drastic regulation of debate. Under the terms of the House bill, a reorganization plan submitted by the President becomes operative if Congress does not act.

That is exactly what happens under the substitute which he now presents and urges the Senate to adopt.

Let me read further what the Senator from Virginia said in 1939 in opposition to the proposal which he now advocates in his substitute amendment, report No. 142, page 4:

Attention is further called to the fact that under the House bill authority is given the President to recommend changes, amendments, alterations, or abolition of governmental functions as well as the administrative machinery necessary for performance of such functions.

I ask Senators to listen closely to the next sentence of the report presented by the Senator from Virginia in 1939. It reads:

Under the House proposal, these recommendations might become effective without as much as a vote in Congress.

That is the situation, Mr. President, with respect to the amendment which he now offers and with respect to the committee amendment. It is not, however, the situation which would apply under the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] in 1939 or under the amendment which I have offered in 1945.

Then I call attention to the further language of the report presented by the Senator from Virginia in 1939, page 4:

Functions of government are the policies of government adopted by the Congress. Without making an issue as to the propriety of abolition or amendment of functions of government in this manner, it is obvious—

Continues the report presented in 1939 by the Senator from Virginia—

It is obvious that the importance of such a delegation of authority to the President is so important that Congress should at least act affirmatively and directly, as contrasted with the negative procedure and drastic debate limitations set forth in the House bill.

Let me read to the Senate what the Senator from Virginia said in 1939 in favor of the Senate committee bill of 1939, which is the same in substance as my amendment of today, and which he then favored and which he is now opposing. Said the Senator from Virginia:

The Senate committee method is simple and direct.

And by the way, the section is even headed in what I consider to be capital letters: "Simple and direct method"; that is the Senate committee method which he then favored and which he now opposes.

Later in the same section of his report the Senator from Virginia said in 1939:

Congress is anxious—

He had learned of this, of course, from his 6 years of work and efforts, as had we all, to some extent—

Congress is anxious for reorganization for economy, simplicity, and efficiency. The people of America are demanding it. The Senate committee bill—

That is the same as my amendment of today, Mr. President—

The Senate committee bill—

Said the Senator from Virginia in 1939—

provides—

What?—

provides a more expeditious way to achieve it.

There is no contention made there that the method which I have proposed would be a dilatory one. There is no contention there made, such as was made last week by the Senator from New Mexico, that my amendment or the Senate committee bill of those days, which was the same as mine, would kill reorganization. Indeed, the Senator from Virginia, after 6 years of study of this question of reorganization of governmental agencies, said in 1939 of the very bill which is the same as my amendment:

It provides a more expeditious way to achieve it.

By the term "it" is meant the reorganization as used in the preceding sentence. And then he said:

At the same time, it—

That is the Senate committee bill which he then favored and now opposes—

At the same time, it—

The same as the amendment presented by me, Mr. President—

protects well-considered and wise proposals, ase well as the rights of the representatives of the people to voice their approval or objections to changes in Government which may be of vast importance.

And then referring to reorganization, the Senator from Virginia said in his report of 1939 to the Senate—and this was not after a few weeks or days of study, it was after 6 years of study of reorganization and of efficiency and economy in government:

Responsibility for it—

That is to say, for reorganization—

lies—

With whom?—

lies jointly with the legislative and executive branches, because primarily it is the duty of the legislative branch to formulate the policies and prescribe the functions given to the executive branch for administration.

And then he continued with these significant sentences in his report of 1939:

However, it must be a precaution of first consideration—

Not a matter of subsidiary importance, but a precaution of first consideration, he said—

in any reorganization that delegation of power at best is a wedge into our form of government of great potential danger. Any new delegation of power—

Said he—

must be explicitly defined and safely curbed.

Mr. President, if we search Senate bill 1120, the committee amendment, and if we search the amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia, with the highest powered magnifying glass known to science, we will find no explicit definition or safe curb to which the Senator from Virginia referred as an essential in his report of 1939.

Mr. President, I know of no reason why principles—and I emphasize the word "principles," not "expediency," but "principles—I know of no reason why principles which were so salutary, so wholesome, so simple, so direct, so deserving of capitalization even as to one of them in the report of the committee, and so fundamental, as stated in the report presented by the Senator from Virginia in 1939, should in 1945 be abandoned, especially in view of the fact that no criticism whatever of these principles is made by the Senator from Virginia or by any other Senator who has spoken upon the floor; the only reason for their abandonment being, to quote again in substance the Senator from Virginia, that (a) we now have four times as many employees as we had in 1939 and (b) we have a different man as President.

Mr. President, laws of one type should not be made for one President and laws of another type for another President. There sits in the chair at this moment an esteemed friend of mine of a different political faith but whom I have known as the Governor of his State, the State of Nevada. I dare say that at no time did he recommend to the legislature of his State that a different series of laws should be enacted and made applicable to the time when he was governor than would be made applicable to the time when someone else was governor merely because of a change in personnel. I recall as does he that Chief Justice Marshall said:

The Government of the United States has been emphatically termed a Government of law, and not of men.

I dare say the decisions of the courts from one end of this land to the other—and I recall the significant and important decisions of the Supreme Court of my own State of Missouri—have emphasized and reemphasized the statement made by that man, intellectual giant as he was, Chief Justice Marshall.

There is in this very building a historic spot, from which that grand man, Samuel B. Morse, from whose family, at least collaterally, perhaps directly, I do not know, the distinguished Senator from Oregon who sits here this afternoon may come, at the place where the Senate Law Library is now located, more than a century ago, sent over the telegraph from here to Baltimore the message, "What has God wrought?"

And this man Marshall, man of great dignity and distinction and integrity of purpose and knowledge and discernment of the law, this man sat in these very surroundings upon that court which has laid down these salutary and fundamental principles of government.

I assert, Mr. President, that we have not yet arrived at the point where we in the Senate should undertake to pass one type of law applicable to President Roosevelt and another type of law applicable to President Truman. There may be those who prefer one man or the other; but, after all, the remarks of Chief Justice Marshall are still true and sound. The mere increase in number of employees of the Government does not justify us in abandoning principles which, as the Senator from Virginia pointed out in 1939, were wholesome and fundamental, unless in the meantime those principles have been found to be fallacious. I assert that the same principles of government are as sound in the days of Harry S. Truman as President, and with an increased number of employees in the Government, as in the days when Franklin D. Roosevelt was President and we had a smaller number of employees in the Government. I undertake to say this afternoon that it is unwise and improper to allow expediency—or "realism," as some term it—to supersede principles of unquestioned merit and excellence.

What about the committee amendment and the Byrd amendment? What is it that they do? I have hitherto stated to the Senate that the committee amendment to Senate bill 1120 delegates legislative power. I do not ask the Senate to rely solely on my conclusion to that effect. We have a Judiciary Committee of the Senate, which at the time of the report on Senate bill 1120, October 18, 1945, consisted of 17 lawyers from among the membership of the Senate. They represent not much less than one-fifth of the entire membership of this body. I again call the attention of the Senate to the fact that not merely do I say that the committee amendment delegates legislative power but that this great body of lawyers, in their report, to which no member filed a dissent, repeatedly say that the bill, by which the committee means the committee amendment, delegates legislative power. Let me remind the Senate of the language used by the Judiciary Committee. On page 3 of the report we find the following:

In an effort to achieve the practical objectives of reorganization of the executive branch, this bill provides that part of the legislative power of the Congress shall be delegated to the President, and that the action of the President, taken in the exercise of the legislative power so delegated, shall be the law of the land unless it be set aside by a resolution passed by a majority vote of either House.

Let me read again the next sentence from the report:

Such a delegation of legislative power does not operate to deprive either House of the Congress of its constitutional right to have no change made in the law relating to organization of the Government without the assent of at least a majority of its Members present and voting.

Again, the committee of 17 distinguished lawyers, Members of the Senate, distinctly used the language "a delegation of legislative power" in the sentence which I have just read.

Let me read another observation from the report of the Judiciary Committee. I pass to the next page, page 4, where we find the following:

It seems apparent that the President will make large use of the Bureau of the Budget in exercising the legislative power respecting reorganization which this bill delegates to him.

As I cast my eye farther down the page I find the following:

In delegating certain legislative power to the President, this bill exempts from the exercise of such power the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General and certain independent regulatory agencies.

The Senator from Virginia himself has explained his own view with respect to whether or not the proposed delegation of power would be a delegation of legislative power. Please note the following colloquy between him and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who listens intently as I speak this afternoon. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday:

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, does the Senator take the position that the proposed delegation of power would be a delegation of legislative power or executive power? Are we delegating legislative power? It seems to me that is the whole question.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] says what he thinks of it in seven words:

Mr. BYRD. It seems to me that we are.

Remember, the question was, "Are we delegating legislative power?" I have quoted the question and the answer.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia asks us to support the amendment, and he himself concedes that it seems to him that we are delegating legislative power.

After the foregoing observation the Senator from New Jersey said:

That is what troubles me with the Senator's argument.

Then the Senator from Virginia made this amazing statement:

Mr. BYRD. Many times we have delegated legislative power. I would say that more than half of the bureaus shown on the chart on the wall were established by Executive order.

He pointed to the charts which are still on the wall, under the clock.

They were not established by Congress. It has been done time and time again—

This is the significant part—

and will be done time and time again in the future. I want it done in such a way that it will be of some benefit to the country by reducing bureaus and agencies, instead of giving the President power, as all Presidents have been given power in the past, to create new agencies and bureaus.

So, Mr. President, this afternoon we find the distinguished Senator from Virginia not only conceding that it seems to him that we are delegating legislative power, but undertaking to say that we have many times before delegated it, and prophesying that it will be done time and time again in the future. I am afraid that his prophecy has the germ of truth in it if we establish the precedent which he asks us to establish.

Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary declares that the bill delegates

legislative power to the President. It reiterates that statement three times after its original declaration. The Senator from Virginia tells us, after 12 years of experience, that it seems to him that we are delegating legislative power. The Senator from Virginia has served in the executive capacity of governor of a State, and he should be able to tell something about whether a power is legislative or executive. Not only does the Committee on the Judiciary make this declaration, and not ony does the Senator from Virginia himself state what I have quoted to the Senate as his belief, but, more important, perhaps, than either of those statements is the fact that the bill itself affirmatively shows that we are delegating legislative power to the President. I said that perhaps that was more important. I withdraw the word "perhaps" for notwithstanding what is said, the bill itself governs. An examination of the bill affirmatively shows that we are delegating, or trying to delegate, legislative power to the President. Why do I say that? It requires no profound technical study to understand why.

The reason why the committee amendment delegates legislative power is simple and clear, and I doubt not that every person in the gallery who may examine the bill can understand the proposition which I advance here this afternoon. The reason why the committee amendment delegates legislative power is that the committee amendment permits law to be made by the President of the United States.

Under the bill, the President is to prepare a plan and transmit it to Congress. There is nothing out of the way in that. I have no objection to having the President prepare any plan he wishes to prepare and transmit it to Congress. I have no objection to having the President make a recommendation, as it is his constitutional duty to do, in respect to matters involving the general welfare of the Nation. The President is doing nothing wrong in preparing and transmitting such a plan. But what happens then, under the committee amendment and under the amendment of the Senator from Virginia? If the Congress does nothing, the plan of the President will become law. Congress will not have legislated. No Member of Congress need cast a vote. No Member of Congress need bestow a thought upon the plan. No Member of Congress need remain awake in his seat within these historical Halls in order for the plan to become law. If Congress sits in quietness and slumber, the plan will become law. In that event, Congress will not have legislated; the President will have legislated. Mr. President, the committee amendment clearly delegates legislative power. The Committee on the Judiciary and the Senator from Virginia are correct in their opinion that it does delegate legislative power to the President.

We have had some very interesting history upon this matter of reorganization. This afternoon I have referred to something which transpired in 1939 when a reorganization bill was before the Congress and was passed. The debate on that historic occasion, Mr. President, well merits the study of every man who raised his hand, as did I, and solemnly bound himself in accordance with the Constitution to follow the mandates of the Constitution. In the debate in 1939 the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], speaking on March 20, 1939, as shown at page 2966 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I hold in my hand, said the following:

> Mr. President, I do not want to continue an argument when the Senator takes the position that in parliamentary government under our Constitution laws can be passed by negation. I just cannot follow that philosophy at all. It is absolutely contrary to every teaching I have ever heard or read of, and consequently, if that is the philosophy of the Senator from Florida I cannot agree with him.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate this afternoon to the fact that the committee amendment and the Byrd amendment are identical in this respect. Each of them would permit a new law to be made effective and in full force without having the Congress give a moment's thought or take any action regarding the plan which would thus become law—a plan which perhaps would obliterate and annul legislation passed by the Congress over the period of a century. The only difference of any consequence between the committee amendment and the Byrd amendment is that under the Byrd amendment it would be more difficult to prevent the President's plan from becoming law than it would be under the committee amendment, for under the Byrd amendment the disapproval of both Houses is required in order to prevent the plan from becoming law, while the committee amendment requires the disapproval by only one House in order to prevent the plan from becoming law. Under either the committee amendment or the Byrd amendment, if Congress does nothing, goes to sleep, or goes home, the plan will become the law.

The additional difficulty which the Byrd amendment interposes in the way of those who might seek to prevent the President's plan from becoming law is strikingly illustrated by the fact that under the Byrd amendment, even if one House votes overwhelmingly to disapprove the President's reorganization plan, the plan will, nevertheless, be in full force and effect unless more than one-half of those voting in the other House of Congress shall vote to disapprove the President's plan. Mr. President, the Constitution intends that legislation shall be created only by having both Houses of Congress concur. If the Senate passes a bill which does not receive the approval of the House of Representatives, the bill will not become law. Section 1 of article I of that great document, the Constitution, provides that—

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

We do not have a unicameral arrangement under which the Senate alone can pass laws and the House of Representatives alone can pass laws. The Constitution requires the taking of favorable action by both Houses of Congress if legislation is to be enacted. Section 7 of article I of the Constitution, in referring to the necessity for the presentation of a bill to the President of the United States for his signature before it shall become a law, describes such bills in the following language:

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Only last month, Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee, composed of 17 lawyers, said on page 3 of its report that—

> The basic legislative power, under the Constitution, is vested in the two Houses of the Congress. No new law can be passed, nor any existing law amended or repealed, without the assent of a majority in each of the two Houses.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to have the Senator make a point perfectly clear. As I understand, under the Byrd amendment, if the President proposes a reorganization plan and if one House of Congress disapproves the plan, but if the other House of Congress approves it, nevertheless the plan will be law.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. That is to say, under this delegation of legislative power it would be easier for the President to pass his legislation than it would be for a Member of this body to get one of his own bills passed.

Mr. DONNELL. Decidedly so.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking in terms of realism, which some of the proponents of the bill have mentioned on the floor of the Senate, I see some very great political dangers in the Byrd amendment. I am inclined to think that if the present political trends continue, it is quite possible that the Senator's party and my party may be in control of the House of Representatives in 1946.

Mr. DONNELL. That is a consummation devoutly to be desired.

Mr. MORSE. I agree. Therefore, under the Byrd amendment it would still be possible, with the approval of one House of Congress, to secure the passage of legislation to which a branch of the Congress controlled by the opposition party might be overwhelmingly opposed.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish to say that I think the Senator is raising a very fundamental question as to whether Congress is going to exercise its constitutional obligation of passing all legislation which is to be binding upon the American people, or whether the Congress is to abdicate that function to the President. I believe that once the people understand the principle which is involved, they will answer that question, both in 1946 and in 1948 in favor of the position taken by the able Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon, who with his characteristic clarity of thought has so intelligently and accurately analyzed the problem before us.

Mr. President, I have referred to the discussion which occurred in 1939 upon the Wheeler amendment. I find that on March 20, 1939, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] spoke on this subject as follows—and I read from page 2965 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Before legislation becomes effective under our Constitution, both branches must affirmatively approve it. It is not possible to legislate by negative vote under the Constitution of the United States.

However, Mr. President, in the event that Congress elects to give any consideration to a plan of reorganization which the President may transmit to it, instead of having the Congress sleep or remain in idleness or go home and thus allow the measure to become effective by inaction, as the Congress could do under the bill, the Byrd amendment would permit the President's plan to remain effective as law if there were mustered in favor of his plan as many as half of those voting in one House, even though the other House voted overwhelmingly against the President's plan.

Indeed the Byrd amendment not only would permit—as would the committee amendment—the President to legislate if Congress did nothing, but on the other hand if Congress decided to vote on a plan submitted by the President, the Byrd amendment would permit the President's plan to become effective as law if one House approved and one House failed to approve the plan.

Mr. President, the committee amendment and the Byrd amendment clearly delegate legislative power. Moreover, the Byrd amendment makes it more difficult to prevent the President's plan from becoming law than does the committee amendment. Even though we all realize the intrinsic importance of reorganization, I can well understand the mental process of Chief Justice Hughes when he enunciated the sentence to which I referred earlier in the afternoon in connection with the Panama Refining case. He said:

The question is not the intrinsic importance of the particular statute before us, but of the constitutional processes of legislation which are an essential part of our system of government.

Mr. President, while I am referring to the Panama Refining case I wish to invite attention to one sentence of the decision in that case at page 421. After speaking of what we lawyers have understood that Congress had a right to do with respect to adapting legislation to complex conditions involving a host of ills, the Court said, through the lips of Chief Justice Hughes:

But the constant recognition of the necessity and validity of such provisions, and the wide range of administrative authority which has been developed by means of them, cannot be allowed to obscure the limitations of the authority to delegate if our constitutional system is to be maintained.

What Senator would rise on this floor today and undertake to say that our constitutional system should not be maintained?

Mr. President, I have said that the committee amendment and the Byrd amendment merely delegate legislative power. I submit as the next proposition that there is no right or power in Congress to delegate legislative power. So far I have discussed only the fact that it does, by the committee amendment and by the Byrd amendment, try to delegate legislative power. What about the right to do so? What power does Congress have to do so? First, what does the Constitution say touching the right of Congress to delegate legislative power to the President or to anyone eles? Let us figuratively call to the witness stand this afternoon the framers of the Constitution of the United States who sat in convention a century and a half ago and drafted that immortal document? I have already quoted section 1, of article I, which reads:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Were those venerable figures of history to be produced upon the witness stand this afternoon, is there a Senator who would undertake to question that they would agree together that the Congress cannot delegate legislative power? Nowhere does the Constitution, either expressly or impliedly, grant to Congress the power to delegate to anyone—the President or anyone else—legislative powers. The absence of such grant is conclusive to the effect that Congress may not legally delegate any of its legislative power.

In *Dorr* v. *United States* (195 U. S. 138, at p. 140), the Supreme Court of the United States said as follows:

It may be regarded as settled that the Constitution of the United States is the only source of power authorizing action by any branch of the Federal Government.

And so the witnesses upon the stand this afternoon, members of the Constitutional Convention who framed the Constitution of the United States, undertook to say by their solemn declaration in that document, and affirm the fact that Congress has no power, no matter how much it may wish to do so, to delegate legislative power.

Let us produce a few more witnesses. What have Members of the Senate of the United States said concerning the question as to whether Congress has the right to delegate legislative power? Allow me to read a few sentences from remarks made by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] in this body on March 20, 1939.

Legislation delegating legislative powers to the President is unconstitutional. And that is what we are doing—delegating to the executive branch of the Government the power to abolish functions of office and repeal laws, and then say that if one branch of the Congress approves the President's action and the other branch does not, it shall become the law. What lawyer upon the floor of the Senate will rise in his place and say that that would be constitutional?

Later on the same day the senior Senator from Montana said with regard to the proposed legislation:

I submit that it is unconstitutional and is contrary to every fundamental principle of American government.

There is a distinguished Member of this body, who, I am sorry, is not present in the Chamber today, whose words all other Members of the Senate listen to with attention and respect. I refer to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], strong, vigorous, powerful, experienced, and conservative. On the same day, March 20, 1939, on which the senior Senator from Montana spoke, the senior Senator from Georgia also spoke. I can picture the distinguished Senator as he rose and said with chasteness and dignity of diction:

There is no support for the contention that Congress may delegate legislative power. It may not do so. The single test of the validity of the act of Congress, when that question is involved, is whether Congress has undertaken to delegate legislative power, or merely the power to apply the legislative formula that may at least theoretically be exactly applied.

A little later the Senator from Georgia said:

But it is a confused statement to say that the Congress may delegate legislative power. It may not do so.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it may be noted that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia demonstrated, which he need not have done for we all recognize it, his integrity of statement by voting twice for the Wheeler amendment, namely, the amendment which the Senator from Virginia has criticized as having been similar to the amendment offered by me, and which, in fact, is to the same effect as is my amendment.

Mr. President, there is another distinguished Member of this body whose name I shall presently utter, and whom I wish were present in the Chamber this afternoon. We all respect him for his ability, scintillating and powerful as it is, challenging the admiration and attention of this body whenever he rises on the floor. I refer to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I now put him upon the witness stand, following those members of the Constitutional Convention who framed the Constitution, and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], each making the dignified and powerful expressions to which I have referred. We now hear the senior Senator from Maryland as he expressed himself on the same day as that on which the other Senators spoke:

Mr. President, ours is a democracy. Let us quit talking about democracy unless the legislative branch of our Government is going to pass the legislation. There is no use beating our breasts about democracy and in a time when there is no stress, when there is no real emergency, handing over unlimited power to the executive branch of the Government, which, under our Constitution, has no right to legislate in behalf of Congress.

Allow me to quote further, Mr. President, from the senior Senator from Maryland. On the next day following the one on which he made the statement which I have just read, the following colloquy occurred between him and former Senator Gillette:

Mr. TYDINGS. Congress fails to take any action, and a period of 10 days elapses. Then

the President's order becomes law, as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. GILLETTE. A period of 60 days.

Mr. TYDINGS. A period of 60 days. Is that correct?

Mr. GILLETTE. Unless the Congress has acted under the powers reserved to it in the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. Congress fails to act. Then the President's order becomes the law of the land.

Then the Senator from Maryland asked this significant question:

Where do we find in the acts of Congress an instance in which a former act of Congress has been repealed in that fashion? May the Executive be given authority to repeal acts of Congress by the passage of a law authorizing him to do so?

Then he says:

I am asking for information, because frankly, without any discussion, I believe that if we give the President that much authority we violate the limitations on the delegation of legislative power, which must have a top and a bottom. We give the President authority, in effect, to repeal an act of Congress; and the citizen can find no law in all the statute books in which the act creating the Interstate Commerce Commission has been revised, altered, or repealed.

I think that is a true statement of the case. I should like to hear the Senator say whether or not he believes the failure of Congress to take action, thus permitting the President's recommendation to become a law, would be good law; in other words, that the President could abolish a department by Executive order because the Congress had failed to act.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was out of the Chamber for a few moments, but I have followed the Senator's discussion very carefully and with much interest, and I wonder if in my absence he discussed the question of whether or not under the Constitution Congress could delegate to the President the right to alter, change, or modify the revenue laws of the Nation, for instance, or such part of them as he might see fit to change, and have his alteration become the law of the land if Congress failed to act. I should be interested in hearing the Senator's discussion of that feature as applied to some rather far-reaching existing laws, because, at least at this moment, it seems to me to have a very pertinent bearing upon the whole discussion in which the Senator is engaging.

Mr. DONNELL. I greatly appreciate the very intelligent question asked by the Senator from Iowa. I have not specifically mentioned the matter of revenue laws, but the whole tenor of my argument has been to the effect that there is no power in Congress to delegate to the President legislative power on any subject—revenue, reorganization, or anything else.

Let me at this moment recall the very appropriate remark of the late Senator Adams of Colorado, a Democrat, speaking of the reorganization measure pending on March 20, 1939, when he said:

We cannot delegate the power to pass legislation. There is no way in which we can do that. Bills which we pass, conferring powers upon the Executive, are sustained only when we lay down the rule that is to be implied.

I call the attention of the Senator to this concluding sentence of the remarks of the late Senator Adams:

We cannot validly delegate the power to reorganize, any more than we can delegate to the President the taxing power.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I had no special interest in the revenue laws or any other particular laws; I merely used them as an illustration. I think that what would apply to the revenue laws would apply with equal force to any other broad field of law, interstate commerce law, or any other broad legislation which Congress has seen fit to act upon.

Mr. DONNELL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Iowa, and thank him for his contribution.

Does the Senator from Oregon desire to be heard?

Mr. CORDON. The distinguished Senator from Missouri is a mind reader. I was just thinking that I might inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether any consideration has been given to the anomaly with which we are faced in the Byrd amendment. We legislate in the bill, and we either do or we do not delegate legislative power to the President. Assuming it is legislative power, of course we could not do that. Assuming it is administrative power, and made administrative by virtue of the application specifically of certain standards, in either event there is legislation, and then by the Byrd amendment we do the still more unusual thing of giving to the Congress the power to repeal that legislation by a concurrent resolution, which can have no effect whatever as law.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. May we listen for a moment now, Mr. President, to the words of former Senator King, of Utah, as he spoke in the debate of 6 years ago. But before passing to what Senator King said, I may say, with respect to the inquiry made by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, that, in my judgment, Congress has within it the power to delegate certain administrative functions, provided there are set forth definite, clear, unmistakable standards. I shall in a few moments discuss whether or not there are such standards in the legislative proposal before us which we are expected to pass upon.

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator will yield further, the Senator does agree with me, however, I take it, that the Congress is certainly without the power to repeal a law by a concurrent resolution, which is in effect what the Byrd amendment sets up as the next step in case a reorganization plan shall be submitted.

Mr. DONNELL. I agree that a law cannot be repealed by a concurrent resolution.

Mr. CORDON. Yet that is what the Byrd amendment seeks, is it not?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall undertake to discuss that phase of the amendment a little later, if I may.

May we listen now to the words of former Senator King, of Utah, when he first quotes article I, section 1, of the Constitution, and then quotes another section, namely, article II, section 3, which reads as follows:

He—

The President—

shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

Continuing, the former Senator from Utah said:

Mr. President, he—

That is to say, the President of the United States—

is not given any legislative authority. He may make recommendations to the Congress, but he may not enact laws nor be the recipient of delegated authority which would authorize him to repeal, modify, or consolidate statutes.

In these two articles of the Constitution—the first dealing with the legislative power and the second dealing with the executive power—we find too clear for argument that the Chief Executive, the President, may recommend to the Congress and that the Congress shall legislate.

I call special attention to this statement by former Senator King:

These two articles do not provide, as the Senators who reported this bill apparently would have us and the country believe, that the President may legislate and report to the Congress, which cannot undo what he has done except by a concurrent resolution requiring a majority vote of both Houses. If the power to legislate concerning what agencies of Government there shall be; where they shall be located; whether in the War Department or in the Navy Department, or in the Department of Commerce, or in the Department of Agriculture, or in some one or more of the dozens of Government-owned corporations is not a "legislative power in the highest sense," then I must admit that my study of the Constitution has been utterly wasted. How can any lawyer, knowing the history of despotic power in the hands of kings and potentates, argue that there is any authority in the Constitution or in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States for what is here proposed passed by understanding—unless, indeed, they have joined the ranks of those who suggest that our Constitution is outmoded and unequal to the tasks before the Nation; and that, in fact, the Congress is so impotent that it cannot legislate. That argument has been made in recent years in Italy, Germany, and Russia. Are we to ignore and disregard the terms of the Constitution at the same time that we are preaching to the nations of the world to observe the fundamental rights of men? The fundamental rights of men, of Americans, are involved in the proposed legislation—the rights of our constituents, who must deal with the various agencies of the Federal Government which the bill purports to authorize the President to shuffle as he may deem proper.

It may be noted that the distinguished late Senator from Colorado, Senator Adams, and former Senator King, of Utah, were numbered among those who voted for the Wheeler amendment along with the Senator from Virginia, who did likewise.

So, Mr. President, we have considered some testimony on the question whether Congress has the right to delegate legislative power to the President or to anyone else. We have considered what the

framers of the Constitution would testify. We have considered what Senators of the United States have testified. And, incidentally, I believe every Senator whose name I have mentioned was upon the other side of the aisle from that upon which I stand today.

Let me conclude this list of witnesses by calling on the courts themselves so that we may see what they have said as to whether Congress has the right to delegate legislative power to the President or to anyone else.

Mr. Justice Harlan, in *Field* v. *Clark* (143 U. S. 649, p. 3088), said:

> That Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President is a principle universally recognized as vital to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution.

This language of Justice Harlan was quoted with approval in the case of the Panama Company (293 U. S. 425), in the year 1935.

In *O'Neal* v. *United States* (140 Fed. (2d), p. 912) the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit said—and I think I am correct in saying that the opinion was rendered by a distinguished woman judge, Judge Florence Allen, who spoke the unanimous sentiments, as I recall, of the court:

> In carrying out the constitutional division of the powers, it is a breach of the fundamental law for Congress to transfer its legislative power to the President.

So, Mr. President, I submit that the testimony is clear, convincing, and unanswerable upon the proposition that this legislative power, which the Judiciary Committee concedes is delegated, and which the distinguished Senator from Virginia gives it as his opinion is delegated, cannot under the Constitution of the United States be legally delegated to the President or to anyone else.

Then, Mr. President, what is the basis on which it is sought here on the floor to attempt to sustain the committee amendment and which I assume will be used as the basis on which to attempt to sustain the Byrd amendment? The only possible contention by which to attempt to sustain the constitutionality of either the committee amendment or the Byrd amendment is the contention to which reference has been made, and which was so skillfully and courteously presented by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] the other day, namely, the contention that the bill itself sets up standards to be followed by the President, that those standards are such that Congress is in fact guiding the hand of the President as he moves, that he is therefore not exercising an unfettered discretion but is constantly bound by congressional limitations thrown about him and that consequently Congress has not delegated its legislative power but is merely directing him to pursue a course which Congress has already charted for him. This is in effect the position taken by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. President, the answer to the contention is obvious and lies in the nature of the so-called standards set up by the bill. They are broad, vague, and lacking in preciseness and definiteness. The President is to determine what changes are necessary to produce seven specified results. He is restricted by certain limitations of time as to how long an agency or function may be continued, by the provision that his plan may not authorize any agency to exercise a function which is not expressly authorized by law, by provisions preventing him from destroying executive departments—by which I understand is meant such departments as the Department of State or War and, by the provision that the reorganization shall not divest any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise specified independent judgment and discretion. These are negative restrictions.

The results, however, some one of which—and I call attention to the fact that it is "some one of which," not all of which—in order to authorize the President to prepare a reorganization plan, he is required to find in the transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition of functions or agencies, and so forth, are necessary or desirable to accomplish, are the seven which are set forth in section 1 of the bill.

Those seven results are broad, vague, and lacking in preciseness and definiteness. The first of them is the facilitation of orderly transition from war to peace. Certainly it is unreasonable to contend that so vague a purpose as the facilitation of orderly transition from war to peace sets out a standard of such preciseness and definiteness that in following it as a guide the President would be traveling along a course charted for him by Congress and merely performing duties defined and legislated for him by Congress.

The remarks of the Supreme Court with respect to the legislative undertaking under discussion in the case of *Schechter Corporation* v. *United States* (295 U. S., 1 ch. 541), are appropriate with respect to the reorganization undertaking set forth in the bill now before the Senate for its consideration. Said the court in the Schechter case:

> For that legislative undertaking, section 3 sets up no standards, aside from the statement of the general aims of rehabilitation, correction, and expansion described in section 1. In view of the scope of that broad declaration, and of the nature of the few restrictions that are imposed, the discretion of the President in approving or prescribing codes, and thus enacting laws for the government of trade and industry throughout the country, is virtually unfettered. We think that the code-making authority thus conferred is an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power.

The language, Mr. President, which I just quoted, is that of the distinguished former Chief Justice Hughes.

It is true that it is possible for Congress to confer certain authority or discretion as to the execution of law, "to be exercised under and in pursuance of the law." In the Field case the Supreme Court of the United States quotes Judge Ranney, speaking for the Supreme Court of Ohio, as saying that the true distinction—

> is between the delegation of power to make the law, which necessarily involves a discretion as to what it shall be, and conferring authority or discretion as to its execution to be exercised under and in pursuance of the law. The first cannot be done; to the latter no valid objection can be made.

The proper distinction, the Court said, was this:

> The legislature cannot delegate its power to make a law, but it can make a law to delegate a power to determine some fact or state of things upon which the law makes, or intends to make, its own action depend.

The following remarks by former Senator King, of Utah, referring to the 1939 reorganization bill, are appropriate concerning the contention that in the pending bill there are prescribed standards of such quality as to prevent the bill from constituting a delegation of legislative power. Said former Senator King on March 22, 1939:

> The bill prescribes no standard with any degree of definiteness. The President is not left with the sole duty of ascertaining a fact and issuing a proclamation to fit in a category named in the law. On the contrary, it is freely admitted by the proponents of the bill that the President is being given the duty of reorganizing the administrative agencies because the Congress cannot legislate, as they say.

I digress to say how familiar that language sounds in view of the fact that that was the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and I think possibly to some extent by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] a few days ago. I quote again from former Senator King:

> On the contrary, it is freely admitted by the proponents of the bill that the President is being given the duty of reorganizing the administrative agencies because the Congress cannot legislate, as they say, and he is to use his own discretion as to the agencies he will reorganize and the ones he will not reorganize, except with respect to the agencies exempted in the bill.

I digress again to call attention to the fact that that is the situation we have here under the bill and under the Byrd amendment. Former Senator King continued:

> Such broad discretion not only fails to bring the bill within the rules stated in the cases I have mentioned, but, on the contrary, such broad and uncontrolled discretion brings the bill squarely within the terms of the *Panama Refining Co. case* (293 U. S. 388) and the unanimous opinion of the same Court in the *Schechter case* (295 U. S. 495, 555). In both these cases, acts of Congress were held unconstitutional because of the broad delegation of legislative power to the Executive; but even in those cases the delegation did not attempt to give the President power to remake, redistribute, and reorganize the entire administrative machinery of the Federal Government which had grown up under specific statutes of the United States since the first Congress in 1789.

A few days ago the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] called attention to the case of *Isbrandtsen-Moller Company* v. *United States* (14 Fed. Supp. 407, 412, S. C.; 300 U. S. 139), and to the fact that that case passed on the sufficiency of the standards set up in the 1932 Reorganization Act, and held that they were within the Constitution. That act, by the way, gave to the President the right, when he found those standards, to issue the regulation—not to send it back to Congress, but to issue the regulation himself. The Senator from Utah further called

attention to the fact that the Isbrandtsen-Moller Co. case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, but due to the fact that the question had become moot in the meantime, the Supreme Court did not decide it.

I call attention also to the fact that the Isbrandtsen-Moller Co. case was followed with approval in the case of *Swayne and Hoyt* v. *United States* (1936 American Maritime Cases 1790) before a three-judge United States District Court for the District of Columbia, approximately 2 months after the decision in the Isbrandtsen-Moller Co. case. But I call attention to these further significant facts:

First, both of those cases were district court cases; and, as previously noted in connection with the Isbrandtsen-Moller case—and it was equally true in the other case—the decision of the court was not reviewed in the Supreme Court.

In the second place, in the Isbrandtsen-Moller case, curiously enough, the court based its decision on the Schechter case and the Panama case, with only a sentence or two—at any rate, a very brief comment.

It will be observed that each of those cases declared, not constitutional, but unconstitutional, certain provisions before the court for consideration. It is very difficult to see how either of those cases can be authoritative to the effect that the 1932 Reorganization Act was constitutional. Certainly the most that could be said would be that some language in the cases might be considered dicta to that effect. I know of no language in either of the decisions of the Supreme Court which could be considered dicta supporting the action of the two district courts.

I call attention to another very interesting fact. Though the court in the Isbrandtsen-Moller case sustained the standards and the delegation of authority to the President, the fact that the contention to the contrary, namely, the contention which I make here today, is worthy of most serious consideration, is indicated by the fact that that contention was presented by a law firm two members of which were, first, Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State of the United States from December 4, 1918, to July 18, 1919, and head of the American delegation to the Peace Conference at Paris, July 28, 1919, to December 9, 1919; second, John W. Davis, Solicitor General of the United States from 1913 to 1918, president of the American Bar Association in 1922, Ambassador to Great Britain from 1918 to 1921, and Democratic nominee for the Presidency in 1924. The contention of that law firm was that there was no "adequate declaration of policy or standard of action" in the Executive Department Reorganization Act of 1939 to make it valid. My recollection is that that language appears in the brief filed with the official reports.

Moreover, it was asserted the other day by the Senator from Utah that anyone who will take the time to compare the standards set up in the 1932 act with the standards proposed to be set up by the pending bill cannot help but agree that the standards proposed to be set up by the pending bill are so much more specific and particular than were the standards set up in the 1932 act that there can be no question about the constitutionality of the bill which we are now considering.

Mr. President, if the standards in the bill which is now before the Senate are so much more specific and particular than were the standards in the 1932 act, I am unable to understand how any mind could possibly have sustained the act of 1932. But the fact is that I have examined the standards set up in the 1932 act, and I do not find in the bill now before us the additional specific and particular standards to which the Senator alludes. In fact, the standards provided in the pending bill are substantially the same as those in the 1932 act—and I have the 1932 act before me—except that one of the 1932 standards is omitted in the pending bill, and two others are added, one relating to economy and efficiency and the other to the facilitation of orderly transition from war to peace.

Mr. President, the addition of the facilitation of orderly transition from war to peace causes the 1945 bill to be even weaker from a constitutional standpoint than was the 1932 act, because, first, the standard of facilitation of orderly transition from war to peace is certainly highly vague, indefinite, and uncertain.

Suppose one of us had to reorganize the Government, and were to read the statute enacted by Congress and find that all he had to do was to reorganize it in such a way as to facilitate the orderly transition from war to peace. How could he tell which departments should be reorganized? How could he tell what functions should be abolished? How could he tell what departments to transfer, consolidate, abolish, tone up, or tone down? No human being could read that language and determine what he should do.

The facilitation of the orderly transition from war to peace is cited as one of the results which are said to make the bill a more constitutional measure than the 1932 act. In the first place, I never heard of degrees of constitutionality. I think I should say, in fairness to the Senator from Utah, that he has made no statement to the effect that there can be degrees of constitutionality. However, there can be degrees of weakness and of strength. As I see it, the bill of 1945 is weaker from the constitutionality standpoint than the 1932 act, for the further reason that not only is the standard of facilitation of orderly transition from war to peace vague, indefinite, and uncertain, but remember that the President, in order to become subject to the direction to prepare a reorganization plan, is required only to find that a transfer, consolidation, or abolition is necessary to accomplish, not all seven of the standards, but one or more. Therefore, under the provisions of the 1945 bill the President could select this vague, indefinite, and uncertain standard of facilitation of orderly transition from war to peace as the standard under which to act.

I again call attention to how unfettered the President is by a requirement that as a condition precedent to forming his reorganization plan he need only find that it will "facilitate an orderly transition from war to peace."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I dislike to disturb the Senator, but it seems to me that he is confusing the purposes to be accomplished with the standards set up in the bill.

Mr. DONNELL. The purposes to be accomplished are the standards set up in the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly the Senator does not take the position that the purposes constitute the standards within which the President must act.

Mr. DONNELL. There are no other standards set forth in the bill. As I have indicated, there are restrictions as to time, and as to the functions that may not be reorganized, but there is no standard from one end of the bill to the other, except those set forth in section 1, unless the Senator considers the restrictions as standards. The bill prescribes that whenever the President, after investigation, finds that the transfer, consolidation, and so forth, to which reference is made in section 3 is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a)—which are the seven results or standards to which I have referred—he shall prepare a reorganization plan. There is no standard, unless either these negative restrictions or the positive results which are set forth in section 1 are considered as standards.

Does the Senator desire further comment?

Mr. MURDOCK. I simply wish to say that I certainly cannot agree with the Senator in his statement that the purposes of the bill are the standards set up, within which the President may act.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator in what section he finds the standards?

Mr. MURDOCK. We are simply in disagreement on that point.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator if he will be kind enough to tell us where in the bill there are any standards other than those provided in section 1, or the negative restrictions to which I have referred?

Mr. MURDOCK. All I wish to do is to call the attention of the Senator to section 2 and section 3 of the bill, which in my opinion set up very definite and specific standards prohibiting the President from acting except in a certain way to accomplish one of the purposes, or more than one, or all the purposes set forth in section 1.

Mr. DONNELL. Taking up the two sections to which the Senator has referred, section 3 and section 2, certainly section 3 cannot be considered as setting up standards. Nothing of any such nature, kind, or description is mentioned in section 3. Section 3 merely prescribes that whenever the President finds, after investigation, that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, abolitions, and so forth are necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a), he shall prepare a reorgan-

ization plan. No standard is set up in section 3, from one end of it to the other, so far as I can find.

So far as section 2 is concerned, it contains the negative restriction to which I have repeatedly referred, with respect to the continuance of an agency beyond a particular time, the creation of a function not expressly authorized by law, the abolition of executive departments, such as the War Department or the Navy Department, and the divesture of a quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion. Other than these negative restrictions, the only standards in the bill, from alpha to omega, are those set forth in section 1 (a), which is corroborated by section 3 (a), which says that whenever the President finds that the transfers, consolidations, and so forth, are necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan. There can be no doubt that the standards of the bill, other than the negative restrictions, are the affirmative ones set forth in section 1, and the President is required to find only that the various transfers are necessary or desirable in order to accomplish one or more of the results sought to be attained. He himself can select any one of them. If he finds that the transfers are necessary or desirable to accomplish one—as, for example, the facilitation of the orderly transition from war to peace—he is justified and, in fact, directed by the bill to prepare a plan of reorganization.

Mr. President, I have heard a number of Senators, particularly, one I have in mind at the moment, discuss the predicament in which some find themselves, on the one hand, in view of the fact that the Constitution prescribes one thing, and, on the other hand, in view of the appropriate and proper respect they have for the Senator from Virginia and his knowledge of agencies of the Government and the conclusion which they might draw from what he said as to the practical difficulty of accomplishing reorganization, if it be not done by Executive action. Mr. President, I appreciate that position, but I understand it only in its language. I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that we should allow a practical problem as to how we are to accomplish a reorganization to cause those of us who believe that the measure is unconstitutional to vote for it, nevertheless.

Mr. President, in compliance with article 6 of the Constitution of the United States, I held up my hand, as did you, and bound myself by either oath or affirmation—in my own case, by oath—to support the Constitution. I find that in my judgment the bill is unconstitutional, I cannot vote for it, even though the reorganization cannot be accomplished by any means other than a violation of the Constituion.

But I am not prepared by any manner of means, Mr. President, to concede that our Government has broken down, that our Constitution cannot be complied with. I am one of those who believe that the Constitution still exists in full glory and power and practicability. If I be wrong as to that, the method is clear by which the people themselves can cure the defect. An amendment to the Constitution can be adopted, as the first President of the United States pointed out in the address I quoted the other day.

Mr. President, again let me say that the first President of the United States cautioned against usurpation of powers and against any means of transferring from one department the powers of another, unconstitutionality. I may add to that an admonition of equal importance which could well and appropriately be made against having any branch of the Government undertake to abdicate, as the Senator from Oregon so aptly expressed it, not merely its constitutional powers but its constitutional duties.

Now I address myself to the argument made by the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from New Mexico that reorganization will be prevented by the adoption of my amendment. I believe I am correct in understanding that the Senator from Utah likewise made a similar argument, or at least that he shares that general view. I may say that the Senator from New Mexico said, the other day, as shown at page 10582, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Mr. President, I am not concerned about the technical question of delegation of legislative authority. I have read a number of Supreme Court decisions on that subject. Frankly, I am a little confused about when legislative authority is delegated and when it is not, and I think the courts sometimes become a little confused.

We note that the Senator from New Mexico there said:

> I am not concerned about the technical question of delegation of legislative authority.

Mr. President, I should like to mention, in contrast, the attitude of the Supreme Court of the United States as to its concern on that subject. From the Panama case, I call attention to page 432, where we find the following short, succinct sentence of Chief Justice Hughes:

> To repeat, we are concerned with the question of the delegation of legislative power.

Although the Senator from New Mexico exhibits no concern, as he says, about the technical question of delegation of legislative power, I undertake to say that this question cannot be brushed off on the theory, as the Senator put it on the next page, that the question of Constitutional construction is a gnat. He said:

> We strain today at the gnat of constitutional construction, but we swallow the camel of overloaded, over duplicated, inefficient, wasteful, and extravagant bureaus in the executive branch of government. I do not wish to keep on straining at gnats and swallowing camels.

In the case of the NIRA, Mr. President, it might have been better if the Congress of the United States had strained at what the Senator from New Mexico calls a gnat. The Supreme Court of the United States did not call it a gnat. It called it unconstitutional to pass that type of legislation, and it declared the legislation null and void.

But what about the argument that reorganization will be prevented by the adoption of my amendment, which provides that before the reorganization plan shall go into effect, both Houses of Congress shall pass and the President shall sign a joint resolution approving the plan? The President would sign the joint resolution, just as he would sign any bill. There is no showing whatsoever that the reorganization would be killed in that event. I quote again the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who on March 20, 1939, rose on the floor of the Senate and said:

> Oh, I know the argument. It is said, "You cannot write a plan to reorganize the Government to which the House and Senate will agree." Who said that? Who can produce any proof to support that point of view? That is a mere supposition. I believe the Congress can write a plan, and I believe if that were done and the plan were presented to both Houses of Congress it could be adoped and would go to the Chief Executive, who would perform his regular function of approving or disapproving the plan.

Then, continuing with the power and vigor which are familiar to us, the Senator from Maryland said:

> Have we not gone far enough in handing over power to the executive branch of the Government? Many powers had to be handed over, perhaps. There may be just argument to support what has been done; but why hand this power over? Where is the emergency? There is no emergency. If we hand this power over, if we pass the bill, we simply write on the statute books of our country that the legislative branch of the Government is incompetent to legislate.

Along similar lines Senator King, of Utah, said, at page 3089:

> Important legislative power is sought to be conferred upon the President by the terms of this measure, the argument being, as I understand, that reorganization can thereby be more quickly secured than by congressional legislation. In other words, it is contended that by the abdication of its power by Congress—

The Senator from Oregon also used that term this afternoon—

> the President may perform legislative functions and execute those powers with greater speed than can a body of 96 Senators and more than 400 Representatives. I am unwilling to support that view, or to confess that the Congress of the United States is incompetent to discharge a duty imposed upon it by the Constitution of the United States.

A few minutes ago one of the distinguished Members of this body was sitting in his chair on the floor of the Senate. I believe he is the only Member of the Senate on our side of the aisle whom I have quoted this afternoon. I refer to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], for whose profound knowledge, judgment, and constant fidelity to duty I have the highest admiration. A few days ago he said, when speaking on this very floor:

> But I see no reason why reorganization cannot be brought about in the same way that other measures of a legislative character are effected. Why should not the President study the matter, present a plan to the Congress, and let Congress determine the method by which the plan shall be adopted?

Mr. President, suppose the desired reorganization cannot be accomplished by means of congressional action—a concession which I am not at all prepared

to make. Let me quote again, I believe, from Washington's Farewell Address:

> But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance, in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can, at any time, yield.

What about the argument of the Senator from New Mexico that the President can now do all that the bill with my amendment would permit, and that the adoption of my amendment will nullify the bill. I desire now to say that it is true that my amendment will nullify the part of the bill which is unconstitutional. I wish to say further to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I make that statement without apology. He was of the opinion, because of some language I used, that I was apologetic in presenting my constitutional views. I am proud to stand on the floor of the Senate and undertake to outline what I think are the correct constitutional views.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to make a suggestion in connection with the remarks which the Senator from Missouri has just made. The question is whether or not the country can look to the Congress to fulfill its legislative duties and obligations under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

It seems to me that in connection with the pending bill, as in connection with so many of the controversies which arise in the Senate these days, there is the very fundamental issue of whether or not we are going to retain in this country a three-branch system of government, with each branch performing its functions under the Constitution under our check-and-balance system, or whether we are going to continue down the road of giving more and more legislative power to the executive branch of government. I think the fundamental political issue which confronts the people of this country today is executive versus representative government.

In that connection I wish to point out that it is a quite different thing for Congress to pass in review upon a reorganization plan of the President affirmatively, and quite another thing for Congress to permit that plan to go into effect without the action of Congress.

I happen to be one who believes that the Congress must take unto itself more checking control over the executive branch of government so far as administrative agencies are concerned. I think it is in the interest of better government to make certain, under such an amendment as that which has been proposed by the Senator from Missouri, that when the President seeks to reorganize any particular commission, department, or agency of government we should be fully aware of the import and implications of such reorganization. I believe that if the Congress had courage enough to vote itself the funds which it needs in order to check upon the administrative agencies of the Government, a great many of the administrative abuses which are now practiced by agencies of the Government would automatically cease.

I am opposed to the pending bill in its present form because, as I see it, it represents simply another case of Congress giving up more and more control over the administrative agencies of Government when it should be exercising greater and greater control. We should certainly say to the President of the United States, when he seeks to reorganize any particular department or commission of the Government, "We will go along with the reorganization if on the merits you can demonstrate to us that the particular reorganization which you request will be in the interest of better government."

I believe that a review with scrutiny of the administrative agencies of Government would result in a more efficient administration of the entire Federal Government from top to bottom.

Mr. President, I do not propose to vote for the bill in its present form, not only because I believe it will result in Congress exercising less control over the administrative agencies of Government than it exercises now, but I do not propose to vote for it for another reason which I will discuss at greater length at another time. I believe that it would weaken the prestige, functions, and obligations of the Congress by giving to the President, through legislation, the power to reorganize the executive branch of the Government and then limiting Members of this body in debate on the subject of the reorganization.

I believe that Members of the Senate know that so long as I am in the Senate, as I served notice several months ago when the Members on the other side of the Chamber wished to exercise a restraint of freedom on debate in this body which I believed to be dangerous in its precedential form, I will never grant unanimous consent in connection with limitation of debate. I will not vote for legislation which seeks to weaken what I consider to be the greatest ultimate strength of the Senate of the United States, namely, protecting the people of this country from Executive tyranny. I shall never willingly permit a limitation upon free debate of the merits of any issue which may come before the Senate. Whenever it can be demonstrated to me that a filibuster is in progress, which is a debate not on the merits of an issue, I shall give very serious consideration to signing a petition for cloture.

Mr. DONNELL. Which is what I believe the Senator did in connection with another bill which was once before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I did so in connection with the consideration of the FEPC bill.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I think the pending bill constitutes a delegation of legislative power with no reasonable standards provided for debate upon the subject. As I said earlier in the afternoon, the bill constitutes an abdication of legislative function and obligation of the Senate. I believe it is also an attempt to weaken the control of this body over the final legislative verdict at which it may arrive. I believe that the control of this body will be weakened by the limitation of debate which is sought to be imposed, and I cannot vote for the bill in its present form.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield, but I wish first to thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his very clear and valuable exposition of his views.

Mr. SMITH. As one of the members of the Judiciary Committee who voted to report the bill to the Senate in its amended form, I wish to say that I agreed fully with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the position taken by them when the issue came before the committee, and I thought that the bill should be reported in the form in which it would have been had the amendment, now offered by the Senator from Missouri, been accepted in committee. I believe that before a plan for reorganization is put into effect it should have the affirmative action of both Houses of Congress. I objected in committee to the type of amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] because it seemed to me that such an amendment would permit one House of Congress and the President to enact legislation to which the other House might object.

I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon whether I understood them correctly to say that they object fundamentally to a bill such as the pending one which provides that after a period of 60 days the plan would become effective as law unless there had been a veto by one or both Houses of Congress. In other words, if I understand correctly, the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon object to the form in which the bill was reported to the Senate by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DONNELL. I will answer the Senator from New Jersey succinctly and accurately. I shall not vote for the bill unless it provides that in order for the plan to become effective it must receive the affirmative vote of both Houses of Congress as well as the signature of the President of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the same question of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]?

Mr. MORSE. I will state to the Senator from New Jersey that it is my position, without equivocation, that I will not only vote against the pending bill, but I will vote against any proposed legislation which could become law without the affirmative action of the Congress of the United States, and that means both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon. I think it is important to have emphasis placed in the RECORD on this point.

Mr. DONNELL. I hope my statement was clear. I think the Senator from Oregon has possibly stated more accurately my position than I stated it. I repeat that I will not and can not, as I see my obligation, vote for this bill unless

it shall receive the affirmative approval of both Houses of the Congress of the United States. Unless it shall contain a provision requiring that the plan shall not be put into effect unless and until the plan of reorganization shall have received the affirmative approval of both Houses of Congress, I will not vote for the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator from Missouri yield for one more question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that the Senator takes the position which he has repeated many times in the debate, namely, that the action of the President called for by this bill is legislative action and not Executive action.

Mr. DONNELL. The bill provides for a delegation of legislative power to the President. That is my opinion.

Mr. SMITH. I assume that the Senator will not object to the President presenting a proposal to reorganize the Government. The Senator makes the point that when a plan of reorganization is presented it is nothing more than a proposal, and that both Houses must be required to act affirmatively in order to make the proposal law.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator has stated my position.

It has been stated in particular by the Senator from New Mexico who addressed himself to the subject, that the President can now do all that the bill with my amendment provides, and that my amendment would nullify the bill. In response to that statement I was saying just before the Senator from Oregon spoke, that it is true that my amendment does nullify the bill to the extent that the bill is unconstitutional. It affects that portion of the bill which, in my judgment, is unconstitutional, namely, section 4 (a) which provides that the reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect if nothing whatsoever is done by Congress.

However, Mr. President, the bill and the amendment which I have submitted do accomplish something, and I think a very important thing. The bill requires the President to investigate and make findings, and if they show a reorganization to be necessary or desirable to produce one or more of the results set forth in section 1 (a), it requires him to prepare a plan.

Mr. President, the requirement in the Constitution, article II, section 3, that the President shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and desirable, does not require him to recommend on all subjects, or at any particular time, but the bill selects the subject, and makes it obligatory that the President perform the duties set forth in the bill. To the extent that it requires the President to examine the subject and submit a plan, I think the bill serves a substantial and a good purpose.

The amendment which I have presented does not prevent the President from exercising leadership, but the leadership which it does not prevent him exercising is the leadership of the wholesome type, namely, the leadership of the type contemplated by the Constitution, that is, as I read from section 3, article II, that he "shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." This bill does not take that power away from him. Indeed, it makes it obligatory, as I have indicated, that he shall take up the specific subject and give us the benefit of his study and of his views by way of a plan. So I say that the plan which I have offered does not prevent the President from exercising leadership.

As I indicated at the outset of my remarks this afternoon, there is no desire on my part to hinder or prevent a reorganization. I concur with the remarks of the Committee on the Judiciary that a reorganization of the executive branch is more imperative today than ever if we are to put this vast structure on a modern and workable basis and effect economy and simplification in its administration. I wish to say, however, that I am opposed to a reorganization which shall be brought about in an unconstitutional manner, and if I think the measure before the Senate is unconstitutional, I cannot vote for it.

Emphasis was placed strongly by the Senator from New Mexico upon the various exemptions set forth in the bill. I do not know just why he brought that out in connection with the discussion of my amendment, for I have had nothing to do with inserting any exemption in the bill. Indeed, when we had before us the only exemption I have heard voted upon, namely, the exemption of the Engineer Corps, proposed by the Overton amendment, I voted against it, and I did so largely upon the clear, cogent, and convincing argument of the Senator from Utah, who pointed out that to exempt that particular agency would be but a precedent which would cause other agencies to ask for like treatment by way of exemption.

Mr. President, I have presented here this afternoon as best I could the point that the bill in its present form is unconstitutional, but there is another point to which I shall address myself. I realize the lateness of the hour, but to my mind this matter is of such paramount importance that I am justified in asking the patience of the Senate to listen to the discussion of the second point, which is, that regardless of whether it be constitutional or unconstitutional, the negative method prescribed by the committee amendment, and that which is prescribed by the Byrd substitute, is opposed to sound public policy.

Mr. President, a procedure by which a measure may become law without any action on the measure being taken by Congress is clearly opposed, in my judgment, to sound public policy, regardless of the constitutionality of the procedure. The very statement of it indicates the soundness of my contention. Procedure by which a measure may become law without any action on it being taken by Congress enables law to be created without any thought whatever being devoted to it by Congress. As I have indicated before, under such procedure Members of Congress could be utterly inactive, they could sleep, or return to their constituencies back home, and then laws created by the President under this bill, setting aside, perhaps, statutes enacted by Congress a hundred years ago, would come into full force and effect. Certainly it is not sound public policy to enact a bill which would permit laws to be created without any thought whatever being devoted to them by the body to which the Constitution gives the exclusive lawmaking functions and power.

Furthermore, each exercise of such procedure as this is a precedent toward permitting other legislation to be created without thought or action by Congress. It may be said that in this instance we must have this particular procedure in order to bring about reorganization. That will be the argument we will hear on something else, "Yes, we must have another violation of the Constitution in order to pass some other legislation," and the fact that we shall have passed the bill now pending will be a strong, a cogent and convincing argument to many of our successors in office as to the importance, the desirability, and propriety of passing other legislation which is likewise vitiated by the delegation of legislative power therein contained.

Furthermore, Mr. President, can it be doubted that there is less feeling of responsibility by Congress in merely having a power to disapprove a measure proposed by someone else which will go into effect if nothing is done, than if Congress has the responsibility on its shoulders to find affirmatively that the measure is a desirable one?

I have no objection to the President preparing a plan and submitting it to the Congress, but I do object to the decreased feeling of responsibility in Congress which would come from the President merely sending up a bill, when all we would have to do would be to look it over and say, "We do not see anything wrong with it," whereupon, without any action on the part of Congress, it would become law. Certainly, such abdication of our duty is profoundly opposed to sound public policy.

Mr. President, instead of being moved by a constant realization that before a measure should be enacted into law a preponderance of proof that the measure is desirable and wise should be found by Congress to exist, under the proposed procedure, by which the President would make a proposal and if we did not do anything, it would become law by default, Congress would be apt to rely largely on a presumption as to the regularity and correctness of the measure as prepared by the executive department.

Can it be doubted that such procedure as proposed by the bill tends perhaps to laziness and slothfulness and inaction by Congress? Can it be doubted that it tends to discourage initiative by Congress? Can it be doubted that it tends toward a surrender to the Executive of the thinking on measures? Can it be doubted that such procedure, ignoble as it would be, would make Congress a mere rubber stamp?

Mr. President, the importance, from the standpoint of public policy, of Congress exercising its function and not surrendering them, was forcibly outlined by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] on March 20, 1939, as follows:

I did say, and I repeat, that the Congress of the United States ought to exercise its functions under the Constitution as the forefathers drafted the Constitution. We ought to have the intestinal stamina to stand up here and say that we can legislate. How can we expect the people of the State of Illinois, or the people of the State of Michigan, or the people of the other States of the Union, to trust parliamentary government if we, ourselves, assert that we cannot trust ourselves to legislate honestly?

Mr. President, by advocating that Congress exercise its own functions, neither the Senator from Montana nor I advocate that the President should not send recommendations to Congress or should not propose legislation for recommendation to Congress. The Senator from Montana clearly states the view which both he and I take in this matter. At least this is the view he took in 1939. I do not know his views today. He said then:

Some Senators have stood on the floor of the Senate and criticised the President because legislation was drafted in the executive department of the Government. I have never been one of these. I say that it is perfectly proper for the executive department of the Government to draft legislation, and that they should send their proposals to the Congress. I do not condemn the executive branch for doing that. I do not condemn the President for doing it.

Then the Senator from Montana said in ringing words:

I condemn any weak-kneed Senator who has not the intestinal stamina to stand up, if he disagrees with the executive department, and say to the President of the United States, to Mr. Ickes, to Mr. Wallace, or to any other officer, "I disagree with you."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] had the following to say on this subject, Mr. President:

How ludicrous it is for us as a legislative branch of the Government to say that one of the great problems before this Nation is the necessity of reorganizing and consolidating and taking other action in respect to the functions of the executive branch of the Government, in the interest of economy and efficiency, but that we do not intend to do a thing in the world about it except to pass a resolution inviting the President of the United States to legislate for us, and that whatever way he legislates will be satisfactory to us if we do not act on the plan within 10 days after he submits it.

The Senator from Maryland continued:

Mr. President, if there is need for reorganization, we should write the plan in Congress. Let it go through the normal processes of government up to the Executive, and have him approve it or disapprove it. If we feel there is no need for reorganization we should do nothing at all.

We ought not to abuse the various executive activities of the Federal Government on the floor of the Senate, and hold this branch and that branch up to ridicule and abuse, and then continue to allow more legislative authority to be transferred to the executive branch of the Government.

The Senator from Maryland called attention to an ominous fact, namely, to the unrest in this country, and expressed the following view:

Already, I believe, one of the great causes of unrest in this country has been the transference of legislative power to separate and independent agencies, which in effect is creating a fourth branch of our National Government, not that of legislation, not that of judicial or executive functions of the Government, but administrative legislation within supposed limits fixed by Congress in passing various acts.

Mr. President, I emphasize, in considering the unsoundness, from the standpoint of public policy, of the proposed delegation of power, the world-wide trend toward abandoning parliamentary government and turning the power over to the executive department. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] on March 20, 1939, forcefully called attention to this trend, in the following language, which is prophetic in its nature:

The whole course and trend today in Europe, and the whole trend in the United States of America, is toward giving up parliamentary government and turning the power over to the executive branch of the government. I say that such a trend is wrong, and as long as I remain in this body I shall continue to fight that sort of thing, regardless of whether or not I am charged with not trusting the President of the United States.

Mr. President, even in Great Britain the tendency toward surrender of legislative power and transference of it to executive domination has attained great momentum. On March 20, 1939, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] said:

Let us take the British Parliament, if the Senator wishes to choose that. If the Prime Minister embarks upon a legislative course, the Parliament has the privilege of stopping that procedure, or reviewing it, or criticizing and vetoing it, before it goes into effect. Can the Senator say that that ancient Parliament has ceased to be the citadel of parliamentary procedure?

It will be observed that even though the Senator from Florida implies his belief that the British Parliament is yet "the citadel of parliamentary procedure," he nevertheless makes no mention of parliament itself being the body which initiates legislation. He emphasizes the Prime Minister as embarking upon a legislative course and refers to the so-called privilege which parliament has "of stopping that procedure, or reviewing it, or criticizing and vetoing it, before it goes into effect."

Mr. President, that is what we are asked to do in the committee amendment and in the Byrd amendment. We are asked to embark upon a legislative course with the privilege retained to ourselves to stop the procedure, to review it, or criticize or veto it before it goes into effect.

Mr. President, although the Prime Minister of Great Britain—and I digress at this moment to pay a word of tribute to the very interesting address which he gave to the Members of Congress yesterday—although the Prime Minister is a Member of Parliament, it is a long distance between embarkation by Parliament itself on a legislative course and embarkation by the Prime Minister upon such legislative course.

On July 27 of this year—I do not think I shall ever forget the occasion—the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made a statement. I do not believe I can give the exact language, but I remember the circumstances clearly. The Senator rose from the seat where the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] now sits, and said:

The House of Lords has almost disappeared from any respectable part in the Government of England, save as a court in which law may be interpreted and announced.

The Senator from Georgia pointed to the House of Commons "as the heart and center and substance of the great British Empire." It is of interest to note, however, that the Senator then said:

The leader of that House is the Prime Minister, next in importance historically to the King, actually of first importance in all the realm where English jurisdiction and English law live.

Mr. President, in a lecture delivered in 1925 at Harvard University by Hon. Robert Luce of Massachusetts, who served for 20 years in Congress, he discussed the wane of the British Parliament as an initiating body. Referring to the time when the Federal Constitution, our own Constitution, was framed, Mr. Luce then said:

The next hundred years saw the wane of Parliament as an initiating body. By the middle of the nineteenth century, individual members of the house had ceased going beyond calling proposals to the attention of the government. A generation later it had become the practice for the ministry to determine upon all the important legislation before Parliament even assembled. With the passage of still another generation, the process of giving to the cabinet the monopoly of initiation was completed. Now no member of a minority, no independent member, if there be such, can hope for consideration of any proposal he may present. Indeed, the ministers have so monopolized the time that no member of the majority not in the government has more than a gambler's chance of getting so much as an insignificant measure considered. Not even by way of amendment may the private member embody his own ideas in legislation unless the government approves or permits. Discussion has dwindled in importance. Today it may be said of the English cabinet that, besides being the chief executive and central administrative board of the nation, it is in effect the law-making body; that of its own initiative and upon its own responsibility it makes the laws, modified only as the criticisms of Parliament may be accepted, and subject to veto only if it loses its majority in the House of Commons; that it shapes the program and directs the procedure of Parliament; that, save for the opportunity to criticize or vote in opposition, the member of Parliament not in the cabinet is a negligible factor; and that inasmuch as the Prime Minister necessarily dominates the cabinet he is virtually an autocrat, controlled by an unwritten constitution which obliges him to act within the law, and having duration of power contingent upon the popular will.

Then said Mr. Luce:

This is the form of government commended to the American people by many academic writers as preferable to that under which we now live.

I digress for a moment, Mr. President, to say that I do not agree that the British form of government is preferable to that over which floats that flag which we see behind the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. Luce continued:

We are urged to approach it by modifying our congressional and executive practices so that we shall have one-man leadership and control. We are told by not a few publicists that this way alone does our salvation lie. From time to time steps in this direction have actually been taken.

Further in his lecture at Harvard University, Mr. Luce said, at page 101:

Three quarters of our Presidents, however, have thought it their duty to execute rather than make the laws. Of course that way of putting it must be understood to take into account the constitutional injunction that the President shall recommend to the consideration of Congress such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient. That which goes beyond recommendation is the debatable share in the making of laws.

The issue was brought into the forum of serious discussion by a little book called Congressional Government, published just 40 years ago and written by Woodrow Wilson, then a graduate student at Johns Hopkins University. In this vigorous volume he urged the superiority of a responsible cabinet ministry over committee government, as he called that by the Congress of the United States.

Continuing further, at page 105 and following pages, Mr. Luce says:

Over against the arguments for the cabinet system are to be set certain other formidable considerations, to my mind not often squarely met by its advocates. First may be put the belief of the framers of our constitutions that the fusion of functions invites tyranny. To be sure it is an old-time belief, but a belief is not necessarily fallacious because it is old. Experience may in the past have taught mankind at least a few things that are still useful.

I remember at this moment a distinguished former Member of this body from my State of Missouri, William Warner, who used to quote Patrick Henry. I cannot quote him exactly from recollection, but in his addresses I have many times heard him say that the only lamp he knew was the lamp of experience. After all, there is a good deal to be said in favor of the old-fashioned gospel that we learn something by experience. Mr. Luce seems to think that that saying has some element of truth, and I am old-fashioned enough to agree with him.

Mr. Luce continued:

In the last analysis, cabinet government, at that when the man who makes the law also administers and adjudicates it oppression is likely to result. Abuse of power has been a characteristic of monarchs.

In the last analysis cabinet government, at the stage it has reached in England today—

Remember, he was speaking in 1925—

is nothing but monarchy under another name, and pretty near absolute monarchy at that while it lasts; for the Parliament can at a moment's notice change any and every precept in the unwritten Constitution of Great Britain, and the Parliament acts at the will of the Prime Minister as long as he is in power.

As I have stated, Mr. Luce was speaking in 1925. What has happened since then? I know that our distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] venerates the University of Virginia, which was founded by a great statesman. I quote from a book published in 1937 by Prof. R. K. Gooch, professor of political science, University of Virginia. I do not know the standing of Professor Gooch, but he was professor of political science at the University of Virginia. He wrote this:

The frank recognition in England of leadership on the part of the executive in the matter of legislation has caused the House of Commons, where practically all important public bills are in practice introduced, to allot to the government by standing order most of the time in which public bills may be brought in. As a result, the greater part and the most important part of the public bills introduced will normally be government bills.

This has a certain humor in it, and yet it is serious when we realize it:

In general, private members' measures—

By the way, I think I am a "private member." I think most of us consider ourselves "private members." We are not members of any superior oligarchy which rules the Senate.

In general, private members' measures must be introduced on a Friday early in the session; for the government monopolizes the time on all the earlier days of the week and, later in the session, takes Fridays as well. Though the House meets earlier on Friday, it also adjourns much earlier because of the week-end habit; and, for the same reason, attendance is likely to be scant.

Since many more potential private members' bills are ready for introduction than could possibly be introduced on the dozen or so Fridays available, the simple expedient adopted in the matter is that of drawing lots.

Under this plan, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and others of us would draw lots to decide who could introduce his bill and who could not.

Private members who desire to participate in the draw hand in their names at the beginning of the session. Successive Fridays are allotted to members in the order in which their names are drawn.

If a private member is lucky enough to draw an early Friday, apparently he may, with further luck and considerable skill, succeed in having his bill become law. However, passage seems to depend on a combination of various circumstances. If the government is opposed to the bill, it will have no chance. If the government should approve it so definitely as to make it its own, the bill would, of course, become a government bill. If the government is indifferent, various procedural difficulties stand in the way. However, it would appear that if the private member is popular or at least not unpopular, if the bill is popular or at least not unpopular, and if the member possesses some skill in respect of parliamentary procedure, the bill will have a fair chance of being passed into law.

In his book on the English cabinet system published in 1939, by Dr. Wangteh Yu, the author devotes himself to an historical study of the evolution of the cabinet system in England. From the name, I presume that the author is Chinese, although I do not know. In the section entitled "the Cabinet Controls the Commons" the writer says, among other things—page 366:

Thus the Cabinet has become the absolute master in the sphere of finance, and wields a power more arbitrary than any Plantagenet or Tudor Sovereign.

The author, Dr. Yu, further says—page 366:

In theory, the House of Commons still possesses power to alter its procedure, and to decide what measures it will consider, but in actual practice control over these matters is exercised by the Cabinet, which, as the supreme master of the Commons, settles what proposals shall be presented to the House and lays them before it for confirmation. As the tightening of the party system has resulted in the weakening of the power of resistance by individual members, they are compelled to accept the measures presented by the Cabinet, whether they approve of them or not.

One of the characteristics of the modern Cabinet is it full control over the legislative output of the House of Commons. As one writer has put it, the Parliament of the present day has largely reverted in substance to the practice of the Parliament of the first Edwards, under which the King, by his ministers, made the laws.

Continuing further—pages 369–370—Dr. Yu says:

Various consequences follow from the possession of legislative power by the Cabinet, such as the encroachment on the liberty of speech of individual members of the Commons, and the reduction of the legislative opportunities of private members almost to vanishing point. * * *

The cabinet also virtually deprives private members of their legislative power, since their measures must meet with the approval of the ministers.

In his book on the British Constitution, published in 1941, the preface to which is dated September 6, 1940, Dr. W. I. Jennings, principal of the Ceylon University College, of Gray's Inn, barrister-at-law, says—page 74:

It must not be forgotten, though, that the last word as well as the first rests with the Government. The major legislation enacted by Parliament is the Government's legislation. The foreign and imperial policy of the nation is the Government's policy. Taxation is imposed by Parliament but determined by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Government not only proposes but, through its majority, disposes.

Continuing further, Dr. Jennings says—page 75:

Parliament cannot govern. It can do no more than criticize.

Continuing further he says—page 97:

Bills are sometimes introduced by peers. They are comparatively rare, because the British Parliament has long ago learned that its task is primarily to criticize legislative proposals, not to initiate them. They cannot pass the Commons unless they are entirely noncontroversial or are supported by the Government; but occasionally a bill presented by a peer does get through.

In his work on Law and Orders, an inquiry into the nature and scope of delegated legislation and executive powers in England, by Carleton Kemp Allen, of Lincoln's Inn, barrister at law, sometime professor of jurisprudence in the University of Oxford, Oxford secretary to the Rhodes trustees, and warden of Rhodes House, Oxford, published in London in 1945, the preface to which is dated November 17, 1944, Mr. Allen said—in speaking of the period between two wars,

namely, the First and Second World Wars—page 41:

Throughout all these years the volume of delegated legislation and executive powers did not diminish and they tended, on the whole, to become increasingly arbitrary. The process was much accelerated by the creation of new departments, with very extensive fields of action, such as the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Transport. In a series of cases, most of which were painful sequelae of the war, the Crown showed a recalcitrance which can only be described as a denial of justice. Protests from the bench were frequent and emphatic, and public uneasiness grew year by year.

Mr. Allen quotes Mr. Dingle Foot, member of Parliament, as saying, on January 27, 1937—page 43:

It does not matter particularly if the House of Commons does not understand what comes before it because it is not our business to understand, but simply to pass the measures presented to us.

Further, Mr. Allen says—page 43:

Nothing, however, stemmed the stream, and it was still growing in volume when another war broke out and turned it into an irresistible flood.

Continuing, Mr. Allen says—page 94:

In the particular matter of delegated powers, modern governments show little disposition to make concessions, the less so when they are advised—as they constantly are advised, and, let it be addded, in all good faith—by the permanent officials that it will be impossible to make the act work if the executive powers are abridged.

It lies, then, in the realm of constitutional fiction to say that Parliament exercises any continuous or effective safeguards over delegated legislation, and it is not surprisisg to find Lord Hemingford (whose view is also that of Sir William Graham Harrison) saying that "the accusation against the House of Commons at the present time is that it allows government departments to do things without knowing what is being done."

Mr. Allen, continuing, says—page 129:

"Parliament," said Mr. Lloyd George, "has never taken any practical steps to scrutinize the estimates with a view to seeing whether expenditure could be reduced without detriment to the public service, and that is one of its primary functions." Mr. Churchill considered the debates on supplementary estimates "the most worthless of any that I have known in my career." Prof. Ramsay Muir described the power of the purse as "wholly unreal." This last witness was more emphatic than any other in his estimate of the decline of Parliament's place in the constitution. "There is no country in northwestern Europe in which the control exercised by parliament over the government—over legislation, taxation, and administration—is more shadowy and unreal than it is in Britain. Parliament is no longer, in any real sense, the sovereign power in the state." If this is thought to be an exaggeration, then the same must be said of the blunt opinion of a man who, at this moment of writing, has a longer memory of Parliament than any other in England. In answer to the question whether he wished to make Parliamentary control more effective, Mr. Lloyd George replied: "Well, it has not got control. I am speaking now after 40 years of experience: Parliament has really no control over the executive; it is a pure fiction."

Mr. President, in the light of the experience of Great Britain, to which the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] referred, as previously indicated, as "the citadel of parliamentary procedure," it is well that we of 1945 in the United States should maintain, rather than abandon and reject, the fundamental principle of government to which the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] referred in the report which he presented in 1939 concerning the Reorganization Act, reading as follows—page 5:

The Senate committee submits that as a fundamental principle of government, Congress should retain the right of direct and affirmative vote upon changes of functions or policies of government and other vast potential powers which may in effect be exercised by the Executive under this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake a detailed recapitulation of my argument this afternoon. I have pointed out the defects of the Byrd amendment, the change of position taken by the Senator from Virginia, the reason for that change, the fact that he makes no criticism of the principles on which my amendment is based and the principles on which the amendment for which he stood back in 1939 was based.

I have pointed out that both the committee amendment and the Byrd amendment delegate legislative power. I have pointed out that there is no right or power in Congress to delegate legislative power. I have called to the witness stand the framers of the Constitution of the United States, the distinguished members of this very body who have spoken on the subject and the courts themselves, in support of the legal proposition I have stated.

I have discussed the only possible basis on which to attempt to sustain the committee amendment and the Byrd amendment, namely, the basis the distinguished Senator from Utah so skilfully presented the other day. I have pointed out with, I trust, at least reasonable clarity the fact that the standards sought to be imposed by the bill, if they can be dignified by the term of standards, are so vague and indefinite and lacking in preciseness as to constitute no standards at all.

Then I have discussed the point made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, namely, that the adoption of a reorganization plan will be prevented by the adoption of my amendment. I have undertaken to answer that proposition and also the argument of the Senator from New Mexico that the President can now do all that the bill with my amendment would permit, and that the adoption of my amendment would nullify the bill.

I have pointed out in that connection that the bill does have merit, provided it is limited by the amendment I have offered, namely, that instead of leaving it to the President at such times as he may find proper to take such steps as he may deem proper, it would be obligatory upon him to study the question of reorganization and to give the Congress the benefit of his views thereon by means of a plan; and then I have pointed out that I base my opposition to the bill and the Byrd amendment not only on the point of unconstitutionality but also on the proposition that the negative method prescribed by the committee amendment and the Byrd substitute is opposed to sound public policy.

I have pointed out the devastating effect which has been had on the British Parliament by the assumption of vast powers—whether voluntarily given or usurped, I do not know—by the British Cabinet.

Having pointed out that situation, I leave to the Senate the proposition that we of the Senate of the United States, standing, as we should do and as we are sworn to do, for the preservation of the Constitution of the United States, should be very slow to pass a bill which by encouraging lack of initiative and by discouraging initiative would be very likely to produce, as the years go by and as the precedents multiply, the inaction, the loss of legislative power, the loss of prestige, and the loss of influence which the British Parliament, the great citadel of parliamentary procedure, as the Senator from Florida has said, itself has experienced.

So, Mr. President, I undertake to say that the Byrd amendment should be rejected, both because it is unconstitutional and because it is opposed to sound public policy. By the same token, and conversely, I assert that the amendment I have offered, which is the same as the amendment which was before the Senate in 1939 and which at that time, in the first instance, was carried by a vote of 46 to 44, as I recall, and later was lost by a vote of 44 to 46, will assure the constitutionality of the measure, preserve its good features, and should be approved by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request, which I hope will be agreed to, with reference to the vote which will later be taken on the Byrd amendment, and the Donnell amendment in the event that the Byrd amendment is not agreed to, and all other substitutes which may be offered to the Donnell amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the vote be taken not later than 2 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to be recorded also as objecting.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we extended the time to 3 or 4 o'clock tomorrow——

Mr. DONNELL. I would not consent.

Mr. MORSE. I would still object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Robert E. Freer, of Ohio, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Adm. Oswald S. Colclough to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years;

Capt. George L. Russell, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General; and

Civil Engineer John J. Manning to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from the 1st day of December 1945.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

That completes the calendar.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE MOTT, OF OREGON

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution coming over from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES W. MOTT, a Representative from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. President, the Members of the House and Senate from Oregon have heard with profound shock and sorrow of the death of their colleague, the dean of the Oregon congressional delegation, Hon. JAMES W. MOTT, at the Bethesda Hospital on Monday last. By a strange and fateful coincidence the death of Representative MOTT occurred on his sixty-second birthday.

Hon. JAMES W. MOTT was born in Pennsylvania, and was taken at an early age by his parents to the State of Oregon where he was reared. He was educated in the schools of that State, and at the Universities of Stamford and Columbia. He practiced law in Oregon. From that State he enlisted in the United States Navy during the First World War.

Representative MOTT served his State with distinction in various public capacities. He served as city attorney of his home city of Astoria. He served for 8 years as a member of the Oregon State Legislature, and also served as corporation commissioner of the State of Oregon. He had been a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States continuously since his election in 1932. Shortly after he became a Member of Congress he was appointed to the Committee on Naval Affairs. He had been intensely interested in the Naval Establishment since his early experiences in the Navy during World War I, and at the time of his death he was an outstanding authority in the field of naval affairs. His life was one of distinct service to his State and to his Nation. His death is mourned not only by his family who have suffered the loss of their husband and father, but by all members of the Oregon delegation. They have lost a colleague and a friend.

Mr. President, at this time I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 191) as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES W. MOTT, late a Representative from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to share the expression of respect for the late Representative MOTT which has been contributed by my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon. I regret that commitments of long standing which cannot be canceled make it impossible for me to attend the funeral of Representative MOTT, but to his friends, relatives, and family I extend my very deep sympathy.

Words of comfort cannot drive away grief at such times of sorrow. However, Representative MOTT's family can take objective comfort in the fact that Mr. MOTT has left this world a heritage of devoted public service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, November 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 14 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Robert E. Freer, of Ohio, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1945. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 14 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR NAVY

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign

Stuart R. Allen	Richard W. Leighton
Joseph P. Andrews	Henry D. Linscott, Jr.
Alton W. Barton	Boyd H. Lewis
Charles W. Bastable, Jr.	Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr.
	Hood S. McChord
Roger W. Brown	Clarence E. McLanahan
Thomas H. Bruno	
Walter J. Buck	Edwin E. McMorries
Frederick J. Byrne, Jr.	James F. Magarahan 3d
Daniel M. Carr, Jr.	
Roger E. Clingman	James J. Martin
Robert W. Cooil	Laurens B. Mathews
Charles T. Creekman	Austin R. Murphy, Jr.
William J. Cummings	Earl B. Myer
David Davidson	Thomas L. Nalley
Philip L. Davis	Edward P. O'Neill
Lloyd C. Emerson	Charles C. Puckett
Clyde E. Fulton	Carroll D. Reasoner
Frank J. Gibbons	Abner A. Rissler
Herbert J. Hackmeyer	John L. Ruhl, Jr.
Ralph S. Haefele	Allen B. Sanders
George F. Halla	Walter E. Scott, Jr.
Alan M. Hamerslag	John C. Senter, Jr.
Virgil J. Harris, Jr.	Charles F. Shea
Frank F. Hart, Jr.	Ralph L. Shepard
Harold F. Hayes	Robert M. Sipple
James D. Hickey	Millard C. Snyder
Gordon G. Hughes	Robert E. Snyder
James A. Humphreys	Curtis P. Waggoner
Cecil P. Jones	Donald D. Webster
Charles A. Kasdorf, Jr.	Edward H. Wigand
Robert W. Kem	James D. Wilson
William G. Leary	

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Louise S. Werner, East River.
Catherine O'Brien, Gildersleeve

LOUISIANA

Margaret G. Reily, Gloster.

MISSOURI

Francis F. Hulett, Sturgeon.

NEW MEXICO

Elger E. Miller, Hollywood.
Josefita E. Miera, San Antonio.

NEW YORK

Ida Pietrobelli, Cottekill.
Harry A. Monroe, Harris.
Thomas G. Spring, Morton.

OKLAHOMA

Orlando W. George, Canadian.

OREGON

Howard T. Edson, Glendale.

TENNESSEE

Ralph G. Hornbeak, Hornbeak.
Ila V. Brock, McDonald.
James A. Green, Pelham.
John W. Hudson, Pocahontas.
John Frank Rucker, Rutledge.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Shepherd Divine, ever near to lead us in the ways of upright living, help us to respond to Thy presence. We praise Thee that there is healing in the hem of Thy garment and blessed comfort in the merciful glance of Thy holy eye. In penitence and prayer we would come unto the world's great altar stairs that slope through darkness up to God and receive the blessing of those who come and seek.

We pray for that faith that lives in spite of existing clouds, that bears and endures through endless strain and waiting. Whatever our condition and wherever we are, lead us to tread this earth with the gracious dignity of Thy children, sharing the inheritance of those who abound in love and are rich in good works. Our Father, reclaim men who are in perils and trials, in temptations and in losses. If we think Thy thoughts and walk in Thy ways, we shall hear Thy footfall, and the deeps of our souls shall arise to the more perfect way. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3749) entitled "An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. MILLIKIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1036) entitled "An act to provide for the payment accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia before the expiration of such leave."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] may address the House for 30 minutes today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the program for Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will announce that tomorrow. I am unable to state now what the program is. To be frank, I know of nothing at the present time. Is there any particular thing the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. RANKIN. I objected to the adjournment last week until we had had 30 legislative days since the introduction of my bill to release from the services, on their own application, men who have been in the service continuously for 18 months, or who had dependents to look after at home, or who desire to return to school.

That 30 days have now expired and the petition—petition No. 9—is on file on the Clerk's desk. The string of Members you see over there at the desk, I suppose, are signing that petition.

But I just want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am not willing to be adjourning over for 3 days at a time as long as we have these millions of servicemen in the armed forces who desire to come home and who can only come home by virtue of the action of Congress. We see that now.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I have had a petition on the desk for some time now. The petition is numbered 8, to get all of these boys out of the service who have served honorably for 18 months. I think it is absolutely a disgrace to this Congress, in view of the action of the military, for not walking up there and signing that petition. The boys could well say next fall that they do not believe in a nominee for Congress who failed to sign that petition. It is about time we got down to earth to help those boys. They fought a great fight and won the war. They have a right to rely on Congress to help them now to come home.

Mr. RANKIN. I signed the petition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] but I prefer my bill because it takes in the men with dependents, and boys who desire to return to school and complete their education, regardless of their lengths of service.

Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I am going to object to adjourning over until Monday.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Dr. James A. Reeves, president of Seton Hill College.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. LARCADE) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a joint resolution relating to the exercise of powers under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and under certain other provisions of law, which, if enacted, would have the effect of taking away from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration the powers under such provisions of law which have heretofore been exercised by such Administrator.

The resolution, however, reserves to the President the authority to designate by Executive order to such other officers or agencies of the Government such provisions of the law as he may deem necessary, having in mind, for instance, authority for the President to assign to the National Housing Authority control over rents and housing, this being necessary, in my opinion, to protect the war workers and migrants scattered all over the United States, until they can return to their permanent domiciles. It is not necessary for me to reiterate my reasons for this action at this time.

Mr. Speaker, reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past 3 years will disclose what I think about the Administrator and the administration of the Office of Price Control. I have been charged by some of the adherents of the OPA as having a personal grudge against the Administrator and the OPA.

In answer to this charge I will say that when I was first elected to Congress a meeting was held by the OPA in my district to discuss ceiling prices on rough rice. Rice is one of the principal industries in my district.

Notwithstanding that I was at first denied admission to the OPA meeting by the officials of the OPA in charge, I later defended the agency in an open meeting attended by between 1,000 and 1,500 of my constituents, telling them it was unfair to condemn the officials or the proposals of the agency until the agency could have an opportunity to demonstrate the need for the program, their

ability to show the fairness and reasonableness in the administration of the program during the emergency caused by the war.

Mr. Speaker, I did give the OPA a chance, and to my amazement and disappointment, the whole outfit proved absolutely impossible, and had it not been for the fight made by myself and my colleagues, the OPA would have destroyed nearly all of the principal industries in my district and State, and even now are still continuing these efforts with respect to the sugarcane and fur industry in Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, my district is one of the largest producers of furs in the United States, and information was furnished me from the American National Fur Breeders Association, through one of the citizens of Louisiana that, furs that had a ceiling price of $1.77 in Louisiana, were selling in the black market in Boston and New York from $15 to $17 per pelt. Of course, this information was transmitted to the OPA.

Mr. Speaker, if damage and destruction to my constituents and industries in my district can be regarded as a personal grudge against the Administrator and the OPA, then I say a grudge of my constituents is a personal grudge by me, for, as their Respresentative in the Congress, I am the only one to whom they have to look for protection, and as long as I am here in the Congress, I propose to try to protect my constituents, their interests, and their industries, Mr. Chester Bowles or anyone else to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bowles, Administrator of the OPA, criticizes the Members of Congress publicly and in committee for trying to safeguard the interest of the automobile dealers of the United States, and I will not enter into a discussion of this question as my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] covers this matter, in my opinion, quite properly in an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date.

However, I do make the observation that if the 325 Members of Congress who oppose the machinations of Mr. Bowles with respect to his ukase of automobile prices, and so forth, desire to call the hand of Mr. Bowles, the joint resolution which I have introduced gives them a good vehicle so to do.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article by Thomas Lyons entitled "The Truth About Foreign Trade Zones"; and in the other to include a joint statement by himself and a colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, following the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] today, I may be permitted to address the House for one-half hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address delivered at the opening session of the Thirty-second National Foreign Trade Convention, by James A. Farley.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include with each certain articles.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by herself at the Pulpit Forum, Peoria, Ill., on Sunday, November 4.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Dr. J. C. Stearns.

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received by him.

Mr. HOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include a poem entitled, "Send Daddy Back to Me," by one of his juvenile constituents; and in the other to include a letter on universal military training.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Progressive, entitled "The Atomic Jag."

AMENDING THE SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act so as to exempt from the provisions of the act all activities and operations of mutual news-gathering cooperatives. This amendment was made necessary by Marshall Field's suit against the Associated Press. The courts have rendered their decision in the case and have done their duty as they see it. As one commentator puts it:

> It must be clear to Congress now that a law intended to protect the people against monopoly has a result never intended when it is applied to mutual news-gathering cooperatives, such as the Associated Press.

Because I agree entirely with that statement, I have introduced the bill to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act.

As a part of my remarks under leave already granted by the House, I include the following editorial on the same subject:

[From the Jersey City (N. J.) Journal]

ONLY CONGRESS CAN FREE ASSOCIATED PRESS FROM MARSHALL FIELD FETTERS

Marshall Field, one of America's richest men, publisher of the Chicago Sun, has the distinction of having succeeded temporarily in shackling the free press of the United States.

He may be expected once again to knock on the door seeking membership in the Associated Press. He should be unanimously voted down, if he does apply at this time. Here's why:

1. When he first applied for membership in the Associated Press he failed of election. A Chicago newspaper member in good standing objected to the election of Field's Sun on the grounds (as he was entitled to object under the bylaws then in force) that for many years the present members have expended millions of dollars to develop a news service which it would be unfair to make available to competitors of the present members in Chicago. Newcomers could buy news service from the United Press, or from Hearst's International News Service, or build up from scratch their own world news coverage (as the radio people have done to some extent). By Field's willingness to see his application and its denial used as a lever or crutch for an antitrust case against the Associated Press, Field has demonstrated his failure to see the value to our Republic of a press free from Government control.

2. A renewed attempt by Field's Sun to gain membership while the Associated Press is being run under the supervision of the courts would be proof that Field is willing to submit the management and news judgment of his Chicago Sun to the superior control of the Government. At the present time, as a result of the antitrust case arising out of the refusal to admit Field to membership, the Associated Press is a ward of the courts. It must submit to the courts some sort of bylaw satisfactory to the courts and then adopt such bylaw; or else, it must accept a bylaw written by the court for the Associated Press. This bylaw must prohibit a vote against any newspaper on the ground that admission would destroy the competitive advantage of members. How can even the wisest judges in the United States write a bylaw to do

that and still leave the Associated Press free? Field, being plainly out of sympathy with the fundamentals of a real free press in the United States, is just as plainly not a suitable person to admit to the membership of the Associated Press.

Field should know that any request by him for admission to the Associated Press has been freed by an act of Congress from restraint by the courts. If and when Congress relieves cooperative news-gathering organizations from application of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, then will be time enough to consider a fresh application from Field, if he then wants to make such application.

The board of directors of the Associated Press is trying to comply with the order of the court by the second week in February. In the meantime the free press of the United States, which is the precious right of the people of the United States, must look to Congress for correction of the situation.

The courts have done their duty. They have interpreted the law and applied it to the Associated Press. It must be clear to Congress now that a law intended to protect the people against monopoly has a result never intended when it is applied to mutual news-gathering cooperatives, such as the Associated Press. It was further never intended to destroy the right of cooperatives to choose their members or to use for their own benefit the commodity—news—which they had bought with their own money and reported by their own efforts.

Cooperative news-gathering organizations should be exempted from the application of the anti-trust laws. Proper legislation enacted before the end of the year would relieve the court of a duty which must be distateful, namely, trying to run the free press from the bench, and would restore to the people confidence that the report of the world's and the Nation's news is free from control by the Government.

OPA PRICING POLICIES

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, about 3 weeks ago a select committee of the House, empowered to investigate executive agencies, filed a report pointing out certain defects in the pricing policy of OPA during the reconversion era.

There has been set up room 215 of the Old House Office Building an exhibit which tells this story better than a thousand speeches. If you want to see what is happening to the 1,700,000 retailers throughout the United States, if you want to learn why low-priced commodities are disappearing from the shelves, if you want to know why the consumer is paying more for an inferior product, I urge you to inspect this exhibit, 215 Old House Office Building, at 10 o'clock in the morning until 2:15 in the afternoon, today, tomorrow, and Friday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

OPA AUTOMOBILE PRICE POLICY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Chester Bowles appeared before the Small Business Committee of the House yesterday and tried to cover up his incompetency to deal with pricing automobiles by accusing dealers of putting pressure on him. He did not in the slightest degree attempt to justify his method of pricing because it was right. The dealers, when they presented their case, based it upon what was the right thing to do. Never in the world will be able to have any continuance of price control on a racketeering basis such as Mr. Bowles has been trying to create. He is hiding behind an allegation of pressure to escape facing the issue and doing the right thing.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we witnessed what I think is one of the most amazing things that has ever taken place in the Nation's Capital. I am talking now about Chester Bowles, who sets himself up as a supergovernment and who practically tells Congress that he is going to disregard any suggestions from this branch of the Government. He tells the automobile dealers that he does not want to be bothered with them, and he goes to great lengths running the affairs of the United States, the world, and everything else combined.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know, and I want to put myself on record, I want to know what the Committee on Small Business has done, what they are doing, and what they are going to do for the benefit of the retail dealers in automobiles and trucks in connection with the hearings that have been held.

Mr. Speaker, when I learned that the retail dealers in automobiles and trucks would have a hearing here in Washington, D. C., on November 8, before the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, I called the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to this hearing before the Committee on Small Business on November 8. My remarks will be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A4756, and I stated that I expected to make an appearance before the committee hearing the next day.

I did make an appearance at those hearings in the House Office room and presented a statement to the committee for the records of the hearings. Following the committee hearings, I was present in the House of Representatives and again addressed the House in connection with the hearing, at which numerous representatives of the retail automobile and truck dealers were present, as well as men from various parts of the country who represented their industry. My remarks will be found on page 10534 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, November 8.

Those hearings were continued, and yesterday Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, announced that he was not going to give any relief to retail dealers in automobiles and trucks, and that his original plan to have the retail dealers absorb the increased price of these vehicles, which the manufacturers will be permitted to charge, passed on to the retail dealers, would be carried out. Mr. Bowles announced that the Office of Price Administration would reject the demands of the automobile and truck dealers, that the retailers were just a bunch of bad boys because they were trying to influence the OPA. This episode of conducting these hearings has been and is, more or less, a sham performance, with some variations that remind me of what happened to a group of milk dealers here in Washington, I think in 1943. They had met with the OPA officials in an effort to find out how much they would be allowed to charge for milk during the coming season. They conferred all day and then were nonchalantly told that there was no big hurry about it—that the summer production would not take place for some 3 or 4 months. Later, on that same day, regulations were promulgated and one milk producer remarked to another that the whole thing had been cut and dried and that the Government officials really paid no attention to the milk producers.

In the case of the retail dealers in automobiles and trucks, there was a slight variation because these men came to Washington and made a sufficient impression to have the Office of Price Administration postpone its proposed program for a few days. It looks as though, however, that the trip of these automobile and truck dealers and their representatives here has not accomplished anything. I am not taking seriously Mr. Chester Bowles' statement that these fellows are lobbyists and that they have no business coming down here to use pressure methods. This is still a free country and people who have their livelihood depending on some Government regulations still have a right to be heard. In the lobby of the House smoking room this afternoon, one Member commented about a conversation he had with a retail dealer. The retail dealer told him that as long as the OPA was going to deny relief, then they were going to put the responsibility for the OPA misdeed squarely on Members of the House of Representatives. I welcome my share of the responsibility because I voted against continuance of the OPA when that measure was before the House last June. I said then, and I want to repeat now, that this outfit is no good and some other agency, composed of competent men, should be placed in charge of the price control question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us keep the record straight.

Question 1. Why did the Committee on Small Business hold these hearings and invite the retail automobile and truck dealers?

Question 2. Now that the hearings have been held, what is the Committee on Small Business going to do about the matter?

Question 3. Is the Committee on Small Business going to sponsor legislation that will give relief to the retail dealers of automobiles and trucks?

Question 4. Does the committee expect to have a bill introduced and then have committee hearings and get the bill reported on the floor of the House of Representatives for action?

Question 5. If the committee succeeds in the foregoing, will it ask the Rules Committee for a rule so it can vote on this legislation?

These are just a few questions that I want answered and the retail automobile and truck dealers want them answered, too. They know that we have a party system of Government and that the Democratic majority can take all of these steps I have indicated and give the Members of the House an opportunity to vote for or against legislation to help the retail dealers in automobiles and trucks. Are they going to do it?

It would be well for interested people all over the country to check up with their Representatives in Congress and get the answers to these questions, and then follow through and see what the Committee on Small Business does that will bring about these practical results.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

FUTURE OF RUBBER

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a news release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, rubber was one of our most critical materials during the war years. American ingenuity arose to the emergency in providing synthetic rubber in abundance from grain alcohol and petroleum.

GUAYULE NATURAL RUBBER

We also developed the growing of the guayule shrub and now have 30,000 acres of 2-year-old shrub now approaching the maximum rubber content for economical production, and should be maintained to complete its natural cycle of 4 to 5 years to determine its economic value as an American crop for natural-rubber production. In my opinion, the 30,000 acres we now have should not be destroyed, but arrangements should be made for private industry to complete this promising source of natural rubber through sale or contractual arrangement. Why destroy a crop of 25,000,000 pounds of rubber now growing in the fields?

I commend the very fine statement just released last Friday by Mr. John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., and former rubber director, on his analysis of the rubber future. In my opinion, his judgment is sound when he recommends maintaining the stand-by synthetic rubber plant capacity and also alcohol rubber plants to be maintained for possible use of distressed farm products.

The following is the statement of Mr. John L. Collyer:

AKRON, OHIO, November 9.—Decisions must be shaped now which will attain the goals of military security and a solution of the coming rubber-surplus problem, John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Co. and former special director of national rubber programs declared here today.

He emphasized that because of the supply of natural rubber will be at first a mere trickle, a year or more remains during which sound and constructive rubber policies can be adopted.

In making public a new analysis of the world rubber situation, the eighth in a series prepared by his company, Collyer said, "We must not fail to prepare now for our continuing military security, and for a wise solution of the surplus problem which will result from an estimated potential world capacity of 3,000,000 tons of natural and synthetic rubber.

"The magnitude of this coming surplus problem is indicated by estimates that annual world consumption will be approximately 1,500,000 tons," he pointed out.

"The time for shaping decisions is now," the company's analysis states, listing as "keys to an enlightened rubber policy for the United States and for the world," three considerations:

1. Military security;
2. Greatest consumer value; and
3. Expansion of rubber uses through low and stable prices.

The analysis cited the active study that has been under way for more than a year by the rubber-study group of the Governments of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and noted that more recently the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion has appointed a Government interagency policy committee on rubber which has the assigned task of studying problems and making recommendations of United States policy.

"Military security must rest on a legislated program—one chosen by an informed American people acting through their elected representatives in Congress," Collyer said, "and greater consumer value and expanded rubber uses will come most quickly from free individual initiative, unhampered by artificial restrictions and controls.

"To insure military security, we believe our Government should maintain a total stand-by general-purpose synthetic rubber production capacity of 600,000 to 700,000 tons a year in plants kept in condition and ready to run.

"From this capacity we recommend a minimum production and use of 200,000 or more tons a year of general-purpose synthetic rubber, regardless of economic factors," Collyer stated.

The B. F. Goodrich Co. president said that, after assuring military security by establishing a stock pile of natural rubber and maintaining production of synthetic rubber, the next consideration should be to supply consumers with the highest-quality products at the lowest economical costs.

"The choice of materials beyond the 200,000 to 300,000 tons of military synthetic—which includes the probable annual production of approximately 100,000 tons of special-purpose synthetic rubbers—should be left to the unrestricted play of economic forces," he said.

"It is estimated that for the next 5 years America's rubber needs will average 825,000 tons a year, or about 25 percent greater than in 1940. Thus, there will be left an average of 525,000 to 625,000 tons a year, or a high prewar total rubber-consumption level, where the choice of materials should depend upon competition.

"The reality of low-cost, high-value American synthetic rubber is the pivot on which postwar rubber developments will turn," he stated.

"A prime objective of natural-rubber producers should be to regain through their price policies such a sizable share of the world rubber market as is needed to sustain their economies and to make possible rising standards of living in the rubber-growing territories."

"If many nations with presently lower standards of living are to expand their use of rubber, its price must be low," he said. "To this end, the earliest possible establishment of a Far East price of around 12 cents or less (United States currency) a pound for natural rubber would assure efficient rubber growers a reasonable advantage in the face of competition with low-cost synthetic rubber, as well as a reasonable return on their plantation investments.

"However, there must first come a period when the plantations are resuming production. At the outset the price might well be the 18½-cent (United States currency) level at which rubber was sold in the Far East during the prewar period when we were building emergency stockpiles while the war clouds were gathering, and before synthetic rubber had become an active threat to natural rubber prices."

Collyer forecast that, compared with the estimated future per capita consumption of 14 pounds of rubber annually in the United States for the years 1946–50, the average for the rest of the world for the same years is estimated at but eight-tenths of a pound.

"If the average annual consumption of the rest of the world could be expanded to only 2 pounds per capita, an extra 1,000,000 tons of rubber would be consumed each year," he pointed out.

Collyer stated that continued improvements in the quality of synthetic rubber will come at a rate induced by the intensity of competition, and that industry should be put on its mettle to speed this progress.

He recommended that the 600,000 to 700,000 tons of maintained United States capacity include the low-cost plants and suggested 25,000 tons of alcohol process capacity as insurance of continued development of rubber from distress farm products.

In his analysis it was pointed out that the armed forces in the first half of 1945 were using rubber at the rate of 550,000 tons a year, and the recommendation was made that they use many of the synthetic rubber products manufactured in peacetime, as they might have to do in times of national emergency.

Mr. Collyer's analysis estimated potential American synthetic rubber capacity at 1,000,000 tons annually, and that of countries outside the United States, including Canada, Russia, Germany, and others, at 400,000 tons annually.

It was estimated that the world's natural rubber productive capacity would be 1,600,000 tons annually if all sources were utilized. Most recent reports indicate that 90 percent or more of the trees in the Far East are intact, it was stated. The large labor forces have been scattered, however, and time will be required for recruiting and training replacements. Also much of the equipment needed in the preparation of natural rubber must be repaired or replaced.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by himself appearing in the Knoxville News-Sentinel and other papers, and an editorial from the Knoxville News-Sentinel.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks

in the RECORD in connection with a consumer's interest and merchant's interest in OPA and include a newspaper item.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement of Republican principles in the State of Arizona.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and subsequent to any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

OPA PRICE POLICIES

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I read the following in the morning's paper:

OPA admitted that some manufacturers are finding it difficult to produce essential goods at current ceiling prices "unless they are willing to operate at very low margins or even at a financial loss."

By upping the profit allowed on lower-cost goods, OPA is following a procedure it tried out first when setting reconversion prices for radios—that of giving a bigger increase in the lower brackets than in the higher.

Such is the philosophy and inefficiency of the OPA. Those who want and can afford to pay for the best have their prices kept down, but the ordinary people who want the ordinary run of goods have their prices raised.

Raising of prices is of course necessary with increased costs of labor and materials. But why place the burdens only on those who are least able to bear them? Confusion and chaos?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

RETURN OF OUR MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, nearly every day you read in the papers of articles telling how United States vessels are carrying French colonial troops to Indochina, Japanese war prisoners back to Japan, and similar news items. You also read of the vessels of all types stationed in our harbors, both at home and abroad. Yet thousands and thousands of servicemen, already long eligible for discharge, as well as men with long periods of overseas service, who should be relieved and returned, are stranded in both the Atlantic and Pacific theaters. This sad condition should never have occurred in the first place. Since it has happened it certainly must be remedied rapidly. The brutality and injustice of all this is having an effect on the men overseas and their families here at home, which will have a far-reaching and long-lasting bad influence on our Nation.

Let me quote two recent letters. The first one is from an officer on Okinawa, who says:

Tacloban, the port which I work every day, is the second largest depot and port from which soldiers in the Pacific will be returned. I know the situation here. We were scheduled to load 27,000 personnel for the States during October. To date less than 2,000 have been shipped. We have men with more than 100 points who have been waiting for 6 weeks for transportation. Some places men in divisions with only 60 points are on their way home with their units.

Believe me, it is not because the shipping is not available that the men are not getting home. They won't let us use the available ships. I can cite dozens of cases where ships have gone home empty. The Army will not let us put troops aboard. If Congress only knew the real facts instead of the bold-face quasi facts which they know, the kettle would blow up. The entire system is rotten and everyone here is completely disgusted by the statements of the War Department and of certain individual "brass hats."

This one is from an enlisted men also on Okinawa:

I can't see why they can't get the men back to the States a bit faster. You see here at Okinawa there are about 150,000 men, but there are about 2,000 ships out in the bay and harbor, just laying out there, so the problem cannot be transportation.

These letters are typical of many others. If the Army, Navy, and merchant marine could solve the supply problems of war, as they did, there is no excuse for not solving this one at once.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include several editorials on our foreign policy and in the second a GI letter.

ADDRESS OF THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Congress of the United States established an important milestone in the history of this Nation. The two Houses sitting in joint session listened to the Socialist Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Attlee, deliver a speech knowing that one of the important objects of his sojourn in the United States is to secure funds to exterminate private ownership of property in his country, which we are fighting a life and death battle to save in our own. My seat was vacant on that occasion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech he delivered yesterday.

THE LATE JAMES W. MOTT

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker:

Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north-wind's breath,
And stars to set;—but all,
Thou hast all seasons for thine own,
O death!

The announcement of the untimely death of our beloved colleague Hon. James W. Mott, of Oregon, has proved a source of profound sorrow to me and to his beloved wife and children I extend my sincere expressions of deepest sympathy.

Although a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon the deceased was a native of the congressional district I have the honor to represent in Congress, having been born in New Washington, Clearfield County, Pa., November 12, 1883. It is a coincidence that his busy and fruitful life terminated on the sixty-second anniversary of his birth.

Residents of Clearfield County, Pa., have been pardonably proud of their native son who after adopting Oregon as the State of his residence proceeded to justify the confidence expressed in him by his countless friends and admirers in Oregon who showed their appreciation for his genius and strength of character by electing him to positions of trust that culminated in his election to Congress in 1933.

One of the happiest recollections of my first days as a Member of Congress is the bond of affection that developed between us when Representative Mott learned that I was elected to Congress from the Blair-Centre-Clearfield District of Pennsylvania. I found in his kindly disposition and wise counsel a fountain of helpfulness during my early days in the House of Representatives.

Within the past few weeks I exchanged correspondence with him while he was convalescing at the Bethesda Naval Hospital and I had eagerly looked forward to his complete recovery and early return to his congressional duties. His sudden passing was a distinct shock to me for he had expressed confidence that he would recover his health and resume his daily routine within a very short time.

The passing of such a distinguished colleague and personal friend recalls the uncertainty of life and is a timely

admonition to all of us to remember the words of the poet Bryant:

So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch,
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

I shall miss kindly, genial Jim Mott, whose friendship was not only a treasure to me but a source of inspiration. It is my fervent prayer that God may comfort his loved ones in the great loss they have sustained in being deprived of the affection and companionship of a loving husband and a devoted father.

PALESTINE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the right-hand column of the front page of this morning's Washington Post is the following item in a box that I think should be called to the attention of the House:

STATEMENT WITHHELD ON AMERICAN REQUEST

Frederick Kuh, Chicago Sun correspondent in London, reported last night that it was "common knowledge among foreign diplomats in London that the postponement" of Foreign Minister Bevin's Palestine statement during the past 3 weeks occurred at the request of the United States Government, which desired to avert undue influence on the New York mayoralty election. Apparently, it was felt in Washington, Kuh said, that Bevin's policy would arouse strong Jewish resentment and might affect the election.

I am sorry that politics is being played with this great issue.

THE LATE JOHN C. SPEAKS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I know that you all share the profound sorrow which I feel at the death of Hon. John C. Speaks, who represented the Twelfth Congressional District of Ohio from 1920 to 1930. His passing was announced by my colleague, Hon. CLIFF CLEVENGER, on this floor last Wednesday. I was out of the city at the time but was able to attend his funeral, where tributes from the community showed the affection and esteem of his friends.

General Speaks was 86 years old at the time of his death. He was born in Canal Winchester, Ohio, in Franklin County, the district in which he lived all his life, which he served in Congress, and where he died. He was in the milling and lumber business, then was later fish, game, and conservation officer of Ohio. He was a member of the Ohio National Guard for 40 years, advancing from private through grades to brigadier general. He was a major in the Fourth Ohio Volunteer Infantry in the Spanish-American War, participating in the Puerto Rican campaign; he commanded the Second Brigade of the Ohio National Guard on the Mexican border in 1916; and commanded the Seventy-third Brigade of the Thirty-seventh Division from the call of troops in World War I until March 1, 1918. He was a thirty-second degree Mason, a Knight Templar and Shriner, and a member of the Knights of Pythias. He was a great Methodist. He was a member of Rotary.

He was a member of a distinguished family, and his own children have carried on this fine heritage. His brother, Oley Speaks, noted music composer, is the last surviving member of 11 children. General Speaks left three sons—Charles, of New York, vice president of the Milk Industry Foundation; Lt. Col. Stanford Speaks, of the Allied Control Commission in Germany; and Lt. Col. John Speaks, recently separated from the Army and now associated with the Government in Washington. His daughter, Margaret Speaks, is a famous radio and concert soprano. His grandson, Pvt. John C. Speaks III, is carrying the Speaks military tradition into the third generation.

Here in Congress he served as a member of the Military Affairs Committee. He won the respect of his colleagues by his unswerving integrity. Those of you who served with him will, I know, regret his passing and join me in sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute,

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve in the One Hundred and Sixty-sixth Infantry with Gen. John C. Speaks, and later to serve with him as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House. General Speaks was a great soldier. He was a distinguished citizen and an able statesman, who served his Nation with devotion in war and in peace. The country was fortunate that he lived so many years. No words of approbation can adequately describe the life and service of Gen. John C. Speaks of Ohio. His record will stand forever as a monument to him. He was an honor not only to the State of Ohio but to America and the cause of good citizenship everywhere has been enriched by his life.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I, too, served with General Speaks. He was a most unusual man, one of the outstanding men of his day in the Congress, always efficient, capable, honest, and dependable. I am sure the State of Ohio has lost a real man. He lived such a life that he has left a splendid heritage to his family.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great American who has passed away. He served in this body with honor and distinction. He served his country as a soldier on the field of battle and he was ever a powerful force for virile Americanism. A fine citizen has died and our sympathy goes to his family and especially to his two children who have won wide recognition in the musical world.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. There is no finer example of a true American anywhere than Gen. John C. Speaks of Ohio, my friend and benefactor on many occasions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, had the great privilege and honor of serving with General Speaks. I remember his many fights for national defense. He was tireless in behalf of having our country prepared. I know his sterling integrity and his great character.

PARLIAMENT PROCEDURE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, those who visited other countries during the summer recess had the opportunity of visiting the parliaments of those countries and noticed the opportunity that a member of parliament has. He may summon any department head or any person in a department before that parliament. He may cross-examine him. A minister of transportation was cross-examined and asked this question: "Why are the trains late?" Cases like this frequently occur in England. There are only 435 Representatives in Congress, meaning that there are only 435 persons in the United States out of a total of 3,700,000 civilians on the pay roll that you can hire and fire every 2 years. There are only 435 direct representatives of the people, and yet they cannot summon any person of all this great army of Federal employees before this body. When a department head turns down a Congressman he is turning down "We the people," the man who is responsible to the people. Those on the Federal pay roll who are not responsible to the people but are safely secure by civil-service tenure (they do not have to come before the people every 2 years—they cannot even be removed for cause if they are New Dealers) may blunder—they may refer you to others instead of doing their work. In spite of this, the Congressman is blamed for the blunders of these appointed politicians because he alone acts for and is responsible to the people.

In view of these facts, should not these appointed politicians be responsible to the statesmen chosen by the people.

OPA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend by remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I sat in on the hearing before the Committee on Small Business when Chester Bowles read that lengthy brief of his. When he had concluded, of all the hundreds of people present, there was not one bit of applause. It was then that the chairman of the committee announced that applause was not permissible, but 5 minutes later, under the cross-examination by one of the committee members the gentleman from New York [LEONARD W. HALL], the House split the roof with applause. Certainly the chairman of that committee missed the boat.

UNKNOWN SOLDIERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the Boston Advertiser on Armistice Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced a resolution which provided for the bringing back of two unknown warriors, one of the unknown to be from the Pacific and one from the Atlantic. I read in part this article:

A new memorial is in order and it is appropriate to bring home for similar tribute two of our unidentified dead of World War II—one from the Pacific war and one from the Atlantic theater. For these were in reality two wars, each more terrible than any in history and one fought beyond the span of the other.

Mr. Speaker, I have had so many letters of approval and suggestions from the families of these servicemen giving their complete approval. I feel that there could be no possible objection, in fact nothing but approval. I know that all of us would like to go to Arlington Cemetery and pay our tribute at the tombs of the unknown warriors. My bill has the wholehearted endorsement of the American Legion as indicated by a letter written by Col. John Thomas Taylor, which is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 11.

The article above referred to is as follows:

TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN WARRIORS

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is our national memorial to our American dead of World War I.

It is time now to consider a memorial as beautiful and as inspiring to our nearly 300,000 dead in the war recently ended.

The white marble Tomb of the Unknown Soldier stands silhouetted above the trees in our national cemetery at Arlington, Va., bearing the simple inscription: "Here Rests in Honored Glory an American Soldier Known But to God."

None but God knew the identity, the race, the religion of this soldier brought home from France a quarter century ago to "rest in honored glory"—a symbol of all who gave their lives for our country. As he became a symbol so did his tomb become a shrine, and there over the years America has paid tribute and the families of our hero dead have found consolation in prayer.

A new memorial is in order and it is appropriate to bring home for similar tribute two of our unidentified dead of World War II—one from the Pacific war and one from the Atlantic theater. For these were in reality two wars, each more terrible than any in history and one fought beyond the span of the other.

We believe the men who fought on these two battle fronts and the families of the men who died on these battle fronts will wish this distinction made.

It would also seem appropriate to erect the Tomb of the Unknown Warriors rather than another Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. In this way all branches of our armed services will be symbolized. For our dead of these latest conflicts, sleeping now in the far lands and alien seas, were members of all branches—Army, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, and the Air Corps of each service—warriors all.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal of criticism now about the operations of various branches of the Government. I call your attention to the Treasury statement of November 8, showing that we are in the red $262,873,750,184.35. I want to know where you are going to get the money.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about everything and we prepare and get things all ready to put on a great big spending spree. Not only for our own Government, but for most of the governments of the world. Some of the governments want from the United States five billions and six billions of dollars as a gift or loan. From the condition of our own Treasury, can we do it? Then for weeks at a time here we appropriate and appropriate and appropriate, and do not give any attention to where we are going to get this money. You, the majority, as Congressmen are responsible for that condition because you made these appropriations out of any moneys in the Treasury that are unexpended, but you will find there is no money there. It is like Old Mother Hubbard's cupboard. We must have a sound, sane, sensible administration of our Government from here on or our Nation will be ruined financially or on the road to bankruptcy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a GI to his brother in my district. This soldier opens up his heart in telling what he thinks of the loss of time in getting GI Joe back home. I want you to read this letter. The Willie he refers to in his letter is his wife. In the name of all that is good, let our Nation exert every influence to return the boys. "There is no place like home."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I attended a meeting called by the Small Business Men's Committee to support all reasonable requests—and they have reasonable requests—of the automobile dealers. I believe that is going to work out. But this condemnation of the OPA is wrong. There are lots of shortages in this country, and if the shortages continue and price ceilings are let out, the price of sugar alone would go to $2 a pound.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by the Presbyterian minister of my home town, Washington, N. C., on the subject of peacetime military training.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Providence Journal of yesterday.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence on the truth about Germany.

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it has been charged, but I do not know whether it is true or not, that Mr. Bowles is a Republican. I cannot believe it because he is too good a man to be such. I know that he is intelligently and persistently trying to save the country from inflation, which is always destructive.

Also, I know that every industry is trying to obtain higher and still higher prices. Mr. Bowles' aim is to protect the consumers, all the American people, and the country. I do not know whether, if the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Minnesota, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, were placed in Mr. Bowles' position they could do as well as he has done and is doing. I doubt it very much.

Mr. Speaker, I know from the large number of communications, telegrams, and telephone calls which I have and am receiving that there is tremendous pressure upon the Price Administrator from manufacturers in most every line to bring about a removal of price ceilings. This despite the millions in profits they have made and are deriving under the present price ceilings. I do not know of a single industry that is not using all the influence that it can command to obtain higher and higher prices for its products and this applies to agriculture as well, notwithstanding the reports of two investigations which have been made under the direction of two outstanding Federal boards showing that the industries could absorb an increase of 24 to 25 percent in wages and still enjoy profits equaling and exceeding those derived before the war. Mind you, these are not reports of labor organizations, but the studied and careful reports made upon the findings of the War Production Board and the War Reconversion Board.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who are continuously assailing the Office of Price Administration and demanding the removal of price ceilings would be the first to complain and criticize should inflation get out of hand. They only hear the blatant protests of manufacturers and producers who are seeking greater profits, and it seems to me that they ignore the condition of the wage earners, of the 20,000,000 white-collar workers, of the several millions of persons who are living on annuities, pensions, and fixed incomes, including retired school teachers, firemen, policemen, municipal, State, county, and Federal employees, and, last but not least, our pensioned disabled veterans and their dependent families, and the hundreds of thousands of wives, children, and dependents of our servicemen and servicewomen who are still in service, whose allotment checks will not be sufficient to properly care for them if there is a further increase in the cost of living. What consideration have the gentlemen who clamor for the removal of price ceilings given to these deserving classes of our citizenry? Do they contend that these millions of people can afford to pay an increase in prices for clothing, foodstuffs, and rents?

Every honest man and woman will admit that the wage earner in the lower brackets, the white-collar worker, the 12,000,000 persons having an income of less than $1,300 per year, the disabled veterans' and dependents' families, and the dependent families of those serving under our flag are finding it a terrible struggle to exist due to the high prevailing prices.

Mr. Speaker, just this morning I interviewed 20 women representing various organizations from every section of the country. I am informed that later this afternoon that 500 women of these organizations will meet this afternoon to protest against the removal of certain price ceilings. This representative group of women are keenly cognizant of the welfare and of the conditions affecting the 20,000,000 of our citizens who cannot stand an increase in the cost of living, especially of food, clothing, and housing rentals which alone takes up over 60 percent of their incomes. I commend these women in their protest against the removal of certain price ceilings. Unfortunately the low-income group have no lobbyists, lawyers, or representatives to send to Washington to present their cause or to exercise influence or threats such as the pressure groups who are seeking greater profits by the removal of price ceilings.

Mr. Speaker, I observe that the staunchest advocates of the removal of price ceilings are also those who have attacked organized labor. It appears to me in this connection that it would be to the advantage of the 20,000,000 of our people in the low-income group to organize to let them know how they feel with respect to the removal of price ceilings and on the matter of inflation and that their interests should not be ignored.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that I am of the opinion that Mr. Bowles is endeavoring to do a good job. While I have not agreed with all his activities, I know he is trying, and by the eternal I believe we should cease criticizing an able and honest man who is exerting his every effort in accomplishing a very necessary, important job.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

LET US BRING AN EXTRA MILLION SERVICEMEN HOME BY CHRISTMAS, WITH MILLIONS MORE TO FOLLOW—SIGN PETITION NO. 9

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the only chance to get these men home who are now serving in the armed forces, and who deserve to come home, is through an act of Congress.

Men are being kept in the service who are badly needed at home to look after their loved ones at home, as are thousands of young men who need to return to school. That is destroying their morale and killing their desire to go to school at all, and probably ruining their future careers. We have untold thousands of men who have been in the service for 18 months or more, many of them men of middle age, who need to come home and resume their various activities. The only way to get them home is by an act of Congress. For that reason, I have filed petition No. 9 at the Clerk's desk to bring my bill up for that purpose. I am going to oppose any 3-day adjournment of Congress until we get a vote on it.

By the passage of this measure we can bring an extra million of these men home by Christmas, with millions more to follow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes on Monday after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PETITION NO. 10—DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I rather think that the men who are suffering in the flesh about these boys staying out of school ought to get together. I want to announce that I have discharge petition No. 10 at the desk to bring H. R. 4155 up for consideration by this body. Mine differs from some of the other bills in that I require the discharge of these men under 21. Then, if they want to reenlist, that is all right. Some of the others put it on the basis of an application. I have found many times that those applications are lost. I would ask that the membership of the House give consideration to H. R. 4155 which would also discharge men with families and one or more children. I think we had better reestablish our family life in this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short letter.

OPA PRICING POLICY

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I also attended the meeting held by the Small Business Committee at which the pressure campaign of the automobile dealers was put on, to try to force OPA to grant higher prices for automobiles.

I was astonished to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], say he could not understand the simple procedure and the method which the OPA has used to base its price, and to call upon dealers to absorb a certain portion of the costs so that they shall not be passed on to the consumer. OPA is guaranteeing the auto dealer a 15-percent profit. I would like to go into a business where I could count on a 15-percent profit next year. That is a pretty fair deal, especially when the dealers' own figures show they made only a realized profit of somewhat over 11 percent during prewar years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN T. WEBB, SR.

Mr. McGEHEE, from the Committee on Claims, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 784) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Webb, Sr., which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 784) entitled "An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Senior", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the House in line 6 of the bill, to-wit "$6,519.95" insert the figures "$7,019.95"; and the House agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
FRANK E. HOOK,
Managers on the Part of the House.
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 784) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr., submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill as passed the Senate appropriated the sum of $7,519.95 to Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr., for the death of their sons, John T. Webb, Jr., and Henry P. Webb, as the result of an explosion of a rocket projectile through the negligence of United States military personnel and (2) for reimbursement of funeral expenses incurred by them on account of such deaths.

The House reduced the amount to $6,519.95, and at the conference a compromise of $7,019.95 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
FRANK E. HOOK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill, S. 784.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. H. MOORE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1015), an act for the relief of G. H. Moore, of Butler, Taylor County, Ga., with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after "appropriated," down to and including "was" in line 9 and insert "(1) to G. H. Moore, the sum of $1,081.50; (2) to Mr. A. J. Moore, the sum of $500; and (3) to Mrs. A. J. Moore, the sum of $500, all of Butler, Taylor County, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the injury of G. H. Moore and Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Moore when the car in which they were."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of G. H. Moore and Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Moore."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORIDA RHONE BURCH

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2545) for the relief of Florida Rhone Burch, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Florida Rhone Burch" and insert "the estate of Donald Rhone."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "her son," and insert "the said."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Donald Rhone."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUFUS A. HANCOCK

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, COMBS, and RAMEY.

ESTATE OF PETER G. FABIAN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, HEDRICK, and BYRNES of Wisconsin.

ESTATE OF GEORGE O'HARA

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, STIGLER, and COLE of Kansas.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 693) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, COMBS, and JENNINGS.

ELMIRA AREA SOARING CORP.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 842) for the relief of the Elmira Area Soaring Corp., with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, STIGLER, and COLE of Kansas.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

NOVEMBER 14, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the standing Committee on Military Affairs, to take effect immediately.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD DAVIS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 400) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following named Member be and he is hereby elected a member of the following standing committee of the House of Representatives: Committee on Flood Control, CLIFFORD DAVIS, of Tennessee.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD further in connection with irrigation in Arizona.

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an article from the New York Mirror, entitled "This Is America," and in the other to include a letter appearing in the October 9, 1945, issue of the New York Times.

Mr. NORRELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a short statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE INVENTORY OF CIVIL SERVICE NOW

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of discussion in the press with regard to recommendations for increases in the salaries of employees in the Federal Government, all the way from top to bottom. I want it clearly understood—I am not opposed to reasonable increases in wages of employees, especially those in the lower-paid brackets where salaries and benefits are inequitable compared with wages paid for similar work elsewhere.

Before we consider the question of increases in salaries of the millions of people on the Federal pay roll, and before we obligate our taxpayers with additional costs, we ought to take an inventory and find out approximately at least, how many employees we really need now that the war is over, in order to carry on the business of government. Let us decide not how much we would like to pay or how many people agencies would like to employ, but rather how many are really needed in view of the tremendous expense and the mounting national debt of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed hearings have been concluded by one of the committees of this Congress dealing with the question of the salaries of those hired to carry on the business of our Government. Our President has proposed a general pay raise in all Federal services, including Supreme Court Justices, who, under his plan, would get $30,000 per year, District judges would receive $20,000, including, of course, retirement lifetime pay accordingly. Cabinet officers would receive $25,000 in place of $15,000, and Members of Congress would be hiked to $20,000 per year under this plan.

Officials in charge of some of our agencies have recommended that heads of departments, now receiving from $8,000 to $10,000 per year, be increased to $15,000 or more. They say it is almost impossible to secure men to carry on the work for less money. I assume there may be a few instances where specific scientific training is required and payment of higher salaries justified, but they are very, very rare and few in Government. I do not believe the heads of such agencies have tried very hard to secure competent assistants, if they have not been able to locate them at salaries of $8,000, $9,000, and $10,000 per year, with added liberal retirement pay and other emoluments. It ought to be understood too that the pay for professional talent is fixed in higher brackets for good as well as bad years.

No one who proposes these high increases in salaries has offered any suggestion as to the source from which the funds are to come, to pay these additional costs. Under the proposals submitted by administration spokesmen, additional expense is about a half billion dollars on the basis of present employment.

The record will show that during the past several years division chiefs and those holding administrative jobs secured their appointments largely because of political influence and not so much by reason of their superior ability. When once planted in such jobs, they usually stay there with increased salaries. What we really need is better and more direct supervision with respect to those who hold such appointments, and more strict accountability regarding their duties.

These proposed top-flight over-all increases are unwarranted. They certainly come with mighty poor taste at a time when there is so much discussion about holding the line in salaries and wages. These proposed increases in higher brackets are not 20 or 30 percent, but they run from 50 to 100 percent.

I contend that before this Congress considers granting increases all the way up and down the line, it better give serious thought and consideration to reduction of personnel in our Government. I believe the rank and file of the taxpayers of this country feel pretty much the same about it.

Do you realize we still have on our pay rolls, approximately 3,600,000 civilian employees, 800,000 overseas, almost one to every three men in uniform, which is about as many as we have ever had. There has been a lot of talk about reductions, but reductions have been very very slow.

About one and one-half million of our employees are clerical or white-collared workers. In addition to this group we have thousands of women in uniform doing practically the same work as girls in civil service. Incidentally, I think these girls in uniform, except those whose services are required in hospitals and in the Veterans' Administration and technical places, ought to be given a chance for release now. Why compel them to stay in the service when girls qualified under civil service can handle the job now that the war is over.

I would like to direct your attention to the fact that the only testimony considered by the committee holding such hearings with respect to this problem is testimony of those in favor of increases. Why not? They, themselves, are a part of it. I do not citicize them for one minute, but I think John Q. Public, the taxpayer, does not have much of a chance to be represented unless Members of Congress are willing to do it. It is for Members of Congress to see to it that the men and women who pay the expenses of Government, and this, incidentally, includes millions of servicemen in uniform, are given the consideration to which they are entitled. Let me repeat, I believe there are some employees in the lower-paid groups who are entitled to consideration with respect to increases in salaries, but let us consider how many are needed before increasing pay.

My appeal this afternoon is that the Committees on Civil Service of both Houses proceed to hold hearings to determine as far as possible the question as to how much of the service rendered by these hundreds of agencies are really necessary in the light of our limited resources and the demand for the curtailment of expenses. That we eliminate every one of the war agencies at the very earliest date possible and see to it that they really are eliminated and not covered into permanent agencies. Then go a step further and pare to the core the services of peacetime agencies that have spread out like mushrooms in the past few years. Make an intensive study with respect to unnecessary services and cut out the tremendous amount of duplication and multiplication of activities that have grown up in our Government, and provide more efficiency that is so much needed.

I have tried the past few years to get Congress to take definite action with respect to this problem. Now is the time and here is the place to do it.

Of course, these thousands of employees who have come into the Government during the war emergency, by and large, have done a good job. They are entitled to credit for it. They knew when they accepted these positions that the jobs were to last during the emergency. There should be no disappointment because of reductions in personnel. It ought to be orderly, efficient, and in accordance with the intent of Congress. We should see to it that veterans' rights are not violated and that career employees are properly protected.

Mr. Bernard Baruch put up a "Stop, look, and listen" sign with respect to Government expenditures. Hostilities ceased sometime ago. Now is the time to hoist a "Stop, look, and listen" sign with respect to the need of employment in our Government.

If those responsible in Government really have a mind to do so, they will adopt such a proposal. They can reduce Government personnel by a million employees in less than 6 months and still do a good job.

Mr. Speaker, we are demobilizing our armed forces, but not the civilian forces at home. We have 3,600,000 Government employees on our pay roll today—800,000 are outside of the United States. We have almost as many civilian employees outside this country as we had at the close of World War I.

The total annual cost of Federal employment is $7,000,600,000. This does not include the expense of women in the armed forces doing clerical work.

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Committees should proceed to hold hearings to determine which agencies should be abolished now. It should proceed to determine the activities and services which should be eliminated. It should see that duplications and multiplications of effort are stricken out. It should immediately investigate the question of inefficiency that is prevalent in many of our agencies.

Mr. Speaker, our country is in debt today in the staggering sum of $268,000,000,000. We are advised the deficit this year will be $30,000,000,000. Again I say we had better "Stop, look, and listen" before we charge the taxpayers of this country with another $500,000,000. The time to take inventory is now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORAND). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REDUCTION IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT—TAKE 2,000,000 OFF THE PAY ROLL

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, emblazoned in the headlines of the Sunday newspapers, of course, designed to reach the greatest number of readers, I read:

Truman details cuts in war agencies. Twenty-three bureaus face overall slash in 1946. Fiscal year's savings $371,000,000.

This is welcome news if it is misunderstood, but it holds out little or no hope for the deflation of bureaucracy when it is really understood. It adroitly gives a false impression to the American people whether or not it was so intended.

It says 23 bureaus face over-all slash in 1946. In fact, what they propose to give is not a meat-cleaver slash, it is not even a scratch. The plan only promises when you read it carefully to take about 123,666 people off of the pay roll out of a total of approximately 3,649,383 employees. It only proposes to deal immediately with 23 bureaus out of 1,141 in the Federal Government and it proposes to deal most gently with those who are separated from the pay roll.

The plan written by Mr. George E. Allen, personal assistant to President Truman, by and with the consent of the President, recommends legislation for these Federal employees which would, to a great extent, reduce the paltry saving of $371,000,000 which they say these cuts in employees between now and June 30, 1946, would accomplish.

Mr. Speaker the President's plan will give the taxpayers no relief because he is endorsing legislation to increase the salaries of all such Federal employees by 20 percent. If he is successful in pushing this legislation through, the salary increase for such employees will amount to about $516,000,000 a year, so you can readily see that instead of saving the taxpayers $371,000,000 their burden will be increased by $145,000,000. And, may I point out he recommends that legislation be passed which is now before the Congress which will place all such Federal employees for the first time under the benefit of unemployment insurance. That means if the President has his way, from now on everyone separated from the Federal service unless he can find a suitable job which compares with the job he lost, he or she may become the beneficiary of unemployment insurance up to $25 a week for 6 months.

The President further recommends that those who have left their homes to come to Washington or to go to the larger cities to accept these jobs should be paid their transportation home. The recommendation of this expense is unparalleled in the history of this country. Most Federal employees, regardless of civil service, throughout the Nation, are political employees. I have never heard before of the Democratic Party or the Republican Party, after they have given political employees a job, guaranteeing that the Government will pay their way back home after the job runs out. This is exactly what the President recommends

Mr. Speaker, I have estimated that if they reduce the Federal pay roll by $371,000,000 it would separate in all about 120,000 people.

We have complained about the demobilization of the Army and justly so. The Army is not run politically and even though it is too slow, it gives one at least a comparison between the operation of a military organization and a political organization. The Army is operating with rocket-bomb speed compared with the political organization in its demobilization on the home front. The Army is demobilizing a million people a month. The present administration is not demobilizing 100 people a month and has not since VJ-day. Let me prove this to you.

Mr. Speaker, when President Truman ascended to the Presidency in April there were 2,914,691 people on the Federal pay roll in continental United States, and it will surprise you to learn that there were 547,000 civilians on the Federal pay roll outside of the United States, making a total of 3,461,191 people paid for out of the Federal Treasury by the taxpayers. The last authentic figures I have are of August 31, 1945, when we find 2,795,213 people on the Federal pay roll in continental United States, with an expansion of 854,170 outside of continental United States, making a grand total of 3,649,383, or an increase during May, June, July, and August of 187,692. It may be, and I hope it will show, that during September and October they have reduced the pay roll by 187,692 people, which would then balance it back to the exact number on the pay roll when President Truman took office.

And, may I point out to you and the taxpayers who pay the bill, that it now requires about $7,600,000,000 a year of the people's money to pay for this bureaucratic horde who yet remain on the pay roll. We are now treated to the bountiful promise that the administration proposes between now and June 30, 1946, to reduce that $7,600,000,000 pay roll by $371,000,000; that is, if the President's 20-percent increase for Federal employees, which will amount to over $500,000,000, is not enacted into law and if those who are separated from the pay roll do not go on unemployment insurance, and if the Congress has courage enough to refuse to pay all their transportation back home if and when they are separated from the service.

Mr. Speaker, the average person on the Federal pay roll who has served 2 years at a $3,000-a-year-salary, if and when he is separated from the pay roll will not have to hitchhike home even if the Congress refuses to pay his way, because he will have the benefit of full pay for a 30-day leave and he will receive his refund of retirement pay of 5 percent of the $6,000 he earned during his 2 years of service which would amount to $300, which amount is more than the average mustering-out pay for the soldiers who won this war for us at a very small monthly salary plus tremendous sacrifices, hardships, and dangers to which they were subjected.

The Members of Congress, by a big majority, I feel certain, who represent the people and try to reduce expenses in an effort to save the Government from financial disaster, are generally agreed that within the next 6 months to a year there should be at least 2,000,000 people separated from the pay roll. If this administration hopes to reduce the pay roll by possibly 120,000 people by July 1 of next year can there be much hope held out that they ever intend to reduce the Federal pay roll by 2,000,000 people. Is it not to the contrary, an indication that they may want to keep the Federal pay roll at a high level in order to control the next national election in the hope of perpetuating the present party in power? You will recall in the last national election the party in power was reelected by about 3,400,000 popular vote majority. There were then about 3,400,000 people on the Federal pay roll.

Those schooled in politics generally regard one person on the Federal payroll as being worth at least 3 votes. It is assumed that there are generally 3 votes in a family and it is further assumed that one member of the family who has the benefit of being on the Federal payroll is generally able to get the other members of the family to vote with him to sustain his job. Can this be the reason the present administration is approaching this problem so tenderly with the result that, come next election, the Federal pay roll will not be 2,000,000 less than it is today?

Mr. Speaker, the servicemen who have returned will have to help pay in taxes these salaries. The farmers who have been working unthinkable hours and who will continue to do so with small net profits at the end of the year, the little businessmen and the laboring men of all types will have to shoulder this burden of heavy taxation to keep this great bureaucratic horde on the Federal pay rolls at the expense of the rest of the people who struggle under the load.

I do not make these statements out of any political bias. It is of too great importance to be approached in that manner. Many of us are more interested in saving this country than in which party will be successful at the next election. I make these statements in an attempt to keep the people from being deceived. I make them in the hope of prodding the administration, if possible, to the point where they will recognize the plea of over 130,000,000 taxpayers for relief. I make them knowing they have the full endorsement of most of the Democratic and all of the Republican Members of Congress. In fact, the majority of the Members of Congress view with alarm, not only the expense of bureaucracy but the power that such a bureaucracy is wielding over the Government to the point where it is encroaching upon the prerogatives of the Members of Congress, who are elected to represent the people.

May I point out that it requires almost double the amount of billions of dollars to pay the Federal pay roll than it required for the entire operating expenses of the Government in 1928.

Mr. Speaker, we can never balance the budget, we can never sufficiently reduce taxes until we begin to curtail expenses, and the time to curtail expenses has now arrived. One way to curtail expenses is to get two to two and one-

half million people who are no longer necessary off of the Federal pay roll back into civilian life where they can contribute something to the upkeep of the Government rather than to continue at the expense of the Government.

If I am accused of being partisan in my approach to this most important question, may I point out that Senator BYRD, a Democrat of Virginia, after a thorough investigation by a congressional committee of which he is the chairman, during the past year has stated time and again, "that there were at least 500,000 people constantly on the pay roll at Government expense who were not needed." If that were true in wartime certainly there are a million people who are on today whose service could be dispensed with. May I point out further that in a recent statement he urged that the Government reduce the Federal pay roll as quickly as possible by the separation from the service of 2,000,000 persons.

With a debt approaching $275,000,000,000, with the Congress and the Nation anxious to help the servicemen when they return to complete their education, to go into business, to buy a farm, to rehabilitate those who are physically disabled so they can make their own way in the future, how can we be as generous and liberal with them as we would like to be unless we can have the cooperation of the administration for real economy starting with the deflation of bureaucracy. It will require $4,500,000,000, or more, to be expended on the servicemen annually to give them the help we have authorized through legislation. Would it not be better to reduce the Federal pay roll by an extra $4,000,000,000 and keep that in reserve for the care of these men as it will surely be needed year after year as the care of the servicemen will mount after they have returned home. Can there be any justification of the expenditure in these times—yes, of even a hundred thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money more than is necessary for any purpose?

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that our normal expenses in peacetime beginning next fiscal year will run around twenty to twenty-five billion dollars. Can we expect to muddle through and avert financial disaster as a nation if we attempt to carry a bureaucracy Federal pay roll of something like $7,000,000,000 a year?

If the President will refuse to take the advice of Mr. Hannegan, the Democrat national chairman, who is the Postmaster General and whose pay roll has increased by 53,995 instead of decreasing, and will insist on reducing these pay rolls by 2,000,000 people in my judgment, it will not only increase his popularity but it will prove to be far better politics than to go along with the politicians who are advising him to the contrary.

The American people will suffer for a long time but when they get enough of anything and when they turn, they turn with great force and effect. Undoubtedly, they are beginning to see that their own economic salvation, the protection of their jobs, the protection of their business, the protection of their farms, their homes, the bonds they have purchased to finance the war and the insurance they have provided for later years, right now and not later, depends on reducing expenses—not increasing them, depends on every possible economy the President and his party can bring to bear to preserve our financial solvency.

Let me show you how bureaucracy has grown in the last 12 years, and I again quote from Senator BYRD, a Democrat, so that I may not be accused of being partisan.

Senator BYRD pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 9, 1945, that 22 agencies are now engaged in housing activities. Twenty-seven agencies are engaged in work having to do with standards and inspection; 29 are engaged in the field of statistics; 24 are engaged in map making; 16 are engaged in education; 14 are engaged in surplus-property disposal; 14 are engaged in the field of safety provisions; 27 in labor relations; 16 in water power and power; 10 in veterans' aid; 20 in conservation of natural resources; 24 in rehabilitation; 22 in insurance; 21 in transportation; 93 in Government lending; 37 in foreign trade; 45 in investigations; 8 in pensions and annuities; 37 in public health; 27 in employment and unemployment matters; 305 in national defense; 6 in public buildings; 64 in business relations, and 44 in agriculture.

Think of it—1,141 Government agencies employing 3,649,383 people at an annual expense of about $7,600,000,000 a year. We cannot continue to carry this load. Pay rolls should be reduced by 2,500,000 people within the next few months. If they are not reduced the responsibility must be placed directly upon the administration in power. It is not a matter of legislation. The administration can make this reduction without any legislation. All of the Republican Members, and I believe the majority of the Democratic Members of the House and Senate, realize it should be done and would welcome such action. The time to act is now in a forthright manner. Let us hope against a faint hope, yes, a faint hope, that such action may be taken.

If we will stop giving America away—and I have started—stop this terrible waste, get the boys out of the Army and back home with their families; yes, and stop the OPA from blocking the road to business and greater employment, adopt business principles of real economy in every department of Government, and everyone go to work in real earnest with less strikes and greater production—we can possibly weather the financial storms ahead and move our country on to a greater destiny.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. My information is that the demobilization in this war is three and one-half times as fast as it was after World War I.

Mr. VURSELL. I think that is quite right.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. What class or type of civilians constitute the increase that has been added outside of continental United States during that time?

Mr. VURSELL. It is the same type of Federal employees that have been serving here in the United States. For instance, some of the departments have greatly increased. The Post Office Department has increased. Within the past few months they have increased their pay roll by something like 43,000 people. Other departments have increased.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand that this report the gentleman is speaking from, Senator BYRD's report, shows something over 3,600,000 employees on the pay roll at this time. Does that represent an increase of nearly 300,000 over the last 6 months?

Mr. VURSELL. No; the gentleman is in error. My figures are correct to date, and as of August 31st the increase has been about 184,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman from Virginia [Senator BYRD] rendered a report to the President a few days ago. Maybe the gentleman had it on his desk. As I remember, in that report he said that before Pearl Harbor there were less than a million people on the pay roll of the Federal Government and there were also less than a million on Armistice Day in 1918. Now we have over 800,000 on the pay roll outside of the continental limits of the United States. Does that correspond with the gentleman's information?

Mr. VURSELL. That corresponds with the information I have from the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Are there something over 3,600,000 employees now?

Mr. VURSELL. According to the last report, that is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It looks like we should begin demobilizing a large group of civilian employees in the Government service.

Mr. VURSELL. I hold those views, and that was the purpose of bringing it to the attention of the House. I hesitated to do this. We are here to try to help direct the affairs of Government as best we can. I know that Members of Congress on both sides of the House realize that a very serious situation is facing the American people, and I know they are for economy. I wanted to provoke thought, and maybe action, by taking the time today to state facts, give these figures, and put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that it will do a little good. If it does, then I have rendered a humble service to my constituents and to the Nation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. May I say, in view of the large civilian pay roll, that bureaucracy does not demobilize itself; it grows and feeds upon itself, regardless of what political party is in power. It takes strong action by the Congress to reduce the number of Government civilian agencies now operating at such tremendous cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. VURSELL. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman have any idea how many people will be required to operate the Full Employment Act, should that become law?

Mr. VURSELL. I have no idea. I am not sufficiently conversant with the full employment bill to discuss it, but I am fearful that it is a long step toward putting the Government in power more greatly as an employer than at the present time. Whether as an employer or not, it may mean the same thing.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If the Government does not economize in its operation, what will be the ultimate result?

Mr. VURSELL. I think the gentleman knows the answer as well as I. It will lead to financial insolvency.

Mr. RICH. There will be a top-heavy Government that will go into bankruptcy because it will be unable to meet its obligations, and the people of this country, whom this Government is trying to serve, will be ruined.

Mr. VURSELL. We are at least headed in that direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of November 2.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by a radio commentator of Springfield, Mass.

FORAND BILL

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today placed on the Speaker's desk discharge petition No. 11, for discharge of a resolution, which will make in order the Forand bill providing for supplemental compensation by the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on November 6, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] addressed the House on matters relating to the Pearl Harbor investigation. During the course of those remarks, the gentleman yielded, and, as appears on page 10446 of the RECORD for that day, I made the following statement:

> The gentleman recalls in connection with the testimony with respect to the so-called "wind execute message" that the testimony of one Captain Kramer was very vital and important and material and that Captain Kramer was badgered and beset by a subsequent effort to break down the testimony which he had given under oath and that Captain Kramer, it is now alleged, is confined at a hospital in a psychopathic ward. Did the gentleman and I get to go to that hospital to try to see Captain Kramer to find out what the facts are with respect to this very vital and important witness and to talk to him and see him? We are denied that right under the order issued by the President, and yet there is one of the most vital and important witnesses who could be brought before this investigating committee, and whole legions of stories have arisen as to the manner in which he was broken down in mind and health subsequent to the testimony he gave. I want to go out to the hospital and see this man. The gentleman from California wants to go out and see him. Can the gentleman do it, or can I, under that order?

Mr. Speaker, my purpose at that time in referring to Captain Kramer was to show concretely the difficulties that confronted members of the investigating committee in any effort to ascertain facts.

I was definitely advised prior to the 6th of November 1945, by sources which I considered to be unimpeachable in character, that Captain Kramer was at the Bethesda naval hospital undergoing treatment in a neuropsychiatric ward. Because of his extreme importance as a witness, I felt that every effort should be made to see and talk with him.

It will be recalled that the President had issued a secret order in August 1945, which in effect prohibited all Army, Navy, or civilian personnel in the Government service, including Captain Kramer, from discussing with anyone information obtained from handling codes or cryptographic material. Thus at the outset, despite the fact that we knew that Captain Kramer, an important witness, was at the Bethesda naval hospital undergoing treatment in a neuropsychiatric ward, he was barred under the Presidential order from talking to us, and it would have been useless at that time to have undertaken to talk with him.

It will be noted that the newspapers throughout the country and in the District of Columbia carried stories on Wednesday, November 7, with respect to the statement which I made in reference to Captain Kramer the day before. It will be noted that in the statement which I made and which I have referred to no charge was made that he was being held incommunicado, and I can assume no responsibility for the interpretations of my statement appearing in the press. It is enough to say that the Navy Department, the officials at the hospital, and Captain Kramer himself saw these newspaper reports on Wednesday, November 7.

On Tuesday, November 8, the Pearl Harbor Committee met, and as a result of that meeting, we were advised that the Presidential order had been revised so as to permit individuals in Government service to discuss the Pearl Harbor incident with individual members of the committee. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] and I decided to visit the hospital immediately. When I returned to my office from the committee meeting, preparatory to going to Bethesda, I found that information had been telephoned to my secretary to the effect that Captain Kramer had been given liberty that morning and was not at the hospital. My secretary called the hospital and inquired whether Captain Kramer was a patient there and was advised that he was. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] and I immediately went to the hospital at Bethesda. There we learned that Captain Kramer had been given "liberty" that morning and that he had left the hospital with his wife. We further learned that he had been in a neuropsychiatric ward, known as N-5. We were advised that he would be at the hospital the following morning, and we returned then, where we met Captain Kramer and Mrs. Kramer and had a long interview.

During the early portion of the interview, the commanding officer of the hospital stepped into the room and advised that there were newspapermen and photographers present who wanted to take pictures and obtain a statement from Captain Kramer. The commanding officer stated that he had discussed the matter with the public relations department of the Navy and that he thought it would be all right to permit the pictures to be taken and for Captain Kramer to make a short statement. Captain Kramer agreed. The pictures were taken and subsequently appeared in the press. Captain Kramer then made a short, succinct and what appeared to me to have been a carefully thought out statement. That statement is as follows:

> I did not desire to make a statement to the press but will do so in view of the grossly inaccurate and distorted statements which have appeared in the newspapers.
>
> I have been a patient at the hospital for some weeks and far from being beset and beleaguered as the newspapers suggest. I am feeling very well. My treatment by the Navy has been as fair and considerate as it could possibly be, and statements otherwise appearing in the press earlier this week are as far from the truth as they could possibly be.
>
> As regards the issues in this case—the question of my testifying before the committee of Congress investigating Pearl Harbor—I am available at this time and have been continuously available to the committee and am prepared to state fully anything that I know that they may want to know.
>
> I was not held incommunicado.
>
> It just happens that the proper approach was not made to see me. I was downtown shopping yesterday when attempts were made to interview me.
>
> The detail work and other things I am being treated for do not necessitate my remaining here every day. I can leave the hospital at my own discretion.

On the basis of this statement, which was later issued to the press by the public relations division of the Navy Department, certain newspapers published headlines such as the one that appeared in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, a Democratic newspaper, under date of Friday, November 9, 1945. This newspaper carried a scare headline across the front page—"Kramer Explodes Keefe's Charges." Because of the importance of Captain Kramer as a witness in this investigation and because I want nothing but truth and facts, and because I am apprehensive that there are interests involved in this investigation that do not want the truth, I believe a statement of

some additional facts is warranted. These are the facts:

Captain Kramer testified under oath as a witness before the naval court of inquiry. His testimony, in my judgment, was clear and factual, and he was supported by the testimony of Captain Safford, who was in the same division of the Navy. After the navy court of inquiry had made its findihgs, the Secretary instructed one Admiral Hewitt to make further investigation. Admiral Hewitt interviewed the witnesses that had testified before the naval court and took further statements from them under oath. Among these witnesses was Captain Kramer. Admiral Hewitt questioned Captain Kramer at length with respect to the testimony which he had given before the naval court of inquiry, and as a result of that examination, Captain Kramer's recollection became less clear as to the events of the week prior to December 7, 1941. His change of recollection brought about by the examination of Admiral Hewitt was on the most vital and important matter in the whole testimony.

Captain Kramer went into active service in the Pacific and was gone for a period of about a year and a half. He then returned to Washington and went into the Naval hospital at Bethesda for a check-up in August of this year. Prior to going to the Pacific he had lived in Arlington with his family. When he broke up his home, his wife and children went to Miami, Fla., where they are living at the present time.

Now, bear this in mind, Captain Kramer had gone to the hospital in August for a physical checkup. This committee and the publicity incident to the work of this committee came to the public on the 6th of September 1945. On the 28th of September 1945, 22 days after this committee was appointed and all the publicity was in the paper as to this investigation, Captain Kramer, on orders from the Medical Department of the Navy, went to the Bethesda Hospital for observation and treatment.

On September 28, 1945, Captain Kramer, under orders from the Medical Department of the Navy, went to the Bethesda Hospital for observation and treatment. He was placed in ward N–5, a neuropsychiatric ward. His uniform was taken from him and he was clothed in pajamas, bathrobe, slippers, and so forth, in accordance with usual practice in that institution. He was there under orders. He remained in that ward continuously while being subject to orders, care, and treatment of the Medical Department. His meals were served to him in the ward, whereas those who had their uniforms ate in the officers' mess. He could not go and come as he pleased, until granted "liberty" on Thursday, November 7.

He showed some improvement, but the physicians in charge, Dr. Raines and Dr. Straub, felt that something which they could not diagnose or understand was bothering him, making his recovery less rapid. On October 30, 1945, Dr. Raines wrote a letter to Mrs. Kramer, addressed to her in Miami, Fla., and among other things, stated in this letter that while Captain Kramer had shown improvement, certain manifestations still persisted. He requested that she come to Bethesda so they could discuss his case with her and try to ascertain if possible what it was that was worrying him. They were unable to get him to say what was disturbing him.

Mrs. Kramer came to Washington, and she felt and so expressed herself to others that he was worrying because of the Pearl Harbor incident and worrying because of efforts that had been made to have him modify or change his testimony.

It is a mere coincidence that she arrived in Washington on the 5th of November, the day after the gentleman from California, Congressman GEARHART, made his speech, and it is a mere coincidence perhaps that the publicity of that speech and the interjection placed in it by myself came to the attention of the Navy Department, the hospital authorities, and Captain and Mrs. Kramer. The facts are, however, that much to the surprise of Captain Kramer himself and without any change in his condition as indicated by any conclusions of the hospital board, he was granted "liberty" the morning of Thursday, November 8, and left the hospital with his wife that morning. He was not present when the gentleman from California, Congressman GEARHART, and I went to the hospital that afternoon. It is perhaps a coincidence that when we returned to the hospital the next morning, Captain Kramer appeared in his uniform, which had been returned to him the day before for the first time since September 28.

The records of the hospital indicate that Captain Kramer had one visitor during his confinement there. This visitor was Captain Safford, also an important witness before the Pearl Harbor investigating committee and a coworker with Captain Kramer in the intelligence division. There is no other record at the hospital showing a visitor other than Captain Safford.

From this record I am convinced that the Navy Department and the higher-ups in Washington fully realized the importance to be attached to the testimony of Captain Kramer. I am fully convinced that efforts were made to get Captain Kramer to modify and change portions of the testimony that he had given before the Navy Board of Inquiry. I am satisfied that this worried Captain Kramer and that his worry, coupled with overwork and fatigue as a result of his service in the Pacific, caused his being ordered to the neuropsychiatric ward in the Bethesda Hospital for treatment. I am satisfied that the psychiatrists there were baffled as to the underlying cause for his continual worry which resulted in the persistent manifestations which they referred to when they wrote to Mrs. Kramer asking her to come to Washington.

I am completely satisfied that the basic cause of Captain Kramer's worry arises from the efforts which have been made to have him change certain vital and important parts of his testimony.

It is too much to expect to obtain any admission of this fact from Captain Kramer himself. Even the psychiatrists at the hospital have been unable to get from him the real cause of his worry. I sincerely hope that when Captain Kramer appears as a sworn witness before the Pearl Harbor committee, he may firmly adhere to the clear-cut statement which he made when he testified before the naval court of inquiry.

In view of all the facts, therefore, and despite the release of the public relations departments of the Navy quoting Captain Kramer, I still stand on the statement which I made on November 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that I might follow the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin in order that we might get this Pearl Harbor inquiry on the even keel on which it started. The distinguished gentleman repeatedly speaks first of him having done certain things on the floor of the House relative to a patient at Bethesda Hospital. After doing what he said he did and making the statement he said he made, there was apparently some statement in some paper in Wisconsin and he today on the floor of the House answers the statement in that paper in Wisconsin. Not once has the gentleman brought the matter to the attention of the committee of which he is a member. Not once has the gentleman said a word about it to the members of the committee, at least on the Democratic side.

When the committee was named there were statements in the paper to the effect that 10 lawyers had been named to the committee. Being honored and privileged to serve on that committee, I felt that we were going to act like lawyers as well as Members of the Congress of the United States. Back where I come from it is a little irregular, it is most unusual, to try your case in the newspapers before you get to court. It is my impression that the system of justice we have in America and which has existed from early days in England down to the present time is based on the fact that a man is entitled to a jury of his peers and to have his case presented in court with counsel on both sides. Then it goes to the American people, who are the jury, to pass upon the verdict.

What do we have here today? We have the gentleman talking about some statement out in a hospital, and about some report before a board of inquiry, when the Pearl Harbor meetings do not commence until tomorrow. Why could not the gentleman sit back or go out and work as we have done and read all the volumes of reports that are on this table, as well as others that are in my office, and make his inquiry and present it, and, in fairness to this gentleman, Captain Kramer or Commander Kramer, whatever his rank may be, have him come into the room before the American press, before the American radio, and before the American people, and then let the distinguished gentleman make his accusations?

On the floor of this House last week, on November 6, one of the gentlemen on the other side said he was surprised that the witness Kramer had not been liquidated, Mr. Speaker, to me that means,

surprise at the United States Navy, the branch which has done a great deal in winning this war under the able leadership of great Americans—the gentleman on the other side said he was surprised that the witness was not liquidated, and to me that means murdered. Is that the way to conduct a fair and impartial inquiry for the American people? Is it fair to have statements made about a witness being in a psychiatric ward? Is it fair to have statements in the paper which in effect are misquotation but based on the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin on this floor, anticipating an inquiry which will not commence until tomorrow?

On November 6 the gentleman talked about the witness.

On November 7 or 8 the gentleman was present when statements were given to the press. Here we are on November 14—I believe it is—I am so busy I have forgotten the date, but tomorrow we commence the inquiry, and we are now going over a small segment of the case we are to hear.

In the Christian Science Monitor, a very valuable paper, a gentleman named Stringer wrote an excellent column. It seems to me it would be well for the members of this committee to read that column.

The effect of the statement of the gentleman was, and I am just giving the general import of it, that the issue to be decided is whether or not there should be a full, fair, open, and complete inquiry by the committee designated by Congress or whether or not it shall be threshed piecemeal in the newspapers, on the streets, and on the floor of Congress in a haphazard fashion so that it will be difficult for the American people to get the facts.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the committee, I feel the hearings should commence tomorrow. When they do commence, what is the procedure? In order to be fair about this matter, the committee tried to get one of the ablest lawyers in America. The Democratic majority of the committee, with those on the minority, voted unanimously to pick an outstanding lawyer, a distinguished gentleman and a great American who was Attorney General under one Republican administration and Solicitor General under another Republican administration. They picked such a man to conduct the inquiry. Regardless of what the other members of the committee may say on the other side of the aisle, I have implicit confidence in the integrity of our counsel and I feel that the American people will get a full and complete story of Pearl Harbor—the truth, the whole truth, and, gentlemen, nothing but the truth.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I prefer not to yield. I will yield to the gentleman later. I did not ask the gentleman to yield. May I be permitted to get on with my story, please?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman does not care to yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be diverted and would like to go on with my case.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield to any Member until I have finished my statement. I hope I make that plain. I do not intend to be discourteous to any Member, but I have a job to do. I want to make a report to this body.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield. Mr. Speaker, I have now told three Members that I will not yield to any Member. I hope I will not be interrupted further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Speaking about newspapers, it is rather difficult when you are a member of a committee to follow the papers if you have members of the committee not reporting to the committee but have something in Sheboygan, Wis., or something else in the Journal and American in New York. If you are going to keep up with the members of the committee on statements that are being made, apparently it would be necessary, under the theory of the gentlemen on the other side, to follow every paper in the United States. I have here a paper which I want to show to the Congress. I want to point out to the Congress, to the Members of this body, to what extremes certain people in America have gone on this inquiry. When the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from California went to the hospital they did not find Captain Kramer there. He apparently was downtown with his wife. The New York Journal and American with glaring headlines across the top of the page said, "Pearl Harbor Witness Vanishes."—vanishes! I have that here and I will put it in the RECORD. The man was downtown with his wife and accordingly the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin did not see him, and says the New York Journal and American, "Pearl Harbor Witness Vanishes."

Just to give you an example of some other things: We thought we might go to Pearl Harbor. Certain members of this committee thought it would be a good idea. I opposed it. I felt we could decide the case on the facts. But eventually the committee decided that it will not go to Pearl Harbor. That decision was the action of the committee. The committee decided not to go. Says the Washington Times-Herald, "The Republicans win a great victory. They are not going to Pearl Harbor."

I do not think that has anything to do with this inquiry. I do not think it is a question of politics whether we go to Pearl Harbor or not. It was the action of the committee. I do not think it is fair for certain newspapers to talk about witnesses vanishing, in headlines about an inch and a half in height, when they have simply gone shopping with their wives. The fact is we have before this committee the report of the Roberts board. We have before this committee the report of the Army board. We have before this committee the report of the Navy board. We have before this committee the top-secret reports of Admiral HART, now a distinguished Member of the other body. We have before this committee the report of Admiral Hewitt. We have before this committee the report of Major Classen. This will be an open hearing. Every single word of testimony will be before the American press. There will not be a question of whether it is the Navy Public Relations said so and so, or one of the gentlemen, a distinguished and able newspaperman, who made the statement about Captain Kramer, and what he had to say. It was that very statement which was given out by the Public Relations Department of the Navy. The gentleman who wrote the statement sits there now in the Press Gallery.

Now, let us be fair. We are going to have a complete and open inquiry. Certain things have been said about certain phases of the inquiry. One of the gentlemen in the other body talked about certain "winds" testimony. We are going into that matter thoroughly. Certain gentlemen talked here about the Kramer testimony, and we will have Captain Kramer before the American people and the American press. Let the American people decide. We are going to have the witnesses before this committee. Every member of this committee has everything in the way of secret, top-secret, and confidential reports made available to them. They are over in the room in the Senate Office Building. I have been reading them night and day.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Not now.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is misstating the facts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, when I was a young lad back home, I had experiences like that regularly. One of the things I observed as a young lawyer—and I am still just a lad—was the fact that when the other fellow accuses you of something, as a good lawyer, watch out for that. Watch out for that. If the other fellow says, "You are putting politics into it," watch out for what he is doing. If he says, "You are making a misstatement," watch out for what he is doing. I have gone through that for years. It is not new to me.

I want to be fair. I want to say there on the table is the top-secret report of Admiral Hart, there is the top-secret report of Major Classen. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Senator FERGUSON, and the distinguished gentleman from Maine, Senator BREWSTER, have the Hewitt report, and the other reports are over in a room in the Senate Office Building. I will stand any challenge on that when I have completed my statement.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but I feel this is not the time or the place to go into the evidence. We have an abundance of evidence. We have an abundance of material. We are going to start hearings tomorrow. All I ask of the gentlemen in this body and the gentlemen in the press gallery and the gentlemen of the radio and the American people is this: Just give us an opportunity to present a full, fair, open, honest, and frank discussion

of all the facts in this case. If we fail in any particular, I for one will join the gentlemen on the other side to go into it thoroughly and bring out all the facts. But, until then, let us not try our case in the newspapers. Until then, let us not quarrel in the papers, back and forth, about statements that are not made to the committee. Until then, let us proceed in a lawyer-like, legislative-like fashion and have the kind of inquiry that this very serious subject deserves.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman made the statement that the committee had been furnished every bit of material. Does the gentleman mean to infer by that that he has assurance that the committee has been furnished anything more than what the various departments of Government have sent up to the committee in response to the request of our counsel? And will not the gentleman agree with me that under that Presidential order, which was not modified until the 7th of November, that as individual members of that committee, not one of us has been permitted to go down and inspect a single record or a single file in order to try and ascertain whether these departments have in fact sent the full record and all of the records up to our committee? And that was the question——

Mr. MURPHY. Just a minute, I want to answer the gentleman's questions one at a time. That is three he has asked and now he is going on to the fourth. Let me answer the first three.

I want to say to the Members of this body and the press of America that one of the best examples of the wisdom of this committee and of the distinguished President of the United States in insisting upon the committee's acting as a committee or through subcommittees instead of as individuals has been displayed by the gentleman on the other side. Imagine the gentleman going down through the files, and each afternoon, by accident or otherwise, there are the gentlemen of the press as he comes out of the department and then he gives out a statement. One paper says one thing, another says another, and then the next day he is on the floor contradicting those statements. We will have hearings and full orderly procedure and we will get every paper and piece of evidence as a committee; and I will say to the gentleman that our distinguished counsel has been doing a fine job getting everything requested. I know the gentleman has made requests and I know counsel is working on them. I know they have gotten everything I have asked for; I know I have more papers now than I can get over by tomorrow; but we are working night and day to get them.

What other questions does the gentleman have to ask?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman will recall, will he not, that I think the 7th day of November the gentleman or I, or any other member of this committee, was not permitted to discuss individually with any officer of the Navy, or Army, or anybody in civilian capacity who might have had any information which they obtained from cryptograph or code material; and it was not until we had built a fire under you fellows that we succeeded in getting that order modified.

Mr. MURPHY. Now, there is a statement by a member of the committee——

Mr. KEEFE. Well, that is a fact.

Mr. MURPHY. Building a fire under members of the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. It is a fact, nevertheless.

Mr. MURPHY. I should like to think we are proceeding in a gentlemanly, lawyerlike, dignified fashion. I may say to my colleague I see no occasion for a reference of that kind. The fact is, there was a Presidential order made in the month of August regarding cryptanalysis and codes—it was during the war and it was to prevent a disclosure during the war. The fact is, that on October 23 there was a modification of that order by the President of the United States. The fact is, that the committee met and we unanimously agreed that it did not go far enough. The fact is, there was some mistake about the new order, and the unanimous action of the committee was that we get a new order, and we have the new order. The gentleman refers to building fires. All the virtue in the world does not repose in the bosom of the gentleman from Wisconsin; there is a little virtue in the bosoms of others. We are trying to do the right thing. I do not believe the gentleman should make accusations like that when he knows the committee acted unanimously on that matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is not the effect of the order this, that when the committee acts, votes, or authorizes either the committee as a whole or a subcommittee or an individual member of a subcommittee to do anything that it can be done?

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman has accurately stated the situation. Let me make this statement just to clear it up. The President of the United States was asked by a certain motion that he direct our committee as to its procedure; in other words instead of the committee's acting as a committee that the President say to us in an Executive order: "Any one of your committee can subpena witnesses, any one of your committee can go out and conduct investigations." The President properly said: "You are a committee of the Congress. Acting through a committee or subcommittees you have all the authority in the world to so act; and if your committee wants to act through a properly named one-man subcommittee it can do just that."

Mr. McCORMACK. What they want to do is to go out, without regard to committee action, and in turn become committees of their own, is that right?

Mr. MURPHY. They want to do exactly what they have done in the Kramer case.

Mr. McCORMACK. They want to go ahead and do their snooping, their legislative witch hunting, in order to create an impression of guilt; then they will pull somebody out of the bag later on with their four one-man grand jury.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to come to the last part of my statement.

The distinguished gentleman from California is quoted in the press, perhaps incorrectly but he is quoted in the press, as having said that they were down to see J. Edgar Hoover yesterday and, said the press, the gentleman from California made the statement that if the Army and the Navy had sent a statement out to the Pacific we would not have had Pearl Harbor. Perhaps the gentleman is incorrectly quoted, but if he is correctly quoted then he is not quoting the facts and I would like to say why. Said the gentleman, there was no message sent. Said the gentleman from Wisconsin, these were weasel words, speaking apparently of the message of the Navy and the Army which the gentleman from California said was not sent, but apparently by inference if sent, the gentleman from Wisconsin said, was not properly worded. May I say to the Members of this body that when the hearing commences we will go into the messages that were sent at the same time as the message from J. Edgar Hoover. Said the wording of the Navy message: "This is to be considered a war warning." Is there anything weasel-worded about that?

Mr. WALTER. What date was that?

Mr. MURPHY. That was sent out on November 27, 1941.

Now, one more quote. The statement I quoted was from the Navy.

Let me quote from the Army. The inference has gone out through the American press unfortunately that no statement was sent out by the Army. Let me quote from the message of November 27 of the Army:

> Negotiations with the Japanese appear to be terminated to all practical purposes with only the barest possibilities that the Japanese Government might come back and offer to continue. Japanese future action unpredictable but hostile action possible at any moment.

Is there anything weasel-worded about that? Both of those were sent to Pearl Harbor on the 27th of November. Is it fair for the press to say that no message was sent by the Army or Navy?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to be fair he will admit that there was nothing directive in any one of those messages telling either Admiral Kimmel or General Short what to do under these strained circumstances.

Mr. MURPHY. I will answer that.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman will have to admit, if he knows anything about military and naval law, that it was the duty of the Washington authorities to direct under a condition of that kind.

Mr. MURPHY. I yielded to the gentleman, but do not take all of my time.

Mr. GEARHART. J. Edgar Hoover's order alerted every one of his FBI men by requiring every one of them to be standing by on 24-hour notice, none of them to be away from a telephone for

over 30 minutes' time. He put them on the alert. Washington Army authorities and Washington naval authorities did nothing to put them on an alert, although not only in Hawaii alone but some place in the world there might be military action by the Japanese.

Mr. MURPHY. Once again the gentleman from California has demonstrated the wisdom of my proposition in quoting from the Christian Science Monitor that certainly this is not the place to try the case. We will have an abundance of testimony of instructions from away back in April on down through November, but the——

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I will not yield further. This is not a duet. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in conclusion——

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me before he concludes?

Mr. MURPHY. Just let me answer the gentleman from California first and then I will yield. There will be an abundance of testimony showing what was sent to General Short and what was sent to Admiral Kimmel, but certainly in a few brief moments you cannot cover a hearing which will take at a minimum from 30 to 40 to 45 days. That is why it is wrong to try this case on the floor of this House.

Mr. GEARHART. And I will tell the gentleman why it is wrong——

Mr. MURPHY. I cannot yield further.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman brought before us that much testimony, and he wants us to read it by tomorrow.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded to the gentleman. I will say to the gentleman, let us have no recriminations. The gentleman from California was kind enough to vote with all of the Democratic members of the committee to fix the hearing for tomorrow, and within 1 week——

Mr. GEARHART. And the information requested was not even supplied to this date.

Mr. MURPHY. And then 1 week later the gentleman changed his mind. But that is up to the gentleman.

Mr. GEARHART. Because the committee promised to supply what we asked for before.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor, and it is not proper to interrupt the gentleman if he does not yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I want to thank the gentleman from California for having voted with the majority on the first vote, at least, to fix tomorrow as the hearing date. But at any rate after tomorrow we will be before the American people and the American press and the American radio, and then let them decide what is going on in committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As a physician I have been somewhat disturbed about some information that has been handed around. I am sure the House will agree that we have three and I think four very able men in this chamber to represent us on the Pearl Harbor investigation, but I hope that the gentleman's committee will get the medical records of Captain Kramer and either prove or disprove that he was given a drug known as hyacine or scopolamine, probably better known as truth serum, upon one occasion. As medical men we chatter around the table as politicians and lawyers do, and that thing has disturbed me, because several medical men who ought to know suggested that that serum was given to Captain Kramer, and I hope the gentleman's committee will ascertain the truth.

Mr. MURPHY. May I answer the gentleman by saying that we will have Captain Kramer in an open courtroom in the presence of the American press and representatives of the radio, and then if there is any evidence about truth serum or some such drug, I am sure we will get the information.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And also whether the medical record has not been removed.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made reference to an alleged statement by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], alleging that in this Chamber on November 6 he said he was surprised that Captain Kramer had not been liquidated.

Mr. MURPHY. That is right.

Mr. JONKMAN. I think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. MURPHY. I will quote exactly from the RECORD. I now hold in my hand RECORD page 10446, third column:

Mr. GEARHART, Mr. SHORT, Mr. GEARHART, Mr. SHORT, Mr. GEARHART.

Now comes Mr. SHORT, and I am reading from the RECORD which I hold in my hand, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, November 6:

Mr. SHORT. I am surprised they have locked him up; I am surprised he has not been liquidated.

Mr. JONKMAN. Certainly, and to whom other could he refer than to Tyler Kent. Tyler Kent had been locked up but Captain Kramer had not been locked up. I think the gentleman is distorting the statement.

Mr. MURPHY. No.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman apparently has not read the newspapers.

Mr. MURPHY. I leave that to any reader in America——

Mr. JONKMAN. He was discussing Kent.

Mr. MURPHY. That is another reason why I say it is unwise to try this case on the floor of this House instead of before the proper tribunal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I have received several communications from persons in the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division advising me of the circumstances surrounding their attempts to secure discharge from the service. In the division are 6,000 overseas veterans, some of whom have had 42 months overseas and over 100 points. They have waited for shipment from the Philippines for several weeks. During that time two divisions with one-half of the overseas time and one-fourth of the fighting time of the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division have already departed or are readying for shipment. The men in the Thirty-seventh understand that a thousand noncombatant troops will be sent home from the Philippines ahead of them. The net result is that these high-point veterans of the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division will spend their fourth Christmas overseas.

The War Department has stated that this division is ordered to be ready for shipment on November 15, but the men understand that they actually will not sail for some time thereafter.

It is difficult to understand why a division with less time overseas should be given preference over a division where the men average to have more points and more overseas service.

Since the War Department has made plans for their return to the United States, I am placing this information in the RECORD in order that all persons interested in the personnel of this division may have the information.

In closing I would like to ask the War Department for a full, public explanation to servicemen with high-point scores—many of them fathers—of the release of a low-score college football player who can play football today instead of replacing some high-point, overseas combat soldier. I have received many letters referring to this particular piece of favoritism which apparently has developed into an Army scandal in the minds of countless real heroes of World War II.

On the bright side of the picture, I was advised by an officer in the War Department today that every service man or woman in Europe eligible for discharge will be back in the United States by February. From May 12, 1945, to November 9, 1945, the Army has discharged 2,870,000 soldiers. The Army is now discharging 45,000 daily. These figures speak volumes about the over-all accomplishment of the Army on demobilization. Yet all Americans wish that particularly high-point men might be reached in an orderly manner for early discharge. Today many of them are still in service who ought to be home.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PALESTINE AND SLICK BRITISH TACTICS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I was startled and I am sure many of you were startled at the administration's consenting to an Anglo-American commission to survey the condition of the Jews in Europe with reference to Palestine as a haven. I was amazed that the administration had fallen for this new British maneuver. I fear that President Truman, for whom I have the highest regard, may have fallen unwittingly into this British trap. Procrastination and delay are the words always on the masthead of the British when they are faced with the necessity for making a decision. I say to Mr. Attlee and Mr. Bevin and Mr. Morrison and the British Government that their delays and their procrastinations will be responsible for the deaths and the martyrdom of thousands of helpless and homeless Jews. Their only hope of refuge is Palestine. Barriers meet them everywhere else. Mr. Attlee sang a different tune when he ran for election than the one he sang here yesterday. I remind the Members of the House of the platform pledges of Mr. Attlee and the Labor Party before election. That party pledge is as follows:

Here we have halted halfway, irresolute between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home, unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish to, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe.

Here, too, in Palestine is the case on human grounds, and to promote a stable settlement for the transfer of populations, let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in.

Let me say by way of parentheses at that juncture, the Labor platform and Mr. Attlee before election held their hands high to heaven and said that which not even the Zionists advocate, namely, that the Arabs should get out to make way for the Jews. But Mr. Attlee, Mr. Morrison, and Mr. Bevin have changed their tactics, have deliberately and flagrantly defaulted on those platform pledges. Let me continue with the platform of the Labor Party:

Indeed, we should examine also the possibility of extending the present boundaries—

That is, the boundaries of Palestine—

by agreement with Egypt, Syria or Transjordan. Moreover, we should seek to win the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments for the execution of this Palestine policy.

The Labor Party repeatedly had challenged and chided both the Chamberlain and Churchill governments for their dereliction in Palestine, and bitterly condemned those governments for their perfidity and for their failure to redeem their pledges given to the Jews and to the world, to wit, that England would keep open the gates of Palestine for untrammeled Jewish immigration and land ownership to the end that the government might facilitate the establishment therein of a national homeland for the Jewish people.

Time and again the leading members of the Labor Party have expressed themselves in favor of the Zionists' aspirations in Palestine. In fact, the British Labor Party has been pro-Zionist for a quarter of a century. Maj. Clement Attlee, now Prime Minister, while a member of the British delegation to the World Security Conference at San Francisco reassured labor's friends in Palestine that he, Attlee, was fully in accord with his party's program on Palestine, which program I have just read to you. He arose from his seat also in Parliament and declared that the political and economic reconstruction of Palestine had become an imperative duty. The words "imperative duty" are not mine; they are his. "Particularly," he said, "in face of the tragedy of the German Jews."

He said that the Jews "were bearing the burdens of other peoples' sins."

It is also significant that Prime Minister Attlee placed in important positions in his cabinet numerous of his colleagues who have been not only sympathetic to the Zionist cause but who have openly and courageously denounced efforts on the part of previous British Government to sabotage and scuttle the efforts of the Jews to develop their homeland in Palestine—the only haven left for harassed Jews in the whole world. Now Mr. Attlee and his colleagues become the enemies of the Jewish efforts and become the saboteurs against Palestine as the Jewish homeland.

Mr. Attlee is just as imperialistic as his predecessors and when Mr. Bevin, who is also as imperialistic as his predecessors despite the Labor label, appeared in the House of Parliament and spoke on foreign policy, somebody looked at Mr. Bevin, who is rather stout of figure, and said, "By jove, Anthony, you have grown fat."

We are told, with reference to the flagrant disregard of promises and pledges made by Mr. Attlee, Mr. Bevin, and their colleagues, that at the Potsdam Conference, for example, an argument ensued between Mr. Molotov and Mr. Bevin. Bevin righteously declared to Mr. Molotov, "I want you to remember, Mr. Molotov, that I represent labor." Molotov very cutely replied, "I remember, Mr. Bevin, but you forget." Indeed, Mr. Attlee, Mr. Bevin, Mr. Morrison, and others very conveniently forget the pledges they made in their platform on which they were elected by an overwhelming majority. We must remind them at all times of those pledges. To me, a man who does not keep his word cannot be trusted further. I want no truck with him. It is the same, or at least should be the same, with regard to a nation. If a nation does not keep its word and does not keep its promises, other nations should have no truck with that nation. England has been guilty of a flagrant disregard of her pledges given time and again with reference to Palestine. Always, when faced with the need for a decision, the British use the dodge and the stall—another inquiry, another investigation, another appointment of another commission, and so forth.

There have been innumerable reports, inquiries, and commissions on Palestine and the Jews. There was the Peel commission. There was the commission which resulted in the abominable, nefarious white paper of 1939, which excluded immigration of Jews into Palestine. There is the Harrison report. Federal Judge Rifkind is over there now as the emissary of the President. He is making an investigation and will finally make a report. There is the report and investigation of General Eisenhower concerning the condition of the stateless Jews in Europe. There was the commission which resulted in the splitting up of Palestine, dividing it into two parts, and severing Transjordan from Palestine. There was a report and investigation made by the Mandates commission of the League of Nations. In 1939, Britain sought to get the consent of the League of Nations for its abominable Malcolm MacDonald white paper, which prohibited land ownership by the Jews after 1944, and precluding immigration into Palestine after that year. What did the Mandates commission of the League of Nations do? They studied the whole question. Not only did they refuse consent to that wretched paper, but they denounced it in no uncertain terms. You know, it was necessary, since England had a mandate over Palestine, for her to get the consent of the League of Nations to make any such drastic change with reference to immigration into Palestine and with reference to land ownership in Palestine. The League of Nations in effect said, "No; you cannot do that. It is contrary to the provisions of your mandate, and we denounce any attempts on your part to do it." But, nonetheless, England flouted the will of the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations. Now she wants another commission. Since she did not recognize reports and findings of those other commissions, since she disregarded the Harrison report and all these other reports, how do we know whether she will not thumb her nose again at the Anglo-American report that will result from the deliberations of this new dodge of Britain—an Anglo-American commission? She can refuse to recognize the findings and recommendations. I do not trust Great Britain when it comes to Palestine, because she has defaulted time and again on the pledges given with reference to the Jews. The words "perfidious albion" are well bestowed and well deserved when it comes to Britain concerning the people of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman made some reference to the fact that we could not place much reliance on a man or on a nation, either one, who, as we commonly say now a days, does a little double talking about these things. Would the gentleman care to comment on a letter that was recently disclosed as going from the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt to King Ibn-Saud?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. I am sorry the gentleman brought that up. It is a very bitter pill for me to swallow; very bitter,

indeed, because I must say that the late lamented President in that correspondence between himself and King Ibn-Saud did not keep faith, did not keep his pledge. That is unfortunate. I say that with all misgivings. I say that with sorrow in my heart, but I have to admit the truth. That is the truth. However great Roosevelt was, here he suffered a lapse from grace. There are some who say the letters in question are in accord with Roosevelt's previously expressed promises. With such interpretation I do not agree.

I repeat perfidious Albion. First, Britain has repudiated the Balfour Declaration of 1917; second, she disregarded our own concurrent resolution of 1922 calling for a Jewish state in Palestine; third, she gave the mandate pledge a hot foot; fourth, she set at naught the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924 which precluded discrimination in immigration into Palestine on the grounds of race or religion; fifth, she kicked around the decision of the Mandate Commission of the League which castigated the white paper of 1939; sixth, she repudiated her debt agreements with us after World War I; seventh, she violated the terms of our lend-lease agreements with her in that she is now using lend-lease tanks, machine guns, and planes to strafe and kill innocent civilians in Indonesia (Dutch territory); eighth, she thus far refuses to ratify the Bretton Woods agreement and gives no sign of so doing and only has until the year's end to do so, but as sure as you are a foot high she will only ratify it if she gets her way on the contemplated economic trade and aid agreement pending.

The conduct of Britain has been disheartening and tragic.

The Arabs have no case in Palestine. Britain raises the Arab peril whenever it suits her selfish purposes. Britain is unafraid of the Moslems. See what she is doing to them in Java—killing and maiming them by the thousands, without a qualm of conscience.

Finally I quote from a statement of the new Zionist organization:

WE CANNOT INVEST IN BRITISH FAITH

Britain now asks America for a loan of billions of dollars. How can Americans rely on Britain's good faith when her government is so careless with her honor and so callous in breaking her obligations and commitments? The sore spectacle of Britain's behavior in Palestine stamps her government as faithless and untrustworthy. Let Britain prove her integrity before we trust her with our savings and investments.

The American people must be warned against the pitfalls of British imperialism. Britain's anti-Zionism is part of the English militaristic scheme to expand Britain's power in new directions. It is a policy which undermines the very foundations and ideals of the United Nations. It is a policy which will involve America in imperialistic rivalries and intrigues. It is a policy which will promote unrest in the world by driving 2,000,000 destitute and despairing Jews in Europe into a dangerous social and political underground. It is a policy based on war and one which must lead to war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two different particulars and to insert certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances in the Appendix of the RECORD, in one to include therewith remarks made recently by Dr. Urey on the May-Johnson bill; and in the other to include a news story on the aircraft industry appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently made at a conference of Members of the House by Dr. Leo Szilard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Illinois). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States more than any other people in the world want peace, permanent peace, and the return of every fighting man who was forced to leave his home and loved ones to wage war on foreign soil. We have been victorious and have emerged from the conflict the most powerful military and naval power on earth. We suffered more than a million casualties, of which more than a quarter million will never return. We told them it was for freedom, and for that they died. The pension roll for World War II has already passed 800,000. The amount of material wealth, money, and resources contributed by America staggers the imagination. This has all been done by a free people to preserve on this planet dignity of the individual, freedom of soul, spirit, and body, the Christian faith, and a government which is the servant and not the master of its people.

Notwithstanding our place among the nations, many responsible individuals and groups high in official positions within our Government have neither the character, strength, nor courage to stand up and defend the principles of Christianity, freedom, and representative government for which the people so willingly offered their all.

On August 23, 1939, Russia entered into a nonaggression agreement with Hitler. The Communists in the United States at once offered the alibi that this move was necessary to prepare themselves against attack and future war. Their action coordinated with similar action by Germany. They justified the attack on defenseless Finland—a small, peace-loving nation. Hitler used the same methods to sanctify his acts of aggression.

The American people, I am certain, want to forget all events leading up to the most tragic war in human history. I am equally certain, however, that they will not tolerate for long the undermining and disruptive influences of Communists in their attempt to destroy this Republic which made no small contribution in saving the Soviet Union from destruction.

Here in our midst, enjoying the protection of the Constitution of the United States and its institutions of freedom, are such men as one Adler, advocating the abolishment of the United States and our way of life; Browder, Foster, and others, declaring that the Soviet Union is the greatest, most powerful champion of freedom among the United Nations. It is time to call a halt and for Americans to stand up and defend our capitalistic system. It was our way of life and those of our allied democracies which enabled the world to free itself of German, Italian, and Japanese totalitarianism.

When Stalin signed the nonaggression pact with Hitler he had something to say about it before an official body of the Soviet Government. Listen to it. I quote:

If we accept the Reich's offer of collaboration, the latter will not hesitate to crush Poland. England and France will thereupon be drawn fatally into the war. There will result a thorough destruction in Europe, and remaining outside the conflict we can advantageously await our hour.

If Germany wins, she will emerge from this war too exhausted to dream of an armed conflict with us. We must, therefore, accept this pact proposed by Germany and work to prolong the war the maximum possible.

Where is the sponsorship of freedom or equality for all people in such announced policy now championed by the leading Communists within our gates?

A short time after the conclusion of this pact, there sprang up in our country Communist-front organizations sponsored and directed by leading Communists and fellow travelers in America. Let us remember that many of these individuals were refugees who had fled Europe after this nonaggression pact was signed and came here to wait out the war and change their policies as often as a weathercock changes its direction, but always consistent with international Communist interests.

One of these groups was the American Peace Mobilization, which began a campaign to label World War II as imperialistic. They even picketed the White House, denounced the war, and staged similar demonstrations throughout the country. The actions of this organization and its associated groups were officially described by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive. In spite of that fact, I know of no action taken by our Government against these groups, whose activities were seditious, if not treasonable.

When Germany invaded Russia on June 22, 1941, this Communist front organization became the American people's mobilization, demanding the United States enter the war, whether we were prepared or not. This was a complete reversal of attitude, one in the interest of international communism.

One of the most vicious fronts established in this country by Communists was called labor's Nonpartisan League. It devoted its activities to labor groups and unions. One of its leaders was Harry Bridges, who recently journeyed

3,000 miles across the country to offer his moral and financial support to striking dock workers in New York, in cooperation with a similar strike in London, which paralyzed our shipping and delayed bringing our fighting men from Europe.

This group described the war as imperialistic and charged that it fostered strikes, promoted dissension between employer and employee, and disrupted production. It denounced France and England as imperialistic and war mongering nations. The moment Germany invaded Russia, members of this same group called the war a people's war and demanded our entry into it.

Another group, but no less effective, was known as the American Student Union. This organization centered its attack in colleges and universities throughout this country. Their technique was the same as the others. They held mass meetings, printed circulars, and denounced the war as imperialistic—until Germany attacked Russia—then it was a people's war. The pattern of all these groups was the same, they followed the Communist Party line.

Today Albert Einstein, who sought refuge and obtained asylum in our land, is loaning his name and heading the Communist-sponsored American Committee for Spanish Freedom. This organization is at this moment soliciting funds for carrying on its objective, namely, working for a break in diplomatic and commercial relations with Spain. This is in turn sponsored by the Communist Abraham Lincoln Brigade and over 50 avowed Communists and fellow travelers.

The underlying motive of such a program is to foment trouble or war among what these Communists choose to call the capitalistic nations, in the interest of the Communist movement.

The time has arrived when we in the United States must take action against these elements. The machinery of government and its officials in the highest positions of the Nation, charged with the responsibility of protecting our people and our country, must do their duty and see to it that we do not suffer the disgrace and humiliation brought upon the people of France by the same subversive elements active today with one objective, the destruction of this government of free men and women.

There can be no compromise with these traitors among us; communism and Christianity have nothing in common. They cannot exist side by side in the same country. One or the other must perish.

Communism is the physical symbol of Marxist theories. Its foundation is deceit. Religion to a Communist is the "opium of the people." They advance that line of thinking everywhere in America. They work through innocent-appearing publications in one form or another; concealing themselves in worthy social objectives they take on new life and encouragement by well-meaning and unsuspecting citizens who lend aid and personal dignity to what appears to be a worthy cause. They are unmindful that those with whom they associate are prepared at the proper time to drive a dagger into the heart of Christianity and private ownership. Then citizens become subjects and government becomes the master and not the servant of a people.

My fellow country men and women, this is the challenge we must meet. Let us meet it with confidence in and a firm reliance upon a just God who has never forsaken this favored land. We have never been defeated by forces from without our country, but we can be destroyed from within unless we awaken to the danger threatening us and rise against it.

In my opinion, the Attorney General of the United States has the power under the Voorhis Act to demand the registration not only of the official Communist organization in the United States but of every Communist and fellow traveler as an agent of a foreign nation. If the act is not deemed broad enough to include them, then let us amend it to make it so. In this way, the propaganda flooding the Nation and the Communist groups here will be properly identified and the people of America will not be misled as were the people of France. Let us stand united against this insidious and threatening danger to our very existence as a nation. Let us make sure that the sacrifices of our heroic men, living and dead, shall not have been in vain.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Messrs. ANGELL, ELLSWORTH, and STOCKMAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Thursday, November 15, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to continue hearings on the stream pollution control bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 p. m., Thursday, November 15, 1945.

Business to be considered: Study of operations under the Public Utility Holding Company Act to be continued.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

827. A letter from the Deputy Executive Chairman, Army and Navy Munitions Board, transmitting an amendment to the current Army and Navy Munitions Board list of strategic and critical materials; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

828. A letter from the Administrator, Surplus Property Administration, transmitting the report of the Surplus Property Administration on surplus chemical plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4450. A bill to provide for payment of travel allowance and transportation to their homes, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 4676. A bill to provide for future trade relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 4677. A bill to discharge men from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4678. A bill to extend the benefits of the laws granting pensions to veterans of the war with Spain, to certain persons who served as teamsters in such war; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 4679. A bill to provide compensation for veterans of World War II who have had pulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4680. A bill to provide for vacations and sickness leave to employees in the postal service wherever stationed on the same basis as for vacations and sickness leave to employees in the departmental service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 4681. A bill relating to the reentry of Chinese laborers and Chinese wives and children into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4682. A bill to grant pensions to veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China relief expedition who served less than 70 days; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4683. A bill to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4684. A bill to provide for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. J. Res. 275. Joint resolution relating to the exercise of powers under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and under certain other provisions of law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution to control and reduce world armaments and weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4685. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4686. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harry Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 4687. A bill granting a pension to Pharris Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4688. A bill granting a pension to Joseph Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4689. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jean Russo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4690. A bill for the relief of Eugene Whanbo (also known as Ik Jun Whangbo, or Eugene Park Hwangbo, or Ik Choon Whangbo); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GEELAN:

H. R. 4691. A bill for the relief of the estate of Warren Gilbert Dugan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4692. A bill for the relief of the heirs of the late John W. Pattison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 4693. A bill for the relief of Richard C. Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 4694. A bill for the relief of the dependents and personal representative of Emil Gottesman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4695. A bill confirming the claim of A. J. Rimes to certain land in the State of Mississippi, county of Amite; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 4696. A bill confirming the claim of Ralph C. Moak to certain lands in the State of Mississippi, county of Amite; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4697. A bill for the relief of R. H. Watson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4698. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1320. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Hoppets Ankare Lodge, No. 21, District No. 5, Scandinavian Fraternity of America, New Castle, Pa., requesting that the immigration quotas for the Scandinavian countries—Sweden, Norway, and Denmark—be increased and made more equal with the quotas allowed to other countries; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1321. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of New York Chapter, Knights of Columbus, protesting against the interjection into an obviously political gathering of an antireligious attack on the religious beliefs of a large segment of the people of the United States by the Russian Chargé d'Affaires, Nikolai Novikov, and chairman of the British Labor Party's executive council, Harold Laski, at Madison Square Garden, New York City, September 24, 1945; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1322. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for emergency legislation to permit the immediate entry into the United States of at least 100,000 Jewish victims of fascism, regardless of quota limitations, and that they be granted asylum by the American people; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1323. Also, petition of Campbell Post, No. 596, the American Legion, Campbell, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to its request for funds for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. W. Emory Hartman, Ph. D., minister of Grace Methodist Church, Harrisburg, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou uncreated source of righteousness, truth, and power, let the majesty of Thy presence now humble our hearts and lift up our spirits. Speak Thou this day to the leaders and people of America, that this Nation may become a holy nation, entirely consecrated to Thee.

Direct us, O God, to use wisely our leadership among the nations. May we employ the vast energies of nature and life for the common good and utilize our God-given resources for the enlargement of the common life. Lead us to sacrifice as devotedly in the pursuits of peace as in the efforts of war. Give us compassion for the shelterless, starving, and suffering peoples of all lands and prompt us to share with them our bounties.

Help us to assert fearlessly in the counsels of the nations the principles of justice, freedom, and equality. In all our enterprises may we place our reliance upon Thee, the one true God, who alone canst save the people. We pray in the name and spirit of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, November 14, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the next two or three days to attend the American Legion Convention in Chicago as an official delegate from my State department of the Legion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate next Friday and next Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of G. H. Moore, of Butler, Taylor County, Ga.; and

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Florida Rhone Burch.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 784) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. STIGLER, and Mr. COLE of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 693) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. COMBS, and Mr. JENNINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 842) for the relief of the Elmira Area Soaring Corp., disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. STIGLER, and Mr. COLE of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. HEDRICK, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. COMBS, and Mr. RAMEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1036. An act to provide for the adjustment of the compensation of certain members or former members of the armed forces

of the United States who, before the expiration of their terminal leave, have performed, or shall hereafter perform, civilian services for the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of G. H. Moore and Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Moore; and

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of the estate of Donald Rhone.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 14, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 940. An act to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada; and

S. 1199. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1415. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 742).

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 896. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 741); and

H. R. 2716. A bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; with an amendment (Rept. No. 743).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2938. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings; with an amendment (Rept. No. 744).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1489. A bill to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to persons whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073); with an amendment (Rept. No. 745); and

S. 1560. A bill to amend the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, to extend reemployment benefits to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who entered the Women's Army Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 746).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1554. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 747).

By Mr. GUFFEY, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution calling on the Secretary of the Interior for a report upon the minerals situation of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 748).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 744. A bill authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions; without amendment (Rept. No. 749).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON BILL PROVIDING FOR SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 187, submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] on November 8, 1945, and request unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 187) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 500 additional copies, parts 1 and 2, of the hearing held before said committee during the current session on S. 292 entitled "A bill to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes."

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures concerning civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government in September 1945. In presenting this report I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that there were 22,213 more people on this pay roll in September than there were in May, when the global war effort reached its peak, and the war ended in Europe.

Much of this increase between May and September will be found in the personnel reported for these months by 13 old-line peacetime agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, Agriculture Department, Commerce Department, Interior Department, Labor Department, Post Office Department, State Department, Treasury Department, Federal Works Agency, General Accounting Office, Panama Canal, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Veterans' Administration.

The civilian personnel total for September was 3,491,000, including 733,792 War Department employees outside the continental United States, and 53,277 regular part-time and substitute postal employees whom the Post Office Department previously had not been reporting. This September total of nearly three and a half million, including the new Post Office reports, was within 4 percent, or 158,769, of the all-time civilian pay-roll record in August, when hostilities ceased in the Pacific.

It will be noted from the footnotes in this report that there is a marked tendency at present to transfer personnel from the so-called emergency war agencies to the more secure locations in the permanent departments, establishments, and agencies. The transfer of personnel, of course, accompanies transfer of functions and funds.

As between civilian personnel reports for August and September, substantial increases will be found in the Post Office Department, Labor Department, State Department, and Veterans' Administration. Decreases were notable in the War Department, Navy Department, and Office of Price Administration.

It should be pointed out that approximately one-half of the reduction in the September pay roll is represented by a net decrease of 76,332 nonclassified employees, among whom, undoubtedly, are a great number of Federal industrial workers who, during the war, were employed in shipyards, arsenals, gun factories, and so forth.

In presenting this report for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the chairman speaks for himself when he submits that the people of the United States have a right to expect the Government to expedite demobilization of the gigantic civilian wartime pay roll which in September 1945, after the war was won in both the European and Pacific theaters, was still three and a half times greater than it was in June of 1939—the last pre-emergency year. I believe the number of civilian personnel now employed by the Federal Government, not only in the United States but scattered all over the world, can be reduced from 3,491,000 to 1,000,000 without impairing any essential function.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reduction in nonessential Federal expenditures—Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for the months of August and September, showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Departments and agencies	1945		Increase (+) or decrease (−)
	August	September	
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Bureau of the Budget	587	[1] 733	+146
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS			
Agriculture Department	95,529	91,136	−4,393
Commerce Department	34,771	35,089	+318
Interior Department	45,055	44,524	−531
Justice Department	26,839	26,243	−596
Labor Department	6,346	[2] 36,629	+30,283
Navy Department	721,342	649,425	−71,917
Post Office Department	387,262	[3] 441,257	[3] +53,995
State Department	11,188	[4] 15,352	+4,164
Treasury Department	95,808	93,636	−2,172
War Department [5]	1,077,179	975,317	−101,862
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES			
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	65	60	−5
Foreign Economic Administration	6,371	6,131	−240
National War Labor Board	3,844	[6] 0	−3,844
Office of Alien Property Custodian	729	651	−78
Office of Censorship	4,700	295	−4,405
Office of Defense Transportation	2,828	1,419	−1,409
Office of Economic Stabilization	19	[6] 0	−19
Office of Inter-American Affairs	1,249	[7] 660	−589

[1] Includes 144 employees transferred from Office of War Information.

[2] Includes 30,974 employees transferred from War Manpower Commission, National War Labor Board, and Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

[3] 53,277 of this number represents employees not previously reported but not new employees as of September.

[4] Includes 7,937 employees transferred from Office of War Information and Office of Inter-American Affairs.

[5] Does not include employees stationed outside the continental United States.

[6] Does not include 22 employees transferred to Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

[7] Does not include 554 employees transferred to the State Department.

Reduction in nonessential Federal expenditures, etc.—Continued

Departments and agencies	1945		Increase (+) or decrease (−)
	August	September	
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES—continued			
Office of Price Administration	61,985	45,492	−16,493
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,310	1,157	−153
Office of Strategic Services	2,103	2,008	−95
Office of War Information	7,989	[8] 230	−7,759
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	458	[9] 583	+125
Petroleum Administration for War	970	839	−131
Selective Service System	18,573	17,662	−911
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,874	1,656	−218
War Manpower Commission	27,839	[10] 0	−27,839
War Production Board	11,311	8,625	−2,686
War Shipping Administration	5,556	5,361	−195
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	349	371	+22
Civil Service Commission	6,863	6,734	−129
Employees' Compensation Commission	517	520	+3
Export-Import Bank of Washington	68	67	−1
Federal Communications Commission	1,508	1,519	+11
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,218	916	−302
Federal Power Commission	655	674	+19
Federal Security Agency	30,368	30,701	+333
Federal Trade Commission	448	441	−7
Federal Works Agency	20,532	20,628	+96
General Accounting Office	14,139	13,783	−356
Government Printing Office	6,943	6,914	−29
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,013	1,999	−14
Maritime Commission	10,280	9,608	−672
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,746	6,613	−133
National Archives	342	330	−12
National Capital Housing Authority	223	218	−5
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	
National Gallery of Art	270	271	+1
National Housing Agency	15,366	14,986	−380
National Labor Relations Board	751	733	−18
National Mediation Board	92	94	+2
Panama Canal	31,555	32,243	+688
Railroad Retirement Board	1,803	1,771	−32
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13,562	14,124	+562
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,150	1,159	+9
Smithsonian Institution	410	418	+8
Tariff Commission	294	290	−4
Tax Court of the United States	119	117	−2
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,686	12,685	−1
Veterans' Administration	73,010	74,093	+1,083
Total [11]	2,915,977	2,757,208	−250,637 / +91,868
Net decrease			−158,769
War Department [12]	733,792	733,792	
Grand total	3,649,769	3,491,000	

[8] Does not include 7,527 employees transferred to the Bureau of the Budget and State Department.

[9] Includes 22 employees transferred from Office of Economic Stabilization but does not include 28 employees transferred to Department of Labor.

[10] Does not include 27,400 employees transferred to Department of Labor.

[11] Includes employees stationed outside the continental United States as reported by various departments and agencies except the War Department. Total for August, 120,046; for September, 114,852.

[12] Employees stationed outside the continental United States, reported quarterly as of June 30, 1945.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar-per-annum and without-compensation employees of the consultant-expert type who are authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1597. A bill granting an increase of pension to Josephine Lawson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 1598. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. WAGNER also introduced Senate bill 1599, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1600. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Calvin Clincher; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. STEWART) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 118, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

SEEING-EYE DOGS FOR BLIND VETERANS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend Public Law No. 309 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans.

Experience in World War I, as well as in World War II, has proven that the greatest benefit can accrue to the blinded soldier, sailor, or marine if immediate relief is made available to him in the way of mechanical aids.

Public Law No. 309, as passed by the Congress with an appropriate appropriation, simply permits the Veterans' Bureau to present mechanical appliances to the war blinded after they have become so-called veterans, that is, only after being discharged from the armed forces, as they are not considered veterans until discharged.

The objective of the amendment sought is to enable the war-blinded to obtain these mechanical devices at once, as the period of training frequently takes 1 or 2 years before they are discharged.

General Bradley, head of the Veterans' Bureau, has endorsed the proposed amendment.

It would seem imperative that action be taken by the proper committee and same reported out as rapidly as possible, in order that this amendment may be of the greatest service to the war-blinded, who have made what many feel is possibly the greatest sacrifice—even greater than of life itself, in the service of their country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from New York will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1599) to amend the act entitled "An Act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans," approved May 24, 1944, to provide for the extension of the benefits of such act to certain members of the armed forces, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WAGNER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AWARD OF NOBEL PEACE PRIZE TO CORDELL HULL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I had the privilege of addressing a letter to the President pro tempore of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The letter reads:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
November 15, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: As you know, our distinguished statesman, Cordell Hull, has been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1945.

Mr. Hull, of course, will not be able to accept the invitation to go to Norway to receive the prize.

It occurred to me that the appropriate place for the presentation of the prize would be in a joint session to be held in the House of Representatives. I understand that the date for the presentation is December 10—the anniversary of Nobel's death.

Under Alfred Nobel's will—he being a Swede—a committee of the Norwegian Parliament was set up to designate the recipients of the peace prize. The prize would be presented by the president of the Norwegian Parliament—the Storting—if Mr. Hull were present in Ohio.

The honor is a significant one. It has been conferred upon an outstanding American, one of our former colleagues, and the appropriate setting for the ceremony, I believe, would be at a joint session of Congress.

I know that you will give this suggestion your immediate and earnest consideration and take the necessary steps to bring about the consummation of this suggestion.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Copy to Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House.

ANOTHER RACE IN ARMAMENTS—EDITORIAL BY A. Q. MILLER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Race in Armaments," written by A. Q. Miller, editor of the Belleville (Kans.) Telescope, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ARTICLE BY JESSE C. SUTER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Let the State Legislatures Act on National Representation," written by Jesse C. Suter, and published in the Washington Star of November 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE—EDITORIAL BY CLARA SAVAGE LITTLEDALE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Six Words and a Date," written by Clara Savage Littledale, editor of Parents' Magazine, in support of the Maternal and Child Welfare Act of 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEATH RATE AMONG MILITARY FLYING PERSONNEL

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum from the Army Air Corps relating to the death rate among military flying personnel in continental United States during 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson at a rally sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, at Madison

Square Garden, New York City, November 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. VANDENBERG obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hart	O'Daniel
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Huffman	Shipstead
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Capper	Kilgore	Stewart
Carville	Knowland	Taft
Chavez	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Lucas	Tunnell
Cordon	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McKellar	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wagner
Eastland	Magnuson	Walsh
Ellender	Mead	Wheeler
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wiley
George	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is a member of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

WISCONSIN CHEESE—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR WILEY AND CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain correspondence I have had with Price Administrator Chester Bowles, respecting injustices of the OPA in dealing with our Wisconsin cheesemakers.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 29, 1945.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In reply to your letter of October 22, I should like to present to you the following facts:

The cheese makers of Wisconsin, although they have a considerable membership, actually represent only a small segment of the cheese industry. In the majority of cases they are paid employees receiving a commission on the poundage manufactured. Usually they have little or no money investment at stake, and are in no way responsible for returns to producers. Their interest in securing a price increase is the possible diversion of milk through this means into cheese channels, and a resulting increase in their own commissions.

The assertions made by certain of the Wisconsin cheese makers that they are denied proper mark-ups for direct sales by "service wholesalers" and on a "retail basis" are without foundation. Revised Maximum Price Regulation 289 is set up on functional lines, and the mark-up for any category is paid to any person who shows that he performs the specified functions.

Another assertion made by them is that the sale of cheddar cheese on a moisture basis is a continuation of the historical practice which permitted payment of a per pound premium. In actual practice the manufacturer of high-moisture cheese, although receiving less per pound for the product, realizes approximately the same return per hundred pounds of milk as the manufacturer of a low-moisture product.

The assertion that our price orders fail to recognize a mark-up for aged cheese is not according to the facts. Amendment 29 to Revised Maximum Price Regulation 289 permits a 2¼-cent mark-up for aged small-size Cheddars, effective December 1, 1945. This amendment was timed so that the consumer might get the benefit of aged grass cheese.

The term "Plymouth plus" is not an invention of OPA but a historical practice dating prewar. It is the designation of a transportation factor covering shipping costs from a surplus to a deficit area. Prior to the war Cheddar-cheese prices were based on Plymouth board sales, plus the freight from this shipping point to the point of destination.

I would like also to call to your attention a conference held in our office late last winter, and attended by Messrs. Mooney and Kopitzke. At that time we suggested:

1. To break down the State-line barrier and include such States as Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois in the Wisconsin price zone.

2. To have Plymouth plus apply within the State of Wisconsin.

3. That the most expeditious means of attaining the ends desired by members attending the conference might be to obtain additional subsidy on Cheddar cheese production in the State of Wisconsin.

All of these suggestions were turned down by the representatives of the Wisconsin Cheesemakers Association. We then asked for suggestions from them as to the procedure that might be followed, but to date we have heard nothing from them along these lines.

The secretary of agriculture of the State of Wisconsin and members of his staff, also Professor Price, head of the cheese department of the University of Wisconsin, have visited this office for the purpose of discussing the problem of the Wisconsin cheese manufacturers. It was stated by these people that the Wisconsin cheese makers do not represent the great majority of the cheese producers, but only a small segment, and that they are a pressure group desiring consideration of regulations not necessarily of benefit to the majority of the industry. Such statements as these, made by men representative of the cheese industry and of the best interests of the citizenry of Wisconsin, have made us reluctant to accept without reservations the recommendations of the Wisconsin cheese makers.

We recognize the great importance of this whole matter of price regulations to the cheese industry and we are arranging a meeting early in November with the members of the National Cheese Industry Advisory Committee, which represents all segments of the industry, so that we may thoroughly consider and discuss this matter in every detail.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

NOVEMBER 15, 1945.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: In response to your letter of October 29 regarding my previous communication to you on the injustices of the OPA in dealing with our Wisconsin cheesemakers I would like to answer each of the allegations made by you point for point in the following manner:

1. Contrary to what you say, the Wisconsin Cheesemakers Association represents 1,200 factories out of a total of 1,600 in the State. That is over 75 percent of the manufacturers of Wisconsin cheese who in turn represent a very large part of the Nation's total production.

2. Contrary to what you say, the Wisconsin cheesemakers (with the exception of the manufacturers of Swiss cheese) own and operate their factories either privately or cooperatively, both types belonging to the association with an individual investment ranging from 10 to 50 thousand dollars.

3. Contrary to what you say, the contention of the Wisconsin cheesemakers that they are denied proper mark-ups for direct sales by "service wholesalers" and on a "retail basis" are with foundation. These men cannot benefit from the mark-ups unless they have a warehouse within 50 miles.

4. Contrary to what you say, since the imposition of MPR–289 the sale of Cheddar cheese on a moisture basis cannot be made except to the processor or to the Government. With the Government no longer taking any substantial quantities of cheese at this time, sales can only be made to processors.

5. You stated that price orders do recognize a mark-up. The answer, of course, is that no mark-ups for aged cheese can go into effect until December 1, 1945, and that the 2¼-cent

mark-up after that time for Cheddar is absolutely inadequate.

6. Contrary to what you say, the Plymouth plus formula instead of being accepted historical practice has had the arbitrary result of jeopardizing Wisconsin, the greatest cheese-producing State in the Nation. The result of this order has been to cost the farmers and the cheesemakers of Wisconsin over $10,000,000.

7. Contrary to what you imply, the first two of the three suggestions which you outlined were so unjust in themselves that it would have been impossible for the cheesemakers association to accept them. They agreed to go along with No. 3. Therefore, your statement that the cheese representatives turned down all three suggestions is grossly inaccurate in that they accepted point three.

8. Contrary to what you state, both the head of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and Professor Price have flatly denied the statements which you alluded to them and said that their statements referred to only a few Swiss-cheese manufacturers in Green County.

9. Your attack upon the cheesemakers association as a pressure group is grossly unfair to the members of the association who are simply seeking justice. For example, how can you consider the head of this association, Mr. L. C. Kopitzhe, as a so-called pressure-group leader when he himself owns and operates a cheese factory at Marion and has himself suffered from the unfair practices which the OPA has followed?

Since you wrote, the National Cheese Advisory Committee has, of course, met. It is my hope that the recommendations made to your office by this committee will be put into effect immediately. I do not desire to continue in a lengthy correspondence debate with you in all the above matters. What we want is action.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

RAISE THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I was very glad to yield a moment ago to the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] to present for the RECORD the address made last evening by Under Secretary of State Acheson on the subject of international friendship. I was particularly interested in the comments of the Senator from New Mexico in assigning a particular significance to the importance of friendship between the United States and the Soviets of Russia. It is that subject, Mr. President, which I wish to discuss quite frankly today. By way of approach, there are one or two related matters to which I wish to refer.

Mr. President, the pending bill now in the Appropriations Committee carrying the balance of our committed appropriation to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, confronts the Senate with the decision of the House of Representatives that our American participation in serving basic international humanities this winter shall be limited to those countries which permit our free press to have free access to free news regarding UNRRA. This heavily underscores a major and a ramifying problem in our international relationships. It has been a smoldering menace for some time. It now breaks out into open conflagration; and it is not calculated to be a mere passing blaze in view of the fact that similar restrictions are prophesied in respect to all subsequent relief and rehabilitation and loan legislation. Therefore I think it would be wise for us and our allies to face the facts in friendly candor and see if something cannot be done about it for their sakes quite as much as for ours.

I shall presently indicate that I think the hope of world peace and fraternity—the achievement of stable and happy relationships between the nations of this earth—are dependent to an amazing degree upon full freedom of international communications. The mutual disclosure of free information and the liberty of a world-wide free press are becoming increasingly indispensable to the successful operation of an interdependent world society. This is no longer just an altruistic theory. It has come to be a matter of grim reality. "Black-outs" make international confidence impossible. When the iron curtain of secrecy falls around an area suspicion is unavoidable, restless conjecture substitutes for knowledge, and dependable trust is out of the question. These are not the implements of peace and progress. Understanding and good will cannot flourish in a vacuum.

I quote from a recent address by Secretary of State Byrnes:

> Understanding brings tolerance and a willingness to cooperate in the adjustment of differences. Censorship and black-outs breed suspicion and distrust. And all too often this suspicion and distrust are justified. For censorship and black-outs are the hand maidens of oppression.

This is also my view, Mr. President. I believe it to be an unassailable axiom that all of the victors of this war must be prepared at all times freely and frankly to submit their actions and their aspirations to untrammeled audit by the conscience of the world. I believe that every departure from this rule is a threat to the peace of which men dream and for which other men have fought and died.

Since these are my convictions, it will be readily understood why I think the House has rendered a real service by bringing this desperately important subject squarely into the open. At the same time, I hope it may be just as readily understood why I am unable to agree that we should suddenly choose UNRRA, on the threshold of winter, as the vehicle for the initial application of an ironclad rule to implement this doctrine. I am unable, Mr. President, to make mercy an arbitrary hostage to the lifting of the iron curtain, at this tragic moment in human misery.

It is unnecessary, Mr. President, to the achievement of our point. The point is amply emphasized when the whole world has seen that one great branch of the American Congress feels so keenly upon this subject that it has decided that not even the good Samaritan can proceed upon these errands of mercy behind the iron curtain where, quoting from the House bill:

> The controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration * * * or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, news of any and all activities of UNRRA which may be prepared or dispatched from such country by representatives of the press and radio of the United States.

At the risk of being charged with inconsistency—which I deny—I unequivocally support this principle, and I shall presently argue for it with all the earnestness at my command. But I cannot and do not support its present summary application to the fulfillment of a humanitarian obligation to which we are already solemnly committed. I think the principle is too important to the welfare of the world to be used against the welfare of starving millions in the war-scorched cockpits of this recent conflict. I am unable, Mr. President, to tie these two unrelated things together. Furthermore, Mr. President, I cannot escape the impact of a headline which I read the other day: "Starving people ripe for revolts in Europe; general discontent in occupied areas calls for quick cooperation by big nations."

I agree with the House that not even the holy business of relieving human suffering can be properly understood or adequately handled in the absence of the authenticated truth. I agree that we are entitled to know the needs we are asked to serve. I agree that we are entitled to know that our service reaches those for whom it is intended. I agree that we are entitled to know from the lips and pens of our own seasoned observers. This would not be a matter of espionage. It would be a matter of mutual understanding. Indeed, it is of greatest concern to our suffering neighbors themselves, because I venture the assertion that if America knew from her own trusted news correspondents, from day to day, the whole running story of human suffering in the war-wasted places of the earth, there would be not an instant's delay in the prodigal American response. We cannot see through the iron curtain. I agree that every rational effort, even in connection with UNRRA, must be made to lift it. We should strive for the full information to which we are entitled, and I endorse an urgent mandate to UNRRA that it make every possible effort to this end.

But, Mr. President, the iron curtain is in the control of governments. It is the people in these areas who die for want of bread. They do not control the curtain. It is the people—pitiful, suffering, starving millions of them facing what probably will be the blackest, cruelest winter since the age of plagues; it is the people from whom our aid would be withheld by an unequivocal order of this nature. You may say the blame would rest upon the government which denied our requirement. But the dead, Mr. President, would not know the difference.

So I do not support this particular amendment in the form approved by the House. But, nonetheless, I support the principle to which it is addressed, and I say again that the House has done a service to the cause by illustrating the extent to which the iron curtain can jeopardize the welfare of people everywhere—and, most of all, those who are "blacked out" themselves.

And now, Mr. President, I want to talk about that principle and the magnitude of its importance. I hope it will be no wrench to our international contacts to deal with it in specific terms. It seems

to me that candor holds the greatest hope for correction.

Another current and extraordinarily ominous example will readily come to mind to prove how the iron curtain interferes with the international confidence which is prerequisite to peace. This example can become a crisis in human existence itself. Desperately important discussions are already at fever heat respecting the future of atomic energy. In every chancellery and at every hearthstone the question is being anxiously asked as to what shall become of the atomic bomb. We are frightened by our responsibilities. There is wide divergence of opinion as to what shall be done. I want to make it distinctly plain that I do not enter upon this field of decision in this discussion. I simply point out that there is one phase of the problem upon which there is practically no divergence of opinion at all. Even those who most vehemently advocate the internationalization of this deadly secret never fail to assert the corollary necessity that there must be unlimited, wide-open, world-wide facilities for mutual inspection and the total exchange of unlimited information upon this score. There can be no dark corners in an atomic age.

President Truman said in his Navy Day speech upon this point that only "frank cooperation among the peace-loving nations can save the world from unprecedented disaster." "Frank" cooperation. I quote the adjective.

The Russian radio last week broadcast an atomic analysis which one newspaper headlined as follows: "Red radio sees world disaster in atom secrecy." It, of course, was speaking about secrecy in the first instance. I repeat that I do not here discuss that phase. I am speaking about secrecy in the last instance; and I am saying that we cannot deal with the former until we have successfully answered the latter. I assert that it would be utterly unthinkable that we, and our British and Canadian associates, would voluntarily or consciously permit any nation to take this so-called secret behind an iron curtain which blacks out all information as to what is being done with it. Then, indeed, would the Red headline be bitterly justified—"sees world disaster in atom secrecy."

The point is, Mr. President, that here again we find a vital international situation wherein any lack of the full, free exchange of peacetime information inevitably intrudes upon international contacts and renders what the President calls frank cooperation impossible. Here, again, those who may deny this free exchange are calculated chiefly to victimize themselves. Indeed, the more this subject is explored the more obvious it becomes that uncensored truth is elemental and prerequisite in seeking peace and friendship in a better world. No amount of expedient appeasement can escape this net result.

Mr. President, bearing upon this particular phase of my discussion, I call attention to the joint statement issued a few moments ago by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the Prime Minister of Canada, regarding their preliminary conclusions in respect to the control of this tremendously challenging problem. I call attention to the fact that what to me is the key paragraph in the entire statement issued by these three distinguished spokesmen, the prime paragraph, the controlling paragraph, the sine qua non paragraph, reads as follows:

> We are not convinced that the spreading of the specialized information regarding the practical application of atomic energy, before it is possible to devise effective, reciprocal, and enforceable safeguards acceptable to all nations, would contribute to a constructive solution of the problem of the atomic bomb. On the contrary, we think it might have the opposite effect. We are, however, prepared to share, on a reciprocal basis with others of the United Nations, detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy—

When?—

> just as soon as effective, enforceable safeguards against its use for destructive purposes can be devised.

In other words, Mr. President, this paper, issued a few moments ago, says—put very bluntly—that the iron curtain must be lifted in this world if there is to be any safe existence for humankind hereafter.

The President, joining with the chief spokesmen for our partners in the possession of this secret, has made public a very interesting, significant, and very helpful series of recommendations. I do not comment on their substance except to say that I approve the emphasis that was put upon the United Nations Organization as the world's best, continuing hope for organized peace and security, that I agree I would rather attempt to control the international outlawry of atomic bombs than the international use of atomic weapons, and that I agree that these things cannot be done behind an iron curtain. I am confident that the President's statement will receive the most serious and sympathetic consideration of the Congress—of the Congress, Mr. President—where a basic and unavoidable share of the responsibility for these fateful decisions inevitably resides under our constitutional form of government, and where it is going to stay.

Wherever you probe this problem you learn the same lesson, Mr. President. Many of our past and present frictions are traceable to the iron curtain. In some instances let us frankly admit that it was our own iron curtain—as, for example, at that famous initial international conference in the United States where the press was virtually held at bay with bayonets. Again, we certainly shared responsibility for the iron curtain at epochal Yalta, where global decisions were made which will affect destiny for centuries to come and which were never fully and frankly exposed to our people. I doubt if we yet know the whole truth. Too often our own diplomacy—too often right here in Washington—our own diplomacy has practiced the reverse of Woodrow Wilson's admonition that peace and justice require "open covenants openly arrived at." In a practical sense, we understand that international negotiation—particularly in time of war—cannot always proceed in a goldfish bowl. But as rational students of past and present history, we also understand that the less often the iron curtain blacks out such negotiation, the less likely is it that liberty and justice will be throttled in the process.

Mr. President, the best evidence of good faith on the part of major powers in executing the trust which they have insisted upon assuming in the peacetime liquidation of this war will be to lift the iron curtain and let in the light upon the evolution of events which will prove or disprove the bona fides of their programs. Let me illustrate.

At Yalta, it was solemnly agreed, among other Polish decisions to which I shall never get the consent of my conscience, as follows:

> The Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot.

Those were fair and reassuring words. But by the time the great powers subsequently reached Potsdam, the potential shadow of the iron curtain had fallen athwart this comfortable prospectus. It had been the assumption of this Government that "free and unfettered elections" included freedom of reporting on these elections. But inasmuch as events in other countries showed the necessity of making specific provision for such freedom of reporting, the great powers—all three of them—wrote the following postscript at Potsdam:

> The three powers note that the Polish Provisional Government in accordance with the decisions of the Crimea Conference has agreed to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates, and that representatives of the allied press shall enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Poland before and during the elections.

At the same time they looked at Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, and said:

> The three [great powers] governments have no doubt that in view of the changed conditions resulting from the termination of the war in Europe, representatives of the allied press will enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland.

During the last week in August, a very limited number of American newspapermen were admitted to these countries. The iron curtain lifted—just a few inches. But at least it lifted, and I want to give full credit to the great powers for this omen of better days to come. It still remains to be demonstrated to what extent this boon is a reality. It remains to be seen whether this limited corps of correspondents will generally enjoy full freedom to report. But again let me report encouragement. There appears to have been a reasonably free press, reporting upon a reasonably free election, in Hungary within the past fortnight. Also it is important to observe that the three major powers have just extended tentative recognition to Albania. The British and American notes—the only ones available—contain this proviso:

> Foreign press correspondents shall be permitted to enter Albania to observe and report freely on the elections and the work of the constituent assembly.

The point I make, Mr. President, is that only in this fashion can we establish international faith and confidence. The world is grimly skeptical. Too many promises in the Atlantic Charter have been scuttled. Suppression of news—suppression of authenticated facts—inevitably invites the suspicion that behind the iron curtain there is a suppression of promised human rights.

Hard-hitting Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, made a public statement a few weeks ago, in which he referred to some of the temporary governments that have been set up in the controlled areas of Europe. Among other things, he said:

> The governments set up in those countries do not, in our view, represent the majority of the people and the impression we get is that one kind of totalitarianism is being replaced by another. This is not what we understand by the much-overworked word "democracy," which appears to me to need definition.

There is only one antidote for such suspicions, if they are groundless, Mr. President. That antidote is the authenticated truth reported in the free press of America and the world. If the suspicions are not groundless, I submit that our own Government has no greater responsibility than to seek, with every emphasis at its command, a true disclosure of the facts.

Mr. President, I do not know why we cannot be as candid in a friendly discussion of our Soviet-American relations as is the Russian press and the Russian spokesmanship, both at home and abroad, particularly since I embrace no such latitudes as they often give themselves. The truth is that the iron curtain has been one of the greatest obstacles to the Soviet-American liaison upon which so much of the world's hope for peace and progress depends. I respectfully suggest that this is not good for either them or us.

When the distinguished senior Senator from Florida stopped recently in Moscow in the course of his global odyssey, it is reported that he asked Marshal Stalin whether the Generalissimo wanted to give him any special message to us. The great Russian leader is reported to have hesitated and then said:

> Just judge the Soviet Union objectively. Do not either praise us or scold us. Just know us and judge us as we are and base your estimate of us upon facts and not on rumors.

Mr. President, that is a fair request. It is for a chance to honor that request that I am pleading this afternoon. It seems to me, in this instance, that Marshal Stalin and I are asking for precisely the same thing. But how can we judge the Soviets objectively—how can we separate "facts" from "rumors"—if the Soviets themselves discourage us from doing so? Only a week ago last Wednesday when the few Anglo-American correspondents in Moscow addressed a plea to the distinguished People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs to relax the stern censorship which rests upon them, Mr. Molotov replied, through a Foreign Office spokesman, that he "did not find it necessary to give the protest his attention." Yet the appeal of these correspondents was only for a chance to apply the Stalin prescription. It pointed out that the Soviet Union was the only great Allied Power that retained wartime censorship, and said:

> Censorship in peacetime of all dispatches relating not only to military affairs but to politics, economic, cultural affairs and every aspect of life in the Soviet Union destroys the value of foreign correspondence in a free world and has created general distrust abroad of all news emanating from the Soviet Union.

Under such circumstances, I repeat, how can we view Russia "objectively" and discard the rumors from the facts? The iron curtain intervenes. It prevents us from knowing them, and—an equal tragedy—it prevents them from knowing us. I quote a recent metropolitan editorial at this point:

> Probably nothing else in the world is so important at this moment as good relations between Russia and the United States. Probably nothing would do so much to promote and cement those good relations as an end of Russian black-outs, foreign and domestic.

I am glad to note a Reuters dispatch from Moscow on November 11, which states that "during the last 2 weeks the rigid application of wartime restrictions appears to have been somewhat relaxed." I am glad to note still further and subsequent statements out of Moscow which indicate a feeling that the "black-out" is being relieved, very recently, to a degree. I cannot overemphasize my conviction that such news is of paramount importance. The more progress we can make in this direction, the less thorny will be the paths of international comity. The better it will be for both of us and for the world. I agree with the editorial comment which said:

> It might be a mistake to assume too much, but if this gesture betokens that Russia is willing to drop her traditional suspicions * * * if it means that she is willing to meet the world half way, then the world will not fail to meet her. And if that is the case, then the present proposals can, indeed, mark the beginning of a new era of peace and plenty which in time may even lift the specter of an atomic cataclysm now hanging over the world.

Secretary Byrnes stated, in a recent New York speech, that we are fully aware of Russia's special security interests in her central and eastern European neighbors and that we can appreciate her desire for insulations. He drew a rather startling parallel with our own good-neighbor policy under the Monroe Doctrine and our inter-American relationships. I shall have to say frankly that I think this was a sadly strained analogy. We Americans do have special security interests in our neighbors; but the world can come and see to its heart's content that we glory in treating them all as sovereign equals. They are our partners; not our satellites. We shall never complain of any kindred special security interests when similarly exercised by others. But this phrase—special security interests—often has another, a different and an ominous connotation in diplomacy. It could be reminiscent, for example, of the notorious Lansing-Ishii agreement of 1917 which Japan used to bedevil China for many years, although I make no such application now. But I shall have to say that I, for one, do not "appreciate"—the Secretary's word—what has happened, for example, in so-called liberated Poland—our faithful ally—where few, if any, of the literal guaranties of the Atlantic Charter, pleasantly reiterated in the recent speeches of both the President and the Secretary, have been fulfilled.

If the Secretary was speaking of special security interests in the true pattern of an inter-American analogy, then I agree. Certainly we can fully understand the Soviet insistence, for example, upon her special security interests against any resurgence of her erstwhile Axis neighbors. With that objective I am in total sympathy. It is part and parcel of the San Francisco Charter. If the iron curtain is one of the devices upon which Moscow feels it must rely for these special security interests, then here is another vital reason to revert to the theme of my speech of last January 10 that, for the sake of all concerned, we had best completely clear the track of all such Russian fears of her erstwhile Axis enemies by signing with all the major allies a long-time treaty, agreeing to stand together—one for all and all for one—in the event of any Axis resurgence, and thus bulwark the United Nations Organization with another and a final steel beam. If that would relieve the pressure on the Balkan and the Baltic states and the related areas, if it would recall the Red army from so-called liberated areas, if it would renew forgotten parts of the Atlantic Charter, and if it would roll up the iron curtain, it would be the greatest bargain ever written into history.

I do not too often agree with Mr. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party; but I do emphatically agree when he wrote last week: "We and the Americans alike must convince the Russians that we have no thought or sentiment which jeopardizes their security." Mutual assurances—both ways—upon this score will do more for peace than any other possible supplement to the San Francisco Charter.

Secretary Byrnes has said: "America will never join any groups in those countries in hostile intrigue against the Soviet Union." Mr. President, in return for the reciprocal realities to which I have referred—and they are essential to peace with justice in this world—I would go even further than the Secretary has gone, and agree affirmatively to join in permanently resisting any such Axis threats as those defined.

Mr. President, I conclude as I began. Not in a challenge but in an appeal, I beg of all nations, wherever they may be, to consider their own self-interest in lifting the iron curtains of secrecy, censorship, and blacked-out truth. Otherwise, is it not perfectly obvious that they will increasingly plague us and our allies in matters of relief, in matters of rehabilitation, in the matter of loans, in the matter of atomic bombs, in the entire evolution of the United Nations Organization—indeed, in all future international relationships? Is there anything to which men of good will need more earnestly to address their efforts and their prayers?

This shattered world is in need of new sources of dependable confidence, new

well-springs of hope. It cries out for mutual understandings. It needs the tonic of universal truth. It needs the inspiration which San Francisco has sought to breathe into the General Assembly of the United Nations as the free and untrammeled "town meeting of the world." We can only stumble if the dark persists. In the words of the Psalmist: "Light is sown for the righteous."

RATIFICATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER BY NORWEGIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was informed a moment ago that the Associated Press has just received the story that the Norwegian Parliament has unanimously ratified the United Nations Charter.

STATISTICS ON DISCHARGES FROM THE ARMY

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, like many other people in the United States, I have been somewhat worried at times over the complaints which have been made with reference to the release of men from the armed services. Since the War Department issued a press release on November 13, summarizing discharges from the Army, I thought that perhaps the RECORD should show exactly what has been done in this respect by the War Department.

During the week ending November 9, 1945, 42,000 members of the military forces were discharged each day; from November 1 to November 9 more than 40,000 were discharged each day. Going back to September 2, VJ-day, since that date there have been released from the Army an average of 32,867.

Since May 12, 1945, to November 9, and including November 9, 2,827,000 men have been discharged from the Army.

These are the facts as given by the War Department, and I think it is well that the people of the United States, who are rightfully asking for the return of the servicemen as rapidly as possible, should know that the War Department is not entirely asleep in this situation, but is discharging more than 40,000 men each day, which is no small task.

I ask, Mr. President, that the press release by the War Department of November 13 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC RELATIONS,
November 13, 1945.

The War Department today gave the following weekly summary of the demobilization program:

Returns to civil life

Released during week ending Nov. 9, 1945	294,000
Total released Nov. 1 through Nov. 9, 1945	379,000
Total released, VJ-day (Sept. 2, 1945) through Nov. 9, 1945	2,235,000
Total released during the period May 12 through Nov. 9, 1945	2,827,000

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], proposed as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], as modified, inserting in lieu of section 4 (a) certain language.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask for the floor for a very few minutes.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] yesterday inquired of me whether the Byrd amendment seeks to repeal a law by concurrent resolution. I stated to him:

I shall undertake to discuss that phase of the amendment a little later, if I may.

I understand that by his inquiry the Senator suggests the thought:

First. Let us make the assumption that (a) the power which S. 1120 delegates to the President is administrative, not legislative, power, and that the bill sets up standards of a nature which make the delegation valid; and (b) the President, pursuant to S. 1120, formulates and transmits to Congress a reorganization plan.

Second. The action of the President becomes law.

Third. The Byrd amendment then undertakes to enable Congress, by concurrent resolution, which has no legislative effect, to repeal the law thus created by the President.

I have outlined my understanding of the inquiry suggested by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. My answer to the inquiry is that—

First. I have the greatest of difficulty in making the assumption that the power which S. 1120 delegates is administrative, not legislative, and that the bill sets up standards of a nature which make the delegation valid.

Second. If, however, that assumption be made, it is, in my opinion, possible for the Congress to provide by S. 1120 that (a) the taking effect of the plan prepared by the President shall not occur until the expiration of a period of time; and (b) if within that time some event specified in S. 1120, whether such event is the adoption of a concurrent resolution or any other incident, shall occur, his plan shall not take effect.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I discussed this matter at some length on Friday last; I shall not take up much of the time of the Senate today.

The Senator from Missouri made a very fine presentation of his side of this question yesterday. I was very much complimented, Mr. President, that he referred so repeatedly to what the Senator from Virginia said 6 years ago and what he said last week. I think, Mr. President, that a Senator certainly has a right to change his mind once in 6 years; in fact, if he does not change his mind oftener than that I think he should not be subject to much criticism.

It is true, Mr. President—and of course it has been discussed here very fully—that the Senator from Virginia supported 6 years ago the position which is now taken by the Senator from Missouri. I explain again that the situation is entirely different now from what it was then; and I am firmly convinced that the only way to effect a reorganization of the vast bureaucracy which has been built up in Washington is to give the President the power to do it subject to a veto by Congress, as is provided in the substitute I have offered. We have today four times as many bureaus and employees as we had 6 years ago.

When the Senator from Missouri speaks of the delegation of legislative authority from the Congress to the President let us bear in mind, Mr. President, that many important executive agencies in the Government have been established by Executive order under the general authority of Congress.

I have a list of some of these agencies here. They are some of the most important in the Government. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them, but I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal agencies established by Executive order

Name	Executive order	Date
White House (Administrative) Office	8248	1939
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	8840	1941
Office of Defense Transportation	8989	1941
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	9347	1943
Retraining and Reemployment	9427	1944
Publication Board	9568	1945
Surplus War Property Administration	9425	1944
Office of Economic Stabilization	9250	1942
Office of Scientific Research and Development	8807	1941
Office of War Information	9182	1942
War Manpower Commission	9139	1942
War Production Board	9024	1942
Civilian Production Administration	9638	1945
War Relocation Authority	9102	1942
War Shipping Administration	9054	1942
Office of Alien Property Custodian	9095	1942
Commodity Credit Corporation	6340	1933
Office of Price Administration	8734	1941
Petroleum Administration for War	9276	1942
Advisory Board on Just Compensation	9611, 9627	1945
Interim Research and Intelligence Service	9621	1945
Foreign Service Officers Training School	9450	
Office of Community War Services	9338	1943
National Housing Agency	9070	1942
Office of the Administrator	9070	1942
Federal Home Loan Bank Administration	9070	1942
Federal Public Housing Authority	9070	1942
Department of Agriculture:		
Agricultural Research Administration	9069	1942
Commodity Credit Corporation	6340	1933
Office of Food Production	9280	1942
Farm Security Administration	7027	1935
Marketing Service	9280	1942
Rural Electrification Administration	7037	1935
Farm Credit Administration	6084	1933
Department of Commerce: Export-Import Bank	6581	1934
Department of the Interior:		
Division of Territories and Island Possessions	6726	1934
Government in the Territories	6226	1934
U. S. Board on Geographical Names	6680	1934
Solid Fuels Administration for War	9332	1943
Southwestern Power Administration	9366	1943
Department of Justice: Tax Division	6166	1933
Department of the Treasury:		
Foreign Funds Control	8389	1940
Division of Personnel	7916	1933
Procurement Division	6166	1933
Federal Property Utilization	9055	1943
Interim International Information Service	9608	1945
Federal Prison Industries, Inc	6917	1934
U. S. Housing Corporation (in liquidation)	2889	1918
UNRRA (United States participation in)	9453	-----

Mr. BYRD. Certainly, Mr. President, it is just as great a delegation of legislative power from the Congress to the Executive to establish new branches of Government as it is to give to the President the right, under the veto provisions provided in the plan I have offered, to abolish these agencies in the interest of economy.

Let us remember, too, that billions of dollars have been appropriated by the Congress in lump-sum appropriations to be expended at the direction of the President. That, I think, is also a delegation of legislative power. These appropriations were made in lump sums some time prior to the war emergency. As I recall, the first one was an amendment attached to the NRA Act providing for an appropriation of over $3,000,000,000, which was virtually at the disposal and dictation of the President; that is to say, where the fund was to be spent, in what sections of the country it was to be spent, was to be determined by the President. I do not think it is anything entirely new, because the Congress of the United States from time to time has delegated legislative power to the President.

Here we have a proposal which has for its purpose the reduction of expenditures, which has for its purpose greater efficiency of the different departments of the Government, and for that reason I am willing to support it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What bothers me about the Senator's amendment is this: Let us say we hold a hearing, followed by debate in the committee and action by the Senate, for instance, on the question of unification of the armed forces, and we decide what we want and pass a law to that effect. The next day we say to the President, "You can change that whole business and recommend a different plan. If you get a majority of the House, although the Senate has not changed its mind, although it has the same view, you can overrule the Senate." Is not that the effect of the Byrd amendment as it is presented in its present form?

Mr. BYRD. It is not the effect as it would be applied to the unification of the services, because the departments of the Government are exempted. The President could not unify the services, under the pending bill, whether the Byrd amendment were adopted or not, because he is prohibited from joining together any two or more departments of the Government, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. TAFT. He could, however, proceed with many bureaus in between, which would to a large extent carry out some of the purpose, particularly with regard to the unification of the Air Forces, under the bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. BYRD. I think the President now has the power to transfer them.

Mr. TAFT. He could transfer the Air Force of the Navy to the Army Air Force if he wished to do so, when this bill is enacted. Is not that correct?

Mr. BYRD. All the 10 main departments of the Government are entirely exempted from abolition or combining.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know, but I think the Senator is mistaken. As I understand, they cannot be abolished, but a bureau can be taken out of one and transferred to another.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; I think the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. TAFT. Furthermore, we approved the nomination of Mr. Wallace last January largely because we first transferred the RFC from the Department of Commerce and set it up as an independent agency. Yet, when this bill is enacted, the President can transmit a reorganization plan transferring the RFC back to the Department of Commerce, and no matter whether two-thirds of the Senate are opposed to it, if he can get a majority of the House to approve the plan, the plan will go through. Is not that a correct interpretation of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator can interpret the bill just as well as the Senator from Virginia can. Under the power proposed to be conferred on him, the President can transfer departments and agencies, excepting for the prohibitions and exemptions which are listed in the bill. I think the Senator could stand here for an hour or so and ask different questions with respect to what the President could do, but the bill is very clear, I think, and if the Senate does not understand now what the President can do, after nearly a week of debate, I do not think it will every understand it.

Mr. TAFT. I want to know whether the Senator thinks the President should be allowed to nullify the will of the Congress after it has debated a question. Does the Senator think that should be possible?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia is supporting the bill, and he is supporting the substitute he has offered, so I do not think there is any question about that. It all goes back to the old question, and I differ with the Senator from Ohio, with all my respect for him and my confidence in him. He thinks Congress can reorganize. I say Congress cannot reorganize under present conditions and do it effectively.

Let us consider, for example, the duplications. I read a list of them to the Senate a few days ago, and want to go over them a little. There are 22 agencies operating within 11 departments with respect to housing.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Several Senators prepared and introduced in the Senate yesterday a bill to reorganize the housing agencies of the Government, placing them permanently under one department, and I hope that bill will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Did the Senator provide for reorganizing the 22 agencies operating in 11 departments? That is not in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I know, under that bill, every department having to do with housing, with the exception of the Veterans' Administration, is consolidated under the National Housing Administration.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator will find that he has omitted a good many of the agencies which deal with housing.

Mr. TAFT. Most of those agencies are obsolete, and I would say that any touch they have with housing today is negligible, with the exception of the Veterans' Administration, outside of the proposed National Housing Agency. I say the job can be done by Congress.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has referred to one bill which has been presented, the only one I know of along that line.

There are 27 agencies operating within 12 departments relating to standards of inspection.

There are 29 agencies operating within 21 departments having to do with statistics.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think there should be some different statistical organizations in different departments. I think there should be different agencies determining standards, and that they should be in different departments. In my opinion, it would be a mistake to consolidate all statistical organizations in one great Government statistical organization. I say that the fact that there are separate agencies is not an evidence necessarily of inefficiency. Perhaps those are much more efficient organizations where they are, devoted to a particular purpose which we are trying to accomplish, than if they were put in a great overhead statistical organization of the Government.

Mr. BYRD. Some of the greatest confusion that exists in Congress today is over the various statistics which are furnished, which differ one with the other, with respect to vital questions confronting the Nation. I know I cannot convert the Senator from Ohio with respect to the matter, but I merely want some of the other Senators to know again about these various duplications.

The next is the agency having to do with surplus war property, a recently created agency. No one, so far as I know, has introduced a bill to consolidate the 14 agencies which are now operating within 12 departments having to do with the disposal of surplus war property.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the law gives the Surplus Property Administrator the power to say which shall be the disposing agency. We have granted that power. I think the President tomorrow can say that there shall be only one disposal agency, if he wishes to do so. He has that power under the law as worked out by Congress.

Mr. BYRD. That certainly is legislative power. Did the Senator vote for the bill to give the President the right to reorganize all the agencies having to do with surplus property?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; because we set up one surplus property administration, and we then provided that as surplus property developed in each department it should be set aside, and that thereafter it should be subject to the rules and regulations made by the Administrator.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, the Senator voted to delegate to the President the legislative power to reorganize these 14 agencies which are dealing with surplus property.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that was a delegation of legislative power. I am quite prepared to give the President some discretion, within reasonable limits, but I think our responsibility is to determine the over-all skeleton outline of the Government of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot see any distinction. If the Senator is willing to vote to delegate power to the President for reorganization in one department I cannot understand why he is unwilling to vote for it in others.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was merely going to supplement what the Senator from Virginia said as to this particular bill. It does give the President the very power that is so bitterly criticized and condemned as to these 14 agencies, and his action does not come back to the Congress for any review.

Mr. BYRD. And then we find the Senator from Ohio supporting that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I see no reason why we should not take a particular department and say that within certain fields the President shall transfer this bureau or that bureau. I am perfectly willing to do that. I am only unwilling to let him abolish bureaus, abolish agencies, or to transfer one agency to another, when Congress has determined that the policy of the Government requires just the opposite of what it is now proposed to authorize the President to do.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Do not these various agencies go through quite a number of departments?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. And they are transferred from department to department, back and forth.

Mr. BYRD. In the matter of war surplus property there are 14 different agencies operating within 12 departments.

We will take labor relations: 27 agencies operating within 11 departments.

Conservation of natural resources: 20 agencies operating within 5 departments.

Rehabilitation: 24 agencies operating within 16.

If the Congress attempted, Mr. President, to reorganize in that field, the bills should go to different committees, because they would deal with different functions of the Government, and it would be impossible to secure a uniform reorganization, which is the only kind that would be valuable. It has got to be viewed from the standpoint of the whole, and I reiterate that the President is the only authority to do that, just as the governor of the State is the only person in the State who could do it. There are many ex-governors here among the membership of the Senate, and I do not believe that a single ex-governor here will deny my statement when I say that there has never been a worth-while reorganization of a single State in this Union unless it had the aggressive leadership of the governor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the Senator able to point to one State of the Union the legislature of which has ever delegated to the governor the legislative power which is delegated in substance by this bill?

Mr. BYRD. I do not know that I can say it has been done exactly the same as in this bill. I know there has been legislative power delegated. In Virginia legislative power was given to me for a large part of the reorganization, except for the 12 main departments which exist in Virginia, just as the 10 main departments of our Federal Government are exempted in the pending bill.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Under the law of Virginia is it not true, as it is in every other State in the Union, in my judgment, that legislative power cannot be delegated to the governor or to any other official? Is that not a correct statement?

Mr. BYRD. It was given to me as Governor of Virginia to consolidate certain bureaus of the government. It was given to me to reduce the expenditures of the government arbitrarily, although appropriations had been made by the legislature. That was done. By reason of that action Virginia went through the depression with a balanced budget; indeed, it was one of three States that did so in 1929–30.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it not entirely possible for the governor to exercise a tremendous influence by the power of recommendation which is given by the constitutions of the various States, rather than by the exercise of a legislative power in effect to be delegated?

Mr. BYRD. Of course, the governor is in much closer contact with the members of the legislature than the President can be with the Members of Congress. A governor has less than one forty-eighth of the country to deal with, because the Federal Government is much more than 48 times as large as 1 State is. I am speaking of the activities of the Federal Government as contrasted with those of a State government.

Mr. DONNELL. With respect to the law of the State of Virginia, has the highest court of resort in the State of Virginia ever held that legislative power may be validly delegated by the legislative department to the executive?

Mr. BYRD. I could not answer that. There was no question whatever raised when the authority was given to the Governor to reduce expenditures. It was given by the legislature, and that was done. It was certainly a delegation of legislative power. The Senator from Missouri will agree with that statement, will he not?

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is unable to inform the Senate of any decision of the court of highest resort in the State of Virginia to the effect that legislative power may be delegated by the legislature to the Governor?

Mr. BYRD. I am not a lawyer, I will say to the Senator from Missouri, and I have not looked up the decisions. So far as I know, in Virginia that question was not raised. It may have been; I do not know. I left the governorship in 1930. It may have been raised since then. But there was no question about the fact that the power was exercised by the Governor. It was exercised for the efficiency and the economy and the administration of State government, and no one complained of it. The appropriations were reduced in proportion to the income. Those were the instructions which were given to the Governor, and that was done, and Virginia went through the depression with a balanced budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Virginia, in answer to the question of the Senator from Missouri, that in Massachusetts in connection with the wartime powers of the Governor in that State, where the legislature granted the very broad executive power to issue decrees and to make orders, and so forth, the supreme court of that State, if my memory is correct, said that was a proper delegation of legislative powers, providing the legislature did not completely abrogate all its powers but retained some control.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. May I testify to the fact that when I went to the legislature in Ohio a complete reorganization bill was recommended by the Governor, considered by the legislature, and passed by it, and if only three States went through the depression with a balanced budget, Ohio was one of them as well as Virginia. So it can be done without the delegation of legislative power, which the Senator requests or prefers.

Mr. BYRD. And still the delegation of power did not do any harm, certainly in the case I referred to.

Mr. President, I shall not take up any more of the time of the Senate. We all know the magnitude of this great bureaucracy in Washington. There are 3,000,000 Federal employees. It is difficult to get any of them dismissed. I repeat that the President is the only person who can effect a real reorganization. We are now confronted with a condition that has never before existed in our country. We have this bloated, tremendous war machine of civilian personnel. It consists of 3,000,000 individuals in this country and 600,000 abroad, nearly 3,600,000. It is costing $9,000,000,000 for wages and salaries alone—$9,000,000,000,

which is twice as much as the total cost of government was when I came to the Senate in 1932.

Mr. President, I have confidence in President Truman. I think he is anxious to reorganize the Government. I think he is anxious to eliminate waste and inefficiency and duplication, and I for one am willing to trust him.

I think this bill is protected in such a way that if anything is done that is very wrong, then the Congress, by the affirmative vote of both Houses, can pass a veto measure, which will set aside any plan the President may present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only wanted to ask the Senator why it is he thinks that the present President would be more economical than the last President? As was stated the other day——

Mr. BYRD. The Senator asked me the exact question the other day.

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think so.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will refer to the RECORD he will see what my answer was the other day.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think I asked such a question.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator asked me why I had more confidence in the present President than in Mr. Roosevelt, and if the Senator does not remember, I said in reply that I did not think Mr. Roosevelt was economy minded. That is nothing new. I have stated that time and again. Furthermore, in justification, I said that in 1939 when he was given this power, the war was imminent and he did not have a fair chance to reorganize.

Mr. TAFT. But what I wish to ask now is, What is it about any policy the President has proposed which leads the Senator to believe that he is for economy? Has he not endorsed every program for spending that anyone has suggested?

Mr. BYRD. I am not going to be involved in that discussion. The Senator from Ohio is entitled to his views about it. I say that I believe—and I can only use my own judgment, based on my own conscience—I believe President Truman will reorganize. I believe he will do a good job. I have talked with him about it.

Mr. TAFT. I am asking the Senator why he thinks the present President will save money any more than was saved by past reorganizations?

Mr. BYRD. I make up my mind by my own mental methods. I have confidence in the President. I do not know whether the Senator from Ohio has or not, but I have. I believe he will do what he said he would do. He told me he would do it, and I am supporting this bill with confidence on my part that the President will do a good job with respect to reorganization.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not agree with the President's recommendation for a 20-percent increase in all salaries, does he?

Mr. BYRD. I do not agree with him in that recommendation. Neither do I agree with his recommendation with respect to an unemployment-compensation allowance of $25 a week for 26 weeks. But that does not mean that I do not have confidence in the statement which he made to me, that he intended to reorganize the Government for economy and efficiency.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly about some of the points which I think are involved in the pending measure. The other day on the floor of the Senate I tried to make myself clear. I understand that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has made some reply to the argument which I attempted to make. Unfortunately I was not present and did not hear the able Senator from Missouri, and I have not yet had an opportunity to read the RECORD. However, there are one or two points which I wish to reiterate.

First of all, in my argument the other day I mentioned the question of constitutionality. I stated that the technical construction which is so often indulged in by men did not concern me in the least, so far as as it related to this measure. I said that because so often men have technically and erroneously construed the Constitution, and I cannot be very much interested in their construction. I yield to no man in my deep affection for the Constitution itself, and my desire to abide by its principles.

What I meant, and what I repeat, is that I do not believe that the constitutional question is involved at all. It is agreed by everyone that power of this kind may be delegated. I think the Senator from Missouri agrees to that statement. At least he did in the argument which he made the other day. I do not know what he said yesterday. I believe that he agrees to that statement, provided proper standards are set up. So the question is whether or not the standards in the bill are sufficient. That is really the only question involved, so long as standards are actually set up.

The pending bill does contain standards. There are commands; there are prohibitions; there are restrictions, limitations, exemptions, and exceptions, all amounting to standards. To my mind the standards set up in the bill go far beyond the ordinary standards provided in bills of this kind. If so, there is no question about their sufficiency. While I have not searched the cases carefully, my recollection is that only one law has ever been held to be bad because of insufficiency of standards. That was the National Industrial Recovery Act, involved in the Schechter decision. I believe that is a correct statement. If it is not correct, I should like to be corrected. I believe that was the only case in which any law was ever held to be bad because of insufficiency of standards.

With respect to the delegation of legislative power, I have said that there is much confusion. There is a great deal of confusion among lawyers and among courts. Some day absolutely that legislative power cannot be delegated. But every one of us who has had any experience with legislation or with the departments knows that nearly every bill relating to a department carries with it the express power giving the department authority to issue regulations and rules, and such regulations and rules are given the force and effect of law. In many cases violation of the rules and regulations is even made punishable by fine and imprisonment. We never see the rules and regulations, which amount to law, for the violation of which men actually go to jail, have their property taken from them, and have heavy fines and penalties assessed against them. I believe that that is too often done. I do not like that type of legislation. If I could, I would make every rule or regulation promulgated by any department reviewable by Congress, and require the sanction of Congress before it became effective. But such drastic laws are enacted, and they are upheld by the courts. For that reason, without meaning to speak offensively, it seems to me that we are quibbling over this question. I believe that we ought to determine, first, whether the standards are sufficient. If they are, then that question is removed.

As to the question of the power of Congress itself to reorganize, I said the other day, and I repeat, that I think it is the primary obligation of Congress itself to enact legislation to reorganize the various departments. If I believed for one moment that Congress would do the job, I would not be in favor of the pending legislation. I would say, "Let us do it, because we are the ones who ought to do it." But the experience of more than 100 years proves that the Congress cannot and will not do it. The Senator from Missouri quoted Patrick Henry, who said that he had but one lamp by which his feet were guided, and that was the lamp of experience. The experience of more than 100 years is that Congress simply cannot and will not do it. It has been tried. It is a practical question. If we can or will do it, by all means let us do it. But how many Senators are now in the Chamber listening to this debate? How many Senators listened to the Senator from Missouri yesterday? I was unable to be present to hear him. I was one of the absentees, engaged in other business, just as many other Senators are now engaged in other business. I am sure that he made a very able address. I am sure that he explored the subject and tried to do his level best for his country. But how many Senators heard his address yesterday? I should say not more than half a dozen. That is no reflection on the Senator from Missouri, and it is no reflection on the Members who were absent. We are busy with countless duties which prevent our staying here and listening to the debate, which should be listened to. I wish that every Senator could remain in the Chamber throughout all the debates. I believe that discussion should be full, free, and complete, and that we should listen to one another; but we do not.

In the light of the actual practical situation which confronts us, does any Senator believe that Congress can or will reorganize the vast multitude of executive agencies? My answer is "No." My answer is that it cannot do so, and that

the job will not be done by Congress. I do not mean to speak disparagingly of the Congress or of the Senate committee; but the other day I pointed out that the exemptions made in the bill are inconsistent and inconclusive. Some were put in the bill without rhyme or reason. An attempt is made to exempt all quasi-judicial agencies, but some are left outside; and the one strictly judicial agency, The Tax Court, is not even mentioned. That is a sloppy, haphazard job, done in my own committee, and I have my own share of responsibility for it. I could not examine into all the departments shown on the chart on the wall. I cannot do it now, and I cannot do it a year from now. Neither can any other Senator; and yet, on the question of exemptions, if in the discharge of our duty, we are to adopt a pattern really designed to guide the President, we should say that we do not wish certain agencies touched. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is not now in the Chamber. Every day he has been calling attention to certain things which the Congress recently approved, and which the President ought not to touch. There are certain agencies which we do not want him to touch. We do not want him to reorganize them. If we are to establish a pattern for the guidance of the President, and some agencies ought not to be reorganized, then we ought to set forth every one of them most carefully. We ought to specify every agency which we do not think ought to be touched. We should say to the President, "This is our pattern. These agencies ought not to be touched. As to all the others, there is where we think organization should be brought about." That would be a guide and a pattern which the President ought to have. It would be a good thing for him to have. But we have not even done that. That is the reason why I oppose the exemptions now provided for in the bill. I would gladly exempt every agency which Congress agrees should be exempted if we were to make a thorough job of it. But I do not want to do it by piecemeal. I do not want to restrict the President in part and impliedly say, in effect, as to all the others which we want reorganized, "All right; go ahead and do it." So I make these remarks to show the ineffectiveness of our power and ability to consider this enormous task.

Mr. President, let me say one more word. I see the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] standing and seeking recognition, and I shall not detain him much longer. I simply wish to say that I am desperately in earnest about reorganizing the executive branch of the Federal Government. I think the waste, confusion, and extravagance are terrible. I do not believe there is a business in the country, not even the largest, which could avoid going into bankruptcy within 30 days if its affairs were conducted as are the affairs of government. Our responsibility is to enact the best and most practical legislation we can enact to accomplish the desperately needed reorganization.

Mr. President, with the amendment of the Senator from Virginia adopted as a part of the bill, I shall vote for the bill, because I believe it does at least approach some practical manner of attempting reorganization. To me it is not a question of politics. The aisle in the center of the Senate Chamber has nothing to do with it. The Republicans during their years of administration have been just as guilty as have the Democrats regarding the confusion which exists, and Democrats have been just as guilty as Republicans have. It is a problem for us all. So I have no hesitancy in voting for the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

During the debate it was pointed out that perhaps one party might control one branch of the Government, that—unfortunately as it might be—the Republicans might obtain control of the House of Representatives at a time when the Senate would be controlled by the Democrats, and that if there were Republican control of the House of Representatives and Democratic control of the Senate, one side might deliberately try to obstruct the work of reorganization. Mr. President, I think that is a very low opinion of the Members of either branch of the Congress. I do not hold that view. I do not think that possibility presents any danger whatever.

I think the problem is one of patriotic consideration of the welfare of our country, without regard to political considerations. Even if the Republicans should win control of the House of Representatives—although I am quite sure they will not do so—I would still have faith that we could obtain adequate approval or disapproval under the plan submitted by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I have concluded. I am through, I say to the Senator from Nebraska.

THE COST-ABSORPTION POLICY OF OPA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I definitely regret that I am compelled to discuss a subject other than the pending measure, and I extend my apologies to the distinguished junior Senator from Utah who is sponsoring the reorganization bill. However, I must take a few minutes to discuss a question which is entirely foreign to the matter which has been under consideration.

I have waited several days to make this statement. In view of the fact that I anticipate that I shall have to be absent from the Senate tomorrow, at this time I request unanimous consent that I may be excused from the session of the Senate tomorrow if I find it necessary to be absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to state now that since I have been a Member of the Senate it has fallen to my lot to work as a minority member with the majority on the Small Business Committee. At times I have felt that we have not made a sufficient number of reports, because almost daily we receive messages and letters from small businessmen or from persons in some segment of an industry here or there stating that they desire to have relief. Many times we have gone to the Government agencies concerned—the WPB, in regard to priorities; or the Office of Price Administration in regard to prices—and have secured relief. But in many other cases we have not secured relief, and concerning them no reports have been filed. With the helpers we have on the Small Business Committee, it would be impossible to file a report each and every time a complaint was received. But ofttimes we get to a place where the Complaints Subcommittee, of which the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is chairman—and I am serving with him—holds hearings on prices or priorities which affect a complete segment of an industry from coast to coast.

I stayed in Washington until August 22 listening to evidence presented to the Small Business Committee by different segments of industry which were requesting relief. Included among them were the aluminum interests who were requesting relief in connection with the distribution or sale of defense plants. Relief was also requested in connection with housing ceilings, meat ceilings, and meat quotas, brooms, and many others. In fact, I was absent from Washington less than 10 days during the summer recess. I was helping to iron out some of the problems which have been affecting industry throughout the country. I asked for the assignment, and I am not complaining because of the amount of work I was called upon to do.

I may say that the Office of Price Administration and other agencies have at times heeded our advice and at times they have gone absolutely contrary to the suggestions which have been made not only by the Small Business Committee of the Senate but by the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives. When the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration does that, I see no other chance to obtain relief except to bring our problem to the Senate floor, and to see to it that the Senate itself not only becomes acquainted with the facts but also has the final word of Government agencies regarding the determination of policy.

I agree with what the Senator from New Mexico said a moment ago about the difficulty of getting Senators to remain on the floor of the Senate. The trouble because of absenteeism is not that Senators wish to be absent. It is simply a matter of having too many conflicting duties. Today five Senators are absent in connection with the funeral of the late Honorable John Thomas of Idaho, whose body is being borne to his own State. I have always had the highest regard for Senator Thomas, and only wish that I, too, could attend the service. Two Senators are absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Mott, of Oregon, another public servant for whom I entertained the highest respect. Today the Pearl Harbor Investigation Committee is in session, and that requires certain Members of the Senate to be absent from the floor of the Senate this afternoon. Furthermore, there is the regular committee work. For instance, yesterday afternoon a meeting of the Appropriations Committee caused many Members of the Senate to be absent from the floor of the Senate. It has become increasingly difficult, as I, as whip

on the minority side can testify, to get Senators to remain on the floor of the Senate where they may hear the debate and may come to know of the need for corrective legislation. For instance, we need particularly to help in connection with the problems of reconversion and the task of getting business back to normalcy.

During the past several weeks, the Office of Price Administration has attempted to expand to all industries what is called its cost-absorption policy. The attempt to expand it is being made on the basis that the producer has had increased costs, particularly labor costs, which the Office of Price Administration feels should be absorbed by some other segment of industry. By that, I mean that when a producer has been granted relief by being accorded the right to increase his prices in order to cover increased costs, in most cases the price ceilings have remained the same and the OPA has asked some other segment of industry to absorb the increased costs, and in some instances it has reached the point of driving a segment of industry out of business.

In this connection I may refer to the wholesale lumber dealers of the United States, about 1,500 of whom have been denied the legitimate, the traditional, and the former discount of 6 percent which they were allowed before the war in order to service the retail lumber yards of the country. That discount, as I have said, has been denied them in its entirety, and many wholesale lumber dealers will have to go out of business because they cannot obtain lumber under the restrictions of the price ceilings which have been imposed by the Office of Price Administration.

The defense which has been made by Mr. Bowles, who is one of the greatest salesmen I ever listened to, is that the policy which his office has inaugurated has been required by congressional order. The statement of the Price Administrator is an indictment of every Member of the Senate. The Price Administrator states that the policies of his office have been imposed because of congressional orders. I quote from the statement of the Price Administrator of November 13, 1945:

> There is only one thing that I and my associates can do, and that is to carry out our legal responsibilities. We shall do what Congress and the President order us to do.

I ask Senators to note that statement. "We shall do what Congress and the President order us to do."

Mr. Bowles continued as follows:

> We shall continue to hold the price line by requiring cost absorption within the reasonable limits of all industry and trade.

That statement was made by the Price Administrator on November 13. The reason the Office of Price Administration is extending its cost-absorption policy at the present time is because of the increased wages which will be given to those who are engaged in productive industry. Some segments of the industry are expected to absorb the cost to which I have referred in order to afford relief to the producer without in any way allowing an increase in price.

I quote further from Mr. Bowles' statement:

> Under our clear orders we have had no choice but to do what we are doing. However, had we had a choice we would, nevertheless, do what we are doing, for I am convinced that it is in the interest of the whole Nation.

In other words, Mr. Bowles assumes absolute authority to write an order for the economy of 140,000,000 people even if Congress has not already given him such authority. He has said that Congress has given such authority to him, but if it had not given him the authority it would make no difference to Mr. Bowles. He states that what he has done is exactly what he would have done in the absence of any authority from Congress.

Mr. President, I am sure that many Members of the Senate have received from lumber dealers and from automobile dealers telegrams asking for relief. They have received telegrams from owners of retail lumber yards relative to what is known as L–41. Senators have also received telegrams with reference to paper, furniture, and so forth. I have been asked what the Senate Small Business Committee is doing. I may answer that the the committee has tried to help, but unless we receive assistance from the Senate in clarifying the mandate which the Price Administrator is attempting to enforce, there will be afforded no relief to various segments of industry, and many of them will be compelled to go out of business. The statement of the Price Administrator can be interpreted by me only to mean that if Congress does not agree with the Price Administrator that he has authority to impose his price control policy, he will impose it any way. He has said that even in the absence of Congressional authority he would impose his cost-absorption policy on all segments of industry.

Mr. President, in imposing such a policy upon industry the Price Administrator is attempting to do two things: First, he is attempting to squeeze out small segments of industry which can not stand cost absorption; and, secondly, he is attempting to regulate the income of business by taking away from it a part of its traditional profits. So the Price Administrator has come forth in a new role and in addition to regulating prices, he now regulates the profits of business. I do not know of anything which could be more socialistic, or which could more nearly approach stateism in its magnitude, than the policy of the Price Administrator in regulating profits of the individual businessman of the United States of America.

With reference to the decision in the case of Philadelphia Coke et al. against Bowles, a decision which was handed down in August 1943, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, Mr. Bowles stated:

> We find the following language handed down as the opinion of the court:
>
> "When such increases are permitted, it is the duty of the Administrator, so far as possible to require them to be absorbed at some appropriate intermediate stage in the process of production or distribution at which there may be an existing margin of profit reasonably sufficient to absorb them."

It was on that point—there are other matters in the opinion which I think contradict the statement which I have read—that the Price Administrator said:

> This decision emphatically established the fact that costs absorption was required by the language of the Price Control Act.

That is an act which Congress enacted in 1942 and amended at various times since. It was extended in 1944 and in 1945.

There was no further decision on the subject until the case of *Gillespie-Rogers-Pyatt Company et al.* v. *Bowles* (144 Fed., sec. 361 (1944)). In both these cases the opinion does not require the Price Administrator to increase maximum prices so as to correspond to every cost increase, but suggests that the Price Administrator should maintain maximum prices which are generally fair and equitable. In order to do so, prices should be increased if they are to be fair and equitable when a squeeze puts out of business one segment of industry. I so interpret both these decisions.

As a Member of the United States Senate I wish to go on record as saying that I do not agree with the interpretation which has been made by the Price Administrator. Furthermore, his interpretation does not conform to the provisions of the act itself, because in the Price Control Act it is provided—I read from section 902 of the code, subsection (e), paragraph (h)—as follows:

> The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods, or means, or aids to distribution, established in any industry, or changes in established rental practices, except where such action is affirmatively found by the Administrator to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion.

The language continues but does not bear directly upon the point at issue. The act states that the Administrator shall not operate to compel changes in business practices. With reference to the wholesale lumber dealers, if the mark-off of 6 percent is not granted to them, the ceiling price at the mill is the same as theirs, the lumber wholesalers, and there is no margin of profit for them on which to operate. Is not that a change from the traditional mark-off practices in the wholesale lumber business? Yet, in open defiance of the statute and what is incorporated in the Price Control Act, Mr. Bowles said that he will interpret it as giving him authority to compel cost-absorption by the industry even though it squeezes some of its members out of business. I say that nothing so socialistic has taken place in all the history of this country.

When questioned by me the Administrator stated that he did have the right to control profits, and that Congress had so ordered. I deny that such authority is in the statute. Nothing has been done by Congress which gave him such authority. I think that the Members of the Senate should go on record in saying that they are not condoning, are not aiding, and are not permitting the Price Administrator to regulate profits. Mr. Bowles has stated that he is regulating profits by the authority of congressional

enactment. He says that when the price-control legislation was reviewed and extended by the Congress in June 1944, and again in June 1945 the cost-absorption policy was fully explained to the Banking and Currency Committees of the Senate and the House. He says it was thoroughly debated on the floor and that various amendments altering the policies were considered and defeated, either in the committee or upon the floor.

He goes further in his statement and says that because of that fact, after this decision of 1943 was handed down—

> It should be wholly clear that OPA has been required by Congress, the courts, and the President, to ask cost absorption within reasonable limits of all industries and trades * * * as a means of preventing inflation.

In other words, if we follow his answer to my questions, he now states that, because of the decision in the Philadelphia case in August 1945 because of the fact that amendments were offered in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1944 and 1945, when the Price Act was extended, and were also offered on the floor of the United States Senate, and defeated, not in anyway approved by the Congress, he now has congressional authority to extend the price absorption policy wherever he chooses.

I went into the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning and talked to the clerk. She stated there had been considerable discussion in June 1945 relative to cost absorption, dollars-and-cents ceilings based upon prewar costs rather than current costs.

As I understand, such an amendment was offered in the committee but was withdrawn and was subsequently offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator from Nebraska realize that the OPA, under its present management and policy, has become bigger than the President, the Congress, and the courts, bigger than economic sense and every other possible consideration, and does whatever it pleases?

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the question of my distinguished colleague from Kansas I should like to say that I feel Mr. Bowles thinks he is bigger than Congress, and bigger than the courts. I do not know yet whether he thinks he is as big as the President of the United States. I would not say that, because I do not know their relationships. But when a man comes before a Senate committee and there states that he has congressional authority to extend cost-absorption policies to all industry, when he says he has a right to invade the right of private contract, and from a retailer who has a contract for 24 percent, to take 4 percent out and give it to somebody else—I say that is more power than Congress ever gave Mr. Bowles, and that he is assuming the power.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator from Nebraska suggest any law Congress has passed which the OPA has regarded, and is regarding now?

Mr. WHERRY. I would not say that Mr. Bowles has not regarded every law, but I would say that in my experience there has been an entire disregard of congressional enactments relative to price ceilings and the price program policy which Chester Bowles has put into effect.

Mr. REED. I agree entirely with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator, and I am grateful to him for his contribution.

When we came to the floor of the Senate, there was offered the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] which applied only to manufacturers and processors. If I understood the amendment correctly, it provided that a maximum price should not be established which imposed a dollars-and-cents ceiling on prewar costs. I do not wish to go into a discussion of that, but if I remember correctly, that was the provision.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The proposition was that there should be the same margin between present costs and ceiling prices that there was in the prewar period between the then costs and the then ceiling prices. That was the provision, in substance. It covered only manufacturers, but if we could have adopted the general principle as to manufacturers, we might well have gone on and adopted it as to distributors.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his statement. I knew it was a dollars-and-cents ceiling, but I thought at that time, because of the fact that it was offered earlier, the other costs were considered, but if it was a dollars-and-cents cost proposal under a price ceiling which permitted the same percentage of profit now as it did then, I desire to be corrected.

I do say that in the discussion of that amendment certainly the price policy systems and policies of the Administrator were under consideration. Unfortunately, the amendment was lost by a rather close vote.

At that time the Administration did not attempt, and has not attempted, to extend on a wholesale basis the idea of dollars-and-cents ceilings and the extension of prots to all industries. This has only come about during the past 3 or 4 months, with the insistence of different pressure groups that wages might be increased without increasing the price ceilings, on the theory that some segments of industry would have to absorb the increase in production costs.

The only other amendment offered at that time was the one I offered for the benefit of agriculture, which was carried in the Senate, went to the House, and was there deleted. The amendment provided that there should be applied to agriculture the price policy we had applied to industry throughout the war. Of course, the pressure groups, of which Mr. Bowles is one of the chiefs, succeeded in their efforts to have the House of Representatives reject the amendment

To my mind that was the only discussion which has ever taken place about the policy which is now being pursued, and which I think is not only wrecking reconversion but which is going to wreck certain segments of industry. I know the Members of the Senate, unless they were members of the committee, have not attended the meetings of the Small Business Committee, and many of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, and I know it is almost impossible to read the volumes Senators have to read in order to become familiar with what takes place before the committees. That is the reason why I am taking the time to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate, to call attention to the fact that Senators are being indicted by Chester Bowles when he says to the dealers and the independent businessmen of their States that Senators are responsible; that they are the ones who passed the congressional order; that Congress ordered him to extend these absorption costs to industry. He is indicting Senators, and we are responsible, unless we take some action to clarify such a policy.

As a Member of the Senate, I wish to go on record as stating that I do not interpret the Price Stabilization Act to mean that it is a congressional mandate requiring the Price Administrator to put into effect price-absorption policies, and that no decision of any court alters my interpretation of the act. I do not want to be quoted by the Price Administrator as stating that I, as a Member of the Senate, am authorizing him, under a congressional order, to put such a policy into effect.

I want it strictly understood that it is my interpretation of the Price Stabilization Act that he cannot change the traditional distribution systems of costs, or the market position of the producer and the consumer, by squeezing out a segment of industry, as he has done with the wholesale lumber dealers, or by taking away from any segment of industry its profit and handing it over to somebody else. That is exactly what is being done by the Price Administrator, Chester Bowles, in the price-absorption policy he is now extending to all industry. He requires one segment of an industry to absorb a cost, but does not permit that cost to be percentagewise placed upon the other segments of the industry, as is required by the Price Stabilization Act.

I expect the opposition is having a caucus now as to what to do with this absorption policy. I hope they are, because I think the responsibility is solely with the majority party of the United States Senate as to what shall be done in the face of an extension and expansion of this policy, which I think is socialistic and destructive of segments of our industry. It certainly is thwarting reconversion at this very hour.

On November 13 Mr. Bowles made an elaborate statement relative to industry under the price-absorption policy which has to do with the selling of automobiles. That is another industry with which OPA is now dealing. In that industry he has gone into the relationship between a dealer and the producer under the right of private contract, not an invoice. The

franchises are permanent. They go on, not only from year to year but last as long as the relationship continues between the contracting parties. Yet, what does Chester Bowles do? He says that he has the right to take 4 percent out of a contract and pay it to the producer, regardless of what the provisions of the contract are, telling one segment it has to absorb what is given to another. That is what is being done. That is what the Price Administrator is doing, and he says Congress is the one that has ordered him to do it.

He went before a committee of the House a day or so ago—the matter will come to the Senate next—and accused the automobile dealers of being a pressure group, attempting to influence him to depart from this absorption-cost policy. Here are the words he used:

> This idea of "government by pressure" is an ominous sign of our times. It is a threat to the democratic rights of all the inarticulate, silent, little people of America.

What would you do, Mr. President, if you were an automobile dealer? Would you not send a telegram to your Senator if the Government came and invaded your right of private contract and said, "You are not entitled to 24 percent. We are going to take 4 percent and give it to the producer of the automobile."

The automobile dealers have already protested to the OPA. They have had meeting after meeting, and many have paid their transportation to this city in order to try to obtain relief from that program. As a last resort there was a hearing before the House Small Business Committee, and now they are sending telegrams advising us of their troubles, asking Congress to protect them, because Chester Bowles says he is operating under a congressional authorization.

Does Mr. Bowles indicate in that statement that he, himself, has taken the responsibility for protecting all the consumers of the United States of America? Is that what he means? He speaks of protecting the sacred rights of the small businessmen of America, and intimates that he is the only one who is protecting them.

Let us see how this procedure would operate. Under the plan, 4 percent would be taken from the retailer and given to the wholesaler. But that would not result in reducing the price of the automobile one particle. If a saving can be made in cost by taking 4 percent from the retailer, then that saving should be passed on to the 140,000,000 people in this country who might want to buy automobiles.

What does Mr. Bowles do? He yields to a pressure group. On the one hand he condemns the automobile dealers as a pressure group which attempts to prevent a decrease in the profit, and on the other he yields to a pressure group in the case of automobiles, and takes 4 percent from the retailer and gives it to the producer. Then he says, "I am holding the line. I am protecting the little man. I am here protecting the consumer." The consumer ought to obtain the resultant saving, and not one segment of a great industry.

Mr. President, there are other laborers besides those who help produce automobiles. Hundreds of thousands of people are engaged as clerks and stenographers working in retail agencies which sell automobiles throughout the country or in other organizations which handle the products of automobile manufacturing concerns. There are hundreds of thousands of mechanics connected with the industry. If it is proposed to increase the wages of the laborers who produce the automobiles, the wages should be increased straight across the board. The wages of the mechanics should be increased. The wages of the shopman in Nebraska should be increased. So should the wages of the man who figures up the bill, the man who sells the goods. If wages are to be increased straight across the board, the retailer must take such increase out of his profits, and another 4 or 5 or 10 percent will come out of his profits. If we want to do the kind of job that should be done, if we want to be absolutely square, wages should be increased throughout the country straight across the board.

Mr. Bowles yields to a pressure group. He says to the public, "I am protecting you. We are not going to let the automobile people charge you one dime more than they charged you in 1942. I am the man who protects the consumer." Then he yields to a pressure group and gives it to them.

Mr. President, I am willing to give the producers every dime that is coming to them, but if we are to increase wages the wages should be increased across the board, and if Chester Bowles succeeds in making any saving in cost that saving should be passed on to the consumer. If there is a saving, John Q. Public should be given the benefit of it, and it should not be given to one particular group which Chester Bowles decides should have it.

Mr. President, Chester Bowles says he is representing the little man. I have a great number of telegrams from wholesale companies. The messages I have here are only a small portion of those which have come to me in the last 3 or 4 days. I handed over to the Small Business Committee more than 500 telegrams from wholesale dealers in which they tell of what will result if this mark-up of 4 percent is not given to them. During the war the selling price of lumber was on the same basis for retailers as wholesalers because practically all the lumber went to Government agencies. Formerly wholesalers were allowed not only 6 percent for themselves but also to finance many of the mills. Today the same selling price prevails. That is not going to be changed. As a result, the operators, especially in the South, can sell their lumber to the chain yards for the same price they can sell to the wholesaler, with no discount, and naturally they are going to sell their lumber to the chain yards. What will happen? The 1,500 wholesale yards which supply the small businessmen who cannot afford to order in carload lots will be at a disadvantage. The chain yards will buy up the lumber. We will find all through the United States that little retail yards which depend on the wholesalers will not be able to obtain any building materials in the months to come. The only ones who will get the lumber will be those who can afford to pay the price, and Senators know who they are and where they live. They will get the lumber and build the houses. The small independent dealer will be robbed because his source of supply has been folded up by Chester Bowles.

Talk about socialism. Talk about regimentation. We already have it in the United States. The Price Administrator can tell 1,500 wholesalers what they must do. He can destroy their business overnight. They will not be able to operate.

I have in my hand a number of telegrams from automobile dealers. I can give the Senate 5,000 of them if it is desired that I do so. They are protesting because Chester Bowles steps into the field of their contracts and encroaches upon the sacred right of contract. I tell the Senate as a lawyer that I know something about defending contracts. I know something about their rights men have under contracts. I say that third parties cannot encroach upon the sacred right of contract. If I am a party to a contract a third party cannot take away from me a part of my profit which is given to me under the terms of the contract, and give it to someone else under a price ceiling.

Talk about socialism and regimentation! We have it in this country. I understand Mr. Bowles wants to continue his war powers during the postwar period. He said he is protecting the small man. Who is smaller than the small businessman? What about the 1,500 wholesale lumber dealers? What about the thousands of men who retail and distribute automobiles?

I have in my hand a publication called the Mandate, which is issued by the National Federation of Small Business, Inc. It is to business what the Gallup poll is to the public. In August they sent out this question:

> Are you for or against the recommendation now being made by OPA relative to price ceilings on new homes and building material?

This question went to over 25,000 independent retailers in this country, in all segments of industry. The vote for was 16 percent. The vote against was 83 percent. Not voting, 1 percent. The question was sent out one month, and the answers were received the next month.

Here is another poll sent out in the month prior. The question was:

> National Automobile Dealers' Association has notified members that OPA will reduce auto dealers' discount at least 5 percent on new cars. Are you for or against such a reduction made against your local auto dealers?

Local businessmen know what that means. In this case more than 50,000 small independent merchants voted. Thirteen percent voted for. Eighty-one percent voted against. Six percent did not vote.

Mr. President, the time has come when the Congress should make its position clear. Are we going to continue to permit the businessmen of America to labor under a misapprehension that under a congressional order Chester Bowles has the right to continue this cost-absorption policy? Either we are for this absorption policy clear through all segments of the industry or else we are

against it. This can be determined in one of two ways. We can amend the Price Stabilization Act further to clarify what we mean by the provisions in which Congress attempted to lay down price control, or else we can terminate the agency. We have one of three courses open. Either to clarify, to terminate the agency, or let it continue. The businessmen of this country are laboring under the misapprehension, or under the misguided theory of Chester Bowles, that Congress has ordered him to do this.

Mr. President, I am today introducing a joint resolution on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], who has worked with me industriously on the committee. He has helped time and again to iron out a great many problems. That work has been done without bringing our problem to the floor of the United States Senate. I want to pay my tribute of highest respect to the Senator from Tennessee. No Member of the United States Senate has cooperated more fully and more courteously with me than has the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, we are introducing a joint resolution to prohibit the establishment of price ceilings at levels which require absorption of increased production cost by one or more segments of a trade or industry. It would require that ceilings be high enough to permit the manufacturer—and I want Senators to understand this—to permit the manufacturer, the processor, the jobber, the wholesaler, the distributor, and the retailer each to realize the same percentage of profit on sales of commodities covered by price ceilings as he enjoyed during the 5-year period from January 1, 1937, to December 31, 1941.

The joint resolution goes further. It also provides that in any industry in which there are established percentage mark-ups or trade discounts, the average of such percentage mark-ups or trade discounts in effect generally shall be of that 5-year period. In other words the joint resolution would do two things. It would prohibit Chester Bowles from regulating the profits of any business in this country. With respect to the question of regulation of price ceilings, he could regulate them up or he could regulate them down, but he would have no authority to regulate the profits of any business under the Price Stabilization Act.

Second, provision is made to assure that he cannot interfere with the traditional price levels based on current cost per unit that will give to the businessman the same return under the present condition as he had percentagewise in the prewar period in the years 1937 to 1941. I cannot see why there should be the slightest objection to that.

I am not in any way criticizing the price level. That is the province of Mr. Bowles, and he can do as he pleases in setting prices. But I think it is beyond the province of the Price Administrator to say that when an increase is permitted the producer, or any other segment of a particular industry, some other segment of that industry must absorb the increase. I do not believe that he has the right to say to a particular segment of an industry, "You may have only so much profit."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator might summarize the situation with another and different analogy. It seems to me that the present purpose of Mr. Bowles is to carry renegotiation of contracts, which was a wartime prerogative, into peacetime without any authority for doing so.

Mr. WHERRY. I absolutely agree with the distinguished Senator. I thank him for his contribution. I had that point in mind. That is exactly what has happened.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take any further time of the Senate. The other day we passed a tax bill. Along with members of the Small Business Committee, I worked incessantly to give relief to small business from the excess-profits tax. The Senator from Michigan helped to the extent of offering an amendment which would have helped taxpayers in the lower bracket in that class. We have taken off the excess-profits tax, but it seems that the Office of Price Administration is obsessed with the idea that, now that the excess-profits tax has been taken off, it should immediately grab whatever it can, and do as it pleases. That is exactly what has happened. Businessmen have been calling me on the telephone. I have been called out of bed dozens of times and asked, "What is the Government going to do? What are the prices? What is to be the program?" An automobile dealer makes a contract with a motor company and receives a discount of 24 percent. Overnight a Government agency takes away 4 or 5 percent of it. This dealer was a father of two veterans, he was holding the business for them. Now they have returned. What do you think these veterans, whom we are to help, think of Congress—Chester Bowles' absorption cost policy.

The worst thing about it is, that this Czar Bowles is telling all the businessmen—I refer, Senators, to his statement before the House committee—that he is operating under a congressional order. In doing so he is indicting every Senator. He makes it appear that we are condoning his plans. How are Senators to defend themselves before businessmen in their own States? Businessmen will say, "You granted this power to Chester Bowles, and you did not withdraw it. What are you going to do about it?"

I am asking that the joint resolution be referred to the appropriate committee. I have been here long enough to know that what will probably happen will be that it will be referred to a standing committee, namely, the Committee on Banking and Currency. The chairman of that committee is present in the Chamber. I love that man, because I think he has the interests of the small man at heart. He is always pleading for the underdog. I tell him now that we must have help. We must have a hearing on the resolution, and we must have it immediately. We do not want to have it crowded out between now and Christmastime.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has mentioned the name of the committee to which the joint resolution will probably be referred.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not the one to decide the question, but I am sure that that is where it will go.

Mr. MORSE. I invite the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that there are two resolutions now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency calling for an investigation of OPA. One of them is mine, the other the resolution of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. Those resolutions have been pending before the committee for several months. Although I smile as I say it, nevertheless I want my words to be interpreted as fighting words. I think it is about time for the Senate of the United States to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from further consideration of those two resolutions and to proceed directly to pass those resolutions on the floor of the Senate. If the Senator will join me in such a motion, I shall be willing to make the motion right now.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator will wait a few days, I wish to give my distinguished friend an opportunity at least to have a hearing on the resolution. I do not wish to indict him yet.

Mr. MORSE. So far as I am concerned, the committee is guilty. It has convicted itself of dilatory tactics and a clear intent to block a fair and open investigation of OPA malpractices.

Mr. WHERRY. In a few days, if nothing happens to this resolution, I will join the Senator. Is that fair enough?

Mr. MORSE. I shall abide by the Senator's wishes, subject to the understanding that unless the committee takes action on these resolutions without further delay, I shall move to discharge the committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Nebraska is again calling the attention of the country to one of the most ominous situations in connection with our present reconversion policy. There was a time, a few weeks ago, when I stated that the strike situation was the greatest deterrent to reconversion, and that the OPA policies and administrative activities came second. I now say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I am fully convinced that the administrative policies of OPA are today the biggest drag to reconversion to normal peacetime activities.

I happen to be a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, occupying the lowly place at the tail of the dog, or wherever the lowest place in the committee is. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nabraska and to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that notwithstanding my intense and vibrant loyalty to the Committtee on Banking and Currency, which I attempt to serve, if, as, and when either Senator cares to make a motion to discharge

the Committee on Banking and Currency from further consideration of the resolutions which have been referred to, and refer them to a committee which will cause action to be taken in this tremendously vital field in reconversion, I shall cast my vote for the motion.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for that contribution. I deeply appreciate his interest in the very problems which I have been discussing today. In his own State there is one of the largest wholesale lumber dealers that I know of. When I say "largest" I mean extensive. There is no longer any profit involved. Any profit the dealer makes is taken away from him. Contracts are negotiated and renegotiated, and afterward the OPA tries to take away from businessmen any profits they may have. The lumber dealer in the Senator's State is one of the 1,500 lumber dealers whom we are trying to help to obtain lumber to be distributed to the retail lumber yards throughout his State and mine, in order that those engaged in small business may benefit from construction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator pointed out that Mr. Bowles had taken the position that Congress has enjoined this policy on him.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, the essence of his policy is that he may permit costs and wages to increase, and yet hold prices exactly where they are.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. That is the policy which he has laid down.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the Price Control Act provides that he shall adjust prices in such a way as to take into consideration increased costs. So the allegation that the Congress has authorized this policy is not true.

Next, I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the policy which Mr. Bowles now announces is supported by the President of the United States. He is responsible for the adoption of the policy. In a recent address he stated that wages must be increased, but that prices must stay exactly where they are.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. When we are undertaking to fix responsibility for this policy, when we go behind Mr. Bowles we find that the responsibility rests in the President of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for that contribution.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] who spoke a few moments ago.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa whether or not the Committee on Banking and Currency has given any consideration to either of the two resolutions relative to OPA which have been pending before the committee for all these weeks?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It has given no consideration that I know of to the resolutions. Letters have been written by the authors of the two resolutions to most of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I myself have talked to several Members who are anxious to have hearings and to look into these questions, but for some reason no hearings have been held, and nothing has been done. That was the reason why I stated to the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Oregon—and I will make a similar statement to the Senator from Indiana when he returns, with respect to his resolution—that notwithstanding my loyalty to the Committee on Banking and Currency, I shall vote to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolutions providing for an investigation of OPA, because I think it is vital, and that the reconversion of industry and business in this country depends upon some revamping and alteration of the administrative activities and policies of OPA.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a further inquiry of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. How frequently does the Committee on Banking and Currency customarily meet?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It meets now and then.

Mr. DONNELL. Principally then, or principally now?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am afraid that I cannot be more definite. Let me say, in all frankness and in the utmost seriousness, that the Committee on Banking and Currency meets with great frequency and acts with great expedition when certain types of legislative philosophy are before it for consideration. When they are not, there is a dearth of meetings.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the Senator from Iowa able to tell us approximately how long the resolution submitted by the Senator from Indiana with respect to the OPA has been pending in the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I prefer that the Senator from Oregon answer that question. I believe that the Senator from Oregon submitted a resolution a week or two after the Senator from Indiana submitted his resolution. The resolutions were not quite the same, but they explored the same field, and I should prefer to have the Senator from Oregon give the dates.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator from Oregon be kind enough to give us that information?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, speaking humorously, I am keenly disappointed that the Senator from Iowa cannot name the date when my resolution was submitted, because, based upon complaints which I received from brethren in the Senate at the time I was making my daily speech to save the lamb crop of Oregon from OPA bungling, I did not think any Senator would ever forget it. Seriously though, I am glad to give the Senator the information he seeks. It will be found from the RECORD that my resolution was submitted on July 12, 1945.

Let me say good-naturedly, but in all seriousness, that I believe that in the interest of OPA itself, as well as in the interest of the administration, we ought to go forward with both those resolutions and hold the investigation called for therein. I say that because I believe that such an investigation would clear up a great many of the false statements which are being made about OPA. At the same time, I believe that the investigations would point out and result in the correction of a great deal of the OPA maladministration and eradicate many of the abuses which permeate the policies of OPA. The President is entitled to such an investigation because the country is rightly holding him responsible for the dictatorial policies and capricious actions of Chester Bowles. The people are entitled to it because they are the ones which are suffering from OPA's gross mistakes and usurpation of power. If the administration has nothing to fear from the investigation, why does it keep the resolution bottled up in a committee controlled by Democrats?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In my judgment, Mr. President, we have here an illustration of a situation which is intolerable. Resolutions of vast public moment and significance have been submitted and referred to one of the standing committees of the United States Senate. As I understand, those resolutions have slumbered there peacefully and quietly for approximately 5 months of this calendar year, during a period in which questions of reconversion have become of tremendous importance to every citizen of the United States. I understand from the answer made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa that letters have been received from the proponents of the resolution calling the attention of the committee to the pendency of the resolution before the committee, and yet the committee does nothing. I undertake to say that this is a situation in which the Senate is amply justified, in my judgment, not only in discharging the committee, but doing so with an expression of censure of the committee for its failure to perform the duties contemplated by the law of our land with respect to standing committees of the Senate.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. While the committee ought to consider the resolutions, I can assure the Senators who submitted them that the committee will reject the resolutions. So if they wish to make a motion to discharge the committee, they had better do so now, because I do not believe there is a chance in the world that a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency will approve a resolution providing for a special investigation of OPA. That is my own opinion. I do not believe that any such resolution will be approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency. We did have Chester Bowles before us, and for 2 days subjected him to as searching a cross-

examination as could be made in any investigating committee. I realize that that does not meet the purposes of the resolutions, but that has been done by the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, it has not produced any results. Let me say very frankly that I do not think it will be found that the majority of the committee will adopt any such resolution. That is why it is not being considered.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to keep the record clear. We have gone off on other resolutions than the one which the Senator from Tennessee and I are introducing. I believe that the proponents of the other resolutions—and I am one of them—have experienced undue delay. Yet I do not wish in any way to infer that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and I, cosponsors of this joint resolution, desire to indict the Committee on Banking and Currency until it has had an opportunity to see the resolution and decide whether it will grant us a hearing on it.

On that point, I offer a suggestion to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I suggest that the Committee on Banking and Currency do as was done by the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, and the Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, in connection with the disposal of defense plants, which involves the disposal of the aluminum plants. I know the members of the Senate Small Business Committee will deeply appreciate it if the Banking and Currency Committee will extend to us an invitation to sit with it in its deliberations on the joint resolution. The Senate Small Business Committee is not a standing committee, and consequently the joint resolution cannot be referred to it. I should like to have it handle the resolution, of course. But the Banking and Currency Committee is a standing committee, and I am satisfied that the resolution will be referred to it. I do not wish to invade the province of that committee or to impose upon the good will of the chairman of the committee, but I feel that my suggestion is a constructive one, and I hope that when the resolution goes to the Banking and Currency Committee it will immediately proceed to consider it and will request the Senate Small Business Committee to sit with it during its consideration of the joint resolution. We can be of great help, I am sure, not only to the Banking and Currency Committee but to the Price Administrator in connection with ironing out the problems of reconversion, especially insofar as the cost—absorption policy is concerned.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I asked the Senator to yield so that I might call his attention to the fact that for 10 days, now, the Senate has been considering the reorganization bill. A number of Senators are present today, anxious to vote on the pending amendment to that bill and to have it disposed of. I wonder whether the Senator from Nebraska can indicate how much more time he intends to consume this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Utah, for whom I have the highest regard, and, of course, I am associated with him on the Judiciary Committee, that before I began my remarks I apologized to him for making the interruption. But in view of the policy which it is announced is to be inaugurated by Chester Bowles, I believe the Senator from Utah and the other members of the committee should be enlightened regarding that policy. I do not know of any piece of legislation which is more important to our reconversion and other domestic problems than the one I have referred to today.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I am not criticizing the Senator at all. I am merely requesting information.

If the Senator will yield further to me——

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I now present a unanimous-consent request, namely, that not later than 4 o'clock today the Senate vote on the Byrd amendment which is offered as a substitute for the Donnell amendment, and that in the event of the rejection of the Byrd amendment, the Senate vote on the Donnell amendment not later than 4 o'clock today. It seems to me we have had ample debate on this matter. All Members of the Senate are thoroughly informed regarding it, I am sure. I believe every Senator here is anxious to vote, and it seems to me just a little unreasonable to deny the request I now make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MORSE. I object.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator from Nebraska should give the Senator from Utah some assurances, and I think he is entitled to have them. I suggest that he promise the Senator that he will not take any longer than the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has taken on the OPA resolution. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator from Michigan for that suggestion. I will agree that I will not take any longer than that.

I should like to say to my good friend, the Senator from Utah, that I have concluded my remarks, except I wish to say as a final word that I think this is the most important legislation that is confronting the Congress of the United States. The idea that excess-profits tax relief has caused producers to wait until January to sell their merchandise is all poppycock. The difficulty is that today the businessman does not know where he is going; he has no confidence; he is fearful of what the administration is about to do. The situation is exemplified by the attitude of the automobile dealers. I repeat there is no other legislation that is more important to our people.

So I say once again that while I am perfectly willing to have the joint resolution referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, because I have always had great admiration for the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the chairman of the committee, as he knows, yet I serve notice on him that if his committee does not give immediate consideration to the joint resolution, regardless of whether it does or does not request the Senate Small Business Committee to sit in with it during its consideration of the joint resolution, we shall ask to have the committee discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and we shall make every effort to have the Senate proceed promptly to correct the policy which this dictator organization is imposing on the people of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] I ask unanimous consent to introduce the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 118) amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the margin of profit which must be allowed in fixing maximum prices, introduced by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. STEWART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Nebraska for the excellent presentation he has made.

Long ago it was said that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Following enactment by the Congress of the price-fixing law which has finally resulted in giving to Chester Bowles the authority to regulate prices, Mr. Bowles had conferred upon himself during wartime a power which he had to exercise in reason and with reason. To all intents and purposes, the war is over now, but we are facing a situation which is just as critical as that of wartime. Today we face the reconversion challenge. So we have let Mr. Bowles retain this power. However, in one way the situation is entirely changed, for during the war we were using our energies and our capital and our manpower to produce war materials and we were asking our people to furnish money with which our country could produce goods which might be described as useless to civilians, or, in other words, war materials, whereas today we face a situation in which there is a pent-up demand for $140,000,000,000 worth of goods. Mr. President, we have the further necessity of meeting a tremendous tax problem, in view of the $300,000,000,000 Government debt and the Government overhead. Consequently, I cannot follow Mr. Bowles in any way whatever in regard to the manner in which he is applying the authority Congress gave him. If he is actually acting under that authority, he is doing it along the line of "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Yes; as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska said, he is doing it in such a way as to put many of our people out of business. He is doing even more than that, because he is putting out of business men who, under normal conditions, would produce incomes which the Government could tax and from which the Government would obtain revenue with

which to pay the tremendous overhead the Government has.

Mr. President, he is doing something else which is often even more demoralizing than interference with income. I can best illustrate it by telling a little incident having to do with a man who throughout the war had been an automobile dealer and had managed to survive. He had no automobiles to sell. He could not buy any. There was none for him to obtain, but nevertheless he managed to survive. His hope was that within the next 6 or 8 months he would receive a reasonable number of automobiles. Then along came the strike and the participation by Government in the strike in a namby-pamby way, unwilling to meet the issue head on, with the result that factories have been closed down, and there are no automobiles for dealers to obtain. The man to whom I have referred came to Washington and found out, as it was so well put by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, that if, as, and when he obtains automobiles, the income which he had figured on will be taken away from him. In other words, his contract is to be taken away from him. If there is anything which America stands for, it is the inviolability of contract, the Anglo-Saxon concept of which is referred to in the Constitution. We now find that the power to regulate, which has been given to Mr. Bowles, is the power to destroy.

Mr. President, someday soon that question will be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States and then, I think, it will be ascertained definitely and clearly that the power to regulate must be reasonable, and that it does not include the power to destroy. It does not include, as was well put by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, the power to violate a valid contract.

Mr. President, the man who came to Washington was discouraged. Nevertheless he had pulled through the war. Now he is not receiving cars. However, if and when he starts receiving them, his profits are to be taken away from him. By whom? By an agency of the Government which he has supported. One of his sons who fought in the war is dead and another one was injured. The father of those sons bought Government bonds, but he found out all of a sudden that he could not make a go of his business.

During the war the wages in his little automobile shop increased. His best mechanics were taken from him by the draft or left to work in war industries. He was required to employ inexperienced men. However, Mr. President, he went through those conditions victoriously, and now, when there is a chance to recuperate his losses after having used his surplus, he gets this blow. I looked into that man's eyes and saw something, Mr. President, that I do not like to see in the eyes of the small businessmen of this country. I saw an unpoised mental status, if you please, and a hatred because Government itself would give him no consideration.

Mr. President, why does Mr. Bowles take the attitude which he takes in relation to the lumber and automobile dealers? It has been said that he takes such attitude because the President has so directed. Why? Because of the danger of inflation?

Let us see. Let us assume that because of equitable treatment automobiles will cost 5 percent more than their present price. Let us assume further that a car which cost $1,200 during normal times will sell for 5 percent more, or $1,260. Is that inflation? Well, we have a $140,000,000,000 pressure. Take $60 per car off that pressure and that is not inflation; it is deflation. That is taking away from the purchasing power that amount of money.

But, Mr. President, that is not the question. The question is, What is fair and equitable? We do not want our Government administrators to prove themselves to be square pegs in round holes. We want them to demonstrate that they are men of judgment and reason. We do not want any more automobile dealers—such as the man to whom I have referred who had gone through the war period doing everything that he could to aid his country—to find all at once that their Government is "cracking" at them from underneath. In other words, does this Government at long last have within it another government?

I am not saying what the wages in the factories should be. I do not have sufficient facts at hand in order to make a statement with regard to that subject. I assert that the laborer is worthy of his hire. But, as so eloquently suggested by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, the laborer is found not only in the factory. Most of the Senators in this body are laboring men. We labor from 70 to 80 hours a week. We have no 40-hour week. Very well; the laborer is worthy of his hire. What about the lumber merchant? What about the automobile dealer? Both have been stanch and patriotic men. They gave their sons, their profits, and their surpluses during the war period. What is the reason for them being given the "undercut"?

Mr. President, we all know that millions of small businessmen were compelled to go out of business during the war. They went out of business because they could not get necessary materials, could not obtain necessary support, and could not obtain customers. It is now apparent that it is the purpose of the Government to put other small businessmen out of business under the fallacious plea that to give them support will be to invite inflation. It appears that it is not inflation to increase the salaries of millions of men, but it is inflation to give the small businessman a chance to live, breathe, and have his being in America.

Mr. President, my hope is that Mr. Bowles will see the light, that the remarks which have been made by Senators on the floor today will cause him to view the situation from a different angle than that from which he has been viewing it, and that he will recognize that he is not to serve merely one segment of this great Republic but that there are other segments besides the PAC which must be served. That statement is intended as no reflection upon labor in any branch of industry.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to speak for only a few minutes on the pending bill. I wish to state what my position is in relation to the bill.

I was not a member of the subcommittee which reported the bill to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, but I am a member of the Judiciary Committee. After hearing the discussion which took place in the committee, I suggested that instead of reporting the bill to the Senate the committee should adopt a general resolution calling upon the President of the United States to submit to the Congress a bill or bills in relation to reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

It has been stated on the floor of the Senate that if we pass the pending bill it will reverse the ordinary constitutional process. I believe that statement to be correct. It has been stated also on the floor of the Senate that the Congress cannot reorganize the executive branch, that to do so necessarily requires action of the Executive. I cannot fully agree with that conclusion, but I do agree that the Executive has not taken any particular steps in the right direction.

It has also been stated on the floor of the Senate that the President is the proper authority to accomplish reorganization. In my opinion, the President cannot do so. He must delegate matters to individuals in order to ascertain what should be done. If the Congress would appoint a committee to study the matter, the committee could, of course, set forth in a bill or a resolution the result of its own findings.

At present, the President of the United States has great power which, in part, he has exercised, but as I interpret the word "reorganization" it does not mean merely the transfer of one agency or several agencies back and forth, as has been done in the past. I think what the people of the country want and what they are entitled to have, is a gradual demobilization—not reorganization—of executive agencies which have grown since the early days of President Roosevelt's administration from 700,000 to more than 3,000,000.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill, because if the bill is not passed much propaganda will be spread over the country to the effect that Congress does not want any reorganization. Let me say parenthetically that Congress wants to demobilize, wants to reorganize, it wants to get rid of bureaucracies, and the great and unnecessary overhead which is weighing down the administrative branch of the Government.

In my humble opinion, the title of this bill is a misnomer, just as the title of the full employment bill is a misnomer. The latter title gave the impression that by passing legislation we could bring about full employment. Every reasonable man knows that is not so. We will not bring about reorganization merely by passing the pending bill, but we will lay the whole matter in the lap of the Pres-

ident, and that is important. We had better once for all put it on the doorstep of some one who is responsible. That is why I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to discuss what I think is the appropriate way to get results. As I see it, the right way to get reorganization and demobilization of the executive departments would be for the President to set up a number of small committees of efficiency experts to investigate the various departments. Let us take the Department of Agriculture, for instance. When Henry Wallace left the Department of Agriculture it was costing the Government about $1,300,000,000. That is the way he reorganized it—upward. If the President were to employ some efficiency experts from the leading business institutions of America—he could obtain them by loan—constitute a committee of three men of judgment, men of vision, put them into a department, and let them go over it with a fine tooth comb, not to demobilize the department entirely, but to get rid of the ineffectives, the loafers, the duplicators, they could in a short time come to certain conclusions, which they could make known to the President.

If such a course were followed in other departments, in a very short time the President would have a concrete, definite basis on which he could submit a plan to the Congress. Of course it will take courage, in the face of an election, but if the President will manifest the courage, he will never regret it. The people want definite, clear-cut, concrete plans. We might say to the President, "You cannot go into the departments, Mr. President, and get politicians to do the job; you cannot get department heads to do it, because they have been credited with 'blowing up' their departments." That is the way they built themselves up, in many cases that is the way they built up their salaries, and Senators know that that condition has existed.

There is nothing prohibiting the President of the United States even now doing what I am suggesting. The bill we are considering, no matter what its provisions, cannot in the slightest degree take from the President his constitutional Executive power, and all the talk about reorganization, demobilization, or what not is largely hot air until the Executive employs men under his direction to get the facts and make the recommendations.

Suppose the President were to go to the Department, which is under Mr. Ickes—and that is another one where this procedure could be beneficially applied—suppose he were to say to Secretary Ickes, "I want you to get some efficiency experts to go through your department and make recommendations as to where the Government could efficiently save money" It is very apparent that if this course were followed and men at the head of the departments were praised for efficiency and demobilization and reconstruction, instead of getting credit for swelling up their organizations, beneficial results would accrue.

Certainly the efforts at demobilization by the President's Bureau of the Budget thus far have been unavailing. That is something to think about. What has the President done? In 1932 a President was elected on the promise to the country that there were too many bureaucrats, and that he was going to get rid of them. It was President Roosevelt who made that promise. We heard here the other day on the floor of the Senate. I think from the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that Congress cannot reorganize, that through decades and decades it has done nothing. It can be seen that wherever the bureaucrats have increased in number that cannot be charged against the legislative branch. That is the result of a natural fungus growth in bureaus.

This bill presents an opportunity to the President of the United States, and that is why I shall vote for it. I want him to seize the opportunity. I want him to demonstrate what he can do—that he is a man who has the courage and the vitality to do things, who sees that we have to meet not only the interest on $300,000,000,000 of indebtedness but that we have to maintain an adequate defense, that there must be efficiency in all branches of the Government, and that we cannot afford to waste the people's hard-earned tax dollars; that he wants to get rid of the loafers, the chiselers, the leaners, and the duplicators in Government. That is why I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. President, while we are discussing reorganization and saving the Government's money, it would be very appropriate, in view of the $300,000,000,000 indebtedness we are facing, that the same procedure be followed in relation to the armed forces. My own personal opinion is that the discovery of atomic energy and the atomic bomb calls for an analysis—a thorough, penetrating analysis—of what will be necessary to keep America safe in the future. We must have men like "Billy" Mitchell, who have farsighted vision. We need them now more than ever. It has been estimated that it will cost us $12,000,000,000 a year to maintain an appropriate defense mechanism. This estimate was made before the atomic bomb was in the picture.

There must now be a revaluation of the whole set-up. We cannot go ahead and squander the people's money on outmoded and unnecessary equipment which was first-class yesterday, but which because of the new atomic age we are living in, may have become absolete or unnecessary today. We must reorient our thinking. This calls for another type of efficiency expert—the best, far-seeing brains in our Army, Navy, Air Forces, and among our scientists. Until this is done, until we learn the answer, how can we safely, realistically, and honestly answer the question as to conscription?

Is conscription necessary? Is it less so or more so than it was, and why? Frankly, I want the truth, and the truth can only come from men who have the vision of a Billy Mitchell, who can look ahead and see what the future has in store.

When we think of the interest on a debt of $300,000,000,000, I repeat, it takes no genius to see that if we can save billions of dollars in the executive departments and save billions of dollars in the Army and Navy, if it is feasible and practicable to save, it will make more certain the balancing of the Budget, and maintain the status of our bonds as the best investment in the world.

ATOMIC ENERGY—AGREED DECLARATION BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE PRIME MINISTERS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM AND CANADA

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on November 1 I delivered a very short address in this body in which I recommended that the atomic bomb be not used in warfare. I also introduced a joint resolution to outlaw it as a weapon to be used in war. I also took the position that we should use atomic energy for civilian and industrial purposes to the last limit, and increase our investigations and researches in reference to it, and make it of the greatest possible value to the people of the world.

In somewhat a different way, but moving toward the same end, this morning a statement was given out by President Truman and by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the Prime Minister of Canada, which virtually takes the same position. I read section 2 of that statement:

> 2. We desire to emphasize that the responsibility for devising means to insure that the new discoveries shall be used for the benefit of mankind, instead of as a means of destruction, rests not on our nations alone, but upon the whole civilized world. Nevertheless, the progress that we have made in the development and use of atomic energy demands that we take an initiative in the matter, and we have accordingly met together to consider the possibility of international action—
>
> (a) To prevent the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes.

And to that I most heartily agree—

> (b) To promote the use of recent and future advances in scientific knowledge, particularly in the utilization of atomic energy, for useful and humanitarian ends.

Mr. President, it seems to me that is a very clear statement. When I made my address 2 weeks ago I thought we should take the lead in securing international agreement respecting atomic power, inasmuch as we had invented the means of using atomic energy, after centuries of effort along that line. I think the first attempt to invent a means for using atomic energy was in the time of Alexander the Great, in Macedonia, some 2,300 years ago. It was afterward attempted by the Romans, and it has been attempted by various other peoples since. But it was found by American effort and the expenditure of $2,700,000,000 of American money. It seems to me that under those circumstances the United States might well take the lead, and I am glad that our President is taking the lead to that end.

I believe the only practical way to settle the question of atomic energy is for this country to take the lead and secure an international agreement that the atomic bomb shall not be used in warfare, but that atomic energy shall be used for the peaceful purposes of mankind.

I have every confidence that in the end some such scheme will work out. While I do not agree with all the statements

made in the release given out this morning, I do agree with the main purpose. I thoroughly and heartily agree with it. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks the statement may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY—AGREED DECLARATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM, AND THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

The President of the United States, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the Prime Minister of Canada, have issued the following statement:

"1. We recognize that the application of recent scientific discoveries to the methods and practice of war has placed at the disposal of mankind means of destruction hitherto unknown, against which there can be no adequate military defense, and in the employment of which no single nation can in fact have a monopoly.

"2. We desire to emphasize that the responsibility for devising means to insure that the new discoveries shall be used for the benefit of mankind, instead of as a means of destruction, rests not on our nations alone, but upon the whole civilized world. Nevertheless, the progress that we have made in the development and use of atomic energy demands that we take an initiative in the matter, and we have accordingly met together to consider the possibility of international action—

"(a) To prevent the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes.

"(b) To promote the use of recent and future advances in scientific knowledge, particularly in the utilization of atomic energy, for peaceful and humanitarian ends.

"3. We are aware that the only complete protection for the civilized world from the destructive use of scientific knowledge lies in the prevention of war. No system of safeguards that can be devised will of itself provide an effective guaranty against production of atomic weapons by a nation bent on aggression. Nor can we ignore the possibility of the development of other weapons, or of new methods of warfare, which may constitute as great a threat to civilization as the military use of atomic energy.

"4. Representing, as we do, the three countries which possess the knowledge essential to the use of atomic energy, we declare at the outset our willingness, as a first contribution, to proceed with the exchange of fundamental scientific information and the interchange of scientists and scientific literature for peaceful ends with any nation that will fully reciprocate.

"5. We believe that the fruits of scientific research should be made available to all nations, and that freedom of investigation and free interchange of ideas are essential to the progress of knowledge. In pursuance of this policy the basic scientific information essential to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes has already been made available to the world. It is our intention that all further information of this character that may become available from time to time shall be similarly treated. We trust that other nations will adopt the same policy, thereby creating an atmosphere of reciprocal confidence in which political agreement and cooperation will flourish.

"6. We have considered the question of the disclosure of detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy. The military exploitation of atomic energy depends, in large part, upon the same methods and processes as would be required for industrial uses.

"We are not convinced that the spreading of the specialized information regarding the practical application of atomic energy, before it is possible to devise effective, reciprocal, and enforceable safeguards acceptable to all nations, would contribute to a constructive solution of the problem of the atomic bomb. On the contrary we think it might have the opposite effect. We are, however, prepared to share, on a reciprocal basis with others of the United Nations, detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy just as soon as effective enforceable safeguards against its use for destructive purposes can be devised.

"7. In order to attain the most effective means of entirely eliminating the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes and promoting its widest use for industrial and humanitarian purposes, we are of the opinion that at the earliest practicable date a commission should be set up under the United Nations Organization to prepare recommendations for submission to the Organization.

"The commission should be instructed to proceed with the utmost dispatch and should be authorized to submit recommendations from time to time dealing with separate phases of its work.

"In particular the commission should make specific proposals:

"(a) For extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends,

"(b) For control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes,

"(c) For the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction,

"(d) For effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions.

"8. The work of the commission should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each one of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken. Specifically, it is considered that the commission might well devote its attention first to the wide exchange of scientists and scientific information and as a second stage to the development of full knowledge concerning natural resources of raw materials.

"9. Faced with the terrible realities of the application of science to destruction, every nation will realize more urgently than before the overwhelming need to maintain the rule of law among nations and to banish the scourge of war from the earth. This can only be brought about by giving wholehearted support to the United Nations Organization and by consolidating and extending its authority, thus creating conditions of mutual trust in which all peoples will be free to devote themselves to the arts of peace. It is our firm resolve to work without reservation to achieve these ends.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN,
"President of the United States.
"C. R. ATTLEE,
"Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.
"W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
"Prime Minister of Canada.

"THE WHITE HOUSE,
"The city of Washington, November 15, 1945."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to another part of the release to which the Senator from Tennessee has just referred. To me it is most significant and points to the only possible road to follow so that atomic energy shall not be used for destructive purposes, and also that other instrumentalities of death and destruction now unknown and perhaps in the offing, which may go even beyond or at least equalize the atomic bomb, shall not be used for destructive purposes. The sentence which I wish to point out, which I believe is of the greatest significance is this:

3. We are aware that the only complete protection for the civilized world from the destructive use of scientific knowledge lies in the prevention of war.

That is the first sentence of the third paragraph, Mr. President, and in that brief sentence lies the hope of mankind. The failure to achieve that purpose will mean the doom of all civilization.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] which is offered as a substitute for the amended amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] as modified.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hart	Murdock
Austin	Hatch	Myers
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Overton
Bridges	Hill	Radcliffe
Bushfield	Hoey	Russell
Byrd	Huffman	Saltonstall
Carville	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cordon	La Follette	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Walsh
Fulbright	Millikin	Wheeler
Green	Mitchell	Wherry
Guffey	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposed as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], as modified, inserting certain language in lieu of section 4 (a). On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, a vote of "yea" is a vote in favor of the Byrd substitute, and a vote of "nay" is a vote in favor of the Donnell amendment as originally offered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the

Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and, therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK] are attending, with the Secretary of Agriculture, an important regional agricultural conference at Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is a member of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired on this question with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired on this question with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "nay," has a pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who would vote "yea." The Senator from Illinois is a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained at a meeting of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is detained on official business, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The vote was announced—yeas 37, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—37

Andrews	Hatch	Murdock
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Bilbo	Hill	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hoey	Overton
Carville	Huffman	Radcliffe
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Stewart
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McKellar	Tunnell
Ellender	McMahon	Tydings
Fulbright	Magnuson	Walsh
Green	Mead	
Guffey	Mitchell	

NAYS—26

Austin	Hawkes	Shipstead
Ball	Hickenlooper	Smith
Bridges	Knowland	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Vandenberg
Cordon	Millikin	Wheeler
Donnell	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	Young
Hart	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Gerry	Revercomb
Bailey	Glass	Robertson
Bankhead	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Brewster	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Briggs	Lucas	Tobey
Brooks	McCarran	Wagner
Buck	McFarland	White
Butler	Maybank	Wiley
Capehart	Murray	Willis
Capper	Pepper	
George	Reed	

So Mr. BYRD's amendment, proposed as a substitute for Mr. DONNELL's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent attending the Pearl Harbor hearing when the vote was taken on the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], as amended, proposed as a substitute for section 4 (a) of the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on that question I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote. The issue now is a very simple one. Apparently the Senate is satisfied with the constitutionality of the method of permitting the President to effect reorganizations and then to have the reorganizations vetoed by two Houses of Congress. I myself do not agree with that interpretation. However, we now have to choose between the Byrd amendment and the committee amendment. The committee amendment provides that when the President submits a plan to Congress, if either House of Congress votes against the plan it shall not go into effect. The Byrd amendment provides that in such case both Houses must vote against the plan. In other words, under the Byrd amendment to the committee amendment, if the President submits a plan and if it goes first to the House of Representatives and if the House of Representatives approves it, the Senate will have no more to say; it will become an absolutely dead letter; the Senate will have no voice whatever regarding the matter. Under the committee amendment, if the House of Representatives approves the plan, it will then come to the Senate; and if the Senate disapproves it, it will not go into effect.

It seems to me that if we adopt the Byrd amendment we shall be deliberately depriving ourselves of the power to decide many important legislative questions in which all of us are interested. We may have decided, one day, that the RFC should not be part of the Department of Commerce. We may have justified our confirmation of the nomination of a Secretary of Commerce on that ground. But the next day the President could submit a plan and we could reaffirm our position; yet what would we have done one day could be nullified the next day, if a majority of the House of Representatives and the President chose to nullify it.

Very often we enact laws to which we attach conditions. In connection with the ratification of the Bretton Woods agreement we said we would authorize the floating of securities in this country and we would have the International Bank guarantee such securities, under the condition that a committee made up of the Secretary of the Treasury and four or five other finance officers approved the sale of the securities in the United States. Yet, along the line of the Byrd amendment, the next day the President might wipe out the power of that board and might permit those securities

to be sold in this country without restraint. That is only an example. But every day we attach conditions to the operations provided for in a particular measure and we provide some power to check in certain instances. Very often we authorize consideration of a matter by some person or agency in addition to the one who has the general power. Yet, Mr. President, if we adopt the Byrd amendment, the President might nullify such a provision; and if he could get a majority of the House of Representatives to agree with him, the Senate would have no voice whatsoever in the matter.

That is the issue we find drawn by these two amendments. I feel very strongly, Mr. President, that we should insist upon letting the Senate have a right to disapprove a plan which is submitted, and that we should retain for the Senate a voice in reaching such decisions. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I do not wish to make an extended statement, but it seems to me that the question resolves itself simply to the point whether we wish to have a real reorganization or whether we do not. In my judgment the opinion of former Attorney General Mitchell on this very question was sound. His opinion was to the effect that provision for a veto by either House would be unconstitutional. Certainly if there is to be a veto of a reorganization plan submitted by the President after we have set up specific standards, which, in my opinion, the pending measure does, then a veto should be exercised only by the two Houses, not by one House acting alone.

Of course, what the Senator from Ohio has said is true, namely, that if a majority of the House of Representatives supported the program submitted by the President, then at the expiration of 60 days, under the bill as amended, it would become the law of the land. But the same may be said about the Senate. If the Senate were in favor of a Presidential reorganization program and if a majority of the House of Representatives were opposed to it, it still would become the law. Mr. President, in my opinion there should be a concurrence of the two Houses in the event of a veto. After we set up specific standards, as is done in the pending measure, after we limit or restrict the President and tell him what he can do and what he cannot do, we should let him go ahead and do the job. If the job was done so well that there was not a concurrence of the two Houses in a veto, then in my opinion neither House would have very much to complain about.

I hope that the Donnell amendment as amended by the Byrd substitute will now be made a part of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, in taking that position, the Senator does not represent the committee which passed upon the bill, I assume.

Mr. MURDOCK. No. A majority of the committee reported the bill in its present form. But it is my opinion that if the Democratic members of the committee had been present in the committee, the vote in the committee would have been the same as the vote in the Senate today on the Byrd substitute.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In justice to the Senator from Utah, I merely wish to say that the position he takes today on the floor of the Senate is identical with the position he took in the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I am not at all changing my mind. I have stated time and again that in the committee I took the same position as the one I take today. I took it then, and I take it now, on the ground that we cannot have reorganization unless we are willing to let the President go ahead and do the job under the standards we set up.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is true, however, that the Senator was overruled in the committee, in which a majority of Democrats were present—in other words, more Democrats than Republicans; is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, no; that is not the fact. As I recall the vote on the bill in the committee, there were approximately three Democrats and a whole tableful of Republicans. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is true, however, that at least two of the Democrats on the committee voted against the position of the Senator from Utah and voted to reject the House bill and adopt the present committee amendment authorizing a veto by either House; is not that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would not say there were more than two Democrats there. As I recall, the only Democrats who were present at that time were the chairman of the committee and myself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, where were the Democrats?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely wrong in saying that there were only two Democrats present, I was present, and was one of those who took a position in favor of the committee amendment, and there were other Democrats who voted with me on the issue.

Mr. MURDOCK. I now recall that the Senator from Montana was present.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it is not a question of whether reorganization can be accomplished. I do not agree that the only way it can be obtained is by giving complete power to the President without any authority being exercised by the Congress. I have great confidence in the President, and I assume he will transmit a reorganization plan to the Congress which will be agreeable to the Senate of the United States. I am sure that any reorganization which will result in reducing the present number of employees of the Government, and cut out the deadwood which exists not only in the executive departments but in some of the other departments of the Government as well, in the War Department, the Navy Department, and in some of the agencies of the Congress, would be of great aid to the efficient administration of the Government. I agree thoroughly with the views expressed by the Senator from Virgina [Mr. BYRD] to the effect that there should be a real reorganization of the Government. However, I do not agree that the Congress of the United States should completely abdicate its powers and turn them over to any person, even though he may be the President of the United States.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK] are attending, with the Secretary of Agriculture, an important regional agricultural conference at Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is a member of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] are detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired on this question with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired on this question with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "nay," has a pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who would vote "yea." The Senator from Illinois is a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is detained on official business, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are detained at a meeting of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—35

Andrews	Hatch	Murdock
Bilbo	Hayden	Myers
Byrd	Hill	O'Mahoney
Carville	Hoey	Overton
Chavez	Huffman	Radcliffe
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Downey	Kilgore	Stewart
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McKellar	Tunnell
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
Green	Mead	Walsh
Guffey	Mitchell	

NAYS—24

Austin	Hart	Shipstead
Ball	Hawkes	Smith
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Taft
Bushfield	Knowland	Vandenberg
Capper	Millikin	Wheeler
Cordon	Morse	Wherry
Donnell	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gurney	Saltonstall	Young

NOT VOTING—35

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Reed
Bankhead	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Barkley	La Follette	Robertson
Brewster	Langer	Taylor
Briggs	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	McCarran	Tobey
Buck	McFarland	Wagner
Butler	Magnuson	White
Capehart	Maybank	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Willis
George	Murray	

So Mr. DONNELL'S amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE subsequently said: Let me state, Mr. President, that I did not respond to my name on the last roll call. Had I been present at the time my name was called, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, beginning with line 4, it is proposed to strike out through line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. —— transmitted to Congress by the President on ————, 19—," the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

On page 21, at the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of section 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there are other amendments pending to sections 203, 204, and 205, I think. The Senator does not propose to change those amendments?

Mr. BYRD. No. The amendment relates to section 202 and 207 only, to carry out the action which has already been taken by the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Will it be in order to offer amendments to sections 203, 204, and 205, if this amendment shall be adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be in order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, if I understand, the amendment now offered by the Senator from Virginia, it merely brings the procedural part of the bill into line with the amendment just adopted by the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Utah is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself. I ask that it be read, and then I shall ask for immediate consideration of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 20, after the comma, it is proposed to insert the words "the United States Maritime Commission."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that a reorganization of the departments of the Government is long overdue. I have supported every motion, every resolution, every bill, which has been before the Senate having that objective in mind ever since I have been a Member of this body. I hope most fervently that the pending bill will be enacted, and that President Truman will be given the opportunity to attempt to bring about a reorganization of governmental departments. I have the fullest confidence that he will do the job thoughtfully, carefully, and efficiently.

However, Mr. President, it is realized, and I think is generally accepted, that there are certain departments of government which should be excluded from the operations of reorganization and thereby remain independent. Under section 7 of the pending bill, the following agencies are mentioned: The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, Securities and

Exchange Commission, the United States Tariff Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Land Bank System, the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Beard, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

I think it must be obvious to all Senators that the Martime Commission should be added to this list of exceptions, because the underlying reason for the exemption of all the boards and commissions named is the fact that they have regulatory and quasi-judicial powers to a very considerable extent. That characteristic certainly pertains to the Maritime Commission. In many ways, in fact, so many that I shall not tax the patience of Senators by attempting even to enumerate them, the Maritime Commission has to exercise regulatory powers. It has to consider and to decide may questions which are of a quasi-judicial nature. It considers matters of rates, and passes on them. It determines questions of penalty, and in countless ways regulatory and quasi-judicial problems are constantly before it.

I believe it should be sufficient for us to bear in mind the character of the business of the Maritime Commission to enable us to reach the conclusion that this exemption should be made. However, for a moment I wish to touch upon several other aspects of the matter, all of which tend, to my mind, at least, to emphasize the fact that the exception should be made. We are all aware of the fact that our history in regard to a maritime program, and especially as to a merchant marine, has been very fitful and inconsistent, and, on the whole, our policy has not developed satisfactorily. A number of times in our history we have had a merchant marine which was adequate for our purposes, yet in each instance we have made the hideous mistake of letting it fall into disuse.

When the First World War began we had practically no modern, up-to-date ships whatever. We hastened to build ships, but we did not launch one until after the armistice. Fortunately this time we began our preparations sooner. In 1936 we created a board, which very wisely was made an independent board, such as I suggest the Maritime Commission should remain. That board started to work to develop shipyards and to build ships, and we were actually launching ships when the tragedy of Pearl Harbor befell us. It is very fortunate, Mr. President, that we were doing so. Each day we needed every ship we could possibly lay our hands on. Every one of them was pressed into service and utilized to the limit. We had really to service the world in world-wide transportation.

Now that the war is over, fortunately, and we can now begin to make our plans for peacetime arrangements, most assuredly we should, if possible, avoid the mistakes we made in the past and see to it that this time we have a merchant marine, and preserve it. We now have more ships than we have ever possessed at any time in our history, more than any nation ever owned, and more than the rest of the world has in the aggregate. Some of those ships we can now dispose of and are planning to do so.

In this connection, Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that our efforts to maintain such a merchant marine as our country requires will call for continued activity of a very able body, exercising very wide authority and authorized to act as quickly as occasion may demand. We will have to do many things from time to time in order to effectuate and to carry out that policy.

But that is not all, Mr. President. The Maritime Commission, charged with the responsibility of perpetuating the merchant marine during peacetime, must perform many functions which are ordinarily not rendered by an administrative board. In other words, to the regulatory and quasi-judicial powers which would ordinarily be exercised by a maritime commission we will find added many others which are at this time necessary because of the necessities of the readjustment period.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, of which I am chairman, has been considering recently a bill providing for the sale of surplus ships, and the bill will soon be before the Senate for action. Such a bill may seem to be a very simple matter; yet we found that in the consideration of it many other matters of policy, yes, of grave policy, affecting various phases of our national affairs, and sometimes of our international relations, were involved. Matters, for instance, growing out of the operations of lend-lease were affected and problems inherent in international relations, especially with Great Britain and Russia, were vitally concerned.

So, Mr. President, in this period of readjustment it is most important that we should have a board which should stand out in authority as any other board having regulatory and quasi-judicial functions, and we should endow that board with and keep it possessed of every characteristic which is necessary to effectuate its far-reaching purposes.

If we are to be consistent in the policy which we long ago adopted, and which the pending bill attempts to emphasize and carry out, then we will certainly add the Maritime Commission to the list of boards and commissions which are exempted.

I think it is quite likely that if some of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary had realized to what a wide extent regulatory and quasi-judicial powers are exercised and will have to be utilized by the Maritime Commission, they would readily have incorporated the Maritime Commission in the list of agencies which were exempted under the pending plan of reorganization. It is my impression that it was denied admission to the list in the bill by only one vote.

Mr. President, I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate by going further into a detailed account of the operations of the merchant marine. I do wish to emphasize again that there is evinced a purpose among the people of the country at this time to see to it that we do not make the mistake, the terrible mistake, we made before of wrecking our merchant marine.

It has been our good fortune each time we were forced into two world wars, to have a breathing spell. In the last war we had a year or a year and a half or more before hostilities reached us, in which we could build and could assemble a merchant marine ready and equipped to do what was necessary for our protection. We cannot always reckon upon such indulgent fortune. God grant it may never happen that we are forced into war, but should it come about, it may be we will have to be prepared in this country on the very first day of warfare in the world to take up the burden and responsibility of meeting full impact of the enemy.

For years I have served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Commerce of which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is chairman. As chairman of that subcommittee I have attempted to handle half a hundred bills concerned with our merchant marine. I have reached very deliberately the conclusion that the maritime commission was fortunate in being a separate agency reporting directly to the President of the United States. I believe it to be imperative that it shall remain distinct.

In accordance with the idea of consistency and following out the theory which has long been accepted and carried out in our Government, and having special consideration for the conditions which exist today, the extraordinary conditions which make it most imperative that at this time we endow and equip our Maritime Commission with all the power and all the authority that may be necessary, I hope the Senate will consider the amendment favorably, and will adopt it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, when the committee considered the pending bill it adopted the policy that all the independent agencies, which are an arm of the Congress, should be exempted. The committee adopted the policy that all quasi-judicial agencies and all agencies of a regulatory nature should be exempted from the act. I shall read from the report of the committee on the bill:

> The regulatory agencies, to the extent that they have been granted by the Congress the power to make rules and regulations having the effect of law, are in a very real sense legislative agencies. Most of these regulatory agencies also exercise quasi-judicial functions of some extent. In greater or less degree, depending upon circumstances, it is necessary to protect these agencies from partisan political action in order to preserve the necessary degree of continuity in public policy.

That is the principle which the Judiciary Committee adopted in reporting the bill. It exempted the Interstate Commerce Commission because it is a quasi-judicial agency exercising regulatory functions. The Martime Commission in the field of water transportation exercises practically the same powers and has the same duties as the Interstate Commerce Commission has in railroad transportation.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Maritime Commission exercises the same powers that the Interstate Commerce Commission

exercises or that the Federal Trade Commission or the Securities and Exchange Commission exercises. They all exercise regulatory powers, but the Maritime Commission goes further than that. It engages in the construction of vessels which are necessary for our merchant marine. It also has in charge the transfer of vessels which it is necessary to dispose of when we have surplus vessels. When we do not have a sufficient number of vessels it has power to construct vessels. It also has power to improve the character of our merchant marine by obtaining better vessels.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Louisiana has said is absolutely correct. It was the committee's intention that all quasi judicial agencies be exempted from the provisions of this bill. When the amendment was offered in the committee it was defeated by only one vote. Frankly we did not know what the duties of the Maritime Commission were, or the amendment would have been included in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. The point I am making is that if we exempt other regulatory and quasi judicial agencies there is added reason for exempting the Maritime Commission.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Louisiana says is absolutely correct.

I read further from the report of the Committee on the Judiciary. Every reason the committee has given for the exemption of the other agencies will apply in full force to the Maritime Commission. I read further:

> The important issues with respect to such agencies involve not expenditures but matters of basic fundamental policy regarding the extent to which they shall be subject to Executive control, and whether they shall or shall not be in any way subordinated to a department head, selected by the President as a member of his official family. Issues of this nature involve major matters of public policy which should not be changed except by the democratic legislative process in full and unquestionable accord with the Constitution.

Mr. President, that is the statement made by the Committee on the Judiciary. This agency at one time was under a branch of the executive department. That did not work out satisfactorily, so in 1936 there was passed the present act which laid down the broad principles which should govern the merchant marine of this country, principles which were to remain the permanent merchant-marine policy. If, under this bill, we authorize the Maritime Commission to be placed back in an executive department from which the Congress found it necessary to remove it at one time, we make the Commission subject to the temporary policies of such department, we destroy the permanent merchant-marine policies which are laid down in the law. Every single reason the Committee on the Judiciary has assigned for the exemption of other quasi judicial agencies applies to this agency.

Mr. President, I submit that the amendment should be adopted, and the merchant marine should be exempted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] for himself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], on page 17, line 20.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, with respect to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Maryland in which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi joins, there is just one point involved, and that is that we add the fifteenth agency which must not be touched in any reorganization plan. The quasi-judicial agencies are well taken care of in the bill, in subparagraph (h) of section 2, which reads as follows:

> No reorganization plan under section 4 shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of * * * divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions.

Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary by that subparagraph in section 2 went a long way in my opinion to protect the quasi-judicial agencies against any interference in the exercise of their rule-making power or in the exercise of judicial power. If we want reorganization and we make all provision therefor, and then exempt all agencies in the executive departments, what have we accomplished?

I make the same statement in regard to this amendment that I made the other day in answer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] respecting the civil functions of the Army engineers. In my opinion the President is just as anxious to preserve their integrity and to preserve their independence of function as is the Congress. In my opinion the President can be trusted not to do anything that will destroy the Maritime Commission or interfere with it. There will be no ships sunk by reorganization. In my opinion there will be nothing of devastating or destructive nature done by the President with reference to the Maritime Commission. But when we exempt another agency, in my opinion we invite other Senators to come forward and ask to have their pet agencies exempted.

I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not understand that we are considering the abstract question of what should go in or should not go in. Certainly what is involved in the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi and myself cannot be in any way regarded as indicating any lack of confidence in President Truman. I am satisfied that whatever will be done by President Truman will be done well. But since we have not only in this bill, but throughout our history, made the distinction and held quasi-judicial boards separate and independent, does the Senator from Utah know of any reason in the world why the Maritime Commission, which renders certainly as many and as varied quasi-judicial duties as any board that is excepted, should be put in a class by itself? Why should it be treated any differently than the Interstate Commerce Commission? Certainly its duties are just as quasi-judicial. There can be no question in the world about that.

Mr. MURDOCK. My answer to the Senator is that, in my opinion, there is not any reason for exempting the others. I think we have well taken care of them by the provision of the bill I read.

I wish to state further that the same arguments were made in the committee that the Senator has made here on the floor today. They were presented by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, and the majority of the committee voted down the amendment, and, in my opinion, the exemption should be voted down at this time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator does not mean to say that the same arguments were made in the committee as have been made here today? The Senator certainly does not mean that. The amendment lost in the committee by one vote, that is true, but, frankly, we did not know what the duties of the Maritime Commission were. I did not.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I remember the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi it was very persuasive, and I thought he gave us all the points and all the reasons why the Maritime Commission should be exempted.

Mr. EASTLAND. But frankly we did not know what the duties of this agency were. The committee adopted the policy that all quasi-judicial agencies should be exempted. The committee wrote that policy into its report. This agency is a quasi-judicial agency and should be exempted for the very reasons set forth in the committee report.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not see how the Senator can take the position that the committee adopted the policy that all quasi-judicial agencies should be exempted from the application of the bill, because there are a score, probably, of agencies in the Government which exercise quasi-judicial functions which are not exempted, and it is my opinion that if the bill should exempt all quasi-judicial agencies in the executive branch of the Government there would not be anything left. They would all claim to exercise at times some quasi-judicial function.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. A more perfect case for the exemption of the Maritime Commission could not be presented than the one presented on pages 4 and 5 of the committee's report. The very reasons why it should be exempted are in the report, as the reasoning of the committee in approving the bill.

We speak of economy. We are all for economy; but there can be no question of economy involved here. This is a very small agency, with a very limited personnel. No question of economy is involved. It is a question of maintaining the independence of this agency. As the

committee says, all agencies of that character are entitled to exemption.

Mr. MURDOCK. My answer is that the Judiciary Committee went as far as it possibly could in subsection (h) of section 2 to protect the independence of quasi-judicial agencies. Let me read that subsection again for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me read subsection (h) of section 2. The Senator refers to the protection given to quasi-judicial agencies. In my opinion this is what the report refers to:

(h) divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions.

If the committee has not set up a standard which will absolutely protect any quasi-judicial agency, I do not know how it could be written into a law.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I decline to yield just now.

By writing a section of that nature into the bill and then taking the next step of exempting 14 agencies, as we have done up to date, to that extent, in my opinion, we cut down the efficiency and efficacy of any reorganization.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, the argument which the Senator from Utah has made in regard to the general provisions has some weight and force. But the committee did not stop there. After giving careful consideration to the question it decided that there were certain agencies whose quasi judicial powers were of such a character and extent that special arrangements should be made. As the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and I attempted to emphasize, in many ways the Maritime Commission exercises quasi judicial powers and regulatory powers to an extent at least equal to those exercised by any one of the commissions named in the exemptions. If there is any reason for the exemption of any of the others, it applies with equal force and effect to the Maritime Commission.

Mr. MURDOCK. My answer to the Senator is that after considering the Maritime Commission the Judiciary Committee, by a majority vote, refused to exempt it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] for himself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to supplement what the Senator from Utah has said, and what I have said heretofore. I shall vote against this particular amendment and any other amendment providing for the exemption of other agencies which are sought to be exempted from the provisions of the bill.

Every argument which has been made here, not only in behalf of this particular agency, but in behalf of many others already exempted, could be made in behalf of practically every other department, bureau, or agency of the Government. If the argument is to be followed to its logical conclusion, we ought to set forth and specify all of them. I have heretofore referred to the exemption of judicial agencies which exercise part-time functions, and to the Tax Court, which is altogether judicial. No one has sought to have it exempted. I have also referred to the National Labor Relations Board, which exercises many semijudicial functions. In the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior there are many such functions. In the Department of Agriculture there are many such bureaus.

My only reason for voting against this amendment is that we are adopting the wrong course and the wrong procedure. We ought to study carefully and know the ones which we ought to exempt, and exempt them all, if that is to be our policy, and if that is what we are to direct the President to do. Not doing that, we ought not to exempt some and leave others out.

For that reason I shall vote against the pending amendment, and I shall vote against the exemption of all other agencies.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Apparently it is the attitude of the Judiciary Committee that it is the only agency of Government which can make any exemptions. The Senate is powerless and the House is powerless. Only the Senate Judiciary Committee can make any exemptions.

Mr. HATCH. In reply to the Senator from Louisiana, I trust that nothing I have said has conveyed such an impression. Unfortunately I was not present in the Judiciary Committee. I think if I had been I would have opposed the work of the Judiciary Committee in the matter of exemptions, just as I voted against the Senator's amendment the other day, and as I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not say that that was the position of the Senator from New Mexico. I said that apparently it was the position of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] to the committee amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. HATCH asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK] are attending, with the Secretary of Agriculture, an important regional agricultural conference at Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is a member of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has a general pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. WHERRY. I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK];

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from In-

diana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are detained at a meeting of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—30

Austin	Gurney	Morse
Ball	Hart	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hawkes	Overton
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Capper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Connally	McClellan	Shipstead
Cordon	McKellar	Smith
Eastland	Mead	Taft
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Guffey	Mitchell	Young

NAYS—25

Andrews	Hill	Myers
Byrd	Hoey	Russell
Carville	Huffman	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Downey	Kilgore	Tydings
Fulbright	La Follette	Vandenberg
Green	Lucas	Walsh
Hatch	McMahon	
Hayden	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—39

Aiken	George	Reed
Bailey	Gerry	Revercomb
Bankhead	Glass	Robertson
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Brewster	Langer	Taylor
Briggs	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	McFarland	Tobey
Buck	Magnuson	Wagner
Bushfield	Maybank	Wheeler
Butler	Moore	White
Capehart	Murray	Wiley
Chavez	O'Mahoney	Willis
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

So the amendment offered by Mr. RADCLIFFE on behalf of himself and Mr. EASTLAND to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, at the end of line 6, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and add: *"Provided*, That no reorganization plan submitted shall contain any disposition in conflict with any act of Congress passed after January 1, 1943, dealing expressly with the creation, transfer, consolidation, or coordination of any agency or the distribution or coordination of powers or functions between agencies or within any agency."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to make a statement at this time, although I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's presentation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think this amendment may be agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill, so perhaps we can get it out of the way first, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say something before the amendment is considered, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Very well; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is quite a famous saying of Mark Twain's that everybody complains about the weather but nobody does anything about it. One of the great things at campaign time and quite often on the floor of the Senate is to have either prepared or unprepared speeches made on the subject of the great governmental monstrosity, the bureaucracy which we have in Washington, the waste of the taxpayer's money, the duplication of agencies, the difficulty of knowing what is going on in one zone or another zone of government, and the unfairness of the system to the taxpayer and to the citizens as well. That comment is proper, and it is always in the form of a generality. Yet when we come down to propose the actual meeting of that issue, we find that because of some particular thing here or there, we scuttle like a lot of rats and avoid the issue and repudiate practically all we have said. There should not be one exemption in this bill from top to bottom, and every Senator in his heart knows it. If we are going to save this Republic we cannot conduct it with hundreds of thousands of activities, many of them set up because of the war, with dozens and dozens of bureaus on top of bureaus, until there is no such thing as intrastate commerce left in the Republic. I defy any Member of the Senate to name one item which is intrastate commerce, as distinguished from interstate commerce. The whole functions of our States, our counties, our cities, and our communities are gradually being destroyed by this thing we have in Washington. Yet exemption has been made of certain so-called quasi-judicial functions. In the name of high heaven, Mr. President, is there one agency, one bureau, one department which does not exercise quasi-judicial functions in this Republic? That is merely camouflage and buncombe, and every Senator knows it in his heart. Here we are in debt $300,000,000,000, with a first mortgage of $8,500 against every family in the United States. Here we have a new President of the United States, at the end of a great world war, after we have all talked in our home States and have sympathized with the millions who have complained—the Rotary Clubs, the chambers of commerce, the labor organizations, the housewives, and all the others. We have said to them, "Yes; something must be done about it." But, Mr. President, when the opportunity comes we hide behind a lot of Hallowe'en ghosts which do not have a shred of substance—I say that with no reflection on anyone—and which cannot be supported by any honest thinking, if our words mean anything.

There should not be one exemption in this bill. We should trust the President of the United States, whether he is a Democrat or a Republican, to be just as much concerned with this Republic as we are. We cannot enable him to reorganize the Government if we tie his hands to his sides and tie his two feet together and put a blindfold over his eyes and put cotton in his ears. But that is what it amounts to.

Mr. President, for months, for years and years and years, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, almost every Member of the Congress at some time or other has said "Oh, this great monstrosity, this bureaucracy, is terrible. Let us investigate the OPA" or "Let us investigate the Shipping Board." The investigation of the Shipping Board occurred when the now Mr. Justice Black of the Supreme Court conducted the investigation. We have investigated almost everything. We have denounced bureaucracy. We have called attention to the debt. We have called attention to the expenditures and the high taxes. But what have we done about them? Nothing.

Now when the one opportunity—perhaps the only opportunity we shall have for years to come—is before us, we throw it away and go back on all our high-sounding words about economy, States' rights, local responsibility, simplification of Government, the destruction of democracy by bureaucracy, and all the other labels we have applied.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I intended to make a comment a moment ago, but I did not do so. The Senator has mentioned the OPA. If the explanation which has been given of the bill is correct, the OPA should also be exempted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the OPA should be included in the exemptions, if the explanation is correct, because it has no function which is not almost entirely judicial in character.

Mr. President, I am surprised that there are on this side of the aisle Senators who refuse to give the President of the United States, at the conclusion of this great war, the simple right or power which he has requested of us, namely, a chance to do a good job, to eliminate waste and duplication, to cut down expenses, to make for a more efficient Government.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Will the Senator, then, prepare an amendment striking from the bill all limitations on the power of the President to reorganize?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will.

Mr. OVERTON. I think that will be excellent, and then we shall have a very short bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

After we have done that, after we have given the President a chance to reorganize, if the job he does is a bad job, we can vote "no." If it is a good job, we can vote "yes." But unless we give the President a chance to do a thorough job, we are only performing a farce right here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield, but before I yield I assure my two colleagues that my reluctance to offer such an amendment is only hinged on the fact that I am not a member of the committee, and there may be many things which have not come to my attention. I have addressed myself solely to the elimination of exceptions; that is all.

I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, is it not a fact that what the Senator suggests is merely that we give the Chief Executive the right to exercise the functions for which the people of the United States hold him responsible?

Mr. TYDINGS. Exactly.

Mr. KILGORE. And if we do not do it properly how can we hold the President responsible?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is the same as if we were to say to a president of a company, whether a coal company, a harvester company, or some other kind of a company, "Bill, we are going to charge you with the responsibility of running this company. But you may not do anything in the bookkeeping department or in the operating department. Do not touch the transportation department. However, we expect you to have an efficient and businesslike organization."

Mr. President, I am astounded at the way my Democratic colleagues on this side of the aisle are showing so little faith in the patriotism, the Americanism, and the business acumen of President Truman. I am astounded at my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who, in campaign after campaign, have attacked up and down the country, this overgrown, extravagant Government with its wasteful bureaucracies, but now seek to perpetuate their existence. I think we should rise to this occasion when we have a $300,000,000,000 debt staring us in the face, when the problem of reconversion is before the Nation and when we are confronted with the problems of price regulation, rent control, and rationing which is still in effect. At this time we have a mounting deficit and we should do all we can to reduce it. Here is a proposal that is totally nonpartisan. There is no reason in the world why we should divide on party lines with respect to the question which is now before the Senate. It is of tremendous importance to the people of this country. I kept my seat a moment ago only because my colleague and friend had an amendment pending, and being from the same State as he, I did not think it was graceful on my part to oppose the proposition which I know he had earnestly in his heart. I am not speaking of his amendment in particular, but I am speaking of amendments pertaining to all exemptions in this bill, and any others which may be offered to it. The conditions about which we have complained have gone so far that we should give the President of the United States a real opportunity to put the Government together so that it will function somewhat in accordance with the conception of its founders, and so that duplication, waste, and overlapping functions may be eliminated and thereby save the taxpayer money, as well as at the same time promote the efficiency of democracy in America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Maryland to say that he was offering an amendment to strike out all the exemptions to which reference has been made?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to do so. That does not mean, however, that the Maritime Commission and some of the other agencies will be eliminated. The President will not confront Congress with a proposal to eliminate an agency which the Congress has created and does not want to strike down. It simply means that he may find here a function which is partially performed by another group over there, and that by a reorganization along common-sense lines the particular function can be performed by one group and the other group freed to do things which are within the scope of its activities.

I appeal to my colleagues, not in any sense of fault-finding or criticizing, to rise to this one occasion and give to the President the opportunity which has been requested. It will be the first opportunity we have had during my tenure in Congress to help bring about at last a reorganization of the Government so that the things about which we have all complained may be eliminated from the operations of Government, and that a more economical and efficient Government may result therefrom.

If we do not like the plan the President proposes we can say so; but for heaven's sake let us go down the only avenue that is open, namely, the avenue of executive reorganization. Every Senator who has been a Member of the Senate for any length of time knows that there is no chance of having enacted a reorganization bill which the Congress alone attempts to bring about. That is shown by what is taking place here today. So let us take advantage of this opportunity and give power to the President. Let us see if he cannot do a good job, and if he does a good job we will have something to be proud of. Whether we be Democrats or Republicans, we will be able to go to our constituents and point to some worth-while achievement on our part as Members of Congress.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if the Senator's argument is carried to its logical conclusion, the amendment will go much further than to strike out the exemptions.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is probably true.

Mr. OVERTON. Some of the exemptions are so broad as to include quite a number of agencies.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would be willing to eliminate everything that could be eliminated if it would give the President the power to formulate a plan of reorganization and submit it to us.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator would be willing to strike out of the bill all limitation upon the President's power.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would be agreeable to doing that. However, I am not a member of the committee, and I hesitate to make such a sweeping proposal. But I should like to see all the exemptions which are specifically named eliminated because there is no more reason for leaving them in the bill than for leaving in the OPA and many other quasi-judicial agencies which operate under the Federal Government.

Mr. President, in the interest of a more efficient Government, I ask that we be allowed to contribute something in the way of democratic processes and obtain a real over-all comprehensive reorganization plan. If the plan does not "stack up," we can strike it down, as provided in the Byrd amendment, at a later date.

Mr. TAFT. How can we strike it down? The answer is that we cannot strike it down.

Mr. TYDINGS. So far as I am concerned with reference to practically all governmental agencies, I would not want to see them stricken down.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's suggestion is that our remedy is to strike the plan down. We do not have such remedy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why not?

Mr. TAFT. Because, according to the terms of the bill, if the House approves the plan it will be put into effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the House approves it I am pretty sure that it will suit me all right. I know that the President will not write a plan that the House will not approve unless the plan is a very bad one. It will be a dozen times better than the hodge-podge of departments, bureaus, overlapping and wasteful activities which already exist. In my mind, there is no doubt that the net result will be an organization which will be better than the one we now have, providing that we give the President the power which has been requested. I think we ought to give it. And let it be said here and now that, in my humble judgment, those who vote against effecting a proper reorganization of the Government, in the face of wartime restrictions, will have something to answer for to the people of the country at some succeeding date.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think I can answer the very eloquent remarks of the Senator from Maryland any better than by reading what he said in the Senate of the United States on March 20, 1939, when a similar question was before the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. What was the date?

Mr. TAFT. March 20, 1939.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator stated as follows:

> How ludicrous it is for us as a legislative branch of the Government to say that one of the great problems before this Nation is the necessity of reorganizing and consolidating and taking other action in respect to the functions of the executive branch of the Government, in the interest of economy and efficiency, but that we do not intend to do a thing in the world about it except

to pass a resolution inviting the President of the United States to legislate for us, and that whatever way he legislates will be satisfactory to us if we do not act on the plan within 10 days after he submits it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Continue reading.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator stated further on that occasion:

Mr. President, if there is a need for reorganization we should write the plan in Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I continue reading:

Let it go through the normal processes of Government up to the Executive, and have him approve it or disapprove it. If we feel there is no need for reorganization we should do nothing at all.

We ought not to abuse the various executive activities of the Federal Government on the floor of the Senate, and hold this branch and that branch up to ridicule and abuse, and then continue to allow more legislative authority to be transferred to the executive branch of the Government.

Already, I believe, one of the great causes of unrest in this country has been the transference of legislative power to separate and independent agencies, which in effect is creating a fourth branch of our National Government, not that of legislation, not that of judicial or executive functions of the Government, but administrative legislation within supposed limits fixed by Congress in passing various acts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator has read my statement, because it practically proves my case. I would much rather have the plan written in the Congress of the United States, and in 1939 I thought that it could be written in the Congress of the United States. But I found it could not be written in the Congress because the effort which was made on that occasion showed me conclusively that it was impossible for Congress to do the work which the Executive should do.

But how small the year 1939 is compared with the year 1945, after the expansion of the Federal Government as the result of a great war. I know the Senator will be fair enough to concede that the Government is not twice as large as it was in 1939, but three or four times as large as it was then. The need then was for a poultice; the need now is for an operation. The Senator cannot use the evidence which fits a time long before this war to prove a case which has no relevancy to the present condition of the Government, in the year 1945.

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. I have not finished. I merely paused for breath. [Laughter.]

No man has had more to say about the weakness of the executive administration, on this floor and off, repeatedly, daily and weekly, than has the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Where does he stand today—in a position of consistency, hunting every amendment and exemption he can write into the bill to tie the hands of the President from accomplishing the result which he claims he really wants? Am I wrong?

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, the Senator is wrong. I am quite prepared to favor binding ourselves to consider any plan the President wishes to submit, to bind ourselves to act on it "yes" or "no" promptly, without any debate, without any amendment. I am wholly unwilling to delegate to the President power to reorganize the Government of the United States, and nullify act after act which the Congress has passed.

Furthermore, I suggest to the Senator that since 1939 we have been in the midst of a great war. It cannot be said that because Congress has not completely reorganized the Government during that time it is unable to do so. In fact, during that time the President has had power, under the first War Powers Act, to effect a complete reorganization of government for the period of the war. That power has been in his hands. We granted him the war power. So there is no difference between today and 1939, except for one thing suggested by the Senator from Virginia, that we have a different President, and, secondly, that the Government is somewhat larger than it was then. Otherwise the principles so well declared by the Senator in 1939 are just as fully effective today as they were at that time.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator can convince many people by his plausible statement that the conditions are no different in 1945, after the war, from what they were in 1939.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me finish the answer, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio about the vote that was just taken to exempt the Maritime Commission. I assume he voted against the exemption.

Mr. TAFT. I voted in favor of exempting it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thought the Senator was willing——

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator know why I voted for exempting it?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think so.

Mr. TAFT. It was because under the Byrd amendment, as adopted, the President could submit a reorganization plan transferring the Maritime Commission to the Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Wallace is opposed to a merchant marine for the United States. He thinks that is something we have to subsidize, and that we should not try to get into that field. The only way I could protect the merchant marine of the United States against such a reorganization plan, with the Byrd amendment in the bill, was to vote to exempt the Maritime Commission entirely from the proposed plan. Therefore I did so.

Mr. TYDINGS. According to the Senator's logic, he would have to exempt all the others, because any of them could be transferred to Mr. Wallace's department or other departments. In other words, it boils down to this, that, using Mr. Wallace as a windmill, the Senator is tilting over the whole reorganization bill, so that there is nothing left of it. Therefore, when he rises and talks about the debt, and about this "great monstrosity," and the inefficiency of this department and that department, and says the matter should be investigated, that this overlaps that, that they have no genius for administration, and so on, it all ends when the one opportunity comes, in the Senator eating his words and saying, "I do not want any reorganization."

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield. The Senator started this debate. I only wish to finish it with him, that is all.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to have the Senator yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to say that if the Byrd amendment had not been adopted, if we had preserved the veto power in the Senate over any reorganization plan, I would not have voted to exempt the Maritime Commission, and I would vote to eliminate all the other agencies which are included in the bill, along with the Senator's proposal.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri for a moment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to have the Senator yield to me for more than a moment, if he will.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator will at least permit me to finish my side of the argument before I take him on, will he not?

Mr. DONNELL. I will ask the Senator to yield for a rather extensive inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I believe in fair play, and an extended inquiry might last a half hour.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I believe in fair play, and I resent very much the imputation made by the Senator from Maryland. I have in my hand the remarks made by the Senator in 1939 showing the basis on which twice he voted contrary to the very vote he cast this afternoon on this floor.

I undertake to say, Mr. President, that the Senator voted in 1939 apparently not on any basis of expediency, which I understand he now bases his vote upon, but voted upon certain principles which I desire to advocate at this moment. I ask him to yield for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad the Senator has made that remark. It is more or less a repetition of what the Senator from Ohio said, and I know that the able Senator from Missouri is sincere in what he says, that I am crucified on the cross of inconsistency, but I am not crucified on the cross of what is right and what is wrong.

To reiterate, the proposition is that the Senator himself is one of the greatest advocates in this Chamber, and off this floor, of reducing Government functions, of putting down overlapping agencies, of doing away with this "monstrosity." He has read the reports over. He has labored by the midnight oil. He has turned rhetoric loose so that it would almost wipe out the national debt if it were coined into dollars [Laughter.]

When he gets the one opportunity to vote to do what he wants done, instead of joining with me, he takes up the shovel of antiquity, digs in the dirt of 7 or 8 years ago, and says, "Before, you took such a position. Even though this Government is four times as large as it was

then, forsooth, why do you not stand on the same ground now?"

I wish to say to the Senator that if there is any inconsistency, I probably have my full share of guilt, and I have no desire to escape it. But I do ask the Senator to walk out and look in a mirror, and I think he will see that the senior Senator from Missouri, with a cornucopia of plenty in one hand and with the empty saucepan of a $300,000,000,000 deficit in the other, and saddling a mule that is called "Waste, extravagance, and bureaucracy," is attempting to ride in two directions on that old beast at one and the same time. [Laughter.]

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the ability of the mental processes of the Senator——

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not yielded to the Senator, and of course, under the rules of the Senate it is customary to ask me to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I beg pardon. Will the Senator yield. I ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a brief comment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator whether or not it is a fact that in 1939 he did or did not vote twice in favor of the proposition presented by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], practically the same as that I have presented, namely, that no reorganization plan shall take effect until there shall be enacted a joint resolution approving the plan.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. Crucify me, if you will. I plead guilty to the soft, but not too soft, impeachment.

Mr. DONNELL. I am not criticising the Senator for his change of opinion.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not changed my opinion.

Mr. DONNELL. But I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senator from Maryland in 1939 did not vote in favor of the Wheeler amendment on any grounds of expediency, but he did so upon the high ground, as I understand, that an amendment of the nature of that offered here this afternoon by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], violated the Constitution of the United States.

I undertake to state it as my judgment that the mere fact that we have four times as many employees as we had in 1939, and the mere fact that we have a different man in the White House today, does not alter one jot or one tittle the Constitution of the United States.

I should like to ask the Senator if this is what he said on March 20, 1939. Did he not say:

> Mr. President, ours is a democracy. Let us quit talking about democracy unless the legislative branch of our Government is going to pass the legislation. There is no use beating our breasts about democracy and in a time when there is no stress, when there is no real emergency, handing over unlimited power to the executive branch of the Government, which, under our Constitution, has no right to legislate in behalf of the Congress.

I ask the Senator if he so stated in 1939.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not only that, but all the rest of it which the Senator might read.

Mr. DONNELL. Well, I will read that too.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; the Senator will not read it in my time.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a minute. Let me take up where the Senator left off.

Mr. President, I had hoped in dealing with the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Missouri in this debate that I might not have to bring up a circumstance of which I am not ashamed but which sheer candor compels me now to refer to in this illustrious assembly. I never looked upon the late President Roosevelt as a man who was interested primarily in reorganization or in economy, and I think the record pretty well illustrates that. I think my record here, not only in that speech but in many, many other speeches over a long period of time, including the purge campaign of 1938, shows that perhaps there was as much resistant quality sitting in the seat I occupy to the whole sweep of bureaucracy, much of which came in with the late President, whether for good or for evil, as was possessed by any other Member of this body. For that reason I had an entirely different conception of what would be accomplished by a reorganization that was to be made under the administration of President Roosevelt than I had of one which might be made under Coolidge or under Harry Truman. It was not a political matter. It had been demonstrated that Mr. Roosevelt believed in a big Federal Government, in the elimination of all intrastate commerce, in carrying the Federal Government down into every household, and doing for the people the things which the communities and the States had done for them.

Therefore, as a matter of democracy, I was interested in making sure that I would have a chance to pass on any plan so devised by the President. I do not conceive that that condition is present here, and what I have just said I say with no reflection on the late President, for he had many admirable qualities. He performed outstanding service in times of great stress. I did not always see eye-to-eye with him, but one thing I did see was that he loved to do things for everybody regardless of the cost and regardless of what I considered to be much of our historic Democratic and Republican heritage.

Therefore, what would be more natural than that I would not want to turn over such a power to a man who was so minded, though he might be right and I might be wrong. That is not the situation which now prevails.

No one conceives that President Truman wants to do other than reduce government. Heaven knows, whatever may be said by way of praise of President Roosevelt, it was not one of his life-long ambitions to reduce the Federal functions during his own tenure of office.

I did not want to bring that matter up. I concede the whole speech referred to by the Senator from Missouri. The Senator has read the basis for a pretty good speech. The only difference between the situation then and now is that it is not the same government. The Government has four times as many employees. The Government has four times as many bureaus and agencies, and the country has a $300,000,000,000 debt. In 1929 the country had a forty-billion- or forty-five-billion-dollar debt. Only a child in the primary grade would assert seriously that the Government today is the same Government that existed prior to the war in 1939 insofar as problems and functions and fiscal set-ups are concerned.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a brief comment.

Mr. DONNELL. The comment I desire to make, Mr. President, is not critical, in any sense, of the Senator. He has a perfect right to change his position between 1939 and 1945. But may I call attention to the fact that while we have four times as many employees today as we had then, and while we have a larger national debt by far than we had then——

Mr. TYDINGS. Eight times as large.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes, eight times as large as we had then, and while we have a different President of the United States than we had then, we have the same Constitution of the United States as we had in 1939.

May I call attention to the fact, as I understand and read the Senator's brilliant and eloquent remarks made on March 20, 1939, as I recall the date——

Mr. TYDINGS. And they were not written the night before, either.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it they were not. I take the Senator's remarks were prepared with care and deliberation and were delivered in a most effective manner. I call attention to the fact that as I interpret his remarks he was basing his opposition to the Wheeler amendment, and his opposition to what was in effect the Byrd amendment, upon the high ground of constitutionality, and with his permission I should like to read a portion of his speech, and I shall not trespass long upon his time.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator can put the speech in the RECORD. I do not want the Senator to read it into the RECORD now. The Senator can place it in the RECORD. I want posterity to read that speech three or four times, because it is a good one.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read a few brief portions of that speech,

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I cannot allow the Senator to do that in my time. He can do it in his own time. I am perfectly willing to admit that the speech was a good one, and I think I have answered the Senator's statement with reference to it. If the Senator wants to engage me in a battle of wits, to lay aside the so-called argumentative part of the proposition, and take up the lighter foils with him, I shall be glad to do so at another time, if he desires to fight with such tools.

Mr. DONNELL. Do I understand that the Senator prefers that I should not read it at this time?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do, until the Senator obtains the floor, and then he can

read it in his own time. I shall be glad if the Senator will put the speech in the RECORD, because I like to have my speeches quoted, not once, but many times.

Mr. President, we have had a little banter in connection with this matter which has not diminished the sum total of human progress, I hope. Perhaps I have been guilty of some inconsistency, but that is a small matter.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not just now. The point is: What is going to be the best thing we can do for the welfare of the Republic. Can we reorganize the Government by exempting so much and so many of its functions that the man we assign to do the task cannot properly do it? Can we hope to achieve greater efficiency by segregating one after the other the numerous bureaus and agencies of the Government, and saying, "Do not touch them"?

Would it not be better, in spite of the argument that has taken place here, considering that we are now unable to balance the Budget, that we are not going to be able to balance the Budget next year, that we have four times as many employees now, or thereabouts, as we had back in the 1930's——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Maryland to page 5 and page 15 of the committee's report on Calendar No. 651, Senate bill 1120.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On page 5 the committee's report states the regulatory boards which are exempted have a total of between ten and twenty thousand employees. Those figures are mine, because they are not added.

On page 15 it is shown that on April 1 there were in Government employ approximately 2,900,000 people. As I understand, these exemptions are all of regulatory boards which were created by laws enacted by Congress to protect the individual citizen against his Government. The purpose of this reorganization is to cut down the executive boards created because of the war and caused by the bureaucracy which grew up in preparation for the war. If we fail to exempt these regulatory bodies we leave to the Executive to carry out the functions which these boards were created by Congress to perform in order to protect the individual citizen from Government itself and from the executive department itself.

From the standpoint of economy, I respectfully point out to the Senator from Maryland that the total number of such employees is between 10,000 and 20,000, if the committee's figures are correct, and that we are dealing with other groups involving 2,900,000 employees. So, on the question of economy alone, I respectfully submit that the Senator's argument is not a strong one.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Massachusetts makes a very strong point when he says that if the agencies so far exempted in the bill were taken out of the exempted class and treated in any way by the President in his program the effect, either plus or minus, would be slight from the standpoint of economy. I think the point is well taken and that the extent of economy or efficiency involved in eliminating these agencies from the scope of the bill would be small.

But that is not what I am attempting to say. We have already included another agency, namely, the Maritime Commission. There is no reason in the world why the OPA should not be included. I am sure that the Senator will see that if his philosophy is expanded like an accordion, we shall soon reach the point where I know that what he wishes to accomplish and what I wish to accomplish will not be achieveable. My remarks were not directed primarily to the exemptions already in the bill. However, I would prefer to have them eliminated. My remarks were directed toward the practice of commencing to exempt this, that, and the other agency from the bill. Other amendments are on the table. I hope they will not be offered, because I feel that the bill could be so loaded down with exemptions that what ought to be achieved could not be achieved. Therefore I concede that the point advanced by the Senator from Massachusetts, so far as economy and efficiency are concerned, is well taken; but I do not concede that the principle is any different whether 14 institutions are exempted, or whether 24, 36, or more are exempted.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. In the light of the Senator's very able argument, I am wondering if he does not see the position of those of us on the committee who would have preferred to eliminate all exemptions, provided there was a proper check by the Congress on what was done under the President's plan.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should be very glad to vote for the Donnell amendment. In fact, I would prefer it, provided that the President had a clear opportunity to do an over-all job. I should prefer to give him complete power, with a check by Congress. I should call that the perfect way to achieve the desired result. I do not believe we can do that. The 14 exemptions already in the bill have led me to try to rescue from the form in which the bill is presented the best I can get of what I should like to have had.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator answers my question. We could have eliminated all the exemptions and could have had a clean bill, provided Congress had the proper check by the constitutional method.

Mr. TYDINGS. If some Senator will submit such a proposal at the conclusion of this debate, it will receive my enthusiastic support. I ask only that all exemptions of bureaus be eliminated, in which event I shall be ready for the Congress to act on the bill. We would be trusting the President to do a good job, and would act only if he did not, whereas now we do not trust him quite enough, and do not even trust ourselves enough.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in view of the discussion of the past few minutes, I should like to place in the RECORD the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in 1939. I am not doing so from the standpoint of criticism. Perhaps I have spoken vigorously, but I feel very strongly on the question. As I see it, in no instance should we sacrifice constitutionality or principles for expediency. In my judgment, the Senator from Maryland, powerful in intellect and eloquent in expression as he is, back in 1939 stated so clearly the constitutional point involved that I should like to have it in the RECORD. I read the following colloquy, which occurred on March 21, 1939:

"Mr. TYDINGS. Congress fails to take any action, and a period of 10 days elapses. Then the President's order becomes law, as I understand. Is that correct?

"Mr. GILLETTE. A period of 60 days.

"Mr. TYDINGS. A period of 60 days. Is that correct?

"Mr. GILLETTE. Unless the Congress has acted under the powers reserved to it in the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. Congress fails to act. Then the President's order becomes the law of the land."

Then the Senator from Maryland asked this significant question:

"Where do we find in the acts of Congress an instance in which a former act of Congress has been repealed in that fashion? May the Executive be given authority to repeal acts of Congress by the passage of a law authorizing him to do so?"

Then he says:

"I am asking for information, because frankly, without any discussion, I believe that if we give the President that much authority we violate the limitations on the delegation of legislative power, which must have a top and a bottom. We give the President authority, in effect, to repeal an act of Congress; and the citizen can find no law in all the statute books in which the act creating the Interstate Commerce Commission has been revised, altered, or repealed.

"I think that is a true statement of the case. I should like to hear the Senator say whether or not he believes the failure of Congress to take action, thus permitting the President's recommendation to become a law, would be good law; in other words, that the President could abolish a department by Executive order because the Congress had failed to act."

Mr. President, as I see it the action taken this afternoon, in part with the assistance of the vote of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, has given to the President legislative power which, as I understand, the distinguished Senator from Maryland believed in 1939 could not be given to the President.

One further word, and I shall close. As I see it, there may be changes in conditions from year to year, changes in the number of employees, changes in the types of departments, and changes in the personnel of the Presidency of the United States. But there remains constantly the Constitution of the United States, which does not change except by the act of the people through amendment. The Constitution remains the same today as it was in 1939, on the day when the distinguished Senator from Maryland deemed it improper under the

Constitution to attempt to delegate legislative power to the President, a power which, by the action we are taking this afternoon, with the vote of approval of the Senator from Maryland, we have undertaken to delegate to the President of the United States.

ONE MILLION NEW BUSINESSES—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WHERRY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article which I have written for Forbes magazine, which includes a brief statement having to do with the argument which I advanced on the floor of the Senate relative to the full employment bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MILLION NEW BUSINESSES

(By KENNETH S. WHERRY, United States Senator from Nebraska)

Our most vital problem today is to win the battle of reconversion. Right now we are at a point where uncertainty may well prevent us from reaching our ultimate goal. A complete, all-out effort must be made to get the wheels of industry humming, to insure an era of expanding prosperity and the largest possible number of jobs.

Hundreds of returning veterans and small businessmen, prevented from activities by the confusion of economic forces, have come to me as a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, asking two questions: What does this administration propose to do to induce new business ventures? How does it plan to assure maximum employment? No answer to either question rests in the New Deal Utopian panacea, the so-called full employment bill, which to my mind is the most flagrant attempt yet to undermine our free economy.

My answer—a businessman's answer—to both questions would be to assure the country the opportunity for the success and legitimate profit of 1,000,000 brand-new businesses, services, and professions, plus a fresh chance for the thousands of small businesses which were war casualties.

A DEFEATIST POLICY

That would be the sound, American approach to the fullest possible employment. Yet, for the next half century, attempts to legislate jobs will probably be with us, kept alive by internal malcontents and alien subversives working through misguided economic planners and professional "do-gooders." There is no logical reason for this type of thinking in America.

It denies the inherent American pride of self-sufficiency and initiative and propounds the idea that a man, his company or his union is no longer able to find opportunity and security except within a collective system. It is a defeatist and a deficit philosophy of providing employment upon vast debt, as opposed to our traditional way of providing employment out of production and the actual creation of new wealth. It completely ignores sound and proven economic principles, such as the fact that the American system of free enterprise and free labor has produced the highest standard of living ever reached by civilization; and was the only economic system able in the hour of world peril to furnish the fighters, the workers, the production, and the machines capable of smashing enemies whose aggression had been long and carefully planned upon a basis of controlled industry and regimented labor.

The idea behind the full employment bill has been publicized in such a manner as to make its opponents appear to deny the virtue and necessity of the fullest, possible employment. Obviously, nothing could be further from the truth. Everybody wants to see full employment, not only for decent Christian reasons of humanity, but also for the selfish reason that everybody profits. There is no controversy over the basic soundness of full employment. The controversy is whether the Government can make such a guarantee without, in the process, destroying the only real source of employment—industry.

There is nothing new in the fundamental idea of planning an entire economy to the end that it produces full employment and security. The Pharoahs tried it, and fell, as did the Incas, and Hitler. We have yet to see what happens with the Soviet experiment, but of its present state we do know two things: (1) Few Americans prefer Russia's standard of living and regimented enterprise, wherever they make progress in trol; (2) every year the Russians incorporate more of the methods of American free enemancipating the worker from slavery to the machine and from complete subservience to the totalitarian economic system.

Any serious consideration of the full employment bill must admit these facts: Either the measure opens the way toward entire and arbitrary Government control of all industry, all business, all farming, and all labor, or else it means absolutely nothing. It is a "fool" employment bill, which fools the public into believing that it will guarantee employment, whereas actually the measure contains no means of providing it. In essence, the bill goes no further than a declaration of policy. No money, nor means of raising money, to meet pay rolls is provided; nor is there any definition of skills and employment, rates of pay, or types of work which might be created.

The bill would commit Congress, at least morally, to a program of guaranteeing full employment by some means which could not be other than arbitrary, totalitarian, and entirely destructive of our free and competitive economic system. The spirit of the bill aims at a vast Government dole of made employment—raking leaves and building nonproductive works—which would be paid for out of taxes and deficit spending at the very time when the burden would act most heavily to further depress existing industry and the possibility of new business. With a saturation of Government borrowing power there would be no further means of raising the enormous deficit pay rolls on nonproductive works. The only alternative would then be for the Government to enter directly into competition with established industry, using means akin to outright confiscation and permanent static controls over all segments of our economy.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL INEVITABLE

Up to the point where any type of Government guarantee would become effective, the impending threat of Government control would hang like a sword of Damocles over business, industry, and labor. Friends of labor have admitted this to me privately. From the outset, the Government would have to be ready to compel people to work where, for how long, and at what wages and jobs bureaucrats dictated. Since full employment could not be guaranteed if widespread strikes were to ensue, the Government would either have to stop strikes or strikes would stop full employment—and production—for such time as they might be in progress. The rights of unions, the initiative of private enterprise, and the freedom of the individual would all be equally endangered and constricted.

In my opinion, that is precisely what the professional economic planners aim at: A state of vague and illusory promises and threats which would ultimately sap the vigor of our traditional system. At the moment, the bill lies shelved in the House, but we can expect efforts either to wiggle it through in present form, or to intrigue toward a compromise measure which will still contain the basic elements of this defeatist thinking.

Now, there is a way toward real full employment, and it is the American way that has worked effectively in the past. It lies in forthright legislation that will actually help instead of hinder the real sources of wealth and prosperity—free labor and free industry. The only possible opportunity for permanent full employment is under an expanding economy which, through increased efficiency, improved techniques and a free play of competitive markets and supplies, will continue to provide more and more goods and services, at lower costs and prices. It is obvious that we cannot maintain such trends if we permit our Government to establish basic economic policies detrimental to sound business practice.

If we seriously hope for permanent prosperity and full employment, we have got to begin at the grass roots of all production and the origin of all wealth—the soil. We possess no wealth that did not originate in agriculture, woods, or mines. We have got to see that those industries are given the opportunity for prosperity. Then we have got to look to the greatest giver of employment—not the farms or factories—but the middle bracket, which includes our self employed, our small businesses, our service trades and professions. This group constitutes the great proportion of the country's earners and purchasing power, and, during the years of economic transition, has been without voice and is nearly throttled.

To give an idea of this group's comparative importance: In 1870, employment was divided into agriculture, 53.5; manufacture, 21.9; service, 24.6. We find in 1920 that a great change had taken place and agriculture showed only 27.6 of employment, manufacture, 32.4, and service, 39.5. But in 1930, service had jumped to 47.2 of all employment. Agriculture had dropped to 21.9 and manufacture to 30.9. The expansion in this group should be even greater in the postreconversion period.

It seems logical, then, to look to the service group, the small-business bracket, as offering the firmest keystone for postwar prosperity. It is this group particularly which would be further burdened and discriminated against by any attempt at Government guaranty of full employment. It is small business that suffers most from red tape, paper work and restrictions. By the nature of its operations, its own employment and its employing cannot be guaranteed. It is inherent in small business that it does not simply improve a technique to increase its profit, nor does it always produce for an already existing market. The small business has to go out and sell its offerings; it actually has to create its own market. It is the chief producer and the chief user of employment, and it is the chief consumer of all business in itself.

FOUR-POINT PROGRAM

To help all business, but small business in particular, to create the fullest and most immediate employment, I recommend concentrated public urging of the following four legislative steps:

1. Revise the tax structure, so that present inflationary trends are eliminated and venture and risk investment is not jeopardized by antagonistic fiscal management. A niggardly tax reduction will not give the impetus necessary to free risk capital and sustain our present national income. We have spent 13 years of pivoting our economy upon the Government. It is time to put the pivot back where it belongs, within business.

2. Actually rid ourselves of all possible restrictions. For example, ammunition has been released as surplus for civilian consumption for some time, but I have a veteran constituent who has found it impossible to get

actual delivery of $6,000 worth of shotgun shells. Red tape and delay are threatening the success of his new business. Those shells will be no good to him when the hunting season closes.

3. Establish Government policies making clear that the Government means to get out and stay out of interfering with business. From March 1939 to June 1944 American business was throttled by over 76,000 separate directives, many of which are still wholly or partially in force. Both established and potential business is just plumb scared to take a risk in view of what the "planners" may cook up next.

4. Congress should take the bull by the horns and set up whatever governmental machinery is necessary to clarify this Administration's attitude on a standard of wages, working conditions, and labor disputes, so that both business and labor can know where it stands and adjust itself accordingly.

These affirmative steps will supply a foundation upon which business initiative can build a new era of expanding prosperity. By next July enough servicemen will be discharged to get hundreds of thousands of new businesses and services immediately humming. If we seriously want the fullest possible employment, that is the American way to make it. We owe the opportunity to our returning veterans, and it is the sound way of reaching a higher level of American prosperity—1,000,000 new businesses; new wealth; new jobs.

ESTATE OF PETER G. FABIAN, DECEASED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

RUFUS A. HANCOCK

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. MORSE conferees on the part of the Senate.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN T. WEBB, SR.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 784) entitled "An Act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Senior", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by the House in line 6 of the bill, to wit "$6,519.95" insert the figures "$7.019.95"; and the House agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
DAN R. MCGEHEE,
FRANK E. HOOK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MURDOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Manning to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, with the rank of rear admiral.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oswald S. Colclough to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George L. Russell to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the Navy nominations.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc and that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc and the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

RECESS

Mr. MURDOCK. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, November 16, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 15 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John J. Manning to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from December 1, 1945.

Oswald S. Colclough to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

IN THE NAVY

George L. Russell to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Joe Sanguinetti, Banta.
Eula M. Cook, Cambria.
Milton H. Jones, Pinedale.
Bertha E. Colahan, Romoland.
Elanora M. Larson, Sunnymead.

COLORADO

Albert Ross Mauro, Weston.

NEW YORK

Herbert S. Redner, Arden.
Clarence A. Parker, Burlington Flats.
Sherman G. Simmons, Byron.
James J. Cunningham, Caledonia.
Charles R. Freece, East Worcester.
Joyce S. Walrod, Georgetown.
Anna C. Townsend, Glenham.
Mary H. Stanton, Glen Spey.
John L. Stecz, Haverstraw.
Harriet Space, Huguenot.
Mary M. McCaughey, Leicester.
Bethel Waters, Marcellus Falls.
Velma G. Banner, Maryland.
Katherine B. Kinne, Memphis.
[illegible]ina H. Davis, Meridian.
M. Louise Soule, Minoa.
John G. Quigley, Mottville.
Matilda B. Engelmann, Mount Vision.
Elva G. Commerdinger, Nesconset.
Nelson A. Fisher, Poestenkill.
Elizabeth F. Filkins, Riparius.
Leona M. Gifford, Sacandaga.
Daisy H. Evans, Slate Hill.
John Speed, Slaterville Springs.
Florence McElroy Simon, Taberg.
Lula M. Oliver, Treadwell.
Margaret M. Kuney, Verplanck.

OKLAHOMA

Albert Smith, Devol.
William R. Baker, Maramec.

PENNSYLVANIA

Bertha A. Snyder, Beachlake.
Ella George, Cassandra.
Marion H. Thrasher, Cranesville.
Martha S. Darlington, Darling.
Lloyd E. Latshaw, Dornsife.
Frank W. Nangle, Force.
Joseph F. Shaffer, Harmony.
Iolabell McElhoes, Home.
Beatrice A. Curley, Ithan.
Ella M. Robinson, Large.
Josephine R. Gift, Lemasters.
Henry L. Whitaker, Narvon.
Beatrice I. Duerr, New Britain.
Eva Morris, New Derry.
Adam Hoover, Newry.
Elmer J. Kirk, Rockton.
A. Irene Close, Sproul.
Zella M. Larimer, Stahlstown.
Harold E. Brocious, Timblin.
Harold H. Peiffer, Union Deposit.
William M. Betz, Venus.
Elsie R. West, Wawa.
Abel S. Landes, Wycombe.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Arthur J. Hagan, St. Margaret's Church, Dorchester, Mass., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of these United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness, and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides, by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion, by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy, and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of the Congress and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, and the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessing of equal liberty.

Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord, that we, Thy servants, may enjoy perpetual health, both of mind and body, and by the glorious intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary we may be delivered from present sorrow and attain to eternal joy through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 191

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. James W. Mott, late a Representative from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a circular.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a tribute by William D. Hassett to the late Charles A. Webb.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the Joint Committee on Printing that my request to have printed the article by Pearley Feen before the Vermont Bar Association will cost $130. I renew my request, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.

LOAN TO ENGLAND

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of the House to know that in the broadcast from London this morning it was officially announced that President Truman had agreed to make a loan to Great Britain of $4,500,000,000. I wonder why such important information has to come from London before it is released in the United States to the American people whose money is being loaned. Furthermore, I would also like to learn by what authority the President of the United States has the power to loan any money belonging to the American people to foreign countries without the consent of Congress. If President Truman is seeking to bind the Congress on foreign commitments before receiving authority from the representatives of the people, he may be skating on very thin ice if he expects to deliver.

I remember about 27 years ago when the late President Wilson made similar loans, without authority of Congress, to England, France, Italy, and other countries. Those loans, running to more than $12,000,000,000, have never been repaid, and I am satisfied that the borrowers never intended to pay.

England does not want a loan. Her leaders have definitely demanded a gift from the American people of $5,000,000,000. Therefore, the proposed so-called loan, if ever made, in my opinion, will be treated as a gift from American taxpayers. A rose by any other name smells just as sweet, whether you call it a loan or gift.

Loans to any foreign country must be passed upon by the American Congress. To avoid disappointments, Congress should act before the President makes any attempt to commit the country. In addition, as long as our leaders are dealing with money belonging to the American people, which must be raised by taxing the people, any announcements should come from responsible officials in Washington and not from official sources in London.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD on the subject of our foreign policy in relation to Poland.

Mr. TALBOT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on the policy of the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a tribute to Ralph K. Bliss, Iowa director of agricultural extension work, made by Paul A. Johnson, Crawford County extension director, Denison, Iowa.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in the Daily Pacifican.

PHILIPPINE COMMONWEALTH DAY, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been 10 years since, as a member of the congressional committee representing the United States at the ceremonies in connection with the inauguration of the Philippine Commonwealth Government, I saw and heard the gay crowds in the streets of beautiful Manila.

Manila was, then, truly the pearl of the Orient.

Then it was rich in the things of economic wealth. Great ships rode at anchor in its matchless harbor, discharging their cargoes of goods from the United States and from many other lands, taking on copra, minerals, sugar and all the many products of the prolific soil of the Philippines. Then, it was rich in tradition. Jose Rizal, the great Filipino patriot, a combination of our own Washington and Lincoln, had trod the very stones over which I walked. Over those same roads had marched the American forces of '98, liberating the Filipinos from a century-old tyranny. Here was beauty and commerce and history—all in one.

But there was something new, something virile, that stirred in the streets of Manila on November 15, 1935. I recognized this unusual factor because I was no stranger to the Filipino people. Over 30 years before that memorable day I had served in the telegraph division of the Philippine Constabulary. Their courage, their kindness, their appreciation of genuine good will was familiar to me. My membership in the National Volunteers of the Philippines had given me an insight into their character. Yet, this upsurge of feeling on November 15, 1935, was something I had never experienced before.

It was the emotion of a people who were taking the first great forward step toward the freedom for which they longed. It must have been comparable to the feelings of Americans upon the signing of the Articles of Confederation when we took the first step toward the

establishment of our Constitution. The Filipino people knew that, under their new Commonwealth Government, they were moving forward to the day of complete independence—guaranteed to them by an act of the United States Congress.

During the more than 6 years of peace that followed the Commonwealth Government grew in stature and in influence. Filipinos who were little more than children at the time of the establishment of the commonwealth had cast their first vote. The American way of life was familiar to them. They knew not only where we lived and how we lived, but they knew our reasons for living the way we do. They had freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of assemblage—the same rights guaranteed to us under our Constitution.

Leaders had been brought to the forefront. The names Manuel Quezon and Sergio Osmeña represented wisdom in the relations of the Filipino people with their friends everywhere in the world. Filipinos had confidence in their elected legislature which made the laws, in their judiciary which interpreted the laws and in their executive department which enforced the laws. Orderliness and respect for law has made deep inroads into the Filipino national character.

When, on December 8, 1941, the full strength of Japan, the aggressor, was launched at the Philippines, the combined American-Filipino armed forces may not have been prepared to meet that assault. But, the Filipino people were mentally, morally, and spiritually ready. Their respect for the orderly processes of law—for the Commonwealth Government—was too deeply imbedded in their minds and their hearts to be torn out, even by the brutal bayonet of their oppressors.

If there was ever a question as to the mutual good faith existing between American and Filipino that question was killed as they both were killed at Bataan and on Corregidor. Doubt fell along the roadside on the march of death. Suspicion vanished as Americans joined Filipinos in the bush on raids against their common enemy.

It is easy to pay tribute to a brave people. History honors Leonidas and his Spartans who held Greece from the Persian hordes. It speaks in awed tones of Horatius at the Bridge. It tells of triumph in defeat like that of Custer at Little Bighorn.

Yet, it is not so easy to pay tribute to the Filipinos—although none were more brave than they. It is difficult to single out individuals for praise when the entire people were heroes. By giving in to the Japanese, the Filipinos might have secured surcease from their sufferings. But the spiritual children of Rizal and Pilar did not choose the way of least resistance. They chose to fight for the restoration of that political and economic progress toward their day of eventual independence that had marked their life under the Commonwealth Government. They chose that way even if it meant the risk of death to them and torture to their loved ones.

Too much cannot be said of how the Filipino guerrillas harried the Japanese enemy for four long years, striking at them from southern Mindanao to northern Luzon. Nor can too much be said of the capable, intelligent manner in which those same Filipino guerrillas supplied valuable information concerning the movements of the Japanese to our armed services. It was this contribution which helped to blast the three enemy fleets in the battle for Leyte Gulf, our subsequent initial landings in Leyte, our combined march of liberation from island to island, and to the liberation of the Philippines which made that region one of the greatest staging bases in all history had it been necessary to utilize it as such for our final defeat of Japan.

It must be emphasized now—and continue to be emphasized—that the battle for the liberation of the Philippines was a joint effort of Filipinos and Americans. The participation of Americans in that effort restored the Filipinos to their homes that much quicker. The participation of Filipinos in that effort was in great part responsible for the saving of many thousands of American lives. Americans used the radio and dropped leaflets to keep the Filipinos informed as to what was going on in the outside world, while the Filipinos, by wireless and by communications carried on through the intermediary of American submarines, kept our military and naval leaders in touch with Filipino guerrilla strength and enemy deployment of troops and supplies.

Today the Filipino people are celebrating their first Commonwealth Day in 4 years, in peace. But Manila is not the same. Her once beautiful streets, her colorful public squares are pitted with shell holes. Her architectual jewels are in ruins. Many of her citizens are homeless. Wrecks of enemy ships clutter the bottom of her proud harbor. The Pearl of the Orient has been laid waste.

Still, here, where Pilar and Rizal once walked, stand the timeless souls of men and women who are no less proud, who loved their fellow men as much as did the patriots of old. Manuel Quezon is dead. He served his people manfully in cementing the indestructible ties of friendship between all Filipinos and Americans. He, too, will be there in spirit.

But President Sergio Osmeña, of the Philippine Commonwealth, lives.

In President Osmeña—in the career of one man—there is a link that joins the pre-Commonwealth Philippines, the Commonwealth Philippines of 1925–41, the embattled Commonwealth of 1941–45, and the just and triumphant Philippine Commonwealth of postwar days, as the Filipino people approach the tremendous responsibilities of independence. We admire and respect him here in the United States. We know that he is a prophet with honor in his own land.

What of the future?

Our first duty is to get the necessities of life to the Filipino people. That is the primary task. The Filipino people must have food, shelter, clothing, education, and medicine. I say "education" in its widest sense, since only an informed people can continue to be a free people. When the basic necessities are provided, then we can put into practice those measures necessary for the stabilization of Filipino economy. We will not rest until we have done all we possibly can for this gallant, determined, law-abiding people.

I am sure that both Filipinos and Americans greet this Commonwealth Day with a prayer. We pray that what we have done in war and peace has not been in vain. We pray that the Commonwealth Government, when the wounds of war heal, will become the gateway to Philippine independence. We pray that the friendship which now exists between our two peoples will endure and grow as other Commonwealth Days are celebrated in the streets of Manila, the Pearl of the Orient.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN AND SERVICEWOMEN IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called attention to the way American soldiers and sailors were being delayed at Okinawa. Today, under permission to extend my remarks, I am putting in the RECORD an article which recently appeared in the Daily Pacifican, giving an outline of the situation as it exists in Manila. I should like to have everyone here read it because it gives another picture of what now is the most important demobilization problem to be solved in the country at the present time. If the Army and the Navy and the War Shipping Administration need anything additional to solve this problem, I feel certain that all they have to do is to request Congress to give it to them. Meanwhile, Congress has provided enough to solve the supply problems of the war, and certainly that material and the money are still available in sufficient quantity to bring these men home in the near future, if the same ingenuity and effort will only be given to it. Congress can provide the authority and the money. It has done so. The executives and the administrators—all appointees of the President—must place the ships and the planes at the proper places.

VETERANS AND SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a veteran detailing his difficulties in purchasing surplus property.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, veterans are still being given the run-around as they seek to purchase surplus property.

Edwin L. Johnson, a recently discharged petty officer, a businessman, and vice commander of the Warren Black Post, American Legion, Ottawa, Kans., has written me detailing his efforts to purchase a car for use as a sales manager.

That letter follows and tells the story in his own words:

Hon. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
Representative, Second Congressional District of Kansas, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

An open letter.

DEAR MR. SCRIVNER: This letter constitutes an urgent request for your cooperation in putting an immediate end to a situation which is thoroughly shameful and an utter disgrace to a Nation as great as ours is supposed to be.

Specifically, the so-called sale of surplus military goods to the World War II veteran by the RFC, the Department of Commerce, and more recently by the RFC. Their methods of offering certain merchandise for sale is literally a game of baiting the GI Joe with a rosy prospect, then letting him down with a quick, cruel thud.

As an individual, and as a World War II veteran, I openly charge the United States Department of Commerce with deceit that borders on actual fraud in the offering for sale of certain war surpluses to veterans. I further charge that the Department of Commerce and RFC have given definite encouragement to black-market operations by their methods of administrating said surpluses.

Your particular attention is called to the fact that, despite the so-called transfer of surplus sales from the Department of Commerce to the RFC, November 5, the Kansas City branch continues to operate with the same personnel and the same policy as before the transfer. The GI gets the same pushing around as before and then ends up with the same disillusionment. The whole system is a tragic farce and at the expense of the war-weary veteran who expected a "break" on his return home and receives only a "kick in the teeth" from those he fought to protect.

Please understand that GI Joe isn't the least interested in the personal mud slinging of William S. Bradley and W. Stuart Symington and their accusations of incompetency on the part of the other. What he does care about is the fact that he is helping to pay for a billion dollars' worth of brains in Washington and isn't getting a dime's worth of properly directed effort. Tossing the hot potato of surplus disposal to veterans back and forth between one or two or three Government agencies isn't going to help the situation one whit.

As an individual World War II veteran I want a clear-cut, workable program on the sale of surplus goods, so I may buy that which I need to maintain my job or business; buy it quickly with no waste of time; and most particularly buy it at a fair price. Your aid in accomplishing this objective is urgently solicited.

To assist you in whatever efforts you may expend in behalf of the World War II veteran, I herewith present a detailed record of my own recent experience in attempting to purchase surplus goods. This report will substantiate my charges of deceit bordering on fraud and encouragement of black-market operations. I could readily add to these charges one of conspiracy to evade the intent of the law recognizing the rights of veterans to reestablish themselves by purchasing surplus goods on a priority basis, on a fair and equitable price basis.

Please note that I was accompanied at all times by another War II veteran during every interview mentioned and on each trip and inspection. At the time the surplus property was inspected at Fort Riley a third noninterested businessman accompanied us and assisted in making a written record of our findings.

Having definite need for automotive transportation to maintain my position as a salesman of farm equipment, I made the usual rounds of automobile dealers and found nothing that could be depended upon. Continuing my search, I found good dependable cars available for purchase, but all at sky high black-market prices. Newspapers carried information to the effect that Government surplus automobiles could be purchased by veterans by following a certain procedure. Another veteran with 100 percent disability and an established need for a car elected to accompany me to see what could be accomplished.

The first step was to motor 75 miles to the nearest SWPC office in Kansas City, Mo. Arriving there we found a long line of veterans also hoping to obtain surplus property, standing in the hallways of the Interstate Mutual Building. After a couple of hours in line, we were admitted to the SWPC offices, where we presented our discharge papers and credentials certifying our need for an automobile. There we found it necessary to fill out three long forms reminiscent of induction days. This routine completed, we were advised that priority certificates would be mailed to us in a few days. We were also advised that our chances of obtaining a car were not very good. No specific reason was given for the discouragement. It was suggested that we call at the Department of Commerce to discuss the matter prior to our returning to Ottawa to await our certificates.

Following up this suggestion, we called at the Commerce office at 2605 Walnut and received a cool reception as we did not actually have the priority certificates. A Mr. Brown gave us some encouragement and stated that a catalog listing all surplus vehicles would be available within the next few days. He agreed to mail us this catalog promptly upon receipt. He further advised that if the catalog listed cars in which we were interested, we should immediately go to the locality where they were stored and personally inspect them. While there, we were to list several choices by code number and return to his office and make an application to purchase.

After receiving this information we returned to Ottawa and patiently awaited the receipt of the priority certificates and the official catalog.

Five days after calling on the SWPC, we received our priority certificates. They were issued as of November 2, 1945, and carried the stipulation, Search Expiration Date January 2, 1946. This notation meant nothing upon receipt of the certificate, but in the light of subsequent events, it assumed enormous proportions. In effect, it means the priority certificate is a hunting license for 60 days (when hunting is extraordinarily poor) and after that you are out of luck.

After waiting for several more days for the Department of Commerce catalog, which had failed to arrive, a long distance telephone call was placed to the previously mentioned Mr. Brown. We were advised that the catalog had become indefinite; however, he had just received word that a number of passenger cars and station wagons were available for inspection at Fort Riley, Kans.

Our next step was to drive 140 miles to Fort Riley for the inspection. We found a few broken-down, smashed and badly travel-worn vehicles (one car excepted), most of which were too far gone to even consider. In the check of speedometers, we were amazed to discover all of the passenger cars had mileages from 31,000 odd to 43,000 odd. Later when in the Kansas City RFC Department of Commerce office, we were brazenly informed those mileages were actual. We were asked to believe an obvious improbability. Plain logic leaves no conclusion other than that premeditated deceit is practiced in attempting to foster off these wrecks upon trusting and gullible GI's.

To continue, five vehicles in various states of repair were selected as possible purchases at the right price. It was agreed by all three persons making the inspection that each vehicle (with one exception) would require from three to five hundred dollars of repair and reconditioning to make it serviceable and dependable. The code and serial numbers of the cars selected were listed according to our instructions.

Before leaving the grounds an employee bluntly stated that most cars entering the surplus pool had good rubber tires, which were switched before being placed on the lot. The largest portion of cars in the pool had no tires at all, with those in evidence in a sad state of repair. Later, in Kansas City, we were informed by the disposal agency that it was news to them to learn the cars had no tires or batteries, and that important operating parts such as timers, pumps and carburetors were also missing.

Our party completed the inspection too late in the day to go on to Kansas City, so returned to Ottowa. The following day we again motored to Kansas City and called at the Department of Commerce office, now under control of the RFC. We met the same Mr. Brown at the same desk. We handed him our list of numbers covering the cars selected, an exact copy of which follows:

No. 1 selection: 1940 tudor Ford sedan; code numbers: 3-DU USA 110810; serial, 6135077.

No. 2 selection: 1941 Ford station wagon; code numbers: DF-175 SB9-2 461-811 BB-18-623389.

No. 3 selection: 1941 Chevrolet business coupe; code numbers: DF-176 SB-2 461-811 AC-83064.

No. 4 selection: 1941 Plymouth 4-door sedan; code numbers: P-9 1448462 USA 137059.

No. 5 selection: 1940 Ford tudor sedan; code numbers: DU-794 W126779; report No. 13.

Mr. Brown consulted numerous books and came up with the following comments and quotes:

Selection No. 1: "I have no record of this car, the number indicates it is still in the process of being transferred to us."

Selection No. 2: "You can have this one for $1,220."

Selection No. 3: "This was sold long ago."

Selection No. 4: "The number shows it has not yet been declared surplus."

Selection No. 5: "The DU number is too high for my books. I have no record of it, so can tell you nothing."

Please consider the foregoing thoroughly, Mr. SCRIVNER. Five cars selected; three not so badly damaged or worn that an expenditure either large or small might place them in fair operating condition. No information on them; yet, they were situated in the heart of the surplus-vehicle pool. Three hundred yards away were rows upon rows of empty vehicle storage sheds. If these cars were actually in the process of being transferred to surplus, why not in storage there until the declaration was complete?

Selection No. 2, a 1941 Ford station wagon with extremely poor tires and most all important motor parts missing and the motor condition most questionable, was quoted at the unbelievable price of $1,220. A $600 price would be a questionable value. Investigation proved this figure to be an OPA low ceiling for "as is" condition. Further investigation brought forth the fact that if I were to purchase this car for $1,220 and spent $600 repairing it, I could not legitimately resell it for $1,520, the regular ceiling for a car with a nonmilitary record. If these prices prevail throughout, then it is my contention that our War II veterans are being played for suckers with the usual pushing around as a part of it. The setting of the speedometers to a certain mileage, the switching of tires, and the removal of parts bears out this contention.

Your particular attention is called to the No. 3 car selected, the best of the entire lot, with promise of a minimum of repair work to make it dependable and usable. The statement that it was "sold" long ago. To whom? At what price? And when? This can be traced and all above questions answered.

What about the three other cars with fair possibilities? Are they being held out for favored people with the proper connections?

We asked Mr. Brown about the procedure followed by car dealers. He stated as follows: "They go to another section and bid on the cars job lot, sight unseen, in quantities of 15 or 20." The price? "Hard to tell, but you can guess."

Expressing our dissatisfaction over the entire set-up, we were advised that a group of five International station wagons were at Camp Crowder that we could go and inspect if we liked. Mr. Brown was good enough this time to tell us the cars were in R-3 condition, described as terrible, and priced them all over a thousand dollars. Needless to say, we did not go to Camp Crowder, but returned to Ottawa much embittered over the whole situation.

We lost several days of good working time. We motored a total of nearly 600 miles, only to find the so-called break for the returned veteran was pure flim-flam and hokum. If millions of returning GI's go through this same useless procedure, what do you suppose will happen? I am certain that I know.

May I have your help for 11,000,000 swell people?

Very truly yours,

EDWIN L. JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, this is but one of thousands of similar cases. It was to eliminate at least a part of these complaints, unjustifiable abuses, delays, and waste that I introduced H. R. 4390, to amend the Surplus Property Act. This bill has the approval of the American Legion and VFW. As yet the committee on expenditures in executive departments has taken no action. I take this opportunity to urge haste. This measure makes purchases simple and direct for personal as well as business use, with priority immediately under that of the States and municipalities, and, of course, it brings the veterans in ahead of the dealers.

Mr. Speaker, these veterans are tired of being pushed around, and I do not blame them. If they want to buy a car, a station wagon, a truck, a jeep, a camera, a shotgun, a flying suit, or any other item of surplus for any purpose, they should be able to do so easily and directly.

Mr. Speaker, the entire atmosphere is becoming charged with ugly rumors and whispered stories about surplus sales which are so many and varied that there seems to be every reason for the Rules Committee to consider House Resolution 385, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER] or some similar resolution which would enable a House Committee to thoroughly investigate every phase of surplus sales, including complaints by veterans, such as the one above.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans deserve better breaks than they are getting in their efforts to purchase surplus materials. Apparently, the only way they will get them is through congressional action, which must not be long delayed.

TRANSPORTATION HOME FOR VETERANS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, while so many of our ships, available for transport duty, are tied up in the harbors idle—there are untold thousands of our servicemen, long eligible for discharge, stranded upon foreign lands and upon God-forsaken islands wanting to come home. There were ample ships to transport our boys to foreign lands for war, but since the war is over, and these boys are eligible for discharge, they are usually advised that "there is no transportation available." These boys want to come home. They have completed their task—and they did it well. The very least that we can do for them now is to urge the Navy to speed up the task of bringing these boys, many of whom have been eligible for discharge for a long time, back to their homeland so they may be discharged and return to their homes. Many of these boys are married, and they desire to return to their homes and families; many of them are farmers and others have businesses, and they are greatly distressed because of their absence from their work, since this war is over; many of them have jobs in our plants, mills, and factories awaiting them, and many of these boys are awaiting the time when they may return home and again enter school so they may complete their schooling, which was so suddenly interrupted when they were taken into the service of their country. The education of these boys must not be interrupted longer, since their services are not now needed in the Army and Navy, and the component parts thereof. Their lives are before them, and they must be given the opportunity to secure their education.

I have received communications from these boys still in the service from all over the world, and I know their greatest desire is to be returned to their homes as speedily as possible. They do not approve of the attitude of the Navy in taking ships, available for transporting troops back home, being taken out of duty. That is so unfair to these boys who are eligible for discharge. That simply requires them to remain longer, merely marking time, without any duty to perform of importance—while our boys, all heroes, simply await the time when some transport ship may bring them back to the United States, and in many cases the boys do not know when that day will come.

This morning I received a circular from T5 Harlan H. Bauer, who is serving with the Twenty-ninth Replacement Depot, entitled "Get the Boys Back Home," and with it was a poem, evidently written by some one of our boys who is waiting—waiting for a ship to bring him home, so he may again resume his work in civil life, and since that poem gives true expression to the feeling of the boys, who are stranded for the present, I incorporate it, herewith, with the unanimous consent of the House. Said poem follows:

The fray is over, the battles are won
There is no more death or loud sound of gun.
Everything's quiet from Guam to Japan,
So why must we stay in this foreign land?

We bore it all then—the filth and the grime
But now we want Freedom, please don't waste time.

We are not robots; we're men wanting to live
We've given our best—what more can we give?

We fought for years and at long last have won
And now that it's over the moment has come
To get us all home—and, please, right away
To live our lives in our own U. S. A.

We have the largest fleet on the seas
So we beg and we pray on our bended knees
Just make one more last wonderful trip
To take us all home. Please give us a ship.

This poem, Mr. Speaker, expresses the wish and the will of our servicemen all over the world. And, may I say that every boy in the service, who is now eligible for discharge under the rather slow processes of both the Army and Navy, should be returned to our country at once, and then discharged promptly, so he may have an equal chance in the future with all others. I urge the Navy to do its part in finishing the job. Use every available ship until the boys are home again—and nothing less will satisfy the people, and the servicemen.

AMENDING NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 391, an act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out line 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what this bill does?

Mr. MASON. The bill proposes to exempt veterans from the payment of fees to secure duplicate documents in connection with their declaration of intention or their certificate of naturalization. That is all it does.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article relating to the Regular Veterans' Association and also a newspaper article.

Mr. THOMASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement made this morning before the Committee on Military Affairs by General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a study by various Government agencies on unemployment compensation.

ARMY CAMPS AND CANTONMENTS IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months I have received numerous complaints from American Army men stationed in the Philippines as to the terrible sanitary conditions in the camps where they are stationed.

Many of these letters covered conditions in the vicinity of Manila.

I turned over to the War Department about 20 of these epistles in an effort to see if that agency would not alleviate the plight of our men who had already suffered the terrors of war and who are entitled to something decent now that the peace has come. I had hoped that these conditions would be corrected.

In the last 10 days, however, I have received letters from Leyte, from men who are not gripers, but good, substantial, American boys, many of whom I have known since their birth, all of whom would willingly suffer real privations if it were necessary. In their letters they tell of living in indescribable filth, of abominable sanitation, of 1 to 3 hours' wait on chow lines in order to receive food that is very often cold, insufficient, and improperly prepared. Conditions such as these might exist in wartime and be excused, but there can be no excuse now several months after the cessation of hostilities. The wealthiest Nation in the world has a great obligation to take care of these men, regardless of in what quarter of the earth they may be stationed, to see that they are properly clothed, housed, fed, and that their morale is kept at a high pitch. This indeed is the least we owe them.

If these conditions are not improved, it is my intention to call upon this Congress within a short time for a full investigation of these far eastern camps and cantonments.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Dr. Lyle B. Borst, of the Oak Ridge scientists.

RADIO ELECTRICIAN AND MACHINISTS UNION

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have filed a third petition from the Radio Electrician and Machinists Union, of Minneapolis, Minn. They are doing the same as most people are doing. They are wondering why this House does not get to business and legislate. Why do not these committees bring these bills before the House? If you want to have an adjournment, then do it now and cut out some of the talk, or get to business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Dr. C. Alphonso Smith at the unveiling of a monument in Goshen Pass, Va., to Commodore Matthew Fontaine Maury.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Joseph Leib.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Richard L. Neuberger.

Mr. SAVAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on November 27, for 30 minutes, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, I have listened to the many witnesses who have appeared to express their views on the proper way to control atomic energy. The bill before our committee was intended to deal only with domestic control, but what is bothering the country more is the international aspects of this problem. I have come to the decision that if whatever production secrets we have are imparted to the rest of the world, particularly to Russia, we should drive high stakes and horse-trade to the *n*th degree. First, an adequate number of atomic bombs should be produced to secure the defense of our own country and in sufficient numbers to keep our commitment with other nations toward preserving the peace of the world. Then we should say to Russia and other governments who have ostensibly joined in the United Nations Organization that we are willing to share the secrets of the bomb and its production on the condition that we be given freedom of opportunity to inspect, investigate, and have full and complete knowledge of their military secrets, patents, inventions, and territorial aims.

The smoke that arose from Hiroshima and Nagasaki was no more dense than the fog that enshrouds Russia's intentions. Why should we take them into our confidence when, aside from the atomic bomb, they know everything about us and we know nothing about them. In my opinion, it is time to eliminate career diplomacy and substitute horse trading so we do not lose our shirts.

This very day, before the Military Affairs Committee, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower answered "No" to a question propounded by me, "Would you favor sharing our military secrets with any nation that knows everything about us and we know nothing about them?"

RELEASE OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include some excerpts and letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that it would not be necessary for the Congress to intervene by legislative action to get the men home from the Pacific and from the Atlantic. It is the duty of the Army and Navy Departments to do that. It looks like, however, that it is necessary for Congress to take legislative action. I have signed the discharge petition filed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I hope we get enough signatures to that petition to get action on his bill. I do not think it is fair to hold men with high discharge scores overseas. I receive letters nearly every day, as you do, from men who have far more points for discharge than the required minimum. Some of them have families. Many of them say they are doing nothing but sitting around. Every time we contact the War and Navy Departments about this, we are told that the bottleneck is a lack of shipping. While shipping may be scarce, the men indicate to me that they believe more shipping space could be provided, and I also believe more shipping provision could be made. I believe, if the Army and Navy had pursued the same diligence in getting the men back that they did in getting them over there, they would have had them back. Of course, I know that Congress has been very active in urging the Army and Navy to expedite the discharge of men. I have written or called the War Department and also the Navy Department countless times and I have written commanding officers both in the States and overseas a great many times. In fact, a great part of my work for the past several weeks since VJ-day has been directed in the direction of trying to help the men and women get restored to their homes. I am glad that considerable progress along this line has been made. In fact, I understand the Army and Navy have reached the point of discharging around 60,000 men a day. But there are still some high-score men overseas who

should be brought back immediately. Again, there are men in this country with pretty high scores and who write me that they are not doing a thing. They feel that they should be discharged and I cannot see why it should not be done.

I have always supported the Army and Navy and I give the heads of both the Army and Navy great credit for their leadership in this great war, but I do feel that they could have gotten these high-score men from the Pacific and from Europe sooner. A considerable number of men who went through all the trials of war and now have high discharge scores are still over there. I want them brought back right away, and if it is necessary for Congress to pass a bill to get it done, I am ready to do it.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CLINTON P. ANDERSON

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I learn from the newspapers that our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, is going out over the country on a campaign tour to get votes for the New Deal. He is being sent out to find why the farmers are voting Republican. He could do a great deal better by staying back at his desk in Washington and tuning his ear to the ground and listening to what the farmers have to say. He would get more information than he can take to them. He is a pleasing gentleman, has been a good insurance agent. But he does not have the answer to the farm problem. And he cannot sell the farmers a gold brick. The farmers of the country are through with the New Deal—that is why they have been voting Republican. I can say now that the farmers of this country are not going to be fooled into following Lawrence of Pennsylvania, Hague of Jersey City, Kelly of Chicago, or Pendergast of Kansas City; they are just not that type. The salvation of America depends on the farm vote and they are going to stay true to American ideals and sound constructive government, they know what is good for America. And the farm vote will save America.

LOAN TO ENGLAND

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend my remarks by inserting an article from the Wall Street Journal and also a short article by George Rothwell Brown.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, November 13, there is an article entitled "Ballyhoo for Britain—Top United States Agencies Map Drive To Make Public Favor Loan to England. State Department Has 100-Page Plan to Use Radio, Press, Off-Record Talks."

Mr. Speaker, in the text of this article, which I insert at the end of my remarks, it will be observed that it is stated that unpublicized governmental polls of public opinion disclose that 70 percent of the American people are against a large credit to Britain.

A momentous question, therefore, is raised as to whether we are, in fact, going to continue to have a government of the people and by the people or a government in which public opinion is manipulated by huge expenditures of taxpayers' money.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the program set forth in this article for the mobilization of public opinion in support of this loan is in direct and flagrant violation of section 201, of title 18, of the United States Code. That section of the code provides that—

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that it was through the violation of the fundamental principles upon which this statute is based that the demagogs of Europe were enabled to establish their totalitarian dictatorships.

Not long ago Mr. Baruch, one of the elder statesmen and a strong supporter of the administration which has been in power for 12 years, gave the sage advice to the American people that they estimate their personal resources carefully before they grant any more foreign loans.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States already owes over $260,000,000,000. Furthermore, it is demonstrable that the United States is not a creditor nation. An analysis of our financial situation last spring disclosed on short-term balances that we were indebted to the world for $5,600,000,000. To be sure, the situation of the United States was somewhat more favorable in respect to long-term balances, but an examination of our international financial situation disclosed the incontestable fact that we were in debt to the world for $1,200,000,000.

It seems strange, Mr. Speaker, that I should have to mention the fact that it is impossible to make money by selling goods to bankrupts; nevertheless, it is necessary to make that statement, because the American people must not be deluded by misinformation, false information, or manipulated information regarding the situation of those who seek to borrow from us.

It should be perfectly obvious, Mr. Speaker, that Britain is bankrupt. If anybody has any doubts upon the question, they have only to read the news reports of the various propositions which have been made to our Government in respect to advances, which the British Cabinet feel are necessary in order to carry on their Government. It wanted first a gift because they could not afford a loan. When that idea seemed unwelcome, then the British said all right, call it a loan but put in a proviso that they would not have to pay, if it were inconvenient to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly clear that it is to gloss over the fundamental facts of the situation we now face, that, as stated in the Wall Street Journal:

Five top Government agencies are mobilizing their opinion-manufacturing machinery for a campaign which will start soon and which officials say will be running at full tilt by December, when Members of Congress probably will be home listening to constituents.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, our Government should not consider the granting of a loan to Britain unless the British put up collateral to secure the payment of principal and interest. For example, the British are in control of copper mines, tin mines, and other mines of base metals of great economic value throughout the world. It seems to me that it would be particularly appropriate for a socialist government, which has undertaken a program of nationalizing great public resources, to allocate a percentage of the output of those mines, at a determined value, toward the annual payment of interest and the amortization of the debt.

Lord Keynes, who, up to the arrival of the British Prime Minister, has been the chief negotiator of the British loan, in a paper read to the economics section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in August 1938, stated that loans secured by raw materials were a preferred means of supplying British exchange to foreign nations. Among other things, he said:

But, on the other hand, here is an opportunity for a substantial volume of foreign investment, where the capital involved is absolutely safe. And in these days that is a primary consideration. We should be enabled by this technique to make loans, where for other reasons we might desire to make them—in southeastern Europe, for example—on the absolute security of commodities physically situated within this country.

This excellent advice was given to England in its relationship with other bankrupt nations. Naturally, as the chief pleader for a bankrupt nation, Lord Keynes' viewpoint now has taken a somersault. That fact, however, does not make his advice to the British in their relationship to bankrupt nations less good, if we appropriate it for ourselves in our relation with bankrupt nations.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a shocking example of loose financing to see the executive branch of our Government grant long terms to some bankrupt nations at a lower rate of interest than the interest which the United States is paying on its long term domestic obligations.

Mr. Speaker, we can all understand why the State Department feels the necessity for a hundred-page-propaganda program at this moment. We are concluding a Victory Loan drive in which the United States is borrowing money at 2½ percent on its long-term obligations, of which a large part of the proceeds, we

understand, will in all probability be loaned to Britain at a far lower rate and for an even longer term. It will certainly take a fog of words and double talk to justify this kind of financing. I ask the House to consider what possible justification there is for our executive branch of the Government to regard the credit of Britain as superior to that of the United States.

Unless, Mr. Speaker, our Government takes some of the precautions set forth above, the $4,000,000,000 which Britain wants will not constitute a loan, it will be a gift, because Britain is already in default for $6,500,000,000 advanced to her in the course of and following the First World War.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of the House to the fact that we have never had even a pretense of adequate reciprocal payments on advances to Britain under lend-lease. For example, I think our Government should demand as a condition precedent to a grant of any accommodation whatsoever to the British Government, that the British cede absolutely and without any restriction of a political or economic nature, all air bases on British territory contiguous to the United States which have been built with American money by American engineers from Newfoundland to Trinidad during the course of the past war.

We should also demand as a condition precedent to any grant in aid to Britain that the British give free access to American commercial air lines to all airports in British territory.

Finally, I suggest we demand that the British cede to the United States all British claims to territory in the Antarctic region. While I grant at this time these territories may not appear to be of great value, at least, you may be sure, the British would not maintain their claims to these territories in the Antarctic if they thought such territories were worthless.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the desirability of maintaining friendly relations with the British upon the highest level, but before closing my remarks I feel constrained to point out that this position of maintaining friendly relations with the British is definitely a two-way proposition. We have heard in this House very recently some eloquent words upon this subject from the Prime Minister of England, but when it comes to deeds we see Britain using all sorts of devices to block American enterprises abroad. For example, let me call your attention to some facts set forth by George Rothwell Brown in an article published in the New York Journal-American of October 23 of this year, which I insert here as part of my remarks:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, October 23.—British determination to prevent American competition within the Empire in the postwar world of commerce and business is not only holding up reconversion but in many cases must be actually detrimental to British interests.

Certainly this policy has proved detrimental to the United States.

For example, one of the largest American oil companies, with extensive interests in the Far East, whose business was virtually destroyed in many parts of Asia by the Japanese invasion, prepared early last summer to be ready to move right back and begin operations as soon as the Japs surrendered.

Application was made for material requirements in excess of $2,000,000 for the rehabilitation of terminal and distribution facilities at Singapore and elsewhere in the Federated Malay States.

It appears that the application was made at the suggestion of the Foreign Division of the Petroleum Administration for War.

The application was approved by PAW and also by the Foreign Petroleum Requirements Committee. Thus all the American agencies concerned were helpful in trying to get a great American industry back on its feet in the Far East.

But then a snag was struck. The application was submitted in routine procedure to the Washington representative of the British Petroleum Office for the Ministry of Fuel and Power in London. This was in June.

Months passed without action. Finally in September, London reported that approval of the application would be granted, provided—and here was the catch—"that all the material required be procured from sterling sources."

This amounted to a refusal by the British Government to permit the importation of American manufactured materials and equipment into the Federated Malay States, although no question of dollar exchange was involved in the proposed transaction, the original application having been made on a no-dollars-required basis.

But that wasn't all. It developed upon inquiry that British Empire sources would be unable to supply the materials except after long delays, up to 12 months.

American industry was ready to supply the materials almost at once.

Moreover, the cost quoted by the British was from 35 to 50 per cent in excess of the American price.

With regard to the tanks required, the price quoted by the British was 50 percent higher than the American price, and the British would require 14 months for delivery, as against 90 days by the American bidder.

[From the Wall Street Journal of November 13, 1945]

BALLYHOO FOR BRITAIN—TOP UNITED STATES AGENCIES MAP DRIVE TO MAKE PUBLIC FAVOR LOAN TO ENGLAND—STATE DEPARTMENT HAS 100-PAGE PLAN: TO USE RADIO, PRESS, OFF-RECORD TALKS—7 OF 10 NOW OPPOSE CREDIT

WASHINGTON.—The American public is expected to drop its opposition to a loan for Britain between now and the turn of the year.

It won't happen by accident.

Five top Government agencies are mobilizing their opinion-manufacturing machinery for a campaign which will start soon and which officials say will be running at full tilt by December, when Members of Congress will be home listening to constituents. The payoff will be legislative action in January.

Between now and then the pressure will pile up. Some maneuvering will be in public view, carefully timed. Speeches will be made by Cabinet members, for instance. Some of it will be a bit more obscure; the Government aims to help in preparation of many a magazine article, Sunday newspaper feature, and privately sponsored radio programs plugging the loan.

MANY OFF-THE-RECORD SESSIONS

A great deal of the activity will be entirely behind the scenes. Plans are afoot for off-the-record sessions in Washington and other cities from coast to coast, in which officials will indoctrinate businessmen, clubwomen, labor and farm leaders, and representatives of literally hundreds of miscellaneous organizations—all carefully chosen for maximum influence on public thinking.

Religious leaders, both ministers and laymen, will be among those welcomed to Washington for education, officials say, much as during the campaign to sell the Bretton Woods monetary plan.

Meanwhile, representatives of Britain in the United States have been specifically instructed to keep quiet about the projected loan.

The American strategy is all drawn up. It is incorporated in a State Department document bulking 100 pages or so which has been distributed to key officials in the Treasury Department, Commerce Department, Federal Reserve Board, and Agriculture Department.

STUDY SHOWS 70 PERCENT OPPOSE CREDIT

This includes a section entitled, "Special Report on Public Attitudes on Foreign Policy," based upon unpublicized governmental polls of public opinion. This study, which also includes analyses of press and radio comment, is understood to show that about 70 percent of the American people are presently against a large credit for Britain.

The present tactics were decided upon after a battle which for a time rocked the State Department. A group of top officials outside that agency demanded that a "high-powered" publicity expert be hired to run the campaign for popularization of the British loan. But after a tussle it was decided "at a high level" that this could backfire, so the job of planning and directing was left to a little-known division of the State Department which has proved its mettle in previous drives.

This is the Office of Public Affairs, whose acting head is Francis H. Russell, a Boston lawyer who came to the State Department in 1941 and first worked on economic warfare and the blacklisting of foreign firms tainted by Axis influence.

OTHER CAMPAIGNS GO ON

Mr Russell contends—doubtless quite correctly—that the British loan campaign will not dwarf other drives on public opinion which his division has carried on with little uproar. These include popularization of the food and agriculture organization, the International Aviation Conference, some inter-American pow-wows, the big hullabaloo for the Dumbarton Oaks plan, and minor campaigns like one for the St. Lawrence waterway.

This work goes on constantly. A few days ago a group of industrialists were invited to Washington for the correct "background" on UNRRA. "Off-the-record" meetings were held recently in Washington, New York, Chicago, Denver, and San Francisco to further the cause of a projected global educational and cultural organization. Late last week an influential group of Washington representatives of national organizations was lectured privately on preparations going on in London for the start of the United Nations security organization.

At least one governmental memorandum has referred to such activities as propaganda. Members of Mr. Russell's staff never use this word themselves, they contend. They wince even when the word "selling" pops up. "We like to think we're meeting a demand for information," they explain.

ion, analyzing the returns, together with press and radio comment, and compounding his reports in document which are stamped

S. Shepard Jones is in charge of Mr. Russell's Public Attitudes Section, which, with funds not appropriated for that purpose by Congress, is engaged in polling public opin- "confidential."

Chester Williams is in charge of Group Relations, among other things, arranging an average of one speech each day by some State Department official somewhere in the coun-

try. He also fixes up the background conferences. For instance, 120 organizations will be in Washington November 26, under auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, to hear private talks by Under Secretary Acheson, Assistant Secretary Clayton, and others on the British loan and other matters, officials say.

HELPS ON DATA FOR ARTICLES

Mrs. Margaret Carter is in charge of a section to which folk are shuttled when they come to the State Department in search of information for magazine stories, radio scripts, or what not. She gives them the proper angle and arranges interviews with Department dignitaries.

Mrs. Delia Kuhn is in command of Public Views and Inquiries, a special writing service which helps publish governmental pamphlets and which answers letters that pour into the agency from the populace. These average 400 daily, but in times of excitement, as during the San Francisco Conference, they hit a rate of 5,500 a day.

Though the State Department occupies a central position in the British loan campaign, it is flanked by strong supporters. Mr. Russell says that liaison is maintained at a high level by conferences between top State Department officials and Treasury Secretary Vinson, Commerce Secretary Wallace, and Federal Reserve Board Chairman Eccles. He did not mention any ranking official at the Agriculture Department, which is also participating.

Interdepartmental ballyhoo is supported even more effectively at a lower working level by mobilization of the public-relations experts of all five departments. A representative of each goes to Mr. Russell's office for briefing on the campaign.

OTHER ORGANS AVAILABLE

The resources of these agencies can be rather staggering when fully mobilized. For example, the Agriculture Department, if it wishes to pull all the stops, can use these organs among others:

A Nation-wide extension service, with an editor in each State who can supply rural papers with stories about the markets for farm products which might result from foreign lending.

County agents, and 4–H Club organizations, where information can be passed by word of mouth.

The AAA organization, including State and local committees empowered to adopt resolutions and hold meetings on the basis of material prepared in Washington if they choose.

Services supplied direct to farm papers, journals, and radio stations.

Agricultural councils in all States and counties, able to reach local facilities of publicity.

The Commerce Department has numerous publications, and doubtless can play on its close connections with trade organizations. The Federal Reserve Board has its own publication, and its representatives, like those of the Treasury, can be influential in speechmaking and private word-of-mouth contact with opinion.

It must be clear that activities such as I have reviewed are clearly a violation of the criminal statutes. It is high time the administrative officials of the Government should be made to obey the laws.

As a last word, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that inasmuch as an analysis of the international financial situation last spring disclosed the fact that the world at large had $20,000,000,000 in assets with which it could buy American goods, I, therefore, suggest that it may at this moment be a great mistake, in view of our threatening inflationary situation, to increase the power of foreign countries to drain goods out of the United States by using our own American resources for that purpose.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, with a debt of $265,000,000,000, word comes over the radio we are going to lend Great Britain four and a half billions more. I ask Mr. Truman: Where are you going to get that money? Now, Mr. Truman ought to know better because Mr. Attlee did not ask the Congress here on Tuesday whether he could get $4,500,000,000 and I want to know why these promises are being made and then they come to Congress and try to drive through these promises made by the Chief Executive to foreign countries. The Congress only should make a loan of that magnitude.

This thing has to stop and we might just as well call the attention of the people to the fact now that we are going to stop it or we will wreck them and the country. If you do not stop it, I believe some of the people back home, come next election, will stop you right in your tracks, and rightfully so. You cannot bankrupt America and expect our people to be happy and prosper. Now let us get some common sense and do for others what we can do for them sensibly and judicially.

My country 'tis of thee
Sweet land of liberty
To thee we sing.

COTTON

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two statements on the great domestic cotton crop by two of our best experts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in three instances, in one to include a newspaper article, in one a letter, and in the third a table from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters, one from the Secretary of Western Yolo Grange, of Brooks, Calif., and the other a letter from Birmingham, Mich., both supporting Mr. STEVENSON'S bill (H. R. 3939) to appropriate funds for research into the causes and cure of cancer and infantile paralysis.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter and an editorial, and in the other some remarks and a letter.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Lieutenant General Doolittle.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent Gallup poll on universal military training.

LABOR INVITES INDUSTRY TO WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper advertisement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the Members of Congress to a rather significant matter especially in view of the troubled state of industrial relations in our country today, as evidenced by the Labor-Management Conference now in progress in the Nation's Capital, having been called for the purpose of securing greater cooperation between management and labor.

I am proud to inform you that organized labor in Wichita, Kans., established a wartime record of cooperating with management which achieved a high mark on the industrial horizon. Organized labor in Kansas did a splendid job.

Now I want to refer specifically to District Lodge 70, International Association of Machinists, largest labor body in Kansas, who recently placed its own advertisement in the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times through its own advertising agency, the McCormick-Armstrong Co., also of Wichita, Kans.

So far as I know, it is the first time that such an advertisement has been conceived by a labor organization. It has received widespread publicity through the Associated Press, the Scripps-Howard syndicate, Business Week, Advertising Age, Kansas Business, and other periodicals.

Under the title "Union Woos Industry," Business Week for November 3, 1945, said:

Advertisements in New York dailies inviting industry to locate in Wichita, Kans., are being inserted not by the chamber of commerce or other usual civic tom-tom beaters, but by an enterprising lodge of the International Association of Machinists (AFL), acting on its belief that employment for all of its former aircraft workers depends on the creation of new job opportunities.

I hope that the leadership and responsibility shown by this labor organization will prove a fine example to the members of the Labor-Management Conference, now in session in Washington.

Wichita, Kans., is known to be the air capital of the Nation. She produced airplanes for civilian use before the war. During the war period she held the record for turning out fighter planes and superfortresses of the very highest type that contributed so much in the winning of the war. There were no stoppages in Wichita, Kans., on account of labor-management problems during the war period. Labor saw to it that each and every contract for war equipment was carried out on time. Labor organizations in Wichita have an outstanding record.

Now I want to include a copy of the advertisement of District Lodge 70, International Association of Machinists, of Wichita, to which I referred a few moments ago:

LABOR INVITES INDUSTRY TO WICHITA—CENTER OF THE UNITED STATES

Our wartime record: Nation's best labor-management relations: No strikes or lockouts; produced more aircraft per capita than any other city.

Our references: Managements at Beech, Boeing, Cessna, Culver Aircraft companies will testify to the wartime job we did for them; labor can do the same for you in Wichita.

Our representative: J. T. Higgins, secretary-treasurer, District Lodge 70; member, Wichita Chamber of Commerce. See him at Hotel New Yorker during convention or write to Mr. Higgins in Wichita for brochure: Mechanized Wichita.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS.

PRICE EXHIBITS

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend a further invitation to the House, particularly to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and the members thereof, to visit the exhibit in room 215, Old House Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that this exhibit is not an attack on price control. It is, however, a clear demonstration of the utterly silly, super-duper rules and regulations that are being imposed on price control, which, in turn, are giving great difficulty to the mills, manufacturers and the 1,700,000 retailers in the United States, causing the consumers to have to pay more for inferior articles.

The Members of the other body have come over to this exhibit and I hope every Member of the House will avail himself of the opportunity to visit it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It demonstrates what is wrong with price control, does it not?

Mr. HARTLEY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

LOANS TO OUR SERVICEMEN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in order to aid the veterans we passed a law providing that loans may be made to them so that they might rehabilitate themselves through the purchase of farms or homes, or enter business, or do whatever else they may elect. I regret that when these deserving men, according to reports which I have received, made application for loans in accordance with the law and regulations, they have been "shushed" around and have encountered various delays, some avoidable and others unavoidable. Unfortunately, some of these delays have been due to the fact that the House refused to adopt an amendment that I offered that provided such loans should be made direct by the Government instead of through banks and lending institutions. The amendment was not adopted because most of you gentlemen on this side followed the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and a few other Members who were more interested in providing additional business and profits for the banks than in the interest of the ex-servicemen whom we pledged to help and for whose benefit the law was enacted.

I am absolutely certain that had my amendment been adopted the delays which have been complained of on the floor from time to time would not have occurred and earlier relief and aid would have been forthcoming, and they would not have been subjected to the red tape and delays which they are now encountering in complying with the regulations that require manifold negotiations with the Veterans' Administration and the private banking institutions.

There is no question in my mind but that through direct loans they would have been more promptly and adequately helped and their rehabilitation would have been more satisfactory. Further, they would have obtained the loans without the payment of excessive charges and other fees that they are now obliged to pay under what I term an iniquitous provision in the GI bill of rights.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE CAUSE OF THE DELAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the delay that has hurt the veterans most is the delay of the committee presided over by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the Committee on Rules, which has refused to report out a rule on my bill permitting ex-servicemen to work without having to pay tribute or to join a union or other organization and pay money to do so.

As a matter of fact, when these boys come home they are required in many instances to pay more money than they can possibly raise before they can work for their daily bread.

This loan proposition may not be working perfectly. We are trying to straighten it out now. We have a conference on that measure today.

But as long as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] holds the bill from this floor of the House, which would enable these men who fought for this country to come home and work for a living, he has no right to get up here and pretend that he is the man who is trying to save the veterans.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday of next week be dispensed with and that it be in order to call the Consent Calendar on Monday of the following week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader if he will tell us the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to. So far I have no legislative program to announce to the House for next week, and I anticipate none, but I would like to make one reservation, and that is if there is any bill capable of being brought up in the House, and it is considered by the leadership advisable or necessary to bring it up, I will give the House 24 hours' notice. I want to state frankly that I know of no such bill. Of course, if a conference report comes in it might be necessary to act on that, although at the present time I know of none. I cannot anticipate what the status of the rescission bill in the Senate will be with reference to a conference report, but the best information I have is that it probably will not be in shape to be brought up next week. Of course, next Thursday is Thanksgiving Day and the probabilities are that the House might want to adjourn on that date.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Even if there is a conference report that may be brought in, we will receive 24 hours' notice?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely. I want to emphasize that I do not think there will be any conference report, but

if there is, there will be 24 hours' notice given. I will protect the membership of the House on that. I further want to emphasize the fact that I doubt if there will be any legislative program for next week, but I make that reservation to protect myself.

Mr. KUNKEL. There will be nothing the following Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. There may possibly be general debate on some matter. I understand the deficiency bill will be ready on November 27, which is a Tuesday. If it is voted out on Monday, the bill will go over until the following day, so I have that in mind.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am receiving many, many telegrams from Massachusetts, that read like this:

One hundred and twenty union members urge your support passage full employment bill original form. Labor is fully aware urgency this measure. President Truman has mandated its passage. We look to you to answer immediately the people's demands.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to see the gentleman from Pennsylvania remarks that I can draw the inference from those remarks, and I hope my inference is correct, that he will vote for the passage of that bill.

Mr. RICH. It is signed by the Russian Relief Chapter of the CIO. We also have many from New York and Brooklyn. Those fellows down there are saying that it is necessary that this bill pass immediately. We have a million and a half jobs in this country and nobody to take them.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is arguing against it now. I thought he was arguing for it.

Mr. RICH. I am just wondering what is the urgency. If it is urgent, we have all of next week to consider it and the committee ought to bring it in here so that we will have something to do; either that or we ought to go home.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now the gentleman is coming and going at the same time. I do not like to see my friend act that way because I like him too much personally. The bill is in the subcommittee. Of course, the subcommittee has to report to the full committee and then the full committee takes action. I can assure the gentleman that I am glad to note the inquiry comes from the gentleman from Pennsylvania. That is most pleasing to me. When the bill comes up I hope the gentleman will vote for its passage. The bill is proceeding as rapidly as possible. It is in subcommittee. That is why I made my reservation. When the bill comes out it may be that we may want to bring it up next week with 24 hours' notice. I want to emphasize that the inquiry from the gentleman is most pleasing to me, and it will be most pleasing if he votes for the bill.

Mr. RICH. Are we going to get a bill in here to give Britain $4,500,000,000?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts said there would be no conference reports next week so far as he knows. We will have a conference report ready on the amendments to the GI bill between now and Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. RANKIN. We will probably report out between now and that time from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation a bill for the establishment of a medical corps in the Veterans' Administration, a piece of legislation that is very necessary. We hope to get it up for consideration early in the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have taken care of such a situation under my reservation with reference to conference reports. When the gentleman submits a conference report the House will have 24 hours' notice of when it will be taken up. Do I correctly understand that the conference report will be submitted Monday?

Mr. RANKIN. I think the conferees will agree this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the report is submitted Monday, then I can announce now that it will come up Wednesday. I imagine it will be a unanimous report.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope so.

Mr. MICHENER. In order that there may be no misunderstanding and that everything may be definite, we are not going to have any business next week unless it be a conference report, as stated by the majority leader? The majority leader has absolute control of the program. That being true, we know there will be no business next week. Then is there objection to the House adjourning, after that conference report is over, for 3 days so that Members who want to go home for Thanksgiving, and who are in a position where they can do so, will not be inconvenienced, since everybody knows there will be no business next week and an objection can accomplish nothing?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has expressed what I have stated, with one exception. I should like to have the RECORD show that my reservation included the bringing up, with 24 hours' notice, of legislation that we feel might be brought up if reported out and in order. I do not know of any. I will keep my word to the House, but I want to make that reservation expressly.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that we have several million servicemen who want to come home just as badly as the Congressmen want to go home. As far as I am concerned, we are not going to adjourn 3 days at a time next week, if I can prevent it, unless we get a vote on some of this legislation to permit these men to return to their homes who are no longer needed in the service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yesterday I submitted a unanimous-consent request to adjourn from today until Monday. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in the exercise of his judgment and his rights objected. I shall not submit another unanimous-consent request to adjourn over any day unless the gentleman from Mississippi himself tells me it is all right.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FULL EMPLOYMENT TARGET FOR TODAY

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is now more than 6 months since VE-day and more than 3 months after VJ-day. Six months ago, we expected when this happy event arrived we would see an immediate rush to peacetime activities, giving jobs to former war workers and soldiers, making the things we all need.

We expected also that as a most important step of this process the Congress would have set its seal of approval on the bill which would give the go-ahead signal to industry. We thought that by now we would have reached an agreement on the most fundamental peacetime measure of our day—the full employment bill.

This bill establishes the right to a job as one of the fundamental American rights and it gives the Federal Government the responsibility for seeing to it that there are jobs enough for all in private or public employment.

This seems as simple and reasonable a proposition as the Declaration of Independence—something which all Americans can and should support. It lays down a principle and establishes a method for providing enough jobs to go around in order to avoid the depression which we all dread.

Yet, to hear some of the Members of this House talk about it, you would think it was a violent, radical, un-American, communistic measure calculated to turn this Nation over to the Bolshevists. I have heard more pure and undiluted bunk on this floor on the subject of this bill than on any other in the past few months.

Gentlemen, there is only one condition under which we need fear communism in this country; and that condition is widespread unemployment. So long as the American system of free enterprise, wisely regulated by a watchful and responsible Government, can provide good paying jobs for most of our people, so long will American free enterprise endure. Only when it breaks down and fails to give jobs will the people show any interest in turning toward communism, or fascism, or any other "ism."

Yet, some of our people are so misinformed they cry Communist at every measure with the slightest touch of liberalism, at every person who has had a new idea since 1860. In so doing, they bring more opprobrium on themselves than on the cause or the individuals they attack. The gentleman from Mississippi, for instances, is well known for his ability to see a Communist in every woodpile. Only the other day it was reported in the Pathfinder magazine for October 31 that he stated at a committee hearing that he regarded Abraham Lincoln as a Communist.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I called the Pathfinder up and they apologized and said that the man who wrote that took my statement and reversed it. When the leader of the

Communist Party, William Z. Foster, talked about Lincoln as being a Communist, I said, "As a Southern Democrat, I resent your branding Abraham Lincoln as a Communist." Now, please do not get your information from those Communists about me but stay by the record while you are discussing me on this floor.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the record show there is at least one liberal in the past century that Mr. RANKIN does not consider as a Communist.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-two Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 188]

Adams	Fellows	Landis
Allen, Ill.	Fuller	Lane
Anderson, Calif.	Fulton	Larcade
Andrews, N. Y.	Gallagher	Lemke
Angell	Gamble	Lewis
Bailey	Gardner	McDonough
Baldwin, Md.	Gary	McKenzie
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gavin	Mansfield,
Barrett, Pa.	Gearhart	Mont.
Barry	Geelan	Merrow
Bates, Ky.	Gerlach	Monroney
Bates, Mass.	Gibson	Morgan
Beall	Gillie	Murphy
Bell	Goodwin	Norton
Bender	Gore	O'Brien, Ill.
Blackney	Gorski	O'Brien, Mich.
Bland	Graham	Outland
Boykin	Granger	Patrick
Bradley, Mich.	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Pa.	Green	Pfeifer
Brehm	Gregory	Ploeser
Buckley	Griffiths	Powell
Bunker	Gwinn, N. Y.	Price, Fla.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall,	Priest
Camp	Edwin Arthur	Quinn, N. Y.
Campbell	Halleck	Rains
Cannon, Fla.	Hand	Ramey
Cannon, Mo.	Hare	Randolph
Carnahan	Harless, Ariz.	Rivers
Case, S. Dak.	Hart	Robinson, Utah
Chapman	Hébert	Roe, Md.
Chenoweth	Heffernan	Roe, N. Y.
Clements	Hendricks	Rogers, Fla.
Coffee	Hess	Sasscer
Cole, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Sheridan
Cooley	Hoffman	Short
Courtney	Hook	Simpson, Ill.
Cravens	Horan	Simpson, Pa.
Curley	Howell	Somers, N. Y.
Dawson	Huber	Stigler
Delaney,	Jackson	Stockman
James J.	Jarman	Sumner, Ill.
Dingell	Jenkins	Taylor
Dirksen	Johnson,	Tibbott
Doughton, N. C.	Luther A.	Torrens
Drewry	Johnson, Okla.	Weaver
Dworshak	Judd	Weiss
Earthman	Keefe	White
Ellsworth	Kelley, Pa.	Wigglesworth
Engel, Mich.	Kilburn	Winter
Engle, Calif.	King	Wolfenden, Pa.
Ervin	Kirwan	Woodrum, Va.
Feighan	Knutson	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 275 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FULL EMPLOYMENT—TARGET FOR TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words the gentleman from Mississippi has demanded be taken down.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the record show there is at least one liberal in the past century that Mr. RANKIN does not consider as a Communist.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. This is not a point of order. These are words taken down on the demand of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Chair does not find anything in the language that is contrary to the rules of the House or is unparliamentary.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the point of order is this: That, taken in the light of his previous statements, where he falsely accused me of making a statement with reference to Abraham Lincoln that was exactly opposite from what I did say, his utterance was a violation of the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Even if the gentleman had given his opinion that Mr. Lincoln was a Communist, that would not have been a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. The point I am making is that that shows the spirit behind his attack, accusing me of regarding every liberal as a Communist. It is not true, and every Member of the House knows it is not true.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed in order.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I trust the Members of the House understand it was not I who caused the roll to be called and brought you all back here.

Some of the Members of this House are, by their loose and inaccurate use of words, confusing the public on the proposals of the bill and on its effects. In so doing they are paving the way for that very communism which they most dread. We must, at all costs, avoid another depression like the one of the early 1930's. The Murray-Patman bill can help us to do this, by foreseeing and forestalling mass unemployment. Our people will not take hopeless poverty so calmly another time; they will seek some other form of government, if we permit it to happen.

Most of us are veterans of the great depression which began in 1929. We remember those weary, desperate years when jobs grew fewer and fewer, when wages sank lower and lower, when sales fell off because workers could not buy, and then more workers lost their jobs because retailers canceled orders. We remember how the slump grew worse year by year, until the country was sunk in a morass of hopeless, cynical poverty.

The measures which were taken to lift us out of that morass indicated a new approach to the problem of depressions. They indicated a final acceptance of the responsibility of the agent of all the people, the Federal Government, to step into any emergency which was causing all the people to suffer, and to remedy those conditions, even though it meant stepping on the toes of some of the people.

We learned many lessons the hard way in the years following 1929, and we must not forget those lessons, now that we face a possible recurrence of those conditions. We learned that our people are a national resource to be cherished and restored, as much as our forests and our land. We learned that individuals can never make personal provision against Nation-wide or world-wide depression. We learned, on the other hand, that group action, Government action, can put individuals back on their feet when they are down, and restore them to self-respecting, self-supporting citizenship. Let us keep those lessons in mind as we face the great task before us now.

During my campaign last year I conducted a poll among a fair sample of the voters of my district, on what the people thought were the two biggest jobs for Congress to get at. Almost every single one said, first, win the war and bring the boys back, then see that the boys have jobs. We are going ahead with the first job as well as can possibly be done; our big task now is the second one—see that the boys from overseas, and the people here too, have jobs.

There are, of course, a handful of people who fear that we cannot ever achieve full employment. They accept the dreary premise that depressions are inevitable and that there is no use trying to do anything about them. They believe it is impossible for Government and business and other economic groups to work together to prevent mass unemployment in peacetime. And they fear the methods which must be used to try it.

Then, there are a few who believe that the only way to get full employment is to give up all forms of free enterprise, and political liberty, and go in for complete regimentation. They say the Russian Constitution is the only one which does, or can, guarantee the right to work. Therefore, goes the reasoning, unemployment is a necessary evil which we put up with here for the other benefits of capitalism.

There are many, I hope most of us, however, who reject both these views. We have seen the miracle of American production turning out undreamed-of quantities of war materials for ourselves and our Allies. We have seen us scrape the bottom of the manpower barrel again and again and again, to find the last available man-hour needed to keep the wheels turning. We have seen American ingenuity search for, and find, better ways of doing things, faster ways of making what we need.

And one thing we have seen which many of us never quite realized before. We have seen the development of a home market for the necessities of life and the minor luxuries which was never even touched before the war. Whole regions are eating better, dressing better, living better than they did in 1939. Yes, of course, many of us have met new deprivations too, but these do not compare in importance with the vast potential market for milk and meat and chairs and houses which the war boom has shown us exists. It will continue to exist, if there is a program for jobs for all, so that those who formerly lived in extreme poverty can go on working for decent wages, and eating well, and buying clothes, and paying rent.

Free America will not admit that chronic mass unemployment is the price we must pay for continued freedom and democracy—not while this vast market exists for what our workers can produce, not while our products are needed to put the bombed and starved Europeans on their feet, not while there are millions of people in the undeveloped places throughout the world who need to exchange their raw materials for the things we can make.

Some Americans have an unreasoning fear of Russia. There is only one condition under which we need to fear Russia or communism, and that is, as I said before, if we let our own system break down to the point where our people look with longing on the comparative prosperity produced under Russian communism. And then it will not be Russia that is at fault, but our own ineptitude in permitting our system to decay so far that we cannot keep our people working and eating.

Let us never forget that there was widespread unemployment in Germany when Hitler took over. The jobless and hopeless masses were an easy target for his promises, and those promises were kept in part—he gave them jobs, though the work he did led to the greatest conflagration the world has ever known. Nazism and communism and other "isms" which deny the freedom of the individual can only grow in an atmosphere where freedom is coupled with starvation and idleness.

The jobless in Germany's depression became the storm troopers of Hitler's movement. The hatreds generated abroad during those black years found expression in the vicious doctrines which we have just spent precious American lives to wipe out. The fanatical lust for foreign territory and for torture and destruction at home was, in part, a reaction against the thwarted wasted years of Germany's young men during their years of idleness. Unemployment leads to reaction and war.

The time, then, has come for the Congress to assume its responsibility for preventing mass unemployment, the scourge of modern times. The time has come, in the words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], to enable all Americans to exercise the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment. Not leaf raking when it is not needed. Not hand work on a road when a machine can do it better and quicker. Not work at subsistence wages on a job for which a man may be totally unfitted. Not spasmodic jobs with long disheartening waits in dreary unemployment exchanges. Not snatches of hours or days which give neither physical nor financial satisfaction. No, we must stick to Mr. PATMAN'S fourfold program of useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment.

If the employment offered does not meet these standards, it will fail of its purposes, of keeping up the individual's morale by giving him an adequate place in our social structure, and of keeping up purchasing power so that business and industry will not decline and the toboggan of 1929 start all over again.

We dare not leave full employment to chance. There are a few who say, "Let us see what business will do first, and then the Government can step in if it needs to." That would not work—it is gambling when you are sure to lose. Because business is sitting back, too, and saying, "Let us see how things are before we expand too fast. Let us not make too great an investment until we are pretty sure of the market." And if both groups are waiting and outfumbling each other, depression will be here before we know it and then it will be too late for any of us.

Of course, there will be a return to peacetime production in many industries, notably automobiles, construction, and electrical equipment. But what about aircraft and shipbuilding? There will be more ships and airplanes than anybody will need for years, many of them convertible to peacetime uses. A great proportion of the plants were never in peacetime production, but were built up for the war emergency. And what about the ordnance plants, chemical plants, and other strictly war industries? What about the doubled capacity and pay rolls of many plants which have peacetime functions—for only half as many workers?

We have been reading a great deal in all the papers about the marvels that await us in the postwar world, marvels made possible by industrial processes and inventions developed during the war. We all have our list of private wants, both the things we consider necessities which have been denied us, like houses and refrigerators and cars, and the luxuries, like private planes, and air conditioning. But no one can risk opening up these new enterprises unless the market is pretty well assured. And how will 138,000,000 customers keep on buying, unless 60,000,000 jobs give them plenty of money with which to buy?

There is no one cure-all which can serve as a peacetime substitute for war production. Social security alone could not possibly fill the gap, important though it is. It is planned to help individuals, or occasionally whole communities, over a temporary crisis. But it would be bankrupt if everyone stopped paying and started drawing out at once. It would be as bankrupt as the fire insurance companies of Berlin must be today.

An improved tax system alone will not do it. Some unwise persons have been suggesting that business can do the job by itself if its tax burdens are greatly lightened. But business can not advance simply with lowered expenses; guaranteed customers are of infinitely more importance to it. If business and individuals are assured of steady income, taxes are no problem; and if they have to be raised, as they may to assure this result, they can easily be met. The most prosperous nation is not the one with the lowest taxes, but the one with the highest standard of living and the least poverty; that is our goal.

There are those who think a farm program is at the root of prosperity. They say that when the farmers can sell at high prices and buy plenty of goods, the country is prosperous. But farmers, like business, can not be kept permanently solvent by subsidies; what they need are lots of people with money to buy food and clothing. When there are no unemployed, the farmers have no worries. When there are millions living below the level of health and decency, no program can save the farmers.

Foreign markets are important, but they are not a single cure-all. In order to sell abroad, we must buy abroad. And sometimes we must buy things we might make at home. Foreign trade must be developed, both in the interests of production and of an economic policy to prevent another war. But foreign markets must not be permitted to become a dumping ground for things other countries do not want, leading to another war.

What about such wage policies as minimum wage, annual wage, higher wage? They can all help. We ought to establish a minimum wage below which a firm may not go and be allowed to stay in business. Sweatshop levels harm the entire community. An annual wage policy would help iron out the seasonal inequalities in various industries whose rates appear high until you figure the months of unemployment they expect to cover. High wages and short hours will help a lot in raising consumption levels in goods and services above the necessities of life; a man must be well above subsistence level if he is to provide a market for automobiles, electrical equipment, and such intangibles as higher education and symphony concerts. But wages alone would not do the job.

Easier credit? No; credit is not an answer, unless there is the ultimate assurance that loans can be paid back. Business can get capital to start with if it can get customers to finish with. Farmers can borrow easily on existing terms—as long as they are sure to sell their crops for good prices. The man with a job can buy a car on time. But the man without a job drags down the whole structure; credit cannot raise him up or put him back on his feet, and credit cannot help the people who need his trade. Assure him the job, and credit takes care of itself—with a reasonable amount of Government help.

It is suggested that many people will go out of the labor market, now that the war emergency is passed—many working mothers, servicemen's wives, old people who will return to retirement, young people who will return to school. It is true that some of them will give up their jobs, but by no means enough of them will to provide jobs for the returning servicemen, let alone the displaced war workers. Many wives want to keep on working. Many old people will find they have taken a new lease on life and do not intend to quit until they are thrown out. Too many young people who left school for the lure of high pay will never go back.

How about public works? Well, public works can help a lot. But they must not be the kind of makeshift, made-work propositions we have seen too much of in the past. Shovel-leaning jobs are bad for morale, and $60 a month wages are bad for business. The Government must get ready the blue prints on more and

better public works than we have had in the past. The level of the jobs done by the relief agencies and other Government agencies during the years before the war was steadily rising and showing a recognition of the need for varied community services using varied skills. We must carry on from there and never go back to accepting relief for any, except those unable to work.

All these things can help keep up the level of unemployment; none of them, alone, or in combination, can do the job, unless someone assumes the ultimate responsibility for saying, "We must have full employment, whatever the cost. We will pay the cost, whatever it is, because it is cheaper and better in the long run than depression and war."

And that brings us to the full employment bill, H. R. 2202, introduced in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Texas, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN. This bill is not a substitute for all the measures outlined above, but, rather, an essential supplement to them. It establishes a policy and places a responsibility. The policy is threefold: First, to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital; second, to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans; and third, to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure full employment, so far as private, State, and municipal enterprises fall short thereof.

How does the bill propose to carry out this policy? It provides that the President shall transmit to Congress each year a national production and employment budget, in which he estimates, first, the size of the labor force; second, the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to provide employment opportunities for such labor force; and, third, the investment and expenditure actually to be expected for the particular period in question.

If the President's estimates show a deficiency in the expected investment and expenditure, then the President is required to make recommendations as to the manner of meeting the deficiency, particularly emphasizing steps which the Federal Government can take to encourage private investment and expenditure.

If the President finds that these steps are not enough to eliminate the deficiency in the investment and expenditure, then he is required to submit, as part of the Budget, a program of Federal investment and expenditure adequate for the purpose. In general, if he recommends the construction of public works, the performance of the construction work is to be awarded to private concerns.

If, on the other hand, the President finds that there is no deficiency, but, rather, an excess of investment and expenditure, he may make recommendations to avoid the inflation which might be expected to develop.

Who is to act on the President's recommendations on the job and investment budget? The bill provides for a joint committee on the National Budget, to be made up of ranking majority and minority Members of the House and Senate fiscal and labor committees. The committee's job is to study the Budget transmitted by the President, to report to the Senate and House of Representatives its findings and recommendations. Then it must submit a joint resolution establishing general policy for the next fiscal year. Such recommendations and policy will be expected to guide the policies and acts of other congressional, legislative, and appropriations committees. It, in effect, proposes a needed reorganization of the workings of Congress, which will promote efficiency and consistency of policy.

In order to keep his finger on the working out of the program, the President is required to review all Federal investment and expenditure every 3 months in order to ascertain whether any change in amount or tempo is appropriate.

The bill does two fine new things which are now needed if we are to keep our complex economy running with the maximum of success: First, it places final responsibility for full employment on the Federal Government, while giving every encouragement to private enterprise and local government units; and, second, it plans to make systematic provision for needs before they occur, thus avoiding the piecemeal, often conflicting hash of relief and public-works legislation of the thirties.

The full-employment bill does not do a great many things for which its critics blame it or its admirers praise it. Let us analyze some of the things it does not do and does not want to do.

It does not absolutely guarantee full employment. It sets up machinery for insuring it, and provides a democratic method for adjusting to increasing production.

It is not just a public-works bill. It may call for gigantic public-works expenditures some years, but in other years it may keep them down to minimum maintenance level. By increasing Government spending in bad years and decreasing it in good, it hopes to achieve a steady high level.

It does not call for deficit financing or uncontrolled Federal spending. The cost of keeping the economy healthy by insuring full employment can be met on a pay-as-we-go basis, year by year, or over a cycle of years. The over-all financial picture can be analyzed coolly and calmly, year by year, much more intelligently than is possible when we permit things to reach desperate straits and then go on a frantic spending spree to try to right them.

The bill does not guarantee specific jobs for specific individuals, in given communities, at work of their choosing. That is an impossibility. It will attempt to plan Government spending, and encourage private spending, without too much dislocation within communities. Every effort will be made to provide opportunities for work, but the individual still has the responsibility of trying to take advantage of the opportunity.

The bill does not guarantee profits to specific business enterprises. By keeping up the general level of spending and employment, it will create an atmosphere favorable to profits for those able to take advantage of the opportunity. It does not propose to unduly enrich, or impoverish, any specific business.

The bill does not provide regimentation of industry, or of employment. It plans to avoid the worst regimentation this country has ever known—the regimentation of bread lines, evictions, idleness.

It is not an appropriation measure. The Congress retains the power to approve, amend, or kill the President's recommendations by appropriating or refusing to appropriate funds, by good or bad legislation affecting industry, labor, agriculture, foreign trade, taxes, social security, housing, health, education, and so on. But if the Congress fumbles the ball, the public will know where to place the blame. The power, and the responsibility, are linked together and placed clearly in the hands of the national legislature.

The full employment bill does not create a planned economy. It does not assign to the Federal Government control over prices, wages, private employment, or production schedules. It provides the bare minimum of Government planning needed to give business and the people confidence that employment and spending power will be maintained.

There are many other things affecting employment and prosperity on which the Congress will have to act. But they are outside the limits of this bill, though their results may affect it. A large scale housing program, for instance, would provide much investment, expenditure, and employment, requiring less public works of other kinds to be provided in the President's Budget. Control of monopoly may encourage development of small industries in scattered communities, giving additional employment. Irrigation projects opening up new farm lands give opportunity to others formerly employed in industry. And there are many other projects, all of which would be taken into account each year by the President in preparing his budget of expenditures and jobs.

The full employment bill offers a plan, general in outline, but specific in policy, for avoiding the one thing which, next to war, we all fear the most. It is the only plan of any general scope which is now being proposed. Its critics offer no substitute; they want to leave it up to chance, and then try to remedy the inevitable results of hesitation and uncertainty with some sort of emergency legislation. It is well to meet an emergency as best you can. But an emergency which could have been foreseen and prevented is not an emergency—it is a national calamity. Opponents of this bill are in the position of advocating an economic Munich, which can only be followed by an economic disaster comparable to the war.

The people need the assurance that something will be done. That assurance alone would bring a sense of confidence which would create employment. Businessmen are afraid to start things; there is a wait-and-see attitude. Give them assurance that employment will be maintained, and watch their dust. Workers hesitate to loosen up with their sav-

ings and buy the things they want; they hesitate to sign term contracts on goods unless they are sure of jobs. Make them sure, and they will send their dollars rolling in to keep production flowing.

The boys who are coming home from overseas to find a place for themselves here need the assurance that there will be jobs for them when they come back. They do not want patriotic Fourth of July speeches from us. What they want and the least we owe them is an act of the Congress which pledges our Government to keep up the job level and keep off depression. Without that the GI bill of rights is only a temporary stopgap. It gives the boys dismissal wages, education, medical care, and other benefits during their period of adjustment, but then what? They cannot live on their mustering-out pay or go to school forever. They want jobs. They do not propose to sell apples or lead bonus marches to Washington to get their rights. I do not propose to ask them to.

The time before us is not unlimited. Already the specter of unemployment hovers on the horizon. There will be trouble and expense involved in any plan or combination of plans that is adopted. But that trouble and expense will be as nothing compared to the effort and money to get us out of a depression once we have fallen in. We can afford anything we need to do to maintain a high level of employment; the only thing we cannot afford to do is—nothing.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield briefly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to ask the gentleman whether he would not agree with me in the following observation: The gentleman pointed out that during the war period there had been a higher level of demand on the part of the people of the country than ever before, consequently that we had been looking for people to work rather than having people looking for work to do; and I should like to ask the gentleman whether, assuming this bill were passed, he would not still believe that the key to a high level of governmental and national income in the country is the maintenance of a proper balance between the productive power of the country on the one hand and the actual consuming purchasing power on the other?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I quite agree with the gentleman from California, and I may say that in the general body of my speech which I have not had time to deliver this afternoon will be found pertinent remarks on that subject.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would not the gentleman further agree that if that is the key that there are a number of different measures that ought to be passed to achieve such a balanced production on the one hand and consumption on the other?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I quite agree with the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And that it is altogether possible for this achievement to be realized without the necessity of governmental regimentation or control over the everyday lives of the people whether they be businessmen, managers, workers, or employees?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I completely agree with the gentleman, and I call attention to the fact that the full-employment bill seeks to have private industry do the job.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. There seems to be an impression on the part of the people who are advocating the full-employment bill that somehow or other you can take the formula that was used in the war and bring about the same kind of employment in peacetime that we have had in wartime. Does the gentleman agree that that is possible?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am pleased that the gentleman has asked this question. In my opinion, the only way in which we can achieve full employment and full production in this country is by continuing the remarkable teamwork of management and labor and government that produced the great outpouring of war material which we have had during the last 4 years. There is no other way in which we can establish a sound, stable economy in this country.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Teamwork is a fine thing and we have had teamwork in this country or we would not as a country have reached the point of advancement we have attained; but what is going to be the financial formula to bring about this full employment under this full-employment bill? In other words does the gentleman propose that we use the same method of financing full employment that we used to finance the war?

Mr. BIEMILLER. The bill states categorically and all sponsors who have spoken for it have stated categorically that we want private enterprise to provide full employment and that only if private enterprise is unable to do so will the Government intervene.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is not answering the question.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. I think perhaps the gentleman has at least partially answered the question I was going to ask, but it is this: Does the gentleman find in any phase of the bill which would indicate that the ultimate result of the bill would weaken our system of free competitive enterprise in this country?

Mr. BIEMILLER. On the contrary, I think it will strengthen the American system.

Mr. DOYLE. Why does the gentleman feel that way?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Because full employment is the only way I know of that the American private-enterprise system can be maintained, and this bill puts the responsibility upon the Congress to find ways and methods of stimulating private enterprise in the United States to provide jobs for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the light of what has happened, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders, but the Chair will put the question. Regardless of the fact there are other special orders, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it not the custom to ask those who are to succeed whether that is agreeable?

Mr. RANKIN. They are present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has stated that there are other special orders. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago you heard one of those ridiculous insinuations that are being used to misrepresent me and other Members of Congress, when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] read that distorted statement with reference to Abraham Lincoln.

If he had shown me the courtesy to ask me about that statement, I could have saved him from making himself look ridiculous.

Here is what happened. We had the Communist leader William Z. Foster on the stand before the Committee on Un-American Activities. In order to justify himself he undertook to tell us that Abraham Lincoln was a Communist. I told him that as a Southern Democrat I resented his branding Abraham Lincoln as a Communist.

Why did you not get the correct information, Mr. BIEMILLER, before you rose and attempted to smear me by leaving the impression you attempted to make?

In order to manifest his vicious attitude he said he was glad to know that there was one liberal since 1860 that I did not regard as a Communist. Of all the baseless insinuations I have ever heard on this floor, that is the most unjustified.

There is a great difference between a real liberal and a crank or a Communist.

I have always been a liberal Jeffersonian Democrat, but I am not a Communist and never will be.

For years I was regarded by the ultraconservatives as a superliberal, because of my fights for the TVA, rural electrification, currency expansion, relief for our disabled veterans, their widows and orphans, and the protection of the farmers of this country against the ravages of special interests. But I am a liberal within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

Go to the disabled veterans in your State and see if they regard me as antiliberal in the light of my record of services to them.

Go to the farmers of your State who are now enjoying the blessings of rural electrification and ask them whether or not they regard me as an antiliberal in my services here.

There are more than a million farmers in this country—tens of thousands of them in his home State of Wisconsin—who are enjoying the use of electricity in their homes as a result of my efforts in this House.

Go to the servicemen of this war and ask them if they regard me as antiliberal. They know that I forced through the amendment raising their base pay to $50 a month, for the first time in history; and they know that I am waging a fight here now to get legislation passed to discharge, on his own application, anyone in the armed forces who has served 18 months or who has dependents to care for, or who desires to return to school. If the gentleman from Wisconsin wants to prove his liberality let him sign petition No. 9 to bring this bill up for passage.

Go to the disabled veterans in our hospitals and ask them if they regard me as antiliberal.

Go to those widows and orphans who were left out in the cold as a result of the economy bill and ask them if they regard me as antiliberal when I was bucking even my own President on that measure and fighting to keep them from being destroyed economically or forced into the breadlines during the depression to which the gentleman referred.

Go to all the men who served in the last war, who felt that they were entitled to adjusted compensation, and ask them if they regard me as antiliberal when I was fighting here for 17 years to see that they were paid.

No, the gentleman from Wisconsin should not get up here and quote communistic literature, or quote William Z. Foster, the Communist leader, in his attempts to classify me as an antiliberal. He should not expect to get correct information from those men who are trying to undermine and destroy the Government of the United States.

Of course, they regard me as antiliberal because I am trying to save my country from destruction at their hands.

My fight for liberal principles and liberal legislation, as I said, has been conducted within the framework of the Constitution of the United States. My country comes first. And I have no apologies to make to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] or anyone else for my efforts to protect our sacred institutions from destruction at the hands of those subversive elements that are continuously plotting the overthrow of this Government.

I have no apologies to make to him or anyone else for my efforts to save America for Americans.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McGLINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to introduce today a resolution on the use of atomic energy in the interest of international cooperation and the public welfare. I still intend to introduce this resolution and within the next few days. It is based upon the views as officially expressed by practically all of the atomic scientists.

However, just before coming to the floor there was read to me over the phone a digest of the statement from the White House now going out over the press wires reporting the conclusions of the talks between President Truman and the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and Canada as to the present disposal of the problem of the atomic bomb. From this digest I gather that their views and those in my resolution run very much in the same direction. It would be hasty of me, however, to proceed today with this resolution and I propose to give the White House statement the study it deserves and to introduce my own resolution as soon as possible after making this study.

In the meantime it is worth while to point out how the thinking of all of us has been expended under the influence of this problem week by week ever since the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and the world first learned of the awful potentialities of this great discovery. We can expect and hope that day by day in the weeks to come the people of the world and their leaders will grow in understanding and realization of the responsibilities that are involved and the next steps that must be taken both for the protection and the benefit of mankind.

When I do introduce my resolution it will be in all humility and with the confidence that whereas it represents the best thought of the atomic scientists at this time it also can be further perfected with time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE FINANCIAL PEREGRINATIONS OF THE ROOSEVELTS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Walter Trohan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was a great traveler, a great fisherman, a maker of history, and a breaker of established precedents of many kinds and in many ways.

His trips and excursions were not entirely at the expense of the taxpayers, but most of them were; and up to May 1937 the press estimated that the President's use of special trains, Government vessels, escorting craft, and other modes of travel had cost the American taxpayers between $1,500,000 and $2,000,000. What those costs have been altogether is anybody's guess.

In 1934 and early 1935 the President cruised on the private yacht *Nourmahal*, owned by his friend Vincent Astor, in company with such friends as Mr. Astor, Judge Franklin Kernochan, George St. George, Lytle Hull, William R. Stewart, Dr. Leslie Heiter, Kermit Roosevelt, his son James Roosevelt, and others.

In the fall of 1935, to mention one of many other similar trips, Mr. Roosevelt traveled by special train to the west coast, stopped at San Diego, Calif., where he reviewed the Pacific Fleet, and went thence to southern California, where he fished from a naval vessel that was attended by other naval craft.

It is recalled that, prior to October 1, 1945, the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, considered the matter of a $200,000 loan made by John Hartford, of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., to Elliott Roosevelt, a son of the late President—a loan which, if Mr. Hartford is worthy of belief, was made only after Elliott's father had given his approval to the loan. Our committee's activities consisted merely of reviewing statements taken, and reports made, by representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue concerning the Hartford and similar loans together with a claim by Hartford of the right to deduct a loss of $196,000 in his income-tax return after the original loan had been settled by Mr. Jesse Jones for $4,000, at the request of the late President.

The majority of our committee felt, and reported, that while the Hartford loan had been settled for about 2 cents on the dollar, with little or no effort by Hartford to make collection in full, the committee was not "justified in challenging the conclusion reached by the Bureau of Internal Revenue," that Mr. Hartford could properly take credit for a loss of $196,000 in computing his later income-tax return. In other words, our committee did not have the benefit of either direct, or cross-examination, of witnesses, but acted solely on the testimony taken and the report made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Copies of the Bureau's investigation, reports, and findings, were published by the committee and filed with the House.

The minority members of the committee recorded their dissenting views in the form of a printed minority report, pointing out, among other things, that the majority report was based, in part, upon testimony of Mr. Hartford to the effect that "he would do nothing to embarrass Elliott's father." So much, then, for the Hartford loan to Elliott Roosevelt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the investigation of the Hartford loan to Elliott Roosevelt by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, frequent mention was made of loans and advances to Elliott Roosevelt by persons other than Mr. Hartford, especially loans and advances to him by Sid W. Richardson and Charles F. Roeser, oilmen of Fort Worth, Tex., for launching Elliott Roosevelt's radio ventures in the State of Texas, concerning which much has been published and said. Indeed, the Bureau of Internal Revenue investigators took much testimony from Richardson and Roeser, among others, including Elliott Roosevelt and his former wife, now Mrs. Ruth G. Eidson, of Fort Worth, Tex. The testimony concerning the Richardson-Roeser loans and advances to Elliott was taken because they, like the Hartford loan, went into the Texas radio activities of Elliott Roosevelt. It is now known that the loans and advances by Richardson have a direct relation to one of the late Presi-

dent's fishing trips; and the facts are such as seemingly to justify the conclusion that they, like the Hartford loan, were made at least with the knowledge, consent, and approval of Elliott's late father.

Many will recall President Roosevelt's 1937 fishing trip to the Gulf of Mexico, when he used an eight-car special train, the Presidential yacht *Potomac*—later discarded—three Navy destroyers, several seaplanes, and established a temporary White House in the swanky Hotel Galvez, at Galveston, Tex.

That same fishing trip included a stop at New Orleans, La., where, to the tune of Happy Days Are Here Again, the President rode between the then Governor Leche and the then and now Mayor Maestri, ate oysters Rockefeller at Antoines, along with other viands for which that place is justly famous, and concluded his repast with special cake and ice cream fashioned in the shape of a tarpon. That New Orleans stop came to be called the "second Louisiana purchase," because, it was said, it regained for Mr. Roosevelt the previously withheld support of the then powerful Huey Long political machine.

On arrival at the tarpon fishing grounds off Port Aransas, Tex., President Roosevelt was welcomed officially by the then Governor of that State, the Honorable James V. Allred; and during the same fishing trip, the same Jesse Jones who later used his own $4,000 to settle the $200,000 Hartford loan to Elliott, and who was then in the good graces of the New Deal, participated in the Gulf tarpon fishing.

An article by Walter Trohan in the Chicago Tribune and the Washington Times-Herald for November 10, 1945, relates for the first time how, at the time of the 1937 fishing trip, certain hot oil prosecutions were pending in the Federal courts in Texas against numerous individuals and concerns; how, after Elliott Roosevelt had introduced certain oil tycoons to his father, and they had entertained the President at an island retreat of theirs off Port Aransas, at least one of the prosecutions was speedily cooled off and disposed of as to the Channel Transport and Marketing Co., owned by the late President's hosts; and how, soon thereafter, oil men Richardson and Roeser commenced to make loans and advances for financing the radio ventures of Elliott Roosevelt in Texas. The article speaks for itself and I shall insert the same in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

It seems likely, Mr. Speaker, that the Richardson-Roeser loans and advances to Elliott Roosevelt's radio venture were made because Elliott's father was President of the United States, and after he, Elliott, had introduced Richardson, with other oil men, to his father on the occasion of the 1937 fishing trip, as disclosed by the Chicago Tribune and the Washington Times-Herald. Indeed, Bureau of Internal Revenue representatives asked Richardson whether he would have made his advances of funds to Elliott if he had been, at the time of the loans, just Elliott Roosevelt and not also the son of the President of the United States." Richardson replied: "I couldn't say positively what I would have done because it was not presented in that way." Richardson also admitted having said, after meeting the President and Elliott on the island and returning to Fort Worth, he felt "it would not hurt" him to "know Elliott Roosevelt better."

Another thing that has not been disclosed is that Hon. James V. Allred, former Governor of Texas, who welcomed the President to Texas on the occasion of the 1937 fishing trip, was appointed by President Roosevelt as a judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas on February 23, 1939. On September 17, 1938, Judge Allred's brother, Rene Allred, was indicted in the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston division, along with other individuals, for conspiracy to violate the Connally Act, known as the hot-oil law. The charge was that the defendants had agreements and transactions with the Channel Transport & Marketing Co., the concern owned by Clint W. Murchison and Dudley S. Golding, hosts to the President at their island retreat, as reported by the Chicago Tribune and the Washington Times-Herald.

Manifestly, Judge Allred could not sit in judgment on his own brother, so, according to court records, a judge from the Northern District of Texas was designated to, and on December 8, 1939, he did, dispose of the case against Judge Allred's brother by accepting a plea of nolo contendere and fixing a fine of $1,000, which was paid.

Thereafter, Judge Allred resigned his judicial position to make the race for the United States Senate against Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL. After being defeated in his Senate race, President Roosevelt again named Judge Allred for a Federal judgeship. It seems, however, to have been asserted at the time that his reappointment was made pursuant to a "deal," and the second appointment failed to bring confirmation.

From what is known concerning Elliott Roosevelt's financing activities, as to which I am assured much more is to come; from what has been said and written about James Roosevelt's lucrative insurance connections and business; and from what has been disclosed of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's large earnings from her writings and radio activities, it is clear that the members of the Roosevelt family have lost but few, if any, opportunities to cash in on their connections with, and relations to, the highest office within the gift of the American people. Someday, Mr. Speaker, I hope the entire sordid story will be told for the benefit of the taxpayers at whose expense, in many instances, these irregularities and improprieties were made possible.

TEXAS "HOT OIL" CASES FADED AFTER TYCOONS WERE F. D. HOSTS

(By Walter Trohan)

The late President Roosevelt's 1937 fishing trip off the coast of Texas was followed by the disposition of certain "hot oil" cases involving a company owned by the President's fishing hosts, and the launching of a Texas radio chain by his second son, Elliott, with the help of the oil men he met on the trip, Government and newspaper records have disclosed.

Evidence that Mr. Roosevelt combined business with pleasure on his search for Gulf of Mexico tarpon in May 1937 is contained in Federal court records, files of Texas newspapers, and the 800 pages of testimony taken by the Internal Revenue Bureau on Elliott Roosevelt's financial operations.

ELLIOTT PROFITED

The investigation into Elliott's finances dealt principally with a $200,000 loan made by John A. Hartford, president of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which was settled for $4,000 at the President's request by former Commerce Secretary Jones. Hartford testified the President encouraged him to make the loan and he finally did so because he was afraid to "incur the enmity" of Mr. Roosevelt.

The new evidence on Elliott's financial operations shows that he secured loans and substantial investments in his radio venture after he presented Texas oil men to his father during the fishing trip on which he was a member of the Presidential party.

Subsequently Elliott secured White House invitations for the Texas oil men, Sid W. Richardson and Charles F. Roeser, who invested and lent almost $250,000 to help Elliott in Texas. At the White House the oil men advised the President on oil policy.

CHANGED PLEA AFTER VISIT

Other new evidence discloses that 3 days after Mr. Roosevelt was the guest of Clint W. Murchison and Dudley S. Golding, other oil men, at their lodge on an island off Port Aransas, Tex., his hosts changed their plea of "not guilty" to one of "nolo contendere" (no contest) in a "hot oil" case involving interstate transport of fuel in violation of Federal law.

One of their oil companies was fined $17,500, which oil men described as nominal. Federal court records contain the history of the case.

Mr. Roosevelt left Washington April 27, 1937. Two days later he stopped in New Orleans, where he rode between Richard Leche, then Governor of Louisiana, and Robert Maestri, then and now mayor to the tune of Happy Days Are Here Again.

PRESIDENT GAINED SUPPORT

The visit became known as the "second Louisiana Purchase," because Mr. Roosevelt secured the support of the Louisiana delegation, which had been hostile toward a third term because of the late Huey Long. Governor Leche later was jailed for malfeasance in office.

At New Orleans Mr. Roosevelt boarded the Presidential yacht *Potomac*, which was accompanied by three destroyers, the *Moffet*, *Decatur*, and *Schenk*. It was estimated that the fishing jaunt cost the American taxpayers $200,000 through the operation of the naval craft and other expenses.

F. D. R. WAS LUNCH GUEST

On May 1, 1937, Elliott, who accompanied the President, went ashore at Port Aransas, where he met Richardson and J. C. Nelson, a friend of Richardson, according to the Corpus Christi Caller-Times. Elliott left Aransas with Richardson for an island named Matagorda, owned by Golding and Murchison, in the "Saltaire," an area off the Texas coast 50 to 75 miles northeast of Corpus Christi.

On May 7 President Roosevelt left the *Potomac* to lunch with his son, the latter's wife at that time, now Mrs. Ruth G. Eidson, and their friends on Matagorda, at the clubhouse of the American Oil Co., which was owned by Golding & Murchison.

The Corpus Christi Caller-Times reported on May 9: "Relating for the first time that he had landed on a nearby island yesterday for lunch with friends of Elliott and the latter's wife, the President said he had seen many shore birds that he had never laid eyes on before."

REPORT OIL FIRM'S FINE

On May 11, 1937, the Corpus Christi paper reported that the Channel Transportation & Marketing Co., of Houston, paid a $17,500 fine on a charge of transporting petroleum products in interstate commerce in violation of Federal law. The National Petroleum News on May 19, 1937, headlined the fine as "Roosevelt's hosts' company in Texas fined for 'hot' oil law violations."

Shortly after the fishing trip, according to Richardson's testimony in the Internal Revenue investigation of Elliott's operations, Richardson lent Elliott $20,000. This sum went toward the purchase of Elliott's first radio station KFJZ, at Fort Worth, September 7, 1937, for $37,500. Subsequently Richardson lent another $15,000 to Elliott for radio operations and $5,000 for personal expenses.

Richardson received stock in Elliott's chain in settlement in 1944 for these "poor boy" loans, as he designated them to Federal investigators. This stock was valued below the amount of the loans. Richardson also purchased $25,000 of stock in the radio chain on two occasions.

Roeser purchased $125,000 of the stock in 1938 and $25,000 in 1939. The stock now is earning money and is valued above the purchase price.

At Fort Worth last September 12 Richardson told Internal Revenue investigators how White House invitations followed his financial contacts with Elliott. Roeser told a similar story to investigators September 5.

"The first time I was invited to the White House was some months after I made Elliott the loan to buy the radio station with," Richardson said under oath.

SAID INVITATION NECESSARY

He explained that he opposed a certain phase of the President's oil policy and Elliott "asked me if I didn't think it was a good idea for me to go up there and discuss it with his father.

"My answer was that I might try to help him (Elliott) on the radio business if he got into trouble, but I damn sure was not going up there to tell the President how to run the United States. Then he asked me would I go if his father sent for me, and my answer to this was that any time the President of the United States sent for me I would be glad to go.

"About 2 weeks after this conversation I was in New York, as well as I remember, and Elliott Roosevelt called me from Washington and said his father wanted to talk to me and would I be good enough to come to Washington and have lunch with him and his mother on a given date and have a visit and discuss this oil business with his father, which I did."

OTHER VISITS FOLLOWED

"Later on I was invited to the White House several times when I was in Washington but always the invitation came through Elliott, except for the last visit that I had with the President, and that was on the Sunday after Pearl Harbor. Mr. Roosevelt had asked Roeser and myself some months before Pearl Harbor to make a survey of the oil business and have Thanksgiving dinner with him at Warm Springs and give him our views and what we thought about the future of the oil business."

Roeser and Richardson did not have Thanksgiving dinner with the President because he cut short his stay at Warm Springs as war neared with Japan. According to the Richardson statement, Elliott advised them his father would see them later, which he did on the Sunday after Pearl Harbor. At that time the oil men were operating the radio chain for Elliott, who was in the Army.

"We did have lunch with him," the statement said, adding that most of the conversation was about the oil business and its relation to the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted at a mass meeting in San Francisco.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, for 8 months, since its birth on January 3, I have followed with interest the peculiar proceedings of the so-called Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee's habits and characteristics are convincing proof of the laws of heredity. The present committee has inherited all of the old Dies committee's character, methods, aims, and motives and it has already been made clear that this present Un-American Activities Committee, like its witch-hunting forebear, is interested in nothing but smearing, insinuating, and extending itself as a political arm. I admit the present committee has seemingly done little these past 8 months—or at least is leaving what little it has done until some strategic time when its unjudicial procedures can effectively damage reputations merely by the committee's investigation of these reputations. However, the activities the committee has engaged in since it was created show its disdain for our constitutional liberties and also show its character as a political weapon.

Before examining the reason—or lack of reason—for existence of the present committee, let us review for a minute the points on which the old Dies committee was condemned by the country at large. It refused to use judicial procedures, smearing and condemning people by means of irresponsible witnesses, by perjured testimony, and by refusing to hear the accused. The old Dies committee appointed investigators who acted without the sanction of the committee. However, through its silence in regard to these investigators, the committee sanctioned their methods of dissregarding the truth, using witnesses who were willing to perjure themselves, and attempting to ruin the good character of people with whom the committee or its investigators happened to disagree. The Dies committee used its high investigating powers to smear publi officials, doing so on several occasions on the eve of elections, at which time it turned its un-American face toward Democrats running for public office and accused them of being Communists or fellow-travellers of Communists. They chose a strategic time for this kind of name-calling, when answers and denials of such accusations could not be made or were ineffective. Nothing ever came of the accusations and investigations except to smear good names by insinuation. Dies himself was of course the most irresponsible of the committee members, disregarding all rules of evidence, acting as a committee unto himself, and showing in every way his scorn of the American tradition of justice and fair play. The new Un-American Activities Committee seems to have much larger ambitions than its predecessor, even though it meets much less frequently. It has shown itself desirous of taking over the functions of the FBI, the FCC, the Interstate Commerce Committee, and the courts. It wants to investigate for the FBI, judge in place of the courts, control functions of the radio in place of the FCC, and initiate laws in regard to radio communications which is more properly the sphere of the Interstate Commerce Committee. Aside from taking on these major tasks, it still finds time, however, to scream Communistic at all with whom it does not agree.

We, here in America, have always enjoyed the privilege of disagreeing. We have never had a "thought police" here to ferret out opposing opinions and kill them. Why, therefore, are we permitting an organ of Congress to act as a Gestapo agent, to cry "Communist" in haste but never even repent at leisure? For 6 months, here on the floor of Congress, I have listened to irresponsible cries of "Communistic." I have heard this cry applied in one way or another to the full employment bill, workmen's compensation, the TVA, the Missouri Authority, the Grand Coulee project, Central Valley Authority, labor's rights of collective bargaining, the Fair Employment Practice Act, anti-poll-tax legislation, and many more measures designed for the welfare of the common man, and the full employment, full production, and full enjoyment of the prosperity of our Nation.

These measures were condemned by Members of this body as communistic. It is unnecessary to point out that all these measures were pledged in the platform of the Democratic Party and most of them in the platform of the Republican Party. Most of these measures were upheld in the President's message to the Congress. It may follow, then, in the minds of some of our Members of Congress that the Democratic and Republican Party platforms and the President of the United States are all communistic. If this does not follow, what certainly does follow is that there are Members of Congress who only support such progressive measures in their party's platform on the eve of election but who refuse to then carry out the will of the people who elected them. I have no quarrel, however, with these individuals or with the individual members of the Un-American Activities Committee. My contention is simply that since there are such differences of opinion, here in the Congress, even as among the people themselves, how can any congressional committee set itself up as an organ to determine who is right and who is wrong, who is American and what is un-American, what is communistic and what is merely progressive—and lastly, but most important, to try to apply all these questions to our free press and our free radio.

Several weeks ago, the committee requested the scripts of nine important radio commentators. Last week the committee's counsel announced to the press that the committee was going to initiate legislation which would compel radio stations to distinguish between what is news and what is opinion. There

is nothing very wrong with such legislation if it confines itself to merely differentiating between news analysts and news reporters. However, the committee spokesman's words were "to regulate wild irresponsible analysts" with "prejudiced viewpoints." Here lies the danger. Is it the Un-American Activities Committee who is to say what is irresponsible and what is not and who may therefore speak and who may not on our radios? This, right along with the intimidating request for the scripts, is a serious attempt to abridge our freedom of speech.

I venture to say that even without this legal differentiation between news and opinion, any American from the age of 8 could distinguish between a 1- to 5-minute news bulletin off the AP and UP wires and a 5- to 15-minute commentary on the news. Commentators are chosen by their sponsors because of their experience, mass appeal, or knowledge. In most cases the sponsors disclaim responsibility for the opinions expressed. In the long run, however, the sponsor renews his contract with the commentator on the basis of his appeal to the public and I always assumed that in this democracy, the mass of the people has common sense, knows what it likes, even knows if it wants to hear honest opposition, and so the commentators and their scripts—and columnists and their columns—rise or fall ultimately by the voice and the will of our American people.

We do not need a congressional committee to scrutinize secretly and for what devious purposes material which is broadcast to the whole world. When this committee said it wished to scrutinize the scripts to "see if they are subversive", I maintain that they were merely intimidating those commentators and their sponsors with whom they happened to disagree in their outlook on political events. I wonder if the radio commentators who are the mouthpieces of the NAM and the reactionary interests of this Nation have also had their scripts requested, so as to scrutinize what is un-American in their attitude? I wonder if the committee was concerned about the next-too-treasonable utterances of the McCormack press during the war we just finished? I wonder if the NAM in America is not a little in sympathy with what this committee is trying to do in its attempt to smear as Reds all progressive commentators. Both Fascist as well as communistic activities must be considered, if accusations are being thrown around indiscriminately.

I fell deeply, however, that this is no time for such wild accusations, hate campaigns, and attempts to silence all opposition views. This is a time for unifying our people, not a time for dividing them. This is a time for full employment, full production, and a spirit of cooperation between labor, agriculture, all the professions, small business, and large business. This is a time for bringing about the fullest realization of all our democratic ideals. This is a time for reconverting to peace with all the vision, energy, and daring we converted to the war and Congress must lend its full capabilities toward this end.

For some time it has been known that the Un-American Activities Committee has been investigating what it calls the Hollywood Reds. Believing it my duty to protect my constituents from the smear of merely being on such a list of subversives as the committee's investigators in Hollywood are purported to be drawing up, I recently attempted to obtain information from the committee about the progress of this investigation. I was refused any information. Yet, on the very day I approached the committee in this regard and was told no information could be given me about the investigation, my attention was called to the November issue of that notorious Fascist magazine the Cross and the Flag, edited by Gerald L. K. Smith. On page 660 of this November issue, volume 4, is an article entitled "Hollywood Exposed" in which 13 points in the Un-American Activities Committee's investigation of Hollywood are revealed. It seems astonishing and most revealing that an admittedly Fascist magazine and its Fascist editor have access to facts concerning recent activities of a congressional committee that are denied to the Congressmen whose constituents are concerned. It appears that in place of the committee clearing through the Congress, it is clearing through Gerald.

No, this is not a committee with a real and necessary democratic function. I maintain that the legislation it will sponsor to control the functions of the radio should rightly come from the Interstate Commerce Committee and be enforced by the Federal Communications Commission. The FBI and the courts can handle adequately questions of subversion or seditious utterances which the Un-American Activities Committee is meddling in. Though this committee acts as a quasi-judicial body, it follows none of the just procedures of our courts. Though it purports to be an aid to the FBI in tracking down subversives, it confines itself to smears against progressives and its political opponents.

The Committee on Un-American Activities should be more rightly named the Committee of Un-American Activities. If it had been thus rightly named, who in this Congress who loves our democracy and values our constitutional liberties would wish to perpetuate it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SPIRIT OF AMERICAN YOUTH

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know that every person on this floor is vitally interested in the welfare of our American boys and our American girls. They are the future Americans. It is not their physical body that will build the future America but it is their spirit and their attitude toward this great free Republic of ours.

I think I know something of the spirit of the American boy from experience. It so happens, as many of you know, that for quite a number of years I was thrown in contact with literally hundreds of fine American boys, interested in athletics, particularly in football. I had an opportunity to see them at first hand, the fine sacrificial spirit that animates a boy when called upon to fight for something in which he heartily believes.

I want to give you just a few illustrations.

I recall one time when I had a team that was going to play another team, and it looked like a hard contest. I had only two quarterbacks, and one of them was incapacitated, in the hospital. The one that I used as a substitute was a boy who did not weigh over 135 or 140 pounds. I said to him before he went on the field that day, "We have a hard contest today and I shall expect you to play the entire game, because we have no substitute." He went on the field and he played a perfectly marvelous game. His great tackles, as he shot out through the air and brought down men before they could reach the goal line, brought the greatest degree of enthusiasm from the crowds, as they saw this little fellow mow down those big husky fellows of the opposing team.

In the second half he played a great game. At the end of the game I went out on the field to congratulate him, but he came toward me with his hand on his jaw. I said, "I want to congratulate you on playing a great game and a full game, and being responsible for the winning of the game." With his hand still on his jaw and talking between his teeth, he said, "I slowed down some in the second half." I said, "Yes, I noticed that. Were you tired?" He said, "No," still talking through his teeth, "you see, I broke my jawbone in the first part of the second half and the bones grinding together took my mind off the game." But he played the game. He is simply typical of the American boy who has been fighting the battles of a great Republic in all parts of the world.

Yes; I recall another case, and it is only one of many I could mention—that of a young man playing the first half. I noticed that in carrying the ball almost from the start of the game the quarterback had to step back two paces and put the ball in his hands. Not once during that first half did he fail to gain—a wonderful halfback, later in life a great lawyer. Between the halves I asked the doctor to examine him. I had talked to this young fellow as he came out between the halves. I said, "I notice the quarterback had to step back a couple of paces and hand you the ball; you did not raise your hands." And he said, "No; I cannot." I asked him why.

He said, "I do not know; I cannot lift my hands, but when I get the ball in my hands I can gain."

I said, "Yes; you gained every time."

The doctor examined him and found that both shoulder bones were broken, but he played—there was no quit in him. He was the type of American boy who has been showing the whole world the high degree of heroism that you find in the American boy brought up under our free institutions.

I want to recall another instance that happened on the shores of Lake Michigan in a great storm. There are storms on that lake which strike terror even to the best seamen. This ship became helpless and finally was wrecked on the rocks. There were human beings on

the disabled ship. A great crowd assembled on the shore from the neighborhood, mostly adults. They said, "That ship is lost and everybody on it." But one young man there—a typical American boy—proceeded to strip off every rag, jumped in the huge rolling waves, and swam out to the boat. He brought back a human being alive. He did that seven or eight times. Finally, they had to pull this heroic and exhausted lad ashore. They took him to the hospital, and in his delirium he kept repeating just one sentence, "Did I do my best?" And the last words the nurse heard that dying boy utter as she bent her head to his lips were, "Did I do my best?"

These boys we have sent to fight our battles have done their best, and we owe them our best. We cannot escape it. They won this war. The war is over. They went into this war at the direction of Congress. They have ambitions; they have aspirations for home life, for education, for marriage, for children, for everything that makes life a joy in a great free country. What are we going to do about it?

They are not being demobilized as they should be. I have letters from all over the world saying that there is shipping to bring them home, that all that is needed is an order from the President of the United States, from the Congress. You Members know that I introduced a bill on September 12, 1945. The committee, of course, has not acted upon it. I waited the requisite number of legislative days and then placed a petition on the desk. Is the report to go out to the country that there are only 75 men in this great legislative body of 435 who are willing to sign that petition and to give these boys a break after what they have done? I hope it is not so.

I have these letters, but I wish every Member of this House would go out to Walter Reed Hospital and confirm with their own eyes what these boys have suffered for you and me and for the preservation of the institutions for which they have sacrificed all that they had. Let us examine some of these letters.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his splendid efforts in hastening the demobilization of those who have served in both the Army and the Navy in this war. Without his efforts I am afraid the rate of discharge would be much slower than it is. The gentleman from New York has waged a great fight in behalf of the war veterans, and my mail indicates they appreciate the fact. May I just say more power to you.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman. I say it is only an act of justice. It does not mean anything to me politically, not at all, but it means everything to these boys and their families. Mothers are awaiting their return, wives are awaiting their return, sisters are awaiting their return, sweethearts are awaiting their return.

These lads are over there with nothing to do, not a thing, on these desolate islands, with plenty of transportation if the President or Congress would act. You Members know the reason without my repeating it why there are no orders issued permitting them to come home.

Here is a letter from New York State with extracts:

DEAR SIR: This information may be useful to convince our Brass Hats and Congressmen to sponsor your bill (H. R. 4010) and get those boys home from overseas.

From letters, mostly boys in the Pacific area, come remarks like these, "Take down that Service Emblem I look like and feel like a dope." "Pop, don't buy any more United States bonds." "Find a place at home so I can never get my hands on this monkey suit." "Send those striker over here, we will work for 75 cents an hour." "Bring those armchair sailors over here."

They went away Americans, but what are they coming home like? God forbid.

Let's get these youngsters home from overseas. Nothing could be worse for the future of America than have three or four million embittered young.

Respectfully yours.

The wife of a serviceman writes and encloses a letter from her husband:

NOVEMBER 7, 1945.

DEAR SIR: After reading the enclosed letter, will you please address any subsequent reply to me. While I hesitate to accuse the Army and Navy of using "gestapo" methods, it has been brought to my attention by the postal authorities that all mail sent to men overseas is "inspected" before delivery, and I don't want to jeopardize my husband's position by having him receive official mail from Washington since his enclosed "gripe" is not for his own benefit, but to bring to your attention the plight of men who have been in the Pacific for three and more years.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. I wish you success in your fight to straighten out the discharge fiasco.

Respectfully yours.

This is the letter from the husband:

DEAR SIR: This depot to which I am assigned is under Replacement Command, Manila, which in turn is under AFWESPAC, Manila. Since the date of our activation, July 1, we have shipped a total of 27,137 men although we are capable of handling easily 30,000 per month.

In the first place, please refer to the Daily Pacifican enclosed, October 14, 1945, issue. You will note a schedule of shipping. We are the Tacloban shipping agency. We today we have shipped a total of 6,392 men compared to our quota of 38,300 for the month. We have no definite word of any further shipping for the month. By way of edification, the Air Force is not included in these figures, as they are not under AFWESPAC, but under FEAF. We have 13,931 enlisted men, 1,325 officers, 330 nurses, and 38 Wacs in the depot awaiting shipment. No man arriving subsequent to September 22 has been shipped.

I'd planned to write you at the end of the month, to be able to quote final figures. However, the Army has, under public and military personnel pressure, finally admitted that every previous statement in regard to demobilization was pure prevarication, invented and obviously designed to placate public opinion and forestall legislation.

Another enlightening fact is the Jap p. o. w. affair. It is common knowledge here that orders have been issued stating that 80 percent of the Jap p. o. w.'s will leave Leyte for return to Japan by November 15. By December 15 the remaining 20 percent will be on their way. Resentment runs high against this very definite inconsideration shown the American soldier, by getting the Japs home for Christmas. Bitter and ironic remarks are being made—"Should have joined the Jap Army," "Let's surrender and get home by Christmas." Army installations on this island require considerable maintenance. P. o. w.'s provide a logical source of labor. As conditions indicate that the Army will be here another 6 months, the manual labor involved for operation will revert to the victorious (?) GI. The Jap will be coddled and fed and clothed—but not worked—in his homeland. In addition, Liberty ships are at present being converted in Tacloban Harbor for that purpose. Do you see any justification for such absolute disregard for the GI? Doesn't that indicate the Army doesn't give a damn for the men?

Please don't consider this a purely personal "gripe" letter. I've been in the Army 38 months, but only 6 months overseas. My point score is 45, so I seek no immediate benefit for myself, even though I pray constantly for an early release from the most degrading and inefficient institution ever foisted on a free people. The point system is not working, as evidenced by the letters written the Daily Pacifican. Where are the 171 separation centers to be in operation by December? What sense is there in lowering the point score to 50 in December when right now we are forbidden by replacement command to accept any man who has less than 90 points? Have we not a right to be resentful and bitter in the face of such flagrant lies being perpetrated? The radio news re unlimited shipping, men with such and such points eligible for discharge, quotas to be shipped, etc., has become known as the War Department lie for the day.

I tell you, sir, for the safety and future of our country, you must take action. I dislike sounding frantic, but my overwhelming desire to see the United States occupy the seat which indicates world admiration is sufficiently strong to require me to speak plainly. I, for one, detest the degrading and inefficient influence of the Army. Multiply my feelings by thousands, and you have a potential powder keg sufficient in strength to split our Nation wide open.

In war we accepted all conditions to get the job done. Now, as American citizens, we insist on an accounting. Although I have every confidence in our democratic country, I regret anything which will cause disharmony and strife. Consider also the effect on the health of all these men here and their families. Statistics show a rapid increase in venereal disease, drunkenness, and disorder, brought about by a "forgotten and be damned" attitude acquired by senseless waiting in a climate and country that has nothing to offer except moral disintegration.

I am not bitter over giving 3 years of my life, but abhor the stupendous inefficiency exemplified by the Army. We want nothing but "out" and the chance to vote against anything pro-Army.

I perhaps am exceeding my authority under Army regulations in writing you, but my sense of decency and fairness has forced me to accept the responsibility. I am, first, an American citizen, and feel I have the right to assist my country to attain the position of success we've worked so hard for. We cannot do it with dissension in the ranks. Give us the unvarnished truth, and then get us home as quickly as possible, thus forestalling any sowing of the seed of revolution.

Respectfully yours.

From an Army corporal in Germany comes the following letter:

DEAR SIR: I have hesitated to write on this matter before because I hoped that the program for returning troops home from Europe would show a satisfactory speed-up, and because I realize that there are thousands of veterans who have more cause for complaint than I.

During the past several weeks, however, there has been no perceptible acceleration in the redeployment program; thousands of

high-point men are still stalled in the ETO; and for those in the middle category of point scores, the situation becomes more despairing each day. All that comes from the Army and the Government is a succession of excuses and alibis on why troops cannot be moved at a more rapid rate, and why veterans must remain in the theater for an indefinite number of months yet.

In my own case, I volunteered through the draft board at ———, N. Y., and entered active service in the Army on December 16, 1942. I have now been overseas for a year, and all this time in service, plus two battle stars, avails me only 54 points. Now, after a series of transfers and reassignments which carried me from Germany to Belgium, to France, I find myself back in Germany constructing a railway bridge across the Rhine, a structure which will cost the American taxpayer a tidy sum, and which, as far as we can discern, will benefit the Germans and French much more than the taxpayer back home.

Meanwhile my father is attempting to operate the farm I left single-handed. At the age of 64, and my mother approaching 72, the burden my parents are carrying is far from light, although he is only keeping about half the stock that we had before I entered the service. And this at a time when food production is one of the most critical problems facing the hungry world. I am the only child. My parents are anxious to have my wife and me take over the operation of the farm, and I am impatiently awaiting the opportunity to do so. Yet, though the fighting has long since ceased, the day of my return home seems no closer—indeed, at times it seems further away than ever. The Army gives out excuses, my parents are still overworked, while I help reconstruct Europe, and my wife lives with her parents at ———, and none of us can find any encouragement in either the Government's actions or explanations.

Why? Why must the soldiers of a nation which accomplished miracles in the transportation of men and millions of tons of equipment and supplies to all parts of the globe under the conditions of war, why must we continue to wait so infernally long while the movement of troops home goes on with incredible slowness?

We are told that the withdrawal of two British ships, that strikes at New York, that Atlantic storms, are the fault. Can two ships cause so much difference to the Nation with the largest merchant fleet in the world? Can the Government intervene with less success in this strike than it did in those affecting the war effort when we were at grips with the enemy? Is the Atlantic suddenly more stormy than it has been before?

We who have served 2, 3, or 4 years in the Army, and 1 or 2 years overseas, are tired of excuses. We want to go home, not at some indefinite time in the future, but with all the speed the Nation can possibly make, if it tries, and we cannot believe it is trying now.

I am not speaking an untruth when I say that the men are rapidly becoming resentful and bitter at the shabby treatment they are getting in the matter of returning home. And I know that I speak for all when I say that if the Army will not take steps to rectify the redeployment program, we expect our Representatives in Congress to take steps to force a speed-up. We came over and fought and won, and the time that consumed from our lives we gave willingly. But the occupation and policing work we feel should be passed on to other young men. We have done the job we came to do, now we want to return to our homes, our wives, our families, our jobs, and we don't want any more excuses. No excuses were accepted from us in doing our job, we are not in the mood to accept those being given us now for the successive delays.

I appeal to you, sir, and to your fellow Representatives, in the name of a decent deal for the veteran and for his family, find out why these delays are existent, force the removal of the men or conditions causing the slowness of our return, and help us return speedily to our own homes and native land again.

Thanking you for your attention, I remain
Respectfully yours.

The mother of a serviceman writes me from Tonawanda, N. Y.:

NOVEMBER 12, 1945.

DEAR MR. REED: I am appealing to you, Mr. REED, to press the bill for the discharge of the servicemen. You seem to be the only man in Washington besides Representative PAUL W. SHAFER, of Michigan, who has not forgotten our boys.

I am a mother of a boy who went into service when he was 18 years old. He has now reached the age of 21. He has been in combat in the European theater and because of age and low points he writes me not to expect him until spring.

I realize there is nothing I can do for him to hasten his return. I am a widow and he is all I have, so I feel so helpless.

Would appreciate, Mr. REED, anything you can do in this serious situation. Those young boys have to get home, so they can have a start in the world and be educated.

Thanking you, I remain,
Very truly yours.

Another letter comes from Tonawanda, N. Y., from the mother of a serviceman:

DEAR MR. REED: I wish you to know that I appreciate your efforts in furthering the discharge bill. It seems to be the only fair plan of discharge, as many of our boys are over there with 45 to 47 points and have been in service 30 to 33 months. I believe it is very justifiable to bring those boys home.

More pressure to bear would be appreciated by many of us who are deeply concerned over the return of our loved ones.

Sincerely.

From a sailor comes this next letter:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I'm sending the enclosed copy to you, sir, with the hopes that some kind of action will be taken. I know you are for us and will do the best you can.

My family as well as myself have been strict Democrats for a good many years, but we've changed, and in a hurry. As my family says: "If he's working to get my boy out, then he's the man for me."

Here's hoping, sir, something can be done about this farce and money-making racket.

Thank you ever so much.

"FROM WHERE WE ROCK

"'Our little seaplane unit,' writes a Navy man from Tokyo Bay, 'comprises only 5 ships and 28 planes, a small slice of the American Navy.' But our little unit is doing its best to fleece you, dear taxpayer.

"Not a single plane of our squadrons has flown in 8 days (another typhoon is on), and not one of our ships has been underway in the past 42 days. We have done even better than that. We've lost 6 planes, costing about $3,000,000, in the last week alone, and that's saying nothing about the 20 or so planes that other seaplane units have lost in these typhoons. Our present 'rocking' record is much better than our fighting record.

"Three thousand men in these five ships have done little the past month except curse the weather, the Government, the brass hats * * * and dream of home.

"And if the weather had been good, there would have been a sightseeing (or patrol) hop along the coast, probably looking for units of the Jap navy which have already been sunk—a rewarding experience.

"But keep smiling, dear taxpayer; this makes it possible for some of 'the boys' to draw their flight pay.

"All of our ships and planes could be bringing high-point servicemen home to their families. But who knows, maybe the veterans are enjoying their extended vacation in the South Sea Islands. And maybe you, dear taxpayer, will enjoy the display of naval might that is being tied up on your east and west coasts for Navy Day.

"(And they say there aren't any ships available for transportation. Who's kidding who?)

"TOKYO BAY, *October 12, 1945.*"

A corporal writes as follows from a hospital here in the United States:

DEAR SIR: I'm writing you because I know you have the interest of all GI's at heart. Mine is a legitimate gripe, please hear my story.

What is being done for limited service men who through no fault of their own never had a chance to accumulate points?

I am 34½ years of age, 42 months in the service and have the following ailments. Poor eyesight, hay fever plus five additional allergies, vasomotor disturbance. These ailments have been the grounds for my not going overseas.

I am now hospitalized for the fourth time this year. I cannot be discharged because I contracted these ailments in America and not overseas. Where is the justice?

Yours truly.

The following letter appeared in one of the ship's papers overseas:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN REED

DEAR MR. REED: Your comments on demobilization printed on page 1 of this paper, give hope and encouragement to the nearly 2,000 men who are my GI colleagues here. They sincerely believe that demobilization should be stepped up, for themselves and for the men who've been out here for so much longer than our brief stay.

Many men aboard our ship are high pointers, and some have passed the 85 mark on this ship. Many have served faithfully in Europe, in Iceland, in the Aleutians, in Panama, in Trinidad, at Pearl Harbor. More than a few are 36, 37, 38, 39 years old, and have children at home, and home responsibilities that men get when they round that 30-year corner. Many quit college to enlist when our country was in danger. Almost all have put in 2 or 3 or 4 years in service where the Army ordered them. And they rightly feel that they're entitled to some consideration in getting back home, to the normal way of life. Others in the Pacific for so much longer are even more deserving. As Representative HAVENNER said, their slogan has been "Wait Till Congress Meets." Men like your straightforward attack on discharges. They want action. And it's men like you, Mr. REED, that we're counting on. All we ask is fair play and action.

Yours truly,

The EDITOR.

The fray is over, the battles are won
There is no more death or loud sound of gun.
Everything's quiet from Guam to Japan,
So why must we stay in this foreign land?

We bore it all then—the filth and the grime
But now we want freedom, please don't waste time.
We are not robots; we're men wanting to live
We've given our best—what more can we give?

We fought for years and at long last have won
And now that it's over the moment has come
To get us all home—and, please, right away
To live our lives in our own U. S. A.

We have the largest fleet on the seas
So we beg and we pray on our bended knees
Just make one more last wonderful trip
To take us all home. Please give us a ship.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The gentleman will remember that a prominent citizen of his State charged that the New Deal would not bring these men back; that a high Army officer had said "we can maintain these men in the Army cheaper than we can on relief."

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am not ready to admit, and I know the gentleman from New York is not ready to admit, that we cannot provide jobs for these men if our private enterprise system is given a chance. There is no reason for not bringing them back.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman knows that since 1933 there have been all the way from 12,000,000 to 13,000,000 unemployed, according to the statistics of the two labor organizations. Never once since 1933 have they been able to make our system function. Why? Because it has been only a sort of a mongrel free enterprise system. Clamps and yokes have been put on people who wanted to develop their enterprises and furnish employment. Therefore, our system just could not function.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I think the gentleman will agree with me that this week we heard an honest planned economist, much franker with us than the planned economists of our own country, lay out also a program that we know will not work.

Mr. REED of New York. I should like to take the floor some day to give my views on the so-called planning. To make a few remarks on it now, the whole history of this country has been that this is a country of planning, but not Government planning. Every man plans; General Motors plans, Ford plans. But the difference between that kind of planning and Government planning is that a group here proposes to plan for the United States, and there is no person or group of persons big enough nor brainy enough to do that. If the plan they lay down fails the whole Government suffers, the whole country suffers, but if an individual plan fails in one enterprise or in half a dozen enterprises, it touches only a small segment of the population.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I believe the gentleman will also agree with me that we have seen an unending procession of these gentlemen, with a divining rod in one hand and a slide rule in the other, claiming to be able to settle all the problems of the United States.

Mr. REED of New York. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. First I wish to commend the very able and active efforts of the gentleman from New York in trying to expedite the demobilization of our armed forces. I am for his bill and for every other bill that will accomplish that purpose.

I am sure the gentleman has observed in the press that hundreds of our ships are being diverted in the Pacific to carrying Chinese soldiers of the south, Chiang Kai-shek's soldiers, together with supplies, a lot of which we furnished, to the north of China.

But for our interference in that war between north and south China, we would have hundreds of ships available to bring our boys home. Furthermore, I see that our country has taken a part in that fight there with the people of Indochina, a country that is 18 times as large as the States of Kentucky or Tennessee, to keep those people in subjection. I am in agreement with the gentleman. It seems to me they do not want to hurry our boys home from the Pacific. They want to keep them there and participate in broils in the countries which we have liberated with American blood and American treasure.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I know how active he has been in trying to get these boys out, as have many of those who have asked me to yield. I know they are patriotic and have signed the petition to try to get this legislation out and bring these boys home. But just as long as we keep our boys planted all over the world and permit them to see what is going on and get mixed up in these quarrels, we will have a series of wars everywhere. You have at least three wars in South America right now. You have it all through the Balkans. There is neither rhyme nor reason for anything they are doing. We need to get our boys home and put this country in order. Private enterprise needs to get going and we will lead the world in prosperity. We can do it under a sound economic program.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Every day my mail is filled with letters from boys in all parts of the world. Some of them are married and have three or four children and cannot get home. They may have 90 or 100 points but they cannot get home because the area commander or officer holds and their immediate commanding officer claims that they are essential and must be kept there. Yet, we have millions and millions of these boys across the seas.

Mr. REED of New York. There is no question about it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We ought to keep driving at it and drive hard until things loosen up and these boys are brought home.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish that every person who believes that what I have said is true and who believes what was said by others on this floor in regard to getting these boys home is true that they would do a little missionary work among the other Members and get them to sign this petition, No. 8, on the Speaker's desk. As I mentioned the other day, people seem to have certain scruples against signing petitions. Perhaps it is not the best way to legislate, but when you cannot get a committee to act for a long time on a matter of this kind, especially when it is one of honor or justice, then this is the way it must be done. What would you think if you went home and went around your neighborhood to visit your friends and asked them to sign your nominating petition? Suppose they were to say, "No, we do not believe in signing petitions; we will not sign," then some Members would not return to Congress at the next session.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that if the President so desired he could issue an Executive order to get these men back and get them back promptly and that the administration must assume responsibility for not doing it and that they must assume the responsibility for having a parade of ships 7 miles long and having ships lying around? It is something that can be handled by the President as the Commander in Chief, is it not?

Mr. REED of New York. It does not require any legislation at all, but when you have the President opposed to the boys coming home and when you have the powerful Military Committee of the House that will not consider legislation to bring the boys home, then the only resort and the only possible remedy for those boys who have fought the battle over there and fought it so gallantly and heroically, for which we are all grateful and proud, is for the Congress to bring out this legislation by way of a petition, and it ought to be signed regardless of any man's scruples about signing petitions.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters, together with a poem which has just been handed to me by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGLINCHEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MCGLINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, this is my maiden speech in the House and I regret that it must be a criticism of one of my distinguished colleagues. On November 2, I wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, calling attention to two bills which I introduced relating to speedy demobilization. As of this date, unfortunately, I have not had the courtesy of a reply regarding my letter.

I called attention to the fact that I was amazed that his committee was busily engaged in discussion of a bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act. It seems to me that this type of legislation rightfully belongs in the Labor Committee and that the Military Affairs Committee should be applying its attention to legislation to bring the boys back home.

I believe that the return of these men to their families could be speeded if Congress had the courage to tackle the problem directly. Thus far, it appears that the War Department dictates to the chairman of this committee. It is claimed widely, and apparently with

some justification, that the reason for retention of men in the armed forces is for the purpose of holding rank. What is being done to refute these allegations? Has the general officer group been reduced? In answer to the first question, apparently nothing, and in the second case, it is a mystery known only to a few on the inside.

Demobilization, to my mind, is the burning issue of the day and I have received thousands of letters from servicemen all over the world, commending me for the introduction of these bills. For fairness they certainly provide for a greater degree of consideration than any other proposal offered. House Resolution 244 would provide for the discharge of men who have served 18 months overseas and those who have had three full years of service. H. R. 4146 would provide for the discharge of married men with one or more children, or in fact any serviceman who has 2 or more dependents.

There can be no question that men who have served honorably overseas for a period of 18 months have earned the right to be returned promptly to their homes. At the same time, there is in this country an army of forgotten men who through no fault of their own had no opportunity to accumulate overseas credits. Many of them were inducted despite physical defects which in most cases made overseas duty impracticable. The average age of this group, according to my observation, is 30 to 37, and it can be readily understood that they are concerned over the prospect of remaining long months in the service in view of the set-back they already have received in their vocations.

Among the most urgent appeals that come to me are those from the wives of servicemen, who have been struggling to maintain their homes and care for their children in the absence of the husband and father. Now that the war has ended they feel, and justly so, that their husbands should be permitted to come home.

It is all very well to point out the difficulties encountered in connection with transportation, but it seems strange that a Navy Day exhibition that entails the use of hundreds of ships could not have been employed in a more useful task, namely, bringing the boys who are waiting at the ports of embarkation to the United States of America.

Another fact I would like to bring to your attention is that more than one of my constituents have discussed with me the advisability of approaching Drew Pearson or Walter Winchell on behalf of some serviceman, feeling that they would be more helpful than a duly elected Representative in Congress. Mr. Speaker, what would you advise? The past few weeks I have been hearing Drew Pearson's broadcasts and heard him criticize the various separation centers because of their laxity in mustering out the boys. But the following week he congratulated one particular center for doubling the number of discharges. Yes, it seems to me these commentators get more consideration from the War Department than the Military Affairs and Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, once again I ask this committee to report my bills. Let us give these boys a real Christmas, which they so justly deserve. Do not let them remain separated from their loved ones while the rest of us celebrate the birth of the Prince of Peace. Yes, I am sure it will be difficult for those who are responsible for holding these men back to celebrate that occasion, knowing that because of their dereliction of duty those boys must spend their holiday away from their families.

Therefore, I ask my distinguished colleagues to urge upon the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee that he report these bills out, so that we may have an opportunity to show these servicemen our sincerity and desire to return them to civilian life and their loved ones.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGLINCHEY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I was much interested in what the gentleman had to say about these long-term servicemen who, through no fault of their own, have had to remain on the mainland of North America and thereby not been able to accumulate sufficient points for discharge. I believe, as the gentleman has stated, that they are the forgotten men in this entire set-up.

Mr. McGLINCHEY. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGLINCHEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. I wish to compliment my colleague on his speech. He has struck a note that appeals to all Members of Congress, particularly myself. Being a member of the Committee on Labor, I have felt it rather ridiculous that the Committee on Military Affairs should handle matters that rightfully belong to the Committee on Labor. In common with the gentleman from Pennsylvania I, too, have received thousands and thousands of letters from servicemen all over the country and all over the world, asking us to speed the demobilization program. We realize that a certain number of men are required to carry out the occupation operations in the occupied countries in a sensible way, but we are concerned about the fellows who have been overseas, who have fought and been wounded but are still over there waiting to be returned to this country. They should be given every consideration. The gentleman has made a distinct contribution in their behalf.

Mr. McGLINCHEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Let me remind the membership that only last year my distinguished colleague was called Private GREEN. He has the honor of being the only United States Army private elected to Congress in the last election. He knows how really worried these boys are about getting back, and he knows likewise the concern of their wives and children that they get back.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGLINCHEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I likewise wish to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the remarks he has made here on the floor this afternoon. I would remind him that on the point of lack of shipping space I made a similar speech on this floor on September 19, in which, among other things, I urged the Navy to use some of the vessels that were now idle or which were about to be decommissioned. I happen to have in my pocket a letter along that very line from a friend and buddy who is in the service, and, with the gentleman's permission, I wish to read portions of this letter.

Mr. McGLINCHEY. I should be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. CHELF. The writer of this letter states among other things the following:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Since I received your speech that you sent to me I have shown it to a good number of the men in the company, because I was proud of what you are doing for the servicemen.

When they had finished it I would lead them into conversation to get their viewpoint on the speech and what they thought of the present demobilization plan. They were all mighty pleased to think that they had someone in Washington who was trying to do something for them. Several have asked that I write to you and give you a little information and I consented because I like them and I also thought that you might want this information to help the cause for which you are fighting.

The men that have been over longest and have from 85 to 90 points and cannot get put on shipment due to the lack of shipping space ask that I tell you of some ships that are being used to transport Jap PW's back to Japan while they are sweating it out here.

1. The *Ralph Waldo Emerson* transported 1,500 Japs home under Auth: Radio Code S-66780.

2. The *Charles Tufts* transported 1,500 Japs on a 15-day voyage under Auth: Radio Code 66275.

3. There has been six ships sail out of the harbor here at San Fernando, *La Union*, northern Luzon within 2 miles of the base here and go back to the United States empty.

These men claim that to get back to the States under any condition would be better than that which they came in here on.

I am passing these opinions on to you because I want to give you the viewpoint of one GI to another and because I thought you would like to know for your own benefit just what was on their minds.

Again, I wish to compliment and thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his contribution this afternoon. These men overseas have done a fine job and are entitled to come home. Ships should not be allowed to come within view of their bases and return to the States empty. Before any vessel is decommissioned, all men should be brought back.

Mr. McGLINCHEY. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his contribution, and especially appreciate his remarks since he also served in World War II and knows the problems of our boys in the service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure the gentleman has been paying close attention to the debate and understands the situation. As I understand it, there are a number of discharge petitions on the desk. One bill provides for the discharge of all men now in service. One bill provides for the discharge of all men now in the service who have had 2 years' service; another for all those who have had 18 months' service; another for all those who are married and have children; another for all those who want to go to school; possibly there are some more. I am just wondering if we discharge all those groups, just what we would have left in the Army. I want to get these boys home as badly as anybody else does, but nothing can be accomplished by talking to ourselves about it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

It seems to me that our Democratic colleagues cannot be on very good speaking terms with the President or else they would say something to him about it. If their statements about returning the veterans are based on facts, they should ask the President to do something about it. It does not do any good to get up here and tell how bad this committee or some other committee may be. The fact of the case is that the President of the United States is Commander in Chief, the war is still on and there is nothing to stop him from issuing a directive any day he wants to which will get these boys home. Someone should assume the responsibility for having 7 miles of ships up there in New York on Navy Day and their spending all the time they did up there, or leaving ships in San Francisco Bay and other ports of this country. Perhaps we are deceiving the boys in the service, I do not know, but I think the time has come that we must admit it is purely an administration policy and they do not seem to want to get the job done too fast. Evidently we are to sit here and wait until this administration gets ready to bring the boys home.

I also call attention to the fact that there is a majority of 53 on the Democratic side of this House. If they cannot run this demobilization business properly, all right, let us admit you cannot do it; yes, even with your majority of 53 Members. Wisconsin papers recently had the following item, saying the Democratic leadership in the Congress do not worry about the shafts of criticism about demobilization. And, to quote:

> The more pressure Republican Congressmen exert on the military to speed up demobilization, the sooner this troublesome subject will be settled.

This really should not be a partisan question.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. I do not think anybody has a monopoly on this anxiety to bring the boys home. The gentleman mentioned the Chief Executive. I went to the White House this morning and talked to the President about this problem and I think that he is just as anxious as any Member of the House or anybody in the country to bring these boys home. We realize it is a great problem, we realize that perhaps to some degree we are to blame, but I think it is the duty of the Committee on Military Affairs and the War Department to get this thing moving.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If the Committee on Military Affairs and the War Department are running the country, let us know it and admit it so we can tell the people the facts. That is the answer to that observation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman bring out the fact that after all the administration has the power, if it wishes, to do a good job and to do this task that should be done. That is, getting these boys out of the service as soon as possible, at least those who have served for a certain length of time. The gentleman also touched on the fact that there was a great waste of shipping space incurred to put on that great spectacle on Navy Day. The gentleman well remembers that many of us protested against the use of those ships at that time for that purpose. Those ships could have been used to bring the boys back home.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Is it not better for us as Members of Congress to leave out the question of where the blame shall be put and do what is within our power; that is, pass a bill requiring it to be done? Is that not our responsibility?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is our responsibility and I know as far as one Member is concerned I have done all I can do, in keeping with just common fairness to the administration, to have the thing done. I have not taken any position that would embarrass the administration or myself. But if all these things are true that you Democrats say and if these men are not useful in the armed forces, then it is the responsibility of this administration to get them back home.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. TRAYNOR. We hear a lot of talk about bringing these boys home. In various camps in this country there are professional men, doctors, dentists, and others who are needed at home. They are there. Now, who ever heard of any serviceman in this country getting out under the point system? They will stay there until they are old men if this war continues. I think we ought to start at home and let some of these men get home first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have another minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if I were a member of the majority party and it was not doing any better job than is being done, I would want a change in the leadership of my party. That is the answer to that observation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to get into politics in connection with this very important matter. This war was fought by those of every political faith. There is no political cleavage between the fathers, mothers, and wives of those men now in the service who are no longer needed there.

I do want to call attention to the fact that the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. The President of the United States holds this situation in the hollow of his hand. A word from him will make all these speeches unnecessary. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] said that he had been down to see the President this morning about this matter. I hope the gentleman will tell the House what the President said to him as to what his position is about discharging these groups. If he asked the President he knows what his position is. The President is opposed to all of these bills providing for the discharge of selected groups, except under the point system and he is opposed to interfering in any way with present regulations governing demobilization. The power to demobilize rests squarely with the President and the Army and Navy. The majority can get any of this proposed legislation through the House if it will only permit it to come up for a vote.

In all humility as a Member of "His Majesty's most loyal opposition," may I say to the majority Members who hold the key that will release these boys no longer needed in the service, you will find plenty of support on this side of the aisle.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, November 30, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] advises me that he will not use the time allotted to him on Monday next; that he will ask for time at some later date.

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS AND DENTISTS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a very serious situation prevails in many communities in agricultural districts. I refer to the great need for doctors and dentists to take care of the civilian population.

I have endeavored in the past to secure from the Army and Navy consideration of early discharges for doctors and dentists to serve certain communities in which at present there is no available medical and dental service. Although splendid cases have been proven by the various cities concerned, yet, almost invariably, there come back rejections of such requests.

Today there has come to my notice a petition to which 1,200 signatures were attached, and which has for its purpose the discharge of Lieut. S. D. Wolstan, so that he might return and serve the community of Minneota, Minn. This community, including the village and farming area surrounding it, embraces a population of 4,000 people, and is entirely without a doctor at present. No satisfactory answer has yet been given by the War Department to this request, and the officials of that village have asked me to help them secure Dr. Wolstan's immediate release.

The nearest medical service that is obtainable is in Marshall, Minn., which is about 10 miles distant, the doctors of which city are so overtaxed with work that they are practically unable from a physical standpoint to make long distance calls to serve another community.

I am calling this to the attention of the House for the simple reason that very scant consideration seems to be given by the various services to requests of this nature from Congressmen, and with this village of Minneota vitally in need of a doctor, there is no time available for the unfolding of a lot of red tape before action is taken.

Surely it is not asking too much of the Army and Navy that they release today doctors and dentists in the same proportion as the services are being reduced. It is common knowledge that many of these men are practically idle. It is my hope that the Army and Navy will show some consideration for the civilian population of America and release at once every doctor and dentist who is not absolutely essential to the services at this time.

Mr. Speaker, may I give to the House at this time further evidence concerning the lack of consideration given by the armed services to requests of this kind.

The Navy Department has recently informed me that the release from the naval service of Lt. Comdr. Leonard J. Monson, MC–V(S) USNR, cannot be considered at this time. Such rejection has been summarily made in spite of the fact that the city of Canby, Minn., is backed up by the Minnesota State Board of Medical Examiners in its contention as to the necessity in relation to the return of Lieutenant Commander Monson to the Canby community. That community, village, and agricultural area combined, embraces approximately 10,000 people and has available as a surgeon only one man. At the very same time good surgeons in the Navy are twiddling their thumbs with nothing to do.

The city of Canby, through the hospital board of that city, has appealed several times to the Navy Department to release Lieutenant Commander Monson, but without avail. They state:

As hostilities have now ceased we are of the opinion that Dr. L. J. Monson's return to his private practice is most vital. The combined population of Canby and community our doctors are called upon to serve totals approximately 10,000, and at the present time we have only one doctor who can qualify as a surgeon. This is a most serious situation.

The Minnesota State Board of Medical Examiners, through its secretary, has also urged upon the Navy Department the necessity of having another physician at Canby, and that Dr. Monson is the logical person, having practiced there previously. In spite of this, the Navy decides differently and rejects this plea.

Mr. Speaker, may I also cite the situation at Lamberton, Minn. Early in 1942 the local doctor of that community, Dr. Edward M. Anderson, joined the United States armed forces upon the solicitation of the Office of Procurement. Following that, he spent about 2½ years in overseas service.

The community of Lamberton has been left without a competent doctor. The only medical men left in that community last April were three retired gentlemen, two of them over 80 years old, and the other past 75. None of these three retired physicians had any office or equipment, or even an automobile, and yet the listing of their names in the Medical Directory made the situation, as far as Lamberton was concerned, look bad to the casual observer.

Upon my presenting this case to Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General, I received a flat rejection. Again in September, following the conclusion of the war, I asked for reconsideration of the case, and stated at that time that one of the three old gentlemen had passed away since spring, and that neither of the other two was able to help in a medical capacity. I again received the sort of rejection that we in Congress are all too accustomed to receive, a letter which was evidently written by some Wave or Wac, who seemingly have instructions to use form letter X, Y, or Z in their replies, to fit the case under consideration.

The Surgeon General's Office, under date of September 25, did concede that possibly Major Anderson would be relieved from active duty because of the point system not later than December 15. But that is slight comfort to the thousands of people of that community who, like any other civilians, occasionally need medical attention and cannot secure that attention without traveling miles to another community, whose doctors are themselves hard pressed.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the House today these three cases in the hope that the services will wake up to the fact that while we in Congress realize that it is absolutely necessary for the boys in the services to have the best medical care that we can give to them, there is at the same time a responsibility on the part of the services to see to it that any medical and dental talent not absolutely needed should be released at once for the civilian population of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BENDER (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of G. H. Moore and Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Moore; and

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of the estate of Donald Rhone.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1036. An act to provide for the adjustment of the compensation of certain members or former members of the armed forces of the United States who, before the expiration of their terminal leave, have performed, or shall hereafter perform, civilian services for the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of G. H. Moore and Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Moore; and

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Donald Rhone.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 16, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

BRAND NAMES AND NEWSPRINT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Brand Names and Newsprint Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Friday, November 16, 1945.

Business to be considered: Hearing on newsprint.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

829. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

830. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Ernst V. Brender; to the Committee on Claims.

831. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a complete set of laws passed by the municipal councils and the legislative assembly of the Virgin Islands during the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 1689. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 1208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 4699. A bill to extend percentage depletion at the 15-percent rate to bentonite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4700. A bill to provide Federal pensions for all individuals not covered by title II of the Social Security Act, and to repeal title I of said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 4701. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4702. A bill to authorize enlisted men and warrant officers of the Regular Army who have served as commissioned officers in World Wars I and II retain their commissions or be retired in highest rank attained; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 4703. A bill to reduce and revise the boundaries of the Joshua Tree National Monument in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4704. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4705. A bill to prevent the contamination of streams and other bodies and sources of water by the escape of sulfur or other polluting water from abandoned coal mines, to prevent entry of such mines by unauthorized persons or livestock, and to aid in preventing or extinguishing mine fires; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 4706. A bill to authorize the appointment of members of the Navy Nurse Corps as commissioned officers in the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RABIN:

H. R. 4707. A bill to extend foreign trade zone privileges to certain types of warehouses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 4708. A bill to provide a method of paying subrogation claims arising out of insurance payments for damages sustained as the result of explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on June 17, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution providing for the bringing to the United States of the bodies of two unknown warriors, who were members of the American forces who served, one in the European theater of war and the other in the Pacific theater of war, and lost their lives during World War II, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a public document of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income Tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II," and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4709. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Franklin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4710. A bill for the relief of Mary Brenton, widow of Richard Brenton, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4711. A bill for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAYFIEL:

H. R. 4712. A bill for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 4713. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reappoint James H. Calk; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4714. A bill for the relief of Lavender W. Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4715. A bill for the relief of Robert P. Stevens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 4716. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Borell; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1324. By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition from the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, by Mr. August Flom, financial secretary, including 226 names, requesting passage of the full employment bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1325. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of numerous citizens of Eddyville, Iowa, in the interest of H. R. 2229, H. R. 2230, S. 690, and S. 809; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1326. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of New York Congregational Church Association, endorsing the FEPC; to the Committee on Labor.

1327. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Associated Industries of Rhode Island, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the State of the Union; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1328. Also, petition of William H. Maynor, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to certain investigations of pier 3 of the Seventh Naval District, Miami, Fla.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, from whom we dare not turn lest we fall, and in whom, if we abide, we stand fast forever, grant us, we beseech Thee, this day Thy help in all our duties, Thy guidance in all our perplexities, Thy mercy and forgiveness for all our shortcomings. Suffer not any one of us to cloud the sky or to bruise the rightful self-respect of any fellow pilgrim on life's dusty way by malice or contempt or failure to lift the cup of encouragement by withholding the full meed of praise for another's work or worth.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom the few among the many to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority and stewardship of government, that there may be justice and peace at home and that through obedience to Thy law and will we may show forth Thy praise among all the nations of the earth. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 15, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the

President had approved and signed the following acts:

On November 14, 1945:

S. 131. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery by property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon;

S. 201. An act for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer;

S. 504. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Crosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township;

S. 559. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service," approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941;

S. 788. An act for the relief of the estate of George J. Ross;

S. 883. An act for the relief of Charlie Tyson;

S. 927. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937;

S. 980. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. Saint Amant, Jr.;

S. 994. An act for the relief of the Central Leaf Tobacco Co., Inc.;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest L. Barlow;

S. 1027. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hibernia I. Conners;

S. 1183. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising from activities of the War Department or of the Army;

S. 1219. An act authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.;

S. 1259. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.; and

S. 1420. An act to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes.

On November 15, 1945:

S. 940. An act to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada;

S. 1139. An act for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims;

S. 1199. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman; and

S. 1362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 391) to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 784) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr., and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 15, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1036) to provide for the adjustment of the compensation of certain members or former members of the armed forces of the United States who, before the expiration of their terminal leave, have performed, or shall hereafter perform, civilian services for the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters which were referred as indicated:

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by Campbell Post, No. 596, of Campbell, and District 13, of Santa Cruz, both of the American Legion, in the State of California, favoring the enactment of legislation providing funds for the restoration of devastated countries throughout the world and for the rehabilitation of people in foreign lands whose lives have been disrupted by the ravages of war; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Conference on the Foreign Born in Postwar America, New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation for the immediate entry into the United States of at least 100,000 Jewish victims of fascism, regardless of quota limitations, and that they be granted asylum by the American people; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 1171) to protect interstate and foreign commerce by providing for the prompt, peaceful, and just settlement of labor relations controversies between employers and employees, to establish the rights and obligations of the parties thereto, to amend the National Labor Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ATTITUDE OF INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS TOWARD ANGLO-AMERICAN PETROLEUM AGREEMENT

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the Independent Petroleum Association of Texas has officially gone on record as opposed to the Anglo-American petroleum agreement which was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week. I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter from the Independent Petroleum Association of Texas setting forth their reasons for their opposition, together with two news articles attached thereto.

There being no objection, the letter and news articles were received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS,
Dallas, Tex., November 12, 1945.

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: By unanimous vote, the directors of the Independent Petroleum Association of Texas, at a meeting Thursday—

1. Went on record against ratification of the Anglo-American Petroleum agreement which was submitted to the Senate last week by the President with a request from him that it be approved;

2. Instructed D. Harold Byrd, president of this association, to send you a telegram indicating our opposition to the proposed agreement,

3. Endorsed the stand taken against this agreement by Olin Culberson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, and by Bascom Giles, State Land Commissioner of Texas, and

4. Instructed the undersigned to convey to you our opposition to this agreement more fully, as follows:

The best evidence that the petroleum industry of America can operate successfully in the future under the American system of free enterprise and free competition is this industry's record of achievement in the past.

When the war broke out, the petroleum industry of America was ready as a strong, going concern to answer every demand. We poured out the very lifeblood of oil and oil products in astronomical quantities despite restrictions and regulations imposed by the National Government as wartime measures.

The revised copy of the agreement, the original of which was withdrawn by the late President Roosevelt when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee declined to approve it, is a rehash of the original. The objectional features in the original are not quite as obvious in the revised copy. Reshuffling articles and sections of the original so that they appear under different heads in the new text does nothing to make the new one acceptable.

The reshuffling begins in article I of the new treaty; on close inspection, article I of the old treaty is found in article I of the new treaty; section 1 of article I of the old treaty is section A of article I of the new treaty; section 2 of article I of the old treaty is section B of article I of the new treaty; section 4 of article I of the old treaty appears in section B of article II of the new treaty; section 5 of article I of the old treaty

shows up in section A of article II in the new treaty; section 6 of article I of the old treaty shows up in section C of article II in the new treaty.

Article II of the old treaty is simply brought forth as article III of the new treaty. This is just a reshuffle.

Article III of the old treaty wends it way back into the new treaty in article IV.

Article IV of the old treaty comes forward as article V in the new treaty.

Article V of the old treaty is found in section C, 1, and 2 of article VII of the new treaty.

Article VI of the old treaty is simply article VIII of the new treaty.

Once the proposed treaty is approved it will supersede the Constitution of the United States. It will become the duty of the Congress to pass whatever laws the Federal Government thinks are necessary to make the treaty effective. The citizens of this country will have no redress in court on appeals for their constitutional rights because of the very fact that a treaty does outrank the Constitution.

There is no real, genuine need for an international agreement on oil even in the form released to the press and widely published in the daily papers and trade journals. The copy given to the public differs from the copy sent to the Senate in one important particular. The public copy states that it shall apply to all British colonies whereas the Senate's copy says it shall apply to those British colonies, a list of which is appended. The list omits the only two colonies which produce oil in any quantities, Kuwait and Burma.

The effect of this tampering is to slip through the Senate a treaty which would put the United States, which produces large quantities of oil, under the terms of the treaty and at the same time exempt the only oil-producing colonies held by the British.

The correction of this error, if it is an unintentional error, would, in no sense, make the proposed agreement acceptable or advisable.

The British concept of carrying on foreign business is through cartels with the British Government, itself, being financially interested. The recent elections in England approved nationalization of certain British institutions and industries.

If the proposed oil agreement is approved, the American members of the commission set up by the agreement would have to deal with an equal number of British representatives whose training and background make them cartel-minded when it comes to foreign business and nationalization of resources and industries at home. Both of these concepts are alien to the American way.

If we make a start, even an innocent looking start, toward putting any part of the American petroleum industry under the sayso of an international commission we may look for proposals to do the same thing to other commodities in world trade—cotton, cattle, wheat, corn, wool, and coal—to name only a few which are produced in America.

We bespeak your active opposition to the ratification of the Anglo-American Petroleum Agreement.

Sincerely yours,

D. HAROLD BYRD.
E. B. GERMANY.
W. L. PICKENS.
GRADY H. VAUGHN.

[From the Dallas Morning News]

ANGLO-AMERICAN OIL DEAL CALLED COLLUSION SCHEME

AUSTIN, TEX., November 6.—Land Commissioner Bascom Giles denounced the pending Anglo-American oil treaty as a masterpiece of collusion between certain Government officials of Great Britain and the United States under which terms the American way of life would be "mortgaged for a mess of pottage."

"Ratification of the treaty (by the United States Senate) could lead to the development of a gigantic camouflaged international cartel, the very kind which flourished under the rule of fascism and nazism," Giles declared.

"It will not only amend the Constitution through subterfuge but will deal a death blow to the rights of a sovereign State to regulate production of one of its greatest sources of wealth.

"There is also no doubt but that recognition of this pact would cost Texas millions of dollars in school land revenue annually. Government control under the Petroleum for War Administration, supplementing State control, tolerated during the national emergency, was dictatorial and cumbersome enough, but for this Government subhimely to ignore State rights and pass over sweeping control to a foreign political hierarchy during peacetime would be catastrophic.

"Such action would be tantamount to permitting peaceful subjugation by foreign powers, who in ravaging our national resources would soon drag us down to the economic level of a second-rate power or to political and economic serfdom."

HIDDEN DANGER SEEN

"The hidden danger of the treaty lies in the fact that no provision is made to prevent representatives of probable additional signatory powers, producing only a fraction of the world's oil supply, from entering into a collusion to outvote this Nation in matters of control production and marketing.

"Texas would be harder hit than any other State in the Nation since it would have little to say about where private business could drill.

"Neither could it regulate production to prevent draining away this great wealth for the benefit of some foreign power. There would be no such thing as State control, as such policy making would depend on the whims of members of the proposed international council who could exercise supreme dictatorial power over exploration, production, and marketing.

"The treaty is being sponsored under the claim that the world's petroleum stocks are dwindling rapidly whereas outstanding experts of the petroleum industry are on record before congressional committees with the declaration that there is no way to calculate the oil reserves still undiscovered."

SENATE GIVEN RUSH ACT

"These same experts have testified that our coal supplies from which oil can be produced are apparently inexhaustible. They have further testified that by devoting one-third of our present proven reserves of natural gas and by producing them at the rate of 4 percent annually we can produce 500,000 barrels of oil daily, which is one-third of our present domestic consumption.

"The effort to force this treaty through the Senate at all costs is a determined one, as is attested by the fact that after the Senate had once rejected the original instrument proponents immediately sought to sneak in the back door by pretending to extract the teeth of the measure and resubmit it as a harmless but beneficial pact.

"Everyone familiar with methods often employed to foster harmful legislation on the public has recognized the old trick of dressing a wolf in sheep's clothing and slipping it in. There can be no doubt but that once adherents of the pact succeed in securing its passage the next step would be to restore the fangs."

CULBERSON CHARGES TAMPERING WITH ANGLO-AMERICAN OIL TEXT

AUSTIN, TEX., November 3.—Olin Culberson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, Saturday denounced the propcsed Anglo-American oil agreement which President Truman has submitted to the United States Senate for ratification.

The treaty submitted to the Senate covers just part of British oil territory but includes all under the jurisdiction of the United States, Culberson said.

The Texas Railroad Commission regulates nearly half of the production within the United States.

Culberson's statement follows:

"Examination of the oil agreement signed in London September 24 and filed on Friday with the United States Senate reveals a startling difference between this official text and the text released to the press and widely published in this country in recent weeks. Only one word has been changed, but that word is all important. It has the effect of leaving the British free to handle the bulk of their oil as they see fit while subjecting this country's petroleum resources to an oil cartel. In the text of the treaty published throughout the world after the agreement was signed in London, the following language appeared, in article 7, subsection C:

"'That for the purpose of this article the word 'country' shall mean—

"'(1) In relation to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and North Ireland the United Kingdom, all British Colonies, overseas territories protectorates, protected states, and all mandated territories administered by that government, and (2) in relation to the Government of the United States of America the continental United States and all territories under the jurisdiction of the United States lists of which as of the date of this agreement have been exchanged.

"The text of the agreement filed with the Senate changes the provisions of the All British Colonies, etc., shall come under the agreement to read 'Those British Colonies,' etc. One word was changed, the word 'all' to the word 'those.'

"Under this new language, all British territories are not included. Only those territories contained in a list exchanged with the United States Government are affected. Burma and Kuwait on the Persian Gulf are omitted from the British list accompanying the treaty. It appears that Burma, future chief oil producer of the British Empire, is exempted, although through the text widely published in this country, the American people were led to believe that all British producing countries were to be included in the agreement.

"Now it is revealed that the official documents, by a change in one word which could easily be overlooked, changes the whole complexion of the agreement by exempting one of the chief British oil holdings, while subjecting all the oil resources of this country to international control and manipulation.

"This is but a new reason for looking upon the proposed treaty with speculation. This is a characteristic diplomatic maneuver which the American people should reject most emphatically. This new development is typical of the whole effort to bring the oil resources of the United States within an international cartel which the British hope will open the gates of this country to duty-free oil."

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from John H. Burns, Jr., president of the Wichita (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, embodying a resolution adopted by its board of directors with reference to the stand taken by Bernard M. Baruch as to our tremendous national debt. I am in full accord with this program, and ask unanimous consent to present the letter and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WICHITA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Wichita, Kans., November 10, 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Member, United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The board of directors of this organization has asked me to convey to you the following resolution which it has unanimously adopted:

"Because of the tremendous national debt which has been unavoidably incurred by the United States during World War II, with its resultant fiscal and economic problems of gigantic proportions, the board of directors of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce respectfully urge the President and the Congress to act with the least possible delay upon the advice of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, mentioned in press dispatches within the past week, that a national balance sheet be prepared so that the American people may know the facts concerning the Nation's total debt obligations, total revenues that may be safely depended upon, how much the Government can afford to advance as loans to war-devastated countries to aid their rehabilitation programs, and how much the Government can afford to contribute as gifts for the purpose of meeting their emergency relief needs.

"It is our belief that until such a balance sheet is prepared, giving answers to these vital and basic questions, no really intelligent or businesslike approach can be made by the Government toward decisions that are essential and of the greatest magnitude in solving domestic and international problems upon which, to a great extent, the peace and general welfare of this Nation and the world depend."

Your comments on this matter will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. BURNS, Jr.,
President.

PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION LEGISLATION—LETTER FROM J. O. GUSTAFSON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from J. O. Gustafson, of Scranton, Kans., president of the Kansas-Missouri Ministerial Association of the Evangelical Covenant Mission Church, opposing the enactment of peacetime conscription legislation. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS-MISSOURI MINISTERIAL
ASSOCIATION OF THE EVANGELICAL
COVENANT MISSION CHURCH OF AMERICA,
October 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR B. CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The ministers of the Kansas-Missouri Ministerial Association, assembled in conference at Oberlin, Kans, October 2–5, 1945, wish to give expression to their opposition to the enactment of the May bill, H. R. 515, which would introduce peacetime conscription as a future policy of our Nation. We feel that peacetime conscription is wholly out of character with our American traditions. Where it has been used in past generations, it has not been a safeguard for peace, but often has been an incentive to aggression and war. Moreover, we feel that such an important legislation should not be passed while millions of our men are still overseas.

This piece of legislation threatens seriously to alter our life and institutions. The passage of such legislation immediately after the overwhelming American ratification of the United Nations Charter would tend to destroy the world's confidence in the sincerity of America's participation in responsible cooperative action on behalf of peace.

We therefore urge you to use your voice and influence for the postponing of the enactment of this piece of legislation.

In behalf of the conference:

Rev. J. O. GUSTAFSON,
Chairman, Scranton, Kans.
Rev. H. L. HULTMAN,
Secretary, Axtell, Kans.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1601. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Valley and McCone, Mont., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Frazer, Mont.," approved August 5, 1939; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1602. A bill to confirm title to certain railroad-grant lands located in the county of Kern, State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(Mr. ANDREWS introduced Senate bill 1603, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and appears under a separate heading.)

BUILDING FOR UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS AND THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill of considerable importance. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the construction of a building, including furnishings and equipment, for use by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, on land now owned by the District government. The site, which is clear of structures and has been used for some time as a parking lot, is bounded by Constitution Avenue, C Street, John Marshall Place, and Third Street NW.

The District government purchased the site in 1929–32 at a cost of $1,770,000. Its present value, as appraised by the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, is $2,420,000. Under the bill title to the site will pass from the District government to the Federal Government.

The amount authorized to construct, furnish, and equip the building is $10,300,000. The building is to be constructed by the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with plans to be approved by a committee of five, consisting of the chief justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the chief justice and an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, one of the District Commissioners, and the Architect of the Capitol.

One-half of the cost of the project is to be borne by the Federal Government and one-half by the District government.

As the District government already owns the site, evaluated at $2,420,000, and as the District and Federal Governments are to share the cost of the project on a 50–50 basis, the District government will be allowed to deduct, as a credit, from its share of the cost of the building, one-half of the value of the site, or $1,210,000.

As the building is estimated to cost $10,300,000, the amount to be borne by the District and Federal Governments on a 50–50 basis would be $5,150,000 each. Deducting from this amount one-half of the value of the site already owned by the District government leaves as the balance to be paid by the District government the sum of $3,940,000.

Adding to the amount of $5,150,000 the half of the value of the site to be borne by the Federal Government makes the total to be paid by the Federal Government the sum of $6,360,000.

The Federal Government is to pay for the construction of the building and to be reimbursed the amount of $3,940,000 by the District government over a period of 10 years following completion of the building. After completion the building is to be maintained and operated on a 50–50 cost basis, divided equally between the Federal and District Governments.

The building in Judiciary Square which now houses the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has been occupied by that court since its erection in 1910. The building is located on Government-owned land and was constructed at the expense of the Federal Government.

The building in Judiciary Square which now houses the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia has been occupied by that court for more than a century. The building, constructed in 1823 and enlarged in 1873, was reconstructed in 1916–19 at a cost of $850,000, one-half of which reconstruction cost was borne by the Federal Government and one-half by the District government. The building, which is located on Government-owned land, is no longer adequate to meet the needs of the court. In fact, for sometime now, it has been necessary for the court to borrow space in other buildings to carry on its activities, and the work of the court is being greatly hampered.

The cost of maintenance and operation of these buildings has for many years been prorated between the Federal and District Governments. Under the terms of the 1946 annual appropriation act, the cost of the District Court Building's maintenance is borne 60 percent by the District government and 40 percent by the Federal Government, and of the Court of Appeals Building, 30 percent by the District government and 70 percent by the Federal Government.

It is urgent that a new building be provided for these courts at the earliest possible date. The district court is now obliged to occupy scattered space in five different buildings, and this fact, together with the fact that the combined space available is inadequate for the court's needs, is not only seriously hampering the work of the court at the present time, but is also making it impossible

for the court actually to carry on certain absolutely necessary work.

It is provided in the bill that the Fine Arts Commission shall pass upon the exterior design of the building, and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission shall pass upon the exact location of the building on the site.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1603) to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction, equipment and furnishing of a building thereon for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. ANDREWS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

APPROPRIATION FOR UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment to House Joint Resolution 266. The joint resolution provides an appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I ask permission to have the amendment printed in the RECORD, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was received, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, strike out the last word in line 3, and all of lines 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to any agency of the Government for the purchase or acquisition of any agricultural product, raw or processed, save such agricultural commodities, raw or processed, at the time of the approval of this act, as are already in the possession of agencies of the Government, which will reflect to the producers of such commodities a price, or prices, below the full parity price on any such commodity processed or manufactured in whole, or substantial part, from any agricultural commodity as provided by section 301, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and by section 201 of the Stabilization Act of 1942: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used, directly or indirectly, for the purchase of agricultural commodities, raw or processed, produced outside of the United States, and our possessions, unless such commodities are not available at full parity prices as provided herein, in the United States and our possessions, or unless such commodities, raw or processed, are commanding a price, or prices, higher than the price standard, or standards, provided by law: *And provided further*, That in all matters where controversies arise with respect to prices to be paid for agricultural commodities, raw or processed, the certificate of the amount of the full parity price, as provided herein, by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be final."

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO THE HANDLING OF INSOLVENT RAILROADS

Mr. WHEELER (for himself and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 192), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Whereas as of June 30, 1945, some 76 railroads in the continental United States were in the hands of receivers and trustees because of insolvency proceedings brought under Section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, or through equity court procedure; and

Whereas the mileage of these railroads is approximately 50,000, and the investment in road and equipment exceeds $4,000,000,000; and

Whereas some of these roads entered bankruptcy in 1933, more than 12 years ago; and

Whereas according to the best information available, court proceedings involving some very important railroads are in such a condition that it is difficult if not impossible to approximate the time when reorganization will be completed and normal operation of the roads be resumed; and

Whereas the earnings of these roads in recent years have been sufficient to accumulate large cash amounts, and have placed such roads in an apparently solvent position; and

Whereas the continued holding of roads that have become solvent in trustee or receiver operation as insolvent roads, is contrary to the general public interest and contrary to sound public policy: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate is authorized and directed either as a committee, or through a duly constituted subcommittee, to make an investigation of the conditions surrounding the operation and handling of said railroads by trustees and receivers through the period of receivership or trusteeship; to inquire into the causes for the long drawn out period of insolvency handling; to investigate the fees paid trustees, receivers, counsel, bankers or bank syndicates, and any and all matters relating thereto. The committee is directed to report to the Senate as early as practicable, with such recommendations as to changes in existing law as may be found desirable to bring roads now insolvent back into solvent operation, and to avoid these long periods of trustee and receiver handling for the future.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expense of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

A NEW DECADE OF FALSE PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM THE GADSDEN (ALA.) TIMES

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New Decade of False Peace," by Mr. Walling Keith, editor of the Gadsden (Ala.) Times, and published in that newspaper on November 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMISTICE DAY ADDRESS BY RABBI NORMAN GERSTENFELD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered on Armistice Day, November 11, 1945, by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPERATION OF THE BANKRUPTCY LAWS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Doesn't Work; Fix It," relating to operations under the bankruptcy laws, published in the Pittsburgh Press of November 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY MAJ. WILLIAM MOISELLE BEFORE THE STATE CONVENTION, A. F. OF L., AND MINNESOTA STATE CONVENTION, CIO

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two addresses delivered by Maj. William Moiselle, one before the State convention of American Federation of Labor at Duluth, Minn., on October 22, 1945, and the other before the Minnesota State convention of CIO, at Minneapolis, Minn., on November 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their appears in the Appendix.]

Andrews	Hart	O'Daniel
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Huffman	Shipstead
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Carville	Kilgore	Stewart
Chavez	Knowland	Taft
Connally	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Tunnell
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Mead	Walsh
Ferguson	Millikin	Wheeler
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wiley
George	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK] are attending, with the Secretary of Agriculture, an important regional agricultural conference at Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is a member of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion Convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT, 1946—AMENDMENT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish for a few minutes to engage the attention of the Senate with respect to an amendment which I intended to submit to the rescission bill which, as I understand, will come up for consideration immediately succeeding final action on the pending bill.

I do so because I am obliged to be absent from the Senate this afternoon and Saturday and Monday. The amendment, which I think will be offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], relates to the pay of flight officers. We had quite a controversy and considerable hearings in the Committee on Appropriations over the matter, and the amendment I speak of was defeated by a vote of 9 to 8, by only one vote. The committee then adopted an amendment relating to the same subject matter, which does not immediately, at least, affect the pay of the flight officers whatsoever.

My proposed amendment reads as follows:

> On page 44, line 8, strike out the word "Effective", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The appropriations contained in the 1946 War and Navy Department Appropriation Acts shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by flying or nonflying officers at rates as follows:
>
> "Nonflying officers, $720 per annum."
>
> Flying officers, not in parachute jumping or glider pay status, who are required by orders of competent authority to participate in regular and frequent flights as an essential part of their military duty and training, shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when in consequence of such orders they participate in such flights: *Provided*, That such increase shall not exceed $125 per month.

That is the present law, and the amendment does not affect the pay of the nonflying officers.

The flight pay, as it relates to officers, was authorized in the act of 1942 and is 50 percent above their base pay. So that generals in the Army who receive $8,000 per annum receive $4,000 in addition as flight pay, and admirals who receive $8,000 per annum receive $4,000 in addition as flight pay.

The purpose of the amendment is in time of peace to cut out the excess flight pay of all such officers, naval and Army, and to reduce the excess flight pay to $1,500 per annum. That will not affect any officer in the Army of the rank of major or below the rank of major, or in the Navy of the rank of lieutenant commander or below the rank of lieutenant commander. There is no reason, Mr. President, why in time of peace this excessive flight pay should be given to the admirals and generals and other high-ranking officers.

The evidence shows that under regulations prescribed by the War and Navy Departments admirals and generals and other high-ranking officers are required to fly 4 hours a month in order to qualify, and if they do not fly 4 hours in the first month they can then fly 8 hours in the second month, and if they do not fly 8 hours in the second month they can fly 12 hours in the third month. I think the evidence shows that this privilege has been abused and that officers who are stationed here in Washington receiving this flying pay make their flights not so much for training, but rather in order that they may qualify to receive their excess pay. For instance, they might fly from Washington to New Orleans to attend a football game, or fly from Washington to New York, and make two such trips in a month, and put in 4 hours flying, and for doing so some of them would receive as much as $4,000 a year extra.

Mr. President, it is said we owe a great deal to the flying corps of the Army for the great victory we have won. There is no question that that is true. But, Mr. President, I do not think that these officers would expect to continue to receive this tremendous extra pay simply because they have rendered heroic service in World War II.

There are others who have also rendered heroic flight service who are not paid as much as my amendment proposes should now be paid to these high-ranking officers. Take, for instance, those who are engaged in parachute jumping. They receive according to law an excess pay, but such excess pay is limited to $100 a month. Those who are engaged in flights in gliders also receive excess pay, but that also is limited to $100 a month. It is less than the $125 which the amendment proposes shall be paid as extra pay to generals and admirals.

Mr. President, in lieu of this amendment the committee adopted an amendment proposing that the War and Navy Departments report back to Congress by January of next year concerning all this excess pay, and that therefore we should wait until that report is received before taking any action.

There has been considerable discussion of this matter in the Appropriations Committee from time to time. It first came up in reference to flight surgeons, as I recall, and it was stated that nothing could be done in the Navy Department appropriation bill, for instance, because that would not affect the appropriations made in the War Department appropriation bill, and in the War Department appropriation subcommittee it was said nothing could be done because that bill would not affect the Navy Department. But here we have a bill which relates to both the War Department and the Navy Department. Here we have a case in which unquestionably the pay to flight officers above the rank of major in the Army and above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy is excessive, and ought to be reduced. This amendment suggests that it be reduced to $125 a month, which would be $1,500 a year. I cannot understand why flight officers should at the present time be given any substantial increase over and above other officers. There is no grave hazard today in connection with flying. It may be that some of the officers who are old in the service cannot handle a plane with the same accuracy and quickness of movement with which a youth can handle it, and it is possible that they may get into trouble. However, I understand that when they fly they usually have a copilot who really handles the plane.

Take the case of the Chief of Staff. The Chief of Staff receives $8,000 a year. A flying admiral or flying general receives $8,000 plus $4,000 a year, or a total of $12,000. There is no necessity for this excess pay, because in time of peace there is no great hazard in flying. There is no more hazard in ordinary flying than there is in glider flying or parachute jumping, and yet, with respect to both those classifications, the excess pay is limited to $100 a month.

It is said that flight officers must pay a little higher premiums on their life-insurance policies. Very well. One hundred and twenty-five dollars a month would be far more than ample to take care of the extra premiums which they must pay upon their life-insurance policies.

I should like to see adopted the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from Tennessee when the rescission bill comes before the Senate. We have before us a case in which excess pay is being paid to a splendid arm of the service in time of war, and which excess pay is no longer necessary in time of peace. We can wait until January, when the War and Navy Departments can make reports on excess pay paid to submarine officers, glider pilots, parachute jumpers, and flight surgeons. Then the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee can undertake to recommend new legislation regulating their pay. But this is a case in which the highest excess pay is given to certain flight officers when in peacetime they are not entitled to the exorbitant excess pay which they receive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I entered the Chamber just as the Senator from Louisiana was concluding his explanation of the amendment which is to be offered to the rescission bill. At this point I desire merely to say that several members of the Appropriations Committee were opposed to the theory of the amendment while the bill was under consideration. The committee decided—I believe by a vote of 9 to 8—to reject a similar amendment. At this time I do not desire to take the floor to give the arguments against the amendment, except to say that those of us who voted against it in its original form felt that it would be very destructive of the morale of the Air Corps in both the Army and Navy at a time when it is very essential to maintain that morale. We feel that the provision which the committee wrote into the bill is a sufficient guarantee against abuse. It calls upon the Army and Navy to make specific recommendations to the Congress with respect to a review of the pay of those engaged in the flying service. The feeling of the majority in the committee was that this was a matter to be considered carefully, and only after full testimony had been presented to the committee. It is my feeling that it is not something which should be added to any legislation by an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is a very faithful attendant upon the meetings of the Appropriations Committee, of which he is a very distinguished and able member.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. OVERTON. He knows that the question of extra flight pay has been under consideration by the committee from time to time for a number of years, although I admit that it has been considered in a rather haphazard manner.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no question that it has been under discussion.

Mr. OVERTON. It was felt that when we were handling the Navy Department appropriation bill we could not do anything, because it would not affect the Army; and when we were handling the Army appropriation we could not do anything about it because it would not affect the Navy.

Is it not also true that these particular flight officers receive more than any other flight officers? They receive more than the officers who do the parachute work, or the officers who do the glider work. Officers in those classifications are limited to excess pay of $100 a month, which is only $1,200 a year. The amendment which I propose would give the other flight officers $1,500 over and above their base pay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not had an opportunity to read the amendment which the distinguished and able Senator from Louisiana is now discussing, but I understand that it is not the amendment which was offered in the committee.

Mr. OVERTON. It means exactly the same thing. It is phrased differently. It would provide excess pay of $1,500 a year, just as the amendment which I offered in the committee provided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I submit that the fact that a different amendment is now being presented from that which was offered in the committee is in itself evidence that the committee has not had time to consider the matter in as well-rounded a manner as it should be considered.

Let me say also that the Secretary of War was invited to come before the committee, as was the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary of War came. If I correctly remember, the Secretary of the Navy was unable to come because the clerks of the committee were not able to reach him in time for the session which we held. The Secretary of War specifically requested us not to take any action fixing the pay before the War Department had had an opportunity to present its case. That is why I feel now, as I felt in the committee, that action upon the matter at this point would be a premature adjudication of a most important subject.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator will pardon an additional interruption, it has always been premature so far as the War and Navy Departments are concerned. It will continue to be premature when the next appropriation bill is before us. It will continue to be premature when the reports are received. There never has been a proper time to regulate excessive flight pay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the language of the bill which will be before the Senate in due time clearly shows that if the amendment recommended by a majority of the committee is adopted the War Department and the Navy Department will be called upon to present their recommendations, and at last we shall be in a position to judge this question upon its merits, after a full hearing.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. OVERTON to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 44, line 8, strike out the word "Effective", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The appropriations contained in the 1946 War and Navy Department Appropriation Acts shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by flying or nonflying officers at rates as follows:

"Nonflying officers, $720 per annum.

"Flying officers, not in parachute jumping or glider pay status, who are required by orders of competent authority to participate in regular and frequent flights as an essential part of their military duty and training, shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when in consequence of such orders they participate in such flights: *Provided*, That such increase shall not exceed $125 per month: *Provided further*, That effective——."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1591) to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1868. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I modify the amendment which I offered yesterday by striking out "1943" and inserting "1945."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The modification will be made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide that no reorganization plan shall reverse express action taken by the present Congress or any other Congress prior to the time the reorganization power expires in 1947. In other words, it provides in effect that, after having taken the RFC away from the Department of Commerce, the President cannot turn around and put it right back there, or after having set up the REA, after long consideration and bitter fight, as an independent agency of the Department of Agriculture, that action shall not immediately be reversed by a reorganization plan. I am even more interested in the everyday situation. We are constantly considering bills relative to the set-up of certain departments and agencies. We are confronted with that situation in connection with the housing bill and the hospital bill wherein we grant certain powers delimited by the right of a board to take certain action or by other conditions which could be removed by a reorganization plan. So my amendment as modified simply provides that when Congress has taken direct action by January 1 of this year, it shall not be reversed by a reorganization plan.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio has exactly the meaning which he has described and defined, and it seems to me to be an unobjectionable amendment. In my opinion, the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government is for the purpose of bringing about the elimination of mistakes which probably have been running over a period of years; and by our experience and by the experience of the Executive it has been learned that there are such mistakes, and they are to be rectified under the reorganization bill.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio that if the Congress has recently taken action affecting an agency and has enacted legislation about it—which must, of necessity, go to the President for his approval—and if the President has approved it and it becomes the law of the land, then certainly the next day or the next week or the next month it should not be subject to change under a reorganization plan. I am agreeable to adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, now that it has been modified to bring the date down to January 1, 1945. So far as I am concerned, acting in behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] in handling this bill, and expressing only my own thought on it, I am perfectly willing to take the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to conference, if it is agreed to by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

On page 13, at the end of line 6, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add: "*Provided*, That no reorganization plan submitted shall contain any disposition in conflict with any act of Congress passed after January 1, 1945, dealing expressly with the creation, transfer, consolidation, or coordination of any agency or the distribution or coordination of powers or functions between agencies or within any agency."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, at the close of the debate yesterday, in a question and answer exchange with the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], he stated that if at the close of the debate some Senator would submit a proposal along the lines of the one then under discussion, it would receive his enthusiastic support. The proposal to which the Senator from Maryland was referring, and which I had suggested to him, was that there should be offered to the pending bill an amendment by which the President would be given free and unlimited power to propose a reorganization plan without any strings attached to it, and which would provide the constitutional protections which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has so ably been advocating in his discussion, namely, that the President's proposal be submitted to both Houses of Congress for their regular constitutional approach and appropriate action.

In light of the distinguished Senator's expression of willingness to go along with an amendment of that kind, I have prepared such an amendment in collaboration with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]; and in behalf of those two distinguished Senators and myself, I offer the amendment to the pending bill. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read. It is in the nature of a substitute. It would give the President full power—in fact, it would ask the President—to reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government, as provided in the pending bill, to determine what changes are necessary, and then to submit his proposal to the Congress. The amendment provides further, as will appear when it is read, that the plan so submitted shall take effect when there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving such plan.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk to be read, and after it has been read, I should like to speak further on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amendment (in the nature of a substitute) proposed by Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. TYDINGS), to the committee amendment to the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, viz: In lieu of the language beginning on page 9, line 9, and extending down to the end of the bill, insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Reorganization Act of 1945.'

"TITLE I

"SECTION 1. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to—

"(1) facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

"(2) reduce expenditure to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(3) increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

"(4) group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(5) reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and by abolishing such agencies as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government;

"(6) eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

"(7) provide for making currently and continuously such adjustments in the Government establishment as may be necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency.

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this title, and can be accomplished more speedily and efficiently thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"SEC. 2. Whenever the President after investigation finds that adjustments in the Government establishment or reorganizations in Government agencies are necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of any reorganizations which he elects to include in the reorganization plan and shall transmit such reorganization plan bearing an identifying number to the Congress, together with a declaration that with respect to each reorganization specified in the plan he has found that such reorganization is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of subsection 1 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session.

"SEC. 3. (a) Any reorganization plan transmitted pursuant to section 2 shall, subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, take effect when there shall have been enacted a joint resolution approving such plan. Each reorganization specified in a plan which shall have been approved by the enactment of such a joint resolution shall take effect on the date of enactment of such joint resolution or on the date specified pursuant to subsection (b) with reference to such reorganization, whichever may be the later date: *Provided*, That if either House of the Congress shall pass a resolution referring a reorganization plan back to the President with a request for specific changes, the President shall reaffirm his approval of the plan as originally transmitted or shall retransmit the plan with changes; and if he shall retransmit the plan with changes, it shall be deemed to be a new reorganization plan.

"(b) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

"SEC. 4. (a) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of any agency or function reorganized under the provisions of this act and in effect at the time of the reorganization shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such reorganization had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed, except as otherwise provided in a reorganization plan.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization plan under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such officer under the reorganization so effected.

"(c) All laws relating to any agency or function reorganized under the provisions of this act shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect.

"Sec. 5. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation owned or controlled by the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, authority, administration, or other establishment in the executive branch of the Government.

"(b) The term 'establishment in the executive branch of the Government' does not include the General Accounting Office, which is an establishment in the legislative branch.

"(c) The term 'reorganization' means any transfer, consolidation, coordination, abolition, or other measure, provided for in any reorganization plan transmitted pursuant to section 2.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

"(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in sec. 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term 'resolution' means only a joint resolution, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Congress approves the reorganization plan No. ——— transmitted to Congress by the President on ————, 19—.', the blank spaces therein

being appropriately filled; and does not include a joint resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

"SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 30 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 30 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

"(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

"SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(b) No amendment to the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

"SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

"(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of sec. 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

"(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

"(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

"(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hart	O'Daniel
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Huffman	Shipstead
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Carville	Kilgore	Stewart
Chavez	Knowland	Taft
Connally	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Tunnell
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Mead	Walsh
Ferguson	Millikin	Wheeler
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wiley
George	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the pending amendment and explain to my colleagues in the Senate what change it proposes in the original bill as it came out of the committee and what change it proposes in the bill as amended by the amendments which were adopted yesterday, that of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and other amendments. Eliminating from the original bill all restrictions on the President as to what he may do and what he may not do, this amendment virtually asks him to present to the Congress a reorganization plan covering anything he wants to cover. All exceptions are omitted. But in the form in which my amendment is offered it protects the Congress by accepting the Donnell amendment, which provides that such a plan shall go into effect when it has been approved by joint resolution passed by both Houses of Congress. This disposes of any question of constitutionality, because that is the way constitutional legislative action is taken.

So, going through the amendment rapidly, I have eliminated section 2 of the bill, which provides certain restrictions on what the President may or may not do in his plan. I have eliminated certain other provisions in section 3, which simply bind his hands, and in very general terms have said that whenever the President feels it desirable to accomplish the objective of reorganization he can submit the program to the Congress and then if the Congress, by affirmative action, by joint resolution, approves the plan, it goes into effect. That eliminates a great deal of material in the present bill which it seems to me would only hamper the President in performing the task of reorganization.

I do not want to be in the position of interfering with reorganization. That is the reason I am urging the plan presented in the amendment. The President should have a free hand to tell the Congress what he wants in the way of reorganization in the executive departments, and it seems to me that the amendment would open the door for him to make such proposals, and then by way of legislative process the Congress could decide whether to legislate it into actual law. That seems to me to cover every objection which can be urged against the bill, and especially the objection made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that we are on the one hand giving the President power and on the other hand placing so many exceptions in the bill that he is shorn of the power which we propose to give him. By my amendment he is not deprived of any power. He can submit to the Congress any proposal respecting reorganization he wishes to submit, and then it is up to the Congress in the proper and constitutional legislative manner to decide whether we will approve of the plan the President proposes.

In title II, I have accepted the procedure which was reported by the committee with regard to expediting action on a proposal of this kind. That is practically unchanged. I have also included in the bill the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] yesterday with regard to resolutions coming before the two Houses, and preventing conflict in that respect.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand, from the Senator's explanation of the amendment, he eliminates from the bill any specific exemptions whatever. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. That is true.

Mr. MURDOCK. But on the other hand he exempts the entire executive arm of the Government from any reorganization except as such reorganization may be carried out by a joint resolution of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Well, I do not know that I understand the Senator's question exactly, but my——

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator with one hand strikes out, let us say, 15 agencies that are exempt under the bill, and then with the other hand he reaches out and takes the whole of the executive department and exempts it entirely from any reorganization, except as that reorganization may be enacted by a joint resolution of Congress. Am I correct?

Mr. SMITH. That is very true, and I take that position definitely because I think the President's action in this matter is legislative, and we have simply asked him, as our agent, to prepare a plan of reorganization which he thinks is desirable. We give him the right to do that. We say to him, "You know more about it than anyone else. We are not putting any restrictions on you. Tell us what you have in mind, and if it comes within what we believe to be the proper

form of reorganization, we, in the exercise of our legislative power under the Constitution, will go along with you. If we do not think so, we will not go along with you." We are doing directly, by direct legislative action, what the bill, as amended by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], tries to do by indirection.

But under the theory of the bill, as amended by the Senator from Virginia, the President's plan would go into effect if the Congress went to sleep. We would have law by taking no action whatsoever. That is what I definitely object to. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] yesterday made an urgent appeal to give the President a chance. That is what I want to do. He is given no real chance by the present bill, which ties him up with restrictions and exemptions. Under my proposal, the President can recommend changes, and we could accept them or not accept them as we deem wise. But I am not willing to give such broad powers to the President to reorganize the agencies of the Government if the Congress is going to be deprived of its legislative right under the Constitution to pass on the plan.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. In order to accomplish what the Senator has now ably explained to the Senate, the Senator includes in his amendment the Donnell amendment, does he not, in almost the identical language it was presented the other day by the able Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SMITH. That is true, because I think the Donnell amendment prevents any question of constitutionality being raised with regard to this legislation, and I think the Byrd amendment is of very questionable constitutionality.

Mr. MURDOCK. So the Senator, if he will yield further, so far as the parliamentary situation is concerned, has brought us right back to where we were prior to a vote on the Byrd amendment and the Donnell amendment. In other words, the Senate is again called upon to cast its vote on the very same subject that we voted upon yesterday in the votes cast on the Byrd amendment and the Donnell amendment.

Mr. SMITH. No; it is not the same vote; because my amendment would give the President a wide range in making his proposal to us. Objections were made on the floor that we were giving the President power with one hand and hamstringing him with the other. I do not want to hamstring the President. I want him to have full power to proceed and make any suggestions he wants to make to us, and we should be protected by retaining to ourselves our right to pass upon the proposals in the legislative way provided by the Constitution.

Mr. MURDOCK. So far as the joint-resolution procedure is concerned, you have adopted the Donnell amendment in identical language.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. I believe in the Donnell amendment because it takes care of the constitutional issue. That is true. I will admit that, of course.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if we do not adopt this substitute we are leaving ourselves in a very confused position. We shall have passed legislation which says to the President, "We want you to do something," but we put so many strings around him and provide so many exceptions concerning the agencies with which he can deal, that if he should see fit to transmit an over-all plan, suggesting fundamental changes, he would be seriously hampered. I have confidence enough to believe that President Truman wants really to reorganize the Government so that it will be more streamlined and consolidation and economy will be brought about. He has the responsibility under this bill to do it. We are inviting him to take such action. He can go into any department he wants to and make recommendations to Congress respecting it. If some parts of the plan are not acceptable, we can return them for his reconsideration. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and I have tried to put the amendment into form so it will have that flexibility.

I submit to my colleagues in the Senate that this is the direct and constitutional way to deal with this question. I think if we deal with it the other way we shall be confusing ourselves and confusing the public. We have been criticized already for giving the President with one hand something and taking it away with the other. I agree with that criticism.

Mr. President, I was quite stirred by the argument made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] yesterday in which he said we should give the President a free hand in trying to reorganize the Government. I want to give the President a free hand to do it, but I do not want to give him a free hand without Congress exercising its constitutional rights and powers in passing on any plans which may be submitted by the President. I cannot see why anyone should object to that constitutional protection being afforded. Whether we have a Democratic President or a Republican President, I would object to any procedure which provided that any plan submitted would become law if Congress did not act upon it. I believe the President has the right to transmit a plan, and under this proposal he is requested to submit a plan to Congress, and then Congress has the constitutional duty to debate the plan and adopt it if, in the judgment of Congress, it is the kind of plan that should become effective.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I desire to ascertain the Senator's viewpoint on this question: Under existing circumstances could not the President, without limitation, make any recommendation regarding reorganization he might please without any new law whatever?

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that he could do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, what do we achieve by the proposal which the Senator submits?

Mr. SMITH. We are taking the initiative in presenting a bill which calls on the President to prepare and submit a reorganization plan. He does not have to do so under the present situation. He is not called upon by anything that is on the books to submit such a proposal. Under this amendment we say distinctly that the President shall investigate the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what agencies therein are necessary to do certain things, and then shall submit any plan he may care to, so, in the future, we shall have presented an affirmative plan on which we can act. I think that justifies the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The point I was registering was, inasmuch as the President can at the present time submit any reorganization recommendation he pleases, and he has not done so, and the fact that he could bring about economy to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars without any legislation, and he has not done so, I wonder where the expectation finds any realistic basis that the passage of the legislation will produce any better result than the existing situation has produced.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I glanced over the referendum provision of the Senator's amendment rather hastily. Is my understanding correct that after the President submits a plan and Congress fails to act within a certain length of time the plan goes into effect?

Mr. SMITH. It does not.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I do not like about the referendum provision is that Congress might in fact be in favor of the plan; but if action on it one way or the other were postponed, we would get nowhere. I suggest to the Senator, with whom I have collaborated in this amendment, that it would help to achieve the desired result if Congress were limited to action within a certain time. Then if the Congress should fail to act, the plan would go into effect. Congress ought to have the right to act; but if it favors a certain plan, it should not be in the position of having no limitation on the time in which it must act. I believe that we may lose a considerable amount of support unless some qualifying language of that kind is contained in the amendment. I respectfully suggest to the Senator that he consider some such proposal as this: That after the President has submitted his plan Congress should have a limited amount of time within which to pass a resolution either adopting it or rejecting it, and that upon the failure of Congress to act within a specified length of time the President's plan takes effect because Congress fails to act one way or the other.

Mr. SMITH. In that case, such a plan could be legislatively operative without action by Congress at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. Congress would have the right to act, but in such a case would actually waive its right. I think the Senator will understand what I have in mind with this brief explanation: My experience in connection with matters of this kind has been that unless Congress is compelled to act one way or the other within a certain period of time, other things come before us, and perhaps a

good plan would have no consideration at all. My concern is that if a good plan is submitted it should not be defeated because we fail to act one way or the other. What the Senator is contending for is the right of Congress to pass upon it. Under the proposal which I make, Congress would have that right; but if it did not exercise the right, the plan ought not to be killed for that reason.

Mr. SMITH. I may say, in answer to the distinguished Senator's comment, that we have tried to provide in title II, under "Procedure," for prompt action by Congress on any plan submitted by the President. But there is nothing in my proposal which would permit any plan to go into effect without legislative action. It is my contention that reorganization is a legislative act, and I doubt very much the constitutionality of any other plan. I should not wish to vote for a bill with respect to the constitutionality of which I was in doubt.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is not the suggestion now being submitted by the Senator from Maryland precisely the proposal reported by the committee itself?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, does the Senator direct his question to me? It is very difficult for me to follow the distinguished Senator from Maryland, after listening to him yesterday and seeing his name on this amendment today, and now hearing him plead for some method of forcing Congress to take action. I have not the versatility of intellect, or whatever it takes, to keep up with that kind of mental acrobatics.

Mr. TYDINGS. I realize the Senator's limitations. It is not necessary for him to state them.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am certainly limited when it comes to keeping up with the Senator from Maryland on this question.

In answer to the question of the Senator from Michigan, the bill as it came from the Committee on the Judiciary made it possible for either House of Congress, by acting separately, to veto a reorganization plan. It seems to me that what the Senator from Maryland wants is exactly what the Byrd amendment does. That is, the Congress must act within 60 days by disapproving the reorganization plan by a concurrent resolution, or the plan becomes effective.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Utah has correctly stated what the Senator from Maryland desires. He stated yesterday what he desired, and stated his desire to his coauthor today. However, the Senator from Maryland is concerned for the moment in trying to wipe out all exemptions which would restrict the ability of the President to reorganize the Government. He is anxious only that once that is done, and the plan is submitted to Congress, it shall not be defeated by the failure of Congress to act. I have respectfully suggested to the Senator from New Jersey that some provision be added similar to the limitation of time in the Byrd plan, which would compel the Congress to act one way or the other.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. What the Senator and his distinguished colleagues do by this amendment is with one hand to strike out the 15 exemptions, and with the other to strike out the entire executive department and bring the Senate and the House back to the position in which we would be without any reorganization bill. Of course, if we desired to do so, by joint resolution we could reorganize the entire executive department. But the able Senator from Maryland so ably, eloquently, and persuasively pointed out yesterday the defects and deficiencies of our present position that I do not wonder that there was an overwhelming sentiment, at least on this side of the aisle, in support of the eloquent address made by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator from New Jersey will yield, let me say to the Senator that I have expressed to the co-author of this amendment the very fervent hope that the referendum provision will not be included in the amendment, and that the limitations on the President's reorganization power would be stricken out. I did so before the amendment was brought to the floor, and I am still in the same frame of mind.

What I am seeking to do now is to have the power of the President untrammeled so far as the plan of reorganization is concerned, coupled with some provision which would compel the Congress to take action by a definite date. As I understand the referendum provision as drawn, there is no such limitation. My interrogatory to the Senator from New Jersey was for the purpose of pointing out that omission, and asking him, when he had time to reflect upon it, if he could not insert such a provision, so that a reorganization plan would not be defeated by reason of the fact that nothing was done about it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. My answer to the distinguished Senator from Maryland is to implore him to come back on this side of the aisle and stand on the address which he delivered yesterday.

Mr. SMITH. We welcome the Senator from Maryland on this side of the aisle.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not having a copy of the Senator's amendment before me, it is somewhat difficult to follow it. However, in connection with the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland, as I listened to the reading of the amendment by the clerk, it seemed to me that it provided for a definite procedure, with a time limit within which a committee could consider the legislation and report to the two Houses of Congress so that a vote could be taken upon it. From listening to the reading of the amendment, I do not understand that there is any way by which a reorganization plan could be pigeonholed in a committee, preventing Congress from acting. Yesterday an example was pointed out of a committee pigeonholing a bill. I do not understand that a reorganization plan could be pigeonholed by a committee, or that action by the Congress could be prevented by filibustering tactics.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is absolutely correct. Great care was taken in drafting title II in order to expedite action of the kind which the Senator mentions. If it is not adequately drawn, we will draft it so that that result can be accomplished. I am the last one in the world to wish to see an important measure of this kind subjected to filibuster or delay. I am convinced that that feature can be taken care of without our giving up legislative authority under the Constitution. I believe that that is the way in which we should approach it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senator will be able to work out an arrangement with the Senator in charge of the bill for a postponement of the final vote on this question until Monday because I think it is of great importance that the substitute be printed and placed in the hands of Senators so that we may have ample time to reflect upon its provisions, and so that Senators on the other side of the aisle may have more time—which I think they sorely need—to reflect upon the action which they took yesterday afternoon.

I wish to say for the RECORD that I am shocked and aghast at the repudiation of democratic procedure of which the Senate was guilty in its vote yesterday afternoon. I never hoped to live so long as to see the greatest parliamentary body in the world take the action which it took yesterday in repudiating what I consider to be one of the basic tenets of representative government. I never thought that the Democratic Party would be guilty of writing the record which it wrote yesterday afternoon in the United States Senate. The principle is still a little too abstract to be fully grasped by the American people because of the shortness of time since the vote. But I cannot believe that once the American people understand the principle which was approved by the Democratic Party in the Senate yesterday afternoon, they will not make their negative reactions to that action perfectly clear.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator realizes, does he not, that in 1932 his party passed a reorganization bill containing provisions requiring a reorganization plan to be submitted to Congress for approval? At that time Attorney General Mitchell, in reporting upon the bill, told the Congress that in his opinion it contained unconstitutional features. Early in 1933 the Senator's party struck out entirely the provision requiring reference to Congress, and gave the President, within the standards of the 1932 Act, carte blanche to go ahead and reorganize the executive department. Then in 1939 the Senate passed a bill

containing the very same provisions as those which were submitted and voted on yesterday in the Byrd amendment. I have not heard the American people cry out and deplore the fact that democracy was ruined and defeated by that action.

It is my opinion that today the American people are crying out and asking Congress to unshackle the President and let him go ahead and reorganize and eliminate the duplications which are found in the executive branch of the Government today. But every time the subject is brought up on the floor of the Senate, reference is made to the Constitution, and Senators complain of the fact that to allow the President to go ahead and reorganize the executive branch of the Government is to strike down democracy. Yet in the next breath they turn around and complain, criticize, and condemn the executive branch of the Government for the very things which the Congress is unwilling to allow the President to unscramble and get rid of.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield further to me, I shall be very brief in what I have to say.

First, I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from Utah that I hold no brief for any unconstitutional acts of the Republican Party, nor do I propose to defend any unconstitutional acts of the Democratic Party. I shall never knowingly vote for any unconstitutional proposals of any party. I wish to say further to the Senator from Utah that he can count on my hearty cooperation in support of any plan which the President of the United States sends to the Congress for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government which can stand the test of congressional debate. However, he will find me always fighting against centralizing in the Chief Executive of this country the power to exercise the legislative functions of Congress which this bill seeks to give the President. I shall always fight to preserve effective checks by the Congress of the United States upon the acts of the President, no matter who he may be. I want no personal government in America. I wish to say that it is the obligation of the Congress to give support to the President in a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government by affirmative action, and I say I do not think the Congress can face the American people and justify any failure to act in the interests of reorganization. But I wish to make perfectly clear for the RECORD that I think it is the obligation of the President of the United States, when the bill which Senators on the other side of the aisle voted for yesterday afternoon reaches his desk for signature, to make very plain to the people of these United States that he does not favor the type of personal government which those on the other side of the aisle voted yesterday afternoon to place in his hands. If Harry S. Truman does not meet that test by vetoing the bill, then I am perfectly confident that he is going to hear from the American people once the people understand the principle which those on the other side of the aisle enunciated yesterday afternoon by the votes they cast on this issue. If he fails to veto the bill he will learn that the American people still want our system of checks and balances to prevail, they still want a representative government in America. Fear of personal power is basic in the political thinking of the free men and women of America. Personal power unchecked inevitably becomes arbitrary, tyrannical, and politically corrupt.

Mr. President, there have been other countries in the history of the world that started out as democracies but went down the path which Senators on the other side of the aisle sought to lead us down by their votes yesterday afternoon. In the case of such countries whenever the legislative branch of government abdicated its powers to the executive, government by men became substituted for government by law until finally they were taken over by strong executives. The danger of such a development can exist in the United States of America. We must ever be alert to prevent the development of personal government in this country. I think the danger of such a political trend in America which those on the other side of the aisle demonstrated by their votes yesterday afternoon is the most serious blow that has been struck against representative government in this country for a long, long time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. Before yielding I should like to say a word. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very fine presentation of the principle he is defending, and I desire to state that, of course, it is my firm adherence to the views he has expressed which prompted me to submit the pending amendment. I agree with him that the action taken yesterday afternoon will come back to plague us if it is allowed to stand. I desire to state that if the bill, including that amendment adopted yesterday afternoon, finally comes before the Senate for a vote, I shall be compelled to vote against it, even though I am a member of the Judiciary Committee which reported the bill and am anxious to have a reorganization plan go into effect. I greatly desire to see the executive branch of our Government properly reorganized, but I insist that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to legislate on that matter, not to have the reorganization made without the taking of any action by the Congress. Mr. President, that is my position in submitting my amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Downey	Hill
Austin	Eastland	Hoey
Ball	Ellender	Huffman
Barkley	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Bilbo	Fulbright	Kilgore
Brewster	George	Knowland
Bridges	Green	La Follette
Bushfield	Guffey	Lucas
Capper	Gurney	McClellan
Carville	Hart	McKellar
Chavez	Hatch	McMahon
Connally	Hawkes	Mead
Cordon	Hayden	Millikin
Donnell	Hickenlooper	Mitchell
Moore	Russell	Tydings
Morse	Saltonstall	Vandenberg
Murdock	Shipstead	Wagner
Myers	Smith	Walsh
O'Daniel	Stewart	Wheeler
O'Mahoney	Taft	Wiley
Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Reed	Tunnell	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have been present during the debate on the pending bill but may not be able to be present in the Chamber this afternoon when the final vote is taken. I wish to make a very brief statement, not in the nature of an argument so much as in the nature of a statement of fact.

I believe that I introduced the first reorganization bill to be introduced in modern times. Anciently, some other Member of the Congress may have introduced such a bill. But it was either under the Coolidge or the Hoover administration that I introduced a reorganization bill which went even further in its provisions than does the pending bill. In other words, it gave to the President the power to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. He functions through the executive branch of the Government. Subsequent to the introduction of the bill to which I have referred a debate took place with reference to the delegation of legislative power, similar to the debate which Senators have heard in connection with the pending bill. In 1939, as I recall the year, I voted for certain limitations to be placed upon the power of the President to effect a reorganization of the Government.

Mr. President, I may say very frankly that I disagreed with the late President Roosevelt with reference to many questions, particularly questions of a domestic nature. I did not like his theory of reorganizing the judicial branch of the Government, and I, therefore, voted to place some restrictions upon the power of the President in that respect.

I believe there is no question about one thing, namely, that legislative power is nondelegable power. It may not be delegated to anyone. It must remain in the legislative branch of the Government where the Constitution placed it, unless we wish to amend the Constitution. But at various times during the history of the Government we have delegated to the executive or to some commission, the power to administer an intelligible rule which the legislature itself had laid down. It was done in connection with the Interstate Commerce Act. The power to make rates and prescribe fares lies unquestionably in the Congress of the United States. But could the Congress exercise it intelligently? I do not believe so. Consequently we have an Interstate Commerce Commission with authority to make rates. That is substantially what it amounts to. After all, we granted such power under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, in which we gave to the President the authority actually to lower or increase tariffs. Certainly, so far as the British and American systems of government are concerned, if there is any power within the legislative branch which has been asserted with greater

vehemence than any other, it is the power of the Congress to levy and collect taxes. But if there is to be any making of, or changes in the tariff, we have believed it to be necessary, at least, that we should lay down an intelligible rule, a reasonable formula by which the legislative branch may turn the job of administration over to a commission or to the President in the event we select the President as the administrative officer.

There is no need to be confused about the question. The legislative power is nondelegable. Under the Constitution the power to make laws was given to the Congress. But it is equally clear—in fact, it has been demonstrated by every Congress that has sat from almost the beginning of our Government, that an intelligible rule can be laid down, that a formula can be prescribed, and that power may be given to someone else to apply it.

Mr. President, let us look at this question in a practical way. The President is the head of the executive branch of the Government. He is responsible for the administration of the laws. He is the Executive. There have been built up around him the executive branches of government, represented by Cabinet heads, and innumerable agencies lodged in the executive branch of the Government.

We even have a court in the executive branch of the Government. The Tax Court of the United States is lodged in the executive branch, located in the Treasury Department. The head of the Treasury Department is a Cabinet officer. We put The Tax Court in the Treasury Department because we did not know where else to establish it. It has to do with nothing else but the administration of tax law. It is a court, nevertheless. It is performing some sort of quasi-judicial function, but it is in the Treasury Department. Some of the judges of that court have been calling on me to offer to the pending bill an amendment to prohibit the President from taking action affecting them. I have not offered such an amendment. I know he cannot do anything with The Tax Court. There is no other place to put that court. He cannot attach it to any other department, unless it be the Department of Justice, and that would not do any good. So the President is not going to bother with The Tax Court, of course, but is going to leave it right where it is, and it will continue to perform functions.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There is one thing he might do, that is, upset what Congress did last year. He might take away from The Tax Court the power to pass on renegotiation appeals, and give it to the Court of Claims, where we decided we did not want it to be. That could be done.

Mr. GEORGE. It might be, and it would not hurt very much if he did that, because The Tax Court has not passed on very many questions. We really wanted to put it in the Court of Claims anyway, but we did not, as a matter of conference action.

The point is that as to questions with respect to tariffs, with respect to railway transportation rates and passenger fares, everything that is under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and with respect to many other intricate and complicated matters, we have tried to lay down an intelligible rule, and we have left somebody else to administer the act.

Mr. President, that is what is proposed now. Let me repeat that I offered the first bill in modern times to reorganize the Government. It did not get anywhere. It was several years before any affirmative action along that line was taken. But Congress would not reorganize the executive branch of the Government to any great extent. Congress is not going to do it. It is not a question of lack of power to do it, but Congress is not going to do it, and I say to my distinguished friend from New Jersey that anyone who tries to have it done will find immediately that he cannot succeed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I have tried in my amendment to give full authority to the President to draw any kind of a reorganization bill he desires to submit to the Congress. In my amendment I am merely asking that Congress shall have the legislative right, under its constitutional function, to pass on it.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that.

Mr. SMITH. I agree fully that the Congress itself cannot write the bill, and that the President must write it. I agree fully with that.

Mr. GEORGE. I go a little further. Congress will not pass any bill reorganizing the executive branch of the Government which someone else writes for it.

Mr. SMITH. That is simply suggesting that Congress will not live up to its responsibility, and I do not wish to take that position. I believe the Congress of the United States will live up to its responsibility if the right kind of a bill is presented, and I believe it should do it, and not say the President can do this without any check by the Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. I entertained the same ideas my friend expresses when I came to Congress, but that was twenty-odd years ago, and my experience has taught me that Congress is not going to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. I lay that down as a postulate: Congress is not going to do it. We may think we will do it, and we may do some things about it, but all Congress is going to do is keep on adding something to the executive branch or some other branch of the Government. That has been the legislative history of our country, and it probably will continue to be.

Theoretically, the distinguished Senator is entirely correct, and actually I should like to see the matter handled in the way he suggests, but I have become strongly converted to the idea that if there is to be any reorganization, it must be brought about by the executive branch, and, whether this bill does it entirely or not, I do not see why we cannot lay down an intelligible rule.

The Tariff Commission was required to find the cost of production at home and abroad of same or similar articles. It was impossible to find the cost of producing many articles abroad. I believed, therefore, that the old flexible provision of the tariff would probably be upset by the Supreme Court. But the Supreme Court did not upset it. They upheld it. They said it did lay down a rule, which, however difficult it was, yet was intelligible.

It is certainly an intelligible rule to say to the President, "If you find that there are overlapping agencies in your own department, if you find there is duplication of work by agencies in your own department, then you shall do so and so." The Congress is outlawing the duplicating agencies, the Congress is outlawing overlapping of authority, but is saying to the President, "If you find it is a fact, submit your reorganization plan."

So far as I was concerned, I was willing to allow a Republican President to send a reorganization plan to this body and have it become law unless Congress rejected it within a reasonable time, and I am willing to do the same under the present President, and for the added reason that during this war many extraordinary Government organizations and agencies have come into being, which are performing the functions of government. The vast army of Federal employees has grown to more than three and a half million in continental United States and abroad, about 3,000,000 in the United States alone.

Mr. SMITH. Is not the fact that Government bureaus are expanding at such a rapid rate and bureaucracy is growing enormously and employing millions of people the very reason why today the people of this country are asking us to put a stop to executive control over things, and asking the Congress to assume its rightful responsibility? That is why I want to see some check established. The Senator is arguing, perfectly properly, that he wants to see that condition brought to an end, and so he wants to give the power to the President to bring about reorganization. I say that if in the past Congress had exercised its power, it would not have allowed this expansion to proceed. That is where Congress has failed heretofore, and I do not want to see it fail again.

Mr. GEORGE. I can agree with the distinguished Senator in principle, but many things have had to be done under the pressure of war, and they will happen again and again under similar pressure. However, I am merely looking at the proposal as a practical matter. If the Congress declares that duplicating agencies and overlapping agencies shall not exist in the Government, if it shall outlaw them and turn over to an agent the authority to find the facts and to proceed with the reorganization, but without destroying or crippling functions for which Congress itself has provided, I know that can be done constitutionally. I am satisfied of that; otherwise, in my judgment, we have an unworkable Government.

Whether it can be done in the case of reorganization is, of course, another question. I would rather see reorganization accomplished by legislation directly, but I frankly do not believe Congress will do it, because the very moment we hit any one of these executive children, or grandchildren, or even remote relations, and say, "We propose to do something with you," we have the whole brood on us; they descend on the Congress with such force and such vigor that anyone who proposes to reorganize the Government in a really effective way is going to be driven out. He might not be driven out of public life—I would not say that his people back home might not admire him and appreciate him—but he would be driven virtually out of his mind, and he might as well cease making any effort to do anything else in a legislative way.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Would that be minimized under the bill as it presently stands? In other words, with the negative action of the Houses as a means of stopping a proposed reorganization plan, would not the pressure be on each Member of Congress just the same under the bill as it now stands as under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey? I cannot see that the pressure of the departments for action, either pro or con, would be lessened so long as the matter was in the hands of the Congress in any particular.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the situation would be different if it took an affirmative act to override the President. But what I am trying to say—and with this I shall close, because I have no desire to submit an argument but only to make my own position clear—is that our Government will not be reorganized, the cost of government will not be reduced, bureaucracy will not be destroyed unless a courageous executive takes the lead. Congress can follow and can give him support, but in no other way will we accomplish the result. That is my settled conviction, which is based upon experience. It grows out of a long service in Congress, and for the reason I have stated I am perfectly willing to give to any President, in whom I have any faith, the authority to bring about a reorganization of the agencies in his own branch of the Government.

We are fortunate in having in our present President a man who served in the Congress, and who has had experience with the Government as it is organized, both as a Member of the Congress and as the Chief Executive. I have the hope, at least, that if given this power and authority the President will try to bring about a worth-while reorganization of government.

I admit that there is virtue in the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. If we were not doing anything more than giving to the President the power he already has under the Constitution, which requires him to submit his recommendations on the state of the Union, but requiring him specifically to do this thing and transmit his own recommendations, whatever they may be, I think that might have some effect on congressional thinking and might lead to positive action which might be helpful. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to give to President Truman the power to submit a reorganization program, and if Congress does not care to upset it within 60 days, or some such period as that, to let it become effective.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a word?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I have tried in the amendment I have just submitted to give the President a much wider scope in his proposal for reorganization than he could possibly have in the bill which came out of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I appreciate that.

Mr. SMITH. I feel that it is a very important feature of the amendment. It removes exemptions and gives a free hand to the President to tell us what he thinks should be done. But then I seek to protect the people of the country, as they should be protected, by retaining in the Congress the constitutional processes. We should revere and support our system of checks and balances.

Mr. GEORGE. I have the strong conviction, of course, that Congress should retain its powers, but I have no fear that in the mere matter of reorganizing the executive branch of the Government any step would be taken by the President which would be harmful to the country, and if any such step were taken certainly the Congress should reassert its power and say, "We gave you the authority to act. We do not like the way you have acted. We repeal or veto what you have done. We undo what you have done."

Mr. President, it is very easy to create agencies and bureaus. It is exceedingly difficult to kill off a group of bureaucrats when once they get into office.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Obviously the distinguished Senator is arguing the same point that I am. We simply have different views as to how to go about it. I agree that it is very hard to head off bureaucracies and agencies located all over the country, and to do away with conditions which disturb us. No one wants to see reorganization accomplished more than I and my colleagues do.

I desire to take this occasion to thank the Senator from Georgia for his splendid exposition of his position, and to say that I respect his judgment highly in connection with everything he discusses on the Senate floor. I regret that I cannot agree with his conclusion respecting the constitutional issue.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. As I understand, Congress passed a reorganization act in 1939, did it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. BALL. Were the provisions in that act respecting the method by which reorganization plans which were submitted should become effective the same as they are in the pending bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. The language is almost identical to that in the pending bill as amended by the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator know how many reorganization plans were submitted under that act?

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot give the Senator the number that were submitted. I have a statement referring to the plans and the amount of money which would be saved under them which I intend to insert in the RECORD. Just offhand I cannot say.

Mr. BALL. Can the Senator tell me whether any reorganization plan submitted under that act was rejected by Congress or by either House of Congress?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not believe any plan was rejected. If I am wrong, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. TAFT. One plan was rejected in the House, I think or perhaps in the Senate. That was the plan which transferred the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was vetoed by the Senate. But the reorganization plan went through because the bill required a concurrent resolution to be adopted rather than simply a veto by one House alone.

Mr. TAFT. The Senate provided for an independent Civil Aeronautics Board and stipulated that it should remain independent, but the plan submitted put it under the Department of Commerce. That plan was approved in the House of Representatives, and therefore, in spite of the veto power of the Senate, the plan went into effect. Under the act of 1939 the reorganization plan dealt primarily with the consolidation brought about in the Federal Security Agency, the Federal Works Agency and the Federal Loan Agency. That was the principal reorganization done under the act of 1939. All features of the plan were accepted by both Houses without difficulty. Only one was vetoed by the Senate.

Mr. MURDOCK. I merely wish to observe that my answer to the Senator from Minnesota was correct; that no plans which have been submitted have been rejected.

Mr. BALL. And only the one reorganization plan which provided for the transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Department of Commerce was rejected by one House, the Senate, but because the House of Representatives did not adopt the resolution rejecting it the organization became effective?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I hesitate to impose further upon the time of the Senate with respect to the matter of reorganization, but again the issue is presented here today so clearly and is of such a fundamental and vital nature, that I think the Senate can well afford to pause in the interests not of itself alone but of the people of the Nation, to consider further the problem which is involved.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. In order to keep the record straight, I will say that I think we have the voting just turned around. The House disapproved of the plan by quite an overwhelming majority. When it came to the Senate I am advised the Senate approved it, which put it into effect.

I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] upon what I regard as a service to the Nation which he has rendered today by the presentation of this substitute amendment. I congratulate also the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] for his courage in joining as one of the coauthors of the substitute. I am unable to agree with a portion of the philosophy of the Senator from Maryland to which he has adverted today.

Senators will doubtless recall that he mentioned something to the effect that Congress would have waived its rights. I do not understand, Mr. President, that the Congress can waive its rights in favor of any bureau or individual official, even though that official be the President of the United States. It is a fundamental principle of civil law, as well as constitutional law, that a delegated authority cannot be redelegated. When the constituents of the Members of the Senate have cast their ballots selecting them as their representatives in the Senate of the United States such Members have no legal, constitutional, or moral right to waive the authority and power which their constituents vested in them, and, perhaps even more important, they have no power to waive the obligations which their constituents imposed upon them.

Our constituents are entitled to expect that we shall devote our thought—yes, Mr. President, our intelligent thought, our affirmative thought, if you please—to matters of legislation before us, and our constituents are entitled to expect that we shall not pass, or undertake to pass, such legislation as that embodied in the amendment which was adopted here yesterday, under which, as I have indicated a number of times and as has been expressed by others, notably by the Senator from New Jersey today, it would be possible for the Members of the Senate of the United States physically to sleep, or to pack up their bags, lock their offices, and go home, and still the plan prescribed and set forth by the President of the United States would become operative. It would be legislation because it would repeal existing laws and because of the nature of the subject matter. I repeat, Mr. President, that under this amendment we could slumber, or close our offices and go home, and still the plan submitted by the President would become law, although it might undertake, and successfully if it be constitutional, to overturn the legislation of a century or more.

Mr. President, I cannot subscribe to the view that Congress has it within its power to waive its constitutional powers or its constitutional obligations.

I listened with great interest a few moments ago to the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I indicated but a day or two ago my profound respect for him, my admiration for his ability and his integrity and his skill and knowledge. In the course of my study of the history of reorganization I noted that only 6 years ago, when the question of reorganization was before the Senate, and when the bill to which the inquiry of the Senator from Minnesota was addressed a few moments ago was passed, the proceedings of Congress, especially those of the Senate, show that the question of the constitutional power of Congress to delegate to the President its legislative powers was considered. I noted with great interest and appreciation the expression on March 20, 1939, by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, who addressed us a few moments ago. He then said:

> There is no support for the contention that Congress may delegate legislative power. It may not do so. The single test of the validity of the act of the Congress, when that question is involved, is whether Congress has undertaken to delegate legislative power or merely the power to apply a legislative formula that may, at least theoretically, be exactly applied.

Today the Senator from Georgia has undertaken largely to repeat the substance of the thought to which I have referred. It is of tremendous importance and interest historically to observe the conclusion to which the reasoning which the distinguished Senator from Georgia enunciated on March 20, 1939, and to which he referred today, led him at that time. By reference to pages 3050 and 3093 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that year, it will be found that the vote of the distinguished Senator from Georgia upon the Wheeler amendment, which directly raised this issue, and which made it obligatory that before the plan of reorganization could become effective it should first be approved by affirmative joint resolution of both Houses of Congress, was in favor of that proposition.

A little while ago the Senator from Georgia referred to the fact that in 1939 he voted to impose certain restrictions on the President. At least, that was what I understood him to say. I undertook to take down his words as nearly as I could in the absence of ability to write shorthand.

As I see it, the vote of the distinguished Senator from Georgia was not particularly a vote to impose restrictions on the President. It was a vote in favor of the proposition that legislation shall not be enacted in our country unless it shall receive the affirmative vote of both Houses of Congress by joint resolution. His vote was not in favor of the proposition for which the majority voted yesterday in the Senate, namely, that Congress may, without any action whatsoever on its part, permit a plan submitted by the President to become a law of the United States, repealing statutes which are upon the statute books of the Nation.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission. To be sure, it has been clearly held by the courts, not only in the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but in the case of the Radio Commission and the Tariff Commission, that Congress does have power to prescribe standards, within certain limits, and that such standards, when so prescribed, may be the basis for the administration of the law by administrative bureaus and commissions such as those to which I have referred. I realize, of course, that it would be idle and foolish to say that every rate upon every type of commodity—chickens, binder twine, and every other commodity—could be fixed by the Congress. Yet the Congress can lay down standards under which rates must provide a reasonable return to the carriers, standards which the Interstate Commerce Commission must follow. Of course, the courts have held, as they should have held under the law and the Constitution of the United States, that such action on the part of Congress is not a delegation of legislative power.

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia recognizes the soundness of the legal proposition to which I refer. He said, in substance, that it was possible to enact legislation enabling the President to reorganize departments, provided that some reasonable formula were prescribed for such reorganiation by the President. I invite the attention of Members of this great body to the fact that the Senator from Georgia failed to illustrate, or even to indicate his affirmative belief that such standards are contained within the bill which is now before the Senate. I do not recall his exact language, but he said something to the effect that such standards might or might not be in the bill. If I misquote him, I hope I shall be corrected, because I would not intentionally misquote the Senator. However, I am certain that he did not say, even remotely, that he could put his finger upon the standards in this bill which are of such nature and preciseness as to enable Congress to follow them, and which would cause Congress to be held within channels already charted for it. A search of the bill from end to end will fail, in my judgment, to show the existence of any such standards.

The Senator from Georgia referred to the overlapping of bureaus; but let me invite the attention of the Senate again to the fact that the bill does not require the President to find, as a condition precedent to the preparation and formulation of a reorganization plan, that such plan is either necessary or desirable to eliminate or reduce overlapping of bureaus.

I have previously called the attention of the Senate—and I do so again—to the fact that the bill sets forth seven distinct things which the President is called upon to consider in determining what changes are necessary. Later the bill provides that if the President finds one or more of those reasons to exist he shall then prepare a reorganization plan. One of the conditions is overlapping; but he is not required to find that overlapping exists. He is not required to make any finding with respect to overlapping. He can place his finger on the very first of the purposes mentioned in the list of seven to which I have referred. What

is it? It is the facilitation of "orderly transition from war to peace." Is there a Member of the Senate, or a person anywhere who would say the statement that orderly transition from war to peace will be a result attained by the reorganization that sets up a standard which the President should follow, a standard so precise, definite, and certain that the President would find himself charted within channels easily discernible?

Mr. President, the remarks of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Schechter case are appropriate on this question. With respect to the NIRA, the court said:

> For that legislative undertaking, section 3 sets up no standards—

It was contended in that case that standards were set up. It was the argument in the NIRA case that Congress had set up standards, but the Supreme Court did not so find. It said:

> For that legislative undertaking, section 3 sets up no standards, aside from the statement of the general aims of rehabilitation, correction, and expansion described in section 1.

That language is equally applicable to the case of a President who is undertaking to put into effect a reorganization which will facilitate "orderly transition from war to peace."

> In view of the scope of that broad declaration, and of the nature of the few restrictions that are imposed, the discretion of the President in approving or prescribing codes, and thus enacting laws for the government of trade and industry throughout the country, is virtually unfettered.

What Senator would undertake to rise here—the Senator from Georgia did not—and say that the President of the United States would be fettered in any sense or in any degree in his reorganization plan by the provision that that plan might be such as to conduce to orderly transition from war to peace?

I conclude the reference to the Schechter case by reading the conclusion at which the Supreme Court arrived with respect to the NIRA so-called standards. Said the Court:

> We think that the code-making authority thus conferred is an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia made the statement, in substance, that the bill requires the President to make certain findings. As I understand the theory of the Senator, it is that when the President makes such findings, he then brings himself within the various standards to which reference has been made. I invite attention again to the language in the Schechter case Chief Justice Hughes said:

> While this is called a finding, it is really but a statement of an opinion as to the general effect upon the promotion of trade or industry of a scheme of laws. These are the only findings which Congress has made essential in order to put into operation a legislative code having the aims described in the declaration of policy.

Mr. President, that is likewise true here. Suppose the President should find, in accordance with the first purpose stated, that the reorganization would facilitate orderly transitions from war to peace. Is not that exactly what the Supreme Court of the United States referred to as a statement of an opinion as to the general effect upon the promotion of trade or industry, or upon the entire condition of the country, of the scheme of laws which might be proposed by the President?

So, Mr. President, when the Senator from Georgia today undertakes to argue in favor of the pending bill, he fails to indicate what standards there are within the bill which make it constitutional and he fails to bring the bill within the operation of any theory of any court which would make it constitutional on the ground that it does not constitute a delegation of legislative power.

As I said, Mr. President, back in 1939 the Senator from Georgia voted not only once but twice on the Wheeler amendment, for the question was closely contested. The matter under discussion related in large part to the question whether the bill then under consideration constituted a delegation of legislative power, and the Senate was called upon to vote twice on the Wheeler amendment, which prescribed that no such reorganization plan could become effective until it had first received the approval of a joint resolution passed by both Houses of Congress. The Senator from Georgia was influenced by some reasoning; and, so far as I can ascertain, certainly his ideas on the question of legislative power did not in any sense tend to lead him to a conclusion any different from the one at which he arrived in voting for the Wheeler amendment.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake to speak very much longer. As I said at the outset, I congratulate the Senator from New Jersey upon the presentation of the amendment. I congratulate him because of its contents. In the first place, it would not restrict the President in any way, but the President could come before the Congress with a recommendation for reorganization in any department or in all departments or in any combination of departments. He would be unrestricted, the benefit of his judgment and his knowledge and his leadership would be retained by the amendment submitted by the junior Senator from New Jersey.

In the second place, the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey would be in very precise and definite furtherance of the general provision of the Constitution which makes it obligatory upon the President to "from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

The amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey goes further than leaving it to a mere generalization. It makes it obligatory upon the President to examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and to determine what changes are necessary to effect the results set forth in the amendment.

So I say that the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey does not restrict the President, but it does place upon his shoulders a mandatory obligation, a requirement that he shall give the Congress the benefit of his judgment. That requirement should be of vast benefit and value to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Then, Mr. President, the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey illustrates very clearly the sincerity with which it is presented, in that it undertakes to expedite the progress of the plan when it comes before Congress. The procedural outline specified in the amendment very clearly points out, says, and provides that if the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 30 calendar days after its introduction or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, within 30 calendar days after its receipt, it shall then be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

Mr. President, I reviewed yesterday upon this floor what happened in the case of certain pending important measures which have gone to the Committee on Banking and Currency of this great body and which have for 5 months lain dormant in that committee; although those who favor the measures have called them to the attention of the committee, still no action has been taken upon them. I undertake to say that a measure which provides, as does the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey—and, indeed, as does the committee amendment also—to the extent it does, relief from the power to crush and wipe out the ability of Congress to legislate, deserves the congratulation and applause of the Members of the Senate.

At this time I wish to point out, furthermore, that to my mind, the procedure set forth in the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey possesses one virtue which is outstanding and which is not possessed by the committee amendment. That virtue lies in the fact that it does not impose a limitation upon debate upon the merits of the resolution providing for approval of the proposed plan. There is a limitation with respect to the length of debate as to whether the committee shall be discharged and as to matters of that type; but when the resolution comes before the Senate, the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will not undertake to throttle the Members of the Senate in regard to the time which they may consume in the presentation and argument of the issues connected with the proposed reorganization. Mr. President, I think that provision of the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey deserves the commendation of the Senate. It deserves it from many standpoints, among others from the standpoint of the history of the Senate in which it has been found advisable not to curtail debate, save only when it shall develop to the extent of a filibuster, in which event we realize we have the power of cloture, which has once been undertaken to be exercised this

very year by the Senate. But the Senate has realized over all this long period of years the importance of allowing full, free, and untrammeled discussion by its Members of issues which come before it, save only subject to the limitation by way of cloture, to which I have referred. I undertake to say that from the standpoint of principle it is vital to the preservation of the Republic to provide for reasonable opportunity for debate in the Senate upon any subject, rather than to have the Members of the Senate foreclosed by an artificial restriction upon them in regard to the time at their disposal during which they may discuss measures.

Mr. President, I admire the stand taken by the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Oregon who, time and time again, has indicated to the Senate his refusal to consent to limitations of debate. I think his stand is wholesome. If debate should ever develop to a point at which a filibuster might ensue, we realize that we have the power to prevent the continuance of such a filibuster within the walls of this Chamber.

So, Mr. President, I say that from the standpoint of principle, the lack of any provision limiting debate on the floor of the Senate is wholesome, proper, and advantageous; indeed, it redounds to the eternal credit of the junior Senator from New Jersey and to the benefit of our Nation that in connection with a matter of this kind he has had the courage to present such an amendment to this body.

But in this particular case not only is the failure to include a provision for limitation of debate wholesome from the standpoint of general principles, but it is wholesome because of the very nature of a reorganization plan. Mr. President, if there were brought before the Senate a reorganization plan involving the question of what powers should be in this department or that department, or in this bureau or that bureau or in this, that, or the other commission—possibly 50 of them; I do not know how many there are; perhaps there are 100 of them; whatever figure the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] may give doubtless is correct—but in the event that a matter of that kind were presented to the Senate, would it be wholesome for this body to be compelled to proceed under a provision that debate upon it should be limited to 10 hours or 20 hours or 10 days? I undertake to say that the provision of the amendment which, although it would expedite progress, still would prevent the killing or smothering in committee of a resolution for the approval of a reorganization plan and still would permit unlimited debate upon the floor of the Senate is wholesome and proper and essential to the preservation of the theory of the Government under which we live.

Then, Mr. President, the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey does something else. I shall mention it in only a very few words, because I have already covered it in substance. I refer to the fact that the amendment goes to the very fundamentals of the constitutional question here involved; it goes to the whole question whether the Members of the Congress shall be permitted to relax and sit quietly and pleasantly and comfortably in their seats and, even slumber day after day, without acting affirmatively on such matters, and thus allow the President to dictate and prepare, and, in effect, pass legislation presented to Congress.

A few days ago I tried to outline the experience had across the water, in Great Britain, where, even in what the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] called "the citadel of parliamentary procedure," we find that over the years the House of Commons has become virtually without power, save as the Cabinet of Great Britain grants, grudgingly at times, perhaps, power to the House of Commons.

Our distinguished friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who spoke this afternoon, rose on this floor on the 27th day of July of this year for the purpose of pointing out the fact that the House of Lords had become a decadent body in Great Britain, and that today it does virtually nothing of significance except to pass upon cases of law or equity which may come before it.

Mr. President, the pending amendment preserves the legislative power of Congress. It does not undertake to do that which the Father of his Country—and which every statesman who has expressed himself in general terms, at least, has warned against—namely, delegate legislate power from this branch of the Government to another. Yet, when we come to the particular question which now confronts us, we are urged by distinguished Members, such as the Senator from Georgia, to give up our legislative power because, perchance and forsooth, we may regain the power at some time later. I am opposed to allowing the President of the United States, whether it was Mr. Coolidge, or Mr. Roosevelt, or whether it be Mr. Truman, to exercise the functions of the legislative branch of this Government.

I invite attention to a statement which was made years ago by Montesquieu, the great French philosophical historian. Montesquieu said:

> When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] who from time to time during the past few days has argued with respect to the bill with much distinction, courtesy, and clearness of expression, today referred to the fact that Americans are crying out for the reorganization of the various departments and agencies of our Government. I join with the Americans to whom he referred in likewise crying out for a reorganization of the Government. I assert that in my judgment the people of the United States, at least the true Americans, are not crying out for the abolition and abdication of power by Congress. My judgment is that no loyal citizen of our country desires Congress to surrender its rights to the executive department. I appreciate the fact that there may be differences of opinion with regard to the legality of the question involved. I make no charge of disloyalty against any man who takes a view contrary to mine with regard to the constitutional issues which are involved, but I undertake to say that the action proposed by the committee amendment and the Byrd amendment represents a delegation of legislative power to the President, and as such constitutes a surrender of the powers, duties, and responsibilities which have been imposed upon this great body by the Constitution of the United States.

The people of our country have the right to have enacted laws which are made not by one man who sits in the White House but by the Congress of the United States. The people of our country have the right to object if the President is to be given the power to formulate and transmit a reorganization plan to Congress and say, "If you gentlemen do not see anything wrong with it, and tell me so, then it will become law," thereby overturning laws which have been accumulating for a century or more. The people of our country are entitled to have the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], for example, to use the breadth of his experience, the profundity of his knowledge, and the excellence of his judgment affirmatively with regard to the questions which may come before the Senate rather than that Congress shall receive a copy of a document, which has been written in the White House, together with a communication stating in effect, "Dear Mr. Senator: If you do not see anything wrong with this, from now on it will be the law of the United States of America."

Mr. President, to my mind the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has put his finger upon something of vital importance by pointing out that if this bill shall be passed by the Congress of the United States containing the provisions of the Byrd amendment, there will then be presented to the President of the United States, the man who exercises the coordinate power in the third branch of our Government, the question of whether he shall sign the measure or veto it. If he undertakes to sign the measure, Mr. President, he will, as I see it, be signing a document under which he evidences his view, and his determination, if you please, that there shall be delegated by Congress to the Executive the legislative power and responsibility which rests upon the shoulders of Congress and which may not be evaded or abdicated.

So, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon has acted very properly in calling attention to the fact that the people of the United States, in the event the bill, if it is passed by Congress, is not vetoed by the President, will have the right to place upon the shoulders of the President of the United States the ultimate responsibility, along with Congress, of such abdication of power on the one hand and the acceptance of a nondelegable power on the other hand by the Executive.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New Jersey not only giving, as it does, absolute power to the President to submit to the Congress any plan which he may care to

formulate—a power which, of course, he already has—but making it obligatory upon him to transmit such a plan, and, within all reasonable limits, expediting the progress of the plan through committee, while at the same time imposing no check or throttle upon free and unlimited debate, deserves the congratulations and approbation of the public.

Finally, Mr. President, this amendment, which undertakes to preserve and keep within our hands and upon our consciences our duties and responsibilities, instead of undertaking passively to delegate those duties and responsibilities to another individual, is entitled to the vote of every Senator of the United States, regardless of his political affiliation.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, earlier in the day the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] called my attention to Calendar No. 673, Senate bill 1459, introduced by him and me, to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases, and he asked if it might not be considered by the Senate. I have spoken about the bill to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the acting minority leader, as well as with the leadership on this side of the Chamber. This is a bill which affects only a very few leases, but action must be had before the expiration of more time or valuable rights may be lost. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be now considered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say that I have consulted with the Republican members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and there is no objection, so far as I know, to the passage of the bill, and I believe it will involve no debate.

Mr. HATCH. I understand it will not.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1459) to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence in the first section of the act entitled "An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas leases," approved July 29, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The term of any 5-year lease expiring prior to December 31, 1946, maintained in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements and regulations and for which no preference right to a new lease is granted by this section, is hereby extended to December 31, 1946."

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, in connection with the pending amendment, I wish to make a few remarks.

If the amendment offered jointly by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], shall be agreed to, we will be right back at the place where we began. No Senator would rise in his place today and say that the President of the United States could not immediately, without the passage of any legislation at all, examine and investigate the executive departments and send to the Congress a plan of reorganization. Having submitted the plan to us, then, of course, Congress, in its deliberate procedure, could let the plan lie here month after month, and it would die without action. That is exactly the position the President and the Congress are in today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe the statement made by the Senator from Utah is sound, but in view of the fact that it must be universally agreed that the Government departments are sprawling and overlapping, and that the President does have the authority and power to act, why has not the President submitted a plan of reorganization and reduction looking to the promotion of efficiency? To me it is no excuse to urge that the President might say, "If I do, Congress will not act on it." It would still seem to me to be the President's duty to submit a plan, and then hold Congress to its responsibility for action.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure the Senator would not want me to answer for the Chief Executive, but the answer is that the President has sent a special message to the Congress asking us to give him the authority coupled with the responsibility to proceed and do the job. The present President of the United States sat in the United States Senate for 10 or 11 years; he knows how impossible it is for Congress to do a reorganization job. In fact, he knows, as the Senator from Georgia stated just a few minutes ago, that if the matter is left to Congress, reorganization of the executive department will not take place.

If the Senator desires any further evidence, I call his attention to the empty benches in the Senate today; I call his attention to the fact that the same condition has existed ever since debate on this reorganization bill began, which, in my opinion, is the best evidence of the fact that Congress is just not interested in reorganization. That is my answer to the Senator.

Bills of this kind have been passed before. In the past we gave President Hoover and President Roosevelt power to do the job, and now one of our former colleagues is asking us to extend to him, as President, not, in my opinion, the power, but merely to give him the responsibility to go ahead and do the job within the pattern and formula laid down by Congress.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I realize that the President has requested this action, but I still contend that the President has the power and the authority to recommend specific reorganization.

In answer to the statement the Senator made a moment ago that it is difficult for Congress to write a reorganization bill, let me call the attention of the Senator to the numerous bills which are prefabricated and prewritten in the various executive departments but upon which Congress passes. True, many of them bear the name of an individual Member of Congress, but it is a well known fact that those bills are written in detail in the various executive departments. When the departments really want something, when they really advocate something, when they insist upon something, they find no difficulty in preparing a bill in its minutest form, assembling the evidence and preparing the facts which they want to present in support of the bill, very often prior to the time it is introduced in the Congress. So I say there would be no difficulty whatsoever—perhaps a burden, but no substantial difficulty—in the President preparing his specific reorganization program and sending it to Congress without any legislation directing him to do so under the powers already existing.

Of course, I admit there would then be encountered the question whether Congress would or would not become ponderous in its consideration and action upon the bill, but the question of ponderosity of legislative procedure is the responsibility of Congress, which we in Congress should not shirk. I may say that, while I am one of the youngest and most inexperienced Members of this body, I do not subscribe as yet—I hope I never shall reach the point—to the statement, the fatalistic statement, if you please, made by a great statesman, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who said he came here originally with the idea that these things could be done, but that he was forced to say, after years of attendance and experience in Congress, that he believed they were impossible of accomplishment because of the inertia in Congress itself.

I may say to the Senator that I, for one, have not lost as yet my respect for the responsibility of Congress, or my zeal to help get Congress to the point where it will do its duty and perform its responsibility under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Iowa on his unlimited optimism. If he can get any comfort out of the statements he has made, in view of the interest which the Senate of the United States is exhibiting, not in reorganization, but in a reorganization bill, I want him to have all the comfort he can get.

I think the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Virginia, both of whom have spoken on this question, have been willing to change their minds—why? Not because of any change of mind or of any change of attitude respecting a principle, but they have come, probably unwillingly, to the realization that there are some things that Congress cannot do, even if it should do them, and one of those things is to reorganize the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wanted to ask the Senator if he thought that it was a sufficient justification for the desertion of constitutional convictions to discover that Congress found it difficult to act as the result of constitutional restriction?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would prefer to have the Senator propound that question to the Senators who, as I understand, are said to have changed their minds on their constitutional convictions, rather than to answer it myself.

I will say to the Senator, however, I agree thoroughly with the distinguished Senator from Missouri and the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia that Congress cannot, under the Constitution, delegate any legislative power. To try to justify under our Constitution the delegation of legislative powers of the Congress is absolutely untenable. I think the Supreme Court time and time again has held emphatically that the delegation of legislative power is unconstitutional, but I take the same position, Mr. President, as the Senator from Georgia did today, that we do not in a bill of this kind delegate any legislative power. We write out the formula. Congress establishes the standards, Congress establishes the legislative pattern, and in this instance calls upon the Chief Executive to fill in the detail. Time and time again the Supreme Court has held, and in my opinion will continue to hold, that that is not a delegation of legislative power. For Senators to stand on the Senate floor and contend day after day that we do not in this bill set up proper standards, in my opinion, is answered quite emphatically by one of our Federal courts. But it seems to me that Senators who argue the constitutional question are perfectly willing absolutely to ignore that court decision and brush it aside and say that it means nothing.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand that the Senator, as he has so clearly stated on other occasions, does not regard this bill as delegating legislative power. Am I correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. If I thought the bill delegated legislative power I would not be here supporting it.

Mr. DONNELL. That is what I understood was the Senator's position. I ask him another question. First, I may say that he answered the question some days ago, but so much time has elapsed that I should like to have the question reanswered, if he has no objection. Am I correct in understanding that he disagrees with the language of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate which in October of this year, on page 3 of its report, used this language:

> This bill provides that part of the legislative power of the Congress shall be delegated to the President.

Further the report used this language:

> Such a delegation of legislative power does not operate to deprive either House of the Congress of its constitutional right—

And so forth. On the next page of the report the committee used this language:

> It seems apparent that the President will make large use of the Bureau of the Budget in exercising the legislative power respecting reorganization which this bill delegates to him.

And then in the next paragraph:

> In delegating certain legislative power to the President, this bill exempts from the exercise of such power—

And so forth. I ask the Senator again: Does he agree or disagree with this language referring to the delegation of legislative power to the President, thus employed four separate times by the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the able Senator is a distinguished member, and which then consisted of 17 lawyers Members of this body?

Mr. MURDOCK. My answer is the same today as it was a day or two ago. I had nothing whatever to do with the writing of the report. I did not know what was in it until it came to the floor of the Senate. I disclaim any authorship of that language in the Senate report, and I simply say it is rather unfortunate in my humble judgment that that language was used. I do not think the language is important. I do not think, in view of the position the distinguished Senator from Missouri takes, that that language is important. If the bill delegates legislative power and finally becomes law, certainly the Supreme Court will take care of that matter if and when it comes to the court.

I say to the Senator again that the courts have already ruled on the question, and I intend in the brief remarks—at least I hope they will be brief—which I shall make this afternoon, to refer to that decision, and if the distinguished Senator is willing to listen to a Federal court, the answer to his argument is contained in this opinion which I will read in a few minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I understand then that the Senator says he disagrees with the language used by the Judiciary Committee to which I referred. Is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. I could not have said it any plainer. I do disagree that Congress has any constitutional power to delegate legislative authority.

Mr. DONNELL. And does the Senator disagree with the statement thus made four times by the Committee on the Judiciary that this bill does delegate legislative power? Does he disagree or not?

Mr. MURDOCK. I have given the Senator an answer to that two or three times. I disagree heartily, emphatically, and vehemently that this bill delegates any legislative power. In my opinion, we have set up the standards specifically. We have told the President what he can do and what he cannot do. And we simply call upon him then within those standards to go ahead and reorganize.

Mr. President, I now ask permission to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks that part of the bill passed in 1932 dealing with reorganization in the executive departments. I also ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks the amendment adopted in early 1933 to that reorganization bill, which amendment was in line with the recommendations made by the then Attorney General Mitchell, in which opinion the Attorney General held that for Congress to reserve the power of veto in the separate Houses of Congress raised very grave questions of constitutionality. As a result of that opinion, the Congress, under President Hoover's administration, struck out that provision which retained the veto power in either House, and the amendment did away with any requirement at all that the reorganization program should be submitted back to Congress before becoming effective.

I ask that that part of the 1932 bill to which I referred and the amendment of 1933 be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE IV—REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 401. In order to further reduce expenditures and increase efficiency in Government it is declared to be the policy of Congress—

(a) To group, coordinate, and consolidate executive and administrative agencies of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purpose;

(b) To reduce the number of such agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head;

(c) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

(d) To segregate regulatory agencies and functions from those of an administrative and executive character.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 402. When used in this title—

(1) The term "executive agency" means any commission, board, bureau, division, service, or office in the executive branch of the Government, but does not include the executive departments mentioned in title 5, section 1, United States Code.

(2) The term "independent executive agency" means any executive agency not under the jurisdiction or control of any executive department.

POWER OF PRESIDENT

SEC. 403. For the purpose of carrying out the policy of Congress as declared in section 401 of this title, the President is authorized by Executive order—

(1) To transfer the whole or any part of any independent executive agency, and/or the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of an executive department or another independent executive agency;

(2) To transfer the whole or any part of any executive agency, and/or the functions thereof, from the jurisdiction and control of one executive department to the jurisdiction and control of another executive department; or

(3) To consolidate or redistribute the functions vested in any executive department or in the executive agencies included in any executive department; and

(4) To designate and fix the name and functions of any consolidated activity or executive agency and the title, powers, and duties of its executive head.

SEC. 404. The President's order directing any transfer or consolidation under the provisions of this title shall also designate the

records, property (including office equipment), personnel, and unexpended balances of appropriations to be transferred.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 405. (a) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of any executive agency or function transferred or consolidated with any other executive agency or function under the provisions of this title, and in effect at the time of the transfer or consolidation, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer or consolidation had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any department or executive agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of any transfer of authority, powers, and duties from one officer or executive agency of the Government to another under the provisions of this title, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the head of the department or executive agency or other officer of the United States to whom the authority, powers, and duties are transferred.

(c) All laws relating to any executive agency or function transferred or consolidated with any other executive agency or function under the provisions of this title, shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect, and shall be administered by the head of the executive agency to which the transfer is made or with which the consolidation is effected.

STATUTORY AGENCIES

SEC. 406. Whenever, in carrying out the provisions of this title, the President concludes that any executive department or agency created by statute should be abolished and the functions thereof transferred to another executive department or agency or eliminated entirely the authority granted in this title shall not apply, and he shall report his conclusions to Congress, with such recommendations as he may deem proper.

DISAPPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE ORDER

SEC. 407. Whenever the President makes an Executive order under the provisions of this title, such Executive order shall be transmitted to the Congress while in session and shall not become effective until after the expiration of 60 calendar days after such transmission, unless Congress shall sooner approve of such Executive order or orders by concurrent resolution, in which case said order or orders shall become effective as of the date of the adoption of the resolution: *Provided*, That if Congress shall adjourn before the expiration of 60 calendar days from the date of such transmission such Executive order shall not become effective until after the expiration of 60 calendar days from the opening day of the next succeeding regular or special session: *Provided further*, That if either branch of Congress within such 60 calendar days shall pass a resolution disapproving of such Executive order, or any part thereof, such Executive order shall become null and void to the extent of such disapproval: *Provided further*, That in order to expedite the merging of certain activities, the President is authorized and requested to proceed, without the application of this section, with setting up consolidations of the following governmental activities: Public Health (except that the provisions hereof shall not apply to hospitals now under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration), Personnel Administration, Education (except the Board of Vocational Education shall not be abolished), and Mexican Water and Boundary Commission, and to merge such activities, except those of a purely military nature, of the War and Navy Departments as, in his judgment, may be common to both and where the consolidation thereof in either one of the departments will effect economies in Federal expenditures, except that this section shall not apply to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 408. The President shall report specially to Congress at the beginning of each regular session any action taken under the provisions of this title, with the reasons therefor.

[Amendment of 1933]

TITLE IV—REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECLARATION OF STANDARD

SEC. 401. The Congress hereby declares that a serious emergency exists by reason of the general economic depression; that it is imperative to reduce drastically governmental expenditures; and that such reduction may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding immediately under the provisions of this title.

Accordingly the President shall investigate the present organization of all executive and administrative agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(a) To reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(b) To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

(c) To group, coordinate, and consolidate executive and administrative agencies of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(d) To reduce the number of such agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and by abolishing such agencies and/or such functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government;

(e) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

(f) To segregate regulatory agencies and functions from those of an administrative and executive character.

DEFINITION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY

SEC. 402. When used in this title the term "executive agency" means any commission, independent establishment, board, bureau, division, service, or office in the executive branch of the Government and, except as provided in section 403, includes the executive departments.

POWER OF PRESIDENT

SEC. 403. Whenever the President, after investigation, shall find and declare that any regrouping, consolidation, transfer, or abolition of any executive agency or agencies and/or the functions thereof is necessary to accomplish any of the purposes set forth in section 401 of this title, he may by Executive order—

(a) Transfer the whole or any part of any executive agency and/or the functions thereof to the jurisdiction and control of any other executive agency;

(b) Consolidate the functions vested in any executive agency; or

(c) Abolish the whole or any part of any executive agency and/or the functions thereof; and

(d) Designate and fix the name and functions of any consolidated activity or executive agency and the title, powers, and duties of its executive head; except that the President shall not have authority under this title to abolish or transfer an executive department and/or all the functions thereof.

SEC. 404. The President's order directing any transfer, consolidation, or elimination under the provisions of this title shall also make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property (including office equipment), and personnel, affected by such transfer, consolidation, or elimination. In any case of a transfer or consolidation under the provisions of this title, the President's order shall also make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with the function or agency transferred or consolidated, as he deems necessary by reason of the transfer or consolidation, for use in connection with the transferred or consolidated function or for the use of the agency to which the transfer is made or of the agency resulting from such consolidation.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 405. (a) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of any executive agency or function transferred or consolidated with any other executive agency or function under the provisions of this title, and in effect at the time of the transfer or consolidation, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer or consolidation had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any executive agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of any transfer of authority, power, and duties from one officer or executive agency of the Government to another under the provisions of this title, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the head of the executive agency or other officer of the United States to whom the authority, powers, and duties are transferred.

(c) All laws relating to any executive agency or function transferred or consolidated with any other executive agency or function under the provisions of this title, shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect, and shall be administered by the head of the executive agency to which the transfer is made or with which the consolidation is effected.

WINDING UP AFFAIRS OF AGENCIES

SEC. 406. In the case of the elimination of any executive agency or function, the President's order providing for such elimination shall make provision for winding up the affairs of the executive agency eliminated or the affairs of the executive agency with respect to the functions eliminated, as the case may be.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER

SEC. 407. Whenever the President makes an Executive order under the provisions of this title, such Executive order shall be submitted to the Congress while in session and shall not become effective until after the expiration of 60 calendar days after such transmission, unless Congress shall by law provide for an earlier effective date of such Executive order or orders: *Provided*, That if Congress shall adjourn before the expiration of 60 calendar days from the date of such transmission such Executive order shall not become effective until after the expiration of 60 calendar days from the opening day of the next succeeding regular or special session.

APPROPRIATIONS IMPOUNDED

SEC. 408. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this title shall not be used for any purpose but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask also that sections 1, 2 and 3 of the pending Senate bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE I

SEC. 1. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to—

(1) facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

(2) reduce expenditure to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and by abolishing such agencies as may not be, necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government;

(6) eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

(7) provide for making currently and continously, subject to the limitation contained in subsection (d) of section 4 hereof, such adjustments in the Government establishment as may be necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this title, and can be accomplished more speedily and efficiently thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

SEC. 2. No reorganization plan under section 4 shall provide for, and no reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of—

(a) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(b) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(c) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(d) transferring to any other agency any executive department or all the functions thereof; or

(e) consolidating with any executive department any other executive department or all the functions thereof; or

(f) abolishing any executive department or all the functions thereof; or

(g) establishing any new executive department, or changing the name of any executive department, or designating any agency as "Department" or the head of any new agency as "Secretary"; or

(h) divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions; or

(i) increasing the term of any office beyond that now provided by law for such office.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency or the functions thereof to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency or the functions thereof with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the abolition of any function or functions; or

(5) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part (by reason of reorganizations under this act or otherwise, or by reason of termination of its functions in any other manner) does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the reorganization plan will not have, any functions,

is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of any reorganizations as to which he has made findings hereunder and which he elects to include in the plan, and shall transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization specified in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of subsection 1 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session.

(b) Any reorganization plan prepared and transmitted pursuant to subsection 3 (a) shall—

(1) make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by such reorganization;

(2) make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with any agency reorganized as the President deems necessary by reason of the reorganization: *Provided*, That such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which the appropriation is originally made and any appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury;

(3) make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished;

(4) designate, in such cases as the President deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization;

(5) make provision for such further measures, consistent with section 2, as the President deems necessary in order to facilitate administration with respect to any agency affected by a reorganization, including provision for the appointment, compensation, and duties of the head or any other officer of such agency: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed to any office under a reorganization plan for a fixed term in excess of 4 years, and no provision shall be made under a reorganization plan for the appointment of any person as the head of an agency or (except for appointment under the classified civil service) as a policy-maker or at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 per year, except by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That no reorganization plan shall fix the compensation of any person at more than $10,000 per year.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I have had these matters printed in the RECORD for the purpose of setting before the Senate the 1932 bill, with the amendment, and the pending bill, for the purposes of making a comparison as to the standards set up by this bill and by the bill of 1932.

Then, Mr. President, I desire to read at this point from the case of Isbrandtsen-Moller Co., Inc., against the United States and others, decided by the District Court of the Southern District of New York, by a court constituted of three Federal district judges. In that case, Mr. President, the very question of standards was raised, raised in the pleadings, argued by the eminent counsel to which the Senator from Missouri referred the other day, and decided on directly by the court. The opinion was written by Judge Chase, a circuit judge who, I am informed, is considered one of the most eminent Federal judges in the United States. In that opinion we find this statement, reading from page 412 of Federal Supplement 14:

There remains only the question of the power of Congress to do that. On this point we are concerned with power regardless of the wisdom or effect of its exercise as a matter of good public policy. Much of the complainant's argument has been directed to the public benefit which would flow from keeping the functions formerly of the Shipping Board independent and free from direct control an executive can exert over the Department of Commerce. Perhaps that is so, but that is for Congress to decide in the performance of its duty to legislate in the public interest, and so long as it acts within the scope of its power as the National Legislature its choice of means and methods is to be given effect.

It is not, nor could it successfully be, disputed that Congress had the power to delegate to the Shipping Board in the manner it did so, the powers and duties that board possessed before Executive Order No. 6166 was promulgated. The change which has been made clothes an executive department with the same powers and duties to be exercised in the same way as before. We think that the same powers and duties which were properly delegated to the Shipping Board could be delegated to any other person or body to which Congress should see fit to cause them to be transferred. It elected to have the President investigate and decide what should be done in this regard in the furtherance of efficiency and economy and then adopted his decision. The result was to abolish a board whose existence was dependent upon the will of Congress and to delegate to the Department of Commerce the same powers and duties the board had possessed. This seems in accord with correct standards as to delegation of authority to act within proper limits prescribed by Congress.

I repeat that statement of the court:

This seems in accord with correct standards as to delegation of authority to act within proper limits prescribed by Congress. (See *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388, 55 S. Ct. 241, 79 L. Ed. 446); *Schechter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States* (295 U. S., 495, 55 S. Ct. 837, 79 L. Ed. 1570, 97 A. L. R. 947).) Whether the delegation, assuredly proper in subject matter and lawfully defined in scope, purpose, and manner of exercise, should have been to an executive department, was within the sound discretion of Congress. As it did not confer upon anyone functions it was bound to keep and exercise for itself, there was no failure to preserve the required separation of governmental powers. Regulatory powers wide in scope have been lawfully conferred upon the

Secretary of Agriculture (*Stafford* v. *Wallace* (258 U. S. 495, 42 S. Ct. 397, 66 L. Ed. 735, 23 A. L. R. 229); *Tagg Bros. & Moorhead* v. *United States* (280 U. S. 420, 50 S. Ct. 220, 74 L. Ed. 524)); upon the Secretary of Labor (*Oceanic Steam Navigation Co.* v. *Stranahan* (214 U. S. 320, 29 S. Ct. 671, 53 L. Ed. 1013)); and upon the Secretary of the Interior (*United States ex rel. Riverside Oil Co.* v. *Hitchcock* (190 U. S. 316, 23 S. Ct. 698, 47 L. Ed. 1074)).

Mr. President, I make the point that a Federal court, a part of the Federal judiciary, has emphatically answered the challenge and the question of unconstitutionality raised by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. It was deciding the same question now raised by the Senator from Missouri in connection with the pending bill involving the reorganization act of 1932. The question of delegation of legislative powers was raised. The question was emphatically answered by the court, which found that proper standards were set up. In support of the opinion of the court, it cites the very cases which the Senator from Missouri has so persistently and repeatedly called to the attention of the Senate in support of his position.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator correctly points out, of course, that the decision from which he read was by a lower Federal court.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was a three-judge court constituted under one of the Federal statutes with which the able Senator is familiar.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator would agree with me that most of the great decisions of the United States Supreme Court holding statutes of Congress unconstitutional have been decisions in cases in which lower Federal courts had already declared the statute in question to be constitutional.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will say to the Senator that frequently the Supreme Court overrules the lower Federal courts. But my answer to the Senator, and to the Senator from Missouri, is that if they have better authority than I have on the question of constitutionality, let them submit it. I say to the Senator that this very case went to the Supreme Court of the United States; and if any Senator or any lawyer will read that Supreme Court decision he cannot help but come to the conclusion that the Supreme Court went a long way in upholding the Federal court which had decided the question.

Mr. MORSE. I think the challenge of the Senator is a fair one, and I should like to meet the challenge. I suggest to him that he reread the Schechter case, the Panama-Pacific case, and other cases in which the Supreme Court has made perfectly clear that Congress cannot delegate its legislative functions, but that it does have the authority to delegate administrative functions.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator and I are in full agreement on that question.

Mr. MORSE. Permit me to finish my thesis. It will not take me long.

Mr. MURDOCK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. MORSE. I think the cases are pretty clear that one of the tests applied to the standards which must be encompassed in any act which Congress passes delegating administrative functions is that the standards shall not permit of the exercise of arbitrary discretion by the body to which the administrative function is delegated. I say to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Utah that the standards which he alleges are provided for in the bill now under discussion are standards which permit of the exercise of arbitrary discretion on the part of the President of the United States. I believe that when the Supreme Court comes to pass upon those standards it will be compelled, in line with principles which it has already laid down, to reverse the decision of the lower Federal court to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. MURDOCK. I know the Senator's position; and argumentative as I may seem to be at times, I would not undertake to convince either the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from Missouri of the correctness of my position or the correctness of the position of the Federal district court which decided in support of the position which I take today. However, I should welcome an opportunity in the future to argue this very question with either of the distinguished Senators, or both of them, before a court which had not made up its mind, as it is so evident that the two distinguished Senators have.

I say again that the Supreme Court of the United States, when it considered the lower court's decision, on appeal of this very case, could very gracefully and conveniently, if there had been any doubt in its mind as to the standards set up, have overruled the lower court and sent the case back. But the Supreme Court did not see fit to do so. In my opinion it went considerably out of its way to decide that the question had become moot by action of Congress; and it decided this particular case on that basis and no other.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I think possibly the Senator, in the concluding portion of his sentence, has already anticipated my question. My point was that the Supreme Court refused to decide this case on the grounds stated by the Court, namely that the case had become moot. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. On the question of standards, the Court held that the question was moot, and did not decide it.

Mr. President, I wish to read a very brief statement from the present Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, a former Member of the House of Representatives, with whom I had the honor and distinction of serving for 6 or 8 years in the House. During the time that he served in the House he was chairman of the House committee dealing with reorganization. In my opinion there is no man in Washington today, unless it be the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has given to the question of reorganization more time, more energy, and more study than has the distinguished former Representative from North Carolina, Hon. Lindsay Warren. I read from a letter written by him to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], dated November 7, 1945, on the question of congressional veto:

> A most significant change is noted in section 4 where provision is made for the veto, in effect, of any reorganization plan by resolution of either House of Congress.

He is referring to the bill as it came from the Senate committee, which provided for a veto by either House, instead of requiring concurrence of both Houses.

I read further from the letter:

> The House bill, like the Reorganization Act of 1939, calls for such disapproval by both Houses through a concurrent resolution. It will be noted the present Senate bill, in practical effect, follows the provision of the original Reorganization Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 413, 5 U. S. C. 124 (1934 ed.)), the constitutionality of which was declared to be in grave doubt in an opinion of Attorney General Mitchell, dated January 24, 1933 (37 Ops. Atty. Gen. 56). In the light of that opinion, the same Congress, on March 3, 1933, amended the act so as to strike from its provisions entirely any provision for a veto by Congress (see 47 Stat. 1517). Since, at that time, no agency was exempt from the operation of the law and the powers granted included the abolition of functions as well as agencies, it will be seen that the power delegated to the President was a considerably greater one than that contained either in the 1939 act or in the present House bill—each of which provides for a concurrent resolution of disapproval by both Houses—a provision adopted in the light of the historical background just stated. The provisions have been tested in the courts where the reorganizations under the former acts were brought in question.[1] If a new reorganization plan has no substantial merit it is hardly to be supposed that either House would vote against a concurrent resolution of disapproval, and in view of the questions raised as to the validity of the one-House plan, my suggestion would be to return to the concurrent resolution plan as in the House bill.

Mr. President, the other day the Senator from Missouri in his argument made much of the fact that in the Isbrandtsen case the plaintiff was represented by eminent and distinguished counsel. His argument, as I understood it, was to the effect that by reason of that fact, despite the fact that the court decided against the plaintiff, the conclusions and the position of eminent counsel for the plaintiff should be considered even ahead of the court's decision. That is what I understood the Senator to say.

I think the answer to the remarks of the distinguished Senator along that line is that we must remember that, notwithstanding the great eminence of counsel for the plaintiff and their great distinction at the bar and their great learning, that the court held against the position of those eminent counsel. Mr. President, in my opinion that argument on the part of the Senator is a fallacious one, and

[1] *Isbrandtsen-Moller Co.* v. *United States* (14 F. Supp. 407, 412, S. C., 300 U. S. 139); *Swayne & Hoyt, Ltd.* v. *United States* (18 F. Supp. 25, S. C., 300 U. S. 297); *Monarch Distributing Co.* v. *Alexander* (119 F. (2d) 953).

in my opinion it is an argument in favor of the position taken by the court.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator has misunderstood the point I made the other day regarding the eminence of counsel. One of the counsel to whom I referred was the Honorable Frank L. Polk, who was the head of the American delegation to the Peace Conference at Paris, and at one time, as I recall, was either Secretary of State or Acting Secretary of State of the United States. The other counsel to whom I referred was the Honorable John W. Davis, who at one time—for some 5 or 6 years, as I recall; the exact time is shown in my remarks of the other day—served as Solicitor General of the United States, in Washington, and later was president of the American Bar Association, which is composed of approximately 25,000 of the lawyers of our country; he also served with distinction in other capacities, one being an ambassadorial capacity; and, in addition, in 1924 he received, and doubtless he deserved, the honor of being selected by the Democratic Party as its candidate for the Presidency of the United States. My argument was that the very fact that counsel of such eminence would present the same argument or take the same position as the one I have endeavored, feebly, it may be, to present to the Senate, indicates the respectability of that position and the fact that it is entitled to thorough and careful consideration.

Mr. President, I am not undertaking to say that the eminence of counsel necessarily implies, by any means, that their position was right and that the position of the court was wrong. I am basing my proposition with respect to the Isbrandtsen case and also the other case in the District of Columbia which followed the Isbrandtsen case—I referred to it in the Senate the other day—on the fact that both of those cases were decided by inferior courts. I use the word "inferior" in no derogatory sense, but I mean they were lower courts—trial courts or district courts—even though they did have three judges. I further base my position upon the fact that neither case was reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States. I may add that all of us know as a matter of common knowledge that the Supreme Court of the United States has on many occasions reversed the holdings not only of district courts but of certain courts of appeal in our country, and I know, as all of us do, that until the Supreme Court of the United States has spoken upon a proposition of Federal law, there is no finality, generally speaking, I think, in the minds of the bar as to the conclusions of law which are considered as final.

So, Mr. President, the point I was making was not based on the fact that eminent counsel argued the case or on the fact that they argued upon precisely the same basis which I presented, as I understand their argument from the brief set forth in the report, or because I believe their judgment is entitled to greater weight or credence than the views of the court, but my point is that the very fact that men of the standing of Frank L. Polk and John W. Davis took such a position indicates very clearly that the position which they stood for and which I stand for, and which in that case has not been ruled on by the Supreme Court of the United States, but was decided, as I conceive, in the Schechter case, is entitled to careful and thorough consideration.

Let me say in conclusion, with respect to the Schechter case and the Panama case, as compared to the Isbrandtsen case, which was decided by the three-judge court, that in the Schechter case and the Panama case the laws concerned were held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, and to my mind it is difficult to understand why the decisions in those cases should now be considered as sustaining the decision in the Isbrandtsen case; and in the second place——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I do not wish to yield further to the Senator, to have him repeat his arguments.

Mr. DONNELL. I beg the Senator's pardon, and I shall take my seat.

Mr. MURDOCK. I prefer to have the Senator repeat his arguments in his own time.

I think I thoroughly understood the Senator's argument with respect to the eminent counsel, and he has now fortified my construction of his argument by referring again to the eminent counsel who presented the plaintiff's case to the court. I say again that notwithstanding the eminence of counsel and notwithstanding the decisions in the Schechter case and the Panama case, the three-judge court refused, even in the light of the eminence of counsel about which the Senator has spoken, to agree with them, but it specifically disagreed with them and it held that no legislative power was delegated.

Mr. President, I am thoroughly cognizant, as is the distinguished Senator from Missouri, of the fact that a decision of an inferior court is not final. But again I call attention to the fact that this case went to the Supreme Court and was not overruled by the Supreme Court. In my opinion the court based its decision largely on the Panama case and the Schechter case, and it decided that the standards set up in the Reorganization Act of 1932 were sufficient. I say to the Senate today that if the standards in the 1932 act were sufficient and specific enough to conform to the Constitution then certainly no reasonable man would take the position today that the standards which we set up in the pending bill are insufficient.

Senators on both sides of the aisle say they want reorganization. They say the American people are demanding it. Mr. President, I agree that they are. On the other hand, I say it is simply impossible to obtain any successful reorganization in the executive branch of our Government if we wait for specific legislation from the Congress. The few Senators present today and throughout the whole debate on this bill indicates a lack of interest in the question of reorganization or a willingness to allow the President to assume the great burden and responsibility necessarily entailed if the job is done. Their vote on yesterday indicated the latter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Good naturedly, I should like to have the Senator from Utah take note of the situation with regard to his reference to the scarcity of Members in the Chamber at this time. I should like to have the Senator note that there are more Republicans present in the Chamber than there are Democrats. It is also interesting to note that the majority of the Senators who are now in the Chamber are Members who recently came from the people.

I believe the Senator is quite correct in his statement that the American people are going to demand a reorganization of Congress, and if he will give them time for another election or two, I think they will send men to the Senate who will see to it that whatever plan of reorganization shall be submitted to the Congress, it will be required to receive the action of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I know it to be the hope of the distinguished Senator from Oregon that some day there will be a majority on his side of the aisle. I hope, of course, that that time will not come, and I am not at all pessimistic with regard to the results of the next election. I am very cognizant of the fact that there are more vacant seats at the present time on the Democratic side of the Chamber than there are on the Republican side, but I am confident that when the vote is cast on the pending amendment my Democratic colleagues will be here in sufficient strength to prevent its adoption.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The statement of the Senator that there are more vacant seats on the Democratic side of the Chamber at the present moment than on the Republican side is true. However, I may invite his attention to the fact that there are six Members sitting on the Democratic side two of whom are Republicans, and that on the Republican side there are four Members who are all Republicans [Laughter.] I merely wish to keep the record straight.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to have the distinguished Senator from Iowa call that fact to my attention, and we welcome him on this side of the aisle. As Members on his side become wiser they eventually move over to the Democratic side. [Laughter.]

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like merely to observe that I am in entire accord with the position taken by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am happy to have the Senator say so.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator stated that the way for Congress to regain its proper place in the picture is by taking more interest in legislative matters. I may suggest to the Senator from Utah that we who support the pending amend-

ment are endeavoring to do so with the hope that the Senator from Utah will come into the fold.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by including as a part of them the report of a former Judiciary Committee of the Senate, the chairman of which at that time was Mr. Ashurst, of Arizona. The committee reported favorably to the Senate proposed legislation which provided for the Supreme Court of the United States to write the rules of procedure for Federal courts in law cases. I doubt, Mr. President, that there was a Republican at that time who voted against the bill. I am quite sure that no Democrats voted against it. For many years complaints had been made about the utter lack of uniformity in connection with rules of our Federal courts. At last Congress wrote the formula and the pattern, and then called upon the Supreme Court of the United States to fill in the details by writing the rules of procedure. Under the bill reported at that time the rules were required to be submitted back to the Congress. After the Supreme Court had completed its work on the rules they were submitted back to Congress and after lying here for 60 days they became the law of the land.

So, Mr. President, the pending bill is not an innovation. It does not create something new in the way of legislative history or legislative enactment. It simply follows a pattern which has existed for many years in connection with the subject of reorganization. I say to my Democratic and Republican colleagues that if they want reorganization, and want it within the lives of present Members of Congress, there is one way to get it, namely, by the enactment of a reorganization bill which will repose some confidence in the President of the United States and give him the responsibility of reorganizing the department for which he is responsible.

Mr. President, I request and hope that the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], in behalf of himself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] will be defeated because it would simply bring us back to the position we would be in without any legislation on the subject at all. We do not need any such legislation as that which is proposed in the Smith amendment. It would not be at all helpful, but would be absolutely destructive of what the Judiciary Committee has done, and would be destructive of what was done yesterday on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask that the report to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1049, 73d Cong., 2d sess.) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3040) to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to make and publish rules in actions at law, report the same favorably to the Senate and recommend that the bill do pass.

An explanation of this proposed legislation is contained in the following letter from the Attorney General:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1934.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I enclose herewith a draft of a bill to empower the Supreme Court of the United States to prescribe rules to govern the practice and procedure in civil actions at law in the district courts of the United States and the courts of the District of Columbia. The enactment of this bill would bring about uniformity and simplicity in the practice in actions at law in Federal courts and thus relieve the courts and the bar of controversies and difficulties which are continually arising wholly apart from the merits of the litigation in which they are interested. It seems to me that there can be no substantial objection to the enactment of a measure which would produce so desirable a result, which, apart from its inherent merit, would also, it is believed, contribute to a reduction in the cost of litigation in the Federal courts.

I request that you introduce the enclosed bill and hope that you may be able to give it your support.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER CUMMINGS,
Attorney General.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in connection with what I understood to be the point being made by the distinguished Senator from Utah with respect to the power to make rules granted to the Supreme Court, I may say that that same proposition was presented in 1939. I should like to read only a few statements from pages 2960 and 2961 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1939. One of the statements was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who said:

I entirely agree with the Senator. Suppose the Congress of the United States had said to the Supreme Court of the United States, "We will give you the power to diminish the jurisdiction of the lower Federal courts" or "We will turn over to you the power to diminish your own jurisdiction or to increase your own jurisdiction," I should say immediately that unquestionably we would have no authority under the Constitution to do anything of that kind. We say to the court, "You may make rules and regulations pertaining to the practice in the Court." That is an entirely different thing. One situation deals with substantive law. The other deals with rules of practice before the courts, which is an entirely different thing.

Then only a little later, as set forth on page 2961 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1939, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana stated as follows:

There is a vast difference between delegating to the Supreme Court, or to the head of one of the departments, the right to make rules of practice before that body, and changing the substantive law upon the statute books of the United States.

There then followed this response by Senator Byrnes:

I agree; and I think there is an entire difference between Congress attempting to say what a court shall do, and Congress delegating to the head of the executive department the right to rearrange departments in the executive branch of the Government and submit an order to the Congress, that order not being effective if a majority of the House and Senate say it shall not become effective.

I thought, Mr. President, that it might be interesting to invite attention to the fact that the very point which has been presented by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] was considered in the Senate on March 20, 1939, during the debate on the question of reorganization.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MURDOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXTRADITION TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have before me Executive I, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, a protocol, signed in Ottawa on October 3, 1945, to be annexed to, and to form a part of, the extradition treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed in Washington on April 29, 1942, which the President sent to the Senate today. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the protocol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and it will be printed in the RECORD.

The protocol, with accompanying papers, is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a protocol, signed in Ottawa on October 3, 1945, to be annexed to, and to form a part of, the extradition treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed in Washington on April 29, 1942.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate a report on the protocol made to me by the Secretary of State.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 16, 1945.*

[Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) protocol between the United States and Canada, signed October 3, 1945.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 15, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a protocol, signed in Ottawa on October 3, 1945, to be annexed to, and to form a part of, the extradition treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed in Washington on April 29, 1942.

The treaty signed on April 29, 1942 (Senate Executive C, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), was approved by the Senate by its resolution of May 27, 1942, and was ratified by the President of the United States on June 6, 1942.

Action on the treaty by the Parliament of Canada was deferred by Canadian authorities pending the discussion of certain reservations with respect to items 26, 31, and 32 of article 3

thereof. The agreement reached as the result of discussion of those reservations by representatives of the Governments of the United States and Canada is embodied in the protocol transmitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES F. BYRNES.

[Enclosure: Protocol between the United States and Canada, signed October 3, 1945.]

EXECUTIVE I, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION—PROTOCOL ANNEXED TO THE TREATY FOR THE EXTRADITION OF CRIMINALS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CANADA, WHICH WAS SIGNED AT WASHINGTON, APRIL 29, 1942

The undersigned, having been duly authorized to conclude a Protocol to be annexed to, and to form a part of, the Treaty for the Extradition of Criminals between Canada and the United States of America which was signed at Washington on April 29, 1942:

Considering that it is desired that the provisions of Items 26, 31 and 32 of Article 3 of the Treaty should not extend to the extradition of persons engaged in lawful business transactions in the requested country, unless the activities of such persons involve fraud, as defined by the laws of both countries, or wilful and knowing violation of the laws of the requesting country; and

Considering that it is desired that said provisions should not extend to the extradition of a publisher or vendor of a lawful publication in the requested country which is primarily intended for sale and circulation in that country, the circulation of which in the requesting country is only incidental to the ordinary course of publication and sale in the requested country; and

Considering that it is desired that all doubt should be removed as to the retroactive effect of any provisions of Article 3 of the Treaty which make extradition possible for an offence which was not previously an extraditable offence:

have accordingly agreed as follows:

1. No person dealing in securities in the requested country in the ordinary course of business and in compliance with the laws of the requested country shall be subject to extradition in respect of any matter involving an offence under Items 26, 31 or 32 of Article 3 of the Treaty, unless the offence involves—

(a) fraud, as defined by the laws of both countries, or

(b) wilful and knowing violation of the laws of the requesting country.

2. No person shall be subject to extradition for the sale and circulation in the requesting country of a lawful publication in the requested country which is primarily intended for sale and circulation in that country, the circulation of which in the requesting country is only incidental to the ordinary course of publication and sale in the requested country.

3. No person shall be subject to extradition by reason of any offence committed at a date prior to that on which the present Treaty comes into effect which was not an extraditable offence at the time when it was committed.

4. The terms of this declaration shall be deemed to have equal force and effect as the Treaty itself and to form an integral part thereof.

In faith whereof, the undersigned have signed the present Protocol and have affixed thereto their respective seals.

Done in Ottawa this third day of October, one thousand nine hundred and forty-five.

RAY ATHERTON,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America.

LOUIS S. ST. LAURENT,
Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a nomination and a protocol, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Robert E. Freer, of Ohio, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1945. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. MURDOCK. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 19, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 16 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Homer Allen Higgins for appointment as State medical officer for Arkansas and State medical adviser for Oklahoma under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of State medical officer for Arkansas and State medical adviser for Oklahoma will be at the rate of $5,180 per annum.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 16 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Dewey T. Clements, Pineview.

UTAH

Harold A. Wood, Holden.
Adrian Janse, Huntsville.
Clark S. Wood, Levan.
Cora E. Paxton, Lynndyl.
Naomi A. Burgener, Midway.
Ora E. Fotheringham, Minersville.
Bertha D. Bench, Saltair.

VERMONT

Bliss W. Farrar, Craftsbury Common.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of life, who gavest eternal hope to all mortals, we praise Thee that Thy teachings are aglow with the promises of our glorified Lord. Today on land and sea there are many heavy with cares who will take up the trials of yesterday disheartened and wondering what the end will be; we ask for them rest from their mental strife and the peace which comes to those who share the easy yoke of our Master.

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord. Thou, O God, art the kingdom, and we believe that Thy hand has been in the founding and fortunes of our Republic. We pray that our citizens of every station may have written on their hearts one flag and one purpose. Grant that clouds may be dispersed and the dreams of freedom and fraternity may become true. We would remember the patriots and the martyrs of the new day; may we follow their chivalrous examples of devotion and sacrifice and bequeath to our children a country worthy of those who have preserved our national integrity. In the immortal name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1890) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. WHERRY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2578) entitled "An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. MORSE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 784) entitled "An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr."

GENERAL OF THE ARMIES JOHN J. PERSHING

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on November 12, 1945, he did on that date send to General of the Armies John J. Pershing the following message:

MY DEAR GENERAL PERSHING: Expressing the unanimous sentiment of all Members of the House of Representatives and at their direction, I send you greetings and best wishes on the twenty-seventh anniversary of Armistice Day.

You have lived the life and performed the service that has made you a great American. Your countrymen are proud to do you honor.

Sincerely yours,

SAM RAYBURN.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TYLER KENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 382) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives the answers to the following questions:

1. Under what charge was Tyler Kent convicted and sentenced to imprisonment in England?

2. Was any effort made to prosecute him under the Federal statutes, or American or international law, by the Federal Government?

3. Of what offense was he convicted and sentenced?

4. When did his sentence expire?

5. Has he been permitted to return to the United States?

6. Is he now being held in England with the approval or without the protest of the American Government?

7. What, if any, orders, statements, or recommendations have been issued by the State Department with reference to his imprisonment?

8. Was his citizenship revoked by either the President or any agency of the Federal Government?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the full report be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 382) requesting information from the Secretary of State with reference to Tyler Kent, having considered the same, report thereon without amendment and recommend that the resolution do not pass.

For the information of the House, there is included in this report the following communication from the Department of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 6, 1945.

The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLOOM: I have received your letter of October 30, 1945, transmitting for such comment as I may desire to make copies of House Resolution 382, the purpose of which is to direct that the Secretary of State furnish the House of Representatives with information in relation to certain questions concerning the case of Tyler Kent.

For your convenience, the questions set forth in the resolution are reproduced below, together with comment concerning each question:

"1. Under what charge was Tyler Kent convicted and sentenced to imprisonment in England?"

In imposing sentence on November 7, 1940, in the Central Criminal Court at the Old Bailey, London, Mr. Justice Tucker stated, in part: "Tyler Gatewood Kent, you have been found guilty by the jury of five offenses of obtaining and communicating documents which might be of use to the enemy for a purpose prejudicial to the safety and interests of the state. * * * You have also been found guilty on one count of stealing one of those documents. * * * The sentence upon you, on the five counts under the Official Secrets Act, is that on each count you be kept in penal servitude for 7 years; on the count of larceny the sentence is 1 to 12 months' imprisonment. All those sentences are to run concurrently."

"2. Was any effort made to prosecute him under the Federal statutes, or American or international law, by the Federal Government?"

The Department is not aware that such efforts were made. It is not vested with jurisdiction over matters pertaining to the prosecution of penal offenses.

"3. Of what offense was he convicted and sentenced?"

See answer to question No. 1, above.

"4. When did his sentence expire?"

The Department is not informed that his sentence has expired. As indicated above, he was sentenced to 7 years imprisonment on November 7, 1940. However, reports received from the American Embassy in London indicate that should he be entitled, because of good behavior, to a remission of a portion of his sentence, which it is understood British law permits, he would now be eligible for release. The embassy also reported that British authorities intend to deport him to the United States upon his release.

"5. Has he been permitted to return to the United States?"

According to the Department's information he is still under detention in London.

"6. Is he now being held in England with the approval or without the protest of the American Government?"

The Department has had no occasion to approve, or disapprove, or protest against his detention.

"7. What, if any, orders, statements, or recommendations have been issued by the State Department with reference to his imprisonment?"

The Department has not issued orders or made recommendations with reference to his imprisonment. A statement with respect to the case was issued to the press by the Department on September 2, 1944, a copy of which is enclosed.

"8. Was his citizenship revoked by either the President or any agency of the Federal Government?"

The Department has no information that his citizenship has been revoked.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Enclosure:

Statement to the press September 2, 1944.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
September 2, 1944.

[For the press] No. 405

The Department of State has taken note of recent inquiries and newspaper reports regarding the case of Tyler Kent, former employee of the American Embassy at London, and the Office of Foreign Service Administration has been instructed to review the matter thoroughly and prepare a comprehensive report. The following is the text of the report:

Tyler Kent, American citizen, an employee of the American Foreign Service assigned to London, was tried and convicted under the Official Secrets Act (1911) of Great Britain before the Central Criminal Court at the Old Bailey, London, in October 1940. The charges against him were the obtaining and delivering to an agent of a foreign country (Germany) copies or abstracts of documents which might have been directly or indirectly useful to the enemy, and which were, at the same time, prejudicial to the safety or interests of Great Britain. Incidental to the proceedings against him, it was brought out that he had violated the Larceny Act of 1916 of Great Britain by the theft of documents which were the property of the Government of the United States in the custody of the American Ambassador, London. The above mentioned were found proven by a jury on the basis of evidence presented during the trial. Kent had worked through a confederate who was allegedly anti-Jewish and pro-Nazi.

The background of the case and the circumstances leading up to Kent's arrest and trial were as follows: Kent, at the age of 22, had entered the Foreign Service as a clerk, his first assignment having been to the American Embassy at Moscow. He was later transferred to the American Embassy, London, arriving there in October 1939. He was assigned to the code room as a code clerk, where his duties were to encode and decode telegrams. Before entering the service he had attended Princeton University, the Sorbonne (Paris), the University of Madrid, and George Washington University. He had acquired several foreign languages, including Russian, French, German, and Italian.

On May 18, 1940, a representative of the London Police Headquarters at Scotland Yard called at the Embassy to report that Kent had become the object of attention by Scotland Yard through his association with a group of persons suspected of conducting pro-German activities under the cloak of anti-Jewish propaganda. Prominent in this group was Anna Wolkoff, a naturalized British subject of Russian origin, the daughter of a former admiral of the Imperial Russian Navy. Miss Wolkoff had resided in Great Britain since emigrating, with her father, from Russia following the Bolshevist revolution, had been hospitably received and had made a considerable circle of friends among Londoners of standing, some of whom had assisted in setting up the Wolkoff family in a small business. After the outbreak of the present war the British police had become interested in Miss Wolkoff's activities, believing that she was in sympathy with certain of Germany's objectives, that she and some of her associates were hostile to Britain's war effort, that she was involved in pro-German propaganda, that she had a channel of communication with Germany, and that she was making use of that channel of communication.

Kent had been observed by Scotland Yard as having been in frequent contact with Anna Wolkoff and in touch with others of a group known to her. Among other things, it had been noted that Kent and Miss Wolkoff were sharing an automobile and that Miss Wolkoff frequently drove this car, using gasoline allegedly supplied by Kent. Scotland Yard was now convinced that Anna Wolkoff was receiving confidential information from Kent, and stated that she would be arrested on May 20. The police added that on the same day they considered it highly desirable to search the rooms occupied by Kent. In reply to an inquiry made by British authorities, Ambassador Kennedy, with the approval of the Department, informed such authorities of the waiver by this Government of the privilege of diplomatic immunity. Scotland Yard thereupon indicated that a search warrant would be issued and that Kent's rooms would be searched on May 20, 1940.

The possibility that an employee of the Embassy, having access to the confidential codes, was making improper use of the material entrusted to him in the course of his work was of the utmost concern to Ambassador Kennedy and to the Government of the United States. Preservation of the secrecy of this Government's means of communication with its establishments abroad is a matter of fundamental importance to the conduct of our foreign relations. In the circumstances described it was imperative that Ambassador Kennedy ascertain, and ascertain immediately, whether Kent was guilty of a violation of trust. There was every reason, in the interest of the American Government, for the waiving of diplomatic immunity and for allowing the British authorities (who alone had the means of obtaining the evidence) to proceed in an effort to prove or disprove their suspicions. In this connection it may be noted that it is well established in international law that the so-called immunity of an employee of a diplomatic mission from criminal or civil processes may be renounced or waived by the sending state at any time.

The search of Kent's room was conducted according to plan, an officer of the Embassy being present throughout. It revealed that Kent had in his possession copies of Embassy material totaling more than 1,500 individual papers. He also had two newly made duplicate keys to the index bureau and the code room of the Embassy, these being unauthorized and in addition to the keys furnished him officially for his use as a code clerk. He explained that he had had these keys made so that in the event he should ever be transferred from code work to another section of the Embassy he would still have access to the code room. Also found in his possession were two photographic plates of Embassy documents believed to have been made by confederates for the purpose of endeavoring to transmit prints thereof to Germany, and certain printed propaganda material which was prejudicial to the British conduct of the war. The police also established that some of the papers found had been transmitted to an agent of a foreign power.

An examination of the documents found in his room indicated that Kent had begun classifying the material by subject, but this work was far from completed. They covered practically every subject on which the Embassy was carrying on correspondence with the Department of State. As may be supposed, they included copies of telegrams embodying information collected by the Embassy which otherwise would not have been permitted to leave Great Britain without censorship. As may be likewise supposed, they contained information which would have been useful to Germany and which Great Britain would not have permitted to reach Germany. It is of interest to note, in this connection, that Kent had, during his service in London, written to the Chargé d'Affaires of the American Embassy in Berlin asking his assistance in arranging for his (Kent's) transfer to Berlin. When questioned as to what he would have done with the documents in his possesison had he been transferred to Germany, Kent replied that he could not state what he would have done with them; he regarded the question as a hypothetical one.

Regardless of the purpose for which Kent had taken this material from the embassy, he had done so without authorization, in violation of the most elementary principles governing the rules for the preservation of the secrecy of the Government's correspondence. By his own showing he had, while occupying a very special position of confidence within the embassy, displayed a shocking disregard for every principle of decency and honor so far as his obligations toward the United States were concerned. The removal of so large a number of documents from the embassy premises compromised the whole confidential communications system of the United States, bringing into question the security of the secret ciphers. It was obviously impossible to continue his services, and Kent was dismissed from the Government service as of May 20, 1940. Thereafter the question of diplomatic immunity naturally did not arise.

So far as the British police were concerned, the evidence found in Kent's room was such as to convince them of the necessity of detaining him at Brixton Prison pending investigation of the use he had made of the documents in his possession and the true implications of his connection with Anna Wolkoff. Ambassador Kennedy, with the consent of the Department of State, agreed to Kent's detention.

On May 28 a representative of Scotland Yard informed the Embassy that investigations were proceeding, that the case became progressively more complex, and that it could not be cleared up quickly. It was believed, however, that there would be a case for prosecution against Kent and Anna Wolkoff under the Official Secrets Act of the United Kingdom.

Kent's trial eventually commenced August 8, 1940, and was attended by the American Consul General. It was held in camera because of the harmful effects to British counterespionage efforts which were to be anticipated if certain of the evidence became public. Prior to the trial the American Consul General in London had called upon Kent (July 31, 1940) at Brixton Prison. The Consul General informed him that he would be taken to court the following day and formally charged with offense under the Official Secrets Act of the United Kingdom, i. e., obtaining documents for a purpose prejudicial to the safety or interests of the United Kingdom which might be directly or indirectly useful to an enemy. The Consul General inquired whether Kent had a lawyer to represent him, to which Kent replied that he had not, and that he had not given the matter any thought. The Consul General advised him that he should be represented by a lawyer and agreed to assist in getting in touch with a suitable solicitor. Kent was subsequently placed in touch with a lawyer, whom he engaged to represent him during the trial.

On October 23, 1940, the jury found Kent guilty of violating the Official Secrets Act. The sentence was postponed until completion of the trial of Anna Wolkoff. On November 7, 1940, Kent was sentenced to 7 years' penal servitude and Anna Wolkoff was sentenced to 10 years. Kent's attorneys applied for permission to appeal. On February 5, 1941, this application was rejected by a panel of judges which included the Lord Chief Justice.

In reviewing the Kent case it is important to bear in mind the circumstances surrounding it. At the time of Kent's arrest and trial Great Britain was at war and the United States was not. The case involved a group of people suspected of subversive activities. The evidence relating to individuals of the group was inextricably mixed, and the activities of no single suspect could be separated from the activities of the others. The interest of Great Britain in such a case, at a time when it was fighting for its existence, was therefore preeminent. Deep as was the concern of the Government of the United States over a betrayal of trust by one of its employees, it is hardly conceivable that it would have been justified in asking the Government of Great Britain to waive jurisdiction over an American citizen in the circumstances described. Kent was within the jurisdiction of the British courts, and all the evidence, witnesses, etc., were available to the British courts. Moreover, it was, as has been mentioned, in the interest of the United States to have determined immediately on the spot, where the evidence was available, whether or not one of its employees in a position of trust was violating such trust. The question whether the United States will prefer additional charges against Kent will be decided after his release from imprisonment in Great Britain and he again comes under the jurisdiction of our courts.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until 6 o'clock tomorrow afternoon to file a report on the bill H. R. 2536.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, of course, may I inquire if minority views are to be filed?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is making today to the Montgomery Republican Club at the Broadmoor Hotel.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement that he made yesterday before the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include two resolutions.

TRANSPORTATION HOME OF SERVICEMEN ELIGIBLE FOR DISCHARGE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is a Member of the House who would not do everything in his power to bring home quickly all the men who are eligible for discharge and who are overseas. But whatever Congress might do, the ultimate job has to be done by the armed forces. No law can bring them back. The only thing that will do any good is to get the ships there to bring the men home. I wrote the War Department some considerable time ago and asked about this matter. I wanted to hear the War Department's side of the question and to be informed on the extent of the effort being put forth to get the eligible men, especially those with high points. I have not yet had a reply. That is one reason I am speaking now. I want to make some constructive proposals. First, that all shipping ought to be made available to bring these men home. Second, that their transportation should take precedence over all civilian travel of every sort that is not absolutely essential. Third, that all kinds of seaworthy ships that can be found should be used even though they may not be altogether comfortable or ideal. As long as the men can get home they will be the last to complain. Fourth, that for the time being there be no idle shipping, but that a real drive be put on to hurry up this job—the same kind of effort that would be expended getting men to a fighting front. Every kind of ship should be employed, even to naval vessels to the extent that it is possible to do so.

Mr. RANKIN. That ought to include planes also.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes, it certainly should, and there again unnecessary civilian or military use should wait till the eligible men are home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, my statement again today is directed at the same question as was that just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. Today I would like to read from a letter written from Wakayama, Japan, to his parents, by a sergeant in the United States Army, who was sent there direct from the European theater without any furlough en route. He says:

Well, it is still the same old story * * *. It seems that from my experience in troop movements in the Pacific, I have never seen such waste in the use of troops as well as in ships. Here in the harbor, like in San Fernando and in White Beach and also in Manila, there are a great number of ships lying idly out in the harbor doing nothing. Why, even this ship that I am on has been lying out in the harbor in the Philippine Islands for a whole month doing nothing, and you should see the huge amount of fungus which has accumulated on the ship.

Later on he referred again to Wakayama Harbor, and he said:

On the port side of this ship I have counted at least 20 ships. A thousand troops could easily be loaded on each. Hence, the small number of 20,000 men could be transferred to the States on them, providing these ships were not lying out idly in the harbor.

I do hope that the ships out in the Pacific in Wakayama and other harbors will be used to bring our service men and women home, as well as that the suggestion offered by the gentleman from California—that ships will not be diverted from this urgent and pressing job to tasks less important which can be done later—will be followed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, surely by this time every Member of Congress must realize that the indefensible policy of our Army and Navy officials is forcing the inescapable conclusion that the failure to return our boys from foreign soil after months and years of service is as deliberate as it is reprehensible. Day after day gold-braided generals and admirals and their staffs parade through our committee rooms with excuses and evasions, while the indisputable evidence is that our boys are retained on barren islands without needful military duties, and ships which could bring them home sail from their ports in ballast or with supplies for some foreign port. It is time that this Congress serve notice on the military and naval self-perpetuating bureaucratic caste, that the day of excuses and evasions has come to an end, and that the demand of representatives of these boys and their families may no longer be flouted by these smug administrators. When we contemplate the plight of our servicemen and see the complacency of these officers who through the war have been comfortably housed in the Pentagon and Navy Department we are moved to wonder "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed that he hath grown so great?" Every Member knows the resentment so properly entertained by the boys overseas. What a sorry thing it would be for our country if our boys who went into a war to fight for the best in the world would, by the puerile action of our brass hats, come out of it embittered against the things that had taken them there.

This Congress should make certain that our boys shall be brought home, and serve notice—unmistakable notice—on Secretaries, generals, and admirals alike that this must and shall be done.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a column.

SHIRKERS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I consider that stealing time is one of the greatest crimes. When a person holds down a job and does as little work on that job as he possibly can do and tries to get as much money as he can for doing as little as he can, that person is a deliberate thief. I can think of nothing more contemptible than to be a shirker and not a worker. We have people in the Government that I know are drawing down wages and salaries, and doing very little, if anything at all. When heads of departments know that we have people in the Government who are doing that, and doing it deliberately, either one of two things should happen: The man who has that job ought to resign and tell the head of the department he has nothing to do, or the head of the department ought to be wise enough to make a survey of his department and find out where those people are. Not only do we have those people in government, but we have them today in industry. In fact, some organizations and leaders of said organizations preach that doctrine—shirkers, not workers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have been taking the floor every few days to urge Members of the House to sign the petition discharging the Military Affairs Committee and bringing in a bill that would permit all the boys to be relieved from service who have served honorably for 18 months.

I want to bring out another idea. Perhaps you have heard about it, but I have the proofs to support it. Many of our boys who have been in Germany are coming back—not as many as should—but they are coming back with this philosophy: The German people know how to live, but in this country we only exist. Then when asked where they got this philosophy they say: "We would talk to professors, visit their homes, and these professors told us we should do just as little as we could, and they paint a very good picture with which we agree with regard to the German system."

Now, there is danger in that and we had better sign this petition and get these boys back to this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a returned soldier on compulsory military training.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and

include a letter read on the radio program Voice of the People of Norfolk, Nebr.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a splendid article written by Charles A. Merrill, appearing in the Boston Globe of September 9, 1945, in connection with the advisability of passing the full employment bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and to include therein editorials from the Chicago Sun, Chicago Times, New York Times, and Baltimore Sun.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address on military training delivered by himself on several radio stations, together with interrogatories by the radio station announcers, and Mr. BROOKS' answers.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith certain editorial comment.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2202, the so-called full employment bill, in part reads as follows:

> All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right of useful, remunerative, regular, full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right.

I am wondering where the idea originated that the Government of the United States owes its citizens full-time employment at remunerative wages. The Government of the United States should never embark on any such program, in which its citizens would look to it for support. For more than 150 years, this Nation has progressed and grown into the mightiest of all nations on the theory that the taxpayer supports the Government and not the Government the taxpayer.

For the past several years there has grown up in this country the attitude and feeling that Washington can solve all of our ills. Only yesterday I received a letter from a woman in my district saying that her husband had reached the age of 65 and was entitled to a pension from the Government. I have received many similar letters from constituents to the effect that they had just attained the age of 65 and that they are now entitled to receive old-age benefits, regardless of need, because they had lived 65 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is the end of private enterprise and individual initiative if this full employment measure is enacted into law. There can be no doubt but that the Government would enter into direct competition with private enterprise and pay wages and set maximum work hours and minimum standards which would eliminate small and big business in this country. If this Congress says that it is the policy of the Government to offer full-time employment at remunerative wages, it would then be the obligation of the Government to go to any limit necessary to attain these goals. It would go into the manufacturing business just like it has gone into housing in direct competition with the taxpaying citizen.

Sunday's edition of the Washington Star carried two full pages of advertisements in which private business was pleading for both men and women to accept employment. These jobs were of every character. That situation does not just exist in the Nation's Capital; it is country wide. We should encourage private business to obtain the badly needed employees rather than to say to it, "If you do not hire them at the wages we say they should get and for the hours that we set, then we will."

All of last week and this week this House has had no legislative program. It seems to be the attitude of our body that we will consider full employment or unemployment compensation or nothing at all. This situation exists despite the fact that much legislation which would encourage our free competitive system awaits action by this House. Many of the committees have voted out a number of bills which should be given immediate attention by this Congress.

The word is going around that some sort of compromise on full employment is being considered. There can be no compromise on an issue that goes to the very fundamental principle of Americanism. This is an issue that you cannot toy with. You are either for giving further impetus and sanction to the movement toward total totalitarianism, or you are for maintaining our system of free competitive enterprise in which the taxpayer pays his taxes in support of the Government. That is the one and only issue we have to consider in connection with the full employment bill.

Only last week I read into the RECORD an editorial from one of the largest daily papers in my State, the Arkansas Democrat. This editorial pointed out the pitfalls and dangers which lie ahead in the Government attempting to guarantee full employment to its people. That editorial was signed by some of our best citizens. These people want to continue as our forefathers did by working and earning and developing and fighting to get ahead. They want to leave to their posterity the same principles which they inherited from their forefathers.

It was necessary that we vote legislation providing for a postwar road-building program. I supported that proposal. Just a few days ago we passed a huge airport-building program. There will be others to follow. But, how can we maintain our present democratic system when we attempt to provide jobs for all from Washington. What are we going to do about paying the interest on an indebtedness of $265,000,000,000 and how do we plan to retire this debt? There must be some stopping point. Mr. Speaker, we have reached that point now. It is time to call a halt.

Let us speed up reconversion by our action on various matters with which we are confronted. We can do this by saying to America, "We will not enact full employment for all which would wreck our economy and bring ruin to our system of free enterprise. The suggestion we make to you is to stop these strikes, go to work at the job of making automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, and other essential domestic goods."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not; I serve notice that next week I am going to object to 3-day adjournments, until we get a vote on discharging from the service those men who are being kept in uniform in idleness at the expense of the Government, who want to come home to look after their families, take care of their own businesses, or return to school.

I shall not object now to adjourning until Monday, but I will not agree to any 3-day recesses until we get a vote on this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I might say that as far as I am concerned I had no intention of submitting a request for 3-day recesses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next?

There was no objection.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GALLAGHER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject, The Weak Shall Be Made Strong.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CADETS AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND ADDITIONAL MIDSHIPMEN AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1591) to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of officers,

soldiers, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Line 12, after "States", insert "*Provided*, That all such appointees are otherwise qualified for admission."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman from Alabama explain the Senate amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senate amendment simply provides that the boys shall be otherwise qualified in order to be certain they will pass the entrance examinations.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire how many boys there are of those who have received this great distinction from the Government; how many sons are there capable of going to West Point or are old enough?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know about that, but certainly there are some. What this does is simply renew the law that was made applicable to veterans of World War I and making it applicable to the veterans of this war.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I do not think we can do too much for these boys who have received this distinguished honor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1868) authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land and naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after "respectively" insert ": *Provided further*, That all such appointees are otherwise qualified for admission: *And provided further*, That appointees under this act shall be selected in order of merit as established by competitive examination."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill and this amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House some time ago and the Senate added an amendment. When the gentleman reserved the right to object a few minutes ago, the statement I made at that time really applied to this bill rather than the other one. I was thinking that this was the one that was up for consideration.

Reverting back to the other bill relating to the sons of those who have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, may I say that it is new legislation, not renewal of preexisting law.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under that legislation there is not taken away any of the appointments that the Members have?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all. The estimate of the War Department is that this would add an average of six a year to the Military Academy.

With reference to the present legislation, this is renewal of the law that was enacted subsequent to the First World War. The only thing that the Senate amendment does is to provide that they must qualify in a competitive examination, and since the number is limited to 40, it will be the top 40 that will be appointed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 2525, an act to include stepparents among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any person who has stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would that include stepparents without proving that they had stood in the relationship of foster parents?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Without having to prove that they had stood in the relation of foster parents to the sailor or soldier?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, I do not see how you could have a stepparent who did not stand in loco parentis.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We have cases where the stepparents do not even take care of the soldier or sailor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the case of dependency, the type that is covered here, you must prove actual dependency.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is for what you call the bonus?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Allowances. It is the rental and subsistence allowances paid to these officers, and you have to prove actual dependency in the case of parents, and you have to prove the same in the case of stepparents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill H. R. 4717, reported out of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several Members have already addressed the House on the subject of signing the petitions to bring to the floor a bill to release from the service men who have been in the armed forces continuously for 18 months, or who have dependents at home to look after, or who desire to return to school.

General Eisenhower said that there is no danger of our ever having a war with Great Britain. General Eisenhower said that there is no danger of our having a war with Russia. Then why should we keep six, eight, or ten million men standing around idle in uniform at the extra expense of a billion dollars a month when they want to get home, when they are needed at home, when their morale is being destroyed, and the desire of these men to return to college is being killed?

I hope every Member will sign those petitions, and for that reason I expect to keep the House in session until we get a vote on one of them.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr.

RANKIN], but it certainly seems to me to be very shortsighted in insisting on the adoption of a policy that will defeat the very end sought to be achieved. Let us for a moment look at the type of men who are being detained in the service; many of whom have had 3 years and more of service. They are the men who through no fault of their own were not qualified for unlimited duty, and if those men are discharged, the machinery that has been set up in order to demobilize our armed forces will be destroyed entirely. For the most part the men affected by the legislation just discussed are skilled in the work incident to speedy demobilization. They are the best men available for that important work. We cannot set up a new organization overnight, and it certainly seems to me, if we are interested in doing more than rendering lip service and shedding crocodile tears for men in uniform, we should consider the matter very carefully before we sign that discharge petition. Instead of heaping criticism on the heads of those who erected the perfectly functioning machine that brought the war to a successful conclusion we should be commending them for the splendid job now being done in getting our fighting men and women home as quickly as the size of the almost superhuman task permits.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two separate matters, and to include in one a letter and in the other an article in regard to the industrial use of gold.

WHERE ARE THE SHIPS?

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a father told me about his son being obliged to serve in small boats now carrying men and freight in the South Pacific, that such small craft were not designed for great open spaces of water, that the operation of these craft in great expanses of water is dangerous and costs the lives of our men. There seems to be no remedy and these boys are told, "We have no ships."

The British have withdrawn two large liners, delaying for many months the return of long-term servicemen. The English are returning their ships to their own profitable passenger trade at the expense of our boys being returned home, even though we paid the British handsomely for each soldier returned on the Queen ships. The very men who helped to preserve the existence of England, are now given shabby treatment by that country, even though they are paid for the transportation of our soldiers. In addition to paying for taking our men to Europe we have paid nearly $100 for the return of each soldier, and at the rate of 15,000 or more on such Queen ships, the British have received more than $1,000,000 a trip for the return of our men who went there to save the British Empire. Yet they forget this all very quickly and are now returning their ships to the passenger trade, forgetting the men who saved them.

The British are not satisfied with all of this; they are now in this country trying to secure 1,500 ships for charter to rebuild their world trade and recoup their own losses, all at the expense of America. The State Department is now negotiating with the British for charter of 1,500 ships before the ship sales bill is passed.

What about the return of our boys to this country, when the British failed to cooperate, even though they are well paid for hauling our fighting men.

All during the war and as fast as our ships came from the yards, the British were given the ships for operation. The Maritime Commission has refused to tell how many American ships the British have in their possession, and what they paid for the use of such ships. The Maritime Commission did not deny that the charter hire was nominal, and that we were obliged to pay for transporting our fighting men on our own ships.

With the War and Navy Departments continually giving the thin excuse that "There are no ships to bring American boys back home," it is high time that the administration and the Maritime Commission tell the American public where the $22,000,000,000 worth of American ships are now reposing, how many are now in the hands of the British and other countries, how much is the charter fee.

The fathers and mothers of American boys are entitled to know why these hundreds of American ships in the hands of the British and other countries, have not been immediately used to return American boys to their homes, especially when the British and other countries are using their own ships to reap the profit of trans-Atlantic trade, rather than cooperate and bring back American boys who fought to preserve their very empire. The British refuse this even though they have received more than a million dollars a trip of the American taxpayers money, while at the same time using American ships without cost. Our boys who have fought to preserve England are surely receiving shabby treatment at the expense of American fathers and mothers who gave their sons and who also paid for $22,000,000,000 worth of ships, much of which is now in the hands of the British and other countries and not being used to bring home our American boys.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a special investigation be held, that public hearings be had before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, whereby the State Department, the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, the Army, and the Navy, be all called for information and examination as to what has become of American ships and why American ships remain in the hands of the British and other countries while our boys are rotting overseas.

The American fathers and mothers did not pay taxes to build ships for foreign nations and penalize their own sons. These ships should be immediately returned to America and used to bring back American boys from the four corners of the earth. It is an insult to American fathers and mothers to have these ships with foreign countries and permit our boys to rot on foreign shores.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that at least one of the staunch advocates of the so-called full-employment bill, now being considered by the Expenditures Committee, is honest enough to tell the Congress and the Nation what the term "full employment" under that proposal would really mean if it were enacted into law.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER] has just stated that our soldiers have been employed during this war, and in substance that we, the Government of the United States, must find employment for them after the war.

That is exactly what full employment would mean under the proposed legislation, and in my judgment is precisely what the gentleman said it would mean—regimentation.

Are we to believe that this is what awaits our soldiers when they return to their homes, the exchange of their fighting uniforms for other uniforms to serve in labor battalions?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS EXPLANATORY OF THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX LAW WITH RESPECT TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD WAR II

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1211) back favorably without amendment a prvileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 102) authorizing the printing as a public document of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income Tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II," and providing for additional copies thereof, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income Tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II" be printed with illustrations, as a public document, and that 12,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 10,000 shall be for the House document room and 2,000 for the Senate document room.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I think the resolution indicates to the House its purpose. This document has been prepared and double checked and rechecked by experts, the idea being that the Members should have the opportunity to send this out to organizations that wish to be of

service to our returning soldiers with reference to the income tax. I think it is a very thorough document. It has the approval of the experts who checked it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman is the author of it, is he not?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, information came to me yesterday that our Committee on Small Business was being accused of causing the Members to receive many telegrams the past week. For the information of my colleagues, may I say I had nothing to do with it. I did not know anything about it until I received telegrams from the dealers in my own district. Neither did any other member of our commitee nor any member of our staff. We have had, I suspect, 75 or 100 different hearings, and this is the only one where that was done. I do not know why they did it unless they just wanted to focus the attention of the Members of Congress on their problem. You could not blame them for it. It was an excellent way to get attention and consideration. If they wanted to do it, there was nobody who could stop them. People have a right to petition Congress. But our committee certainly had nothing to do with it. So I want you to know that it was not any effort on our part which caused the flood of telegrams. We agreed to give the automobile dealers a hearing for a very good reason. Our committee sponsored what was later known as the Murray-Patman law which kept the 35,000 automobile dealers in business during the war and kept motor transportation rolling during the war. They did one of the most marvelous jobs that was done during this war. The automobile dealers servicing all these automobiles and keeping them going did a wonderful job. By reason of the fact that our committee sponsored that legislation, we felt it was our duty to give them a hearing when they contended that the Office of Price Administration was refusing to give them a hearing before issuing an order which would be so detrimental to them. I believe every Member of this House will agree with me that it was the right thing to do. It certainly was. We wrote into the OPA law section 2 (h). I honestly believed then and I believe now that that section was intended to preserve the historical and traditional methods of doing business for all dealers. We wanted to make sure that there were no increases. The object of it was to freeze the established methods of distribution as they existed at the time. It seems plain to me and we felt that we had it stated very plainly in the law. But the OPA has taken another view and the Emergency Court of Appeals has sustained that view. We felt it was our duty to give the dealers a hearing on it. I am glad we did. We got all the information before the OPA, and the automobile dealers and the Office of Price Administration are conferring now and trying to arrive at some satisfactory conclusion. So our hearing has certainly brought forth the facts.

TOO MUCH SENTIMENT FOR INFLATION AND AGAINST OPA

May I call your attention to the fact that I think there is too much sentiment in this House—although this is my own opinion and I may be wrong—that the Office of Price Administration is the only enemy that small business has and that if a person is in favor of small business, then he cannot be in favor of the OPA. Of course, I do not agree with that. Of all the automobile dealers that you have received telegrams from, I doubt if there is one of them that will ask you to vote to repeal the OPA. No, they will not ask you to do that. They are not in favor of killing the OPA. They just feel that they have been treated wrongly in this instance, but without the OPA they know they would be absolutely ruined. Small business knows that they would be absolutely ruined without the OPA.

AN EXAMPLE

To repeal the OPA to help small business would be just as reasonable as using a hammer to kill a fly on a baby's nose. That is how reasonable it would be. It would absolutely destroy small business to repeal the OPA law.

DETRIMENTAL EFFECT UPON SMALL MANUFACTURING OPERATIONS SEEN IN TOO EARLY REMOVAL OF CERTAIN PRICE CONTROLS—COCONUTS

An illustration of the impact on a small manufacturer of the premature lifting of price control on scarce items occurred last week when OPA removed the ceiling price on whole coconuts because they were held to be an "inconsequential item." A candy manufacturer, using coconuts in his product, reported the following facts to the House Small Business Committee.

In 1941–42, the company purchased coconuts abroad at $15 per thousand. As the war progressed, the price steadily climbed. The manufacturer made several requests upon OPA to place a price ceiling on coconuts. Finally, in February, 1944, OPA established a ceiling price of $61.50 per thousand on sales by importers.

Fresh fruit buyers, including large chain organizations, applied pressure on OPA to secure removal of the ceiling. OPA removed the product from price control on October 26, against the advice of manufacturers using the product and against the advice of the regional OPA price executive in Atlanta, Ga.

On October 24 the candy manufacturer had received a boatload of coconuts from Honduras. On October 28, 2 days after the control was lifted, he was offered $140 per thousand for the nuts contained in the Honduras shipment. The following day the price had jumped to $175 per thousand. To secure confirmation of this market situation, the candy company, at the suggestion of the Small Business Committee, sold some of the shipment to a nationally known chain-store organization at that price. The next day the price had again jumped to $250 per thousand, f. o. b. New York. This was for nuts which before the war had cost only $15 per thousand.

This swift increase in the price of one of its major-product ingredients forced the candy manufacturer to reduce production drastically. One hundred and fifty employees were laid off in Puerto Rico, 75 were dropped in Tampa, Fla., and 50 more were laid off at the firm's Connecticut plant. The company is now compelled to seek a price increase from OPA for its final product. That is just one example of what inflation will do.

CONGRESS WARNED

Therefore, I am humbly warning Congress that of all times on earth that we should be careful to preserve this country against ruinous inflation, the time is now. We are already on an inflation roller coaster. Unless Congress supports price control until we have adequate production, we must either hold on this roller coaster or be tied in. Let us hope we make the trip safely if we must take it. But I am more frightened today over the prospect of runaway inflation than I have ever been since I have been a Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Texas be allowed to speak for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we must do whatever is necessary to prevent ruinous inflation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I have a letter this morning from a very capable man. I think he favors the continuation of some of the OPA, but he suggests that the Congress, by law, exempt from the operation of OPA small business. For instance, those businesses whose turn-over during the last year was not more than a million dollars. What would the gentleman suggest about that?

Mr. PATMAN. I would be opposed to it.

Mr. MICHENER. Why?

Mr. PATMAN. He would ruin himself along with all other businessmen while he was ruining the country, as such a provision would be impossible of administration.

Mr. MICHENER. Why?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, take as an example, after the other war we had inflation. The merchants did not know what to pay for things. They did not know what they could sell them for. Finally they had their shelves filled with goods which they bought hurriedly for fear they would go higher which went

down to almost nothing overnight. It caused 500,000 of them to go into bankruptcy almost immediately. We do not want that to happen any more. The people who have thought this thing through want some stability. They want to know what they have to pay for things, and they want to know what they can sell them for. Otherwise, we will have inflation like they have in France. They took the control off of sugar, and sugar went to 50 cents, a dollar and a half, and two dollars a pound. If you were to take the controls off of sugar in America today, it would sell for $2 a pound in a week.

Mr. MICHENER. I just want to send the gentleman's reply to my constituents, because of the gentleman's important position in the House and with the administration with reference to this matter.

Mr. PATMAN. I would be very glad to have the gentleman do that, but do not get the idea, as much as we are annoyed and irritated by the regulations and rules of OPA, that you will be helping the country by taking off all controls. Take the controls off of everything that you can, and start taking them off as quickly as possible, but when you take them off of an article that is scarce and of which there is a limited supply, the price will soar to unreasonable heights.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Where I think OPA is wrong in this instance is in seeking to put the burden of carrying on during this affluant time, as they call it, upon the little dealers throughout the country and not taking a like position of putting the burden of increased costs upon the manufacturer, who can well afford to carry it on, in which event there would be no inflation on anybody.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we have all the facts, and the representatives of the automobile dealers and representatives of OPA have been conferring with each other since yesterday at noon. I hope they will arrive at some satisfactory conclusion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to transgress on the time of the House but I do not want to let the statement about OPA made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] go unchallenged. I disagree with him. We start with the proposition that we are in favor of price controls where that is necessary. Then we are faced with the fact that the OPA has been a monumental failure from start to finish. We can get rid of the OPA. We can have price controls and the American people can get a little decent treatment from some Government agency that knows its business. They will never get it from OPA, because the men in charge of that program do not know what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on other occasions loyally and vigorously defend the Office of Price Administration. I have yet to hear him argue on the floor of this House against anything that that organization has ever done. So far as I know, he has always favored their policies and has always been able, to his own satisfaction, to develop laudatory excuses for every mistake that they have made.

But we may just as well recognize that the Office of Price Administration is proceeding along unsound lines. You may be able to prevent what the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] calls inflation, by fixing prices which will deprive the merchant and small businessman of a profit. You will certainly prevent him from staying in business if that is what OPA wants to do.

Now OPA has said to the retail dealers in automobiles and trucks that the discount rate which the manufacturers of automobiles and trucks heretofore allowed him is to be changed and if necessary eliminated. The manufacturer is to be allowed to raise the price of automobiles to the retailer, and in order to take care of that increased cost of manufacture, the discount which the retailer has heretofore had is to be diminished to the extent necessary to take care of the increased price. This procedure, OPA announces, will prevent any increase in the cost of automobiles to the man who buys one for personal use. In obtaining this result, it has been pointed out that the retail dealers in automobiles and trucks would be put out of business, because they could not make a profit. I am not in favor of that procedure. This fallacy of keeping somebody from making a profit runs all through the philosophy of the Office of Price Administration. It is a communistic, planned, economy worked out by the policy makers in OPA. Whether or not it is intended to destroy small business, this procedure can have no other result. The Government would then have to furnish the service which has heretofore been rendered by the retail dealers, the small businessman, and eventually we would have everybody working for the Government. That sort of thing does not square with my belief in the American system of private enterprise.

I want people to make a profit. I want it even if there is a reasonable rise in prices. A reasonable increase in prices is not inflation. You do not have the inflation element involved unless and until you get the speculative element involved. Permitting businessmen to make a reasonable profit is not going to lead to speculation.

As I suggested the other day the popular conception of inflation has to do with printing-press money issued by the Government. A government that is bankrupt, and starts to issue $1,000 bills for everybody soon finds that the bills are just so much paper, and a $1,000 bill will not even buy a loaf of bread. That is what happened when the German mark and the French franc lost their values following World War I.

The best way to avoid printing-press money and speculation is to start the productive processes going. We will have to change from a wartime production of material to a peacetime production of materials. When the businessman can make a profit, he is going to start his store, or his factory, or other business enterprise, and he is going to hire men, and he is going to have pay rolls, and they are going to create wealth in the shape of manufactured articles for sale to people who want them. This means increased employment.

Not only in connection with the problem of the retail automobile dealers, but in every other line of business, the OPA seeks to prevent men engaged in these different lines of industry from making a profit. That is a certain way to retard production and prevents the creation of new jobs. Just remember when the lines of the unemployed begin to lengthen, and many people say that will come, a vast share of that responsibility will rest on the mistaken and foolish policies of the Office of Price Administration.

Now there have been extensive hearings before the House Committee on Small Business on this problem dealing with the retail dealers in automobiles and trucks. I have no hope that OPA will work it out satisfactorily. So when the people interested write me, I am going to ask the House Committee on Small Business to tell me, so I can tell these people, just what the House Committee on Small Business plans to do. Is it going to propose legislation and then see that it is enacted to take away from the OPA the right to ruin the small businessman? If not, just what value is there to be attached to these hearings which have been attended by dozens and dozens of men engaged in the retail business of selling automobiles and trucks? I wait for an answer to that question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper items and editorials.

Mr. LEA (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE OPA AND AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a week ago last Wednesday I had a lengthy conversation with Mr. Zenas Potter, special assistant to Chester Bowles, and Chief of Congressional Information in OPA, in respect of the dealer discount to be allowed on new automobiles. Mr. Potter explained to me in detail the rea-

sons for OPA's policy in fixing the discount that would be allowed on new car prices, which I understand is about 11 percent. He said they had the support of the courts and that no change would be made. That was before the convening of the automobile dealers here in Washington.

Mr. Potter told me also that OPA had deferred announcing its final decision until after this conference but that it would stand in any event. I want you to think about that. In substance, Mr. Potter told me the automobile dealers were wasting their time and chasing rainbows. He apparently thought no particular harm would come from their being allowed to exercise the right of petition under the Constitution.

This same gentleman referred to these automobile dealers twice as "nuts." He said that their trade-in policy before the war was "nuts"; that they lost money on the second-hand automobiles which they took in. Mr. Potter as good as told me that the OPA was now going to tell them how they must run their business.

I should like to know why it is that the chairman of the Small Businessmen's Committee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], being as close as he is to the OPA, and one of the strongest advocates of arbitrary price control, did not know that OPA had made a final decision and that this would not be altered regardless of what the automobile dealers might ask when they came to Washington.

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman will yield I just want to suggest that if they were called "nuts" they have been comforted today by having coconuts thrown at them.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Since under the gentleman's statement Mr. Bowles and the OPA already knew they were going to make the order that they are now going to make, what was the purpose in the committee representing small business having the hearing if they had already been foreclosed and everyone knew they were going to go ahead and make the order anyhow?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I will have to let the gentleman answer that for himself.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may answer?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The reason is obvious. The dealers claimed that OPA had not given consideration to their views or used information that they had and they therefore came to Congress, the only body to which they could come, to demand a full and open hearing where they could present all their facts. The OPA at our request suspended any order until after the hearings and they promised consideration of any information that could be furnished to them. As evidence of the fact that they were acting in good faith, after we finished our hearing the OPA officials from Mr. Bowles on down having to do with this problem met with representatives of the dealers and have been in session since yesterday afternoon and are still in session considering these things; and they are not issuing any order until they have given the dealers full consideration.

Mr. RIZLEY. But Mr. Bowles through the press and otherwise has said what he is going to do just as soon as the hearing is over. This being so are we not just engaging in double talk with the automobile dealers? I am not in position to say because I probably do not know whether he is right or wrong, but I do know it is wrong to lead the dealers to think that some committee here is going to give them relief when it has already been foreclosed in advance as the gentleman from Ohio has just said they told him before this hearing ever started they were going to issue the order; and my prediction is that they do issue that exact order.

Mr. PATMAN. But they did not make the order; that is the evidence.

Mr. RIZLEY. And the gentleman has not closed his hearings.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the evidence; and they have promised to give consideration to everything that was presented, and they are giving consideration to it.

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes; give consideration to it and then do just exactly what they proposed to do before.

Mr. WEICHEL. In other words these hearings in the Small Business Committee were, unless that order was going to be wiped off by the OPA and permit the automobile dealers to have their side fully considered, if nothing was to be done, it would be a mere fake and a sham on the part of the OPA.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more statement. One of the strangest things I have witnessed since I have been a Member of this body is the attitude taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], on the matter of inflation. He assures us that he is gravely concerned about the danger of inflation, that we must hold the line to prevent run-away inflation and plunge the Nation into chaos. Yet this same gentleman is, in my judgment, the greatest advocate of printing-press money in the United States, which is the only real cause of uncontrollable inflation.

I do not believe there is another man in the United States who is more responsible for the actual and potential inflation that now confronts us than is that gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from an overseas soldier.

THE OPA AND AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed this colloquy. I think it is a very healthy sign as well as bringing out considerable information.

If the gentleman from Texas who assumes to a large extent the duty of preventing inflation in this country and who is accused of being one of the policy makers of OPA, having great influence with the OPA, will go over to room 205, Old House Office Building, and see a line of merchandise where the cheap, shoddy stuff is being allowed to be manufactured and sold for at least 50 percent more than the old staple lines of tried and tested merchandise under the operations of the OPA, not in one or two instances but in dozens upon dozens of instances, I think he might decide that possibly the OPA could do a little better job of administering the act than it is doing at the present time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. For a question only.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman take into consideration the fact that the OPA deals with eight million commodities and prices?

Mr. VURSELL. I can understand that.

Mr. PATMAN. They can make a few mistakes like human beings will. There is a reason, and I can tell the gentleman the reason why some of those mistakes were made.

Mr. VURSELL. I anticipate the gentleman's question. Of course, they have made some mistakes, but why have they not got the courage to rectify the mistakes they have made? They made a mistake, in my judgment, with the automobile dealers the other day, but they will not rectify it. It is a dictatorial, un-American policy of government in this country, in my judgment.

Chester Bowles is nothing more than a public-relations man. He is not an experienced businessman, yet he overrules the historic background of business concerns that represent hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of investment and employing thousands of people. He is all-powerful and refuses to act when a prudent man would be convinced that he should act because he had acted wrongly in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has a considerable part of the responsibility for the maladministration of the OPA. We are all for price control. None of us wants inflation. The law gave the power for price control in the hope that it would do a good job, and in many instances it has, but every time price control has come up in this House for extension, I am sorry to say that certain leaders have insisted it be extended without amendment. Many of us have wanted to tell Chester Bowles by our actions here on the floor of the House when price control came up for extension that the Congress still thought it had a rein on his administration. We wanted him to think that there was some check, but unfortunately the Administration has given orders carte blanche and stood behind him faithfully up to the very present minute. If we had passed the 6-month amendment extension when OPA was up before, and they had known that they were going to have to come back for a renewal of OPA, in my judgment we would have had a better

administration than to have passed the act for a year.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, some Members a few minutes ago have taken the Select Committee on Small Business to task in connection with the hearing of the automobile dealers. Apparently these gentlemen who have spoken are not familiar with the facts because I am sure they would not want to misrepresent the matter to the membership of the House. As evidence of the fact that the Select Committee on Small Business did a good job with this hearing, and did the best it could under the circumstances, is the statement of Mr. Mallon, president of the National Association of Automobile Dealers. He said that he and the members of the NADA were well pleased with the expediency with which the hearing was called and with the way in which it was conducted.

The facts of the case are that the president of the Automobile Dealers Association stated to the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business that they had not been able to get the full facts before the OPA and they had not been given proper and full consideration by the OPA. There was some delay in getting and assimilating all of the records that they wanted. So just as quickly as this request was made a meeting was called, hearings were planned, and the OPA had officials there to listen to the side of the automobile dealers and get the facts as presented by the dealers. The association had reports of profits and of financial conditions from about 1,952 dealers throughout the country. This information was given to the OPA at this hearing. All of the dealers who testified said that they were well pleased with the hearing. As evidence of the fact that it has done some good and served a useful purpose, representatives of the OPA and of the automobile dealers are now in session trying to work this matter out. When the hearing started the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the committee, called on Mr. Bowles and asked him to withhold any order until the hearings were completed and until the parties had a chance to talk things over and get the facts. Mr. Bowles agreed to do that. The hearings have been completed and the parties are now in session. I hope that they will work out a settlement that will be satisfactory to the automobiles dealers and to the OPA.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that during the time that I have been a member of the Select Committee on Small Business it has been my observation that no man in the House has fought harder for the interest of small business than the chairman of that committee. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is always vigilant in trying to see that small business has an opportunity—a chance—to compete and to make a reasonable profit. He has been a strong champion of small business, not only as a member of this committee but in his activities in the House of Representatives. He realizes, as do most of us, that if free enterprise is to survive the small business of the Nation must have an opportunity to survive and expand.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Referring to the gentleman's statement that some of the gentlemen who spoke on the subject did not know the facts, the gentleman does not mean by that that what I stated was not a fact, because I read from a telephone conversation I had with the gentleman. I refer to Mr. Zenas Potter in the OPA.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman implied that the hearings of the Small Business Committee were a sham and did not serve any useful purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the gentleman will read the remarks he will not see that. Some other gentleman referred to that, but I did not.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That was my interpretation of what the gentleman said. If I am wrong in my interpretation the record will undoubtedly show what are the true facts. I hope I am wrong in my interpretation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Well, the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If the chairman and the other members of the committee make a report and Mr. Bowles pays absolutely no attention to it, what should be done with Mr. Bowles?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is for Congress to pass the laws. Mr. Bowles only administers the law that Congress passes. If Congress wants to change the law in connection with that matter it has the right to do so. I hope a solution may come from the conference now being held.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Nation's Business on the threat of inflation.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RANDOLPH, for November 19, 20, and 21, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 784. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, November 19, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

832. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Special Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies submits its ninth intermediate report pursuant to House Resolution 88 (79th Cong., 1st sess.). Resolution for the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority (Rept. No. 1210). Referred to the Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 102. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a public document of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income Tax Law With Respect to the Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II," and providing for additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1211). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to certain agreements between carriers, with amendment (Rept. No. 1212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4480. A bill to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal, without amendment (Rept. No. 1213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4717. A bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Referred

to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon; with amendments (Rept. No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse; without amendment (Rept. No. 1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of E. D. Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 1219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1250. A bill for the relief of Roy S. Councilman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Leonard Hutchings; with amendments (Rept. No. 1221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb; with amendments (Rept. No. 1222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Viola Theriaque; with amendment (Rept. No. 1223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1848. A bill for the relief of Max Hirsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Thomas Sumner; with amendments (Rept. No. 1225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker; with amendment (Rept. No. 1226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2171. A bill for the relief of Solomon Schtiernman; with amendments (Rept. No. 1227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Arnold Mecham; with amendment (Rept. No. 1228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mirtie Pike; with amendments (Rept. No. 1229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2393. A bill for the relief of Elsie Peter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2661. A bill for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 1231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2837. A bill for the relief of George Stiles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2963. A bill for the relief of William Phillips; with amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders; with amendment (Rept. No. 1234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3514. A bill for the relief of Paul Stanik; with amendments (Rept. No. 1235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3904. A bill for the relief of Raymond C. Campbell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4240. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot; with amendments (Rept. No. 1237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 382. Resolution requesting information from the Secretary of State with reference to Tyler Kent; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4717. A bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4718. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4719. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building thereon for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4720. A bill to amend the act of December 7, 1944, relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 4721. A bill to transfer certain real and personal property in Ward County, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4722. A bill to exempt from gross income for income-tax purposes certain earnings of honorably discharged veterans and his or her spouse and children under 18 years of age received since December 7, 1941, and received during certain periods after discharge; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 4723. A bill for the relief of John M. Shipp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4724. A bill for the relief of Edwin H. Sanford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 4725. A bill for the relief of Alexander Michailovich Kalinin, Paul Lougbine, and Leon de Witt Ravadovsky; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4726. A bill for the relief of Frederick D. Ballou; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4727. A bill for the relief of R. R. Whitener; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4728. A bill for the relief of James Harold Pendley, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause I of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1329. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: A resolution of the Maine Woolen and Worsted Association adopted November 8 at their meeting held at the State House, Augusta, Maine, urging no action reducing present tariff schedules concerning the woolen and worsted industry until full opportunity is afforded all parties and this association in particular to be heard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1330. Also, petition of Adelbert A. Jameson and approximately 100 other citizens of Rockland, Maine, and vicinity, urging immediate action on H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1331. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Resolution of the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association, Johnstown, Pa., protesting against the expulsion of the Hungarian population from Czechoslovakia, by the provisional government of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1332. Also, a resolution of the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association, Scalp Level, Pa., protesting against the expulsion of the Hungarian population from Czechoslovakia, by the provisional government of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Father Almighty, whose love will not let us go, outlasting all our stolid indifference, the resistless working of Thy eternal purpose beats ever against the stubborn self-willed barriers which we have set up. For this still moment may we hush all other sounds save the divine knocking and the entreating voice which says: "If any man will open the door, I

will come in." We know, O Spirit of Love and Purity, that when our heart's door swings on its hesitant hinges and Thou dost enter, those things which are unlovely and unclean cannot stay to embitter and pollute.

Come to us, we pray Thee, as refining fire to purge our inner lives from envy, hatred, prejudice, and malice. Suffer us not to let the sun go down upon our wrath. In a mad and violent day, may we walk and work in the peace that the world giveth not, in the charity that thinketh no evil, in the good will that bridges all chasms; and when the sunset comes, may we face its summons with an approving conscience void of offense toward Thee and our fellow man. We ask in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 16, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 17, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 562) for the relief of Klau-Van Pieterson-Dunlap Associates, Inc.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 102) authorizing the printing as a public document the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income-tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II," and providing for additional copies thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

H. R. 1863. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any person who has stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 16, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 784) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the Senate Tuesday and Wednesday because of my absence from the city with the Senate's Special Atomic Bomb Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following-named Senators, who are members of the Atomic Energy Committee, may be absent for 2 days from sessions of the Senate, to proceed to Oak Ridge, Tenn., on an inspection trip: The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate on tomorrow, Tuesday, and on the following day, Wednesday, in order to attend meetings of the Atomic Bomb Committee which will be held outside Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent tomorrow and on the day following in order to attend a meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee at Oak Ridge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent on the same days in order to attend meetings of the Atomic Bomb Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

THE ITEM VETO—RESULTS OF GALLUP POLL

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a recent Gallup poll which shows very substantial approval throughout the country for the item veto, a proposal which I have repeatedly presented to the Senate and which is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I should like to add that President Roosevelt in a letter to the Senate in his lifetime endorsed the item veto. I should like further to add that President Truman has endorsed it. I ask that the Gallup poll upon this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL

PRINCETON, N. J., November 15.—Americans ordinarily take a very cautious attitude toward changing traditional procedures of government, but there is one reform proposed by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, which appeals to a substantial majority of voters.

Senator VANDENBERG'S proposal would authorize a President to veto specific items in appropriation bills.

At present, under the Constitution, the White House must approve or veto any bill as a whole. This makes congressional logrolling combinations possible and enables Members to get their pet schemes adopted by tacking them onto appropriation bills as riders, since the President cannot veto parts of a bill.

The Vandenberg proposal to change this system was put before a cross-section of the voters of the country in an institute poll as follows:

"At the present time when Congress passes a bill to spend money, the President cannot veto parts of that bill but must accept it in full or veto it. Do you think this should be changed so that the President can veto some items in a bill to spend money without vetoing the entire bill?"

The vote of the public follows:

	Percent
Yes	57
No	14
No opinion	29

The Vandenberg proposal, introduced in the Senate and now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee, was in the form of a resolution to submit to the States a constitutional amendment authorizing a President to veto parts of appropriation bills.

Many students of government have long felt that the system was in need of reform. The principle of the Vandenberg proposal has been in effect for some time in several State governments, including New York.

The idea is a nonpartisan one so far as voters themselves are concerned. Both Democrats and Republicans polled in the sample support the proposed reform by about the same majority.

Overwhelming approval is found among voters with opinions in every education group.

An analysis of attitudes by political party and by education follows:

	Yes	No	No opinion
By party:	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Democrats	59	12	29
Republicans	56	20	24
By education:			
College	70	20	10
High school	65	17	18
Grade school or no school	49	12	39

INABILITY OF KELSEY-HAYES WHEEL CO. TO FURNISH TRUCK PARTS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask to read into the RECORD at this point a telegram which the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. of Detroit sent to all its patrons:

NOVEMBER 15, 1945.

We regret to inform you that as of today we are discontinuing shipments of all original equipment truck parts. This decision is necessary due to the delay of the Government agency, the Automotive Branch, OPA, in acting on price relief or suspension for these parts. Until some action is taken by this agency by which we can recover in our selling prices the increased labor and material costs we have been compelled to add since March 1942, we will be unable to serve you.

KELSEY-HAYES WHEEL CO.

Mr. President, the message speaks for itself.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Murdock
Ball	Hart	Myers
Barkley	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Reed
Buck	Hill	Revercomb
Bushfield	Hoey	Robertson
Butler	Huffman	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Carville	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	La Follette	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Tunnell
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Moore	Wilson
Guffey	Morse	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a complete set of laws passed by the Municipal Councils and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands during the fiscal year 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT RELATING TO COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide eligibility for annuity at age 70 after at least 5 years of service in lieu of 15 years of such service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—RESOLUTION OF WAKE FOREST (N. C.) COLLEGE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the faculty of Wake Forest College, North Carolina, in regular session November 12, 1945, relating to the development and control of atomic energy.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE,
Wake Forest, N. C.

We, the faculty of Wake Forest College, aware of the tremendous import of atomic energy and atomic weapons to all mankind, believe that the security of the United States can be achieved only through international cooperation for the joint control of these new forces. We believe that a policy of secret research and exclusive national control can only result in a ruinous competitive armaments race in which all the nations of the world will join, leading to the danger of a new and catastrophic world war. From such a war no people will emerge free, if indeed they survive at all.

We therefore resolve and urge:

1. That the United States as the country that has opened the way for the development of atomic energy, should immediately invite the Governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union to a conference to prevent competitive armaments and consider the problems arising from this overwhelming development.

2. That the United States champion the need for international development with the broadest utilization of all resources and the widest freedom of research and interchange of ideas.

We believe furthermore that any legislative effort which stifles free and open scientific investigation, which seeks to prevent public surveillance and criticism of the application of atomic energy will stifle scientific progress, undermine peace and is therefore harmful to the national interest.

We therefore urge Congress:

1. That legislative action for the control of atomic energy be preceded by full, free, and public discussion.

2. That the authority for the guidance of the development of atomic energy shall consist of men of scientific competence, fully compensated for their services and able to work toward the maximum utilization of atomic energy for the welfare of the public and not for the interests of any special group.

3. That the administrator chosen to direct the work of such an authority be a civilian.

4. That security regulations be limited to direct military application of atomic power and that free research and right of publication be immediately resumed in the field of atomic physics.

Passed by the faculty of Wake Forest College in regular session November 12, 1945.

E. B. EARNSHAW,
Secretary.

PEACETIME COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—LETTER FROM ORMAL L. MILLER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Rev. Ormal L. Miller, pastor of the First Methodist Church, of Topeka, Kans., expressing his opposition to peactime compulsory military training. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Topeka, Kans., November 8, 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I want to register a very emphatic protest against the program for compulsory military training which is being proposed. In my judgment it is a serious mistake with far-reaching consequences for the future.

It should be very apparent to us by this time that military power is a very dangerous factor in the life of any nation. It does not provide security, as witness the plight first of France, and later of Germany. It inevitably creates tensions and suspicions which sooner or later result in trouble.

The military leaders of the Nation have demonstrated their ability to prosecute a successful war, but I refuse to grant them superior insight into the way to maintain peace. It is my belief that we will make a fatal mistake to permit them to influence the future course of the Nation. We have fought two tragic wars to rid the world of militarism, and now having decisively crushed militarism in Germany and Japan, it seems unbelievable that we will assume the same role which has brought them to disaster.

Reference has been made to our responsibility to the future youth of the Nation. It seems to me we have a very great responsibility to the youth of this generation, and of a generation ago, who have made a great sacrifice to rid the world of this curse. Our greatest contribution to future generations will not be military regimentation, but vigorous and sacrificial efforts to establish vital agencies of peace and international cooperation.

The training of large armies is not our problem. At the time of Pearl Harbor we had many men in training, but industry was not in production to supply them. I am convinced that any real emergency will be met adequately by civilian armies if need be, provided atomic power has not produced catastrophe first. We confront a new phase of international history, and it is fatal to attempt to carry out-moded methods into the future. Rather let us be adventurous in building understanding, brotherhood, and creative agencies of peaceful cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

ORMAL L. MILLER.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER — LETTER FROM CABINET OF WICHITA (KANS.) COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter from the cabinet of the Wichita (Kans.) Council of Churches relating to the United Nations Charter.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Wichita, Kans., November 14, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: The United Nations Charter has been ratified with unprecedented speed. The peoples of the earth are pinning high hopes on this important organization. If the United States and Russia and Great Britain will collaborate, UNO will wield an important force in world affairs, but, of these three, the moral leadership rests primarily with the United States.

In reality, if the United States takes the wise course, the other nations of the world will follow our leadership and UNO will succeed. If we follow the wrong course, it will fail. To make it succeed, the wisest step for the United States is to precede all decisions that have international implications by consultation with the other nations through UNO.

Such questions as universal military training, the control of atomic energy, the government of vanquished peoples, the disposal of colonies, the establishment of bases, and such, if decided by ourselves, in isolation, will provoke rivalry. But if we will discuss them with the United Nations before taking action, there will be a spirit of confidence and the foundation of peace.

We urge that you be alert to use the offices of the UNO in every proper international matter. We urge that you resist the passage of acts that have bearing on international relations prior to report of our UNO delegates as to the understandings they have been able to secure. If we can hold enactment of universal military training and similar matters in abeyance pending an attempted agreement among the nations, it may be possible to eliminate many costly policies.

Let us get away from bloc action as far as possible. Let us try the democratic way among the nations—full and free discussion, full publicity, full cooperation. This is the most hopeful course for the future.

Respectfully,

CABINET OF THE WICHITA
COUNCIL OF CHURCHES.
RALPH E. LIGHTNER, *President.*
JOHN W. MELOY, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1152. A bill to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 750).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 1289. A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 751).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 7. A bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; with an amendment (Rept. No. 752).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 608. A bill to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 753).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1604. A bill for the relief of Leo Stuhr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1605. A bill to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. Murray) introduced Senate bill 1606, to provide for a national health program, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1607. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Peter Kim; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 1608. A bill for the relief of William A. Gallagher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1609. A bill for the relief of Catherin Gilbert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1610. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT OF 1946—AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 28, line 12, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That of the funds remaining available for advance base construction, material, and equipment, not to exceed $6,000,000 shall be available toward reconstruction of the civilian economy of Guam."

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Ansgar Lutheran, of November 12, 1945, entitled "Universal Military Training," and a letter which I have received from a member of the armed forces at Camp Gordon, Ga., dated October 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

President Truman has spoken. He asks us to introduce universal military training. We must do the same as they have done in Europe in the past. But what has happened to the nations who had universal training? They are now prostrate in the dust. Germany, Japan, Italy, France. The nations, Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, that were not prepared for war, won the war.

Is that the way of the world? Does it mean that he who takes the sword shall perish by the sword? Jesus did say something about that, and He should be an authority worth listening to even in Washington. Oswald Spengler pictured the nations with strong military regimes as nations that would finally be defeated. He did this in his book The Decline of the West. He was right.

What is it that makes a nation strong? Would it be out of the way to quote Psalm 20: 7–8? "Some trust in chariots and some in horses; but we will make mention of the name of Jehovah our God. They are bowed down and fallen; but we are risen and stand upright."

Whenever civilization gets to depend upon mechanical things alone, it is doomed.

Universal military training will change our whole national outlook. It will make us develop a military spirit. What effect will that have upon our national life? It will be the military men who will decide our policies. Have we not constantly condemned the military clique of Japan, and the military men of Prussia? Are we now to begin to develop that which we have just defeated and which we are just placing on trial both in Japan and Germany?

Let us give peace a chance. The common man is sick of war. He was made to sacrifice for war, he will gladly sacrifice for peace, but he must be shown the way.

What do our leaders think universal training can do for us? It certainly cannot prepare our souls for national emergencies. It never could. History proves the very opposite.

And the atomic bomb. An atomic bomb may be planted secretly in 50 of our big cities and let off as a time bomb, so these cities will be wiped out in 12 hours. History teaches us that spiritually decadent people always lose. No spiritually weak people can win no matter what weapon they get. Germany proved that. She lost because she had lost her soul. Only the strong Christian can survive.

We know that the advocates of the universal training will say, keep your powder dry. But no powder is ever dry if Christianity is forgotten.

Sometimes we have thought all men sent to Congress should first have a heavy course in history and Christianity before they are sworn into office. We must get to see that the things men live by are not the mechanical things, it is the things of God.

CAMP GORDON, GA., *October 29, 1945.*

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the present time when questions of the utmost importance in regard to the future welfare of the United States are being debated and a decision must be made I feel it is the duty of every citizen to make known his ideas to the elected legislators of the country.

I am deeply concerned about the peacetime military training program. My 2 years' service in the Army have convinced me that 1 year of military training will not materially increase our national strength militarily. The stupid tasks of picking up cigarette butts, match sticks, etc., do not teach our soldiers the functions of warfare. To use the Army's own act as a reason; 17 weeks' training was considered sufficient to fit a man for combat; why is it they are now asking 52 weeks' training, three times as much?

I think one of the determining factors in our recent victory was numerical superiority in personnel, planes, guns, and all types of matériel.

And here is a very vital point that we should keep in mind: peacetime conscription for military training does deny the individuals affected the rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. If we allow this one encroachment upon our freedom are we not opening the door to those who would like to further subject us by restrictions of our personal freedom? I be-

lieve the recent events pertaining to demobilization clearly indicate the potential threat against that freedom as we have always known it.

I do not want to rear my son to be a number in the Army against his will. I feel it is his birthright to have the decision of his life, insofar as it does not transgress upon the rights of his fellow men, in his own hands during peacetime.

However we must have national defense and I sincerely believe a larger Regular Army and Navy, and expanded National Guard, ROTC, with perhaps, a new branch of training at the junior high school or high school to create an enlisted men reserve, but keep the entire program on a voluntary basis.

When our civilization reaches the point where we will not voluntarily defend ourselves, families, country, and way of life then our civilization will have reached a point where it ceases to be worth the sacrifice of armed defense. And at this point may I ask: are all the proponents of peacetime military training on a compulsory basis thinking of defense and only defense? Two years' Army service will cause a freedom-loving American to ask many questions.

I also believe the time-consuming factor in our present defense system is not the mobilization of military personnel, as illustrated by the Army 17 weeks' training program in conjunction with a Regular Army as cadre and a reserve of officers and enlisted men, but rather in the field of matériel, the time lag in manufacturing new war goods. For an illustration, our present equipment will be obsolete in a few years if it is not already obsolete due to the atomic bomb. Our best defense lies in the hands of a few scientific men and industrialists. A group of these men constantly working on new military weapons, in complete cooperation with the military, and simultaneously formulating production plans that will successfully tie in with our industrial set-up. And here is another point worth mentioning, can we take steps that will insure the acceptance and fair trial by the military of new or revolutionary matériel, methods, etc.? We do not want any Gen. Billy Mitchell type episodes in the future.

I have expressed my opinion as a citizen of the United States who is deeply concerned about the future and hope you will consider it as such.

Sincerely.

GERMAN BUSINESS STILL A MENACE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "German Business—Still a Menace," written by Senator THOMAS of Utah and published in the November 1945 issue of the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD COOPERATION—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, at the mayor's dinner at the Francis Marion Hotel, Charleston, S. C., in connection with the Jimmy Byrnes Homecoming Day, November 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RED CROSS—ARTICLE BY AGNES E. MEYER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the Red Cross, written by Agnes E. Meyer, and published in the Washington Post of November 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITIQUE OF LABOR LAW—ADDRESS BY PROF. WILLIAM STERNBERG

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Critique of Labor Law," delivered by Prof. William Sternberg, of Creighton University School of Law, Omaha, Nebr., before the Postwar Institute of the Nebraska Bar Association on October 31, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO AN ATHLETE DYING YOUNG—SERMON BY REV. ALLEN PENDERGRAFT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "To an Athlete Dying Young," delivered by Rev. Allen Pendergraft on November 4, 1945, at All Saints Church, Buffalo, N. Y., which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters received by him on the subject of universal military training, which appear in the Appendix.]

DELAY IN DISCHARGING SERVICEMEN

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three letters addressed to him on the subject of the discharge of servicemen, which appear in the Appendix.]

OUR CHILDREN—POEM BY EDWARD T. PACA

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Our Children," written by Edward T. Paca, of Englewood, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 380)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

(For President's message see p. 10817 of the House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. MURRAY], I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill which I send to the desk and request that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill proposes to establish a national health program along the lines set forth by the President in his message on this subject just read. Representative DINGELL has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1606) to provide for a national health program, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in 1939 I introduced a national health bill, which was considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill was given a favorable report by a subcommittee, but because of the war no action was taken.

In 1940, I, with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], introduced a hospital construction bill. The bill was reported out favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor and passed by the Senate.

During the past 5 years I have continued to study very carefully the entire health problem. The bill introduced today is an improved bill. It is the result of the constructive suggestions of many outstanding medical authorities and of labor, farm, consumer, and health organizations interested in improving the Nation's health.

The need for a national health program has been proved many times. In restating the need I should like to quote from a statement, Principles of a Nation-Wide Health Program, issued last year by 29 leading health experts, including 13 outstanding doctors. Here is what these experts said:

American medicine at its best is unsurpassed but it is also beyond doubt that the medical facilities and services actually available to many of our people are far below the best. There have been great achievements of the American medical profession, American hospitals, public health and welfare agencies in providing care for sickness, educating personnel, advancing medical knowledge, reducing and preventing disease. Nevertheless unmet needs for medical care are widespread and the burdens of sickness costs are heavy and sometimes overwhelming. There has been a gratifying reduction in the death rate, but the lowering of death rates is not an adequate measure of the extent to which medical care is available or needed. Moreover, the fact that death and disease rates are much greater in some States than in others, and greater among low than among high-income groups, demonstrates that there are still needs and opportunities.

Medical services should be made financially accessible to all through a national system of contributory health insurance, combined with taxation in behalf of people without sufficient income, preventive services and needed extensions and improvements of all facilities. In order that comprehensive service shall be available to all or most of the population and in order to minimize the administrative costs of acquiring members, it is essential that financial participation in the system be required by law. The contribution for medical-care insurance will not mean an added burden on the earnings of workers. The American people are now spending for physicians' services and hospitalization enough to provide for all with only minor supplementation, if these payments are regularized, instead of failing with disastrous uncertainty. Place should be maintained for voluntary action by many agencies as well as for action by our national, State and local governments.

The same basic facts and proposals were contained in the official statement of policy on Medical Care in a National Health Program adopted in October 1944 by the American Public Health Association Here is what that association said in its official statement:

I. A large portion of the population receives insufficient and inadequate medical care, chiefly because persons are unable to pay the costs of services on an individual-payment basis when they are needed, or because the services are not available.

II. There are extensive deficiencies in the physical facilities needed to provide reasonably adequate services. Such facilities include hospitals, health centers, and laboratories. The needs are most acute in poor communities, in rural areas, and in urban areas where the population has increased

rapidly or where the development of facilities has been haphazard or the financial support inadequate.

III. There are extensive deficiencies in the number and the distribution of personnel needed to provide the services. Here again, the needs vary according to categories of personnel and to characteristics of communities.

IV. There are extensive deficiencies in the number and categories of personnel qualified to administer facilities and services.

V. Many communities still are not served by public health departments; others inadequately maintain such departments. Thus, some communities have never utilized organized health work to reduce the burden of illness, and others share its benefits only in part. In these communities especially, people lack information on the benefits of modern medical care.

VI. Expansion of scientific research is urgently needed. Despite past and current scientific advances, knowledge as to the prevention, control, or cure of many diseases is lacking.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HEALTH PROVISIONS

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced includes five provisions which will make available basic health services to all the people wherever they may live and whatever their income may be.

First, the present Federal grants-in-aid to the States for public-health services are broadened and increased to speed up the progress of preventive and community-wide health services. It should therefore be possible, over a period of years, to assure that essential public-health services are available in all parts of the country, especially the rural areas which are so sadly in need of such services.

Second, the community-wide maternal and child-health services, aided by Federal grants to the States, are similarly broadened and strengthened.

Third, Federal grants-in-aid to the States are authorized for meeting the costs of medical care for needy persons.

At the present time there are 3,000,000 needy persons receiving cash assistance grants under Federal-State public assistance programs. However, Federal funds under existing laws cannot be used to match State or local expenditures which are made directly to doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, or other medical agencies.

By authorizing Federal grants to the States for meeting these direct medical expenditures, more adequate medical care will be made available to these persons; and hospitals and practitioners will receive more adequate compensation for their services.

Fourth, prepaid medical care is made available.

All four of the provisions which I have just mentioned will greatly help to round out the health services of the Nation. By preventing sickness, disability and premature death, they will pay vast dividends in human welfare and, at the same time, reduce the costs of other public and private welfare programs. Unless we provide a method of spreading the cost of medical and hospital care, people will still not obtain the treatment they need.

Fifth, grants-in-aid are provided under the prepaid medical care plan to non-profit institutions engaging in research or in professional education.

These 5 provisions are essential to the development of a broad national health program. They must, however, be supplemented by other provisions in order to assure a truly comprehensive national health program.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record as a part of my remarks the remainder of my statement, including questions and answers on the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE PREPAID MEDICAL CARE PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1945

1. Does the prepaid medical care title of the bill provide for "socialized medicine?"

No; if by the term "socialized medicine" is meant medical care furnished by Government doctors free of charge. The term "socialized medicine" has been loosely used for a number of years to describe any changes in the provision of medical services to which the American Medical Association leadership is opposed. The only definition of "socialize" in Webster's Dictionary which describes the effect of the bill on medical practice is "to adapt to social needs or uses." This title II of the bill will accomplish by making medical services more generally available than they are today, while retaining free choice of doctor for the patient and freedom on the doctor's part to work under the system or to remain out of it as he prefers. If it is charged that the bill proposes to make medical services more generally available than they are today, that charge is valid and is a compliment to the bill.

2. If, as Dr. Fishbein declares in his editorials in the Journal of the American Medical Association, health conditions and the standards of medical service are higher in the United States than anywhere else in the world, why is a change necessary?

The United States is not the healthiest country in the world. Dr. Fishbein presents a very favorable over-all picture but he neglects to state that conditions are not nearly so satisfactory in poor agricultural States, in rural regions of wealthy States, in low-income sections of our large cities, and among low-income groups in our population. Take, for example, the infant and maternal mortality rates. In 1942, while 40 babies in the entire United States died at birth for every 1,000 born alive, in 1 State the rate was 98, and 80 in another.

We find similar wide variation in maternal mortality rates. The rate for mothers who died in childbirth was 60 percent higher in the Southern States than in New England. The number of Negro mothers who died when their babies were born was twice the number of white mothers. Twenty-five percent more mothers died in towns and villages with less than 10,000 population than in the cities with population of 100,000 or more.

We are proud of our steady reduction in deaths from tuberculosis. Here again, however, the over-all favorable picture conceals many inequalities. In New York City one over-crowded district has a death rate from this cause which is 30 times the rate in more favored districts. The highest tuberculosis mortality rates for several States are four to five times the average in the States with the best records.

Probably few people would have believed, 6 years ago, that more than half of our young men would be found physically or mentally unfit for general military duty. Yet that is exactly what was revealed by Selective Service examination records of the first 3,000,000 registrants. Soon after the early days of the war, certain of the physical standards were relaxed. Nevertheless, recent figures from Selective Service still show the appalling fact that 50 percent of the young men examined were either completely unable to perform general military service or were made fit only after correction of defects. Out of 14,000,000 men (most of them under 30) examined by June 1, 1944, 4,500,000 were classified as IV–F, unfit for military service despite the lowered physical and mental requirements for military service; more than 1,000,000 after being inducted were later discharged for defects which became apparent after induction; and 1,500,000 were inducted but made fit for service only after certain defects had been corrected—giving a total of 7,000,000 that were initially unfit. Another fact stands out from the Selective Service figures: 1,500,000 of the 7,000,000 unfit were rehabilitated for military service readily and the numbers of such rehabilitated cases could have been easily doubled, indicating that with adequate medical care the proportion of unfit would have been much less.

Length of life is often considered a measure of the health of the people. Yet statistics of life expectancy for males in prewar years showed a number of countries in which the average future length of life was greater than in the United States. For example: At birth, life expectancy in at least 4 countries was better than that for white males in the United States; at age 20, life expectancy in 8 countries exceeded that in the United States; at age 60, the United States was exceeded by at least 12 countries.

Most of these are health insurance countries. In the United States, inability to pay the costs of medical care prevents many people from receiving the care they need and limits doctors in the kind and amount of care they can provide. People who don't see a doctor don't get any kind of care—good or bad. Many doctors are unable or unequipped, because of the cost to the patient, to make use of the marvels of medical science which are described so glowingly by some medical spokesmen. Patients of these doctors get a type of medical care not much better than that their fathers and grandfathers received.

3. Is it true that if the prepayment provisions of the bill are enacted into law "they will destroy the private practice of medicine in the United States"?

This statement is not true. If the bill is enacted into law, physicians will continue to practice medicine much as they do now. They will have the choice of practicing full time under the system, of combining care of patients paid for by the system with care of uninsured patients and of those who prefer to pay for their care privately (that is, without making use of their prepaid protection), or of continuing to practice full time outside the system. Whether caring for prepaid patients or for others, they will be free, as they are now, to practice alone or as members of a group.

Patients will be free to choose their general practitioners and to change them if their first choice proves unsatisfactory. Doctors will be equally free to accept or reject patients who choose them. Free choice is explicity guaranteed in the bill (sec. 205).

4. Is it true that under the bill the "entire medical profession in the United States would be placed under the direction of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service"?

No. This is not true. Section 203 in the bill, which relates to administration, is concerned not with the administration of medical practice but with the administration of a system of paying for medical care.

The provisions in the bill do not interfere with the professional aspects of medical practice. The Surgeon General is "authorized to negotiate and periodically to renegotiate agreements or cooperative working arrangements" with the medical profession and with hospitals to "utilize their services and facilities and to pay fair, reasonable, and equitable compensation for such service and facilities."

The usual method of making payments to general practitioners is to be that which is chosen by the majority of physicians in any given local areas. However, provision is also made that, if approved by the Surgeon General, other methods of payment may be made to physicians who do not choose the method of the majority. It should be noted that the Surgeon General wouldn't hire doctors for the prepaid services or direct the medical profession. He is authorized to work out mutually satisfactory agreements or cooperative working arrangements with the doctors as to methods by which they would be paid for their services to insured persons. The same holds true for methods of payment to dentists.

In adopting the basic policies that would guide these arrangements, the Surgeon General is required to consult with the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, on which the medical and dental profession will be adequately represented through members they nominate.

5. It is said that the National Advisory Medical Policy Council will have no authority—will be merely a puppet council. Is this true?

No. This is not true. The council has been given no final administrative authority, because an advisory council is not and should not be an administrative body. An explicit statement in the bill which bound the Surgeon General to follow the advice of the advisory council in every instance would hamper his freedom of action to an unreasonable extent and would deprive him of the necessary authority to carry out his duties and responsibilities. He is, however, bound to consult them on all matters of policy. The bill is explicit and detailed in its description of the administrative policies on which the Surgeon General is authorized to act only after consultation with the council (section 205).

In appointing the members of the advisory council, the Surgeon General is required to select them from panels of names submitted by professional and other agencies and organizations concerned with medical, dental, and nursing services and education, with the operation of hospitals and laboratories, and from other persons, agencies, or organizations informed on the need for or provision of medical, hospital, or related services and benefits. It will, therefore, be a council composed of experts in the various fields and of representatives of the public. No responsible administrator would dare to act contrary to the advice of an advisory council of this character on any matter of importance unless he had adequate grounds on which he could defend his position publicly. Moreover, the Surgeon General is required to include in his annual report to Congress an account of his consultations with the advisory council, and also their recommendations and his comments thereon.

6. Isn't $3,000,000,000 a year an enormous amount of money to spend on medical care and hospitalization?

Absolutely not. We spend more than this now for all medical care. The sums of money to be allocated to the personal health services account will not for the most part represent new expenditures. To the extent that they do—through budgeted expenditures—the people will receive much more service than they do today.

Medical care ordinarily costs the people of this country in direct payments and through taxation about four to five billion dollars a year. Direct expenditures by the people themselves amount to about three to four billion dollars. About two to two and one-half billion dollars is spent in an ordinary nonwar year for medical services excluding dentistry and home nursing.

7. Is it true that the Surgeon General will assign all patients to all doctors?

Certainly not. In each area patients will have free choice of all general practitioners of medicine or dentistry within the system (sec. 205 (b)).

8. Will the hospitalization provisions in the bill destroy the voluntary hospital system?

No; this is nonsense. Nothing in the bill provides for or would even permit any interference in the internal management of any hospitals—private, public, or sectarian. This is explicitly forbidden in the bill (sec. 206 (c)). All hospitals which meet acceptable standards—such standards as those utilized by the American Medical Association or the American College of Surgeons in determining whether or not hospitals shall be included in its annual register—would as a matter of course be included in the list of hospitals eligible to receive insured patients. In communities where hospital facilities are sparse there will undoubtedly be commonsense modification of these standards. There is explicit provision in the bill for this (sec. 214 (k)). The object is to make hospital care more available to people—not less available.

Each qualified hospital is also guaranteed the right to choose how it will be paid. The hospital can be paid direct under a mutually satisfactory agreement. Or it can be paid by the patient, who receives his benefit in cash at so many dollars per day of hospital care (sec. 214 (h)).

The assurance of adequate income should enable hospitals to improve their facilities. The type of records which will be required will be no more difficult for hospitals to keep—perhaps less difficult—than those required by the Blue Cross plans.

9. Will the provisions for grants-in-aid for medical education mean that medical education will be controlled by the Surgeon General and that he will dictate which men and women may become medical students?

Of course not. The provisions of section 213 of the bill give the Surgeon General no such authority. The purpose of this provision is to provide needed funds for the stimulation and support of research and medical education. Projects must be initiated by the medical schools and research foundations themselves. Such requests must, of course, be approved by the Surgeon General after consultation with the advisory council, to make sure that public funds are wisely spent.

This provision was put in the bill as a result of suggestions made by the medical profession in regard to the earlier Wagner health bill of 1939. It seems only proper that the people who profit so much by the advancements of medical science and improvements in medical education should contribute in this way to these desirable ends.

10. Is it true that the bill would be used to "take over" medical schools and hospitals?

Of course not. There is absolutely nothing in the bill which would authorize or even permit this. Nothing in the bill permits interference in the internal management of either medical schools or hospitals. The payment of hospital benefits to hospitals and of grants-in-aid to medical schools will provide a financial security that many institutions have never before possessed. This assurance of necessary funds should strengthen and stimulate them to do more effective work than they have ever done before, without in any way giving up independence and freedom of action.

11. Is it true that the enactment of the bill will plunge the physicians into political slavery?

Absolutely no. This statement has been made by opponents of a national prepayment plan to confuse and disturb physicians and others. There is nothing "political" about the office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. The Surgeon General holds a term appointment. The United States Public Health Service has a long and honorable record of almost 150 years. Many of the advances in public health which the editorials in certain medical journals credit to the private practitioners of medicine have been stimulated by the activities of the Public Health Service and by similar public agencies.

12. Is it true that under the hospitalization provisions of the bill people will not be able to choose their hospitals?

People do not usually have free choice of hospitals today. Ordinarily, they go to the hospital in which the physician treating them has a staff appointment. Sometimes they have a choice of two or more hospitals in the community. They will have the same freedom under the provisions of the bill. They will have as much free choice of hospitals as they have today under the Blue Cross plans. All hospitals in good standing will undoubtedly elect to receive insured patients in order to obtain the assurance of guaranteed income which will thus be available to them.

13. Will people be obliged to take any doctor the Surgeon General tells them to, if this bill becomes law?

Certainly not. The bill expressly provides free choice of general practitioners (sec. 205 (b)). Ordinarily, a patient will go to a specialist only on the recommendation of his physician. This is for the protection of the patient. Most people should see a general practitioner first before they go to a specialist. The patient who goes to a specialist on the advice of a physician is likely to be taken care of more satisfactorily than if he follows the suggestion of a neighbor or picks out a name in the telephone book. The same statements apply to dentists.

14. The bill says the Surgeon General can limit the number of patients a physician will be allowed to treat. Won't that keep people from having the doctor of their choice?

Not any more than at present when a patient chooses a doctor who already has all the patients he can take care of. This provision in the bill (sec. 205 (j)) is merely permissive. It states that the "Surgeon General may prescribe maximum limits to the number of potential beneficiaries for whom a practitioner or group of practitioners may undertake to furnish general medical benefits * * *." It does not require the Surgeon General to do so. Protection of patients and doctors was the only purpose in giving the Surgeon General permission to set a maximum. Such a maximum would undoubtedly be the largest number of persons whom one doctor could take care of satisfactorily. It would therefore be a larger number than doctors ordinarily take care of. As a result, this provision, if the Surgeon General found it wise to use it, would rarely, if ever, interfere with the guaranteed freedom of insured persons to choose their own doctors.

15. Does the bill place in the hands of one man—the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service—the power and authority * * * to designate which doctors can be specialists?

Questions like this one confuse and disturb physicians and the public because they can be answered by neither a flat "yes" nor a flat "no." Under the prepaid program, specialists would be compensated at a higher rate than general practitioners. This is only fair and proper. To provide a measure for determining what types of services and which practitioners should be compensated at this higher rate, the Surgeon General is authorized in the bill to set up general standards for this purpose. In establishing these standards, he must, however, consult the advisory council and utilize standards and certifications already developed by physicians through their professional organizations.

16. Will the enactment of the bill result in the deterioration of medical practice?

On the contrary, it should improve the standards of medical practice. Many doctors are hampered today in their treatment

of patients by the inability of the patient to pay for the special diagnostic and treatment services he requires. The provisions for consultant and specialist services, for hospital care, and for X-ray and laboratory services as benefits under the bill will mean that doctors can make use of these services whenever they consider it advisable, without considering the patient's pocketbook.

17. Doesn't the phrase giving the Surgeon General the authority to "prescribe and publish such rules and regulations," used in section 203 (f) of the bill, mean that the Surgeon General will have too much power?

This phrase has been frequently quoted to convey just this impression. But no administrator can administer a national prepayment plan without setting up certain rules and regulations. It is a phrase commonly used in bills. It has no sinister significance. It merely gives the administrator the power to establish necessary administrative measures. He is specifically forbidden from using the "rules and regulations" to act contrary to the other provisions of the bill.

18. It has been said that if the bill becomes law people must depend upon "a doctor who is paid by the Government and is presumably working 8 hours a day instead of 24." Won't this make it very hard for people to get a doctor if they need one at night or on holidays?

Certainly not. Any such idea is nonsense and an insult to the medical profession. There is not one statement in the bill which even implies that doctors are to work any specified number of hours. Many a doctor who answers a patient's call today has no idea when or whether he will be paid for his services. Why should we assume that doctors will look after their patients less conscientiously when they know they will be paid than they do today when payment is often uncertain?

19. Is it true that, under a system of prepaid medical care, physicians will have lower incomes than they have now?

With 60,000 physicians in the armed services during the war, of course, those left in private practice have been overworked and their incomes have been very high. They would not be so high in an ordinary year. If the question really means "will physicians have lower incomes under the bill than they usually have" the answer certainly is "no." Before the war, the highest average gross income physicians ever made was in 1928 or 1929—again years when all incomes were unusually high. In those years physicians earned on the average about $9,000 gross, but in the years since then and before the war their average incomes have been from $5,600 to $8,500 gross.

It is estimated that on the average $1,500,000,000 annually could be spent for physicians' services. At this rate, if 150,000 physicians were in full-time practice, they would average about $10,000 income in a normal year under the bill. Like the previous figures, this includes incomes of both general practitioners and specialists. The general practitioner earns less than the specialist and, as the bill provides, the qualified specialist will continue to receive a higher rate of pay than the general practitioner. Thus, specialists as a whole would receive more than the $10,000 average, and general practitioners as a whole somewhat less than the average.

20. It is claimed by opponents of a national plan that voluntary prepayment plans could do the job as well, if not better. Is this true?

Experience here and abroad has shown us that voluntary plans could not handle the job. You can't persuade enough people, much less the bulk of the people, to join voluntary plans. Moreover, the voluntary plans which have been operating so far are too restrictive and too costly in the care they provide. There has been a lot of talk about Blue Cross (hospitalization) plans being able to handle hospital care; but even after more than 15 years of existence these plans cover only seventeen to eighteen million people—most of these in large urban centers. Hospitalization is the easiest kind of insurance in the medical field to sell. Voluntary plans that provide medical care now cover only about 4 percent of the population in spite of recent and very vigorous efforts of the American Medical Association and State medical societies to promote this type of plan. The medical society plans now cover only a few million persons. For the most part they give care only when the patient is in the hospital.

Without exception, voluntary plans are too expensive for the lower-income groups (the people who are most in need of medical care) and there are too many illnesses for which care is not given under these plans.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION BILL

The Senate Committee on Education and Labor has already favorably reported out S. 191, the hospital survey and construction bill which will enable hospitals, clinics, and public health centers to be built in communities where they are needed. While the bill has several defects and inadequacies it is an important beginning. By constructing hospitals in rural areas, and other areas where they are needed, it will be possible to speed up the progress of comprehensive hospital care. In turn, the prepayment of medical care costs, including the costs of hospitalization, will assure the maintenance of the hospitals which will be built and will encourage the construction and improvement of needed hospitals. A sound hospital-construction program requires that there is also an insurance system to cover hospitalization costs in order to make sure that hospitals will be used by sick persons and that satisfactory wages, hours, and working conditions of hospital employees will insure high standards of hospital maintenance.

MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs already has before it legislation providing for the promotion of medical research and professional education. The passage of such legislation should help to advance medical discoveries, to improve the quality of medical research in our universities and medical schools, and to make it possible to give opportunities for further training and education to many more young men and women. At the present time many promising individuals are denied this opportunity because of lack of financial means and because of the restrictions which the medical schools apply particularly to persons of minority groups.

The National Health Act which I have introduced contains provision for medical research and education, particularly in section 314 (f) (1) and 314 (l) of the Public Health Service Act (pt. A of title I of the bill) and section 213 of title II of the bill.

The amended provisions in the Public Health Service Act will make additional Federal funds available to the States through the United States Public Health Service for public health research, training of personnel, public health education, and planning and coordination of health services and activities.

Section 213 of the bill provides that, as a part of the prepaid medical care program, the Surgeon General is directed, with the advice of the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, to administer grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions and agencies engaging in research or in undergraduate or postgraduate professional education. Such grants would be made for projects showing promise of making valuable contributions to the education and training of persons in furnishing health benefits or of making valuable contributions with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of disease or disability. Provision is made for giving preference to educational projects for returning servicemen seeking postgraduate education or training in medical, dental, and related fields. The initial sums available for such grants-in-aid would be $10,000,000 for 1946 and $15,000,000 for 1947. The sum available each subsequent year for such grants-in-aid would be 2 percent of the amount expended for health benefits. These grants-in-aid are a necessary part of any prepaid medical-care program. They will enable medical schools to develop more adequate programs for general practitioners, specialists, and other medical personnel to take refresher and postgraduate courses so that such persons can keep abreast of modern medical discoveries. Under present-day arrangements the results of new discoveries are not brought quickly enough to the attention of all practitioners.

The GI bill of rights contains educational provisions and loans which also should help during the next few years to break down the barriers to further professional education and research which have existed. But the GI bill will only apply for a limited period of time to only part of the population. We must have permanent and comprehensive legislation covering all medical research and education and allied fields. Such legislation under a national health program should, of course, provide for coordination with general research and education programs.

CASH BENEFITS DURING DISABILITY

A comprehensive national-health program cannot be achieved without providing cash benefits to individuals during periods of sickness or disability. I have already introduced legislation with Senator MURRAY (S. 1050) and Representative DINGELL has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives (H. R. 3293) which provides for such payments during both temporary or extended sickness or disability as a part of our other cash social insurance payments. This legislation already is pending before the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means. These pending bills also provide that there should be set aside annually an amount equal to 2 percent of the social insurance benefits paid on behalf of all such disabled individuals to be used for medical, surgical, institutional, rehabilitation, or other services to disabled individuals entitled to receive cash disability insurance benefits, if such services are not otherwise available through existing legislation, and might aid such individuals to return to gainful work.

I am hopeful that Committees of the Senate and House which have this matter now before them will hold hearings on it soon to expedite this legislation as part of both a national health program and an expanded social security program.

OTHER HEALTH LEGISLATION

There also are pending before the Congress at the present time several other special bills relating to health, each limited to a particular problem. While each problem—and each bill—has certain merit, piecemeal consideration of each separate problem by the Congress is not the most satisfactory way of developing a sound national health program. Such a piecemeal approach inevitably results in gaps, overlaps, and inconsistences; it may result in competition for trained personnel to administer such programs, especially in cases where a sufficient number of trained persons is not yet available. I hope, therefore, that each such pending bill will be considered in relation to a comprehensive national health program.

The appropriate committees of Congress also should go into all aspects of health which impede providing adequate medical care. The present deplorable situation with respect to institutional care in many communities indicates the need for Federal grants-in-aid to the States for the improvement of standards, services, and working and living

conditions in these institutions. State licensure laws are so complex, so lacking in uniformity, and so obstructive of interstate mobility of qualified practitioners that some Federal legislation is necessary to bring order out of this chaos. There are no medical schools in some States, and measures to remedy this defect should be considered. Finally, the discrimination which most medical schools practice against student applicants from minority groups requires congressional consideration and appropriate action.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1945

The National Health Act of 1945 contains three titles, as follows:

Title I—Grants to States for Health Services.

Title II—Personal Health Service Benefits.

Title III—General Provisions.

TITLE I—GRANTS TO STATES FOR HEALTH SERVICES

Title I contains three parts, as follows:

Part A—Grants to States for Public Health Services.

Part B—Grants to States for Maternal and Child Health Services.

Part C—Grants to States for Medical Care of Needy Persons.

All three parts of title I provided grants-in-aid to the States for health services for which the Federal Government already provides funds. In general, the purpose of this title is to amend and broaden existing legislation by eliminating existing restrictions so that present State and local programs can operate more effectively.

PART A—GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

This section amends section 314 of the Public Health Service Act. The provisions concerned with grants for the venereal disease and for the tuberculosis programs are unchanged. The subsections dealing with general public-health work are revised so as to strengthen the program and pledge complete Federal cooperation to the States in moving as rapidly as practicable toward the development of adequate public-health services in all parts of the country. The present authorization of $20,000,000 a year for grants to States is replaced by an authorization to appropriate a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes. Also, the maximum annual amount authorized to be available to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for demonstrations, training of personnel, and administrative expenses is increased from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 a year.

In order to receive the Federal grants the States are required to develop their own plans in accordance with their own needs, and to submit these plans for approval. They must be approved by the Surgeon General if they meet the requirements that are specified in the bill. An orderly system of arrangements is laid down, insuring reasonable standards and systematic financial participation by the States. This is the same general pattern as has been followed for public assistance since the original Social Security Act of 1935. The amounts of the grants to States are determined by an explicit formula, designed to give proportionately more aid to the poorer States. The variable Federal grants would range from 50 to 75 percent of the total public funds expended under the approved State programs.

Section 314 (k) of the Public Health Service Act provides for coordination between the administration of the public health services under this program with the services provided under the other programs in the bill.

PART B—GRANTS TO STATES FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

This section relates to Federal cooperation with the States to provide health services for mothers and children. A common plan is followed in each of the two aspects of this part, dealing respectively with maternal and child health and with crippled children. In order to receive Federal grants, the States are to develop their own plans, in accordance with their own needs. If these plans meet the requirements specified in the bill, they must be approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau. The requirements are those that are essential to insure reasonable standards, systematic financing and administration, and reasonably rapid extension of the services to all parts of the States and on an adequate basis. Administration by the Federal authorities is required to be in close consultation with the State authorities.

As in the case of grants for public-health work and medical care for needy persons, the Federal grants in part B would be on a variable basis, so as to give special aid to the poorer States. The variable Federal grants would range from 50 to 75 percent of the total public funds expended under the approved State programs, the amount in each case being determined by a specific formula written into the bill. The Federal Government would be entering into full partnership with the States in providing services for mothers and children, leaving wide latitude to the States as to the scope and content of the programs.

Section 128 (c) of this part provides for coordination between the administration of the provisions under this program with the services provided under the other programs in the bill.

PART C—GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAL CARE OF NEEDY PERSONS

This section provides Federal grants to States for medical care to persons determined by the States to be needy under a cooperative Federal-State plan of public assistance. It provides variable Federal grants to the States, ranging from 50 percent to 75 percent of the total expended, depending upon the State's per capita income. The higher rates apply to the States with the lower per capita incomes. The program authorizes Federal matching, on this variable-grant basis, of medical care for any needy individual (without the rigid maxima contained in existing law).

These Federal grants, like the similar provisions of the present law, are to be made out of general revenues. As under existing law, State plans must meet various requirements specified in the bill, including maintenance of civil-service merit standards for administrative personnel.

The limitations in the existing Federal law are removed so that States may obtain Federal funds to help provide medical care to needy persons and thereby to reduce illness and suffering and wherever possible to help needy persons to be restored to self-support. Most States are already providing such care under existing public-welfare laws, but, because of the restrictions in the Federal law, this care is not adequate. By providing Federal financial participation toward meeting part of such costs, States will be encouraged to broaden the scope and improve the quality of such medical care.

In view of the fact that the proposed legislation would make additional Federal funds available to every State in the Union, it is essential that the State programs provide more adequate assistance and improved and simplified administration. Since under this part the largest part of the total cost will come from Federal funds, it is reasonable that all persons in the United States who are actually determined to be needy by State agencies be given medical care. The bill provides that as a condition for obtaining Federal funds the State public-assistance plan must provide for distribution of funds so as to assure meeting in full the medical need of individuals throughout the State as determined in accordance with standards established by the State. This provision would not modify the existing law which places upon the State the responsibility for determining who is a needy individual and the amount of assistance to be granted such individual. It is designed, however, to assure that needy individuals in a particular county will not be denied assistance because of the lack of adequate local financial participation by such county.

Section 136 of this part provides for coordination between the administration of medical care under this program with the services provided under the other programs in the bill.

TITLE II—PREPAID PERSONAL HEALTH SERVICE BENEFITS

Title II of the bill provides for a system of prepaid personal health service benefits.

Section 212 of the bill establishes a personal health services account, out of which all the benefits under this title are to be paid.

The financial barrier to adequate hospital and medical care is the basic reason for the unequal distribution of doctors and hospitals as between urban and rural area and as between prosperous and underprivileged communities. It is the basic reason for the failure of low-income families to receive as much medical care as the well-to-do, although they have more sickness. It is an important cause of the shockingly high rate of rejections under selective service.

A system of prepaid medical care will go a long way toward breaking down this financial barrier. Such a system will enable the people to obtain all needed medical care and will give them security against catastrophic costs for which they cannot budget individually. It will encourage doctors to settle in rural areas and communities to construct needed hospitals and health centers by assuring adequate incomes, equipment, and facilities for modern medical practice. It will benefit patients, doctors, and hospitals.

Title II of the bill provides for a comprehensive system of prepaid medical care. The provisions of the bill are based upon long and careful study of existing prepayment medical care plans in this country and abroad. The provisions of the bill are consistent with the policies and program set forth (1) in the Report of the Health Program Conference on Principles of a Nation-wide Health Program, issued in 1944 by 29 leading health experts, including 13 medical doctors; (2) in the report on medical care in a national health program, adopted in 1944 by the American Public Health Association; (3) in the policies set forth in the recent statement on the people's health, issued by the Physician's Forum; and (4) in statement No. 16, issued October 3, 1945, by the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care. Representatives of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations joined in the adoption of the first-named report. The provisions of the bill are consistent with the policies and programs set down by both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations in their annual conventions.

A Nation-wide comprehensive prepayment medical-care plan can be financed in any one of several different ways. Premiums can, for such a purpose, be raised through income or general taxes or through pay roll contributions, or both. In either case minimum and maximum provision can be provided. The extent of a general governmental contribution out of general revenues to such a plan depends upon the comprehensiveness of the groups covered and the services provided. All in all, these problems are best decided after a decision has been reached on all the details of the medical-care plan itself. Moreover, the financial details relating to the raising of the revenue for the plan raises many special problems which have a bearing on existing income taxes and pay roll contributions and should be considered in relation to these laws.

The bill does not, therefore, specify any particular method by which the sums authorized to be appropriated under section 212 of title II would be raised. Since under the Constitution legislation relating to the raising of revenue must originate in the House of Representatives, this matter has been left to separate legislation. There is already pending before the Congress legislation (H. R. 3293 and the companion bill S. 1050) which provides for the raising of revenue for personal health service benefits. This separation of legislation between the revenue and benefit aspects of the program is in keeping with previous practice. In both 1935 and 1937 legislation relating to railroad retirement was considered and enacted in this way.

It is both necessary and desirable that first and foremost consideration should be given to the benefits. If the Congress thinks that it is sound to provide prepaid medical care to the American people, the method of financing such a plan can be worked out jointly by the appropriate committees of the Congress which have jurisdiction over these matters.

PREPAID MEDICAL CARE IS NOT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Propagandists for some organized medical groups have criticized a national prepaid medical-care on the ground that it involves "regimentation of doctors and patients," "lowered standards," "political medicine," and "socialized medicine," and so on. But prepaid medical care is not socialized medicine; it is not state medicine. These "devil words" are all designed to confuse the issue.

A system of prepaid medical care is simply a method of assuring a person ready access to the medical care that he or she needs by eliminating the financial barrier between the patient and doctor or hospital. Since patients are guaranteed free choice of doctors, doctors are guaranteed the right to accept or reject patients, and hospitals are guaranteed freedom to manage their affairs, it should be obvious that the system does not involve regimentation of doctors, hospitals, or patients. Neither do I believe the propaganda that the doctors of this country will lower the standards of medical care simply because they are guaranteed payment for their services.

There are many individuals, honest and sincere in their desire for improved conditions, who nevertheless fear any change, and distrust all new social legislation. Those of us who have sponsored social legislation have faced similar opposition against many proposals for social betterment, but we have persevered and succeeded, and we have seen these new programs accepted as part of our basic system of American freedom and democracy. Over 30 years ago in the New York Legislature I fought for workmen's accident compensation and most of the arguments which are being made against prepaid medical care now were made against workmen's compensation then. Now all of the States but one have workmen's compensation laws—all include medical benefits, which is health insurance for industrial accidents and disease. The time has come for us to extend the principle of health insurance to cover nonindustrial accidents and diseases as well.

The fears and doubts expressed about workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and other measures for social security have proved to be without foundation. In the future, when we have succeeded in our struggle for a comprehensive health program for the entire country, we will be able to say about health insurance, too, that present-day apprehensions and misgivings were groundless.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE SAFEGUARDED

Freedom of medical practice is carefully safeguarded. Each person is entitled to choose his own family doctor from among all physicians or groups of physicians in the community who have voluntarily agreed to go into the system. Each doctor or group of doctors is free to go in or stay out of the system. These doctors who participate are free to accept or reject patients who may wish to select them as their family doctor, and the participating doctors are specifically given the right to choose the method through which they are to be paid for the services they furnish. Patients and doctors may change the arrangements after they have been made if they become dissatisfied. Doctors practicing as specialists, individually or in groups, would be entitled to special rates of payment if they meet professional standards for specialists. Existing arrangements for hospital care would not be disturbed.

Every effort also has been made to protect the professional position of dentists, nurses, and nursing organizations. Hospitals are guaranteed protection against interference in the management of their own affairs. The basic policy has been to provide medical and related services through arrangements that are worked out so that they will be satisfactory to the public and to those who furnish the services. Mutual agreements, reached through negotiations and contracts, are specified in the bill as the method to be used, and that is the democratic way of doing things.

The Surgeon General is authorized to negotiate cooperative working arrangements with Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and with private groups or individuals, to provide the benefits by utilizing their services and facilities on payment of fair and reasonable compensation. The health benefits may be furnished to noncovered persons such as needy persons receiving public assistance, if appropriate arrangements are made to pay on their behalf the cost of services furnished to them.

VOLUNTARY PLANS AIDED

There has been much misunderstanding about the part that voluntary hospitals, group-service organizations, existing voluntary insurance or prepayment plans and similar agencies may play in a prepaid medical-care system. Let me emphasize that our bill makes a place for them, so that they can continue their good work. All qualified hospitals, all qualified medical groups or organizations, will be able to participate in the program as organizations that will furnish services to the insured persons who choose them; they will receive fair payments for the services they furnish under the bill; and they will have enlarged opportunities to be service agencies for particular groups or for their communities. This applies to service organizations created by trade unions, consumer groups, employers, nonprofit community groups, churches, fraternal associations, groups of doctors or individual doctors, medical societies, or many other kinds of sponsors, or groups of sponsors. The bill not only provides for utilizing existing service organizations but it also encourages the creation of new ones.

The groups operating under the Blue Cross hospital-insurance plans will be able to continue to act as representative of the participating hospitals and the community groups that own or manage the hospitals, and they will have large opportunities to be important public organizations that facilitate the administration of vital parts of the insurance system. The same will be true for many other community and public organizations.

Medical service groups—private clinics, salaried staffs of hospitals, group-service plans such as the Kaiser or the Ross-Loos plan—furnishing service under the system would be as free as they are today to select their own staffs and their own method of paying physicians and others on their staffs, irrespective of the method of payment which prevailed among the individually practicing physicians or dentists of the local area.

HOSPITAL CARE

Hospital care is limited to 60 days per year, with a possible maximum of 120 days if experience proves that such benefits can be afforded. All qualified hospitals are eligible to participate. The Surgeon General is forbidden from exercising supervision or control over the management of hospitals that participate in the system.

DECENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION

Every effort has been made to keep a fair balance in the bill between the principles of administrative responsibility and democratic administration. The administrative officers are given duties to perform and the necessary authority so that they can carry out their duties efficiently and promptly. But their authority is carefully limited through checks and balances. Limitations are carefully specified in the bill; for example, the rights of insured persons and of physicians and hospitals are set down.

Moreover, the Surgeon General is directed to decentralize the administration of the program to the maximum extent possible, and administration through the States and localities is given preference and priority wherever the State and local authorities wish to take over the responsibility. Where no such arrangements have been made, the Surgeon General is directed to establish committees in each locality to aid in the administration of the program and to assure that the program will be adapted to local needs. Such committees shall include representatives of the insured population, doctors, hospitals, other agencies furnishing service under the program, and other persons informed on the need for, or provision of, health benefits. These provisions assure that there will not be any dictatorship or regimentation under the bill, as some propagandists have implied.

The Surgeon General is directed to establish a National Advisory Policy Council with which he is required to consult on all important questions of policy and administration. Members of this Advisory Council would be appointed from panels of names submitted by professional and other organizations concerned with medical services, education, hospitals, etc. The Advisory Council must also include representatives of the public. The Surgeon General is required to make a full report to the Congress each year on the administration of the program. Such report must include a record of the consultations with the Advisory Council, recommendations of the council, and any comments thereon. Such a report assures that all relevant facts, opinions, recommendations, and actions of the Surgeon General and the Advisory Council will be public information and that the Congress has full information upon which to revise or amend the law. To assure that the Advisory Council will and can meet on its own motion the bill provides that the council shall meet not less frequently than twice a year and whenever at least four members request a meeting. The bill also provides that the council itself and each of its members shall be provided by the Surgeon General with secretarial, clerical, or other assistants. Finally, the council itself may establish special advisory, technical, regional, or local committees or commissions, whose membership may include members of the Advisory Council or other persons or both, to advise upon general or special questions, professional and technical subjects, questions concerning administration, problems affecting regions or localities, and related matters.

The bill specifically provides that all such councils—national and local—are to be only advisory to the appropriate administrative officers. Some medical groups have strongly advocated that the advice of such councils

should be binding upon the administrator; that the national council should have power to veto the action of the administrator; and that the council should approve all regulations before they are issued. Such provisions have not been included in the bill because they are contrary to sound principles of public administration. Such a provision would result in the delegation of public authority to private persons. It would bestow upon private interests the control of the entire program. Only in recent years has it become apparent that adequate medical care is as much a concern to the consumer of medical care—the public—as to the producers and distributors of medical care. The technical and professional aspects of medical or hospital care should be under the constant control and supervision of qualified professional personnel. But sound public policy demands that on other aspects of medical care—such as financial matters and the administration of medical care—the public must have a voice and the controlling interest.

Throughout the bill, there are specific provisions requiring the Surgeon General to consult with the National Advisory Council on particular matters. Thus, section 205 (c) requires that in determining what are specialist or consultant services (for the purpose of higher rates of remuneration to persons rendering such services), the Surgeon General must establish general standards only after consultation with the advisory council. Similarly, in connection with, including any hospital on the list of participating hospitals, section 206 (b) requires that the Surgeon General make his finding of facts and decisions on the status of any hospital in accordance with general standards established only after consultation with the advisory council. In placing any limitations on benefits under section 210 the Surgeon General must also first consult the advisory council.

Moreover, section 204 (b) of the bill specifically states that the Advisory Council shall advise the Surgeon General on—but it is not limited to—the following seven matters:

1. Professional standards of quality to apply to personal health service benefits;

2. Designation of specialists and consultants;

3. Methods and arrangements to stimulate and encourage the attainment of high standards through coordination of the services of general or family practitioners, specialists and consultants, laboratories, and other auxiliary services, and through the coordination of the services of physicians and dentists with those of educational and research institutions, hospitals and public-health centers, and through other useful means;

4. Standards to apply to participating hospitals, to the relations or coordination among hospitals, and to the establishment and maintenance of the list of participating hospitals;

5. Adequate and suitable methods and arrangements of paying for personal health service benefits;

6. Studies and surveys of personal health services and of the quality and adequacy of such services; and

7. Grants-in-aid for professional education and research projects.

The bill places responsibility for the sound administration of the prepaid medical-care program in the hands of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. The office of the Sugeon General is and has been nonpolitical and has developed close and satisfactory relations with State and local health officers and with officials and members of the American Medical Association. By placing responsibility in the hands of a single administrator long versed in medical administration, prompt, efficient, and economical administration of the prepaid medical-care system can be assured.

Some organized medical groups have criticized this provision on the grounds that it centralizes too much authority in one man and that it tends toward medical dictatorship. As I have indicated, I do not think there is any merit to this charge. But if the Congress should come to the conclusion that there is any merit to this criticism, it could place the responsibility for the over-all administration of the program in the hands of a board of say three or five persons, with the possibility of utilizing the Surgeon General as the administrative officer of such a board. If such an arrangement is adopted it should be clear, however, that all or the majority of the members of the board should be full-time public members with no financial or other interest which would be inconsistent with their responsibility for nonpartisan, competent administration in the public interest. Any other arrangements would be contrary to the best interests of the consumers of medical care.

Specific provision is included in the bill for hearings and appeals on any disputed issues between practitioners, hospitals, and covered persons. Specific provision is made for the judicial review of any disputed issues arising under the plan. Here again, the bill establishes adequate protection against any regimentation or dictatorship.

HIGH MEDICAL STANDARDS ENCOURAGED

High standards of medical care are protected and encouraged through incentives for the professional advancement of doctors, postgraduate study, professional education, research, and the availability—regardless of the patient's ability to pay—of consultant and specialist services (including the services of surgeons, internists, psychiatrists, obstetricians, pediatricians, dermatologists, and others, hospital and similar facilities, laboratory services, optometry services, and X-ray services. Provision is made for the addition of dental and home-nursing services as rapidly as practical. The bill is clear in requiring that the arrangements to provide the medical and related services shall be worked out so that they are mutually agreeable to the administrative officers and to those who agree to furnish the services.

The bill contains various provisions to assure that medical benefits will be of the highest quality that can be made available, will promote personal relations between doctor and patient, will emphasize prevention of disease, and will be adapted to the needs and practices of the community, in both rural and urban areas.

The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service—a doctor—would administer the technical and professional aspects of the program. The Surgeon General would also be directed to work out the closest possible coordination between the prepaid medical and hospital services and the public health services of the Federal, State, and local governments.

The Surgeon General and the Social Security Board are directed to make studies and to report to Congress on dental, nursing, or other services not provided under the system, and on services and facilities needed for the care of the chronic sick and for persons afflicted with mental diseases.

The Surgeon General is directed, with the advice of the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, to administer grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions and agencies engaging in research or in undergraduate or postgraduate professional education.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 301 provides for the usual separability clause.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have been very much interested in the statement of the Senator from New York about the bill which he on behalf of himself and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has just introduced. Does the Senator's bill take care of all the people, particularly I have in mind the large group engaged in agriculture and those living in the rural districts?

Mr. WAGNER. It does.

Mr. HILL. In other words, it is all-inclusive?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; it is all-inclusive.

Mr. HILL. The provision for the prepayment of medical costs under the insurance plan would take in everybody.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Murdock
Ball	Hart	Myers
Barkley	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Reed
Buck	Hill	Revercomb
Bushfield	Hoey	Robertson
Butler	Huffman	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Carville	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	La Follette	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Tunnell
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Moore	Wilson
Guffey	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TERMINATION OF RATIONING OF BUTTER, OLEOMARGARINE, FATS, OILS, AND MEATS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I desire to detain the Senate for but a few moments.

On the 8th of November I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 185), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The resolution concludes with the following:

Therefore be it:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meats as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than November 15, 1945.

Mr. President, the date of November 15, of course, has already passed. The

resolution, which was submitted by me, is one of the "whereas" resolutions. It includes a sort of summary of the evidence submitted and the conclusions reached by a subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee at various and sundry hearings on the meats, fats, and oil situation. I shall read the resolution. I might state at the outset that my purpose in referring to the resolution at this time is to explain the reasons for not having called it up for consideration before November 15, and further to ask that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because the resolution does not ask anything of the Office of Price Administration. It asks that the Department of Agriculture be directed to require OPA to cease the rationing.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is not asking for consideration of the resolution at this time?

Mr. STEWART. No; I would not do that, of course. All I shall ask at this time is that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I may say further at the outset that I have already mentioned this matter to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who appears not to be in the Chamber at the moment though he was here a few minutes ago, and he advises me he has no objection to such a request.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the United States military services and other Government agencies have recently released for public consumption in the United States 100,000,000 pounds of high quality creamery butter; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to sell 8,000,000 pounds of creamery butter in foreign markets; and

Whereas 100,000,000 pounds of creamery butter added to current commercial stocks and expected production during November and December 1945 will provide at least 150,000,000 pounds of creamery butter for each such month; and

Whereas 150,000,000 pounds a month is more than enough to provide for all unrestricted domestic civilian consumption of high quality creamery butter during November and December and provide for an adequate year end carry-over; and

Whereas the production of butter begins to increase in December, due to seasonal factors, and continues to increase monthly for the ensuing 6 months; and

Whereas civilians will have the entire United States butter production available for their use during 1946, with the exception of very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas oleomargarine, which is used for the same purpose, is in surplus supply; and

Whereas there will continue to be sufficient fats and oils available to produce supplies of oleomargarine equal to the demand for it; and

Whereas the current civilian allocation of other fats and oils, including lard, is at the highest rate since the initiation of fats and oils rationing; and

Whereas shortening, salad and cooking oils are being produced in quantities greater than at any time since regulations were imposed and in quantities greater than those produced prior to the war; and

Whereas the supply of raw materials needed to produce shortening, salad and cooking oils will continue to be sufficient to maintain this production; and

Whereas the production of lard, one of the chief fats and oils, will be substantially increased beginning not later than November 1, due to the seasonal increase in hog slaughter; and

Whereas the availability of supply is now sufficient to provide as much fats and oils as has ever before been consumed in this country during a peacetime period; and

Whereas the total domestic production of fats and oils, including lard, during 1946 will be available for civilian consumption, except for very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas meat supplies in the United States at the present time are admittedly available at the annual rate of 159 pounds per capita and will continue to be available at this rate for the remainder of the year; and

Whereas meat supplies in this quantity are greater than were ever before available in the United States during any prewar period; and

Whereas meat supplies will be available during 1946 at a rate far in excess of the quantity consumed at any previous time; and

Whereas the supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese are abundant; and

Whereas the military has ceased purchasing poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese; and

Whereas the large supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese will supplement the supplies of meat available for civilian consumption in the United States; and

Whereas the continuation of rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat is causing hoarding, maldistribution, and disruption of normal marketing; and

Whereas the expense of continuing rationing is no longer warranted; and

Whereas industry is capable of reestablishing normal distribution of these commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than November 15, 1945.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to amend the resolution by changing the date from November 15 to December 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I correctly understand that the Senator is now submitting a new resolution?

Mr. STEWART. No, Mr. President. This is a resolution which I submitted on the 8th of this month, in which I asked for the discontinuance of rationing of the products referred to in it at a date not later than November 15, 1945. That date has now passed. That is the reason I ask to amend the resolution. It is the same resolution which I submitted on the 8th of November. As I stated, it is one of the "whereas" resolutions. The whereases constitute a summary of the evidence and conclusions reached by the Small Business Subcommittee, of which I was chairman, as a result of numerous hearings we have held this fall on the subject.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Because the OPA was involved.

Mr. STEWART. I assume that was the reason.

Mr. MURDOCK. I now understand the Senator is asking unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. STEWART. I am going to propound such a request, that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because the resolution asks that the Department of Agriculture be required to direct the OPA to discontinue rationing. I understand that the OPA has no further control over rationing, except under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. So I believe that the resolution was improperly referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I think the Senator from Utah was in the Chamber when I stated that I had discussed this question with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and that he agreed with me that the resolution had been improperly referred. At least, he said he would have no objection to the request which I intend to propound in a moment. Before propounding the request I wish to say a word or two about the resolution.

From time to time for the past 3 or 4 months we have been holding hearings upon complaints of small packers, individuals, and others interested in industries which might be affected by any decision relating to meats, fats, oils, and so forth. A great many questions, and many phases of the problem were considered. The Senate Small Business Committee, the group which has listened to the hearings, as well as the staff of the committee, has become definitely convinced that the time for the lifting of rationing is here. We feel that there is absolutely a surplus of meat, as well as a surplus of practically all kinds of fats and oils. The only question which may arise at the moment in that connection is as to whether there is an adequate supply of lard and certain pork products. We are told, and the evidence before the committee in the last hearing, approximately 2 weeks ago, was conclusive in the opinion of the experts, that after the first of the year, or between the 1st of December and the first of the year, there will not be a shortage of pork products of any kind, because of the expected increase in the supply of hogs. The accuracy of that view is daily being demonstrated, so we are advised, since the hearing was held. Therefore I think it is but fair to the American public that the rationing of all meat products, as well as fats and oils of all kinds, including butter and oleomargarine, be completely lifted.

On one occasion we were told at the hearings that it was possible that an order to that effect would be made, lifting the rationing by the 1st of November. That was early in the fall. Now we understand that it is to be postponed until the first of the year. That is information which has come more or less indirectly from the Department of Agriculture. But certainly we have an adequate supply of every single item which is needed in the case of practically every one of the fats, oils, and meats referred to in the resolution. Very definitely we have a decided oversupply of butter, and of meat of practically every kind.

All these commodities are purchased with red rationing points. The same kind of points used to purchase a beef roast are used to purchase a pound of butter. I understand they are called red points. So all these products are in the same category. An oversupply of one balances a short supply of the other to a certain extent. We have now reached the point where we have an oversupply of practically all of them.

We learned at the hearings that the southern part of the country consumes a much larger amount per capita of fats, butter, lard, and oils than does any other section of the country. The average per capita consumption is between 48 and 50 pounds throughout the entire Nation, but in the southern part of the country, where many coal mines are located and where cotton and other crops are industriously cultivated in the hot season of the year, the people consume an average of approximately 100 pounds a person, which is about twice the national average. Naturally, therefore, this summer and fall there was a great shortage of fats and oils in the southern area of the United States, and we had considerable difficulty in having adjustments made; but fortunately after 3 or 4 weeks we were able to have sent into that section at least a temporarily adequate supply of fats and oils.

It is our belief that if rationing on fats and oils and meats can be lifted, the problem will naturally adjust itself within a reasonably short time. With a large oversupply of every one of the products mentioned in the resolution, I think it is but right and proper that the order which the resolution proposes should be issued.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has not yet returned to the Chamber. I think perhaps he is at lunch. However, he stated to me that he would have no objection to my request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 185, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

A CONSTRUCTIVE WOOL POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this morning the Special Committee of the Senate on the Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool began hearings which it is hoped may result in the development of a constructive wool policy by the Congress and the executive branch of the Government. At those hearings I made an opening statement to which I should like to invite the attention of Members of Congress, as well as others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask that this statement, entitled "Wanted, a Constructive Wool Policy for the United States," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States is without a wool policy. Although it is the world's best market for wool, it produces less than it consumes. Its domestic producers of wool are unable to enter the market with the slightest confidence because exporting countries which consume far less than they produce pursue a very positive policy intended to capture the American market.

The three principal exporters of wool are the British Dominions, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Of these South Africa in the period before the war consumed practically none of its wool, New Zealand less than 3 percent, and Australia scarcely 7 percent. Among them they will have, in the postwar period, an estimated exportable surplus of 1,440,000,000 pounds, which, when added to the accumulated stocks now on hand, will mean a total surplus of almost 4,500,000,000 pounds in world trade.

During the war the consumption of wool in the United States has been doubled because we have produced here unexpectedly large amounts of both military and civilian woolens. Importations which in 1942 amounted to 60 percent of the total amount of wool consumed by the United States mills had risen in August of this year to 88 percent. Meanwhile, there has been accumulated in the United States a stock pile of British owned wool amounting now to 286,000,000 pounds which, when added to the United Kingdom and Dominion stocks, makes a total of 3,601,000,000 pounds.

Unless a positive program is developed to stimulate the utilization of wool the prospects for consuming this tremendous surplus are not bright with consequent disadvantageous effects on the domestic producers.

The industrial plants of Germany have been practically destroyed and while it is reported that textile mills in France and Belgium have not been seriously damaged, there is little likelihood that these countries can be expected rapidly to resume even their prewar consumption. Thus the burden of wool consumption is thrown on the United States. Here, however, with the demand for military uniforms at an end, the market for wool will be measured largely by civilian consumption.

The loyalty of the British Dominions to the mother country is easily understood when one considers the leadership which the Government of the United Kingdom is providing the Dominions in planning for the disposal of their huge surpluses. Representatives of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa met in London early this year to confer with representatives of the United Kingdom to devise a plan by which British stocks and the future clips may be sold in such manner as to protect the producer from loss. The British Government has constituted itself a highly able and successful salesman for the wool producers of its Dominions. It is the hope of American wool producers that their Government will not be less jealous of their interests than the United Kingdom is of the interests of the producers of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

It is true that during the war the Commodity Credit Corporation has from year to year purchased the domestic clip in this country at ceiling prices. This policy has been beneficial, but it has existed only on a year-to-year basis and to date there is no indication of what the future program is likely to be.

It is true also that when, at the beginning of the war, this Government undertook to permit the United Kingdom to establish a stock pile of wool in the United States it effected an agreement that the wool should not be sold in the United States until the United States and Great Britain had agreed upon the conditions of sale, one of which would be the payment of the tariff duty. This agreement has been respected, but it is one of the major objectives of British policy to dispose of the United Kingdom stock pile in this country as soon as it can be done.

Two other aspects of Government policy toward United States production are not quite so satisfactory. Ceiling prices on wool have been held down in the face of increased costs of production while, in the public-lands States, grazing authorities of both the Department of Agriculture, through the United States Forest Service, and the Department of the Interior, through the Grazing Service, have indicated a positive desire to increase the fees paid by producers for grazing upon the forest reserves and the grazing districts. The net result of this uncertain, not to say contradictory Government policy, has been an accelerating liquidation of domestic flocks. It is now estimated that the 1946 clip in the United States will not be more than 300,000,000 pounds as against a normal prewar clip of approximately 450,000,000 pounds. The numbers of breeding sheep in the United States have declined approximatly 25 percent since 1942.

It is thus evident that the time has come for Congress and the executive arm of this Government to develop a constructive policy with respect to wool. We cannot be less considerate of the American producers than our British cousins are of the Dominion producers. It would seem that this is the appropriate time for the Government of the United States to announce such a policy, for the terms and conditions of an American loan to Great Britain of large proportions are now under active consideration by the representatives of the two governments.

This special Senate committee, recognizing the importance of the problem, has invited not only the representatives of Government agencies which have jurisdiction over matters affecting the wool industry, but the representatives of all branches of the domestic wool industry to assemble here to give consideration to the development of a constructive United States policy. One thing seems to be clear, namely, that in the face of a world surplus of wool our greatest need is to seek ways and means of expanding the market. It is by finding broader uses of wool, that is to say, by increased consumption, that we can best attack the disposal of the huge surplus. The British conferees who worked out the British wool program have estimated that it will take 13 years from June 30, 1945, to eliminate the present stock.

Wherever we turn we are confronted with surpluses, whether it be with respect to war facility plants built by this Government to supply the United Nations with the materials of war or agricultural commodities like wool. Heretofore we have attacked this problem by the restriction of production if not by the actual destruction of the commodities themselves and this has been done in the face of the acknowledged fact that by far the great majority of the people of the world are still unable to purchase the commodities which they need to maintain a decent standard of living. The State Department in its negotiations with foreign

countries may well consider ways and means of urging foreign governments to stimulate living standards abroad so that the United States will not be called upon to continue to absorb world surpluses to the disadvantage of American producers.

The question, however, is presented not only to Government, but also to industry, what can be done to increase the consumption? What can be done to make it possible for people here and everywhere to secure and use more of the commodities which we are so clearly capable of producing?

What can the manufacturers of woolens do to promote the use of wool and particularly what can American manufacturers do to help the American producer stabilize his market at a level that will enable him to meet the cost of production? What can the wool trade do to promote this objective? By the suggestions which are offered here before this Senate committee and the assembled representatives of Government it surely will be possible to develop an American wool policy.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the distinction between the committee amendment and the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I offered last Friday.

The committee amendment was prepared on the theory that very limited power should be given to the President, within certain well-defined channels and with a number of exceptions, to present a reorganization plan to the Congress for its action. The committee amendment also provided that after a period of 60 days, if the plan were not vetoed, by concurrent resolution of both Houses, it would become law. Objection was made to the committee amendment from two different standpoints, and it was because of those objections that I offered my amendment as a substitute, in order to meet all the objections which have been made to the committee amendment.

My substitute simply provides that the President shall submit a reorganization plan, and it limits him in no way as to the field he shall cover or the executive departments he shall include, and on the other hand, in order to make the procedure constitutional and to preserve our congressional legislative power, it provides that such a plan, in order to go into effect and to become law, must have the affirmative approval of Congress by means of a joint resolution passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

That, briefly stated, is the alternate plan which, if adopted, will save us all the confusion which now has been brought about by the committee proposal with all the exceptions and amendments which have been offered and all the endeavors which have been made to curtail the President's initiative, and to surround him with all sorts of limitations and difficulties in proposing his program. At the same time, my substitute also obviates the constitutional objection, namely, that legislation cannot be enacted without the affirmative action of both Houses of Congress. It seems to me that if the Members of the Senate will recognize the simplicity of the substitute proposal and adopt it, it will be possible to move immediately in the direction of a worth-while reorganization plan, and bring about expenditious action upon it.

It has been suggested to me today, Mr. President, that there are two objections to my plan. One is that my proposal specifies no date before which the President shall submit his plan. If an amendment providing for a deadline when the President shall submit his plan is offered, I shall be very glad to have it included in my amendment. The other suggestion is that my substitute fails to provide a way by which the reorganization plan, after it has been submitted to the Congress by the President and has been referred to a committee, shall automatically get out of the committee, in the event it becomes buried there. I shall be very glad to have that point taken care of by providing that after a certain number of days a plan which has been referred to a committee shall automatically be returned to the Senate.

In brief, Mr. President, my amendment in the nature of a substitute provides, first, that the Congress shall approve a reorganization plan submitted by the President by regular constitutional process, involving positive legislative action taken by both Houses of Congress; and, above all, my plan will give the President a free hand to tell the Congress exactly how he believes the executive branch of Government should be reorganized. That is the difference between the committee plan and the plan I have proposed.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator from New Jersey contend that the President does not now have the right to submit to Congress such a reorganization plan, without having the Congress take any action at this time?

Mr. SMITH. That point was raised Friday. Of course, the President does have the right to submit a reorganization plan at this time, but we all realize that over a period of years no President has done so.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator's proposal would give the President additional authority in that respect; would it?

Mr. SMITH. My substitute would call upon the President from time to time to determine whether reorganization in the executive branch of Government is necessary and, if it is found to be necessary, to submit a reorganization plan to the Congress.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; and it would leave the country where it now is; would it not?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not think it would leave the country where it now is, because it calls upon the President to submit a plan to the Congress, and in title II provides special machinery whereby the House of Representatives and the Senate can expedite action on the plan, whereas under the usual procedure there would be all the ordinary delays incident to the enactment of legislation.

I am convinced that my substitute proposal will result in securing reorganization under a plan submitted by the President. Without the adoption of my proposal, I think no such reorganization would be secured.

Mr. President, I believe the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Morse
Ball	Hart	Murdock
Barkley	Hatch	Myers
Bilbo	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Buck	Hill	Reed
Butler	Hoey	Revercomb
Byrd	Huffman	Robertson
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Chavez	Knowland	Smith
Connally	La Follette	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Tunnell
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Fulbright	McMahon	Walsh
George	Maybank	White
Gerry	Mead	Wiley
Green	Mitchell	Wilson
Guffey	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as I am compelled to attend a hearing at 2 o'clock, and may not be able to vote on the pending amendment, I wish to express briefly my views with reference to it.

I am opposed to any amendment which requires affirmative action on the part of Congress, by joint resolution or otherwise, before any reorganization ordered by the President may take effect. I would vote for an amendment which would eliminate all exemptions from the pending bill and leave the matter entirely to the President. I would do that no matter who the President might be, because I think we can trust any man who has been elected President of the United States, or who becomes President under our constitutional processes, to have the interest of the country at heart. I think that we can also trust him to have more inside information with reference to the workings of the various departments than we can have as Members of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have only a minute in which to complete what I wish to say, if the Senator will permit me to conclude my statement.

Mr. President, what I have said was without any reflection upon the Congress, because in the very nature of things the President must be more intimately associated with the departments over which he presides as Chief Executive than are we, the Members of Congress.

I feel that if the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] were agreed to it would take us right back to the original proposition that Congress should reorganize the Government. I do not believe that Congress either will or can reorganize the Government. If it had the time to devote a whole session to the subject, without being burdened by any other considerations, it might be able to perform the task. But with all the multitude of duties which burden us and which are on our doorsteps all the time, it is impossible for Congress to reorganize the departments of Government.

I was a member of a special committee on reorganization which was appointed in 1939, of which the former Senator from South Carolina, now the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, was the chairman. As a result of our hearings and our deliberations in connection with the reorganization of the Government, temporary and partial reorganization legislation was enacted. In am convinced that the only way to reorganize effectively the Government is to authorize the President, who is the head of all the departments of the Government, to do so. If he does so in a way which Congress does not approve, then Congress, by joint resolution, should have the right to disapprove. I understand that to be the proposal contained in the pending bill if the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is not adopted. Therefore, while I would vote for an amendment offered by any Senator to eliminate all exemptions—even those contained in the House bill—from the proposed legislation, inasmuch as the pending amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is coupled with the provision that any plan for reorganization which the President may submit must be affirmatively approved by a joint resolution of the two Houses before it can become effective, I am compelled to register my opposition to it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to point out to the Senator that according to the bill which he is supporting, which provides that the President may submit a plan the rejection of which would require a resolution of both Houses, the President and one House alone could put a plan into effect even if every Member of the Senate objected to it. I feel that that is unconstitutional, entirely aside from the unwise policy involved. I agree fully with the Senator that the President is the one who should propose a reorganization plan, and that is why I have eliminated, through my amendment, every restriction which might be placed upon him. He would be free to tell us what kind of a plan he wants, but I insist that after the plan has been presented it should be within our constitutional power to say whether we will make it law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator's attitude. I do not impugn his good faith in any way. I am sure the Senator is sincere.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not troubled about any suggested inhibitions because I think Congress has the power, under the Constitution, to authorize the President, or any agency which it may designate, to work out a reorganization of the Government departments. Congress created all of those departments in a rather haphazard way. It established them one at a time, and frequently without regard to coordination. Because of that fact we now have the topsy-turvy system about which we all complain constantly and about which we apparently are not willing to authorize anyone to do anything unless we reserve to ourselves the right to undo it by affirmative legislation. I do not believe in that method.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I shall have to leave the Chamber very shortly.

Mr. SMITH. Is the Senator willing to accept the bill in the form in which it was reported by the committee, providing that if either House objects within the prescribed period——

Mr. BARKLEY. No; personally I would not accept it because I do not think we can legislate by a single House of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. But we are legislating by a single House when we allow one House and the President to put into effect a plan.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; we are not legislating in that way. We are providing that once the President prepares a reorganization plan and submits it to Congress, unless Congress by appropriate legislation—and that means the action of both Houses—shall disapprove it, the plan shall go into effect.

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry to disagree with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the logical constitutional method by which the Congress can declare its attitude with respect to the matter.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I am now compelled to leave.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as a substitute for the committee amendment as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. SALTONSTALL's name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] because of a temporary and slight illness. I am authorized to say that if present he would vote "yea" on the pending amendment.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BUTLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and vote "yea."

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who was in the Chamber a while ago, and I assumed he was still here. I see he is not now present. I therefore transfer the pair which I have with him to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Caroline [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are detained at a meeting of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho. The Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—25

Austin	Hickenlooper	Smith
Ball	Knowland	Taft
Bridges	La Follette	Tydings
Butler	Moore	Vandenberg
Capper	Morse	White
Cordon	Reed	Wiley
Donnell	Revercomb	Wilson
Gurney	Robertson	
Hart	Shipstead	

NAYS—40

Barkley	Guffey	Maybank
Bilbo	Hatch	Mead
Buck	Hayden	Mitchell
Byrd	Hill	Murdock
Carville	Hoey	Myers
Chavez	Huffman	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Downey	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Eastland	Lucas	Taylor
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Tunnell
George	McFarland	Walsh
Gerry	McKellar	
Green	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—29

Aiken	Glass	Saltonstall
Andrews	Hawkes	Stewart
Bailey	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Bankhead	Langer	Tobey
Brewster	Magnuson	Wagner
Briggs	Millikin	Wheeler
Brooks	Murray	Wherry
Bushfield	O'Daniel	Willis
Capehart	Overton	Young
Ferguson	Pepper	

So Mr. SMITH's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MITCHELL in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out "is hereby repealed", and insert "is hereby amended by striking out the words 'upon the termination of this title' and inserting the words 'on July 1, 1947.'"

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer this amendment in behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who is unable to be present.

On the 18th page of the bill appears this cryptic sentence:

SEC. 8. The second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), being the last sentence of the said title I, is hereby repealed.

Turning to the First War Powers Act, we find that we gave the President power to reorganize departments, with some limitations, without any reference to Congress whatsoever. The President has exercised that power throughout the war. Under the First War Powers Act it is provided that at the expiration of war all the departments in which changes have been made shall go back to the condition in which they were before the war.

The effect of the proposed section 8 is to provide that the changes made shall continue forever, although never submitted to the Congress. The effect of my amendment is to provide that they shall continue until July 1, 1947, the last date upon which the President may act under the proposed law. In other words, he will have full opportunity to submit a reorganization plan making the changes permanent if he wishes to do so, and then Congress will have a chance to veto the plan if it desires to do so.

Mr. President, it seems to me this is a reasonable way in which to handle the matter. Many of the changes in the Government set-up were made solely for war purposes. We granted the President the power only with the idea that they should be made for war purposes. It seems to me that now it is proper for us to say that the President may make the changes permanent, under the proposed reorganization law, if he wishes to do so, but if he does not do so by the 1st of July 1947, when his powers under the proposed law will expire, the departments shall revert to their prewar status.

I hope the Senator in charge of the bill may feel that this is a reasonble method of handling the situation. It seems to me we did not intend to make the war changes permanent changes in the Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it seems to me the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is strictly in line with the philosophy of the bill. I agree that the changes in organization of the executive departments which have been made under the First War Powers Act would become permanent, under the language of the bill, without ever being referred back to the Congress. Under the amendment now offered by the Senator from Ohio proposed changes would be referred back to the Congress, and the time would be identical with the time provided in the pending bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wanted to ask the Senator from Utah if it is not correct to say that there was no intention in the committee to take affirmative action to make these war agencies permanent. There was the the intention to bring them within the general reorganization plan. Is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. HATCH. And there is then no conflict between the intention of the committee and the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I can find no objection at all to the amendment and, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to have it go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and for myself I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, beginning on page 19, line 15, it is proposed to strike out all down to the end of the bill and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. The committee shall have 10 days in which to consider and report out the resolution. If the resolution is not reported out by the committee within such 10 days, the committee shall be deemed to have been discharged from the further consideration of the resolution. On the eleventh day after the referral to the committee of the resolution, it shall become the special order with precedence over any unfinished business. Not later than 1 hour after the House in which such resolution is pending meets on the first day on which it meets following the nineteenth day (Sundays excepted) after the day on which the resolution was introduced, a vote shall be taken in that House on the question of the adoption of the resolution. The resolution shall be debatable up to the time specified above for the taking of the vote, and the time shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No notice or motion to reconsider any vote upon the resolution shall be in order. The procedure provided by this section shall not be applicable with respect to a second resolution relating to the same reorganization plan. In any case in which two or more resolutions with respect to the same reorganization plan are introduced in the same House on the same day, only one resolution with respect to such reorganization plan shall be deemed to have been introduced in that House on that day and such one resolution shall be considered to have been introduced jointly by the sponsors of the separate resolutions relating to such reorganization plan.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, just a word respecting this substitute in title II covering procedure. Briefly stated, if the veto resolution is sent to a committee, the amendment simply makes it automatic that the resolution shall come back to the Senate floor, so that it cannot be buried in committee. The danger in this type of legislation is that a resolution may be buried in committee, and the President's reorganization plan may become law without action by either House. The resolution at least should come back to the floor without having to be voted out of committee. The amendment simply deals with a question of procedure, which the Senator from Michigan and I thought should be embodied in negative legislation of this type. If the President presents a plan, then within 60 days after the plan is presented it goes into effect should there be no action by either House. The danger is that the plan might be buried in committee with no chance for either House to vote. The amendment deals with the question of

procedure. It would simply bring the resolution back on the floor automatically. That is what we are proposing by the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, while the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] contains automatic features, and may in some respects be preferable to the procedure provided for in the bill, it is my opinion that the amendment has not been thoroughly thought out, and it is subject in my humble opinion to considerable criticism from that angle.

I point out one thing in particular. Let us suppose that at the expiration of the 10 days the resolution automatically comes from the committee. The amendment provides that it shall then become the pending business before the House or Senate and shall be debatable for 10 days. The 10-day period is to be divided, as I understand, equally between the opposing parties. But there is nothing in the amendment at all that would preclude extraneous debate entering into the picture and excluding entirely debate on the resolution which would be before the Senate. The present method of procedure was worked out in the 1939 act, and has been found to operate quite efficiently, and the House has agreed to it. It does much less violence to the rules of the two Houses than the proposed amendment, and in my opinion it would be a mistake for the Senate hurriedly to adopt the amendment instead of adopting the language of the pending bill. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah a question, and at the same time to compliment him on the very able way in which he has handled the pending legislation. I ask the Senator to turn to the bottom of page 11. Section 2 on page 10 provides:

> No reorganization plan under section 4 shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

Then at the bottom of page 11—

> (h) divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions; or

And at the top of page 12:

> (i) increasing the term of any office beyond that now provided by law for such office.

I was wondering if the Senator could tell us what changes that language would effect. It seems to me that is a more or less wholesale exemption of any agencies that perform quasi-judicial functions, or are engaged in investigative or rule-making functions, which is, as I see it, a very broad latitude.

Mr. MURDOCK. The thought of the Senate committee, I may inform the Senator, was that any quasi-judicial agency in exercising quasi-judicial functions or rule-making functions should be absolutely independent of, say, a Cabinet officer. The purpose of the committee was that in the event a quasi-judicial agency which is now independent should be placed under a Cabinet officer, notwithstanding that fact the Cabinet officer should in no way interfere with the absolute independence of the quasi-judicial functions or the rule-making functions of such agency.

Mr. President, if subparagraph (h) of section 2 is left in the bill I believe there is a possibility in conference to make the language more definitive, to restrict its meaning, so that it will not have the broad scope it has now, and that we may be able to rewrite subparagraph (h) in such a way that some of the exemptions, or many of them, may be eliminated from the bill, and that full protection may be afforded under the language that may be developed in conference.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the interpretation of the Senator, then, that any agency engaged in quasi-judicial investigative or rule-making functions is exempted from the bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I do not think that is a fair construction of the language. It may be well to read it.

Mr. BYRD. It seems to me that the provision could be couched in more appropriate language. It seems to me to be ambiguous.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us take the Department of Agriculture. We find in that Department the Forest Service, which certainly could be defined under this language as a quasi-judicial agency. In the Department of the Interior we find the General Land Office, which is constantly rendering quasi-judicial decisions respecting land matters.

Mr. BYRD. Suppose the President wanted to recommend the abolition of an office. Let us take the OPA. That is certainly a quasi-judicial agency in the making of all kinds of decisions. The language is:

> Divesting any quasi-judicial agency.

If the OPA is abolished it would certainly be divested of the right of doing these things.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the abolition of an agency would not be precluded by this language.

Mr. BYRD. Could not the Senator, who is a very able lawyer——

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Draft a provision which would be clearer? I hesitate to vote for the bill if there is a possibility that that provision would exempt a great number of agencies, because nearly all the agencies of the Government make rules and regulations and have the power of investigation, and so forth. I have a list of such agencies given to me by the Bureau of the Budget. It construes the language to mean that quite a number of agencies would be exempted from the bill if passed in its present form.

Mr. MURDOCK. I doubt that the language is sufficient to exempt an agency. The whole purpose of it is to protect an agency in its independence of functions, so far as quasi-judicial functions and rule making are concerned.

Mr. BYRD. I have no desire to protect these bureaus in the matter of authority which they have frequently usurped and taken to themselves with respect to making rules and regulations. That is something in which there has been a great abuse. I do not want to disturb the Senator by offering an amendment, but I do think there ought to be some way to clarify that provision.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that the language is now too broad in scope, and I am hopeful of improving and correcting it in conference; but I may say to him that I am not ready at this time intelligently to deal with the question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to comment briefly on the amendment, because the question arose at a time when I was present in the subcommittee. It was explained by the chairman of the committee [Mr. MCCARRAN] in this way, as I recall it—and I am sure that this is the interpretation which I obtained at the time as to what was intended by the amendment

First of all, it was not intended to curtail to any degree whatever the President's power to reorganize the agencies as contemplated by the bill. He could abolish functions and make the reorganization just the same as though the amendment were not in the law. But it was intended that with respect to any such agencies as remained which exercised discretion and judgment, there should be nothing in the plan which would permit any interference with the independent exercise of the discretion and judgment vested in them by law. Frankly, I do not see how a reorganization plan could contain such a thing.

Mr. BYRD. Mr, President, the Senator from New Mexico is satisfied with the provision. I am not a member of the committee, and did not hear the argument, but it seems to me that there is a loophole by which many agencies might claim exemption from the Reorganization Act.

Mr. HATCH. I was satisfied with the explanation.

Mr. BYRD. But the explanation is not in the bill. We are voting on certain specified language. The Senator is an able lawyer, and I should like to have him read it and see whether he thinks it exempts quite a number of agencies which are now performing various quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions.

Mr. HATCH. I do not think it exempts them, but I say that if there is any doubt whatever, I join with the Senator from Utah in saying that the language should be clarified, and it should be made certain that it is not intended as an exemption of all agencies.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Utah and the Senator from New Mexico are

taking a great interest in this subject. Apparently they are satisfied that the language can be changed in conference so as to make it do what it is intended to do.

Mr. HATCH. I am sure it can.

Mr. MURDOCK. I feel that it can.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Dallas, Tex., signed by several bankers. I should like to read it. It is as follows:

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator From Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It has been called to our attention that the President under the bill which has just passed the House would have the power to abolish the Comptroller's office. This in our opinion would be a very serious mistake. It would place the examination of banks under the Federal Reserve Banking System which would place that institution in a dual position. In a crisis who would they protect, the Federal or the public? The Comptroller's office does not cost the Government anything. The expenses are paid by the banks of this Nation. The Comptroller's office is the only independent agency to which the banks of the country can turn for advice. We hope that when this bill is presented to the Senate that you will so amend it that the President will not have the power to place the banking system of this Nation into politics or destroy the only avenue of the country banks of this Nation. The Comptroller's office reports only to the President of the United States, therefore it is the only independent agency now in force open to the country banks of this Nation.

NATHAN ADAMS.
J. B. ADOUE, Jr.
FRED F. FLORENCE.
P. B. GARRETT.
DE WITT T. RAY.
J. C. TENISON.
R. L. THORNTON.

Mr. President, I should like to see the reorganization bill go to the President with no exemptions whatever, permitting the President to reorganize the executive branch of the Government and submit his reorganization plan to both Houses of Congress for ratification, or rejection. But inasmuch as the bill now contains exemptions for 13 or 14 different agencies, and inasmuch as these bankers in Dallas, Tex., seem worried about the authority granted by the bill to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, unless I can have some assurance from those who are handling the bill that the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency is not to be abolished in the reorganization, I should like to include that agency in the exemptions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, does the Senator propound the question to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I propound the question to the able Senator from Utah as to whether or not, in his opinion, there is any possibility of abolishing the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, the Senator from Utah is not in a position to say what the President of the United States may do. But, in my opinion, the President of the United States, coming from a small town himself, is going to guard just as jealously as any Senator or any Member of the House against anything that would interfere with our country banks.

We have in the Government today the Federal Reserve System, handling banks. We have the Comptroller of the Currency hanrling certain functions in connection with our banks. We have the Treasury Department handling certain other functions, and we have the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation handling still other functions. It is my opinion that, if there is any part of our Government which needs looking into for the purpose of coordination and reorganization, it is the agencies which handle our banking system. A representative of the FDIC, in the person of Mr. Crowley, appeared before our committee and made the same plea. He said, "If you do not exempt us, you will destroy the small banks of the country." Now we have the same argument used with respect to the Comptroller of the Currency. It is all done in behalf of the small banks.

I come from a small town and all I know about banks is what I know about country banks. Certainly I do not wish to do anything which would in any way interfere with or imperil those banks. I am satisfied that the President of the United States does not wish to injure them in any way. So my answer to the Senator is that, even without exempting the Comptroller of the Currency, we can rest assured that nothing will happen under the present Chief Executive which will in any way be injurious to the country banks. I hope that the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency will not be exempted. It is my opinion that there is plenty of room for coordination and reorganization in the agencies which handle our banks. But if we eliminate all of them, we go down the road with five different agencies of the Government, all handling banks, all of which, except the Federal Reserve System, would be exempt so far as the reorganization bill is concerned.

Mr. O'DANIEL. As I understand, the Comptroller of the Currency handles not only the small banks of the Nation but audits the larger banks, the national banks.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true, but I understood that the Senator's argument came from those speaking on behalf of the smaller banks.

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; they are speaking for the larger banks of the Nation. They do not desire a consolidation of governmental agencies when their interests are opposed to it. The Federal Reserve System is one agency. The Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency is an entire different agency, which audits the national banks of the Nation. It would be a serious thing, as they view it, if the auditing of the records of national banks were taken away from this independent agency in the Treasury Department and placed in the Federal Reserve System. The bill as now written would make that possible. The President could do it, and in all good conscience he might think it was the thing to do. So these bankers are worried.

Mr. MURDOCK. The bankers appeared before our committee. Mr. Crowley appeared in behalf of the FDIC. As a matter of the utmost caution the committee saw fit to exempt the FDIC; but it was my opinion that the argument made for the FDIC was a much better one than could be made for the exemption of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. It is my opinion that in any reorganization or coordination of agencies dealing with the banks we should not exempt all those agencies and permit them to go down the road just as they are today.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am compelled to leave the Chamber to attend a committee meeting in a few moments.

Something which was said by the Senator from Utah impels me to leave this comment on the RECORD: The Senator from Utah has just stated that he thinks there is a better argument for exempting the FDIC than for exempting the other fiscal instrumentalities. I agree with him, and urge that no matter what happens, the FDIC should retain its exemption. I feel that even though no other bureau or agency were exempted, the FDIC ought to be exempted at the present time. In the final analysis, that is the steel beam underneath the popular confidence in our banking system. There is no doubt in the world that it was the FDIC which made it possible for us to sail through the past 10 difficult years without serious banking trouble. The American people are sleeping at nights in regard to their banks. Why? Primarily and fundamentally because of the FDIC.

Mr. President, I think it would be a tragic error to allow anything to be done with the FDIC which might even involve a discussion of what was going on in respect to a change in its set-up. We all know that it has been magnificently operated. It has been brought to the point where it has assets approximating $1,000,000,000. It is economically managed. There is no necessity to worry about it from a reorganization standpoint; but fundamentally there would be reason to worry about any invitation to the American people to begin suspecting that anyone was starting to change in some fashion the set-up of the FDIC.

I thank the Senator from Texas for permitting me to make this suggestion. I hope that in the course of the discussion of the fiscal agencies and reorganization no one for an instant will think of even approaching a suggestion that the exemption of the FDIC shall not be maintained.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to make a brief reply to the Senator from Michigan. I have known of the distinguished Senator's intense interest in the FDIC ever since I came to the Senate. I wish to say now that there is nothing which the Democratic administration, of which I have been a member, has done that I am prouder of than the enactment of legislation relating to our banks. As the Senator has stated, I think the out-

standing achievement in banking legislation has been the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. As the Senator has so eloquently stated, under the FDIC system the people are not worrying any more about the possibility of bank failures. So far as I recall, in the committee there was no opposition to having the FDIC exempted.

However, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve System, and the Treasury all have a hand in the examination and control of our banking system, and it seems to me we should not absolutely tie the President's hands in dealing with that situation. When we have exempted the FDIC, I think we have gone far enough.

Therefore, I hope the Senator from Texas will not offer his amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I also must leave the Chamber, in order to attend a committee meeting. I have asked the Senator to yield to me because I also have received messages and telegrams concerning the exemption of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. In one of the messages the Senator from Texas read there was a statement similar to one contained in a message I have received, namely, that this bill in itself does not transfer the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Federal Reserve System. The idea seems to prevail generally throughout the country that the bill itself will make that change. I arise now merely to state for the RECORD that there is nothing in the bill which will make any change in regard to the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. So far as I know, it may or may not be that some persons think that Bureau should be under the Federal Reserve System; but I am quite sure that nothing in the bill would require such a change.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Of course, Mr. President, the measure under consideration certainly gives the President of the United States the authority to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. In the opinion of the bankers who have telegraphed me and in the opinion of other bankers, the abolition of that Bureau would indeed be a calamity. If the national banks of the country were placed entirely under the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve System, there would be no checks or balances; it would all be the Federal Reserve System.

I am wholly in accord with the statements which have been made here by the able and distinguished Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Utah regarding the exclusion of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. If any agencies are excluded I think it is wise to exclude that agency from the reorganization plan, because it has certainly performed a worthwhile function in assuring the small depositors that their deposits are safe. But that assurance applies only to deposits of $5,000 or less. There is no guaranty by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for deposits of more than $5,000. Many depositors have deposits exceeding $5,000, and they must be able to have confidence in someone or some agency with reference to the security of those larger accounts. They place that confidence in the national banks which hold their deposits. The national banks have a very good reputation. While they do not actually guarantee deposits in excess of $5,000, their standing is such that in large measure they occupy the same position as that of the FDIC in guaranteeing the smaller deposits. I repeat, the people have confidence in the national banks of this country, and that confidence may be shaken if the Bureau of Comptroller of the Currency is abolished, and its duties of checking the national banks transferred to the Federal Reserve System.

Today there is some discussion relative to consolidating the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency with the Federal Reserve System. The bankers to whom I have referred think that would be a calamity, and therefore they have telegraphed me stating their reasons for urging the retention of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency as an independent agency. Their position is that unless assurance can be given that the Bureau of Comptroller of the Currency will not be abolished by the reorganization plan, and amendment prohibiting the abolishment of that agency should be offered.

Inasmuch as I am unable to obtain such assurance I offer an amendment prohibiting the abolition of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, and I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, in line 20, after the comma, it is proposed to insert:

Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

THE PRESIDING OFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I now move that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 4129.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I now move that all after the enacting clause of House bill 4129 be stricken out, and that the committee amendment, as amended, of Senate bill 1120 be substituted therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CORDON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Ball	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bridges	Hill	Robertson
Buck	Hoey	Russell
Bushfield	Huffman	Shipstead
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Taft
Carville	La Follette	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarran	Tobey
Cordon	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	White
George	Mitchell	Wiley
Gerry	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4129) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. REVERCOMB conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, will be indefinitely postponed.

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT RELATING TO INCOME TAX LAWS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES OF WORLD WAR II

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MITCHELL in the chair) laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 102, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income Tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II" be printed with illustrations, as a public document, and that 12,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 10,000 shall be for the House document room and 2,000 for the Senate document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate just exactly what this is?

Mr. HAYDEN. The concurrent resolution authorizes the printing of a public document providing information for veterans with respect to income tax laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS—STATEMENT BY NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE COUNCIL

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on November 18 a release covering the subject of labor-management problems was made public by the Most Reverend Karl J. Alter, Bishop of Toledo, chairman of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Council.

I look with favor upon suggestions of this character which have to do with the development of advanced ideas in the field of labor-management relations. Because of the importance of this news release, and because of the originality of the suggestions which it contains, I should like to have it made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wish to point out particularly two paragraphs which I think are very interesting. I read from the statement:

> The suggestion grows out of two facts that hinder the settlement of labor disputes. One is the danger that if strikes of great magnitude occur, laws enforcing compulsory arbitration may ensue. That would be tragic. Voluntary arbitration is good, but compulsory arbitration is a long leap down the totalitarian road and is no help toward the proper settlement of disputes on either side. It will, in fact, not be accepted so long as the working people and the employers are Americans and believe in their dignity as sons of God.

The statement says further:

> Our proposal is a modest one but one of far-reaching importance. It is that a method of fact-finding be set up to reinforce conciliation, arbitration, collective bargaining, and the attitude of the public toward any important labor dispute; * * * These boards would make the facts known. They would make no decision as to the dispute. They would present the facts to fortify the right side in a dispute.

Mr. President, this suggestion is built around the possibility of setting up fact-finding boards which would not be directly associated with the conciliation or the arbitration or the collective bargaining agency, but would be independent, separate, and distinct, and would bring out the facts after consultation with both sides to the dispute, or all sides to the dispute, and make the facts available to those who have to do with the work of arbitrating or mediating or conciliating disputes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from New York about compulsory arbitration. From what study I have given the subject, compulsory arbitration is something which theoretically is very appealing, but as a practical solution would not be workable, for the very reason the Senator has mentioned, namely, it would start a dictatorship if we compelled men on the one hand or industry on the other to do something which they thought would in the end bring ruin on either. I have come to the conclusion that, in spite of the appeal of compulsory arbitration, I do not believe forcible settlement can be achieved without potential liabilities which far outweigh any temporary advantages if that policy should be promulgated and continued.

However, there is one phase of the present labor difficulties about which I should like to see something constructive done. I do not know that I am accurate in my facts, but one gains the impression that when labor and management, through collective bargaining, enter into a contract, and management then breaks the contract, labor has the right to strike, and no one would want to take that right away from labor. On the other hand, if labor breaks its contract and refuses to work, so to speak, under the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement, there does not seem to be any redress for the owner of the plant, or the management. Has the Senator given any thought to that phase of the present difficulties?

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion, which is substantiated by reports which are drifting into the public press, that that is one of the questions now being considered.

Of course, in all contractual obligations we naturally subscribe to the theory that, once a contract is made, it should be carried out by both parties; but there are many provisions in contracts which subject themselves to multitudinous interpretations, such as cost-of-living requirements, and failure on the part of the contractor to secure sufficient orders to keep his employees together.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think there is reasonable ground for difference of opinion, but let us suppose there are a thousand men in a plant, and, for the purposes of the illustration, let us suppose it is a closed shop, and that through collective bargaining a contract is entered into. Let us suppose that 200 men go on a strike unauthorized by the union, in other words, the union itself or its officials do not authorize the strike, but, so far as the company is concerned, the 200 men being in key positions, by striking have perhaps paralyzed the whole plant.

I think that in a case such as the one I have suggested, or one related to it, management is entitled to more protection than the present law gives it. I have noticed something along this line leaking out from the conference now taking place. Certainly if management were to declare a lock-out in violation of a contract it would be held up to censure, and properly so.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. If 200 men who have agreed not to strike because conditions are satisfactory go out on a strike, unless the union orders it, it seems to me management reciprocally should be entitled, in such a case, to some redress. There is a void in the law, so far as that phase of labor-management relations is concerned. Does the Senator agree with me generally?

Mr. MEAD. I think generally the Senator's statement is correct, but he must remember that there are probably many difficulties which result in injustice to the workers, which have been perpetrated upon them by certain elements of the management class. For instance, it was my obligation to make an investigation of production in the automotive trade, and while on the surface it appeared that the workers were either slowing up or holding up war production, many acts of management could be advanced as reasons behind the work stoppage or slowing up. There are a thousand and one ramifications, but they are generally based upon the ideal condition the Senator presents. Throughout the war it was demonstrated in many cases that the labor leadership of the country came to the support of management in breaking so-called outlaw strikes, and in maintaining proper contractual relations.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator, and it is not an easy situation to handle. My point refers to cases where there is the right of collective bargaining, and management and labor enter into an agreement, and the union, which is the bargaining agent, does not consider the point raised, whatever the dispute may be, sufficient to warrant calling a strike or a real violation of the contract, and therefore it does not order a strike, but, nevertheless, a substantial number of employees strike anyway, indulging in what labor and management have frequently called wildcat strikes, and management stands helpless, even though the labor unions are cooperating with it trying to get the men back into the plant.

I do not believe it is fair to leave the situation in that shape. I have no solution to suggest, but I am hopeful that the present conference will devise one, because it has seemed to me that a case like that presents one of the justifiable complaints which management has had, namely, that if they enter into a contract with a union in good faith, make a hard and fast contract, and the union itself feels satisfied as a whole that the conditions are good, no group should be allowed to break a contract which was entered into for that group's protection.

Mr. MEAD. As I said before, we have had excellent demonstrations of the patriotic efforts of labor leaders to suppress outlaw strikes, such as the Senator has mentioned, especially during the war period. We also have information that this subject is now receiving attention by the labor-management conference. I am sure we are both concerned that no legislation shall be enacted which will in any way deny to the individual the economic freedom which should go with citizenship. That is, we cannot force an individual to sell his labor against his free will. Solution of the problem is difficult, but it occurs to me that by setting up a fact-finding board, such as that recommended in the press release of the National Catholic Welfare Council, there may be the possibility of an avenue of approach so that when the facts are developed, and are made known to both sides and to the public, the number of

strikes which do not carry with them the support of public opinion may be reduced to a minimum.

Mr. President, I will say that I really believe this is one of the most important domestic problems in our democracy, and I am glad to see that colleges and universities are taking up the subject and are organizing schools on management-labor relationships. I think it will result in a great deal of good. The Senator from Maryland will probably recall a recent utterance by Mr. Tobin, the president of the teamsters' union, in which he called attention to the fact that as a rule labor loses tremendously by strikes, except when it is absolutely necessary that they gain recognition, and thus, as sometimes happens, become able to eliminate a serious injustice that could only be eliminated by strikes.

I point out that it would be much better if these gains could be acquired without the economic losses which are sustained by the workers as a result of long-drawn-out strikes. So labor along with management is looking for the opportunity to settle difficulties in a more orderly manner than has been invoked in many cases in the past.

I think so highly of the statement because of the fact that it brings a new element of thought into the consideration of this problem, that I now ask to have it made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *November 18, 1945.*

The following letter was sent today to the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor and to Judge Walter P. Stacy, chairman, Labor-Management Conference:

"The Department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference wishes to make a suggestion to the Department of Labor of the United States and to the Labor-Management Conference.

"The suggestion grows out of two facts that hinder the settlement of labor disputes. One is the danger that if strikes of great magnitude occur, laws enforcing compulsory arbitration may ensue. That would be tragic. Voluntary arbitration is good, but compulsory arbitration is a long leap down the totalitarian road and is no help toward the proper settlement of disputes on either side. It will, in fact, not be accepted so long as the working people and the employers are Americans and believe in their dignity as sons of God.

"The other fact is that methods of conciliation and voluntary arbitration often lack that thorough knowledge of the facts underlying the disputes which normally is necessary for a just agreement or a just decision.

"Our proposal is a modest one but one of far-reaching importance. It is that a method of fact finding be set up to reenforce conciliation, arbitration, collective bargaining, and the attitude of the public toward any important labor dispute; that the fact finding be in the hands of a board representative of neither side of the dispute but representative of, as far as possible, impartial members of the public; that the President of the United States or the Secretary of Labor appoint them; that as many boards, national, regional, or local, be set up as are required to aid in the settlement of major disputes; that these fact-finding bodies be instructed to report quickly; and that they receive statements from both sides in the dispute and from other competent witnesses; and have available all the pertinent knowledge which the Federal or State governments possess. These boards would make the facts known. They would make no decision as to the dispute. They would present the facts to fortify the right side in a dispute.

"Threats of major strikes now loom. Other strikes seem to be in the offing. Others will occur after this present period ends. We recommend this fact-finding procedure both for current disputes and for the future. The facts will furnish ground for just agreements in collective bargaining and just decisions in arbitration.

"We consider this proposal both as a way to help settle current disputes and as a permanent policy of the American Government and the governments of the States. We do not contemplate this procedure except in important cases.

"The usefulness of these boards depends upon their being established early in a dispute and upon the speed of their action. Delayed statements of fact would be calamitous.

"We think that there are enough honest and capable persons in our country to man these boards in the interest of the general good.

"Sincerely yours,

"KARL J. ALTER,
"Chairman, Social Action Department,
"N. C. W. C., Bishop of Toledo."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think I am in general agreement with the philosophy of the Senator from New York on this particular matter, and likewise I have looked with a great deal of approval upon the recent statements of President Truman that one of the most dangerous things that could ever happen to labor would be for the Nation to have what might be called a national wage policy under which everyone's wages more or less would be fixed arbitrarily by the Federal Government. That might in the beginning appeal to labor, but in the end it would simply mean that jurisdiction would be taken of the whole field of wages, and if we ever adopt such a policy labor could not strike without striking against the law, and the law would be there until repealed. So when individuals are appealing to the administration that it fix a particular wage standard, so-called, they are giving hostages to fortune on the road to dictatorship, for the same reason the Senator advanced when he said that compulsory arbitration would also lead in that direction.

I am glad that the administration has not fallen into that error, because in my opinion labor eventually would be hurt more than anyone else if such a policy were carried into effect.

Mr. MEAD. If we set up the machinery for the settlement of disputes, if we give to the participants all the information and all the knowledge necessary for the effective settlement of disputes, and then if we maintain in this democratic country of ours real democracy in the settlement of industrial disputes based upon the freedom of the worker, I believe we will become the outstanding example to the industrial nations of the world.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT, 1946

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4407, reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes. I will state that I make the motion for the purpose of having the bill become the unfinished business, and not with an expectation that it will be taken up this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent further, as is customary in connection with a bill of this kind, that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARK IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 674, House bill 2851, to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the City of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2851) to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have conferred with certain minority members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and as the result of the conference I beg leave to state that there is no objection offered on this side of the Chamber to immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2851), which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 6, line 6, after the word "compensation", to strike out "without regard to" and to insert "in accordance with the provisions of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 7, after the word "laws", to strike out "or", and insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 18, after the word "act", to strike out "Any appropriations for the National Park Service not exceeding $25,000 and moneys which may be donated for the purposes of this act shall

be available for the necessary expenses of such investigation", and insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 to carry out the provisions of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

INCREASE OF PAY OF MEN IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some weeks ago I offered on the floor of the Senate a measure seeking to increase the pay of the men in the armed services. It was voted down by a disappointingly large vote. I based my argument in part for the necessity of such an increase upon the obvious fact that it would increase voluntary enlistments. I think that everything which has transpired in connection with Army service since that date has verified the soundness of my amendment. Those who are opposed to a volunteer army do not want to increase the pay of our soldiers. I repeat today, Mr. President, that I do not think we are going to be able to raise by way of voluntary enlistment the Army which we need to do the police job that is needed to be done in various parts of the world unless we correct the pay injustice that men wearing the uniform of the United States Army today are suffering. Not only are the soldiers suffering a wage injustice but their families are suffering as the result of not being allowed adequate allotments to take care of those families while the men are in the service. I have many letters from wives and parents of servicemen describing the great hardships that are resulting from the pittance now allowed many needy cases.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I remember when the Senator made his proposal, but the amount of increase provided for is not in my mind.

Mr. MORSE. At that particular time I suggested that in order to show our good faith in the matter we propose a token increase of $25 per month, with the understanding that we would take the matter under advisement and investigation and determine how much more ought to be allowed in order to give these men a fair day's pay for a fair day's work which they are performing for the people of the United States while serving in the Army during the postwar period.

Mr. STEWART. That would be a total of about $75 a month for the average GI?

Mr. MORSE. Plus the subsistence allowances he receives.

Mr. STEWART. That means the base pay. The base pay today is $50.

Mr. MORSE. It would be $75 under my proposed amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Did the Senator ask for an increase in subsistence pay for the family of the GI?

Mr. MORSE. Not in that particular amendment, although the RECORD will show that I spoke in behalf of the need of such a thing being done in connection with the study which I proposed with regard to the whole question of servicemen's pay.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator's amendment refers to new enlistees, or those who would remain in the Regular Army.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator contemplate the payment of more money to those who would serve overseas during the period of occupation than to those who would serve in this country during that time?

Mr. MORSE. I am satisfied that the committee which would investigate the matter would find upon a careful analysis of the facts that it should bring back just such a recommendation—that there should be an extra increase in pay for the man himself while serving overseas.

Mr. STEWART. In the main I am inclined to be in sympathy with the Senator's amendment. I think we ought to do all we can to encourage volunteers in this particular period. The more we do along that line the nearer we can come to settling the problem of further drafting of young boys.

Mr. MORSE. The reason I make any comment at all on the subject today is that the same argument was made at the time I offered my amendment for increasing soldiers' pay that is usually made in the Congress of the United States when the Congress wishes to do something inadequate as of the moment, and yet put off final determination of the merits of the basic issue involved in a proposal until a later date. The usual argument was made that the subject ought to be taken under consideration, and that more time ought to be devoted to it than could be devoted by the Senate on the day when I proposed the amendment for the immediate consideration of this body.

Such inquiry as I have been able to make leads me to make the statement that nothing has been done by any committee of the Senate since the matter was under discussion, and I am satisfied that nothing will be done until we begin, by such procedure as I am starting to adopt this afternoon, to arouse the people of the country to the fact that their Congress is not doing anything so far as making an investigation of Army pay rates is concerned. I submit that the Congress should be conducting a careful investigation regarding adequate pay for the men in the armed services, and in regard to giving a decent allotment to the families of those men, who at the present time, in large numbers, are suffering unnecessary and unjustifiable hardship because the Government of the United States is not awarding them decent allotments so that they can maintain themselves in self-respect and decency while the male members of their families are serving in the uniform of the United States.

My mail shows—as does the editorial which I shall ask permission to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks—that men in the armed forces are perfectly aware of the injustice which they and their families are suffering in regard to Army pay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Higher Pay and Allotments for Service Men," published in the Stars and Stripes, mid-Pacific edition, of November 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER PAY AND ALLOTMENTS FOR SERVICEMEN

There has been much talk recently of raising the wages of mainland civilian workers in order that take-home pay may be held at something approaching wartime levels.

The Stars and Stripes suggests that any such wage increases be accompanied by reasonable increases in servicemen's pay and dependency allotments.

The United Automobile Workers Union has asked a 30-percent boost in basic wage rates.

Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co., may agree to a 15-percent increase for Ford workers.

Secretary of Commerce Wallace has suggested a 15-percent increase in wages and around a 10-percent increase in manufactured-goods prices.

The higher wages, it is argued, are to come out of increased production efficiency, business savings due to lower taxes, and higher prices.

The Stars and Stripes does not wish to enter the dispute over whether or not the wage increases can be justified. That is a matter to be settled by genuine collective bargaining between unions and management, with impartial assistance from Government.

But the Stars and Stripes does wish to make the point that if wages of civilian workers are to go up—10, 20, 30 percent—and if prices are to go up as well, then the serviceman's pay and his dependency allotment should be raised correspondingly.

If, in the national economic picture, civilian wage increases, with accompanying price rises, can be justified, then surely a similar increase in the soldier's, sailor's, and marine's pay is no more than fair.

To be sure, the serviceman has no union to bargain for him, and rightly so. But, if Army and Navy careers, whether for a lifetime or only a year, are to be made as attractive as civilian jobs, and especially if voluntary enlistments are to amount to much, someone must see to it that the financial rewards of the man who chooses to remain in the service of his country keep pace with what he might be making as a civilian. The waiving of income tax on wartime service of EM is merely a step in the right direction.

Dependents of servicemen have to pay for food, housing, clothing, transportation, and recreation in the same markets as other civilians, the price level, if it goes up, will affect eveybody at home, not just those who get the higher wages.

The Stars and Stripes has no intention of driving a wedge between civilian wage earners and servicemen and their dependents. That would be foolish because most servicemen are wage earners at heart and want nothing so much as to get back into overalls.

We are merely putting in a bid for readjustments in servemen's pay and dependency allotments commensurate with any widespread increase in civilian wage rates.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take this occasion to say that it is my judgment that servicemen are not going to get justice on this issue until they start to make their demands upon the Congress understood by language as to which there can be no misunderstanding.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of sundry postmasters which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wallace S. Gourley, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania;

William McClanahan, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee; and

John P. Logan, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Freer to be Federal Trade Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HAYDEN. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 19 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Alice Y. Brown, Hercules, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mildred H. Moran, Spring Valley, Calif., in place of R. P. Wilson, resigned.

IOWA

Leadayle I. Brayton, Somers, Iowa, in place of H. W. Hesser, removed.

KENTUCKY

Ida Sanders, Dorton, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bessie De P. Givens, Dunmor, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Conda L. Gurley, Insull, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Kathryne S. Doggett, Blanchard, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bettye R. Kemp, Ethel, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Audrey N. Evans, Jamestown, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John L. Richard, St. Gabriel, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Paul E. Teifer, Trenton, Mich., in place of E. N. Moroney, removed.

MINNESOTA

Donald Krey Grant, Wyoming, Minn., in place of W. D. Banta, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Josephine Agnes Washkewicz, Hainesport, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

A. Eloise Maness, Star, N. C., in place of T. L. Maness, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

William A. Gamble, Edgeley, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Ravely, resigned.

Josephine McLauchlin, Sanish, N. Dak., in place of H. H. Bugge, transferred.

John Wiedmann, Venturia, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OREGON

Weldon C. Keller, Vida, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ethel E. Morris, Modena, Pa., in place of C. L. Wagner, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Silvestre G. Gonzalez, Lares, P. R., in place of Ricardo Mendez, Jr., resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Myron J. Cannon, Hermosa, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Walter L. Wiseman, La Vernia, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James B. Pitman, Muldoon, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Albert L. Van Alstine, New London, Wis., in place of Jacob Werner, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 19 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Robert E. Freer, to be Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1945.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Earline Jarman, Cuba.
Arthur A. Burgess, Winfield.

MISSOURI

Morris S. Major, Mountain Grove.

NEBRASKA

Irma M. Davis, Weston.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marie M. Bassler, Brockton.
Charles J. Tumelty, Broomall.
John W. Wasil, Calumet.
Margaret M. Reddy, Connerton.
Howard E. Gilfillan, Conoquenessing.
Vesta Y. Stevens, Flinton.
Anthony Cickavage, Frackville.
I. Elizabeth Clark, Graterford.
Mayme S. Porter, Hokendauqua.
Charles Frailey, Minisink Hills.
Dorothy M. Steuart, Salina.
Bette M. Logan, West Monterey.
Rocco Moff, Weston.
Francis T. McMahon, Wyncote.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, as we wait at the altar of prayer, we invoke Thy blessing of peace and guidance upon all who take counsel together. Grant that the wisest thought may quicken all who are associated with the Congress, consuming the dross of unworthy ambition and giving implicit trust and a perpetual hope in the deliberations. We beseech Thee to make all hearts receptive to the deep truth that freedom is determined only by the will of a free people. We praise Thee that man's true value is reckoned far above the things born of earth and clings to those ideals which are a part of our national heritage. Thou, whose presence is the gift of peace, dwell in us, that our difficulties may provide the materials for wise achievements and contribute to the upbuilding of Thy kingdom in human relations. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 16, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1459. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

The message also announced that the PRESIDENT pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain

records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Justice.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of State.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Department of War.
6. Interim International Information Service.
7. National Archives.
8. National Housing Agency.
9. Petroleum Administration for War.
10. United States District Court (Northern District of Indiana).
11. War Manpower Commission.

THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the custom of the House of Representatives, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to read Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there could be no more appropriate occasion than the times in which we are living to again call the attention of the Congress and the people, not only of this Nation but of the world, to the words spoken by the immortal Lincoln on November 19, 1863, at the dedication of the Gettysburg National Cemetery.

Lincoln said:

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made on last Saturday by the Conference of the Catholic Bishops of America.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an original statement he made last week before the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives of Congress in opposition to any resolution restricting the term of office of the President of the United States.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, for preservation and edification of all, the address by His Excellency P. Zadeikis, Minister of Lithuania, delivered at the banquet of Americans of Lithuanian descent, held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., November 16, 1945, in support of the Kelly-Willis congressional resolution on Lithuania's independence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the California Creameries Association.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters from the Stars and Stripes.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after all commitments and the business of the day, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include as an addition to my remarks an editorial from the Chicago Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the greatest pressure group in America is trying to undermine the workings of the OPA. I believe the OPA has saved the people of this country billions of dollars, and has saved us from inflation.

The editorial by the financial editor of the Chicago Herald on the workings of the OPA is added as a part of my remarks. It is about time this forum be not used as a wailing wall.

The editorial is as follows:

RECORDS OF TWO WARS VINDICATE THE OPA

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor)

In studying the record of World War I, economists noted that one of the greatest costs was the price inflation that took place in all countries during the war and the years that immediately followed. The cost was not economic alone, although the economic cost was staggering, but social and, in many countries, political.

With the advent of World War II, each country, almost independently, determined to take certain recognized steps to avoid the price consequences of the monetary inflation that was still regarded as the necessary method of financing the war.

A few economists scoffed at such efforts, insisted they would be futile and instead of standing aside to await the results, as would true research scientists, became voices of obstruction.

Now let's look at the record. First of all, World War II lasted longer than its predecessor and its cost was many, many times as great. The forces of inflation, consequently were much greater.

INFLATION CUT TWO-THIRDS

In the United States from 1914 until Armistice Day 4 years later, average prices rose nearly 100 percent. From the time Hitler invaded Poland until 5 years later consumer prices rose approximately 30 percent, or less than one-third as much. Two-thirds of this rise, moreover, occurred before this country entered the war and before any legislation was passed aimed at price control.

Commenting on this record, Chester Bowles has said:

"So we see what the defeatists said was impossible has, up to the present time, been accomplished."

Are the "defeatists" convinced? Not at all. In one breath they refuse to admit that anything has been accomplished. Confronted by the evidence, they charge that the results were achieved only through stifling bureaucracy and relinquishment of our freedom.

PETULANTLY COMPLAIN

Some, petulantly, complain that they have not been allowed to spend as they please the money that has been burning on their pockets. They ask:

"Why shouldn't we be allowed to do what we like with our own money?"

They never like to stay around and hear the very simple answer:

"Because there has been a war which diverted so much of the productive facilities of the Nation to the manufacture of armament that there hasn't been enough to go around and won't be for maybe a year or two. Under such circumstances the interest of the country as a whole supersedes the selfish interest of the minority which stands willing to disrupt our whole economy by bidding for scarce goods. Just be patient, the very little freedom you have lost is microscopic toward what you might very easily lose if unchecked inflation would undermine the soundness of our currency and the Government's credit."

The defeatists sometimes reply:

"But higher prices are needed to encourage production."

MANY PROBLEMS TODAY

That may or may not be. Today the United States is hard at work on reconversion. There are problems of many kinds, involving raw materials, parts, labor, prices, and a certain something without a name, let's call it "click." Production men know what we mean. When a plant "clicks" it really turns out the goods—everything is in adjustment and moves according to schedule. There is a "click" for the economy as a whole as well as for each individual plant.

There never has been a time when everyone has been satisfied with price and that would be true today. Our personal conclusion is that price is not nearly as important a factor in delaying production today as one might judge from headlines, speeches, and conversation.

Most plants have not begun to "click" as yet. Until they do, managements must largely guess as to the price they need to produce profitably. And they have been assured by the OPA that at that time, if prices are not adequate relief will be granted.

Meanwhile, it would be a good idea to support the OPA and not rock the boat.

ALFRIED KRUPP

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to deplore the action of the International War Crimes Tribunal in refusing to indict Alfried Krupp, the

present owner of the Krupp interests, the notorious son of an even more notorious parent, who is now undergoing softening of the brain but undoubtedly no softening of the heart.

At this time I hope, indeed, that the motion of the French, the Russians, and the Americans that this Alfried Krupp be indicted, is renewed and carried. I think he should be indicted not as a substitute for his father, but if I may use the phrase "in his own right" as a war criminal.

OPERATION OF STEAMSHIPS IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill giving the Alaska Railroad, owned by the United States Government, basic authority to operate steamships in the Alaska trade. I do so with some degree of reluctance. By and large I am not in favor of extending government operations to a field previously and traditionally served by private capital. In this case, however, it seems not only desirable but highly essential.

Alaska is now threatened by an increase in the already high and almost intolerable rates which are charged for both freight and passenger traffic. Perhaps nowhere else in the world were marine rates so high as in Alaska before the war. With the advent of war surcharges were placed in effect which in some cases were as high as 45 percent. Now we are told that these rates are not high enough to permit profitable operation and that another boost must be made. I am informed that available figures may indicate the need for a general rate structure 80 to 100 percent above that which prevailed before the war.

If these increases are allowed, or if any increases at all are allowed, the result will be economic death for Alaska. The Territory simply cannot survive under such a burden. One of the great reasons for the comparatively slow development of Alaska has been the general lack of transportation facilities and the high charges made for services with respect to such facilities as have existed. Transportation costs have always been high in pioneer countries but the pattern elsewhere has been that these costs slowly declined as population tended to increase and as modern techniques made it possible to operate carriers more cheaply. This has not been so in Alaska. There we find that with improvement in techniques, costs have gone steadily up, not down, and the population increase has been nowhere what it should have been on account of these stratospheric freight rates. Until more roads are built, until more air service is provided, and until water rates are adjusted to figures comparable with those in trades elsewhere it is, indeed, hopeless to expect the kind of development the Territory ought to have for its own benefit and for the benefit of the Nation.

While I cannot vouch for them, figures have been made available to me indicating that the ton-mile rate for automobiles from Seattle, Wash., to Seward, Alaska, was seventeen and sixty-three hundredths times as much as the ton-mile rate from San Francisco, Calif., to Honolulu, although it is several hundred miles farther to Honolulu. The rate on clothing was five and sixty-five hundredths times greater to Seward, on cement two and seventy-seven hundredths times, on iron and steel three and fifty-hundredths time, on machinery three and fifty-hundredths times, on oil and petroleum three and twenty-six hundredths times, and so on down a long list.

What are the circumstances surrounding the present move to increase rates? Soon after the war started vessels in the Alaska service were taken over by the War Shipping Administration and operated for the Administration by their owners as agents. Service was on a wartime basis and there were no regular schedules. Ships were sent where they were needed and when they were needed in conformity with military requirements. Transportation of civilian passengers and freight was properly subordinated to the bigger and more urgent job of delivering all the varied equipment necessary for the building of Army and Navy installations, and of shifting Army and Navy personnel and civilian defense workers.

Civilians generally, as was to be expected, found it tremendously difficult to travel. Stocks and foodstuffs and other essential requirements were often dangerously low in principal Alaska communities because the ships necessary to haul them were not available.

Yet Alaskans did not complain. They took all this in their stride. They knew they were in an active war zone. It is difficult for the residents of continental United States to realize how acute the Japanese threat to Alaska was from December 7, 1941, until the summer of 1943. Constant Japanese submarine surveillance, the eventual attack on Dutch Harbor in the early summer of 1942 and the subsequent occupation of the outer Aleutian Islands by the Japanese made the fears of Alaskans that their country might become a major battleground completely understandable.

In return for this diminishing and infrequent steamship service which they gladly accepted as part of their patriotic duty the residents of Alaska were compelled to pay rates substantially greater than before the war. Under direction of the Government surcharges were imposed. After the Japs had been stopped and finally expelled from the Aleutians—the only point on this continent on which they had established themselves—the surcharges were cut only in southeastern Alaska.

I did not believe, and I do not now believe, that the handful of people in Alaska should ever have been compelled to pay these surcharges. They should not have had to pay them any more than they were required to pay for the cost of naval vessels in Alaska waters. Operation of the Alaska ships by the War Shipping Administration was almost exclusively a military operation and as such the additional cost should have been borne by the Nation as a whole.

These terrifically high rates would, under ordinary circumstances, have caused almost a total depopulation of Alaska. Gold mining had been closed down by Government order. The people of Alaska accepted in good spirit all the heartaches and financial losses and adjustments necessary in connection with shutting down of their second largest industry. They responded to the Government order without hesitation in the belief that total war required the stoppage of all sorts of activities not directly and vitally connected with the winning of the war. Only later were they to learn that gold mining was the only industry so affected. Only later were they to discover that race tracks were left to operate as usual, and a host of other activities in nowise connected with the winning of the war were privileged to continue as in peacetime.

The only thing that saved Alaska then was the fact that the Federal Government spent hundreds of millions of dollars in construction of military installations. These heavy expenditures with the consequent employment of thousands of men took up the slack, and increased wages made it possible for the economic life of the country to continue even with added freight charges. However, many salaried workers whose incomes rose very little, if at all, found themselves in a strait-jacket on account of steadily rising living costs.

All of us had looked forward hopefully to the war's end as a time when freight rates would go down. The thought and hope was they would go down not to the prewar levels, but, at long last, substantially below them so that the delayed settlement of Alaska on a scale commensurate with its size and resources might take place. It comes as a double shock, therefore, to learn that we are confronted by the possibility that instead of paying less for freight and passenger travel we may have to pay much more than before.

It was only a little more than a year ago that the late President Roosevelt in a speech at Bremerton, Wash., told of his hopes and aspirations for Alaska—how be believed it would prove to be the homeland for pioneering veterans and others who in the Territory could hope to find space and opportunity in the last great westward expansion of our American people.

President Truman has likewise expressed an interest in the Territory's development. He has spoken out plainly in favor of the political aspirations of Alaska's people in their striving for statehood.

These wishes, as expressed by the Nation's leaders, become meaningless when measured against the hard realities of economics as reflected by transportation charges. The development they hoped for can never be accomplished under these circumstances. Indeed, the Territory is bound to lose rather than gain population if maritime rates go up.

Alaskans and others interested were suddenly confronted on November 9 with a Maritime Commission order for a rate hearing to be held in Seattle, Wash.,

on November 27. The hearing was granted upon petition of the War Shipping Administration. Obviously, the Territorial government of Alaska could not prepare a case between November 9 and 27. Equally obviously no other interested parties in Alaska could hope in any such limited time to make an effective showing.

We have petitioned the Maritime Commission to postpone the hearing at least until spring. We believe we are entitled to such postponement as a minimum consideration. If reports in common circulation are correct, the War Shipping Administration will withdraw from Alaska early next spring. If that is true, it is rather difficult to understand why it should be so insistent at this late date about increasing rates. The argument of the agency that deficits are being incurred and must be wiped out is not valid. So far as I am aware, there was no legal compulsion for WSA to continue to operate Alaska vessels after the end of the war. It is said deficits have been continuing ever since then. Why, then, did not WSA turn the ships back immediately and allow the private operators to present their case to the Maritime Commission? It is difficult to understand—for me it is impossible to understand on the merits of the case—the agency's seemingly sudden concern as to the rates of a service which it is not likely will last more than 3 months.

I am told that labor costs are unbearably high and labor is inefficient in the Alaska marine service. I am told the owners of the Alaska fleets are anxious to have the Maritime Commission set a higher schedule of rates now so that when the vessels are turned back they can represent that the rates were established by one branch of the Government at the request of another branch and therefore are fair and proper. I do not believe this is the time or the place to debate the merits or lack thereof of these contentions.

However, I do believe, and emphatically, that the hearing should be postponed. It should be postponed so the main parties in interest, the people of Alaska, may be heard. Only yesterday I was informed in a telephone conversation with Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska that he intends to call a special session of the Alaska legislature in March. It is possible the legislature would desire to make an appropriation so that experts to present Alaska's case might be retained. Funds for such a purpose are not now available in the Territorial treasury.

The hearing should be postponed, too, until the owners of the vessels are in control of their ships. The War Shipping Administration should not be a party to this proceeding. After all, the Alaska service is still operating under conditions far from normal, and the charges which might be necessary today could easily be far too high a few months from now.

It may be that evidence before the Maritime Commission at the hearing—to be held, as I hope, at a later date—will demonstrate conclusively that present rates are too low. It may be necessary upon the basis of the findings to raise them. If that should be so let me make this prediction—tramp steamships will come to Alaska, will take a good part of the cream of the trade, and the profits of the Alaska operators will drop further to the point where they will be compelled to come to the Maritime Commission for yet another increase. It will lead only into a vicious circle, satisfactory to no one and simply disastrous to Alaska.

If the hearing is held and increases are allowed I suppose the War Shipping Administration, the vessels' owners, and the labor unions that furnish men for those ships will be happy, but some thought should be given somewhere along the line to several scores of thousands of Alaskans. They will suffer, acutely. In consideration of this I am introducing a bill giving the Alaska Railroad the right to operate steamships. We must either have Government operation or a Government subsidy. We are not asking too much in asking for one or the other.

Alaska is the responsibility of the Federal Government. Alaska is the responsibility of this Congress. In sad truth we Alaskans are little more than wards. I sometimes think we have been niggardly in what we have asked for during the years, but we have always received even less. We have repeatedly asked for more home rule, for extension to the Territory of at least the minimum rights of self-government, but these pleas have gone unheard. With them, we could have hoped for a growth and development which would have allowed us to take our proper place. Without them we have no alternative except to appeal to this body.

It is grievous to have to contemplate that right now when we as a Nation are so concerned with freedom of peoples all over the world and the democratic aspirations of those peoples that we so blindly overlook something that ought to be of much more intimate concern—the rights of American citizens living under the American flag on this very continent.

STRIKES IN THE GREAT LAKES MINING AREA

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a situation involving the methods of the National Labor Relations Board in the matter of calling for strike votes. This has to do with the whole Lake Superior iron mining industry.

All of these companies have unqualified no-strike contracts for the life of their contracts. I emphasize the point that these are unqualified.

There is at the present time no dispute between any of these companies and their men. In spite of this, they have all received notice from the National Labor Relations Board fixing November 28 for a strike vote, which, as a representative of the taxpayers of my district, I emphasize is taken at the expense of the Government.

Even were there a dispute between any of these companies and the unions working in their mines, there is a requirement that any action must go through grievance procedure first. Notice from the National Labor Relations Board for this strike vote gives no indication of any dispute nor of any alleged dispute.

Representatives of the Board state that they are obliged by law to call for a strike vote—and this without having to find any reason—simply because application has been made by the union.

When these instructions were first issued, it was said that an inclusive count would be made rather than a count by mines and plants. This was so flagrant that strong protest was made with the result that orders to the field men were reversed and counts will be made by mines and plants.

From information that I have been able to collect I find that there is the probability that these counts will all be lumped and handled as though they were the result of counts of an entire industry before they reach the President.

There can be little doubt that this is one of the efforts being made to bury the little fellow completely.

In examining the correspondence upon which I am basing this statement I was very much interested to find that the War Labor Board used the caption "Re Steel strike ballot."

The Lake Superior iron mining industry is not a part of United States Steel. Those of us in the Great Lakes area know full well that every effort is being made to force some such arrangement in order that there can be no voice from the small mine owners. This heading is, therefore, of particular interest as it divulges the purpose of the NLRB.

The Smith-Connally Act is being used as some of us feared it would be—as an excuse to call strikes rather than as a preventive, in this particular instance, in a situation where every company has an incorporated nonstrike clause and where there is no dispute of any kind involved.

As representative of the taxpayers of the Twenty-second District of Ohio and as a loyal American, I protest such methods.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address on postwar problems delivered by himself at the annual meeting of the Colorado State Chamber of Commerce at Colorado Springs, Colo., on November 9, 1945.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rehabilitation and our postwar policy in Germany, Poland, and other countries, and include a newspaper item and a quotation; also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project and include some quotations.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include excerpts from the

testimony of General Robins, of the War Department engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, my remarks at this time will be very brief. Last Monday I announced I would report today to the American people on the State of the Union with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I have to report that nothing has been done.

When I received the home-town papers, this morning I read with astonishment a statement by an alleged opponent of the seaway project that atomic power would make the seaway obsolete, I think he said, in about 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, there are four classes of people that are opposed to the project. Three of those classes I am going to refer to. The fourth class consists of a lot of well-intentioned but misinformed American citizens who have not been converted to the cause as yet. The three classes to which I wish to refer particularly are the ones that are spending money and engaging in a lot of tommyrot propaganda, against the seaway.

I must congratulate this boy who dug up a new excuse for opposing the seaway. The opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project have been hard pressed for some real arguments against it. They have sunk to new low levels, if such a thing were possible, when they dig up this fanciful argument that they must give us a word of caution before we waste any money on the seaway until we find out about nuclear energy. If their arguments about atomic power was anything but silly, then they would be advocating that the Government fill up New York Harbor, Boston Harbor, and the harbor at New Orleans, and other harbors, because they would be afraid that atomic bombs would ruin those great harbors.

REPORT OF NOVEMBER 12

Mr. Speaker, a week ago, November 12, I reported in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as to lack of progress on the St. Lawrence project. I called attention to the fact that no progress had been made. I am sorry that I have to report the same situation today: No progress.

Here are the facts:

Senate Joint Resolution 104, authorizing construction of the project, was introduced in the Senate by Senator BARKLEY and others on October 2, 1945. It was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

October 3, 1945, President Truman sent a message to Congress calling for construction of the St. Lawrence project.

October 4, 1945, I called for immediate action on the Barkley resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 104. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A4170.

On November 12, 1945, I called attention to delay and no action on the Barkley resolution. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10601; also Appendix, page A4835.

Well, here we are, and 48 days have elapsed since October 2, 1945. Nothing new to report.

WHAT IS THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT?

A vast number of people with whom I discuss this subject tell me that they do not know anything about the project. They are honest and frank in their statements. The project will sell itself once the American people know and understand the facts. The seaway plan visualizes the creation of a great marine highway for commerce, providing deep-draft navigation from the westernmost port on Lake Superior, 2,687 miles to the Atlantic Ocean. We already have a 14-foot channel and by increasing the depth at one or two places from 14 feet to 27 feet it will be possible for oceangoing vessels to come up the St. Lawrence River from the Atlantic Ocean and touch at the ports on Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior. All that remains to be done is to dredge channels in certain spots to a depth of 27 feet. Since ancient times water commerce has invariably contributed to the prosperity and wealth of the peoples and the nations of the world. The St. Lawrence seaway and power project is intended to accomplish that result.

GEN. THOMAS M. ROBINS TESTIFIES

One of the most distinguished Army engineers in the world is Gen. Thomas M. Robins, of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. This group is commonly referred to as the War Department engineers. General Robins has a long and an honorable career in the service of his country. His record in the work of the War Department engineers is outstanding and Members of Congress who have become acquainted with what he has done, recognize him as a most valuable public servant.

General Robins is a student of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Over a period of many years, he has had to do with this proposed development, on account of the fact that it comes within the jurisdiction of the Army engineers to recommend to Congress for or against proposed river and harbor improvements. So, General Robins, when he testified on Thursday, June 19, 1941, before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, was talking, not as just an ordinary engineer, but as an expert who had devoted years of his life to a study of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. He knew every imaginary argument—and the arguments are all imaginary—against this project. He brushed them off, just like getting rid of flies in the summertime. At the time he testified, the Rivers and Harbors Committee had under consideration a bill to develop the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. This was a bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Chairman JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, and is practically the same kind of bill that is now pending at this time in the Congress of the United States.

GENERAL ROBINS ENDORSES THE PROJECT

I quote exactly from the record of the testimony of June 19, 1941, as follows:

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE BASIN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., Thursday, June 19, 1941.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we have General Robins before us this morning. You may proceed, General.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. THOMAS M. ROBINS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY

General ROBINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the St. Lawrence River is a natural transportation route between the Great Lakes and the sea and offers an exceptional opportunity for the production of hydroelectric power.

In the early stages of the commercial development in North America the St. Lawrence River was partially improved for both navigation and power purposes, and for many years plans have been in the making for the complete and full utilization of the resources of this waterway.

It has been generally understood throughout the country that some day these plans would have to be carried out. In my opinion, that day has now arrived. The country can no longer afford to be without the transportation facilities and the power which can be made available by full and comprehensive development of the St. Lawrence River, either from the standpoint of national defense or the commercial needs of our great inland empire bordering on the Great Lakes.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the testimony of a disinterested American citizen and Government official, and it will carry conviction with everyone who wants to see the right thing done for the American people.

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, now discuss the possibilities of hydroelectric power, but anyone interested can get the unvarnished truth from the testimony of General Robins and you will find out just how much electric power is going to waste because of the fact that this project has not been undertaken and completed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two clippings from the Mail Bag sent to him by an overseas serviceman.

Mr. ROCKWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief article appearing in the November issue of Rotarian.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Lt. Alan S. Wood.

SURIBACHI FLAG

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HINSHAW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast made by himself and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

UNJUST CRITICISM OF WITNESSES IN PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the American people are looking for great results from the Pearl Harbor probe now going on at the other side of the Capitol. It seems to me, however, that the members of that committee might very well avoid any partisanship in their discussions and, above all, avoid personal attacks on any of the witnesses who appear before that committee.

According to the newspapers last week certain attacks were leveled against Rear Admiral Thomas B. Inglis, Chief of Naval Intelligence. Admiral Inglis is a hero of this war, a man above all reproach, and it is an outrage that anybody should accuse him of falsification. He is a man who wears the Navy Cross, the Silver Star, and the Bronze Star for heroic action, and the Purple Heart. The last time I saw him was at the Naval Hospital where he was just completing a 7 months' siege resulting from wounds received in his heroic rescue, or attempted rescue, of the aircraft carrier *Princeton* when his own craft, the *Birmingham,* was very severely damaged, and in spite of painful and severe wounds to himself he returned from a hospital ship the next day to reassume command of the *Birmingham,* and bring her back into Pearl Harbor safely thousands of miles away.

For anyone on either side of the aisle to attack the patriotism, the courage, the loyalty, or the truthfulness of such a man is absolutely absurd and without foundation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to commend the gentleman for his remarks. It is high time that someone should defend the character of these witnesses.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one a newspaper article, in one a resolution, and in one an editorial.

COFFEE SUBSIDY

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday papers inform the Members of Congress that the administration is going to spend around $24,000,000 for a 6-month coffee subsidy. During the war a number of alibis were offered for subsidy plans used to conceal the spreading inflation and the dilution of the value of the dollar.

The war is over, so the war alibi for subsidies is gone.

It should be most interesting to hear the alibi explaining this latest trick from the New Deal's bag of financial black magic.

Will this twenty-four million come out of the bond drive now going on? Does this subsidy mean that the administration has adopted the Nazi scheme of peacetime subsidies to conceal inflation?

Congress and the people, whose savings must finance these financial acrobatics, should get the truth.

UNJUST CRITICISM OF WITNESSES IN PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] who just spoke in connection with the Pearl Harbor investigation, and I think that we can all take heed to what he said. Character and reputation is something that cannot be bought; it is earned by act and deed and example. This inquiry should not be conducted from a Republican or a Democratic angle. It is a question of an impartial investigation. In that I think I speak the sentiments of a majority of the Members of this House. I hope that from now on the investigation will be conducted on a high plane, and that all of the members of the investigating committee will realize that they occupy a quasi-judicial position and that as such it will be more consistent with the dignity of the hearings, the proceedings, and the dignity of the Congress if members of the investigating committee would refrain from uttering or making statements or expressing judgment until after the evidence is in. I join with the gentleman from Michigan in the fine statement that he has just made and believe that great good will come out of it.

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are communities in New York State so depleted of doctors that mothers are neglected in childbirth and both the mother and infant lost for lack of medical care. The Army and Navy have hoarded physicians and are now doing so, when the facts show that thousands of doctors in the military service are idle. There are large areas of the country where the homes of the aged, orphan asylums, schools, colleges, and farm populations are deprived of the care of competent physicians. There are cases where physicians of recognized ability, now frozen in the military service, who have had only one soldier to treat in over a year. The military has sought to escape criticism by placing the decision in the hands of a civilian doctor in each State. The officer in New York State assigned to decide whether a doctor in the service is to be demobilized is Dr. Joe R. Clemmons, chairman of the New York Procurement and Assignment Service, Federal Security Agency, formerly the Manpower Commission. It is evident that little attention is given to national health, safety, or interest when cases are presented to the authority for relieving medical officers from active duty. This arrogant indifference of the military to the peacetime requirements of the citizens may, however, serve the salutary purpose of warning against the dangers of militarism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a petition from a group of Rhode Island citizens. It may exceed the limit, but I doubt it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include several editorials on the subject of censorship.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include remarks from a speaking program held recently in his district.

Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. WILSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

HOUSING FOR RETURNED VETERANS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, a veterans' home priority bill, in order to provide broader, more generous and more careful provisions for home and farm procurement for veterans.

This bill provides generally as follows:

First. Unconditional priority for building materials for homes or farms for veterans.

Second. Revocation of any statutes or executive orders which operate to impede the purposes of the bill for liberalizing conditions under which veterans may ac-

quire homes or farms, improvements thereto or liquidation of debts thereon.

Third. An increase from $2,000 to $5,000 in the sum the Government will guarantee to private lending agencies in loans for veterans' homes or farms.

Fourth. Establishment of a special Veterans' Housing Bureau in the Veterans' Administration to make studies and operate specifically to aid veterans in procuring loans for the acquisition of homes or farms.

Fifth. Requirements for other Federal agencies to cooperate with the Housing Bureau of the Veterans' Administration in a protracted effort to provide all veterans who may desire them, with homes or farms.

Sixth. Heavy penalties for evasion on the part of Government officials of any of the terms of the broadened act.

Mr. Speaker, veterans returning from overseas service are coming back home to be confronted with an inexcusable condition of confusion and frustration. Men who have been through the horrors of war and months of living in water up to their shoulders in fox holes and in the slime and filth of tropical islands have a big enough job to do in readjusting themselves to peaceful and orderly lives at home without being loaded with additional burdens as a penalty for having bravely served their country in war.

The job of readjustment, with all the help the Government can give, will be beyond the strength of many unless a very intelligent program is set up and very intelligently administered.

There is no place like home. This is peculiarly and poignantly true in the heart and mind of the man or woman who has served in the hell of war overseas. No single measure could have a greater effect in giving the returned veteran a stake in his Nation, in his community, and in his life than a home of his own in which to house a wife and a family of happy children. I can conceive of no influence which could more rapidly eradicate the nightmares of war experiences from the slumber of returned veterans than to be engaged in the happy duties of building their own homes, improving their own farms, taking their own brides over their own thresholds and preparing to raise happy families of useful citizens.

There is no good purpose to be served in closing our eyes to the fact that the veterans have been given the run-around in thousands of cases. The terms of my bill are perfectly simple, plain, and logical; if there is anybody in the United States who deserves unqualified priority of materials to build homes and improve farms, it is the men and women who went out to fight in the defense of this Nation. If there is anyone who deserves loans at a low rate of interest—certainly as low as we are considering making loans to foreign nations—it is the man or woman who went out to fight in the defense of our Nation. That is why I provided in my bill that the Government shall assume the payment of all interest above 2 percent on guaranteed loans to veterans for homes and farm-procurement purposes.

While the rest of us, no matter how hard we worked, got good wages at home; lived, worked, ate, and slept in comfortable and safe surroundings, and while we were able to buy bonds and lay up savings against the problems and the confusion of postwar reconstruction and readjustment, the men and women of our armed forces were fighting for $50 a month; they were living under conditions that tried not only their bodies but their nerves as well. Therefore, I think it cannot be denied by any fair-minded person that the men and women of our armed forces should be given every assistance within the power of the American people to acquire as rapidly as possible homes and farms on conditions that will make it not only possible but easy for the veteran to pay off his financial obligations.

I have no patience with those who talk about the possibility that some homes may revert to the Government. This country needs housing—good housing—as it never needed housing before. The way of human nature is such that the veteran will have a tough time financing a home or a farm unless a special effort is made through the Veterans' Administration to help him through the unavoidable intricacies and complications of private loans for home and farm procurement.

I think it is obvious that by far the greatest majority of the veterans, given the opportunity to acquire homes or farms under such conditions that they can live comfortably and pay off their debts in due time, will take root in their respective communities and will develop a civic pride equal in every way to their magnificent patriotism and their unbounded bravery in fighting and suffering and enduring for their country.

We can do no less than this for the veteran, and if I can find any more to do for them I shall certainly move to accomplish it if possible.

I cannot see how anyone can oppose the simple measures embraced in my bill, and I do not believe anyone will oppose them.

I cannot conceive of an America that could be made as sound, as safe, and as free as quickly in any other way than by enabling veterans to procure homes and farms and to settle down to the comforts and the pursuits of a peaceful America under an orderly and law-abiding liberty.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, receipt in my office of a petition signed by about 1,200 wives and other relatives of servicemen leads me to renew my demand on the floor of the House for the passage of a bill which I recently introduced calling for the discharge of fathers in the armed forces. I believe the American home must be preserved. I feel that unless fathers are brought home soon to their loved ones to assist in the rearing of their children and to help build a better country out of this great America of ours, we shall retard the postwar growth and the progress of the Nation for many years. I repeat the American home must be preserved. It can only be preserved by bringing back the thousands upon thousands of fathers who are in the service at this time.

It is only fair to reward the magnificent efforts made by the wives and mothers of servicemen's children to see that the heads of families the country over are allowed to come back.

Otherwise, we cannot expect that new generation of Americans will be raised in the atmosphere of the institution which has made America the most progressive and the most spiritually minded Nation in the world.

I hope Congress will take immediate action on this matter because the War and Navy Departments have thus far failed to do anything about it. Every American family needs the father in the home nearly as much as the mother. Together husband and wife are equipped to rear their children. Apart, they cannot accomplish nearly as complete and perfect a job.

RETURN OF OVERSEAS VETERANS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, just recently I called the attention of the House to what is going on with the hundreds of ships that are owned by our Government. And also the complaints from all over the country and our veterans as to why our overseas men have not been brought home. The only excuse being given is that there are not enough ships.

Since making those remarks, I understand that there are now more than 600 of our American-owned ships in the hands of foreign nations. It is no wonder that there is a shortage of ships, and our boys have not been brought home. It seems we give everything to the world and penalize our own men.

I have introduced a resolution calling for the immediate return of our ships to this country to be used for the immediate return of our boys from overseas, and it is included herewith:

A bill to provide for the securing of our ships with foreign nations and the return of the armed forces overseas, and for other purposes

Whereas foreign nations have more than 600 ships owned by the United States Government; and

Whereas these ships were paid for by the fathers and mothers of those in the armed forces; and

Whereas the War and Navy Departments say that there are not enough ships to bring home the armed forces; and

Whereas there are millions of armed forces overseas waiting to be returned home,

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States, the Department of State, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration, immediately secure our ships from foreign nations and have

them used for the returning of our overseas armed forces to the United States.

THE RIGHT OF PETITION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Chester Bowles, the OPA Administrator, in a statement before Congressman PATMAN'S Small Business Committee intimated that a flood of protests from the auto dealers of America, in the shape of telegrams and telephone calls, constituted "government by pressure," and that this flood of protests was akin to the CIO lobbyist groups that have recently afflicted us like a plague of locusts, it proves to me that he does not know the difference between the constitutional right of petition or protest and the somewhat obnoxious practice of lobbying, as it is usually carried on today. In order to set him straight in this matter I include in my remarks a pungent editorial taken from the Rockford Morning Star, Rockford, Ill., November 15, 1945, that clearly points out the wide difference between the right of petition and the practice of lobbying. I hope Mr. Bowles will take due notice thereof and will guide himself accordingly.

RIGHT OF PETITION

OPA Administrator Bowles ran up against the right of petition in full flood this week, and didn't like it. In fact, he labeled it "government by pressure," forgetting that petition is anchored in the Constitution.

The flood was turned loose by the Nation's automobile dealers—in the main, small businessmen. The protest was against the cost-absorption formula devised by Bowles, under which manufacturers were to have a slight increase to meet higher labor and material costs, but which was to come out of the hide of the dealers, who were to be ceilinged at old schedules. The automobile dealers are not the only businessmen included in this cost-absorption policy.

The dealers turned loose a flood of protesting telephone calls and telegrams. Bowles said poignantly that the calls tied up the OPA's switchboards and "delayed the receipt of many important communications." He expressed his admiration for the efficiency with which the campaign was organized; nonetheless he branded petition mere pressure.

It may be that the petitions should properly have been addressed to Congress. Congress, indeed, got its share. But the executive branch has to so great a degree assumed autonomy that it is a fair question whether administrative offices can claim immunity from petitioners. If they tracked up Bowles' front porch instead of going around to the tradesman's entrance, their trespass is probably defensible.

In any case we suspect that Bowles will have to change his views about petition. It is an integral right in our system. It isn't merely pressure lobbying. Moreover the auto dealers, who have taken in good spirit a lot of punishment during the war and have not griped, had a special right to be heard.

Is it a lobby when a group of businessmen who have remained silent and forbearing for years suddenly comes to the front with a protest? The dictionary defines a lobby otherwise; a lobby, says Webster, "frequents" a governmental hall with its pleas. The auto dealers haven't "frequented" Bowles' vestibule or that of Congress. This protest isn't lobbying, it is a petition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered on Saturday afternoon at the National Cemetery at Gettysburg commemorating Lincoln's speech there 82 years ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes today, concerning the return of stranded soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, over the week end the War Department announced that it has further reduced the critical score under the point system to 55. I have at least 100 letters from high-point men in both the European and Pacific theaters, who are sitting around, doing nothing, waiting to come home. Some of these have as high as 95 points. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what good does it do for the War Department to reduce the critical score under the point system unless they bring the boys home and discharge them? Apparently this announcement is just another sop to keep the public pacified.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PLANS AND BLUEPRINTS FOR A LASTING PEACE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1943, I extended my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on plans and blueprints for a lasting peace. Recently I had occasion to reread that statement and find no reason for changing it except to underscore some things. Momentous events have happened since December 6, 1943—events of which we could only hope and dream at that time. Chief among these events has come the end of the war, and very significant—the creation of the atomic bomb.

In this statement back in 1943, I considered several proposals of world organization such as Union Now, which I rejected, and Ely Culbertson's World Federation, of which I approved the general outline. I do not know Ely Culbertson very well, personally, and have talked to him face to face only twice, but I have read some of his books and lectures, and I am more and more convinced that he has a reasonable and sensible way out of the present world dilemma.

There has just come to my attention a paper by Ely Culbertson on how to control the atomic threat. This I commend to the attention of every Member of Congress and administrative officer of Government, for somebody had better think of something quick, or it may be too late to think of anything. As I said back in 1943 Culbertson had offered—not a perfect plan—but the most sensible and feasible proposal that had yet come to my attention. The United Nations Charter and all the recent steps taken to form a union of peace-loving nations materialize his idea in general, and it may be that with such amendments as Culbertson now proposes the perfected United Nations Charter could provide an effective organization giving safety against chaos and destruction. It is a slender hope.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered recently in Washington by Professor Bliss.

Mr. BARDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert a sermon delivered by Rev. F. Hubert Morris, of the First Presbyterian Church of New Bern, N. C.

CONTROL OF ATOMIC POWER

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a statement by President Truman, Prime Minister Attlee, and Prime Minister King.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday President Truman, Prime Minister Clement Attlee, and Prime Minister Mackenzie King released their statement with reference to the control of atomic power. I congratulate them on the fine statement they made. It came at a very opportune time. It came at a time when the people of this country and the people of other countries were becoming somewhat confused about the control of atomic power and at a time when people in high places, as high as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate, were saying that this is the opportunity of the United States to control the world by dropping a bomb whenever we saw some country getting out of hand. This idea would be the quickest way to promote a third world war. Our people do not want to control the world; they are anxious to cooperate with the United Na-

tions Organization to outlaw and bring about a permanent peace. This statement will ease the strained relations we have with some countries; it will unify our thinking toward the use of atomic power for civilian pursuits. I think it came at a time when such a statement was needed.

TEXT OF ATOM COMMUNIQUÉ

The President of the United States, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the Prime Minister of Canada have issued the following statement:

"1. We recognize that the application of recent scientific discoveries to the methods and practice of war has placed at the disposal of mankind means of destruction hitherto unknown, against which there can be no adequate military defense, and in the employment of which no single nation can in fact have a monopoly.

"2. We desire to emphasize that the responsibility for devising means to insure that the new discoveries shall be used for the benefit of mankind, instead of as a means of destruction, rest not on our nations alone, but upon the whole civilized world. Nevertheless, the progress that we have made in the development and use of atomic energy demands that we take an initiative in the matter, and we have accordingly met together to consider the possibility of international action:

"(a) To prevent the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes.

"(b) To promote the use of recent and future advances in scientific knowledge, particularly in the utilization of atomic energy, for peaceful and humanitarian ends.

"3. We are aware that the only complete protection for the civilized world from the destructive use of scientific knowledge lies in the prevention of war. No system of safeguards that can be devised will of itself provide an effective guarantee against production of atomic weapons by a nation bent on aggression. Nor can we ignore the possibility of the development of other weapons, or of new methods of warfare, which may constitute as great a threat to civilization as the military use of atomic energy.

"4. Representing as we do, the three countries which possess the knowledge essential to the use of the atomic energy, we declare at the outset our willingness, as a first contribution, to proceed with the exchange of fundamental scientific information and the interchange of scientists and scientific literature for peaceful ends with any nation that will fully reciprocate.

"5. We believe that the fruits of scientific research should be made available to all nations, and that freedom of investigation and free interchange of ideas are essential to the progress of knowledge. In pursuance of this policy, the basic scientific information essential to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes has already been made available to the world. It is our intention that all further information of this character that may become available from time to time shall be similarly treated. We trust that other nations will adopt the same policy, thereby creating an atmosphere of reciprocal confidence in which political agreement and cooperation will flourish.

"6. We have considered the question of the disclosure of detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy. The military exploitation of atomic energy depends, in large part, upon the same methods and processes as would be required for industrial uses.

"We are not convinced that the spreading of the specialized information regarding the practical application of atomic energy, before it is possible to devise effective, reciprocal, and enforceable safeguards acceptable to all nations, would contribute to a constructive solution of the problem of the atomic bomb. On the contrary, we think it might have the opposite effect. We are, however, prepared to share, on a reciprocal basis with others of the United Nations, detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy just as soon as effective enforceable safeguards against its use for destructive purposes can be devised.

"7. In order to attain the most effective means of entirely eliminating the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes and promoting its widest use for industrial and humanitarian purposes, we are of the opinion that at the earliest practicable date a commission should be set up under the United Nations Organization to prepare recommendations for submission to the Organization.

"The Commission should be instructed to proceed with the utmost dispatch and should be authorized to submit recommendations from time to time dealing with separate phases of its work.

"In particular the Commission should make specific proposals:

"(a) For extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends.

"(b) For control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes.

"(c) For the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.

"(d) For effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions.

"8. The work of the Commission should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each one of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken. Specifically it is considered that the Commission might well devote its attention first to the wide exchange of scientists and scientific information, and as a second stage to the development of full knowledge concerning natural resources of raw materials.

"9. Faced with the terrible realities of the application of science to destruction, every nation will realize more urgently than before the overwhelming need to maintain the rule of law among nations and to banish the scourge of war from the earth. This can only be brought about by giving wholehearted support to the United Nations Organization, and by consolidating and extending its authority, thus creating conditions of mutual trust in which all peoples will be free to devote themselves to the arts of peace. It is our firm resolve to work without reservation to achieve these ends."

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 2788

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 2788 has already been filed. I ask unanimous consent to have permission to file minority views on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and some newspaper excerpts.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in the first to include a radio address, and in the second and third to include newspaper editorials.

Mr. NEELY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Pearl Harbor Inquiry."

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials by the associate editor of the Washington Evening Star on the question of Washington suffrage.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper statements.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

CAPT. THOMAS BROWNING INGLIS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in 1914 I appointed to the Naval Academy a youngster named Thomas Browning Inglis. He is the distinguished officer who is now appearing before the committee of investigation of Pearl Harbor. In my opinion he has been subjected to treatment such as no reputable, high-minded, patriotic member of our armed forces should be subjected to, especially by a Member of either House of the Congress.

I think I should tell the House something of the background of this young officer. His father was the pastor of my Presbyterian Church in Bay City, Mich. When I first knew the boy he was a youngster in short trousers. He was a fine boy. His father died while he was pastor of my church. The mother, in addition to her many other accomplishments, had been one of the finest school teachers who ever taught in Michigan's schools, and was the beautiful character which one would expect the mother of this splendid officer to be.

She was the mother of four children, of which Tom was the youngest. After her husband's death Mrs. Inglis took her little brood to Cheboygan, Mich. She bought 40 acres of cut-over land, built a little house thereon and proceeded to raise and educate as best she could her little brood. The older children went to the public schools. Tom, being the youngest, was kept at home and his mother took charge of his education during his earlier years. I doubt whether he attended the public schools for more than 2 years. As I recall, he was not a high-school graduate when he entered one of the preparatory schools near Annapolis, where he remained for 3 months. He took his substantiating examination with 600 other nominees, and, very much to my surprise and amazement, he received a "4.00" in English and also a "4.00" in mathematics. Every Member of the House knows the significance of these perfect marks. To me this was then, and still remains, an amazing accomplishment, especially for a boy with the limited opportunities he

had had to prepare himself for such an examination.

The record of Thomas Browning Inglis at Annapolis was a splendid one. While there he gained the admiration, respect, and affection of everyone who knew him. He has retained that admiration, respect, and affection in all the years since. His professional assignments have come to him from those under whom he has served, and the splendid way in which he has handled the duties thereof account for the fact that today, at 46 years of age, he is a rear admiral in the Regular United States Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not carelessly appoint youngsters to the Military and Naval Academies. I make it my business to know all there is to know about every youngster I so honor. As the years go by, I do not lose sight of the boys who, through my appointment, have embarked upon a career in the armed forces of our country. I make it my business to know how they are progressing and how they are succeeding in the discharge of their duties. I do this because I have a pride in my selections. I want each one of them in their service to reflect credit upon the service and the country. At the moment I do not recall a single one of these boys who has during his term of service reflected anything but the highest credit to himself and his country.

Mr. Speaker, I have made many appointments to the two academies. In no single instance has one of my appointees served more honorably, more efficiently, or with greater distinction than has Rear Adm. Thomas Browning Inglis. There is no officer in the entire United States Navy who has a greater love for the Navy and who is more jealous of its fair name than he. He is a most honorable gentleman. Men of his character do not lie.

Mr. Speaker, during this past war Rear Admiral Inglis has spent most of his time at sea in command of fighting ships. He commanded a ship in the Atlantic when the tragedy of Pearl Harbor occurred. His latest command was the cruiser *Birmingham*, which had under his command as fine a fighting record as any ship in our Navy.

My colleague, Representative BRADLEY, of Michigan, has referred to only a small part of the combat activities of this fine ship. She was in practically all of the battle activities up to and including the time when the *Princeton* was seriously damaged by Japanese bombs and the explosion of her aft magazine. It was while lying alongside the *Princeton*, which had been set afire by bombs—and when the *Birmingham* lay alongside—that the aft magazine exploded. Most of the *Birmingham's* crew was on deck helping to fight the fire, and her casualties in dead and wounded far exceeded those of the *Princeton*. It was then that Admiral Inglis was so seriously wounded. In his wounded condition he brought his ship across the Pacific, and thereafter was hospitalized for seven long months. His record in peacetime service as well as during the war has been something of which the Navy can be, and I am sure is, very proud.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SHORTAGE OF SOIL PIPE AND PLUMBING

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, modern homes cannot be built in the countryside or in the cities without soil pipe and plumbing equipment. We can pass all the resolutions we want to with respect to having homes for veterans and other people, but the fact remains you cannot build homes until the material is produced.

One man tells me he has 4,000 homes under construction and can make no progress whatsoever. The soil pipe industry informs me in a series of letters this week that their production has dropped from 500,000 tons per year to 115,000 tons per year. When we get ready to go back to work in this country we can build homes and do other things, but until then your resolutions are not going to be very effective.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

RETURNING SERVICEMEN

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a soldier from my town in which he states there are 15,000 men with points from 60 to as high as 90 on the island of Leyte, with no boats taking anyone out for the past 13 days. They are almost despairing as to whether or not they are going to get home. They are wondering what will happen to the lower-point men when they are so slow with these high-point men. I only hope the Army and Navy will extend their efforts to get shipping and get these boys back home. It is hard on their morale and might affect them throughout many years of their life.

The letter I refer to reads as follows:

PALO LEYTE, P. I., *November 9, 1945.*

Congressman C. W. VURSELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter pertains to the forgotten men on Leyte of which I am one. I've been overseas 20½ months, 12½ months spent here on Leyte island, and needless to say, I'm sick and tired of the place and everyone that continually screams "No shipping space." As of September 2 I have 66 points which make me eligible to go home on November 1. Will I ever get home to my wife and child? I'm inclined to think not unless you and all the other Congressmen do something about the so-called no boats available story that we hear every day. Can't more Liberty ships be converted to troop ships as the enlisted man's notable friend Lieutenant Colonel Davidson in Manila suggested nearly 1 month ago?

There are at present 15,009 returnees at the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot at Tacloban, Leyte, including numerous men with over 90 points. There has been no shipment whatsoever—except 18 men on emergency furlough—for the past 13 days. Over 1,100 men have been in the depot 42 days awaiting shipment. Only 2,650 have been shipped out of here during the entire month of October. So, apparently no ships whatever are assigned to Leyte, and the men are taken out now and then by drips and drops. My complaint is: if these men are never moved how in the name of our good Lord will the 60- and 70-point men ever get a chance to go home? Please turn on the heat where it counts. For results use the club, not faith.

* * * * *

I came across on a converted freighter, the U. S. S. *Seawitch*. They brought us over on anything that would float—including cattle boats—so, why can't they take us back to our loved ones on similar boats?

Will you please answer this letter? I'd like to know the answers and facts as to why we are being delayed.

Sincerely.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances and include excerpts in each.

Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include certain records.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the morning press advises that the UAW-CIO in Michigan may, within 48 hours, because its demand for a 30-percent increase in wages has been denied by General Motors, call a strike which before it is ended may throw out of their jobs over 100,000 workers and which will indirectly affect more than a million people.

Now, I am asking if some Member on the majority side; if some representative of the UAW-CIO; some representative of the Political Action Committee, of Sidney Hillman, of R. J. Thomas, president of the UAW-CIO; of Walter Reuther and Richard Frankensteen, the CIO's recent candidate for mayor of Detroit; some representative of Philip Murray, will please arise during the coming week and tell this House, if and when this strike is called and a hundred thousand or more men are out of jobs, who is going to give them employment?

Will Sidney Hillman, Thomas, Frankensteen, or Murray give any one of the hundred thousand or more a job? Or is the United States to step in when the unemployment payments have been exhausted and maintain them in idleness?

Any meddlesome boy or individual can take the family timepiece apart, but not all of those who do it can put it together again.

Now, if some of the gentlemen here who are always, figuratively speaking, damning all employers, all the creators and maintainers of jobs, all those who meet pay rolls, will just get up on their feet and answer that question, it may be of great help to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, some of the members of which

are now trying to write a bill calling for the expenditure of some $24,000,000,000 to create jobs for some 8,000,000 anticipated unemployed workers.

Those named above are able to close down industry, to throw men out of jobs. Did any of you ever hear of any one of them creating a job, giving employment?

HOUSE PERIODICAL PRESS GALLERY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law compensation at the rate of $2,700 per annum, payable monthly, for the services of a superintendent of the House Periodical Press Gallery—

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution temporarily.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House. The gentleman has withdrawn the resolution, which is his right.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—HEALTH LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message to the Congress of September 6, 1945, there were enumerated in a proposed economic bill of rights certain rights which ought to be assured to every American citizen.

One of them was: "The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health." Another was the "right to adequate protection from the economic fears of * * * sickness * * *."

Millions of our citizens do not now have a full measure of opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health. Millions do not now have protection or security against the economic effects of sickness. The time has arrived for action to help them attain that opportunity and that protection.

The people of the United States received a shock when the medical examinations conducted by the Selective Service System revealed the widespread physical and mental incapacity among the young people of our Nation. We had had prior warnings from eminent medical authorities and from investigating committees. The statistics of the last war had shown the same condition. But the Selective Service System has brought it forcibly to our attention recently—in terms which all of us can understand.

As of April 1, 1945, nearly 5,000,000 male registrants between the ages of 18 and 37 had been examined and classified as unfit for military service. The number of those rejected for military service was about 30 percent of all those examined. The percentage of rejection was lower in the younger age groups and higher in the higher age groups, reaching as high as 49 percent for registrants between the ages of 34 and 37.

In addition, after actual induction, about a million and a half men had to be discharged from the Army and Navy for physical or mental disability, exclusive of wounds; and an equal number had to be treated in the armed forces for diseases or defects which existed before induction.

Among the young women who applied for admission to the Women's Army Corps there was similar disability. Over one-third of those examined were rejected for physical or mental reasons.

These men and women who were rejected for military service are not necessarily incapable of civilian work. It is plain, however, that they have illnesses and defects that handicap them, reduce their working capacity, or shorten their lives.

It is not so important to search the past in order to fix the blame for these conditions. It is more important to resolve now that no American child shall come to adult life with diseases or defects which can be prevented or corrected at an early age.

Medicine has made great strides in this generation—especially during the last 4 years. We owe much to the skill and devotion of the medical profession. In spite of great scientific progress, however, each year we lose many more persons from preventable and premature deaths than we lost in battle or from war injuries during the entire war.

We are proud of past reductions in our death rates. But these reductions have come principally from public-health and other community services. We have been less effective in making available to all of our people the benefits of medical progress in the care and treatment of individuals.

In the past, the benefits of modern medical science have not been enjoyed by our citizens with any degree of equality. Nor are they today. Nor will they be in the future—unless Government is bold enough to do something about it.

People with low or moderate incomes do not get the same medical attention as those with high incomes. The poor have more sickness, but they get less medical care. People who live in rural areas do not get the same amount or quality of medical attention as those who live in our cities.

Our new economic bill of rights should mean health security for all, regardless of residence, station, or race—everywhere in the United States.

We should resolve now that the health of this Nation is a national concern; that financial barriers in the way of attaining health shall be removed; that the health of all its citizens deserves the help of all the Nation.

There are five basic problems which we must attack vigorously if we would reach the health objectives of our economic bill of rights.

1. The first has to do with the number and distribution of doctors and hospitals. One of the most important requirements for adequate health service is professional personnel—doctors, dentists, public health and hospital administrators, nurses, and other experts.

The United States has been fortunate with respect to physicians. In proportion to population it has more than any large country in the world, and they are well trained for their calling. It is not enough, however, that we have them in sufficient numbers. They should be located where their services are needed. In this respect we are not so fortunate.

The distribution of physicians in the United States has been grossly uneven and unsatisfactory. Some communities have had enough or even too many; others have had too few. Year by year the number in our rural areas has been diminishing. Indeed, in 1940, there were 31 counties in the United States, each with more than a thousand inhabitants, in which there was not a single practicing physician. The situation with respect to dentists was even worse.

One important reason for this disparity is that in some communities there are no adequate facilities for the practice of medicine. Another reason—closely allied with the first—is that the earning capacity of the people in some communities makes it difficult if not impossible for doctors who practice there to make a living.

The demobilization of 60,000 doctors, and of the tens of thousands of other professional personnel in the armed forces, is now proceeding on a large scale. Unfortunately, unless we act rapidly, we may expect to see them concentrate in the places with greater financial resources and avoid other places, making the inequalities even greater than before the war.

Demobilized doctors cannot be assigned. They must be attracted. In order to be attracted, they must be able to see ahead of them professional opportunities and economic assurances.

Inequalities in the distribution of medical personnel are matched by inequalities in hospitals and other health facilities. Moreover, there are just too few hospitals, clinics and health centers to take proper care of the people of the United States.

About 1,200 counties, 40 percent of the total in the country, with some 15,000,000 people, have either no local hospital, or none that meets even the minimum standards of national professional associations.

The deficiencies are especially severe in rural and semi-rural areas and in those cities where changes in population have placed great strains on community facilities.

I want to emphasize, however, that the basic problem in this field cannot be solved merely by building facilities. They have to be staffed; and the communities have to be able to pay for the services. Otherwise the new facilities will be little used.

2. The second basic problem is the need for development of public health services and maternal and child care. The Congress can be justifiably proud of its share in making recent accomplishments possible: Public-health and

maternal and child-health programs already have made important contributions to national health. But large needs remain. Great areas of our country are still without these services. This is especially true among our rural areas; but it is true also in far too many urban communities.

Although local public-health departments are now maintained by some 18,000 counties and other local units, many of these have only skeleton organizations, and approximately 40,000,000 citizens of the United States still live in communities lacking full-time local public-health service. At the recent rate of progress in developing such service, it would take more than a hundred years to cover the whole Nation.

If we agree that the national health must be improved, our cities, towns, and farming communities must be made healthful places in which to live through provision of safe water systems, sewage-disposal plants and sanitary facilities. Our streams and rivers must be safeguarded against pollution. In addition to building a sanitary environment for ourselves and for our children, we must provide those services which prevent disease and promote health.

Services for expectant mothers and for infants, care of crippled or otherwise physically handicapped children, and inoculation for the prevention of communicable diseases are accepted public-health functions. So, too, are many kinds of personal services such as the diagnosis and treatment of widespread infections like tuberculosis and venereal disease. A large part of the population today lacks many or all of these services.

Our success in the traditional public-health sphere is made plain by the conquest over many communicable diseases. Typhoid fever, smallpox, and diphtheria—diseases for which there are effective controls—have become comparatively rare. We must make the same gains in reducing our maternal and infant mortality, in controlling tuberculosis, venereal disease, malaria, and other major threats to life and health. We are only beginning to realize our potentialities in achieving physical well-being for all our people.

3. The third basic problem concerns medical research and professional education.

We have long recognized that we cannot be content with what is already known about health or disease. We must learn and understand more about health and how to prevent and cure disease.

Research—well directed and continuously supported—can do much to develop ways to reduce those diseases of body and mind which now cause most sickness, disability, and premature death—diseases of the heart, kidneys, and arteries, rheumatism, cancer, diseases of childbirth, infancy, and childhood, respiratory diseases, and tuberculosis. And research can do much toward teaching us how to keep well and how to prolong healthy human life.

Cancer is among the leading causes of death. It is responsible for over 160,000 recorded deaths a year, and should receive special attention. Though we already have the National Cancer Institute of the Public Health Service, we need still more coordinated research on the cause, prevention, and cure of this disease. We need more financial support for research and to establish special clinics and hospitals for diagnosis and treatment of the disease especially in its early stages. We need to train more physicians for the highly specialized services so essential for effective control of cancer.

There is also special need for research on mental diseases and abnormalities. We have done pitifully little about mental illnesses. Accurate statistics are lacking, but there is no doubt that there are at least 2,000,000 persons in the United States who are mentally ill, and that as many as 10,000,000 will probbaly need hospitalization for mental illnesses for some period in the course of their lifetime. A great many of these persons would be helped by proper care. Mental cases occupy more than one-half of the hospital beds, at a cost of about $500,000,000 per year—practically all of it coming out of taxpayers' money. Each year there are 125,000 new mental cases admitted to institutions. We need more mental-disease hospitals, more outpatient clinics. We need more services for early diagnosis, and especially we need much more research to learn how to prevent mental break-down. Also, we must have many more trained and qualified doctors in this field.

It is clear that we have not done enough in peacetime for medical research and education in view of our enormous resources and our national interest in health progress. The money invested in research pays enormous dividends. If anyone doubts this, let him think of penicillin, plasma, DDT powder, and new rehabilitation techniques.

4. The fourth problem has to do with the high cost of individual medical care. The principal reason why people do not receive the care they need is that they cannot afford to pay for it on an individual basis at the time they need it. This is true not only for needy persons. It is also true for a large proportion of normally self-supporting persons.

In the aggregate, all health services—from public-health agencies, physicians, hospitals, dentists, nurses, and laboratories—absorb only about 4 percent of the national income. We can afford to spend more for health.

But 4 percent is only an average. It is cold comfort in individual cases. Individual families pay their individual costs, and not average costs. They may be hit by sickness that calls for many times the average cost—in extreme cases for more than their annual income. When this happens they may come face to face with economic disaster. Many families, fearful of expense, delay calling the doctor long beyond the time when medical care would do the most good.

For some persons with very low income or no income at all we now use taxpayers' money in the form of free services, free clinics, and public hospitals. Tax-supported, free medical care for needy persons, however, is insufficient in most of our cities and in nearly all of our rural areas. This deficiency cannot be met by private charity or the kindness of individual physicians.

Each of us knows doctors who work through endless days and nights, never expecting to be paid for their services because many of their patients are unable to pay. Often the physician spends not only his time and effort, but even part of the fees he has collected from patients able to pay, in order to buy medical supplies for those who cannot afford them. I am sure that there are thousands of such physicians throughout our country. They cannot, and should not, be expected to carry so heavy a load.

5. The fifth problem has to do with loss of earnings when sickness strikes. Sickness not only brings doctor bills, it also cuts off income.

On an average day, there are about seven million persons so disabled by sickness or injury that they cannot go about their usual tasks. Of these, about three and a quarter millions are persons who, if they were not disabled, would be working or seeking employment. More than one-half of these disabled workers have already been disabled for 6 months; many of them will continue to be disabled for years, and some for the remainder of their lives.

Every year, four or five hundred million working days are lost from productive employment because of illness and accident among those working or looking for work—about forty times the number of days lost because of strikes on the average during the 10 years before the war. About nine-tenths of this enormous loss is due to illness and accident that is not directly connected with employment, and is therefore not covered by workmen's compensation laws.

These then are the five important problems which must be solved, if we hope to attain our objective of adequate medical care, good health, and protection from the economic fears of sickness and disability.

To meet these problems, I recommend that the Congress adopt a comprehensive and modern health program for the Nation, consisting of five major parts—each of which contributes to all the others.

FIRST. CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS AND RELATED FACILITIES

The Federal Government should provide financial and other assistance for the construction of needed hospitals, health centers, and other medical, health, and rehabilitation facilities. With the help of Federal funds, it should be possible to meet deficiencies in hospital and health facilities so that modern services—for both prevention and cure—can be accessible to all the people. Federal financial aid should be available not only to build new facilities where needed, but also to enlarge or modernize those we now have.

In carrying out this program, there should be a clear division of responsibilities between the States and the Federal Government. The States, localities, and the Federal Government should share in the financial responsibilities. The Federal Government should not construct or operate these hospitals. It should, how-

ever, lay down minimum national standards for construction and operation, and should make sure that Federal funds are allocated to those areas and projects where Federal aid is needed most. In approving State plans and individual projects, and in fixing the national standards, the Federal agency should have the help of a strictly advisory body that includes both public and professional members.

Adequate emphasis should be given to facilities that are particularly useful for prevention of disease, mental as well as physical, and to the coordination of various kinds of facilities. It should be possible to go a long way toward knitting together facilities for prevention with facilities for cure, the large hospitals of medical centers with the smaller institutions of surrounding areas, the facilities for the civilian population with the facilities for veterans.

The general policy of Federal-State partnership which has done so much to provide the magnificent highways of the United States can be adapted to the construction of hospitals in the communities which need them.

SECOND, EXPANSION OF PUBLIC-HEALTH, MATERNAL AND CHILD-HEALTH SERVICES

Our programs for public-health and related services should be enlarged and strengthened. The present Federal-State cooperative health programs deal with general public-health work, tuberculosis, and venereal disease control, maternal and child-health services, and services for crippled children.

These programs were especially developed in the 10 years before the war, and have been extended in some areas during the war. They have already made important contributions to national health, but they have not yet reached a large proportion of our rural areas, and, in many cities, they are only partially developed.

No area in the Nation should continue to be without the services of a full-time health officer and other essential personnel. No area should be without essential public-health services or sanitation facilities. No area should be without community-health services such as maternal and child-health care.

Hospitals, clinics, and health centers must be built to meet the needs of the total population, and must make adequate provision for the safe birth of every baby, and for the health protection of infants and children.

Present laws relating to general public health, and to maternal and child health, have built a solid foundation of Federal cooperation with the States in administering community-health services. The emergency maternity and infant-care program for the wives and infants of servicemen—a great wartime service authorized by the Congress—has materially increased the experience of every State health agency, and has provided much needed care. So, too, have other wartime programs such as venereal-disease control, industrial hygiene, malaria control, tuberculosis control, and other services offered in war essential communities.

The Federal Government should cooperate by more generous grants to the States than are provided under present laws for public-health services and for maternal and child-health care. The program should continue to be partly financed by the States themselves, and should be administered by the States. Federal grants should be in proportion to State and local expenditures, and should also vary in accordance with the financial ability of the respective States.

The health of American children, like their education, should be recognized as a definite public responsibility.

In the conquest of many diseases prevention is even more important than cure. A well-rounded national health program should, therefore, include systematic and widespread health and physical education and examinations, beginning with the youngest children and extending into community organizations. Medical and dental examinations of school children are now inadequate. A preventive health program, to be successful, must discover defects as early as possible. We should, therefore, see to it that our health programs are pushed most vigorously with the youngest section of the population.

Of course, Federal aid for community health services—for general public health and for mothers and children—should complement and not duplicate prepaid medical services for individuals, proposed by the fourth recommendation of this message.

THIRD. MEDICAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

The Federal Government should undertake a broad program to strengthen professional education in medical and related fields, and to encourage and support medical research.

Professional education should be strengthened where necessary through Federal grants-in-aid to public and to nonprofit private institutions. Medical research, also, should be encouraged and supported in the Federal agencies and by grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit private agencies.

In my message to the Congress of September 6, 1945, I made various recommendations for a general Federal research program. Medical research—dealing with the broad fields of physical and mental illnesses—should be made effective in part through that general program and in part through specific provisions within the scope of a national health program.

Federal aid to promote and support research in medicine, public health, and allied fields is an essential part of a general research program to be administered by a central Federal research agency. Federal aid for medical research and education is also an essential part of any national health program, if it is to meet its responsibilities for high grade medical services and for continuing progress. Coordination of the two programs is obviously necessary to assure efficient use of Federal funds. Legislation covering medical research in a national health program should provide for such coordination.

FOURTH. PREPAYMENT OF MEDICAL COSTS

Everyone should have ready access to all necessary medical, hospital, and related services.

I recommend solving the basic problem by distributing the costs through expansion of our existing compulsory social insurance system. This is not socialized medicine.

Everyone who carries fire insurance knows how the law of averages is made to work so as to spread the risk, and to benefit the insured who actually suffers the loss. If instead of the costs of sickness being paid only by those who get sick, all the people—sick and well—were required to pay premiums into an insurance fund, the pool of funds thus created would enable all who do fall sick to be adequately served without overburdening anyone. That is the principle upon which all forms of insurance are based.

During the past 15 years, hospital insurance plans have taught many Americans this magic of averages. Voluntary health insurance plans have been expanding during recent years; but their rate of growth does not justify the belief that they will meet more than a fraction of our people's needs. Only about 3 percent or 4 percent of our population now have insurance providing comprehensive medical care.

A system of required prepayment would not only spread the costs of medical care, it would also prevent much serious disease. Since medical bills would be paid by the insurance fund, doctors would more often be consulted when the first signs of disease occur instead of when the disease has become serious. Modern hospital, specialist, and laboratory services, as needed, would also become available to all, and would improve the quality and adequacy of care. Prepayment of medical care would go a long way toward furnishing insurance against disease itself, as well as against medical bills.

Such a system of prepayment should cover medical, hospital, nursing, and laboratory services. It should also cover dental care—as fully and for as many of the population as the available professional personnel and the financial resources of the system permit.

The ability of our people to pay for adequate medical care will be increased if, while they are well, they pay regularly into a common health fund, instead of paying sporadically and unevenly when they are sick. This health fund should be built up nationally, in order to establish the broadest and most stable basis for spreading the costs of illness, and to assure adequate financial support for doctors and hospitals everywhere. If we were to reply on State-by-State action only, many years would elapse before we had any general coverage. Meanwhile health service would continue to be grossly uneven, and disease would continue to cross State boundary lines.

Medical services are personal. Therefore the Nation-wide system must be highly decentralized in administration. The local administrative unit must be the keystone of the system so as to provide for local services and adaptation to local needs and conditions. Locally as

well as nationally, policy and administration should be guided by advisory committees in which the public and the medical professions are represented.

Subject to national standards, methods and rates of paying doctors and hospitals should be adjusted locally. All such rates for doctors should be adequate, and should be appropriately adjusted upward for those who are qualified specialists.

People should remain free to choose their own physicians and hospitals. The removal of financial barriers between patient and doctor would enlarge the present freedom of choice. The legal requirement on the population to contribute involves no compulsion over the doctor's freedom to decide what services his patient needs. People will remain free to obtain and pay for medical service outside of the health-insurance system if they desire, even though they are members of the system; just as they are free to send their children to private instead of to public schools, although they must pay taxes for public schools.

Likewise physicians should remain free to accept or reject patients. They must be allowed to decide for themselves whether they wish to participate in the health-insurance system full time, part time, or not at all. A physician may have some patients who are in the system and some who are not. Physicians must be permitted to be represented through organizations of their own choosing, and to decide whether to carry on in individual practice or to join with other doctors in group practice in hospitals or in clinics.

Our voluntary hospitals and our city, county, and State general hospitals, in the same way, must be free to participate in the system to whatever extent they wish. In any case they must continue to retain their administrative independence.

Voluntary organizations which provide health services that meet reasonable standards of quality should be entitled to furnish services under the insurance system and to be reimbursed for them. Voluntary cooperative organizations concerned with paying doctors, hospitals, or others for health services, but not providing services directly, should be entitled to participate if they can contribute to the efficiency and economy of the system.

None of this is really new. The American people are the most insurance-minded people in the world. They will not be frightened off from health insurance because some people have misnamed it "socialized medicine."

I repeat—what I am recommending is not socialized medicine.

Socialized medicine means that all doctors work as employees of government. The American people want no such system. No such system is here proposed.

Under the plan I suggest, our people would continue to get medical and hospital services just as they do now—on the basis of their own voluntary decisions and choices. Our doctors and hospitals would continue to deal with disease with the same professional freedom as now. There would, however, be this all-important difference: whether or not patients get the services they need would not depend on how much they can afford to pay at the time.

I am in favor of the broadest possible coverage for this insurance system. I believe that all persons who work for a living and their dependents should be covered under such an insurance plan. This would include wage-and-salary earners, those in business for themselves, professional persons, farmers, agricultural labor, domestic employees, Government employees, and employees of nonprofit institutions and their families.

In addition, needy persons and other groups should be covered through appropriate premiums paid for them by public agencies. Increased Federal funds should also be made available by the Congress under the public assistance programs to reimburse the States for part of such premiums, as well as for direct expenditures made by the States in paying for medical services provided by doctors, hospitals, and other agencies to needy persons.

Premiums for present social-insurance benefits are calculated on the first $3,000 of earnings in a year. It might be well to have all such premiums, including those for health, calculated on a somewhat higher amount such as $3,600.

A broad program of prepayment for medical care would need total amounts approximately equal to 4 percent of such earnings. The people of the United States have been spending, on the average, nearly this percentage of their incomes for sickness care. How much of the total fund should come from the insurance premiums and how much from general revenues is a matter for the Congress to decide.

The plan which I have suggested would be sufficient to pay most doctors more than the best they have received in peacetime years. The payments of the doctors' bills would be guaranteed, and the doctors would be spared the annoyance and uncertainty of collecting fees from individual patients. The same assurance would apply to hospitals, dentists, and nurses for the services they render.

Federal aid in the construction of hospitals will be futile unless there is current purchasing power so that people can use these hospitals. Doctors cannot be drawn to sections which need them without some assurance that they can make a living. Only a Nation-wide spreading of sickness costs can supply such sections with sure and sufficient purchasing power to maintain enough physicians and hospitals.

We are a rich nation and can afford many things. But ill-health which can be prevented or cured is one thing we cannot afford.

FIFTH. PROTECTION AGAINST LOSS OF WAGES FROM SICKNESS AND DISABILITY

What I have discussed heretofore has been a program for improving and spreading the health services and facilities of the Nation, and providing an efficient and less burdensome system of paying for them.

But no matter what we do, sickness will of course come to many. Sickness brings with it loss of wages.

Therefore, as a fifth element of a comprehensive health program, the workers of the Nation and their families should be protected against loss of earnings because of illness. A comprehensive health program must include the payment of benefits to replace at least part of the earnings that are lost during the period of sickness and long-term disability. This protection can be readily and conveniently provided through expansion of our present social insurance system, with appropriate adjustment of premiums.

Insurance against loss of wages from sickness and disability deals with cash benefits, rather than with services. It has to be coordinated with the other cash benefits under existing social insurance systems. Such coordination should be effected when other social-security measures are reexamined. I shall bring this subject again to the attention of the Congress in a separate message on social security.

I strongly urge that the Congress give careful consideration to this program of health legislation now.

Many millions of our veterans, accustomed in the armed forces to the best of medical and hospital care, will no longer be eligible for such care as a matter of right except for their service-connected disabilities. They deserve continued adequate and comprehensive health service. And their dependents deserve it, too.

By preventing illness, by assuring access to needed community and personal health services, by promoting medical research, and by protecting our people against the loss caused by sickness, we shall strengthen our national health, our national defense, and our economic productivity. We shall increase the professional and economic opportunities of our physicians, dentists, and nurses. We shall increase the effectiveness of our hospitals and public-health agencies. We shall bring new security to our people.

We need to do this especially at this time because of the return to civilian life of many doctors, dentists, and nurses, particularly young men and women.

Appreciation of modern achievements in medicine and public health has created widespread demand that they be fully applied and universally available. By meeting that demand we shall strengthen the Nation to meet future economic and social problems; and we shall make a most important contribution toward freedom from want in our land.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 19, 1945.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RAMSPECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Raymond Moley appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] has a special order for November 30. She does not desire to use the time on that day and, on her behalf, I ask unanimous consent that she may have the same time following other special orders on December 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman rom North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DISCHARGE OF CERTAIN SERVICEMEN

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I am following up on the bill I introduced on the 24th of September which would compel the discharge of young men under 21 years of age, of men with a wife and one or more children, and of men over the age of 35 years.

In this connection may I say that this project was not initiated simply to get somebody out of the service. In my opinion it is well-conceived legislation; it is highly important to the Nation and to the family life of our country. If we were engaged at this time in a war, of course no one would offer a proposal to discharge or release any soldiers from the service no matter what capacity they served in; however, it appears to me as if we are forgetting that we are not at war and we are loath to offer a program and provision for the discharge of those who ought to be discharged and returned to their homes.

I know that there is involved the difficulty of transportation, but in the bill I introduced in the House I said, "As rapidly as transportation facilities will permit." But I did add to that: "In no event longer than 90 days after the effective date of this act." When I introduced the bill I knew it would never get to the floor of the House in the usual way. I was not disappointed when 30 legislative days expired and no action had been taken. I did not expect any action. I knew that it would be necessary, if the bill ever reached the floor of the House for the consideration of the membership, to have it presented by way of a petition for discharge.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here today to say anything unkind about the Army or the Navy or any of the officers or officials of either of these services, but I do suggest that the question of consideration of these men who have been taken into the service in their teen ages, taken from their schools and colleges in the midst of their efforts to obtain an education in this country, the men who have served from the 2 to 3 and 4 years in this war, separated from their wives and one or more children, is a public question, and not one of military concern particularly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the difficulty grow not out of the unwillingness of the Army or the Navy to permit these men to get out of the service, but out of the fact that it is the policy of our Government to keep them over there? Now I notice the trouble that is being reported in the papers. In all of these countries there are little wars here, there, and all over. Does not the gentleman realize that there is an over-all policy which may require those men to stay? I am not in favor of such a policy but it occurs to me that the fault does not lie so much with the Army and the Navy as it does with those who make the policy.

Mr. FOLGER. I cannot answer the gentleman about that.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I think perhaps there is at least a partial answer to that situation in another direction. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress informs me that on the 6th of May, when we had two wars going on, we had 1,497 generals, but on the 1st of October, after 1,500,000 men had been discharged, and both wars were over and the country was at peace, we had 1,527 generals; an increase of 30 generals. I am wondering if we can demobilize the Army without demobilizing some generals if this job is to be done effectively?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I suggested in the beginning that I did not propose to have so much to say about the Army and the Navy, but I do suggest that we have not come to realize that we are not at war. We have not come to realize what it means to many of the men who are doing no job at all, or may be supposed to be doing patrol duty somewhere either in Japan or a portion of Germany, and that there are millions and millions of them there. The policy that is outlined in my insistence and my bill is supplemental and additional to any policy that has been or will be adopted by the Army or the Navy in the discharge of men who are not needed to perform these duties, which are quite inconsequential as compared with the needs and requirements for which they were called together in this vast number of twelve or thirteen million men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How can the gentleman harmonize that policy of bringing all these men home with the policy of maintaining or being a part of the United Nations, where we are supposed to furnish the men to maintain peace throughout the world. You surely cannot keep them over there fighting and bring them home at the same time. We have to let go of one policy or the other.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I would have to talk a long time to answer that. In the first place, we are in a different age altogether. Overnight our whole life was changed. In that connection, may I read excerpts from a few articles which I have found in respect to this matter:

Such blasts as leveled Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 5 and 8, 1945, never occurred on earth before, nor in the sun or stars, which burn from sources that release their energy much more slowly than does uranium.

Then from Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times:

In a fraction of a second the atomic bomb that dropped on Hiroshima altered our traditional economic, political, and military values. It capped a revolution in the technique of war that forces immediate reconsideration of our entire national defense problem.

Then, Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill had something to say about this in a speech which he made, I think, before the House of Commons:

There are those who considered that the atomic bomb should never have been used at all * * * that rather than throw this bomb we should have sacrificed a million Americans and a quarter of a million British lives in the desperate battles and massacres of an invasion of Japan. Future generations will judge this dire decision, and I believe, if they find themselves in a happier world from which war has been banished and where freedom reigns, they will not condemn those who struggled for their benefit amid the horrors and miseries of this grim and ferocious epoch.

The bomb brought peace, but man alone can keep that peace.

Nothing can stay the progress of research in any country, but the construction of the immense plants necessary to transform the theory into action cannot be improvised. So far as we know, there are perhaps 3 or 4 years before the great progress in the United States can be overtaken. In these 3 years, we must remold the relationships of all men of all nations in such a way that men do not wish, or dare, to fall upon each other for the sake of vulgar, outdated ambition, or for passionate differences in ideologies, and that international bodies by supreme authority may give peace on earth and justice among men. Our pilgrimage has brought us to a sublime moment in the history of the world.

From the least to the greatest, all must strive to be worthy of these supreme opportunities. There is not an hour to be wasted; there is not a day to be lost.

Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? To my mind, it means that we must come to a full realization of the fact that it is just about as sensible to undertake to carry on war according to the methods and with the means that we employed in this last war, World War II, as it would have been to use in this World War II the rifle and the musket that were known during and prior to the War Between the States.

It is not a question of comparison, but we are going to have absolute destruction through war or we shall have no war at all. We cannot have war without total destruction of a part or all of the civilization of the world. Why, then, do we punish these young men who, willingly, many of them by voluntary action of their own, spent 2 or 3 years of the most important part of their lives, who laid their books down in the high schools and came home from the colleges and went off to war, for what? To defend this Nation against the onslaught of two of the most merciless nations of the world. Our men did not want to fight. They never have wanted to fight. They did not want to be soldiers. They did not want to lead a military life. They do not now and never did intend to make that their career upon this earth. Yet, as though they did, painfully we have heard

that they will give no consideration to the return of the school-age boys as a part of our program of the demobilization of the armed forces. We have been told that. What must we do? The only thing left for us to do, as men giving consideration to the civil requirements of the development of our young men in this country, is to seek legislation to require their return. I am again suggesting that the importance of these considerations is not best addressed to men of military bent. Their judgment, in my opinion, is not so reliable as that of the man who lives with the situation every day here at home. We have heard and we accept it as a fact that as the twig is bent, so the tree will be inclined. We have heard and accept it as fortunate sometimes, and sometimes unfortunately true that "I am a part of all I have come in contact with." For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it does not convince me that the policy of denial in the demobilization program of consideration to men who have a wife and one or more children, to boys who seek an education, as I say, I am not convinced that that policy is best for this country. It is a question that can be more wisely and safely determined by those whose lives have been devoted to educational pursuits of themselves, their children, and their neighbors' children, to those who have seen and who have observed from day to day the grief, the sorrow, and sometimes the disaster of separation of a man from his wife and his children.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Holding the views that you do about the education of the young men, how do you justify the conscription of these 18-year-olds for compulsory military training?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I answer that by saying that I voted to conscript them, if you want to call it that, and that is not an impolite term so far as the truth is concerned. I voted for it because we were told they were necessary to the defense of this country. War was inevitable. I knew it in 1940, and the majority of the people in this country knew it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. We were attacked by those who had spent 8 or 10 years in making ready for the day when they would undertake to conquer and enslave the world. For the protection of this country those boys were sent to war. But that necessity does not now obtain, in my opinion, and will never obtain, with the means and methods of warfare now at hand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman did not understand me or else I did not make myself clear. I was not talking about that conscription. I am talking about the bill that is now pending before the Committee on Military Affairs conscripting the young men of the future, conscripting them today.

Mr. FOLGER. The gentleman has drawn me out on something that I do not know whether I had adverted to, but I am bound to answer by saying I am opposed to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is making a fine appeal to get these boys back home, and I was wondering whether he was in favor of conscripting them today to send some others across.

Mr. FOLGER. No, sir. I must say I am opposed to it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina. I have a petition in the well to bring out my bill, H. R. 4125, that would permit the discharge of all men who have been continuously in the service for 18 months or more or who have dependents at home who need their attention, or who desire to return to school.

I have just received a letter from San Francisco, from a young married man in the service. Evidently they are shipping these men to Asia. General MacArthur said he would not need over 200,000 men in Japan, and I believe he said when he got things under control he could get along with 60,000. Yet, listen to this letter, written from San Francisco on November 13, 1945:

> I am with a unit composed of 65 men who are shipping overseas tomorrow. About 90 percent of us are 30 or over, pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, with at least two children. What I want to know is how long does the War Department intend to keep us in the service, now that the war is over.

I contend that holding these men in the service now cannot be justified from any standpoint.

Mr. FOLGER. I thank the gentleman.

I want to read to you something that Lieutenant General Clay said with reference to the very subject which the gentleman from Mississippi was speaking about.

> Gen. Lucius B. Clay, General Eisenhower's deputy, dropped in tonight for the dedication of the new enlisted men's club and was asked about the I-want-to-go-home attitude of American occupational and military Government forces. Quoting General Clay's reply:
>
> "The sooner we get rid of the 'I want to go homes' and replace them with a personnel who want to stay, the better we are off. We want people who will stay and make a career of this job. We are getting 15,000 new personnel this month."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman stated a moment ago that he knew in 1940 that war was imminent. That was about the time when President Roosevelt said: "Whoever thinks we need a two-ocean Navy is just plain dumb." Is it possible the gentleman had some information that the White House should have had back in those days? These are the days of the Pearl Harbor investigation, and probably there are some things we ought to know more about.

Mr. FOLGER. I think I understand the gentleman. This is not a political matter with me. I will observe, however, that it is quite evident that as far back as 1939, and probably even further back, the then President of the United States realized that there was great danger of war and danger of our being drawn into it. He realized that, of course, in 1940 as did many of the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, for what purpose are we keeping these boys and these men in the service, if you want to call it service? I noticed the other day, just Friday, I think, a statement in the press that the one millionth man had been discharged—that is "t-h", one millionth—and figuring from that, with VE-day May 8, 1945, and 1,000,000 men discharged as of the present date, I calculate that at this rate it would require about 5 years to demobilize the eight or ten million boys and men who are supposed to be sent back home.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I believe the gentleman has been misinformed as to the number of men the Army has discharged. I believe he will find that the Army has discharged approximately 3,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps together.

Mr. SHAFER. Yes. I am very much in favor of some movement to get these boys home. The gentleman may recall that it was brought out earlier on the floor today that the War Department reduced its critical score under the point system to 55 over the week end. I asked the question then: What is the use of reducing this critical score if they do not bring the boys home? Is it just to add some more sop to pacify the public? Perhaps the gentleman can answer that.

Mr. FOLGER. Answering the gentleman I may say I hardly think it is stubbornness or an attempt to deceive the people on the part of the Army and Navy, but just that they are not able to return the men as fast as we would like. They are doing the best they can. My bill would urge them to greater effort because 90 days is the limit within which they are obliged to find ships and transportation.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my point is, of course, that these men who are being shipped overseas are very high-point men, some having as many as 95 and 100 points, some as high as even 115 points.

Mr. FOLGER. I realize that, but that is something I cannot go into. I am talking about the policy to be adopted in any program that is set up to require the discharge of men with families because they have been disrupted long enough; and those boys under 21 should be brought back home and permitted to continue their schooling. If not they will grow up in ignorance and never will have an education.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. They are being kept in service by one point; that is, a point of order against my amendment the other day.

I believe I am going to get that amendment put on in the Senate, but if I do not, when you Members get through hearing from home we will get enough signers on

one of these petitions to bring one of these measures to the floor and pass it.

But I want to ask the gentleman from North Carolina, even taking the figures used by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], 3,000,000, that still leaves about 8,000,000 in the service, does it not?

Mr. FOLGER. According to my understanding it does. What I read was probably a little boasting about the discharge of the one-millionth man, referring to the Army alone.

Mr. RANKIN. I saw the statement to which the gentleman from Michigan referred. But suppose 3,000,000 have been discharged. That still leaves us with an Army and Navy and Marine Corps of something like 8,000,000 men at a time when Douglas MacArthur tells us he will not need over 200,000 in Japan and when we have at least 3 other nations in Europe helping to police Germany. We will not need any more men in Germany than MacArthur will need in Japan.

Then why keep all these 8,000,000 men in the service when they are begging to come home, when their people want them, and when these boys are having their morale destroyed and having their opportunity to go to school taken away from them? I say it is the duty of Congress now to pass legislation of this kind and we ought to do it at once.

Mr. FOLGER. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the very fact that these two considerations are denied in the demobilization policy are the things that make it necessary for me and you to do something we do not want to do; that is, to have Congress, if we can, take hold and require that it be done.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and I have enjoyed it very much. As chairman of the Committee on Education may I say that I have been brought in rather close contact with the educators of the country and with the college people of this Nation. The people of this country know that some of our large institutions, and I refer to colleges with a thousand or twelve hundred students, were so depleted that they only had from 60 to 80 students in the college, who were usually IV–F's or somebody taking research work. This clearly shows to me and to many others familiar with the situation that we are now experiencing about a 4½-year educational deficit in this country. If we continue this deficit then follow that up by taking the next crop of boys from high school and putting them into the Army, I am wondering where the President thinks he will get the technicians, the dentists, the doctors, the skilled professional men to carry out the program just outlined in his message read to the House a few minutes ago?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina may I say that I have written every governor in the United States and every superintendent of public instruction and I have received favorable replies from the great majority of them. However, the superintendents of schools and the presidents of colleges say they are afraid to comment too much lest they be charged with trying to do something to aid their own cause, to fill their own colleges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

THE LATE MRS. ROBERT CROSSER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the house for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I wish to inform the Members of the House of the death of the devoted wife of our able and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mrs. Crosser has been an exemplary mother, a constant source of inspiration during adversity and health, both to her family and to those who have sought her counsel and assistance.

To Mr. CROSSER, who has had the good fortune to enjoy the companionship of such a remarkable, cheerful, and understanding wife, we offer our deep sympathy in his sorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DISCHARGE OF CERTAIN SERVICEMEN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina who spoke a minute ago that I agree with many of the things he said and I am going to speak along the same line. From the way the soldiers are being handled and their return being held up, one is almost led to the belief that the Army has moved in and taken over. At any rate, that is the way the country has begun to feel about this matter.

The fellows over there are beginning to think that Mr. Dewey was right when he charged that certain agencies here are not going to be in any hurry about getting these men home. I want to read a letter that tells you how the morale of these men is being broken down. This is a letter from a serviceman overseas to his mother:

> Just a few lines to let you know I'm all right but terribly blue and homesick and depressed. It doesn't look like I'll get home until at the earliest Easter. They aren't making any attempt to get the men home from over here. This sitting around doing nothing but just waiting, waiting is driving me crazy. All the news we get here from Manila is totally disheartening. Men with 80 and 90 points are still sitting around waiting to come home down here. There isn't any reason in the world for it.

I want to say that there is no reason for many of these soldiers being over there. I received a letter some time ago from a lieutenant who said that they were on a boat 700 miles out of the Panama Canal when they received official notice that the war was over, and that boat, instead of coming back, went on down 17,000 miles to New Guinea, where they unloaded them, then loaded them up and took them to Manila, where they still are, and when that boat sailed into the Harbor of Manila, there were 496 ships tied up in the harbor, some for 4 months. Manila was so full of personnel that there was scarcely room to sit.

Back to my letter:

> Why don't you do something about such things back there. What is this? Are we just a bunch of sheep to be just herded around and kicked and mauled just as though we weren't fit to lick the earth even. We're human beings. We want to come home to our loved ones. We don't want to sit over here until we rot. Yes, I'm talking to you like this. If there is anything going to be done about it, it will have to be the civilians back there to do it. Isn't our country supposed to be a democracy? Well, I have been told it was, but ever since I've been in the Army I have begun to doubt it more and more. Yes, they write this and that in the papers, about getting so many men home already. It is all a bunch of lies. They are discharging the men in the States to make it look like the men are getting back from overseas. Believe me, if the people of the United States don't soon open their eyes, they are going to have a revolution on their hands. Yes; you all can sit back there in nice soft arm chairs, drink cold drinks in the summer and live a lovely life while we sit over here and sweat our lives away. It's a wonderful world, isn't it. Sure, I've got a lot to look forward to. Will I get to enjoy it when I'm young and able to enjoy life or must I wait until I'm too old to enjoy it. It all is up to you mothers and fathers as to the answer to that. I'm pretty even tempered and very hard to get aroused, but I'm aroused now and mad enough to fight to get home. Here's a little story you might like to hear. It seems that a captain of a ship here went into Manila to the transportation authorities and said: "Colonel, I have a ship going back to the States empty on which I can take at least 500 men with me," and the colonel looked at him and told him to get the hell out of there, that he was running this show. If I were back there I'd sure see what the reason was, why these men aren't being returned from overseas to their homes. Yes, I can hear you now saying, "The very idea of a son of mine talking to me like that." Well, how else am I going to make you see the facts? I've been telling you all along how things were, but you didn't believe me. Well, what do you say. How about some action back there? There isn't a single reason in the world why they couldn't have every man home by the first of the year.
>
> Yes, you say trust in the Lord; He'll see you through. Well it isn't the Lord who is keeping me over here. It is that damn War Department. My work is done here, so what are they going to do with me? Ha! They are going to assign me to another outfit and probably send me to Japan. Yes, when all the men in the United States with 2 years service in the Army are being discharged, and here I am with over 3 years and going up to Japan probably. Yes, we sure do have a wonderful Government; don't we? We are supposed to have freedom of speech. Well

why don't you mothers and fathers and wives and relations speak your piece and get that Government back to earth. Yes; I'm not the only one like this. Every last one of us over here are completely fed up. Unless something is done back there soon there is bound to be one awful explosion before long. I'm on orders now to be shipped out of here for where no one knows, but we all know it won't be back to the States. I made a prediction before I came overseas that I'd be home for Christmas '46, and by the looks of things I'm sure not going to be far wrong. The officer in charge of the sanitation department issued a statement the other day to the effect that Liberty ships could be fixed up in 48 hours to transport about 750 troops back to the States on each one. Now the generals here are trying to have him thrown out for that. They claim it isn't sanitary enough to move troops on them, yet thousands of troops came over here on them, and they have been used to transport troops back and forth over here. One of them was good enough to bring about 500 men up here to the Philippines, and I was one of them, and so I can't see why they can't be used to get us home. I don't think I should be the first to come home by any means, but then, too, I can't see why they can't get every man back in the States by the first of the year. Lack of shipping space. Ha! What a poor excuse. I'll bet you there are at least 1,500 ships lying out here in the Pacific in harbors, idle and empty, and not doing a thing, and yet they tell you and me there is a lack of shipping space. All I've got to say is if you were here in my place you'd sure feel the same way I do. Now I don't want to hear a word from you about trying to be patient. I'll blow up sky high then. I'm using all the will power and self-control I've got right now to hold onto myself. There isn't a damn thing to do here, and besides it is entirely too hot even if you wanted to do something. Yesterday I tried playing horseshoes to do something to keep from going crazy. It helped a little, but I played two games and then I was tired of that. There is only one thing in my mind right now, and that is home, home, home. I can't relax and be patient. Gosh, I do want to come home, with all my heart and soul.

We have closed up shop here. I haven't worked for the last 2 days. We moved everything out on last Friday, so all I do is be around and read and try to keep my mind occupied. Oh, please, please, mother, do something back there to get me home to the States.

Well, I guess after you read this letter you'll not want to have anything to do with me any more, and I guess I can't blame you, but there are my feelings to a "t." Well, must close for now and go eat. Hope to hear from you soon, and let's write Congress every day if necessary to get a little action and get us home.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I gather from what the gentleman read there that that young man is a little out of patience with the War Department and the Navy. What does the gentleman think is going to happen to the Congressmen when that fellow gets home and finds out that we have not been doing anything about that 6-month clause that said he was entitled to be discharged 6 months after the fighting was over.

Mr. GROSS. Here is the answer to that in another letter: "No boats, no votes."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now he is talking business.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The man that wrote that letter appealed to the mothers and fathers to let their Congressmen hear from them. In addition to the flood of mail I am getting, within the last 2 days I have received 100 telegrams from the mothers and the wives of soldiers in Pennsylvania alone, and I received about 75 from Ohio today, appealing to me to get my bill passed to get these men out.

Mr. GROSS. I have another letter here signed by 11 veterans over in Manila. I will read just a couple of paragraphs of this letter and insert it as a part of my remarks:

It seems to me that hardly any effort at all is being made. I am beginning to wonder, Do they really want us back? As Mauldin put it so effectively, "There didn't seem to be any delay getting us over here. And since when has the War Department begun getting solicitous about our comfort?"

We have been told through various agencies that the fire hazard is too great for us to ride on LST's, making our beds of the same wooden cots that we are using at the present. It is too long and tedious a journey to be made in such a manner. That was told to us with a perfectly straight face, to us and thousands like us, all of whom made at least two amphibious assault landings (under fire) from these very same ships. The very same cots, for that matter, placed on top of 50-gallon drums of 80-octane gasoline and flamethrower fuel.

Now, they say they cannot bring these men home in those ships, even when they do not have all of the above hazards on board.

There were enclosed with this letter a number of newspaper clippings from a Manila paper, Daily Pacifican. I will comment on this clipping briefly and include it as part of my remarks. It says:

Ships can carry 1,500 men, yet may return empty.

A ship capable of carrying 1,500 returnees to the States stands a good chance of leaving for the west coast with only a ballast load, unless various Army and civilian agencies get together within the next few days.

You notice this says, "unless various agencies get together."

The snarled situation came to light when officers and crew members of the steamship *Marguerite Le Hand*, a large C-3 cargo vessel now at pier 5 here, told yesterday how they had tried without success to interest Army authorities in using their vessel as a troopship.

The ship has fresh-water tanks sufficient to hold 500 tons of water. It has ventilated holds. It has ample large refrigerator units now in operation.

In addition, the crewmen said, the *Le Hand* is equipped with its own evaporators capable of producing about 20 tons of fresh water a day.

When an effort was made to find the reasons underlying the Army's alleged lack of interest, conflicting statements came from all sides.

Col. R. B. Lincoln, of the plans and requisitions section of AFWESPAC Transportation Corps, told a Pacifican reporter that it was not feasible to use ships like the *Le Hand* because they have an insufficient water-carrying capacity. Colonel Lincoln also stated that the departure of the vessel from San Francisco, if it did sail from here as a troopship, would be delayed about 3 days while the makeshift accommodations were ripped out and the vessel disinfected.

In addition, Colonel Lincoln stated that it would be necessary to obtain permission of the War Shipping Administration before the *Le Hand* could be used to carry troops.

When asked about this latter statement, R. A. MacDonell, acting regional director of the War Shipping Administration here, declared "The WSA has never turned the Army down on a request for ships."

While MacDonell failed to state whether his office had been asked for the necessary permission to convert the *Le Hand*, he did say that AFWESPAC Transportation officials had radioed the War Department yesterday morning for War Department permission to use the vessel. Colonel Lincoln also said that a communication had been sent to Washington.

MacDonell estimated that it would take 4 or 5 days for the War Department reply to reach officials here.

Commenting on this, one of the *Le Hand's* officers stated that while a sailing date has not been set for his ship, "it might leave before the permission is received from Washington."

Answering objections that the *Le Hand* was not suitable for troopship conversion, crew members stated flatly that they could carry about 1,500 troops under "fairly comfortable" conditions. The ship has fresh-water tanks sufficient to hold 500 tons of water. It has ventilated holds. It has ample large refrigerator units now in operation.

In addition, the crewmen said, the *Le Hand* is equipped with its own evaporators capable of producing about 20 tons of fresh water a day.

Meanwhile, the *Le Hand* is slated to return to the States in ballast unless orders are changed beforehand.

A ship's officer estimates that about 20 days at the most will be required to complete the Manila-San Francisco voyage.

A veteran writes to me as follows:

During the time of war there was no consideration for the comfort and safety of the enlisted personnel who traveled in vermin-infested Liberty and Victory ships with latrines set upon the deck next to mess halls. There was no consideration for the men who chose to sleep in the downpouring rain to avoid the open holds with their lack of ventilation, where bunks were arranged five high, 2 feet between bunks.

Yet they say, "Too unsanitary," and all that.

I have another letter from Manila. I am getting dozens of them each day. This letter ends up by saying to the Congress, "No boats, no votes." Make up your minds—those fellows mean it. I am not a bit afraid of them so far as the "no boats, no votes" is concerned. This is not a vote-getting proposition with me. I have three of my own in the Army and have a definite interest in the other fellow's boy and girl over there, as well as the fathers of the million lonesome children at this end. It is a fact that over in north Africa, Germany, Indochina, and in the Aleutians there are certain groups of nurses and soldiers who have become detached. They are just like refugees. They have nobody to go to and nobody to look to. There is a group of them in Iceland. This thing has gotten to a point where not only are those fellows blowing up but the people here are, too. It is just because the Army has moved in and with it is coming compulsory military training unless we stop them and stop them real soon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Friday next for 30 minutes, after the reading of the Journal, the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and to include therein some editorials.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

H. R. 1868. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any person who has stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

H. R. 1868. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any person who has stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Post Office and Post Roads Committee will hold a hearing Tuesday, November 20, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 2647, a bill to restore the 2-cent postage on first-class mail for local delivery, and H. R. 4652, concerning substitutes in the postal service, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Brand Names and Newsprint Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Tuesday, November 20, 1945. Business to be considered: Hearings on nylon hosiery.

There will be a meeting of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, November 26, 1945. Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 2764, freight forwarders' legislation.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

833. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to provide eligibility for annuity at age 70 after at least 5 years of service in lieu of 15 years of such service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

834. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Claims.

835. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4717. A bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; with amendments (Rept. No. 1238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary submits a minority report and views on H. R. 2788, part II (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 865. An act for the relief of the estate of Agnes J. Allberry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 215. A bill for the relief of Virginia Packard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 919. A bill for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 948. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1073. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Verbarg; with amendment (Rept. No. 1245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1251. A bill for the relief of the Irvine Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. W. McMurray, R. T. Latham, G. B. Cooper, L. W. Pearson, and Billups Oil Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, Ralph Demert, and the estate of Lon Thurman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2167. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Orvis Welch; with amendments (Rept. No. 1250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2168. A bill for the relief of Charles Zucker; with amendment (Rept. No. 1251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Westover; without amendment (Rept. No. 1252).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2670. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Kathleen Lawton McGuire; with amendment (Rept. No. 1253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2884. A bill for the relief of B. H. Spann; with amendments (Rept. 1254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2901. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Janet McKilip; with amendment (Rept. No. 1255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2974. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bobby Messick; with amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3012. A bill for the relief of George W. Murrell and Kirby Murrell, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3052. A bill for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3454. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of William Clyde McKinney, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3554. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Liter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3641. A bill for the relief of M. Martin Turpanjian; with amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3677. A bill for the relief of J. Tom Stephenson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2769. A bill for the relief of C. Frank James; with amendments (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3791. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mersman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3808. A bill for the relief of the estate of William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault; without amendment (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4269. A bill for the relief of Ida Barger, Hazel A. Beecher, Etta Clark, Jesse Ruth France, John W. Nolan, Anna Palubicki, and Frank J. Schrom; without amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Senate Joint Resolution 51. Joint resolution granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI; without amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4729. A bill directing the War and Navy Departments to forthwith discharge from the military and naval forces of the United States all enlisted military personnel who have amassed via the point system of the Army a total of 35 points or more and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4730. A bill to provide for a national health program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4731. A bill to authorize the Alaska Railroad to engage in the business of operating oceangoing vessels; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 4732. A bill to designate September 14 as a day on which the flag is to be displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 4733. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4734. A bill to decrease the rate of postage on air mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 4735. A bill to provide for a United States air-mail postal card and to authorize the transmission by air mail of private mailing cards (post cards); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4736. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel 30 days' leave immediately preceding their discharge from, or release from active duty in, the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4737. A bill to prevent control of broadcasting by coercive practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4738. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility in or near the city of Ukiah, Mendocino County, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4739. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility in Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4740. A bill for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4741. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility at Paradise, Butte County, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 4742. A bill establishing a special housing bureau in the Veterans' Administration to act in relation to the procurement of homes or farms for war veterans, and to liberalize loan conditions pertaining thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 4743. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain accumulated leave benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4744. A bill relating to the clothing and equipment allowances of individuals upon discharge from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 4745. A bill to make railroad companies responsible in damages to passengers for injuries suffered by reason of drinking conditions on trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4746. A bill relating to the care and treatment of seamen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4747. A bill providing for the payment of direct Federal old-age assistance to citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4748. A bill to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4749. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American soldier who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 401. A resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4717, a bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4750. A bill for the relief of C. C. Vest; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 4751 A bill for the relief of Elbert C. Altman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 4752. A bill for the relief of J. G. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4753. A bill for the relief of Wesley P. Stephens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 4754. A bill with respect to national service life insurance in the case of the late Robert P. Marshall; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 4755. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the East Division of the Eastern Judicial District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of A. Eugene Maynor, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4756. A bill relating to the naturalization of Giovanni Schillaci, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4757. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gussie Feldman; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1333. Mr. WELCH presented Resolution No. 5031 passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco on October 22, 1945, petitioning Congress and

urging the enactment of such legislation as will provide for the relief of all those citizens who are entitled to such relief, but who because of lack of residential qualifications are unable to qualify for indigent aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation, to Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite spirits. From Thy hands we have received the gift of life, the blessings of home and of friendship, and the sacrament of beauty; in the fullness of Thy mercy Thou hast given us work to do and the strength wherewith to do it.

Make Thou our consecration a channel for the healing stream of Thy grace, so that having been sustained by Thy patience we may be patient, having freely received Thy bounty we may be bountiful, and having been blessed by Thy love without measure we may obey Thy behest, in an earth which is now one neighborhood, to love our neighbor as ourself. Through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 19, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MANASCO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. HOFFMAN, and Mr. BENDER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Brewster	Butler
Barkley	Buck	Capper
Bilbo	Bushfield	Carville
Chavez	Knowland	Saltonstall
Connally	La Follette	Shipstead
Cordon	Lucas	Smith
Donnell	McCarran	Stewart
Downey	McClellan	Taft
Eastland	McFarland	Taylor
Ellender	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Maybank	Tobey
Fulbright	Mead	Tunnell
George	Mitchell	Tydings
Gerry	Moore	Wagner
Green	Morse	Walsh
Guffey	Murdock	Wheeler
Gurney	Myers	Wherry
Hatch	O'Daniel	White
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hill	Radcliffe	Willis
Hoey	Reed	Wilson
Huffman	Revercomb	Young
Johnson, S. C.	Robertson	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business with the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have been excused. They are members of the Atomic Energy Committee, which is on an inspection trip to Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are detained at a meeting of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused and is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

STATISTICS OF THE GRADE AND STAPLE LENGTH OF COTTON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDITIONAL CLAIM FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY VESSELS OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional claim for damage by collision between the barge *Annapolis* and the U. S. S. *Moray;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITION RELATING TO TOLL-FREE PRIVILEGES ON SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND (CALIF.) BAY BRIDGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from C. H. Purcell, director of public works of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., transmitting a resolution adopted by the California Toll Bridge Authority, relating to clarification and restriction of toll-free privileges for Government traffic using the San Francisco-Oakland (Calif.) Bay Bridge, which, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PEACETIME COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—LETTER FROM CAUTIOUS A. CHOATE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter from Cautious A. Choate, executive secretary, Central Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church, Wichita, Kans., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime compulsory military training.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTRAL KANSAS
CONFERENCE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Wichita, Kans., November 12, 1945.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Ninety thousand Methodist people of central and western Kansas do not want universal peacetime conscription of their young men.

I represent the Central Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church and my work takes me over the western two-thirds of the State. On every hand I hear expressed a great fear that universal military peacetime training will be fastened upon America at this time. There is a common feeling that this would

be one of the greatest tragedies to come out of the war.

I find general objection to this program, from the humblest member of the church to the bishops, on the following grounds:

1. Military training throws young men, as yet unready for the temptations of military life, into a society which far too often corrupts the moral and spiritual life in which the strength of any nation lies.

2. It creates a military set of mind that can see only force as a vital factor in the settlement of international disputes.

3. It would class our country among the great group of nations which have depended upon universal training and have experienced it as one of the chief factors of their downfall.

4 Our emphasis today should be on the positive factors which create good will, the surest kind of defense.

We should promote and support the machinery being set up for international cooperation. Universal military training is a slap in the face to other nations and an invitation for them to do likewise, thus condemning everything which is being done for peace.

5. Against whom are we preparing? Japan and Germany are defeated. Only Russia is a possible enemy. A good-neighbor policy toward her would be much more effective than an armament race.

6. The whole program looks too much like an effort of the military group to fasten the system upon America at a time when we are uncertain and afraid. The fact that with peace many officers are facing demotion cannot be a negligible factor in any citizen's thinking on this subject.

These reasons and many others make the defeat of any bill for peacetime military training the No. 1 "Must" for every Christian. Let us give good will and friendliness a chance before we adopt so belligerent a policy.

Sincerely yours,

CAUTIOUS A. CHOATE,
Executive Secretary.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from Samuel W. Barrow, national commander of the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Washington, D. C., embodying a resolution adopted by the Twenty-ninth Division Association, comprising former officers and enlisted men, including inductees, of the Twenty-ninth Division, United States Army, American Expeditionary Forces, World War I and World War II, at their annual convention held in the city of Baltimore, Md., relative to Senate bill 1239, to provide for retirement of certain officers and former officers of the National Guard, a measure which my colleague [Mr. CHAVEZ] introduced. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter embodying the resolution, and that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
TWENTY-NINTH DIVISION ASSOCIATION,
November 16, 1945.

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., at the annual convention which assembled on the 2d day of September 1945 at the Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore, Md., adopted the following resolution:

"Resolution 5

"Resolution to provide for retirement of certain officers and former officers of National Guard—

"Whereas Senate bill 1239, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, a bill to provide for the retirement of certain officers and former officers of the National Guard of the United States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, has been introduced in the United States Senate: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Twenty-ninth Division Association comprising former officers and enlisted men (including inductees) of the Twenty-ninth Division, United States Army, American Expeditionary Forces, World War I and World War II, at their annual convention held in the city of Baltimore in the State of Maryland, on September 1, 2, and 3, A. D. 1945, are unanimously in favor of such legislation; therefore, be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded to the distinguished Senator from the State of New Mexico, the Honorable CARL A. HATCH for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the earliest practicable date."

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL W. BARROW,
National Commander.

Mr. CHAVEZ presented a letter embodying a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very fine telegram received by me from the Physicians Forum of New York, commending me for introducing yesterday the health bill, which is designed to carry out the recommendations of President Truman.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 19, 1945.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Physicians Forum congratulates and commends you for introducing a new national health-insurance bill in accordance with President Truman's message. We heartily agree that such legislation is the only means to proper distribution of good medical care for all Americans. We are also completely in accord with the provisions for Federal support for hospital construction, for expansion of public-health, maternal and child-health services, for more adequate professional education and research, and for disability insurance. As practicing physicians, we know that only through such a national measure can the health needs of all the people best be served.

ERNEST P. BOAS, M. D.,
Chairman.
MILES ATKINSON, M. D.,
Vice Chairman.
SIDNEY M. GREENBERG, M. D.,
Treasurer.
GEORGE D. CANNON, M. D.,
Secretary.
HENRY B. RICHARDSON, M. D.,
Editor.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CARVILLE, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (S. 1483) to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska," approved May 3, 1943, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 754) thereon.

REHABILITATION OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to report without amendment the bill (S. 1610) to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 755) thereon. The report recommends the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1611. A bill authorizing the erection of a monument to Sacajawea; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1612. A bill to amend the act of January 22, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 5), to authorize and direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase aluminum for stockpiling purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1613. A bill extending certain recognition and rights to members of the Voluntary Port Security Forces and members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary who were enrolled as temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR THOMAS OF IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 193), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 193, submitted today by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], providing for payment of funeral expenses of the late Senator John Thomas, of Idaho, who recently passed away, and I request unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 193) was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH CONGRESS?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BRIDGES

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article

entitled "What's Wrong With Congress?" written by Senator BRIDGES and published in the October issue of Pageant magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL BEFORE CONFERENCE ON ATOMIC POWER AND PUBLIC POLICY

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TUNNELL before the conference on atomic power and public policy held in New York City, on November 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ABOLITION OF THE POLL TAX—ADDRESSES BY SENATORS GUFFEY AND ELLENDER

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD radio addresses delivered by Senators GUFFEY and ELLENDER on November 19, 1945, on the subject of abolition of the poll tax, which appear in the Appendix.]

RELATIONS BETWEEN AMERICA AND RUSSIA—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Can America and Russia Stay Friends?" written by Senator THOMAS of Utah and published in the November 1945 issue of Pageant magazine which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO SOUTHEASTERN AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture in Anderson, S. C., to the Southeastern Agricultural Conference, which appears in the Appendix.]

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL AS IT RELATES TO VETERANS—LETTER FROM SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATOR

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated November 9, 1945, from Stuart Symington, Surplus Property Administrator, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—STATEMENT BY DEANE W. MALOTT

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on universal military training, by Deane W. Malott, chancelor of the University of Kansas, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE UNDER FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the International Association of Public Employment Services setting forth reasons why the Employment Service should continue as a Federal service, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT, 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President, independent offices, and executive departments," on page 2, line 7, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$5,226,461" and insert "$3,437,042."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, before we proceed further with the committee amendments, may we not have a general statement concerning the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to make one.

Mr. WHITE. There are two things in particular in my mind that I should like to have brought out.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course this is an appropriation rescission bill. We have appropriated very large sums for the entire year for the war. The war ended a short time ago, and recommendations have been made by the President to cancel a great many appropriations. That is the main purpose of the bill.

I will ask the Senator from Maine what were the specific things he wanted to have brought out?

Mr. WHITE. The bill seeks, as it is framed perhaps, to repeal appropriations heretofore made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not to repeal appropriations, but to reduce the amounts in very substantial sums.

Mr. WHITE. I think the total sum is approximately $51,000,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The total amount as reported to the Senate is $51,244,680,213.

Mr. WHITE. That is the amount, then, by which appropriations heretofore made are to be reduced?

Mr. McKELLAR. Some of them are canceled, but in most instances they are reduced.

Mr. WHITE. Can the Senator tell us what amounts are still left available to the various agencies and departments of the Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; they are shown in the report. I will give them in a moment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is the total amount of the reductions for 1946?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is the total amount of the reductions contained in this bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. The total amount of reductions reported by the committee is $51,244,680,213.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I ask the able Senator whether that reduction will be reflected in the tax bill for next year?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. The Senator will have to ask that question of Senators who are members of the Finance Committee. I see one to my left, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and a very active member in front of me, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. They can tell more about that than I can. I am not a member of that committee. But I will say that the cancellation of $51,000,000,000 which has been appropriated ought to make a very important difference in our financial condition in that there will not be spent the $51,000,000,000 which otherwise would probably be spent if it were not canceled.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then it certainly ought to be reflected in a reduction in the taxes in the next tax bill Congress will be called upon to pass.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the tax bill already enacted reduces taxes very considerably. I do not recall the exact figures.

Mr. GEORGE rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Georgia for the purpose of answering the question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator refer to the tax bill of this year, the one Congress recently passed?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am inquiring if the cancellation by the pending bill of great appropriations will be reflected in reduction in taxes for 1946?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Georgia to answer that question.

Mr. GEORGE. I was about to say, Mr. President, that the reductions or cut-backs made in prior appropriations will not be reflected in the tax bill for the simple reason that we will still have a deficit, even after these reductions are made, so that the budget will still show a deficit for 1946–47. The most optimistic hope expressed anywhere I think is that by 1948 we may have a balanced budget, and then there should be further reduction in taxes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think I might say that, so far as the Finance Committee estimates are concerned, they are based on Budget expenditures, and we have never, since Congress came back this fall, expected to spend the $51,000,000,000. It has never been counted in any estimates; and by rescinding the appropriations we do not in any way reduce the estimates of expenditure for the fiscal year 1946 or the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year 1947.

I may say further that if the President's recommendation of a health program or an insurance program, which was submitted yesterday, is adopted there will be no further tax reductions under any circumstances, because that would cost at least three or four billion dollars a year out of the General Treasury in addition to the pay-roll taxes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine asked for the amounts which are left in the various appropriations, and I am very happy to give the figures.

The various executive agencies will have left $12,387,845,048.

The Military Establishment will have left $23,884,693,366, which, as can be easily seen, is quite a tidy sum.

The Naval Establishment will have left $56,941,859,984.

So that the appropriations are still quite large, and necessarily so. The figures are for the whole fiscal year.

Mr. WHITE. Can the Senator give the total of the figures he just recited?

Mr. McKELLAR. They total $94,000,000,000. We have canceled $51,000,000,000 of the appropriations, and this is November, and there will be another rescission bill later on, as I understand.

Mr. President, if there are no further questions, I ask that the bill be read for committee amendments.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. While the Senator is speaking of reductions, I should like to ask for an explanation of the item on page 30, line 19, Naval Training Station. For 1944 the amount is $54,000 and for 1945 it is $600,000. Why is there such an increase?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not an increase at all. This is a cancellation For the naval training station at Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho, for the fiscal year 1944 there had been unexpended the sum of $54,790; and for the fiscal year 1945, $604,708. We save that much in those 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 10, after the word "to", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$190,000"; in line 12, after the word "to", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$50,000"; and in line 14, after the word "to", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 14, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$10,662,558" and insert "$5,662,558"; in line 19, after the word "to", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$30,000"; in line 20, after the word "to", strike out "$230,000" and insert "$240,000"; in line 22, after the word "to", to strike out "$550,000" and insert "$600,000"; and in line 24, after the word "to", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 9, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$11,500,000" and insert "$9,500,000"; in line 13, before the word "and", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000"; and in line 15, after the word "to", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$2,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 23, after the word "Management", to strike out "$447,886,225" and insert "$439,096,806."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices", on page 7, after line 17, to strike out:

Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses, Federal Communications Commission (national defense), $930,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 14, to strike out:

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for grants to States for administration of unemployment compensation and employment service facilities operated in conjunction therewith, as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935, as amended, $30,000,000, which shall be in addition to the amounts appropriated for such purposes in title II of the Labor Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Housing Agency," on page 11, line 3, after the words "independent offices", to strike out "$666,505,849" and insert "$665,575,849."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive departments (nonwar), Department of Agriculture," on page 11, after line 6, to strike out:

Emergency rubber project, $1,649,790, and the balance remaining shall be used to liquidate such project, including the elimination of the remaining plantations, the rehabilitation and return of leased lands to the owners and the disposal of other property according to law, and for the continuation of the production, breeding, and disease phases of guayule research on indicator plots and experimental areas until June 30, 1946.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Emergency rubber project, $1,649,790, and the balance remaining shall be used under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture to liquidate such project in an orderly manner immediately on the passage of this act, including selling the two mills as individual units and disposal of each lease by sale or by contractual arrangement; and for field and laboratory research on the various phases of guayule and retaining all needed property and equipment to carry out this purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Interior," on page 13, after line 15, to strike out:

Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, Division of Geography, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 17, to strike out:

War Relocation Authority: Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority, Department of the Interior, $5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Justice," on page 15, line 6, after "crimes (emergency)", to strike out "$2,480,000" and insert "$1,240,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Labor," on page 15, after line 19, to strike out:

Employment office facilities and services: The unexpended and unobligated balances, on the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this act, of appropriations, excluding the appropriation of $7,791,134 to carry into effect the provisions of section 602 of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, made in the first paragraph under the heading "Employment office facilities and services" in title VII of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1946, shall, on such thirtieth day, be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Employment Office Facilities and Services: The appropriations made in the first paragraph under the heading "Employment Office Facilities and Services" in title VII of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1946, shall be available, in addition to the objects which are specified in the first paragraph under the heading "Employment Office Facilities and Services" in title VII of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1946, for grants to States to finance the total costs of administration of State-wide systems of public employment offices, in accordance with standards and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor as necessary to carry out the purposes of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended (excluding sec. 5 thereof): *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor shall make such grants through the Social Security Board and in accordance with the procedures applicable to grants under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and shall, in connection therewith, certify to the Social Security Board the amounts of such grants for each State; and upon such certification the Social Security Board shall certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury, in addition to the amount, if any, payable by said Board under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, and the additional amount so certified shall be paid to each State by the Secretary of the Treasury out of the appropriations herein made available for such grants: *Provided*, That such portion of such appropriations as may be necessary shall be available to the United States Employment Service for all necessary expenses, including personal services incurred in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That no portion of such appropriations shall be made available to a State unless the State (1) has made provision for the transfer to and retention in the State-wide system of public employment offices of employees of the Federal Government who had been employed in State and local employment service functions in such State, in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions except that individuals so transferred may be separated or terminated for good cause, as determined in individual cases under the applicable State merit system, or separated or terminated by reason of reductions in force found necessary in the interests of efficient operations, and may be separated after they have been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State-wide system of public employment offices under the State merit system in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions or (2) has requested the detail of such employees to the State agency under the following proviso: *Provided further*, That so much of such appropriations as may be necessary shall be available, in lieu of any portion of the grant to the State, for the payment of compensation (under the salary scales applicable to such employees prior to the enactment of this act) to employees of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor, who, upon the request of the State, and for the purpose of permitting continuity in their employment pending an opportunity to qualify for State employment in accordance with this paragraph, may be detailed by the Secretary of Labor to the State agency for service in the State-wide system of public employment offices: *Provided further*, That if, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing (which may be a joint hearing with the Social Security Board under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended) to the State agency, the Secretary of Labor or his representative determines, and so certifies to the Social Security Board, that the State has failed substantially to comply with the provisions required by this paragraph or with standards and regulations prescribed to carry out the purposes of the act of Congress ap-

proved June 6, 1933, as amended, the Secretary of Labor, in lieu of making the grant to the State for such purpose, may maintain in such State a State-wide system of public employment offices until the Secretary is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply.

On the earliest practicable date in the case of each State, but in no case later than the one hundred and twentieth day after the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of Labor shall transfer to the State agency in each State designated under section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended, as the agency to cooperate with the United States Employment Service under said act, the operation of State and local public employment office facilities in such State, and in connection therewith the Secretary of Labor shall provide for the return to such State of the employment office facilities and properties transferred by such State to the Federal Government in 1942 to promote the national war effort and may also provide for the transfer and assignment to such State, without reimbursement therefor, of all other public employment office facilities and properties including records, files, and office equipment which are located in such State: *Provided*, That as a condition to such transfer and assignment of Federal properties the Secretary may require the recipient State to waive any claim which may then exist or thereafter arise out of the use made by the Federal Government of, or for the loss of or damage to, property and facilities transferred by the State to the Federal Government in 1942.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is the amendment covering pages 16 to 20, involving the United States Employment Service.

Mr. McKELLAR. It involves the return of the Employment Services to the States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I offer an amendment on page 19, line 12, after the word "than", to strike out the remainder of that line and all of line 13, and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1946", so as to read:

On the earliest practicable date in the case of each State, but in no case later than June 30, 1946, the Secretary of Labor shall transfer to the State agency—

And so forth.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this question was the subject of controversy in the committee. I offered a similar amendment in the committee, and it was rejected by a small margin. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference. However, I believe that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] feels that it ought not to be adopted.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I was out of the Chamber for a few moments. Has the Senator from Kentucky offered an amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I offered an amendment on page 19, line 12, to strike out the language "the one hundred and twentieth day after the enactment of this act" and substitute "not later than June 30, 1946", so as to read:

On the earliest practicable date in the case of each State, but in no case later than June 30, 1946, the Secretary of Labor shall transfer to the State agency—

And so forth. I wish to make a very brief statement in support of my amendment. As we all know, the President, in a message to Congress and in communications to both Houses, has urged that the United States Employment Service be not returned to the States immediately. He has called our attention to the national problem which confronts our Government with reference to unemployment, and in my judgment he has properly emphasized, at least during the period of reconversion, the national obligation growing out of possible widespread unemployment. We all know that this situation grows out of the postwar period. It grows out of the wide dispersion throughout the country of employees in war plants, and it grows out of the very natural inclination of people involved in possible unemployment to look to the Government of the United States, under whose program this situation has been or may be created, to find jobs for them. In my judgment, the President has wisely suggested that the United States Employment Service be retained for a short period. He has not advocated, and does not now advocate, that the United States Employment Service be kept permanently as an agency of the United States Government, although there are many who feel that there ought to be such a permanent service. I am one of them. But that has nothing to do with the return to the States of the United States Employment Service which is now in existence and which was taken over by the Federal Government as a result of the war. The President has urged that a little more time be given to enable this agency to help work out the problem of employment; and it is a well-known fact that, regardless of the number of men now unemployed or the number who may be unemployed within the next few months, the vast majority of them are applying to the United States Employment Service to help them secure positions. There is bound to be a hiatus, whether brief or extended, between the return of the Service to the States and the ability of the States to deal adequately with the problem. There may be a change in personnel, and there likely will be, when it becomes a wholly State-operated institution. During that readjustment of personnel there is bound to be, as I see it, a lag in the efficiency of the Service.

The bill which the committee has reported provides that the Employment Service shall be returned not later than 4 months from the date of the enactment of this appropriation bill. Of course, that leaves the date indefinite. If we may assume that the bill will be enacted on the first day of December, then on the first day of April—4 months thereafter—the Service would be returned to the States. My amendment would extend the period to June 30—through April, May, and June—a period 3 months longer. In view of the possibly chaotic conditions growing out of unemployment and the lag in the efficiency of the Service at a given time when it is returned to the States, it seems to me that 3 months more, by way of an extension of the period beyond which the United States Employment Service will not be extended, is a wise provision.

So I hope the Senate will agree to adopt the amendment and will let the extension go to the definite date of June 30, which is the end of the fiscal year, and at which time all appropriations terminate.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a brief résumé of the situation to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The proposal to return the USES to the States in the very near future seems to me to be extremely ill-considered. Instead of building a foundation for reconversion, we are tearing away one of the few stones that were in place, thanks to the foresight of President Roosevelt, who federalized the Employment Service at the outbreak of war, who provided the means of getting the mobilization job done on a completely voluntary basis, and who inspired the Employment Service to achievements which no other nation who fought in this war can match.

A declaration to return the USES to the States at this time is a declaration that the unemployment problem is not and will not be a serious one—that the 6,000,000 or more veterans who will be discharged in the next 6 months need no assistance in locating a suitable job. I cannot share any such feelings of optimism. The problems connected with the reconversion of human beings are much too grave to be dismissed so lightly. I firmly believe that the veteran and the displaced war worker will need the counsel and assistance of a trained staff of USES personnel who, through their loyalty and eagerness to do a public service, have done a magnificent job. It would be disastrous, in my estimation, to disrupt this service at this time on some vague hope that 48 States will be able to carry on with the same high standards of efficiency and endeavor as we have today under the federally operated USES.

The Senate recently went on record, despite the lack of clarity of the issues involved, as favoring a return of the USES to the States in the very near future. This ran directly counter to the specific request made by the President of the United States in his recent reconversion message to the Congress that the USES should remain under Federal operations until June 30, 1947, or earlier, if feasible. The President did not maintain that the USES should continue indefinitely to be operated as a Federal organization. He emphatically declared, on the other hand, that we were beginning a very critical period and that in order to be prepared for a worsening situation, the USES, which has always been operated federally during periods of crises, should remain federally operated until we ride out this one. This seems to me to be a perfectly reasonable request unless we are willing to take issue with the President's appraisal of the seriousness of the situation. I repeat that the problem of the veteran is not one of the future but rather is one with us today. The release of veterans last month and this month is far ahead of schedule and is likely to continue at a rate at least 50 percent higher than anticipated. Veterans are jamming the Employment Service offices all over the country. The staffs of these offices are being overwhelmed by the volume of requests for assistance in finding jobs and obtaining counseling. If we want to assure complete breakdown in these services and facilities we can do it in no better way than to return the Employment Service to the States under the terms of this compromise. The issue is so clear that the Congress will alone have to bear the discredit for the weakening at this time of the Employment Service, since President Truman has repeatedly asked that it remain under Federal operation until June 30, 1947. I hope the Senate will refuse to accept this compromise measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I recall, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky is exactly the same—or, if not, substantially the same—as one I offered in the committee. I offered such an amendment there, and it was voted down by a vote of 9 to 7. My amendment proposed that the date June 30 be adopted. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the language of the amendment:

On the earliest practicable date in the case of each State, but in no case later than June 30, 1946—

If the amendment is agreed to—

the Secretary of Labor shall transfer to the State agency in each State designated under section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended—

And so on. In other words, the question is, Shall there be that length of time within which the transfer shall be made to each one of the 48 States. In the committee it was argued, on the other side, that the Government took over the Service almost at once. I have forgotten the various statements which were made. Some were that it was 10 days, others that it was 2 days, others that it was 2 hours, and so on.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt, it was taken over in 11 days.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well, 11 days. Various statements were made as to exactly how long it took. Some persons said it was done immediately; others said it was done in 2 days; others said it was done in 11 days, as I recall.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference between having the Government take over the service and having the Government put it back in the hands of the various States. In the States various laws governing unemployment have been passed since the time when the service was taken over, so we have learned, and in the case of some States the resumption of operation of the service by the State will take longer than in the case of other States.

I wish to say that I am in favor of returning the service to the States. I disagree with my friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I do not think the Federal Government should handle this matter. I think it should be handled by the States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not say I think the Federal Government should handle this service. I said I think there should be a permanent agency of the Federal Government interested in employment. By that I do not mean that the States should be deprived of their jurisdiction, but I mean there should be a Federal agency interested in coordinating with the States in seeking employment for persons who are out of work.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am happy to have the Senator's explanation and to know that he does not mean that the United States Government should handle the actual affairs of this organization.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not have in mind that the Federal Government should deprive the States of or should do anything to discourage them in carrying on these functions; but, in my judgment, inasmuch as the problem is an over-all one and a national one, as we have recognized before, in enacting legislation to take care of it as such there should be an agency of the Federal Government to cooperate and coordinate with all the efforts in the States in securing the greatest possible opportunities for employment for the people of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a matter about which I am not so sure; but, of course, I understand the Senator, and I am glad he did not say what I thought he said in the beginning.

I think the Service should be transferred to the States. I was never more certain about anything in my life. But I think there should be a reasonable time within which to do it in an orderly and a proper way. The Government is putting up half the money, and there is no reason in the world why the Government should not take its time in this matter. I see no reason for making June 30, 1946, the last day on which the organization could be returned to the States. The provision is that it shall be returned to the States as rapidly as possible. With that I am in hearty accord. But if some State were unable to take it over by May 1 and if we had previously declared that it should be taken over by that date, obviously we would have made an unwise provision.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator will recall that the language of the amendment inserted by the Senate meets that contingency by specifically providing that where a State cannot make arrangements to take over this Service and to put the employees on the State pay roll they may be retained on the Federal pay roll and may be loaned by the Secretary of Labor to the States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Personally, I think that is a very unwise provision. The loaning of Federal Government employees to a State or the loaning of employees by one department to another department of the Government has never met with my approval. I think there should be employees for each department; and in the case of the Employment Service, if a State has control of it, I think the State should pay for it. That is my own judgment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALL. That particular provision was recommended by the Secretary of Labor in order to meet the possibility that some States whose legislatures are not scheduled in the near future might, because of their laws, be unable to hire the Federal employees or might have difficulty in doing so. Actually, it is presumed that approximately 44 of the States will have no difficulty at all in transferring the Federal employees to the State pay rolls, in the case of employees hired by the Federal Government since it took over the system. But this provision was an emergency one, to meet the situation in the case of the few States which, until they can have a session of their legislatures, will have difficulty in placing on State pay rolls such employees who have been on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. McKELLAR. I doubt very much whether an emergency of that kind can be met beforehand. The bill specifically provides:

On the earliest possible date, in the case of each State—

And so forth. The Service shall be returned. After providing that, it seems to me the question of the exact time does not make a very material difference. I am one of those who are intensely interested in having the Service returned to the States at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, under any language which may be contained in this bill, in no event can the Federal Government turn the Service back to all the States at the same time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I do not see how that would be possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. It must be done separately, with each State depending upon the circumstances existing in that State.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. The additional 3 months provided for in my amendment, however, would make it possible by the end of that time for the Federal Government to have more completely wound it up than might be possible by the date fixed in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my judgment about it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, who first asked that I yield.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on the point made by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I yield briefly to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. On the point the Senator from Kentucky has raised, let me say there is nothing in the bill to prevent the Secretary of Labor from waiting until he has negotiated agreements with the 48 States and then turning the Service over to all of them at once. As a matter of expediency, obviously that is what he is going to do. He does not want to have a system that is half State and half Federal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. BALL. That would not be an efficient system.

Mr. BARKLEY. Even under the language of the bill as the Senator has quoted it, if by the end of the 120-day period there are circumstances which make it impossible to return the Service to the State, that time is to be prolonged until some indefinite date.

Mr. BALL. No; the time is not to be prolonged. However, there is a loophole providing for the Secretary to loan employees to the States.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the law would extend the fiction of State control, but as a matter of fact it would be done by employees of the Federal Government who had been loaned to the State in order to consummate the fiction.

Mr. BALL. It would not be a fiction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting chairman of the committee two questions which may lead to suggestions for an amendment. On page 18, starting in line 8, the language has to do with the retention of Federal employees. Beginning in line 12 we find in parentheses the following language: "under the salary scales applicable to such employees prior to the enactment of this act."

In other words, those employees would be paid at Federal rates while all other employees would be paid at State rates. It seems to me that that arrangement would lead to unnecessary complication.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe that the language does not have the meaning which the Senator from Massachusetts has given to it. I think it is intended that those employees shall be paid at State rates. If there is anything wrong with the language and the Senator can improve it, I see no reason why it should not be done. The intention is that the employees shall be paid the rates provided by the State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The employees who are transferred to the State system will be paid at State rates, and the employees who are loaned by the Secretary of Labor under the second proviso will be paid at Federal rates until they are taken over by the State Government. Am I correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not think the Senator is correct. He has not stated the committee's intention.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is no dispute at all between the State authorities and the United States Department of Labor, or the United States Employment Service, with relation to the question of employees. When the question first arose, and it was evident that there was a controversy of some nature, we asked the representatives of the State and Government employment services to confer with Mr. Murphy, of the legislative drafting service. The provision of the bill with reference to taking employees from the Federal pay roll and putting them on the State pay roll was in complete agreement with the State authorities and the representatives of the United States Employment Service.

The State authorities very frankly stated, "We are assuming a responsibility. We need employees who are familiar with the work. We need their help. So we will arrange to have them transferred as quickly and as expeditiously as we can."

I may say to the Senator that the language in the bill relating to the transfer of employees is in complete accord with the recommendations made by the representative of the States, and in complete accord with the desires of the United States Employment Service. There is no dispute at all about that part of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. May I ask another question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Kentucky has suggested an amendment providing that the date of transfer shall not be later than June 30, 1946. I personally prefer the language of the bill providing for 120 days. I think that the employment offices will not function satisfactorily until they have been turned back in whole to the State governments.

I should like to ask the acting chairman of the committee about the last proviso on page 18, beginning in line 21 and ending in line 10, on page 19. The language states in substance that if the Secretary of Labor is not satisfied that the States are doing a good job, he may, himself, take over the service. As the bill reads, and as I understand it, the Secretary of Labor is to be the judge of whether the States are doing a good job. If he decides that they are not doing a good job he may take the service over completely. The language to which I refer is one of those pernicious "or else" clauses. "You do it the way I want it done or else I will take it over." It seems to me that the determination of the question should be left to the States. If they do not do a good job, and the people in the country are not being employed, the Congress will have to do something about it. But to incorporate in the bill these "or else" clauses by which we crack a whip over State governments is to lead to misunderstandings and unpleasant relationships, and it will not be conducive to efficient State service. I ask the acting chairman of the committee if he would object to an amendment that the language on page 18 in line 21, beginning with the words "*Provided further*", and continuing to the end of line 10 on page 19, be stricken out of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, again I may say that the provision to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred is one to which the representatives of the States have agreed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, I have nothing more to say about it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object very strenuously, even if they have agreed, because to say that we can take away the money if we find that the State is not doing something in accord with the purposes of the act is an absolute nullification of a State-aid program. If we want to specify particular defaults which justify taking over the services, I think that would be proper. But I think it is absolutely bad legislation, and destructive of the whole theory of a State-aid program, to incorporate in the bill the kind of a provision to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, when we asked those who represented the States and those who represented the United States Employment Service to reach an agreement, they agreed upon the language which is now contained in the bill.

Mr. BALL. I talked to some of the representatives, and they said they would like very much to have the proviso eliminated from the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. They made an agreement with reference to the text about which we are now talking. That is all I know about it. Originally the appropriation was to be matched by the States. It is now to be a complete grant of Federal funds.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that if an agreement was reached, it was an agreement to do certain things within 120 days following the enactment of the act, instead of by June 30, 1946. If an agreement was entered into, a part of it may not be rejected and used in connection with some other provision of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. With reference to the period of 120 days, I may say that the House fixed a period of 30 days, and the Senator from Kentucky now proposes to change it to the 30th of June 1946.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who is in charge of the bill, off the floor, but I have taken part, as the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] both know, in the negotiations which took place between the State authorities and the committee. This is approximately the situation: the present condition is wholly unsatisfactory. The two principal functions are to pay unemployment compensation, and to determine, in paying unemployment compensation—which is a most important consideration—whether or not the applicant for such compensation has been offered and has declined suitable employment. There is no person I know of who thinks that those two functions can successfully operate separately and under different authorities. There are some who believe that the Federal Government should take over the whole thing. I am not one of those; but they can make a good case in logic. There are those who think the service ought to go back to the States now. I agree with that, too, but the provision to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers was a part of some of the compromises which I am going to mention.

Mr. President, at the present time there is a state of indescribable confusion in the exercise of these two functions. First, who determines whether or not an applicant for unemployment compensation has been offered suitable employment? At the present time that is determined by the USES, while the payment of compensation for unemployment is made by the State authorities. Those two functions should be brought together at the very earliest possible date.

Over a period of some days I was fairly active in helping the State authorities to get what from their standpoint was the best bill possible. They objected, in the first instance, to granting the Secretary of Labor the authority to make the finding as to whether or not proper standards of unemployment services in a State were being maintained, but, if in the judgment of the Secretary of Labor, that is not being done, authority is given to him to go into a State and operate the Federal employment system in that State only until the State service can be put on a satisfactory and sound basis.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely wish to try to make it perfectly clear just what the bill proposes in that case. The proviso at the bottom of page 18 begins with these words:

Provided further, That if, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing (which may be a joint hearing with the Social Security Board under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended) to the State agency, the Secretary of Labor—

And so forth. In other words, the Secretary does not have power to go in and do it offhand. He must do it after reasonable notice and a hearing, if desired, which I think is important.

Then again, as the Senator very properly points out, the concluding phrase in this proposal reads:

Until the Secretary is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply.

It is not contemplated that the Federal Government shall take over the State service and keep it; it is merely a question of complying with the Wagner-Peyser Act, which Congress has passed. It would not be a permanent transfer.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we made an earnest effort to resolve, so far as we could, the differences of opinion between the State authorities and the Federal authorities. One trouble is that in the minds of the entire State officialdom there is a deep-seated belief that a considerable and influential part of the Federal administration wants to federalize the unemployment service and they believe that the longer action is delayed the less chance there will be for its return to the States.

Mr. President, I discussed with the State authorities this very proposal and I urge them to accept it. I told them that Secretary Schwellenbach had appeared before the Senate committee; that I was present when he testified, and that he said he would turn the service back to the States as rapidly as he could. He did not think that all the State services needed to be returned at the same time, and neither do I. I think if the Secretary of Labor carries out this program, he will begin to turn the services back to the States as rapidly as he can. So, partly upon my request, the State authorities accepted and agreed to the insertion of this clause to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred.

Mr. President, I am taking the Secretary of Labor at his word. I am going to credit him with good faith until the opposite has been demonstrated. By the same token the Senate voted by 56 to 23 to adopt the well known Lucas amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois a month ago. That amendment provided that these agencies should be turned back in 90 days. The House has passed a bill to turn them back in 30 days.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I call particular attention to the fact that this subject was debated on the floor of the Senate. We considered it only 2 months ago. Its merits were discussed both ways, and, as the Senator says, by a vote of 56 to 20 the Senate voted in favor of turning the Employment Service back to the States in 90 days. That was a definite vote of the Senate of the United States at that time that they would be returned to the States on the 1st of January, and that would have been done if the House had considered the bill and accepted it—the 1st of January, not the 1st of April, not the 1st of July.

So I want to call attention to the fact that this subject has been discussed. It has been discussed from every angle. We discussed the whole history of it, and it was well understood that the unemployment services were to be turned back to the States. So I want to reinforce the Senator's statement that the Senate has decided this question.

Mr. REED. I am one of those who are known as great compromisers. The Senator from Arizona and myself worked long in an effort to bring about a composition of the differences of view. I think these services could be turned back to the States at any time within 30 days, but in the interest of comity and harmony I agreed to the 120 days. I think I voted in the committee for a shorter period, but the committee adopted 120 days, and I hope that will not be disturbed.

I agree with the Senator from Arizona that, after all, what we do here today is going to be reviewed in conference with the House, and whether we write into this bill June 30, 1946, which we ought not to do, or whether we write into the bill 120 days, which we ought to do, or whether we write into it some other period, when the bill comes out of conference, in my opinion, it will be found that this agency will be turned back to the States in about 60 days.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to move to strike out the proviso beginning in line 21, page 18.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is another amendment now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. There is an amendment now pending.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I shall withhold the motion until the pending amendment is passed upon, but I hope that at the proper time the proviso in question may be eliminated from the bill.

In furtherance of what the Senator from Kansas has said, let me say here that we agreed to turn these unemployment agencies back to the States and then we hold over their heads this threat that they will be turned back again to the Federal Government if the job is not well done. That is an "or else" provision which is unfortunate and will make for poor service. In my opinion it is much better to turn the service over to the States, and then if they do not do a good job, let us legislate further.

In due course, I shall offer such an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. Let us vote on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. What is the amendment upon which we are about to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to change the date to June 30, 1946. A vote "yea" will be in favor of the amendment and a vote "nay" will be against it.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, we fought this issue out in the Committee on Appropriations. Some of us tried to make the provision 90 days, and we finally compromised on 120 days. The Senator from Tennessee offered the motion to make the date June 30, and I think it received only a couple of votes in the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; the vote was 9 to 7 in the committee.

Mr. BALL. For June 30?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and I gave notice at the time it was defeated that I would offer it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BALL. My recollection was that the vote was stronger than that, but the Senator undoubtedly knows the record.

However, the Senate committee went to a great deal of trouble to meet several objections to the House provision, which would have required turning over the State employment offices within 30 days. There was the problem involved in transferring employees, many of whom had no State status. There was also the problem of whether we were going to appropriate the funds to the Secretary of Labor, who now has the Employment Service under him, or to the Social Security Board, which originally was the Federal agency handling the matter, when the Federal Government took over the State offices.

I think we have worked those questions out very well in the Senate committee amendment. The Barkley amendment provides for the transfer on June 30; and I think there has been abundant evidence that if we set the date June 30 that will be the date when there will be a transfer, if it ever happens, not before. The whole administration is opposed to transferring these offices back to the States until June 30, 1947, and I think that if we give the agency the authority to hold them until June 30, 1946, they certainly will keep them under Federal control. In that case, the whole Senate amendment will become meaningless. We might as well simply strike out the House provision and let the appropriation stay exactly as it is, because we will not be doing anything.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the vote which was taken on Wednesday, September 19, last.

There being no objection, the vote was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], adding at the end of

the committee amendment, as amended, a new section.

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I, therefore, withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BREWSTER (after having voted in the affirmative). There was a possible understanding about a pair, and in order to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding I will consider myself paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and so I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained from the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness. If present, both of these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 23, as follows:

Yeas—56: Aiken, Andrews, Austin, Bailey, Ball, Bilbo, Bridges, Briggs, Brooks, Butler, Byrd, Capehart, Capper, Carville, Chandler, Cordon, Donnell, Ferguson, Fulbright, Gerry, Gurney, Hart, Hawkes, Hickenlooper, Hoey, Johnston of South Carolina, Knowland, La Follette, Langer, Lucas, McCarran, McClellan, McKellar, Millikin, Moore, Morse, O'Daniel, Reed, Robertson, Saltonstall, Shipstead, Smith, Stewart, Taft, Thomas of Oklahoma, Thomas of Utah, Tobey, Vandenberg, Walsh, Wheeler, Wherry, White, Wiley, Willis, Wilson, Young.

Nays—23: Barkley, Chavez, Downey, Green, Guffey, Hatch, Hayden, Hill, Johnson of Colorado, Kilgore, McFarland, McMahon, Magnuson, Mead, Mitchell, Murdock, Murray, Myers, Radcliffe, Russell, Taylor, Tunnell, Wagner.

Not voting—17: Bankhead, Brewster, Buck, Burton, Bushfield, Connally, Eastland, Ellender, George, Glass, Maybank, O'Mahoney, Overton, Pepper, Revercomb, Thomas of Idaho, Tydings.

So the modified amendment of Mr. LUCAS to the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the whole history of this matter was written when we had this subject before us 2 months ago. The employment offices were taken over temporarily by the President without congressional authority. The only purpose I can see in extending the date to June 30, 1946, is to permit a longer time until Congress can consider a proposal to make the activity permanently a Federal one. That is the only significance in this date. We have before us an appropriation bill for 1946. If we do not turn the offices back until the 1st of July 1946, they may not be turned back at all, and we will have the whole question to consider again in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947. The only purpose of extending the date is not to get more time, it is to maintain a status quo during which the effort may be made to make these offices permanently a part of the Federal Government. That is the only significance of this particular date.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I could not let the Senator make that statement without challenge, in view of the fact that there is no man in the Senate who is more in favor of the States managing and controlling social-security payments than I am. I am not in favor, and I do not expect to be in favor, and so far as I know no Senator on this side of the aisle is in favor, of keeping this activity in the Federal Government permanently. I assure the Senator that he is mistaken about the matter, and that, so far as I am concerned, I shall use every endeavor to have the Service returned to the States.

Mr. TAFT. I did not say anything about the Senator. After all, the Senator did not offer the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offered it in the committee, and I am merely stating the facts.

Mr. TAFT. It is perfectly clear that the same question will come up in connection with the appropriation bill for 1947 sometime along in March or April next year, as to whether we will appropriate in the year 1947 for the USES or for the State employment offices. So, if we adopt this amendment making the date June 30, we leave the whole subject open for reconsideration further by the Congress. It will come up on the next appropriation bill. It seems to me we should settle the issue, if that is what we want to do, and the way to do it is to fix the date at some time short of June 30.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The same thing would happen if it were made 120 days, or 90 days, or 30 days, for that matter. Congress can restore the activity to the control of the Federal Government; but I do not believe a corporal's guard in the Senate would vote to do that.

Mr. TAFT. I hope the Senator is correct, but the effect of maintaining the status quo is to assist the fight when the question comes up next April. If the offices are once turned back before the next appropriation bill is considered, I do not believe the subject will be practically before the Congress, so far as any controversy is concerned.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that we should stand by the decision we made. If we are in favor of turning the services back, they can be turned back just as well by the 1st of April as by the 1st of July. We have settled the question. If we make the date the 1st of July, the question will still be open.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brewster	Huffman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Bushfield	Knowland	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Carville	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	McFarland	Tunnell
Cordon	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Mitchell	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Morse	White
Fulbright	Murdock	Wiley
George	Myers	Willis
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wilson
Green	O'Mahoney	Young
Gurney	Radcliffe	
Hatch	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on page 19, line 12, after the word "than", to strike out the words "the one hundred and twentieth day after the date of enactment of this act", and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1946."

On this question the years and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALL. A vote "yea" is a vote for the Barkley amendment to set the date for June 30, 1946, and a vote "nay" is a vote to retain the committee provision of 120 days?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and allow my vote to stand, as I understand he would vote as I have voted.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business with the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is excused, the excuse for his absence having heretofore been stated.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have been excused. They are members of the Atomic Energy Committee, which is on an inspection trip to Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—31

Barkley	Huffman	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Connally	McCarran	Stewart
Downey	McClellan	Taylor
Eastland	McFarland	Tunnell
Ellender	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	Maybank	Wagner
George	Mead	Walsh
Green	Mitchell	Young
Hatch	Murdock	
Hill	Myers	

NAYS—35

Ball	Gurney	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hoey	Smith
Brewster	Knowland	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Tobey
Butler	Moore	Wheeler
Capper	Morse	Wherry
Carville	O'Daniel	White
Cordon	Radcliffe	Wiley
Donnell	Reed	Willis
Ferguson	Robertson	Wilson
Gerry	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—28

Aiken	Glass	Magnuson
Andrews	Guffey	Millikin
Austin	Hart	Murray
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Kilgore	Vandenberg
Byrd	Langer	
Capehart	McMahon	

So Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED. I move that the vote by which the Barkley amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I previously suggested, to strike out, on page 18, the proviso beginning in line 21, and continuing through line 10, on page 19. I do so for the reasons which I have already stated. This is one of those "or else" clauses, by which the Secretary of Labor would hold a threat of withholding grants or of taking the services from the States and placing them under the Federal Government if the States did not conduct their services properly.

Without going into further detail, I hope that the amendment may be adopted. If the States do not do a good job, Congress should act and take the services away from the States. But while the States are trying to carry on, they should not have a whip held over their heads so that if they do not administer the services in this way or that way they will be taken away from them and put back in the Federal Government. I do not believe that such a provision would make for good legislation or good administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the committee amendment on page 18, beginning on line 21.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if I thought the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts was correct I would not object; but that is not the case. The provision we are now discussing was agreed to by the representatives of the States. As the Senator from Kansas has pointed out, it is merely a temporary matter. Only when there was difficulty of any kind could the Secretary of Labor take back the service, until he was satisfied that there would no longer be failure to comply.

How is the money to carry on this activity obtained? A tax is levied on employers throughout the United States. Money is being taken from employers throughout the United States for an unemployment-compensation tax. There has been accumulated in the Treasury approximately $600,000,000 over and above what the employers have paid into the system. For that reason we are abandoning the old arrangement, under which the States matched the Federal contribution, and will pay for the activity entirely out of the Federal Treasury.

This is a beautiful illustration of the modern conception of States' rights. The Federal Government levies the tax. Every employer knows that it is a tax levied by the Congress which he must pay, and he knows that he pays it to the collector of internal revenue. So we do all the dirty work of raising the money. Then the States have the right to "come and get it"; and, according to the Senator from Massachusetts, after they come and get it, we are to have nothing to say about how they carry on. Having levied and collected the tax, and having appropriated the money and turned it over to the States, we should then make no further inquiry, and raise no question at any time as to whether the States are properly administering the activity. This provision does not say that any morning the Secretary of Labor arises from the wrong side of his bed, he may arbitrarily take back the Employment Service. When we look at the provision in the bill, we find that it says very clearly that it is to be taken back upon a complaint, upon notice, and after a hearing in which the Social Security Board can participate. That is a very different procedure as compared to having the Secretary simply take it back. Then, if he does take it back, he can hold it only long enough to satisfy himself that the States are conducting the kind of employment service for which the Federal Government is paying out every cent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood the Senator to say that this was only a temporary provision.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, Mr. President, the Senator misunderstood me. I said it was a provision whereby the Federal Government could operate a State employment service temporarily, until the matter could be straightened out so that the State would again operate a satisfactory service. As we see by the very language of the act, it is not contemplated that the Federal Government shall take it back and keep it forever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the decision is with the Secretary of Labor who is the one who must be satisfied. He calls the State service before him; and, after a hearing, he having been dissatisfied in the first place, he says, "No; that service is not being properly run, so I will take it over."

If it is a temporary matter, as the Senator says, it means that perhaps today the service will be operated by the Federal Government, tomorrow it will be operated by the State government, and the next day it will be operated again by the Federal Government—of course, after due hearings.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator believe that the Congress having levied the taxes, having raised the money, and having appropriated the money, should wash its hands of the matter, and say, "We do not care whether the service is good or bad; it is none of our concern. We cannot do anything about it. Take the money and do what you please with it."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully call to the Senator's attention the fact that there is pending on the calendar today a bill with relation to hospitals, and under that bill money would be turned over to the States, without further supervision, as I understand, by

the Federal Government. Furthermore, there is in the committee a bill providing for education, and the money is to be turned over to the States without further supervision by the Federal Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. In all my experience in the Congress, I know of no legislation by which we have appropriated money to a State, to aid the State in carrying on an activity, when no standard was set up whereby there would be some supervision by the Federal Government to see that the money raised by the taxpayers and appropriated by the Congress was expended in some way to conform with the law under which the State received the money.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me point out that there is already such a provision in the Social Security Act. Let me read the provision of the act relating to unemployment compensation. It is section 303 (b):

> Whenever the Board, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency charged with the administration of the State law, finds that in the administration of the law there is (1) a denial in a substantial number of cases of unemployment compensation to individuals entitled thereto under such law or (2) a failure to comply substantially with any provision specified in subsection (a)—

Those are the specific things provided in subsection (a)—

> the Board shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until the Board is satisfied that there is no longer any such denial or failure to comply. Until it is so satisfied, it shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State.

That law is now on the statute books. The only thing the committee amendment does is, in the first place, to broaden the power to withhold money. I do not see why we should adopt that language now, because the Social Security Act is substantive law, and we should not change it in an appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is referring to failure on the part of the State to carry out the provisions of the Unemployment Compensation Act. This matter relates to the United States Employment Service, an entirely different subject matter.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, no. After the Employment Service is turned back to the States, it will be operated under title III of the Social Security Act. In this bill we are making grants to the States for unemployment compensation, as provided for in title III of the Social Security Act, and every cent that is turned over to the States shall be subject to that provision of title III.

Really, there is no need for any of these provisions about noncompliance and about hearings, because the matter is already cared for by the present law. The bill says that in such case the Secretary of Labor may maintain a statewide system of unemployment offices. I take it that is the purpose of the committee amendment. I do not think it should be included in a 1-year bill. If the Social Security Act is to be changed, it should not be changed by this bill.

As a matter of fact, the Employment Service will be turned back to the States around the first of April, under the present provision. In 3 months—that is as long as this provision will apply—there will not be any chance to determine whether there is or is not default. It seems to me this provision is intended to give the Secretary of Labor a loophole by which to avoid turning the employment offices back to the States if he does not wish to do so. I cannot see that the provision has any other purpose. Otherwise, the matter should be left for a revision of the Social Security Act, which is now before the Congress and is being taken up by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. We should not here try to determine the purpose of that act. Although I may be wrong in my suspicion, it seems to me that the only effect will be to give the Secretary of Labor a loophole by which to avoid compliance with the requirement to return the services to the States, and it would permit him to hang on to the employment services for a long period of time, because I take it that would be the effect of the provision relative to 1 year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator is wholly mistaken as to the attitude of the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor understands that the Senate already has voted to return the Employment Service to the States, and he understands that the House has made a similar decision, and that the Service is going to be returned to the States. Of course, the Secretary of Labor stated in the hearing that he was opposed to that proposition; but all he was concerned with when he appeared before the committee was to have incorporated in the bill a provision to transfer the Service back to the States in an orderly manner. In order to have that done, he asked the State representatives and the representatives of the United States Employment Service to get together and work out a program, and the provision in the bill is what they worked out.

This provision was agreed to by representatives of the States; and if those who are officially representing the State employment services agree about this matter, I do not see why the Senator has to worry about it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Arizona does not necessarily follow the views or opinions of the representatives of the State employment services, and neither do I. I think we have to decide these questions for ourselves.

I wish only to point out that in a carefully considered Social Security Act we already have laid down the conditions in accordance with which money may be withheld from the States. We certainly have not turned back these services to the States as yet, and we shall not do so until the 1st of April. I see no reason why we cannot consider this question as to the exact terms of punishment, if you please—the taking over by the Federal Government—at the time when we consider amendments to the Social Security Act.

I think the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts should be adopted. I think we should definitely stick to the Social Security Act and its provisions, and we should not try to attach legislation to an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "War Department," on page 20, line 12, after the word "departments", to strike out "$57,854,572" and insert "$51,594,572."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 13, after "In all, title I", to strike out "$2,956,807,646" and insert "$2,940,828,227."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency," on page 21, line 4, after the words "Access roads", to strike out "$3,076,845" and insert "$2,576,845."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Executive Office of the President," after line 12, to strike out:

> Alien Property Custodian, $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Military Establishment," on page 23, line 25, after the numerals "1942–1946", to strike out "$12,829,151" and insert "$10,829,151."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 14, after the numerals "1942–1946", to strike out "$3,944,994,479" and insert "$3,899,682,479"; in line 17, after the word "men", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000"; in line 19, after the word "Army", to strike out "$561,018,000" and insert "$521,018,000"; and in line 21, after the word "animals", to strike out "$1,670,000" and insert "$1,358,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 2, after the numerals "1942–1946", to strike out "$1,679,434,000" and insert "$1,671,934,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 5, after the numerals "1942–1946", to strike out "$12,166,313,000" and insert "$11,313,313,000: *Provided*, That before any permanent fields are determined upon or permanent buildings erected thereon the Air Corps shall submit to Congress a list of such fields and the justification therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 12, after the numerals "1942–1946", to strike out "$268,039,000" and insert "$267,539,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 14, after the numerals "1942–1946", to strike out "$2,349,523,571" and insert "$2,306,763,000"; and in line 17, after the words "Engineer Service", to strike out "$2,054,408,571" and insert "$2,011,648,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 22, after the numerals "1942–1946", to strike out "$8,300,000,000" and insert "$8,100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transfer of appropriations," on page 27, after line 7, to insert:

Army of the Philippines, $200,000,000: *Provided*, That service in the organized military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941, shall not be deemed to be or to have been service in the military or naval forces of the United States or any component thereof for the purposes of any law of the United States conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon any person by reason of the service of such person or the service of any other person in the military or naval forces of the United States or any component thereof, except benefits under (1) the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, under contracts heretofore entered into, and (2) laws administered by the Veterans' Administration providing for the payment of pensions on account of service-connected disability or death: *Provided further*, That such pensions shall be paid at the rate of one Philippine peso for each dollar authorized to be paid under the laws providing for such pensions: *Provided further*, That any payments heretofore made under any such law to or with respect to any member of the military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines who served in the service of the armed forces of the United States shall not be deemed to be invalid by reason of the circumstances that his service was not service in the military or naval forces of the United States or any component thereof within the meaning of such law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provision," page 28, line 24, after "In all, title II", to strike out "$30,903,090,564" and insert "$29,752,017,993."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Naval Establishment," on page 29, line 6, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$10,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 11, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$6,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 4, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$38,262,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 7, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$2,600,000,000" and insert "$2,550,451,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 10, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$128,214,285" and insert "$69,247,269."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 2, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,229,880,000" and insert "$1,283,510,540: *Provided*, That the rescission of $400,000,000 of the appropriation shall not act to reduce further the contract authority."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] wish to be heard on this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Navy Department is quite disturbed over some of the reductions which have been made in the pending bill. I have been in communication with the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee with reference to the reductions. So far as the Navy is concerned, its position can best be stated by reference to a letter which I have received from Admiral Horne. I send the letter to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, November 15, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The original estimate for the cost of providing adequate laying-up facilities for ships of the reserve and inactive fleets was $116,000,000.

As a result of the cuts made by the Bureau of the Budget, this amount had to be reduced to $88,768,750.

As a result of the further rescission made by the House of $45,000,000 for the public-works bill, the amount for this project had to be again reduced to $56,915,584.

Contract work already obligated for this project amounts to approximately $24,000,000, and the total estimated cost of absolutely essential work to provide the very minimum of required facilities is approximately $75,000,000. It can be seen from these facts that the amount of approximately $57,000,000 left after the House rescission will mean a curtailment of some of the absolutely essential work.

I have just been advised, and confirming my telephone conversation with you, that the Senate Appropriations Committee has further reduced this appropriation by $53,630,540, with the specific recommendation that this total amount should be applied against the projects for laying up of ships and permanent construction of hospitals.

There was only approximately $21,000,000 left in the House bill for hospitals. Even if this amount were eliminated in toto (which is, of course, not possible), we would still have to reduce the project for laying-up facilities by approximately $32,000,000 more, which would provide then a total amount for this project of only approximately $25,000,000. As noted above, we have already obligated $24,000,000, which practically exhausts all of the available funds if the Senate rescission is finally made, which means that none of the additional and absolutely essential items under this program can be undertaken.

In the preparation of the plan for laying up of the reserve and inactive fleets, the Department arranged for the irreducible minimum of facilities. It is easy to see that unless there are adequate berthing facilities for tying up the ships, the ships must be anchored in the open roadstead. Such ships, if anchored offshore, must either be kept in a reduced commission and manned by service personnel or civilian caretakers and preservation gangs employed, resulting in a wasteful utilization of labor as well as greatly increasing the chances of an expensive casualty. Work under such conditions will naturally be less carefully supervised, and the deterioration that can be prevented with shore connections and shore facilities may soon exceed the saving in not providing adequate facilities with the easy access and efficient handling that the berthing provided by the plan offers.

A secondary point is that the speed of laying up the vessels will be greatly retarded if the vessels cannot be berthed ashore and the shore facilities available to assist in the laying up of vessels. This will inevitably tend to retard the release of the officers and enlisted men who are not destined to remain with the postwar Navy.

It is therefore strongly urged that every effort be made to have at least the amount cut back by the Senate Appropriations Committee put back in the bill and, for the reasons outlined above, if it is possible, to have at least a part of the rescission by the House committee reinserted when this bill comes up for conference.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. HORNE,
Admiral, United States Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, briefly summarized, the letter complains against the cut in the naval hospital service item. It says:

It would eliminate the construction of 915 permanent hospital beds required for postwar needs. In addition to deleting the construction of these hospital beds it also involves the elimination of numerous other items required for the rehabilitation and security of patients and the efficient operation of some 20 naval hospitals.

The reduction would also greatly affect the efforts of the Navy Department to establish bases or anchorages for a reserve fleet. It is well known that a large number of vessels must be placed in anchorage basins or tied up at docks. Proper facilities are not available, but have been provided for by appropriations, and in fact, some contracts have already been made.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has an intention of offering an amendment. I listened to the last part of the letter very carefully—and I had already read the letter, as the Senator knows—and apparently it merely asks that the conferees abide by the House provision.

Mr. WALSH. I think all we need do is vote down the Senate committee amendment, which will restore the House provision.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. I am in thorough accord with him. I think we have gone a little too far in the cuts in the Navy appropriations, particularly in the two main items he has mentioned, namely, in facilities for laying up

ships, the lack of which in the end will result in greater cost, and in the appropriation for hospital beds.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I quote from the letter which I have had read:

> If this rescission of approximately $32,000,000 stands, I am satisfied that within a very few years the cost to the Government will be as great as the proposed saving due to the extra cost to handle about one-third of the vessels in improper berths or anchored in the stream far from the services and with the least efficient utilization of labor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I might suggest to the Senator, and I think he will agree with me, that one of the troubles after the last war was that naval vessels were left lying idle, and finally were put on the junk heap. I think it is a question of conserving money in the last analysis, and it would be well not to have a repetion of what happened in 1920.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has made an accurate observation as to what happened in 1920, after the last war.

From what I have learned from various members of the Committee on Appropriations, they themselves feel that the cut has been too severe. I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will agree that the Senate committee amendment may be rejected and the House provision may stand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I cannot do that, for the reason that the amendment was offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is chairman of the Naval Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. He seemed to think this appropriation was wholly unnecessary, and that it should be cut. He is not present today, because of illness, and I do not feel that I can make an agreement for him. It will have to go to a vote. Can it not be brought to the attention of the Senate again? Why not let the amendment be agreed to? It cannot result in harm being done.

Mr. WALSH. It would be unfortunate if on a vote the Senate Committee amendment were agreed to, because that would somewhat tie the hands of the conferees. If the Senate conferees would agree to review and restudy these cuts in the light of the information that has been presented, that would be satisfactory.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to have the Senator come before the conferees and make any argument he wishes to urge about the matter, if he will let the amendment go to conference.

Mr. WALSH. If I let it go to a vote, and we should not succeed in rejecting it, our hands would be tied.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I think it would be better to let it go to conference.

Mr. WALSH. On the assurance of the acting chairman of the commmittee—and I know of his sympathy with what I am saying—I am disposed to let the amendment be approved, with the understanding that there will be a review and restudy of the whole situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is the Senator referring to the amendment on page 34, line 7?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. The appropriation is a lump sum. It is difficult to tell just what the allocation of the sums will be.

Mr. WALSH. The items in question affect hospitals and berthing facilities for ships which are placed in reserve.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is all true.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator from Texas that if he will let the amendment be agreed to we shall be glad to have him join the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from South Carolina and come before the conferees. That is the best course I can suggest.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Texas is one of many Senators who have spoken to me about the subject and who feel very strongly about this cut being extreme. I think the acting chairman of the committee himself has some doubt about it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator from Tennessee saying he would be glad to have me join other Senators in appearing before the conferees. When this matter came up last week it was necessary for me to be in South Carolina in connection with the visit to that State of the Secretary of State, who delivered a most important address in a great homecoming welcome.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for inviting us to come before the conference committee. I do not see that I would have much better luck before the conference than I had before the Committee on Appropriations. They heard us with one ear open, and their heart valves all closed.

Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the item discussed by the Senator from Massachusetts. I should much prefer that the Committee on Appropriations made clearer, in all the appropriation bills, what money is to be spent for. They merely provide it in a great wad, so to speak, and turn it over to a department to allocate as it sees fit. I think the practice in many State legislatures is superior to that system.

What I am particularly interested in is the item for hospitals. It was provided by authorizations in existing law that the Navy could build certain hospitals. They had appropriations with which to build them. They were preparing their plans and getting ready to erect them, when the Committee on Appropriations comes along with a big pair of shears and clips off the appropriation, and then seeks to legislate by inserting a clause that no hospital shall be built within a certain time.

The result is that a hospital projected to be built by the Navy at Austin, Tex., is eliminated. Another hospital proposed to be built by the Navy, and for which plans have already been made, a hospital at Marlin, Tex., the county seat town where I reside, was eliminated entirely, although the Navy has already spent a good deal of money drawing the plans and getting ready to proceed with the building of the hospital.

I wish to quote the testimony of Admiral McIntire, Surgeon General of the Navy, before the House committee. I thought he knew something about hospitals, but he has not been through the mill as some of us have. I am about to read from a General Statement for Public Works program, fiscal year 1946, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, by Vice Admiral Ross T McIntire.

Mr. President, we all believe in economy, of course, and I want to see cut back every dollar it is not necessary to spend, but I do not propose to cut back on the building of hospitals for wounded soldiers and sailors who are returning from the battlefields. Admiral McIntire says these naval hospitals are needed to care for the men now in the Pacific, the wounded and the sick.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Texas. Only a month ago I was assured by the Navy Department that a hospital had been approved for wounded marines and sailors to be built in South Carolina. It was authorized more than a year ago, yet that also would be eliminated now. It could not be built then because of lack of material. I want to be certain, as does the Senator, that we have economy wherever possible, but I want to be certain that the men returned from the war may get attention and treatment in hospitals where they are needed. That cannot be done in temporary buildings such as those we have now, because many of the veterans are permanently disabled.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that under the cuts imposed by this bill the naval hospital at Beaufort, S. C.——

Mr. MAYBANK. That is at Parris Island. It is the main training base on the east coast—New River and Parris Island, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that hospital will not be built under this provision.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator's assumption is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to weary the Senate——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If all this money is eliminated of course the hospital will not be built.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the action of the Senate committee stands the hospital will not be built.

Mr. President, Admiral McIntire testified:

> It will be recalled that the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery submitted a very conservative estimate of additional requirements—

Additional requirements, Mr. President—

> for the fiscal year 1946 public work appropriation, estimated to total about 10,000 beds. It was stated that in the interest of economy every effort would be made to secure those beds either by the conversion of surplus Federal facilities or by the lease and conversion of suitable civilian facilities, resorting to construction only as a last alternative. The only exception to this policy was

the permanent naval hospital at St. Albans, required as a replacement for the obsolete plant at Brooklyn. It can now be seen as a result of curtailment of the war effort that requirements will be met by a program providing about 85,000 beds, in lieu of the 90,000 previously estimated.

Justification of the program is based on known deficiencies in operation of certain naval hospitals due to lack of one or more essential units, plus bed requirements calculated on projected naval strengths at intervals of the demobilization period.

I shall omit a part of the testimony, Mr. President, but shall ask to have Admiral McIntire's full statement incorporated in the RECORD in a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to call the attention of the Senate and of the distinguished Senator from Texas to the fact that General Bradley, who is in charge of the Veterans' Administration, only recently made a survey with the hope that perhaps he might be able to use some of the temporary hospitals at Army camps in various places throughout the United States to house and care for some of the extreme cases. As the result of this very careful investigation by the Veterans' Administration 60 hospitals were declared surplus, and I am told that General Bradley himself says that some of these hospitals, of which they had hoped some part or some small section might be used, were of temporary construction and were not good enough to be used for the type of hospitalization about which Admiral McIntire testified.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Resuming reading from Admiral McIntire's testimony, Mr. President:

In setting up the revised 1946 public-works program it was considered advisable to include in it a certain number of permanent hospitals, looking forward to the disestablishment of many of our temporary hospitals which are attached to stations that will be abandoned. These hospitals are:

	Beds
United States naval hospital, St. Albans, N. Y.	1,000
A naval hospital in the San Francisco Bay area	1,000
A naval hospital in Beaufort, S. C.	500
A naval hospital in Austin, Tex.	500
A naval hospital in Marlin, Tex.	500

Had the war continued these beds would have been urgently needed in the over-all hospital program.

I wish some of the members of the Appropriations Committee were present. This is an appropriation bill. I observe only one member of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I also call attention to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] who is a member of the committee.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to inform the Senator that I am a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Also the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to know that the three Senators are also members of the committee.

Mr. REED. May I inquire, is this an indictment or a compliment.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I simply said I wished a greater number of members of the Appropriations Committee were present. I am glad to know that the Senator from Kansas is in attendance, and looking after the bill, although the Senator does not know what is presently going on because he was in conversation with another Senator.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire further——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The Senator from Texas has the floor. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I should like the Senator from Texas to enlighten the Senator from Kansas further as to what feature of the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I continue to read from Admiral McIntire's testimony:

Now that the war is completed, these beds are urgently needed—

I want members of the Appropriations Committee to hear those words of the Surgeon General of the Navy, stating that these beds are urgently needed now—

urgently needed so that naval personnel can be housed in permanent structures and the temporary hospitals be disestablished.

Do Senators want our wounded men to be housed in permanent fireproof structures or do they want them housed in old shacks? I want them housed in permanent structures.

I continue to read:

This is in the interest of good hospital care and also in economy of operation.

The Bureau of the Budget, in reviewing the 1946 public-works program of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, reduced the amount of money requested from $55,897,700 to $26,764,511. It was necessary then for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery to recommend to the Bureau of Yards and Docks a revision of its public-works plan.

In order to meet this drastic cut, the San Francisco Bay project of 1,000 beds was deleted. The hospital at Marlin, Tex., of 500 beds was deleted. The naval hospital at Austin, Tex., was reduced to 200 beds, and the naval hospital at St. Albans, N. Y., was reduced to 600 beds. This resulted in a reduction of 2,200 permanent beds in the 1946 program.

Mr. President, I ask that the complete statement made by Admiral McIntire on the subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT FOR PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1946, BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, BY VICE ADMIRAL ROSS T M'INTIRE

It will be recalled that the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery submitted a very conservative estimate of additional requirements for the fiscal year 1946 public works appropriation, estimated to total about 10,000 beds. It was stated that in the interest of economy every effort would be made to secure those beds either by the conversion of surplus Federal facilities or by the lease and conversion of suitable civilian facilities, resorting to construction only as a last alternative. The only exception to this policy was the permanent naval hospital at St. Albans, required as a replacement for the obsolete plant at Brooklyn. It can now be seen as a result of curtailment of the war effort that requirements will be met by a program providing about 85,000 beds, in lieu of the 90,000 previously estimated.

Justification of the program is based on known deficiencies in operation of certain naval hospitals due to lack of one or more essential units, plus bed requirements calculated on projected naval strengths at intervals of the demobilization period. Past experience demonstrates that the peacetime hospital sick rate is about 2 percent of total naval strength. To this must be added a factor arising from the prolonged definitive care required by war casualties. Whereas the average length of stay on the sick list for the usual hospital patient received in peacetime is approximately 28 days, war casualties requiring extensive surgical repairs and rehabilitation may pass 6 to 12 months in the hospital, thus increasing the requirements for beds. Other additional factors increasing the hospital patient load are the patients who will be admitted as a result of screening personnel prior to discharge, supernumeraries such as Coast Guard and dependents, and Veterans' Administration patients. Currently about 2,500 beds are allocated to the Veterans' Administration, but it has been stated by that agency that a request for increase may be expected, as beds become available, to a maximum of about 10,000.

As of October 1 the total hospital patient load was 101,332. It is estimated that seasonal incidence of communicable disease, plus the increase of patient load resulting from screening personnel prior to discharge, will offset any decreases resulting from demobilization until about December 15, 1945, following which there will be a gradual reduction in patient load to 56,646 by July 1, 1946. For the remainder of the fiscal year the average patient load is computed to be 88,934 of which 75,327 may be expected to be hospitalized within the continental limits. Since the existing normal capacity is now 123.4 percent occupied, it is obvious that as the patient load declines first consideration must be given to abolishing the existing and very undesirable crowding in naval hospitals. This will be managed by permitting attrition to occur in the most overcrowded facilities while at the same time assigning incoming drafts to new facilities which will be established as the program is completed.

In setting up the revised 1946 public-works program it was considered advisable to include in it a certain number of permanent hospitals, looking forward to the disestablishment of many of our temporary hospitals which are attached to stations that will be abandoned. These hospitals are:

	Beds
United States naval hospital, St. Albans, N. Y.	1,000
A naval hospital in the San Francisco Bay area	1,000
A naval hospital in Beaufort, S. C.	500
A naval hospital in Austin, Tex.	500
A naval hospital in Marlin, Tex.	500

Had the war continued these beds would have been urgently needed in the over-all hospital program. Now that the war is completed, these beds are urgently needed so that naval personnel can be housed in permanent structures and the temporary hospitals be disestablished. This is in the interest of good hospital care and also in economy of operation.

The Bureau of the Budget, in reviewing the 1946 public-works program of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, reduced the amount of money requested from $55,897,700 to $26,764,511. It was necessary then for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery to recommend to the Bureau of Yards and Docks a revision of its public-works plan.

In order to meet this drastic cut the San Francisco Bay project of 1,000 beds was deleted. The hospital at Marlin, Tex., of 500 beds, was deleted. The naval hospital at Austin, Tex., was reduced to 200 beds, and the naval hospital at St. Albans, N. Y., was reduced to 600 beds. This resulted in a reduction of 2,200 permanent beds in the 1946 program.

The allocation of the further rescission by the House Appropriations Committee of an additional $45,000,000 from the appropriation public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, further reduced funds for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery public-works program to $21,224,257, necessitating the elimination of the following projects from the 1946 program:

National Naval Medical Center Research Institute: West annex for.

Naval hospital, St. Albans, N. Y.: Permanent construction of 384 beds and accessories thereof.

The annex for the Naval Medical Research Institute is planned to provide additional space required in housing special research equipment essential to the postwar medical research program, and its deferment will delay the launching of important research projects.

The construction of a 1,000-bed permanent hospital at St. Albans, N. Y., was authorized under the 1946 public works appropriation and is urgently needed in the postwar period to provide a permanent naval hospital in the New York area as a replacement for the old Brooklyn Naval Hospital. The further cutback in the St. Albans project is so extensive that provision remains for only 216 of the original 1,000 beds, making it impossible to operate only the permanent unit. Many patients must continue to be housed in temporary buildings.

It is considered vitally necessary to proceed immediately with a well-ordered construction plan for the postwar Navy. There will be in all naval hospitals about 12,300 beds in permanent construction by January 1, 1946. It is estimated that about 28,000 beds in permanent construction will be required in order to accommodate the expected patient load of a postwar Navy of 660,000, including the Marine Corps. This total includes 10,000 beds estimated by the Veterans' Administration as an immediate peacetime requirement. Thus it is obvious that a majority of patients must continue to be housed in temporary construction. It will be easily understood that it is not good economy to hospitalize 1,000 patients in a 5,000-bed temporary institution. The rescission of funds for the public-works program imposed by this bill has forced a reduction of 2,584 of the permanent hospital beds required for the postwar period. Since these beds must eventually be provided by the Government, as a part of a sound postwar hospital program, no economy is seen in eliminating these projects at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not want to take up more of the time of the Senate, because it may be futile—it probably is futile—since the well-oiled and well-organized Committee on Appropriations is against any change in what they have done. But, Mr. President, this conduct will not be approved by those who want adequate hospitalization facilities for the wounded and the maimed and the sick boys who are coming back from the Pacific Ocean. That is where the chief burden is going to be. Admiral McIntire told me in so many words that they needed these facilities for the hospitalization and care of men from the Pacific area. Mr. President, this cut-back will eliminate two hospitals in which I am primarily interested. I am interested in all of them, but two are located in my own State and if I do not look after them I should feel derelict in my duty.

I do not know what the fortunes of this effort will be, Mr. President; I am afraid it will be very ineffective; but I desire now to serve notice on the Appropriations Committee that when the regular bill for 1946 comes along I shall make a superhuman effort to restore these items to that bill. I hope Senators will read the testimony of Surgeon General McIntire in the RECORD. If they do they will be convinced that these reductions in appropriations for Navy hospitals should not take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, beginning with line 6.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, because of the attitude of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], whose judgment I always regard highly, and who, as I understand, thinks that any effort now made to change these figures by amendment or otherwise, if it should result in an adverse vote, would in the long run operate to our disadvantage——

Mr. WALSH. That is my judgment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not offer a specific amendment to increase the amount, but I am serving notice now that if I know how to do it I shall cooperate with other Senators and form a little guerrilla band, if necessary, to see to it that the Committee on Appropriations pays some attention to the needs of wounded sailors and soldiers who want to be housed in permanent structures rather than in old discarded Army installations.

Mr. WALSH. I might add that there are few Members in the Chamber, and if a quorum were called and the vote cast it would be a vote cast without any knowledge of the discussion which has taken place.

Mr. CONNALLY. They would rush in.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to say that I thoroughly agree with what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has said, and I shall certainly join him and appear before the conference committee in the hope that the House provision may be adopted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with what the Senator from Texas has said respecting the care of wounded soldiers and sailors. Everyone who is familiar with the record of the Committee on Appropriations must know that that committee is trying to and has taken care of wounded soldiers and sailors. I believe that if the record were known it would be found that the Committee on Appropriations has less to do with wounded soldiers and sailors and even dead soldiers and sailors than probably some other committees of the Senate.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, and have given very little study to the question of location of hospitals. I heard the Senator from Texas speaking about the location of a hospital at Marlin, Tex., which I understand is a rather small town. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. In the matter of the location of hospitals I have frequently heard the suggestion made that they should be located in or near large towns. The suggestion was especially impressed on me by a situation in Oklahoma. In Okmulgee, Okla., which is what might be called a county-seat town, a hospital has been built which may now be regarded as a temporary hospital, but my information is that it is a good hospital. A move has been made to build a new hospital. The hospital at Okmulgee cost about $5,000,000, and I have never been furnished with proof that it is not ample for the Veterans' Administration. I believe that the Veterans' Administration has recommended a hospital 100 miles away, at Oklahoma City, which is a large town. One of the reasons assigned was that the facilities in a large town were so much superior to those in a small town that it would be advantageous to build veterans hospitals in the larger towns. That is the reason why I was impressed by what the Senator said about his desire to have a hospital built at Marlin, Tex.

Mr. CONNALLY. Admiral McIntire of the Navy wanted to use the hospital at Marlin, Tex., particularly for the treatment of rheumatic and arthritic patients. The town is famous as a health resort.

Mr. MOORE. Would that reason outweigh the alleged advantages of building hospitals in larger towns?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not subscribe to that doctrine. As I understand, that is the view of the Veterans' Administration. I am not authorized to speak for the Veterans' Administration, but I understand that General Bradley and his administration wish to locate veterans' hospitals near large cities.

Mr. MOORE. That is my understanding.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is fine for those who operate them.

Mr. MOORE. As I understand, the Senator does not agree with that doctrine?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree with it. I do not believe that the wishes of the cities ought to have a great deal of influence in the location of hospitals. The superintendents, doctors, and officers who operate the hospitals may like to be close to a large city; but there are not many of the hospital patients who can get out on the boulevards. They must remain in the hospitals. So I do not agree with that philosophy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, beginning in line

6. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 18, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$1,481,300,000" and insert "$1,324,691,800"; in lin 22, after the word "to", to strike out "$135,765,200" and insert "$128,116,900"; in line 25, after the figures "$44,934,000", to insert the word "and"; on page 35, line 2, after the word "to", to strike out "$758,050,800" and insert "$835,050,800"; in line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and (4) continuing experiments and developmental work, and so forth, from '$81,272,500' to '$61,000,000' and insert "the subappropriation 'continuing experiments and development work, and so forth,' is hereby increased from '$81,272,500' to '$148,256,500'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 35, line 12, after the numerals "1944", to strike out $41,321,480" and insert "$40,521,480."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 36, line 5, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$310,000,000" and insert "$307,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 36, line 17, after the word "vessels", to insert "except, not to exceed $24,100,000 may be available during the fiscal year 1946 against the construction of five advanced type combatant vessels and 17 minor craft."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 41, after line 19, to strike out:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 364), the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to issue in kind during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, one service blue uniform and overcoat to each enlisted man in the naval service upon return to the United States from sea and foreign shore duty upon the sworn statement of such enlisted man that he was prevented, by competent naval authority, from taking such articles of clothing with his person at the time of his assignment to sea and foreign shore duty: *Provided*, That the value of such articles of clothing shall be charged to the clothing and small-stores fund.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 364), the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to issue in kind one dress blue uniform and overcoat to each enlisted man in the naval service upon his return to the United States from sea and foreign shore duty for separation from the naval service upon the sworn statement of such enlisted man that these articles of clothing are not now in his possession by reason of compliance with orders of higher naval authority or other exigencies of the service beyond his control and that no claim for reimbursement will be filed for the value of such articles so replaced: *Provided*, That the value of such articles of clothing shall be charged to the clothing and small-stores fund. The authority contained herein shall terminate on September 30, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 22, to insert:

Personnel of the Naval Reserve, not qualified for sea duty, will, upon their application, be placed on inactive duty if surplus to requirements.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 43, to insert:

The dependents and household effects of such civilian and naval personnel of the Naval Establishment (without regard to rank or grade) on duty at locations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, as may be determined upon by the Secretary of the Navy, may prior or subsequent to the issuance of orders for the relief of such personnel from their stations, or subsequent to the discharge or release of such personnel from active service, be moved (including packing and unpacking of household effects) from such locations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, to such locations as may be designated by such personnel, or dependents concerned, by the use of either Government or commercial means of transportation, and later from such locations to the duty station to which such personnel may be ordered, and current appropriations of the Naval Establishment available for travel and transportation may be used for this purpose. In lieu of the transportation in kind authorized for dependents, the Secretary of the Navy may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to the commercial transportation costs (including taxes if paid), for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 24, after "In all, title III", to strike out "$14,604,721,830" and insert "$14,309,609,614."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provision," on page 44, after line 7, to insert the following:

Effective December 1, 1945, no military or naval personnel shall receive during the remainder of the current fiscal year aviation pay unless the person affected is assigned to duty on air activities prescribed by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as requiring regular and frequent participation in aerial flights, or is required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights in order to continue his fitness for his primary technical skill: *Provided further*, That in addition, on or before January 1, annually, the Secretaries of War and Navy, respectively, shall certify to the Congress by rank and age group the number of such officers above the rank of major of the Army or lieutenant commander of the Navy, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall on or before January 3, 1946, submit to the Congress a joint recommendation for revision of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, including but not restricted to recommendations with respect to increases authorized for flying pay, parachute pay, glider pay, submarine pay, and similar special pay and allowances.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] who is ill, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 44, at the beginning of line 8, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out the word "Effective" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The appropriations contained in the 1946 War and Navy Department Appropriation Acts shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by flying or nonflying officers at rates as follows:

"Nonflying officers, $720 per annum.

"Flying officers, not in parachute jumping or glider-pay status, who are required by orders of competent authority to participate in regular and frequent flights as an essential part of their military duty and training, shall receive an increased 50 percent of their pay when in consequence of such orders they participate in such flights: *Provided*, That such increase shall not exceed $125 per month: *Provided further*, That effective ——."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to the committee amendment on page 44, line 8.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the amendment. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] wished to be heard on it, and I have sent for him.

It seems that a large number of officers in the Army and Navy have had increased air-service pay of 50 percent. In the case of a high-ranking officer in the Army or Navy—for illustration, one who receives a salary of $8,000 a year—if he was engaged in flying service during the war his salary was increased to $12,000 a year, or an increase of 50 percent. That was under authority of law at the time, but it was supposed to be only for the duration of the war.

Since the end of the war, under some regulation an officer can increase his salary by going in the air 4 hours a month. Complaint was made to the committee by those interested in both the Army and Navy that that was not intended to be a part of the law. It was not intended that by simply going in the air and flying to Chicago and return, or to New York and return, cr remaining in the air in any way for 4 hours, an officer should receive an increase in salary of 50 percent.

The committee came to the conclusion that it was unfair and unjust for officers to increase their salaries in this manner. Both flying officers and nonflying officers were able to take advantage of the increase. However, nonflying officers were limited by law to an increase of $720. Therefore, this amendment after leaving the increased pay of nonflying officers, of that kind, including doctors and officers at $720 per annum, provides as follows:

Flying officers, not in parachute jumping or glider-pay status, who are required by

orders of competent authority to participate in regular and frequent flights as an essential part of their military duty and training, shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when in consequence of such orders they participate in such flights: *Provided*, That such increase shall not exceed $125 per month.

That simply means that officers who fly the required amount of time shall not receive more than $1,500 a year additional pay. Many of us thought that 50 percent was too much. I believe that this amendment ought to be agreed to. That is why I am offering it in the the absence of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the limitation of $1,500 affect only officers in the higher ranks, and not those in the lower ranks?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. So that those in the lower ranks would receive the 50 percent increase when they engaged in flying.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. The amendment would affect only the higher-ranking officers. Some of the high-ranking officers increase their salaries by 50 percent merely by flying 4 hours a month. Some of us thought that that ought not to be done, and for that reason the Senator from Louisiana submitted his amendment. I approve the amendment, and I believe that it should be adopted. I hope the Senate will accept it.

A few moments ago the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] stated that he wished to be heard in opposition to the amendment. I see that he is now in the Chamber, and I now yield the floor so that he may discuss it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee was very kind to give notice to the Senate of my desire to be heard.

First, Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter which I have received from the Secretary of War, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In response to your request of me concerning the effect of an amendment to the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946, which was introduced by Senator OVERTON on November 16, 1945, the following information is submitted:

The amendment offered by Senator OVERTON, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD November 16, 1945, reads as follows:

"On page 44, line 8, strike out the word 'Effective' and insert in lieu thereof the following: " 'The appropriations contained in the 1946 War and Navy Departments Appropriation Acts shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by flying or nonflying officers at rates as follows:

" 'Nonflying officers, $720 per annum.'

"Flying officers, not in parachute jumping or glider pay status, who are required by orders of competent authority to participate in regular and frequent flights as an essential part of their military duty and training, shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when in consequence of such orders they participate in such flights: *Provided*, That such increase shall not exceed $125 per month."

The amendment does not affect the pay of nonflying officers. It does, however, place a maximum limitation of $125 per month ($1,500 per year) on the extra compensation received by flying officers. The amendment, therefore, affects the pay of all officers authorized to receive flight pay who are above the rank of major in the Army and Marine Corps, and lieutenant commander in the Navy.

A small percentage of officers in the grade of major would also be affected. The following tabulation shows the approximate number of Army officers presently authorized to receive flight pay:

Generals of the Army (5-star)	1
Generals (4-star)	4
Lieutenant generals (3-star)	13
Major generals (2-star)	72
Brigadier generals (1-star)	200
Colonels	3,000
Lieutenant colonels	6,000
Majors	10,000
Captains	24,000
First lieutenants	55,000
Second lieutenants	45,000

Of the above officers, as closely as can be estimated at this time, the following would be affected by the proposed amendment:

Generals of the Army (5-star)	1
Generals (4-star)	4
Lieutenant generals (3-star)	13
Major generals (2-star)	72
Brigadier generals (1-star)	200
Colonels	3,000
Lieutenant colonels	6,000
Majors	1,700

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, without reading it, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received from Assistant Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan, transmitting a copy of a letter which was addressed to the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee by Secretary Forrestal.

There being no objection, the letter and attached copy of letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF THE NAVY FOR AIR,
Washington, November 15, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a letter of 10 November from the Secretary of the Navy addressed to Senator McKELLAR.

I would like to express to you my concurrence with the statement made by Secretary Forrestal to the effect that no changes should be made in the pay schedules now in effect, including flight pay, except after a thorough study.

The amendment to the rescission bill which has been passed by the Senate Appropriations Committee will provide for that study, and the Navy will submit to the Congress by 3 January 1946 a full study with respect not only to flight pay but, further, with regard to the pay structure of the Navy as a whole.

I feel very strongly that the Navy should have this opportunity of presenting the results of a thorough study to the Congress before any action is taken which would reduce the pay of a limited group of personnel.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

NOVEMBER 10, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR,
Senate Appropriations Committee.

MY DEAR SENATOR: With regard to the attached proposed amendment to the rescission bill now under consideration by your committee, it is my considered opinion that the whole matter of the pay structure of the armed services is a subject which should receive the early attention of the Congress. The armed services are now operating under the basic structural provisions of the 1908 pay bill, as modified by the 1922 Pay Readjustment Act. No changes should be made in the pay schedules now in effect, including flight pay, except after a thorough study. The opinion of personnel of all ranks and ratings of all services concerned should be obtained and considered.

The proposed amendment would, without mature deliberation, reduce the pay of a large number of naval aviators whose services in the recent war contributed so greatly to that war. This reduction in pay would not be in accord with the apparent policy of the administration toward increasing compensation of Government personnel.

The proposed amendment would, in my opinion, adversely affect the existing high morale of naval aviation. It would, I fear, most seriously react against the efforts of the Navy to induce large numbers of experienced naval aviators of the Naval Reserve to transfer to the Regular Navy. I believe it is hardly necessary for me to point out to you the serious consequences which would result if we now lose the services of this excellent group of young combat experienced aviators.

For the above reasons I am strongly opposed to the proposed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall be content to say that the Appropriations Committee considered this matter at length; and, being of the opinion that it would be altogether improper at this time to legislate such a far-reaching change in the schedules of aviation pay in both the Army and the Navy, the committee rejected an amendment which was substantially the same as the one now offered by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the able Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming has requested that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Sullivan, together with a copy of a letter from Secretary Forrestal, be printed in the RECORD, I believe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I wonder whether the Senator will permit me to read an excerpt from the letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Sullivan, because it is so succinctly stated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. HILL. The letter is under date of November 15, 1945, and it contains the following statement, among others:

I would like to express to you my concurrence with the statement made by Secretary Forrestal to the effect that no changes should be made in the pay schedules now in effect, including flight pay, except after a thorough study.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

A majority of the Committee on Appropriations was of the opinion, of course, that the door should be closed against any abuse of the present provisions for extra pay for flight. Therefore, the committee has reported to the Senate the amendment which appears on page 44, beginning in line 8.

Suffice it to say that this amendment requires the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, to certify as to the essentiality of any flights which may be taken by officers in the respective Departments, before they shall be entitled to the extra pay. It also requires these Departments to make a report to the Congress in January 1946 covering the whole subject of the aviation-pay structure.

So, Mr. President, with that report before us, the Congress then will be in a position to act with information, without haste, and in a manner designed to preserve the best interests of the flying services.

Actually, Mr. President, this is a matter of legislation, and it should come from the respective legislative committees having to do with the affairs of the services. To me, the most important aspect of the matter, however, is that during the war the aviation services of both the Army and the Navy rendered heroic service to the country. The exploits of those two flying services have never been excelled in any combat service. Now that demobilization is upon us, however, the sad fact is that the personnel of both these services is beginning to disappear. Testimony before our committee from General Arnold indicated that the rate of accidents in the Air Corps is rising. Skilled and able personnel are retiring into private life. No one can doubt how important it is, not only to the United States but to the whole world, that the Air Corps of both the Army and the Navy shall be maintained at a high level of morale in this period. No one doubts that the maintenance of peace in the world will depend upon the existence of an efficient and effective air force in the armed services of the United States.

Mr. President, these aviators, of high degree or low degree, during the war received compensation upon a schedule to which the Congress had given its complete approval. To undertake now, in this summary manner, without a constructive study of the situation, to cut the compensation of these fliers would, it seems to me, clearly undermine the morale of both services. We are saying to this branch, and to this branch alone, "You must now accept a severe reduction in your compensation."

It is not a matter of dealing with a few officers at the top. It is a matter of dealing with thousands of officers. The letter of the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, clearly indicates that 1,700 majors, 6,000 lieutenant colonels, 3,000 colonels, and 200 brigadier generals will be affected. To them, if the Senate should adopt the amendment, the Senate would be saying "Despite your services in this war, and although you have not had an opportunity to tell your story to a committee f the Senate, we are now undertaking to cut your compensation"—and this in the face of the fact that the action of the committee has been sufficiently clear to close the door to any abuse of this excess pay and to call upon both the Army and the Navy to present to the Congress a full study of the whole matter. Surely, Mr. President, the Senate will not wish to undertake to make this radical departure in such a hasty and such a premature manner as would be the case if this amendment were adopted.

The Committee on Appropriations, after having heard what evidence was presented, decided against the amendment. The committee heard personally from Judge Patterson, who appeared before us. Secretary Forrestal sent a letter to the committee. An effort was made to have Secretary Forrestal come before the committee at the same time Judge Patterson appeared there, but such short notice was given that the clerks of the committee were unable to reach Secretary Forrestal in time. Secretary Patterson appeared before the committee, having received the message only that morning. His statement to the Committee on Appropriations was simply this:

> Do not act hastily. Give the War Department an opportunity to examine this matter. The War Department will cooperate. The War Department will do its part to prevent abuse. But it does not want to see the morale of the Air Force impaired by hasty action.

The War Department will cooperate. The War Department will do its part in order to prevent abuse, but it does not want to see the morale of the Air Forces impaired by hasty action.

That, Mr. President, is the story. It was sufficient to convince the majority of the members of the committee, and I believe it should be sufficient to convince the majority of the Members of the Senate that the committee was right in rejecting the proposal.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator has quoted Secretary of War Patterson. I should like to quote a brief paragraph from a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal. The letter, which is addressed to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, states in part as follows:

> The proposed amendment would, without mature deliberations, reduce the pay of a large number of naval aviators whose services in the recent war contributed so greatly to that war. This reduction in pay would not be in accord with the apparent policy of the administration toward increasing compensation of Government personnel.
>
> The proposed amendment would, in my opinion, adversely affect the existing high morale of naval aviation. It would, I fear, most seriously react against the efforts of the Navy to induce large numbers of experienced naval aviators of the Naval Reserve to transfer to the Regular Navy. I believe it is hardly necessary for me to point out to you the serious consequences which would result if we now lose the services of this excellent group of young combat experienced aviators.

That is the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal.

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, Mr. Sullivan, also wrote a letter which he closed with the following statement:

> I feel very strongly that the Navy should have this opportunity of presenting the results of a thorough study to the Congress before any action is taken which would reduce the pay of a limited group of personnel.

As the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, the committee amendment provides for the study to which reference has been made. Not only that but it even fixes a limitation. It provides that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall make reports to Congress on or before January 3, 1946. That is hardly 45 days from now. It provides also that they shall furnish to the Congress a list of names of men in the Army above the rank of major, and in the Navy above the rank of lieutenant commander, who draw extra flight compensation.

Without having had an opportunity to obtain necessary information the Senate should not hastily this afternoon act upon the matter. We should do what the committee recommends in its amendment be done, namely, obtain the information, and then we will be in a position intelligently to act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama.

There is now pending on the calendar a bill which was reported from the Civil Service Committee, raising the pay of civil officers and employees of the Federal Government. It would be strange, indeed, in the face of an appeal such as the Senator from Alabama has quoted from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, for the Senate to undertake to say that the compensation of flying officers should be summarily reduced.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum in justification of flying pay be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks with reference to the amendment which was considered by the Senate a few moments ago.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTIFICATION OF FLYING PAY

1. The necessity for recognizing the hazards of military flying has been accepted by all nations since the initial development of military aviation.

2. Congress first authorized flying pay in 1913 because of the hazardous nature of flying. The National Defense Act of 1920 and the Pay Readjustment Act of 1922 provided 50 percent extra flying pay for those who participate in regular and frequent flights.

3. In 1939 a special board consisting predominantly of nonflying officers appointed by the War Department to study the flying pay problem made a careful investigation into all aspects of military flying hazard and justification of flying pay. I quote from their report (p. 14): "Adverse criticism has been heard of the principle of paying military personnel for flying duty. In view of this criticism the board has reinvestigated the subject carefully and in detail. This investigation has shown that this criticism is unjustified. It has been demonstrated conclusively that any flying involves a hazard above that incurred in routine military duties which do not involve flying, and the board is further convinced that continual flying jeopardizes the mental and physical well-being of the average man. Further, the board believes that the experiences of the past 20 years indicate that the average useful

service life of the flying officer will be markedly shorter than the service life of the officer on nonflying duties, due to the necessity for youthful physical and mental alertness and stamina demanded by the operations of modern airplanes in military flying. The increased hazards and expectancy of a shorter service life fully justify extra compensation to the men who subject themselves to the risks incident to flying."

4. The facts presently on hand indicate that the hazards of military flying are as prevalent today as they were in 1938. The following figures and fatality rates were computed from records available in the Office of the Air Surgeon:

TABLE I.—*Death rates per 1,000 per annum 1944, continental United States, flying versus nonflying personnel*

	Number	Aircraft accident		Other than aircraft accident		Total	
		Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
Flying personnel	235,242	4,207	17.9	220	0.9	4,427	18.8
Nonflying personnel	1,134,265	227	.2	516	.4	743	.6
Total	1,369,507	4,434	3.2	736	.6	5,170	3.8

The greatest number of deaths in the Army Air Forces is among flying personnel and the greatest single cause is aircraft accident. The death rate among flying personnel in aircraft accidents (17.9) is approximately 30 times the death rate among nonflying personnel due to all causes.

TABLE II.—*Fatality rates—Flying personnel*

(Rate per 1,000 per annum)

Year:	*Rate*
1932	17
1934	16
1936	20
1938	14
1944	18

Notice the rate of fatalities per 1,000 flying personnel per annum in 1944 is greater than in 1938, 1934, or 1932. At the same time the fatalities per hours flown in 1938 were 1 per 15,553 hours of flight as compared to the rate in 1944 which was 1 per 8,000 plus hours of flight.

5. The following comparisons of life expectancy between flying and nonflying officers were made from a study by the Office of the Air Surgeon:

Average expectation of life of men at age 20

	Years
Regular Army officers, nonflying	49.3
General United States population, white males	46.0
Rated observers, Regular Army officers	43.4
Pilots, Regular Army officers	37.2

Pilots may expect 12 years less of life than nonflying Regular Army officers. Rated observers may expect 6 years less of life than nonflying Regular Army officers.

Pilots at the age of 20 may not expect to live any longer than other officers at the age of 32.

One out of every four pilots will die before his thirty-ninth birthday.

6. Insurance companies are exhibiting new interest in writing aviation insurance. However, only one company—Travelers—have announced their rates—$12 per year per $1,000 in addition to normal rate—same as before war. Some companies are writing some at lower rates but until the military aviation risk tables are backed up by facts they are doing so only on a tentative basis and are not publishing their rates. It is the opinion of our life insurance contact—Colonel Grayson of Personal Affairs Branch—that most companies will go back to old rates for military aviators as soon as risk tables, based on the facts, are worked out. There is an indication that lower rates might be available, for bombardiers, navigators, and flight surgeons.

7. It can be seen that in spite of great advances in military aircraft design and vigorous safety measures within the Air Force during the past 10 years the accident rate has not decreased. This is not comparable with the records of commercial air lines for many reasons. In the first place, performance is inimical to safety factors in aircraft design. The exigencies of aerial combat has forced the Air Forces to utilize the advancement in aircraft construction to increase combat performance rather than to use this advancement to increase aircraft safety factors. The necessity for minimizing losses in combat while maintaining military effectiveness establishes the balance between design performance and design safety factors. Military flying as a type in itself is mor hazardou than normal flying. The introductions of new aircraft operated under hazardous weather and terrain conditions tend to maintain the hazard of military flying compared to the routine, constantly repetitious route flying of commercial air lines.

8. Flying pay as compensation for extra hazard inherent to military flying is as necessary today as it has been in the past. Until further developments alter the conditions in the interest of a strong Air Force there should be no change in the basic principle of flying pay.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point which the Senator from Alabama has made in reading from letters which were written by the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. I remind Senators that there is a bill before the Congress to increase the number of officers in the Regular Army. We were told that approximately 4,000 Regular officers would be taken into the Air Force, and that the Air Force of the Regular Army was in dire need of officers. I think we should not talk about raising the compensation of civil-service employees while at the same time we reduce the pay of officers and men of the armed forces. Of course, I thoroughly agree with the Senate committee amendment, which would prevent any unreasonable request for flight pay on the part of members of the Army and Navy Air Forces, but the amendment we are now considering goes too far, in my judgment, and is not necessary.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to offer for the RECORD a letter in its entirety from General Arnold dated November 12, 1945. The letter is written on the subject which we are discussing. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY AIR FORCES,
Washington, November 12, 1945.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: Having been informed that a proposed amendment is being voted upon by your committee this morning, which will have a disastrous effect on our Army Air Forces, and knowing of your keen interest in the Army Air Forces, I want to place the following facts before you.

The amendment which would reduce the flight pay of Army flying officers to the minimum for a major in the fourth pay period will have the following effects:

a. It will reduce the pay by more than $100 a month of all of our air combat leaders in the late war, including a great many of our leading aces.

b. It will destroy the career incentive in the Army Air Forces at the very time when we are making every reasonable effort to induce young Reserve officers of outstanding ability, as demonstrated in the war, to become members of the permanent establishment.

c. It has been clearly demonstrated, and on one occasion by an impartial War Department Board, that there is a career hazard in military aviation, and that the flying officer must carry the burden of heavy additional insurance for the protection of his family, if he is to undertake this additional hazard.

It is my considered view that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to suggest a course of action which would have a more disastrous effect on the Army Air Forces than the amendment which is proposed. I believe it will result in destroying the morale of the Army Air Forces in the most critical period in its history.

Sincerely,

H. H. ARNOLD,
Commanding General, Army Air Forces.

Mr. GURNEY. In his letter General Arnold states that the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] "will destroy the career incentive of the Army Air Forces at the very time when we are making every reasonable effort to induce young Reserve officers of outstanding ability, as demonstrated in the war, to become members of the permanent establishment."

That statement alludes to the same subject matter which was brought up by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. The Air Forces have great need for experienced men. They need them in the permanent establishment. The need will persist so long as world conditions continue to be in any way threatening to the security of our country.

General Arnold states further:

It is my considered view that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to suggest a course of action which would have a more disastrous effect on the Army Air Forces than the amendment which is proposed. I believe it will result in destroying the morale of the Army Air Forces in the most critical period in its history.

Personally I believe there is some justification for a complete "look-see" at the extra pay being given members of the Army and the Navy, not only for flying but also for service on submarines and gliders, in parachute service, and possibly some of the other services such

as the infantry. That would include the infantry medical corps. All such compensation should be adjusted on the basis of equality in both the Army and the Navy. We should not single out one branch, as is being proposed in this amendment.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota is a member of the Appropriations Committee. This very amendment was rejected by the committee, was it not?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Appropriations Committee acted wisely when it rejected the amendment. There had been no hearings on the matter. No witnesses had come before the committee to advise it with reference to the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator is not a member of the committee or surely he would not have made such a statement. The committee heard a great deal of evidence on the subject. If the Senator will examine the hearings he will be in a position to confirm my statement.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator advise me with reference to the testimony which was given?

Mr. McKELLAR. Here are the headings: "Question as to abuse in payment of flight pay," on page 546; "Flight surgeons," on page 545. A memorandum from General Arnold appears on page 546. The entire matter was gone into before the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. I agree in part with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The record is before me.

Mr. GURNEY. I think we went into the matter in a haphazard way. We did not consider the entire matter. We did not have an opportunity to question representatives of the War Department and the Navy Department. They did not tell us what they had in mind for the future.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from what I see in examining the hearings, the questions which were propounded were very sketchy in character, and there was no real hearing held upon the subject. Is that not true, in the sense that the Appropriations Committee could have had witnesses appear before it so that the committee could have gone into the matter and heard the complete facts with reference to the situation? Is that not correct?

Mr. GURNEY. When we went into the subject of the pay structure in 1942 with regard to both the Army and the Navy, it took the joint committee of the Army and of the Navy a couple of months to prepare their joint recommendation with reference to equalized pay and just compensation to every man in every branch of the Army and of the Navy. Then the Committee on Military Affairs considered it, hearing witnesses from the Army and Navy. Possibly it took us a matter of a week. Then the Committee on Naval Affairs had the matter before it, and made certain recommendations, and finally the bill was reported, after a period of about 3 months. The question now under discussion was considered in a matter of a few hours.

Mr. HILL. So far as the hearings in the committee were concerned, I would say it would be more a matter of a few minutes than of a few hours, because, as I stated, there has been no real hearing on this subject by the committee. I am sure that was one reason why the committee rejected the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that again he is wholly mistaken. The question was raised, and we gave the officials of the Army and Navy time to make a report on the subject. Secretary Patterson came before the committee and testified in substance to what appears here. Only one other question in connection with the bill was considered as carefully as was this one, and that was the question we disposed of a little while ago. That was the only other question which was considered for the same length of time and in the same careful manner.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me say in conclusion, Mr. President, that the amendment, if adopted, will not only be unfair to the Army flying officers who still remain in the service—and in the military service 10,990 will be affected—but I believe it will be notice to all the flying men that this Nation is not as grateful as it should be for the heroic services they have rendered in this war.

The flying services certainly did a great job in hastening the end of the war. In order that my statements may not be misconstrued, I may say that the ground forces were always glad to have air cover in any battle in which they were engaged, they were very grateful for the services rendered by the flying men above them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. So far as I can see from the hearings, no one spoke for the Navy. Did anyone speak in reference to the Navy air arm or the marine air arm?

Mr. GURNEY. We had letters, but no actual representative from either the Navy or the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think I should make a statement about this matter. In the first place, I think it would not be very hard to prove that I have been a friend of both the Army and the Navy. The committee gave them every appropriation they requested.

In the next place, I do not believe it would be very difficult to prove that I have been very friendly to aviation. I introduced the first bill providing for carrying mail by airplane. It was passed, and is on the statute books now. I never was more ridiculed in my life, and I do not mind giving some of the names of those who ridiculed me. One was Senator Hardwick, of Georgia; another was Senator King, of Utah; another was Senator Borah, of Idaho. There were a number of other Senators, then Members of this body, who ridiculed me for suggesting that mail could be carried by air. I had encountered very active and vigorous opposition in 1917, when I introduced the first bill to establish a little jerk-water mail-carrying air line between Washington and New York, and was able to get an appropriation of only $100,000. The next year I got a similar appropriation. The third year I got $450,000, enough to extend the line to Chicago, and the fourth year, 1920, when the proposal was to extend the line to San Francisco, the real fight came, but I succeeded in my efforts notwithstanding the great opposition I met. I succeeded each time, and carrying mail by air became established by law of the land. It has been a marvelous success, as all flying has been.

I wish to say to the flying officers of both the Army and the Navy, and any others who have flown in this war, that they have rendered a great service. I take off my hat to them. I do not believe any officers ever did a finer job. They rendered greater service than has ever been rendered before. I do not want to see their wonderful work besmirched—I repeat the word, "besmirched"—by anything that may happen in peacetime.

Something has been said about morale. I first learned about this matter from a statement of a very distinguished officer of the Navy, who received a very large salary, but because he made air trips once a month, drew half as much in addition. It hurt me when I heard it, but in a day or two, when I examined into the matter, I found that that officer, when he put his mind on it, was made of the right kind of stuff. He voluntarily took his name off the list.

Why did this great commander of naval ships do a thing like that? Did he feel as if he were hurting the morale of the Navy when he refused to take that which he had inadvertently taken in the beginning? No. All honor to him. He felt that he was increasing the morale of the organization over which he presided by declining to take this pay in peacetime which had been authorized only for time of war.

Therefore, speaking of morale, here was a man who took advantage of the provision, and it hurt his own morale to such an extent that he declined to continue it. I am not calling his name, but I wish to say that I have a thousand times more respect for him for taking his name off the list.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Referring to the Senator's remark that this pay was given only during time of the war, I want to have the RECORD show that the first authorized extra flying pay was provided in 1913, given because of the hazardous nature of flying. The National Defense Act of 1920 and the Pay Readjustment Act of 1922 provided 50 percent extra pay for those who participated in flying. That has been continued ever since 1920.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps the Senator is correct that it is in the general law. But I wish to ask the Senator a question. If he were a naval officer above the rank of lieutenant commander, and did not make flying a business, but flew only occasionally, and since the war was over flew merely enough to come within the limit of 4 hours in a month,

would he be willing to take pay of this sort?

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, I do yield. I asked a question, and I shall be glad to yield. The Senator would not do it, I know.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me say to the Senator that this officer, whoever he may be, may have arrived at his high position in command of the flying services, and of other services or branches of the Navy, because of his experience in flying, which had come about through perhaps 30 or 40 years of service. There may be some justification for Uncle Sam paying that officer the extra pay for the knowledge he gained, and the fact that he was able to give wise orders during the war to other men may have been well worth whatever it cost Uncle Sam. If he did not need the pay, as a matter of morale I think I would compliment him if he did not draw the pay, if he did not make any actual, bona fide flights.

Mr. McKELLAR. To gain the extra flying pay does not require bona fide flights. It applies to any flights. The officer merely has to be in the air for so many hours. The amendment does not apply to any of the younger officers, merely to officers above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy. If an officer above those ranks goes up and stays 4 hours a month, he increases his salary by 50 percent. I may be wrong, but to my mind I do not think that is fair or just.

Now I wish to say a word about the committee. Ordinarily the Committee on Appropriations is composed of 25 members. Former Senator Burton, who was a member of the committee, is now on the Supreme Court bench, and the vacancy on the committee has not been filled. That leaves 24. I do not think former Senator Burton was present when this matter was passed on. I think there were only 24 members on the committee then. The vote on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to reject an amendment similar to this was 9 to 8. That was a total of 17 members. The vote to reject was 9, out of a total of 24 members on the committee. It was not a majority of the committee. I do not know what inducement or argument could have been made or offered to change the result one way or the other. If the full membership of the committee were present, the same result might have occurred. I wanted to explain to the Senate that only 17 members of the committee were present and that the vote was 9 to 8.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that that is a very strong argument to dissuade the Senate now from voting to overturn the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator always used that argument, we would be in a very bad fix, because most of our bills are passed by what is not a majority. Unfortunately, that is so.

I was present and the Senator from Wyoming was present, and the vote was 9 to 8.

Mr. President, we have heard much said about morale. Let us see about morale. I never was more astonished in my life than when General Arnold testified, and I want to quote his words as to what the proposed action would do to the Army Air Forces. I like him so much that I want to use his exact words. They are as follows:

> I have been informed that you have referred to the War Department a proposed amendment to the first supplemental surplus appropriations rescission bill for 1946 which would restrict flight pay which may be paid to the flying officers of the Army Air Forces to that of the minimum of a major in the fourth pay period. This proposed amendment will, in my considered opinion, have the effect of destroying the Army Air Forces in the most critical period of its history.

Listen to that language, Senators. Let me read it again, because this is the language of the head of the Army Air Forces:

> This proposed amendment will, in my considered opinion, have the effect of destroying the Army Air Forces in the most critical period of its history.

Is there a Senator on the floor who agrees with General Arnold in that statement?

Mr. GURNEY rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I count the Senator from South Dakota as one.

Will any other Senator stand up? Does any Senator believe that statement? Of course General Arnold made a mistake about the matter. He is a perfectly truthful man. I am not impugning his truthfulness, but he simply became a little excited about this matter. Listen to the language again:

> This proposed amendment will, in my considered opinion, have the effect of destroying the Army Air Forces in the most critical period of its history.

I do not think this is the most critical period in its history, for that matter, but I read that language for the purpose of showing the Senate how excited a man can become when the interests of those under him are concerned. In one way he is to be complimented, and in another way I think he has made a great mistake in giving that advice to the Senate.

Let us see whom the amendment would affect. It would affect one of the generals of the Army. We have five generals of the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. That means it would affect General Arnold, a five-star general. It would affect one five-star general.

Mr. McKELLAR. General Arnold flies all the time. It would not affect him in any way; it would not affect him a particle now, and it might affect him in the future if he continues to fly. That, however, I do not know. It might affect him after he retires. But I do not think it will affect him now in the slightest.

Next, it would affect four generals. I do not know whether they are retired or still in active service.

It would affect 13 lieutenant generals, who would receive pay and one-half for flying 4 hours a month.

It would affect 72 major generals, 200 brigadier generals, 3,000 colonels, 6,000 lieutenant colonels, and 1,700 majors. It would not affect 8,300 majors.

Talk about morale, Mr. President. It would affect only a comparatively few officers. It is perfectly clear that the whole thing arose out of the purpose to increase the salaries of officers who rarely flew; who, indeed, flew merely once a month. It seems to me we ought not to permit such a thing. It seems to me we ought to stop it now. The amendment would not affect at all second lieutenants, of whom there are 45,000. It would not affect first lieutenants, of whom there are 55,000. It would not affect captains, of whom there are 24,000. It would not affect 8,300 majors.

The same is true with respect to the relative classes of officers in the Navy.

Under those circumstances, Senators, I do not see how we would injure the morale of the Army or the Navy by discontinuing a plan under which by flying 4 hours a month the higher ranking officers can secure 50-percent increase in pay. The fact that one admiral who was a flier refused after a short period to accept the increased flight pay tells the whole story. We could argue the point for a month, but we could never make so good an argument as that. He inadvertently took the increased pay at first, but later refused it. Why? In view of the moral plane on which our Army and Navy operate he felt that he should not take the increased pay. The fact that he did not think he should take it speaks louder than words.

Mr. President, I shall ask for a vote on the amendment. It seems to me that the amendment prepared by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] should be agreed to. I regret he is not present. I have probably presented the matter very inadequately because I am perhaps not so familiar with the subject as he is. But I think we will be doing the Army and the Navy the greatest possible injury if we allow the situation to remain as it is.

It is said that we ought not take this action without an investigation being made. Is a matter of this kind subject to being investigated? We know exactly what the situation is. Everyone knows what it is. Are we going to let Army officers who are not regular fliers receive this increase in pay? The proposal would not hurt the regular fliers at all. The general of the Army referred to does not operate a plane. The 4 generals in question do not operate planes. The three lieutenant generals do not operate planes. Neither do the 72 major generals, the 200 brigadier generals, the 3,000 colonels, the 6,000 lieutenant colonels, or the 1,700 majors. So we ought not allow such a condition to continue. I hope the Senate, by approving the amendment, will not permit the condition to continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let us have a standing vote.

On a division, the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 44, beginning in line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 12, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That of the funds remaining available for advance base construction, material, and equipment, not to exceed $6,000,000 shall be available toward reconstruction of the civilian economy of Guam."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, that is the amendment I have discussed with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator make a brief statement about it? I think I should accept it, but I should like the Senator to make a brief statement concerning it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there have been several bills before the Committee on Naval Affairs relating to Guam. This particular appropriation is the result of an authorization by the Naval Affairs Committee for the building of public buildings in Guam. The bombardment of Guam by American forces in order to drive the Japs out resulted in the destruction of every single solitary public building, including schools, what would correspond to a city hall, the jail, the courthouse, and the post office. This appropriation is to provide funds to be taken from the advance base construction appropriation and used for erecting the buildings to which I have referred. The original request before the Committee on Naval Affairs was for $15,000,000, but we felt that the program was too elaborate and expensive, and we reduced the recommendation for authorization to $6,000,000. It will be necessary to build schools, administration buildings, a jail, a hospital, and, in fact, every building which a community of 22,000 would need for public uses.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe that this construction should be done, and so far as I am concerned I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] on page 34, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill, H. R. 4407, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUMMARY OF FIFTH QUARTERLY REPORT OF OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the Fifth Quarterly Report of the Office of Contract Settlement may be printed in the body of the RECORD. The office of Contract Settlement, which is headed by Mr. Robert H. Hinckley, has been carrying on the utterly tremendous task of settling terminated war contracts. I am sure that the report of a work of such magnitude is of interest to all Members of the Senate. The full text may be obtained, but I think it would be of value to have a summary of the report printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Victory brought mass terminations as was expected. The magnitude of the contract settlement job is now known. We are confident that if everyone continues to do his part it will be speedily and successfully completed.

The surrender of Japan brought termination of 113,000 prime contracts involving $24,000,000,000 in canceled commitments. On September 30 the total number of prime contracts pending settlement was 103,000 involving canceled commitments of $37,000,000,000.

Both industry and government are prepared to handle this volume of terminations. Organizations for contract settlement are available and have been supplemented with additional personnel. No major problems of policy and procedure have arisen since VJ-day.

Experience to date has been extensive. Of the 288,000 prime contracts involving $62,000,000,000 in canceled commitments terminated from the beginning of war production to date, 185,000 involving over $25,000,000,000 in canceled commitments have been settled.

The immediate goal of the Government is to settle the bulk of the canceled prime contracts by December 31. Progress toward this goal has already been made. During September, 2,900 prime contracts were settled with cost to the Government and 16,700 without cost. The total number settled was more than twice the number settled in August, the previous peak month.

The immediate goal of industry should be to file claims rapidly and to settle canceled subcontracts by the end of the year.

Achievement of these goals by Government and industry will complete contract settlement for a large number of war contractors.

The rate of settling canceled commitments averaged $1,000,000,000 per month during the quarter. The volume of terminations made prior to VE-day was not large enough to support a high settlement rate. Furthermore, with victory over Japan, contract settlement was interrupted in August and early September to place the maximum effort upon the more pressing problems of effecting terminations and reconverting to civilian production.

During the latter part of the quarter, contractors filed an increased volume of claims. If they continue to increase the volume of claims filed, the settlement rate can increase to $4,000,000,000 or more in canceled commitments per month before January 1.

The soundness of the steps taken in advance of mass terminations has now been demonstrated. Preparation for contract settlement and confidence in policies and procedures have contributed to speedy reconversion.

Quick plant clearance has been possible even with mass terminations. In almost all cases, termination inventories and Government-owned plant equipment are being removed from plants within the 60 days prescribed by the Contract Settlement Act.

Only a small portion of industry's total funds is tied up in canceled contracts. It is estimated that the gross amount owed by Government under canceled contracts is less than $3,500,000,000. The amount of industry's funds actually tied up is considerably less than this, however. Partial payments and T-loans outstanding totaled $320,000,000. In addition, a large proportion of the $1,900,000,000 outstanding in other Government-guaranteed loans and in advance payments is now being used to finance terminations rather than war production.

On September 30, the War Department had the equivalent of 22,000 persons engaged in full-time contract-settlement work; the Navy Department had 4,800 persons engaged full time and 1,900 part time; the Maritime Commission, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Treasury Department had a total of 242 assigned full time and about 2,000 persons available for part-time work.

To date, both Government and industry have handled contract settlement well. Contractors have expressed their satisfaction. This Office has received few complaints. Only 21 appeals have been filed by contractors with the appeal board of this Office.

This Office expects the continued cooperation of contracting agencies and industry. Such cooperation has been the basis of success in contract settlement to date. It is the same as that which made possible our great war production. Its continuation will bring about complete attainment of the objectives of the Contract Settlement Act.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1580, Calendar 722, known as the United Nations Organization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I should greatly regret to see that motion agreed to at this time. The proposed legislation is of importance and interests a great many Senators, and there is hardly a handful of Senators in the Chamber at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not my purpose to proceed any further with the bill this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator willing to agree that the bill shall not be taken up for consideration and action before Monday?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that personally I have no particular desire to press the bill, but this is only Tuesday, and it seems to me that to postpone action until Monday——

Mr. WHITE. As a practical matter, tomorrow is the day before Thanksgiving; the next day is Thanksgiving; and

the day after is the day following Thanksgiving. We shall see a complete exodus of Senators from nearby States during the next 3 days. It seems to me that there ought not to be forced on the attention of the Senate and pressed for consideration legislation of this importance at this time. About all I can do is to make the point of no quorum. I do not like to do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why will not the Senator allow the bill to be made the unfinished business? That does not mean that we must vote on it at once. I am sure that his group is resourceful enough to postpone action.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I believe I was in the committee when the bill was ordered to be favorably reported to the Senate. I think I am personally kindly disposed toward it, and I expect to vote for it when the voting time arrives, but it seems unfair—I almost recall that word, but I shall let it stand—at this time, with such a small number of Senators present, to take action upon a piece of legislation which is of interest to many Senators. So far as I can immediately recall, there is now present only one member of the minority who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I see present on the majority side only two members of the Foreign Relations Committee. It seems to me that Senators, having had no notice that this matter was to be presented at this time, ought to be given consideration. I very earnestly appeal to the Senator from Texas not to press his motion and not to force this matter upon the consideration of the Senate at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that absent Senators are not without some notice.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators have come to me and asked if any important business was to be transacted during the Thanksgiving period. Not long ago I took the question up with the Senate leadership. At that time the bill was not on the calendar, and there did not seem to be any objection to adjourning over Thanksgiving. If we are to take up the bill tomorrow, we must have time to get Senators back here. Several Senators have left, to be absent over Thanksgiving.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not my purpose to compel any Senator to return.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. CONNALLY. Senators who live near Washington have the advantage of being able to go home for Thanksgiving, and frequently for week ends.

Mr. WHERRY. The Atomic Energy Committee has left. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has left, as has the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not like to proceed in the absence of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WHERRY. I join with the minority leader in asking if the distinguished Senator will not let the bill go over until Monday.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the objection to letting it be made the unfinished business?

Mr. WHERRY. In that event I shall have to send telegrams to absent Senators, because if it is made the unfinished business it may be the business for tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think that unless the Senator is willing to agree that the bill will not be taken up until Monday, we shall have to make the point of no quorum, and discuss the question. I had no notice of any intention to take up the bill today. I do not believe that the minority leader had such notice. I do not know about the senior Senator from Michigan. He may have had notice, but he did not tell us so before he left. He will not be present tomorrow. Friday is a very unsatisfactory day to begin the consideration of a matter so important as this. I believe that if the Senator will talk with the leaders, they will be willing to make the session on Friday a purely formal session, with no business to transact. If that is the understanding, it is perfectly agreeable to me to have the bill made the unfinished business now.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is exactly what must be done, because we must meet again before Monday. We cannot adjourn from today until Monday, so we must meet one day between now and Monday.

Mr. President, I am not trying to press this matter. In justification of my motion, let me say that for a week or ten days I have had an agreement with the leadership on this side. When the reorganization bill was under consideration, it was understood that when consideration of that bill had been concluded, the United Nations Organization bill would be taken up. I gave way to the Appropriations Committee for the consideration of the rescission bill. I am not pressing the matter now; but let me say to Senators that the United Nations Organization will be in being rather soon, and I am anxious that we settle the matter of representation at the earliest possible moment. I am not trying to drag any Senators back here. I should particularly like to have the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] present, because he was in the conference at San Francisco. I should like to have all other Senators present. However, Senators know that we cannot keep Senators in the Chamber when they are in the city. Today we had a discussion on a very important matter, and only about 15 Senators were present. We cannot drag them here, and we cannot keep them here after we get them here.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The vote showed that apparently only 63 Senators are in the city. This is a matter of overwhelming importance.

Mr. CONNALLY. What does the Senator wish to do?

Mr. TAFT. I should like to have the Senator, in cooperation with the majority leadership, agree that if the bill is made the unfinished business the Senate will adjourn until Friday, and that the session on Friday will be purely a formal session, at which we shall not be required to debate this particular measure. Is that a possible understanding?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall have to debate it a little while longer. How would it suit recalcitrant Senators [laughter] to agree to make the bill the unfinished business, and then lay it aside tomorrow for the call of the calendar? Then, presumably, the Senate will adjourn until Friday, and probably from Friday until Monday.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will it be necessary to meet tomorrow?

Mr. WHITE. Will not the Senator strike the word "probably" from his reference to having the Senate take a recess from Friday until Monday?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not the leader, and I wish to consult the leader. I understand the leader wishes to have the Senate take up the calendar tomorrow; that is my impression.

Mr. WHITE. I am more interested in having consideration of the legislation referred to postponed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if any other Senator wishes me to yield to him, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am more interested in what the Senator from Texas is going to say.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Maine knows that I am not inclined to be disregardful of the wishes of other Senators.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, Mr. President; I have always found the Senator to be most courteous.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me suggest that the Senate take a recess until Friday, take up the calendar on Friday, and then proceed on Monday to consider the United Nations Organization bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to state that I just made that suggestion internally, and I am now trying to connect with the telephone, to see if it will be agreeable to follow that course.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. If that can be done, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. CONNALLY. I must consult the majority leader.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Since there seems to be quite a good deal of opposition to having the Senate proceed now to consider the United Nations Organization bill, I wonder if it will be agreeable to have the Senate consider at this time the hospital bill, if it develops that it is not possible now to have the Senate take up the United Nations Organization bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, to the suggestion that the Senate take up the hospital bill—and I realize it is important, too—I offer the same objection that we have made to having the Senate take

up the bill referred to by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. I am satisfied that my distinguished colleague from Alabama will agree with me that because of the fact that we are now entering the Thanksgiving period and inasmuch as several Senators have already left the city, certainly before considering those two important measures or any other important measures we should at least give the absent Senators a chance to be in their seats in the Senate Chamber. If that opportunity is given, then if only a handful of Senators are present in the Chamber when the bills which have been mentioned are considered, no objection will be made on that score. But several Senators already have left the city. The atomic-bomb Senators—the Senators on the Atomic Bomb Committee—have gone. We all know about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I object. There are a lot of atomic-bomb Senators remaining. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's objection is well taken. There are a lot of buzz-bomb Senators here, too, and a lot more of them will be here after the Thanksgiving period. [Laughter.] I wish to give them a chance to return to the Senate Chamber before such measures are considered, and I think we should give them a chance to do so.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, does the Senator feel that they should be here when the hospital bill is considered?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly do.

Mr. HILL. Then the Senator is saying that the Senate cannot take up any legislation of consequence until Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest to the able whip of the majority party that we did everything we could do to find out whether any important legislation was to be taken up today, or before Monday; but up until this morning we could not find out anything about the program. I am just as anxious as is any other Senator on either side of the aisle to have the Senate take up such bills. I agree with the statement which has frequently been made that Senators should be in their seats and should not be absent. But certainly if there is ever an excuse for a Senator to be absent at any time, it is over Thanksgiving Day.

Senators desire to be in the Chamber when important bills are considered. If there is any desire to have the bills referred to taken up now, the Senators who have left the city will have to be brought back.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator is advancing a new doctrine. I have heard about absentee landlordism in Europe in past years, and evidently the Senator's idea is to let absenteeism run the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator well knows that I do not advocate that. I have helped obtain the attendance of quorums in the Senate for the Senator from Texas in connection with the consideration of some important legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course I have.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator to wait a moment; he is speaking in my time.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Texas yielded to me, and I am merely commenting on the observation the Senator made. I say that it is not a new doctrine.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield again.

Mr. WHERRY. I think when a bill so important as is the bill which has been referred to is ready to be considered by the Senate, notice should be given by the majority leader as to when it is to be taken up, so that Senators on both sides of the aisle may be advised.

I have worked along with the majority leader. I think he is a fine leader, and I am very happy to work with him. I realize that it is not always possible to tell when measures will come up for consideration by the Senate; but I think if the majority leader were here at this time he would be entirely agreeable to consenting to the request I have made, namely, that if there is a desire to have the Senate consider the hospital bill and any other bill, let them be taken up on Monday.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator, and I do not wish to ride roughshod over his suggestion. I pay him the compliment that he is always here.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course I am.

Mr. CONNALLY. I simply say the Senate should not be run by absentees. The Constitution contemplates that the business of the Senate will be conducted in this Chamber, not in a Pullman car or in a fishing lodge or in a night club in New York.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, Mr. President; I wish to say that the Senators to whom I have referred have not gone to night clubs in New York.

Mr. WHITE. Of course they have not.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think I shall be able to ease the agitation of several Senators. Although I promised to yield to the Senator from Nebraska, I ask if he will permit me to continue for a moment?

Mr. BUTLER. Of course.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have arrived at a solution of this very difficult and knotty question, I say to the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator from Texas wishes to make a statement, even though he did yield to me, of course that will be satisfactory.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. I shall do that.

Mr. President, I move that Senate bill 1580, the United Nations Organization bill, be made the unfinished business, with the understanding that the Senate will recess from today until Friday, and that on Friday the calendar will be called, and then presumably the Senate will take a recess until Monday.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I hope the minority whip and my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maine, the minority leader, will notify the Senators on their side of the aisle that the United Nations Organization bill will be taken up on Monday. If they find that they are not able to notify the Senators on their side of the aisle, if they will give me the names of those who are absent I will notify them that the bill will be taken up on Monday. Of course, they have known all the time that the bill was on the calendar. They have known all the time, informally, that we were going to take it up just as soon as the other bills were out of the way.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I will see to it that Republican Senators are here, and let the Senator from Texas take responsibility for the Senators on his side of the aisle.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say that the minority Members always read what the Senator from Texas has to say, if they do not happen to be in the Senate Chamber to hear him, and they will take notice of what he has to say with respect to the program.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Maine. He is always very generous and kind, very affable and suave, and I wish I possessed some of his qualities.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I simply wish to say that as soon as possible after final action is taken on the United Nations Organization bill, I shall make every possible effort to have the Senate consider the hospital bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator, before taking up the hospital bill, will permit the Philippine rehabilitation bill to be considered. I do not believe consideration of that bill will take long, because it comes from the committee with a unanimous report in its favor. But for the very obvious reason that the Philippines are in desperate straits, and inasmuch as consideration of the bill will not take long, I hope that before the Senator commits himself finally to the program which has been suggested, he will give us a chance to have the Philippine rehabilitation bill considered. I do not believe its consideration will consume more than a few hours at the utmost, if any length of time at all.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that I shall be delighted to cooperate with him in that respect. I simply wish to have Senators know that I intend to make every possible effort to have the hospital bill taken up promptly, and I do not wish to have us find ourselves in the position in which we are today, with Senators asking that consideration of a certain bill go over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the Senator's statement. If we could have statements similar to that one from the majority leader or the majority

whip—namely, that an effort will be made to take up certain bills—it would be very helpful to those of us on this side of the aisle. The fact that the announcement has been made indicates that we shall have real sessions from now on.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader, always tries to be thoughtful of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. He always tries to give as much notice as possible about the bills which are to come up and he always tries to say when they are going to come up.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. For instance, yesterday, after action was completed on the reorganization bill, which had been before the Senate for approximately 10 days, it was understood that the appropriations rescission bill would be considered by the Senate today, if possible. Of course, appropriation bills have the right of way. But the distinguished majority leader certainly makes every effort to give the Senate notice and to keep the Senate advised regarding the time when bills will come up and concerning the business to be transacted by the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Alabama that I have already mentioned this matter to the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, and he asked me to try to have the bill ready for consideration next Monday, should opportunity offer itself for its consideration.

I hope that the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Maine will cooperate in having the bill taken up, as I believe they will——

Mr. WHERRY. We will.

Mr. TYDINGS. Because they all realize that rehabilitation is very vital to the 18,000,000 people of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Alabama has said concerning the majority leader. I acknowledge a very great debt of appreciation to him for the courtesies and the kindness he shows me from day to day throughout the sessions. I appreciate, too, something of the difficulties which confront him as majority leader. I know perfectly well that he cannot from day to day inform us with certainty of the program, because the program changes with almost every change of the wind. I think the majority leader endeavors at all times to be courteous to those of us on this side of the aisle. I simply wish to say that much, so that it may not be thought that either I or the Senator from Nebraska or any other Senator on this side of the aisle feels critical of or unkind toward the majority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 722, Senate bill 1580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, from the remarks which have recently been made on the floor of the Senate with reference to the legislative program for the next few days, it is quite apparent that the calendar will be called at the next session of the Senate. On the calendar there is order No. 698, House bill 3660, which received the unanimous vote of the House of Representatives. It was considered by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and was unanimously reported to the Senate. A similar bill is known as Senate bill 469, the Byrd-Butler bill, with reference to the financial control of Government corporations.

In view of the fact that the calendar is later to be called, I believe it would be interesting and perhaps helpful to those who may wish to inform themselves thoroughly with regard to the bill, to have in the RECORD as of today some remarks which I had intended to make in connection with the presentation of the bill when it is reached on the calendar. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I had prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

In this connection, I may state that several departments of the Government, particularly the Comptroller General, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury, have cooperated most helpfully in writing the bill, in assisting to obtain favorable action on it by the other House, and in having it reported to the Senate. I wish especially to pay my compliments and respect to Comptroller General Lindsay Warren for the great amount of labor which he and his associates performed in connection with the bill.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has merely requested to have his remarks in the nature of a statement appear in the RECORD following the remarks he has already made in explanation of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

(Statement of Hon. HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, in the Senate of the United States)

Mr. President, in the Byrd-Butler-Whittington bill, H. R. 3660, providing for financial control of Government corporations, we are dealing with a measure which has been strongly endorsed by the President of the United States in the following correspondence:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 11, 1945.

Hon. ABE MURDOCK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURDOCK: By direction of the President I am sending you herewith a copy of his letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments endorsing the Byrd-Butler bill.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES G. ROSS,
Secretary to the President.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 11, 1945.

Hon. CARTER MANASCO,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANASCO: I am writing this note to eliminate any misunderstanding as to my attitude on the Byrd-Butler bill which is now before your committee as H. R. 2177.

I heartily favor this proposal. It is a long-delayed, forward step applying the sound doctrine of an executive budget, as enacted in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, to the many important Government corporations which have since come upon the scene.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

This legislation has been called the most outstanding in its field since enactment of the Budget and Accounting Act in 1921. The authority for that statement is Congress' own agent, Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States.

This bill covers 101 separate corporations. While one of them, the Panama Railroad Company, is nearly 100 years old, and a few date back to World War I, most are products of the economic and war emergencies of more recent years. On June 30, 1945, these corporations had total assets of $29,400,000,000, and the Government had $13,200,000,000 invested in them. Such funds were being employed in vast lending, financing, and insurance operations; in the generation and transmission of electric power; in manufacturing and commerce; in rail and water transportation; in subsidy programs; and in countless other activities. Most of us are familiar with the larger corporations such as Reconstruction Finance and Commodity Credit, and with some of their operations, but even the names of all of them would be beyond the average citizen's fund of information. The bill is not aimed at any particular corporation or group of corporations, but it subjects all of them to the financial controls necessary to coordinate their operations with the over-all fiscal policy of the Government.

My interest in this subject was aroused more than 2 years ago, when I was preparing for my trip to Latin America. I was requested by both the Byrd and Truman committees to look into programs of Government organizations, including corporations, in that part of the world. I had scarcely obtained a list of Government corporations before one of them called me by telephone and asked where I had found out about them, because they were supposed to be secret. I kept their secret, but the situation intrigued me.

On February 1, 1943, I had introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, calling for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures—the Byrd committee—to investigate Government credit

agencies, many of which are in corporate form. The Byrd committee made a complete study of Government corporations, in which I cooperated, though not then a member of the committee. In August 1944 the committee filed its Report on Government Corporations. Following publication of that report as Senate Document No. 227, Seventy-eighth Congress, discussions took place between the staffs of the committee and of the General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, and Treasury Department, as to the best means of giving effect to the recommendations of the report for establishing over-all control of Government corporations by the Congress and the President through the established fiscal agencies of the Government. My participation in those discussions increased my knowledge of the ramifications of this corporate branch of the Government and strengthened my conviction that some legislative means must be found of applying financial controls to the corporations in a manner suited to their programs and statutory functions.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The result of all these studies was the introduction in the Senate on February 5, 1945, of the Byrd-Butler bill, S. 469. I am proud to have been coauthor of that bill with Senator BYRD, who is to be commended for the effort he has expended and the results he has already achieved in this field. After hearings on S. 469 before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, further conferences took place among all the parties concerned with the aim of removing any valid objection of the corporations to the rather stringent provisions of the original bill.

Meanwhile, bills H. R. 2051 and H. R. 2177, identical to S. 469, had been introduced in the House by Representative CASE of South Dakota and Representative WHITTINGTON. When the House Committee on Expenditures commenced hearings on the Whittington bill, H. R. 2177, both Senator BYRD and I appeared, as we had before the Senate subcommittee, in support of the legislation. The bill S. 469, as tentatively revised to meet the corporations' objections, was offered to the House committee and made the starting point for its further action, resulting in the introduction of this superseding bill, H. R. 3660, by Representative WHITTINGTON. The House passed the bill unanimously September 12, 1945.

PURPOSES

Control of the public purse is one of the most important prerogatives of the Congress under our Constitution. That control has been virtually abdicated in the case of many Government corporations. This bill is intended to provide annual scrutiny and current financial control by the Congress of the financial transactions and operations of Government corporations. The bill provides for an annual business-type budget for each wholly-owned Government corporation, to be submitted to the President through the Bureau of the Budget and transmitted by him to the Congress as a part of the annual Budget. It provides for an annual commercial-type audit of Government corporations by the Comptroller General and a report by him to the Congress of their operations, financial condition, and compliance with law. It requires the Secretary of the Treasury to approve the depositaries, financing, and Government security transactions of Government corporations, with certain qualified exemptions.

The provisions of the revised bill should remove any fear on the part of any Government corporation that it is to be put in a strait-jacket, but should also make it plain that it is the policy of the Congress to establish and maintain over the corporations the kind of fiscal control suitable to their activities. That policy has the support of the Comptroller General of the United States, the good right arm of Congress, who was the first witness aside from the authors of the bill at the hearings. It has the support of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the equally good right arm of the President, who also testified at the hearings. Likewise, at the House hearings in May 1945, Treasury Department representatives appeared in support of the bill.

The Budget provisions of the bill do not apply to mixed-ownership corporations, that is, those in which a part of the capital stock is owned by the United States and a part by others. The audit and Treasury provisions do apply to the mixed-ownership corporations as long as the Government has capital invested in them.

CORPORATIONS UNDER BILL

The following corporations are specifically named in the bill as subject to its provisions:

WHOLLY OWNED GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS [1]

1. Commodity Credit Corporation.
2. Federal intermediate credit banks (12 banks).
3. Production credit corporations (12 corporations).
4. Regional agricultural credit corporations (1 still in operation).
5. Farmers Home Corporation.
6. Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
7. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
8. Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.
9. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
10. Defense Plant Corporation.
11. Defense Supplies Corporation.
12. Metals Reserve Company.
13. Rubber Reserve Company.
14. War Damage Corporation.
15. Federal National Mortgage Association.
16. The RFC Mortgage Company.
17. Disaster Loan Corporation.
18. Inland Waterways Corporation.
19. Warrior River Terminal Company.
20. The Virgin Islands Company.
21. Federal Prison Industries, Inc.
22. United States Spruce Production Corporation.
23. Institute of Inter-American Affairs.
24. Institute of Inter-American Transportation.
25. Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc.
26. Inter-American Navigation Corporation.
27. Prencinradio, Inc.
28. Cargoes, Inc.
29. Export-Import Bank of Washington.
30. Petroleum Reserves Corporation.
31. Rubber Development Corporation.
32. U. S. Commercial Company.
33. Smaller War Plants Corporation.
34. Federal Public Housing Authority (or United States Housing Authority) and including public housing projects financed from appropriated funds and operations thereof.
35. Defense Homes Corporation.
36. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
37. Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
38. United States Housing Corporation.
39. Panama Railroad Company.
40. Tennessee Valley Authority.
41. Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

MIXED-OWNERSHIP GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

1. Banks for cooperatives (1 central bank and 12 regional banks).
2. Federal land banks (12 banks).
3. Federal home loan banks (12 banks).
4. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

BUSINESS-TYPE BUDGET

I have repeatedly assured the corporations, as one of the original sponsors of this legislation, that it was not our purpose to hamper their programs, but that we were aiming at a uniformity, system, and coordination which is lacking in the present situation. Accordingly, the budget provided by this bill for wholly owned Government corporations is to be a business-type budget or plan of operations, with due allowance for the need for flexibility, in order that the corporation may properly carry out its activities as authorized by law. The business-type budget will differ from the administrative-type budget required for regular Government departments, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will need to accumulate and apply experience in the development of the budget programs. The bill specifies certain minimum statements deemed essential for the information of the Congress. Such statements will show the financial condition and the results of operations of the corporation for the last completed fiscal year, with estimates for the current and ensuing years, and will include estimates of operations by major types of activities, estimates of administrative expenses, estimates of borrowings, and estimates of the amount of Government capital to be returned to the Treasury or of appropriations needed to restore capital impairments.

Upon receipt of the budget programs, as modified or revised by the President in accordance with his recommended program for the entire Government, the Congress would enact whatever legislation it deemed necessary making available to the corporation such funds or other financial resources as it may determine. Both the House and Senate committees in reporting on this legislation have called attention to the need for discretion in determining the type and nature of the limitations to be placed on the corporations' financial activities, bearing in mind the need for flexibility in many of their operations and the statutory responsibilities of such agencies. This bill will require the wholly owned corporations to pass in review before the Congress each year and will give the Congress an opportunity to control their budget programs in the manner and to the extent considered appropriate without preventing them from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, largest of all Government corporations, has signified its agreement with the principle that Congress should have an opportunity annually to scrutinize and pass upon the activities of such corporations and its willingness to undertake to operate under the budget features of this legislation. To say that there is no practicable way in which Congress can get a look at the financial plans of these corporations would be tantamount to admitting that Congress has created something bigger than itself and beyond its control.

COMMERCIAL-TYPE AUDIT

All Government corporations are already subject to audit by the Comptroller General as the agent of the Congress, under section 5 of the George Act, Public Law 4, approved February 24, 1945. Since this bill is to be the fundamental law on financial control of Government corporations, it includes in slightly modified form the audit provisions of Public Law 4.

The audit provisions of this bill are effective with the first governmental fiscal year commencing after enactment of the bill. They require an audit of the financial transactions of wholly owned Government corporations, and of mixed-ownership corporations for any period during which Government capital has been invested therein. The audit is to be conducted by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. A report of each such audit for each fiscal year is to be made by the

[1] Several of the corporations listed are in various stages of liquidation and dissolution.

Comptroller General to the Congress by the 15th of the following January.

Such report must set forth the scope of the audit and include the usual financial statements. It must also include such comments and information as necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the corporation, and any pertinent recommendations the Comptroller General may have. The report is expressly required to set forth any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, is unauthorized by law. Copies of the audit reports are to be furnished to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the corporation at the time of submission to the Congress.

The scope and extent of the audits and the manner in which they are conducted will conform to generally accepted practices and procedures followed in independent audits of commercial, industrial, and financial institutions, as applied by the Comptroller General. Just as in the case of the business-type budget, the commercial-type audit is better suited than the regular governmental type to the operations of a Government corporation. Generally speaking, the purpose of the governmental type of audit is to determine the validity of expenditures under appropriations made by the Congress and to insure compliance with the restrictions placed by the Congress on such expenditures. The governmental audit is a part of a system designed to enforce the personal accountability of officers authorizing or expending such funds upon the basis of documents ordinarily transmitted to the General Accounting Office and retained in its custody. On the other hand, the commercial type of audit is separate and distinct from the corporation's accounting system and internal financial controls. It is designed to determine the financial condition and results of operations of the corporation. Such determinations are made through examination of the corporate records at the places where they are normally kept in the conduct of the business.

The audit provisions of the bill will insure an independent audit of the corporations by the Comptroller General as the agent of the Congress. If the audit is to be truly independent and informative to the Congress, the Comptroller General must not be restricted or hampered in going into the financial affairs of the corporations. However, to avoid unnecessary duplication of audits in cases where corporations are required by law to be examined by a supervising administrative agency, such as the Farm Credit Administration, as a part of its system of supervision and regulation, the bill requires the Comptroller General in making his audits to utilize reports of such examinations to the fullest extent deemed by him to be practicable.

Other audit provisions of the bill apply to the audits to be made thereunder certain administrative provisions of the First Deficiency Act of 1945 concerning the audit of all Government corporations under the George Act.

The audit reports should be helpful to the Congress when considering the Budget programs of wholly owned corporations. They will keep the Congress informed of the financial activities and financial condition of those mixed-ownership corporations in which Government capital is invested, and will thus aid in protecting the Government's interest as part owner. They will also be of assistance to the executive branch in its fiscal-management problems.

TREASURY FISCAL CONTROL

The bill includes requirements relating to the selection of depositaries and the financing of Government corporations, as well as to their dealings in Government or Government-guaranteed obligations. Such requirements are intended to coordinate these important financial activities with the general financial program of the Government.

As to depositaries, the bill requires that the corporations' banking or checking accounts be kept with the Treasurer of the United States or, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, with a Federal Reserve bank or a bank designated as a depositary or fiscal agent of the United States. Certain exemptions from and waivers of this requirement are provided for, including an exemption of several types of farm-credit institutions having a close relationship with local farmer-borrower associations subject to a requirement that such institutions report their depositaries to the Secretary of the Treasury annually. Upon receiving such reports, the Secretary is empowered to make written reports to the corporation, the President, and the Congress if he deems it advisable.

With respect to financing, the bill provides that obligations of the corporations offered to the public shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities and rates of interest, and in certain other respects shall be as approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. Also, it requires Treasury approval of the sale or purchase by a Government corporation, for its own account and in its own right and interest, of direct obligations of the United States or obligations guaranteed by the United States, in amounts in excess of $100,000 at any one time. In lieu of applying these financing and security provisions to certain farm-credit institutions, the bill requires those institutions to continue their present policy of consulting with the Secretary of the Treasury prior to taking action, and permits the Secretary, in the event an agreement is not reached, to report the reasons for his disagreement to the corporation, the President, and the Congress. In the event Government capital is entirely withdrawn, the corporation will not be subject to these Treasury fiscal controls.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

It came to light during the hearings on this bill that 18 of the corporations which the bill seeks to control were chartered, in some instances without express advance authority of the Congress, in a State or local jurisdiction. If the Federal Government needs to employ the corporate form for its activities, it does not need to go into a State and organize the corporation under State law, with resulting confusion and complications. It has sufficient facilities for creating corporations solely responsible to it. The bill provides that no Government corporation shall be created hereafter by any Federal officer or agency except by an act of Congress or pursuant to an act specifically authorizing such action. It further provides that no wholly owned Government corporation created by or under the laws of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, shall continue beyond June 30, 1948, as a Government agency, but permits the reincorporation of any such corporation prior to that date by a specific act of Congress. There are no State-chartered corporations among the mixed-ownership group.

Another point worthy of comment is the large amount of Government capital at the disposal of these corporate enterprises, often without any limit on the period of use thereof or any specific requirement as to the disposition of such funds when no longer needed. The bill provides for such situations by directing that the annual budget program of wholly owned corporations include estimates of the amount of Government capital funds to be returned to the Treasury, and that the President include in the annual Budget recommendations as to such return of capital by mixed-ownership corporations. It also requires the audit reports of the Comptroller General to make recommendations in such matters. With these recommendations at hand the Congress will be able to act to prevent any Government corporation from tying up funds no longer needed by it.

Finally the bill furnishes a means of handling the financial affairs of Government corporations whose activities do not require the autonomy and flexibility characteristic of the corporate form, but could just as well be carried on as regular governmental activities. In such case, when recommended by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and approved by the President and the Congress, the corporation is to be regarded as a regular Government establishment for the purposes of the Budget and Accounting Act and other laws relating to fiscal matters.

All of these miscellaneous provisions are in furtherance of the general policy of congressional coordination and control of the corporate activities of the Government.

SUMMARY BY SECTIONS

Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the "Government Corporation Control Act."

Section 2 declares it to be the policy of the Congress to bring Government corporations and their transactions and operations under annual scrutiny by the Congress and provide current financial control thereof.

TITLE I—WHOLLY OWNED GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Section 101 enumerates the wholly owned Government corporations covered by this title. This includes 41 separate corporations or groups of corporations, which is increased to 63 if each corporation included in a group, i. e., Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit corporations, is counted individually.

Section 102 provides for the submission of an annual budget program by each wholly owned Government corporation to the President through the Bureau of the Budget on or before September 15. The Bureau of the Budget, under such rules and regulations as the President may establish, is authorized and directed to prescribe the form and content of, and the manner in which such budget program shall be prepared and presented. Such budget program is to be a business-type budget or plan of operations, with due allowance given to the need for flexibility, including provision for emergencies and contingencies, in order that the corporation may properly carry out its activities as authorized by law. The section requires the submission of the usual corporate financial statements on a comparative basis for the last completed fiscal year, with estimates for the current fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal year. Such statements are to include estimates of operations by major types of activities together with estimates of administrative expenses, estimates of borrowings, and estimates of the amount of Government capital funds to be returned to the Treasury during the fiscal year, or the appropriations required to provide for the restoration of capital impairments.

Section 103 authorizes the President to modify, amend, or revise the corporations' budget programs submitted to him and directs him to transmit the revised budget programs to the Congress as a part of the annual budget required by the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921. It also authorizes amendments to the annual budget programs to be submitted from time to time.

Section 104 provides for the consideration by the Congress of the budget programs and the enactment of legislation, if necessary, making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine. Such programs would be referred to the House Committee on Appropriations and, after hearings, be reported to the House, in the form of (1) simple authorizing legislation, showing that the Congress had considered and approved the budget program but not setting

a limitation on the corporate financial activities other than that provided by substantive law, or (2) legislation incorporating such specific limitations as necessary to enforce the will of Congress in the carrying out of the corporate financial activities or to conform such activities to the general financial program of the Government.

In cases where no other law required a congressional authorization of expenditures, the corporation, if it had means of financing other than annual appropriations, could continue to operate in the absence of any action by Congress on its budget program. To insure that such legislation would not be used as a means of destroying any Government corporation or preventing it from carrying out and financing its authorized activities, this section includes a specific provision that it shall not be construed as preventing wholly owned Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law. The section also provides specifically that no provision thereof shall be construed as affecting in any way the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended. This language preserves intact the right of the Tennessee Valley Authority to utilize its receipts in carrying out certain operations and business activities as authorized under present law.

As to the lending corporations, such as the Federal intermediate credit banks and production-credit corporations, the provisions of this section would not change the fundamental authority of the corporations under existing law, in respect to their financing, their administrative management and control, or their lending operations. It would require an annual review of all their operations by the President and the Congress, with the right, if necessary in the public interest, to set limitations on expenditures.

Section 104 includes a further provision to make it clear that the existing authority of wholly owned Government corporations to make contracts or other commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations is not affected. This provision was included to meet the objection of certain corporations that the enactment of H. R. 217 in its original form would place them completely on a fiscal-year basis and interfere with their flexibility of operation and with the making of long-range contracts under authority of law.

Section 105 provides for an audit of the financial transactions of wholly owned Government corporations by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit is to be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office are to have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and are to be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit is to begin with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of the bill.

This section also includes a provision authorizing the Comptroller General to coordinate his audit of the financial transactions of the corporations under this bill with the audit which he is required to make in certain cases under other provisions of law for the purpose of settling the accounts of officers handling corporate funds.

Section 106 requires the Comptroller General to make a report of the audit for each fiscal year to the Congress not later than the following January 15. This section requires the report to set forth the scope of the audit and specifies financial statements to be included therein. It also calls for the Comptroller General to include in his report such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the corporation, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as in his judgment should be accomplished. The report is also required to show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each such report is to be furnished to the President, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

Section 107 permits the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the President, to make recommendations as to those activities carried on by a wholly owned corporation which could be handled in the same manner, insofar as concerns fiscal matters, as those of a regular agency or establishment of the Government. In the event that Congress concurred, such activities would thereafter be carried on in accordance with the requirements of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and other provisions of law relating to fiscal matters.

TITLE II—MIXED-OWNERSHIP GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Section 201 defines mixed-ownership corporations to include (1) the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (2) Federal land banks, (3) Federal home-loan banks, and (4) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Section 202 requires the financial transactions of mixed-ownership Government corporations for any period during which Government capital has been invested therein to be audited by the General Accounting Office in the same manner as applicable to wholly owned Government corporations under the provisions of section 105.

Section 203 requires the Comptroller General to make to the Congress a report of each such audit for each fiscal year, of the same type, at the same time, and in the same manner as the reports required to be made by him pursuant to section 106.

Section 204 directs the President to include in the annual Budget any recommendations he may have as to the return of Government capital to the Treasury by mixed-ownership corporations.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 301 restates and applies to the audit to be conducted under sections 105 and 202 of this bill certain provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945, approved April 25, 1945, authorizing appropriations to the General Accounting Office for the expense of audits; requiring reimbursement by the corporations to the General Accounting Office for the cost of such audits and deposit of the sums reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; authorizing the employment of not more than 10 persons without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and of professional services of firms and organizations for temporary periods or special purposes without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; and prohibiting the use of funds of any Government corporation to pay the cost of any private audit of the financial records of the offices of such corporation, except the cost of such audits contracted for and undertaken prior to the date of said First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945.

This section also requires the Comptroller General in making the audits provided in sections 105 and 202 to utilize to the fullest extent deemed by him to be practicable reports of examinations of Government corporations made by a supervising administrative agency pursuant to law. It further provides that the audit in sections 105 and 202 shall be in lieu of any audit of the financial transactions of any Government corporation required to be made by the General Accounting Office for the purpose of a report to the Congress or to the President under any existing law. Under this last provision such audit would supersede, as of the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of this bill, the audit of all Government corporations now required to be made by the General Accounting Office under section 5 of Public Law 4, approved February 24, 1945.

Section 302 provides for the keeping of banking and checking accounts of all wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporations with the Treasurer of the United States, Federal Reserve banks, or depositaries designated by the Secretary of the Treasury subject to the proviso that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to waive the requirements of this section under such conditions as he may determine. The Federal intermediate credit banks, production-credit corporations, the central bank for cooperatives, the regional banks for cooperatives, and the Federal land banks are exempted from the provisions of this section, except that these corporations are required to report annually the names of their depositaries to the Secretary of the Treasury, and that the Secretary of the Treasury may make a report in writing to the corporation, to the President, and to the Congress which he deems advisable upon receipt of any such annual report.

Section 303 provides that obligations of wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporations which are offered to the public shall be approved as to the form, denominations, maturities, interest rates, and other terms and conditions by the Secretary of the Treasury. This section prohibits the sale or purchase of any direct or guaranteed obligations of the United States by wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporations for their own account and in their own right and interest in excess of $100,000 except by approval or waiver by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Federal intermediate credit banks, production-credit corporations, the Central Bank for Cooperatives, the regional banks for cooperatives, and the Federal land banks are exempted from the provisions of this section, except that these corporations are required to consult with the Secretary of the Treasury prior to taking any action covered by the provisions of this section. In the event of disagreement resulting from such consultations, the Secretary of the Treasury may make a report in writing to the Corporation, to the President, and to the Congress stating the grounds for his disagreement. This section also provides that any mixed-ownership Government corporation from which Government capital has been entirely withdrawn shall not be subject to the provisions of section 302 or of this section during the period such corporation remains without Government capital.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to exercise any of the functions vested in him by this section through officers or employees of any Federal agency designated by him, with the concurrence of the head of the agency concerned.

Subsection (a) of section 304 prohibits any corporation from being created, organized, or acquired hereafter by the Federal Government for the purpose of acting as an agency or instrumentality of the United States, except by an act of Congress or pursuant to an act of Congress specifically authorizing such action.

Subsection (b) of section 304 requires all wholly owned Government corporations created by or under the laws of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, or under the laws of the District of Columbia, to cease operating as agencies or instrumentalities of the United States by June 30, 1948, and prohibits the investment in or employment by any such corporation after that date, except for purposes of liquidation, of Federal funds. This subsection directs the proper corporate authority of every such corporation to institute dissolution or liquidation proceedings on or before June 30, 1948, but makes provision for reincorporation of any such corporation prior thereto by act of Congress, setting out its purposes, term of existence, powers, privileges, and duties, including the power to take over the assets and assume the liabilities of its respective predecessor corporation.

THE PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I shall discuss for a short time the situation with reference to Pearl Harbor.

At the time of the surrender of Japan I was under the impression that we as a Nation had fought a pretty good fight. I confess that I experienced a feeling of pleasure when I thought of how well the war had been planned and how well the plans had been executed. I was proud of the manner in which the Presidents of the United States had performed their functions as commanders in chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States.

Shortly thereafter I began to hear veiled criticisms of the President who had died, with reference to Pearl Harbor. That is something which I think will not have the backing of the better thinking people of the United States.

There appeared an editorial in yesterday's New York Times which I think should be read into the RECORD. It reads as follows:

THE PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY

The congressional committee investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster has been so bedeviled from the start by partisan wranglings on both sides that it has already seriously undermined public confidence in its fairness and impartiality. But the latest conduct of some of its Republican members in particular can hardly bring comfort or satisfaction to the national leaders of that party.

The Republican Party has provided distinguished leadership to the Nation in the past and aspires to lead it again in the future. But Republican members on the Pearl Harbor committee have not only attempted to impugn the honesty of the American Navy; they are also espousing the cause of Japan against that of their own country. And they are doing so in defiance of all the historic evidence. The country has the right to know, and know now, whether these tactics are merely the result of the strategy of the individual Republicans involved, or whether they are part of the calculated strategy of the Republican congressional leadership. It is up to that leadership either to repudiate the slurs cast upon the American fighting forces and American policy, or to stand convicted of identifying itself with them—if only by silence.

The thesis of some of the Republican members was stated most bluntly by Representative GEARHART, of California, when he declared: "The Japanese were doing everything in their power to get an acceptable agreement and got slapped in the face on November 26. That precipitated the war." Representative GEARHART was referring to the famous American note of November 26, 1941, which those of his persuasion prefer to call by its Japanese designation of the "Hull ultimatum." There was never an excuse for any mistake about that note. There is even less now in view of the evidence before the committee itself. And only deliberate misstatement of the facts can now sustain Representative GEARHART's charge.

The record speaks for itself. As early as 1931, Japan embarked on a career of conquest as ambitious and as frankly avowed as was that of the Nazis. She first subjugated Manchuria over American protests. In 1936 she concluded the anti-Comintern pact with Germany and, with that as a backing, invaded China the next year. In 1940, when the western powers were engaged in a life-and-death struggle with Hitler, she concluded a hard and fast military alliance with Germany and Italy, and prepared not only to drive the "foreign barbarians" from the Far East but also to swallow the whole Orient in her "coprosperity sphere" as a base for world conquest. As early as January 1941 her war lords began to prepare for war against the United States, including an attack on Pearl Harbor.

Her great opportunity, hailed in Japan as a "divine wind," came when Germany invaded Russia on June 22, 1941, thereby securing Japan's northern flank. Ten days later an imperial conference, presided over by the Japanese Emperor, adopted a crucial national policy, whose nature was revealed in another 10 days by orders for an all-out mobilization for total war. Within 2 weeks Japan invaded French Indochina to provide a base for attacks on the Netherlands Indies and Singapore. This was followed by mutual freezing of assets and virtual suspension of trade. By August the Japanese Fleet began to assemble for war games to rehearse the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the plans for it were completed by September 13. On October 5 the date of the attack was fixed for December 7, our time; General Tojo took over the Government October 17; and the fleet sailed on its fateful mission November 25, or 24 hours before the Hull note was even delivered.

There goes the accusation that Secretary Hull brought on the war. Twenty-four hours before the Hull note was delivered Tojo took over the government and the fleet sailed on its fateful mission November 25.

True, the Japanese fleet could have been recalled if a settlement had been reached before December 7. But the only settlement that would have recalled it would have been an American acceptance of the Japanese note of November 20, which was a real ultimatum because, unlike the Hull note, it contained, even if unknown to the American Government, a time limit after which military action was to follow automatically. And that note demanded that the United States end her long-standing policy of supporting China, and not only supply Japan with all she wanted for the prosecution of her war in China, especially oil, but also compel the Netherlands East Indies to do likewise. Had the United States bowed to it, Germany and Japan would now control all Europe and Asia, and this country would stand alone against their might. Great Britain and France did not need such a humiliating ultimatum to declare war on Hitler. The American Government merely replied with a note offering a broad basis of agreement which contained no threat whatever. General Tojo himself has declared that he accepts responsibility for the war. Does Mr. GEARHART wish to relieve him of it?

Mr. President, this editorial puts squarely up to Mr. GEARHART the determination as to which side he is on, According to the New York Times editorial—and it was printed as the first editorial on the editorial page—he is arguing the case of Japan. And for what purpose? Why do we notice such headlines as appear from day to day? For instance, I have here a headline which appeared on Tuesday, November 20, 1945, "Admiral says Roosevelt vetoed '40 plea to have fleet quit Pearl Harbor."

There is constant misrepresentation, because much of the stuff that is put out as news is not news; indeed, it is not even suspicion. It is born of a desire to find some fact by which to besmirch the memory of the dead President.

Those who have the idea of besmirching someone do not stop with the President. They smear the military officers. Somebody has made a great mistake, they say. I wonder how George Washington or General Grant, or any of the American officers of the past, would have stood with these critics.

Oh, they want to go through the personal files of the former President of the United States. They want to dig up something, and they want to be alone when it is done. Can any reason be given why any man should want to search out something alone, and without the remainder of the committee? Is there any sensible, honorable explanation? I know of none.

Some Roosevelt haters have gone so far in their criticisms and false insinuations that they now must try to justify their position. They have given their statements to the newspapers long before questions were asked. We may find their questions set forth in the newspapers—"impartial investigators," people whose only purpose is to find the truth, and whose desire is to have the people of the Nation know the truth. Yet they go to the newspapers and publish their lists of questions.

Their insinuations are spread in headlines, and newspapers which have followed their insinuations, their lead, are in a peculiar position. They are out on a limb. They have to try to justify the position they have taken. The smears they have industriously tried to place on the man who was the victim in the greatest struggle the world ever saw, who at the time when the same gentlemen were opposing the preparation of the United States for the war which everybody knew was coming were opposing preparing the United States for that contest, now seek to smear the memory of the man who did see it, and made their prophecies look like fools' statements.

In this smear campaign those who are attempting to carry it on have a beautiful chance, because they are in no way handicapped by having to tell the truth. Any insinuation as to the late President will get front-page news on the part of certain newspapers.

I think Admiral Dewey would have been declared to be the most despicable character if these persons had been in position to describe him at the time he won his great victory. Of what is President Roosevelt guilty except that he protected the United States when others were afraid to do it, or thought it was good, petty politics, partisan politics, to

hide behind some statement as to his having a desire to be a dictator?

I do not see why it is necessary to besmear anyone. I do not know why we cannot admit that this has been a wonderfully fought war. While we were attacked, and the most despicable methods on earth were used against us, our Government did have men who measured up to the occasion and who did win the war.

No, that is not the method some of our people think they should employ to win partisan political victories. Their belief is that they can win victories by besmearing the man who had the confidence of the American people through four elections, a man who died as much a victim of the war as any man who was shot and killed.

This sneak attack upon the grave of Franklin Roosevelt has already failed. The United States Navy turned back the attack last week, and General MacArthur yesterday gave it the final blow.

In their hatred of the late President his opponents who had never been able to divorce him from the public during his lifetime took new courage at his death, and set out to prove that the Japs were merely a wonderful little people whom Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, hungry for slaughter, tricked into war. That is what they want us to believe. One of the committee said they were doing everything they could to have a peaceful arrangement. With ghoulish glee the Republican national chairman, Brownell, and the more reckless members of that party—we notice the leaders do not join in this—plotted to besmirch the reputation of the Nation's wartime Commander in Chief. Never having been able to do this when he was alive, they would try it when he was dead.

Their plot was as fantastic as the ones they had used when he was living—as hollow as Dewey's charge in 1940 that Roosevelt was out to establish communism in the Republic.

The public had never fallen for such propaganda in the past, but his opponents hoped it might now, when their conqueror was in the tomb. Their plan was to rake through the wreckage of Pearl Harbor and find there the evidence that the pacific, friendly Japanese were trapped by Roosevelt's diplomatic cunning into fighting for their sacred liberty.

In their desperation, his opponents have, in effect, put on Japanese kimonos and hissed, "excuse Japan, please. Honorable Roosevelt and Honorable Hull teased us into honorable surprise attack."

Well, what evidence have these gentlemen in borrowed kimonos now turned up? First of all they have the Navy's word that captured Japanese authorities and Japanese documents prove beyond the slightest doubt that Japan's war lords had allied themselves with Hitler and ravaged peaceful China, and had plotted as early as January 1941 to cripple the United States by a sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. By August 1941, the Jap Navy was rehearsing this sneak attack, and on October 5 even named the date for this criminal act—December 7. The evidence is clear that the Japanese Fleet set out for the cowardly trip to Hawaii on November 25.

Here is where the plot blows up, for they had in their ghoulish ambition hoped to prove that Secretary Hull's message to Japan, sent November 26, had provoked the whcle Pearl Harbor venture. And now the Japs openly confess that their fleet had sailed before they learned of Hull's message.

The Japanese Fleet which so stealthily and treacherously set out for Pearl Harbor could have been recalled in mid-ocean if the United States had abjectly surrendered through diplomatic channels. Of course, the sneak attack could have been called off if President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull had hauled down the flag and said to Japan, "So sorry. Go ahead, ravage China; go ahead, take India; go ahead, turn over all the resources of the whole Orient to Hitler. We are glad to desert our friends and knuckle down to the dictators."

Certainly, we could have bought off the Japanese by abandoning the principle of democracy, abandoning humanity, abandoning our own national security. But if Roosevelt and Hull had thus hauled down the American flag, they would today be receiving the scorn of the civilized world, instead of that of merely a few disappointed partisan opponents.

One of his opponents was forced to admit that the Japs' own statements had cleared Hull of provoking the sneak attack; yet, in his baffled vexation, he lost his head and struck at the Navy. How unjustified and cruel this was can be determined by merely reading the actual testimony of the Navy spokesman, Admiral Inglis.

And now imagine, if you will, Mr. President, the confusion of these apologists for Japan, when yesterday there appeared in the afternoon newspapers and in the testimony the report of the Army Intelligence in Japan, the word from the headquarters of General MacArthur, bearing out the Navy's findings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TUNNELL. No, not now. I shall be through in a short time, and then shall yield the floor.

All through the war, General MacArthur's work has been complicated by the efforts of the Roosevelt-haters to put him into a position of rivalry with the late President. For their own selfish purposes they have used the brave general, trying to build him up as a political weapon they could wield. Now they are caught in their own trap, for the general's report on the pre-Pearl Harbor activities of Japan, arrived at by Army Intelligence, substantiates the Navy's findings as given the Pearl Harbor Committee by Admiral Inglis.

May we now expect the "kimono" boys to smear MacArthur? The armed services, whose intelligence work was good enough to break the Japanese secret code during the war, have each in their separate way proved that it was the Jap war lords and not Americans who struck at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. President, there is one more thing which seems to be very interesting in connection with this subject. We were told that the President had a desire to be called a War President. Yet Admiral Richardson testified that the President stated, "No, we are not going to war"; that the country would not go to war even though Thailand were taken, or possessions of the Allies were taken. He doubted that we should go to war even if the Philippines were taken.

So Admiral Richardson's testimony gave very little encouragement to those who thought they could dig something out of his testimony to cause the memory of the man who had been our greatest Commander in Chief to be less revered.

Mr. President, what satisfaction comes from all this? What is its purpose? There can be but one purpose. Why do they not attack President Truman? President Truman foresaw just such attacks as the one which has been made. I remember well where he stood and the speech he made calling on the Senate to appoint a committee which would prevent there being any ground for such an attack as has been made. But the ground for attacks has had but very little to do with the attacks which have been made. The lack of reason for the attacks has not been a preventive.

President Truman stands in the fortunate position of having taken the position that everything should be on the up-and-up in this war, and he watched the war contracts, the construction work, with a committee over which he presided, and he succeeded to a remarkable degree, and the people of the Nation made him Vice President, and then he became President on the death of President Roosevelt. So we are now in the peculiar position that while we have won a war we have aroused the antagonism of a partisan spirit which has gone to the extent, according to the New York Times, of defending and apologizing for Japan. I suppose we had just as well apologize for Japan as apologize for Germany. I think both are on a par. I think we had better take a little time to give some credit to those who have been so gallant, who have sacrified so much time and effort, and who placed themselves on the side of America, rather than to besmirch them even to the grave, and after the doors of the grave have been closed on them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have certainly the greatest respect for the late President Roosevelt, and after the speech which has just been delivered, which has disturbed me very greatly, as a new Member of this body who appreciates the importance of the work performed by the Senate, I wish to say a few words. I have not always agreed with the late President, but I have always had great respect for him.

The speech I have just listened to would seem to indicate that the honorable Senator from Delaware was impugning the integrity of members of the committee which is investigating the Pearl Harbor incident. From my service and experience in this body I know the Members on the other side of the aisle who are serving on that committee, and I have a high regard for them, and am confident that they would live

up to their obligations under the Constitution and the oath they have taken as Senators. I know personally the two Members from this side of the aisle who are serving on the Pearl Harbor Committee, and I have a high regard for their integrity and their feelings toward their obligations and the oath they took as Members of this body. I do not know personally, and I am not sure I could even name the Members of the House of Representatives who sit on the Pearl Harbor Committee. But I am confident, sir, that none of the members of the committee from either House are making apologies for Japan, or are trying, by any questions asked, to make out of this investigation anything for their personal aggrandizement or for their own benefit, or for that purpose to bring out anything that is of a slanderous nature.

And, sir, I cannot, as one who has listened to the entire speech just delivered by the Senator from Delaware, as one who is a new Member of this body, and who speaks now with a great deal of hesitation, but with much sincerity, believe that there is any man on the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee from either the House or the Senate who through questions or statements of his is making apologies for Japan or Germany and is trying to bring discredit on the late President of the United States. Rather, I believe, every member of the committee is trying his utmost—rightly or wrongly, we are not judges as of today and will not be until the report is submitted—to get the facts concerning Pearl Harbor.

We may not agree with the methods used by members of the committee on either side of the aisle, but, sir, we certainly should not impugn their motives. We should not believe that they are making apologies for Japan or that they are trying, as Senators, to do anything but to live up to their obligations as citizens of the United States and as sworn employees of our Government.

I say this much on behalf of all the members of the committee whom I know, and also those whom I do not know, because I cannot believe that they would have been selected if they had been men of the character indicated.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I greatly regret the speech which has just been made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL]. First, I regret it because it was an attack upon Members of the Senate who were not present in the Chamber and in a position immediately to answer the charges made against them.

I regret it also because clearly, in my mind, it violated the rules of the Senate in that the Senator spoke with disrespect of Members of this body. I think clearly that the utterances of the Senator from Delaware were subject to a point of order. If a point of order had been made, it would have been the clear duty of the Chair to have required the speaking Senator to take his seat, and he could not have proceeded until permitted by the Senate to do so.

I deplore the speech on both grounds. I did not feel compelled to make instant reply, because I am perfectly willing to leave to my colleague from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] full opportunity to make any defense he sees fit to make in his own behalf. I have equal confidence in the capacity of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to meet any criticisms which may be made of him. I do not know how much of the speech my colleague has heard, but I venture to say that he has heard enough so that he has a fair sample of the entire speech, and I leave the Senator from Delaware to his tender mercies.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I left the hearings this afternoon at 4 o'clock and arrived at my office at quarter past 4, when I was called on the telephone from the Chamber and informed that the Senator from Delaware was indulging in a somewhat personal vituperation of the members of the committee investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster. I came into the Chamber as quickly as I could.

In my service here it has been my understanding that in the event any member of this body proposed to discuss a matter of a personal character affecting another member, it has been the invariable practice, I believe throughout most of a century, that the other member was entitled to the courtesy of notice. I know that that is the invariable rule which I have followed. It was taught to me by my elders and betters when I entered this body. I assume that perhaps the Senator from Delaware was in ignorance of that rule, in not taking occasion to inform either the Senator from Michigan or myself that he proposed to discuss the quality of our personal service in our capacity as representatives of this body. However, I regret that I was not advised in time to be here to listen to his discourse.

I now note that, having delivered whatever might have been his attack, to which the two previous Speakers, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] have referred, the Senator from Delaware has promptly left the Chamber, even before they finished speaking, apparently without interest in whether or not there might be any reply to any of the insinuations or accusations which he made.

From the hurried report of this situation from my colleagues I gather that the Senator from Delaware has referred to our activities in the committee which was appointed on September 6, pursuant to the resolution submitted by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The first time it occurred to me that there was any misunderstanding in this matter was in connection with a cartoon which appeared in the Washington Star on Sunday of this week. It portrays the Senator from Maine as saying to the Senator from Michigan that "The Navy is trying to make the Japanese responsible for Pearl Harbor." The Senator from Michigan is represented as saying, in apparently very feeling tones, "We will not let them get away with that." I gathered that the plain insinuation was that we were taking the Japanese end of this argument, and that the Japanese, and no one else, had the simple and sole responsibility for Pearl Harbor.

As I pondered this suggestion, I was amazed that so penetrating a cartoonist as Mr. Berryman had voiced the idea, and I wondered whether or not it represented the thought of any substantial number of our citizens. I could well understand how some such idea might get abroad from the necessary inquiries as to the Japanese program, plans, and various developments. It would be very easy to attach sinister suggestions to a detached word or phrase here and there, or to the difficulties and discussions which inevitably arise. But it seemed to me that the simple and sufficient answer to any suggestion that either the committee or any of its members is proceeding somewhat afield or somewhat apart from the inquiry is found in the very purpose of the inquiry itself.

If the Japanese were solely responsible for Pearl Harbor, what is this investigation all about? Certainly we needed no investigation to determine that the Japanese attacked us vilely and foully at Pearl Harbor. Certainly the distinguished majority leader, when he submitted his resolution on September 6 and asked for its immediate adoption, had no illusions on that score. I could read at length from his masterly address on that occasion. I invite the attention of the Senate and of the country to what he said, pointing out that for 4 long years this country had pondered what was back of this situation, how it happened that such terrific damage was done and 3,000 of our young men were slain by the sneak attack, and whether or not there was any fault or responsibility upon anyone in the United States, as the majority leader said so poignantly, high or low, living or dead.

At no time during this inquiry have we even approached the borders of the very profound questions which he raised. But I recall to the Senate a little of what he said, in order that Senators may understand the full scope of what the investigation was supposed to cover.

After first detailing the history of this matter and of the various investigations, the Roberts report, the Hewitt report, the Hart inquiry, the Navy inquiry, and the Army inquiry, under the direction of Congress, the Senator from Kentucky said:

> Mr. President, I shall not at this time attempt to discuss these various reports in detail, but after studying them to the extent possible in the time at my disposal, I am convinced that a further searching inquiry should be made under the authority and by the direction of the Congress of the United States.
>
> In forming this opinion, Mr. President, I cast no reflections upon the ability, the patriotism, the good faith, or the sincerity of the boards which have thus far investigated and reported upon the Pearl Harbor disaster, nor on any member of these various boards.

I wish that the Members of this body could display similar confidence in the integrity and intentions of the Members of this body who have been assigned, without solicitation upon their part, to participate in the searching inquiry proposed by the majority leader. Apparently we were selected because of the

experience which we had had for 4 years upon an investigating tribunal which had certainly come to command the confidence of the people of the United States. Its chairman was finally elevated to the position of President of the United States. Whatever we have learned regarding investigations we have learned at the feet of the one who is now the Commander in Chief. We have tried to apply those lessons in carrying out the high responsibility with which we have been entrusted. In the full language of the distinguished chairman of our committee—

> It should be conducted without partisanship or favoritism toward any responsible official, military, naval, or civilian, high or low, living or dead.
>
> It should be conducted in an atmosphere of judicial responsibility, and it ought to be so complete and so fair that no person could doubt the good faith of the report and the findings made in it, or those who make it.
>
> It ought not to be conducted or undertaken for the purpose or with the sole view of vindicating or aspersing any man now in office, or who has been in office during the period involved.
>
> It ought not to be undertaken or conducted for the purpose of enhancing or retarding the welfare of any political party, or any person now in office, or any person who desires or aspires to hold public office.

Why was this necessary? Because the reports—and again I quote the majority leader—

> are confusing and conflicting when compared with one another, and to some extent contain contradictions and inconsistencies within themselves.
>
> Under these circumstances it is not strange that widespread confusion and suspicion prevails among the American people and among the Members of Congress.

It is a most amazing thing that in the very inception of this inquiry, during a period of 9 weeks of preparation, the full committee was laboring under the handicap of an Executive order which forbade the disclosure of any information by any members of the executive department concerning the major subject of this inquiry and the revelations contained in the various messages decoded from the Japanese. That, after all, was the primary purpose of the inquiry; and yet it has been only within the past 10 days that it has been possible for any member of the executive department to speak with any measure of freedom to any member of the committee or its counsel. So under those circumstances, which we have hitherto detailed upon the floor of the Senate, the difficulties of which we have pointed out—and there has been a full and free discussion in accordance with American tradition—we have concealed nothing in urging that we felt that the situation was to some extent a handicap.

Finally, the procedure has commenced; and during the past 4 days we have been holding hearings—premature, as we believe, because the vast number of documents necessarily concerned with this inquiry and absolutely essential to the examination of witnesses were not then and are not now available to the committee or to any of its members.

But under those circumstances, and in compliance with the will of the majority who control the functioning of the committee, we have proceeded with the hearings which have thus far elicited information of the highest importance to the people of the United States and to posterity which, after all, must be the final judges not only of the rectitude of those of us here, but of the determination of a course calculated to avoid another Pearl Harbor in the days that are to come. That, after all, I take it, is the fundamental purpose of this procedure, and in that connection it is necessary to examine into the acts of men everywhere, high or low, living or dead. There cannot be a curtain drawn across. Yesterday Admiral Richardson appeared and testified as to his conversations calculated to demonstrate what degree of responsibility in connection with certain actions was to be borne by any of those in authority, and there must necessarily be and there will be a long procession of other witnesses—naval, military, civilian, diplomatic, high and low—and in the course of time the program will unfold.

Upon what are based the accusations made by the Senator from Delaware, which I have not been privileged to hear, I cannot tell until tonight or tomorrow when I shall read the RECORD, when it may well be in order to pay further attention to his comments. But certainly, Mr. President, it is idle to suggest that in this proceeding, all we need to do—as was the suggestion of the Berryman cartoon; and I hold Mr. Berryman in very high regard, both as a friend and as a cartoonist—or to suggest that all we in this country need to do is to say "The Japanese are responsible for Pearl Harbor," and with that dispose of the case, and dismiss the idea that anyone else in America—in our armed forces, in our diplomatic services, in our executive departments—was in any way negligent or at fault. If that were the only purpose, then there would be no need to constitute a joint committee, no need to adopt the resolution so eloquently presented by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on September 6, and no need for the long and weary labors which already have been exerted in the examination of thousands of pages of documents and which will proceed for no inconsiderable time to come.

Certainly the thought of America and of its people is that they shall be the ones who shall be the final judges of this matter—not we little pygmies who pass our day here in pitiful publicity for a time, not we, not this committee, not the Senate; but the people of the United States, upon the basis of the record we may be privileged to write.

The majority leader suggested in his discussion a week or two ago that the minority had no monopoly on patriotism or on intelligence or integrity. With that suggestion we, as Americans, certainly agree. But it has been the tradition of Anglo-Saxon government for nearly a thousand years, from the time when the barons wrested their just rights from King John at Runnymede, that no man is competent to investigate himself. So it has been a principle of Anglo-Saxon parliamentary government that the minority have rights, that the minority are privileged to ask questions, that the minority are recognized as a responsible element in the functioning of government.

So, Mr. President, the minority who stand here indicted by the absent Senator from Delaware, have certain rights which we shall continue to hold inviolable. After we have been privileged to read what the Senator from Delaware may have said, if it shall require answer, we shall be pleased to make whatever answer may be appropriate. We are unable to reply to charges which we have never heard or seen. But if the Senator from Delaware suggested or if anyone suggests that all there is to the Pearl Harbor investigation is to decide that the Japanese were to blame, and then call it a day, then, indeed, is all the discussion of 4 years a very vain thing; then, indeed, is the majority leader, who presented the resolution, chasing up an entirely blind alley; then indeed, are the ten Members of the Congress who have been designated by their colleagues to act as the committee, and who have been laboring in the vineyard for weeks without end, trying to arrive at a determination which shall be calculated in some way to be a conclusion of this subject—then, indeed, we shall have been doing a vain thing.

But if we are to take the task seriously, then we hope the majority will recognize that in one aspect of this matter they are in some measure seeking to investigate themselves. Without any disparagement of the distinguished majority leader and his colleagues, I am sure everyone will agree that it would be a little difficult for the majority leader to take the bit in his teeth and explore all the highways and byways, as he so eloquently expressed it here upon this floor a little while ago, in order to expose the defects of an administration of which he has been so intimate a part.

This matter involves no reflection upon the patriotism or loyalty of any man. We are all human. We all make mistakes. It is possible that some gentleman upon the other side may have made mistakes, but I am sure they are good enough Americans not to wish to hide behind any curtain of refusal to have a full, fair investigation now that the war has ended.

It is possible that downtown, in the War Department, in the Navy Department, in some of the other executive departments, someone made a mistake—not through malicious intention, not through lack of patriotism, but through the limitation which prevails upon human conduct in every way. We simply ask to have granted to us something of the charity which they necessarily must ask for themselves, as we go forward, not seeking to destroy the reputation of any man, but seeking to lay before the American people, as well as we may, the records of a military catastrophe unprecedented in the history of this country and, almost, in the history of the world, and to ascertain all of its facts and implications, which ended, not at Pearl Harbor, not with the death of 3,000 men there, or with the sinking of our battleships there, but not until a year later, when, on a shoestring, we went into Guadalcanal. Then we were still paying

a terrific price for the lack of adequate preparedness resulting in no small measure from the destruction of our forces at Pearl Harbor by the sneak attack there.

So, Mr. President, if this country is concerned with developing a defense mechanism which shall be capable of bringing about not merely the integration of our military services but the integration of our diplomatic services so that there shall never again be a lack of coordination which shall contribute in any degree to so dire a disaster, then, indeed, our labors will not have been in vain.

Mr. President, I am sorry that any Member of this body, thus early in this investigation, without, so far as I know, attending the hearings or reading the record which already has been written, should seek to destroy the confidence of the American people in the record which has been written by men who are trying day by day before that tribunal to maintain a searching scrutiny of cross-examination in accordance with the tested traditions of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, in order to bring out the truth. Although I have not had adequate opportunity to examine what the Senator from Delaware has said, it appears to me to be rather a strange note that there seems to be so great a fear that perhaps we shall uncover something which may in any degree reflect upon the competency or the intelligence or the possible mistakes of any persons. After all, in all the enormous responsibilities of the last decade it is little wonder if anyone made a mistake. Yet there seems to be a fear that mistakes may possibly be uncovered, if they were made.

I do not speak here as a judge. I simply appeal for continued fairness of consideration of the procedures which the Senator from Michigan and I are seeking to apply from the lessons we learned at the feet of the Truman Committee throughout the past 4 years. We have no doubt that time and events will vindicate the wisdom of the course and the procedures which we are advocating so earnestly as calculated to give to the American people a fairer picture of the facts.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I simply should like to have the RECORD show that I was present at the Pearl Harbor hearing, and during almost the entire hour between 3 and 4 o'clock I was asking questions of Admiral Richardson in the hearing room in the Senate Office Building. I then returned, after 4 o'clock, to my office, where I received word that the Senator from Delaware was making a statement on the floor of the Senate and that it might be of interest to me. I immediately came to the floor of the Senate, but the Senator from Delaware had concluded his remarks, so I am not advised as to what those remarks were.

At the present time, not knowing or having an idea as to what the Senator from Delaware said, I am unable to make any further statement; but between the time of this session of the Senate and the next, I wish to read his remarks; and if they call for a reply I shall ask permission of the Senate to address it at some time during the intervals between the holding of committee sessions, which consume the hours from 10 to 12 in the forenoon and from 2 to 4 in the afternoon. Of course, I wish to advise the Senator from Delaware of my intentions so that he may be present and have the privilege of being on the floor at the time of the delivery of my remarks. That is a privilege which I did not have during the delivery of his remarks.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator suggest that the Senate meet tomorrow? I believe it was the plan of the leaders to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

Mr. FERGUSON. That would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. BREWSTER. It seems to me that it is a very unusual situation in which we find ourselves. I am advised by my colleagues that much of the discussion of the Senator from Delaware, in its attack upon certain Members of the Senate, was undoubtedly out of order. While I hesitate to bring personal affairs into the Chamber of the Senate, the Senate is apparently the forum in which such statements as have been made should be answered. Apparently the remarks of the Senator from Delaware were considered to be of some importance and consequence. I feel that it might be well for this tribunal to reassemble tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. When the distinguished Senator was engaged before the Pearl Harbor committee, discussion took place on the floor of the Senate as to what should be the order of business, and what the Senate would do during the remainder of the week. It was pretty well understood and agreed, I believe, that there would be no session of the Senate tomorrow, and that at the conclusion of its business today the Senate would take a recess until next Friday. Of course, if the Senate convenes on Friday the Senator will have an opportunity to say what he wishes to say.

Mr. BREWSTER. May we have an understanding that if the Senator from Michigan and I feel that it is necessary and appropriate to reply in some form to the Senator from Delaware, we may secure consideration of the Senate? I ask the question because we are supposed to be in attendance upon the sessions of the Pearl Harbor committee from 2 to 4 o'clock every afternoon.

Mr. HILL. The Senator requests what?

Mr. BREWSTER. I request that an understanding be reached that the Senator from Michigan and I will receive recognition of the Chair between 12 o'clock and 2 o'clock next Friday.

Mr. HILL. It is the understanding that there will be a call of the calendar on Friday, but I assume that the distinguished Senator from Maine and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, if they wish to address the Senate when it convenes on Friday, will be able to do so. I do not believe there will be any difficulty in obtaining the floor. Certainly if the Senator should see fit to rise to a question of personal privilege, as he knows he has a right to do at any time, and ask for the privilege of addressing the Senate, after obtaining the floor he could address the Senate for as long as he saw fit.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is unfortunate to involve the personal privilege rule. It is always subject to the rule of the Chair.

Mr. HILL. There is no question that the Senator will be given leave to speak.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Maine, my colleague, and the Senator from Michigan will have an opportunity to make such statements as they deem appropriate on convening of the Senate on Friday next.

Mr. HILL. I certainly believe that if either the Senator from Maine or the Senator from Michigan shall desire to address the Senate on Friday, they will have an opportunity to do so.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this Act shall take effect October 1, 1946: *Provided, however,* That any travel or transportation specifically contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract of carriage or shipment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ED. C. JOHNSON,
BURTON K. WHEELER,
E. H. MOORE,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
LYLE H. BOREN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, with reference to what bill is the conference report?

Mr. WHEELER. The conference report is on House bill 694, the so-called land-grant bill. The only change made in the bill by the conference committee was to strike out the McFarland amendment. There was considerable objection in the Senate to the amendment, but it was taken to conference. The House refused to accept it. Otherwise the bill is in the form in which it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Has the conference report been signed by all the conferees?

Mr. WHEELER. It has been signed by all the conferees except the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. He did

not sign the report because the amendment involved happened to be his.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate, following today's session, the Committee on Claims may be authorized to file reports on certain bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Herbert E. Gaston, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950; and

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports from committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wallace S. Gourley to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William McClanahan to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. Logan to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, November 23, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 20 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Frank Olson, of Idaho, to be Register of the Land Office at Blackfoot, Idaho, vice Frank E. Dekay, term expired.

WAR DEPARTMENT

THE CHIEF OF STAFF

General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the Chief of Staff with the rank of General of the Army, for a period of 4 years from November 19, 1945, vice General of the Army George Catlett Marshall, the Chief of Staff.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM OCTOBER 20, 1945

Lt. Col. Harry Langdon Reeder, Infantry (temporary colonel).

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM NOVEMBER 1, 1945

Lt. Col. Jay Edward Gillfillan, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Richard Jaquelin Marshall, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Leon Edward Ryder, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Jay Drake Billings Lattin, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Donald MacMullen, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Ralph Townsend Heard, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Turner Mason Chambliss, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Ehlert, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Theron Gray Methven, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Whiting Daniels, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Francis Arnold Hause, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Paul Lewis Ransom, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Roderick Random Allen, Cavalry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Edward Elliott MacMorland, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Adolphus Worrell Roffe, Cavalry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Manton Sprague Eddy, Infantry (temporary major general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Henry Benjamin Holmes, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Gabriel Thornton Mackenzie, Infantry (temporary colonel).

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, for the term of 2 years.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 20 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Wallace S. Gourley, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William McClanahan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John P. Logan, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma.

POSTMASTERS

KANSAS

William D. Trump, Ellsworth.
Glenn Vernon Downs, Leoti.

MICHIGAN

Estelle L. Grady, Glen Arbor.
Boyd L. Havens, Hope.
Christina Meyers, Rothbury.

MINNESOTA

Herman B. Lund, Dalbo.
Bonnie B. Martinson, Upsala.
Fred A. Melcher, Woodstock.

NORTH CAROLINA

Treva Wakefield, Guilford.

PENNSYLVANIA

Nellie E. Flaherty, Morea Colliery.
Timoria E. Warnick, Nuremberg.
Anna Nock Kristofeck, United.

TEXAS

Errie E. Morgan, Arcadia.
Clark Tablor, Clyde.
Doris Johnson, Comstock.
William C. Harrell, Emhouse.
Lucille R. O'Connor, Newgulf.
Randolph B. Gafford, Turkey.

WISCONSIN

Emma P. Heesakker, Combined Locks.
Bonnie P. Clark, Gilmanton.
Laura A. Guenther, Knowlton.
Margaret E. Ingham, Lynxville.
Verl A. Bokath, Rib Lake.
Ambrose Sheedy, Suamico.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou who travelest on the wings of the morning, teach us

to worship Thee in spirit and in truth. We bow before Thee this day, realizing our imperfections and marred by our faults and petty sins; forgive us, Thou eternal one, whose holiness transcends all human understanding. On Thee we build and by faith lift our prayer and praise to Thee.

Dear Lord, hold us close to Thee; make us true because of those who trust us, and pure for the sake of those who care. As courage of convictions is so essential in the exercise of our duties, crown us with the hatred for hate and with the love for love. Thou in whose being the simplicity and mystery of life and death meet, cleanse us from all unworthiness; strengthen us with the sanctity of reason and with the humility of prayer and meditation, and all glory be unto Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a public document of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income Tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II," and providing for additional copies thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2851. An act to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R 4129. An act to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. REVERCOMB to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1944, I made a short speech in the House relating to UNRRA. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend that speech in the RECORD again.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I made a speech on January 25, 1944, on the same subject. It is brief. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend that speech in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION OF MEN IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill on September 12 of this year to provide for the demobilization of men in the service who had served honorably for 18 months. Not being able to get action by the committee, a petition is now on the Speaker's desk for those who wish to sign on behalf of the boys.

I hope that the spirit of Thanksgiving and Christmas will cause those Members who have been reluctant to do so to sign that petition and give the boys a fair break.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend a letter from a soldier in India. It is signed by men from 20 different States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REED: Being from your State, and due to the fact that you have been one of the outstanding legislators for the quick return of the men overseas, I am taking the liberty to write you this letter for the men of this organization.

We had read and heard on the radio that the boys from this theater would be the first ones returned home due to the climatic conditions here and disease, but so far we have to be shown. There are men in this organization alone with over 4 years' service, 20 months of which have been spent in this theater and we are still sweating it out. Calcutta and Karachie have men with 70 points or more still waiting for a ship and 60-point men haven't even begun to move and as you know they are supposed to be on their way home this month. It would seem that either false statements are being given out by the press or that there is something else radically wrong.

As an example of what is going on over here I would like to state an instance of ridiculous inefficiency, waste of labor and time which could have been avoided, and would have released men for return to the United States. This organization was told that our mission was finished and that we were to be declared a surplus unit, so the men finished up their work in record time and all equipment was turned in. Shortly after this had been done we were informed that another job was to be done. We had already placed most of our men on detached service in Calcutta where about 50 percent of them are being utilized. Our orders stated that one of our large floating cranes was to be returned to this station, together with three crews for 24-hour operations to load 18,000 tons of steel, from a large QM drum plant here, onto barges to be returned to Calcutta. Two tugs were also returned with crews to shift the barges; altogether 32 men were involved plus the personnel of the QM drum plant. Our men, with the thought in mind of getting home, tore into the job, and in 4 days had loaded 5,000 tons of steel, in all 12 barge loads. Six barge loads had been dispatched for Calcutta to Calcutta when orders came through from our headquarters there canceling the operation and stating that all the steel would have to be returned to its original station, unloaded and returned to the QM drum plant and restacked at said plant, which we are doing at this time. It would seem that instances of this kind are numerous and uncalled for and result in greatly deterring the return of our men to the good old U. S. A. which we want to see more than anything else in the world, especially after being in this God forsaken country all this time.

Another thing that doesn't set well with the men is those who enlist in the Regular Army get a priority in going home. To many the thought occurs that instances such as stated are deliberately initiated to obtain enlistments in the Regular Army and many men have enlisted for the sole purpose of getting out of here for that 90-day furlough back home.

I and the other men who sign this letter are from many different States and all admire your stand on returning men to the United States and feel that this information may give you added facts to put before the public. We have all been proud to serve our country in the national emergency, but now that it is over and victory is ours we firmly believe that the return of men could and can be much more efficiently handled. Needless to say right now our morale has hit a new low, and we are tired of broken promises.

We thank you in advance for the action you will take upon receiving this letter for we are certain it will not go unnoticed.

Yours very sincerely.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a soldier stating the soldier's views on UNRRA.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made to the Eastern Milk Producers Association in Syracuse.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping and editorial.

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the minimum wage bill.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Under Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address he delivered at a bond rally and in the second to include a resolution adopted by the International Fur and Leather Workers of Peabody, Mass.

DISCHARGE OF PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, on October 18 I introduced a bill in the House (H. R. 4425), a bill to provide for the prompt discharge or release from active duty of certain physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, who have served for 2 years in the armed forces. Up to date the bill is resting in the House Committee on Military Affairs, while thousands of these professional men are kept in camps in this country and abroad, doing nothing.

After listening to President Truman's message yesterday on health insurance, and after having had 7 years of military service and many years of dental practice, I would suggest that the first move in a health program should be to put this wasted professional talent now in the armed forces in a position where they could render health service. To me, this would be the sensible thing to do.

HEADED FOR COMMUNISM

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have heard the story of the fellow who wanted to cut his dog's tail off. He started at the outer end and cut off half an inch. The dog hollered. The tail was not short enough so he cut off another half inch. The dog hollered again. He kept cutting off the dog's tail until finally he got it just about the length he wanted it to be, the dog yelping his head off all the while. In the past 10 years the party in power, the New Deal party, has been passing a lot of laws trying to socialize America. They started with NRA, then followed with WPA, CCC, OPA, FHA, PWA, and so forth, and so forth. Now they are proposing the FEPC, proposing the full employment bill, rocking-chair money of $25 a week for half a year to think. Why not stop monkeying around cutting the tail off by inches and cut it off right at the place it should be cut off and admit that we are going to communism in this country.

Mr. REED of New York. I presume the reason they cut the dog's tail off a little at a time was to save the dog pain.

Mr. RICH. Yes; they think it will fool the people into believing that it is not socialism. But they will find out the pain will come when freedom is lost—when liberty is gone socialism will be here—too bad.

I thought when Mr. Truman came into office as President he would stop this trend, but he is on the road to socialism at top speed. Congress, it is up to you to keep America free now. The boys in the Army did their job. Now it is up to Congress. Save our Constitution, liberty, and freedom—or weep and wail later.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on next Tuesday under an appropriate order of business for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

CAPITAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION AT TUSKAHOMA, OKLA.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to insert articles from Newsweek and the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the speech I made November 7 proposing Tuskahoma, Okla., as the world capital seems to have caught the fancy of the national press. Newspapers and magazines of far-reaching circulation have given it a lot of space which I might say we in Oklahoma do not mind a bit. I should like to insert in the RECORD just two of the many clippings that have reached my desk; one that appeared on page 39 of the November 19 edition of Newsweek, and a feature story from the November 18 issue of the Chicago Sun written by Mr. Milburn P. Akers.

Mr. Akers remarks that statesmen may prefer the wild life of Chicago to that of Tuskahoma. I think it would be far more wholesome to have our statesmen hunting wild deer in the Kiamichis than chasing tame "dear" in Chicago.

I should also like to voice a gentle thought here which I hope will reach the proper ears. Since most of our large cities are bidding to make a home for the United Nations, why not effect a compromise by choosing Tuskahoma?

The items from Newsweek and the Chicago Sun are as follows:

[From Newsweek of November 19, 1945]

O-O-O-O-O-KLAHOMA!

The majestic Golden Gate, the Black Hills of South Dakota, and the banks of the Hudson have been the most frequently proposed sites for the United Nations Organization capital. Last week in Congress a new contestant was nominated—the Kiamichi Mountains of southeastern Oklahoma. Representative PAUL STEWART, hefty Oklahoma Democrat, was downright lyrical in proposing Tuskahoma, capital of the old Choctaw Nation, for the UNO seat:

"It is an area transversed by the pure waters of the Kiamichi River, protected on the north by the Potato Hills of the Ouachitas, on the east by the majestic Kiamichis, approached from the west over rolling prairies, and from the south through fertile valleys.

"The sunshine is clear, the rainfall gentle.

"Dogwood and red bud bloom in season, and pines, cedars, holly trees, honeysuckle, and magnolias are ever green.

"We in Oklahoma have always suspected the Almighty of keeping this spot for some special purpose and now we are inspired to offer it to the world."

In conclusion: "It would be fitting to put the world capital here in one of the last centers of the Indian government, to show this country's first inhabitants that we have tried to use well this land we took from them."

[From the Chicago Sun of November 18, 1945]

OH, WHAT A BEAUTIFUL NOTION—TINY TUSKAHOMA EXTOLLED IN RACE FOR UNO CAPITAL

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Chicago, Philadelphia, and San Francisco, too, better take note of Tuskahoma. The ancient capital of the Choctaw Nation, down Oklahoma way, wants United Nations headquarters located in its midst.

Tuskahoma—virgin territory unravished by the world—so its chief advocate says—might not be such a threat were it not for the oratorical prowess of the Honorable PAUL STEWART, of Antlers, who represents Oklahoma's Third Congressional District.

What has Philadelphia or Frisco to offer in competition? Even Chicago appears hard pressed as Representative STEWART grows lyrical extolling Tuskahoma's virtues. Consider these passages from his speech, duly recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of but a few days ago:

"It (Tuskahoma) is in an area traversed by the pure waters of the Kiamichi River, protected on the north by the Potato Hills of the Ouachitas, and on the east by the majestic Klamichis, approached from the west over rolling prairies, and from the south through fertile valleys."

SUNSHINE IS CLEAR

That, by no means, is all.

In Tuskahoma, we are told, "the sunshine is clear (Chicago and Philadelphia smoke commissioners take note), the rainfall gentle and adequate, and the temperature pleasant 12 months of the year."

Who, except the Los Angeles or Miami Chamber of Commerce, can compete with that?

But Tuskahoma has far more than merely a salubrious clime. There, so the Congressman says, "dogwood and red bud bloom in season, and pines, cedars, holly trees, honeysuckle, and magnolia are ever green."

Wildlife, too, is in abundance.

That claim may be the only weak spot in Tuskahoma's armor. For, if we know statesmen, they will prefer the wild life of Chicago to that of Tuskahoma.

Tuskahoma, however, is fated for distinction.

"We in Oklahoma," Mr. STEWART informed the House, "have always suspected the Almighty of keeping this spot for some special purpose, and now we are inspired to offer it to the world as a seat of international government."

What can Chicago do against competition such as that? Philadelpha and Frisco, also, will be well advised to withdraw their invitations, recall any committees which have gone to London to sponsor their claims, and give the honor to Tuskahoma by acclamation.

NOT A BAD IDEA

It's probably not such a bad idea at that. Delegates, upon awakening, might be inspired to give forth with a few bars of "Oh, What a Beautiful Morning."

What chance of discord among statesmen who start the day with:

"Oh, what a beautiful mornin',
"Oh, what a beautiful day.
"I've got a wonderful feelin'
"Everything's going my way."

Even dour Molotov, once he caught the Oklahoma spirit, might prefer the "pure waters of the Klamichi" to vodka. Then, instead of spending time devising ways to lift Ernest Bevin's blood pressure, he might go 'round humming "The Surrey With the Fringe on Top."

Tuskahoma it is. As Mr. STEWART said: "It would be fitting indeed to put the world capital here in one of the last centers of Indian government."

He might have added: "For if the United Nations fails to work, then Tuskahoma, a last center of Indian government, can also mark the last center of all government."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by himself on last Friday evening.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on the Judaic research at Yale University, which was made possible by the generosity of Mr. Louis M. Rabinowitz, vice president of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include some thoughts on political refugees.

Mr. SPARKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made recently on universal military training, also two newspaper items relating to such training.

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Thomas E. Dewey.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from an official of the American Legion on the subject of the sale of surplus property to veterans.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a peace plan by a constituent.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Dorothy Thompson.

CHINA: WHAT PRICE PEACE?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from Life magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that so many Americans have concluded "the war is over" and that we won it, when, as a matter of fact, all we have done thus far is to defeat the German and Japanese military forces. Who wins the war depends on what we do from here on. It will be won by whatever forces and ideas dominate in the reconstruction of Europe and the development of Asia.

We got into this war with Japan because we finally woke up to the fact that we did not dare let Japan get control of China—which means control of Asia. Are we now to throw away that hard-bought military victory by abandoning China?

Chiang Kai-shek could have had peace on repeated occasions if he had been willing to desert his allies. Are we now to try to get peace by deserting him when the war is not over and cannot be until almost 2,000,000 Japanese soldiers in China are disarmed and back in their own country?

Last March I said on this floor that the American people must "get down to bedrock and see that it is not enough to beat Japan, if we would have peace. We have to win the war so it will stay won, and for freedom, or we will have to do it over again under infinitely more difficult circumstances?"

Mr. Speaker, the test of whether we are to win or lose the war in Asia is at hand. Incomparably the best statement I have seen on the present situation in China appeared in the following editorial in Life magazine under the title "China: What Price Peace?" It dispels much of the current confusion by showing that the issues in China and our own obligations and interests there are not nebulous or divided but in reality are very clear and definite and compelling:

CHINA: WHAT PRICE PEACE?

IF WE MEAN WHAT WE SAY ABOUT INTERNATIONALISM, WE WILL STICK BY OUR WARTIME FRIENDS NOW

At Tsingtao, at Tientsin, and at other points on the coast of China, there are today some 53,000 United States marines. There are worse places to be than these cities, as the marines well know. If the Jap surrender had not intervened, they and a million more American boys might have been storming a bitterly defended coast of Japan this very month instead of holding ports and guarding railroads in China. Of the armed might which the United States had marshaled in Asia, these marines are a mere fraction, left behind to cement the victory and to clean up the wreck-strewn wake of war.

And now the cry goes up that this handful has no business there. Mass meetings are held, and United States newspapers editorially demand that we quit China. And their families cry, "Why aren't our boys back home?"

Well, why? That the question should be asked at all and that it is so feebly answered by our Government are measures of America's incapacity for leadership in world affairs. Yet it needs a straight and careful answer if that leadership is ever to be assumed.

A year ago the American people, formally and repeatedly, through Congress and in public-opinion polls, solemnly assured each other that they had forsworn isolationism for good. We signed the United Nations Charter as a pledge of our intention to stick by our allies in winning the peace. But peace has not yet been won. China, it so happens, is the first of our wartime allies to challenge our anti-isolationist resolutions with a sharp and difficult test. If Ame ans mean anything at all by "international cooperation," we will demonstrate it by cooperating with China. If we mean anything by "understanding" other countries, we will show it by trying to understand China. If we mean anything by the "interdependence" of nations, we will recognize the interdependence between China's fate and our own.

Unfortunately, there is a difficulty about China which clouds the attitude even of those Americans who are willing to meet this test. The difficulty is not a conflict of interest between China and America, for there is no such conflict. It is a difficulty within China itself. China, as it has been off and on for 30 years, is having civil war. This habit of civil war has caused many Americans to doubt whether China, far from being one of the great powers, is even a nation at all in the accepted sense. If it is not a nation, how can we do business with it as a partner in the new interdependent world? Or is there now a going concern called China with which, as one nation to another, America can and should deal?

To answer that question no special pleading is necessary. A review of some rather elementary facts about China, too long obscured by blood-spattered headlines, will suffice.

China today

The first elementary fact about China is that it is a large and definite place on the map, a place with a legal status in the family of nations, a well-recorded name (the Republic of China) and no boundary disputes with any of its neighbors. Until recently there were some unsettled questions between China and Russia over boundaries, but these were all settled by the Soong-Stalin treaty of August 1945. China no longer includes Outer Mongolia, but it does include Sinkiang, Formosa, and Manchuria. All the nations of the earth recognize this.

Until this war various European powers had special rights in China which they had obtained from the decrepit Manchu dynasty before it was overthrown in 1911. An example is the famous international settlement of Shanghai, which used to be the most important part of the most important seaport in Asia. It has been a basic objective of the Republic of China to get all these special concessions to foreign imperialism canceled. The last of them has been canceled by agreement during the war. Thus Shanghai is now entirely Chinese just as New York is entirely American. Hong Kong, still British-owned, is a special case which the Chinese expect to negotiate out with the British some time in the next 10 years.

But while the prewar concessions were canceled, some new ones were established just before VJ-day. In return for Russia's promise to get out of Manchuria China gave Russia the use of Port Arthur as a naval base and certain rights to Dairen and to the Manchurian railroads. It was a terrible pain to the leaders of the Republic of China to do this, since the basic policy has been for decades to get rid of all foreign concessions on Chinese soil. But most people considered that China was justified in making these concessions in return for what appeared to be full guaranties of peace and friendship with Russia along 5,000 miles of frontier.

So, except for a few tiny dots on the map, the geographical boundaries of the Republic of China are established over more than 3,000,000 square miles—about the same area as the United States.

So much for the land; now the people. Along the mountains of central Asia there are a few million tribesmen who are not strictly Chinese. But there are more than 400,000,000 people in China who are strictly Chinese and they are much more homogeneous than, for example, the people of the United States. Popular misinformation about the Chinese includes the idea that they speak many entirely different dialects. This idea is far more wrong than right. At least 300,000,000 Chinese speak a language which varies no more than the dialects of Vermont and Alabama.

Culturally the Chinese are united to a rare degree. Half a dozen religions are represented. Christianity is particularly strong among the educated leaders of new China. The average Chinese is Confucianist, but Confucianism is an ethical view of life which has no quarrel with formal creeds. Thus many Confucianists see no inconsistency in observing Buddhist and Taoist rituals while worshiping their ancestors and following Christian customs at the same time. Until the war "modernism" divided the Chinese more than any other cultural factor. The people of the eastern seaboard had been more affected by modern or western ideas than the people of the interior. But the war drove millions of Chinese back from the coast and this speeded up the interior's exposure to "modernization."

The Chinese are an intelligent, industrious, and purposeful people. Yet their standard of living remains, by American standards, incredibly low. Three hundred years ago the average Chinese probably lived better

than the average European, but in the last 100 years the Chinese standard of living has not changed much, while the Western standard has advanced with tremendous speed, especially in America. Can the Chinese people bring their country up to date and achieve a modern standard of living? Nobody who knows the Chinese doubts that they can if given the chance. The name of that chance is peace.

The Chinese Government

A well-defined land, a well-defined people, China is also a Nation with a well-defined Government. The Government of the Republic of China is headed by Chiang Kai-shek, and his Government is recognized as the legal government by every nation in the world. This Government has successfully met two great tests in peace and war. In the 8 years 1929–37 China, largely though not wholly under this Government, made notable progress. In the 8 years 1937–45 this Government withstood all attempts of Japan to overthrow it. Most Americans grossly underestimate the significance in China of this simple fact: that the legal government of China maintained itself on Chinese soil (not in exile) as the only government over at least half the land of China, and held the allegiance of the great majority of Chinese in the other half. The Government maintained itself and kept most of its functions going. It collected taxes, it supported armies, it maintained its diplomatic representatives in every friendly country; it also maintained schools and hospitals, post office and telegraph, and it gave such relief as it could to the needy. All this was done on a necessarily inadequate scale, but all the functions of government were performed.

Chiang Kai-shek's government has often been justly criticized as a dictatorship. A graver fault is that it has hitherto lacked the strength and ability to control things in China enough. Hence, inflation; hence, also, the abuse of conscription and other scandals. The corruption in Chiang's government, so readily publicized by the casual or hostile press of other countries, is the cause of shame to tens of thousands of sensitive Chinese. At the same time the Chinese are proud that their government, however scarred and tarnished, stood through the storms. Of this the symbol is Chungking, the city built on a rock. Today the government is moving to the older capital of Nanking. Chungking's heroic moment in history is over. It is and always was an unlovely city. The Chinese patriot now wants to put Chungking forever behind him; but he also wants to have it remembered for a thousand years.

The executive branch of the Chinese Government is headed by T. V. Soong, famous as the most modern-minded man in Chinese public affairs. His cabinet, man for man, is probably as able and as liberal as Truman's Cabinet. The governmental difficulty in China begins a little way down the line where the number of modern-trained men becomes very thin. The Chinese are well aware of this and there is nothing they want more than American assistance in (1) training more personnel, and (2) helping to administer some of the less political jobs meanwhile.

But there is one special fact about China's government which is wholly foreign to American tradition and whch Americans either do not understand at all or are continually forgetting. It is a government operating under a special plan laid down by Sun Yat-sen, the founder of the Chinese Republic. His plan called for a period of tutelage while the Chinese people should be prepared for full democracy.

This plan made sense in China because when the Republic was founded not 2 percent of the Chinese could read. During the period of tutelage the government, according to Sun Yat-sen's plan, was to be in the hands of one party, that party being the Kuomintang, founded by Sun Yat-sen. The trouble with this kind of scheme is that the party given the monopoly of government, for however good reason, never wants to relinquish it. The current argument in China about more or less democracy comes down to one point—when will the Kuomintang declare that the period of tutelage, and hence its monopoly, is ended? That question has been answered by Chiang Kai-shek and the other leaders of the Kuomintang—as soon as a constitutional convention can be held. It would have been held this very month if civil strife had not intervened. The convention will adopt the constitution which will govern China in the post-tutelage period. This constitution, it is promised by Chiang and the Kuomintang, will contain a full guarantee in Chinese terms of civil liberties and of other parties' political rights.

As in most countries, including the United States, one of China's minority parties is the Communist Party. But the Chinese Communists differ from other countries' Communists in an important respect—instead of just preaching and politicking, they shoot and they control. They control the rural sections of an area in north China containing about 80,000,000 people. And although they nominally acknowledge the political authority of Chiang Kai-shek, just as William Z. Foster accepts the authority of Truman, in practice they refuse the central government access to their part of the country by force of arms. The. have also instituted land and social reforms which make their regime seem more progressive than the rest of China's, at least to visiting journalists fresh from the fetid atmosphere of wartime Chungking. But why the Communists feel obliged to protect these reforms with artillery has never been well explained.

The Communists are not the legal government of any part of China, and no nation recognizes them as such. Nor are they in any formal sense Russia's representatives in China; Russia has a Chungking Embassy of Russians, like any other great power. When Stalin signed his treaty with T. V. Soong, he foreswore any intention to recognize or support the Chinese Communists. In fact, Stalin flatly promised moral as well as military support to Chiang's government. The Communists are therefore an internal problem for the legal Government of China to handle as best it can.

Civil war

Today Government troops and Communist troops are killing each other, and United States marines, however hard they try to keep out of the way, are being accused by Communists of fighting on the Government side. How did that happen?

When Japan surrendered to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Forces, Douglas MacArthur, the immediate problem facing Chiang Kai-shek was to establish the authority of his government over Chinese territory hitherto held by the Japs. Naturally, he did not want the Japs surrendering to Communists, for that would enlarge the Communist enclave and increase its supply of arms. His surrender orders, which were official for all his allies, specified that the Japs should surrender only to Government representatives and to United States forces. The Japs, docile in defeat, have obeyed this command. Chiang also asked his ally, the United States, to let its troops assist him in carrying out the surrender terms. This we did. The United States Army in China flew many thousand Chinese troops into liberated territory. There was nothing sinister or intrusive about this American help to Chiang Kai-shek. It was the least one ally could do for another to help liquidate the war. According to General Wedemeyer, there were in October 4,000,000 Jap soldiers and civilians to be rounded up and sent home to Japan. Although this job has been proceeding apace, it is reason enough why the United States Navy still guards the China coast and why United States marines are ashore.

But Chiang has a further problem: To restore an economy disrupted by 8 years of war. This problem is intimately part of his need to establish his authority. Thus Shanghai desperately needs coal to keep its utilities and start its textile factories running. Coal for Shanghai comes from the north. The United States has allocated 10 Liberty ships to move this coal. But the railroad, also necessary to move the coal, runs through Communist territory; and the Communists have been blocking and destroying the railroad. If United States' aid to China's recovery is to be effective, United States Marines have a clear right and duty to guard this railroad against marauders, whether Communists or private bandits. That, at Chiang's request, they have also done. So far our so-called intervention in China's affairs has gone no further.

The Communists are greatly outnumbered by government troops. There is no military communism in South or West China, or in the Yangtze Valley. The fighting is pretty well localized above the Yellow River and along the Great Wall. When Chiang establishes his authority there, he will have completed the political unification of China (except for Manchuria, where, owing to Russia's special interests, the situation may be long confused).

For that unification, Chiang, who needs peace above all things, is paying the price of civil war. Yet this civil war—strange as it may seem to Americans—is a part of, not separate from, the amicable political negotiations also going on between Chiang and the Communist leaders in Chungking. Just as strikes and lockouts, or the threats thereof, are part of collective bargaining, so limited warfare is a branch of political bargaining in China today. By tearing up railroads and postponing China's recovery, the Communists can improve their bargaining position vis-à-vis the Kuomintang—up to a point. The point on which Chiang will not yield is the point of unity: The unity and independence of all China. His whole career, his whole place in history, is tied up with that.

United States policy

"The unity and independence of China" should be a familiar phrase to Americans. For that has been a cardinal point of United States foreign policy—as cardinal as the Monroe Doctine—for at least 50 years. Japan, just before Pearl Harbor, asked us to abandon this policy. Our refusal to do so was a direct cause of the war. During the war, at Cairo, Roosevelt and Chiang Kai-shek made this ancient policy a specific war aim.

We beat Japan; but the objective of our policy—a free and united China—has not yet been achieved. Until it is, our victory over Japan is a negative and bootless victory indeed. This may not be a very comforting thought to the bored and homesick marines at Tsingtao and Tientsin. But a great power that does not intend to go isolationist cannot afford to abandon a cardinal policy out of postwar boredom or whim.

In the confusing aftermath of war, the safest thing for us to do is to rededicate our wartime alliance with China and its government. Under Chiang Kai-shek, China is closer to sovereign unity today than ever in modern times. There will be no lasting peace in Asia, and, therefore, none for America either, until the achievement of that unity gives the Chinese people their chance for progress in the modern world.

So far, United States policy in Asia has been correct and consistent. It has erred, if at all, on the side of oversensitivity to the cry, "Bring our boys home!" This cry is partly heartfelt and partly Communist propaganda. In either case, you can't build a foreign policy on slogans like that.

Never was there a time or place when a calm and courageous American public opin-

ion could do more to insure peace in the future. The divisions in this opinion should be healed at once. There will be time enough to sympathize with Chinese Communists after they become a legitimate political party and start acting as such. There will be time enough to accommodate our Chinese policy to Russia's when Russia's Chinese policy—if it ever does—becomes different from ours. Now is the time to support the legitimate government of China with all our heart and soul. We need regret nothing if we stick by our friends in Asia, the best friends now and the greatest friends-to-be a nation ever had.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the industrial labor problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION HOME OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I made a 1-minute speech about the transportation home of our troops. I have before me a letter from a soldier published in the Pacifican, which is an Army newspaper, in which a man who has no chance himself to be released contends that men in his outfit would be very happy to volunteer the work of equipping Liberty ships for the use of transporting our troops back home.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this brief clipping as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

WORK VOLUNTEERS

EDITOR: In regards to Lt. Col. C. H. Davidson's statement in your paper that Liberty ships can be made ready, provided he has 50 men to work on each of them, I wish to state that this organization has been receiving replacements by the hundreds these past few weeks, with no assignment whatever, and nothing to do week after week.

I have spoken to many who would be glad to do any kind of work, provided it would help get home those men who are entitled to it.

There are probably hundreds of these replacements in other headquarters organizations, and an immediate check would reveal thousands who are more than glad to put in their share, in addition to those men who are to be shipped home on these ships, and are now sweating it out by the thousands in the replacement depots.

That would be the last straw if now, in addition to a shortage of shipping space claimed, that there would be an additional claim of a manpower shortage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Under Secretary of War before the American Legion Convention yesterday on national defense.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object this time, because this carries us over Thanksgiving; but I do desire to make a short statement with reference to the veterans' legislation now in conference.

I told the House the other day that I thought the conferees could get together, and we should be ready to bring the report to the floor of the House early this week. In that I found I was mistaken. The conferees are in a deadlock and have adjourned until next week. Several Members of the Senate delegation had to be out of town for a few days. They called attention to the fact that Thanksgiving would be next Thursday, and asked me, as chairman of the conference, not to call another meeting until next week. One of the main provisions, I will say, that we are deadlocked over, is that of home and farm loans; the question of appraisement. Under the House bill they do not have to depend on Washington to do the appraising. Under the Senate bill they do, with the result that thousands of service men are unable to buy homes, and all of them, or practically all of them, are unable to buy farms. Up to the time the conference met I believe there had been 26,000 homes purchased, that is, houses, throughout the United States, and 800 farms. As the law is now written my contention is that there will be no homes or no farms sold to amount to anything to the servicemen in the agricultural States. For that reason we are in a deadlock, and I am not sure what the consequences will be.

I also told you that we would have the bill for the set-up of a Medical Corps in the Veterans' Administration ready for consideration early this week. I find now that it will be necessary to carry that bill over until Monday. We hope to get it then.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GRANTING PRIVILEGES TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4489) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in order that the bill may be explained, I understand it is a unanimous report and that all the members of the committee, both Republicans and Democrats, feel that it is an emergency matter and should be disposed of now.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The gentleman from Michigan is correct. This is an emergency bill which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It has the approval of the State Department and the Treasury Department. The purpose of the bill is to treat the employees of international organizations of which the United States is a member on a par with employees of embassies and legations. This is done primarily to take care of the employees who will come to this country in the event this country is selected as the headquarters of the United Nations Organization. There has been a preliminary vote that this be the country in which those headquarters shall be located. Naturally we hope very much that that will be confirmed when the general assembly of the United Nations organization meets. The State Department has called to our attention that other members of the United Nations Organization have taken similar action, and it is very important for us to take this action.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Does this involve appropriations?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. This does not involve any appropriation. It merely states that when an employee of some organization of which we are a member—and we cannot become a member except by Congressional action—desires to come into this country to serve his nation, he may bring his household effects and other goods into this country free of our tariff laws, just as does an ambassador and the employees of any embassy or legation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does this bill amend the Immigration Act?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. This has no bearing at all on the right of an alien to come in and acquire citizenship. That is covered by something that is entirely separate. Under existing law, all employees of foreign nations sent here to serve their countries have the right to come in on a temporary visa and stay until their duties are discharged. This has no bearing on anything except our tariff laws and other restrictions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it does amend the Immigration Act, does it not?

Mr. KNUTSON. No.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. According to section 3, line 14, page 9, of the bill, it does amend the Immigration Act.

Mr. KNUTSON. It does not affect immigration.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It does not affect immigration. It just carries out the general policy of our Government with respect to letting employees of other nations come into this country.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman will agree, as will all members of the Committee on Ways and Means, that this was unanimously recommended by all the departments of the Government having anything to do with this subject matter, and it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. As so well stated by the gentleman from Virginia, all it does is to provide the employees and personnel necessary for the discharge of the duties of the United Nations Organization and similar international organizations, where the members are the governments, somewhat similar treatment to that accorded ambassadors and the employees of embassies and legations.

In fact, it is not quite as broad as the general application now in the case of embassies and legations. I think it also ought to be pointed out that we are all hoping that the headquarters of the United Nations Organization established at the San Francisco Conference will be located here in the United States. Preliminary action has been taken to approve that. The action of the general assembly in confirmation of that will be necessary. Now, if we are to hope to have the United Nations Organization's headquarters to be located in the United States, it will be absolutely essential for this type of legislation to be passed. Other countries seeking the headquarters of the United Nations Organization have already taken similar action so that it is of importance that we take this type of action. I would also like to emphasize that in passing this legislation we still do not go quite as far as the situation now exists in reference to embassies and legations.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that the passage of this legislation is a prerequisite to securing the United Nation's central headquarters in the United States. They are not going to come here unless we grant the privilege to all the countries that are members of the Organization to bring in such employees from those countries as are deemed necessary to the functioning of the group.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The gentleman from Minnesota is absolutely right. What he says and what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has said is more fully set forth and amplified on page 6 of the report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question. The gentleman from Tennessee stated that the admission of these citizens of foreign countries would be limited to those necessary to the conduct of the work of this International Organization. I refer the gentleman to page 9 of the bill which amends the Immigration Act so as to permit the admission of an alien officer or employee of an international organization, his family, attendants, servants, and employees. I can find no restriction in the bill on the number of attendants, servants, and employees that that individual might have. I am wondering if there is any restriction.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I would remind my distinguished colleague from Ohio of the fact that there is no restriction upon that class of employees who come to the United States now to work in embassies and legations. We point out on page 6 of the report, as follows:

> The committee has ascertained [from the Department of State] that the privileges to which international organizations and their officials will be entitled are somewhat more limited than those which are extended by the United States to foreign governments. This is particularly true with respect of the following matters: (1) The exemption from customs duties to officers and employees of international organizations is limited to baggage and effects imported in connection with the arrival of the owner whereas the exemption enjoyed by diplomatic officials is considerably broader; (2) foreign governments and diplomatic officials enjoy substantially broader exemptions from excise taxes than those which would be extended to international organizations under this bill; (3) the immunity from suit to be extended to officers and employees of international organizations is limited to immunity for acts performed by them in their official capacity whereas diplomatic officers enjoy full immunity from legal processes in this country.

It was also brought to our attention that the act passed by the British Parliament is far more liberal than this act. We limited this as much as we could safely do and still permit the proper entry of employees of the international organization.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But there is no limitation on the part of dependents or employees or servants that any of these individuals can bring in?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Technically, no; practically, yes. They have to support everybody they bring over here, and I do not believe they will bring many more than they will actually use.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me ask one other question, if I may. This bill is not limited to the United Nations Organization, is it?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. No; but it is limited to an international organization of which we are a member, and we cannot be a member without an act of Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It would cover any international organization?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It has to be international. It has to be public and not private; the Congress has to vote us into it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It has to be an international organization that the Congress of the United States has approved; is that right?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is right, it has to be voted on by Congress, on which you and I have the privilege of voting.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. With reference to the admission of these persons under the immigration laws, they are not admitted for the purpose of citizenship. They will only become temporary employees, and only admitted to work, and to do exactly what this bill provides they should do. It does not involve the question of quota limitations whatever. They are not admitted for citizenship purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. And that applies only so long as they are in the service of their country?

Mr. JENKINS. They are subject to the same deportation regulations as anybody else who is admitted.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If they leave that foreign service we could deport them.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill does not interfere with State laws in any way?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. None whatever.

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman will yield further, there may be some question as to how this matter was referred to the Ways and Means Committee. In addition to the tariff regulations, it also has to do with social security. Many of these individuals who come in to work for this organization want to have some social-security regulations of their own. It is supposed that this will be a gigantic organization and that many Americans will find employment with it. Those Americans will have to leave the service of our Government and go to work under that organization. Consequently, they should be protected, from the standpoint of social security. That is another reason why this bill came to our committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The gentleman is absolutely right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That for the purposes of this act the term "international organizations" shall include only public international organizations of which the United States is a member and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order or orders as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided: *Provided*, That the President shall be authorized, if in his judgment such action should be justified by reason of the abuse by an international organization or its officers and employees of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided or for any other reason, at any time to revoke any such des-

ignation, whereupon the international organization in question shall cease to be classed as an international organization for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. International organizations shall enjoy the status, immunities, exemptions, and privileges set forth in this section, as follows:

(a) International organizations shall, to the extent consistent with the instrument creating them, possess the capacity—

(i) to contract;

(ii) to acquire and dispose of real and personal property;

(iii) to institute legal proceedings.

(b) International organizations, their property and their assets, wherever located, and by whomsoever held, shall enjoy immunity from suit and every form of judicial process except to the extent that they may expressly waive their immunity for the purpose of any proceedings or by the terms of any contract.

(c) Property and assets of international organizations, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall be immune from search, unless such immunity be expressly waived, and from confiscation. The archives of international organizations shall be inviolable.

(d) Insofar as concerns customs duties and internal-revenue taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation, and the procedures in connection therewith; the registration of foreign agents; and the treatment of official communications, the privileges, exemptions, and immunities to which international oranizations shall be entitled shall be those accorded under similar circumstances to foreign governments.

SEC. 3. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Customs with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the baggage and effects of alien officers and employees of international organizations, or of aliens designated by foreign governments to serve as their representatives in or to such organizations, or of the families, suites, and servants of such officers, employees, or representatives shall be admitted (when imported in connection with the arrival of the owner) free of customs duties and free of internal-revenue taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation.

SEC. 4. The Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Effective with respect to taxable year beginning after December 31, 1943, section 116 (c), relating to the exclusion from gross income of income of foreign governments, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Income of foreign governments and of international organizations: The income of foreign governments or international organizations received from investments in the United States in stocks, bonds, or other domestic securities, owned by such foreign governments or by international organizations, or from interest on deposits in banks in the United States or moneys belonging to such foreign governments or international organizations, or from any other source within the United States."

(b) Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1943, section 116 (h) (1), relating to the exclusion from gross income of amounts paid employees of foreign governments, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Rule for exclusion: Wages, fees, or salary of any employee of a foreign government or of an international organization or of the Commonwealth of the Philippines (including a consular or other officer, or a nondiplomatic representative), received as compensation for official services to such government, international organization, or such Commonwealth—

"(A) If such employee is not a citizen of the United States, or is a citizen of the Commonwealth of the Philippines (whether or not a citizen of the United States); and

"(B) If, in the case of an employee of a foreign government or of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, the services are of a character similar to those performed by employees of the Government of the United States in foreign countries or in the Commonwealth of the Philippines, as the case may be; and

"(C) If, in the case of an employee of a foreign government or the Commonwealth of the Philippines, the foreign government or the Commonwealth grants an equivalent exemption to employees of the Government of the United States performing similar services in such foreign country or such Commonwealth, as the case may be."

(c) Effective January 1, 1946, section 1426 (b), defining the term "employment" for the purposes of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, is amended (1) by striking out the word "or" at the end of subparagraph (14), (2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or", and (3) by inserting at the end of the subsection the following new subparagraph:

"(16) Service performed in the employ of an international organization."

(d) Effective January 1, 1946, section 1607 (c), defining the term "employment" for the purposes of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, is amended (1) by striking out the word "or" at the end of subparagraph (14), (2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or", and (3) by inserting at the end of the subsection the following new subparagraph:

"(16) Service performed in the employ of an international organization."

(e) Section 1621 (a), (5), relating to the definition of "wages" for the purpose of collection of income tax at the source, is amended by inserting after the words "foreign government" the words "or an international organization."

(f) Section 3466 (a), relating to exemption from communications taxes is amended by inserting immediately after the words "the District of Columbia" a comma and the words "or an international organization."

(g) Section 3469 (f) (1), relating to exemption from the tax on transportation of persons, is amended by inserting immediately after the words "the District of Columbia" a comma and the words "or an international organization."

(h) Section 3475 (b) (1), relating to exemption from the tax on transportation of property, is amended by inserting immediately after the words "the District of Columbia" a comma and the words "or an international organization."

(i) Section 3797 (a), relating to definitions, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(18) International organizations: The term 'international organizations' means public international organizations of which the United States is a member and which are designated by the President by Executive order as being entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities."

SEC. 5. (a) Effective January 1, 1946, section 209 (b) of the Social Security Act, defining the term "employment" for the purposes of title II of the act, is amended (1) by striking out the word "or" at the end of subparagraph (14), (2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or", and (3) by inserting at the end of the subsection the following new subparagraph:

"(16) Service performed in the employ of an international organization."

(b) No tax shall be collected under title VIII or IX of the Social Security Act or under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act or the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, with respect to services rendered prior to January 1, 1946, which are described in subparagraph (16) of sections 1426 **(b)** and 1607 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and any such tax heretofore collected (including penalty and interest with respect thereto, if any) shall be refunded in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of erroneous or illegal collection of the tax. No interest shall be allowed or paid on the amount of any such refund. No payment shall be made under title II of the Social Security Act with respect to services rendered prior to January 1, 1946, which are described in subparagraph (16) of section 209 (b) of such act, as amended.

SEC. 6. International organizations shall be exempt from all property taxes imposed by, or under the authority of, any act of Congress, including such acts as are applicable solely to the District of Columbia or the Territories; and shall be entitled to the same exemptions and immunities from State or local taxes as is the United States Government.

SEC. 7. (a) Persons designated by foreign governments to serve as their representatives in or to international organizations and the officers and employees of such organizations, and members of the immediate families of such representatives, officers, and employes residing with them, other than nationals of the United States, shall, insofar as concerns laws regulating entry into and departure from the United States, alien registration and fingerprinting, the registration of foreign agents, and selective training and service, be entitled to the same privileges, exemptions, and immunities as are accorded under similar circumstances to officers and employees, respectively, of foreign governments, and members of their families.

(b) Representatives of foreign governments in or to international organizations and officers and employees of such organizations shall be immune from suit and legal process relating to acts performed by them in their official capacity and falling within their functions as such representatives, officers, or employees except insofar as such immunity may be waived by the foreign government or international organization concerned.

(c) Section 3 of the Immigration Act approved May 26, 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 203), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting the following language:

"(7) An alien officer or employee of an international organization, his family, attendants, servants, and employees."

(d) Section 15 of the Immigration Act approved May 26, 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 215), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 15. The admission to the United States of an alien excepted from the class of immigrants by clause (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), or (7) of section 3, or declared to be a nonquota immigrant by subdivision (e) of section 4, shall be for such time and under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed (including, when deemed necessary for the classes mentioned in clause (2), (3), (4), or (6) of section 3 and subdivision (e) of section 4, the giving of bond with sufficient surety, in such sum and containing such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed) to insure that, at the expiration of such time or upon failure to maintain the status under which admitted, he will depart from the United States: *Provided,* That no alien who has been, or who may hereafter be, admitted into the United States under clause (1) or (7) of section 3, as an official of a foreign government, or as a member of the family of such official, or as an officer or employee of an international organization, or as a member of the family of such officer or employee, shall be required to depart from the United States without the approval of the Secretary of State."

SEC. 8. (a) No person shall be entitled to the benefits of this act unless he (1) shall have been duly notified to and accepted by the Secretary of State as a representative,

officer, or employee; or (2) shall have been designated by the Secretary of State, prior to formal notification and acceptance, as a prospective representative, officer, or employee; or (3) is a member of the family or suite, or servant, of one of the foregoing accepted or designated representatives, officers, or employees.

(b) Should the Secretary of State determine that the continued presence in the United States of any person entitled to the benefits of this act is not desirable, he shall so inform the foreign government or international organization concerned, as the case may be, and after such person shall have had a reasonable length of time, to be determined by the Secretary of State, to depart from the United States, he shall cease to be entitled to such benefits.

(c) No person shall, by reason of the provisions of this act, be considered as receiving diplomatic status or as receiving any of the privileges incident thereto other than such as are specifically set forth herein.

SEC. 9. The privileges, exemptions, and immunities of international organizations and of their officers and employees, and members of their immediate families residing with them, provided for in this act, shall be granted notwithstanding the fact that the similar privileges, exemptions, and immunities granted to a foreign government, its officers, or employees, may be conditioned upon the existence of reciprocity by that foreign government: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as precluding the Secretary of State from withdrawing the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided from persons who are nationals of any foreign country on the ground that such country is failing to accord corresponding privileges, exemptions, and immunities to citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BOREN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 694) entitled "An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic," for printing in the RECORD.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4129) entitled "An act to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is agreeable to the minority members of the committee that this bill go to conference, is it?

Mr. MANASCO. I have discussed it with the members present, and they have agreed to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MANASCO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. HOFFMAN, and Mr. BENDER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a newspaper article in each.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the Vincent R. Costello Post of the American Legion.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news release.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the life and character of the late James W. Mott and to include therein a poem.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from today's Washington Post.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of November 14, entitled "It Is Time To Start Saving."

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota.

There was no objection.

COST OF SOCIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the President addressed to the Congress a message dealing with a compulsory health program. The message failed to tell us how much that program would cost, but I should like to call to the attention of the House the fact that there is already pending in various committees in this body and the one at the other end of the Capitol authorization for appropriations for one form of governmental assistance or another aggregating $38,850,000,000. I do not know how many billions of dollars the latest program advanced by the President will cost, as he gave us no indication, but it would seem to me that in sending a message of that nature to the Congress he should let us know how much it is going to cost; and furthermore, he should tell us where we are going to get the money. Failing in that we can but conclude that the President is trying to take our minds off the labor stalemate which is rapidly sending our economy into a tail spin.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WHY THERE IS NO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM BEFORE THE HOUSE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those men who believe in the people, who believe in the destiny of this country, who believe this country is going places. There never was a time in the history of the country that we were on such a sound financial basis as far as businessmen, laboring men, and farmers are concerned. There are few businessmen who do not practically own their own stocks of goods without any debt of any kind whatsoever. We are able to go forward with a reconversion program if we work together.

My friend from Minnesota showed me yesterday a letter he had received from the minority whip. This letter quoted a statement of the majority leader: "Business, none." That same order of business could have been included in the notice of the minority whip last week and the week before. I believe this is not the fault of the majority organization but of the committees of this House. These committees are holding up bills which are of vital importance to the security and the best interest of this country in committee and are not reporting them out for consideration. There seems to be a feeling of distrust toward the Members of Congress. I am a member of four committees, for instance, and only one of them has been active, the Committee on Indian Affairs. I might just as well not be on a committee at all.

Business and capital needs employment at the present time. I am very much interested in seeing that the pledge we made to our American servicemen, whether they be sailors, marines, or soldiers, is kept. We gave them a pledge of full employment when they were battling overseas against death and we should see that they get full employment when they return to civil life.

Mr. Speaker, there is one bill that will build up this country more than any other, in my opinion, and I refer specifically to the bill providing for the St. Lawrence Canal and its power development. This bill will create business, it will create trade, it will create employment and will develop this country in a way that no other bill could possibly develop it. The Tennessee Valley Authority has done more for that part of the country in putting it on the map than anything that has ever occurred in Tennessee or that section of the United States. The same may be said of the Missouri Valley bill, and the same may be said of the various rivers and harbors bills now pending.

I want to see consideration given also to bills that labor has asked for. With the great productive capacity of this country, with its capability for furnishing men work, I can see no reason why men should work for 40 or 45 cents an hour. We are told that these large business concerns have not the equipment with which to employ men and pay them 65 cents an hour. However, if they were required to pay 65 cents an hour, in my opinion, they would get the equipment and as long as they are allowed to buy cheap labor they will use cheap labor.

A few years ago there was imported from China one carload of iron ore. We were told at that time that our markets were going to be flooded with the products of the cheap labor of China and that our iron mines in Minnesota and other parts of the country would remain idle unless the tariff were increased. The fact of the matter is that carload of iron that was unloaded in Seattle was brought over by the Steel Trust to influence public opinion.

The same is true of products that are on sale in this country labeled "Made in Japan." Now, if Japan had wanted to flood our markets with her commodities she would not put a label on them. She would have sent them to this country unlabeled.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot see why these measures cannot be reported out immediately. A large majority of the Members of Congress, at least three-fourths of them, have told the aged that their old-age benefits were going to be increased and that they were going to be given these benefits on better terms and conditions.

We cannot get this or any other bill having this objective brought before the House.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does the gentleman know of any movement on foot by the administration to permit an old-age pension bill, or a bill of similar character, to even get before the House?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not believe the administration is keeping it back; I believe it is the leaders of the committees on both sides of the House.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. The gentleman mentioned the St. Lawrence seaway and power project a while ago. I agree with the gentleman that there has been a long, or what appears to me to be an unnecessary, unexplained, and mysterious delay in getting action on that measure. Will the gentleman inform the House as to why there has been this long, continuous delay that has existed not only in this body, but in another body, ever snce the third day of January 1945, when Congress convened? Does the gentleman know why there is this persistent delay on a project that he says he wants to vote on?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not know, but I attribute it, as I said before, to the fact that the leaders on both sides of the House, especially those who have been here a long time, do not trust the Members. If they are not in complete agreement on the objective of these measures, at least they should allow them to come before the House. These bills will have to go through both Houses. Why should we sit here day after day, doing nothing but talk, talk, talk, criticise, fight battles that are past, in place of having our eyes to the future, for the benefit of our country and for the benefit of the soldier boys, to see if we cannot do something? I want action and sane thinking.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, he did not answer my question. I wonder if the gentleman knows, or if he does not know, how he can find out what is taking place with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project? There has been a program of no action not only in the House, but in another body, along those lines; a do-nothing attitude on a project that would furnish an ideal postwar employment program for the American people.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I cannot answer that question. There is another question I want to take up. There are before committees of this House three bills to relieve corporations from the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States. One of them refers to the Associated Press, one to the railroads, and one to the insurance companies. But as far as labor is concerned, the only bill before this House is a bill to take away the freedom that labor received under the Clayton Act and the Wagner Act, and to place this matter under the jurisdiction and control of the courts. It seems to me that the people who are advocating the free employment system, the capitalistic system, and want it to continue, as I do, are absolutely determined that their system cannot exist unless it is by slave labor.

These enemies of labor are asking one thing. Do they think labor is going to take it lying down, or is it a deliberate attempt to create disunion? A general strike in this country would be to the detriment of all except a few vultures that would pick the bones of those corporations and small businesses that might fail under such a condition of warfare. The only thing I am asking of this Congress and these Members is to give us a chance to vote on these important measures.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to discuss the industrial and labor situation. I have no prepared speech. But I have the results of a lot of thought on this very important question.

In the first place, let me start out by referring to an article that appeared in the press not very many days ago, which was a survey of the outlook for industrial production and employment. It was an optimistic survey. For instance, as to heating equipment, it said it was expected the output would be twice the 1939 average and employment would be up 50 percent. By the way, it was in a statement by the Civilian Production Administration that these figures were given. In stoves, ranges, water heaters, and hot-water furnaces, the output and shipments were anticipated to be about 3 times those of 1939, with a two-thirds gain in employment. In clocks and watches it was expected there would be double the 1939 output and 60 percent greater employment. I could go on down the line with radios, motor vehicles, silverware, electric appliances, mechanical refrigerators, sporting goods, and so on, and show that in every single instance it was estimated that whereas output would double or treble, employment would increase only 20 percent, 50 percent, 60 percent, or such a matter.

The main lesson I derived from those figures is one that I think is patent on its face, that is, that with output increasing much more rapidly than employment it becomes quite evident that the key to the markets for these goods, which is in turn the key to employment and the key to a healthy economic situation in our Nation, lies in a broader and more effective general distribution of buying power and a better division of that buying power than we have had in the past. For otherwise, if employment increases only 50 percent whereas output doubles or increases 3 times, it is perfectly plain that we are going to have goods seeking a market and not finding it.

On that particular point, Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that this Congress has definite and specific duties to perform. I am not going to go into detail as to that today but I do want to point out the problem of mass purchasing power as the crucial problem with regard to future employment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman speaks of a very crucial problem facing us today. Does not the gentleman feel that the stopping of these strikes springing up all over our Nation today is really the crucial problem? I wish the gentleman would comment on that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is what I want to devote most of my time to. I now come to the very point the gentleman from Minnesota has just raised.

In the first place, it is well for us to remember that the number of men rendered idle by strikes in this postwar period has so far been only a fraction as many as were rendered idle by strikes in the period after the First World War.

In the second place, it is important to remember that at the present time there are many times as many men organized into labor organizations as was the case at that time.

In the third place, it is important to remember that, as the President himself pointed out on one occasion, it was quite inevitable that after the controls of the war period, and after the intensity of the production effort during that time, there would be a period during which there would be considerable unsettlement in the minds and perhaps the actions of a good many of the workers along with other people in the population.

I recognize and believe that all those factors should be carefully weighed in order that we should not become panic stricken and too excited about problems that are inevitable. First of all, may I say that I think there is another kind of strike which must be recognized along with labor strikes and that is the tendency which I am afraid is rather apparent today in some management quarters to hold back production in view of

the unwise action of the Congress in repealing outright the excess-profits taxes as of the first of next year. This at the present time means there is a positive advantage in not making too much money now provided you can do it after the first of the year. I am not trying to defend either of those situations, but I do think we want to put them in their proper place alongside each other.

I have written letters to people in which I have said something like this. These people have written and said, "What is Congress going to do about the problem of labor stoppages and strikes and so on? Why do we not have a strong action on the part of the Government to put a stop to these things?"

I have pointed out to those people that we have to take our choice between two courses of action. On the one hand, we could continue with the course of action that we have pursued during the war, which was to have the machinery in the hands of Government for the impartial settlement of disputes between labor and management with an attempt to enforce the decisions of that body. Now, that is one way that you can stop strikes. But if you are going to stop the processes of collective bargaining, then you immediately take the responsibility for setting up some kind of impartial tribunal which would have to be ultimately governmental in order to hand down decisions by the Government as to what is going to be done. I have asked the question as to whether we want to continue with that kind of system or whether, on the other hand, we want to do the best we can with a scheme of free collective bargaining between labor and management, understanding that if we choose that course of action there will inevitably be dislocations and troubles and sometimes strikes in the process.

No one can very well deny the right of a group of workers to strike. Once you deny that right, you have denied something that is absolutely fundamental to the freedom of the industrial worker.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman brings out the fact that labor has an inalienable right to strike. Does the gentleman not feel, however, that along with that right to strike there is also a responsibility which labor unions should accept as to their part in this Government of the United States of America?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the very next point that I was going to make. I would like, however, to make it in my own way if the gentleman does not mind.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have come to this conclusion, that although up to date the troubles that we have experienced in this country have been of no great consequence, we must at least face the danger that there will be serious work stoppages in the future. I believe, furthermore, we must take account of a different psychology on the part of the American public in general than has persisted in the past. Perhaps some of the Members who are listening to this speech have expected me to make a speech all on one side of this question.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. COX. In that observation I must insist that it is my opinion the gentleman is mistaken. I do not think anybody is expecting anything from him except what is completely consistent with his best views on this subject.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I consider the gentleman as being one of the most sincere men of the House, and I certainly wish to compliment him on his courage in bringing up a very vital question which needs discussion and consideration by the Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much. I am sorry I made that remark. It did not have any real pertinence anyway.

Let me say I believe there is a point of view among the American people today which is different from the one which has pertained in the past. One reason for that is the tremendous concentration of power which exists, both on the management side of the picture and on the labor side of the picture, which was not true so much in the past. In other words, in the past people felt there was a struggle going on but not between forces which were in such a position of preponderant power and influence as they now feel is the case with highly organized groups of industry on the one hand, amounting to almost a monopoly, and highly organized groups of workers on the other hand. I am of the opinion, therefore, and it is a considered opinion, that we cannot simply argue on the basis of the past. I am concerned lest, unless there is an awakened consciousness on the part of both management and labor to a high degree of responsibility to the general public of this Nation, in the absence of a practical expression of such feeling of responsibility there will be deep resentment among the people, an increasing impatience and bitterness, and an insistent demand that Congress take action. If hurriedly taken, such action probably will not be the kind of well-advised action that could really help solve the problem. It is important, therefore, to act before any crisis is upon us.

The main thing I want to say today is to appeal to the management and labor conference and everybody else to remember that the American people are feeling in their minds at this hour differently from what they have before; and to appeal to this conference, to management and labor generally, to remember that one psychology which above all must be avoided is the psychology which says we are in such a mess now that we have to concentrate power in government. I am not going to name what that psychology is, but we have had some bad experiences with it in a good many countries in the world in the last few years, and a great world war in consequence of it.

The way in which we can avoid it is by a greater degree of consecration to the public interest on the part of everybody. In pursuance of this idea, I am not going to just leave it in somebody else's lap. I am going to make a proposal—not original with me—not perhaps very popular with everyone, but one which I think deserves careful study.

In the first place, I want to say that as far as public utilities are concerned, it is my judgment that in the field of public utilities, both management and labor have got to be willing to submit to some kind of a settlement of disputes which will stop short of strikes. That is just as much the responsibility of management as it is of labor, because it means that management has got to accept the decisions made by impartial boards.

But speaking generally of the problem outside the public utilities it seems to me some proposal of this kind may give the answer. It has already been advanced in similar form to the one I am going to give, by a Member of the other body. Furthermore, I am making this proposal as the result of a very long conversation I had with Father Masse, who is associate editor of America, one of the leading liberal Catholic journals. I was deeply impressed by what he said. Management agrees pretty well with labor, in the present condition of things, that an increase in wages of, let us say 15 percent, would be possible. There is not much dispute on that point. Certainly something must be done to try to equalize the take-home pay of the worker in order not to have a sagging of purchasing power. Beyond that point there is an area of dispute that centers around the question as to whether management can pay more or not.

My suggestion is briefly this: Suppose a 15-percent increase were granted, and then it was agreed to bargain collectively to the effect that the worker should receive at the end of a given period a certain percentage of the net earnings of the corporation, after being earned.

Under those circumstances there could not be a difference of opinion as to whether the corporation was able to pay the further increase or not, it would already be known that it could.

The collective-bargaining agreement would have to cover the question as to what is a proper definition of net earnings. Labor would receive something to which I am convinced they are entitled, and which they have not gotten but have been trying to insist upon, namely, a knowledge of what the corporation's financial status really is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. On the other hand, there would be an incentive for the worker to have a definite concern about the volume of production coming out of that corporation which I believe, after all, from the consumer's point of view is a matter of the utmost importance.

I could not refrain, Mr. Speaker, from making this speech today, because I do believe that the future of free labor, the future of free institutions in this Nation, to a considerable extent, hangs in the balance and on a reasonable settlement of these problems.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; if I have any time remaining.

Mr. SAVAGE. If, instead of some solution such as the gentleman has proposed, we try to control labor, and should control labor, and then set up Government control, we ourselves take the responsibility, it seems to me, of then telling the employers to pay more money.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Of course we do.

Mr. SAVAGE. Then if that cannot be done at current prices we also have the responsibility of looking into it and saying we will have to raise the prices of the commodities.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Quite right. More people should realize that fact. I want to emphasize that my proposal was not for the Government to do this at all; it was for this to be put on the table for collective-bargaining purposes.

Mr. SAVAGE. Yes; I agree with the gentleman on that, but if we did let the Government control it then we have to set prices and we have to control industry and labor also.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. We do. Once we inject that we have got to continue with controls from step to step. That might as well be recognized in the first place.

Mr. SAVAGE. Then it is either a matter of free economy or Government control.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true, excepting I am convinced there are measures that can be taken now to prevent things from going wrong; and that is what I want to try to accomplish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and also to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

On yesterday I secured permission to extend some remarks. I am advised that they exceed the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing. I ask unanimous consent that the rule be waived and that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, both requests are ordered.

There was no objection.

RESTORATION OF BILL TO PRIVATE CALENDAR—MRS. EVELYN MERRITT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, at the call of the Private Calendar on October 2, 1945, the bill (H. R. 2927) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Merritt was objected to through error. I now ask unanimous consent that this bill may be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 20 minutes.

MORAL CONDITIONS IN JAPAN

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article, also a letter addressed by me to the Secretary of the Navy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, one evening last week I was quite disturbed when I read in the columns of our Washington press a letter written by a chaplain in the Navy which described conditions in Tokyo. On yesterday I received from one of my very distinguished constituents, a former attorney general of my State, copy of this letter taken from the Minneapolis Star-Journal dated the 14th of this month.

I have been one who has been as careful and temperate about my public criticism of the Army and Navy during the war as any Member of this body; however, I feel that the letter which is written to the public of the United States by this chaplain calling attention to conditions over in Japan is one that must have immediate attention.

The chaplain describes generally the fact that many of our young men in the Navy are under the age of 20 years. We are all aware of the fact, of course, that on the request of the armed services that we drafted during the war young men of 18 years of age. We also know that many of the young men in our communities 17 years of age have enlisted in the Navy by and with the consent of their parents to serve and to sacrifice their lives if necessary in the winning of the war. We, the Army and the Navy face some responsibilitiy now that the war is over of safeguarding the morals of our young men to the best of our ability, taking into consideration the conditions under which they may be serving. The serious thing I am concerned about in this article, which I shall put in the RECORD, is the fact that the chaplain goes on and describes the conditions existing particularly in Tokyo wherein apparently the chief medical officer over there has determined the policy, as I gather from the chaplain's letter, over the objection of some of the other naval medical men and over the objection of at least two of the chaplains, of supervising the control of one house of prostitution in which these youngsters are lined up by the M. P.'s, thereby giving condonation, supervision, and approval to such acts.

I am seriously troubled with this situation which the chaplain has described, and I think he is to be heartily commended for having the courage of calling this condition to our attention, because the only inference I can draw from this article is that somebody in charge of naval affairs over there not only condones but supervises the situation and encourages the situation which exists wherein these young men were permitted to go to a house of prostitution, every single member of which was diseased.

He goes on and states that some of the chaplains and medical officers made a survey and found that the prostitutes who inhabit this house were dirty, highly painted, clothed in gaudy rayon pajamas, some of them with open sores on their face and feet. He goes on and comments that in considering the rate of disease there are some forms of venereal disease in the Orient that do not respond to treatment. He states that some of the prostitutes have been exposed to leprosy; that in the evenings the same girls are patronized by Japanese men. He further states that it is hard to see any intelligence behind the Navy's policy.

"Present plans," he says, "calls for the opening of other houses similar to the one just described."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather tragic that we should win the war with the finest type of young manhood that this country could offer and then allow such a situation to exist. It is tragic that these young men should be subjected to a condition which certainly will result in moral decay. It surely will follow that some of these men are going to become diseased and carry that disease with them through life, with all of the possibilities which only the imagination can picture. I am today addressing a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, in which I respectfully call the chaplain's letter to his attention, calling his attention to the fact that the military and the naval officials of this country have asked for these young men; that they have been entrusted to the Army and the Navy in the hope, of course, on the part of everyone that, so far as is humanly possible, proper safeguards for their protection will be thrown around them by the Army and the Navy. Certainly I feel that we are entitled to some kind of a statement from the Secretary of the Navy and from the Navy Department. I do not know that it applies to the Army; but if it does, I think the Congress should consider that element as well. Certainly I feel that the officer who is responsible for putting out such an order, either directly or indirectly, is subject to removal, investigation, and court martial. I cannot believe that such condition is something we have to tolerate along with war or that it should be allowed to exist either in Japan or any other place where our occupational forces may be stationed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman mentions that this officer who is responsible for this situation should be called in for court-martial proceedings. I have had some experience with the treatment given some of the enlisted personnel in the Navy, and I found that in many instances the enlisted men have been subject to court martial and sentenced for many, many months for the most trivial offenses. I am inclined to believe that in the case of officers rather than to court martial them they are more apt to get a promotion for conduct of this kind. I hope that is not the case.

Mr. O'HARA. I hope the gentleman's statement in reference to this situation will not be followed out. I sincerely hope that something will be done to immediately check that situation; that it will be wiped out, and if somebody is responsible for that condition, as this chaplain says, then I want to know what is going to happen to him. I want to know what the attitude of the Navy and the Army is going to be. If we are going to have a continuation of the Selective Service System as we now have it, taking in these 18-year-old youngsters, urging them to enlist to go into the occupational forces, or a continuation of such for those men who are in the service, the Congress will want to know what the policy of the Army and the Navy is going to be as to those young boys who are now going in. I think the people of this country are entitled to know. I think we are entitled to know now not next year or the middle of the year but now what the attitude is going to be. If the Army and the Navy are going to come to us and say, "We must have the draft of 18-year-olds continued in peacetime," and if that is what is going to face the young men of this country who will be taken from their homes, their churches and their schools, I want to know it and so do you.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Recently the Congress passed a volunteer bill, but if the fathers and mothers of this country should learn or should believe that these conditions obtain in our occupation forces, it certainly would be a very great discouragement toward getting volunteers to go to those countries to help police them.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree with the gentleman and sincerely hope there will be an answer to this. I am not making this statement purely in the spirit of criticism, but I certainly am making it in the spirit that if it is true or if any part of it is true, to insist on its immediate correction.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. It shows that the gentleman is very much concerned with the morality of the young men of the Nation. I may say that on yesterday I sent a letter along this same line to the Secretary of the Navy. When my Government conscripts men, I consider it the trustee of their health and morality. This report is a tragic commentary on the direct contribution of some man some place in our Government some place along the line, contrary to all the ideals of this Nation.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman. I know he has sons of his own in the service, as I have. It is not because of that fact that I make this statement, but because we want all these young men protected to the very best of our Government's ability.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to compliment my colleague upon having the courage to break this thing wide open. A very rigid investigation should be made.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. I wonder if the gentleman has seen an attempted reply or an explanation of this letter of which he is speaking.

Mr. O'HARA. No, I did not see it. However, I called the Navy Department yesterday and talked to a gentleman over there, for whom I have the highest regard, with respect to this article. I asked him what he knew about it. He said that he did not know anything about it other than that he had seen the letter. Of course, he did not have permission to reply at that time. I told him I was going to write the Secretary of the Navy and certainly put on record my views on this article.

Mr. FOLGER. The Navy did issue the next day an attempted explanation of the charge that is made in the letter. I do not know who issued the explanation, but it was not at all comforting or reassuring. I commend the gentleman on what he has done today.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Does not the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota agree that until the question to which he has referred today is definitely cleared up we had better discontinue any consideration of further drafting 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old men during peacetime?

Mr. O'HARA. Certainly, if this condition is going on, perhaps it would be a very wise thing for the Congress to find out about some of these things. It would make a lot of difference as to what we as the Congress will do in the future either as to continuing the Selective Service Act or instituting universal training.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has given us one more reason why we should use every available ship to bring back these tens of thousands of boys who are slated to be returned home to the United States, both from the Pacific and the European theaters of war.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman.

Of course, the Members of the House can appreciate that what disturbs me is the effect upon these youngsters. They may come from the finest homes and have the highest morals, but you can imagine the effect upon these boys when you see a line of them, four abreast, controlled by the MP's, or whatever the controlling military authority may be, whether Army or Navy, going into one of these houses of prostitution. They will feel the moral let-down and the moral degredation that is going to naturally follow when those youngsters see what is going on and when they feel as they must, because the inference is inescapable, that this is something that the Navy or the Army condones and approves. That is also shocking to me as an individual trying to have some appreciation of what affects the morals, the morale, and physical well-being of these boys in service.

I do not want the morals of our servicemen destroyed.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of November 14, 1945]

POLICY IN JAPAN BRINGS PROTEST—CHAPLAIN ATTACKS SEX LAXITY IN NAVY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—On October 20 the Star-Journal published a story from Tokyo by Foreign Correspondent William McGaffin on vice conditions to which American troops were exposed in Japan. The story evoked many inquiries from readers about the accuracy of its implications. Now a letter from an Iowa naval chaplain on the same subject has been given cognizance by Admiral King. Because the letter is more explicit than McGaffin's story on a subject of obvious concern to Americans, it is reprinted below with only slight condensation.)

To the EDITOR: Since a large percentage of the Navy are reserves, many under 20, and we chaplains are entrusted with the moral welfare of these men, we believe the American public should be informed when conditions and policies exist that jeopardize the morality of our servicemen.

As a policy of venereal disease control, the Navy is permitting unrestricted access, by all men on liberty in the Yokosuka area, to houses of prostitution where the venereal incidence is considered 100 percent. The control is the prophylaxis administered by naval corpsmen on duty in the houses.

Since September 11 liberty parties have been permitted ashore in this area and I have been able to observe the situation from the beginning. On September 2 the medical officer in charge of venereal control told me it would be his policy to supervise the places of prostitution by examining the prostitutes, segregating those infected, insisting on cleanliness within the houses, and by establishing adequate numbers of prophylactic stations throughout the town.

Some ships ran training films on venereal disease, and announced that a high percentage of venereal disease could be expected in Japan. On other ships, the commands refused to do anything to discourage promiscuity and gave no warning about expected venereal incidence.

On September 14 it was disclosed that of a typical group of prostitutes 51 out of 60 had syphilis, were not being treated, that there would be no further examinations, and that no policy of treatment or segregation would be followed.

Coincidental with Archbishop Spellman's visit here, by September 16 all "red light"

districts were declared out of bounds. A group of us chaplains inspected the restricted area after a week of suppression.

We found that although the method was not totally effective, the number of offenders that got into the restricted area was small, as its geographic location made policing comparatively easy.

It was not so easy to suppress the freelance prostitutes and the smaller houses in the unrestricted area, but there was little open violation. A man intent on sexual contact could find it, but he had to exert considerable effort and run the risk of arrest. Men were treated as usual at prophylactic stations with no threat of disciplinary action, and, during this period of suppression, the number of treatments ashore and afloat decreased remarkably.

At a meeting of the fleet medical officers, on September 26, it was proposed that one large "house" be opened, that it be operated with the understanding that all the women were diseased, and that a voluntary system of prophylaxis be available by placing a Navy-operated treatment station within the house.

Although some medical officers and two chaplains in attendance protested, it was stated by the senior medical officer that this was to be the policy.

Subsequently, the chaplains of the fleet met, and submitted to the Flag a memorandum that represented the unanimous opinion of the group. The action of the chaplains was ignored, and Sunday, October 7, the Yosuura house was opened to enlisted men, with geisha houses permitted to accept the patronage of chiefs and officers.

Although the number of men on liberty next day was considerably under normal because of rain, I observed, in company with four chaplains and the officer of the day of the military police, a line of enlisted men four abreast almost a block long, waiting their turn at the Yosuura house.

MP's kept the lines orderly, and permitted only as many as could be served to enter at a time. As men were admitted into the lobby, they would select a prostitute (113 on duty that day, according to 1 of the Japanese attendants), pay the 10 yen to the Japanese operator, and then go with the girl to her room. We inspected several of these rooms and found them reasonably clean.

When the men returned they were registered and administered prophylaxis by Navy corpsmen. Although approximately 20 men could be treated at a time, there was a line waiting.

True, many of the men were the type one might expect to patronize such a place, but the bulk of the customers were younger men. The open accessibility of prostitutes in this place has been a factor contributing to the first sex experience of some of my men.

The prostitutes were dirty, highly painted, clothed in gaudy rayon pajamas, some of them with open sores on their faces and feet.

When one considers the rate of disease, that there are some forms of venereal disease in the Orient that do not respond to treatment, that some of the prostitutes have been exposed to leprosy, that in the evenings these same girls are patronized by Japanese men, it is hard to see any intelligence behind the Navy's policy. Present plans call for the opening of other houses similar to the one just described.

On the basis of these facts, it is contended that:

1. The Navy's policy of unrestricted sexual opportunities with diseased women is no solution for the problem of venereal control.

2. American people should insist that the Navy immediately adopt a policy of rigid suppression in regard to prostitution. (In the light of Japanese culture, an order to Japanese civilian police making it illegal for Japanese women to cohabit with any American personnel would greatly increase the effectiveness of such a measure here.)

3. The Navy, which completely ignores moral implications in the present situation, be charged to consider the moral aspects of policies governing personnel.

4. The people who loan their sons to the Government demand moral protection or refuse to supply the personnel for our armed forces.

5. Although many naval officers are gentlemen, others by example and advice have encouraged immorality among our men.

6. The Navy's unlimited sale of beer, which has contributed to moral delinquency and numerous street incidents here, be discontinued. And that throughout the Navy, soft drinks be made just as available as beer whenever beverages are provided by the Navy.

7. An organization that has demonstrated such brilliant strategy in defeating the Japanese military, not permit our men to become the open victims of Japanese prostitutes in the final round.

LAWRENCE L. LACOUR,
Chaplain, USNR.

TOKYO.
(Oskaloosa, Iowa)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1945.

Hon. JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has been called, both by publication last week in the Washington press and in the Middle West, to an open letter from Lawrence L. Lacour, chaplain, USNR, in which he describes conditions of prostitution and sex laxity among men in the Navy stationed in Japan.

It appears from this letter that at a meeting of the fleet medical officers, a proposal was made that one large house be opened and operated with the understanding that all the women were diseased, and that a voluntary system of prophylaxis be available by placing a Navy operated treatment station within the house. This was done over the protest of some of the medical officers and two chaplains who were in attendance at the meeting, the senior medical officer stating that this was to be the policy. M. P.'s kept the lines orderly and permitted only as many men to enter the house of prostitution as could be accommodated at one time.

At the insistence of the military authorities, the draft age was lowered to the age of 18 during the war, and boys of this age are continuing to be taken in under the Selective Service Act. In addition, thousands of young boys have enlisted, many of whom have done so only by and with the consent of their parents. These boys and their parents had every reason to believe that their lives might be offered in the sacrifice that was necessary for the winning of the war, but certainly there was never any thought in the minds of the parents or the people of this country that they would be subjected to conditions outlined in the chaplain's letter, and sadly I note that many of the customers of these houses of prostitution were younger men.

I cannot understand the thinking on the part of the medical officer who promulgated such an order. It is obvious that the moral break down and degradation which would result from such conditions would have the encouragement and condonation of the naval authorities in that area. Can there be any question of the moral decomposition of young men subjected to such conditions, who see not only military encouragement but military control of the lines leading to houses of prostitution where their comrades and associates are exposed to diseased prostitutes?

Certainly such actions on the part of our military forces, if true, are not glorified by the fact that exposed members of the armed forces report to prophylactic stations. Neither do such actions increase the confidence of the American people in the plea of the military for placing the youth of this country in the armed forces for compulsory military training under peacetime conditions.

The chaplain who had the courage to call this to the attention of the people of this country is to be complimented. The conditions which he describes certainly demand a complete investigation, and I respectfully request that the following be done:

1. That you immediately issue an order, terminating conditions described in the chaplain's letter.

2. That the officer or officers responsible for these conditions be immediately removed from duty, an investigation made, and action taken under proper court-martial proceedings.

3. That I be advised as to the Navy's policy for controlling venereal diseases and safeguarding the physical and moral welfare of boys in the naval service.

I am sure, Mr. Secretary, that you are as much appalled as I am by the conditions cutlined by Chaplain Lacour's letter. To me it is tragic that conditions such as those he describes should exist, and I am greatly concerned about the immediate correction and future control of such conditions.

Very respectfully yours,

JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 21, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, November 26, 1945. Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 2764, freight forwarders' legislation.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, November 28, 1945, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4571. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; with amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIKES: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 524. An act to provide for one national

cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIKES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3936. A bill to provide for the evacuation and repatriation of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States and whose remains could not heretofore be returned to their homelands due to wartime shipping restrictions; with amendment (Rept. No. 1272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2927. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Merritt; with amendment (Rept. No. 1273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4580) granting a pension to Paris Peerson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4758. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Reserve components of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4759. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American service man or woman who lost his or her life while serving in one of the various theaters of war during World War II; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4760. A bill to provide for the securing of our ships from foreign nations and the return of the armed forces overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4761. A bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of housing, and to insure the availability of real estate for housing purposes at fair and reasonable prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution concerning the source and condition of American power; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 4762. A bill for the relief of Loui Usry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 4763. A bill for the relief of R. L. Benton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4764. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paul Lederer; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 4765. A bill for the relief of James H. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1334. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 24 members of the Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Bessemer, Pa., urging that Congress support UNRRA and whatever rationing is necessary to feed the hungry people of Europe and also legislation that may be necessary for the preservation of peace and unity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1335. Also, petition signed by 36 members of the American Legion Auxiliary, No. 225, of Aliquippa, Pa., opposing S. 1203 and H. R. 3522; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1336. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs, Milwaukee, Wis., with reference to S. 1050 and H. R. 3293; to the Committee on Ways and Means

1337. Also, petition of Mrs. Lucile Nelson, legislative chairman, Henry S. Blomberg Auxiliary, No. 847, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Superior, Wis., with reference to a veterans' hospital in Superior, Wis.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee who art able to do exceeding abundantly more than we ask or think, we offer our thanksgiving for all that makes life rich or fair; for homes that gleam and blossom in the sunlight of peace and plenty; for the gracious greetings of friends when the heart beats low; for that which makes life sacred and honest work divine; and for that faith that assures us that the sea of life has another and a fairer shore.

O bless us with the mercy of grateful hearts for those who have walked the ways of the cross through labor, pain, and death to save this tottering world. Move above every fireside throbbing with sorrow and care and impart unto them that love which was cradled in the heart of God.

With the choicest blessings of Thy spirit, be Thou with our President. In the overheavy burdens of his high office, enable him to respond with wisdom and courage. Manifest Thyself to our Speaker and all Members of the Congress and give them Thy gracious blessings. In the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4407. An act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) entitled "An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address which he delivered on November 12, 1945.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include certain statements of consumer groups on price control.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three items, one from Life magazine, one from the Southern Patriot, and one from Americans United.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Cecil B. Dickson and a sermon by Rev. Theodore Ainsworth Greene.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. TARVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted recently by the Georgia State Baptist Convention.

Mr. BURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the postal service during the war.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SURRENDER OF PRISONERS OF WAR BY SWEDEN TO RUSSIA

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make use of the forum of Congress to appeal to His Majesty's Government of Sweden to reconsider its decision to surrender to the Soviet Government 157 alleged prisoners of war from the Baltic Provinces. These alleged prisoners of

war are Lithuanians to a great extent, some Esthonians and Latvians who were dragooned into the German Army and who escaped to Sweden at the first opportunity.

I am sure the proud record of the great Government of Sweden and its humanitarian cooperation on all questions of displaced prisoners and refugees will at this time make it reconsider in this instance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

SERVICEMEN'S FEDERAL INCOME TAXES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that House Document No. 379, entitled "Servicemen's Federal Income Taxes. Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income Tax Laws With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States, World War II," is now available to the Members in the document room.

LOANS TO VETERANS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a news story showing how GI loans are tied up in red tape.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, a recent UP dispatch from Santa Ana, Calif., carries a story that the banks there have found it necessary to discontinue GI loans because of more than 20 feet of Veterans' Administration forms are required to be filled. It is too much red tape, and the procedure has entirely bogged down. It is hoped that the conferees of the other body will see the advisability of adopting the amendments to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act this House passed last summer.

The news item follows:

VETS LOSE HOME LOANS IN 20 FEET OF RED TAPE

SANTA ANA, CALIF.—The Santa Ana Building & Loan Co., weary of filling out 20 feet of forms for every GI loan, today canceled 30 such loans and charged the Veterans' Administration with "bogging down in red tape."

All the uncompleted loans were for servicemen's homes, the company said. The cancellations were expected to leave the 30 families homeless.

"The red tape and lack of interest shown by the Veterans' Administration have dictated the action," the company said. "There are 24 separate forms which must be filled out by the loan company for the Veterans' Administration. These forms, filled out on one side only, reached nearly 20 feet in length."

Mr. Speaker, this situation is not the fault of the law, but exists due to voluminous regulations issued by the Veterans' Administration. One amendment adopted by this body requires regulations to be reviewed by the committees enacting the law. Such review could prevent unnecessary regulations. I hope this amendment is retained by the conferees.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in line with what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] has just said, I call attention to the fact that in the conference between the two Houses, the House conferees are insisting on the House provisions which would do away with the red tape on these veterans' loans and permit the appraisal of these properties to be made by local people. As it stands today, so far as the farming element of this country is concerned, the loan provision of the GI bill might just as well have been thrown in the waste basket.

As I pointed out on yesterday, only 26,000 houses have been purchased under this bill by ex-servicemen and only 800 farms, in the whole United States.

What we are trying to do is to get rid of the red tape of which these veterans complain and make it possible for this bill to operate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the veterans obtaining loans for the purchase of farms, it seems to me that we are getting more and more into a complicated legislative mess all the time. When the GI bill was up for consideration I tried in my humble way to correct certain situations, but I did not get the job done. The Cunningham bill introduced months ago by our colleague from Iowa would be a step in the right direction. To date not even a hearing has been had. Why not? I repeat, Why not?

I notice in the RECORD that our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, and a Member of the other body have introduced bills which in my estimation should be considered by the Veterans' Committee. Is not this veterans' legislation for homes and farms worthy of consideration? Does this administration wish to accept the responsibility for this do-nothing policy in regard to this important legislation?

We are then in the ridiculous position now of furnishing millions of dollars each year to nonveterans for farm loans at 3 percent interest, other nonveteran groups, for other purposes, money at 2 percent interest, whereas under the GI bill of rights all loans that have been made up to date have been at the rate of at least 4 percent. If a veteran wishes to purchase a farm or a home in Alaska the veteran has to pay 8 percent interest.

I think the time has come when we should get this straightened out, and we can do so if and when the majority will let it be accomplished. There is not much legislation having consideration. Why not consider these veterans' bills?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution recently passed by the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts on the subject of compulsory military training.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the office of the Chief of Staff on the return of high-point men in the Pacific.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include remarks recently made in Boston by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include comments appearing in the Boston Post by Robert L. Norton.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders for today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, a report of the activities of the House Committee on Small Business has just been distributed to the Members of the House. In this report the committee makes the statement that on November 30 it must conclude its work due to its inability to secure adequate funds.

The work of no investigating committee concerned with domestic problems is of more importance to the people of my region. We have almost nothing but small business in New England. The accomplishments of the House Small Business Committee are detailed in this report. From substantially every one of the activities enumerated there was some tangible result: an unworkable order of OPA was given some sense, an order of ODT was changed to remove an unreasonable ban, a regulation in a WPB order was amended which made possible the increase of production in a critically needed line of goods. To be sure, the work of the two latter agencies is largely finished, but price control is still very much with us. The efforts of this committee in representing the interests of little business before OPA's policy makers are as badly needed in the months immediately ahead as at any time since this committee was created. Small business needs a strong, active, belligerent committee to protect its interests.

Hearings lately conducted by the committee that have brought out the cost absorption policies of OPA prove this. OPA states that evidence presented at recent hearings has been not only helpful but has actually contributed information which has resulted in a modification of price proposals under consideration.

The hearings which this committee held in New England on tax problems of small business gave the opportunity to our people to present difficulties under which little business operates. This evidence could have been presented to no other committee of Congress since most of the witnesses could neither have gone to Washington nor could have made arrangements to be heard by any other committee.

I have had an opportunity to observe not only the conduct of the committee in its official work but also the manner in which it has used its funds. I question whether there has been any investigating committee of the House which has been more frugal. Not only has it been economical in the matter of expenses but has actually denied itself in the interest of stretching its funds to cover the maximum possible ground.

Until price controls can be further relaxed and tax policies affecting small business enterprise further modified to a normal basis, small business needs a strong spokesman in Congress. The House Committee on Small Business should continue to be that spokesman.

OVERTIME COMPENSATION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4720) to amend the act of December 7, 1944, relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States, previously referred to the Civil Service Committee, be rereferred to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

A FORTHRIGHT STATEMENT

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on September 4 Mr. Herbert Morrison, Lord President of the Council, addressed the National Conference of Labor Women at Leeds, England, and what he said upon that occasion attracted a great deal of attention in this country. True, we were only permitted to read extracts of Mr. Morrison's timely address, so I wrote him for a complete copy of his remarks with a view to placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that my colleagues and I might have an opportunity to read the full text.

Mr. Speaker, I have read Mr. Morrison's address with profit and admiration. When we contrast his courageous utterances with the vacillating and pusillanimous policy of appeasement being followed by President Truman and his advisers we need not be surprised if England outdistances us in the recapture of the foreign markets.

Herbert Morrison is a practical statesman. He came up the hard way. As Lord President of the Council he is one of the spokesmen of the Labor Government in England and what he said at Leeds is based upon long experience, careful study, and keen observation. In short, he told the Labor women of England that there is no short cut to prosperity, that all wealth is the result of creative toil, and that prosperity can only be attained through maximum production. I wish it were possible to place a copy of Mr. Morrison's timely remarks in the hands of every employer and employee in America. Certainly, his statement should be read by every labor leader and every American who is now out on strike.

Mr. Morrison's address follows:

First, I would like to say a few words as a tribute to the magnificent contribution which women have made to our war effort. I do not intend to say a great deal about this, because I know that you all made these sacrifices not in order to be praised by the Government but because you knew that without them we could not have won the war.

The high degree of mobilization of our total resources in this war has been largely due to the contribution made by women. Let me quote a few figures: In 1939 we had less than 5,000,000 women of working age in employment. During the war the figure rose to nearly 7,000,000. And in addition, nearly half a million women were in the forces or were in full-time civil defense. In other words, over 2,500,000 additional women entered employment. Without that we could not have mobilized our manpower anything like so well. We would have had to have had a smaller army and the soldiers would have had fewer munitions with which to fight. At one time we had nearly 2,000,000 women making munitions of various kinds. And, of course, millions of other women outside the munitions industries were making clothing and equipment of all descriptions directly contributing to the war effort.

These are the figures of employment. They tell an important part of the story of women's war effort, but only a part. A large number of the women in industry also had another job, that of looking after a house and probably a family. Many did a full-time job in the factory as well as running a home. Nearly a million women found it possible to do a part-time factory job in addition to their household responsibilities. And large numbers of other women found that they had a full-time job on their hands looking after a home and family, particularly in these difficult times of war.

An all important aim of Government policy must be over a period, for it cannot be done without work and planning to raise the standard of living of the people in our country. By that I mean not merely raising it above its present level; that we may take for granted. As soon as we can convert our industries from war to peace purposes and demobilize men from the forces, so soon will there be an increase in the comforts of life of civilians in this country. That is an immediate task.

Nor do I mean just getting back to the prewar standard of living. That is not good enough. Various social surveys showed that before the war many of the British people were living in serious poverty. Mr. Rowntree's investigation in 1936 showed that 7 percent of the working-class population of York were in what he called primary poverty. In other words they had not enough money to live on. In Bristol in 1937 an investigation by the University showed that over 10 percent of the families investigated fell below the poverty line. Other investigations told substantially the same story. These investigations were carried out by independent people with no particular axe to grind and, what is more, their definitions of what constituted poverty were very strict; certainly they did not use a generous interpretation.

And even the families who could not be said to be in danger of starvation lacked large numbers of goods which are necessary for the fuller life. Few working-class households had sufficient in quality or quantity of such things as pots and pans, crockery, furniture, linen, etc., not to mention such things as various appliances to reduce the drudgery of housework, etc. Therefore the prewar period cannot be our standard. We must get very much beyond that if we are to claim any achievement.

How are we going to do this? There are two methods. The first is to see that our total resources are fairly distributed. A system of family allowances and a comprehensive system of social insurance will do a great deal to remove some of the worst features of the prewar world. Much of the poverty was among the families with children. In Bristol one working-class child in five came from a home where income was inadequate to provide a bare minimum standard: poverty affected more than twice as many children as adults. Family allowances will help to remove that. Similarly provision during sickness and unemployment, and measures to prevent sickness and to provide full employment will remove two other important causes of poverty. And those who are past working age must have better basic old-age pensions.

But there is a limit to what we can achieve merely by transferring money from one person's pocket to another's. The burden of taxation is already very high, not merely on

the rich but upon every worker. One of the proper uses of the instrument of taxation is to promote a fairer distribution of income. But there are limits to this policy. Present rates of taxation on the rather better paid workers are so high that it tempts many to accept the undesirable view that it is not worthwhile earning more. Taxation on profits in the unsocialized sector of industry may sometimes be so high as to leave insufficient incentive to reduce costs or to increase turn-over—though let me stress that management no less than labor has got to put its best foot forward.

The benefits which can be provided under the social-insurance measures are limited by the burden which we can fairly place on the people who have to contribute either by weekly contributions or by taxation. If we are to be able to provide better benefits and to reduce taxation and provide more of the goods of life for everybody, then the only way to do that is by increasing the total national income. This is the second method. It is to increase the size of the cake; in other words, to increase the supply of goods and services available within this country.

The main way to increase the national income is by increasing national efficiency; that is to increase output per head, the general productivity of industry. Indeed if we do not pay particular attention to this aspect we may find ourselves with a falling national income, therefore a falling standard of life. There is no magic nor natural force which automatically insures that the national income of a country will continue to increase. It can only be done by work, thought, drive, and initiative.

In the case of this country, certain factors will tend to reduce the real output of goods and services available for the consumption of the population. The raising of the school-leaving age to 15 will reduce the number of people in employment. An increase in the number of workers enjoying holidays with pay, the possibility of people retiring from work earlier in life, and the continuing tendency to reduce the hours of work, all these factors will of themselves tend to reduce the total national income—unless they go forward side by side with rapid technical advance and a marked increase of output per man-hour. Unless both considerations are nicely programed and balanced, we can head for disaster. If we want prosperity we must not fear work, for a poor production must mean a poor standard of life. The social advances mentioned are, of course, all desirable things in themselves and represent aspects of a rising standard of living which cannot easily be measured in money terms. I mention them only to show that our increased productivity has to march with or to offset these factors before it can start increasing the total supply of goods and services available to the community.

Then there are certain adverse factors, mainly a legacy of the war. Many industries have not been able to maintain or replace their equipment because of war shortages; we have fewer houses and many of these are badly damaged, and we have lost much of our income from overseas investments. Nor must we forget that the average age of our workers is bound to rise. And it may be that the prices which we have to pay for our imports of food and raw materials—the terms of trade—may move against us. One can thus think of many factors all tending to depress our total national income and reduce our chances of a major increase in the standard of living.

Nevertheless I feel confident we can achieve a real increase in the standard of living of our people. To do this:

(a) We must insure that all the available resources of this country are used and nothing is lost through waste, particularly waste in the form of unemployment. That means the Government must have and carry through a policy for full employment;

(b) We must raise the output per head and the efficiency of the industrial resources of the country. That means the Government must have and carry through a policy for industrial efficiency.

The Government is fully convinced of the necessity of so planning our natural resources as to achieve full employment. In the main this means securing a sufficient volume of purchasing power, of spending both by individuals and the Government, to see that all who wish to be employed have a chance to be so. And I am tempted to add—that those who wish to live in idleness are required to work.

But today my main theme is industrial efficiency; the second leg of our program to increase the national standard of living. If we could increase productivity and over-all efficiency by 15 percent in the course of the next 5 years, then the total national income would be increased by over £1,000,000,000. That would represent an important raising of the general standard of living in this country. It is not an impossible target; in fact over a somewhat longer period when the dislocation caused by the war had been completely eliminated, I would venture to set a somewhat higher target. It is not impossible but it will not happen by itself. Few good things happen by themselves—we have to make them happen.

How can an increase of this order be achieved? First what can the Government do:

1. The Government intends to socialize certain important basic industries and make these industries as efficient as possible. Each of these nationalized industries will have important contributions to make to increasing national productivity. And efficient basic industries should stimulate the prosperity of all the other industries and increase their competitive power in the export markets. Mind you, nationalization is no magic cure. It is not an end in itself. It provides the conditions and the opportunity. The test of success will be whether those industries will be better run; whether they show a steady increase in technical efficiency and public spirit from the top to the bottom.

2. The Government can play their part in insuring that the sectors of industry and commerce left in the hands of private ownership are run efficiently. The efficient firm and efficient management must be encouraged. We must prevent practices which restrict output and efficiency. Expansion and not restriction must be the keyword.

3. The Government intends to stimulate new capital investment in both the socialized and the private sectors of industry—new buildings, plant, and machinery. This is not going to be easy at first because whilst we are using labor and resources upon making new machinery and plant we reduce the chance of increasing goods for immediate consumption. But once the new plant and equipment is installed then we should get a big leap forward in the output of all the everyday things we so badly want.

4. The Government intends to encourage scientific research. We have used our scientists to improve and perfect the weapons of war. We must use them and give them the same encouragement by proper facilities, etc., to make their contribution to the problems of peace and civilian production.

5. Expenditure on technical and university education is to be increased. Everybody who can benefit by the opportunity should be able to get adequate technical and scientific training, or the kind of higher education which will fit him for the managerial and supervisory posts.

But much as the Government can do, they cannot do everything. In the end, whether we succeed in making an important advance in our over-all standard of living will depend on the men and women in industry, whether they be operatives and foremen, clerks or managers. If they are not interested in efficiency and in increasing output, if they cling to old outworn methods of doing things and are reluctant to try out or change over to new machines, new ways of doing things, if they lose the spirit of enterprise, then whatever the Government may do we will fail to achieve our object.

Here then is something which the Government intends to aim at, and for which they require the active support of all Labor men and women who must carry the fine spirit of the war and of the election into their day-to-day work. The abolition of poverty and a substantial increase in the average standard of living of everybody in this country, an increase well above the prewar level, should be within our grasp by the end of the 5 years. Its achievement depends on an increase in our industrial efficiency and in the output of our goods and services, coupled with the proportionate development of consuming power. We can do it and with your help we will do it.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial by Booth Tarkington entitled "It's Time To Be Afraid," and in the other, a letter.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an article by George Rothwell Brown, and in the other to extend his own remarks.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a news release from a Minneapolis paper.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a Pacific service paper.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to create a select committee of five

Members of the House to study and investigate the use of our air and water shipping facilities in returning surplus military and naval personnel to this country.

We are told, and the men themselves are told, that they will be returned just as soon as shipping space is available for them. I raise this question, Mr. Speaker, Is everything possible being done to make every transportation facility of this country available for these men? I want the answer to that question. If the answer is "No," then I want changes made immediately.

We hear rumors all over that ships come back from the Pacific empty; that transport planes are used by officer personnel in taking junkets here and there when these planes could be bringing some of our fighting men home to their families; that available ships are not being converted for troop transport purposes; that Victory ships have been removed from military service and switched to commercial trade. If there is one iota of truth in any of the rumors, something is wrong and must be corrected immediately. Mr. Speaker, every effort must be made to make every inch of shipping space at our command available for these men to return home. This is a must program.

The Army and Navy can have all the fancy demobilization programs and plans they like, but these plans do not do a bit of good if they do not bring the boys back.

I personally know, and every Member of Congress knows, of many men with all kinds of points or credits—whatever you want to call them—that are still waiting for that ship to come in. Just as an example, look at some of the men in the Thirty-second — Red Arrow — Division. This division is credited with 654 days in action in the Pacific during the war. Words cannot describe the hardships endured by these men and the sacrifices which they have made. I commend, however, to your reading an article in the recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post by Sgt. Charles Murdock, entitled "The Red Arrow Pierced Every Line." You will be proud to be an American when you read it, but you will also wonder why these brave men have not been brought home long ago. A very close personal friend of mine left with that division when it sailed from San Francisco April 22, 1942. He has not come back yet. That is 43 months ago, 1,310 days. There are many others who left with him who are not back home yet. Why are these men still out in the Pacific? The Army contends that they still have not found shipping space to bring them home. If that is true, then what is wrong with our shipping facilities?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is a long time to take out of a man's life. The trouble is we have a labor government here that is following the policy of appeasement, appeasement, appeasement. I do not look for any change and I do not think the gentleman need look for any change until we have had a change in administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is a very long time, particularly when you are out in the Pacific in the swamps and the mud of those islands. There a minute seems like a day.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] would indicate that these boys would not get back until after 1948?

Mr. KNUTSON. It looks that way.

Mr. RANKIN. I have a petition on the Clerk's desk over there, petition No. 9. If Members of Congress will sign it, we will bring that bill to the floor of the House next week, pass it, and bring these boys home. It is up to the Congress of the United States. We can bring these boys home if we will just try.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It is up to the Congress, but may I remind my friend from Mississippi that you can have all the petitions and bills you want saying that the boys should be out of the service, and they are not worth the paper they are written on if you do not provide the shipping facilities to bring them back. That, I am afraid, is not being done.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that we have the shipping facilities now. We have the same facilities we got them over there with.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But they are not using them, are they?

Mr. RANKIN. No, but we can make them do it; it is up to the Congress. If Congress wants these men back home, we can get them home.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I hope they will.

Mr. RANKIN. So do I.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am very glad the gentleman brought up this question, and particularly glad that he has given attention to the boys in the Pacific. I think his suggestion of a special committee to look into these shipping facilities is very much in order. I was out in the Pacific. I talked to hundreds of these boys out there since VJ-day. I know how they feel. This matter of spending time in the tropics, 42 or 43 months, is a thing that is not appreciated in other theaters. The boys who have been out there in the jungle and in the malaria-infested countries have gone through a lot that is not measured by the number of days they have been in combat.

The boys in the Pacific are not going to be brought home as rapidly as those in Europe until more shipping or other transportation is made available for them. Because of my interest in the subject, I addressed an inquiry to the War Department recently on the subject, to see what progress they were making with regard to the boys in the Pacific. In the extension of remarks for which I earlier today received permission, I am placing a letter in which the Office of the Chief of Staff states that it is hoped that the boys with 85 points on the original computation will be home by the end of November. That may be progress, but it reveals how slow by comparison things have gone in the Pacific. The announced point score has been reduced far below 85 for those who have overseas service. And in the States those who have had overseas service and who have 50 points are being discharged. I hope the gentleman's resolution is considered by the Congress and acted upon promptly in order that transportation may be made available for the boys in the Pacific.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he is making. I hold in my hand an envelope which contains a letter I received this morning from a boy in the Philippines. On the back of that, in red pencil, is this notation, to which Members of the House might well afford to pay heed: "No boats, no votes."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I think that soldier has the right idea.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish to congratulate the gentleman for taking the floor and making this speech. I believe it will be very helpful. I am utterly astounded that the Congress of the United States, after the great and heroic battles these boys have fought, should neglect them when there is an opportunity to sign petitions Nos. 8 and 9 and others up there to bring them home.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. But I still insist that what we have to do first is assure transportation for these men.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to yield, not to take issue with him on the question of bringing the men back, but I feel perhaps there should be some little clarification on this question of the relationship between the time of getting the men over there and getting them back. I have done some investigating on my own very recently, and I have figures which lead me to the conclusion, which I believe is a sound conclusion, that the men are being brought back 12 times faster than they were sent over. That investigation covers a period of the last 3 months. I think at least the RECORD should show the result of that investigation. I believe if the gentleman will investigate the matter himself he will find that those figures are about correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I will not take issue with the gentleman's figures. They may be bringing them back 12 times faster than they sent them over.

But I am convinced that they could be brought back a great deal more quickly than they are being brought back and that there is a muddle some place in our shipping facilities. The gentleman himself has read and heard some of these rumors. Whether they are based on fact or not, we do not know. That is what I am asking, that the Congress set up a committee to find out whether or not those rumors are true, and if they are true and if our transportation facilities are not being used to the limit to bring them back, this condition should be corrected immediately and Congress should see to it that they are.

Mr. PRIEST. I want it to be understood that I am not taking issue with the gentleman on the question of bringing them back, but I do believe that an investigation will show that a much better job has been done in the past 60 days and that a great deal of progress has been made during that time in shipping facilities.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I hope they make more progress. I want every surplus soldier and sailor returned home immediately. This cannot be done unless every means of transportation at our command is used to the limit.

I pray, Mr. Speaker, that you and your party, which is in control of this House, will use every effort to bring this resolution to the floor of the House at the earliest possible date. By adopting this resolution at an early date, Members of the House can demonstrate whether they are sincere in their expressed desire to see these men brought back home where they belong.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Wisconsin said that he was not questioning the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee. Personally, I would question the conclusion the gentleman from Tennessee made, if he holds that all boys in the Pacific and far eastern theaters are getting home as rapidly as they went over. It may be that, taken on an over-all figure, the rate of return may be faster than a selected period during which the boys were taken over. But if you will examine specific cases in the Pacific, I am confident you will find that men are being overlooked and that shipping is not available to them and that in isolated islands and out-of-the-way places, and even in Manila, men are not being given the transportation facilities that have been given to men in other places, nor are individual high point cases given the transportation necessary to make general policies effective. Therefore, I would challenge the proposition that they are all being returned as rapidly as they were taken over there.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I think we all want our boys brought back right now. For my part, I want them brought back a great deal more quickly than a discharge petition will bring them back. A petition takes a long time after it is signed before it comes before the House. It can only be considered by the House on the second and fourth Mondays of each month. I think the administration should take action. It has the power.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. The refusal of the Committee on Military Affairs to even consider this problem leads me to believe that the soldier who said a slogan was going around among his comrades that "The New Dealers took us over, but it will take the Republicans to get us back to America," may have some merit.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. REED of New York. In reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], may I say that it will certainly do no harm to sign this petition to try to bring these boys back. It is one method by which you can get legislation on the floor, and when you know the administration is not going to act, then you should use the only expedient that you have.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As long as the gentleman has made that statement, and I agree with him, will he answer this question: What is the use trying to get them back now if it is the policy of the party in power or the administration to keep a million or two of them over there, not only to police Europe, not only to rehabilitate all those other countries in which they have been fighting, but also to carry on and reorganize those countries and stay there indefinitely? Until we learn how long the administration wants to keep them, is determined to keep them abroad, we are laboring in the dark.

Mr. REED of New York. There should be enough Members in this House to appreciate what the boys have done, to immediately get them back to their homes. There is a great moral issue involved, as well as other things.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we would adopt a resolution stating that the war is over, the 6 months would begin to run and they would be automatically discharged at the end of the 6-month period.

Mr. REED of New York. This war will not be over while this crowd is in.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Bringing the boys back is quite a job, I am sure the gentleman will admit. Would it not seem to the gentleman that we could at least make it possible for Washingtonians to get to town, and get the streetcars and busses running again?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course, that is just a domestic problem. We are asked to attend to and solve these world-wide problems first. That has never been my theory, but that seems to be the theory of the present administration.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is another bottleneck in getting the boys back home after they get to the west coast. The ODT has issued an order as of December 2 that 70 percent of all commercial air-line seats will be reserved for transporting the troops going to the east coast from the west coast. I talked to them yesterday about that, and it will accommodate about 800 soldiers. Then I called the ATC, and I find that the ATC has only 13 airplanes daily from the west coast to the east coast, where they should have hundreds of airplanes in order to transport the boys coming into the west coast back home.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a domestic problem, something here at home that requires immediate action.

IT IS TIME FOR A SHOW-DOWN

Some folks are parasites. They want to live in comfort without making their fair contribution to the welfare of all. They are insistent and loud-mouthed, though comparatively few in number. They, their theories and their demands, are the cause of much of our present trouble. Every American who is not a businessman or an employer wants and should have a job at a fair wage, and most of them are willing to earn the wage paid.

In theory, we are all born with equal opportunity, and we would like to believe with equal ability, but in reality neither is true. We cannot all have a business of our own, be employers. Some must work for others; others must provide the jobs. The job providers are comparatively few in number, but they are governed by the same motives, they have the same desires, as do those who must work for them.

Unless a potential employer thinks he can make a profit, he will neither create nor maintain a job. Fortunately or unfortunately, a majority of the employers possess competency and they can, during a strike, eat, wear clothing, and have shelter for a longer period of time than can the average employee.

For the last 12 years those who must work for a livelihood have been told by politicians and agitators that employers, as a class, were a bad lot, intent only on serving their own interest; while every witness, including Director of the Budget Smith, Director of Reconversion Snyder, Secretaries of Commerce, the Treasury, and Labor Wallace, Vinson, and Schwellenbach, and representatives of the A. F. of L. and the CIO, appearing before the committee considering the so-called full employment bill, admitted that we have here in this country a system of government and economy which has given the man who must work for a livelihood a greater prosperity and happiness, more of every desirable thing than any other system anywhere in the world. Each, while giving lip service to that system, advocated a policy which, in my judgment, would destroy it.

The last administration and the present one each has been sowing seeds of discord and the harvest is now with us with strikes and threatened strikes throughout the country. Today this Nation is confronted with a situation which is the direct result of the teachings of the last administration and of its corrupt alliance with politicians and racketeers in the so-called labor movement.

Sidney Hillman with his Political Action Committee, Phil Murray, R. G. Thomas, Walter and Victor Reuther, and Richard Frankensteen, with their UAW-CIO, in effect over the years have been telling employees who have been receiving higher wages, under better working conditions, and for shorter hours than any group of employees anywhere in the whole world, that the men who gave them employment were greedy, selfish, arbitrary, unfair, unpatriotic, and inhuman profiteers. The result is a strike against General Motors, a threatened strike in the steel industry, and here in Washington a strike which affects the everyday operation of the Government.

Hundreds of thousands of employees have been, or will be, thrown out of their jobs, deprived of their means of livelihood, by these strikes which either now exist or are threatened. Millions of others who are dependent upon the operation of our industrial system will suffer.

What has Sidney Hillman and his PAC, Philip Murray, R. G. Thomas, Walter and Victor Reuther—who received part of their training in Russia—and Richard Frankensteen and the others who are advocating these strikes, to offer the employees of General Motors and others who go on strike, in lieu of their pay checks? Do not the gentlemen who are causing these strikes, who have created the conditions which have brought them about, realize that Wilson of General Motors, that the Fords, in fact a majority of the employers, can, if they wish, when a strike is called, just close shop and go on a vacation?

If General Motors, Chrysler, Ford, Steel, and the Transit Co. here in Washington, in answer to the demands of the union and in reply to the strikes, should say, "All right, boys, we cannot compel you to work. We cannot meet your demands. We are closing shop and going on a vacation. When you get ready to work, let us know. We are going to Miami, Fla.," just what would Sidney and his cohorts offer? Just what would they do to meet the unemployment? The answer is obvious. Nothing constructive. As wreckers, they are superb; as creators of jobs, meeters of pay rolls, they are worse than failures—they never even started.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Is it not a fact that a great many people who will be thrown out of work will go on the unemployment rolls at the expense of the Government?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; but that is not going to last. Those reserves which have been accumulated in the various States, as in Michigan, running into the hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of dollars, are going to be exhausted. How long do you think the unemployment compensation fund is going to last when 350,000 men go on strike? And then go on down the line and consider all the others who are dependent upon those who are on strike for their livelihood.

Mr. VURSELL. I do not approve of strikes and I agree with the speaker, but I wanted to point out that there is an additional expense to the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There has been a corrupt political alliance for the last 10 years or more between the politicians in the majority party and the labor racketeers and some labor leaders. There is no doubt about that. There has been a tie-up. In return for votes, time and time again, special favors have been granted to organized labor. More than once, the last administration and its agencies acted for and in behalf of CIO, as against AFL and independent unions.

It is my contention that many of those favors were never asked by the rank and file. They were asked and insisted upon by leaders who did not care what happened to the worker. The workers many times were satisfied. Some of the leaders are content if they can continue in their position of power, willing at any time to sell out labor when it would serve their own selfish purposes, enable them to collect dues.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman knows, of course, that the leadership which is responsible for these strikes never goes off the pay roll.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no. They are on the pay roll all right, and they draw two or three times more than what a Congressman receives. While the worker is off a pay roll, the union official is on; continues to receive his pay.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. They are willing to sell out the daily wage of the men whom they claim to represent; let them lose their pay, but in no instance, so far as I know, has any labor leader ever sacrificed his own income during a strike.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have seen some of the expense accounts of these representatives of organized labor. Some call for a thousand dollars a month, unaccounted for except by the statement "miscellaneous or incidentals."

Now, let me go back a moment. My question is, What has Sidney Hillman and the PAC and these other gentlemen I have named to offer to the man who must work, who has a wife, who has children who must eat, children who want to go to school, children who need a doctor, who need this, that, and the other, who is out of a job because of a strike? What has Brother Sidney and his wreckers to offer? What is he holding out to that man in lieu of the pay check which these employers, who have been so roundly damned, have been paying over the weeks, the months, the years? Labor has the right to strike. No one finds any fault with that; at least I do not. But I again ask:

If General Motors, Chrysler, Ford, Steel, and the transit company here in Washington, in answer to the demands of the union and in reply to the strikes, should say, "All right, boys. We cannot compel you to work. We cannot meet your demands. We are closing shop and going on a vacation. When you get ready to work, let us know. We are going to Miami, Fla.," just what would Sidney and his cohorts offer? Just what would they do to meet the unemployment? The answer is obvious—nothing constructive.

What is their answer? Permit me to anticipate. They will ask the President to take over private industry, meet their demands, and charge the cost to the taxpayer. That would be fine and a convenient solution, were it not for the fact that neither they nor the administration has the ability or the experience, the thrift, nor the willingness to work, to successfully operate any of the businesses which give their adherents the bread, the butter, the clothing, and the shelter they enjoy. And unfortunately for them, the Federal Government has only one source of revenue—taxes—and again unfortunately, if private enterprise is put out of existence, there will be insufficient tax money to create the jobs, meet the pay roll.

Again I say, "All right, gentlemen, if you are not satisfied with your working conditions, with your jobs, or if there is something wrong and you want to strike, that is your privilege here in America, but you have no right to stand in the way of the man who wants to work."

And I wonder, too, if those who advocate the right to strike, those who want to strike now and then and anytime regardless of the terms of their written contract, when things do not satisfy them, or when their leaders want to advance their own political fortunes, will concede to their employers the right to strike.

I wonder what will happen after the strikers get these 300,000 General Motors employees out. I wonder what will happen if the employers go on strike, for instance, Henry Ford I and Henry Ford II, each of whom has more money than he can possibly use, having no reason to work, so far as I know except a desire to carry on the business which they have founded and to provide jobs for their employees, autos and farm machinery for their customers. Ford does not need to work. Ford II, III, IV, and so on down the line, do not need to work. They have more money than they can spend. So why should they fight and why should they quarrel and why should they be worried in an effort to keep open the factories which Thomas and Reuther are determined to close if they cannot rule?

Once more I ask, Just suppose that those employers for the moment adopt the policy of Hillman and Murray and Frankensteen and Reuther and Thomas? Suppose they adopt that policy and say, "All right, boys, now you fellows who have gone on strike, as far as we are concerned, that is all right with us; we are just going to take our little hand bags, we are going to take our wives and our children and we are going South, West, or somewhere, and on the factory door you will find a notice that when you get

ready to work, you let us know, and we will come back."

While the boys are making up their minds whether or not they want to go back to work, what is Sidney Hillman and that crew of wreckers—I say "wreckers" and I use that term advisedly—going to do about it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is Sidney going to do about it while Wilson and General Motors and the rest of the employers are down South, or out in California? And I am not going to cause any controversy for advocating which place they want to go. What is this crew of wreckers, who never in all their lives, so far as I know, created an industrial job, going to do about it? Are they going to hand the idle worker, who must go to the grocery store or send his wife each week or each day, a check equal to what he would have earned had he worked? What are they going to give him? What sort of a piece of paper, signed by whom, and calling for what?

I have asked that question over and over again and I wish that somebody in this House who characterizes some of us as labor baiters—I wish that some representative of labor, would show up here on the floor and tell us.

Then, coming to the strike right here in Washington, what do you think about that? What do you think of a Government that allows such a thing? Oh, we are fussing about what we should do in Germany and Japan and all the islands of the seas. All over the world we are trying to set things right, and here in the home of the National Government we have a group of men who lack either the courage or the inclination to get its own employees on the job in the morning. Now what do you think of a Government that is trying to set the whole world right, other places, other peoples, ten, twelve and thirteen thousand miles away from here, where we are trying to clean house for them—trying to fix their affairs for them—and here in Washington, is unable, if its employees happen to live 2 or 3 miles from the Capitol, to get them to their places of employment?

If you were lucky and owned an automobile, you rode. But if you were a Federal employee and you did not have an automobile, you could not get here this morning on time, nor Uncle Sam, with a representative in the White House and 435 Representatives here in Congress—I see only 2 or 3 Members on the majority side, while there are 50 or more Republicans here—Uncle Sam—Uncle Sam in the control of the majority party—just cannot operate a transportation system efficiently enough to get the Members of the majority party to the House, to get his own Federal employees downtown to transact his own business.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman just spoke of the absence of the Members on the majority side. They are probably walking in to work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hope none of them, when he should not, makes a left-hand turn as he comes in. That is all right for you to laugh at. Too many on the majority side have been turning to the left too long.

The gentleman from New York has referred this morning, and so have other Members of the House, to getting the boys back. Do you not know that some of those applications for discharge are pending here in Washington, and they cannot be processed unless these young men and young women who are employed by the Federal Government get down to work? Can we let this kind of a strike go on?

When the agitators and the politicians have destroyed private enterprise, ended the ability of the businessman and the industrialist to pay taxes, Sidney Murray and the rest of the wrecking crew will discover they are trying to lift themselves by their own bootstraps and that procedure has never been strikingly successful.

Yes, it is time for a show-down and the Federal Government here in Washington should, as an example, authorize the Capital Transit Co. to employ the necessary help, to use the armed forces of this country to operate the system which here in the Capital must function if the Government itself is to transact its business. See H. R. 4612.

Employees cannot, they should not, be forced to work, but if they do not want to work under the terms the employers can give them, they should get out of the way for those who are willing to accept the jobs.

If the taxi drivers call a sympathetic strike, a short cut to the solution to that would be the revocation of their licenses, or a transfer of Federal employees competent to operate until other drivers come in.

This is supposed to be a free country. No man should be compelled to work against his will nor should any man be permitted to stand in the way of another willing and eager to work at an offered job.

Sidney and his outfit should discover now that, while they have the right to advocate a strike, while their membership has the right to strike, employers may also reach the conclusion that they, too, have the right to quit providing jobs.

Heretofore strikes have been "duck soup" for some labor agitators, organizers, and some union officials. This has been especially true during the wartime, when, no matter what the cost, production was necessary.

The Government cannot indefinitely meet the demands of union leaders and, unfortunately, while the organizers and the leaders of these strikes will not themselves, because of the salaries which they receive, suffer, the members of the unions, like the rest of us who must work for the money which we need to purchase food, clothing, and the necessities of life, may be out on a limb if employers, adopting the policy of the agitators, go on strike.

The rain, we are told, falls on the just and the unjust. Unfortunately and regrettably, the hardships of a strike fall not only upon those who cause it but upon the innocent worker and the innocent bystander.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

STRIKES

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the country is very much disturbed at this hour because of the strike situation. Many of us are receiving messages urging that the Congress take some action. There is meeting in Washington at this time the conference representing management and organized labor called by the President for the purpose of working out some plan that will avoid or reduce to the minimum work stoppages and strikes, particularly in this reconversion period, when naturally many people are losing their jobs.

The Congress has refrained from taking any action on proposed labor legislation since this conference has been in session. I am advised that the intent has been to give this conference every opportunity to get results without irritation on the part of Congress.

In short, labor and management have been called together around the table and, I believe, with the blessing of practically all of our people. Much has been hoped for. Nothing can be accomplished, however, if a spirit of defiance, resistance, and a lack of willingness to give and take is to control the participants. This is no time for rule or ruin. According to the press nothing has yet been accomplished. However, where there is life there is hope. Until this morning that hope was justified.

In these circumstances certain organized labor leaders have seen fit to call the greatest strike in the history of our country. I am not sufficiently advised as to the merits of the strike to speak authoritatively. However, we all know that nothing can come of a conference when one side attempts to force its will by strikes and threatened strikes during the conference. At 3 o'clock this morning the bus and streetcar operators in the city of Washington went out on strike. The city is without transportation. Today thousands of employees whose services are necessary in carrying on the Government are unable to reach their work—right here at the seat of government—and this is just a sample of what is going on throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable, yes, it is deplorable. It shows an attitude on the part of these particular labor leaders which is not in keeping with a spirit of get-together, bargain collectively, give

and take, iron out our differences, and get to work in the best interests of the country.

The Congress has been tolerant. As a matter of fact, it has been doing practically nothing for the last few days, and possibly all because those in authority did not want to in any way interfere with the operation of this labor-management conference. Patience has ceased to be a virtue. If it is within the power of the Congress to do something, that should be done now.

The President has certain constitutional as well as other powers which he could use to get results. If he does not choose to assert this power and does not even speak up at this critical hour, then the Congress should lay all other things aside in an earnest effort to provide mandatory legislation that will compel action and which has some hope of success.

Mr. President, I beseech you to come out with a courageous statement in behalf of all of the people—not in the interest of either management or labor. I believe, with many others, that such a declaration on your part at the moment will do more to alleviate instantly the terrible strike conditions now prevailing than any other one thing. I speak most respectfully, yet most earnestly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include several editorials.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he had received from a young serviceman in Japan.

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement by R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, and also an editorial from the magazine The Nation.

The SPEAKER. There are gentlemen who have special orders to address the House at this time. If it is agreeable to them, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] may proceed for 1 minute. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that a strike should be called at this time. I think that in order that the Nation may know and in order that this Congress may know who is responsible for the strikes, we ought to have an investigation completely and thoroughly into the facts, and I am satisfied that you will find these strikes are company-incited.

All of us regret that a strike is taking place in the plants of America's leading corporation, General Motors. But let us not be stampeded by a hostile press and a hostile radio, and by lobbyists representing the manufacturers, into the easy position of blaming everything on the workers or on the union.

I offer the following article from the magazine The Nation, which appeared in the issue of June 30, 1945, to show that certain segments of the automobile industry, and particularly General Motors, wanted a strike. I also submit a recent statement by R. J. Thomas, president of the UAW-CIO, which recounts the efforts made within the last few weeks by the union to stave off the strike:

The following editorial over the signature of UAW-CIO president, R. J. Thomas, appeared in the United Automobile Worker, official organ of the union, which was being mailed to a million members today:

"I am writing this column as the showdown between your union and the big three in the automobile industry moves to a climax.

"Just before the Auto Worker went to press, negotiations with General Motors were to be resumed, but there seemed little hope that anything worth while would result. The corporation, the largest, richest, and biggest money-making enterprise in the world, has refused utterly to grant any increase in wages without corresponding price increases, and treats our fully justified demands for wage increases to take care of the losses in take-home pay as something on which they will not negotiate. The company negotiators listen—but they laugh at the idea of paying the wage rates they can so well afford.

"It is regrettable that an outfit which sets the pace for the whole auto industry should be operated by socially irresponsible men. The perfect illustration of that was GM Vice President Harry Anderson's now classic remark a few days ago that they would not open their books even to their own stockholders. The corporation is being operated, not by its owners, but by a managerial clique whose entire financial investment represents at best a minority of the stock. It is this little group, responsible only to themselves and entirely lacking in any consciousness of their obligations to society as the operators of the world's largest business, which is, in effect, forcing a costly and terrible strike upon us.

"God knows the top leadership of the UAW-CIO has neither sought nor wanted a collision of this kind. But I think the people of America will agree with our own membership that we have been patient, we have been fair, we have sought to do no more than maintain the economic well-being of our people and of the country as a whole, in our proposals to General Motors Corp. and to Chrysler and Ford.

"Since the beginning of the present controversy, GM has never indicated in word or in deed its willingness to give an inch on wages. Its attitude is a clear indication that the corporation is not only expecting a strike, but welcomes the test of strength. No doubt this tough policy is because of the provisions of the Federal tax laws under which GM's strike losses would largely be repaid out of the Federal Treasury through tax refunds. The corporation is acting on the assumption that this is a fine time to decide the issues, when it will have the Treasury of the United States to finance it, and the workers will have to depend upon their limited resources.

"Should there be a strike, it must be conducted on our part with complete and orderly discipline, and with full confidence that the du Pont family cannot successfully flout the just demands of the automobile workers."

[From The Nation of June 30, 1945]

DETROIT PLANS FOR CHAOS

(By Irving Richter)

While the United States Chamber of Commerce has been entering into a labor-management charter with the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor, and while progressive management generally is seeking to reconvert to peacetime production with a minimum of economic dislocation, the major corporations in the automobile industry are deliberately fostering disorder and planning for chaos. They have adopted and are acting upon the philosophy set forth last August by John W. Scoville, chief economist for the Chrysler Corp.: "If you believe in economic freedom and competition, then you will be opposed to collective bargaining. * * * As industrial turmoil increases, more and more people will see the evils generated by collective bargaining, and we should look forward to the time when all Federal labor laws will be repealed."

To hasten that happy day, automobile manufacturers are actively stirring up the "industrial turmoil" on which they rely. They are doing it in at least five ways. They are fomenting strikes, conducting lock-outs which they call strikes, and utilizing all their power as advertisers to discredit labor for striking. They are following a veterans' reemployment and seniority policy which, while it offers little to veterans entering or returning to the industry, attempts to persuade them that their security depends upon the destruction of union organization. They are conducting a campaign to split off locals of the United Automobile Workers' national organization and to reduce them to the status of independent or company unions, as a first step toward eliminating collective bargaining altogether. They are carrying on an active antilabor, anti-Wagner Act, anti-NLRB lobby in Washington. And they are seeking to carry other segments of our economy—notably the National Association of Manufacturers and the farm organizations—with them on the road to postwar strife. The detailed documentation of these charges must await the congressional investigation which UAW officials have demanded, but enough is already known to make the pattern clear.

First, the widely publicized strikes. Two examples are typical. One day last February plant supervisors at Chrysler's Dodge factory in Detroit summarily fired eight officials of the local union while a dispute on production schedules was going through the established grievance procedure. The next day supervisors at the Briggs plant, a close Chrysler affiliate, similarly dismissed eight officials of the local. Men at both plants, exasperated by a number of earlier incidents, struck. Officials of the union charged that the plant supervisors were acting under explicit orders from the top Chrysler management, whose reliance on "industrial turmoil" has been noted. A subsequent event confirmed their suspicions. When union trouble-shooters, whose task it is to enforce the no-strike pledge, appeared at the struck Chrysler plant, the bitterest opposition to their back-to-work arguments came from a plant committeeman, Ray Lovelace. Despite his efforts, the men voted to end the strike—only to learn that Lovelace had been promoted to a company labor-relations job in the South. "Was this a reward for services rendered?" asked the union.

Where provocation by management fails to achieve more than a momentary work stoppage, the company may resort to lock-outs, as in the recent Packard episode. There a small group of men walked out when established grievance procedure was ignored. When the rest of the 20,000 workers reported to work next day, they found the plant gates locked against them. The men hung around or went home—only to read in all three Detroit newspapers, "20,000 Packard workers continue to strike; cause unknown." The press generally, hungry for automobile advertising, has played the company game with greater ardor than usual.

The industry's ultimate goal—a return to nonunion individual bargaining as it existed in the days of Coolidge—is clear both from

its words and from its actions. The Automotive Council for War Production—wartime alias of the Automobile Manufacturers' Association—is actively lobbying for amendments to the Wagner Act and decreased NLRB appropriations; its director, George Romney, has been quoted in the New York Times as warning that reconversion will be delayed by the operation of collective bargaining.

While publicly bemoaning the wartime strikes, Romney has advocated more democracy for local unions and has asked the Government to decentralize CIO power. He knows, of course, that it has been the international officers and regional directors who have made the no-strike pledge stick. What better proof that Romney and his principals, like Scoville, want more strikes, not fewer?

The General Motors Corp. has recently issued to all its foremen an order which strikes at the heart of established procedure for collective bargaining. The order requires the foreman to refuse to call a union committeeman to hear an aggrieved worker unless the worker has first given the complete story of his grievance to the foreman. It further orders the foreman to remain present at all times while the worker and the committeeman discuss the grievance. Obviously this will discourage all but the toughest union men from reporting a grievance. And if the union cannot be used for handling grievances, the natural reaction of the worker will be to balk at joining or paying dues to the union.

Chrysler's economist, John W. Scoville, makes it very clear why the corporations are out to destroy the CIO Automobile Workers: "Fair wages are wages that are just high enough to attract the required number of employees of the desired quality. No labor unions are required to secure fair wage rates." But it is with respect to veteran reemployment and seniority that the industry has most obviously tipped its hand, and sown dragon's teeth which may some day cause serious trouble in Detroit. The UAW, with 300,000 members in the armed forces, has a staff of 7 veterans working full time on veterans' needs. The organization knows what may happen if efforts to turn veteran against worker succeed and has demanded that all collective-bargaining contracts be reopened for the insertion of veteran-seniority clauses. To date none of the Big Three has complied.

Instead, the industry's proposal is to grant to veterans a so-called superseniority which in effect provides that the employer can fire anybody at any time, even a veteran of World War I who has been with the company ever since, in order to put a returned veteran in his place. Having displaced the senior employee, however, the returned veteran does not achieve seniority himself under the company proposal. On the contrary, he can be fired like any other novice after the 1 year provided in the Selective Service Act. In short, the automobile industry proposes to destroy seniority altogether, for veterans and nonveterans alike, under the guise of providing jobs for returned servicemen. Ultimately the best protection for the veteran as for everyone else will be jobs for all—60,000,000 jobs. The industry's program is to sell the veteran the notion that the only way for him to get a job is to take it away from someone else.

* * * * *

Detroit has tasted full employment—and the companies don't like its savor. Rufus Tucker, General Motors economist, puts it this way: "I believe that 3,000,000 is the minimum possible allowance for unemployment, even in years when the demand for labor is high." Actually, Tucker's figures call for 7,000,000 unemployed in 1950—the 3,000,000 mentioned, plus 4,000,000 others—"practically all the men in the emergency labor force and practically all the women who would normally have retired, and at least two-thirds of the women who would not normally have entered the labor force." Scoville, the Chrysler economist, writing in Barron's, adds that the right to a job is "one of the most absurd of the current fallacies"; it could be established only by "replacing freedom with communism."

With so many millions out of work, who will buy Detroit's automobiles? The industry has an answer to that one, too. Current demands on the OPA to permit a 25-percent price increase for automobiles show one side of the coin. The other side is the low production quota of 200,000 automobiles for the rest of 1945, made necessary by present steel shortages. After 6 months of such limited production, with plants like Willow Run closed down altogether without plans for reopening, Detroit will have sufficient unemployment and industrial turmoil to satisfy the most turmoil-loving enemy of collective bargaining. Incidentally, limiting automobile production to a few hundred thousand a quarter, divided among half a dozen companies—instead of the 10,000,000 annual production the UAW says is possible and practicable—will make an unassailable case for price rises and open up a postwar perspective featured by fewer cars, more unemployment, racial tension, veteran unrest, and wider profit margins than ever before. Already progress has been made, with an estimated 120,000 let out of jobs since or in anticipation of VE-day.

Fortunately attempts to seat other economic interests on the same postwar toboggan have so far not succeeded. The automobile lobby in Washington has joined hands with food processors and with Senator LEE O'DANIEL's Christian America Association to cripple enforcement of the Wagner Act in the food industries through a rider to the NLRB appropriation bill. In return Ivan McDaniel, of the fruit-packing lobby, whose earlier antilabor activities were uncovered by the La Follette committee, is backing the automobile industry's drive for other antilabor legislation. But the farm organizations generally have shown a most encouraging unwillingness to go along.

The National Farmers Union, of course, continues its established policy of farmer-labor cooperation. And neither the Farm Bureau Federation or the Grange has swallowed the Automotive Council bait. Ed O'Neal, Farm Bureau president, has said: "It is axiomatic that national income cannot be maintained unless labor is practically fully employed, and at fair wages"; and a recent Grange report on foreign trade stressed the need "to maintain full employment and thus assure a basis to preserve our American standard of living for agriculture as well as for industry." Perhaps farm leaders have taken warning from the words of Scoville, of Chrysler: "While I condemn collective bargaining as an assault on liberty, as an evil thing, * * * I realize that collective bargaining is only one chick in the foul breed of vultures that seek to pick the meat from the bones of honest men. * * * Farmer schemes for parity prices are of this malignant type."

* * * * *

Support for the automobile industry's position is being sought chiefly in the executive committee of the NAM. George Romney, of the Automotive Council, though not a member, sat in on the committee's meetings when it decided not to sign the labor-management charter. Subsequently he attacked the charter in a series of radio broadcasts. B. E. Hutchinson, vice president of Chrysler, attacked particularly the provision in the charter which stipulates that "the fundamental rights of labor to organize and engage in collective bargaining shall be preserved." Hutchinson objected that this provision froze "the present situation in regard to labor law." The NAM, however, has not yet surrendered to the voices of reaction from Detroit. Members of its executive committee have let it be known that Romney was asked to leave the most recent meeting of the committee.

Automobile manufacturers themselves, it is important to note, are not solid in their support of the Automotive Council's program for a return to the labor-relations policies and the scarcity of the Hoover era. Paul Hoffman, president of Studebaker and chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, is working hard to implement the labor-management charter. The Ford Co., though it has joined General Motors and Chrysler in playing veterans off against workers, refrained from the general assault which the industry launched against unionization at the Mead committee hearings in Detroit in April. Even within the companies which support Romney important executives can be found who see the dangers to democracy in the industry's present course. But their fears are voiced only in their homes and clubs; to date not a single management in Detroit has protested.

Eighteen months ago Charles E. Wilson, of General Electric, warned the National Association of Manufacturers as follows: "I tell you frankly that I am deeply alarmed today over the possibility that a right-wing reaction may draw some sections of capital so far away from our traditions as to imperil the entire structure of American life as we know it." Consciously or unconsciously, Wilson was describing the present high command of the automobile industry.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include therein a copy of two letters from boys in the service.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because no objection is made, I think it is poor procedure to have 1-minute speeches before special orders that have been heretofore entered. Should any further requests be made today, I shall object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had an inquiry as to the approximate cost for the proposed universal military

training plan which is now being generally discussed. Therefore, I requested information from my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York, Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, who has been interested in this proposed legislation for the past 20 or 25 years and who I consider is an authority on this matter, as to the approximate cost to carry out such a program as is now being considered.

I am in receipt of a letter from him which is indeed most informative and interesting, and I know the Members have a great respect for his opinion on matters of this nature. He outlines that this proposed training would cost approximately $2,400,000,000 for an estimated million youths a year, 700,000 for the Army and 300,000 for the Navy. The cost to run about $1,700,000,000 for the Army and about $700,000,000 for the Navy. This he estimates as the approximate cost now, but that the cost would increase over the years.

His letter is as follows:

Hon. L. H. GAVIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Replying to your letter of November 8, let me say that inquiries which I have made at the War Department result in the following estimates having to do with the cost of universal military training: Approximately 1,200,000 youngsters reach the age of 18 each year. Up to a few weeks ago both the Army and the Navy made their plans on the assumption that the physical qualifications required of the youngsters would be the same as those required under the Selective Service System. On that assumption, it was figured that about 830,000 youngsters would be admitted to training each year, the Army to take a little over 600,000 and the Navy to take a little over 200,000. However, the President, in his recommendation to the Congress, urged a more liberal physical standard, so that only those youngsters who were totally unfit should be rejected, leaving all of the remainder, fit and partially fit, to be admitted to the training. This recommendation caused the War and Navy Departments to revise their estimates to the extent that the Army would train 700,000 and the Navy 300,000—a total of 1,000,000 trainees each year. The Army people estimate that the total average annual cost for training 700,000 after the system has been running a few years will approximate $1,700,000,000. This includes all the pay and allowances to be given to Regular Army and Reserve officers (the latter greatly predominating) who will be assigned to the job of teaching and training. It also includes pay for the trainees on the basis of $30 per month, plus necessary expenditures in the way of dependency allowances which may be required by some few of the youngsters for the help of their families. The Navy estimates run about parallel with those of the Army. For the training of 300,000 youngsters the Navy will need, all told, about $700,000,000. One thing should be remembered: During the first few years of the training the cost will be somewhat less than the estimates cited above, for the reason that both services have on hand a large accumulation of facilities and equipment which can be used profitably without additional cost. In other words, they can live on their fat in this respect for a while. As time goes on, however, those facilities and equipment items will suffer from wear and tear and actual expenditure, thus necessitating expenditures for repair and replacement. In other words, it will take more money to run the show 8 or 10 years from now than it would take during the next 3 or 4 years. The estimates of the War and Navy Departments cited above are what might be called long-pull estimates. They reflect the opinion of the Departments as to the annual cost after the fat has been consumed, not the annual cost of the immediate future.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. WADSWORTH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial which appeared in the Oconomowoc Enterprise, of Oconomowoc, Wis., dated November 15, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THANKSGIVING DAY—WHAT DO OUR MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES THINK OF IT?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for all intents and purposes tomorrow will be Thanksgiving Day. I am reminded of the old judge of whom the lawyer said, "He not only reached an erroneous conclusion, but gave the wrong reason for it."

It must be rather discouraging to the men in our armed forces scattered all over the world who are begging to be brought back home to look after their families, to look after their businesses, or their farms, or to return to school, to see us celebrating Thanksgiving, a week in advance, under the conditions that prevail throughout the country today.

Ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have deemed it my duty to vote as I thought the people I represented would want me to vote if they could all be here and understand the proposition before the House. I take it to be my duty to speak up, regardless of pressure from the outside, on questions that vitally affect the welfare of every human being in America; and I believe that is what my people want me to do.

Do not lay too much unction to yourselves, you Republicans, or you Democrats. This is not a political issue and you cannot win it by default. Someone said that the Republicans would petition out this bill to get these men out of service. Well, there are not enough of you to bring the bill out, and not one-third of you have signed either petition up to date. The same situation prevails on the Democratic side of the House.

What I shall say today will be nonpartisan. My country comes first.

We cannot unload the responsibility onto the President. The President has his responsibilities as Chief Executive. We have ours as Members of Congress. The only people who cannot get on the Federal pay roll, except by election of the people, are Members of the House of Representatives. A man can ascend to the Presidency from the Vice Presidency or from the Cabinet; a Senator may be appointed; but the only man on the Federal pay roll who cannot get there any other way, except by a vote of the people, is a Member of the House of Representatives. We are the direct representatives of the people of our districts.

Now, suppose these boys, 8,000,000 of them, could look in on Washington today, and look in on Detroit, Mich., and other places where these strikes are being carried on, and ask themselves, "What were we fighting for? Why are we being held out here in uniformed idleness against our will, when our wives and children are crying for us to come home?" Or the man who left a business to discharge his patriotic duty, who now sees that business going to rack and ruin or being taken over by some fellow who clamored for war and then dodged the draft. That may be pretty strong language, but I can show you a good many instances, and so can you. How do you suppose that man feels when he sees a strike of the highest-paid laborers the world has ever known? Men in that business draw $3,000, $4,000, and $5,000 a year, without any more ability than these millions of men in the armed forces who are fighting for $50 a month.

How do you suppose the young fellow feels, who has gone into the service, who is just out of high school, who now realizes that if he is kept there a year or 2 or 3, it may deprive him of the opportunity to finish his education? How do you suppose these boys feel when they are even being shipped overseas now, instead of being sent home? General MacArthur tells us in effect that he has more men over there than he needs already. They are falling over each other in Europe.

If you really want to help them get home, sign one of these petitions, or all of them. Let us bring these boys home. It will not take 3 weeks after the petition is signed, to get the bill through, either, as was intimated a while ago.

I told you the other day I had a bill before the House—and I certainly wish the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] were here, because I would like to have him hear this. I have a bill before the Rules Committee that would allow any ex-serviceman to work without having to join a union or pay tribute. Why not? We did not draft them into the CIO, did we? We did not draft them into the AFL. We did not draft them into the Maritime Union. These servicemen have the right to work for their daily bread without having to pay tribute.

I told you that when you passed the wages and hours bill. Talk about the "four freedoms"!—you took from the poor fellows in this country the first freedom, the freedom to work for their daily bread without paying tribute to these men who have been named here today, some of whom are drawing salaries, I am told, as much as the salary of the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, for the number of people I represent I believe there are more real hard workers among them than any other district I know. I have said before, and I say now, the hardest workers in this country are the farmers of the Nation. Especially is this true of the cotton farmers, because they have to work in the hot sun—plow, hoe, and pick cotton in the hot, broiling sun. What do you suppose they are getting for that

work today? About 22½ or 23 cents an hour. A cotton farmer gets only 1 cent an hour for his work for every cent a pound he gets for his lint cotton. Today he is getting 22½ or 23 cents a pound. I pointed out the other day the fact that those farms had been stripped of white youth because where our population is about evenly divided between the two races in the South, they took about four white men to one Negro, and therefore stripped the white farms of their youth. Today those boys are being held in service, denied the opportunity to come home and carry on the farm work, even at the meager incomes they would draw.

Let us see what is going on here, and I can tell you now you had better get your feet on the ground, on the economic soil of America, and quit this running around after every will-o'-the-wisp. We are having a streetcar strike here in Washington right now. I am told that these people average $3,400 a year apiece. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I understand they are paid at least $1.02½ an hour apiece. There is not an intelligent farmer in my district who could not run a streetcar, if you would just give him a little training. They have girls running these streetcars and yet they paralyze the entire system here in Washington with a strike for higher pay while our farmers are working for 22½ or 23 cents an hour and our servicemen are serving for $50 a month.

If the Rules Committee will bring out my bill tomorrow, bring it to the floor of the House Friday, and let us pass it and send it to the Senate, let them pass it, and every streetcar in Washington will be rolling inside of 24 hours, and you will have these servicemen going into Detroit and other places taking over the work and starting the machinery moving to manufacture the materials the American people need.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. These transit employees in Washington are on strike. I call attention to the fact that the school teachers in my State and in very many other States have infinitely more justification in striking against their salaries, for in many cases they are not one-third of what these transit employees are receiving here.

Mr. RANKIN. There is not 1 school teacher out of 20, and I dare say there is hardly 1 out of 50, in my State who draws as much money as a streetcar conductor in Washington did before this strike.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. RANKIN. And there is not a school teacher in my district, or the gentleman's district, who could not operate a streetcar. Any man who can run an elevator or drive an automobile can operate a streetcar.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with practically all the gentleman has said. I believe I agree with the gentleman more often than he agrees with himself.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to say this. Now the gentleman is over on our side of the House. He is talking to twice as many Republicans as Democrats on the floor at the present time. We have gone along with the gentleman a good many times. Why does not he get his house in order over there?

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that as I said in the beginning, I am talking to both sides of this House. I am not confining my remarks to anyone. I am speaking to Members of all parties.

I have no objection to labor drawing a reasonable wage. I want everyone to have a reasonable wage. I know what work is. I rode a carriage at a sawmill for 2 years, in the rain, in the sun, and in the cold wind. I know what it means. I have been a sawyer. I have done everything that is to be done at a sawmill, or on a farm. I know what work means. I also know what labor racketeering means. These labor racketeers are hurting the cause of the laboring people. I want to tell you now if we are going to permit this country to be thrown into a turmoil by a group at the top who are drawing larger salaries than they ever could draw working, and many of whom have never done a lick of work in their lives, chaos will result. It is about time that the Congress woke up and passed laws to protect the American people from such outrages.

If this is not done we are going to destroy the farmers of the country. I see where the OPA, on top of all this, is going to put a ceiling on the price what goods are manufactured. It is about time we got rid of the OPA. I am tired of those commissars attempting to tell the American people how naked they shall go. You cannot buy clothes now. You cannot buy a suit of cotton underwear in Washington, you cannot buy a white shirt, simply because the OPA has made it impossible for the mills to manufacture those materials. Cotton is piling up in the warehouses, our farmers are drawing the most meager income of any class in America; and, mark my word, if this thing continues you are going to drive industry out of the country.

I see that they are going to boost wages up to a certain point, then put a ceiling on the prices of automobiles, or whatever articles are manufactured. I am wondering what they are going to require them to put into the automobile or into the piece of goods or machinery that is manufactured.

It reminds me of Old Bill who ran a restaurant in Nettleton, the town where I lived years ago. His customers got on him one day and started to kid him about his rates. They said, "Uncle Bill, you have got to come down on your prices. You must serve us a hot meal for 5 cents or we are going to quit you." The next morning Uncle Bill had a sign on the door, "Hot meals, 5 cents." His customers asked, "Do you mean that?" He said, "Yes; walk right in." They asked, "What is it?" He answered, "Pepper sauce and crackers."

I wonder if the OPA is going to require the automobile manufacturers to put into those automobiles the essential machinery and materials to make them really modern or are they going to drive these fellows to other countries to manufacture automobiles?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I made the statement on the floor and of course it is right because everybody knows it, every school child knows it, that the cure for inflation is production. The OPA is making it absolutely impossible for free enterprise to function. It looks as if there is a deliberate attempt to simply bring this economy of ours to a complete standstill.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and I see men on this floor running interference for the OPA, or attempting to, which reminds me of Old Lightning. He said that when they moved west he had to walk and drive a swarm of bees across Arizona. He said he came very near losing several of them.

When I see Members of the House arise, attempt to run interference for the OPA, and tell us what a glorious millennium they are going to build for us with the wonderful things they are doing, I think of the story of Old Lightning.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have another illustration.

Every time I think of Commissar Bowles and this OPA, I seem to see a fellow trying to hold a lid, that is too small, down on a boiling pot, while the soup is spouting up all around him. While he tries to hold one thing down another one comes up. He cannot any more regulate prices in a free economy than he can reverse the laws of nature by his imperial edicts.

We are going to have to get back to the fundamentals of economics, and the way to do it is to repeal the law creating the OPA, repeal the wages and hours bill and the Wagner Act and the Walsh-Healey Act, and get back to protecting the American people from the kind of racketeering to which they are now being subjected.

Get your feet on the ground. Let the Congress of the United States exercise those functions for which it was elected.

You talk about inflation. Inflation is already here.

As I pointed out the other day, at the end of the last war we had $5,698,000,000 in circulation. Today we have $27,825,000,000 in circulation, and it is increasing all the time. You are not stopping it. The Constitution of the United States says that "Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof," and until we step in and say where they shall stop and stabilize our currency at a level that will allow those prices to level up, or level down, and stay there, you are going to have turmoil, confusion, and uncertainty—if not chaos.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Let us take an ordinary country town bank. Under normal conditions prior to the war it had a million and a half dollars in its statement, and it now has $5,000,000 through the purchase of Government bonds and increase of deposits that was brought about by various legislation we have passed here. Is there not about $3,000,000 of inflation in that bank?

Mr. RANKIN. The currency is already inflated. It has gone from $5,698,000,000 in 1920 to $27,825,000,000 in 1945. You already have inflation. Suppose you undertook, as was done after the last war when the Federal Reserve Board had a brainstorm, went into a tail spin, and raised the rediscount rate, called loans, squeezed the currency, and drove prices far down below the cost of production and broke nearly everybody in the country. Suppose we try that again. Just as surely as the night follows the day, if Congress permits that policy you will have a depression or a panic, and a sentiment sweep over this country to repudiate the national debt, because you will be unable to pay it. Once you repudiate the national debt you will have destroyed confidence in your Government. You will have destroyed the confidence in America's credit. The American people believe in this Government. They have confidence in its integrity, as the rest of the world does—we must not destroy that confidence. For when we do, we destroy our country.

Let me tell you another thing. You hear a great deal about nazism and fascism and communism. As I said the other day, they are all symptoms of the same disease. One of them is the chill and the other is the fever of a dying civilization. I see that in Great Britain they have set up a national socialist system. They are going to take over the land. That means the farmers will be reduced to peonage or to slavery. Do you want that in Kentucky? Do you want it in New York? Do you want that in Missouri? Do you want it in Iowa, or Minnesota? We do not want it in Mississippi. We want that system of free enterprise that George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin and James Madison and Abraham Lincoln and Jefferson Davis and every other great statesman of America has stood for.

That is what we want in this country. We do not want our country to get under the control of a little group of aliens who have flooded in here and got rich out of this war, coined their money from the blood and tears of the suffering men, women, and children of America, and now run around over this country and call every American they cannot control or intimidate a native Fascist.

I am so tired of those long-nosed reprobates smearing the American people and at the same time fostering a policy that they know, and every other intelligent person knows, will wreck this Republic if it is carried on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have before me a list of the wages they are drawing in these various industries.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I ask the gentleman if the Congress has not already given away the power to regulate the value of money through the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act?

Mr. RANKIN. Congress did that, but it can take it back at any time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We should do it.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course we should do it. We are going to have to do it, or the Federal Reserve System is likely to wreck this Republic.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman was talking about the volume of the money in the country a little while ago, about purchasing power.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Over before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is that so-called full employment bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, well, I cannot go into that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. The gentleman's party controls that legislation. Over there the members of the Cabinet are advocating that we create these jobs. I understand it is "must" legislation. They want 8,000,000 jobs at not less than $3,000 apiece. In any man's figures that is $24,000,000,000 additional.

Mr. RANKIN. There is where they get confused, and there is where they confuse the country. They talk about 60,000,000 jobs. What is a job? It is work. The man out yonder on the hillside tilling the soil has a job and his son would have a job doing the same thing, if you would let him get out of the service and get home and take it. The man out there running a sawmill, that is being threatened with a jail sentence by the OPA every day that he runs it, has a job, or would have if they would let him alone. There would be jobs for the men around him.

The lawyer who practices law in his office has a job, the doctor has a job, the merchant has a job, the streetsweeper has a job, the hotel man has a job, the filling station man has a job. Do not let them mislead you to believe that all these 60,000,000 jobs are going to be in the Ford plant or on the streetcars in Washington.

Of course there are 60,000,000 jobs, and there have been all along, until we began to interfere with them with legislation. If we would get back on the beam and legislate for the American people and not for a group on the outside who want to dictate for their own selfish interests, we would have 60,000,000 jobs, and every man who wanted to work would go home and go to work. We would bring these men home from the service, and they would make this country the richest and the finest Nation the world has ever seen. But you continue to keep them there as you are doing today and let them become dispirited, discouraged, and embittered, from the letters they receive from their weeping wives and children, you let them come back here embittered, and you will have thrown away the victory and lost the peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement from the Labor Department with reference to wages throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. While our cotton farmers are working in the hot sun for 22½ or 23 cents an hour, industrial laborers, many of whom are now on strike, were drawing the following wages:

Average weekly and hourly earnings in manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries in August 1945

Industry group or industry	Average weekly earnings, August 1945 [1]	Average hourly earnings, August 1945 [1]
		Cents
All manufacturing	$41 81	102.5
Durable goods	45.89	111.4
Nondurable goods	36.61	90.8
DURABLE GOODS		
Iron and steel and their products	46.14	110.9
Blast furnaces, steel works, and rolling mills	50.61	120.0
Gray-iron and semisteel castings	47.17	110.2
Malleable-iron castings	42.33	109.6
Steel castings	45.34	113.4
Cast-iron pipe and fittings	37.74	90.0
Tin cans and other tinware	38.83	90.2
Wirework	45.09	105.3
Cutlery and edge tools	38.94	95.3
Tools (except edge tools, machine tools, files, and saws)	42.83	98.3
Hardware	40.48	98.1
Plumbers' supplies	41.98	104.4
Stoves, oil burners, and heating equipment not elsewhere classified	41.67	103.4
Steam and hot-water heating apparatus and steam fittings	44.26	104.7
Stamped and enameled ware and galvanizing	40.86	101.5
Fabricated structural and ornamental metalwork	47.26	109.1
Metal doors, sash, frames, molding, and trim	45.80	106.7
Bolts, nuts, washers, and rivets	47.88	106.5
Forgings, iron and steel	48.00	124.3
Screw-machine products and wood screws	45.61	105.7
Steel barrels, kegs, and drums	37.55	101.1
Firearms	52.19	123.1
Electrical machinery	44.11	105.0
Electrical equipment	45.54	108.4
Radios and phonographs	37.65	91.2
Communication equipment	46.01	105.6
Machinery, except electrical	48.55	113.6
Machinery and machine-shop products	47.81	111.8
Engines and turbines	48.46	121.5
Tractors	51.15	116.2
Agricultural machinery, excluding tractors	48.16	112.3
Machine tools	53.81	117.9
Machine-tool accessories	50.33	120.1
Textile machinery	44.34	101.6
Typewriters	40.13	102.1
Cash registers, adding and calculating machines	51.44	118.8
Washing machines, wringers and driers, domestic	43.70	102.0
Sewing machines, domestic and industrial	52.13	110.7
Refrigerators and refrigeration equipment	39.05	110.4

Footnotes at end of table.

Average weekly and hourly earnings in manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries in August 1945—Continued

Industry group or industry	Average weekly earnings, August 1945 [1]	Average hourly earnings, August 1945 [1]
DURABLE GOODS—continued		
Transportation equipment, except automobiles	$54.28	Cents 129.6
Locomotives	51.56	126.2
Cars, electric- and steam-railroad	46.04	113.9
Aircraft and parts, excluding aircraft engines	48.58	119.0
Aircraft engines	48.30	126.9
Shipbuilding and boatbuilding	60.53	138.6
Motorcycles, bicycles, and parts	49.88	106.8
Automobiles	41.42	123.6
Nonferrous metals and their products	46.01	106.5
Smelting and refining, primary, of nonferrous metals	50.05	109.7
Alloying and rolling and drawing of nonferrous metals except aluminum	51.82	111.4
Clocks and watches	39.00	94.5
Jewelry (precious metals) and jewelers' findings	41.43	97.3
Silverware and plated ware	46.05	102.1
Lighting equipment	34.04	104.0
Aluminum manufactures	45.93	106.3
Lumber and timber basic products	33.07	81.6
Sawmills and logging camps	32.32	80.2
Planing and plywood mills	35.78	85.9
Furniture and finished lumber products	34.11	84.1
Furniture	34.55	85.8
Caskets and other morticians' goods	33.01	86.5
Wood preserving	33.92	79.1
Stone, clay, and glass products	38.96	93.7
Glass and glassware	38.96	98.4
Glass products made from purchased glass	34.42	82.8
Cement	44.29	96.0
Brick, tile, and terra cotta	33.47	82.3
Pottery and related products	35.11	91.0
Gypsum	43.83	93.8
Lime	39.54	81.3
Marble, granite, slate, and other products	37.64	94.0
Abrasives	48.75	108.1
Asbestos products	47.40	101.2
NONDURABLE GOODS		
Textile-mill products and other fiber manufactures	29.64	77.1
Cotton manufactures, except small wares [2]	27.22	71.2
Cotton small wares	34.62	82.2
Silk and rayon goods	30.67	76.6
Woolen and worsted manufactures, except dyeing and finishing	34.59	87.7
Hosiery	27.29	79.4
Knitted cloth [2]	32.32	78.0
Knitted outerwear and knitted gloves	28.96	78.4
Knitted underwear	26.65	71.0
Dyeing and finishing textiles, including woolen and worsted	34.49	82.5
Carpets and rugs, wool	35.00	91.8
Hats, fur-felt	42.86	110.6
Jute goods, except felts	34.60	78.7
Cordage and twine	32.63	76.6
Apparel and other finished textile products	27.93	84.4
Men's clothing, not elsewhere classified	30.00	90.0
Shirts, collars, and nightwear	22.92	69.8
Underwear and neckwear, men's	23.65	75.4
Work shirts	19.46	57.9
Women's clothing, not elsewhere classified	33.67	104.1
Corsets and allied garments	28.56	78.7
Millinery	37.57	99.9
Handkerchiefs	24.09	68.2
Curtains, draperies, and bedspreads	25.88	72.6
House furnishings, other than curtains, etc	30.47	79.8
Textile bags	28.07	71.9
Leather and leather products	33.62	85.7
Leather	43.18	97.9
Boot and shoe cut stock and findings	33.01	83.5
Boots and shoes	32.24	83.2
Leather gloves and mittens	27.48	80.5
Trunks and suitcases	32.29	83.0
Food	38.13	88.2
Slaughtering and meat packing	41.57	94.0
Butter	36.68	75.6
Condensed and evaporated milk	39.97	76.8
Ice cream	40.50	82.3

Footnotes at end of table.

Average weekly and hourly earnings in manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries in August 1945—Continued

Industry group or industry	Average weekly earnings, August 1945 [1]	Average hourly earnings, August 1945 [1]
NONDURABLE GOODS—continued		
Food—Continued		Cents
Flour	$43.14	88.2
Cereal preparations	45.20	99.5
Baking	39.36	87.6
Sugar refining, cane	36.12	86.2
Sugar, beet	37.87	98.7
Confectionery	30.18	76.6
Beverages, nonalcoholic	35.77	83.3
Malt liquors	53.14	116.5
Canning and preserving	30.11	82.2
Tobacco manufactures	30.15	76.1
Cigarettes	34.10	81.1
Cigars	26.49	71.0
Tobacco (chewing and smoking) and snuff	28.63	73.0
Paper and allied products	38.70	87.9
Paper and pulp	41.77	91.1
Envelopes	36.44	84.0
Paper bags	35.17	80.9
Paper boxes	34.44	83.3
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	46.70	114.2
Newspapers and periodicals	52.93	131.1
Printing, book and job	44.14	106.6
Lithographing	47.30	109.6
Chemicals and allied products	43.41	100.3
Paints, varnishes, and colors	46.34	99.8
Drugs, medicines, and insecticides	35.25	85.6
Soap	47.98	100.8
Rayon and allied products	40.33	95.3
Chemicals, not elsewhere classified	53.96	116.0
Explosives and safety fuses	44.83	105.9
Ammunition, small-arms	36.22	97.6
Cottonseed oil	26.18	57.8
Fertilizers	32.51	74.5
Products of petroleum and coal	56.97	121.6
Petroleum refining	59.27	127.1
Coke and by-products	49.80	109.6
Roofing materials	45.55	97.7
Rubber products	46.76	111.9
Rubber tires and inner tubes	52.81	126.9
Rubber boots and shoes	42.21	93.7
Rubber goods, other	40.02	96.9
Miscellaneous industries	40.94	97.7
Instruments (professional and scientific), and fire-control equipment	51.39	116.2
Pianos, organs, and parts	41.34	101.7
NONMANUFACTURING		
Mining:		
Anthracite	49.44	133.1
Bituminous coal	49.89	124.8
Metal	43.97	104.9
Quarrying and nonmetallic	41.25	88.5
Crude petroleum production	54.77	118.7
Public utilities:		
Telephone	[3]	[3]
Telegraph [4]	43.44	90.1
Electric light and power	50.71	113.9
Street railways and busses	51.59	97.4
Trade:		
Wholesale	43.27	101.3
Retail	29.01	77.2
Food	34.68	77.4
General merchandise	23.91	63.4
Apparel	29.99	81.9
Furniture and house furnishings	39.49	91.7
Automotive	42.58	93.8
Lumber and building materials	37.66	90.4
Hotels (year-round) [5]	24.37	54.8
Power laundries	28.05	66.4
Cleaning and dyeing	31.14	75.5
Brokerage	59.10	[3]
Insurance	46.73	[3]
Private building construction	55.79	138.3

[1] These figures are based on reports from cooperating establishments covering both full- and part-time employees who worked during any part of one pay period ending nearest the 15th of the month. As not all reporting firms furnish man-hour data, averaging hours and average hourly earnings for individual industries are based on a slightly smaller sample than are weekly earnings. Data for the current and immediately preceding months are subject to revision.

[2] Revisions have been made as follows in the data for earlier months: Cotton manufactures, except small wares, May 1945 to $27.52 and 66.7 cents. Knitted cloth, May 1945 to $32.64.

[3] Not available.

[4] Excludes messengers and approximately 6,000 employees of general and divisional headquarters and of cable companies.

[5] Cash payments only; additional value of board, room, and tips, not included.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include quotations from a speech made by Daniel Webster with reference to whether or not the President is a representative of the people.

Mr. GEARHART (at the request of Mr. CASE of South Dakota) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain correspondence.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

SKIING

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, if our hope for world peace is to come from the association of peoples rather than governments, I should like to have you listen to me for about 5 minutes on skiing, because it is rapidly becoming an international sport.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many people there are in the United States interested in skiing. In the Rockies, the Sierras, in New York, and New England there are many active in skiing. I do know that in my district and in the Pacific Northwest there is wide interest.

Fifteen thousand members pay dues in the affiliated clubs of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. It is estimated that an additional 70,000 belong to clubs not yet affiliated with the Pacific Northwest Ski Association or who are not members of any club.

I mention this because skiing is rapidly becoming an international sport. Today, I suspect that it outranks all sports of an international nature, with the possible exception of foot racing and swimming.

Skiing, of course, would be impossible if it were not for the mountains of the United States and the watersheds which provide suitable snows late in the season. In my own Pacific Northwest, it is possible to ski the year around, and for 8 to 10 months of the year ideal conditions can be found for skiing.

This accounts for the growing number of ski enthusiasts.

Twenty years ago, skiing as a form of sport was the exception and was restricted to a few specialists. Today, whole families journey to the forest reserves and the gentle mountain slopes of Sun Valley, Mount Rainier, Mount Spokane, Leavenworth, Stevens Pass, and many, many other famous places in the Northwest.

It seems to me that the Forest Service and the Federal Government should lose

no time in reopening these recreational areas. In addition to making healthy recreation and the appreciation of nature, available to our own citizens, skiing looms large as a medium that can hurdle the barriers of custom and language and bring the peoples of many areas of this world closer together.

Skiing has probably received its greatest impetus from Norway, Sweden, and the Tyrolean Alps. Prior to the war, many of the experts and champions of these areas came to America and put on both exhibitions and competitions with our own skimasters.

Realizing the importance of this medium of contact and exchange, early last August while in Oslo, Norway, I called on Sigmund Ruud. Ruud is well known in this country. As recently as 6 years ago, Sig was in a competition at Leavenworth, Wash., on a ski jump not more than 20 miles from my home.

He broke the record, that day, for that ski jump. A week later, jumping in northern New York, he leaped almost 290 feet and again broke the record for that New York ski jump.

I found Sig working for the Johannsen & Nilsen Ski Goods Co. I had a nice visit with him. He speaks English very well.

I asked him when he was coming back to America to show us his skill. He said he hoped very soon, and that only the day before he had received a cable from Seattle inviting him to bring a team of 20 Norwegians over for an exhibition. He said:

> We are now planning to make that tour early next year. Only, this time, I will bring my younger brother, Asbjorn. He is only 25 now and far better than I ever was.

Sig also told me that the Norwegians are very much interested in getting hickory from America. Their yields are running out and Norway needs American hickory for her skis.

I mention all this because on August 13, 1945—that is this year—the use of our national parks and the recreational use of our national forests was curtailed.

I understand that quite recently the Budget denied an appropriation that would have restored the rotted out condition of the recreational facilities in the national forests. I feel that these appropriations should be respected.

They do not amount to a great sum and yet the possibilities from a small appropriation for this purpose in terms of the national health and appreciation of our mountain resources, and the possibilities of promoting good will and sportsmanship among all people, are almost priceless.

I trust that before the deficiency appropriation which we will consider next week has been signed by the President, action will have occurred to restore these funds and once more make available a resource and a national blessing that belongs to all the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. WOOD]. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts from the San Francisco Chronicle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOOD). Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNITED STATES POLICE FORCE FOR THE OCCUPATION OF JAPAN AND GERMANY

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th of October 1945, I introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a police force to take over the work of occupation in Germany and Japan. This would relieve the Army for overseas duty. I find in the daily and periodical press that the same thought is occurring to others who are concerned with the efficiency of American occupation forces.

I should like to say at the very beginning of my remarks that I have great faith that our American generals and the men of our Army have been conscious of the duties required in the transition from active warfare to occupation of subdued enemy territory. The nature of the requirements for warfare and for police work—which is what occupation amounts to in the main—are quite different. The demanded skills are very different. The maintenance of order and the instilling of new ideals and the evolution of forms of government and ways of life in Germany and Japan require, to my way of thinking, the establishment of a force of men who are trained in all phases of police work, such as we have in our excellent Federal Bureau of Investigation, and in our State police agencies. We need other men trained in the techniques of propaganda and in education to assist in the transformation of philosophies. We need men who are trained in tact and judgment and diplomacy to handle the civil affairs.

I have no doubt of the ability of our men who are now doing the job. But I have serious doubt that the training for warfare which they received equips them to do the work they are now called upon to perform.

It naturally pleased me very much to find that General Eisenhower told the Military Affairs Committee, to which my bill was referred, when he appeared before it on November 15, that he had been thinking along these same lines. General Eisenhower said:

> I believe that in the long run there might be some scheme of constabulary worked out whereby we can make Germany foot the bill, thereby making it more economical in manpower because they will become experts.

Later, during the same testimony, General Eisenhower said:

> I believe by next June we ought at the very least to be down somewhere around 300,000 or 350,000 men in Germany; and with the development of a constabulary, with the perfection of techniques and methods, we can certainly bring that figure down materially thereafter.

While I am aware that the Military Affairs Committee invited General Eisenhower to discuss other legislation with it, I am sorry that the members of the committee did not take advantage of the opportunity to ask him to express himself at greater length about his ideas for the development of a constabulary.

I believe that it would be to the advantage of our Nation in the discharge of its duties to enter upon such an enterprise at the earliest possible time. Under unanimous consent, I include immediately following my remarks, H. R. 4349:

H. R. 4349

A bill to establish the United States Police Force for the Occupation of Japan and Germany

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) there is hereby established in the Department of War an organization to be known as the "United States Police Force for the Occupation of Japan and Germany," hereinafter referred to as the "Police Force."

(b) The Police Force, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, shall, at the earliest practicable moment, assume and execute all the duties and functions of the Army in the occupation and administration of Japan and of that part of Germany which is under the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Police Force shall consist of a Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and such number of members, clerks, experts, and other assistants as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of War, shall, from time to time, deem necessary for the efficient performance of the functions and duties of the Police Force.

(b) The Commissioner shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum, and the Deputy Commissioner shall receive compensation at the rate of $7,500 per annum. The Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner shall receive such allowance for expenses (including a subsistence allowance not to exceed $20 per day) incurred by them in the performance of their duties as may be authorized by the Secretary of War.

(c) The Commissioner shall, without regard to the civil-service laws, appoint the members, clerks, experts, and other assistants, and he shall, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such clerks, experts, and other assistants.

(d) The grades and annual rates of compensation of members of the Police Force shall be as follows:

(1) Colonels, $4,500 each;
(2) Majors, $3,900 each;
(3) Captains, $3,500 each;
(4) Lieutenants, $3,100 each;
(5) First sergeants and detective sergeants, $2,800 each;
(6) Sergeants and detectives, $2,500 each;
(7) Corporals, $2,200 each;
(8) Privates, $1,700 each, with an annual increase in compensation until a maximum of $2,100 per annum is reached.

(e) Each member of the Police Force shall be furnished quarters and rations in kind, or granted, under such regulations as the Commissioner may prescribe, an allowance in lieu thereof, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the member is being performed, and shall not exceed $10 per day. Payments of such allowances may be made in advance.

(f) The act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, are hereby extended to the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, members, and employees of the Police Force.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner shall establish a training school for the proper instruction of persons volunteering for service in the Police Force. Such school shall be situated at such place or places as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of War, may determine. Student recruits at such school shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 per month, and shall be furnished quarters and rations in kind. Training at such school shall not be required of any person whom the Commissioner finds qualified for service in the Police Force.

SEC. 4. No person shall be accepted for service in the Police Force or for training for such service unless he is a citizen of the United States and his physical and mental fitness for such service has been satisfactorily determined.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of War shall issue from time to time to the Police Force, upon requisition of the Commissioner, such arms, ammunition, engineer and sanitary matériel, aircraft, motor vehicles, and military supplies of all kinds as may be necessary to enable the Police Force to carry out its duties and functions under this act.

SEC. 6. The Commissioner shall provide the members of the Police Force with suitable uniforms and other clothing, and, with the approval of the Secretary of War, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary for the control and regulation of the Police Force.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the legislative business on next Tuesday, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, November 23, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, November 26, 1945. Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 2764, freight forwarders' legislation.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, November 28, 1945, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4605. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; without amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4628. A bill to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Eli Richmond; with amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 233. A bill for the relief of Hamsah Omar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2809. A bill for the relief of Theodore Maudrame; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2887. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mrak; with amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3765. A bill for the relief of Herman Trahn; with amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 4766. A bill providing for the release of a portion of Marquette National Forest for private use and development; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4767. A bill to correct an inequity existing in the case of holders of adjusted-service certificates who did not accept payment in bonds under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4768. A bill to better adapt the loan programs authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the needs of veterans and low-income farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4769. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4770. A bill creating an import quota on watches and watch movements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4771. A bill to provide for the payment of direct Federal assistance to permanently and totally disabled individuals, blind individuals, and certain individuals 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4772. A bill to require the payment of prevailing wages on highway construction financed in whole or in part by Federal funds; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4773. A bill to require the registration of legislative counsel and lobbyists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 4774. A bill to provide for military training of youths in peacetime; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4775. A bill to regulate subversive and un-American propaganda; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 402. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of the use of air and water shipping facilities in returning surplus troops to the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. Res. 403. Resolution to provide for an investigation of plans for railroad reorganization; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4776. A bill for the relief of Mr. H. G. Winfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 4777. A bill for the relief of the Sawtooth Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4778. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from a decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by the legal representatives of the estate of Robert D. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1338. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Anna Priebe and others of Lemmon, S. Dak., for legislation that will ban the advertising over the radio of alcoholic beverages, in which beer and wine are today the chief offenders; also recommending a censorship of the motion-picture industry, to eliminate the promotion of drinking and the depiction of a low standard of morals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1339. By Mr. GWINN of New York: Petition of Mrs. John A. Querker and 2,364 other signatories, petitioning the Congress of the United States to open the mail service between Germany and the United States in order that they might help send relief to their loved ones and their families; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, from all the draining duties in the valley of toil, we would take now the climbing morning path to this shrine of our spirits, here to be made aware of eternal realities and lifted out

of our littleness by abiding values greater than ourselves, to which we would give ourselves with new singleness of purpose.

In this dismaying era with all its darkness, we are deeply thankful for the things that cannot be shaken and for guiding lights that no winds of violence can ever blow out—for the leaping flame of truth and goodness and beauty and integrity and love, the perpetual light fed by the encompassing presence of the Eternal God of our salvation.

Cleanse our hearts that Thou mayest work in us and through us for the coming of Thy kingdom. In the vast difficulties confronting the makers of peace restore and strengthen and sustain our souls and lead us in the paths of righteousness, for Thy name's sake. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1945.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CARL HAYDEN, a Senator from the State of Arizona, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HAYDEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 20, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 21, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 784. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr.; and

S. 1036. An act to provide for the adjustment of the compensation of certain members or former members of the armed forces of the United States who, before the expiration of their terminal leave, have performed, or shall hereafter perform, civilian services for the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4489) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE DECORATIONS CONFERRED BY GREAT BRITAIN ON AMERICAN CHIEFS OF STAFF

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, His Britannic Majesty King George VI, through his Ambassador to the United States, the Earl of Halifax, further confirmed the friendship uniting British and American peoples, and honored the American Chiefs of Staff in a ceremony at the British Embassy, November 21, 1945.

The Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief William D. Leahy, the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces and General of the Army George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff and Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, Chief of Staff and General of the Army Henry H. Arnold, each was decorated with the insignia of Honorary Knight, Grand Cross of the Military Division of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, G. C. B.

To all who value the history of successful united service in war as progress toward unity for peace, the record of this first combination of the British-American Chiefs of Staff is an encouragement.

That this gracious compliment by our British comrades in arms may be publicly acknowledged, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, following these remarks:

First. Conferment of G. C. B.'s on United States Chiefs of Staff by the Earl of Halifax.

Second. An account clipped from the New York Times giving further information regarding this ancient Order of the Bath.

There being no objection, the conferment and newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERMENT OF G. C. B.'S ON UNITED STATES CHIEFS OF STAFF, NOVEMBER 21, 1945

No more honorable duty could fall to me than that which I today have to discharge, of conferring upon the leaders of the United States services the decorations which His Majesty the King has been pleased to award.

And by curious coincidence we do this on the day that public announcement is foreshadowed and made of changes in the tenure of these high and responsible posts.

I know how greatly the King would have wished to be able himself to confer these decorations—but that has not been possible.

And there is perhaps the compensating advantage that the conferment in Washington permits the presence of relatives and friends, and of many who have worked most closely with the recipients.

I only wish as we recollect his own special contribution to a great war partnership, that we might have had the presence of Sir John Dill and Lady Dill.

It would be presumptuous, as it would plainly be unnecessary, for me to attempt any appraisement of the quality or value of service which these distinguished officers have rendered. How they directed the creation of power for this country and for the Allies—and how they employed the power thus created.

Such appraisement is part of history and will remain for all men to read.

Certainly the Combined Chiefs of Staff, in which those whom we wish to honor today played so notable a part, has been one of the great achievements of the war. There has never been anything like it between allies before; and the confidence that it was able to establish, has been both a great weapon of victory and a great example for the future. I know what it has meant to the British Chiefs of Staff and to those who represent them in Washington, to work with partners and colleagues on terms of complete mutual trust; and I hope that this practical collaboration may prove a model that will be followed over the years to come in many other fields.

[From the New York Times of November 21, 1945]

BRITAIN DECORATES FOUR MILITARY CHIEFS—HALIFAX PRESENTS ORDER OF THE BATH TO MARSHALL, KING, LEAHY, AND ARNOLD

(By Lewis Wood)

WASHINGTON, November 21.—On behalf of King George VI, the cherished Order of the Bath was bestowed today by the Earl of Halifax, the British Ambassador, on four commanders of America's fighting forces today.

In a ceremony at the British Embassy the Ambassador presented the insignia of Honorary Knight Grand Cross of the Military Division of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath (G. C. B.) to Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy, General of the Army George C. Marshall, Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, and General of the Army Henry H. Arnold.

The British Ambassador said that it would be presumptuous for him to appraise their services in the war.

"Such appraisement," he said, "will be part of history and will remain for all men to read. Never before has there been anything like this in the history of allies. This cooperation has been a great weapon of victory and a great example for the future."

Happily enough, the Ambassador stated, the occasion came on the very day when it was announced that the tenure of Generals Marshall and Arnold, and Admiral King would be changed.

The American officers were escorted by the British Chiefs of Staff in Washington, Field Marshal Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, Admiral of the Fleet Sir James Somerville, Lt. Gen. Sir Gordon N. Macready, and Air Marshal Douglas Colyer. The eight men slowly paced up a center aisle and then the British officers ranged themselves on either side before the Ambassador, who stood between American and British flags on standards.

First to receive the honor was General Marshall. As he stood there, an aide of the Embassy advanced with a red velvet pillow upon which rested the decoration, a star, which was then pinned by the Ambassador on the general's uniform. A British airman then laid over the General's shoulder a broad red ribbon from which hung another decoration. The officer was Squadron Leader John Mitchell, assistant air attaché, and the navigator of former Prime Minister Churchill's plane.

One by one the Americans received the Order of the Bath, founded in 1399, and received by King George I in 1725. Ambassador Halifax congratulated each. The whole affair was over in 15 minutes, whereupon the Ambassador invited his guests to tea, but warned the American commanders that they must first afford the photographers full opportunity.

Formalities ended, relatives and friends crowded forward for congratulations.

The Order of the Bath is divided into a military division and a civil division. There are three classes in each, viz, Knight Grand Cross (G. C. B.); Knight Commander (K. C. B.), and Companion (C. B.).

The C. B. of the Military Division is conferred only on officers of or above the rank of commander in the Navy, or major in the Army, who have been mentioned in dispatches for services in war, and they may subsequently be advanced to the higher grades of the order. The civil C. B. may be bestowed upon officers of the fighting services in times of peace, and upon civilians.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 20th instant, the following reports of the Committee on Claims were submitted on November 21, 1945:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

H. R. 843. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Hanley; without amendment (Rept. No. 756);

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend; without amendment (Rept. No. 757);

H. R. 1192. A bill granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 758);

H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 759);

H. R. 1358. A bill for the relief of O. M. Minatree; without amendment (Rept. No. 760);

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 761);

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Jay H. McCleary; without amendment (Rept. No. 762);

H. R. 2029. A bill for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart; without amendment (Rept. No. 763);

H. R. 2191. A bill for the relief of Cleo E. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 764);

H. R. 2300. A bill for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore; without amendment (Rept. No. 765);

H. R. 2886. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 766);

H. R. 3135. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 767);

H.R. 3225. A bill for the relief of Rolla Duncan; without amendment (Rept. No. 768); and

H. R. 3390. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll; with an amendment (Rept. No. 769).

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 1371. A bill for the relief of Reginald Mitchell; without amendment (Rept. No. 773);

H. R. 2518. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 774); and

H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 775).

By Mr. MORSE:

H. R. 874. A bill for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges; with an amendment (Rept. No. 772);

H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of John August Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 770); and

H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 771).

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Carl Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 776);

H. R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Clifford E. Craig; without amendment (Rept. No. 777); and

H. R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Mary Galipeau; without amendment (Rept. No. 778).

By Mr. WHERRY:

H. R. 2836. A bill for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti; without amendment (Rept. No. 779);

H. R. 2930. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital; with amendments (Rept. No. 781); and

H. R. 3011. A bill for the relief of John Hames; without amendment (Rept. No. 780).

SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the credentials of the newly designated Senator from Kentucky, who has been appointed by the Governor to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of former Senator Chandler, are at the desk. I ask that they be read, and that the new Senator be permitted to take the oath of office at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the credentials.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

FRANKFORT, KY., *November 19, 1945.*

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, I, Simeon Willis, Governor of said Commonwealth, do hereby appoint Hon. WILLIAM A. STANFILL a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent the State of Kentucky in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of Hon. A. B. Chandler is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Simeon Willis, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1945.

Given under my hand and seal as Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky at 2 p. m. this, the 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1945, and in the one hundred and fifty-fourth year of the Commonwealth.

[SEAL] SIMEON WILLIS,

Governor, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:

CHARLES K. O'CONNELL,

Secretary of State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator designate will present himself at the desk the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. STANFILL, escorted by Mr. BARKLEY, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Acting President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the Permanent Status Delegation of the Legislature of Puerto Rico and the board of directors of the Civic-Charitable Association of Ensenada, P. R., expressing gratitude to President Truman for his message to Congress recognizing the right of the people of Puerto Rico with regard to self-determination; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Benjamin Fuller Post, No. 64, American Legion, of Pittsburg, Kans., favoring enactment of peacetime compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

Resolutions adopted by Local No. 21, of Peabody, Local No. 22, of Woburn, Local No. 46, of Worcester, and Local No. 295, of Winchester, all of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, in the State of Massachusetts, favoring an immediate program so as to solve effectively America's economic needs and compel employers to increase wages without any accompanying increase in the cost of living; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the members of the Department of Social Service of the Diocese of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime universal military training, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by members of the Massachusetts Clerical Association comprising the clergy of the Episcopal Diocese, and the Episcopal Evangelical Fellowship, both of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for international control of atomic energy; to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION OF OMAHA (NEBR.) RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Wilbur A. Jones, president of the Omaha (Nebr.) River Development Association, handed to me a resolution adopted by that association relating to the Missouri Valley Authority. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Committee on Agriculture of the United States Senate, of which Senator ELMER THOMAS is chairman, is considering the Murray bill (S. 555) for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, the Omaha River Development Association, through its executive committee, at a meeting held in Omaha November 16, 1945, records its vigorous opposition to the measure for the following reasons:

1. The bill grants to three men not elected by the people legislative, judicial, and executive powers, contrary to our conception of government. There is no provision in the bill for their removal.

2. The bill places in jeopardy all of our State and Federal laws governing the use of water in a flood-control and irrigation development program.

3. Thousands of American men are returning from military to civilian life and are now looking for work. The Pick-Sloan plan of development is ready to go now, and to pass the Murray bill would be to delay the start of the program for probably as much as 5 years.

4. The present (Pick-Sloan) program is in capable hands and coordination of the various phases of the program is being obtained through the interagency committee. The acts of Congress of last December and of last March constitute a satisfactory water bill of rights and define the area of activity of each agency and integrate the programs of the experienced agencies of government. They detract in no way from the basic laws under which Congress has always guided these agencies that have become, at home and abroad, the most effective to be found anywhere in their respective fields.

Therefore we ask that the Murray bill be rejected and that appropriations be made speedily for the immediate prosecution of the present development program of the Missouri River Basin.

OMAHA RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
WILBUR A. JONES, *President.*

PROTEST AGAINST USE OF GRAINS AND SUGAR IN MANUFACTURE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution by the Fifth District of Kansas Federation of Women's

Clubs, assembled at Wichita, Kans., taking a stand against the use of grains and sugar by brewers for the manufacture of intoxicating liquors. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the brewers are receiving grains and sugar to manufacture intoxicating liquors; and

Whereas, it has been scientifically proven that alcoholic liquors are detrimental to the health of American people and welfare of the American Home; and

Whereas homemakers are deprived of necessary sugar for domestic use: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Fifth District of Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs assembled at Wichita, Kans., October 19, 1945, That the Federal Government restrict the use of sugars for such purposes.

Mrs. FLOYD TURNER,
Mrs. W. H. VONDER HEIDEN,
Mrs. ROY E. THOMAS,
Resolutions Committee.

FOOT AND MOUTH AND OTHER CATTLE DISEASES—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from F. E. Mullen, executive secretary of the American Live Stock Association, Denver, Colo., a resolution adopted by the American Veterinary Medical Association calling attention to the dangers of foot and mouth diseases. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas through the highly efficient efforts of veterinarians working in close cooperation with livestock producers our country has been placed in a most enviable position with regard to the health and condition of our livestock herds and flocks; and

Whereas this condition has been made possible only at great sacrifice to our livestock producers and at great cost to both State and Federal Government; and

Whereas one of the greatest contributions that veterinarians and the livestock industry of this country can make to the war effort is to insure a continuing ample supply of meat, meat products and dairy products to our armed forces and our civilian population; and

Whereas all industries and people in our country would be adversely affected by a disastrous or dangerous disease becoming epizootic in our livestock, for as agriculture goes so goes the Nation; and

Whereas any step lessening the safeguards applying to importations of live animals or dressed meats or unsterilized meat food products from countries where foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, surra, or contagious pleuropneumonia or other equally dangerous diseases exist would constitute a grave hazard to our livestock industry and to wild animal life, and to our present and future food supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Veterinary Medical Association do most earnestly and sincerely appeal to the Congress of the United States and to all Federal and State officials to strengthen present laws and regulations pertaining to imports from such countries and we most emphatically warn against the calamity that undoubtedly will result if there is any lessening of the embargo provisions of the present law.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BALL (for Mr. SMITH), from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution relative to the formation of an International Health Organization; with an amendment (Rept. No. 782).

By Mr. ELLENDER:

From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 566. A bill relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals; with amendments (Rept. No. 783).

From the Committee on Claims:

S. 1338. A bill for the relief of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 792).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 704. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 784).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1471. A bill to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; without amendment (Rept. No. 785).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 342. A bill to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for nonpayment of fines; without amendment (Rept. No. 786);

S. 343. A bill to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended (11 U. S. C. 63), so as to remove the legal incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy; without amendment (Rept. No. 787);

S. 344. A bill to prescribe and furnish to United States commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal; without amendment (Rept. No. 788);

S. 345. A bill concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States commissioners; without amendment (Rept. No. 789);

S. 346. A bill to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States commissioners; without amendment (Rept. No. 790); and

H. R. 2465. A bill to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner; without amendment (Rept. No. 791).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 905. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Bullock; with amendments (Rept. No. 793); and

S. 1294. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 794).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 976. A bill for the relief of Mildred E. Hooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 796).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1480. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 796).

TERMINATION OF RATIONING OF BUTTER, OLEOMARGARINE, FATS, OILS, AND MEATS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 185, which was submitted by me on November 8, and was improperly referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and then on motion which I made a few days ago was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Almost simultaneously with the ordering of the committee this morning of a favorable report of this resolution, which calls for the end of rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, oils, and meats, the OPA and the Department of Agriculture announced, and the announcement has already been made public and appears in the newspapers, the fact that rationing is ended, as of midnight tonight, I believe, on all fats, oils, meats, butter, and oleomargarine. Nevertheless, in compliance with the direction from the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to report the resolution and request that it be spread on the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution reported by the Senator from Tennessee will be received and placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 185) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States military services and other Government agencies have recently released for public consumption in the United States 100,000,000 pounds of high-quality creamery butter; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to sell 8,000,000 pounds of creamery butter in foreign markets; and

Whereas 100,000,000 pounds of creamery butter added to current commercial stocks and expected production during November and December 1945 will provide at least 150,000,000 pounds of creamery butter for each such month; and

Whereas 150,000,000 pounds a month is more than enough to provide for all unrestricted domestic civilian consumption of high-quality creamery butter during November and December and provide for an adequate year end carry-over; and

Whereas the production of butter begins to increase in December, due to seasonal factors, and continues to increase monthly for the ensuing 6 months; and

Whereas civilians will have the entire United States butter production available for their use during 1946, with the exception of very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas oleomargarine, which is used for the same purpose, is in surplus supply, and

Whereas there will continue to be sufficient fats and oils available to produce supplies of oleomargarine equal to the demand for it; and

Whereas the current civilian allocation of other fats and oils, including lard, is at the highest rate since the initiation of fats and oils rationing; and

Whereas shortening, salad, and cooking oils are being produced in quantities greater than at any time since regulations were imposed and in quantities greater than those produced prior to the war; and

Whereas the supply of raw materials needed to produce shortening, salad, and cooking oils will continue to be sufficient to maintain this production; and

Whereas the production of lard, one of the chief fats and oils, will be substantially increased beginning not later than November 1, due to the seasonal increase in hog slaughter; and

Whereas the availability of supply is now sufficient to provide as much fats and oils as has ever before been consumed in this country during a peacetime period; and

Whereas the total domestic production of fats and oils, including lard, during 1946 will be available for civilian consumption, except for very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas meat supplies in the United States at the present time are admittedly available at the annual rate of 159 pounds per capita and will continue to be available at this rate for the remainder of the year; and

Whereas meat supplies in this quantity are greater than were ever before available in the United States during any prewar period; and

Whereas meat supplies will be available during 1946 at a rate far in excess of the quantity consumed at any previous time; and

Whereas the supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese are abundant; and

Whereas the military has ceased purchasing poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese; and

Whereas the large supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese will supplement the supplies of meat available for civilian consumption in the United States; and

Whereas the continuation of rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat is causing hoarding, maldistribution, and disruption of normal marketing; and

Whereas the expense of continuing rationing is no longer warranted; and

Whereas industry is capable of reestablishing normal distribution of these commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than December 1, 1945.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1614. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who have participated in the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 1615. A bill providing for the release of a portion of Marquette National Forest for private use and development; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1616. A bill establishing a special Housing Bureau in the Veterans' Administration to act in relation to the procurement of homes or farms for war veterans, and to liberalize loan conditions pertaining thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 1617. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1618. A bill to exempt the Navy Department from statutory prohibitions against the employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WALSH also introduced Senate bill 1619, to extend the effectiveness of title B of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1620. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Commodore John Barry, "Father of the American Navy"; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 119, to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate Joint Resolution 120, amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 relating to the standards by which maximum prices shall be established, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate Joint Resolution 121, to provide for an embargo on the shipment out of the United States of new automobile and truck tires and tubes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and appears under a separate heading.)

WAIVER OF NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs a bill to extend the effectiveness of title V of the Second War Powers Act of 1942.

A brief explanation should be made, because this bill would make some contribution to the demobilization program.

Title V of the Second War Powers Act of 1942 authorizes waiver of compliance with the navigation and vessel inspection laws.

This title expires on December 31, 1945, and unless renewed, would require vessels transporting troops home to comply with all of the navigation and vessel inspection laws. There are, for example, 200 Liberty ships now used to carry 550 troops each, and 97 Victory ships converted to carry approximately 1,500 troops each. If those vessels were required to meet navigation and inspection laws they would carry only approximately 12 men each.

Unless the authority contained in title V is extended as proposed in the bill, the operation of returning overseas personnel and equipment to this country would be seriously retarded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and refered to the Comittee on Naval Affairs as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bill (S. 1619) to extend the effectiveness of title V of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WALSH, was read twice by its title and refered to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ELECTIONS FOR NATIONAL ELECTIVE OFFICES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from the President of the United States, which I should like to have read from the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 23, 1945.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Territories, and Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am writing you because there has developed an emergency problem with respect to the elections for national elective offices which are necessary in the Philippine Islands.

Under the Constitution of the Philippines, the terms of all of the members of the house of representatives and of two-thirds of the members of the senate of the Philippine Congress expire on December 30, 1945. The term of President Osmeña, under the joint resolution of November 12, 1943, continues until a successor has been elected and qualified. It was not possible to hold the elections which the constitution fixes in November 1945. There is no provision, in that constitution, for such elections to be held at any other time.

Accordingly, it seems highly desirable that the United States Congress enact legislation to deal with the situation before it adjourns for the holidays.

I enclose for your consideration a draft of a joint resolution which I believe would meet the need. This draft provides that elections shall be held for national elective offices not later than April 30, 1946, with the newly elected president, vice president, and congress taking office not later than May 28, 1946, and with the newly elected congress convening in regular session not later than the same date. The present Philippine Congress is authorized to fix the date of the elections and date for the convening of the newly elected congress in regular session, and the dates fixed shall not be subsequent to April 30, 1946, and May 28, 1946, respectively. Should the Philippine Congress fail to fix such dates, then the dates are fixed by this joint resolution. The elections are to be under Philippine law and provision is made for dividing the newly elected Senators into those having 4- and those having 6-year terms, so that hereafter the elected senators will hold office for the regular 6 years. The preamble contains explanatory and clarifying recitals.

The Secretary of the Interior, the High Commissioner to the Philippines, and the President of the Philippines have joined in recommending that legislation along this line be enacted.

I have written a similar letter to the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, inasmuch as the suggestion by the President of the United States for legislation is in response to a request of the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, I take pleasure in asking unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to carry into effect the purport of the latter just read. I request unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and then referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on

Territories and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas the interruption of constitutional processes of government in the Philippine Islands, due to enemy occupation, has prevented the holding of elections in 1943 and 1945 as provided by the constitution of the Philippines; and

Whereas the term of office of the President of the Philippines has been continued by the joint resolution of November 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 590), until such time as a successor has been elected and qualified; and

Whereas the Philippine Congress, under the terms of the constitution of the Philippines, cannot convene after December 30, 1945, because the terms of office of members of the house of representatives and of two-thirds of the members of the Philippine Senate will have expired on that date; and

Whereas the liberation of the Philippines and the restoration of constitutional processes of democracy in the Commonwealth now permit the holding of an election in the immediate future; and

Whereas the members of the electoral commission responsible for the conduct of the elections have already been appointed by the Commonwealth government in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas the constitution of the Commonwealth of the Philippines makes no provision for the emergency in which elections, though of vital necessity, cannot be held at the regularly scheduled time; and

Whereas it is the desire of the United States to fulfill her pledge to prepare the Philippines for independence and to make possible that grant of independence in accordance with existing now: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines not later than April 30, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date for such elections, and the date fixed shall not be subsequent to April 30, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date, then April 30, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

SEC. 2. The president and vice president then elected, the senators then elected (who shall be all but those then in office whose terms continue until December 30, 1947), and the members of the house of representatives shall take office, and the elected Philippine Congress shall convene in regular session not later than May 28, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date or dates for the assumption of office and for the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session, and the date or dates fixed shall not be subsequent to May 28, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date or dates, then May 28, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date for assumption of office and the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session.

SEC. 3. The terms of office of the president, vice president, and representatives then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945. The terms of office of eight of the Senator elected at such elections shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945, and the terms of eight senators then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1943. Division of the senators elected at such elections into these two classes shall be made in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. The term of any senator then elected to fill a vacancy in a term expiring on December 30, 1947, shall expire on that date.

SEC. 4. The manner of holding such elections shall be as provided by the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

PROPOSED EMBARGO ON EXPORT OF AUTOMOBILE AND TRUCK TIRES AND TUBES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution and have it appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) to provide for an embargo on the shipment out of the United States of new automobile and truck tires and tubes, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the joint resolution which I have introduced would provide an embargo on the shipment of new automobile and truck tires out of the United States for a period of 6 months after the enactment of the joint resolution, except in the case of Government agencies. It would also provide a penalty consisting of a fine of not more than $10,000 for any person violating the provisions of the act.

I can see no logical reason for the shipment abroad during the last quarter of 1945 of more than half a million tires and tubes for trucks and automobiles, at a time when critical shortages of these essential items exist all over the United States.

These shortages are especially critical in the agricultural States of the Midwest, where automobile travel is necessary in conducting everyday business; where farmers use their cars every day to take their children to school; where markets are usually from 10 to 25 miles distant, and frequently much farther; and where the nearest doctor is often 40 or 50 miles away. The situation is even worse in Montana. Truck tires are even more essential in the conduct of everyday business in that area. In my own State of North Dakota we produced more than 350,000,000 bushels of small grains and potatoes last year, and practically all of it had to be trucked to market. Our production this year is even greater. A large proportion of the two and a half million head of cattle, sheep, and hogs which North Dakota farmers will take to market this year also will go by truck. Yet at this time a tire certificate is not much more than a mere piece of paper, when tires cannot be found. I feel that we should make sure that our own essential tire and tube needs are met before we ship such commodities abroad.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4489) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL HOUSING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject National Housing, delivered by Senator ELLENDER on November 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON PALESTINE BY HON. GUY M. GILLETTE, REPRESENTATIVE ANDREW L. SOMERS, AND DAVID STERN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement issued by Hon. Guy M. Gillette, Representative Andrew J. Somers, and J. David Stern on the eve of their departure to London on behalf of the American League for a Free Palestine, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS OF MR. ATTLEE AND MR. EDEN

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the remarks of Hon. Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and extracts from the remarks of Hon. Anthony Eden, on the subject of foreign relations, which appear in the Appendix.]

THOUGHTS AND WISHES OF THE MAN IN THE STREET—ADDRESS BY ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at a dinner of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association, at French Lick, Ind., November 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

GALLUP POLL OF VETERANS ON PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Gallup poll entitled "War Veterans Found Strong for Peacetime Army Training," published in the Washington Post of November 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTAINMENT OF UNIVERSAL PEACE BY THE RULE OF LAW

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Senate bill 1580, the bill providing necessary implementing legislation to effect our active participation in the United Nations Organization, was made the unfinished business of the Senate Tuesday. On account of the holiday, I am told it was agreed no action would be taken on the measure until Monday. Due to a long-standing engagement in New Mexico, it is necessary for me to leave Washington on Sunday. It will, therefore, be impossible for me to be here during the debate on the bill. I regret very much this forced absence at this particular time, for I am intensely interested in seeing the bill enacted into law quickly. I feel certain it will be. Nevertheless, because of my interest in the measure and the entire world situation, I am taking this opportunity to discuss some of the matters involved in the pending measure and others of immediate concern to all of us.

Senate bill 1580, together with our active participation in the United Nations Organization, constitutes a departure

from the course our Nation has previously followed. This departure is a wise one in that it will enable us to participate in world affairs in times of peace. With the passage of the pending bill, we can participate even to the extent of using force, if necessary, to prevent war. Instead of waiting for war to come, we shall now act in advance and, by so doing, perhaps, prevent war.

It may be anticipated that some question will arise as to that section of the bill which confers authority on the President to utilize armed forces for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with section 43 of the San Francisco Charter. As to the constitutional right of the President to so use our armed forces, I do not entertain the slightest doubt.

The Supreme Court has more than once upheld the authority of the President to use our armed forces without specific congressional authority, in cases falling short of a state of war, as in the case of physical attack, or the immediate danger of such attack, upon American citizens or upon the agencies or property of Government, here and abroad. That such use of our troops has been more or less ordinary practice, is a matter of common knowledge. In international affairs the President is allowed far greater latitude, as has been expressly held by the courts in more than one decision.

In this day of undeclared war and surprise attacks, this power of the Executive must be recognized, and, certainly, there must be no curtailment of clearly valid constitutional power.

Senate bill 1580 merely grants in advance congressional authority to the President to do that which may be necessary in order to protect against certain contingencies, a power which the courts have recognized now in large degree rests in the President. If anything, the pending bill may, in a way, limit rather than expand present Executive authority.

Mr. President, this bill does not constitute a long step toward complete international collaboration, but it is an essential one. It, with other steps the world has taken, represents the minimum the nations should do. So strong is my conviction that we must go far beyond what is being done, I might, with some logic and reason, oppose S. 1580 because it does not go far enough. That, Mr. President, is not my purpose. I do not oppose or criticize this measure. On the contrary, I approve it, as I approve the other steps we have taken. My regret is that we do not do more.

Mr. President, in spite of VE-day, notwithstanding VJ-day, many look at the world now with grave misgivings. Many thinking people entertain substantial fear as to the present and for the future. That fear is based only in part upon the recent discovery of the use of atomic energy and the making of the most terrible and deadly weapon of war man has as yet devised. There are other weapons capable of almost as much destructive force as the bomb, and no person knows what science may further discover and reveal.

In the article the Atomic Bomb and American Security, by Richard Bernard Brodie, appearing in the Yale Institute of National Studies, an article which I am sure has been sent to every Senator, and which, incidentally, is worthy of careful study by all of us, this direful statement, concurred in by nearly all scientists, is made:

> Scientific knowledge today embraces no hint of a possibility of neutralizing the atomic bomb; it does contain signposts pointing to the possible exploitation of other and equally horrendous means of destroying human life, such as radio-active gases.

In his report discussing some of the possibilities of future development, Prof. H. D. Smyth, chairman of the department of physics of Princeton University, says:

> From the military point of view it is reasonably certain that there will be improvements both in the processes of producing fissionable material and in its use. It is conceivable that totally different methods may be discovered for converting matter into energy since it is to be remembered that the energy released in uranium fission corresponds to the utilization of only about one-tenth of 1 percent of its mass. Should a scheme be devised for converting to energy even as much as a few percent of the matter of some common material, civilization would have the means to commit suicide at will.

Such discoveries as await in the future, with those already made, have so changed every previous concept, we, as molders of policy, must radically revise former opinions and plan and legislate in the light of things as they are and will be—not as we might wish they were. Frankly, minimum action, such as the world seems to contemplate in present efforts to preserve peace, may be prophetic of continued minimum endeavor in the future. Such lassitude could well mean total disaster.

Our times do not call for minimum effort. They call loudly and vigorously for—nay, they demand—the maximum effort of all nations and all peoples if civilization is to survive. The minimum in this day of unheralded, undreamed-of progress in the art of killing will not suffice.

Mr. President, this is no fault-finding statement. This is no time for captious criticism. It is time to devote every bit of our energy and intelligence, in cooperation with other nations, to finding the best possible plan to prevent the great discoveries of science from being used to destroy all of us. For, such are the portents which confront the world.

I do not propose now to discuss the atomic bomb nor the terrible havoc and disaster it may forebode. The debris and death at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the yawning cavern in New Mexico, with its once-steel tower completely vaporized, speak a universal language. It may be the language of doom. All people know what actually happened when our scientists, with others, crossed the border of the unknown into that universal sphere never before entered by mortal being.

I do propose to discuss, in connection with atomic energy and other tremendous forces of destruction, some of the problems which confront us as legislators. First, let me say that intimate scientific knowledge of the bomb and atomic energy is not necessary for the task before us. This is emphasized in the report to which I have referred and in which Professor Smyth says:

> We find ourselves with an explosive which is far from completely perfected. Yet the future possibilities of such explosives are appalling, and their effects on future wars and international affairs are of fundamental importance. Here is a new tool for mankind, a tool of unimaginable destructive power. Its development raises many questions that must be answered in the near future.
>
> Because of the restrictions of military security there has been no chance for the Congress or the people to debate such questions. They have been seriously considered by all concerned and vigorously debated among the scientists, and the conclusions reached have been passed along to the highest authorities. These questions are not technical questions; they are political and social questions and the answers given to them may affect all mankind for generations.

Professor Smyth further says decisions as to policy, use, and control must be made by the people, acting through their representatives. That, Mr. President, is the question, the political, moral, and social question which we must answer. They are not questions with which we can delay. We live now in a brief period of grace. It is running fast. Let it not expire through our lack of vision or lack of action.

The world for many generations has scoffed at and scorned the Nero who fiddled while Rome burned. Descendants of the surviving remnants of our generation may read our history as one which fiddled while an entire civilization died.

Do I speak as one who is disturbed? I am disturbed. I am disturbed because in nearly every suggestion reliance upon power, upon force and strength of military might to keep civilization safe and secure is stressed. That course is the course which has always led to war. It is the survival of the fittest, of the strongest. But, are we the fit and strong now? At the moment we are, but, when we unloosed the atomic bomb, we actually lessened the security of our own great strength. We, ourselves, became far more vulnerable than ever before.

Whatever may have been true in the past, the discovery of atomic energy and other forces equally destructive which await discovery and development, make it now impossible for any nation to isolate itself from the rest of the world. Great strength may prove to be a great weakness.

Whether we like it or not, we are actually being forced into one world. That statement is, perhaps, a little short of the actual truth. We are already in one world. Debate, misgivings, and fears on that point are relegated to the past. The question we have to answer, the decision we and the other nations have to make, is: What kind of world shall this one world be? Right decisions, proper courses, cooperative action, can make a world of peace, plenty, and prosperity. We can choose that kind of world or we can choose a world of destruction and death.

We have already agreed, and rightly so, that atomic energy and other means of mass destruction must not be used

for military purposes. Just as soon as proper international controls can be set up, we shall share with other nations the knowledge which we, Great Britain, and Canada now possess. Again I repeat, this is right. According to every authority, any hope that we might permanently retain the secret is vain and entirely unreliable.

Acting under undisputed constitutional authority, the President has submitted a plan to other nations providing, in effect, for control of atomic power through the United Nations Organization, an international body. When we grant control of atomic energy to the international organization, under whatever forms and details may be agreed upon finally, we are actually setting up a world government. We are delegating national sovereignty to an extent the quibblers had not even guessed a few short months ago.

Yet, so tremendous has been the impact of the atomic bomb upon the peoples of the world that even the most skeptical agree that such unbelievable force can be safely controlled only in a true international set-up. In providing such control, we automatically submit to a form of world government.

In an article by Prof. Richard Schlegel of the research staff of the Palmer Physical Laboratory at Princeton University, there is set forth something of the far-reaching effect of an international agreement for the control of atomic energy. Professor Schlegel says in part:

> If the nations give up the right to use atomic power for military purposes, they to a large extent give up their right to make war. For modern war is not fought as a rough international game, within the bounds of certain rules. Rather, every conceivable resource of destruction is employed. If possession of atomic-energy weapons is the exclusive prerogative of an international authority, every nation will be inferior to the supreme military power of that authority. Thus international control of atomic energy is equivalent to the creation of an international governing body to which the individual nations have surrendered their sovereign right to make war. In effect, the international control of atomic power will bring a world authority which can enforce universal peace.

Acting under stern necessity, we are already taking the preliminary steps to place atomic energy under control of an international authority, and that, as Professor Schlegel says, is equivalent to the creation of an international governing body. In this thought, I agree. And, with the end, namely that of world organization, actually being forced upon us by atomic energy, I heartily approve. Indeed, the awful, destructive, deadly force of atomic energy, which at first so frightened all of us, may in the end prove to be the means, force, or cause, by which nations will be compelled to cease and abandon their wanton destruction of each other. Strange as it may be, actual fear and terror, the horror of total destruction, may be man's best hope of peace. Perhaps I am wrong in saying that fear itself can constitute hope. Perhaps it would be better to put it, that the grim, ghastly necessities of self-preservation constitute the hope of men. After all, necessity has been the basis of some of the most outstanding achievements of the human race. The old saying that "necessity is the mother of invention," has been true for generations. Today, necessity may be the mother of permanent peace.

In being blasted into a form of world government by fear and necessity, as we have been, we are entering an association which will necessarily expand and grow throughout the years to come. The only question now is: How much control or how much government can we agree upon now? What is essential?

The other day, in connection with control and law, I quoted from the excellent editorial Modern Man Is Obsolete, written by Norman Cousins and now published in book form. In the quotation I used, it was said:

> But reject all other arguments for world government; reject the geographic, economic, the idealogical, the sociological, the humanitarian arguments, valid though they may be. Conside only the towering job of policing the atom—the job of keeping the smallest particle of matter from destroying all matter. This means control. But control is no natural phenomenon. It does not operate of and by itself. Control is impossible without power—the power of investigation, the power of injunction, the power of arrest, the power of punishment.
>
> But power, like control, cannot be isolated, nor is it desirable except under carefully defined circumstances. Power must be subordinate to law, unless it is to take the form of brute, irresponsible force. Here, too, we are involved in an important interrelationship, because law can be derived only through government. Law is a product of moral, judicial, executive, legislative, and administrative sanction—all of which adds up to government. And government means what it says: the process of governing. It is not a decentralization, it is not informal organization, it is not the right of veto or the right of secession by any state or states. It is a central body none of whose members has the right or the means of aggression or withdrawal. It is the source of legitimate action and legitimate redress.

The reasoning of Mr. Cousins is most convincing. Ultimately, the nations of the world will agree upon a strong world-wide government. When that will be, none of us can now foretell. Our task today involves, as Secretary Byrnes said in his address at Charleston just recently, the use of such machinery and means as we have at hand. In fact, we must use the machinery we now have, improving it as best we can, making every needed amendment and change as we progress toward the ultimate goal of complete world-wide rule by law instead of rule by force. Many are the suggestions as to how this may be accomplished.

Recently someone sent me a most interesting book by Emery Reves, entitled "The Anatomy of Peace." While there is much in the book with which I do not agree, I was tremendously impressed with the chapter Treaty or Law. Every Member of Congress might profitably read the entire book, and especially those chapters devoted to law among nations. Among other equally, if not more important and stronger-expressed statements, the author says:

> Quite certainly peace is not a utopia.
>
> The only question is, What kind of peace?
>
> If we seek peace between X sovereign units, based on treaty agreements, then peace is an impossibility and it is childish even to think of it. But if we conceive peace correctly, as order based on law, then peace is a practical proposition that can be realized just as well between the nation-states as it has been realized so often in the past among states, provinces, cities, principalities, and other units.
>
> Whether we are to have peace or continually recurring war depends on a very simple proposition.
>
> It depends upon whether we want to base international relations on treaties or on law.
>
> If from the Second World War we emerge with another treaty or covenant, the next war may be taken for granted. If we have the foresight, and decide to make that fundamental and revolutionary change in human history, to try to introduce law into the regulation of international relations, then, and not until then, shall be approach an order which may be called peace.
>
> The reason for this is not difficult to understand.
>
> The essence of life is constant change, perpetual development.
>
> Up to now, peace between nations has always been a static conception. We have always tried to determine some sort of status quo, to seal it meticulously in a treaty, and to make any change in that status quo impossible except through war.
>
> This is a grotesque misconception of peace. After having tried it a few thousand times, it may be wise to remember what Francis Bacon said three centuries ago, that "it would be an unsound fancy and self-contradictory to expect that things would have never yet been done can be done except by means which have never yet been tried."
>
> Human society and human evolution, a dynamic phenomenon par excellence, can never be mastered by static means.
>
> Treaties are essentially static instruments.
>
> Law is essentially a dynamic instrument.
>
> Wherever we have applied the method of law to regulate human relationship, it has resulted in peace.
>
> Wherever we have applied treaties to regulate human relationship, it has inevitably led to war.

Mr. President, I do not quote Mr. Reves as an authority. I do not know whether he is or not. I do know that his book reveals profound study and knowledge of the history and the development of civilized man and also of nations. The challenging thoughts so clearly expressed are not to be cast aside lightly.

I wish to express my own emphatic approval of some of the things the author says about diplomacy, diplomats, treaties, and law. With no reflection upon our own officials of state, the President, Secretary Byrnes, and their many able assistants and administrators, I assert that diplomacy, treaties, and all the age-old methods of negotiating peace have miserably failed the world. It is not the men I condemn. Individuals are of small importance. Upon the methods, means, and practices used in the field of international relations rests the blame.

Just the other day the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], valiantly espousing the cause of freedom of the press and of communications, called for frankness and candor in relations between nations. "Lift the iron curtain," he cried, aiming his remarks at our neighbor and ally, Russia. I agree with the Senator, but when has the iron curtain ever been entirely lifted as nations deal with each other in political matters? Have not the doings of various diplomatic corps always been shrouded and

their intrigues concealed by governments not only from other governments but from their own people as well? What do the people of the different countries know today about what is going on behind the diplomatic curtains of the world?

Do not mistake me. I repeat, I do not criticize our State Department nor the President, both of whom are doing all that can be done under the system which prevails in all governments. I do not demand that we adopt a different course by ourselves. We cannot change the world by our single action.

I am condemning the whole system of treaty, alliance, and diplomatic negotiations which have existed for generations. I condemn secrecy, intrigue, and deception in dealings among nations even as I would condemn such practices in dealings among men. I charge that in these things lies the root of most of our misunderstanding, distrust, and suspicion, and I ask, How could it be otherwise? I declare that much of the misery of war and human suffering and sacrifice on the battlefields have been occasioned by the unholy arts of so-called diplomatic dealings among nations.

It is not that I decry—and certainly I do not belittle—the necessity for many agreements, treaties, and understandings among and between nations. There must and there always will be such agreements. They simply amount to contracts between nations. They are as necessary to national and international dealings as contracts among individuals. Whenever the time comes in the world that treaties and agreements will be solemn, binding, and enforcible according to principle and law and by methods of legal procedure and machinery, the world will have taken a long step away from war and toward peace.

The thing I decry, criticize, and condemn in what I am saying is that heretofore our treaties and agreements have not had binding effect and force, and, when broken, there was no legal method of enforcement. In the case of peace treaties and obligations of that kind, when the treaty has been broken, the only remedy has been war. That is the situation which must be obliterated and driven from the world of nations. It can be done only by radical change and the establishment of procedure and machinery in keeping with the progress of all modern advancement in every other field, and in keeping with the stern realities of actual survival which today confronts every nation in the world.

It is time to change. It is time to try something new. It is time to substitute law instead of force. It is time to adopt complete freedom of thought, communication and of press everywhere in the world. Upon no other basis can a civilized, peaceful world order be built. It is time to adopt and try out that system which is the absolute antithesis and opposite of concealment, deception, intrigue, and their ultimate result—war. It is time for all the world to do away with the "unsound fancy and self-contradictory" which expects "that things which have never yet been done cannot be done except by means which have never yet been tried." The antithesis and opposite of the old method, the method which has not yet been truly tried, is the rule of law. It is for that rule I call and insist today. It is for that rule to which the hopes and yearnings of all the peoples of the world are turned. They want no more killings on inglorious battlefields.

Is it a vain hope in which the world indulges? It has been. The failure of its achievement is written in the blood of every man who has died in battle. In the failure to achieve it in the future may be written the death of all civilization.

Obstacles? Yes; there are many. Difficulties? Yes; they are great. I do not underestimate the task which lies ahead. Languages—a thousand different tongues; races and creeds—without number; customs and habits—without end; hatreds, suspicions, and distrust—as many almost as there are nations and tribes; poverty and wealth—they exist everywhere.

The difficulties just mentioned may seem vague and rather indefinite. "Why not be specific?" may be asked. "Why not mention other countries?" Well, why not? They are not taboo with me. Without going too deeply into diplomatic channels, some troublesome things might well be discussed.

There are and there will continue to be difficulties with other nations. To accept the new, to renounce power and adopt law, will be troublesome for many nations, including our own. The use of the great military power that we, Russia, and Great Britain possess today, will not be easy to forego. The temptation to impose our will upon the rest of the world will be great. But we must forego the use of military strength except to preserve peace and prevent aggression. We must resist the age-old temptation to dominate and rule, a temptation to which many an empire of the past yielded and by yielding perished. If we do not so forego power and resist temptation, if we do not continue to work together valiantly for peace, if we do not cooperate to drive force from the world and substitute law therefor, chaos awaits all the world. If we ever discontinue the unity which gave us victory in battle, and go our separate ways, be assured we shall perish, not separately, but all together. As poor, blind Samson of old, we may easily pull down the pillars of the temple, but we shall surely die together.

Why can we not continue together? Do we, who fought so well together in war, now fear each other in peace? Why should we fear any nation? Why should any nation fear us? Why, for example, should Russia fear us? Or, why should we fear Russia? Russia has not a single thing we require except her good will and her continued strong cooperation for a just peace in every country of the world. There is no reason why our paths should cross. We have nothing Russia must have from us, that she cannot obtain through peaceful, friendly negotiation, but never through violence. Russia needs to acquire no territory by conquest. Within her borders lies ample room to expand and develop for a hundred years to come. Plain commonsense, ordinary intelligence, friendly relations of long standing, mutual gain, advantage, and prosperity, all demand continued peaceful, friendly relations among all the Allied Nations. Both our strong allies, England and Russia, require peace, not a temporary cessation of hostilities, an armistice, but a long peace, or, better still, an era to repair the damage of war and build for the future even as do we here in this vast, prosperous country of ours. Such things a world of law and order will promote and secure. Without law and order, such peaceful, prosperous ways and times will perish in the dread holocaust of a race of men consumed and destroyed by forces of its own creation.

It is true that misunderstandings appear to have arisen among nations. There are those in our own country and in Russia who seem to fear and distrust each other. Irritations have existed. Why, and of instances, it is not for me to speak at this time. The general situation—the long-time view—not of present friction, if any exists, is my theme. But well do I know that minor friction, not properly healed, may lead to major fracture. Frankly, all the countries of Europe lay too much stress upon so-called national boundaries between friendly adjoining countries. Some even insist on trying to dominate internal affairs of neighboring nations. Such things are sores which perhaps cannot be avoided during the transition period through which we are now passing. But they have no place in this present age.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose now to place blame upon anyone. But it is true that many students of international affairs clearly see a grave danger to permanent world accord in present unilateral steps being aggressively taken by the Soviet Union. Others declare Great Britain is following in some places a similar course. Even we are accused of like policies in certain areas. No matter which nation pursues such course, it is wrong. It will destroy that unity of action which the world needs more than anything else to prevent world war three. Unilateral action is not only a serious blow to our present United Nations Organization, but it is almost a death knell for a world order based upon the principles of law for which I so earnestly contend today.

Only yesterday in an article entitled "From Bad to Worse," Walter Lippmann wrote:

> It is clear that toward the second week of the London Conference—about September 22—there was a decision in Moscow to reduce to a minimum the business of settling affairs by means of international conference.

He added:

> There was no break in diplomatic relations but there has been what is tantamount to a break in diplomatic intercourse. Soviet officials abroad took a line which came very near to being one of nonparticipation in the machinery of international action which exists to deal with the postwar world.

I wish I could assail Mr. Lippmann for making an unfounded statement. I wish I could assert that he is wrong and only speaks of things which add to present difficulties. Unfortunately, I cannot

assail him, nor can I assert that he is wrong. To many observers his statements appear to approach the truth too close for comfort. I say "comfort" because the world badly needs the assistance of the Soviet Union, just as the Soviet Union needs the assistance of the world. Her help is greatly needed to make the United Nations Organization a success. Some say we cannot proceed without her. Her cooperation and strong support are needed if we are to have any kind of a world based on law and justice. It will be a tragedy for all the world if such unilateral action continues. This tragedy of all tragedies will be because it is such a useless and unnecessary thing. There was a time when, in her defense and in order to survive, she had to wield her vast power and throw all her mighty resources into battle. For her bravery and cooperation with us then, we admire and applaud her. But that time is past. The Soviet Union cannot live a life of isolationism and nationalism, and acheive that rich, full, and complete life to which destiny has definitely pointed her.

By every just and proper means we and other nations, who are minded as we are minded, must convince Russia and every other nation which hesitates to participate in that world order which can alone preserve peace and prevent war, of the folly of nonparticipation. Not with malice, certainly not with anger or animosity, but with strong, candid, and open dealing completely free from guile, intrigue, or deception, the other nations must continue positive leadership, so steadfast, firm, but so fair and so just, that no nation shall hesitate to join in delegating whatever part of national sovereignty is necessary to make this world a world of law, a world of justice, and a world of order.

But what if such leadership does not prove to be successful? This is a natural question. What then? War? Force? What course should then be followed? My answer is that, having exerted the type of leadership suggested, if it does not succeed, there is still a course which the rest of the world can pursue. That course will not be one of retaliation in kind. We shall not return unilateral action with unilateral action. We shall not resort to threats and certainly not to violent measures. Even the atomic bomb, temporarily as it is in our possession, shall not be used to compel action in accord with our wishes.

While it may be a digression, it might be well to reassert here that until proper international controls can be agreed upon we shall use the atomic bomb exactly as President Truman said in his first announcement. That deadly instrument of destruction shall be retained as a sacred trust for the benefit of all nations and used to preserve peace only. It shall never be used to force, compel, destroy, or to further our own interests. Of this, every nation can and must have absolute assurance, for such is not only the mind and will of the President of the United States, but it is the mind and will of the American people.

The course which I am utterly convinced we should and will pursue in the event any nation does refuse to participate and fully collaborate in world unity is a simple one, and one which is right. It is simply for the nations to proceed, leaving out that nation which does so refuse. The rest of us can and shall vigorously progress toward the goal we have set. We will not surrender our ideals. We will not compromise on anything short of complete accord based on law, not on flimsy treaties, simple paper agreements, which would again become mere scraps of paper. I know there are dangers in this course. But we live in a world fraught with danger on every hand. Without minimizing the dangerous aspects of possible disagreement, rebellion, or internal strife, we shall face them frankly, candidly, and declare them to be the lesser of the evils. The progress of mankind shall not be halted by recalcitrant people anywhere. This is no ultimatum. It is the expression of a determined purpose possessed by the overwhelming majority of American men and women, by the great majority of all nations, and the almost unanimous deep and sincere desire of all the peoples of the earth who want no war, save the war on want. We are all thoroughly tired of sending sons to die in battle in times of peril, only to see the same old order reestablished when the peril is passed. We are desperately sick of seeing our sons fight, die, and win, only to have their brave sacrifices rendered nugatory and vain by the stupidity, ignorance, and lack of vision, faith, and intelligence on the part of selfish-minded, politically ambitious, grasping, greedy world statesmen. The people of the world are resolved that this monstrous, savage, cruel, and inhuman thing men call war shall be driven from the earth. Never must it occur again.

This course may seem too difficult. It may require strength and character too great for ordinary mortal beings. But, do we dare act as ordinary beings today? Have we not assumed the garb of immortal gods as we trifle with energies and forces so strong that we may destroy the very planet on which we live? When our scientists, under our instructions and with our support, discovered the source of all power, did they not cross into a realm where only God had trod before? It is written that man may not look upon the face of God and live. It remains to be seen whether man may usurp the power of God and survive.

It is said that the ancient Chinese had a proverb which asks this question:

> What is the use of having a thousand-league horse if you do not have a thousand-league man to ride him?

When our scientists captured the secret of atomic energy, they captured a thousand-league horse which had roamed the ranges of the universe since time began. Now we have seized the force of all forces. It is ours to ride and to utilize as thousand-league men would ride and utilize it.

More than thousand-league men, our responsibilities to all mankind are to use this force as God would use it, for it is His force, His energy and His power. We have tapped that infinite force which some say is the stuff which moves worlds. We have created vital energy from dead mass so powerful that it can destroy every living thing on earth. Such is the force we have loosed among mortal beings. Truly, we must measure up in some degree to those principles of Him in whose image we are created. The old ways of darkness must be abandoned. For war and disorder, the world must substitute the rule of law and order those rules which have ever controlled and governed the universe.

Mr. President, you may call this world government. Up to a certain point, it is. But there is no control of internal affairs and none is contemplated. There is no world citizenship. It is not a super state.

Some very practical knowledge of man's limitations and of his weaknesses lead me not to demand a complete world government now. I know such supergovernment will not burst upon the world in full blossom and full growth. I do not ask, seek, or expect perfection. I ask that we use, to the utmost, the tools and equipment which we now possess, and do that today which present wisdom and judgment permit. Preliminary steps already taken must be continued.

Surely, the nations of the world, building on the structure which they have already started—the San Francisco Charter—can vigorously continue. The first stones necessary in the building of that world government, into which the scientists have already shoved us, whether we concede it or not, must be laid.

We can adopt a code of international law to regulate the external affairs of all nations.

We can establish an international court of justice, giving it compulsory jurisdiction in all juridical matters of international relations as prescribed by and under the code of international law.

We can set up and maintain an international military force to preserve peace among nations, prevent aggression, and enforce the mandates of law and of the international court.

Necessarily, these steps include a strong international police force.

How can these things be accomplished? What of national sovereignty—the greatest of all barriers, the chief cause of war? These are pertinent questions which should be answered. How can this beginning of government by law be made? Actually, we have already started on the road. The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], during the discussion on the San Francisco Charter, pointed to the long-time possibilities which lie in the assembly provided by that document. Tracing the growth of the British Parliament, he was suggesting similar development of the United Nations Assembly. With the ultimate suggestion, no one disagrees. Now, under present conditions, exigencies of time and progress, speedier growth is required. The suggestion of a constitutional convention of nations is excellent, but certain practical considerations seem now to prevent such procedure. Probably the nations would not now be willing to adopt a constitution. Vague fear would prevent it. But, Mr. President, the San Francisco Charter should not be scrapped. It must, and should be, amended.

First, the veto right in any one of the great powers must be revised and changed. An organization whose machinery can be stopped and rendered totally useless by the vote of one nation rests upon a foundation so unstable it can hardly endure in the light of things as they are today, although at the time the provisions were adopted at San Francisco it might have seemed altogether different.

The Covenant should be further amended to grant legislative authority to the assembly. Such authority could and should be clearly defined in the amendment to the Charter. The assembly would possess only such power as was expressly conferred. All other power would be expressly reserved to the several nations. But within well defined and clearly established boundaries, the assembly so authorized could enact a code of international law covering every necessary regulation regarding relations among nations. No extensive code would be required. It could be short and simple. One of our great difficulties in thinking along these lines is that we continually stress the difficulties, both intricate and complex, and do not seek simpler approach.

Procedure for the court is already provided. Nations could speed the day of judicial determination by quickly providing for adherence to the court and giving it compulsory jurisdiction, which I believe is absolutely required. The machinery for such is already set up. It needs only to be put into motion.

There may be other and better methods than those I have suggested. If so, they should be adopted. Mine are merely suggestions, often made by others, but worthy, I believe, of utmost consideration. But all of these involve some delegation of national sovereignty. That, I do not dispute. I admit it. Nay, I assert it. I also assert that any world organization involves some delegation of so-called national sovereignty. Of such delegation, I am not afraid. I am a thousand times more afraid to live in our present age, in a world where all sovereignty is retained and kept within the several nations. Where each nation is its own lawmaker, its own judge, and the executioner of its own decrees, nothing but war results. We, with other nations, have clung to the shibboleth of national sovereignty to our own undoing. If nations continue so to cling, destruction may and probably will await all of us.

Adhering to a world organization with the minimum structure for law and order such as I have outlined will be in keeping with evolutionary progress, which began when man first adhered to group or tribe, and eventually to village, city, and state. Each step has involved some delegation of sovereignty; but, with each delegation, greater security, greater benefit and lasting improvement have occurred. In each instance, the delegation has come as a part of evolution and growth. Today we advocate one more step in the development of man—such delegation of external sovereignty as will bring him security against the fear and dread of aggression and war.

We boast of not delegating our sovereignty; that we have never done so and that we will never surrender one iota of it. Idle boasts, foolish talk, and absurd conclusions. We have delegated sovereignty of many kinds and in many different ways.

We did not delegate sovereignty at Pearl Harbor. The Japs took it away from us there. In the Philippines they totally destroyed all the sovereignty this great Nation of our possessed in a land we were in honor bound to protect and preserve against aggression. True, we finally took it back. But, through the long years when American boys were forced into the gruesome death march, into long terms as prisoners of war, ill-treated, starved, cruelly beaten, tortured, some of them slain in horrible, barbaric fashion, where was national sovereignty then? It was not on Bataan, nor on Corregidor. And all this went on while we in the Congress and throughout the country talked of a national sovereignty. If such we possessed, it was preserved only by the bravery of our fighting men on the field of battle. The sovereignty of every son who has died in battle has not been delegated. No; not delegated. It has been completely destroyed. His sovereign right to live the free life of an American citizen, the right to love, to marry, to have a home, to raise a family, to live his allotted span of threescore years and ten, free from fear and free from want, was completely taken from him forever. It is time, I think, that we dwell more on the sovereign rights of men and women to live and to let live, than to quibble over outmoded words, terms, and phrases.

Within the outline I have mentioned and the means I have set forth, can and will be included all the various steps which have been suggested as preventive measures, such as complete inspection within nations of all scientific, industrial, and other activities which might lead to creation of military force and power. Within that outline could also be included all the worthwhile suggestions which have come from many sources.

But our task—the one which lies immediately ahead of us and not in some remote, far-off, distant time—is to choose that course we deem to be wisest and follow it vigorously and determinedly, without doubt or hesitation, until the goal which we establish is attained. That goal, to me, is the one I have announced, to establish law itself as the ruling force in the world.

With such action there must and will come those improved economic relations so necessary in the health and well-being of all humanity. With these, too, shall come educational developments, full exchange and sharing of ideas, knowledge, and scientific discovery, essential to the type of education which ultimately will lead to that culture upon which the foundations of civilization will eventually be built and upon which they must eternally stand.

Mr. President, no longer do I dread the future. In the beginning I said there were grounds for grave fear as one looked at the world today. That is true, but true only if we look at the darkness and the gloom and fail to see the ray of hope that does glimmer through if we but have the wit and wisdom to comprehend the possibilities which actually exist. There are rays of light. The great scientists who have made the world-startling discoveries of force to be used in destruction, can, if given the opportunity, turn those discoveries and many more into benefits of which we do not now dream.

Mr. President, I turn again to the words I quoted from the Smyth report, where it is said:

> Because of the restrictions of military security there has been no chance for the Congress or the people to debate such questions. They have been seriously considered by all concerned and vigorously debated among the scientists, and the conclusions reached have been passed along to the highest authorities. These questions are not technical questions; they are political and social questions, and the answers given to them may affect all mankind for generations.

Here is our field, the political, moral, and social field. We are not the scientists to understand, nor is it necessary for us to know, the technical details of this new power. But we are the scientists, or should be, in the political field. Here are the problems which we, and we alone, can solve. Let us apply a small fractional part of the intelligence used by the technical men in their discoveries to the problems which are exclusively ours, and the new order can be established. Our world can be constructed on a basis of law and order. Mankind can live in peace. War can be outlawed, and those who come after us will have cause, indeed, to rise up and call this generation blessed.

Mr. President, I have outlined, perhaps, the least of the processes through which we must go in our evolution and growth. They will not all be accomplished at once; no one believes that. But they must come quickly. We must be on our way now, lest all nations perish in the most miserable failure of all generations and of all men.

Paraphrasing, I conclude:

He who lets this generation die
Lets all generations die,
And all generations dying curse him.

He who lets this generation live
Lets all generations live,
And all generations living bless him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I desire to commend the Senator from New Mexico for a very enlightening, thoughtful, and reasoned treatment of some of our pressing problems.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Maryland in his expression of appreciation of the speech which we have just heard from the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. It was not only a very able but a challenging speech; it was a speech which contributed much to our thinking on the all-important subject of the preservation of peace for our own country and for all the world. It was a speech worthy of the highest and finest traditions of the Senate of the United States.

ALUMINUM PLANT DISPOSAL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, my remarks are directed to the pressing problems of aluminum plant disposal and the glaring failures of the Government agencies entrusted with this all-important task.

Now that the war is won, these facilities, in the largest measure possible and with the utmost speed, must be converted to peacetime uses.

The people of the United States, who are, today, the owners of this vast wartime industrial plant, have a right to know what goes on behind the murk and confusion of present policy. They have a right to insist that these facilities be used to promote their own well-being and not according to the dictates of selfish and predatory interests.

The Congress set a general framework in the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to guide the disposal of Government-owned plants and other facilities. The act called for the disposal of public property in an orderly and equitable manner. Among its paramount objectives were the purpose to safeguard national security, to foster private enterprise, to discourage monopoly, and to stimulate full employment. The act also instructed the Surplus Property Board—now the Surplus Property Administration—in cooperation with the various disposal agencies, to report to Congress within 3 months after enactment of the law on disposal plans for specified classes of property. Plants costing more than $5,000,000 were included. Aluminum plants and facilities appeared at the head of the list.

More than 6 months after its report was due, the Surplus Property Administration showed no sign of having a program for aluminum plant disposal. A growing concern became manifest among many people, because this policy of government inaction, by resulting in shutdowns and unemployment, acted as an economic strangle-hold upon their communities.

To survey the problems at first hand, the Subcommittee on Aviation and Light Metals of the Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program held hearings in the Pacific Northwest, where a considerable share of the aluminum facilities are located. Members of the subcommittee were the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and myself, as chairman.

The testimony heard by this subcommittee, as well as subsequent evidence before other Senate committees, makes one fact crystal clear to me: Failure of the Government to act plays directly into the hands of a monopoly group that has everything to gain by a do-nothing policy. The attitude of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the disposal agency for aluminum facilities, smacks of outright collusion with this group, or, at the very least, indicates striking incompetence to perform the designated function. I will say more about these matters in a moment, but first I want to discuss briefly the background of events leading up to the present problem.

For 50 years prior to the war, the Aluminum Co. of America, known as Alcoa, was the only producer of primary aluminum in this country. Aluminum is made from a compound called alumina, which in turn is derived from bauxite. It has been said that by destruction of Alcoa's alumina plant before the war, the enemy could have put back our aluminum production and aircraft program for a period of 18 months. This is not the occasion to review Alcoa's role in the early defense program. It is recorded in the hearings and reports of the investigating committee under the distinguished chairmanship of Mr. Truman. It is enough to say that when war came, this country was caught short. Another company, Reynolds, managed to enter the field; also the Government itself, through the Defense Plant Corporation, effected a tremendous expansion of aluminum facilities.

The hungry war machine devoured aluminum at a rate that caused production to be expanded six or seven times. Capacity is now almost 2,500,000,000 pounds annually. The Government's investment in aluminum producing and fabricating facilities aggregates almost $700,000,000, and if we add the corresponding share of public power costs, the investment comes to about $1,000,000,000. Employment in the entire industry rose from 35,000 to a peak of 150,000; and an estimated 2,000,000 workers learned how to process aluminum and magnesium in aircraft and other war plants.

Practically all of the 50 Government aluminum plants were designed, built, and operated by Alcoa. Thus, the present economic and technical problems of disposal are rooted in the decisions of a private corporation which could not successfully deny its interest in the postwar market. During the war the Government, as owner, was the largest single factor in the aluminum business. Alcoa, as operator, produced over 90 percent of the alumina and primary aluminum and large proportions of aluminum products. What the Government does in disposal of its plants now will determine whether the pattern of monopoly control will be continued and consolidated or whether it will be broken to make room for new producers in aluminum.

In the Pacific Northwest are located publicly owned aluminum facilities estimated to cost $200,000,000. More than half the public power produced at Bonneville and Grand Coulee has been devoted to servicing the needs of those plants. Dr. Wilson Compton, president of Washington State College, stated before the subcommittee that decisions with respect to the disposal of these public properties would hasten or retard the development of the Pacific Northwest for 20 years. Among all witnesses, with the exception of spokesmen for Alcoa and the general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there was a sense of urgency and a call for prompt and vigorous Government action. Mr. D. K. MacDonald, chairman of the light metals committee, Western States Council, said:

> This is a right-now proposition. These gentlemen who represent labor are interested in having their men go to work, and we fellows in business are interested in seeing these plants operate and other industries come in behind them, so there will be business done.

Henry K. Kaiser, who testified before my subcommittee in San Francisco, warned that—

> We must move, because this whole question of whether this country survives is determined entirely by the speed of its reconversion.

Spokesmen for labor pointed out that many thousands of workers were recruited by the Government and industry on the promise that their jobs in aluminum be permanent. These workers want to stay and keep their homes. Scrapping plants, as Mayor Otto A. Dirkes, of Spokane, said, is scrapping people.

It was unanimously agreed that the Pacific Northwest is capable of building up an integrated aluminum industry. When so developed, the industry, according to Paul J. Raver, head of the Bonneville Power Administration, can employ 25,000 workers, almost four times as many as then employed. Many more workers will get jobs in other industries that consume aluminum if a vast potential market is tapped by new enterprise. On the basis of present estimates, reconversion in the Northwest will have no place for about 90,000 workers unless new industries, big and small, open up. A rounded industrial development is necessary to bring this area into economic balance with other sections, with resultant benefit to the whole Nation.

At Spokane representatives of the Olin Industries, Kaiser Co., Reynolds Metals Co., Columbia Metals Corp., and Alcoa all expressed an interest in acquiring Government plants in the Northwest, and in laying the ground work for an integrated aluminum industry. With the exception of Alcoa, which was the only company offering to purchase outright, these companies wanted, as a first and immediate step, to lease from the Government on terms which would guarantee them an adequate supply of power and raw material, and an interim market until their enterprises were operating on a sound competitive footing. No company was willing to put itself in a position where Alcoa would be both a competitor and the only source of supply for alumina, basic to the production of aluminum. Constructive proposals were put forth for Government action to facilitate the acquisition of plants by private producers other than Alcoa.

Alcoa, for its part, admonished against decisive Government action at this point. It stood to gain by a do-nothing policy, because then the vast Government plant would be scrapped, or Alcoa would get those facilities it desired on its own terms. In this way it would protect its monopoly position in the postwar market—a position of high prices and restricted output. At the same time Alcoa was unwilling to make available to potential competitors data on Government plant operation which they considered necessary for an adequate appraisal of these plants. The glowing tributes and fine lip service that Alcoa paid to competition find no warrant in the long industrial experience of that company.

Alcoa thought it could well afford to sit easy because the leases it held on Government alumina and aluminum-producing plants had two or three more years to run. Early in the defense program, the importance of making lease arrangements which would not further postwar monopoly control nor hamper the Government's freedom of action in disposal was stressed before the Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which had a part in these arrangements with Alcoa, and which knew of their terms all along, appeared to have come up with an original discovery—that the Government could make no move to dispose of aluminum plants. There were indications too, that Alcoa was using the lease as a bargaining weapon to secure policies in its favor. When the absurdity of the lease situation, wherein the Government's hands were tied from acting in the public interest, was brought out by the subcommittee in the Spokane hearings, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation scurried around to reexamine its position.

Now the lease with Alcoa contained a provision to the effect that if production in all leased alumina and reduction plants fell below 40 percent of capacity for a 6-month period, either party could cancel on 60 days' notice. By a diligent search of the production figures, the further discovery was made that Alcoa was not maintaining 40 percent of capacity in its reduction and alumina plants, and on August 30 of this year the Reconstruction Finance Corporation gave notice of lease cancellation effective as of October 31. Finally, then, the Government was free to negotiate with other interested parties. The initiative in terminating these restrictive agreements, I assure the Senate, did not come from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and the general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, joining the notice of termination with an offer to discuss the matter further with Alcoa, included this unusual statement:

> In the event we can arrive at a mutually satisfactory basis for adjusting the matter or should you convince us that we are wrong in our present position, we will withdraw the notice of termination.

Now I submit that this is not proper talk for a Government agency that has such a tremendous responsibility to the people of this country. In effect this agency is asking a private corporation to make decisions for it on matters of grave public importance.

A legitimate and understandable concern has been expressed by some Members of the Senate and by other persons, as to the unemployment resulting from the abrupt closing down of the leased facilities. A large measure of responsibility for this distressing state of affairs must be borne by Alcoa because of its die-hard uncompromising pursuit of its own interests. Alcoa refused the offer of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as alternative to canceling the case, to continue operations for a year, subject to a 60-day notice of termination. But an equally large measure of responsibility must be borne by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which never acted with foresight, and which piled up a heap of difficulties of its own making.

The negative disposal record of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to date indicates beyond a shadow of a doubt that it is not a fit agency to perform this all-important task without a thorough housecleaning and a complete revamping of its fundamental approach. Here are a billion dollars' worth of facilities in aluminum alone, and the trifling contribution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to issue a few brochures, send telegrams, or write letters asking who is interested, then sit back and wait for customers. To suppose that a complex portion of the industrial economy can be sold like a piece of surplus equipment is a gross misconception of the job. The very minimum of groundwork requires careful plant by plant studies of productive possibilities, of cost schedules, of prospective markets for products, of the skills in available labor, of the regional economic setting. Consideration must be given to steps necessary to assure prospective buyers of opportunities for stable operation and a reasonable profit. The facts must be presented in an attractive way to possible buyers, and in the case of aluminum particularly, a practical working program must be advanced to get competition into the industry. In the words of a witness before the Spokane hearings of the subcommittee: "The disposal of surplus property, translated into less fancy and more meaningful language, is the ways and means of using the public facilities and the newly created skills of war workers." The Kaiser witness at the subcommittee hearings reported his inability to find a representative of Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the field with sufficient authority to negotiate in the matter of plant disposal. The Surplus Property Administrator's report to Congress itself admits that "the present degree of interest in plant acquisition has arisen slowly in the absence of a campaign of disposal."

A root difficulty brought out by the subcommittee hearings in the Northwest was the jockeying that went on between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Surplus Property Administration with regard to disposal responsibility. In theory the Surplus Property Administration formulates the policy on disposal and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation carries it out. Between the policy and its execution there is a wide and varying range of problems which each agency is inclined to put off on the other, with a consequent evasion of responsibility by both. In fact, these two agencies are but links in a chain of irresponsibility which they are trying to forge all the way up through the Attorney General's office, the courts, and the Congress.

Had the legal minds in both agencies spent as much time trying to carry out their duties under the law as they have in debating the limits of their respective authorities, this country would be considerably better off today. The Surplus Property Act provides the basis for intelligent and workable disposal policies, and gives a clear mandate to strive for high levels of production and employment. Neither of these agencies has come to Congress and said: To carry out the objectives of the Surplus Property Act, such and such must be done, and—if necessary—we require additional legislation in the following particulars. On the contrary, Mr. Symington, the Surplus Property Administrator, and Mr. Goodloe, General Counsel for Reconstruction Finance Corporation, have constantly advertised the difficulties of the aluminum-disposal problem and have tended to regard the act as exempting them from taking the initiative. Difficulties there are, we must admit, and difficulties there always will be, as long as we live in this uncertain and interesting world. But one axiom we must learn from the long congressional scrutiny of war administration: Difficulties are put in the foreground when it is desired to keep fundamental necessities in the background.

On September 21, 1945, 12 months after enactment of the Surplus Property Act, and 9 months after the due date for its report, the Surplus Property Administration presented to Congress its program for disposal of aluminum plants and facilities. I recommend that Members of both Houses, if they have not already done so, make a serious study of this report. With many, if not all, of its facts and proposals I can agree. But it does not go far enough, and it gives no promise that the Government program will succeed. An admission of defeat is registered even before the work of disposal has begun. Mr. Symington did not specify what was lacking for the successful execution of his responsibilities; instead he prejudged his own failure and handed responsibility up the line by concluding:

> The Board recognizes that conditions beyond its control may make this program impossible of accomplishment. In that event, unless the courts dissolve or reorganize Alcoa under the Sherman Act, it will be for Congress to consider whether to leave the aluminum industry under the domination of one company or whether to authorize the Government either by subsidized or direct operation of key plants to provide some measure of production that is independent of Alcoa's control.

The basic weakness of the aluminum report, which prompted this admission, is that it alters little or nothing as to the hard facts in the case. Mainly it proposes a scale of priorities in disposal, giving preference to competitors of Alcoa and permitting Alcoa to have only those facilities which the Department of Justice will approve as consistent with competition in the industry. This expression of preferences, it is true, reflects the intent of the Surplus Property Act and the mandate of a recent court decision as construed by the Attorney General. But expressing preferences will not of itself dispose of plants. With the 50-year head start that Alcoa has in the aluminum industry, it is no easy matter for competitors to gain a foothold.

The aluminum report of the Surplus Property Administration is dated September 21, 1945. According to the law, the Congress had a 30-day period of review. In view of the importance of

this particular disposal problem, the Congress saw fit to extend the review period another 30 days. That time is up. No further action has been suggested in the Congress. The Surplus Property Administration can now assume its program to have been approved. It can now try to sell or lease facilities as proposed.

The foregoing events, as I have indicated them, make it imperative that a way be sought out of the present impasse.

There are good prospects of getting competitive producers in the aluminum industry if the Government supports an interim market. A sensible and practicable way to do this is by Government stock-piling for national defense. Recommendations that Government purchase of aluminum in a stock-pile program be integrated with plant disposal were made by practically all the industry witnesses, except Alcoa, at the Pacific Northwest hearings of the subcommittee. The Army-Navy Munitions Board has also recommended the stock piling of primary aluminum, and recent hearings have been held on bills to establish stock-piling machinery. Proposed legislation, however, is of a broad, general nature and confers no specific authority upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to take necessary action in a way to facilitate aluminum-plant disposal. The aluminum report of the Surplus Property Administration makes no recommendation whatsoever in this regard, except the diffident conclusion that "government policy can also be shaped, if necessary, to enable new producers, along with established old producers, to contribute to that stock pile."

It seems to me that if an aluminum stock pile is acknowledged as vital to national security, and if such purchase by the Government will help get the aluminum plants into operation by private business, there is no reason why the two programs cannot be coordinated. Here is a familiar instance of the Government's left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing. I had supposed, when we set up the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, that here was an agency to take care of this very difficulty and to unify the reconversion program on all fronts. No doubt that Office has reviewed the report on aluminum-plant disposal submitted by Mr. Symington to the Congress. But for all the difference it made, that Office need not have been in existence at all. It stands on the side lines as a more or less interested spectator. Judged by the plain meaning of the law, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has failed miserably to do its duty.

I recommend for the prompt consideration of the Congress a simple amendment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. This should extend existing authority relating to strategic materials, so that aluminum purchased for stock-pile purposes can be integrated with the disposal of aluminum facilities, consistent with any subsequent stock-pile authority that may be established.

In conclusion I want to say that disposal of aluminum plants presents a yardstick to measure Government performance under the Surplus Property Act. Here is a test of whether the objectives declared in the act will remain empty words or be translated into the living deed. Here is a challenge to the Government in its disposal program, by breaking the grip of monopoly power in the aluminum industry, to set the direction for the whole economy—to substitute for the old order of scarcity and privileged enterprise a new order of expanded production and free independent enterprise.

If it moves wisely and with dispatch, the Government can lay the ground work for a prosperous and productive economy; if it continues to falter and delay, mounting unemployment and distress will be its only accomplishment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PROBLEMS OF RETURNING SERVICEMEN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we have recently passed an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, known as the GI bill of rights, making certain improvements in the law, which now stands as a rather generous provision for returning veterans in many important respects, but not in all.

There is being published this week in the Survey Midmonthly, a national journal of social work, a report by Mr. Bradley Buell and Dr. Reginald Robinson. The report is semiofficial at best, but it is important, particularly since it touches upon the needs of returning veterans in certain of those respects which are not covered by the so-called GI bill of rights.

The report is stated to be the result of 5 months of study and field examination of the problems of returning veterans in various communities. Of course, that can be only a sampling. I understand that most of the work in the field has been in the South and West. Three cities of considerable size, and many small ones, were used as focal points. The report covers those factors in the problem of the serviceman which are really community matters and which necessarily present extreme variations as between various sections of the country. Actually, every single man is a different case. Rarely have two men exactly the same problems; and there are very important factors aside from money, provision for education, and so forth, reaching all the way down to the families of the men themselves.

The report by Messrs. Buell and Robinson states, as a result of the survey, that an undue proportion of returned veterans are being confronted by problems of the family, of emotion, economy, and so on, which very adversely affect their readjustment into the life of the community. At one place the report says:

> When the glamour of the moment is gone, when the high excitement of welcome home is over, here will be the residual legatees of a community's failure to organize and equip itself as of today with services which can reduce these difficulties to a minimum. Here, in a practical sense, will be the veterans' problem of tomorrow, evidenced in tragic personal dissatisfaction and a society of disturbing community discontent.

Those are big words, but they mean much, as we study them.

Messrs. Buell and Robinson proceed to say that immediate steps must be taken to provide the services which we owe in that line to the veterans of the Army and Navy. Furthermore, one of the first steps advocated to enable veterans "to land on their own feet in the tradition of American youths" is the establishment of a national service to give communities the leadership which they are now lacking.

Mr. President, in that particular recommendation I am unable to agree at this time. In the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and in the measures being taken by the Veterans' Administration in carrying out that and other laws on the subject, the Federal Government has already set up what I regard as sufficient leadership provision, as the situation now appears. It does remain to follow through down to the local levels, to the families of the veterans, and to their individual cases. That function—and it is a duty—is, to my way of thinking, the province of levels lower than the Federal Government.

The States may well concern themselves with that aspect of the problem, insofar as the States represent the differences in the attendant circumstances, and the leadership which Messrs. Buell and Robinson advocate can be better supplied at the State level; and this should be done.

Mr. President, it happens that such provision was initiated in the State of Connecticut as long as 2½ years ago. It grew out of an organization set up at that time and known as the Connecticut State Reemployment Commission. It was not set up specifically for veterans at all. There has been some publicity as to that commission during the last 2 years, and in it the movement has been variously known as the Connecticut plan, the Bridgeport plan, and the Gray plan. Governor Baldwin originally sponsored the movement. It was entirely unofficial. The Governor found in a Mr. Carl Gray exactly the kind of man who was needed. Mr. Gray is an industrial executive and a busy man, but he is one of the class of very busy men who always contrive to find time to do something more, particularly in the interest of the public good, and for which he never gets paid.

The Connecticut Reemployment Commission is not an operating agency, but it is made up of representatives of many

operating agencies and interested groups in various positions. It is concerned with the coordination of interagency activities and the cooperation of those engaged in such activities, so that each is a supporting factor of the other and by no means a dominant factor in the accomplishment of the plan, except in its own community. In other words, the commission provides a leadership on the State level in the respects where Messrs. Buell and Robinson find that leadership is needed.

Incidentally, that commission was and still is altogether voluntary. It has never consumed any Federal funds whatever, and never has used any of the funds of the State, until the last few months, when a State act made it official and provided something in the way of travel expenses for the men who do the work.

The reemployment commission has never had any hard and fast rule as to how local committees are to be formed, by whom, or whether each is a committee by itself or a subcommittee of another local community organization interested in postwar problems in general. The main objective is to work through some local committee which is deeply conscious of the human engineering aspect of employment and readjustment, and is interested in helping the individual to be a useful member of his community and also of his own family, irrespective of the form of help he may need.

Some of the publicity concerning this organization is the result of observation of the city of Bridgeport, which has been in the forefront of the Connecticut movement. That city does have a small number of full-time men engaged in the program, and last year it set up an annual budget for the purpose. Even so, the voluntary services are most important in Bridgeport, and in the rest of the State almost all of the work is on a volunteer basis.

Out of that movement, which was initiated by Governor Baldwin two and a half years ago, as a part of the Gray plan, there have grown up subsidiary organizations which are known as veterans' reemployment and advisory centers. The particular task of such centers is in relation to the affairs of the veteran. The American Legion was prominent in the original formation of those groups which began sometime back, and other veterans' organizations have joined with them in full seriousness.

Their work constitutes a very considerable portion of what is being done in their communities in the readjustment of veterans. There are now more than 150 local committees in Connecticut which are engaged in this most important work.

It is rather interesting to get a cross section of the matters about which veterans inquire. In 1 day, 941 veterans went to 30 centers, seeking advice, some of them on more than one subject. At that time education was the topic which was most interesting to them, and insurance was next in importance. At another time claims were most important, and at times what are known as counseling and family services are highly important. Very often housing is the most important.

About last August, before any action had been taken by the present Congress on the amendment to the GI bill of rights, I received a letter from one of the veterans' reemployment and advisory committees. The man who wrote it was informing me of his views on the working of the bill as it then stood; and he wrote as follows:

> Many articles have appeared in print recently which have blasted the Veterans' Administration in its entirety. Irrespective of whether such criticism is justified, anyone who says that the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—the GI bill of rights—was hastily written and rushed through Congress as a political measure is very misinformed or has some ulterior motive. It is a good bill, obviously designed to provide needed assistance to the veteran and, at the same time, protect him from his own inexperience.
>
> From the various changes proposed in the present law some improvement can manifestly result. Some of those amendments are apparently designed to eliminate red tape. As administered by this office in close cooperation with other institutions, there is practically no objectionable red tape. For instance, an enlisted man's application for a loan doesn't see a single Government form until after the proposal has been thoroughly checked. The present bill is basically sound. All it needs is intelligent administration. I am only afraid that enough pressure will be brought from various sources to persuade the Senate that the GI bill of rights should be fundamentally changed.
>
> If there have been any gripes from servicemen on the application of the law to their individual cases, such complaints as reach this office have been very few in number and such as would be expected from a few individuals. If Congress could confine its attention to ironing out some of the administrative difficulties in the Veterans' Administration, particularly as regards hospitals, and encourage the formation of such community organizations as Bridgeport's, it would do much toward eliminating the possibility of another "march on Washington."
>
> Through a fortunate chain of circumstances, Bridgeport has tackled this problem of readjustment in a manner which has been held up as a model for national application.

There has been some publicity to that effect, but that is another matter.

The letter concludes as follows:

> I wish that a Senate committee could visit us and observe the practical application of the present law. It works here.

Mr. President, I have stated what has occurred in my own State merely as an illustration, and in following up what is being proposed by the Survey Midmonthly. The illustration which I have given is in connection with only one phase of the problem—mostly that of economics.

But the human engineering phase is very difficult to write about. It is less tangible, but highly important. It extends into the respective families and into the minds of the individual soldiers themselves. They are all different. No two are alike. They need sympathetic and understanding treatment. Very often the necessity of understanding goes straight to the families. Men who on returning find that their families are unable to understand them, and they cannot understand their families. Right there the trouble starts. I think that the article to which I have referred by Messrs. Buell and Robinson will be well worthy of reading when fully published, and well worthy of the attention broadly over the Nation.

PLANNED INFLATION—ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES CONTRADICT ITS PROMISES TO PREVENT INFLATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, throughout the war we have heard a great deal of the tremendous dangers of inflation. All kinds of control measures have been proposed and adopted by Congress in order to prevent the catastrophe of rapidly rising prices with all the abnormality and hardship which they bring about. We have submitted to radical curbs on the traditional freedom of American housewives and American business. We have closed our eyes to tremendous injustices and oppressions which have daily occurred in the administration of the laws relating to wages and prices and rents. Now, we are suddenly confronted with an administration policy which not only threatens to undo everything that has been done, but ultimately to stimulate an inflation in this country far greater than anyone has conceived of.

Lip service is still paid to the slogan of anti-inflation. Credit is daily claimed for the maintenance of price ceilings, whether these ceilings are effective or not. But two policies contradict these professions; first, the policy of deliberately spending Government money in excess of any reasonable sum which can be raised by taxation and constantly supporting an increase in those expenditures; and, second, the policy of encouraging a general increase in wages. It is utterly hypocritical to talk about maintaining prices while increasing costs, and about Government spending which either increases taxes or inflates purchasing power. In fact, the maintenance of prices under the conditions of rising taxes and costs will only decrease production, and break down that much sooner any legal price structure which it is attempted to maintain.

IMPROVEMENT IN LIVING STANDARDS CANNOT BE PRODUCED BY GOVERNMENT SPENDING, OR BY RAISING ALL WAGES AND SALARIES

If we are going to avoid both inflation and deflation, the economic goal of the Government should be a stable level of wages and prices, and a Government budget substantially balanced. Only thus can we hope, through a steady increase in production and a steady increase in productive ability, to secure a constant improvement. The only possible way to raise standards of living in this country is by increasing production and productive ability. This cannot be done by a policy of boom and depression. It cannot be done by boosting at one fell swoop the whole wage and salary level. If the price level is too high for the wage level, the consumers suffer, buying stops, and depression is produced. On the other hand, if the wage level is too high for the price level, all incentive to produce or expand productive facilities ceases, production and employment drop, and again we face depression. The secret of economic prosperity is a balance between wages and prices, a balance between purchasing power and production, a balance between savings and expenditures for consumption, a balance between farm prices and industrial prices, and a balance between Government expense and taxation. Depressions have occurred in

the past because some factor had gotten completely out of adjustment with the other factors. Thus, in 1929 savings ran far ahead of consumption, and too many people tried to make a fortune and live without working during the remainder of their lives. Furthermore, farm prices and farm purchasing power had fallen below wages and industrial prices from 1926 on. In 1938 wages, taxes, and other costs increased too fast for prices.

The best way to improve the condition of the whole people is to take rapid advantage of increase in productive ability by granting some increase in wages, but even more by bringing about a decrease in prices. If a particular industry like the automobile industry becomes more efficient, most of the benefit ought to be passed on in the price of automobiles. Many workers are in jobs where their production ability cannot be increased and unless the prices of mass-production industries are lowered they do not share at all our increased average standard of living. Comparatively, they are worse off. Not only is it an advantage to a great many more people to decrease prices, but it increases production and thereby increases further the productive ability of the industry and its ability to decrease prices further. A general increase of wages and salaries without any increase in productive ability is pure inflation, and is bound to be reflected in higher prices for all.

WAGES HAVE INCREASED FASTER THAN PRICES

The course of wages and prices is clearly shown by tables in reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which tables I ask to have printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits A and B.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, straight time hourly earnings of factory workers—not take home pay which increased about 70 percent—have increased on the average from 66.4 cents in January 1941 to 93.3 cents in July 1945, an increase of 42 percent. At the same time the cost of living index based on the retail prices of goods purchased by an average lower income family has increased from 100.8 to 129.2, approximately 28 percent or 14 percent less than wage rates. Wholesale prices of all commodities have increased from approximately 80 on January 1, 1941, to 105.9 in July 1945, an increase of 32.4 percent or approximately 10 percent less than wage rates. Wholesale prices of all commodities other than farm products and foods have only increased about 8 percent, while wholesale prices of farm products have increased 72 percent.

There is very little evidence that there has been any increase in the efficiency of labor per man-hour over all industries since 1941. There is a great deal of talk about increased efficiency, but, so far as I can discover, it relates only to a limited number of highly mechanized industries, to those industries to which war brought an abnormal increase in volume, and to the production of war materials where it results from greater knowledge of how to make these materials. The figures show generally that efficiency does not increase in time of war. Of course, there are thousands of jobs in which there is and can be no increase of efficiency per man-hour. I think of waiters in restaurants, elevator operators, and even Senators.

Even before the adoption by the President of his present policy there was some evidence that prices were too low to meet wages and other costs. The policies of the OPA undoubtedly put out of business many small packers and many small operators in other lines. In many industries adequate profits or more than adequate profits have been made, but smaller units in many industries are today operating at a loss. Many products are priced so that a loss is involved in their manufacture. This has resulted in the stoppage of production of standard articles like cheap clothing and standard cotton goods. In short, it looks as if already we had let average wage rates outrun average prices more than can be justified by any increase in efficiency.

Let me say that I do not purport to pass on the justice of prices in particular industries or of wages in particular industries. Undoubtedly, wages are too low in some industries and can be further increased. Prices may be too high on some products. I am speaking merely of the general average throughout the United States which determines over-all economic results. The President is encouraging an over-all increase in all wages and salaries.

WE SHOULD TRY TO STABILIZE WAGE RATES AND PRICES AT APPROXIMATELY PRESENT LEVELS

In short, we now have inflation and inflation which is somewhat out of adjustment. We are faced with the question whether the country would be better off to return to prewar levels or to have prices and wages stabilized approximately where they are. This decision is not entirely in our hands, because the laws of economics and supply and demand operate even in a totalitarian state. Even a complete control of wages and prices in peacetime would not enable us to determine exactly what the wage rate and price level will be, and such a control would utterly destroy freedom and be contrary to the whole basis on which the success of private enterprise must be founded. Nevertheless, Government policies relating to finance, credit, and many other indirect measures can have some effect on the level of wages and prices. To me it has seemed best that we should try to stabilize as far as possible at the present level, where we are. Increases in both wages and prices have been fairly general. We are already committed to the policy of maintaining basic farm prices about where they are for 2 years after the war, even at Government expense. Basic prices of materials like steel and copper have not risen in any substantial percentage, and are not likely to drop now. It looks as if we would have to maintain at least the present prices of lumber and paper if we want to get any supply of these materials at all. It would be very unwise and difficult to reduce wage rates. The sensible policy appears to be one of trying to stabilize at the present levels.

TRUMAN POLICIES WILL FORCE ULTIMATE INFLATION

President Truman has adopted the extraordinary policy of encouraging a general increase in all wages and salaries at the same time that he tries to hold down prices by arbitrary controls. To my mind this is a ridiculous, dangerous, and ultimately impossible policy. It has, however, been frequently advocated by members of the administration. It is clearly the philosophy of Mr. Chester Bowles and the New Deal economists in the Office of Price Administration. It is the policy of Mr. Henry Wallace.

In the President's recent speech, he said:

> Wage increases are therefore imperative—to cushion the shock to our workers, to sustain adequate purchasing power, and to raise the national income.

Later he said:

> Therefore, wherever price increases would have inflationary tendencies—

And they all do, of course—

> we must, above all else, hold the line on prices. Let us hold vigorously to our defense against inflation. Let us continue to hold the price line as we have held it since the spring of 1943.

It may be pointed out from the tables already submitted that since the spring of 1943 average wage rates have gone up 12 percent, while prices have risen only 3 percent. This policy is to be intensified. While the President avoided any direct statement of the percentage of increase which he favors, it was given out to the press that Government economists felt that a 20-percent or even a 24-percent general increase could be made without increasing prices. A 24-percent increase would add 34 points to the present index of 142, making the index 176, or a 76-percent increase since 1941 in straight-time hourly earnings—adjusted for interindustry shifts. A corresponding increase in prices would make at least a 60-percent increase over prewar. This would double the whole increase in cost of living which has taken place during the war.

The administration is also pressing for an increase in the minimum wage from 40 cents an hour to 65 cents an hour, or a 62½ percent increase. Such an increase in the minimum wage reflects itself generally in wages up through the scale.

The President has recently advocated a general increase in the wages of Government workers of at least 20 percent, in addition to the 21 percent which has been recently granted, or a total increase of approximately 45 percent since before the war. I have yet to find anyone who claims that the average efficiency of these workers per man-hour has increased.

The President has further recommended that the higher officials all receive an increase of $10,000 a year, which would be 50 percent in the case of Judges of the Supreme Court, 66⅔ percent in the case of the Cabinet, and 100 percent in the case of other Federal judges, of Representatives and Senators. Perhaps all these officials are more efficient, but I doubt it. Obviously, any such increase would suggest and encourage a similar increase in all salaries throughout the

United States. Certainly increases are justified to keep up with the cost of living, but the President is proposing increases more than double the increase in cost of living.

The general effect of this entire policy would be to raise wages and salaries to a point at least 75 percent above prewar rates. For months we battled about the Little Steel formula, supposed to limit increases to 15 percent. The new policy makes the Little Steel formula look foolish and futile. I think the people ought to know that Congress has not the slightest intention of making any such increases in official salaries as the President has recommended.

Again, Mr. President, I do not say that present wages and salaries are in all cases sufficient. Undoubtedly, there should be substantial increases in some fields and adjustments in others. I believe they should be increased to meet the increase in the cost of living, which only illustrates the fact that if we constantly force prices up, we are going constantly to have to force wages up, resulting in a constant spiral of inflation. But the new policy advocates a general increase nearly twice as great as that which has already occurred. It is about as reckless and irresponsible a policy as any administration has ever proposed.

One can only commend the President for his forthright statement yesterday placing the blame for the traction strike here on those who broke their collective-bargaining agreement. But the attitude of mind which considers a 30-percent increase a matter of right prevailing over all considerations was produced and encouraged by the President's own extraordinary policy of advocating general increases for all. If Representatives and Senators are advised by the President to double their own salaries in the middle of their contract term, why, say the streetcar operators, can we not do the same?

ADMINISTRATION POLICY MEANS HIGHER PRICES

It should be clear to all that the policy means inflation and ultimately will force an increase in price of 65 percent or certainly 60 percent over prewar prices. We cannot lift ourselves by our boot straps. We do not really increase our national income merely by increasing wages, as the President claims. It would be easy to reach Henry Wallace's figure of two hundred billion a year by inflating wages and prices. We could do even better by stamping every $1 to make it a $2 bill. But no one would be any better off. I have pointed out that, considering all activities of men and women workers in all fields, the war has not brought about more than a negligible increase in the productivity of labor. We may reasonably hope that the steady increase of prewar years will be resumed and justify lower prices and some wage increase. But certainly there is nothing now to justify an increase of wage rates to 70 percent over prewar.

Wages and salaries cannot and should not amount to more than 70 percent of national income.

The argument of the CIO and others who think as the President does is that in some way by increasing all wages and salaries, employees can get a bigger share in the national income, and reduce the percentage which goes to other persons who work for themselves, or earn profits in business.

This overlooks the fact that wages are approximately 85 percent of the direct and indirect cost in the manufacturing industries. It furthermore overlooks the fact that the percentage of the national income which goes to wages and salaries tends to remain constant over long periods of time. Since 1933 the percentage of the national income going to wages and salaries has run between 67 and 70 percent, and if the free-enterprise system is to work, wages cannot take much more than 70 percent in the future.

In the years from 1935 to 1940 the national income was divided as follows: To wages and salaries, 68 percent; to return on capital in the form of dividend, interest, and rent, 16 percent; to farmers, 6½ percent; to other business and professional men working for themselves, 9½ percent.

During the war years, 1941 to 1945 inclusive, 70 percent went to wages and salaries, 10 percent to return on capital, 8 percent to the farmers, 3½ percent to others working for themselves, and 3½ percent to corporation savings toward an increase in capital. In the earlier period 1933–40, corporations made no net addition to capital.

Certainly, the farmer ought to get 8 percent of the national income if we are to have a prosperous agriculture; 8½ percent for all others who work for themselves, for the most part small business and professional men, does not seem unreasonable. Ten percent of the national income amounting to approximately $12,500,000,000 is not an unreasonable return on some $250,000,000,000 of property saved and invested to provide jobs and homes and services for 135,000,000 people. It costs on an average $7,500 of capital to provide one additional job. If we want capital saved to provide the jobs we must have, there must be some incentive to save instead of spending. We need at least another $100,000,000,000 of capital invested as soon as possible.

It is quite possible that a few percent might be chiseled off these returns to other people than employees, but the resulting increase in wages and salaries could not be more than 5 percent, say from 70 percent to 75 percent. This could not justify any 70 percent increase over prewar wage rates.

We have heard a good deal in recent months of the terrible increase in corporation profits. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks a table showing the amount of corporation profits from 1929 to 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the outcry overlooks the fact that corporations actually lost $6,000,000,000 in the years 1931, 1932, and 1933, and that the return of the capital invested was wholly inadequate to stimulate saving or investment through the year 1938. Since that time profits, which include the dividends I have heretofore referred to, have totaled about 6 percent of the national income. If these profits were cut in half, it would only make possible an increase of wages and salaries from 70 percent to 73 percent of national income, which would pay for a wage increase of 4¼ percent over present rates instead of 20 percent or 24 percent over present rates. As a matter of fact, high employment and good wages have always existed at the same time that corporation profits and returns to farmers and others were reasonably liberal. The wage earner was never so badly off as when he got 78 percent of a greatly depleted national income in 1932.

In short, the prosperity of our system depends upon proper balance between wages and salaries, farm income, business profits, and prices. No one gains by trying to grab the other man's share. He simply distorts the picture to a point where depression and unemployment result. In 1929 the property owners tried to grab too large a share, and certainly did not aid themselves or anyone else in the country. Of course, profits can be too great, but if we prevent or regulate monopoly, profits cannot long remain higher than necessary to stimulate investment and therefore employment.

The President is not able to see that price increase is only the result of inflation, not inflation itself or the cause of inflation. It can be brought about by a Government deficit which creates purchasing power without corresponding production. We shall have borrowed $260,000,000,000, and much of the proceeds are of no value to the civilian population. We have created $100,000,000,000 of purchasing power out of thin air. Only a huge production of civilian goods can prevent its ultimately increasing prices.

I do not wish to deal here with the general question of the tremendous expenditures which the President's policy seems to indicate. The armed services alone apparently are going to ask for approximately $9,000,000,000 a year, the new social-security program will cost two or three billion dollars a year, and certainly the budget, if we add up everything the President has recommended, will come very close to $30,000,000,000 a year.

But inflation is bound to result also from an increase in wages, salaries, and other costs. The OPA seems to think it can hold prices down while it permits wages and costs to increase and for a while this might be done, but at a terrible cost. While ultimately higher prices must result, while even now illegal black market operators thrive and flourish, a period of unemployment and depression can be caused like that of 1920. For the result of holding down prices when costs increase is to discourage production, to discourage the enlargement of plants, to discourage thousands of smaller, and larger operators from beginning the enterprises which should produce employment. Mr. Bowles may or may not be right on the automobile industry. A few large manufacturers in any industry may be able to resume their prewar production and operate at a profit. But Mr. Bowles and the

New Dealers must give up their ideas of anything like a "dynamic economy," if they act only with reference to a few large manufacturers.

A shoe manufacturer told me last month that he could double the size of his factory and would like to do so, but that as long as he was losing money on every pair of shoes manufactured, he saw no reason to do more than supply his regular customers. To permit wages to increase and hold prices defeats the very purpose of the policy. It creates an excessive demand and no production. Purchasing power will not produce goods if there are no goods or if no one can make them without losing money. Ultimately price control has to be relaxed or it is swamped in a black market. Then if we have not manufactured a depression by discouraging production, prices must go up to meet the increase of costs.

What we now see is a planned policy of inflation. It means ultimately a tremendously high cost of living, balanced for some by increases in wages and salaries, but not for others. White collar workers, teachers, and State employees cannot get the increase that others may receive. Millions of people have their standard of living reduced. Those who have saved money or widows who receive life insurance find that the proceeds will buy only half what they planned. Charitable institutions find their endowments, in effect, cut in half. The cost of American goods rises to a point at which we can no longer compete in the export market. Inflation creates a boom. Booms are followed by depressions. It is a reckless and irresponsible policy adopted, apparently, merely because the Political Action Committee and the OPA demand it. It is an attractive political policy. Everyone likes to have his wage or salary raised. Everyone likes to get 48 hours' pay for 40 hours' work without working any harder. But getting something for nothing is an illusion.

The CIO planners know better. Their present policy is a political policy, designed to wreck the system of free enterprise if they can do it. It is not designed for the benefit of their own members, who would pay in increased prices the supposed increase in pay.

THE NEW POLICY WAS DEVELOPED BY THE OPA. IT IS UNSOUND, UNJUST, AND HYPOCRITICAL

The policy now announced by the President is only the development of a policy developed by the OPA during the past 2 years, dominated by the thinking of its numerous left-wing economists. About 2 years ago they adopted the policy of establishing an absolute freeze on retail prices regardless of any increase in costs. Except for the black market break-down in the case of various commodities this policy was successfully adhered to, for, from May 1943 until May 1945, straight-time hourly earnings rose 11 percent while the cost of living only rose 2½ percent as shown by the reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In other words, on the average, industry was compelled to absorb more than a 9-percent increase in cost during these 2 years. Many industries were able to do this, particularly when they had a large volume of war business, but others were forced out of business or compelled to do business at a loss. We saw this result in the case of the small packers. We saw it in the disappearance of many textile goods from the market. I have cited many other instances on this floor. The OPA admits that they are compelling many lines of commodities to be sold at a loss and that some industries are compelled by regulation to do business at cost. But the fetish of an absolutely frozen retail level has been maintained in face of the conditions which necessarily forced higher costs.

Recently I was very much surprised to hear that at OPA insistence the RFC has now provided a new subsidy on the price of coffee. It was found that we had to pay Brazil 3 cents a pound more for coffee, and, instead of passing that on to the consumer, which seems to be the only reasonable course—it would cost the average American family about 3 cents every 2 weeks—the OPA is proposing to absorb that by a new subsidy which will cost the American taxpayers during this fiscal year $24,000,000, because OPA is determined that on the books at least, on the record of prices, there shall be no increase in the retail price. On what principle the taxpayer should pay it instead of the consumer I frankly do not understand, and I was the more surprised because as I recall, within the last month, OPA had abandoned the subsidy on butter, which cost a very considerable amount of money.

Today OPA ends the rationing of meat. I do not know whether the rationing of meat ought to be ended, but I know that the trouble with meat has not been due to its rationing. The trouble with meat has been the pricing system which has been pursued all along the line from the producer to the feeder to the packer to the distributor. It seems to me that the situation will be worse if meat rationing is ended, and that the black market condition will increase so long as attempt is made to maintain the very rigid and arbitrary price level which is now maintained.

This policy in the first place is unsound, as I have already pointed out with reference to the extension of it now proposed by the President. By requiring products to be made at a loss it kills production which is the only ultimate method of reducing prices. After fixing a price at which only the largest and most efficient operator can survive, it attempts to adjust for individual manufacturers, allowing some higher prices than others, a policy, of course, which amounts to a fixing of profits rather than prices. Furthermore, as supply increases this relief is of no real assistance to the small concerns, because they cannot compete with the lower prices forced by the OPA on the larger, more efficient concerns. Prices of finished products should be uniform and there should be a margin for the entire industry, based on some prewar margin. This is not a guarantee of profits, because on that margin the efficient concerns will make money and the inefficient concerns will not, just as before the war.

In the second place, the policy of the OPA has been completely unjust to many concerns, especially the smaller companies without representation in Washington. There has been a strong anti-business prejudice, and every businessman is met by the assumption that he is trying to make more than he ought to make. Mr. Bowles in his statement on October 23 before the Banking and Currency Committee denounced businessmen as greedy and as pressure groups.

Injustice is perhaps tolerable in time of war; businesses that fail are casualties of the war; but today the war is over, and we are interested, not in maintaining arbitrary price levels at any cost, but in the promotion of prosperity and employment.

In the third place, the whole attitude of the Price Administration is hypocritical. It pretends that it desires to make adjustments, but it does not intend to do so and seldom does. Applications for increases lie for months in the different sections of the OPA. They are granted by one section and refused by its superior. If one is finally granted it is probably half the increase justified by the evidence and often admitted to be fair by officials in the OPA itself. By that time costs have again increased. One Senator said that OPA has a defense in depth. Certainly it has made it effective.

I do not mean to say that OPA rulings are always wrong, or that the businessmen are always right, but I do say that the general policy of the OPA has been so tight as to squeeze many businesses, discourage production and reconversion and new projects, and cause particular distress to the thousands of small industries which ought to be encouraged.

The Executive order approved by the President on October 30 is a snare and a delusion. It authorizes increases in wages, as if such increases had not been taking place ever since VJ-day. It graciously permits an employer to grant an increase and then apply for an increase in prices which he can be sure he will not get. The Price Administrator cannot take the increase into account until after a test period of 6 months after the increase has been made. By the time the Price Administrator got around to granting an increase, if he ever did, there would be a full year of operation on increased wages and no increase in price. Long before the increase is granted I trust his office will be abolished.

Again, I do not say that in any particular industry, like the automobile industry, wage increases can or cannot be absorbed. I do say that taking the country as a whole, it is absolutely impossible to increase wages without increasing prices, except by forcing men out of business, discouraging those who remain, and decreasing production. The Price Control Act contemplated fair prices for each commodity, and provided that the Price Administrator should take into account general increases in cost of production, distribution and transportation. He has in my opinion refused to follow the spirit of the act and the provisions of the act.

Price control should be based on fair prices for each commodity, based on current costs, and approximately prewar margins over cost.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution designed to carry out that general proposal. The joint resolution is similar to the amendment which I offered last year, except that it includes distributors as well as manufacturers.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 relating to the standards by which maximum prices shall be established, introduced by Mr. TAFT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRICE CONTROL MUST BE REFORMED OR ABOLISHED

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I believe that price control during the war period was essential. I helped draft and enact the price control law, and supported its extension during the war period. Today, I think most of the control imposed is wholly unnecessary. There are certain scarce commodities where I believe control should be continued, such as sugar and some building materials where the scarcity is so great that there might be a tremendous speculative rise. But as the Price Administration is administered today, I believe we would be better off to abolish it entirely than to continue as it is. It should be reformed and its powers defined.

Price control will be impossible to administer for long when combined with the policy of removing all restrictions from wage increase and encouraging general wage increases, but that period may be just long enough to utterly discourage reconversion and bring about serious depression through increased unemployment.

The OPA is propagandizing wildly for a further renewal of its powers after the first of next July. It caused to be inserted with every allotment check that went out to the dependents of servicemen in October, a card headed "Danger ahead, America," urging that "we must continue to hold the price line until supplies equal demand." Of course, on this principle some control might be indefinitely continued. The other side of the card enjoins every housewife to watch the price line. Refuse to pay a penny over the ceiling price. Be sure you get full weight and the grade for which you are paying. The implication is clear that every retailer is probably a chiseler and trying to short-change the consumer. Over 8,000,000 of these cards were sent to the families of servicemen, probably the most blatant piece of propaganda in which any Government bureau has engaged to perpetuate itself. And yet Mr. Bowles talks about pressure groups. I am beginning to get telegrams from CIO groups saying that prices must be controlled for a long time to come. I have no doubt that the inspiration of those telegrams is from the Office of Price Administration itself.

It is easy to work up an unthinking support for a general control of prices, among people who do not realize that price fixing can only end in the socialization of industry and dictation to the individual. So also it is easy to work up unthinking support for a Government prohibition of strikes. But people do not seem to realize that a general prohibition of strikes, or compulsory arbitration, means the fixing of wages by law and by force. If strikes are forbidden, except in certain temporary cases as during the life of a collective bargaining agreement or pending a conference, the Government must assume the responsibility of fixing wage rates, first in one industry, and then in all.

In my opinion a general policy of fixing wages and prices means the end of freedom of enterprise in any country. It subjects to Government control hundreds of millions of transactions every day in the year. It regiments every activity of businessman, housewife, employer, and employee. It must be abandoned at the earliest possible moment.

Now that peace has come, the Government should not assume to state any general policy of wage increase or decrease. It should leave that to collective bargaining in each industry, and it should adjust such prices as are to be controlled for a few months more, to the increased costs which actually exist.

We are met and will be met by the argument that economic emergency at home is exactly like the emergency created by war. The argument is a fallacy. Controls are necessary in war. We must give up many of our freedoms. No such necessity exists in peacetime to surrender the freedom for which the war was fought. The maintenance of freedom is essential to the kind of prosperity and standard of living we wish to attain. Prices should be controlled by the prevention of monopolistic practices. If competition is maintained they will adjust themselves to the place where they should be. In cases of great maladjustment or abuse, Government can occasionally step in as perhaps in the maintenance of farm prices.

CONCLUSION—DEPRESSION, THEN INFLATION

In conclusion, Mr. President, the Government today is pursuing two diametrically opposed policies, one to support a general increase in salaries and wage rates, and the other to keep retail prices frozen. This policy in the immediate future threatens reconversion and reemployment to such an extent that it may actually throw our economy into a tail spin. The Government itself is already predicting a total unemployment load of 8,000,000 which I believe to be wholly unnecessary if we can return to common sense in economic policy. If the policy is combined with general strikes which further check production, we may repeat our experience of 1920.

But ultimately the general policy of increasing salaries and wage rates is bound to produce a serious inflation and raise the whole level of prices in this country to a point which will produce hardship on many, speculative profits for a few, a boom like 1929, then again a major depression such as that in 1932.

EXHIBIT A

Average earnings of factory workers compared with cost-of-living changes

[Bureau of Labor Statistics]

	Gross weekly earnings	Gross hourly earnings	Straight-time hourly earnings— Based on current employee-hours	Straight-time hourly earnings— Adjusted for inter-industry shifts (hours as of January 1941)	Cost of living index, 1935–39=100
1939 (average)	$23.86	$0.633	$0.622	$0.640	99.4
1940 (average)	25.20	.661	.648	.654	100.2
1941 (average)	29.58	.729	.702	.700	105.2
January	26.64	.683	.664	.654	100.8
February	27.47	.685	.664	.663	100.8
March	27.90	.689	.665	.665	101.2
April	28.08	.702	.679	.677	102.2
May	29.34	.721	.694	.689	102.9
June	30.23	.732	.701	.698	104.6
July	29.62	.735	.708	.710	105.3
August	30.25	.736	.707	.710	106.2
September	30.67	.748	.719	.719	108.1
October	31.35	.761	.730	.727	109.3
November	31.23	.773	.745	.739	110.2
December	32.18	.783	.750	.744	110.5
1942 (average)	36.65	.853	.805	.781	116.5
January	33.40	.801	.762	.751	112.0
February	34.05	.803	.761	.751	112.9
March	34.63	.811	.767	.755	114.3
April	35.10	.822	.777	.762	115.1
May	35.82	.835	.788	.771	116.0
June	36.25	.845	.797	.775	116.4
July	36.43	.856	.809	.783	117.0
August	37.38	.870	.820	.790	117.5
September	37.80	.892	.844	.811	117.8
October	38.89	.893	.839	.807	119.0
November	39.78	.905	.848	.810	119.8
December	40.27	.907	.847	.809	120.4
1943 (average)	43.14	.961	.894	.846	123.6
January	40.62	.919	.859	.819	120.7
February	41.12	.924	.863	.820	121.0
March	41.75	.934	.870	.827	122.8
April	42.48	.944	.878	.833	124.1
May	43.08	.953	.885	.840	125.1
June	43.25	.959	.891	.843	124.8
July	42.76	.963	.899	.850	123.9
August	43.52	.965	.897	.848	123.4
September	44.39	.993	.925	.871	123.9
October	44.86	.988	.916	.863	124.4
November	45.32	.996	.923	.867	124.2
December	44.68	.995	.927	.873	124.4
1944 (average)	46.08	1.019	.947	.896	125.5
January	45.29	1.002	.931	.877	124.2
February	45.47	1.003	.931	.878	123.8
March	45.64	1.006	.934	.881	123.8
April	45.55	1.013	.942	.889	124.6
May	46.02	1.017	.944	.892	125.1
June	46.24	1.017	.944	.894	125.4
July	45.43	1.018	.950	.901	126.1
August	45.88	1.016	.945	.897	126.4
September	46.24	1.032	.962	.914	126.5
October	46.94	1.031	.956	.908	126.5
November	46.85	1.035	.961	.909	126.6
December	47.45	1.040	.963	.912	127.0
1945:					
January	47.50	1.046	.970	.920	127.1
February	47.37	1.043	.968	.918	126.9
March	47.40	1.044	.969	.922	126.8
April	47.12	1.044	.971	.925	127.1
May	46.03	1.043	.977	.934	128.1
June	46.32	1.038	-------	.931	129.0
July	45.45	1.033	-------	.933	129.4

EXHIBIT B

Table showing the percentage of national income paid out to various types of recipients from 1929 to 1945

[Department of Commerce Statistical Abstract]

	Wages and salaries	Farmers	Other individual business and professional men	Return on capital including interest, rent, and dividends
1929	63.7	6.2	10.2	18.4
1930	70.0	5.5	9.4	21.2
1931	74.0	4.4	8.9	22.9
1932	78.0	3.7	8.4	24.5
1933	70.0	5.3	10.0	20.7
1934	69.0	5.4	9.8	19.0
1935	67.0	7.3	9.5	18.0
1936	66.0	6.8	10.0	18.3
1937	67.5	7.0	9.5	17.0

Table showing the percentage of national income paid out to various types of recipients from 1929 to 1945—Continued.

[Department of Commerce Statistical Abstract]

	Wages and salaries	Farmers	Other individual business and professional men	Return on capital including interest, rent, and dividends
1938	70.0	6.2	9.5	16.3
1939	68.0	6.0	9.7	15.6
1940	67.0	5.6	10.0	14.7
1941	67.0	6.5	9.7	12.8
1942	70.0	8.1	8.6	10.3
1943	70.0	7.9	7.7	9.3
1944	72.0	7.4	7.7	9.3
1945	70.5	8.0	8.1	10.3

EXHIBIT C

Table showing net corporation profits after taxes, and the percentage of national income represented thereby from 1929 to 1945

[Department of Commerce Statistical Abstract]

	National income	Corporation profits	Percentage
1929	$83,326,000,000	$7,194,000,000	8.6
1930	68,858,000,000	1,723,000,000	2.6
1931	54,479,000,000	−1,614,000,000	−3.0
1932	39,963,000,000	−3,646,000,000	−9.1
1933	42,322,000,000	−625,000,000	−1.5
1934	49,455,000,000	549,000,000	1.1
1935	55,719,000,000	1,668,000,000	2.9
1936	64,924,000,000	3,767,000,000	5.8
1937	71,513,000,000	3,943,000,000	5.5
1938	64,200,000,000	1,658,000,000	2.5
1939	70,829,000,000	4,228,000,000	6.0
1940	77,809,000,000	5,844,000,000	7.5
1941	95,618,000,000	7,668,000,000	8.0
1942	119,791,000,000	7,600,000,000	6.3
1943	149,400,000,000	9,800,000,000	6.5
1944	160,700,000,000	9,900,000,000	6.2
1945	157,000,000,000	9,300,000,000	5.9

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GUFFEY. When were the salaries of Members of Congress increased from $7,500 to $10,000?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know.

Mr. GUFFEY. More than 20 years ago, on March 4, 1925. Does the Senator know the wages paid to streetcar conductors and motormen at that time?

Mr. TAFT. No; I could not tell the Senator.

Mr. GUFFEY. An increase in the salaries of Government officials is proposed. The Senator says that Members of Congress have no right to have their salaries increased. Do not Members of Congress have some rights, after waiting 20 years?

Mr. TAFT. I am suggesting that any increase in congressional salaries should be in accordance with the increase in the cost of living, and that salaries should not be doubled. I shall be glad to vote for an increase in salaries of Members of Congress which would represent the increase in the cost of living, which has increased about 30 percent since 1929. That does not justify a 100-percent increase, which is what I am opposing.

Incidentally, today practically every streetcar operator does the work which two men did in 1925.

Mr. GUFFEY. He does not work any longer hours.

Mr. TAFT. Street-railway labor has nearly doubled.

Mr. GUFFEY. The streetcar operator does not work any longer hours. Platform expenses are lower now than they were 20 years ago. The streetcar operator is no more efficient now than he was at that time.

COST-ABSORPTION POLICY OF OPA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on Thursday, November 15, on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and myself, I introduced a joint resolution asking for relief from the policy of the Office of Price Administration relating to the absorption of costs by various segments of an industry. After an increase has been granted for any reason to the manufacturer or producer, instead of the price ceiling being raised on the particular product involved, various segments of the industry which handle the product are called upon to absorb the increased costs. At that time I discussed the automobile pricing program. I also discussed the wholesale lumber discounts, with which every Senator should acquaint himself, because they affect the distribution of lumber to the retail yards.

I hold in my hand an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, reading as follows:

OPA MOVES TO HIKE UNDERWEAR SUPPLY

WASHINGTON.—The OPA on Wednesday acted to provide more heavy underwear in time for the winter season.

It authorized manufacturers to apply for price increases to assure a profit, but said prices to the public will not be increased. Distributors' profit margins will be narrowed.

This dispatch applies to the manufacturers of underclothing. Without any doubt, the policies of the Office of Price Administration which are now being promulgated are expected to apply to all industry.

The question I raised then and the one I raise now is whether OPA have a right to regulate the profits of a business. It is my theory—and I thought I showed it very clearly before—that the Price Control Act applies only to the regulation of prices. Here again the OPA is extending into the clothing industry the same formula which has been applied to the lumber industry, the automobile industry, and a dozen others. In each case the Office of Price Administration is attempting to regulate profits. It says to the distributors of clothing that after the producers and the textile mills have been granted an increase—in this particular case it was an increase in wages—somewhere along the line the distributors must absorb the additional costs. That is what is holding up so many of our businesses and is causing trouble with reconversion. I have statistics to prove that it is having its impact on the retailers and distributors of the country.

Let me read an Associated Press dispatch from Philadelphia:

RATE OF BUSINESS MORTALITY STAGGERING

PHILADELPHIA, PA., November 13.—The rate of business mortality in the United States reached "the staggering total of approximately one dead out of every three born" during the first quarter of this year, Alfred Schindler, Under Secretary of Commerce, said today.

Schindler asserted in an address that "approximately 550 small businesses have been casualties by the wayside each day of the year."

While 50,000 businesses closed during the first 3 months of the year, Schindler said, only 130,000 new business ventures were opened.

If we inquire of those businesses what their trouble has been, we find, as I said last Thursday, that the difficulty has been unnecessary regulations; it has been the price policies adopted by the OPA which have taken out of the distributors' pockets the increased costs which have been allowed somewhere along the line to other segments of the industry. I tell the Senate that the joint resolution introduced by the Small Business Committee was presented in all seriousness. There should be no politics about it. It has been referred to a committee, but as yet we have received no notice of hearings on the resolution. I am on my feet today to call the attention of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, to which the joint resolution has been referred, to the fact that we expect to have hearings on it at some time in the near future.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The matter was discussed at the last meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee. The general conclusion of the committee was that it would prefer to consider measures designed to correct the evils in the Price Administration, rather than to go into an investigation of its past history. I think it was at least implied that immediately after the first of the year such measures would be given serious consideration, but that we would be taking two bites at the matter if first we investigated and then we considered measures on the subject. The Senator has a joint resolution relating to it, and I have just introduced a joint resolution on the same subject. I hope there may be other measures for the purpose of correcting the conditions to which we are referring. I assure the Senator that I shall do everything within my power to force the beginning of hearings on those measures as soon as Congress returns in January.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his observation enlightening the Senate regarding what can be expected from the Banking and Currency Committee early in January.

Let me say concerning the resolutions to which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has referred that at least one of them—the one introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon—called for an over-all investigation. Of course, I am in favor of that. In fact, if I remember correctly, I believe I joined the distinguished Senator from Oregon in the introduction of either that resolution or a similar one.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to state for the record that during the next morning hour I shall move to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from further consideration of Senate Resolu-

tion 156, because I am not interested in waiting until January for action which should have been taken at least 4 months ago.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and I shall support his motion.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the joint resolution to which I have referred is not for the purpose of investigating the OPA. I am in favor of having the OPA investigated, but I should like to have the resolution brought before the Senate immediately. I refer to the measure which has to do with prohibiting the Office of Price Administration from permitting an increase in cost to any particular group anywhere along the line and then compelling a wholesaler or retailer or some other segment of the industry to absorb that cost without increasing the price. If that course is continued, then the present administration and the Congress will have squarely given authority to the Price Administration to regulate the profits of every business in the United States. Such authority is not granted by the Price Control Act. I think the measure to which I have referred should immediately come to the floor of the Senate, and I think there should be no politics about it at all. This is a question of preserving our American economy. It is a question of preserving businesses which have been in existence for many years. Their life blood, which is their profit, is being taken away from them, and in many instances they have had to close their doors. How in the world, Mr. President, can we encourage a veteran to establish himself in a business in view of all the uncertainty with which he is confronted now relative to prices and price regulations? It is simply impossible.

I ask the Members of the Senate please to study the joint resolution to which I have referred, and I hope the Banking and Currency Committee will not delay action on it further.

The corrective legislation to which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has already referred—the joint resolution he has introduced today—falls into a different category, it seems to me, from that of the measure calling for an overall investigation. I have not seen the Senator's resolution. If it includes the same provisions as those which were included in the one introduced on behalf of the Senate Small Business Committee, all well and good; we can consider them together. But the relief we seek is the placing on the Office of Price Administration a prohibition against continuing to take from wholesalers or retailers or distributors the profits to which they are entitled under the sacred right of contract, merely in order to take care of an increased cost granted by the OPA further down the line. Such procedure is what has been disrupting our commerce, and it is the reason for the statement that the casualties of small businesses have been 550 a day throughout this year. The number will increase and we shall have greater difficulty in stabilizing our economy unless we correct the so-called cost-absorption policy which is being used by the planners in the bureaus in Washington to put over a program of increasing wages without increasing ceiling prices. We might just as well face that issue and decide what we shall do about it, and then not allow businesses to be molested in connection with a right, which they have under private contracts, to receive profits to which they are entitled and which they must have if they are to continue to exist.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Louis Kavan, secretary of the Federation of Nebraska Retailers. His letter has to do with the action taken by the OPA in connection with shortages in sugar inventories in the case of certain grocers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION OF NEBRASKA RETAILERS,
Omaha, Nebr., November 20, 1945.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Immediate and drastic action is necessary if we are to avoid a wholesale prosecution of honest retail grocers throughout this area.

Several grocers received summons to appear before the OPA hearing commissioner this coming week, on account of being short in their sugar inventories. Some of these grocers are only short a few pounds and when you stop to consider that we have had sugar rationing for almost 4 years, some allowance should be made due to pilferage, misplaced or lost sugar stamps and various other reasons.

I have been informed by the local legal department that no tolerance is allowed under the law and any retailer whose sugar stock is not up to what he should have will be served a summons and will have to appear before the hearing committee. There isn't a single retail grocer in the United States who could possibly account for every pound of sugar originally allowed under the law.

It is about time to stop some of this damned foolishness, making criminals out of honest legitimate businessmen. You have no idea of the mental agony this sugar deal is causing. There are bootleggers now offering sugar stamps for sale, I understand, at $8 per hundred. You can appreciate the position a retailer can place himself into if on one side he is being prosecuted for being a few pounds of sugar short, and on the other side some racketeer is offering him a means of getting himself out of difficulty.

It certainly looks as though the OPA is using their legal department to drum up as many cases as they can so at some future date when they are seeking an extension of the act and increased appropriations they can use the number of cases instituted as reason for extension and more money. As a champion of the small retailers, I know that we can depend upon you to fight this damnable condition to a finish.

For your information chain food stores are not responsible as individual stores as far as allowable inventories are concerned. The headquarters office of the chain takes care of all of the ration program. In this way the chain store avoids getting into trouble with OPA. This whole OPA program seems to be working toward centralized control, as well as the centralization of big business.

Yours very truly,

LOUIS KAVAN,
Secretary.

INADEQUACY OF AID TO VETERANS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which comes from a man who has just recently been honorably discharged from the service of his country. He was an officer in the service, and formerly was a practicing dentist in Nebraska. I should like to have the Members of the Senate know about the difficulty which a man in his position is having in obtaining material which has been declared surplus by the Army. When the men are being discharged, they are given the impression that they can use their certificates of discharge in getting almost anything in the world they want, but it does not work out that way. The letter which I submit will illustrate the facts of the situation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 16, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: As I well know, the majority of letters reaching your office consist primarily of complaints and criticism and I will admit now that this letter will be no exception. I will contend, though, that what I have to say is true, not only in my own individual case, but also for thousands of veterans that are trying through the various Government agencies to reestablish themselves in their respective fields of endeavor, and it is with their welfare in mind I relate my own experience, for I feel that I have my profession and can become established some way, but they are literally and figuratively stuck.

When I was first separated from the service I was informed that all I needed to do was present my certification of discharge to any of the number of agencies dealing in surplus property and I would be able to obtain the necessary dental equipment to furnish my office.

At my home, Alliance, Nebr., I contacted the representative of the Veterans' Administration and was told to go to the Lincoln, Nebr., office and I would be taken care of on the matter. In Lincoln I was then sent to the Omaha office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. There I was interviewed and requested to fill out long and no doubt necessary applications, which listed in detail every item needed for my use. After a 10-day wait the applications were returned to me properly filled out, certified, and verified, with an authorization to call on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Omaha and tell them my needs. This I did, only to be sent in turn to St. Louis, Mo., and Kansas City. At every office the answer was the same, nothing available and no information as to when such equipment would be declared as surplus.

Back again in Lincoln I tried all of the commercial dental supply houses only to learn that such equipment is not being manufactured and they could not promise delivery in anything less than 6 months. At this time I contacted my former employer, Mr. Livingston, and he explained my plight to you.

After receiving your telegram instructing me to see Mr. John DeMun in the Kansas City office of the RFC, I notified him by wire of my arrival, then proceeded to his office. I was treated nicely there, that I will admit, but the equipment situation is still far from settled.

Mr. DeMun's office informed me they had absolutely nothing in the way of dental or medical equipment; and if they were to obtain it that day, it would be at least 3 months before their bookkeeping system could be organized to handle it. Their only explanation was that the services had not yet declared

any such material as surplus, and until the office of the Surgeon General of the Army did so they had no authority in the matter, as well as no equipment.

I do appreciate, sir, everything you have done to help me on this matter, but I now have the feeling it is a useless task. I do have fears for those men unable to find employment and that intended to go into business for themselves, for they are due for considerable disappointment when they hit the snags of these various agencies.

As for the dental and medical profession, we are definitely tied down being unable to obtain the very necessary equipment, but the irony of it all is that the Midwest is complaining of a shortage of doctors and dentists.

I want to thank you again, Senator BUTLER, for the interest you have shown in my case.

Very sincerely.

STATE PLAN FOR WATER USE IN NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address which was delivered at Kearny, Nebr., at a meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, by Hon. C. Petrus, a member of the Nebraska Unicameral, and chairman of the water committee of the legislative council. The address was on the subject of a State plan for water use in Nebraska.

Nebraska has nearly 1,000,000 acres which are irrigable, and we in Nebraska are keenly interested in a water-development program. I am sure the address will be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATE PLAN

When the pioneers of Nebraska set up their homes it was their belief that full development would be reached when the sod had been turned under and the land put into cultivation. From then on the task would consist of tilling the soil.

Our history as a State is so brief that on the clock of the ages it scarcely represents a single swing of the pendulum. Yet those of us who have lived the greater portion of that period are fully conscious of fundamental changes already in the making and other violent changes indicated as a part of the near future.

These changes are in many fields. The soil which seemed to the pioneers inexhaustible in its fertility has been found to be limited both in its intrinsic content and by deterioration by erosion.

Our capacity to consistently produce crops is impaired by recurring cycles of deficient rainfall.

We find ourselves in a changing economy where inadequately organized agriculture is caught in the squeeze of other highly organized economic groups.

Government, which during pioneer days was essentially local, has been rapidly centralizing, first into State activity and then Federal control.

Our Nation has two systems operating simultaneously in the same space—a political system in which decisions are arrived at by counting persons and an economic system in which decisions are arrived at by counting dollars. In the political system each of us has an equal voice. In the economic system our voice is determined by how many dollars we can vote.

It is not strange that these two systems develop friction. The important question is how conflicts are resolved. When decisions are made in the economic system which a majority of the people do not like, resort is had to the political system to overrule the economic decisions.

Much of our present turmoil arises from the interference with economic decisions by political agencies. As we observe the process, however, we soon sense that it is not always that the political system functions in response to majority decisions. Rather the political system responds to pressures from minority groups or blocks, formed to sponsor the demands of specific interests.

Among such groups or blocks are organized labor, organized agriculture, chambers of commerce, organized old-age groups, organized school teachers, organized highway users, organized manufacturers, and hundreds of other groups.

It is no answer to assert that these groups ought not to exist. Organized labor is an inevitable outgrowth of centralized economic power. The individual laborer has no such bargaining power as to enable him to deal at arms length with single employers of tens of thousands. Organized industry has for many decades successfully enlisted governmental support for programs which have brought benefits to industry with little if any benefit to agriculture. This being so, the farm bloc came into existence to obtain governmental support for programs designed to aid agriculture.

Chambers of commerce, that organized group which speaks, in the main, for agencies of distribution, has been vociferous in its demands for the support of business, otherwise euphoneously referred to as "private enterprise."

Under our form of Government it is entirely proper for all of these agencies to exist and to speak for their respective constituencies.

These groups are all firm believers in democracy in the political sense of equal power to all citizens at the ballot box in the selection of public officials chosen to serve in governmental positions. But when these public servants have been chosen, these various groups each make their demands for benefits. We shall ultimately face the question of whether our economic system of private property can endure if these various demands are all met.

The problem which these factors present is to find means of evaluating, in terms of the general public interest, the various programs, of coordinating the various programs into sound policy and then, by sound argument, seek to support the coordinated plan in the interest of the general welfare of all people.

Democracy, that combination of philosophy, economic functions and governmental procedure, which seeks the liberation of the individual and the maintenance of the individual as a free agent, has successfully met the challenge of war. It remains to be yet determined whether democracy can successfully meet the challenge of forces of disorganization. There is a very real need for processes of integration. This is true not only in the national sphere. It is equally true in State matters.

The greatest tribute we can pay to General Eisenhower is that he succeeded in obtaining teamwork among the Allies. This was not always made possible by the willing acceptance of all—it was possible because the choice was between agreement and teamwork on the one hand and disunity and defeat on the other.

We in Nebraska are in need of teamwork. We need to change from quarreling camps to effective allies in order to achieve our common objectives. This does not mean that we need to end the work involved in sponsoring specific projects in which we have a special interest. It does mean that we all recognize that all specific developments require the support of an over-all program without which all fail. The question is, how can such a unified development be accomplished.

We can state an objective which meets with unqualified approval, namely, we all desire the fullest use of all of our natural resources. When we attempt to describe methods for the achievement of this universal objective we soon find ourselves in disagreement. Nor is this strange. We are not alone in this matter of differences of opinion resulting from looking at a common problem from different points of view. Neither need we assume that these differences necessarily stem from unworthy and selfish motives.

Persons as far removed from immediate personal interests as the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation found themselves in conflict with reference to future plans in our area. When the Army engineers looked at the problem of Missouri Basin development from the standpoint of flood control and navigation and the Bureau of Reclamation looked at the problem from the standpoint of irrigation and soil conservation, their respective plans failed to coincide. It was necessary for Congress to lay down some guiding principles, one of which was that water originating in the semiarid West was, in the public interest, charged with a first function of beneficial use superior to navigation. In other words, irrigation is superior to navigation. With this principle established the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation were able to coordinate their plans into a unified program.

The first task in seeking a solution to a problem is to seek agreement as to a definition of the problem itself. The next step is to separate the problam into its component parts.

We have already stated the problem: How shall we obtain the fullest use of all of our natural resources?

The problem separates itself into a rather substantial list of component parts. Among them are (1) conservation of soil, (2) the highest beneficial use of water, principally irrigation, (3) flood control, (4) development and distribution of cheap electric energy, (5) navigation, (6) sanitation, (7) conservation of wild life, (8) development of recreational facilities, (9) development of a combined and balanced raw material and industrial economy.

There is now before us a plan for the development of the Missouri Valley in which we are all vitally interested, known as the Pick-Sloan plan. While the development outlined in this plan does not specifically include all of the items which we have enumerated in our list of factors, it does include many directly and others indirectly.

We need to undertake a frank and critical examination of this plan with its basin-wide approach.

If we can for a moment forget the current debates about who shall be in charge and think about the plans themselves we may be able to arrive at some conclusions that can help us to chart a course. For myself I am willing to confess that the debates about MVA have been of small value. At times I have been tempted to believe that much of the oratory has been designed to confuse rather than to enlighten. I have heard very little about plans of construction. Most of the discussion has been what President Roosevelt used to refer to as "iffy." If Congress appropriates the money and if the structures are built who shall function as management, and with what authority? I do not mean to suggest that the question is unimportant, but it can have no substance unless funds are made available and structures built.

Lying between the Rocky Mountains and a line north and south from Canada to the Gulf through the eastern portion of our State are millions of acres of fertile land. Nature in this area has developed immense drainage areas, which discharge water through the Missouri River and the Mississippi. Here live about 7,000,000 of human beings whose eco-

nomic welfare depends on the use of the water which nature supplies. This is one-sixth of the land area of the United States.

The individual is unable to harness these resources. The task is too large for a neighborhood of individuals, or counties, or local districts. The solution requires the enlistment of the economic power of the entire Nation.

Fortunately, the Nation is interested. Plans have been formulated by the expenditure of substantial sums of Federal funds. Approval has been given by Congress, and some of the work appears ready to be undertaken in the very near future. The plan is to irrigate about 5,000,000 acres more, of which about 1,000,000 acres is in our State. All of our State is within the Missouri Basin.

How well does our planning as a State fit into these national plans, and what, if anything, remains for us to do either to modify our plans or to seek modification of the national plans?

I think it can be said with the fullest confidence that nothing will be done in our State contrary to the laws of our State. This is so, not because power does not exist in the Federal Government to override State decisions, but because it is the established policy of Federal agencies to wait until the State deems the proposed development desirable and adjusts its laws so as to make that development possible in full conformity with State laws.

We can perhaps illustrate this point with the practise of our own State agencies in the matter of State highways. Where local controversies raged as to routes or kind of construction, the State agencies left the community and worked in other areas, until the contending groups composed their quarrels in order to ge out of the mud.

We may anticipate like action by the Federal agencies. If we are more interested in our own controversies than we are in progress, we shall in all probability have all the time we want to continue our quarrels while work is in progress elsewhere.

What is the general outline of these Federal plans? The rivers which drain the area east of the Rocky Mountains take strange courses. The Missouri and the Mississippi both start a journey northward while their destination is the Gulf of Mexico. After abandoning the course to the north the Missour travels eastward until it finally starts going south. These detours have resulted in bringing the main stem of the river system east of the area which needs the water most.

In our own State the Niobrara describes a similar pattern. The Loup River system starts generally in a southeasterly direction as though it intended to follow the general slope of the State from northwest to southeast. If this course had continued the Loup River waters would have reached the Platte in areas where water is in great demand. But for some reason nture started this water to the north and east and kept it out of the Platte River for some 200 miles.

The Platte flows along the hillside of our sloping plain with no tributaries from the south and with very little surface drainage from the north.

The broad outline of the Federal plans gives recognition to these factors and if carried into effect will provide for interceptions and rerouting of some of the water across the intervening elevations in order to use more water for irrigation in the area west of the main stem of the Missouri.

This diagonal rerouting of surplus water will not become a reality in our State unless the laws of the State are so modified as to make it consistent with our legislative policy.

It will therefore become important for us to attempt to evaluate the Federal plans in terms of the general welfare of the State.

Engineering studies are still in process and perhaps it is too early to attempt final conclusions. We can, however, make some approach even before final studies are complete.

Four major developments are within the possibilities in the near future. These are:

1. The Republican Valley development.
2. Completion of the tricounty project.
3. The mid-State development.
4. The Loup River projects.

I mention these four, not with the thought that these are the only projects in contemplation but because they hold the key to other developments.

The Republican Valley development is largely self-contained and seems fully realizable within the present legislative policy of the State. There is much planning yet to do before the completed program will be before us but there is a minimum of conflict between that development and the other three which we have mentioned.

The keen rivalry between tricounty and mid-State is well known. It is also very understandable. The decision of the State supreme court 9 years ago construing existing statutes limiting the use of Platte River water to the Platte River watershed cut off about half of the land which the tricounty plans, as originally developed, had included. The decision did not, however, restore the appropriated water to the Platte River Valley, (using the word "valley" as meaning the valley proper as distinguished from the watershed).

It is small comfort to the people in the mid-State area to know that the Platte River water may not be used on the Republican side of the watershed, if it will still go out of the valley and be used on the upland. Their primary concern is (or should be) how much water goes out of the valley, not where outside of the valley it is used.

Any impartial student of the situation must recognize that the State is vitally interested in the mid-State development. Everyone familiar with the situation must sense that the State at large should bend every effort to provide for that area a dependable and adequate water supply.

Nor is that problem limited to a supply for gravity irrigation. A depletion of the subsurface waters in the region which in a state of nature had a water level which afforded subirrigation must give concern to the State, both from a sense of fundamental equities and from the point of view of the economic welfare of the State.

The question is whether these conflicting interests can be accommodated and both be more fully served.

In my judgment they will neither be fully served if we confine the water supply to that which flows in the Platte River alone.

The Platte River system will receive something like 320,000 acre-feet annually by means of transmountain diversion, that is to say, water which in a state of nature would go down to the Pacific on the west side of the Continental Divide. It is not probable that much of this water will reach Nebraska. It will be used and reused both for gravity irrigation and pump irrigation west of our State boundary. However, we are still counting on surplus water from the South Platte for the effective use of the Sutherland Reservoir. The existence of the added supply from the west side of the mountains gives greater assurance that such surplus water will become available and thereby serve the Platte valley this side of North Platte.

The Kingsley Dam has brought and will continue to bring very substantial benefits to the lands in the Platte River valley.

But when all of this has been said much unsatisfied demand exists and will continue to exist in the lower reaches of the Platte River valley where the mid-State development is proposed.

How, then does the proposed Federal plan affect the situation?

As nearly as I can understand the present plans, they contemplate irrigation of something like 365,000 acres in the Platte valley from water brought from the Loup system.

This is another way of saying that under these plans the Platte valley will have more water from the Loup than Tri-County in its original plans, proposed to use on the other side of the Divide.

Unlike the Platte, in which water largely disappears in the summer, the Loup, with its sand-hill supply is very nearly constant. Any substantial amount of water brought across the few miles that separates the Loup and Platte between Kearney and Grand Island would have far reaching effect particularly on the north side of the Platte River. The mid-State project would look very much more feasible with this source of water supply added.

The question then arises as to what should be our State policy with reference to this proposed development. The dominant issue before the people of our State in this postwar period will be how best to turn our resources to the fullest account for our welfare and economic advancement.

The next most important issue before us is how we shall be able to develop that kind of industry in our State which will process the agricultural products into increased value before those products leave the State. We cannot permanently prosper as a people on a raw material economy. Our permanent economic welfare will require a balance between raw material economy and industrial economy.

Our experts estimate that we use for all purposes almost 8,000,000 acre-feet of water annually. This water is now used to develop over half a billion kilowatts of hydroelectric energy annually. We are using something like 6,000 irrigation wells. We have 47 hydroelectric plants. We have something like 1,000 miles of canals. The limiting factor on agricultural development is water. The limiting factor on industrial development is cheap power. An unhappy recollection is that during the drouth years we spent enough on relief in the Missouri Basin to have provided this development of both water and power.

Our progress agriculturally and industrially is inextricably tied up with our intelligent and effective use of our water resources.

We shall accordingly be required to face the issue of our legislative policy with reference to that use.

May I call your attention to the conclusions reached by the water committee of the legislative council a year ago?

"1. Our total supply of water available annually for irrigation is less than the prospective demand from landowners who are willing to pay for water at the rates currently charged.

"2. The available and usable supply of subsurface water for irrigation is very much less than is generally believed, and is in danger of being seriously depleted. Provision must be made for replenishment of the supply if development is to continue.

"3. Experience with pump irrigation suggests the need for State supervision of the use of groundwater, but the people in the areas affected have not been convinced that such supervision is desirable. We do not now have sufficient scientific evidence upon which to base a satisfactory system of supervision, and the need for further observation and study is clearly indicated.

"4. It is imperative that the State, as well as all agencies engaged in operating or developing irrigation projects, recognize the fact that water rights are property and that, as such, they are entitled to all the protection which by our Constitution and laws we give to other property. Neither confiscation nor impairment is justified at any place, or for any cause.

"5. By common consent, and without basis in existing law, the people living in a river valley, as distinguished from the people within the drainage basin of the river but not

in the valley proper, should have first call on unappropriated water of that river.

"6. By like consent, people living within the drainage basin of a river should have, as they now have under existing statutes as interpreted by the Nebraska Supreme Court, a priority of consideration above those living beyond the watershed in other basins.

"7. If neither the people within the valley proper, nor those above the valley but within the drainage basin, make full use of all available water, then the State's policy should be altered to the extent necessary to permit such unused water to be used beyond the watershed in other basins.

"8. In the Platte River Valley, after the direct flow of the river had been fully appropriated, further development became virtually impossible without the construction of storage facilities. The construction of such facilities has been largely suspended, and probably cannot be undertaken again until after the present war. Those areas which have not as yet constructed storage facilities should not be penalized for having failed to do so in the past. Nevertheless, the principle should now be adopted that unless they shall construct such facilities within a reasonable time, they must forfeit their claim to prior consideration over irrigable lands beyond the watershed. The subcommittee is unable to suggest the exact period of time which should be allowed, but feels that the present war emergency should be taken into account, and that some reasonable period should be fixed, to begin as soon as conditions permit a resumption of construction work.

"9. The present law prohibiting transwatershed diversion should be continued until it is established whether or not the available water in the Platte River will be put to beneficial use within the Platte Basin. If it cannot or will not be so used, the law should then be amended to permit its use beyond the watershed.

"10. New proposed developments, such as the Nebraska mid-State project, must furnish satisfactory evidence of the economic possibilities of their proposals. Insofar as the water appropriations of the central Nebraska public power and irrigation district, or any other agency in the State, are valid appropriations, they constitute property rights which cannot be confiscated or impaired. If any new project requires for its development a partial relinquishment of such rights, this must be accomplished by agreement acceptable to the agency now possessing the rights, or by condemnation with just compensation.

"11. If the best interests of the State can be served by combining the central Nebraska public power and irrigation district with the proposed Nebraska mid-State project, and if such combination can be accomplished without loss to the former district, that course should be followed. If losses should be incurred in effecting a combination of the two projects, the mid-State people must be prepared to offset such losses.

"12. For the immediate future no new legislation is indicated. Reference has been made to the probability that further legislation will be required in the future, but such legislation must await the termination of the war, and must be based upon further study and experience.

"13. It is recommended that the legislature make provision for continued study of the water resources of the State by making it the duty of some specified agency of the State government to continue such studies, and by providing the necessary funds therefor. Provision should be made for such continued studies to include a study of the feasibility of small storage reservoirs on the upper portions of drainage areas, together with the effect of such reservoirs on flood control, groundwater supply, and usable supply for power and irrigation.

"14. It is further recommended that the legislature make some provision whereby the State of Nebraska can participate effectively in studies and planning for basin-wide development, and in the negotiation of interstate compacts relating to the use of waters, and the approval of such compacts by Congress."

Since that report was formulated, the Pick-Sloan plan has been presented. If we determine to follow the conclusions of the legislative report we will establish as the basic principles:

1. The people in the valley proper, as distinguished from the watershed, have first call on the waters of a river.

2. The people in the watershed come next.

3. Water that cannot be put to effective beneficial use in the valley or watershed may be used beyond the watershed.

It is submitted that these principles, if put into effect, will furnish a sound policy for the State and will also permit the regional development now under consideration.

C. PETRUS PETERSON.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 675, at which point the consideration of the calendar was suspended at the last call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 675.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN SETTLERS IN THE TOWN SITE OF KETCHUM, IDAHO

The bill (S. 862) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, is amended by striking out the words "three years" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "six years."

RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY THROUGH MONTGOMERY BELL PARK, TENNESSEE

The bill (S. 1366) to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Tennessee is hereby authorized and empowered to convey a right-of-way for railroad purposes, not in excess of 100 feet in width, to the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway over, through, and across the Montgomery Bell Park in Dickson County, Tenn. (previously known as the Montgomery Bell recreational demonstration area), notwithstanding the express condition contained in deed dated May 25, 1943, from the United States of America to the State of Tennessee, which deed was executed pursuant to the act of June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 326), entitled "an act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects and for other purposes." Such conveyance by the State of Tennessee shall not be deemed a breach of the express condition that the State of Tennessee should use the said property exclusively for public park, recreational, and conservation purposes. The State of Tennessee is authorized to expend funds received as a consideration for such conveyance for the acquisition of additional land needed to round out the Montgomery Bell Park area.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN AGE LIMIT FOR APPOINTEES TO THE MILITARY ACADEMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1123) to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs and was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the recommendation that it study the bill with reference to the features in it pertaining to admission to the Naval Academy. The Committee on Naval Affairs approved the bill and recommended its passage.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is merely a temporary measure for the purpose of helping certain young men who have lost their opportunity to be admitted to West Point.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy."

THE RANK OF BUREAU CHIEFS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill does five things: First, it authorizes a chief of bureau, after 1 year's service, to be promoted to the rank of vice admiral; second, it permits a chief of bureau so promoted to be retired on his own application after 3 years' service with the rank and retired pay of vice admiral; third, it permits a chief of bureau holding the rank of vice admiral to be retired in that rank for physical disabilities at any time during his term of service as such chief of bureau; fourth, it provides that a chief of bureau, upon completion of his term of services as such, shall have the permanent rank of rear admiral if of a lower permanent rank; and, fifth, it provides that an assistant chief of bureau shall have the rank of rear admiral.

Stated briefly, the bill would legalize for the future the ranks which have been temporarily given to some of the chiefs of bureaus during the war.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of section 3 of the bill. On page 2, in line 17, there appears the following language:

SEC. 3. That the terms "chief of bureau" and "assistant to chief of bureau" as used in this act include the Judge Advocate General and the Assistant Judge Advocate General, respectively.

I was wondering if that language would include the Director of the Budget and Reports, as well as Assistant Director of the Budget and Reports.

Mr. WALSH. I am pleased that the Senator has called attention to that matter because the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is interested in having done what the Senator from New York has suggested, and he recommends it.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 2, to strike out all of lines 17 to 20, both inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 3. That the terms "chief of bureau" and "assistant to chief of bureau" as used in this act include the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General, the Director of Budget and Reports, and the Assistant Director of Budget and Reports, respectively.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PROSECUTION OF WORK ON CERTAIN RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) to provide for proceeding with certain rivers and harbors projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may I ask the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], to explain the joint resolution? It would repeal certain provisions of an existing act, and request authorization to proceed to the construction of certain rivers and harbors projects.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is there provision in the original act with respect to what projects shall be proceeded with?

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill which passed the Senate, which was an authorization bill, was somewhat similar to the bill which was reported favorably by the Post Office and Post Roads Committee. The legislation which was passed last March contained a proviso to the effect that no more work could be started, even though appropriations may have been made, until 6 months after the war had terminated. The reason the Senate incorporated such a provision in the bill was because of the lack of strategic materials and manpower. The pending joint resolution merely gives authority to the Army engineers to go forward with construction whenever the money is appropriated by Congress, without having to wait until 6 months after hostilities have been declared ended.

The joint resolution was unanimously approved by the Committee on Commerce at a meeting held by that committee last month.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not want to object to or interfere with any construction in the State of South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is not involved any question of construction in the State of South Carolina. The joint resolution applies to an authorization which the Congress passed last March.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is just the point I am making.

Mr. MAYBANK. No money has been appropriated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Are there any funds which the engineers might use and proceed without an appropriation?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that under the present law none of these projects could be constructed until 6 months after the duration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I believe that many States are interested in this question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. The interest extends from Maine to California, up and down the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and along the Gulf.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think we should examine these projects.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senate already did so and listed, by unanimous consent, those projects in the bill which were approved by the Commerce Committee.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the bill in question does nothing but remove present prohibitions which were provided in not only the Rivers and Harbors Act, but also in the Flood Control Act, and in the National Highway Act. There was contained in those acts prohibition against the construction of any of the projects provided for until 6 months after the issuance of a proclamation terminating the emergency. Legislation has already been enacted removing such restrictions from the National Highway Act. If this bill is passed and becomes law it will remove the restriction from the comprehensive Rivers and Harbors Act which Congress passed last year. If that is done, divers projects in the act can be commenced only after money has been appropriated for that purpose. As I understand it, those appropriations are with reference to recommendations which have been made by the Board of Army Engineers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the very point I am getting at. May any of these projects be proceeded with, as legislation now stands, even after the removal of the bar of 6 months, until there has been an appropriation for the particular projects?

Mr. CORDON. My answer to the Senator from West Virginia is that they cannot be proceeded with except in those minor instances where there is a revolving fund for maintenance, and so forth.

Mr. HILL. The main purpose of removing the proviso is that Congress may go ahead, if it sees fit, and make appropriations.

Mr. CORDON. Yes; instead of waiting 6 months after a formal declaration of the end of the emergency has been made.

The joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law 14, 79th Cong.), is amended by striking out the following: "That no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect: *Provided further.*"

MRS. CATHERINE DRIGGERS AND HER MINOR CHILDREN

The bill (H. R. 801) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LESLIE O. ALLEN

The bill (H. R. 2620) for the relief of Leslie O. Allen, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM WILSON WURSTER

The bill (S. 1448) for the relief of William Wilson Wurster was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

ESTATE OF ALEXANDER McLEAN, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 2027) for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN J. GALL

The bill (H. R. 2160) for the relief of John J. Gall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF FRANZ TILMAN, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 2166) for the relief of the estate of Franz Tilman, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF ED EDMONDSON

The bill (H. R. 2481) for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARLETHIA ROSSER

The bill (H. R. 2399) for the relief of Arlethia Rosser was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. WERNER HOLTZ

The bill (H. R. 2479) for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EVELYN JOHNSON

The bill (H. R. 2642) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENCE ZIMMERMAN

The bill (H. R. 2241) for the relief of Florence Zimmerman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNIE M. LANNON

The bill (H. R. 1956) for the relief of Annie M. Lannon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

G. F. ALLEN

The bill (H. R. 3137) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES ALVES SAUCIER

The bill (S. 831) for the relief of James Alves Saucier was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Alves Saucier, of Poplarville, Miss., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army truck at the Gulfport Army Airfield, Mississippi, on August 24, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

OSCAR S. REED

The bill (S. 1077) for the relief of Oscar S. Reed was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oscar S. Reed, of Auburndale, Mass., the sum of $350, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Navy vehicle, at Portsmouth, N. H., on August 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CHRISTIAN H. KREUSLER

The bill (H. R. 3302) for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

The bill (H. R. 3660) to provide for financial control of Government corporations was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, for just a moment I should like to have the attention of the acting majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], concerning order No. 698, which he asked to have go over.

It is clear, as the Senator indicates, that this is a very important piece of legislation. It has been before the Congress for many months. It originated in the Senate. A similar bill was introduced in the House, where it was amended to some extent, and passed unanimously by the House last September. The House bill came to the Senate, and a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the full committee reported unanimously in favor of accepting the House version of the bill. It is the House bill which is on the calendar today, instead of the original Senate bill.

It is of considerable importance, Mr. President, that the Comptroller General's office know at a reasonably early date whether they are to administer the proposed act during the coming year. I should like to have the assurance of the acting majority leader that the bill may be considered at an early date in order to accommodate the Comptroller General.

Mr. HILL. As the distinguished Senator from Nebraska knows, I am acting as leader only temporarily. As an individual I may say that I shall be glad to cooperate and collaborate with the Senator to the end that the bill may receive early consideration by the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that we might take it up at the end of the consideration of the calendar today, if there is to be no substantial debate.

Mr. HILL. I shall endeavor to ascertain the facts about the bill and advise the Senator from Nebraska later as we proceed with the calendar.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, earlier in the day I said it would be necessary for me to be absent from Washington for some time because of certain previous engagements. I now ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the sessions of the Senate until the business which calls me away is completed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF NAVY NURSE CORPS

The bill (S. 1491) to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is a House bill on the calendar on the same subject, House bill 4411, order of business 702, and I ask that that bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4411) to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1491 will be indefinitely postponed.

EXEMPTION OF NAVY OR COAST GUARD VESSELS FROM CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1494) to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights and for other purposes; which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 15, after the words "Secretary of the Navy", to insert "or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of Coast Guard vessels operating under the Treasury Department"; on line 17, after the word "as", to strike out "he" and insert "either", and on page 3, line 1, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. When the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Treasury, or such official or officials as either may designate, shall make any finding or certification as prescribed in section 1, notice of such finding or certification and the character and position of the lights to be displayed on such vessels shall be published in "Notice to Mariners."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any requirement as to the number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of lights required to be displayed by vessels under the act of Congress approved August 19, 1890 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 61–141), entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea"; or the act of Congress approved June 7, 1897 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 154–231), entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collision upon certain harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States"; or the act of Congress approved February 8, 1895 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 241–294), entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters"; or the act of Congress approved August 19, 1890 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 301–351), entitled "An act to adopt special rules for the navigation of harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States, except the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal, supplementary to the act of August 19, 1890, entitled 'An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea'", and all laws amendatory thereto, shall not apply to any vessel of the Navy or of the Coast Guard, where the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of Coast Guard vessels operating under the Treasury Department, or such official or officials as either may designate, shall find or certify that, by reason of special construction, it is not possible with respect to such vessel or class of vessels to comply with the statutory provisions as to the number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of lights. The lights of any such exempted vessel or class of vessels shall, however, comply as closely to the requirements of the applicable statutes as the Secretary shall find to be feasible.

SEC. 2. When the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Treasury, or such official or officials as either may designate, shall make any finding or certification as prescribed in section 1, notice of such finding or certification and the character and position of the lights to be displayed on such vessel shall be published in "Notice to Mariners."

SEC. 3. This act shall expire on June 30, 1948.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE REGULAR ARMY

The bill (S. 1532) to authorize the appointment of certain persons as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army the following persons: Hoyt S. Vandenberg, presently serving in the temporary grade of lieutenant general in the Army of the United States; James H. Doolittle, presently serving in the temporary grade of lieutenant general in the Army of the United States; Raymond S. McLain, presently serving in the temporary grade of lieutenant general in the Army of the United States; Curtis E. LeMay, presently serving in the temporary grade of major general in the Army of the United States; and Lauris Norstad, presently serving in the temporary grade of major general in the Army of the United States.

SEC. 2. Any persons appointed pursuant to the provisions of the first section of this act shall be counted for the purposes of provisions of law establishing the authorized number of brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL PERMANENT MAJOR GENERALS AND BRIGADIER GENERALS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The bill (S. 1533) to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent major generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of major general in the Army of the United States: Edward P. King, Jr., William F. Sharp, George F. Moore, George M. Parker, Jr., and Albert M. Jones.

SEC. 2. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Army of the United States: Clifford Bluemel, James R. N. Weaver, Maxon S. Lough, William E. Brougher, Joseph P. Vachon, Charles C. Drake, Bradford G. Chynoweth, Clinton A. Pierce, Arnold J. Funk, and Lewis C. Beebe.

SEC. 3. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Luther R. Stevens, an officer of the Philippine Constabulary serving as a temporary brigadier general in the Philippine Army, as a permanent brigadier general of the line of the Regular Army.

SEC. 4. Effective as of the date of his relief from active duty, Carl H. Seals, a retired officer of the Regular Army serving on active duty as a temporary brigadier general in the Army of the United States, shall be advanced on the retired list of the Regular Army to the grade of brigadier general, and shall receive the retired pay provided by law for officers retired in that grade.

SEC. 5. Any persons appointed pursuant to the provisions of section 1, 2, or 3 of this act shall be additional general officers of the line of the Regular Army in the grades to which so appointed and shall not be counted for the purposes of provisions of law establishing the authorized numbers of general officers of the line of the Regular Army. Nothing in this act shall be deemed permanently to increase the authorized number of general officers of the line of the Regular Army or to authorize the appointment in the grade of general officer of the line of any successor to any such person.

COMPUTATION OF DOUBLE-TIME CREDITS IN DETERMINING RETIRED PAY

The bill (H. R. 1512) to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENTINE H. KEELER AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1961) for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT A. HUDSON

The bill (H. R. 4018) for the relief of Robert A. Hudson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NANNIE BASS

The bill (H. R. 875) for the relief of Nannie Bass was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUE FLIPPIN BRATTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3198) for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,030" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,030."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on this bill. This case involves a young lady of Lafayette, Tenn., who while a passenger in an automobile was injured because of the negligence of military authorities. A bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative GORE providing for the payment of $25,000. The young lady was very seriously injured. The House passed the bill allowing her $10,000.

When the bill came to the Senate it went to the Committee on Claims, and that committee allowed only $8,000. I have a letter from Representative GORE which I should like to have printed in the RECORD which states that that sum is wholly inadequate. I ask to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 10, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: Your Committee on Claims has favorably reported my bill, H. R. 3198, for the relief of Sue Flippin Bratton, but they have amended it by reducing the amount to $8,030. The same thing was attempted in the House and after a floor fight the House supported $10,000.

Even $10,000 is a measly amount for what has happened to this young lady—a beautiful girl of 18 made an invalid for the rest of her life. I don't see why the Government should be niggardly. It may be that custom will prevent an increase being made, but certainly $10,000 is small enough. I introduced the bill for $25,000 and still think that amount would be inadequate.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appeal to the Senator from Louisiana to join me in requesting that the Senate allow the amount provided by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Claims went over this bill very thoroughly. The War Department suggested the payment of $6,000 plus hospital bills, or an aggregate of eight-thousand-and-some dollars. As the distinguished Senator from Tennessee states, the accident in this case was a very serious one, and I doubt if the young lady will ever fully recover; in fact, she is totally disabled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; she is totally disabled.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the consideration of the case the committee followed the recommendation of the War Department, but in view of the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, I would urge no objection, but will leave the matter to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Senators who feel, as the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Louisiana do, that the claimant should have $10,000, should vote to reject the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). That is a correct statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may add that this girl was only 16 years of age, just beginning life. She has been permanently disabled, and it seems to me that by all means $10,000 certainly is little enough to be allowed her under the circumstances. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator indicate generally the nature of the injuries which are alleged to be permanent?

Mr. McKELLAR. Among other things, she is paralyzed.

Mr. ELLENDER. She is totally paralyzed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to read from the committee report, which states:

On February 19, 1944, at about 8:30 p. m., a 1937 Chevrolet sedan, owned by Vernon

Keene, operated by his son, Paul Keene, and in which Sue Flippin Bratton, 16-year-old daughter of Roscoe Bratton, of Lafayette, Tenn., was riding as a passenger, was proceeding south on Halltown Road at an estimated speed of 35 miles per hour. Approximately 270 feet north of the Halltown Road Bridge, the Keene vehicle rounded a curve to the right and as it entered the approach to the bridge it struck the projecting guardrail. The guardrail penetrated the Chevrolet sedan at a point about midway of its left side and struck Sue Flippin Bratton, who was riding on the left side of the rear seat, piercing her body. As a result of the accident Miss Bratton sustained serious personal injuries.

The claims officer, who carefully investigated the accident, found that—

"The evidence * * * clearly reveals negligence or acts of omissions of military personnel acting within the scope of their employment by not properly repairing bridge rail which was definite cause for injury to claimant; however, evidence also shows that the driver of the car in which claimant was riding as a passenger was negligent in that he was not exercising reasonable care in the operation of his vehicle under the circumstances. The proximate cause of the accident is determined as resulting from the joint or concurrent negligence or omission of military personnel and persons other than the claimant."

The War Department, in its report dated July 2, 1945, states the evidence fairly establishes that the accident and resulting personal injuries sustained by Sue Flippin Bratton were not caused by any fault or negligence on her part, but were caused solely by the combined negligence of the military authorities in failing properly to repair the guardrail of the bridge, which had been damaged in connection with the operations of Army troops, and of Paul Keene, the driver of the vehicle in which Miss Flippin was riding, in approaching a narrow one-way bridge at such a speed that he was unable to see the projecting end of the guardrail in time to move further to his right and avoid it.

Under the law of the State of Tennessee the negligence of the driver of a motor vehicle may not be imputed to a guest passenger not engaged on a joint enterprise (*Schwartz* v. *Johnson*, 152 Tenn. 586, 280 S. W. 32). It is the view of the War Department that the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton should be compensated for the medical and hospital expenses incurred in the treatment of Miss Bratton and that reasonable compensation should also be awarded for the benefit of this minor for the serious personal injuries sustained by her in this accident. While the amount of the proposed award, $25,000, is excessive, the War Department would have no objection to the enactment of the bill if it should be amended to provide for an award to the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton in the amount of $8,030 ($2,030 for medical and hospital expenses, and $6,000 for pain and suffering and personal injuries), which, it is believed, would constitute a fair and reasonable settlement for all of the damages sustained by Miss Bratton as a result of this accident.

Mr. CORDON. So far as a specific statement covering the report is concerned, the Senator need not read it to me. The statement that in this case there is total permanent paralysis is sufficient for me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CANDLER COBB

The bill (H. R. 1781) for the relief of Candler Cobb, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPHINE BENHAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Josephine Benham, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,300" and insert "$661.81."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GENEVIEVE LUND

The bill (H. R. 3790) for the relief of Genevieve Lund was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STANLEY J. LILLY

The bill (H. R. 3249) for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BEN GREENWOOD AND DOVIE GREENWOOD

The bill (H. R. 2686) for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM CARL JONES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1323) for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,405.80" and insert "$3,551.90", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William Carl Jones, of Merigold, Miss., the sum of $3,551.90, in full satisfaction of the claims of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said William Carl Jones as a result of gunshot wounds inflicted by a guard at the prisoner-of-war camp at Merigold, Miss., on March 24, 1945, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and funeral expenses incurred as a result of such injuries and death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REHABILITATION OF THE ISLAND OF GUAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1466) authorizing rehabilitation of the island of Guam, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$6,000,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to construct such permanent facilities for the civil populace of the island of Guam as he may deem necessary for their economic rehabilitation at a cost not to exceed $6,000,000 in aggregate amount.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I request an explanation by the Senator from Massachusetts of Senate bill 1466, with particular reference to the fact, as I recall it, that the other day when the Senate passed the rescission bill there was an amendment contained in that bill providing $6,000,000 for rehabilitation work in Guam? I assume that the purpose of the pending bill is to authorize the expenditure of that fund, but I should like to have the Senator clear the matter to my mind.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has stated the correct explanation of the reason for this bill. It is to authorize an expenditure of $6,000,000. The Navy Department originally requested an authorization of $15,000,000. The committee held extensive hearings and decided that the program of rehabilitation was excessive. It is intended to rebuild structures which were destroyed as a result of the American bombardment of Guam while the Japanese were in control, consisting mainly of public buildings. The plan which was submitted to us called for what we thought was too large a sum of money, and we reduced it to $6,000,000, which was the amount provided in the so-called rescission bill which was passed by the Senate a few days ago.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, am I to understand, then, that the Senator's view is that the enactment of Senate bill 1466 will not operate as an authorization for an additional $6,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. WALSH. No. A committee of the Senate has reported an authorization bill which is the basis for an appropriation. We had reported the bill at the time the money was appropriated. It is simply to operate in conjunction with the appropriation, and represents no additional money.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONFERRING OF DEGREES BY THE HEAD OF THE POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE NAVY

The bill (S. 1493) to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields, was considered, ordered to be en-

grossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy is authorized, upon due accreditation from time to time by the appropriate professional authority of the applicable curriculum of such school leading to masters or doctors degrees in engineering or related fields, to confer such degree or degrees on qualified graduates of such school.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL FOR LOSSES AT NAVAL REPAIR BASE, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The bill (S. 1492) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $22,434.28, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ADJUSTMENT OF UNPAID BALANCES IN PAY ACCOUNTS OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 1467) to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations, of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon certification to the Comptroller General and the Secretary of the Treasury by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts on transfer and counterwarrants of the net amount of the unpaid and overpaid balances occurring in the individual pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of any fiscal year, such net amount shall be charged against the appropriation for the fiscal year in which such balances occurred, and from which such amount was payable, and shall be credited to and payable from the corresponding appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

DECENTRALIZATION OF POWER TO CONVENE AND REVIEW GENERAL COURTS MARTIAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1545) to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "or", to insert "a", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy (Rev. Stat., sec. 1624, art. 38), as amended or superseded by the act approved February 16, 1909, chapter 131, section 10 (35 Stat. 621), as amended by the act approved August 29, 1916, chapter 417 (39 Stat. 586), is amended and reenacted to read as follows:

"ART. 38. Convening authority: General courts martial may be convened:

"First. By the President, the Secretary of the Navy, the commander in chief of a fleet, and the commanding officer of a naval station or a larger shore activity beyond the continental limits of the United States; and

"Second. When empowered by the Secretary of the Navy, by the commanding officer of a division, squadron, flotilla, or other naval force afloat, and by the commandant or commanding officer of any naval district, naval base, or naval station, and by the commandant, commanding officer, or chief of any other force or activity of the Navy or Marine Corps, not attached to a naval district, naval base, or naval station."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the committee printed in the RECORD, so that the record may be available in connection with future legislation on this subject.

There being no objection, the report (No. 706) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1545) to amend article 38 of the articles for the government of the Navy, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to make permanent authorized wartime procedures for the decentralization of the power to convene and review general courts martial, and to make certain technical changes in existing law with respect to the convening of general courts martial necessitated by organizational changes in the Navy since the enactment of the present statute.

The first subsection of the bill amends article 38 of the articles for the government of the Navy so as to authorize the convening of general courts martial by the President, the Secretary of the Navy, the commander in chief of a fleet, and the commanding officer of a naval station or larger shore activity beyond the continental United States. The only change that would be made by this part is to extend the authority to commanding officers of larger shore activities than naval stations (such as naval bases) outside the continental United States.

The second subsection enlarges the classes of naval officers who may convene general courts martial, when empowered by the Secretary of the Navy. The present law provides for the convening of general courts martial, when empowered by the Secretary of the Navy, by the commanding officer of a squadron, division, flotilla, or larger naval force afloat, and by the commanding officer of a brigade or larger force on shore beyond the continental United States, and, in time of war, if then so empowered by the Secretary of the Navy, by the commandant of any navy yard or station or brigade or larger force ashore, not attached to a navy yard or station. S. 1545 would eliminate the distinction between times of war and times of peace, and the officers authorized to convene general courts martial, when empowered by the Secretary of the Navy, would include (1) the commanding officer of a division, squadron, flotilla, or other naval force afloat; (2) the commandant or commanding officer of any naval district, naval base, or naval station; and (3) the commandant, commanding officer, or chief of any other force or activity of the Navy or Marine Corps, not attached to a naval district, naval base, or naval station. The enactment of the second subsection of the bill makes it unnecessary to reenact the provisions of subsection 3 of present law and that subsection is not included in the revision of article 38 provided for in the bill.

The changes in existing law are considered necessary to take care of changes in organization and to make the provisions applicable to the present organization of the Navy. The only vital change of substance is the elimination of the restriction on the discretionary power of the Secretary to authorize certain officers to convene general courts martial only in time of war.

Acting under his wartime power to decentralize general courts martial the Secretary has set up wartime procedures for convening general courts martial and reviewing the records of such courts which have substantially decreased the average time necessary for the processing of cases. This has been done without impairing in any way the thoroughness of the review of cases by the Navy Department. It is considered desirable to retain these time-saving procedures in order to expedite the processing of courts martial in the postwar period. This cannot be done under existing law, but can be done under the present bill.

The bill decentralizes the power to convene and review general courts martial which developed under wartime authority, and should be of benefit to the accused due to the elimination of long periods of waiting and delay.

The committee understand that the Department has the question of the administration of naval justice under study with a view of elimfnating some defects which the war has exposed.

The bill, if enacted into law, would involve no additional expense to the Government.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill from the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee?

Mr. WALSH. This bill, Mr. President, relates to court-martial procedure in the Navy. The whole question of revising and modifying and modernizing court-martial proceedings in the Navy is under study, and it is expected that later there will be prepared a bill dealing with the whole subject, which will bring up to date the procedure of courts martials.

This bill merely relates to decentralization of power to set up court-martial boards. Heretofore the Secretary of the Navy has had to set up the board in court-martial proceedings, resulting in great delay and much inconvenience. This bill would permit the Secretary of the Navy to authorize a commanding officer at one of the larger naval bases to designate the personnel of a court-martial board, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It may not be apropos of this particular legislation, but I should like to ask the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee whether any consideration has been given to a change

in the present court-martial proceedings under the peculiar situation in which we now find ourselves, where hostilities have ceased but the President has not declared the war to be at an end, nor has the Congress made such a declaration. As the Senator well knows, the penalties under court-martial proceedings are much greater during time of war than they are during time of peace, and men charged with what normally would be minor infractions are subject to stiffer penalties than would ordinarily be justified, because we are still technically in a state of war. I was wondering if anything is being done to correct that situation?

Mr. WALSH. No; that subject does not relate to this bill, but it is a very important one, and is being studied by a group of high-class able civilian lawyers. They have been going through all the laws dealing with court-martial procedures and are expecting to make recommendations which the committee will act upon later. This bill relates only to appointment of court-martial boards by a process of decentralization of power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1405), to authorize the President to retire certain officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment to strike out beginning on page 3, sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and insert new sections in lieu thereof, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy shall, whenever he deems it advisable, appoint boards of officers to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the line and staff corps of the Regular Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore and officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in the ranks of major general and brigadier general.

SEC. 2. (a) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall consist of not less than five officers of the Regular Navy serving in ranks above that of rear admiral except that officers of the staff corps of the rank of rear admiral may be appointed as members of any board appointed for the consideration and recommendation of officers of the staff corps for retirement.

(b) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Marine Corps serving in the rank of major general shall consist, so far as practicable, of three line officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in ranks above that of major general. If there be an insufficient number of such officers available, the deficiency shall be supplied by the appointment to the board of officers of the line of the Regular Navy serving in ranks above that of rear admiral.

(c) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Marine Corps serving in the rank of brigadier general shall consist, so far as practicable, of five line officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in ranks above that of brigadier general. If there be an insufficient number of such officers available, the deficiency shall be supplied by the appointment to the board of officers of the line of the Regular Navy serving in the rank of rear admiral or above.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convene boards of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps serving in the ranks of captain and below in the Navy, and colonel and below in the Marine Corps, within such categories or groups of such officers as shall be specified in the precepts convening such boards. The members of such boards shall be senior in rank to any officer under consideration.

SEC. 4. The recommendations of each board convened pursuant to this act shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Navy with his recommendations to the President for approval or disapproval, in whole or in part.

SEC. 5. Each officer recommended for retirement pursuant to this act shall, if such recommendation be approved by the President, be placed on the retired list on the first day of such month as may be set by the Secretary of the Navy but not later than the first day of the seventh month after the date of approval by the President.

SEC. 6. When any officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps or the Reserve components thereof has completed more than 20 years of active service in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including active duty for training at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service, he may at any time thereafter, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be placed upon the retired list on the first day of such month as the President may designate.

SEC. 7. (a) Each officer retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty, if his performance of duty in such rank as determined by the Secretary of the Navy has been satisfactory. In any case where, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, any such officer has not performed satisfactory duty in the highest rank held by him while on active duty, he shall be placed on the retired list with the next lower rank in which he has served but not lower than his permanent rank. Officers retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay with longevity credit of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active duty pay: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *Provided further*, That officers whose computation of pay on the active list is not baesd upon years of service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of their active duty pay.

(b) Nothing within this section shall prevent any officer from being placed on the retired list with the highest rank and with the highest retired pay to which he might be entitled under other provisions of law.

(c) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank.

SEC. 8. (a) Section 10 of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), is, hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Personnel appointed or advanced under the authority of this act may be continued in their temporary status during such period as the President may determine, but not longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency or, in the case of reserve and retired personnel, not longer than the period herein specified or the date of release from active duty whichever is the earlier and in no case longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency. Upon the termination of their temporary status such personnel on the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps shall assume their permanent status and those of the retired list and of the respective Reserve components, including the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall have, when returned to an inactive status, the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under a temporary appointment, unless entitled to the same or higher grade and rank pursuant to section 8 of this act, as now or hereafter amended.

"(b) (1) Personnel of the retired list returned to an inactive status with higher rank pursuant to subsection (a) shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"(2) Personnel of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and personnel of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve appointed or advanced under the authority of this act shall, when subsequently retired, if not otherwise entitled to the same or higher grade and rank or retired pay, be advanced to the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under temporary appointments, and shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"(c) Personnel of the classes described above who have been retired or released from active duty prior to the date of this amendment shall be entitled to the benefits of this section from the date of retirement or release from active duty, as the case may be.

"(d) Personnel accorded higher rank pursuant to this section shall, if subsequently assigned active duty, be recalled to active duty in their permanent grades, ranks, or ratings, to which they are entitled under other provisions of law."

"(e) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank."

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as altering or amending any provision of section 7 of the act approved June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

SEC. 9. When any officer of the Navy or Marine Corps serving in a rank below that of fleet admiral has attained the age of 62 years, he shall be placed upon the retired list by the President with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty and with retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active duty pay of such rank: *Provided, however*, That the President may, in his discretion, defer placing any such officer on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable but not later than the date upon which such officer attains the age of 64 years, except that not more than 10 officers whose retirement is so deferred shall be on the active list at any one time; *And provided further*, That no officer of the Navy or Marine Corps shall be placed upon the retired list pursuant to this section until the first day of the sixth month following

the date of approval of this act or until the date upon which he would be retired for age pursuant to law existing prior to the date of approval of this act, whichever may be the earlier.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the same thereto, shall apply to personnel of the Coast Guard in relationship to the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to personnel of the Navy in relationship to the Navy: *Provided*, That wherever authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy, similar authority shall be deemed given to the Secretary of the Treasury to be exercised with respect to the Coast Guard at such time or times as the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department: *Provided further*, That the boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Coast Guard serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall be composed of senior Coast Guard officers if available or otherwise as the Secretary shall determine.

SEC. 11. The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 13 and subsection (e) of section 15 of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 951 and 952).

(b) Section 1444 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by that portion of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 579), reading: "except as herein otherwise provided, hereafter the age for retirement of all officers of the Navy shall be 64 years instead of 62 years as now prescribed by law"; section 2 of the act of January 28, 1929 (ch. 109, 45 Stat. 1142); and section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

(c) Subsection 12 (e) of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 950).

SEC. 12. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall terminate on June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall be declared to be ended by proclamation of the President or by an act or resolution of Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, one of the principal features of the bill is that which reduces the retirement age from 64 years to 62 years, but gives the President the power to retain 10 admirals who have reached the age of 62 if in his discretion the Navy needs their services. The reason for this reduction in age is to make promotions more rapid, and also to allow younger men to advance to the rank of admiral and assume the duties of admiral earlier than they would if the age were kept at 64 years. The legislation with respect to the age for retirement of admirals is permanent. So are the provisions for the selection of admirals. The other provisions expire 1 year after the war. The real purpose of these provisions is to readjust the officer personnel before the postwar Navy is established.

Another feature of the bill which is of considerable importance is the retirement provision. Up to the time of the war the Navy Department eliminated through the selective board system what might be called, to use a slang term, "dead wood." Some officers of limited ability have been carried during the war because of their experience and training and because they were of value and there was a great pressure for officers. This bill permits the Secretary of the Navy to establish boards to consider the records of officers and to eliminate those who, for one reason or another, are found to have become unsatisfactory or unable to perform their duties. It sometimes happens that an officer, when he is promoted, is physically well and mentally alert and able to carry on the job, but after 2 or 3 years, for one reason or another, he may not be able to measure up to the standard required and yet is not of sufficient age to retire. This bill would permit the setting up of boards to do what in peacetime was done by the selection board. It is expected that it will result in giving the Navy more efficient officers, and also remove officers who are reaching advanced age, so that younger officers, more alert and better qualified to perform their duties, will be selected.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts whether this bill authorizes the retirement of commissioned officers in the Navy who have a temporary advanced grade and authorizes retirement pay based upon such temporary grade?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. The bill authorizes retirement at the highest rank which may have been reached. Of course as the Senator suggests, some ranks are only temporary. When the bill originally came before the committee it dealt only with officers, but we have included enlisted men, so that an enlisted man who was promoted temporarily during the war, let us say from a petty officer first class to lieutenant, would retire as lieutenant under this bill. The bill applies the same retirement provision to enlisted men as to officers. That is one thing the committee insisted upon. There is not one provision or right in this bill which does not apply to enlisted men as well as to officers.

Furthermore the bill deals with promotions, so the enlisted man would receive the temporary promotion illustrated by the case of the petty officer. The original bill applied only to officers.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If I am correct, section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942, which provided for the retirement and the granting of retirement pay based upon temporary grade at the time of retirement, as I understand, is repealed by section 11 of the pending bill.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. This bill, although repealing that section, contains other sections, carrying into force the provisions of that section.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CORDON. I am particularly interested in the matter, Mr. President, because from my investigation I find that that same right is not granted to officers of the Army. I believe it should be granted to the officers of the Navy, but I believe it should also be granted to the officers of the Army, and I hope the Committee on Military Affairs at the appropriate time will give careful consideration to legislation I shall offer dealing with that subject.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if the Senator will wait a moment, I should like to offer two amendments to the committee amendment.

On page 11, line 14, before the word "Navy", I move that the word "Regular" be inserted.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. On page 8, line 24, after the figures "1945", I move to insert the following: "or if a prisoner of war during World War II, the rank in which he was serving on November 1, 1945."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. On page 11, line 4, after the figures "1945", I move to insert the following: "or if a prisoner of war during World War II, the rank in which he was serving on November 1, 1945."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. The last two amendments, on page 8 and also on page 11, were suggested by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and I offered them on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming and myself. The amendment provides that a prisoner of war who has not been where he could receive his promotion will be considered to have been promoted, and will receive the benefits of retirement as though he had not been a prisoner of war.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I have scanned the bill hurriedly. I am wondering how it changes the present retirement pay of line officers.

Mr. WALSH. It makes no change in the rank at which an officer is retired, but bases his retired pay on the pay of the highest rank held during the war. It is a bill to make provision for moving out of the Navy, officers who are not satisfactory but who were not weeded out during the war as selections out of the Navy were suspended.

Mr. BALL. They can be retired at their temporary grade, with retirement pay up to 75 percent of their pay.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. BALL. That applies even though they may have had only 20 years' service under the first section?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. The retirement covers three periods, one of 20 years, another of 30 years, and a third of 40 years.

The bill is intended to give retirement pay at the highest rank attained, somewhat as compensation or reward for services. However, with respect to retirement at the age of 62, which is the general retirement age, the law applies only to regular officers and not to reserve officers. The reason for that is that a Reserve officer might be called for 2 or 3 years, and if he received the same retirement pay as that received by a regular officer at the age of 62, he would be in the same position as a regular officer who had served all his life in the Navy. So a distinction is made at the age of 62 between the regular officer and the Reserve officer. Of course, the retirement pay of a Reserve officer is calculated upon the basis of his rank, taking into consideration the number of years of service.

Mr. BALL. I take it that the Navy is now retiring officers at their temporary

grade at approximately the same retirement pay as is provided under this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Yes, when they are retired for physical disability or combat injuries.

Mr. BALL. The bill would extend the privilege to officers in lower grades.

Mr. WALSH. To officers in all grades.

Mr. BALL. The Navy has been granting such retirement pay on a temporary basis under the war powers.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BALL. What change in permanent law prior to the war would be involved?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, there were no temorary ranks prior to the war. All were permanent ranks.

Mr. BALL. And the retirement pay was 75 percent of the pay at whatever rank a man was retired.

Mr. WALSH. On a permanent basis.

Mr. BALL. At the permanent rank.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; whatever the permanent rank was.

Mr. BALL. If a rear admiral goes back to the rank of captain, and serves 5 years without receiving a promotion, and is then retired, he will retire on the basis of his temporary rank of rear admiral, which he held during the war.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct. The same is true of enlisted men. If a man served for 18 years as a seaman, but during the war had risen to the rank of lieutenant, junior grade, or lieutenant, senior grade, and after the war goes back to the rank of enlisted seaman, he will retire with the rank of lieutenant.

Mr. BALL. In the case of Regular officers who reach the age of 62, they have received retirement pay to the extent of 75 percent of the pay of their permanent rank. That has been true all along, under the permanent law.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. There is no change whatever in that respect. The principal reason for the bill is that it is expected that there will now be some eliminations, by reason of the boards which are to be established under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator know how that retirement allowance compares with that of the Army, or the judiciary? Of course, Congress has none.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that Army and Navy pay and allowances are the same.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The retirement age in the Army has been reduced to 60 years, instead of 62 years.

Mr. WALSH. But the pay is the same. If there were any discriminations by way of higher retirement pay in the Army than in the Navy, or vice versa, the respective committees would hear about it very quickly, and corrective legislation would be introduced.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator happen to know what the retirement pay for Federal judges is?

Mr. WALSH. As I recall, they are retired on full pay.

Mr. BALL. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. I request that the report on this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report of the committee will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The report (No. 701) is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1405) to authorize the President to retire certain officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Amend the bill as follows: On pages 3, 4, 5, and 6 strike out sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convene boards of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps serving in the ranks of captain and below in the Navy, and colonel and below in the Marine Corps, within such categories or groups of such officers as shall be specified in the precepts convening such boards. The members of such boards shall be senior in rank to any officer under consideration.

"SEC. 4. The recommendations of each board convened pursuant to this act shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Navy with his recommendations to the President for approval or disapproval, in whole or in part.

"SEC. 5. Each officer recommended for retirement pursuant to this act shall, if such recommendation be approved by the President, be placed on the retired list on the 1st day of such month as may be set by the Secretary of the Navy but not later than the 1st day of the 7th month after the date of approval by the President.

"SEC. 6. When any officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps or the Reserve components thereof has completed more than 20 years of active service in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including active duty for training, at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service, he may at any time thereafter, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be placed upon the retired list on the first day of such month as the President may designate.

"SEC. 7. (a) Each officer retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty, if his performance of duty in such rank as determined by the Secretary of the Navy has been satisfactory. In any case where, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, any such officer has not performed satisfactory duty in the highest rank held by him while on active duty, he shall be placed on the retired list with the next lower rank in which he has served but not lower than his permanent rank. Officers retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall receive retired pay with longevity credit at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years' service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *Provided further*, That officers whose computation of pay on the active list is not based upon years of service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of their active duty pay.

"(b) Nothing within this section shall prevent any officer from being placed on the retired list with the highest rank and with the highest retired pay to which he might be entitled under other provisions of law.

"(c) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank.

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 10 of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 10. (a) Personnel appointed or advanced under the authority of this act may be continued in their temporary status during such period as the President may determine, but not longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency or, in the case of reserve and retired personnel, not longer than the period herein specified or the date of release from active duty whichever is the earlier and in no case longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency. Upon the termination of their temporary status such personnel on the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps shall assume their permanent status and those of the retired list and of the respective Reserve Components, including the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall have, when returned to an inactive status, the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under a temporary appointment, unless entitled to the same or higher grade and rank pursuant to section 8 of this act, as now or hereafter amended.

"'(b) (1) Personnel of the retired list returned to an inactive status with higher rank pursuant to subsection (a) shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"'(2) Personnel of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and personnel of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve appointed or advanced under the authority of this act shall, when subsequently retired, if not otherwise entitled to the same or higher grade and rank or retired pay, be advanced to the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under temporary appointments, and shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"'(c) Personnel of the classes described above who have been retired or released from active duty prior to the date of this amendment shall be entitled to the benefits of this section from the date of retirement or release from active duty, as the case may be.

"'(d) Personnel accorded higher rank pursuant to this section shall, if subsequently

assigned active duty, be recalled to active duty in their permanent grades or ranks or ratings to which they are entitled under other provisions of law.

"'(e) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank.'"

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as altering or amending any provision of section 7 of the act approved June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

"SEC. 9. When any officer of the Navy or Marine Corps serving in a rank below that of fleet admiral has attained the age of 62 years, he shall be placed upon the retired list by the President with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty and with retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active duty pay of such rank: *Provided, however*, That the President may, in his discretion, defer placing any such officer on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable but not later than the date upon which such officer attains the age of 64 years, except that not more than 10 officers whose retirement is so deferred shall be on the active list at any one time: *And provided further*, That no officer of the Navy or Marine Corps shall be placed upon the retired list pursuant to this section until the 1st day of the 6th month following the date of approval of this act or until the date upon which he would be retired for age pursuant to law existing prior to the date of approval of this act, whichever may be the earlier.

"SEC. 10. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the same thereto, shall apply to personnel of the Coast Guard in relationship to the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to personnel of the Navy in relationship to the Navy: *Provided*, That wherever authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy, similar authority shall be deemed given to the Secretary of the Treasury to be exercised with respect to the Coast Guard at such time or times as the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department: *Provided further*, That the boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Coast Guard serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall be composed of senior Coast Guard officers if available or otherwise as the Secretary shall determine.

"SEC. 11. The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

"(a) Section 13 and subsection (e) of section 15 of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 951 and 952).

"(b) Section 1444 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by that portion of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 579), reading: 'except as herein otherwise provided, hereafter the age for retirement of all officers of the Navy shall be 64 years instead of 62 years as now prescribed by law'; section 2 of the act of January 28, 1929 (ch. 109, 45 Stat. 1142); and section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

"(c) Subsection 12 (e) of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 950).

"SEC. 12. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall terminate on June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall be declared to be ended by proclamation of the President or by an act or resolution of Congress."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the bill is to provide for a readjustment of officer personnel which is considered essential in an efficient and vigorous postwar navy. During the war, laws governing separation from the service by retirement except in cases of physically incapacitated officers and those who reached the statutory retirement age were suspended by the Congress. The voluntary retirement provisions of law, such as retirement in the discretion of the President after 40, 30, or 20 years, respectively, of service were suspended administratively. The employment of every officer of the Regular Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard whose services could be employed in any capacity whatsoever was so employed during the war in an effort to conserve personnel in the interest of the critical manpower shortage in war industry.

The appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, approved June 11, 1940, suspended the involuntary retirement of officers adjudged fitted under the provisions of the Personnel Act of June 23, 1938. The act of June 30, 1942, suspended many of the provisions of the Personnel Act of June 23, 1938, regarding permanent promotions and retirement. As a consequence, there are many officers on the active list of the Navy today, particularly in the higher ranks, whose services can no longer be efficiently employed.

In order to make the necessary readjustment in the active list of the Regular Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, the present bill will authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convene boards, composed of senior officers, to review the records of officers and make recommendations concerning their retirement. The bill also lowers the current statutory age of retirement from 64 to 62 for all officers below the rank of fleet admiral with the provision that the President may defer the age retirement of not to exceed 10 such officers for a period of 2 years for special assignment.

General Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, states that there are today a few officers of the Regular Marine Corps who have been promoted through the various grades for years who, when assigned to a responsible command in combat, demonstrated that they were unfit professionally for command assignments. There were other officers who were not able physically to cope with combat conditions and some who broke mentally. Some of the officers in the latter categories fully recovered after hospitalization. Such officers should not be continued on the active list of the Marine Corps, because they have clearly shown that they are not capable of meeting such conditions and therefore should not be retained.

The recent war has emphasized the necessity for youth and vigor in maintaining the Navy and Marine Corps at peak performance under the strain of combat. World War II has conclusively demonstrated that alert and youthful officers are absolutely essential in the successful prosecution of any war.

The committee are of the opinion that enactment of the present bill is necessary to insure that our post-war Navy be officered with young, alert, and vigorous officers.

A SECTION BY SECTION EXPLANATION OF THE BILL IS AS FOLLOWS

SECTION 1

Section 13 of an act approved June 23, 1938, provided that, if in time of peace, the average number of vacancies in the grade of rear admiral, in any year was less than eight, the Secretary of the Navy should convene a board consisting of the Chief of Naval Operations; the commander in chief, United States Fleet; and the commander, Battle Force, to recommend for retirement a sufficient number of rear admirals to cause an average of eight vacancies per year.

Section 15 (e) of the same act provided that boards should be appointed to recommend for retirement a sufficient number of general officers of the line of the Marine Corps to insure that there would be an average of two vacancies per year.

These two sections of the act were temporarily suspended during the war and no rear admirals of the Navy or general officers of the line of the Marine Corps were retired in accordance with these two sections of the above-mentionel act.

Section 1 of the bill (S. 1405), authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to appoint boards to consider and recommend officers of the Regular Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore and officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in the ranks of major general and brigadier general for retirement.

The bill does not limit the number of officers who may be recommended for retirement. Also, it authorizes the appointment of boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Staff Corps as well as officers of the line.

SECTION 2 (A), (B) AND (C)

The composition of boards for similar duty under the act of June 23, 1938, could not be appointed because of changes in naval organization. This act provided for a board consisting of the Chief of Naval Operations; commander in chief, United States Fleet; and commander, Battle Force. The office of commander in chief, United States Fleet; and Chief of Naval Operations is now vested in one and the same officer. The office of commander, Battle Force, no longer exists.

Section 2 (a) of the present bill provides that boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers in the rank of rear admiral and commodore shall consist of not less than five officers of the Regular Navy in ranks above rear admiral. Officers of the Staff Corps are eligible for membership on boards for consideration of Staff Corps officers.

Section 2 (b) provides that boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers in the rank of major general of the Marine Corps shall consist, as far as practicable, of three line officers of the Regular Marine Corps in ranks above major general. If insufficient numbers of Marine Corps officers are available, officers of the line of the Regular Navy in ranks above rear admiral shall be appointed to supply the deficiency.

Section 2 (c) provides that boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers in the rank of brigadier general of the Marine Corps shall consist, so far as practicable, of five line officers of the Regular Marine Corps in ranks above brigadier general. If insufficient numbers of Marine Corps officers are available, officers of the line of the Regular Navy in the rank of rear admiral or above shall be appointed to supply the deficiency.

SECTION 3

The act of June 23, 1938, modified the system of promotion by selection in the Navy and Marine Corps. Officers not selected for promotion were either retired or discharged. Some of the provisions of this act regarding involuntary retirement of officers were suspended by the act of June 11, 1940, and all of its provisions with respect to permanent promotions and retirement were suspended by the act of June 30, 1942. Consequently, there are many officers on the active list of Navy and Marine Corps today who, under normal peacetime conditions, would have been selected for permanent promotion to higher rank or would have been placed on the retired list.

Section 3 of the present bill authorized the Secretary of the Navy to convene boards of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the ranks of captain and below in the Regular Navy and of the rank of colonel and below in the Regular Marine Corps. The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe, in the

precept convening the boards, the categories or groups of officers to be considered by each board. Members of such boards shall be senior in rank to any officer under consideration.

This section is temporary legislation and will expire shortly after the termination of the present war. The enactment of this section will effect the retirement of many officers who would normally have been retired in peacetime.

SECTION 4

The recommendations of the selection boards convened under the act of June 23, 1938, were submitted to the President for his approval or disapproval.

Section 4 of the present bill provides that recommendations of each board shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Navy with his recommendation to the President for approval or disapproval, in whole or in part.

SECTION 5

Under the act of June 23, 1938, officers who failed of selection for promotion were retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they fail of selection the second time.

Section 5 of the bill, S. 1405, provides the date on which officers shall be placed on the retired list pursuant to recommendations of boards approved by the President. This date is the first day of the month set by the Secretary of the Navy but not later than the first day of the seventh monh after approval of the recommendation by the President.

SECTION 6

Under existing law all officers of the Navy below the rank of vice admiral and all officers of the Marine Corps below the rank of lieutenant general are placed upon the retired list upon reaching the age of 64. Any officer, upon his own application, shall be placed upon the retired list after completing 40 years of active service. Any officer may be retired, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, after 30 years of active service. Officers of the line of the Navy and Marine Corps, except chief warrant officers, may be placed on the retired list, on their own application, at the discretion of the President, after 20 years of service. Officers of the Naval Reserve may be placed on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve after 20 years of active service provided the last 10 years of such service have been performed during the 11 years immediately preceding their transfer to the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve.

Section 6 of the present bill amends existing law by providing that any officer of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps or of the Reserve components therof may, in the discretion of the President, be retired on his own application after more than 20 years of active service, at least 10 years of which must have been active commission service. This provision will equalize the voluntary retirement privilege after 20 years of active service for all types of officers. The provision will be similar for line and staff, for Regular and Reserve in the same manner throughout.

SECTION 7 (A) AND (B)

Existing law provides that all Regular officers who served in World War II, and who are retired or return to an inactive status, shall receive the highest rank held by them on active duty, but with their retired pay based upon their permanent ranks. Where personnel are specially commended for heroism in combat with the enemy, they receive an additional promotion of one rank when placed on the retired list but with their retired pay based upon their permanent ranks. In general, retired pay is computed at the rate of 2½ percent of the pay of the permanent rank multiplied by the number of years' service for which entitled for pay purposes on active duty, not to exceed 75 percent.

Section 7 (a) of the present bill provides that officers recommended for retirement pursuant to the foregoing sections of the bill shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank held on the active list, provided performance of duty in that rank has been satisfactory, and with retired pay based upon 2½ percent of the pay of the rank in which retired multiplied by the number of years of service, not to exceed 75 percent. If an officer's service in the highest rank has not been satisfactory he shall be retired in the next lower rank, but not below his permanent rank with retired pay based on such lower rank. The temporary rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945 (VJ-day), is the highest rank in which an officer may be retired pursuant to this section. His retired pay would be based upon that rank.

Section 7 (b), is a saving clause to insure higher rank and pay if so entitled under other laws.

SECTION 8 (A) AND (B)

The act of July 24, 1941, provides for the temporary promotion of officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard during periods of war or national emergency. Section 10 of that act provides that officers who receive these temporary promotions shall, when retired or placed on an inactive duty status receive the highest rank in which they served on active duty with retired pay based upon their permanent ranks. Section 10 has been construed as not permitting officers of the Naval Reserve to return to an inactive status in the highest rank held while on active duty.

Section 8 (a) of the bill, S. 1405, would amend section 10 of the act of July 24, 1941, in the following particulars:

(a) Reserve officers placed on an inactive duty status would hold the highest rank in which they served satisfactorily on active duty under a temporary commission. Reserve officers receive no pay while on inactive duty. If recalled to active duty they would return in their permanent ranks.

(b) Retired officers when they resume an inactive status would hold the highest rank they held satisfactorily on the active list under a temporary commission and their retired pay would be based upon the pay of that rank. If again recalled to active duty they would return in the rank in which originally retired.

(c) Regular officers who will remain on active duty would revert to their permanent ranks. When subsequently retired they would be retired in the highest rank satisfactorily held under a temporary commission with retired pay based upon the pay of that rank unless entitled to a higher rank and higher retired pay. It is to be noted that officers of this category will continue in service with the probability of attaining or exceeding by permanent rank their highest temporary rank in the years of service that follow. Many of the retirements of office in this category will therefore be governed by other provisions of law.

(d) Members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve when eventually returned to an inactive status in such Reserves or when retired would be so returned or retired in the highest rank satisfactorily held under a temporary commission while on active duty, with retired or retainer pay based upon that rank. If recalled to active duty, they would be recalled in the ranks or ratings in which originally transferred to the Reserve.

The temporary rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945 (VJ-day), is the highest rank in which an officer may be retired pursuant to this section. His retired pay would be based upon that rank.

An amendment to section 10 of the act of July 24, 1941, is contained in section 7 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465). This amendment permits temporary appointments made under authority of the act of July 24, 1941, to continue in force until 6 months after June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall end. Section 8 (b) of the bill, S. 1405, makes it clear that this amendment is not intended to be disturbed.

SECTION 9

Under existing law officers below the grade of vice admiral must be retired on attaining the age of 64 years. When officers in the grades of admiral and vice admiral are released from the office for which such temporary rank of admiral and vice admiral was made, they retire, providing they have attained the age of 64 years.

Section 9 of the present bill changes the statutory retirement age from 64 to 62 years, in ranks below that of fleet admiral, but authorizes the President to defer placing any such officer, in numbers not exceeding 10, on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable, but not to exceed the date upon which such officer attains the age of 64 years. It is intended that those officers deferred by the President for special assignment will be retired upon the completion of the special assignment for which they were deferred. It is provided that the retired pay of these officers shall be 75 percent of their highest active-duty pay and their retired rank the highest held while on active duty.

Officers now approaching the age of 62 or 63 years contemplate retirement at the age of 64. If section 9 of the bill, S. 1405, is enacted these officers will face immediate retirement without adequate warning and without time in which to make preliminary adjustments in their personal affairs. Consequently section 9 contains a proviso which will delay retirement of such officers until the first day of the sixth month following enactment of section 9.

SECTION 10

Section 10 of the present bill makes the provisions of this bill applicable to the Coast Guard.

SECTION 11 (A), (B), AND (C)

Section 11 of the present bill repeals provisions of law inconsistent with the provisions of this legislation.

Section 11 (a) of the present bill repeals section 13 of the act of June 23, 1938, which provides that should it be found in time of peace at the end of any fiscal year that the average number of vacancies in the grade of rear admiral has been less than eight, the Secretary of the Navy shall convene a board to recommend for retirement a sufficient number of rear admirals to cause the foregoing average number of vacancies. It also repeals subsection (e) of section 15 of the act of June 23, 1938, which provides for a board to be similarly convened to recommend for retirement general officers of the Marine Corps in the event that there are fewer than two vacancies in the grade of general officer of the line of the Marine Corps at the end of any fiscal year during peacetime.

Section 11 (b) of the present bill repeals section 1444 of the Revised Statutes as amended by the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 579), which provides that the age for retirement of all officers of the Navy shall be 64 years, section 2 of the act of January 28, 1929, which provides that when any officer below the rank of vice admiral, including any officer of the Dental Corps, is 64 years old, he shall be retired by the President from active service is also repealed by section 11 (b) of the present bill. Section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465), grants the same retirement benefits now accruing to other temporary rear admirals or major generals who may be retired by reason of physical disability. Section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942, is repealed by section 11 (b) of the present bill.

Section 11 (c) of the present bill repeals subsection 12 (e) of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 950), which provides that an officer

of the line, after the completion of 20 years' commissioned service, upon his own application and in the discretion of the President, may be retired from active service and placed upon the retired list.

SECTION 12

Section 12 of the present bill places a time limitation on section 3 of the bill. It limits the time in which the Secretary of the the Navy may convene boards to consider officers in ranks of captain and below in the Navy and colonel and below in the Marine Corps for retirement, until June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall be declared ended by proclamation of the President or by act or resolution of the Congress.

CONTEMPLATED CHANGES IN THE NAVY SYSTEM OF PROMOTION BY SELECTION

Many of the laws relating to the promotion by selection of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps have been suspended during the war. Upon the termination of the war these laws now in suspension will become reactivated.

The committee understands that the Navy Department is making a study of changes which seem desirable in the body of law governing promotion by selection in the Navy and the committee intends to hold hearings and possibly recommend changes in existing law prior to the time existing law becomes fully effective by reason of termination of the present war.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in such organizations was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PROCEDURE IN CONDEMNATION OF PROPERTY FOR LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

The bill (H. R. 1902) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let the bill go over.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to do so.

Mr. OVERTON. The purpose of the bill is simply to place the flood-control provision in reference to condemnation proceedings relating to the lower Mississippi Valley in line with the usual rule which prevails throughout the rest of the United States. The rule prevailing throughout most of the United States is that whenever the Government acquires property by condemnation, the practice and procedure shall be in accordance with the provisions of the State law, insofar as it is applicable. The rule in relation to the condemnation of property in the lower Mississippi Valley is different from that obtaining in the other sections of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I see the entire purpose of the bill. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1902) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1516) to amend section 12 of the Bonneville Project Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BILBO. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

The bill (H. R. 3979) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TAXATION OF RAILROAD ROLLING STOCK IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1278) to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the rolling stock of railroad companies, refrigerator-car companies, parlor-car companies, sleeping-car companies, tank-car companies, express companies, car-renting companies, and all other companies owning parlor, sleeping, dining, tank, freight, or any other cars which are operated or run over or upon the line or lines of any railroad or terminal company in the District of Columbia, shall be deemed to be located in said District for purposes of taxation, whether or not the individual units are continuously in the District or are constantly changing, and such property shall be reported, assessed, and taxed within the time, and at the rates prescribed by law for the reporting and taxation of other personal property in the District of Columbia.

(b) Such rolling stock as is primarily located in the District of Columbia shall be reported and taxed at its full and true value on the last day of the calendar year preceding the tax date.

(c) Such rolling stock as is not primarily located in the District of Columbia shall be reported and taxed in the manner following:

(1) Every railroad company operating rolling stock over or upon the line or lines of any railroad or terminal company in the District shall report to the assessor of the District of Columbia the various classes of such rolling stock so operated by such company whether owned by it or any other railroad company; the number of miles traveled by each class of such rolling stock within the District during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the total number of miles traveled by each class of such rolling stock on all lines over which such company operates during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the total full and true value of each class of such rolling stock owned by such company on the last day of the calendar year next preceding the tax date; and such other facts and information as said assessor may require. The taxable portion of the rolling stock of each such company shall be determined by applying the mileage traveled in the District by the various classes of such rolling stock operated in the District by such company to the total mileage traveled by the various classes of such rolling stock on all lines over which such company operates, and the tax shall be assessed on that portion of such rolling stock owned by such company on the last day of the calendar year next preceding the tax date. The mileage and value of the rolling stock owned by such company which is permanently located outside of the District of Columbia shall not be included in the computation of such assessment.

(2) Every parlor-car company and sleeping-car company owning parlor and sleeping cars (except those owned by railroad companies and described in paragraph (1) of this subsection) which are operated in the District over or upon the tracks of any railroad or terminal company, shall report to the Assessor of the District of Columbia the total number of miles traveled by all such cars, and also the miles traveled by such cars within the District, during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the total full and true value of all of such cars so used as of the last day of the calendar year next preceding the tax date; and such other facts and information as said assessor may require. The taxable portion of the value of the cars owned by any such company and used within the District shall be determined by applying to such value the ratio between the mileage traveled by such cars in the District and the total mileage traveled by such cars within and without the District.

(3) Every car company, mercantile company, corporation or individual (other than railroad, parlor-car and sleeping-car companies described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection) owning or leasing any stock cars, furniture cars, fruit cars, refrigerator cars, meat cars, oil cars, tank cars, or other similar cars, which are run over or upon the line or lines of any railroad or terminal company in the District of Columbia, shall furnish to the Assessor of the District of Columbia, on forms prescribed by said assessor, a true, full, and accurate statement, verified by the affidavit of the officer or person making the same, showing the aggregate number of miles made by their several cars over or upon the several lines of railroad within the District of Columbia during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the average number of miles traveled per day within the District of Columbia by the cars covered by the statement in the ordinary course of business during the year; and such other pertinent facts and information as said assessor may require.

Every railroad company whose lines run through or into the District of Columbia shall annually furnish to the said assessor a statement showing the name and address of every car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual (other than railroad, parlor-car, and sleeping-car companies described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection) whose cars made mileage over its tracks in the District of Columbia during the calendar year next preceding the tax date, and the total number of miles made within the District of Columbia by each during said period.

It shall be the duty of the said assessor to ascertain from the best and most reliable information that can be obtained and from said statements the number of cars required to make the total mileage of each such car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual within the District of Columbia during the period aforesaid, and to ascertain and fix the valuation upon each particular class of such cars, and the number so ascertained to be required to make the total mileage within the District of Columbia of the cars of each such car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual within said period shall be assessed against the respective car companies, mercantile companies, corporations, or individuals. The valuation thus obtained shall be the full and true value and shall be the taxable portion of the cars

owned by any such car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual and used within the District of Columbia.

(d) All of the provisions of law relating to the filing of returns, assessment, payment, and collection of personal-property taxes in the District of Columbia shall be applicable to the companies described in the foregoing subsections.

(e) Any individual, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation aggrieved by any assessment of taxes made pursuant to the provisions of this act may appeal therefrom to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as set forth in sections 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of title IX of the act entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1938.

(f) The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the taxable year beginning July 1, 1945, and each taxable year thereafter.

RECORDING AND RELEASING OF LIENS ON CERTIFICATES OF TITLE FOR MOTOR VEHICLES, ETC.

The bill (S. 1212) to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, is hereby amended to read:

"SEC. 12. The fee for recording liens or assignments or releases of liens upon a certificate shall not exceed the sum of 50 cents for each lien or assignment or release of lien on each automobile contained in the instrument."

VOLUNTARY APPRENTICESHIP IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1189) to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the bill was introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. It is a very lengthy bill. It merely establishes a system by which apprentices will be recognized in the District, and provides for the appointment of an apprenticeship council. It is in line with the system which prevails in many of the States of the Union, and there has been quite a demand by industry in the District of Columbia for just such a law. It meets with the approval of the Commissioners and the attorneys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to open to young people in the District of Columbia the opportunity to obtain training that will equip them for profitable employment and citizenship; to set up, as a means to this end, a program of voluntary apprenticeship under approved apprenticeship agreements providing facilities for their training and guidance in the arts and crafts of industry and trade, with parallel instruction in related and supplementary education; to promote employment opportunities for young people under conditions providing adequate training and reasonable earnings; to relate the supply of skilled workers to employment demands; to establish standards for apprentice training; to establish an Apprenticeship Council; to provide for the establishment of local joint trade apprenticeship committees to assist in effectuating the purposes of this act; to provide for a Director of Apprenticeship within the District of Columbia; to provide for reports to the Congress and to the public regarding the status of apprenticeship in the District of Columbia; to establish a procedure for the determination of apprenticeship agreement controversies; and to accomplish related ends.

SEC. 2. Without regard for any other provision of law with respect to the appointment of officers and employees of the United States or the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall appoint an Apprenticeship Council, composed of three representatives each from employer and employee organizations, respectively. The Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia or, if he shall so designate, his representative in charge of trade and industrial education, and the Director of the District of Columbia Employment Center shall, ex officio, be members of said council, without vote. The terms of office of the members of the Apprenticeship Council first appointed by the Commissioners shall expire as designated by them at the time of making the appointment: One representative each of employers and employees being appointed for 1 year; one representative each of employers and employees being appointed for 2 years; and one representative each of employers and employees for 3 years. Thereafter, each member shall be appointed for a term of 3 years. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of said term. The compensation of each member may be fixed without regard to the provision of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and each member of the council, not otherwise compensated by public money, shall be paid not more than $10 per day for each day spent in attendance at meetings of the Apprenticeship Council.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Labor shall appoint a Director of Apprenticeship who shall serve without compensation and who shall have no vote. Without regard for the provisions of any other law with respect to the appointment of officers and employees of the United States or the District of Columbia, the Director of Apprenticeship shall be chosen from among the employees of the Apprentice Training Service actually engaged in formulating and promoting standards of apprenticeship under the provisions of Public Law, No. 308. The Apprentice Training Service is further authorized to supply the Director or the council with such clerical, technical, and professional assistance as shall be deemed by said Service to be essential to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. The Apprenticeship Council shall meet at the call of the Director, or the chairman thereof, and shall aid in formulating policies for the effective administration of this act. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Labor, the Apprenticeship Council shall establish standards for apprenticeship agreements in accordance with those prescribed by this act, shall issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the intent and purposes of said act, and shall perform such other functions as are necessary to carry out the intent of this act. Not less than once every 2 years the Apprenticeship Council shall make a report through the Commissioners of its activities and findings to the Congress and to the public.

SEC. 5. The Director, under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor and with the advice and guidance of the Apprenticeship Council, is authorized to administer the provisions of this act in cooperation with the Apprenticeship Council and local joint trade apprenticeship committees, to set up conditions and training standards for apprentices, which conditions or standards shall in no case be lower than those prescribed by this act; to act as secretary of the Apprenticeship Council and of joint trade apprenticeship committees; to approve, if, in his opinion, approval is for the best interest of the apprentice, any apprentice agreement which meets the standards established by or in accordance with this act; to terminate or cancel any apprenticeship agreement in accordance with the provisions of such agreement; and to perform such other duties as are necessary to carry out the intent of this act: *Provided*, That the administration and supervision of related and supplemental instruction for apprentices, coordination of the instruction with job experiences, and the selection and training of teachers and coordinators for such instruction shall be the responsibility of the District Board of Education.

SEC. 6. Local joint trade apprenticeship committees in any trade or group of trades may be approved by the Apprenticeship Council. Such apprenticeship committees shall be composed of an equal number of employer and employee representatives appointed by the groups or organizations they represent, or the committee may consist of the employer and not less than two representatives from the recognized bargaining agency. In a trade or group of trades in which there is no bona fide employee organization, the Apprenticeship Council may appoint a joint trade apprenticeship committee from persons known to represent the interests of employers and of employees, or the council may act itself as such joint committee. Subject to the review of the council, and in accordance with standards established by or under authority of this act, joint trade apprenticeship committees may set up standards to govern the training of apprentices and give such aid as may be necessary in effectuating such standards.

SEC. 7. The term "apprentice," as used herein, shall mean a person at least 16 years of age who has entered into a written agreement, hereinafter called an apprenticeship agreement, with an employer, an association of employers or an organization of employees, which apprenticeship agreement provides for not less than 4,000 hours of reasonably continuous employment for such person and for his participation in an approved program of training through employment and through education in related and supplemental subjects.

SEC. 8. Every apprenticeship agreement entered into under this act shall contain—

(1) the names and signatures of the contracting parties, including the apprentice's parent or guardian if he be a minor;

(2) the date of birth of the apprentice;

(3) a statement of the trade, craft, or business which the apprentice is to be taught and the time at which the apprenticeship will begin and end;

(4) a statement showing the number of hours to be spent by the apprentice in work and the number of hours to be spent in related and supplemental instruction, which instruction shall be not less than 144 hours per year;

(5) a statement setting forth a schedule of the processes in the trade or industry divisions in which the apprentice is to be taught and the approximate time to be spent at each process;

(6) a statement of the graduated scale of wages to be paid the apprentice and whether the required school time shall be compensated;

(7) a statement providing for a period of probation during which time the apprenticeship agreement shall be terminated by the Director, at the request in writing of either

party, and providing that after such probationary period the apprenticeship agreement may be terminated by the Director by mutual agreement of all parties thereto, or canceled by the Director for good and sufficient reasons;

(8) a provision that all controversies or differences concerning the apprenticeship agreement which cannot be adjusted by conference between the apprentice and the employer or under the terms of the apprenticeship standard shall be submitted to the Director for determination as provided for in section 9;

(9) a provision that an employer who is unable to fulfill his obligation under the apprenticeship agreement may, with the approval of the Director or under the direction of the joint trade apprenticeship committee, transfer such contract to any other employer: *Provided*, That the apprentice consents and that such other employer agrees to assume the obligations of said apprenticeship agreement;

(10) such additional terms and conditions as may be prescribed or approved by the council not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. No apprenticeship agreement shall be registered or approved by the Director under the provisions of this act unless it conforms with the standards established by or in accordance with this act and is in the best interests of the apprentice. Where a minor enters into an agreement for a period of training extending into his majority, and such agreement has been approved by the Director, then such apprenticeship agreement shall, if the parties therein so provide, have the same force and effect during the period covered by the majority of such minor as if such agreement were entered into during the majority of such minor.

SEC. 10. (a) Upon the complaint of any interested person or upon his own initiative, the Director may investigate to determine if there has been a violation of the terms of an apprenticeship agreement made under this act, and he may hold hearings, inquiries, and other proceedings necessary to such investigation and determination. The parties to such an agreement shall be given a fair and impartial hearing after reasonable notice thereof. All such hearings, investigations, and determinations shall be made under authority of reasonable rules and procedures prescribed by the Apprenticeship Council, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Labor.

(b) The determination of the Director shall be filed with the council. If no appeal therefrom is filed with the council within 10 days after the date thereof, as herein provided, such determination shall become the order of the council. Any person aggrieved by any determination or action of the Director may appeal therefrom to the council, which shall hold a hearing thereon after due notice to the interested parties. Any person aggrieved or affected by any determination or order of the council may appeal therefrom to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at any time within 30 days after the date of such order by service of a written notice of appeal on the Director. Upon service of said notice of appeal, said council, by its secretary, shall forthwith file with the clerk of said district court to which said appeal is taken a certified copy of the ordered appealed from, together with findings of fact on which the same is based. The person serving such notice of appeal shall, within 5 days after the service thereof, file a copy of the same, with proof of service, with the clerk of the court to which such appeal is taken; and thereupon said district court shall have jurisdiction over said appeal, and the same shall be entered upon the records of said district court and shall be tried therein de novo according to the rules relating to the trial of civil actions, so far as the same are applicable. Any person aggrieved or affected by any determination, order, or decision of the district court may appeal therefrom to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner as provided by law for the appeal of civil action.

SEC. 11. The provisions of this act shall apply to any person, firm, corporation, or craft in the District of Columbia which has voluntarily elected to conform with its provisions.

SEC. 12. As used or referred to in this act, the term "the Secretary of Labor" shall mean the administrator of that Department or agency of the United States Government authorized to administer the provisions of Public Law No. 308.

SEC. 13. Sections 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 21, chapter 2 of title 15 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

CONTINUANCE OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 236) providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

QUORUM FOR TRANSACTION OF CORPORATION BUSINESS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 2874) to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to authorize any corporation formed under authority of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of such code to specify in its bylaws that a less number than a majority of its trustees may constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the corporation, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN FISH IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 3636) relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OPENING OF ROAD ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAINING SCHOOL PROPERTY IN MARYLAND

The bill (H. R. 3873) to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREE COPIES OF RECORDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 3868) to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNUAL REPORTS BY TRUST COMPANIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 3867) to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN ALTON AND EDWIN ALTON

The bill (H. R. 2512) for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT E. SEVERNS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Albert E. Severns, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JAMES LYNCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2835) for the relief of James Lynch, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$8,764.60" and insert "$3,764.60."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MABEL FOWLER

The bill (S. 845) for the relief of Mabel Fowler was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 751–791), Carl F. Fowler, who was electrocuted on September 16, 1943, while seeking to correct failure of electric facilities at the Army air base near Mitchell, S. Dak., shall be deemed to have been a civil employee of the United States within the purview of said act, at the time of his death and compensation for death shall be payable to Mabel Fowler, if she is found to be the widow of the said Carl F. Fowler, under the conditions provided in section 10 of such act of September 7, 1916, such compensation to be computed in the manner prescribed in said act upon the basis of $175 as representing the monthly wage of the deceased at the time of his death. Any compensation for death received by said Mabel Fowler under any other workmen's compensation law shall be credited in such manner as the United States Employees' Compensation Commission may find to be just and equitable against any compensation which she may receive by reason of this act: *Provided*, That claim for compensation for death under such act shall be filed within 1 year from the approval

of this act: *Provided further,* That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

MRS. STUART B. RILEY

The bill (H. R. 2810) for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES A. BRADY

The bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of James A. Brady was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2543) to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIS. Let the bill go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will withhold his objection for a moment, this bill merely requires weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I have had some reports from associations who oppose the legislation, and I should like to take the time to study it a little further.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3709) to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BURGLARY, FIRE, OR OTHER CASUALTY CLAIMS OF POSTMASTERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the act entitled "an act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with an amendment, on page 3, in line 17, after the name "United States", strike out "this limitation shall not apply" and insert "the limitation shall be 2 years as."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS BY POSTMASTERS IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 304) to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with an amendment, at the end of the bill, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Each certificate of oath, affirmation, or acknowledgment executed by a postmaster within the Territory of Alaska under the authority of this act shall be signed by the postmaster, with a designation of his title as such postmaster, shall have affixed thereto the cancellation stamp of the post office, and shall state the name of the post office and the date on which such oath or affirmation is administered or such acknowledgment is taken. Postmasters shall keep a memorandum of all deeds and other instruments of writing acknowledged before them and relating to the title to or transfer of property, which memorandum shall be transmitted to their successors in the office of postmaster and which shall be subject to public inspection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INCREASE OF PER DIEM EXPENSES AT POST OFFICES SERVING MILITARY AND NAVAL PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 697) relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment was, on page 1, in line 10, after the word "stations", to insert "or at civilian plants devoted to war production."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 3, after the word "stations", to insert "or civilian plants."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry about the bill. I note that it carries a provision setting the per diem expenses at $4 a day, which, as I understand, is considerably in excess of the amount of subsistence expense allowed by the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926. I rise to inquire why any special consideration should be given to the employees mentioned in the bill, inasmuch as similar consideration would not be given to others who may be incurring per diem expenses in connection with Government business?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall read from the report submitted by the Post Office Department.

Public Law 128 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 9, 1943, authorized the Postmaster General to detail postal employees from main post offices to postal units at Army camps, posts, or stations, without changing their official station and also authorized allowances not exceeding $2.50 per day in lieu of actual expenses while so detailed.

The limitation of $2.50 per diem has been found to be extremely inadequate in a number of cases. Many of those employees, especially those at Newport News and like places, have continued on their detail at the $2.50 per diem at a real sacrifice to themselves. A determination was made by postoffice inspectors that $4 a day was the minimum upon which these men in their particular assignments could exist.

In order that the Department may have authority to make adequate allowances in those cases where employees are now making a financial sacrifice upon the $2.50 a day allowance, the enactment of H. R. 697, which would increase the maximum allowance from $2.50 to $4 per day, is recommended.

It is estimated that upon the basis of present conditions the cost of this measure will not exceed $15,500 per annum.

It has been ascertained from the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission to your committee of this report.

That is signed by the Acting Postmaster General. There is an additional letter from Mr. Walker, the former Postmaster General, to the same effect.

The bill applies only to certain cases. It simply would give the Postmaster General the right to increase the amount in cases in which such increase is necessary; that is all.

If the Senator had heard the testimony in the committee, I am sure he would be in favor of passage of the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I rise to inquire whether there are any compelling reasons for making an exception in favor of the civilian employees mentioned in the bill, without providing for a similar increase in the per diem subsistence for all other civilian employees in the United States who now are paid what is manifestly an inadequate amount. It seems to me that the whole problem should be reexamined and that an appropriate subsistence allowance should be made for all those who are compelled to be away from their homes on the business of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that would involve a tremendous expenditure of money. As it is now, as the Senator will see when he reads the letter of Postmaster General Walker which is attached to the report, the bill would apply to such employees at Richmond, Calif.; Crockett, Calif.; San Diego, Calif.; Baraboo, Wis.; Joliet, Ill.; and Camden, Ark., where the postal employees referred to are unable to get along on the present subsistence pay. It is manifest that when the Department examines the various situations, no such increased allowances should be made except in cases where the amounts presently allowed work an injustice upon the employees.

I hope the Senator will consent to the passage of the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I had in mind the fact that the wording of the bill authorizes an allowance not to exceed $4 a day. I understand that gives a discretion to the Postmaster General.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. I make the point that no standards are set up under which the Postmaster General is directed to exercise that discretion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the standard is that where the ceiling amount allowed, $2.50 a day, is not sufficient to pay the actual expenses of the employees who go to those places, the increase shall be allowed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in view of the Senator's explanation and the fact that his explanation will be controlling in case a question arises, I have no further objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1560) to amend the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, to extend reemployment benefits to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who entered the Women's Army Corps.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before the bill is passed, I desire to submit an amendment which is necessary in order to prevent doing an injustice to the group of women who served either in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps or the Women's Army Corps. Therefore, I offer the following amendment:

On page 2, in line 11, delete the period and substitute therefor the following: *"Provided,* That, in the case of any such former member who has been discharged from or relieved from active duty in the Women's Army Corps prior to the effective date of this subsection, application for reemployment may be made at any time within 90 days after such effective date."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The effect of the bill as it nows stands will be, will it not, to extend the benefits provided by it to the former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, provided they went into the Women's Army Corps within 3 months after the termination of their service with the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is there anything in the bill which would extend those privileges or benefits to the members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who did not continue with the service when it became federalized and when its members were required to take the Army oath and to submit themselves to the other regulations?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think not.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I would be somewhat interested to know about that, for the reason that the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was formed without the obligation of service as normally required in the Army or the Navy. The members of that Corps could resign from it at any time they chose to do so, and in many respects were not subject to court martial. There was a great difference between the character of discipline to which they were subjected and the discipline to which members of the subsequently formed Women's Army Corps were subjected. The members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps were more or less their own bosses. If they wished to leave that service, they could do so. Later, many of them entered the Women's Army Corps. However, many of them elected not to go into the Federal service, in which they would be required to take the Federal oath as a member of the armed forces.

I should merely like to be certain whether the benefits referred to are to be extended to those who did not elect to enter the armed forces, in which they would be subjected to the requirement to take the oath of allegiance and be subject to the provisions relating to court martials and all the other restraints of regular military service.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who severed their connection with that corps and left the service at that point will not be affected by the pending bill; but those who severed their connection with it and subsequently enlisted in the Women's Army Corps will receive the benefits of section 8 of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Those reenlistments will have to have been made within a period of 90 days; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator need entertain no concern, because if I understand what he has referred to, every safeguard he has suggested has been accorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Service Extension Act of 1941, approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 627), as amended (50 U. S. C. App., Supp. IV, 357), is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 7." and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Any former member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who, within 90 days after termination of her service in that corps, entered active military service by enlistment or appointment in the Women's Army Corps without having accepted a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any employer during such 90-day period, shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to a position which she left to enter service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, to the same extent that a person inducted under said act is entitled to reemployment benefits with respect to a position which she left in order to perform training and service: *Provided,* That, in the case of any such former member who has been discharged from or relieved from active duty in the Women's Army Corps prior to the effective date of this subsection, application for reemployment may be made at any time within 90 days after such effective date. The provisions of section 8 (b) (A) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, shall be applicable to any such former member without regard to whether the position which she held shall have been covered into the classified civil service during the period of her military service or during the period of her service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps."

PAYMENT OF ACCUMULATED AND ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE TO CERTAIN PERSONS

The bill (S. 1489) to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to persons whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Utah whether the act referred to in the bill as the "act of December 22, 1942," is one which authorizes the transfer of the civilian employees mentioned in the bill from one service in the Government to another.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not know whether the act to which reference has been made allowed transfers in the way the Senator has suggested. The purpose of the pending bill is merely to take care of certain inequities which have arisen with reference to these civilian employees. The bill would authorize payment for earned annual leave which had accrued to female dietitians and physical-therapy aides employed as civilians by the War Department prior to March 31, 1933.

Mr. CORDON. I note that that is the explanation to be found in the report. The bill refers to dietitians and physical-therapy aides, and I am merely inquiring whether or not the transfer was effected by section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942. I assume that it was.

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that the transfer was effected under this act of December 22, 1942, and by an omission or oversight no provision was carried in the act so as to protect the annual leave which these persons who were transferred already had to their credit. That is the purpose of the bill, merely to correct an omission in the act of December 22, 1942.

Mr. CORDON. I made the inquiry because the class of people affected is to be limited to those who were discharged pursuant to the act to which reference has been made.

Mr. HILL. Yes. Those civilian employees were transferred to the military, and under the act transferring them an omission occurred, and no provision was made to take care of their annual leave rights. The purpose of this bill is to correct that condition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1489) to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to persons whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person whose appointment as a civilian employee was terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act

of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), shall be entitled to receive compensation, based upon her rate of pay as such civilian employee at the time of such termination of service, for the period of any accumulated and accrued annual leave to which she was entitled at the time of such termination of appointment to be computed over the period immediately following separation from civilian service, except that this act shall be deemed to authorize payment of any person for any such accumulated and accrued annual leave which was credited to her upon her subsequent employment by any department or agency of the Government.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to female dietitians and physical-therapy aides whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073)."

PAY INCREASES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 749, Senate bill 1415, go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I announced that as early next week as I can do so, it is my intention to ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of this bill. I hope that the Members of the Senate will be present so that it may be disposed of.

Information has been very generally disseminated among many Senators, who have repeated it to me, to the effect that Federal employees have already had a 45-percent increase in their compensation. The facts are these: There was no increase in the basic compensation of the administrative Federal workers from 1929 to 1945. The Federal workers were the last Federal employees, as a group, to receive any increase. Long after farm prices, corporation employee salaries, and wages of employees in many industries, had been increased, the Federal employee received no increase. As a matter of fact, the Federal employee lagged 2 or 3 years behind all of the other great groups of employees.

It is true that soon after Pearl Harbor the Federal workers who had been working a 39-hour week were placed on a 44-hour or a 48-hour week and received straight time without any premium for overtime. That increased amount of work was virtually the only thing which saved many of them from destitution and insolvency.

Last spring Congress increased the basic compensation of these workers in the administrative branches by less than 16 percent. At the same time we gave to them the overtime premium. So for 2 or 3 months our Federal workers were in a fortunate position, but now practically all overtime has been eliminated. Only in the veterans bureaus and in some of the minor categories are employees receiving any overtime. Consequently, the Federal worker is now left with a basic increase of 15.9 percent, or less than 16 percent.

It is true that Senators who oppose this bill will say that instead of the increase being 16 percent it has been 21½ percent. That is true. The average increase in the annual compensation of the administrative worker, instead of being 16 percent, has been 21 percent. That arises from three factors. First, there were brought into the Government service during the war period a large number of important officials in all categories. That situation did not help the ordinary employee. In addition to that, during the expansion, employment agency heads were, in some cases, compelled to upgrade workers; that is, pay more to men than their grade entitled them to receive. figures which I have just given reflect that fact. In the employment agencies, that upgrading having been reversed, as it should have been, the workers are now being properly appraised with reference to their work.

In the third place, we did accelerate to a limited extent what we term "within-grade employment." We increased the waiting period in certain cases from a period of 12 to 18 months to a period of from 18 to 30 months. All those factors increased somewhat the average, but the increase in the basic compensation of the Federal worker since 1929, under Hoover, has been less than 16 percent, and not 45 percent, as certain Senators have stated to me they have been led to believe.

During the past 4 or 5 years, as the latest studies show, the cost of living has gone up 33 or 34 percent. So we now find Federal workers receiving substantially less purchasing power than they received 3 or 4 years ago. Forty percent of them are now receiving less than $2,000 a year, and the condition with reference to those who are compelled to support wives and children is so desperate that I was nauseated as I listened to the testimony with reference to some of the cases before the Civil Service Committee.

The fact with reference to the upper brackets, agreed to by nearly all outside businessmen, editorial writers and Government leaders, is that the Government is highly inefficient because it is unable to pay the necessary salaries to obtain men to conduct properly this great, complicated Government. General Bradley told us of one example which could be multiplied hundreds of times. The Government now has in its veterans' insurance departments by far the greatest and most complicated insurance business the world has ever known. Executives of private insurance companies are paid $50,000, $75,000, $100,000, and $125,000 a year, but the most General Bradley can arrange for the men under him is perhaps only $6,000 or $7,000 or $8,000 a year. Of course, he cannot obtain experienced, high-class executives for the salaries which the Government is willing to pay.

Mr. Anderson, the Secretary of Agriculture, told us of the unparalleled necessity of bringing into the Agriculture Department men whom the Government will have to pay $10,000 or $15,000 a year, who are handling billions of dollars, and by whose services the Government may, in a single act, lose millions of dollars.

So, Mr. President, I urge upon Senators to be present if possible in order to participate in the discussion of this bill next week.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in view of some statements which have been made by the Senator from California in respect to this bill, I wish to say that there will be given to the Senate many interesting facts and bits of information if, as, and when this bill is brought up for consideration next week. The story is not one-sided. The bill is a very vital proposal and if enacted it will cost the American people, by way of taxes, approximately $2,000,000,000 extra each year. In my opinion every Senator will be vitally interested in exploring the subject.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Did I understand the Senator to say that if this bill is passed and enacted into law it will cost the Government $2,000,000,000 extra a year?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is exactly what I said. It will be somewhere near that figure. It will be short of $2,000,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. It will be short by a billion six hundred million dollars.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I had not intended to go into the details of the matter because I do not think this is the proper time to do so. But the statement that the bill will cost the taxpayers nearly $2,000,000,000 was arrived at in this way: This bill applies to 1,600,000 classified civil-service employees. It is proposed to give them a 20-percent increase across the board. If the classified employees receive the increase the postal employees will be entitled to it. The railway mail clerks will be entitled to it. All civilian employees of the Government will be entitled to it. Three million six hundred thousand civilian employees of the Federal Government are just as much entitled to it as are the civil-service employees. The increase will cost the people of the United States close to $2,000,000,000 a year, before the end is reached. I assert that the bill merits serious consideration and attention of the Senate and of the House before it is enacted into law.

There are certain wage adjustments in the Federal Government which I believe to be absolutely essential. I think there are inequities which Congress must approach, solve, and correct. But when this bill is proposed for consideration next week, facts will be presented to the Senate which I believe will clearly show that no proper exploration of this field, and especially no proper exploration of the needs of the lower-paid employees in Government service, has been conducted by this committee, and that the committee's investigations were confined almost exclusively to those who appeared before the committee and advocated doubling the salaries of Senators and Representatives, doubling the salaries of the court judges, and practically doubling the salaries of the Members of the Cabinet as well as certain other high-paid officials in Government service. Practically no time was given and no substantial evidence was produced before the committee, or was permitted by the committee to be introduced, exploring the

field of the low-paid worker of the Government, who certainly needs attention if this is an economic matter. Those questions will be presented.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred to the committee's not permitting this information to be brought before it. Will the Senator please explain that a little further?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall be glad to explain it. I had not intended to go into the subject at this time and would not have done so except that the Senator from California went into it at some length. I merely wanted the Senate to know that there were two sides to the question, and I believe a presentation of the opposing views will be interesting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The bill (S. 1554) to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Over.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I hope the Senator who asked that the bill go over will allow me to make a short statement about it, because it is an important bill, and we are losing time and are apt to lose good men.

There is no doubt in the mind of anyone familiar with the needs of the Army that there is extreme necessity for an increase in the regular commissioned staff, which is apparent, and if this bill is not allowed to pass, some of the best men in the Army who are being released will not have an opportunity to join up with the service and get their commissions at this time.

The purpose of Senate bill 1554 is to increase the commissioned strength of the Regular Army to not exceeding 25,000, and to prescribe the manner in which the additional appointments, approximately 8,000 in number, are to be made.

The bill authorizes the appointment of these additional officers in the grades of second lieutenant through major, inclusive, from among persons who have performed outstanding commissioned wartime service, and provides for the determination of the rank of each appointee to be made in the following manner.

Under the bill, credit is given each person at the time of appointment with (1) his total actual Federal commissioned service in the Army of the United States from December 7, 1941, to the date of appointment; or (2) a constructive service credit equal to the time by which his age exceeds 25 years. The base age of 25 years used in computing constructive service credit is the average age at which Regular Army officers now in the service were appointed as second lieutenants. After computation of the constructive and actual service is made, the greater figure is applied, and appointment is made in a grade commensurate with the present Regular Army time in grade provisions, which are, second lieutenants up to 3 years, first lieutenants from 3 to 10 years, captains from 10 to 17 years, and majors from 17 to 23 years.

A large number of the most promising temporary officers are now returning to civil life under the present demobilization program, and unless the appointment of such persons in the Regular Army can be accomplished at an early date the opportunity to obtain their services will be lost. The purpose of the enactment of this measure is solely to meet this situation, and the number involved is in no wise intended to relate to the size and composition of the postwar Military Establishment.

Although the ultimate peacetime commissioned strength of the Regular Army cannot now be determined because of the existence of many factors which are still unknown, it is clear that the minimum number of officers that will be required will exceed 25,000. Experience of the past 20 years has demonstrated that a minimum of 25,000 officers is required for an enlisted strength of 250,000 to 300,000 men. The officers appointed under this bill would be in grades determined by their age and experience. The bill is designed to avoid the creation of a "hump" in the promotion list such as that resulting after World War I, and to provide a method of integration of officers into the present Officer Corps of the Regular Army in a manner which would be fair both to the Regular Army officer and to the new appointee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objections being heard, Senate bill 1554 will be passed over. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, did order of business 750, Senate bill 1554, go over?

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator from Oregon ask that it go over?

Mr. CORDON. Yes. I had no thought that it would go over with prejudice, but I desire opportunity more carefully to examine it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of House bill 2716?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the name "Public Health Service", to insert "shall be established only in localities where there are a sufficient number of Federal employees to warrant the provision of such services."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Civil Service I desire to ask consent to have a perfecting amendment adopted, as follows: To insert at the end of line 17, page 2, the words *"Provided,* That whenever the professional services of physicians are authorized to be utilized under this act the definition of a physician contained in the act of September 7, 1916, shall be applicable." The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] reported the bill, and I understand he has no objection to the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. BILBO. I object to order of business 751, House bill 2716.

Mr. CORDON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CORDON. Was request made that order of business 751, House bill 2716, go over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not so understand. Suggestion was made by the Senator from California that he desired to offer an amendment. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of line 17, after the word "environment", it is proposed to insert the following proviso: *"Provided,* That whenever the professional services of physicians are authorized to be used under this act"——

Mr. BILBO. A parliamentary inquiry. I have requested that this bill go over. Can the Senate proceed with the bill after that request is made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to have the amendment stated.

Mr. BILBO. It is all right to perfect it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what bill is before the Senate at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 751, House bill 2716. The Senator from California suggested an amendment, which the Chair directed the clerk to state to the Senate. If any Senator cares to object to the consideration of the bill after that is stated, he may do so.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, at the end of line 17, after the word "environment", it is proposed to insert the following proviso: *"Provided,* That whenever the professional services of physicians are authorized to be utilized under this act, the definition of a physician contained in the act of September 7, 1916, shall be applicable."

Mr. BILBO. Over.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the amendment go over with the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if Senators who have objection will withhold the objection for a while, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill. I am very sure that if they were familiar with the terms of the bill they would not object.

Mr. BILBO. I am afraid the Senator will convince me. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES FOR RETIRED ANNUITANTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 896) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29,

1930, as amended, approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes," which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942 (Public Law No. 411, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. In the case of those who before the enactment of this act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, or the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, the annuity shall be recomputed and paid in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this act."

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed so as to reduce the annuity of any annuitant, nor shall any increase in annuity accrue under this act prior to its enactment.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following the month in which this act is enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the bill on page 2, line 7, to strike out the words "prior to its enactment" and in lieu thereof to insert "to any annuitant for any period prior to the effective date of this act."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand the amendment changes the bill so that any payments will not be retroactive.

Mr. MORSE. It makes perfectly clear that there will be no retroactive payments beyond the effective date of the act.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon has been studied, and I believe it accomplishes exactly the purpose he has just stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2938) to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BILBO. I ask that the bill be passed over. I should like to say that I reported the bill from the District Committee, but there have been some developments with respect to the effect of the amendment which was offered in committee to the House bill. So I ask that the bill go over until we can make a further study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REPORT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR UPON MINERALS SITUATION OF THE UNITED STATES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 22) calling upon the Secretary of the Interior for a report upon the minerals situation of the United States was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to report to the Congress within 6 months upon the minerals situation of the United States, including estimates on the current reserves of the principal minerals, and to prepare and submit within the same time such other data as he may deem useful to the Congress in formulating a program for the making of the surveys, examinations, studies, and investigations required to safeguard the Nation's future security and economy by supplying the basic geological, technological, and economic information needed to assist industry and Government in a continuing program of exploration, conservation, and development of the Nation's mineral resources.

The preamble was agreed to.

PAYMENTS OF REWARDS TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES FOR INVENTIONS

The bill (H. R. 744) authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EFFECTUATION OF PURPOSES OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1152) to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Servicemen's Readjustment Enabling Act of 1945."

SEC. 2. (a) The disability of minority of a resident of the District of Columbia who is eligible for guaranty of a loan pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. L. 284) and of a minor spouse of any such resident (when acting jointly with such resident) is hereby removed with respect to the incurring of any obligation all or part of which is guaranteed under the provisions of said act or in conjunction with which a secondary loan is so guaranteed, and with respect to the exercise of the rights of ownership in any property acquired with the proceeds of any such obligation, including the right to sell, convey, lease, encumber, improve, or maintain the same and to further obligate himself incident to his exercise of such rights.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any building association or building and loan association or any savings and loan association, incorporated or unincorporated, organized and operating under the laws of the District of Columbia, or any Federal savings and loan association whose main office is in the District of Columbia, may invest its funds in: (1) Property-improvement loans insured or insurable under title I of the National Housing Act; (2) loans to veterans of World War II when guaranteed in whole or in part by a loan guaranty certificate issued under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 including, without limitation, such loans as are unsecured and such loans as are junior to another mortgage or lien upon the security; and (3) other secured or unsecured loan for property alteration, repair, or improvement or for home equipment: *Provided*, That no such unsecured loan not insured or guaranteed by a Federal agency shall be made in excess of $2,000: *Provided further*, That the total amount loaned or invested and held in unsecured loans not insured or guaranteed by a Federal agency as provided for under this subsection at any one time shall not exceed 15 percent of the association's assets.

SEC. 3. Any building association, building and loan association, or savings and loan association organized and operating under the laws of the District of Columbia, is authorized to lend money to veterans of World War II and others upon the security of a first deed of trust or first mortgage upon real estate, to be repaid in monthly or quarterly payments to be applied first to interest and the balance to principal until the indebtedness is paid in full, and without subscription to, or ownership of any shares, and such loans shall be known as direct-reduction loans. Direct-reduction-loan borrowers, and all persons assuming or obligated under direct-reduction loans made or held by such association shall be members of the association, and at all meetings of the members of the association, each borrower or each obligor upon a direct-reduction loan shall be entitled to one vote as such member.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1289) to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission, was announced as next in order.

Mr. YOUNG. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 7) to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think it would be improper for the Senate to take up this bill at a time when the Senate is considering bills on the consent calendar under the 5-minute rule. The bill is one of the most important to come before the Senate for some time, and I hope in the reasonably near future to have the matter brought before the Senate at a time when the Senate can give it proper consideration.

EXCLUSION OF LANDS IN DESCHUTES COUNTY, OREG., FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 608), to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add the following proviso: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall disturb any vested rights of any person or persons in or to said real property or any part thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1483) to amend the act entitled "An act providing for suspension of annual assesment work on mining claims held by location in the United States including the Territory of Alaska", approved May 3, 1943, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. Similar bills have been before the Congress almost continuously during the past 13 years. They

have been passed at various times for certain lengths of time, by reason of the depression in the first instance, because of the war in the second instance, and for other reasons. But the time is approaching, Mr. President, when the public domain of the United States should not be held under mining claims without a compliance with the spirit and intendment of the law applicable to mining claims. The law is that where a claim is taken for mineral in place or for a placer claim, work should be done annually on the claim so as to develop the true worth of the claim. Suspension bills have been passed by reason of the fact that labor was scarce in some instances, and due to lack of money because of the depression in other instances. But the time is fast approaching when labor will be plentiful and when we will be looking for postwar projects to give employment. The only reason I want the bill to go over at this time is so it may be limited as to the extent of time within which it will be operative.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest to the Senator that the bill is definitely limited. As the law now stands there is a suspension of the law until the 1st of July following the end of the war, as proclaimed by the President or by Congress. The difficulty with the present situation is that if a proclamation were made on June 15 or June 25 of this year there would not possibly be time to organize the necessary work to comply with the statute. So that the pending bill merely changes the existing law so that the work will be suspended until one year from the 1st day of July after the cessation of hostilities as proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know the scope of the bill. I know that President Roosevelt, when he signed the last extension bill, said it would be the last time extension of time would be given. I think it is time to stop the whole procedure. We have men out of employment now and we will have more of them as they come back from the war without employment and seeking employment. Their source of employment in years past has been, in many instances, doing the anual assessment work on mining claims. What is going on now is that great areas of the public domain are being held in absentee landlordship by those who have done nothing whatever to develop their claims or to develop the mineral resources of the country in which the claims are located.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1610) to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. This is a bill of great importance. It ought not to be passed on the Consent Calendar. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REGINALD MITCHELL

The bill (S. 1371) for the relief of Reginald Mitchell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Reginald Mitchell, of North Hollywood, Calif., the sum of $106.85, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when a United States Army vehicle collided with another automobile and pushed it into the rear of the automobile which he was driving, at the intersection of East Seventh Street and Maple Street, in Los Angeles, Calif., on November 10, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CLEO E. BAKER

The bill (H. R. 2191) for the relief of Cleo E. Baker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

O. M. MINATREE

The bill (H. R. 1358) for the relief of O. M. Minatree was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ADDIE S. LEWIS

The bill (H. R. 3135) for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY GALIPEAU

The bill (H. R. 2290) for the relief of Mary Galipeau was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

L. WILMOTH HODGES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 874) for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$9,641.75" and insert "$7,141.75."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLIFFORD E. CRAIG

The bill (H. R. 2189) for the relief of Clifford E. Craig was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN AUGUST JOHNSON

The bill (H. R. 977) for the relief of John August Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. RUTH COX

The bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF EASTERN CONTRACTING CO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2518) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, House bill 2518, Calendar No. 771, appears to be a bill which seeks to confer jurisdiction on one of the courts of the land. The jurisdiction of bills of this nature has always been, so far as I can recall, in the Committee on the Judiciary. For some reason or other this bill seems to have gone to another committee, although it is a matter which deals exclusively with the jurisdiction of courts. I do not think the matter should have gone to the Claims Committee in the first instance. There is no report here from the Claims Committee at this time, and I now move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Claims has been considering similar bills for the past 8 or 10 years to my own knowledge, and I see no reason at all why the bill should be transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not a matter which pertains to a claim. It is entirely a matter which pertains to the jurisdiction of a court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the bill was properly referred to the Committee on Claims because the bill would grant the Court of Claims the right to hear a case involving a certain claim.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a matter which has been handled by the Committee on the Judiciary right straight along. I desire to draw the attention of the Senate to the language of the bill:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding any prior determination—

And so forth. In other words, this is the conferring of jurisdiction of a specific matter to a specific court. It is a matter which belongs to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada insist upon his motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. McCARRAN. No. I ask that the bill go over at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ESTATE OF THOMAS McGARROLL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,926.50" and insert "$5,571.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CARL LEWIS

The bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Carl Lewis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JOHN R. BLACKMORE AND LOUISE D. BLACKMORE

The bill (H. R. 2300) for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WESLEY J. STEWART

The bill (H. R. 2029) for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATRICK A. KELLY

The bill (H. R. 2595) for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF ALFRED LEWIS COSSON, DECEASED, AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1960) for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF HARPER THEODORE DUKE, JR.

The bill (H. R. 2886) for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF MATTIE LEE BROWN, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 1316) for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRAVEL PAY AND OTHER ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS OF THE WAR WITH SPAIN, AND SO FORTH

The bill (H. R. 1192) granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection, who were discharged in the Philippine Islands, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAY H. McCLEARY

The bill (H. R. 1978) for the relief of Jay H. McCleary was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCIS A. HANLEY

The bill (H. R. 843) for the relief of Francis A. Hanley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SYBIL GEORGETTE TOWNSEND

The bill (H. R. 850) for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROLLA DUNCAN

The bill (H. R. 3225) for the relief of Rolla Duncan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN HAMES

The bill (H. R. 3011) for the relief of John Hames was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANGELO GIANQUITTI AND GEORGE GIANQUITTI

The bill (H. R. 2836) for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. J. D. WHITESIDE AND ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2930) for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,259" and insert "$1,888"; and in line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,828.66" and insert "$4,596.16."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the bills on the calendar.

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when the House bill 3660, Calendar No. 698, to provide for financial control of Government corporations, was reached on the calendar I asked that the bill go over. Since asking that the bill go over I have consulted with the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reported the bill. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky advises me there is no objection to the bill of which he is aware, and he knows of no reason why the bill should not be passed at this time. Therefore, Mr. President, I withdraw the objection I interposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3660) to provide for financial control of Government corporations was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS BILLS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there are on the desk five bills reported during the recess from the Committee on Claims. Favorable reports have been received on all five bills from the various departments involved. I ask unanimous consent that the five bills may be considered at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator when the bills were reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. They were reported from the Committee on Claims today. They were supposed to have been reported during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Are they all claims bills?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; they are all claim bills.

Mr. WHITE. Do they come with a unanimous report from the Committee on Claims?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, these are all bills for the settlement of private claims of individual citizens.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The bill (S. 1480) for the relief of Charles R. Hooper was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Hooper, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $6,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Charles R. Hooper while employed in the United States navy yard at Washington, D. C., in the year 1894: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MILDRED E. WALDRON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 976) for the relief of Mildred E. Waldron, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000"; in line 6, after the word "to", to strike out "Mildred E. Waldron" and insert "the estate of Howard Francis Waldron"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "her claim" and insert "all claims"; and in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "her husband" and insert "the said", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to the estate of Howard Francis Waldron, of Minneapolis, Minn., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death, on April 25, 1944, of the said Howard Francis Waldron, who was killed by the right rear wheel of a United States Government truck which began to move as he was boarding it near Cathedral Bluffs, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful,

any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Howard Francis Waldron."

HAROLD E. BULLOCK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 905) for the relief of Harold E. Bullock, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "compensation", to strike out "for personal injury sustained by him and"; and in line 10, after the word "which", to strike out "they were" and insert "she was", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold E. Bullock, of Las Vegas, Nev., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation and for the death of his wife, Mrs. Harold E. Bullock, as a result of personal injuries sustained by her, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle on Highway No. 66, near Oro Grande, Calif., on July 27, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. ALLAN F. WALKER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1294) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker, of Sepulveda, Calif., the sum of $2,500, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for the death of their son, Dennis Allan Walker, who died as a result of burns received by him when a United States Army airplane crashed at 9363 Burnet Avenue, in Sepulveda, Calif., on January 25, 1945: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAYNE EDWARD WILSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1338) for the relief of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor, of Lebanon, Del., the sum of $3,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said Wayne Edward Wilson, on August 28, 1944, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of his being burned when he came into contact with a cable hanging from a live electric wire, near Lebanon, Del., such cable having been dropped onto the electric wire from a United States Army airplane: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the last bill included in the request of the Senator from Louisiana.

REFERENCE MANUAL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word of appreciation to the acting majority leader for the reconsideration of House bill 3660.

In that connection, in July last, at the close of the session before the recess, the distinguished majority leader asked that a certain report prepared by the Comptroller General listing all Government corporations be made a Senate Document. It was so ordered. The document has been printed as Senate Document 86. I wish to make that statement for the benefit of Senators, because I know that they will all wish to refer to Senate document 86. I hope they will obtain copies and refer to it in connection with the bill to which I have referred.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the Chief of Staff with the rank of General of the Army, for a period of 4 years from November 19, 1945, vice General of the Army George Catlett Marshall, the Chief of Staff.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 2 years.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William McChesney Martin, Jr. to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Herbert E. Gaston to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 23 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

JUDGE, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. Shackelford Miller, Jr., of Kentucky, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, vice Hon. Elwood Hamilton, deceased.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James E. Mulcahy, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York. (Mr. Mulcahy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 3, 1945.)

Russell Nichols, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Albert M. Rowe, term expired.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Charles A. Donnelly, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana in place of Joachim O. Fernandez, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

George T. Cromwell, of Annapolis, Md., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., in place of Gilbert A. Dailey.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Arthur A. Quinn, of New Jersey, to be comptroller of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 23 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR TERMS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 1950

William McChesney Martin, Jr.
Herbert E. Gaston.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Louis Mini, Dalzell.
Sylvia A. Bash, De Soto.
Laurence A. Clark, Poplar Grove.
Eschol A. Houtchens, Raritan.
Ruby Maxwell, Table Grove.

KENTUCKY

Ida Sanders, Dorton.
Bessie De P. Givens, Dunmor.
Conda L. Gurley, Insull.

LOUISIANA

Claude C. Badeaux, Garden City.
William M. Jones, Heflin.

UTAH

Arthur H. Reeve, Hinckley.
Frederick C. Hoyt, Orderville.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 23 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTER

Robert E. Lynch to be postmaster at Green Bay, in the State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who doth stoop from Thy throne when the storm is high and the world is in the maze of maddening things, we would be still and know that Thou art God. Above all differences of opinion, in partisan situations, O bring us all to the common sanctuary where a common need binds all in a common fraternity. Grant that we may serve Thee in our own generation, working in such a spirit of unity and concord that the nations of the world may find our example worthy of emulation. Persuade us, O God, that the only security that lives is that which is couched in sacrifice and that rules in the spirit of the brotherhood of man.

The Lord our God hath brought us into a good land, a land of brooks of water that spring out of valleys and hills; a land wherein we shall eat bread without scarceness; we shall not lack anything in it. Let us beware that we forget not the Lord our God, for it is He that giveth us power to get wealth, that He may establish His covenant forever. In the name of the Promised One, Thy Son. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN (at the request of Mr. MANASCO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Board of Review of the War Department in reference to the improvement of the Big Sandy River in Kentucky.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the Honorable Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two places, in one to include a copy of a letter and in the other an editorial.

THE SLAUGHTER OF LAYING HENS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the plan of the Department of Agriculture to the effect that they propose to subsidize the slaughter of laying hens is, in my opinion, worthy of very serious thought before being put into operation.

Shall we not first determine whether our people will have sufficient eggs for food before we begin to talk about slaughtering the hen? How many millions of dozens of eggs could not the starving peoples of Europe use if we happen to have more than we need? Why should we fear an overproduction of food?

Certainly it will cost us quite a lot of money to hold up the price of eggs to the producer to the 90 percent of parity guaranteed by law. That money, however, paid to the producer of eggs will come back sevenfold in gross income to our Nation, as we all know that the farm dollar changes hands seven times before it quits rolling through the paths of our economy. Remember, plenty of food, and food alone, will prevent chaos in many European nations this winter.

Mr. Speaker, it will cost our Nation much more than these few millions of dollars for price supports if we countenance any plan which has for its basic principle the lessening of production of food. It would seem to me that no nation can prosper by destroying potential food production while other nations starve.

Today the housewives in this city are paying 73 cents a dozen for eggs and it would appear to be very poor policy to advocate anything now that would make it still more difficult for the poor people of this Nation to obtain that great food. Eggs sell for 40 cents per dozen in southwestern Minnesota. It would be well to find out why they should cost 73 cents here.

If we do have a surplus of eggs or of any food, the Red Cross, UNRRA, and charitable organizations can see that these foods help relieve want in our own country or other nations. Let us remember what happened to our meat supply just the other year when we began to fear an overproduction of pork and our Government cut down the number of sows by threatening a lowering in the support price. Our butcher shops have been empty for 18 months as a result.

Mr. Speaker, it is a dangerous thing to talk about holding down our production of food. Far better too much food than starvation. A few millions of dollars for support prices are far preferable to empty shelves in the grocery store and hungry children in the streets. Yesterday I saw 3 young boys carrying home their boxes of food and groceries for Thanksgiving dinner, and they each had a dozen eggs in their box. One of them dropped his carton of eggs on the steps of the street car and was disturbed because his mother had remarked about the 70 cents needed for a dozen.

I repeat that the announced plan of the Department of Agriculture should be considered from many angles besides that of the support price. Certainly we can give to the farmer parity price for his production of all possible food today while the world is in the shape it is, with mililons of people going hungry. Permitting UNRRA to buy these surplus eggs and keep the laying hen producing is better policy now than to subsidize this slaughtering of our flocks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short item.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Senator LA FOLLETTE, which article appears in the Progressive maga-

zine, published in Wisconsin. I am informed by the Public Printer that this article will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $121.40, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost the extension may be made.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a doctor friend of his residing in Japan.

SOME STARTLING FIGURES ON IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we hear it said that the tariff policy of the Republican Party was responsible for the depression of 1929 and 1930. A large group of all classes of college professors in 1930 signed a protest against Republican tariff policies, smeared President Hoover, and demanded free trade. Mr. Roosevelt in the 1932 campaign made the tariff an issue and promised to reduce all tariffs drastically. The tariff records show that these college professors were not only poor prophets but their position was intellectually dishonest.

That Mr. Roosevelt was not sincere in his promises is proven by the fact that neither he nor any other New Deal leader ever advocated or attempted to repeal or reduce any of the then existing tariff laws. Figures from Government reports taken for the 4 years of Mr. Hoover's administration, as compared with the last 4 years of Mr. Roosevelt's administration preceding the war, prove that a larger percentage of the imports coming under Mr. Roosevelt's administration were subject to tariff duties than under Mr. Hoover's administration. These figures show that the tariff rates were not reduced at any time under the Roosevelt administration.

The following are the figures taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United States, pages 466 and 467, for the year 1939:

Percentage of actual imports subject to tariffs:	
Average Hoover administration 4 years, 1929–32	33.32
Average Roosevelt administration 4 years, 1935–38	41.14
Rates of duties spread over entire imports:	
Average Hoover administration 4 years, 1929–32	16.38
Average Roosevelt administration 4 years, 1935–38	16.35

Secretary of State Hull, recognized as one of America's great free traders, preached vehemently that reduced tariffs would increase imports and would thereby give the foreigners more money to buy American goods. He also argued vehemently that tariff reductions would be our best guaranty against war and that it would practically guarantee peace in the world. Comparing the 4 years in the Hoover administration with a similar period in the Roosevelt administration, it appears that Mr. Hull's doctrine was fallacious, because in the Hoover administration the per capita exports and imports far exceeded the exports and imports in Mr. Roosevelt's administration.

In other words, the figures show that the reciprocal trade policy under the New Deal did not increase foreign trade and neither did it preserve peace. The following figures taken from the Government records will verify my statement:

Exports per capita:	
1927–30	$39.23
1935–38	20.99
Imports per capita:	
1927–30	32.05
1935–38	17.94

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I just made and to include some figures that prove the statements I have made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RECORD OF THE MEDICAL MEN IN WORLD WAR II

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the record of the medical men and the medical service in this war is outstanding. It has never been equaled by any Army in any war. There were over 570,000 wounded in World War II, of whom 360,000 were returned to some type of duty. There were some 25,000, or approximately 4 percent, who died of wounds.

In World War II only 6 men in each 10,000 died of disease each year. This is a lower death rate in disease than that of civilians in the same age group here in the United States; yet, these men lived in every part of the world under adverse physical and sanitary conditions. In World War I, 165 in each 10,000 died each year of disease, and these men were serving only in the United States and in Europe; the death rate in the Union Army in the Civil War was 712 per 10,000.

The death rate from pneumonia has been reduced from 24 percent in World War I to six-tenths percent in this war. The death rate from meningitis has been reduced to 4 percent in this war as compared to 34 percent in War I.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress and the country can look with considerable pride upon this fine record of the medical service. There is no record in civil life or elsewhere to compare with this, and certainly a good job has been done in preventative medicine, as well as in the treatment of disease.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of all other special orders for today, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tomorrow night, Saturday, to file a report on the bill H. R. 4780, the Second War Powers Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

RATIONING ENDED FOR MEATS, CANNED FISH, FATS, AND OILS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the following announcement was made this morning by Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson:

Termination of rationing of meats, canned fish, and of fats and oils, effective 12:01 a. m. Saturday, November 24, was announced today by Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson. The decision to end rationing of these foods was concurred in by Price Administrator Chester Bowles.

"This action will in no way affect our plans for the shipment of meats and certain fats and oils to allied and liberated countries, where the average level of food consumption is very much lower than in this country," Secretary Anderson emphasized. "We intend to carry out the President's promise to ship the maximum amount of food to help relieve distress and prevent starvation in devastated countries, including those paying directly for food supplies and those being served by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration."

Consumers will no longer be required to turn in ration stamps or other ration evidence for purchases of beef, pork, veal, mutton, canned fish, butter, lard, shortening, margarine, or related oils. The only food item remaining under rationing control is sugar. Because of the serious world-wide shortage, there is no immediate prospect of lifting sugar rationing.

The decision to lift rationing of all foodstuffs except sugar is made possible by the changes in food requirements and supplies which have taken place since VJ-day. Coupled with the sharp reductions in military needs for food is the seasonal increase in livestock slaughter, a record production of poultry, including turkeys, and prospects for a record supply of eggs in the months ahead.

"We have watched this rationing situation carefully," Secretary Anderson said, "and have waited until we felt sure of our ground before the decision to end controls on meats, canned fish, and fats and oils was reached. While we have had good supplies of beef in recent weeks, the seasonal increase in hog slaughter is just getting under way. We estimate that for the month of December supplies of meat available to United States civilians will be at an annual rate of about 165 pounds per capita, after allowing for military needs, for set-asides to produce over 30,000,000 pounds weekly for shipment abroad to allied and liberated countries, and 4,000,000 pounds for commercial export. Even if UNRRA should take a substantial tonnage, the supply would still be above those limits

that would make the continuance of rationing essential.

"The 1946 civilian meat supply outlook is likewise favorable, even if there may be some tightening in the supply in the second and third quarters. In the first quarter—the months of January, February, and March—the indicated civilian supply will be at the annual per capita rate of about 155 pounds. If we should give UNRRA an extra allotment of a hundred million pounds per month and set aside slightly more than that for sales by the Department of Agriculture to European countries, the supply would still be at a rate of around 150 pounds per capita in this country. With such a supply rationing is virtually unnecessary and becomes difficult to administer."

Secretary Anderson indicated that during the second and third quarters of 1946 meat supplies would be smaller than in the first quarter largely because of the seasonal decrease in livestock slaughter. After accounting for export and UNRRA requirements, Department of Agriculture estimates show a net per capita supply for United States civilians of 142 pounds for the second quarter and 140 pounds for the third quarter. This compares favorably with the 1935–39 average consumption rate in this country of 126 pounds per person. By the fourth quarter of 1946, this country's meat supply is expected to climb above 160 pounds per capita after deducting supplies for foreign shipment. This is far above the 150 pounds per capita in 1944 when most meat rationing was suspended for part of the year and a very high level of consumer buying power prevailed throughout the country.

"Although fats and oils will continue in short supply throughout the world, the discontinuance of rationing of these commodities in this country at the same time that meat rationing is being lifted appears preferable to the institution of a completely new system of rationing for fats and oils alone," Secretary Anderson pointed out. "To continue rationing of fats and oils, after cessation of meat rationing, would require a completely new rationing system, involving the reregistration of more than 500,000 industrial and institutional users and the possible issuance of new ration books to all civilians in this country."

For the month of December supplies of fats and oils are expected to be at an annual rate of 50 pounds per capita, compared with an average prewar consumption of 48 pounds. During the first and second quarters of 1946 per capita civilian supplies of fats and oils are expected to be at the annual rate of about 45 pounds, or nearly 10 percent below the prewar rate.

"These estimates are based on a conservative allowance for exports of fats and oils for essential relief uses in countries which have suffered greatly during the war," Secretary Anderson said. "Consumption of fats and oils in all those countries has declined sharply and it is very necessary that steps be taken to fill their minimum needs. We intend to make every effort to obtain all the vegetable oils possible from the recently liberated far eastern areas, and to improve the collection and procurement machinery. We are also on the lookout for supplies which may be available in other parts of the world. Even though rationing is ended, there still remains the need for preventing waste of any fats, and for salvaging all waste fats needed for the manufacture of soap and for other industrial uses."

In order to fulfill commitments on food to be shipped abroad, Secretary Anderson said that set-asides and other necessary regulations will be continued. Manufacturers of shortening, margarine, salad oil, and other products will continue to operate under existing quota limitations. Allocations and export and import controls will be maintained to help insure an orderly flow of food supplies for use in this country and abroad.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR GI JOE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the bill called the Rogers GI Joe bill—H. R. 4051. This bill gives the commoner—the GI Joe—the same rights that an officer has, namely, 2½ days furlough per month or the pay thereof. If "equal rights" is going to be the dominant phrase in this country, there is no reason why every Member of Congress should not be in favor of this bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and to include subject matter in each.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Charlotte Observer.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial from the Knoxville Journal and in the other an editorial from the Nashville Banner.

Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Raymond Gram Swing.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

UNRRA

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting by unanimous consent a broadcast by Raymond Gram Swing, on the subject of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation, calling attention to the fact that we won a glorious victory, but that we may lose the peace if we are not very careful. Mr. Speaker, I think this is one of the most important subjects that will engage our attention in a short while, and I trust that the Members will read this statement on that question. It is a grand statement and, in my opinion, most convincing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts and communications.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from an officer in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement published in the Economic Review by Mr. Hayek.

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include some editorials.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President for his statement of late Wednesday afternoon when in ordering the United States Government to take over and operate the Capital Transit Co. he stated:

> It is a blow at the sanctity of labor agreements. It strikes, too, at the very roots of orderly government. The action of this union brings discredit upon the whole body of organized labor, which naturally decries any violation of a sacred covenant. The Federal Government will not permit this kind of action to interfere with its processes either in the Capital or any part of the Nation.

It so happens that our Military Affairs Committee recently reported out a bill to rescind the Smith-Connally Act and on which a rule has been granted, to which I offered several amendments, two being adopted. The one merely places limitations on both union organizations and corporations as to political contributions. It in no way deters any individual from making any political contribution to whomever he desires. In this case what is sauce for the goose is intended shall be sauce for the gander.

The other amendment carries out exactly the objective the President had in mind when in his statement he said:

> This strike is a blow at the sanctity of labor agreements.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment is as follows:

> SEC. 4. In the event of any strike or concerted failure or refusal to work during the life of a collective-bargaining contract which includes a no-strike provision, the employer shall be relieved of any obligation under the contract, and the labor organization shall lose its status as a bargaining agency for a period of 1 year. Any such labor organization which is a party to the contract may be sued in its own name in any Federal district court in which any of its officers may reside, or be found, and shall be responsible in dam-

ages to any party injured as a result of the breach.

Now I want to ask, is there anything unfair about that? Apparently the President and I at least agree on the matter. All I trust and hope is that the President will support the Congress in any action they may take towards an attempt to solve some of labor-management difficulties. No one in Congress. I am sure, has any desire to penalize either labor or management but certainly they must be made to realize that a contract is a contract and must be lived up to by both parties.

THE LATE GENERAL ALEXANDER M. PATCH, JR.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, 56 years ago today in Arizona, which at that time was a remote region on this continent and not yet a State of our Union, there was born to Captain and Mrs. A. M. Patch, a son who was destined to become one of the greatest Americans of his age and one of the top field commanders of our American armies in the global war that has just closed.

From early boyhood Alexander M. Patch, Jr., was taught to be a soldier. And what a soldier he became. He studied at St. Luke's Preparatory School near Philadelphia, at Lehigh University, and was graduated from West Point in 1909. After serving on the Mexican border he fought with the First Infantry Division in France during World War I and participated in the occupation of Germany following the armistice in 1918.

In 1941 Alexander M. Patch, Jr., was promoted to brigadier general and led forces into New Caledonia, taking over command from General Vandegrift, the present Commandant of the Marine Corps, and directed the capture of Guadalcanal. So brilliant were his successes in the southwest Pacific that he was called back to the United States and given command of the Seventh Army.

After flying to Italy he immediately proceeded to prepare for the invasion of France. His forces landed on the beaches in southern France east of Marseilles, fought their way up the Rhone Valley through the Vosges Mountains, taking Strasbourg, and were the first American army to penetrate the almost impregnable Siegfried Line. In late March this year his forces crossed the Rhine. He was an infantry expert and struck with lightning speed. He knew the value of surprise.

It was my privilege, along with other Representatives of this body and of the United States Senate who went to Europe last April to inspect the Nazi atrocity camps, to meet General Patch. It was only a month after he had crossed the Rhine and at his headquarters at Gmünd near Göppingen. Even now I can clearly see his tall figure, erect, easy and magnificent, steadily and evenly taking its stride across the open court between the army barracks. It was still a week before any German surrender and troops were rushing feverishly but orderly up to the front. Patch was serious and serene, dignified and determined but with a burning faith, undying hope and supreme confidence deeply carved in every line of his fighting face. The unlimited reserve and untapped strength of this man were overwhelming. He was born to conquer.

With the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and our able colleagues in this House, Mr. IZAC, of California, and our late lamented friend of Oregon, Mr. Mott, we drove for 160 miles with General Patch from his headquarters southeast of Heidelberg down through devastated Ulm and Augsburg to horrible Dachau and blasted Munich. All four of us were immensely impressed by the imperturbable spirit and by the fine, even balance of emotion and reason in this courageous man. His men had for him the highest regard and the greatest admiration. Their confidence in him was supreme. They knew that in him they had a real leader who would take them to victory. He possessed an admirable mixture of firmness and tenderness. After the complete capitulation of the Third Reich, General Patch returned to this country and was given charge of the Fourth Army Command at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio to train fighters for the Japanese conflict. Fortunately, that conflict ended before his task was completed. He happily lived to see the fall of Japan as well as Germany. He had fought both.

Only 8 days of illness defeated him in his final battle. Pneumonia was a more formidable foe than the Nazis or Japs. He died night before last in the Army's Brooke General Hospital in San Antonio, leaving behind him a very fine wife, a brother who is also a lieutenant general, Joseph D. Patch, of the United States Army, a daughter and a daughter-in-law, the wife of his son, Alexander M. Patch III, who was killed in action in October 1944 in France while leading an infantry company of the Seventy-ninth Division. The Patch family were and are a fighting tribe of patriotic Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I feel a sense of great loss after knowing General Patch for only the brief time that I did. I shall never forget his cold, steel grey-blue eyes, his warm soft-spoken words, his firm resolute will, his thoughtful consideration which commanded the respect of all men in his command, officers and enlisted men alike. I am sure that all Members of this body join me in expressing deep and sincere sympathy to the bereaved family in the loss of one of the great Americans of our age. Lt. Gen. Alexander M. Patch, it seems to our finite minds, was too young to die. By his life, character and his heroic deeds, he has justly won for himself the plaudits of a grateful people. God rest his tireless soul.

REDUCING APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4407), an act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, we have an understanding with the gentleman from Missouri as to when the first conference shall be had. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the understanding on the other side of the aisle, the bill will not actually go to conference before the 10th day of December.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, DIRKSEN, and ENGEL of Michigan.

SESSION OF THE HOUSE ON SATURDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the majority leader whether the rules reported for the May bill and the Hobbs bill have been filed or will be filed today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Until I have that assurance, Mr. Speaker, I shall object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman reserve that?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Yes. I will reserve the right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the request at this time.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to outline the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday is District day. I am unable to state whether there are any bills from that committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that next Monday is Consent Calendar day.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I was just coming to that. It is my understanding, however, that it is also District of Columbia day, but I am unable to state whether or not there are any bills from that committee which are ready.

The Consent Calendar will be called as a result of the unanimous-consent request entered into last week that that calendar be in order on next Monday.

On Tuesday, if there is no objection, we will meet at 10 o'clock and dispose of the conference report on the land grant bill, and then take up the Deficiency Appropriation bill. I expect the Deficiency Appropriation bill will be disposed of on Tuesday if the House meets at 10 o'clock. If not, then it will go over until Wednesday.

The next order of business will be H. R. 4421, a bill from the Naval Affairs Committee relating to the size of the personnel of the Navy.

Of course, there are conference reports. There is the conference report on the rescission bill and the reorganization bill. If those reports are reported, they will be brought up as quickly as possible after they are reported to the House.

Then, on Thursday and Friday, if the full employment bill is reported out and a rule is reported, if it is possible to bring it up—and I doubt it—but, if it is possible, we will bring that bill up. If it cannot be brought up and it is possible to bring up the Second War Powers Act, that will be taken up.

Then there is the bill H. R. 4717 from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is chairman. If a rule is reported on that, that will be brought up just as soon as possible, having in mind what I have said with reference to the full employment bill and the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Having no information that it was the purpose of the House leaders, after going along very slowly for the last 2 weeks or a month, to meet at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning, the subcommittee which has under consideration the full employment bill has arranged to make a report to the full committee on Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock. I am sure, having sent out telegrams to the members, that the chairman of the committee will want to meet at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning. But if the House is going to be in session at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning, naturally the committee cannot meet. Your program calls for legislation I am interested in and I want to be on the floor when the House is in session.

I will say further, being one of the conferees on the reorganization bill, there is no indication up to this time that the conferees will meet until the full Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments disposes of the full employment bill. I do not think you should take the action contemplated of meeting at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning, without any advance notice to a legislative committee that has been trying for the last 4 months to get some legislation before the House that has to do with the so-called full employment bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not submitted any request, but the Chair may state that the Chair is very much interested in the so-called Boren bill and would like very much to see the conference report adopted.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say in connection with the observations made by the gentleman from Missouri that I am very glad he made them; they are very pertinent; and, of course, they will be kept in mind. I know of no reasons why the request would be made before Monday.

I personally feel I am committed by reason of the promise made to the Committee on Appropriations to give them all day Tuesday, that is what would be the regular legislative day, on the deficiency appropriation bill. I will keep in mind what the gentleman from Missouri said. It may be that arrangements can be made to bring up the conference report after the disposition of the deficiency appropriation bill and before the Navy bill. The opposition of the gentleman will be kept in mind.

Mr. COCHRAN. Did I understand the Speaker to say he was very anxious to see the conference report on the Boren bill adopted.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. I serve notice on the House now that I am very anxious to see the conference report defeated, and I will guarantee that there will be a roll call on the conference report if that be necessary. I will use every parliamentary means at my disposal if necessary to defeat the conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do not get me into that, I am not discussing that. I will, however, bear in mind what the gentleman says.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has made no request. Without objection the gentleman may extend his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri are fully justified. The leadership, of course, had a difficult problem in arranging for the consideration of the deficiency bill. I might say, as the leader will recall, that the alternative was to take up the bill on Monday, the day on which it was reported. But, rather than bring it up on the day reported, following our usual custom we preferred to meet earlier the next day.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I should like to have the House know that the Committee on Military Affairs has been conducting hearings on the President's request for universal military training and we have requested witnesses to appear next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. Our meetings all begin at 10 o'clock in the morning. These witnesses are coming from various parts of the country. I hope something can be done to avoid the necessity of having them come here only to find we are not able to hear them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that at the time the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] discussed it with me I took the position that it was the practice to allow 24 hours to intervene between the reporting of a deficiency bill and its consideration on the floor in order that the membership other than the members of the Appropriations Committee might know what was in the bill, and I felt that that practice and custom should be adhered to.

I wish the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to understand that I promised him that the deficiency bill would be brought up on the 27th of the month. If we cannot meet at 10 o'clock, and I regard what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has said as being very pertinent, also the statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky, personally I feel that the deficiency appropriation bill should be given the right-of-way on Tuesday.

Mr COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I fully agree with what the gentleman said and if he carries that promise out and lets the appropriation bill lay before the House for 24 hours before it is called up, that will suit me, because it will be impossible to report the deficiency bill on Monday before 12 o'clock and if it lays over for 24 hours we cannot call it up until 12 o'clock the next day. Therefore we are in full agreement and if that policy is followed there is no necessity meeting before 12 o'clock Tuesday.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my hope that we might call up the veterans' bill on next Monday and pass it under suspension of the rules. This bill provides for the setting up of a medical corps in the Veterans' Administration.

We have heard all the smears against the Veterans' Administration; we have heard all these attacks from various sources; we have worked hard now for a bill that we think will iron out the difficulty.

If I cannot get the bill up under suspension of the rules I want the Rules Committee to adopt a resolution I have introduced to give us a rule, because I can tell you now that the Congress is going to be in session every day until that bill is voted on.

Let me say further that the conference on the amendments to the GI bill is still in deadlock. We are getting protests from all over the country that veterans cannot get loans on homes and on farms because of the red tape which exists under present laws as far as appraisements are concerned. The House bill corrected

that condition. Now we are trying to get the Senate conferees to agree.

Just as soon as we reach an agreement I am going to bring that report to the House for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PURCHASE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY VETERANS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under the present law and procedure, a veteran seeking to purchase surplus property is in better position if he forgets that he is a veteran and makes his application as a small businessman, because the present regulations provide that the Smaller War Plants Corporation can exercise its Federal priority on behalf of small business and thus make null and void any application made by and preference issued to the veteran as a veteran exercising his so-called veteran's preference. For that reason, if the Members of Congress have a desire to extend to the veterans the bona fide priority which will enable them to obtain surplus property ahead of small business applicants who may have made their applications to purchase surplus property subsequent to the veterans, this legislation must be enacted.

Today I have introduced a bill which amends the Surplus Property Act to enable a veteran to obtain a genuine, bona fide priority.

The introduction of this bill is motivated by the action of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Consumer Goods Division, Office of Surplus Property, in a recent case where a veteran made his application for a machine and his preference was granted and subsequent thereto Smaller War Plants Corporation exercised its Federal priority and purchased the machine on behalf of a small business concern which made its own application subsequent to that made by the veteran for which his preference was granted.

It is small wonder that numerous complaints have been made by veterans because of their inability to purchase surplus property, especially where the articles are scarce. I urge, on behalf of veterans, that this legislation be speedily enacted.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION—AMERICAN LEGION RECOGNIZES WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to attend the twenty-seventh annual convention of the American Legion held in Chicago this week. It was a great convention, the most serious-minded, business-like national convention that I have been privileged to attend. It being the first peacetime national Legion convention since 1941, an air of solemnity prevailed.

Running true to form were many fine, patriotic speeches, most of which were short and to the point. The central thought of a vast majority of them was a determination to preserve the peace that was earned by such noble and costly sacrifices. The Legion emphasized the need for preparedness, as it has done since World War I, as the most practical way of remaining at peace with the world. High on the priority list of convention addresses were those delivered by the five vice presidents of the American Legion Auxiliary. The auxiliary, organized 2 years later than the Legion, was celebrating its silver jubilee.

The American Legion Distinguished Service Medal was awarded to several, including General Eisenhower, whose 5-minute speech of acceptance of the award was one of the high lights of the convention. Another was the acceptance speech of young Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., now a commander in the United States Navy, on behalf of his father. Young Franklin D. looks, acts, and speaks more like the late President than any of his brothers.

The great State of Oklahoma scored twice at Chicago by the election of Capt. Fred LaBoon, of Chickasha, Okla., as one of two World War II veterans as national vice commander; also the election of the charming Mrs. Hope Reed, of Vinita, as vice president of the Legion Auxiliary. The other World War II veteran so honored comes from the State of Idaho.

The American Legion is to be commended for recognizing so early two outstanding young World War II veterans to high positions in their national council. Although Fred LaBoon grew up in my home city and I had known him since he was a small boy, I had not seen him for more than 4 years until this week. He is a fine, clean-cut, young man with a pleasing personality. I had occasion to talk to him in Chicago about his 40 months in Jap prisons and also concerning his starvation diet while on the Death March of Bataan. Fortunately, these horrifying experiences have not left the Legion's new vice commander embittered, as has been the case with so many others, but have given him a keener sense of appreciation and understanding of our sacred American liberties. Oklahoma's Fred LaBoon will make an enviable record as national vice commander of the American Legion and I predict that the recognition thus given to the veterans of World War II by this great veterans' organization will prove to be a mighty forward step in cementing unity and understanding between veterans of World War I and World War II.

THE LATE W. FRANK JAMES

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I rise to announce the death of a former distinguished collegaue and Member of this House, my predecessor, the Honorable W. Frank James, who served with distinction and honor for 20 years in this distinguished body, having risen at one time to the chairmanship of the important House Committee on Military Affairs. He was a worthy opponent and a gentleman in every respect. I know that those who knew him, and his former colleagues will regret his demise and mourn his passing.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I am sure that every Member of the House who served with Frank James will join in mourning his passing. When I first came here, at least, during the late twenties, he became chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I fought with Frank James year after year for the development of the water power on the Tennessee River and for its distribution to the people in that area. Frank James lived to see that dream come true, and I want the RECORD to show that no man in the House regrets more than I do the passing of this very distinguished citizen of the State of Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Major General Lemay at the tenth anniversary of the stratosphere flight in the Black Hills, S. Dak.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial from today's New York Times on the situation in China and our obligations there, and in the other to include some correspondence.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was in the first instance somewhat confusing to me to hear the majority leader, to see

the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] crack the whip and lift the hide off the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER] who apparently was trying to get before the House for consideration legislation which would, he believed, enable private industry to continue creating and maintaining jobs; and then, in almost the next breath, to hear the majority leader praise the other gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] who insists upon bringing out the so-called full-employment bill under which the Government for one item may be required to spend some $24,000,000,000 to give jobs to those who may be unemployed even though they were thrown out of their jobs by strikes.

I just could not figure out the apparent confusion until I remembered that alliance, that corrupt political alliance, between the Democratic Party's leadership and the labor leaders, and then I caught onto what it was all about.

There is the drive for "must" legislation which will aid the PAC of Sidney Hillman and his candidates, and a slow-down policy which it is hoped will kill off and bury remedial legislation which some of us believe will aid private enterprise in giving full employment.

If political advantage is not sought, is not the reason back of the "must" legislation, back of the opposition to legislation which may aid in solving labor disputes—the strikes—what is back of it all?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in considering legislation on the floor of the House until it is agreed to by a committee, especially when I am a member of the committee considering the bill, but the statement has been made so many times that the so-called full-employment bill is going to give jobs to strikers and all others desiring a job that I simply want to say that there is not a line in that bill and there never has been a line in any so-called full-employment bill that authorizes an appropriation for one job, with the exception of the Council of Economic Advisers for the President, and to pay the expenses of a joint committee of the House and the Senate which is set up under the bill. I think it is about time that everyone ceased to say that the so-called full-employment bill sets up jobs for millions of people in this country, including strikers.

What the original bill and the bill agreed upon by the subcommittee does is to provide for a declaration of policy. It lays down standards and then sets up in the office of the President provisions for economic advisers to make investigations and reports in reference to conditions throughout the country or any part of the country, information upon which the President can intelligently send a message to the Congress advising the Congress of the conditions that exist and making such suggestions as he desires relative to what should be done. The way is likewise open for the President to make any suggestions in reference to taxes, or in fact any other matter that he desires.

I have hesitated for a long time, much as I would have liked, to reply to some of the speeches that have been made on this floor concerning this legislation, but have refrained from doing so and I will not go into detail now but I will wait until the bill is before the House to express my views concerning the legislation. I do hope that with this brief explanation Members will not make any statements in the future saying that the bill under consideration by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments provides for millions of jobs including strikers. It is the legislative committees and the Appropriation Committee that will have to pass legislation and appropriate money to provide jobs and as I repeat and emphasize there is not even an authorization for jobs outside of the positions for the economic advisers in the President's office and for the clerical help for the joint committee. That is not even an authorization but a limitation of the amount that the Appropriation Committee might appropriate for the economic advisers to the President and for the assistants that the joint committee will need.

FILING OF CERTAIN RULES

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I objected to the request of the majority leader that when the House adjourns today it adjourns until Monday next. I objected until such time as the majority leader could give assurance as to when certain rules relating to the Hobbs and May bills would be filed. I find on consulting the rules that a rule must be reported at the end of 3 days. In view of that rule, I say to my distinguished majority leader that I shall not object if he cares to renew his request.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CAN WE GET ALONG TOGETHER?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my intention to introduce a resolution on the use of atomic energy in the interest of international cooperation and the public welfare. I postponed the introduction of this resolution because the President of the United States, who had been in consultation with Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain and Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada, had that day issued a joint statement in regard to this all important issue—the control of the atomic bomb.

I had hoped the Truman-Attlee-King statement would be an historic document to implement the need for growing understanding between the peoples of this shrinking globe. I had hoped that it would be an answer to the prayers of millions of Americans and hundreds of millions of people the world over; an answer to their yearning for peace; a declaration from two of the three most powerful nations on earth, that nothing—neither the atomic bomb of this hour nor the prejudices of yesterday nor the uncertainties of tomorrow can weaken the bonds of unity that have been forged between peace-loving peoples of the earth in the agony of "blood, sweat, and tears."

Of course, I am in agreement with the general principles of the joint statement. Moreover, knowing the men who wrote this document and of their great concern for the welfare of man and their desire for peace, I am able to give the statement the best interpretation. But it still falls short of the necessity of this hour.

It would be less than honest if I did not say that the statement we had so long awaited is a disappointment.

The aim of our foreign policy is peace. I know that. The American people know that. They not only yearn for peace, they expect it. They demand peace.

But the concern in this hour is that fear and timidity because of our great responsibility may close the narrow channels to the open sea of tomorrow's peace and security.

The concern is that striped pants diplomacy will again dominate the Council table; that we will not sweat it out, sit it out, wait it out.

The concern is that fear will tighten our generosity, narrow our perspective, and thereby lose for us the belief and faith that a peaceful world can be built on the cooperative efforts of the peoples of the earth. It is that belief which we must husband at all costs.

Dr. Albert Einstein has said:

> The release of atomic energy has not created a new problem. It has merely made more urgent the necessity of solving an existing one.

The real problem confronting us today is not the control of the atomic bomb—for after the atomic bomb it may well be bacteriological warfare or some other new weapon which uncontrolled may destroy the world. The problem is the same old problem that has been haunting man down through the years. It is the problem of the control of the relations between men.

Can we get along together? The introduction of the atomic bomb into our midst has only made the getting along together a more urgent matter.

The Truman-Attlee-King statement is disappointing in that it places the main emphasis on the atomic bomb and not on the getting along.

But it is the getting along together which must be stressed in this hour in order that we may be able to control the atomic bomb or any other threat to peace which must be handled on an international basis.

There is a lesson that we can learn out of the history of the making of the atomic bomb, which in itself points the way.

We were morally right in this war and therefore we drew the scientists to our side whether their background was that of invader or invaded. We owe a world-wide debt to the scientists from abroad, for without them we would not have made the atomic bomb. We would not have won the scientific race of all time. We would not have won the war.

If we are right now, we will draw the strength and support through unity and cooperation and trust and belief and hope in the future which are needed to win the peace.

It is the morality of our position which is at stake in this hour.

If the joint statement had been issued immediately after the two great explosions over Hiroshima and Nagasaki it would have been received as a great document. But in the months of silence which followed, voices whispering, "We have a secret. We will share nothing. It is our sacred trust. The only thing the world understands is force," have been allowed to grow until they have become dangerously loud.

Our foreign policy is peace, and we understood long before the war that friendship is the most powerful weapon there is for peace.

Throughout the war while we continuously worked to build the firm foundations of peace, we continuously moved toward the building of world understanding and cooperation.

Because of our objective, we continuously sought to strengthen the bonds of friendship between ourselves, Great Britain, and Russia.

We are at the crossroads. If we now even seem to rely upon force instead of friendship we will have set our feet on a dead-end street.

If the idea that we cannot rely upon international agreements in this hour is allowed to gain momentum, we will be heading back into isolationism before we know it. A new kind of isolationism to be sure, but isolation just the same—an atomic age isolationism.

And what will that mean? Mounting tensions as other nations begin making their bombs; total governmental control; vast appropriations; government, cities, and industries decentralized, each with his own mountain to hide under; the White House in Washington or Missouri; the Senate in Tennessee; the House of Representatives in Illinois; the Supreme Court in Michigan; and the State Department in Ohio. And when we get to the Cabinet and other branches of the Government there will hardly be enough States to go around. And it will take money to do this—more money than it took to wage the war. But the greatest price that we will pay will be that we will sleep quiet no longer.

For atomic age isolationism will demand a trigger finger. It will demand more than that. It will demand that we strike the first blow. It will demand that we be forever and forever alert against potential enemies. It will demand that power to declare war will be given to one man, and he will not declare war. He will just push a button. It will mean the end of democratic processes, and in the end it will mean the end of man.

What, then, is our only recourse?

Learning to get along together. But how can we learn this very hard lesson?

By facing facts daily, relentlessly, realistically.

I am reminded of the words of Thomas Huxley, "Sit down before fact as a little child."

What are the facts?

These are the facts:

All the scientists agree, and President Truman and Prime Ministers Attlee and King concur in their joint statement, that if there is to be another war it will not be just a war of destruction, but a war of annihilation—a war that can be over in a half hour with 40,000,000 dead and our industrial cities destroyed; that there is no specific defense against the atomic bomb or other new weapons. For no defense can ever be complete. Europe today is mute testimony to that fact. If only 10 percent of the robot planes carrying atomic bombs are effective they will do the job.

That we have no monopoly on atomic weapons is a fact. There are atoms in every country. The knowledge of atom splitting is now world-wide. The basic scientific discoveries which led to the bomb dropped over Hiroshima were made in the laboratories of foreign countries. In the actual making of the bomb, many of the key scientists were foreigners, and some have returned to their own countries.

Even though we keep our know-how to ourselves—and that means the actual ordnance blue prints—the scientists tell us that any other industrial nation which has the needed raw materials, the scientists, and the urge can build atomic bombs in from 3 to 5 years. Well, suppose it is 10 years. Is that time to even dry our tears? Money is not needed, you see—just material, men, and the will.

These are the facts. The scientists and our leaders are agreed. Surely they leave but one way open—to continue the great traditions achieved in this war; to hurry on our appointed way as free people.

We must not falter now. Now, we dare not lose our way. Our great achievement of builded friendship, born out of this terrible war, must live. It must be strengthened and further built upon for now—now, the new day dawns.

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

The conquest of atomic power is the greatest testimony to the universal genius of mankind. It foreshadows a most remarkable world-wide advance of science and technology for decades to come. It foreshadows the great age now dawning.

Surely we will not falter now. Surely we will not turn our backs now. Not if we hold fast to the facts as verified by tragic experience:

War is a man-made conflict between at least two nations. Other nations, whether they like it or not, may become involved because their vital interests are at stake.

No single country can keep the peace alone.

In order to maintain and build the peace, which was more fully realized in the United Nations Organization Charter than in the Truman-Attlee-King statement, it was necessary to develop and maintain and strengthen the solidarity of the Big Five and the United Nations Organization.

If any of the Big Five fall out there is no practical likelihood of the United Nations Organization working.

Under the Security Council you have a commitment of contingents of armed forces in order to maintain and keep the peace, and atomic energy is just one other factor which has to be handled on a similar basis of political mutual understanding.

Each new problem cannot be treated as a completely isolated case. Policies cannot be based upon unilateral action as contrasted with collaborative action. If we hope to work together permanently, we must be partners—not partners except. For if it is the atomic bomb today, why is it not bacteriological warfare tomorrow?

The Commission as proposed in the joint Truman-Attlee-King statement is useful but not likely to be adequate in terms of the great significance in the release of atomic energy.

The Commission is no substitute for direct consultation between the heads of States.

In times of war, the heads of States who are the responsible officials spend all of their waking life on the problems of war. Certainly it is as important, if not more important, to keep the peace and to prevent the bloodshed, devastation, and final destruction which would come with another war.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made by the scientists and released to the press on November 17, 1945, together with the names of the 132 scientists who have endorsed this statement. I also wish to include a background history of nuclear physics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Why does the gentlewoman ask that this material be inserted in the Appendix? Why not include it in her speech?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. There are so many names that I thought it would fit better as a special article in the Appendix.

Mr. SABATH. I think it might add—although it would be hard to add anything to what the gentlewoman has already stated, I know——

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. The gentlewoman has made a wonderful speech and made a wonderful appeal, but in view of the fact that this statement has been signed by

so many outstanding men I feel it would be well for the gentlewoman to make it a part of her speech, perhaps adding it at the conclusion of her speech, rather than placing it in the Appendix.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I will adopt the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Speaker, and modify my request to include the statement of names at the end of my speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is upon the statement of these scientists that the resolution I now offer is based:

Resolution on the use of atomic energy in the interest of international cooperation and the public welfare

Whereas in the atomic bomb there has been unleashed the most destructive force known to mankind, in the production of which the United States can have no enduring monopoly and against which there is no specific military defense; and

Whereas any effort to pursue a foreign policy based on our temporary superiority in atomic weapons will force other nations as well as ourselves into an atomic armaments race, thereby creating a world of fear and hatred in which nations great and small face sudden destruction; and

Whereas the fundamental aim of United States foreign policy is to have world peace—an aim which cannot be achieved by the United States alone or by any other country by itself, but only through maintaining and strengthening the cooperation and unity of the peace-loving peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the United Nations Organization cannot function successfully unless the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union cooperate on all major issues: Therefore be it

Resolved, That prior to any attempt to set up specific international machinery for dealing with atomic energy, the President of the United States immediately invite to a conference the governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, in order to discuss the common danger created by atomic weapons, and to plan for the joint approach by these three nations to the other members of the United Nations Organization for establishing a world-wide system of international cooperation and control of atomic energy to the end of preventing a competitive armaments race and safeguarding peace.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, the war is over but the world is uneasy—peace is not yet won.

The fact is that relations between the Big Three have become strained. Yet, we fought and died together, side by side, until victory was ours.

And the final fact is that if we do not win this peace side by side there will be another war—the last war.

Those are the facts.

The question is, "Can we live together?"

We can afford to split the atom, but we cannot afford to split the Big Three.

That is what the scientists have been telling us, not because they are suddenly gifted with political foresight but because daily in their lives they sit down before facts and face them—without prejudice—realistically. Men must settle their differences around a council table from here on if man is to have a future.

If man is to survive, international collective bargaining must replace international anarchy and lawlessness.

The scientists keep reminding us that wars are man made; that we can save ourselves if we have the will to do so but it will take our collective wills; they are trying to tell us by the continuous marshalling of the facts, that scientists alone cannot save the world.

We can insure our safety only through the mutual consent of all the peoples of the earth.

SCIENTISTS' STATEMENT

Resolution on the use of atomic energy in the interest of international cooperation and the public welfare

Whereas in the atomic bomb there has been unleashed the most destructive force known to mankind, in the production of which the United States can have no enduring monopoly and against which there is no specific military defense; and

Whereas any effort to pursue a foreign policy based on our temporary superiority in atomic weapons will force other nations as well as ourselves into an atomic armaments race, thereby creating a world of fear and hatred in which nations great and small face sudden destruction; and

Whereas domestic policy must provide for free scientific investigation and discussion and public surveillance and criticism of the application of atomic energy which are the best guaranties that peace will be secured, that competition in devastating armaments will be ended, and that the public will be given full access to scientific developments which, furthered by Government sponsorship, belong to the people whom this Government represents: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States immediately invite to a conference the Governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, in order to discuss the common danger created by atomic weapons, and to plan for the joint approach by these three nations to the other members of the United Nations Organization to the end of establishing a system of international cooperation and control of atomic energy which will prevent a competitive armaments race, safeguard world peace, and make available to all peoples the peacetime benefits of atomic energy; and

That any domestic policy instituted by the President and the Congress of the United States for the control and development of atomic energy should be in harmony with an international system of control and cooperation and that it should further provide for scientific freedom and the peacetime utilization of atomic energy in the interests of the whole people.

This statement has been endorsed by men of such caliber as Dr. Harlow Shapley, director of the Harvard Observatories, Harvard University; P. W. Bridgman, department of physics, Harvard University; Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner, professor of chemistry, University of Chicago; James Franck, Nobel prize winnner, professor of physical chemistry, University of Chicago; A. J. Dempster, professor of physics, University of Chicago; Glenn T. Seaborg, professor of chemistry, University of California, metallurgical laboratory; H. D. Smyth, professor of physics, chairman, department of physics, Princeton; Albert Einstein, professor of theoretical mathematics, member extraordinary, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton; Linus Pauling, professor of chemistry, California Institute of Technology; Eugene P. Wigner, professor, mathematical physics, Princeton.

SCIENTISTS ENDORSING RESOLUTION ON ATOMIC ENERGY FOR WORLD PEACE

Federation of Atomic Scientists, composed of the following associations, representing 90 percent of the scientists who worked on the development of the atomic bomb:

Atomic scientists of Chicago: John A. Simpson, Jr.; Austin M. Brues; E. Rabinowitch; G. T. Seaborg; D. L. Hill; J. J. Nickson; L. Szilard.

Association of Oak Ridge Scientists, Clinton laboratories: P. Henshaw, W. E. Cohn, S. G. English, H. S. Brown, J. H. Rush, E. G. Bohlmann, R. P. Metcalf, J. G. Stangby, L. B. Borst, K. Z. Morgan, R. N. Lyon, M. D. Peterson.

Association of Manhattan Project Scientists, New York City area—executive committee: E. Adler, F. Bonner, B. Jacobschn, I. Kaplan, M. Mayer, F. T. Miles, R. D. Present, C. D. Swartz, C. Williams.

Association of Los Alamos Scientists—executive committee: W. M. Woodward, J. Keiler, W. A. Higginbotham, R. R. Wilson, J. Manley, V. Weisskopf, D. Frisch, D. Lipkin.

Atomic engineers of Oak Ridge—group at Carbide-Kellex plant: J. A. Armitage, F. C. Armistead, W. C. Beard, H. A. Nowak, C. D. Slade, A. M. Squires, T. Williamson.

Atomic production scientists of Oak Ridge—group at Tennessee Eastman plant: John Pomeroy, David Wehmeyer, John Trimmer, W. A. Arnold, Chauncey Starr, Dieter, Gruen, Harry Pearlman.

Association of Philadelphia Scientists, representing 1,100 Philadelphia scientists, Prof. W. E. Stephens, chairman.

The Association of Cambridge Scientists, radiation laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The rocket research group, Alleghany Ballistics Laboratory.

The Association of New York Scientists.

The National Working Committee on Atomic Energy, headed by Dr. Harlow Shapley, head of astronomy department, Harvard University; chairman, scientific division, Independent Citizens Committee for the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, including:

I. Amdur, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Donald H. Andrews, department of chemistry, Johns Hopkins University.

J. Lloyd Bohn, department of physics, Temple University.

P. W. Bridgman, department of physics, Harvard University.

Walter G. Cady, Wesleyan University.

Frank K. Cameron, University of North Carolina.

A. J. Carlson, department of physiology, University of Chicago.

W. Edward Chamberlain, department of radiology, Temple University.

R. G. Clark, Wesleyan University.

E. G. Conklin, president, Philosophical Society.

H. G. Steinbach, department of zoology, Washington University.

Fayette Taylor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Lloyd W. Taylor, Oberlin College.

Alfred V. Wilhelmi, Yale University, School of Medicine.
Sterling Hall, Yale.
Oscar Wintersteiner, Squibbs Institute.
Harry A. Curtis, University of Missouri.
Howard J. Curtis, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
Kenneth S. M. Davidson, Stevens Institute.
F. W. Aydelotee, Princeton.
Leslie P. Dunn, department of zoology, Columbia.
Reuben Gustavsen, University of Chicago.
Herbert S. Harned, department of chemistry, Yale.
H. D. Hass, department of chemistry, Purdue.
Ernst A. Hauser, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Selig Hecht, department of biophysics, Columbia.
T. R. Hagness, department of chemistry, University of Chicago.
Warren C. Johnson, department of chemistry, University of Chicago.
Isaac M. Kolthoff, department of analytical chemistry, University of Minnesota.
Wesley C. Mitchell, department of sociology, Columbia.
Karl Menger, department of mathematics, Notre Dame.
Otto Meyerhof, department of physiological chemistry, University of Pennsylvania.
T. H. Morgan, California Institute of Technology.
Stuart Mudd, department of bacteriology, University of Pennsylvania.
John P. Peters, Yale Medical School.
Hans Rademacher, department of mathematics, Swarthmore.
Oscar K. Rice, department of chemistry, University of North Carolina.
Robert Chambers, New York University.
Raymond D. Kirk, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.
Arthur Schlesinger, department of history, Harvard.
Paul D. Sears, Oberlin College.
L. J. Stadler, University of Missouri.
W. M. Stanley, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, Princeton, N. J.
E. V. Cowdry, Washington University.

INDIVIDUAL SCIENTISTS SIGNING RESOLUTION ON ATOMIC ENERGY FOR WORLD FEACE

Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner, professor of chemistry, University of Chicago.
James Franck, Nobel prize winner, professor of physical chemistry, University of Chicago.
Robert S. Stone, professor of radiology, University of California Hospital.
W. H. Zacharaisen, professor of physics, University of Chicago.
H. G. Steinbach, department of zoology, Washington University.
Farrington, Daniels, professor of physical chemistry, University of Wisconsin; director, metallurgical laboratory.
A. J. Dempster, professor of physics, University of Chicago.
Glenn T. Seaborg, professor of chemistry, University of California, metallurgical laboratory.
Richard Courant, professor of mathematics, chairman, department of mathematics, New York University.
H. D. Smyth, professor of physics, chairman, department of physics, Princeton.
Eugene P. Wigner, professor of mathematical physics, Princeton.
Oswald Veblen, professor of mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.
Albert Einstein, professor of theoretical mathematics, member extraordinary, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.
Linus Pauling, professor of chemistry, California Institute of Technology.
Frank H. Spedding, professor of chemistry, Iowa State College.
Charles C. Lauritsen, professor of physics, California Institute of Technology.
J. C. Stearns, professor of physics, dean of faculties, Washington University.
E. V. Cowdry, professor of anatomy and director of research, Barnard Free Skin and Cancer Hospital, Washington University.
B. E. Youngdahl, dean, school of social work, Washington University.
C. F. Cori, professor of biochemistry and pharmacology, Washington University.
Joseph Erlanger, professor of physiology, Washington University.
Philip A. Shaffer, dean, School of Medicine, Washington University.
J. Bronfenbrenner, professor of bacteriology and immunology, Washington University.
George W. Beadle, professor of biology, Stanford University.
Paul Kirkpatrick, professor of physics, Stanford University.
F. W. Bergstrom, professor of chemistry, Stanford University.
Hubert S. Loring, professor of biochemistry, Stanford University.
J. Murray Luck, professor of biochemistry, Stanford University.
C. V. Taylor, professor of biology, Stanford University.
E. W. Schultz, professor of bacteriology and pathology, Stanford University.
Vern O. Knudsen, dean, graduate school, University of California, Los Angeles.
William G. Young, chairman, chemistry department, University of California, Los Angeles.
Ernest C. Watson, professor of physics, California Institute of Technology.
Ira S. Bowen, director, Mount Wilson Observatory, Carnegie Institute.
R. A. Ogg, Jr., associate professor of physiology, Columbia University.
Charles D. Coryell, professor of chemistry, University of California, Los Angeles.
Alexis Hartman, professor of pediatrics, Washington University.
Lawrence T. Post, professor and head of department of optholmology, Washington University.
Robert A. Moore, professor of pathology, Washington University.
F. R. Bradley, director of hospitals, Washington University.
Edwin F. Gildea, professor of psychiatry, Washington University.
T. E. Walsh, professor of otolaryngology, Washington University.
Stuart A. Queen, professor of sociology, Washington University.
A. L. Hughes, professor of physics, Washington University.
W. Barry Wood, professor of medicine, Washington University.
George Saslow, instructor in medicine, Washington University.
G. E. M. Jauncey, professor of physics, Washington University.
Roy Thomas, instructor in physics, Washington University.
C. F. Hagenow, professor of physics, Washington University.
Victor C. Twitty, professor of zoology, Stanford University.
Harold M. Bacon, professor of mathematics, Stanford University.
D. Clayton Spencer, professor of mathematics, Stanford University.
Franklin A. Butter, Jr., professor of mathematics, Stanford University.
David L. Webster, professor of physics, Stanford University.
Seville Chapman, professor of physics, Stanford University.
Arville I. Levorsen, professor of geology, Stanford University.
Aaron C. Waters, professor of geology, Stanford University.
Ben M. Page, professor of geology, Stanford University.
Eliot Blackwelder, professor of geology, Stanford University.
Siemon William Muller, professor of paleontology, geology, Stanford University.
Paul R. Farnsworth, professor of psychology, Stanford University.
Ernest R. Hilgard, professor of psychology, Stanford University.
Maud Merrill, professor of psychology, Stanford University.
Calvin P. Stone, professor of psychology, Stanford University.
Leland H. Brown, professor of electrical engineering, Stanford University.
Lanislaus L. Marton, professor of physics, Stanford University.
Alfred S. Niles, professor of aeronautics, Stanford University.
B. M. Green, professor of mechanical engineering, Stanford University.
O. C. Shepard, professor of metallurgy, Stanford University.
James W. McBain, professor of chemistry, Stanford University.
Philip A. Leighton, professor of physical chemistry, Stanford University.
Carl R. Noller, professor of organic chemistry, Stanford University.
G. S. Parks, professor of chemistry, Stanford University.
F. O. Koenig, professor of physical chemistry, Stanford University.
F. W. Weymouth, professor of physics, Stanford University.
J. M. Crismon, professor of physiology, Stanford University.
D. J. Gray, professor of anatomy, Stanford University.
C. H. Danforth, professor of anatomy, Stanford University.
D. L. Bassett, professor of anatomy, Stanford University.
R. S. Turner, professor of neuroanatomy, Stanford University.
S. Raffel, professor of bacteriology immunology, Stanford University.

C. E. Clifton, professor of bacteriology, Stanford University.

Victor E. Hall, professor of physiology, Stanford University.

F. Field, professor of physiology, Stanford University.

William W. Hansen, professor of physics, Stanford University.

Felix Block, professor of physics, Stanford University.

HISTORY OF NUCLEAR PHYSICS

To those who still believe that atomic energy or anything else in the realm of science can long be a secret or a monopoly, a brief historical development of the science of nuclear physics—which is the name physicists give to the science development of atomic energy—nuclear physics is neither new nor is it our exclusive possession. Everyone has heard of the alchemists who sought a touchstone whereby they might turn lead into gold. Nuclear physics is this modern touchstone. The modern scientists, however, in finding this touchstone came upon something else of which the alchemists never dared dream, a new source of energy. Dr. Einstein in 1905 suggested this idea. What he said was:

Matter may not be indestructible, and if you can find a means of destroying it, you will release the enormous reservoir of energy which is associated with it.

You will ask, Then why did not scientists immediately seize upon this new source of energy? Why did not we hear of it long before 1945? The reason is not far to seek. Not only are these nuclear reactions which result in the destruction of matter very rare events, naturally, but until recently the means had not been discovered for making them occur at will and on a large scale. Actually physicists tried for almost 50 years before they succeeded in doing both of these things, and the journals of science during these 50 years have been in reality a pageant of the attempts of men of many countries, none of whom solved the whole problem until July 16, 1945. Who were these men? A French physicist, Prof. H. Bequerel, in 1896 discovered that uranium had a new and peculiar property. Pierre and Marie Curie, in 1898, isolated the material from uranium which was responsible for this new property and called the phenomena radio activity.

In the succeeding 15 years in the universities of the world men tried to become better acquainted with the radiations of these weird elements, until in 1913 Lord Rutherford in England and a Prof. Neils Bohr in Copenhagen drew their model of the nuclear atom which to them and to other scientists throughout the world explained many of the novel effects which they had observed. The idea of the nuclear atom made it evident that the different fundamental materials or elements with which we are familiar are not as different as chemists up to that time had suspected. This thought served as a spur to Rutherford and others who in the years between 1913 and 1920 performed experiments from which they concluded that they had converted one element into another.

In so doing they had destroyed minute quantities of matter and had observed that amounts of energy was released, which verified on a Lilliputian scale the theory presented 15 years before by Einstein. Still the amount of matter destroyed and the amount of energy released were so insignificant that the scientists themselves at that time had no hope of making any practical, let alone destructive, use of them.

It was not until 1932 when a new tool was developed at Cambridge by Sir James Chadwick—who has directed British work on the atom bomb—which gave scientists the hope that they might some day develop an energy source of practical importance. This new tool was the neutron, and its properties were investigated at some length by Irene Curie, daughter of the earlier Marie Curie, in Paris and Prof. E. O. Lawrence, of the University of California. In 1934 the neutron opened the door to the practical realization of atomic energy. It will reassure those of us who have had difficulty in comprehending the meaning of this vast new power to know that it was not for five full years after Prof. Enrico Fermi, working at the University of Rome, produced the first so-called atomic fission that the scientists themselves realized what they had done.

The names connected with this realization are names which you have all seen recently in the press, Prof. Otto Hahn and Dr. Strassman, Dr. O. Frisch and Prof. Lise Mitner in Berlin, Professor Joliot in Paris, Prof. Neils Bohr, whom I have already mentioned, and Drs. Anderson, Fermi, Einstein, Szilard, and Zinn in this country. Their discovery was made shortly before the world became involved in war. Each nation then entered the race to see who would achieve atomic fission on a large scale. The results in that race you all know—we won.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. First of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman for what she has said. She knows how I feel about this matter and how deeply I appreciate her words. I would like to make one comment, if I may, then ask a question. In the first place, I would like to comment on the discussion that the gentlewoman has engaged in about the moving of American cities, installations, and the Government to other parts of the country and putting them underground. It seems to me that, to the extent we are urged to place our reliance on military preparation, it is obviously the rankest deception of the people and utterly unfair not to put that sort of thing at the very forefront of their consciousness as the minimum necessity if the women and children of America are to be defended against an atomic war.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. May I answer that by saying that we might also remind people of some of the statements that have been made by the scientists, and they are in agreement. For instance, suppose we were to move all our cities and all our people, suppose this exodus should begin, which, I repeat, would cost more than the war we have just been through, we still could not dig a hole deep enough for ourselves to guarantee against the penetration of atomic bombs. The scientists agree on this. There is no escape by the underground-housing method. Anyway, do we want to spend the rest of our lives and the rest of our children's lives digging holes?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The thing that further impresses me is that in attempting to win an atomic war, as the gentlewoman has pointed out, one must sacrifice every principle of democracy, decency, and religion in order to do it.

Now I want to ask this question, however. Is it not necessary that we face realistically this fact that if we are to build peace and if we are to end the fear and suspicion which are the worst enemies of peace, it becomes a necessary part of any agreement on the matter that all nations agree to the end of unilateral secrecy; that they agree to open their borders to inspection and surveillance of what may be happening within those borders by an international body of scientists and engineers commissioned for the purpose of maintaining peace, and that we have to recognize that as an essential sine qua non of an agreement in which the nations will have the kind of faith we have been talking about?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I agree with the gentleman, and probably a good many other things must be agreed upon in order to outlaw war, but what I am getting at here is that we must sit down together; that we not exclude one of the members of the Big Three before we start. What we have to learn now is the science of human relations. That is where we are behind. We are a thousand years behind—and unless we advance rapidly in this science we will lose the faith of the peoples of the world, and with it the last chance for peace. That is our problem.

Mr. VOORHIS of Califorina. Would not the gentlewoman agree that all nations on the face of the earth have got to be challenged by forthright leadership on the part of the United States in this problem?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Absolutely, because we dropped the first bomb and because we are the most powerful nation in the world.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to compliment the gentlewoman on her very fine and statesmanlike exposition of this very important subject. I know that she speaks from a deep earnestness and deep concern on this question because I know of the many hours of study that she has given to it and also the many conferences she has had with the leading scientists of America who made this bomb and who know its terrible impact upon humanity. I want to endorse everything that she has said and I also want to compliment her on bringing this resolution out.

The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and myself have both called for practically the same thing in speeches made 30 and 60 days ago. We did not go to the logical end of presenting a resolution. I trust that this resolution will not be ignored and that it will

be given consideration. I think the events of today as well as the events of the first hundred days of the atomic age, are showing more and more the necessity for solving this problem, and we cannot solve the problem in the timorous way we have started. We have to take the leadership that science has forced upon us. History will record as to whether we were big enough as a nation to take the responsibility which the discovery of this terrible instrument has placed upon us, and if we draw back at this time, the devastation of humanity will be the only alternative answer. I compliment the gentlewoman very much. I know that she speaks not only as an able representative of her own constituency but as a mother of two beautiful children, and with the concern in her heart for the children of America as well as for the handling of this question.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I, too, compliment the gentlewoman and concur in her views. The gentlewoman spoke of the strain throughout the world. Even in this country we have strain, for instance, in labor conferences. People become emotional. They say what they do not mean, and consequently they do not get together. On the floor of the House, Members become emotional at times, so that we do not speak in accordance with their mental discipline. Right here in our country we become emotional; we allow some pet peeves or likes and dislikes to control us, and if we are not able to overcome those emotions can we do it worldwide? What, in the gentlewoman's opinion, is the solution? Some say trust to Almighty God about getting together. Is there a solution?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I tried to suggest a solution in my paper. In the first place, we must face the facts. The facts in this circumstance lead us to only one conclusion, that if we do not learn to get along destruction faces the world.

Mr. RAMEY. If we fight each other here we lose ourselves sometimes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. We have never before been in a situation that faced the entire world with the necessity of either getting along peacefully or blowing itself up in a final atomic blast. This is a new situation, and it demands new attitudes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE TRUTH ABOUT H. R. 2788

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in the issue of the Washington Post dated November 19, 1945, was an article by Drew Pearson, in his column The Merry-Go-Round, about H. R. 2788, a bill which I introduced, which has been reported favorably by the House Committee on the Judiciary, and for the consideration of which a rule has been granted.

I realize that the reputation of Drew Pearson for truth and veracity is well known in these parts; nevertheless, in view of the fact that many Members of Congress and many small business people throughout the country are supporting H. R. 2788, I think it is only fair to take up his article line by line, point out the lies in it, indicate the truth, and suggest to anyone who doubts, the place in the United States Code to which he may turn to find the truth.

Lie No. 1, quoting Mr. Pearson's article:

House bill 2788, just reported out of the Judiciary Committee, would limit to a period of 1 year the time in which the Federal Government could prosecute various criminal acts. In other words, if a violator of the law could get away with it and remain undetected for 1 year after the transgression, the statute of limitations would have run out, and he could not be prosecuted.

So says Mr. Pearson.

Here is the truth, Mr. Speaker. This bill does not affect criminal prosecutions at all but refers only to a limited group of actions for damages and penalties under the laws of the United States for which a specific limitation is not now fixed. The time within which criminal prosecutions must be commenced is set out in title XVIII, section 582, of the code, as follows:

No person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense, not capital, except as provided in paragraph 584 of this title, unless the indictment is found, or the information is instituted, within 3 years next after such offense shall have been committed.

In other words, for the prosecution of the ordinary criminal offense there is a 3-year statute of limitations. Two exceptions exist, one in the case of a capital offense and the one set out in section 584 here referred to, which is an old statute setting up a 5-year period with respect to the violation of the laws relating to the slave traffic. H. R. 2788 in no way affects these statutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In the case of capital offenses, the statute of limitations is for longer than 5 years.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Yes, that is correct. I should have added that there is no limitation on that. But the point I am making is this—whatever the law now is with regard to the time in which criminal offenses must be prosecuted, it is not changed by H. R. 2788.

I want to go to lie No. 2, again quoting Mr. Pearson:

For instance, the proposed law provides that if anyone defrauds the Government in disposing of surplus property, he cannot be prosecuted after 1 year.

Now, the truth is that the 3-year statute of limitations applies in the case of any person who defrauds the Government in the disposal of surplus property. Not only that, when we had that bill before this House, we had an amendment which provided that the running of the 3-year statute in that particular situation would be suspended until such time as the war is declared officially over either by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress. In other words, the situation is this. If a person should today violate the surplus property law and defraud the Government, he could be punished; he could be fined; he could be imprisoned; and he could be imprisoned for 6 years after this Congress or the President declares that the war is at an end.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman means that prosecution could be instituted within 6 years.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. That is correct. If a person should today violate the surplus property law and defraud the Government, prosecution against him could be instituted 6 years after the President or the Congress declared the war was at an end.

In all those criminal cases it is only necessary to institute the criminal proceedings in the 3-year period, or in the case of surplus property within the 6-year period.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Upon the institution of a prosecution, the fact that the person was indicted on that charge would suspend the running of the statute of limitation.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. And that would be so even though the person should not be brought to trial for a number of years?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct, and H. R. 2788 has nothing whatever to do with the criminal penalties or with the time within which prosecutions must be commenced.

Now, lie No. 3—quoting Mr. Pearson:

The Judiciary Committee also proposes that if the director of a national bank violates the law and can get away with it for 1 year, he cannot be prosecuted after that.

Of course, that is not true. There are many laws putting criminal penalties on bank directors for doing certain things. They can be prosecuted if the prosecution is instituted within 3 years after the doing of the wrongful act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But, reiterating the statement of the gentleman, the bill H. R. 2788 has no connection or relation whatever to any criminal proceeding; has it?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is exactly right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. So this 3-year period or 6-year period has nothing to do with it?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. It has nothing to do with it; not a thing in the world. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Yet, Mr. Pearson makes a very definite statement that it does.

In the next sentence Drew Pearson lumps four lies in one sentence, which is a record, I think, even for Drew Pearson. The sentence is:

> The same is true of copyright infringement, violation of civil-rights statutes, fraud in registration of public lands, and violation of the Wages and Hours Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Maybe he was trying to prove the statement of the late President Roosevelt that he was a chronic liar.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Possibly. And in that connection, I think if Drew Pearson were in a court instead of in the newspapers, it would be proper to call some witnesses as to his truthfulness and veracity. We might have the statement of our late President that he was a monumental liar. We could get the statement of Cordell Hull about his lies. We might get the statements of various Members of the Senate and House who have called him all kinds of a liar, including a revolving liar, as I recall it.

Now, I must get on. I am not trying Drew Pearson. I only want to set out the truth about H. R. 2788.

I want to consider each of these four lies before referred to separately. The first one relates to laws against copyright infringement: United States Code, title 17, paragraph 28, provides a fine of not more than $1,000 and a jail sentence of not more than 1 year for willful infringement of a copyright.

That is not affected by H. R. 2788.

Lie No. 5, relating to civil right statutes: You will find that law in title 8, chapter 3, of the code, where there are contained various statutes providing fines and imprisonment for violation of certain civil rights. In that chapter the Congress has heretofore provided a 1-year statute for the prosecution of those offenses. That is another exception to the general 3-year rule. And, of course, that is not affected by H. R. 2788.

Lie No. 6, relating to fraud in the registration of public lands: That subject is treated in United States Code, title 43, section 88, which provides for the removal of registers of public lands as a punishment for certain wrongful acts; for certain acts done various criminal penalties would apply; and the 3-year period applies in most of these instances. That is the 3-year period within which criminal action must be commenced.

H. R. 2788 has no application there.

Lie No. 7, relating to the wage and hour law. Quoting Drew Pearson:

> The latter case—
>
> Referring to the wage and hour law—
>
> is particularly interesting. An employer could willfully violate the wage-hour law knowing that if he gets caught all he will have to do is pay a fine for that 1 year; yet he may have been violating the law for 3, 4, or 5 years.

Of course, there is not a word of truth in that statement. If you will turn to the Wage-Hour Act, you will find the criminal penalties are in section 16 (a) of that act, and here is what it provides:

> Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of section 15 shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both—

And so on. Every employer who violates those provisions may be prosecuted under the law as it exists today, within 3 years. He can be prosecuted just the same, if H. R. 2788 becomes the law of the land, and I hope it does.

The statement of Drew Pearson did contain one truth, believe it or not. I think it must have been an accident. He said that H. R. 2788 had been reported favorably by the House Judiciary Committee. That is correct. This bill was reported favorably, and the report has been filed. The report sets out exactly what the bill does. The bill itself is very simple. I am certain that Drew Pearson could never have read it. I am sure that the editor of the Washington Post could never have read it. If they had, I believe the slightest tinge of journalistic ethics, or the slightest sense of decency or fair play in either of those gentlemen would have kept them from publishing the article to which I am referring.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to commend the gentleman from Iowa for the enlightening discussion of H. R. 2788 which he is making. I would like to know when this bill will reach the floor of the House.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I would like to know also. I intend to put in my extension of remarks a list of the organizations of this country of small business people who appeared at the hearings and told their story of how they were being threatened with bankruptcy under existing law. It is all in the hearings. I wish you would all read the hearings.

A rule has been reported for the bill. It was reported some time ago, and it provides for 2 hours of general debate. The only reason it has not been here during the 3 weeks we have been on a sit-down strike is because, for some reason, the leadership, which can call up this bill, has not called it up. I want to say, in all fairness to everyone concerned, there are some members of the committee, there are some Members of the House, there are some people in the executive branches of the Government who, while they agree with the general philosophy of this bill, think the period of limitation should be different. Some think it should be 2 years, some suggest 3. We have an open rule, any amendment can be offered; whatever the will of the House would be in that regard would govern.

The fact is that this bill is not just offered in behalf of thousands of small business people in the country, but the taxpayers have an interest in it also. I wish you would turn to the hearings—they are not long—particularly to the testimony of Henry Simmons, associate counsel of the Federal Cartridge Corp. of Minneapolis. Here is what happened to that company: Mr. Simmons told us at the hearings that their organization was an organization built by the Federal Government, the Federal Government put all the money in it. They were making ammunition for the Government. His corporation simply operated it. At the time he was here they were faced with 350 suits by people whom they considered working in an administrative capacity, who were being paid from $200 to $600 a month, yet they claim they are entitled to time and a half for overtime. That would have meant nothing to this company, it would come out of the Government's money, the taxpayer's money. Nevertheless, the company undertook to go into court and defend; and were going to set up two defenses, first that the wages and hours law did not cover that kind of company because they were not engaged in interstate commerce but were engaged in making ammunition for the boys on the battlefields of the world; and, second, they were going to set up the defense that these plaintiffs were working in an administrative capacity, hence did not come under the act. Now, mind you, before they went to trial they were advised from the Attorney General's office and the Labor Department that they were not to set up those defenses. That is the way some of our bureaus protect the interests of the taxpayers. We were told at the hearings that at least 5,000 suits had been instituted against contractors of the War Department alone and that the extra money might amount to $2,000,000,000 unless there was some limitation of the right to bring these suits.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. The gentleman in his remarks used the phrase "If we had not been on a sit-down strike here." That phrase carries the implication that the Congress is on a sit-down strike. I do not believe the gentleman wishes such implication to be carried to the country at a time when there are so many complaints throughout the country that Congress is not in action, Congress is not working. By that statement the gentleman meant just those few Members who are holding back legislation, did he not?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The gentleman is correct. I want to get the record straight so I will point out what I think the situation is. The bill has been reported, the rule has been granted, it can be called up at any time by certain individuals. It has not been called up in spite of the fact that efforts have been made to get the bill called up.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand, this bill limits the time within which an action may be brought by people like those the gentleman has just mentioned who were really working in an administrative capacity but assumed the atti-

tude of laborers in order to get penalties and time and a half.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. All of which would come out of the pockets of the taxpayers as a general rule. Is it not true that this bill will limit actions which are in the nature of suits to recover penalties?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. And is it not a further principle of law that penalties are never favored by the law?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The gentleman states it very well.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to ask if there is any limitation now with respect to prosecutions for violation of the Wages and Hours Act?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The gentleman means criminal prosecutions?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; is there any statute of limitations?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. There is the 3-year general statute of limitations; in other words, the indictment must be returned or the information must be instituted within 3 years after the offense is committed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it the purpose of the bill as reported to make that 1 year instead of 3?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is the effect of this bill to make the statute of limitations 1 year instead of 3 years?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Oh, no, indeed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I want to get that clear.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No. This bill does not affect the statute of limitations having to do with criminal prosecutions or injunctions, nor does it affect any statute of limitations that specifically limits the time within which any suit may be brought. It only applies a limit to certain statutes for the recovery of damages or penalties where there is now no limitation.

Mr. JENNINGS. The actions to which this bill applies are all actions in the nature of civil actions?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The gentleman is correct. They are actions in the nature of a penalty, for the most part.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I wanted the gentleman to make that clear because I thought that was the intent of the bill.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct. Under the Wages and Hours Act, for example—and this has happened many times—the administrator will tell you that you are not under the act. He did that for the logging people out on the west coast in regard to certain employees. A year from now there may be a different ruling which says you are under the act; whereupon, in spite of your good faith in following the ruling of the Administrator, they can sue you for time and a half and go back to the beginning of the law. The courts have commented on the fact they must impose a penalty of double the amount involved, as well as costs and attorneys' fees. They have no alternative. You cannot even settle your liability. If you should undertake to settle it, make settlement and pay out your money to the worker, he can go in and sue you, anyway. This is to put a limit of 1 year on that sort of a rough penalty. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Is there any valid reason for considering this legislation as antilabor?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Not the slightest. Let me say in reference to that: Here is what is happening all over the country and what is going to happen in the future. In the absence of a Federal statute the States may act and they are acting. They have already enacted specific statutes putting a limit on the time within which these wage-hour suits may be filed. Here is the record: Two States have fixed a 3-year limit; three have fixed a 2-year period, five have fixed a 1-year period, and one has fixed a 6-months' period.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, there is another thing to this limitation, fixing it at 1 year within which to bring these actions. The witnesses may become scattered, the records lost, and so forth.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The business people do not know until the end of the year whether or not they are going to have to meet a lot of these suits. This would put the limitation at 1 year. It is simply a matter of protection?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One other point. I notice that Labor printed an article this week, and I am sure it wants to be reasonably correct about any of its statements. They have an article very much like Drew Pearson's statements. Perhaps they may have followed the statement of Drew Pearson. When the gentleman extends his remarks, will he comment on the article appearing in Labor? They may want to know this.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The reference the gentleman made to several States having enacted statutes of limitation would not cure the matter because some Federal courts may obtain jurisdiction where the State statute of limitation might apply?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No. The Federal courts apply the State statutes where there is no Federal statute.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But there are only a few States that have enacted such statutes of limitation?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. We have 6 out of 11 which have fixed 1 year or less. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, I am not quarreling with anyone who thinks the statute of limitations should be a little longer. That is a question for the House to determine. The point I raise is that this bill should be brought in here and considered, and there should be some limit fixed for the protection of small employers and for the protection of the taxpayers.

Now my attention has been called to an article appearing in the November 24, 1945, issue of Labor. That article also contains false statements. The writer of it must have relied upon Drew Pearson's statement rather than upon the bill, the committee report, or the hearings.

The simple answer to the article is that H. R. 2788 does not affect any suits for criminal prosecution, or any suits for injunction against law violators. It has reference only to suits for damages or penalties.

An examination of the testimony of Mr. Walling, administrator of the Wages and Hours Act, will show that he, too, thinks some statute of limitation should be adopted by the Congress. He laments the fact that States are already adopting statutes of limitation fixing varying times.

Mr. Walling recommended a 3-year Federal statute. He did not deny that a previous administrator had recommended a 2-year statute. Hearings, pages 157 and 158.

In fact, Mr. Walling made a very fair and constructive statement. The editors of Labor, and everyone else really interested in protecting both employees and employers can read his statement with a great deal of profit.

The Judiciary Committee has held extensive hearings on H. R. 2788. Appearing at the hearings in support of the bill were the following organizations:

First. The National Association of Motor Bus Operators.

Second. The National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Third. The Travel Time Executive Committee, of Portland, Oreg.

Fourth. The American Trucking Association.

Fifth. The American Mining Congress.

Sixth. The American Short Line Railroad Association.

Seventh. The Association of American Railroads.

Eighth. The Federal Cartridge Corporation.

Ninth. Grain and Feed Dealers' National Association.

Tenth. The American Farm Bureau Federation.

Eleventh. The National Association of Manufacturers.

Twelfth. The National Association of Building Owners and Managers.

Thirteenth. The National Sand and Gravel Association and the National Ready-Mixed Concrete Association.

Fourteenth. The National Coal Association.

Fifteenth. The Baltimore Association of Commerce.

Sixteenth. The National Association of Ice Industries.

Seventeenth. The American Institute of Laundering.

Eighteenth. The National Automobile Dealers Association.

Nineteenth. The United States Independent Telephone Association.

Twentieth. The Associated General Contractors of America.

Twenty-first. Linen Supply Association of America, National Industrial Launderers and Cleaners Association.

Twenty-second. The American Retail Coal Association.

In addition to the above-named well-known associations, many individuals have expressed their support for this proposed legislation.

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain excerpts from the RECORD and from the press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Mr. Anthony Eden in the British House of Commons lent his voice to the clamor for the abandonment of American sovereignty. I thought it was about time somebody in the House or the Senate of the United States inform Mr. Eden that such a thing will not occur.

This is not the first time such a program has been brought to my attention. Last week I quoted from a speech by one Dr. M. J. Adler of the University of Chicago, made in Cleveland, Ohio, in which he said, "We must do everything we can to abolish the United States."

In my opinion that is treason in this country, but unfortunately you have a certain element of wild-eyed internationalists who think more of foreign countries than they do of the United States, or think more of some supergovernment they would like to set up, than they do the United States, parading over this country, preaching that poisonous doctrine.

Quoting this Dr. Adler further—and parenthetically, you would think from hearing the speech that he was born in a foreign country. But Jewish Who's Who says he was born in New York. That is the only information we have on it. Furthermore, he says, "The only answer to the threat of atomic war is world government, complete relinquishment of the United States and all other national sovereignties." In other words, what they want is a world government to which the United States will be subordinate.

Now, when it comes to Great Britain and any other country in the world except our own, I am pro-British, but I want to say now that so far as I am concerned the United States will never become a province of the British Empire; the United States will never become a subsidiary of the Soviet Union; and the United States will never become an outlying territory of some super world government. I am willing, as I have always been, for my country to aid in maintaining peace among the nations of the earth, but I am not willing to surrender the sovereignty of my own country and set up some super government to be run by a gang of long-nosed internationalists to intervene in the affairs of every country in the world. I am opposed to such a policy of intervention.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to warn the gentleman of what may happen now if he keeps on talking along that line.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I do not care to yield further. I want to discuss this matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to tell you what happened to me in 1942 when I tried that. On January 27 and January 30, 1942, I objected to the same sort of procedure which they are now trying. That is, to the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes to the surrendering of our independence; to making us a part—but only a part—of "union now" of a super United States of the World to a "United Nations" organization, and they haled me down before the grand jury. Are you prepared to go down there? Those two speeches—you can find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of January 27 and 30, 1942—make the same protest the gentleman just made, and remember what happened to me.

Mr. RANKIN. That was during the war. The war is over now, and we won the war.

I am getting tired of hearing people trying to tell the American people that somebody else won the war for us. If it had not been for the United States, its manpower, its patriotism, and its great productive capacity, there might have been a different story throughout the world today. But what I am complaining of is these attempts to subordinate our country to a superworld government or to destroy American sovereignty, now or at any other time.

Mr. Eden says, "Every succeeding scientific discovery makes greater nonsense of old-time conceptions of sovereignty." In other words, Thomas Jefferson's and George Washington's ideas of sovereignty are nonsense, in his opinion. With all deference to Great Britain, as between Mr. Eden and Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, I much prefer Washington and Jefferson.

He says:

> It is yet true that national sentiment is still as strong as ever—

I hope to God he is correct about that—

> and here and there it is strengthened by this further complication of differing forms of government and different conceptions of what words like "freedom" and "democracy" mean.

Every time you undertake to defend the American Republic, some fellow who apparently never read the Constitution rises and cries out "Isolationist." When I came to Congress what we knew as an isolationist was a tariff advocate. Measured by that standard, I am as far from being an isolationist as any man in the House. I never voted for a tariff bill in my life.

I discussed this question with Cordell Hull. I do not believe Mr. Hull would ever agree to this proposition of surrendering American sovereignty, now or hereafter.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Does the gentleman consider that the United Nations Organization would be strong enough to come in the class of a world government?

Mr. RANKIN. I hope not.

Mr. SAVAGE. My only objection to it is that it is not quite strong enough. It could do a better job of maintaining peace if it were stronger.

Mr. RANKIN. You gentlemen who want to see some other government take over the United States certainly do not appeal to me, and I have never heard one of you make a logical argument in favor of it.

Mr. SAVAGE. I do not want it to take over, but I think it is like when we had so much trouble between the States as a federation. We ironed out our problems and became a strong nation only when we wrote a constitution and made a government out of it, and it did not take away the States' rights.

Mr. RANKIN. So you want to do that and set up a world government to take away the powers of the United States and put us on a parity with Siam and Iran and Iraq, and all the other nations of the earth. That does not appeal to me at all. If the gentleman wants to take that attitude, he may do it.

Mr. SAVAGE. No, I do not want to give up any sovereignty.

Mr. RANKIN. There is absolutely no similarity with the case the gentleman mentioned, unless you are going to set up a supergovernment with powers to dictate to the United States of America. As far as I am concerned, that will never happen.

Mr. SAVAGE. I only want them to dictate on matters of war.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, "yeah."

Mr. SAVAGE. Such a government can outlaw war.

Mr. RANKIN. I will get to that in a minute.

I believe with Thomas Jefferson, the greatest political philosopher of all times. After a long and eventful career Jefferson was elected President, I believe, at the age of 57. On the front steps of the Capitol he laid down his international policy, as "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

We can do our duty as far as the nations of the earth are concerned in maintaining peace without those entangling alliances that would destroy American sovereignty and subordinate us to the will of representatives of foreign powers.

I will tell you what they told me about the San Francisco Conference. They said that everyone they saw there from a foreign country had one thing uppermost in his mind, and that was what his country was going to get out of the United States.

It is not up to us to finance and fight all the wars that can be cooked up hereafter. Now I am in sympathy with the British people. I realize they are in a hard situation. Great Britain is having difficulty with her territories. She is even having difficulty now with one of Holland's territories—Java. I realize that Great Britain's population is old and on the decline, that is, the population of the British Isles. She cannot feed one-half of her population out of her own soil. I realize they have no oil, no gas, and no water power, and very little coal—and what they have is deep and of a very low grade. I realize they are going to have to go out and bring in over long transmission lines food and raw materials, as well as the fuel to manufacture goods, and then process them under the most adverse circumstances and take them back over those long transmission lines and sell them in competition with people who have all those things at home. I realize it is a sad picture, but that does not justify me in underwriting a program of destroying the sovereignty of my country. Today, America is the leading nation of the earth. Almighty God, in His infinite wisdom, has placed us on that pinnacle and placed in our hands the weapons by which we can maintain the peace of mankind.

Now, let us get back to the League of Nations. I was elected in 1921. I supported Governor Cox on a platform endorsing the League of Nations with article 10. We went to the American people and when the election came off it took the Mississippi State line to stop the Republican landslide. They carried every State north of Mississippi except Kentucky, and we came very near losing it. The day I took my seat in Congress, the Republicans had 169 majority in the House and 23 majority in the Senate. Now, these matters ultimately must be left to the American people. I want to let them know facts. And if our party does not let them know the facts now, we may suffer the same results we did in 1920.

If we do not let them know now that we are not going to set up a supergovernment to wipe out American sovereignty and make it subordinate to a world organization, we may suffer the same fate we did then. We can help maintain the peace of the world, if other nations want it done. They have told us, and I am tired of hearing it said, that we were the cause of this war because we did not get into the League of Nations. We did not interfere with the League of Nations in the least. They set it up and carried it on for years and took in almost every country except the United States. The League of Nations blew up from the inside. It was the old story of the Tower of Babel collapsing amidst a confusion of tongues.

We had another example of it the other day when these foreign ministers met in London. They also suffered a confusion of tongues.

The League of Nations had a right to stop Japan from going into Manchuria. The United States offered to join and help to stop her. We could not get any support from the League. What were they there for? Oh, yes; they were all scrambling for each individual nation's own particular benefit.

The League of Nations could have stopped Mussolini from going into Ethiopia. It did not do it. The American people and the American Government would have joined in that protest, but all they did was to tap Mussolini on the knuckles, and he went on down and raided and plundered the helpless people of Ethiopia. Let me give you another illustration.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. I was going to say that while I had an opportunity of agreeing with the gentleman that I do agree with him that the League of Nations was not much good because it was not strong enough to do the job.

Mr. RANKIN. It was just as strong as the nations inside of it wanted it to be.

Let me show you how strong it was. You just do not know how strong it was. I have been told that John D. Rockefeller gave the League money to construct the building to hold their sessions in. That is the old way of saturating their international minds with Standard Oil. A few years later a controversy arose between the Standard Oil Co. and the Republic of Paraguay. I want the gentleman from Washington to listen to this. If he had been here 20 years ago, he would have heard a great deal about Tacna-Arica.

Tacna-Arica was on the front page of every paper. What was Tacna-Arica? A couple of small areas about the size of an average county in northern Chile, on the west coast of South America. The oil interests wanted Bolivia to get hold of Tacna-Arica so they could run their pipe lines out to the Pacific Ocean.

Chile would not agree to it. We even sent General Pershing down there. That was back in those good old days when TOM CONNALLY called Secretary of State Hughes "the Secretary of Oil." When you want to see international business pick up, you strike oil. Six hundred years ago Marco Polo told about seeing oil springs in the Mosul area. There was nothing done until 1921 or 1922, when they struck oil down there, and immediately the State Department got interested. TOM CONNALLY branded the Secretary of State "the Secretary of Oil." He said it took an oil well to get the State Department interested in the Luson Conference.

So they sent General Pershing down there to try to iron out the Tacna-Arica trouble and to get this right-of-way, this corridor, if you please, out to the Pacific Ocean. But those countries on the west coast of South America would not yield unless the oil companies would go in the natural way and pay taxes as they went. General Pershing came home in disgust. Later on they conceived another bright idea, and there is where Mr. Rockefeller's contribution to the League of Nations bore fruit. They decided to drive down toward the Atlantic Ocean through the Grand Chaco, which belonged to Paraguay. So they just got an army together and started down through the Grand Chaco. That is the territory, as I said, that belongs to Paraguay. In 1868, after a long controversy, they called on Rutherford B. Hayes to act as arbitrator, and, among other things, in settling these disputes over territorial lines, he held that the Grand Chaco belonged to Paraguay. Every government affected signed the agreement, and everybody understood, on down until a few years ago, that the Grand Chaco belonged to Paraguay. But they got this Bolivian Army together and started down through the Grand Chaco. It was a pipe-line war, if you please. Paraguay had developed a general, a little fellow named Estogaribbia, who was educated in a French military school, the ablest military leader that South America has produced since Bolivar. He got his army together and drove them out of Paraguay. When this proposition was exposed on the floor of the Senate, very much as I am reciting it to you now, the heads of the governments of South America got together and stopped that war.

But what did the League of Nations do? The League of Nations branded Paraguay as the aggressor. When they did that they lost the confidence of the rest of the world. From that time on the League of Nations gradually went to pieces.

Now, that is what happened during the time that the League of Nations was in session. Do not forget that China was a member of the League of Nations also at the time Japan invaded Manchuria.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Ethiopia was a member of the League of Nations, too.

Mr. RANKIN. Ethiopia was a member of the League of Nations.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And when Poland and these other countries got into the war they were all members of the League of Nations.

Mr. RANKIN. They were all members of the League of Nations.

Now, our country is not after any territory. We are after maintaining our own peace and helping to keep the peace of the world, but you cannot do it by abandoning the sovereignty of the United States to any world government or becoming a part of any other supergovernment with the power to dictate what shall be done inside the United States.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. Italy also was a member of the League of Nations.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SAVAGE. All she had to do was to say, "I quit; I am going to declare war," and they could not stop her.

Mr. RANKIN. They did not try.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. SABATH. In view of the statement of the gentleman as to the power and influence of Standard Oil, let me remind him that there were also other interests behind the move to weaken the League of Nations. Is it not a fact that because of that Great Britain permitted

Germany to rearm and also permitted Japan to rearm?

Had we been members of the League of Nations we would have strengthened the position of France and the other countries, and I believe neither Germany nor Japan would have been permitted to rearm.

Mr. RANKIN. We offered to help them stop Japan, and they did not even join us. The war started when Japan invaded Manchuria. We offered to help stop them. Henry L. Stimson was Secretary of War at that time. He urged England to help stop them. The American people wanted to stop them. But, now, do not forget that certain American and British influences had built up Japan. That is where she got her strength. Now she must be obliterated from among the civilized nations of the earth.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman states that Japan was armed or rearmed. Japan had never been disarmed until now. She has always been armed.

Mr. RANKIN. Japan was allegedly fighting on our side in the last war. She never had been disarmed; and until the Disarmament Conference in Washington of 1921 that I described here the other day, Great Britain had a secret alliance with Japan.

No; Japan had been built up as a buffer against us and against Russia in the years gone by, and some alleged Americans have helped to do it. They sold them scrap iron and oil at that time when they knew they were using it to murder the Chinese in Manchuria.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has referred to the fact that Britain refused to join us in 1931 to stop Japan from going into Manchuria. Is it not also a fact that Britain refused to join France in stopping Mussolini from going into Ethiopia?

Mr. RANKIN. I think so.

Mr. KNUTSON. It follows therefore that Great Britain is primarily responsible for the last war.

Mr. RANKIN. I would not say that; they were all members of the League of Nations.

Mr. KNUTSON. They were the opening engagements of the war.

Mr. RANKIN. I see here that the British farmers are told to cooperate or risk seizure. This socialist government they have over there is getting ready to take over the British farmer who does not do exactly what he is told to do.

Do you want that in the State of Washington? Do you want that in Texas? Do you want that in Nebraska? Do you want that in Minnesota or Ohio? We do not in Mississippi. Is that the kind of stuff we are going to underwrite? Is that the kind of government we are going to have when we set up this supergovernment and abandon all sovereignty?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Eden said "there is a difference of concept as to the meaning of the words 'freedom' and 'democracy.'"

I should say there is. Now we come down to the atomic bomb.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he proceeds to another subject?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. In the present Soviet-dominated government of Poland we read where the Polish farmers are compelled to sell at least one-fifth of the total produced on their land for practically nothing in order to take care of people in the cities.

Mr. RANKIN. There is no freedom, there is no liberty in any place that is dominated by Communism. Remember that. And I can tell you right now this national socialist government they are setting up in Great Britain is coming pretty close to communism.

That is what the American people do not want. Now, then, they talk about the atomic bomb. There was a good deal said here today about secrecy. They do not want us to have any secrets about this thing. You are not going to do business successfully with any country that keeps out all the press agents of your country and keeps everything secret from the rest of the world and demands all our secrets for themselves. If you want to get rid of some secrets, let us pull back the curtain and let the world know what is going on in every nook and corner of the earth.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Down in my country when people trade they always get a quid pro quo. They swap and they get something. What are they proposing that we get for this secret?

Mr. RANKIN. I see that Mr. Bevin comes out and demands to know what the United States is after. Of all people to ask that question. I thought it was made very plain long ago that we were not out for territorial aggrandizement.

They talk about giving away the secrets of the atomic bomb. In my opinion, if we stay just where we are we will maintain the peace of the world better than if we turn over all the secrets and all the machinery to people who now maintain a strict secrecy about their operations all over the world.

You know, wars as a rule have been stirred up by special interests. But they are going to be very careful from now on, because they occupy the enormous buildings in the big cities. In the next war the first bomb will drop on them; so they are not going to be so desirous of having a war started for us country people to fight and pay for.

Perhaps the greatest Indian who ever lived was Push-ma-ta-ha. He was buried with military honors down here in the old Congressional Cemetery under a purple beech tree at the end of North Capitol Street more than a hundred years ago. He was a brigadier general in Jackson's army at the battle of New Orleans.

In the old days there was an Indian and a white man that got into some trouble and the Indian killed the white man. They met for a trial. Push-ma-ta-ha was there. He was chief of his tribe. They began wrangling. Some of them did not want any trial; they wanted to kill the Indian. They kept on talking so persistently that directly old Push-ma-ta-ha got up and he said: "We came to court. We propose to abide by your court. You say you want war. If so, we are ready. I am just back from New Orleans where I fought with General Jackson. My men are here. We are prepared. If you want war, we will have war; but if you want court, we will have court."

They had court.

As long as we have this atomic bomb we can demand peace and get it. It would take England 5 years with all her ingenuity to manufacture the machinery with which to make the machinery to make these bombs. It would cost billions of dollars before she was through with it. It would take Russia longer.

We are not threatening the world by holding the secret or the know-how of making these bombs, as President Truman said. We are not threatening the world, but we do hold in our hands the power to say to them: "If you want war, we will have war; but if you want peace, we will have peace."

The American people want peace. That is what we are driving at, and we are now in a position to demand it.

In my opinion, if we continue the policy laid down by President Truman in this statement, it will do more toward ending wars than anything else that has ever occurred. Press back the curtain, turn the sunlight on the actions of every country in the world. Let us maintain the secret or the know-how and let the world know that we are going to hold this power, but that we are not going to use it to destroy other nations. In my opinion, that would do more toward bringing about permanent peace in the world than peddling these secrets out to every country that is now threatening war on their neighbors.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. How can we expect all of the nations in the world to have confidence that we will use our power in the right way? Would they not have more confidence in a world organization, where they would be represented, that would have the power to use the atomic bomb for peace?

Mr. RANKIN. Simply because they have confidence in us now. They had confidence in us 15 years ago, more than they had in the League of Nations, when they were all members, because they know we were not out to try to plunder the weaker people of the earth. What

we are after is to maintain peace and get our boys back home, and get our people on a solid economic foundation and lead the world, not as an entity of a supergovernment, but as these great United States of America—the most powerful and richest country the world has ever seen—lead them into the light of a new civilization.

Mr. SAVAGE. Would not all the countries have more confidence in an organization that each one had representation in?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not arguing against the set-up, but I am arguing against making it a superstate with power over the people of the United States of America.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Getting back to the matter whether England is socialist or not, I am wondering whether the gentleman from Mississippi kept track of the activities of our own Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not care to go into that. I rose to discuss this question today because I think Mr. Eden is making a sad mistake, and I think if he continues advocating such policy as that which is now advocated by a few irresponsibles in this country of wiping out American sovereignty, I think it will have a tendency to strain the relations between the two great English-speaking nations of the earth that are not strained today.

As I said in the beginning, I am not only friendly to the British, but I am prejudiced in their favor whenever it comes to any question between them and any other nation in the world except the United States; but I am not prejudiced enough to fall for that kind of stuff, to wipe out the sovereignty of my own country and have it become subordinated to or a province of or a subsidiary of some supergovernment over which the American people would have little or no control.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a radio broadcast to be delivered on Sunday, and in the other several resolutions adopted by the Propeller Club of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the other day I secured permission to insert in the RECORD a petition from citizens of the State of Rhode Island. At the time of making the request I stated that it would not exceed the cost. I was granted permission while the Speaker pro tempore was in the chair. I am informed by the Public Printer that this insertion will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $179, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances, and include excerpts from newspaper articles in each.

REFUSAL OF GENERAL MOTORS CORP. TO BARGAIN IN GOOD FAITH WITH UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, the refusal of General Motors Corp. to bargain in good faith with the United Automobile Workers on its wage demands constitutes one of the most flagrant examples in American industrial history of the arrogant contempt of great corporations for Government policy, for their workers, and for public opinion.

I will introduce into the RECORD the detailed history of that refusal on the part of General Motors on Monday, as I have not quite completed it at this time.

General Motors refused to agree to the union's proposal that the negotiations be held in public—open to the press and radio.

General Motors refused to negotiate with the union even behind closed doors on any matter relating to its ability to pay the wages the union demands.

General Motors refused to accept conciliation by Government representatives.

Finally, on last Tuesday, General Motors refused to tell the union whether it would or whether it would not accept the union's proposal to submit the dispute to arbitration on the basis of the facts.

General Motors has said from the start that the only result of the union's wage demand was a strike. It long ago advised its workers in factories and offices to prepare for a strike. It wrote every one of its thousands of employees in person. It sent these letters at the same time that its representatives in negotiation with the union were refusing to discuss the issues of the union's demand.

The Washington Post states editorially this morning—I quote:

It is not easy to understand the failure of General Motors to agree with the Reuther suggestion (of arbitration) even if the corporation does not approve of all the arbitration terms he outlined. It could have accepted at once the principle of arbitration and signified a readiness to discuss and define the terms under which the proceedings should be conducted.

Of the union's proposal for a final and binding decision to be made by the arbitrators is praised by the Post:

This is a hard and fast commitment to renounce the strike weapon in favor of a just, peaceful, and orderly procedure. It takes cognizance of the public interest. It calls for a settlement by facts instead of by force. It sets a statesmanly example for unions and employers everywhere.

Refusal of General Motors to negotiate, to accept conciliation, or to accept arbitration, becomes even more inexcusable and contemptuous of the public interest when looked at in the light of the union's demand. From the outset the union has stated that it wants a 30-percent increase in wages without any increase in prices, and it has put the proposition squarely to General Motors time and time again that if the corporation can show that it cannot pay a 30-percent wage increase without raising its prices, then the union will scale down its wage demand to what the corporation can pay without raising prices.

The corporation refuses even to discuss that proposition. It refuses to offer an increase of even 1 percent in wages with a pledge not to use that wage increase in seeking higher price ceilings from OPA.

General Motors has shown from the outset of this case that it is interested in talking higher wages only if those wages can be used to raise its prices. General Motors is hell-bent for inflation. That is why it will not negotiate, will not conciliate, will not arbitrate the statesmanly demand of the United Auto Workers that wages be raised and that the price line be strictly held.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. In view of those facts, certain forces are trying to bring to the public certain untrue statements in regard to the unions at this time, thus bringing about an emotional situation in the country that is very unfair.

Mr. HOOK. I thank the gentleman for his very timely and very fair statement.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Washington Post to which I have referred is as follows:

ARBITRATION OFFER

Collective bargaining has failed to end the impasse between the General Motors Corp. and the United Automobile Workers Union. We do not think that in this situation collective bargaining has failed the conflicting parties so much as the conflicting parties have failed collective bargaining. There was, on the one hand, a flat worker demand for an increase of 30 percent in the basic rate of pay; and, on the other hand, there was an equally flat refusal to grant the demand, garnished with one or two proposals patently unacceptable to the union. This is rhetoric, not bargaining.

There remained, then, but two solutions for the dispute. One of these was arbitration; the other a strike. Now that the strike has begun, the desirability of arbitration looms even larger than it did before. We should think it would seem preferable to the employers and the employees as well as to the public. Continuation of the strike in the automobile industry will seriously retard the whole reconversion process and may well lead to a prolonged embitterment of labor-management relations. For this reason we applaud the proposal submitted by Walter Reuther on behalf of the automobile workers to settle the dispute by arbitration.

As we have observed in connection with the local transit strike, unwillingness to arbitrate by either party to a dispute suggests a lack of faith in the validity of its position. It is not easy to understand the failure of General Motors to agree with the Reuther suggestion—even if the corporation does not approve of all the arbitration terms he outlined. It could have accepted at once the principle of arbitration and signified a readiness to discuss and define the terms under which the proceedings should be conducted.

We hope that it will still do this. The union, however, was extremely peremptory in hitching a 24-hour deadline to its arbitration offer—some of the terms of which are debatable, to say the least.

The most novel features of the union's arbitration proposal are, first, that the arbitration board's decisions "shall not be used as a basis for a price increase for any General Motors product so long as these decisions shall remain in effect," and, second, that if the board "concludes that the General Motors Corp. has the ability to pay a 30-percent increase in scheduled hourly wage rates and still yield profits, after taxes, in excess of such profits in its best profit year during the past 10, the board shall be empowered to make advisory recommendations concerning price reductions on the products of the General Motors Corp."

The first of these provisions has the virtue of sharpening and limiting the arbitration board's problem. It says, in effect, that the benefits of a wage increase should not be vitiated by a price increase or conditioned upon the expectation of one—which the President has, in any case, banned for the next 6 months. But the President has also said that at the end of 6 months requests for a lifting of price ceilings should be considered by OPA on the basis of experience. We can see no reason why General Motors should be denied this opportunity for relief if experience proves that it is justified; nor do we see any sense in denying the corporation the right to raise its own prices if it wishes to do so, once official price control has been abandoned.

The union's second stipulation must have been inscribed with Mr. Reuther's tongue in his cheek. It is possible, of course, if General Motors achieves a very high level of production that it will make tremendous profits next year, even with a big boost in its wage rate. And economies effected through volume and efficiency should, no doubt, be passed on, in part at least, to consumers. But it is scarcely the function of an arbitration board, under our system of enterprise, to determine this. Price policy is a basic function of management. We do not know, anyway, what possible legal force there could be in the "advisory recommendations" of the arbitration board.

However, the most important provision of the union proposal is that "all decisions and recommendations of the board shall be * * * final and binding upon the parties." This is a hard and fast commitment to renounce the strike weapon in favor of a just, peaceful, and orderly procedure. It takes cognizance of the public interest. It calls for a settlement by facts instead of by force. It sets a statesmanly example for unions and employers everywhere.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, November 26, 1945. Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 2764, freight forwarders' legislation.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, November 28, 1945, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

836. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend Public, No. 779, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, approved December 1, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

837. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a clarifying letter in the amount of $52,932.74, which amount was omitted from the letter of August 11, 1945, from the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4780. A bill to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Salvador Lorenz Fernandez; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4779. A bill to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4780. A bill to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana (by request):

H. R. 4781. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4782. A bill to authorize donations of surplus office equipment of the Office of Price Administration to local governments as reimbursement for services furnished by such governments to such administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 4783. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 4784. A bill relating to sales of surplus property to veterans under the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4785. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the establishment of a geophysical institute at the University of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. Res. 404. Resolution on the use of atomic energy in the interest of international cooperation and the public welfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 405. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1438, to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States naval service a career, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Puerto Rico with reference to their endorsement of President Truman's message determining their political status; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1340. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 45 members of the American Legion Auxiliary, Unit No. 641, of Baden, Pa., protesting strongly the passage of S. 1203 and H. R. 3522; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1341. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, endorsing the general housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1342. By Mr. WEISS: Petitions to discharge fathers in the service signed by approximately 150 constituents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1343. By the SPEAKER: Petition of California Toll Bridge Authority, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging clarification and restriction of toll-free privileges for Government traffic using the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1344. Also, petition of the American Slav Council of Milwaukee County, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of the Hook and Patterson resolutions for the abolishment of the un-American Rankin committee; to the Committee on Rules.

1345. Also, petition of National Association of State Universities, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement for the Congress of the United States to establish a special joint committee of the House and Senate expressly commissioned to formulate sound principles of Federal-State relationships in the area of educational administration; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as noontide marks the hurrying day and our words are hushed to silence, we would bathe our hearts and minds in the glorious thought that amidst all life's changing scenes we are with Thee.

Purge us of low desire; lift us to high resolve. So speak to us that we may hear Thee and, hearing, go forth with obedient hearts to this anguished generation as living echoes of Thy voice. In this great hour of human destiny, deepen in us the sense of surpassing opportunity and of glorious mission to do our full part in averting a global catastrophe as our willful world is given this one last chance. May it be in Thy providence that our America, desiring nothing but peace for herself and for all the world, may come to the kingdom for such a time as this. In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 23, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SHACKELFORD MILLER, JR., OF KENTUCKY, TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, SIXTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, notice is hereby given that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, December 3, 1945, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room in the Capitol Building, upon the nomination of Shackelford Miller, Jr., of Kentucky to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, vice Hon. Elwood Hamilton, deceased. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

ETHNOLOGICAL RESEARCHES ON AMERICAN INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians," approved April 10, 1928, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Library.

TRANSPORTATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

A letter from the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public, No. 779, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, approved December 1, 1942, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Los Angeles district, California Federation of Women's Clubs, in council assembled at Long Beach, Calif., favoring an appropriation of $550,000,000 for allocation to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation to alleviate the housing situation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Arthur Coffman, of Norman, Ark., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the application of certain unpaid social-security and unemployment-compensation allowances to the reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter from Mrs. C. Masonhime, of Hanover, Pa., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3922) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health and welfare of mothers and children and for services to crippled children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Louise Minton, of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for sharing the secrets of the atomic bomb with other nations; to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

TIRES FOR FARMERS AND ESSENTIAL USERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. YOUNG] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD a letter from Emil Kyetlien, secretary of the Barton Farmers' Union Local, Pierce County, N. Dak., relating to the shipment of tires to European countries.

There being no objection, the letter was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUNBRIDGE, N. DAK., *November 24, 1945.*

Senators LANGER and YOUNG,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: We, the 72 members of Barton Farmers' Union Local, Pierce County, ask that you investigate and take steps immediately to reverse the flow of tires from European countries to our own farmers and essential users.

Yours truly,

EMIL KYETLIEN,
Secretary, Barton Farmers' Union Local.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3167. A bill to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 797);

H. R. 4100. A bill to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut; without amendment (Rept. No. 799); and

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 800).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; with an amendment (Rept. No. 798).

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 194), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by the Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to February 26, 1945, as extended by Senate Resolution 112, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to May 8, 1945 (relating to an investigation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I ask unanimous consent to submit for printing in the RECORD a report relating to civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government by departments and agencies for the months of September and October 1945 showing the increases and decreases in the number of paid employees.

There being no objection, the report was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for the months of September and October, showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Departments and agencies	1945		Increase (+) or decrease (−)
	September	October	
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Bureau of the Budget	733	743	+10
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS			
Agriculture Department	91,136	89,019	−2,117
Commerce Department	35,089	[1] 36,227	+1,138
Interior Department	44,524	44,085	−439
Justice Department	26,243	25,709	−534
Labor Department	36,629	35,360	−1,269
Navy Department	649,425	604,898	−44,527
Post Office Department	441,257	443,942	+2,685
State Department	15,352	[2] 21,078	+5,726
Treasury Department	93,636	94,556	+920
War Department [3]	975,317	909,771	−65,546
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES			
Committee on Fair Employment Practices	60	53	−7
Foreign Economic Administration	6,131		−6,131
Office of Alien Property Custodian	651	613	−38
Office of Censorship	295	134	−161
Office of Defense Transportation	1,419	663	−756
Office of Inter-American Affairs	660	615	−45
Office of Price Administration	45,492	42,301	−3,191
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,157	1,084	−73
Office of Strategic Services	2,008	1,066	−942
Office of War Information	230	23	−207
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	583	581	−2
Petroleum Administration for War	839	529	−310
Selective Service System	17,662	17,390	−272
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,656	1,588	−68
War Production Board	8,625	5,367	−3,258
War Shipping Administration	5,361	5,191	−170
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	371	380	+9
Civil Service Commission	6,734	6,006	−728
Employees' Compensation Commission	520	526	+6
Export-Import Bank of Washington	67	70	+3
Federal Communications Commission	1,519	1,522	+3
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	916	1,174	+258
Federal Power Commission	674	665	−9
Federal Security Agency	30,701	31,975	+1,274
Federal Trade Commission	441	449	+8
Federal Works Agency	20,628	20,474	−154
General Accounting Office	13,783	13,786	+3
Government Printing Office	6,914	6,995	+81
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,999	2,021	+22
Maritime Commission	9,608	9,149	−459
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,613	6,168	−445
National Archives	330	336	+6
National Capital Housing Authority	218	235	+17
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	
National Gallery of Art	271	271	
National Housing Agency	14,986	14,488	−498
National Labor Relations Board	733	792	+59
National Mediation Board	94	97	+3
Panama Canal	32,243	32,029	−214
Railroad Retirement Board	1,771	1,797	+26
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	14,124	15,878	+1,754
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,159	1,149	−10
Smithsonian Institution	418	420	+2
Tariff Commission	290	285	−5
Tax Court of the United States	117	119	+2
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,685	12,026	−659
Veterans' Administration	74,093	79,995	+5,902
Total [4]	2,757,298	2,643,881	−133,244 +19,917
Net decrease			−113,327
War Department [5]	733,792	733,792	
Grand total	3,491,090	3,377,673	

[1] Includes transfers from Foreign Economic Administration.

[2] Includes transfers from Office of War Information, Office of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Strategic Services, and Foreign Economic Administration.

[3] Does not include employees stationed outside continental United States.

[4] Includes employees stationed outside the continental United States as reported by various departments and agencies, except the War Department. Total for September, 114,852; and October, 113,063.

[5] Employees stationed outside the continental United States, reported quarterly as of June 30, 1945.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1621. A bill for the relief of Northeast Airlines, Inc.; and

S. 1622. A bill for the relief of Gordon Cole Hart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1623. A bill to provide for the release of certain persons from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1624. A bill to grant to enlisted members of the armed forces certain privileges with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 1625. A bill with respect to national service life insurance in the case of the late Robert P. Marshall; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1626. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who incur disabilities while serving as members of the American Field Service; to the Committee on Finance.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to Senate bill 1580, to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, and ask unanimous consent that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter into such agreement or agreements, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, providing for the numbers and.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

APPROPRIATION FOR UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Provided further, That, except in the case of commodities in the possession of an agency of the Government upon the date of enactment of this act, no part of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to any agency of the United States Government for the purchase or acquisition of any agricultural commodity, or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, at any price which is not sufficient to reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity the full parity price or comparable price therefor (as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture and adjusted by him as provided in sec. 3 (1) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended): *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the purchase of any agricultural commodity, or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, produced outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions if such commodity is available in the United States or its Territories or possessions at prices not in excess of those required to reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity the parity price or comparable price therefor (determined, published, and adjusted as above prescribed): *Provided further*, That in the case of any question concerning the prices which meet the requirements of the two foregoing provisos, the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture shall be final.

EXPEDITION IN AMELIORATING THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for about 5 minutes.

The housing shortage in America is a national disgrace. If not corrected soon, it will make for countless tragedies. It is the No. 1 example of bureaucratic ineptitude and lack of planning, with 12 Federal agencies stumbling over their own feet. It is an example, too, of the danger of Federal paternalism with State and local governments shirking their

housing responsibilities although their treasuries are fat with surpluses.

The President should immediately appoint an emergency-housing expediter with powers to coordinate and stimulate Federal, State, and local activities to cope with the housing crisis. Failure to appoint such an expediter will cause incalculable harm to the physical well-being and morale of our people, particularly our returning servicemen.

Our veterans who bled for us in fox holes are being forced to live in rat holes—in garages, in coal sheds, in automobiles with their families. They are not going to stand for this treatment from a Government which has promised them everything which is their due. These boys were taken into the Federal service, so much of the responsibility is with the Federal Government to see to it that the veterans get a square deal in relation to housing. But the States and the cities cannot "pass the buck." They also have a responsibility.

The Lanham Act was recently amended to authorize the NHA to provide housing facilities for distressed families of veterans and servicemen. However, no funds have been made available as yet to carry out the intent of this legislation.

Under the present prospects, only 400,000 units will be built next year, although there is an immediate demand for between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 new homes.

The emergency housing expediter, as I see it, would do the following:

(a) Consult with private and public housing authorities on the steps necessary to provide maximum incentive to private builders while preventing a ruinous boom-bust spiral.

(b) Take steps necessary to smash the bottleneck of union restrictions on mass-produced housing.

(c) Take steps to stimulate the States and localities to exhaust all possible means to cope with the housing shortages by their own efforts.

(d) Discharge the Federal Government's responsibility to its returning servicemen while avoiding any permanent competition in the housing field with private enterprise.

(e) Prevent rapacious landlords from squeezing cash from desperate renters.

(f) Encourage local communities to amend their obsolete municipal building codes, which restrict the building of houses.

(g) Break the monopolies in the construction industry.

Let me say, that in my humble opinion, if the citizens of any given community would really get back of their own local problem relating to scarcity of houses—providing homes for returning veterans and their wives—if they would really get down underneath the job would be accomplished.

Now there are in every community facilities which could be utilized and if properly adapted would make good, temporary quarters, at least. I refer to armories, municipal buildings, which are largely vacant. Then there are also homes with an extra bedroom. There are also apartment houses in many instances which could handle additional occupants.

I am thinking of this Thanksgiving and Christmas season in which we are. I know nothing more appropriate in the cities throughout the Nation than for men and women in each community to tackle this problem. It will pay a thousandfold. It will show these young married veterans that we did not just talk, that we are now and will continue to be sincerely grateful for the sacrifices which they and their buddies made. We cannot afford to have our heroes—because we failed to plan adequately—left out in the cold. In each community to which the boys return there are parents and relatives who owe more than a citizen's obligation.

Mr. President, I desire to make my position clear. We are told that 50,000 brides of American servicemen are awaiting transportation from Britain to this country. Of course, the obligation of the Federal Government is primary, but the obligation of the cities is very close to being primary and the obligation of the parents of the boys who married these girls is also primary, and they can do a real job. They are in a position where they can do the most good. If this whole situation is properly appraised and looked after I am sure we will solve the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks two resolutions adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions by the joint committee of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee and the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County on Emergency Housing Shortage

Whereas the metropolitan area of Milwaukee, Wis., in common with similar urban areas throughout the United States, is presently experiencing a severe housing shortage which has been in large measure caused by justifiable restrictions on the use of building materials during World War II imposed by the Federal Government as war measures; and

Whereas the inconvenience and actual hardship of such housing shortage is becoming more and more acute due to the return in ever-increasing numbers of veterans of the armed forces of the United States and such veterans and their dependents are the persons who will be the first to suffer from such housing shortage; and

Whereas it is the sense of the joint committee on emergency housing that inasmuch as this problem has in large part been caused by necessary Federal war measures, it is still the responsibility of the Federal Government as a corollary war measure necessary to reestablishment of World War II veterans in civil life, to provide such assistance, financial, by relaxation of restrictive regulations, and by the supply of existing materials, as will make it possible for the Milwaukee metropolitan area together with all other like areas to relieve such housing shortage; and

Whereas the so-called Wagner-Ellender housing bill is now pending before the Committee on Banking of the United States Senate and is susceptible of amendment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Senators from Wisconsin be and they are hereby requested to prepare and submit an amendment to such bill whereby sufficient funds may be appropriated to cover the costs of dismantling existing vacant temporary war housing, transportation of such materials, and its erection and rehabilitation in areas of acute housing shortage and also where advisable to erect new temporary housing, all as a necessary war measure, and thereafter do everything possible to secure the enactment of such regulations; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senators from Wisconsin and to the Representatives in Congress from Milwaukee County.

Whereas the community of metropolitan Milwaukee county is faced with a serious problem with respect to adequate housing of returned veterans, many of whom are married; and

Whereas the shortage of housing is an immediate emergency; and

Whereas the Army presently is housing a number of German prisoners of war at General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee County's airport, at Milwaukee, in quarters which could serve to relieve such immediate housing shortage if the prisoners were removed; and

Whereas it is apparent that the labor of such prisoners can be used to better advantage in agricultural areas: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Milwaukee County hereby requests the War Department to take the necessary steps to remove such prisoners from General Mitchell Field barracks, and to make such barracks available to Milwaukee County for the purpose of housing returned veterans of World War II; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of War and to the Representatives of Congress from Milwaukee County.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY AT THANKSGIVING AND DEDICATION SERVICE AT WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WILEY at the Thanksgiving and dedication service held at Washington Cathedral, November 25, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LET US NOT FORGET THE PILGRIMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIS

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Let Us Not Forget the Pilgrims," delivered by him at the annual dinner of the Mayflower Society of the District of Columbia, in Washington, D. C., on November 23, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the demobilization of the armed forces, delivered by him at Hartford, Conn., on November 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS BY WILLIAM GREEN AND PHILIP MURRAY ON THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and a statement issued by Mr. Philip Murray,

president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, endorsing the principle of the President's national health program which appear in the Appendix.]

REVIVAL OF OLYMPIC GAMES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement signed by sundry students of Colby Junior College, New London, N. H., urging the revival of the Olympic games, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Chair would like to ask if there is any amendment to be offered so that there may be something before the Senate. At the present time there is nothing before the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maine.

THE PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on November 20, during a session of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] made a somewhat extended speech, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, in which he took very serious exception, challenging the motives and the activities of minority members of the committee and of the Congress. I replied to the speech as well as I could last Tuesday, without having had the privilege of hearing it, as it was delivered without prior notice to any member of the committee immediately concerned.

The first charge leveled by the Senator from Delaware was that some people were making a so-called "sneak attack." That was the primal charge. I think the action of the Senator in leveling these charges without prior notice to the members of the committee partook somewhat of the character of a "sneak attack" itself, under the long-settled principles of propriety in such matters. However, that is not particularly important, as it is a matter spread upon the record, and one which would seem to invite discussion.

While the Senator from Delaware did not mention any Member of the Senate by name, so it might seem that the Senator from Michigan and myself are perhaps "putting on a kimono," as the Senator from Delaware suggested, which might indicate we had some sensitivity on our own part. I think the whole content of the speech is sufficient to indicate that the Senator had reference to the activities of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself as members of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee.

The rules of the Senate were very clearly violated in the reference to a Member of the House of Representatives who was named. Whether or not the rules were violated so far as the Members of the Senate were concerned I should leave to more erudite authorities. At any rate, when I was asked, on reaching the floor very near the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Delaware, as to whether or not the question of personal privilege or violation of the rules should be raised, I suggested that it need not be. I felt that the Senator must have given some consideration to the matter, and that it was better to hear him to the end, rather than raise a question as to whether or not he was within the rules of this body in the character of attack he was making and the suggestion as to our motives.

I have advised the Senator from Delaware that I would discuss the matter this morning, and I should like to make reference to the subject in order that the records of this body may be complete.

I may say, first, that I find it very difficult to believe that the Senator from Delaware was entirely or solely responsible for the character and content of this speech. I say that because my respect and regard for him are such that I find it difficult to believe that certain of the suggestions and insinuations would have been made if the record had been completely explored, because they are so utterly at variance with the facts. While we all recognize the assistance of "ghosts" in the preparation of our speeches—I think we all are compelled to resort to them, under present conditions—I think we also need to be very sure that our "ghosts" are accurate, and it seems to me there is internal evidence that at least assistance in the preparation of this somewhat unprecedented attack was given by a very miniature, and I think I might almost say, minuscule, Michelson. I believe Charlie Michelson, the ancient "ghost" of the Democratic Party, would turn over in his political grave if he could see the extent to which his masterpieces have been dragged in the dust in some of the suggestions that were here made.

The first item to which I would refer in connection with this matter is of a rather personal character. I would not labor the Senate with any matters of personal defense unless there seemed to be also a relation to the broader issues which are involved.

The attack is—and I quote from page 10855 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 20:

> There is constant misrepresentation.

That is the suggestion. I continue quoting:

> They want to go through the personal files of the former President of the United States. They want to dig up something, and they want to be alone when it is done. Can any reason be given why any man should want to search out something alone, and without the remainder of the committee? Is there any sensible, honorable explanation? I know of none.

That certainly is a very extreme attack, and it is a matter of record here that discussion in this body had been concerned with the move by the Senator from Maine to explore the files.

This furnishes in part the reason why it is difficult for me to believe that the Senator from Delaware was solely responsible for the preparation of this speech, because of the care with which he usually operates in matters of this character, as I have learned in my association with him on the Truman and the Mead committees.

The reason why I find it difficult to believe that he would endorse such a misstatement if he were familiar with the records is that it clearly appears in the records of this body, on page 10353 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 2, when this matter was thoroughly thrashed out here, that the motion which I made was—and I quote from it:

> That the chairman be authorized on behalf of the committee to authorize any member of the committee, upon request, in company with a member of the staff, to examine any records deemed to be relevant to the current investigation.

I quote further, from page 10591 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 9, when the same matter was further explored in detail. I quote now the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]:

> When he finally—
>
> Referring to the Senator from Maine—
>
> made his motion and put it in writing and it was voted on, it carried the suggestion that he individually be permitted, along with someone whom the chairman might name—either a member of the committee or of counsel—to go along with him to examine the files.

This would seem to establish indubitably that there was never any motion before the committee for the Senator from Maine or anyone else to go alone, as alleged in the extraordinary speech of the Senator from Delaware, and examine records anywhere.

Whether or not there is any proper answer to the rhetorical question of the Senator from Delaware, "Is there any sensible, honorable explanation?" of a desire to search the files of the executive department by a member of the committee alone, it has absolutely no relation to the facts in this case, and I am sure that the Senator from Delaware would be the first to desire that the RECORD should be corrected, and that it should be clear that, so far as the records of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee are concerned, no motion was ever made that I or any other member of the committee should go alone to examine the files. So there is no need of any sensible or honorable explanation except from those who are responsible for making such a charge.

The second nature of the attack on those associated with this matter is—and again I quote:

> The smears they have industriously tried to place on the man who was the victim in the greatest struggle the world ever saw, who at the time when the same gentlemen were opposing the preparation of the United States for the war which everybody knew was coming were opposed preparing the United States for that contest.

If this had any relation to the Members of the Senate on the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee on the minority side, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] or myself, I should like to have it clear in the RECORD as to whether

or not we were opposing the preparation of this country for the war.

The Senator from Delaware goes on to state—and again I quote from page 10855 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 20:

> In this smear campaign those who are attempting to carry it on have a suitable chance, because they are in no way handicapped by having to tell the truth.

Now let us see about the truth of this charge that those who dare to ask some questions regarding the situation at Pearl Harbor are not telling the truth. Let us see whether we were concerned with blocking the preparedness of the United States.

The Senator from Michigan became a Member of the Senate, I believe, in 1942, so that he was not concerned with earlier matters. I was serving in the House from 1934 on, and in the Senate from 1940 on, and I think it is a matter of record, thoroughly familiar to many Members of the majority side, that throughout most of that period most of the measures concerned with our preparedness received my unqualified support. From the very earliest days, when there was a very small group of us in the House who took a rather serious view of the situation and voted for some of the measures of preparedness, on down through legislation for the draft and various other measures, practically all of which were concerned with our military preparedness, I voted in every instance in accordance with those who believed that America should be more adequately prepared. I think the truth of that record is written across the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for anyone who may be interested to read.

But let us come down to even more recent times. Let us come down to last year when we were still concerned with adequate preparedness, when the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], at the instigation of the administration, had instituted certain measures to improve the draft legislation. They had been stymied in the Military Affairs Committee for a considerable time, and finally, again at the instigation of the administration, the Senator from North Carolina and myself took the responsibility, under the very delicate conditions then existing, of ourselves introducing a measure calculated further to strengthen the armed might of the United States in accordance with the unanimous request of the Army and Navy authorities alike. We went before the Military Affairs Committee and defended it. We asked repeatedly, over a period of months, for earnest consideration by those in authority in that committee and in the Senate to take action. And throughout that entire period, when as we thought, we were trying to serve the more adequate preparedness of the United States in circumstances involving considerable attack, I do not recall once hearing the clarion voice of the Senator from Delaware being raised in behalf of that measure. I do not challenge him because he did not. I do not even question his motives or his patriotism in his actions. But I say it is a curious commentary that in view of this record written across the pages of the last 10 years, that I upon this side of this body should be challenged for any failure to advocate adequate preparedness when it was impossible to secure consideration of that measure considered essential by both the Army and Navy authorities of the United States.

So much for the somewhat personal aspects of this matter. One other contribution I should like to make of rather personal character. I have been a longtime friend of the American Navy. I was at San Juan, Puerto Rico, on the day of Pearl Harbor, speaking the night before at a dedicatory exercise for a naval installation, and making a rather memorable statement that the United States Navy could lick the Japanese Navy anywhere, any time; that man for man, gun for gun, ship for ship, they were infinitely superior. That statement, which was published on the morning of December 7, attracted considerable attention; and Secretary Knox and I occupied at that time the somewhat melancholy position of having predicted our invincibility at the very time that we were being destroyed. I mention that merely as a symbol of my confidence in our Navy and in its success.

In 1938, when the naval expansion bill was before the House, it was proposed to limit the number of naval aircraft to 3,000, there having been no previous limit. At that time, when it was proposed to limit naval aircraft to 3,000, it was as Admiral Leahy testified on the stand the other day, through the assistance of certain Members of the House—and I happened to be the one chiefly instrumental—that that naval expansion measure, which had been requested by the authorities in the executive department, was amended by an amendment which, instead of limiting naval aircraft to 3,000, imposed a floor of 3,000, by inserting the words "not less than 3,000" instead of a 3,000 limit. I sometimes wonder, as we contemplate the 45,000 naval aircraft we today have, where we would have been if that limitation had not been eliminated and the vision of air power then broadened so that all the country and the Navy might continue an expansion which was so essential to our military defense. But enough of this personal matter.

I come to the broader charge, as leveled in the New York Times of that date and quoted by the Senator from Delaware, that some of us had impugned the honesty of the American Navy. That was the suggestion, to which the Senator from Delaware apparently gave credence, with or without examination of the record. This charge was based, I assume, upon the episode concerned with the challenge to the testimony of one of the naval officers on the spot about the accuracy of his testimony. The accuracy of the testimony, I may say, had been challenged in a way, as the admiral concerned, 24 hours later, before any questioning of it on my part, himself put in the record an explanation of his testimony which was designed to reconcile it with the facts; so that I think it is clear that he himself had some doubts regarding the matter.

But as to impugning the honor of the American Navy, that is certainly a very large charge, particularly against anyone who has been concerned throughout his entire service in Congress with naval affairs as a member of the Naval Affairs Committees, both of the House and of the Senate. Let us see whether or not so broad a charge as impugning the honesty of the American Navy can be based upon my questions and comments in connection with this episode.

In the first place, as the Senator from Delaware well knows—and as I believe most other Members of the Senate know—the entire record of the Truman committee, now the Mead committee, of which the Senator from Delaware is a member, throughout the whole 4 years of its life has been concerned with impugning either the intelligence or the integrity of certain members of the armed services. That has been practically the entire matter in which the committee has been necessarily engaged. The records of the Senate are replete with reports of the committee, in many of which the Senator from Delaware participated, and with respect to none of which did he ever dissent.

Even as recently as 2 months ago charges were brought to our attention regarding peculation of supplies in the Pacific by certain naval officers. The Mead committee took the matter up, and after our complaints were registered with the authorities we discovered that not only had the officer who had been charged with the derelictions been acquitted by a court martial, but the naval authorities proceeded to court-martial the one who made the complaint.

It was necessary, as the Senator from Delaware and other Members know, for the Mead committee to go directly to the Secretary of the Navy and Admiral Nimitz and demand action. The result was a conclusive demonstration that there had been peculations, not only in minor amounts, but in very large amounts, and irregularities which demanded the most searching scrutiny, which resulted in a change in the entire system of naval inspection. Did anyone suggest that because the Mead committee had exposed these derelictions by individuals, we had thereby impugned the honesty of the entire American Navy or Army?

I have before me the rather extended report of the Senator from Delaware after his visit to the north African area. The entire report is replete with very serious indictments of individual action by officers in both services, as to their lack of concern with the public welfare, and whether or not their acts could be reconciled with a proper regard for the welfare of the United States. Does that mean that we were impugning the intelligence or integrity of the entire services? By no means. We were exercising the responsibility of the legislative branch to inquire closely, as it has done throughout a century, into the actions of members of the executive department, to see whether or not they were responsive to the authority and responsibility given them.

As to this particular affair, I shall not enter into an exhaustive discussion. I have the records before me of the first four volumes of the testimony, in which the episode concerned with the admiral is presented. It aroused perhaps undue attention in the press. Strong language was used. Whether or not the admiral who was presenting the Navy case was indulging in what may be called evasive action will have to be determined from a reading of the record. Because of my position I shall not presume to judge his action impartially. I cannot plead the extenuation of having acted in the heat of the moment, because under the procedure of the committee I deferred my questioning until 48 hours after the admiral had made these statements, which seemed to me not to correspond with a full and frank presentation of the facts.

The examination was concerned with the allocation of our fleet between the Atlantic and the Pacific. That is a question which has been discussed to a considerable extent, and one which will undoubtedly have to be considered—how many battleships there were in the Pacific, how many there were in the Atlantic, the relative strength of the two fleets, and whether or not the disposition was in accordance with what good naval or military judgment would deem wise.

In that connection the admiral stated that there were a certain number in the Pacific and a certain number in the Atlantic. There was in my hands what was called a battle report, which I had theretofore assumed to be an official report, made by two naval officers at the request of Secretary Knox. It was so stated in the frontispiece. In that report different figures were given regarding the allocation. The Senator from Michigan was examining the witness. In all good faith we asked the admiral repeatedly whether or not he was sure that the figures which he gave as to the Atlantic and Pacific could be correct. The examination continued for 6 or 8 pages, to determine whether or not he could be sure. Finally he recited the names of all the ships, and still we persisted, believing that there must be some error, because of the records which we had.

The next day it developed, under his explanation, that he chose, either consciously or otherwise—and only he knows whether or not he understood the purport of what we were seeking—to ignore the existence in the Atlantic of the two most powerful units of our naval defense, or that of any other nation, the battleships *Washington* and *North Carolina*, which at that time had been commissioned. Whether or not we can disregard the existence of two fleet units of that character is for any individual to determine.

At any rate, perhaps unduly disturbed by our experiences in the past 4 years, when we have not always had what we have considered full and frank presentation by naval officers, and by a certain controversial attitude which developed between the armed services and the Truman committee or the Mead committee, I felt that his attitude and action were unwarranted, and so stated. I called his attention to the fact that his statements were unqualifiedly false. That is strong language. Perhaps it is stronger than should have been used. I am quite ready to accept rebuke if that be true. There was no doubts about the facts. If his conscience is clear, he may be able to justify his statement. The reason I questioned it was that he was one of the most brilliant young officers in our Navy, with a most creditable record. Within the past 2 weeks he has been made Chief of Naval Intelligence. If his intelligence had not been so strongly emphasized, I would have been more ready to think that possibly he did not understand the purport of our questions and what we were trying to elicit. So much for whether or not the suggestion I made impugned the honesty of the American Navy. I certainly think that is a rather sweeping charge, on the basis of very insufficient facts.

As to the third charge which is made, it seems to me that it goes to the heart of the matter. That is the suggestion, clearly running throughout the thread of the Senator's remarks, that we are seeking the defense of the Japanese; that the Japanese were the sole ones responsible for Pearl Harbor; that any words in mitigation of their crime against civilization mean taking their side; and that, as the Senator—I think unhappily—characterized it in his prepared statement, we were "putting on Japanese kimonos." I take it that is the essence of the charge.

This suggestion, as I have previously stated, appeared in a cartoon by Mr. Berryman, to the effect that the Japs were to blame for Pearl Harbor, and that was all there was to the matter. If this suggestion is correct, there are two or three things which ought to be said. One is that a great deal of time has been wasted in trying to find out who was to blame.

The investigation into this subject started with Secretary Knox's visit to Pearl Harbor immediately after the event. He went there to find out what had happened. He returned with certain reports. Subsequently Mr. Justice Roberts and his commission of distinguished military and naval men were sent to Pearl Harbor to ascertain the facts, and they returned with a report placing certain responsibilities.

Thereafter the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], then an admiral in the Navy, was assigned by the Navy to make an investigation. Admiral Hewitt was later assigned. Then came the Army board, which under the direction of the Congress made an investigation to determine responsibility. It made reports charging certain Army officers with derelictions, and also placing certain responsibility on the State Department.

If the Japanese were solely responsible for Pearl Harbor, what has been the reason for all these investigations? How does it happen that all through this period of 4 years there have been repeated, recurring investigations?

Coming down to more modern times, we find the distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], who was responsible on September 6 for presenting a resolution, reciting in the course of his very memorable address on that occasion that he had read all the reports, that they were utterly confusing and conflicting, and that he thought it was imperative that a joint committee of the Congress be constituted to investigate all the facts and find out, for the benefit of the American people, where the responsibility lay.

Meanwhile the President of the United States had submitted these reports on August 26 and he had something to say about the matter. It did not occur to him, apparently, that the Japanese were solely to blame. He apparently had some other ideas about it, and I shall quote from his comments upon that occasion. This is the statement made by President Truman on August 30:

> I have read the Pearl Harbor reports very carefully, and I came to the conclusion that the whole thing is the result of the policy which the country itself pursued. The country was not ready for preparedness. Every time the President made an effort to get a preparedenss program through the Congress, it was stifled. Whenever the President made a statement about the necessity for preparedness, he was vilified for doing it. I think the country is as much to blame as any individual in this final situation that developed in Pearl Harbor.

Not even the President of the United States seemed to think that the sole responsibility for Pearl Harbor rested upon the Japanese. All the distinguished investigators, distinguished public officials, including the President of the United States and the distinguished majority leader, have thought that there was some responsibility on some individuals in the service of the United States or in the country at large, and so it was determined that this committee should be constituted as a joint committee of the Congress to explore all the facts.

Mr. President, I am sure the Washington Post will not be considered as unduly partisan to the side of those who have dared to ask questions about this matter. I think it will be recognized that the Post has certainly been most outspoken in its approach to matters relating to our foreign policy. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Post of last week. In it the Post made it abundantly clear that it felt there was a very considerable measure of responsibilty upon upon those in the very highest authority. I am sure neither the Senator from Delaware nor anyone else will suggest that the Washington Post is seeking to make any "sneak attacks" or is undertaking to smear or besmirch any individual who is trying simply and solely to determine for all future time whether there is any more effective way to handle our affairs so as to save the interests of this country. I quote, from the Washington Post of last Thursday, an editorial which is entitled "Richardson's Testimony"; I read the concluding sentences of it:

> Neither Admiral Richardson's testimony nor anything else that has thus far been disclosed by the Pearl Harbor investigation in the least justifies the accusation of certain partisan Republicans and fanatical isolationists that President Roosevelt actually desired, and conspired, to bring about the destruction of the Pacific Fleet as the only means of reconciling public opinion to a long and costly war against the Axis powers.

That is not a charge I have ever made or that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has ever made, so far as I know, but I quote it for what it is worth.

Now I read further from the Washington Post's summary of Admiral Richardson's testimony:

It does, however, indicate that Mr. Roosevelt was taking some very extravagant risks in his efforts to apply his foreign policies by political and diplomatic means. It does suggest an extraordinary overconfidence and a dangerous disregard for realities which seem to have spread from the White House to the military, naval and diplomatic bureaucracies. There is no question that Admiral Richardson was right and the President wrong about the folly of exposing the fleet to risk of annihilation by a surprise attack on Hawaii. And in this respect it is ironical but not unjust to recall the President's subsequent lecture to those "typewriter strategists" who had ventured to question on some minor points the omniscience of military and naval experts.

That is the conclusion of the editorial.

Mr. President, I now ask that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

RICHARDSON'S TESTIMONY

Until the appearance of Admiral Richardson as a witness, the congressional investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster of December 7, 1941, had, despite all the publicity given to it, added very little to what was covered or implied in the previously published report of the Army Pearl Harbor Board. Admiral Richardson's testimony is, however, quite new and startling, and introduces another question into the controversy, namely, whether the late President Roosevelt was not using the Navy as an instrument of diplomacy rather than of defense.

Admiral Richardson was known in the service as one of the naval officers who had given a large part of their lives to the study of the Pacific problem and to the possibility of war between the Japanese Empire and the United States. Besides, as commander in chief in the Pacific, his was the responsibility for the safety of the fleet. Thus, his opinion, expressed before both President Roosevelt and Admiral Leahy at a luncheon in the White House just 14 months before Pearl Harbor, should have carried unusual weight. Admiral Richardson testified that he told the President that it was a strategic mistake to keep the fleet, undermanned as it then was, based at Pearl Harbor. It was in no condition, the admiral said, to conduct operations against the Japanese. Preparations for war could be made more rapidly if all the fleet, except the Hawaiian detachment, were returned to its natural base on the American west coast. Among other things, Admiral Richardson believed that, whether there was to be peace or war in the Pacific, the thing most immediately necessary was to recruit the fleet to full strength, to have it fully supplied with provisions and ammunition, and generally placed in a condition of readiness for war at any moment.

On both these points he was overruled by the President, and for what appear to have been purely political considerations. The President said that the fleet must be kept at Pearl Harbor, first, because its presence there would have a restraining influence on the actions of the Japanese Government and, second, because the withdrawal of the fleet would, rightly or wrongly, give the impression at home that the United States was weakening in its attitude toward Japanese aggression.

To the first point Admiral Richardson retorted that a civilian government in Japan might be impressed by such a gesture, but that a military government, such as then existed, would be impressed only by the knowledge that the American Fleet was actually capable of war. The President, however, replied that he would not approve the removal of the fleet from Pearl Harbor unless it could be done in such a way as to convince both the American people and the Japanese Government that we were not weakening in our far-eastern policy. Yet, at the same time, according to Admiral Richardson, the President made it plain that we had no intention of going to war because of impending aggression by Japan against Thailand or the Dutch East Indies, and that it was very doubtful that we would fight even if the Philippines were attacked, although sooner or later Japan would inevitably make some move that would draw us into conflict with her. Admiral Richardson's second point, that the fleet must be recruited to full strength, Mr. Roosevelt dismissed on the ground that, if the need arose, it would be easy enough to take in and train civilian mechanics and technicians.

Neither Admiral Richardson's testimony nor anything else that has thus far been disclosed by the Pearl Harbor investigation in the least justifies the accusation of certain partisan Republicans and fanatical isolationists that President Roosevelt actually desired, and conspired, to bring about the destruction of the Pacific Fleet as the only means of reconciling public opinion to a long and costly war against the Axis Powers. It does, however, indicate that Mr. Roosevelt was taking some very extravagant risks in his efforts to apply his foreign policies by political and diplomatic means. It does suggest an extraordinary overconfidence and a dangerous disregard for realities which seem to have spread from the White House to the military, naval, and diplomatic bureaucracies. There is no question that Admiral Richardson was right and the President wrong about the folly of exposing the fleet to risk of annihilation by a surprise attack on Hawaii. And in this respect it is ironical but not unjust to recall the President's subsequent lecture to those "typewriter strategists" who had ventured to question on some minor points the omniscience of military and naval experts.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure that if any persons desire to challenge the patriotism, the sincerity, or the purpose of the Members on this side of the aisle, they will not challenge that the Washington Post is entitled to an acquittal of any charge of that character on its record, and the Post seems to consider that this, at least, is a matter which invites the serious consideration of the people of the United States.

But in connection with the suggestion that anyone who says a kind word regarding any Japanese he is immediately subject to indictment, let me quote, from the very record of our hearings, some language which has been used since the hearings started, indicating that throughout the negotiations, or throughout the very early stages, at least, there was a possible hope and expectation that something might be accomplished to avoid war. I quote words from the record:

There was an opposing group in Japan representing honest lovers of peace and law and order.

Mr. President, are those the words of an isolationist? Are those the words of someone seeking to smear and besmirch? Those are the words of Cordell Hull, to be found on page 41 of our record.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly.

Mr. McMAHON. Were those the gentlemen who were in charge of the Japanese policy on Pearl Harbor day?

Mr. BREWSTER. No; they certainly were not. But what I am seeking to establish is that Secretary Hull himself in his testimony before our committee has said things which, if they had been said by me or by any other Member on this side of the aisle, I am sure would have instantly subjected us to a charge of "putting on a Japanese kimono." It seems to me that it is on such insufficient grounds that these most unfortunate suggestions or charges have been made, and I cite the language I have quoted only for that purpose.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. McMAHON. It seems to me that the Senator's thesis comes down to trying to prove that the Japanese were not solely to blame for Pearl Harbor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator have any doubt about that?

Mr. McMAHON. I am not attending the hearings; I have not read the RECORD. But I simply wished to understand correctly what the Senator's thesis is. Of course, it was my understanding that we had been surprised at Pearl Harbor and that the investigation was an effort to learn why we had been surprised.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. I did not anticipate that there was any reason for the joint congressional committee conducting the investigation to try to establish any joint guilt upon the part of the United States Government for that most treacherous act.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not clear whether the Senator from Connecticut has listened to all I have said. I tried to be very clear about it. What I tried to make clear was that throughout all the investigations which have occurred—that conducted by Secretary Knox, the one conducted by Mr. Justice Roberts, and so on—the purpose was to find out whether there was any portion of blame or responsibility on the part of any member of our armed services or of the executive department or, as President Truman himself said, whether a part of the blame was on all the people of the United States. I have understood that was what we were seeking to do as well and as wisely as we could. The suggestion that anyone who was taking that position necessarily was taking the side of the Japanese seemed to me to be repudiated by the course of the investigations throughout the past four years. That is what I attempted to demonstrate; that was my intention.

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad to have the Senator's explanation, because, speaking very frankly; from reading reports which have appeared in the press I have been led to believe that some of the

members of the committee have been endeavoring to advance the thought that there were those in this country who were responsible, at least in part, for the war between us and the Japanese.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator refers to the suggestion that somebody had baited the Japanese into the attack.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; that is the impression I have gained from what I have been reading in the newspapers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Whether or not any questions by any members of the committee could be tortured into such an inference is a matter for the record. I am very sure that nothing which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] or I have ever said, publicly or privately, can justify any such conclusion as the one to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred. I must leave to other Members of the Senate their interpretation of their own questions and remarks concerning the matter.

Mr. McMAHON. I take it, then, that the Senator's position is that the Japanese were wholly and solely responsible for having launched their attack upon Pearl Harbor, and that the purpose of the committee is to find out why we were surprised in connection with the attack.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is my understanding. I have never questioned the patriotism of anyone concerned with the entire affair. I believe that all persons connected with the matter were trying as well and as wisely as they could to do what would serve the national interest. The only purpose now is to try to find out whether we may learn any lessons for the future.

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad to have the Senator say so, because from reading the reports which have come out of the hearings, I have understood that certain members of the committee were trying to show that the United States should in part bear the responsibility for the attack which was made at Pearl Harbor. I believe that any contention of responsibility in that regard is absolutely unfounded, and should not be advanced by any Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very happy that the Senator from Connecticut has referred to the subject in order that the record may be clarified. I know of no single word or collective words of mine at any time which would justify such an inference as the one to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. President, I again refer to the statement of the Senator from Delaware which, apparently, was a part of the gravamen of his case, in criticizing the headlines in the press. He said:

> Why do we notice such headlines as appear from day to day? For instance, I have here a headline which appeared on Tuesday, November 20, 1945, "Admiral says Roosevelt vetoed 1940 plea to have fleet quit Pearl Harbor."

Then he continued:

> There is constant misrepresentation, because much of the stuff that is put out as news is not news; indeed, it is not even suspicion. It is born of a desire to find some fact by which to besmirch the memory of the dead President.

Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to defend the gentlemen or ladies of the press. They are quite competent to perform their tasks, and I am sure that they try earnestly and conscientiously to do so. But, so far as the accuracy is concerned of the statement, "Admiral says Roosevelt vetoed '40 plea to have fleet quit Pearl Harbor," I have not thus far heard anyone question it. It represents the unchallenged evidence, and the President assumed full responsibility. Admiral Richardson testified to it. It was supported by written documents from Admiral Stark who said that he agreed with it, and the President assumed responsibility as a diplomatic and military measure. Whether or not he was justified in so doing is one of the questions which is being explored. It is not being explored because we question his patriotism or his purpose, for, after all, to err is human. I assume that, in view of the sacrifices which have been involved, what the country is concerned with is establishing the facts.

Mr. President, I do not desire to labor the Senate further with a discussion of this matter. I say in conclusion that while the investigation partakes in some degree of a post mortem on one of the greatest tragedies in our history, certainly one of the greatest disasters which our Nation has ever suffered, I gather that the dominating purpose is not to hold a post mortem or to place the responsibility upon any one man or any group of men, but is, instead, to establish a prologue to the future. We hear statements made and read in the press of rumblings of a war which may occur hereafter. We see developments taking place all over the world which seem calculated to disturb our international relations, and we here in America are taking what may perhaps be characterized as a primary course in international relations. We wish to see how they are conducted, and we now look behind the scenes and into the records in order to ascertain whether it is possible that any individual at any time made mistakes. We do so not because we wish to impugn the patriotism of anyone, but because we ourselves have a lesson to learn. We wish to ascertain whether or not it may be well to reorganize in some measure our constitutional processes in order that there may be a greater integration of responsibility for our foreign policy as between the Executive and the Senate, whether or not a permanent under-secretariat in the State or other departments may be wise, and whether or not the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which has recently been appointed to confer at periodic intervals with the Secretary of State may be calculated to bring about the exercise of greater wisdom on the part of the Executive. We do these things not because we think the result might have been different 4 years ago, but because we are working toward the great objective of making the powers of the Government far more effective in the days to come.

So, Mr. President, in its explorations the members of the committee are seeking, as earnestly and honestly as possible, to write the record not because we fondly imagine that the 10 individuals who constitute the members of the committee can determine either the responsibility or the cause, but because we may at least, by the intelligence and integrity of our procedure, write a record for all in future time to read. We want to obtain the facts which are indisputable and put them on the record. We want to obtain those facts which are in controversy and have them clearly written down in the testimony of all responsible individuals who are available. We want to make it possible not only for the 130,000,000 Americans who have sacrified so much, and who President Truman said were to blame for Pearl Harbor, but for all posterity to read the record and profit by the lessons which it may contain.

We are told that history teaches us nothing except that history teaches us nothing; that we learn nothing from history except the fact that we learn nothing. We hope that civilization is improving somewhat, and that the signal efforts of this committee are being conducted to that end. While there arose an unfortunate controversy within the committee, some of us felt, and strongly so, that our efforts were handicapped. I believe that I may say that in the proceedings of the committee, perhaps sobered by the high sense of the responsibilities which we exercise, there has been no circumscribing of the examination, although we still feel that our work has been handicapped in some measure by failure to have adequate records. But I feel confident that as the spirit of this inquiry develops, and as time goes on, we shall be able in increasing measure to explore the records connected with the case. and to write, I hope, a record which will justify not only the labors of the committee, but of all the individuals who are concerned, as well as reflect credit on the Congress of the United States which is seeking earnestly to serve the great public interests which are so obviously involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I regret beyond words that anyone has seen fit to try to drag the inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the Pearl Harbor tragedy through the muck and mire of bitter partisan politics.

It is disgraceful and poor thanks for the heroism of those men who died at Pearl Harbor and those who died subsequently as a result of that ghastly tragedy.

Personally, when I entered into this inquiry, I was moved by one purpose: To ascertain and make public the facts and have the facts fix the responsibility in order that such a terrible catastrophe might neve again be repeated in the history of this Nation. I felt, and I still feel, that whatever mistakes were made which resulted in the Pearl Harbor defeat must be brought to light.

With so much knowledge available as to what the Japs were doing it is hard for any fair-minded person to understand how this catastrophe could happen and why our fleet and our air bases were left helplessly exposed to attack. It is the committee's job to find this answer.

I am moved by a sense of public service which I hope is high above any cheap partisan prejudice. Regardless of what others may do or say, I propose to con-

tinue this investigation to the best of my ability on that plane, high above the controversies or schemes of factions or parties, and I do not intend to be distracted by personal attacks by those who do not desire to have all facts disclosed.

I hope partisan attacks on the committee or its members will be permitted to rest in their own shame before the people. I feel that it is imperative to the welfare of the Nation that this investigation be conducted above prejudice or blind passions, and carried to a fair and clear conclusion. That is the line I shall follow.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I was very much pleased when I heard the statement of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. While I may not have heard all he said, I think his statement in the main was that of one interested in the country in which he lives, and in an honorable way of approaching the investigation which he is helping to make. I was pleased at what he said, and I congratulate him.

I do not intend today to enter into a discussion with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] as to whether or not the attack of the Japanese was an attack of infamy I have believed it was, and still believe it was after the Senator from Maine has concluded, or whether it was inspired by an American President, an American military force, or an American naval force. I shall not go into that question now, and I shall not go into the question as to the position which the Senator from Maine or any other Senator has taken.

I think that if the Senator will read what I said—and I do not believe he had any difficulty understanding what I said—he will conclude it did not apply to him unless he and those members of the committee to whom he refers are the whole Republican Party. Senators will find that I was attacking the Republican Party for the position it has taken against the President of the United States, or naval officers, or military officers. If the Senator is any considerable part of the Republican Party, of course, I have that to consider as another reason why I do not want to belong to that party.

Mr. President, I notice in the RECORD that the other day, in my absence from the Senate, the Senator from Maine made a statement. We have heard and read the statement in the last few days that certain things were said in the absence of the Senator from Maine. He has set up certain rules which I must follow, according to his theory. He says I spoke in his absence or without notifying him. The other day he said in the Senate:

> I assume that perhaps the Senator from Delaware was in ignorance of that rule, in not taking occasion to inform either the Senator from Michigan or myself that he proposed to discuss the quality of our personal service in our capacity as representatives of this body. However, I regret that I was not advised in time to be here to listen to his discourse.

Any time the Senator from Maine wants to discuss me he is welcome to do so, whether I am present or not present, because a record is kept of what happens here, and if he says anything to which I take exception I shall be able to answer it, and I intend to answer him, if I find, after examination of his statement today, that there is anything in it which requires an answer or is worthy of the time of the Senate. If so, I shall answer it.

However, I want to say to the Senator from Maine that in my opinion the people of the Nation are not gravely interested in his opinion of me, nor of my opinion of him, nor, in fact, of his opinion of himself, nor of my opinion of myself. I think the people of the Nation are interested in having a fair, factual investigation, and whether or not the Senator shall find out that it was the President, or whether it was the Japanese, who started this attack of infamy, we can later determine.

Apparently, I am ignorant. That is what the Senator says. He says that I am in ignorance. Well, a great many of us live in ignorance. Ignorance, after all, is a difference in knowledge. I am probably ignorant of what the Senator from Maine knows, and he—I would not dare suggest it if he were not present—may be ignorant of some of the things with which I am familiar. It may be a sacrilege to say that, but I shall say it. I do not know on what theory he attacks people without the idea that they can reply. I confess my ignorance in that respect. I confess my ignorance as to why it is such a terrible offense to call to the attention of the Nation that there is such a thing as an apparently concerted movement to make it appear that either our naval or military officers were responsible for the war or that President Roosevelt was responsible. Again I must plead ignorance. No doubt the Senator from Maine knows, because he is the one who used the word "ignorance." I think perhaps he speaks with authority. I shall not question it.

But what is the idea of accusing another Senator of ignorance? If a Senator is ignorant, the world will soon know it, if the world wants to know it, or if the world cares anything about it. If the world is interested in whether I am ignorant or not it will soon find out. If the world agrees with the Senator from Maine that I am ignorant, then his position one way or another will not greatly influence it. That again may be sacrilege. I am not very greatly concerned whether he classes me as ignorant or not. In fact I do not know but that I am complimented. If a person really studies another man's history, he will find that the man studied is familiar with some subjects, and I concede that the Senator from Maine probably has something with which he is familiar. I am not going to class him as ignorant. I would not dare say so in the Senate. To be perfectly fair, I do not think he is. I am not going to pass on him the judgment he has passed on me. Perhaps I do not have the reason that he has. However, I have not had a friendly newspaper call attention to my not knowing who caused the war.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maine quoted a statement which appeared in the Washington Star. Therefore I take it, it must be true and correct. On page 10857 of the RECORD the Senator said:

> The first time it occurred to me that there was any misunderstanding in this matter was in connection with a cartoon which appeared in the Washington Star on Sunday of this week. It portrays the Senator from Maine as saying to the Senator from Michigan that "The Navy is trying to make the Japanese responsible for Pearl Harbor." The Senator from Michigan is represented as saying, in apparently very feeling tones, "We will not let them get away with that."

Mr. President, I may be accused of ignorance, but I have never by a friendly newspaper been accused of ignorance as to who caused this war.

The Senator from Maine refers to ethics, a subject on which I have no doubt he is an authority. He states that I am guilty of unwarranted conclusions, or, I believe he said today, statements that were not facts. I believe that is what he told the admiral the other day, so I believe the admiral and I must be in about the same class—we are both liars—in the diplomatic, careful language of the Senator from Maine.

I remember that just a few days ago the Senator from Maine discussed the same question; I do not mean the question of my veracity or my ignorance, though I imagine he would have discussed it if there had been any reason for doing so at that time; but he did discuss Pearl Harbor, and at that time the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] was present, but I noticed that neither the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] nor the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was present. Whether the Senator had notified them of his intended speech, I do not know. According to the record, they were unavoidably absent.

In conclusion, let me say that, so far as my ignorance is concerned, I do not know that there is any man whose opinion I value less on that subject, or one whose disapproval I fear less. So far as the facts in the matter which he has discussed are concerned, I give him notice now that if I find it advisable or desirable I shall discuss his speech of today. I shall not attack either his veracity or his ethics. The people of this Nation are not interested in such things. If they are interested at all, it is in what happened at Pearl Harbor, and what is the intention of those who are today misrepresenting the facts. What is the purpose of the collection of people around certain men whenever they appear after a hearing or before a hearing? What is the reason for the name Roosevelt appearing in every headline, with the intimation or insinuation that somehow he has been responsible for something dishonorable? I will go into that question at a later time, and at greater length.

The question before the American people today is whether or not, in view of the forecasts, insinuations, and intimations which we have had, they can expect a fair report. In some of the newspapers I have seen the statement that there will be two reports, a majority report and a minority report. Furthermore, it has been stated or intimated what those reports will be. If that is the condition at the present time,

I doubt very much whether the American public will get much more from the investigation, unless one takes the position which the Senator from Michigan says he is taking, the position of the majority, the position of the person who says, "We simply want to get at the facts." That is what the Senator from Michigan said, and I think no one can take exception to that statement. I certainly do not.

I regret that the Senator from Maine took occasion, in my absence and without notice to me, to accuse me of ignorance and of the violation of an ethical rule. I regret that he apparently took pleasure in doing so. The thing to which I wish to invite attention is that this particular Senator, in calling the attention of the Senate and of the Nation to an implied rule, neglected to say that he was violating that rule at the very moment when he attacked me and called me ignorant without my knowing that he intended to say a word.

I suppose his knowledge of ethics is adequate. I am speaking of the practice. He has told us what the rule is, and that it was handed to him by his betters. I cannot conceive who that could be. At least, I was accused by a Senator who was violating the rule which he was citing. As I understood him, it was not a rule of the Senate. I may be in ignorance as to that. He said that it was something which had grown up through the years. I am sorry that he was the one to violate it under those conditions. He says, "He is the man who first made the attack. Therefore, any attack on him is justified." I do not believe that that rule in morals will apply. If someone steals something from me, I do not believe that I am justified, according to any moral law, in stealing from him. If anyone attacks me unethically, I do not believe that I am entitled unethically to attack him. I believe that rules of ethics are more general than that.

In my opinion, the rules of ethics apply to Pearl Harbor. They apply to the implied attacks through the newspapers on any Member of this body, and they apply to the attack on a dead President, the greatest the Nation has had within my memory. I believe that the rule of ethics is a little broader than our friend would have it. His idea of the rule of ethics is something which applies to me and does not apply to him. I shall not go into the question any further.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCMAHON in the chair). The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment further in connection with what seems now to be primarily a somewhat personal affair.

I wish to have the RECORD clear that, so far as concerns the violation of the rule of notice, the first time I discussed this subject on the floor of the Senate was immediately after the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Delaware. About 5 minutes before he had concluded I was informed that he was discussing the activities of the committee of which I am a member. I came directly into the Chamber. The Senator was concluding his remarks. I immediately sought recognition. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] spoke very briefly, castigating most severely the remarks of the Senator from Delaware, having listened to the entire discourse. Immediately following that I took the floor and delivered the address of which the Senator speaks.

Whether or not my remarks justify the characterization of a "sneak attack," which are the words which the Senator from Delaware has used, I leave it to the Senate to decide whether or not his attack, without notice to us, while we were engaged with the Pearl Harbor investigating committee, had any aspects of an unfortunate character. I never knew before that a Senator could take the floor and denounce other Senators, and then, by immediately leaving the Chamber, escape the consequences of his act. Yet apparently that is the plea which the Senator from Delaware now seeks to make. The only discussion in which I indulged occurred immediately at the conclusion of his remarks. I was without full information as to everything he had said, except to the extent I was able hurriedly to glean certain facts from my colleagues. Last Friday it had been indicated that I would discuss the question, but finding that the Senator was absent from the city, I waited until today and notified him that I would take the floor. So I think the proprieties have been sufficiently observed.

As to the matter of the suggestion of his ignorance, I regret that that occasions him any concern. I used those words only in explaining why I could not believe that he assumed full responsibility for what he said last Tuesday, and in taking that position I pointed out in his speech certain statements which seemed to me not to correspond with the recorded facts. I read the RECORD, and I said that my regard for his integrity and intelligence was such that I was sure that if he were familiar with those facts he would not have made a statement not in accord with them. So I attributed his statement to ignorance of those facts, because I was sure he would not have made such a statement if he had known the facts. That is all I have to say, Mr. President. I am sure the Senator was not fully informed.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the Senator has said he assumes I was not familiar with the facts, but at the same time he has accused me of ignorance. That is what I objected to. He says it causes me concern. It does not cause me as much concern as it would if I felt there were any ground for it. The fact that he, not today, but last Tuesday, would stand on the floor of the Senate, when he had not heard what I had said, and accuse me of ignorance is what I objected to, and that is what I have mentioned.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Associated Press carried a story yesterday which, as it appeared in the Washington Star, surprised me a bit. I should like to read it so as to give an idea of my remarks which are to follow. The headline of the story is: "HATCH Censures FULBRIGHT on Foreign-Policy Attack."

The story following this head reads as follows:

> Senator HATCH, Democrat, of New Mexico, took Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, to task yesterday for criticizing the administration's foreign policy in a radio broadcast.
>
> Senator FULBRIGHT declared Friday night that American foreign policy is "improvised on the spur of the moment" and that the Government is "drifting about in a fog of indecision."
>
> Even though everything the Senator said were true, I deplore the fact that Senator FULBRIGHT saw fit to condemn the administration foreign policy in a radio address where it could not be challenged, Senator HATCH told newspapermen.
>
> I strongly believe critical speeches of such all-important subjects as the Nation's foreign policy by United States Senators should be made on the floor of the Senate, where the speaker's denunciation might be subjected to the same critical analysis, debate, and perhaps the same condemnation in which the Senator indulges.

I regret very much that the senior Senator from New Mexico is not present today. I tried to get in touch with him, but apparently he is not available and is not in town. I merely want to say to the senior Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have the most profound respect and with whom I have seldom, if ever, disagreed, especially on matters of foreign policy, that I am highly flattered that he considers the statement I made on Friday night worthy of the attention and the time of the Senate. It never occurred to me that the Senator might even notice my remarks. Having heretofore made several remarks on kindred subjects on the floor of the Senate, I did not recall that he had ever noticed them, and I believe he will concede, if he will examine them, that not all of them were entirely in agreement with the policies, either domestic or foreign, of the Government. It had never occurred to me that that was a requisite of being either a member of the party or a Member of the Senate. I had considered it entirely appropriate to speak directly to the people of the country by radio, as I observe many other Members of the Senate do, and I cannot see why that is any particular reason for a censure, as the press dispatch quotes the Senator from New Mexico as uttering, and I presume that the newspaper account is correct.

The statement which I made over the radio——

SEVERAL SENATORS. Louder!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The request that I speak louder is one reason why I, perhaps, prefer the radio, as I do not have as strong a voice as I ought to have for discussions in the Senate.

As I started to say, the statement which I made over the radio was on November 23, last Friday evening. Since the senior Senator from New Mexico has given the impression at least that he thought it was of sufficient importance that I should have made it here, for which I am very thankful, and I appreciate the implied invitation at least to make the speech on the Senate floor, I thought it might not be amiss to read it

here for the consideration of the Senate itself. It will take only 10 minutes; it is a very short statement, and I do not think it is particularly offensive to anyone except perhaps the Senator from New Mexico.

I merely say that this was an address to the people, not to Senators, and, therefore, some allowance will have to be made for certain expressions because they were not written for the Senate.

The address which I delivered over the radio was as follows:

I have a very serious purpose in speaking to you tonight. It is simply to ask of you, with all the conviction of which I am capable, that you give serious and solemn thought, as citizens of this Republic, to the policies which your Government, and my Government, is currently following in its relations with other nations. During the 40 years of my existence I, like you, have enjoyed the opportunity for the good life afforded to us by this great country. You and I, as citizens of this Republic, have more to lose by a breakdown of civilization, than any other people on earth. I, like many of you, have two children, 6 and 9 years old. I should like, as I am sure you would like, to see our children grow up in a world in which they too might have an opportunity for a decent home, with friends and a family of their own. I do not want to have them blown to bits by an atomic bomb, nor do I want them tortured and exterminated in slave-labor camps by a new dictator. Surely, it is not asking too much that all of us who have been spared the real suffering in this war, should now devote our most serious thoughts to the prevention of these fantastic horrors for our children.

I am asking that you give your best attention to our foreign affairs, because I know that you want a decent world for your children, as much as I do. I am asking it because I have come to the conclusion that our Government has lost its bearings, that it is drifting about in a fog of indecision; and I believe that the best hope for a wise solution lies in the wisdom and common sense of the people of this country. You, the citizens of these United States, are the only power that can give to your Government the backbone and the courage to adopt those policies which are indispensable to the creation of a free and decent world for our children. Neither the Russian, the British, nor the Chinese people can make your Government do anything. Only you can.

Nearly every discussion of foreign affairs has a way of bogging down in complicated technicalities and vague generalities. As a result, too many of us have concluded that it is much too difficult a subject for our simple minds, so we think we must leave it to the experts. That is a fundamental error.

Although it may be true that the superficial aspects of foreign affairs are complicated, the basic principle upon which all civilized society has been founded since the beginning of history, is simple and clear to anyone who will bother to think of it for a moment. Civilization began with the family unit. It progressed from that through the tribe, the city state, the principality, to the nation state, as we have it today. Within these organizations, as they develop and as they extended their authority over ever increasing areas of the world, there was relative peace among the inhabitants of the units. In fact those which were unable to establish and maintain peace within their borders, so weakened themselves by fighting, that they were supplanted or absorbed by those communities which could maintain peace. The fundamental principle upon which all successful communities of peoples were based was law. Law in the early family and tribe, just as in this Nation, today, merely meant rules of conduct to which all were subject, and which were enforceable by the collective might of the community. Without these rules of conduct, there was chaos; every man against every other man. Without these rules there could be no commerce, no peace, no security of the person, no opportunity for progress or decency of any kind. Without these rules of conduct we were similar to, if not worse than, the animals in the forests.

This principle of law is not some strange, difficult, academic concept of the idealistic do-gooder. You have but to consider your own community; your county, your city, or your State, to see how commonplace it is. Scarcely a day passes but you see the symbols of, and you enjoy the benefits of, these rules of conduct. The traffic lights, the policeman and the sheriff are the symbols. The fact that they may not molest you, at least not often, is but an indication of the relatively high degree of civilization that we have attained. In the eary days of this country, in fact not so very long ago in the West, these symbols of the law were very active indeed and it was a rare day when their power was not exerted in a tangible way in curbing those lawless elements among us.

The other essentials of effective rules of conduct are the courts and the legislatures. In the earliest days of human society the patriarch of the family exercised all the functions of the law. However, as these organizations grew in size and importance there gradually developed the division of these functions into the three branches as we know them today in highly developed States; the legislative, the judicial, the executive. My point is simply, that the absolute and fundamental requirement for an orderly and peaceful organization of human beings is rules of conduct enforced by the organization as against all its members. No other principle has ever brought peace to any substantial group of men. This is not a complicated or esoteric concept. On the contrary it is within our everyday experience and is familiar to every one of us.

If it be true, as I sincerely believe it is, that there can be no lasting peace without law, then our policy should be clear. Rules of conduct can be established over peoples in two ways; either by force or by agreement. To do it by force means persistent and successful warfare until one nation imposes its will on all others. For us to follow this policy is unwise and unlikely. It is contrary to our traditions, it has little chance of success, as the Germans have shown us twice; and it is abhorrent to most of us. To do it by agreement, is in accord with our traditional beliefs and practices. It was by agreement that we established law among the original 13 independent sovereign States in 1789, a radical experiment at that time. If we had not done so it is practically certain that today there would be several proud and belligerent little countries on this continent, eager to defend their sovereignty with their lives, and with a standard of living and of happiness comparable to that of Europe and the Balkans of today. Washington, Madison, Jefferson, Hamilton, and Franklin were wise. They demanded and obtained the rule of law.

In view of our own experiences, and of all human history, I cannot understand why our present Government does not exert all its influence toward the creation of rules of conduct applicable to all peoples. The logical subject matter for a beginning is armaments, including the atomic bomb. The machinery to begin with may be created by relatively simple amendments to the Charter of the United Nations. The abolition of the veto provision, and the delegation of certain rule-making powers to the United Nations Organization, would go far toward the accomplishment of our purpose.

Our Government unfortunately does not seem to appreciate the function of law in the maintenance of peace. The principle of absolute national sovereignty is utterly inconsistent with the existence of binding rules of conduct. Our efforts should be toward the restriction of sovereignty and the extension of law, but I am unable to discover any such policy underlying our Government's actions. On the contrary, many of the statements of the Government have directly the opposite effect.

At this critical time in history, when we need, as never before, decision and action in our foreign affairs, we are dangerously irresolute and beset by contradictions. The Senate formally disavowed isolationism in August and the President professes a faith in the United Nations, but his actions and statements are not designed to give life or vitality to that organization. We, as much as any nation, insisted upon the veto provision in the charter. We now propose large armed forces by conscription; we demand exclusive bases in the Pacific; we insist upon our right to participate in the affairs of eastern Europe, and we keep the atomic bond to ourselves under the guise of an assumed superiority and a self-appointed sacred trusteeship. At the same time we deplore militarism; we object to Russia's demand for bases in the Mediterranean and Dardanelles, we refuse her request to participate on an equal basis in the affairs of Japan. We complain of her actions in the Balkans, and we would oppose any mention of the Panama Canal. I am not now judging the merits of these individual issues. My point is that we apparently have no plan of action, no principles or convictions to guide us. Our actions and policies in foreign affairs seem to be improvised on the spur of the moment. We "play by ear" without the slightest regard for the harmony of the composition.

Such a method of dealing with serious questions of government can lead only to disaster. We must decide, as a nation, whether or not we do believe in the United Nations and in the principle of law as the basis for international relations, and if we are willing to support them with all our influence.

We need not, and should not, disarm now in order to do this; but in some unmistakable manner we must make known to the world our intentions and purposes. We have a choice between two policies, armed might and imperialism on the one hand, or rules of law enforceable by the United Nations on the other. We must arm to the teeth and increase our strength by the domination of strategic bases in the Atlantic as well as the Pacific, if we are to rely solely upon our own might for our security. If, on the other hand, we intend to seek security under law and justice, every effort must be made to induce all the United Nations to accept enforceable rules of conduct superior to their national sovereignty. It is my conviction that the only hope for a lasting peace lies in the establishment of these rules of law. We who are middle aged or beyond, may, by the natural course of events, escape the next war. But your children and my children, helpless as they are to make these decisions for us, will not be so fortunate. As I said in the beginning, you, the people of this Republic, are the only power on earth that can compel a wise decision by your Government. It is your wealth, your homes, your loved ones that are the hostages of war. It is your responsibility to think, to discuss, and to use every means at your command to give your Government wisdom and courage in its quest for the right decisions.

Mr. President, after reading these remarks a second time, I am still unable to see that they were inappropriate in a discussion of matters involving all of us and all the people of this country. As I have said, it never occurred to me that the Senate would be interested in my

remarks, and I am highly flattered and complimented by the implication of the Senator from New Mexico that Senators are interested. I hope that if the Senator has any further comments to make about what I have said, he will make them on the floor of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 744. An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions;

H. R. 801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children;

H. R. 843. An act for the relief of Francis A. Hanley;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend;

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Nannie Bass;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of John August Johnson;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Carl Lewis;

H. R. 1192. An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of O. M. Minatree;

H. R. 1512. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Candler Cobb;

H. R. 1902. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Annie M. Lannon;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others;

H. R. 1961. An act for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler;

H. R. 1978. An act for the relief of Jay H. McCleary;

H. R. 2027. An act for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased;

H. R. 2029. An act for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of John J. Gall;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Craig;

H. R. 2191. An act for the relief of Cleo E. Baker;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Florence Zimmerman;

H. R. 2290. An act for the relief of Mary Galipeau;

H. R. 2300. An act for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore, and Louise D. Blackmore;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of James A. Brady;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Arlethia Rosser;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz;

H. R. 2481. An act for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson;

H. R. 2512. An act for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton;

H. R. 2595. An act for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly;

H. R. 2620. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Allen;

H. R. 2642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson;

H. R. 2686. An act for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley;

H. R. 2836. An act for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti;

H. R. 2874. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to authorize any corporation formed under authority of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of such code to specify in its bylaws that a less number than a majority of its trustees may constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the corporation;

H. R. 2886. An act for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.;

H. R. 3011. An act for the relief of John Hames;

H. R. 3135. An act for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3198. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Rolla Duncan;

H. R. 3249. An act for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly;

H. R. 3302. An act for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler;

H. R. 3636. An act relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish;

H. R. 3660. An act to provide for financial control of Government corporations;

H. R. 3790. An act for the relief of Genevieve Lund;

H. R. 3867. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies;

H. R. 3868. An act to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3873. An act to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md.;

H. R. 3979. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4018. An act for the relief of Robert A. Hudson;

H. R. 4411. An act to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hart	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Huffman	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Butler	Langer	Stanfill
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McMahon	Tunnell
Donnell	Magnuson	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Guffey	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] because of illness. I should like to have the announcement stand for the day.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate now has before it for consideration Senate bill 1580 to which I respectfully invite the attention of all Members of the Senate. It will be noted that the bill relates to action by the United States in regard to its membership in the United Nations Organization.

It is not my intention to dwell at great length on the provisions of the bill relating to the participation of the United States in the United Nations Organization. Copies of the bill, together with

copies of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, have been on the desks of Members of the Senate for nearly 3 weeks. The most important provisions of the bill have been widely discussed in the press. I assume, therefore, that the Senate is thoroughly familiar with the issues before it. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, however, I should like to make a few general remarks about some of the important aspects of the measure.

Mr. President, last July the Senate ratified the Charter of the United Nations Organization by the very large majority of 89 to 2. By that action we gave our solemn pledge to cooperate with the other United Nations in the difficult task of undertaking to maintain world peace. Our obligation was then assumed. The pending measure makes no change in that basic obligation, but it does undertake to point out how the United States shall fulfill some of the obligations which it assumed under the United Nations Charter. It is, in fact, the first important step in making possible the close collaboration of our Government with the new organization. I wish to emphasize the fact that in this bill the United States is undertaking no new obligations. We are but making the necessary arrangements within our own Government so that we may carry out the obligations which we have already assumed under the Charter. All the great powers such as Great Britain, the Soviet Union, France, and China, have submitted their ratifications of the Charter, as have a majority of the other United Nations. A meeting of the Preparatory Commission is now taking place in London, and it is assumed the General Assembly will meet in January 1946. So it is, therefore, important that we should delay no longer than is absolutely necessary taking steps properly to place the United States in a position to perform its duties under the Charter.

My hope, therefore, is that the Senate will act speedily and decisively upon the pending measure. I do not desire to deny any Senators their opportunity of discussing in appropriate length the terms of the bill, nor preclude them from offering amendments for the consideration of the Senate; but I invite attention to the fact that in view of the impending events to which I have referred, it is necessary that we act as promptly as possible. In this turbulent and war-worn world, it is imperative that the United States demonstrate beyond any doubt its willingness to cooperate in every possible way in keeping the peace, and in aiding in keeping the peace in other areas of the earth.

Mr. President, I desire to point out and to emphasize the fact that the proposed legislation under consideration was prepared in a bipartisan manner, in close cooperation between the Members of the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and the State Department. At this point, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to express my deep and abiding thanks to the minority members of the committee for the fine spirit of cooperation which they manifested in undertaking to solve the international questions which were involved. Throughout the consideration of the matter they have been most helpful, and our action for the past 2 or 3 years has been, so far as I could observe, wholly without partisan taint, or partisan political bias. So I congratulate and thank the members of the minority for their patriotic and statesmanlike attitude.

We have also worked this matter out in consultation with the Department of State. The Department of State cooperated in drafting the bill, in its revision, its modification, and in its final form.

At this point I wish to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Secretary of State are arranging a program of consultations and cooperation in the time ahead of us such as we had for the past 2 or 3 years when Mr. Hull and Mr. Stettinius were Secretary. In our foreign relations it is of the highest importance that we deal upon a broad scale of cooperation, rather than approach our dealings with the bitterness and rancor characteristic of political dissension.

The most important section of the bill would authorize the President to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces and the other assistance to be made available to the Security Council for the purpose of maintaining peace and security in accordance with the terms of the Charter.

It will be remembered that this matter was discussed when the Charter was before the Senate. Under the terms of the Charter the Security Council is authorized, and really directed, with the aid and under the sponsorship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to make agreements with the various nations which are members of the United Nations Organization with respect to the numbers and types of military forces which are to be made available by the respective governments to the Security Council in the event it is ordained that military forces are to be employed under the doctrine of sanctions as against a nation which has not yielded to peaceful measures of settlement.

I shall not delay the Senate by reading the text or the terms of the Charter, but in article 43, chapter 7, it is provided:

> All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Mr. President, the obligation already rests upon the United States to make these agreements, so that the pending bill merely authorizes the President—although the obligation rests on him anyway—to make the agreements with the Security Council.

Special agreement may be subject to the approval of Congress by appropriate bill or joint resolution. I understand that on this point probably some amendment will be offered, one especially by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], specifying that the agreements may be ratified only by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. I trust that the Senator from Missouri, upon reflection, will not press the amendment.

Since the obligation exists to furnish the forces, I think it is desirable, probably, to have the concurrence of the House of Representatives in the approval of the agreements. Appropriations will be involved for the maintenance of the armed forces. The House of Representatives always claims the right to have a hand in appropriations. Action by both Houses through a joint resolution would be equally as effective and binding as the independent action of the Senate. The real essence of the matter was determined by a two-thirds vote of the Senate when we ratified the Charter itself, the obligations of which we are now undertaking to effectuate.

It is not provided, as some Senators probably will desire, that the President must first come to the Congress and secure specific authorization for the furnishing of troops in each and every instance. I feel sure that upon reflection Senators will see that that sort of a plan would be wholly ineffective. It is provided, however, that the President shall have the authority in certain emergencies to employ the troops up to the number specified in any special agreement entered into. In other words, he could not employ more troops than we have agreed to furnish in the nature of a police force or a greater number than we have agreed to supply to the Security Council through the President of the United States.

Mr. President, under our conception of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council must have both the power and the authority to act promptly in time of crisis, or it will fail in its all-important task. Bitter experience has shown that this is one place where we dare not temporize. The Security Council is one agency we cannot afford to hamper.

Let us assume an international crisis of such a character as to call for the intervention of military force. To await action by Congress, involving debate in both branches of the Congress as to the calling out of troops in the case of such an incident, would perhaps mean postponing calling them until after there was any occasion for using them at all.

Take for instance the Boxer Rebellion in 1900, in which case we sent an army to China. American residents were being attacked in the diplomatic compounds in Peking. The delay of a few days would probably have meant the lives of some of those American citizens. President McKinley acted promptly and made available a military force, without consultation with Congress, without any action of the Congress. He sent that armed force to China to cooperate with the armed forces of other nations, under the command of an over-all general who was not an American.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if the Senator is suggesting that hereafter, in the case of disorder in any country which may

endanger nations of other countries, the Security Council can step into that country with an armed force, in spite of the fact that its government is doing its best to protect the citizens of other nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is nothing in the bill which warrants that question.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator was suggesting that the United Nations Organization is going to act in a case such as that of the Boxer Rebellion in China.

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. TAFT. I wondered if that was the Senator's interpretation of the duties of the Security Council.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator is in error. I was using the Boxer incident as a measure of the necessity for prompt action. I did not suggest, and the bill does not authorize our interference in the internal affairs of any other nation. But if the Senator wants a specific case, let us take the case of Hitler when he invaded the Rhineland. Suppose we had said, "We are against it, and we are going to land troops against him and stop him, but we are going to submit the matter to Congress, which will debate the question, and have a speech from the Senator from Ohio on the subject, and see where he stands." In the meantime Hitler would have entered the territory and seized it, just as he did seize it. Then the speech of the Senator from Ohio would be totally unavailing.

Mr. TAFT. I want to make it clear that I am wholly in favor of giving authority to the Security Council to use armed force, permitting its use without reference to Congress. So far as I know no amendment to be offered would suggest anything different from that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I feel greatly encouraged and strengthened in the attitude we are taking; and I say that in all sincerity. I realize that for some time it has been reported that the Senator from Ohio intended to offer amendments to the contrary effect. I am gratified that upon reflection and meditation, if he ever entertained such an intention, it has been abandoned.

Mr. TAFT. I have always felt that the crucial point of action on the part of the United States was when our representative voted on the Security Council at the direction of either the President or the Congress. Once the vote is cast, it seems to me we are in duty bound, under the Charter, to go ahead with the armed forces which the Senator is discussing. But it seems to me we must give serious thought to the question of the basis on which that vote is cast, either in an affirmative or a negative way.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, we should be careful, we should use judgment in our votes in the Security Council. That is one reason why we favor the provision that our representative on the Security Council shall represent the President of the United States, and vote as he is directed to vote by the President, the constitutional head of our Government, the man upon whom devolves the duty of carrying on our foreign relations. It makes it all the more important that we hold the President himself responsible for the action of our representative on the Security Council.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. A great deal of emphasis has been placed on the veto power which we hold under the Charter. As I read this bill that veto power which the United States has against the use of armed forces against itself or other nations, is vested in this bill ultimately in the President of the United States, and Congress has nothing to say about its use. Is that a correct interpretation of the pending bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would not say that Congress has nothing to do with it; but the vote in the Security Council should be the vote of the President of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. The point I make is that we are now saying that the veto power which has been reserved shall be vested in the President, and not in Congress. Is not that a correct interpretation of the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from Ohio brought up the question of the veto. I regret to have to mention a matter which I saw in the press the other day, that Mr. Eden in the House of Commons had declared against the veto, and that it ought to be abolished, and so forth and so on. Without discussing the merits or demerits of the question of the veto, I shall take the liberty of saying that Great Britain, in the Conference at San Francisco, when Mr. Eden was present, stated that if the veto was not contained in the Charter she would not sign. Now Mr. Eden is making the statement that the veto should be abolished. I do not know whether the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] remembers that occasion, but I am sure there are others who remember that what I have suggested took place.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Unless the veto is ultimately removed how is it in any way possible to control the development of the atomic bomb by the nations who can exercise the veto?

Mr. CONNALLY. If there should always be one stubborn nation which would veto everything, the Senator would be right. If we are to assume that one particular nation is going to say "No, No," to everything that is proposed, of course the veto will be an effective weapon in its hands. There can be no dispute about that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As to the veto, am I correct in the assumption that it is not intended by this enabling act to transfer to the President whatever may be the constitutional powers of Congress in any subject matter that may come before the organization? Where the Congress does retain jurisdiction over a subject matter that might be voted upon by our delegate in the Council, to that extent the President would simply be a vehicle for issuing instructions in accordance with the retained powers and will of Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. Whatever the powers of Congress may be, if our constitutional duty reaches to that point, of course the President would be an instrumentality of Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A while ago the Senator was asked whether this entire veto power was delegated to the President. I do not think we need to argue it now, because it would involve an argument of all the powers of Congress, but if it should develop that Congress has some constitutional power in some phase of the matter, would not the President be voicing the will of Congress in that particular matter rather than his own will?

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator from Texas undertook to say a while ago was that under this bill and under our conception of the Charter the representative in the Security Council was supposed to represent the views of the President of the United States. I think I understand the Senator's point, but it is a little difficult for me to find an example of what the Senator has in mind as to the constitutional functions of the Congress. If such be the case, the President, I assume, would respect the authority of Congress and would act in accordance therewith.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it is very clear under this enabling legislation that the representative on the Council shall act under the instructions of the President, and I do not see how it could be any other way. But if the Congress does retain any jurisdiction in the matters on which our representatives in the Council will have to act, then I am merely suggesting that to that extent the President, as he does in executing all legislation passed by Congress would be passing on the instructions of Congress. He would be merely the vehicle for expressing the will of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no quarrel with that view.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. If the view expressed by the Senator from Colorado respecting the condition under which the President of the United States could order our delegate to vote to send a portion of our armed forces, under the control of the Council, into a certain territory to put down aggression is accepted as the correct one, then I have no objection. But the fact of the matter is, regardless of anything that may be said, that whenever the President has exercised the power to use troops without coming to the Congress of the United States it has been exercised for the purpose of saving American lives or preventing the destruction of American property.

This proposal goes much further than that because the President is being given the power not only to protect American lives and property but it may be to protect Russian lives and property, or English lives and property, or Dutch lives and property, wherever and whenever the Council determines that there is an aggression, and without any definition by the Congress of the United States as

to what amounts to aggression. So we now have an entirely different problem confronting us, it seems to me, and that is where the difference lies between the members of the Foreign Relations Committee which have approved this legislation and myself, for, as the Senator stated, while when we agreed to the Charter we assumed an obligation, yet when we pass this bill we are going to be told, regardless of anything else, that the power lies entirely in the hands of the President of the United States, and that Congress does not have anything to do with it except when it comes to the use of greater power than what we give him in the first instance. The trouble is that when we give him the power to direct a small force and the other government concerned is great enough to prevent its use, we are then at war, whether we want to call it war or whatever we may want to call it, and the Congress is going to have to accept that fact, and vote then for the use of more troops. I am opposed to that. Instead of giving more power to the President of the United States, which might involve the country in war, I would much prefer to see the power curtailed. I am not afraid of the Congress debating a question for a long time, as some have said, when the interests of the United States are affected or when there is a real aggression on the part of a powerful nation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas again yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand the burden of the distinguished Senator's present argument, it is that under this enabling legislation we look forward to further legislation in which we can define the limits of the military forces which we will contribute for police power and for the exercise of the President's constitutional rights in matters of police power, and that the President will have to come back to Congress for the larger grants. Thus reserving to the Congress its traditional war powers.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, in response to the statement of the Senator from Montana about giving more power to the President, let me say that the bill does not really give him any more power. The bill simply makes it plain and defines it. The historical instances in which the President has directed armed forces to go to other countries have not been confined to domestic or internal incidents at all. I hold in my hand a copy of the RECORD of July 10, 1941, in which appears a long list, which I shall not read, of incidents in which the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, without any consultation with the Congress, sent armed forces into other countries.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no question to raise on that point. I am very familiar with that list of cases. But they were cases involving small powers, where our action would not lead to war because of the fact of our overwhelming strength. They were cases which involved protection of American lives and property.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is partly accurate and partly inaccurate. He says the cases were only those involving American lives——

Mr. WHEELER. Or property.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; or property. The first instance in the list was that of Amelia Island in 1812. The purpose was to protect a Spanish island from foreign invasion or control—directly relating to the action of a foreign government. That is why the troops were sent to Amelia Island in 1812.

In 1814 troops were sent to Spanish Florida to expel the British. Was Britain a small, weak, wobbly nation in 1812, when she succeeded within a very short time in conquering Napoleon, the mighty military titan, who strode triumphant with sword in hand across the map of Europe? Britain was not very weak at that moment.

Mr. WHEELER. But Florida was on this continent.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know Florida is on this continent. Every country is on some continent.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but we are talking about sending troops now to Asia or Africa or any other place.

Mr. CONNALLY. The enterprise in which we are now engaged is not simply a question of geography.

In 1823 we sent troops to Cuba to pursue and break up a gang of pirates.

We sent troops to Puerto Rico in 1824 to atone for insult to the flag and procure apology.

And so on, and so on.

There is nearly a page of incidents of the President of the United States, without consulting Congress, sending armed forces into foreign lands.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me remind the Senator that in many cases the President has sent troops into a foreign country to protect our foreign policy.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Notably in Central and South America. That was done in order to keep foreign countries out of there—was not aimed at protecting any particular American citizen. It was aimed at protecting our foreign policy.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I presume that by the Charter we have laid down a foreign policy which we can protect.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is absolutely correct. I was trying to indicate that fact by reading the list of instances of intervention on our part in order to keep another government out of territory in this hemisphere. That was a question of carrying out our international policy, and not a question involving the protection of some American citizen or American property at the moment.

So it is in this case. We might as well abandon the United Nations Charter unless we intend to carry out its policies, its purposes, and its ambitions. One of those is in behalf of peace. When all peaceful measures fail, when persuasion fails, when reason fails, when logic fails, and the recalcitrant nation is bent upon mischief, with evil purpose, there is no other course to follow except the use of armed forces. We expect to contribute, under the obligation which we have already assumed, our quota of military forces to be available to the Security Council to put down aggression at its very beginning.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I remind the Senator, too, that the United Nations Charter differentiates and discriminates between two types of forces—on the one hand, a force which is contracted by the membership for a specific purpose, and on the other hand a subsequent force, which is not contracted. I know of no reason why there should be a primary contract for any forces if all forces are to be handled alike and none of them allowed to the President of the United States by way of preliminary use. Why did we agree to that provision in the Charter which looks for a contract between the United States and the United Nations Organization—a contract which, by the way, we shall pass upon? Why did we provide for a contract force unless we intended that that particular contingent should be handled differently from the general armed force of the Nation? It seems to me that the question answers itself. When we agreed to have a contracted force—and we have so agreed—we must have meant that we intended the contracted force to be handled totally differently from the remainder of our national defense resources. Therefore it seems to me that what the Senator is saying is totally justified, namely, that our commitment stands with respect to the use of the contracted peace forces under the direction of the President of the United States pursuant to his traditional constitutional authority, and that when the Senate voted last July it must have meant to discriminate between those forces and the general national defense forces of the country.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. The Charter provides that special military agreements with respect to the number, kind, and quota of troops or other armed forces are to be made between the Security Council and the individual governments. Of course, it was presupposed that such forces would be something less than the full armed might of the Nation. We did not need any instructions on that point. Constitutionally we can exert the force of our entire armed might at any time. However, it was provided in the Charter that there should be special military agreements. Why would there be a special agreement unless it were to make available to the Security Council the so-called police forces? There is as much difference between the two as there would be between the regular police force of this city and the force which might become necessary in an emergency, when a writ of posse comitatus might be issued, calling to arms every male citizen of the District of Columbia.

These contracts must be submitted to the Congress. When the agreements are

made with the Security Council, they must come back here. Senators will have an opportunity to debate them, to offer amendments, to qualify them, and so forth.

As to declaring war, that is not a question which is involved here at all. These forces are not exacted to make war. They are exacted as peace forces, to undertake to preserve peaceful nations against aggression and attack. If we wish to go to war, we can still go to war by declaring war and making use of our entire armed forces. I do not suppose we would hesitate to do so if we felt that the national interest required or demanded it. So, Mr. President, these agreements are simply to carry out obligations which we have already assumed. We have promised to make such agreements. We have promised to send quotas of armed forces when called upon by the Security Council; and, of course, we are going to do it.

I am convinced that the Presidential use of armed forces in order to participate in the enforcement action under the Charter would in no sense constitute an infringement upon the traditional power of Congress to declare war. We are not taking the power away from the Congress. As the Foreign Relations Committee pointed out in its report to the Senate on the Charter, when we had the Charter before us—

> Preventive or enforcement action by these forces upon the order of the Security Council would not be an act of war but would be international action for the preservation of the peace and for the purpose of preventing war. Consequently, the provisions of the Charter do not affect the exclusive power of Congress to declare war.

We do not retrench on that statement. I have already adverted to the fact that over a period of 150 years United States armed forces have been sent into many sections of the globe, under the direction of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, without consulting the Congress.

Mr. President, I stand for the integrity of the Congress; I think all of us stand for the integrity of the Congress; but we must realize that the President of the United States is also a constitutional officer. He has duties and responsibilities. Under the Constitution we are not invested with authority to direct all the actions of the President of the United States. The Congress is not the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. We may call forth the Army and Navy in case of war, by the action of the Congress approved by the President of the United States; but after we declare war, and after we call out the armed forces of the United States in defense of the flag, they are under the command of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

The bill would also bestow upon the President—I hardly think "bestow" is the proper word; at any rate the bill defines the authority of the President to carry out the economic sanctions to which we have agreed in the United Nations Charter. The bill would bestow upon the President power to join with the other United Nations in applying enforcement measures short of the use of armed force. Here again the Security Council must be in a position to act quickly and decisively. By taking prompt action in the application of diplomatic and economic sanctions it may be possible to direct law breakers into the paths of peace, and thus avoid more drastic enforcement measures calling for the use of armed forces.

In other words, Mr. President, all of us at San Francisco were convinced that if the United Nations Organization were to prove effective it would have to be based upon the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. If the members of the League of Nations had possessed the necessary courage, foresight, and power in 1936, Hitler could have been stopped in his tracks by the application of economic sanctions, or at the most by a police force of several hundred thousand men. But a few years later the United Nations were forced to call upon their combined human and material resources to stem the tide of Fascist aggression.

We regard the employment of economic sanctions, and even military sanctions, as something in the nature of preventive medicine, to prevent the disease from developing, to prevent acts of aggression, to prevent unjustified invasion or conquest of peaceful nations. No one would deny that this is a broad grant of authority. I readily agree that to give the President authority to impose sanctions of an economic character is a broad grant of authority; but we have promised to do it. When we ratified the Charter we promised to give to the Security Council power and authority to impose economic sanctions as well as military sanctions. They are not without precedent. The history of the United States is replete with instances of legislation authorizing or directing the President of the United States to impose embargoes.

As early as 1794 embargo legislation was enacted by the Congress bestowing upon the President the power to lay embargoes on all vessels in American ports whenever in his opinion the public safety should require it. During the next 15 years of our history five different statutes were enacted suspending commercial relations with various nations, but leaving the discontinuance of the restraint to the President's discretion.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say that everyone of those acts had a definite date for its ending. As I recall, the first one, for example, set a termination date at the end of the next session of Congress. Everyone of those statutes has a definite termination date.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be. Probably there was a reason for that, a particular situation, for instance, which the Congress felt would be ended by a certain date, and so the statute had a time limitation.

Among the other examples of such delegation of power to the President, one readily recalls the arms embargo legislation of 1912 and 1922 and the so-called neutrality legislation—the first statute, after being thoughtfully considered, was never regarded as being a neutrality act—of 1935, 1937, and 1939. Those are recent acts with which Senators are, of course, familiar.

How important it is that we authorize the President to take such action in collaboration with the other United Nations in order to maintain world peace. During the past 25 years, Mr. President, the greatest lesson of our generation, a lesson which has been indelibly impressed upon the minds of the American people, is that world peace is indivisible. The virus of war, like disease germs and radio waves, recognizes no boundary lines. It leaps over mountain ranges and across distant seas. In the shrinking world in which we now live, the only sure way to stay out of war is to prevent it, to stop it before it begins. This is the basic assumption of the United Nations Charter. It is the basic assumption, too, of article 41, which provides that in case the peaceful methods of settling disputes fail, the Security Council may call upon its members to apply diplomatic and economic sanctions against an aggressor nation. Once the Security Council has made its decision to act under article 41, our obligations become clear. Article 2, paragraph 5, of the Charter, reads:

> All Members—

And we are among the "all Members"; we have obligated ourselves; we have pledged our faith—

> All Members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A few moments ago the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] called attention to the fact that at least many of the economic sanctions instituted by the President had limitations as to time. I should like to ask a question in that connection. Under the bill which has been reported by the committee, the President will have to report to Congress at least once a year; will he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Presumably the President would report on such an economic sanction when he made his report to Congress. That report would require no action by Congress in the way of either accepting or rejecting it. Would it not offer an opportunity for the Congress to pass a resolution ordering the President to cease the economic embargo which he had put into effect?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that Congress would go to the extent of ordering the President to do so, because the Congress cannot order the President to do anything. But it would give ground for discussion and perhaps a resolution disapproving and condemning the action of the President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. In other words, at least once a year the Congress would have an opportunity——

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; it absolutely would have an opportunity. The Senator said "presumably." It is specifically

provided that the President shall report at least once each year, not only as to any economic sanctions but as to any military sanctions.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the Congress will not have to wait until the President reports. The Congress will be free to discuss such sanctions at any time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course.

Mr. WHEELER. The Congress can at any time discuss any such sanctions, either economic or military.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course.

Mr. WHEELER. But once they are put into effect, of course, the Congress will be almost powerless to say that the sanctions shall be removed; or, at least, it would be very difficult for Congress to do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, public opinion has a tremendously impelling force.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct in saying that neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives need wait for the President's report. The Senator from Montana well knows—and no one knows it any better than he does, and why he should ask me the question I do not understand; I think it was an observation, rather than a question—that neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives is limited as to the subject matter which it may discuss or the time it shall consume in such discussion even by the patience of its auditors.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Reference has been made to the fact that the President will have to report annually to the Congress. I remind the Senator that, in addition, the President is required to make special, current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter and on the participation therein, under his instruction, of the United States. In other words, the purpose is to furnish that information to the Congress concurrently, contemporaneously, just as rapidly as possible.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct. I assume that the report would be similar to the report on the state of the Union, which the Congress receives once a year from the President. But whenever the President takes any action under the military or economic sanctions or other preventive measures, he is required to make a special report on them to the Congress. Provision to that effect is found on page 4 of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I presume I know, but I should like to have the Senator tell us what will be the effect if Congress says to the President, by means of a resolution, "You shall stop this economic sanction." What would the President do then?

Mr. CONNALLY. There would be a terrible row, I should think. That is about all that would happen, because if we bind ourselves by treaty to do it, and if we enact the bill, and if the President acts under it, I do not know anything we could do to undo it, except to defeat the President in the next election, or perhaps to repeal the act.

Mr. TUNNELL and Mr. MILLIKIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I defer to the Senator from Delaware, who first addressed the Chair.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask what the Senator thinks would be the effect of a failure of the Congress to pass the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it would be very discouraging, and would make the other United Nations think we did not intend to cooperate or carry out the obligations we have assumed under the Charter.

Mr. TUNNELL. In the opinion of the Senator from Texas, it would have quite a deleterious effect on the opinion of the rest of the world as to our sincerity; would it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Absolutely.

Mr. TUNNELL. And if the United Nations Organization failed as an organization, if it had to quit—as the League of Nations has done, in effect—would not we then be taking the position of assuming the blame for that situation?

Mr. CONNALLY. We would be heaped with calumny and the blame would be piled upon us, regardless of whether we intended to have the Organization fail. But that would inevitably be one of the results of adverse action on this bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. And particularly since we already have agreed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; particularly so inasmuch as we have agreed to do it, under the Charter.

Mr. President, the question is not whether we shall cooperate with the other United Nations in the imposition of economic and diplomatic sanctions. As suggested by the Senator from Delaware, we have already promised to do so. That decision was made when we ratified the Charter. The basic question now is, How can we best and in the most prompt and effective manner do that, so as to contribute toward the prevention of war?

Much of the legislation which is now pending before the Senate, Mr. President, provides for the representation of our Government in the various organs and agencies of the United Nations.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the subject he has been discussing, as I observe he is about to do, I wonder whether he will permit me to ask a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Gladly.

Mr. AUSTIN. As I recall, if I do so correctly, it is article 51 of the Charter which preserves for the United States the right to defend itself in the event of an armed attack. Is it not true that there is nothing in the pending bill which diminishes in the least degree the constitutional authority of the President of the United States to order any number or kind or type of armed forces for the purpose of repelling an armed invasion?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that undoubtedly the Senator is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think we should not forget that point in our discussion of the division of the measure relating to armed forces. We should remember that we are not conferring upon the President authority in that respect. Instead, we are limiting his authority to use the armed forces for certain purposes. We are recognizing a constitutional authority, and we are doing it specifically in article 51 in a certain event; and that one, as I apprehend or as I believe, is unlimited in its extent. We can by ourselves alone, or in conjunction with others, successfully repel an armed attack, and we can employ the armed forces necessary for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Vermont is, of course, correct in his statement. In the case of an armed attack upon the United States, the President has constitutional authority, as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, to call out the entire armed force of the United States in order to resist the attack. However, that matter has no reference whatever to anything contained in the bill or in the Charter.

Mr. AUSTIN. There is no limitation contained in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill does not go into that matter at all, and places no limitation upon the powers of the President. So it has been well pointed out that there is a clear distinction between the kind of forces which the President may call out under this bill and under the Charter and the kind of forces which he may call out in the case of an attack upon the integrity or security of the United States. Article 51, referred to by the Senator from Vermont, provides that nothing in the Charter shall limit in anywise the use of armed forces under the circumstances of an outside attack by a foreign nation.

Mr. AUSTIN. And that provision is not limited to a region at all; it covers the globe.

Mr. CONNALLY. It occurs, however, in the reference to the regional setup. At least, that is as I recall it.

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. At any rate, I remember the clause. No matter where it appears, it is in the Charter. Whether it appears on the first page, on the second page, or on some other page, is not highly important.

Mr. President, I started to make some suggestions about other bureaus or agencies created under the United Nations Charter to which representatives might be appointed. It should be noted that the bill provides for Senate approval of the appointments of all top-ranking representatives of the United States as delegates to the Security Council. Inquiry may be made as to why, if the Senate is to confirm the nominees for representative on the Security Council and his assistant, it should not confirm the appointment of delegates to the Assembly. The reasons are these: The Assembly meets only once a year. The President will probably wish to appoint three or four, or possibly more additional delegates to the Assembly. It will be only a matter of a short time before he will

probably wish to appoint as delegates members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. Some members of the committee thought that it would be unseemly to require Senate approval of the nominees who might be Members of the House and who might resent action of the Senate in passing upon their eligibility. We thought it was not of great importance that such nominees be confirmed. The situation would be comparable to that of passing upon the appointment of a delegate to an international conference. If the President wishes to pick out a distinguished man and pay him the honor of appointing him as a delegate, we thought it would be unnecessary for his appointment to be confirmed by the Senate.

With regard to the authority of the United States delegate to the Security Council, I have already pointed out that he could cast no vote, nor take any important action if it were not in line with the instructions of the President of the United States.

It has already been suggested that the President, on his part, must report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives annually, and at other times, with reference to certain actions which he may take. He must make special reports of any action of the Security Council.

We are not taking our hands off the control so far as the Constitution gives us such control.

It is apparent, of course, that each year we must make our contribution of funds. The arrangements for supplying armed forces to the Security Council must be approved by us. Of course, the Congress will be very often called upon to pass legislation before the recommendations voted by the various agencies or organs can be put into effect by our Government. I wish to point out that the commissions and other agencies under the Security Council, or under the assembly, have no authority to enact legislation, and they have no authority to enforce any of their recommendations. They must submit their recommendations to the respective governments, which may accept or reject them, according to their own judgment and will. So that matter, so far as the United States is concerned, is completely retained within the control of the Congress.

Mr. President, as we look about over the world today we see many lowering and threatening clouds. There is revolution in the East Indies, warfare in China between groups in that unhappy land, strife in Palestine and in Iran, and trouble in Argentina as well as in Spain and in many other countries. In the terrible backwash of the costliest and deadliest war in all our history, death, destruction, and destitution are present in many portions of the earth. While the guns are again quiet, our fight to maintain peace has just begun. Even a mere listing of the problems which face us staggers the imagination. Scores of cities, now lying in ashes and ruin, must be rebuilt or reconstituted. Transportation has been practically destroyed. Famine, disease, and cold must be combatted. We are contributing to the solution of these problems. From our Treasury we are giving to the nations of Europe and to other parts of the earth liberal and generous donations to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to shelter the homeless. We must redraw many of the boundary lines of the earth and stabilize currencies. We have taken steps to stabilize the currencies of the world. We must reopen the channels of trade. Shipping, cartels, oil, civil aviation, and world waterways, and many other matters, including the atomic bomb, must be considered and treated by the Congress of the United States and other nations of the world. But, Mr. President, we cannot at one stroke solve all these problems. We believe that a good beginning of the solution is to provide the method of preserving the peace of the world so that the people may cease to fear, return to their normal pursuits, and take up the thread of their lives where it was interrupted by war.

In this dark and gloomy picture the United Nations remain at present, at least, the only hope for peace. Personally, I think we should have an early convening of a conference to bring about the final terms of the treaty of peace. I fear that the longer the final settlement of the peace treaty is delayed the more difficult and aggressive will become the clashes among different factions and groups in the various countries of the earth. We should have the final peace treaty entered into in order to settle disputes with reference to boundaries and bases. The meeting will not be a quiet one. There will be considerable disturbance. I can hear raucous voices lifted, but the meeting must be held. I think the earlier it is held the better.

Mr. President, if there is any hope for humanity—and I believe there is—we must maintain the rule of law among nations and banish the scourge of war. I hear Senators say glibly that we must either have imperialism or law. But we cannot alone make the law for the world. There are other nations in the world. We must bring about the final reign of law by making slow and sometimes weary progress toward that end. The United Nations is a good beginning. It is a modest beginning. We do not seem to desire a world state. We do not expect an international legislature to be established, such as I fear some Senators advocate, which would pass laws for the United States and the other nations of the world. But we have laid down in the United Nations Charter certain great principles with reference to the settlement of international disputes in behalf of preserving the peace. What we are trying to do here now is to make effective the obligations which we assumed when we ratified the Charter. I thoroughly agree with President Truman, Prime Minister Attlee, and Prime Minister King, of Canada, who stated after their recent conference in Washington that the goal we seek can only be achieved "by giving wholehearted support to the United Nations Organization and by consolidating and extending its authority, thus creating conditions of mutual trust in which all peoples shall be free to devote themselves to the arts of peace."

Mr. President, those are noble words, they are exalted sentiments, and if we can induce the peoples of the earth and the rulers of the earth to follow those great principles—and when I say the peoples I include the rulers—the dawn of the day of peace may not be far distant.

Mr. President, what we need is less of unilateral action on the part of individual states and nations and more of United Nations teamwork. What we need today is to project the comradeship of war into the comradeship of peace. The United Nations Organization is the only vehicle by which that objective can be reached. Under these circumstances, having ratified the Charter, let us pass the pending legislation and redeem the pledges which we have assumed.

No doubt the atomic bomb, of which we have heard so much, and the other new weapons being developed by science, may change considerably the task of the United Nations. It would be foolhardy to suggest, however, that the atomic bomb has rendered the Security Council an unnecessary, ineffective instrument of world peace. Far from it. The importance of the work mapped out by the United Nations Security Council at San Francisco has already increased many times. If there ever was a time to think and act as united nations, that time is now.

From the moment when the representatives of 14 nations met on June 12, 1942, and vowed to fight on together to the end, until the final armistice was signed, the world witnessed the most magnificent demonstration of unity and solidarity ever recorded in the annals of international relations.

What we have done in war we must now undertake to do in peace. Let us, on our part, make sure that the United States contributes its full share. The United Nations Charter is the only present hope for world peace and cooperation. A month ago the Charter went into effect. The new Organization is rapidly becoming a living reality. In that Organization we must not in any way shirk our responsibility or leadership. We have only one alternative. Either we assume our responsibilities with the vigor and determination characteristic of the American people, or we let the world tumble in about us.

Mr. President, we have heard a good deal of talk in recent times about peace and about our foreign policy. There are those who criticize the United States foreign policy, some saying we have none. I wish to suggest to those who are so critical along these lines that they should read the speech which President Truman made in New York some time ago, in which he pointed out his own conception of our public duties and responsibilities in foreign relations. His was a most commendable statement.

It is easy enough to sit on the side lines and criticize matters in the field of foreign relations. It is wholly a different thing to have responsibility and to undertake to carry out our objectives when we cannot carry them out alone.

President Truman made an address, which appears on page 10129 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 29, 1945. In that address he listed 12 propositions, as follows:

1. We seek no territorial expansion or selfish advantage. We have no plans for aggres-

sion against any other state, large or small. We have no objectives which need clash with the peaceful aims of any other nation.

2. We believe in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all peoples who have been deprived of them by force.

3. We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

4. We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western Hemisphere.

5. By the combined and cooperative action of our war allies, we shall help the defeated enemy states establish peaceful democratic governments of their own free choice. And we shall try to attain a world in which nazism, fascism, and military aggression cannot exist.

6. We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power. In some cases it may be impossible to prevent forceful imposition of such a government. But the United States will not recognize any such government.

7. We believe that all nations should have the freedom of the seas and equal rights to the navigation of boundary rivers and waterways and of rivers and waterways which pass through more than one country.

8. We believe that all states which are accepted in the society of nations should have access on equal terms to the trade and the raw materials of the world.

9. We believe that the sovereign states of the Western Hemisphere, without interference from outside the Western Hemisphere, must work together as good neighbors in the solution of their common problems.

10. We believe that full economic collaboration between all nations, great and small, is essential to the improvement of living conditions all over the world, and to the establishment of freedom from fear and freedom from want.

11. We shall continue to strive to promote freedom of expression and freedom of religion throughout the peace-loving areas of the world.

12. We are convinced that the preservation of peace between nations requires a United Nations Organization composed of all the peace-loving nations of the world who are willing jointly to use force if necessary to insure peace.

The President sets forth here a brilliant catalog of international principles. Yet Senators and others say the United States has no foreign policy.

Mr. President, we have not a charter of foreign policy, as some of the nations of the world have. Some nations have a well-defined program of aggressive action in behalf of their trade or in behalf of spreading their boundaries. We entertain no such conceptions of sovereignty.

I noted that former Justice Roberts, of the Supreme Court, presided over a meeting in Vermont or New Hampshire recently in which it was said, "Oh, the United Nations Charter is not sufficient. We must have a world government." I do not remember the details, as to whether they went far enough to say whether they wanted a world legislature and a world court.

We are not yet ready for a world government; we are not yet ready for the consolidation of our own Nation into a conglomerate host of other nations, with their prejudices and hatreds. I believe the United States can serve mankind better by remaining the United States, and by setting an example to the world in the light of our historical background and our devotion to the great principles of constitutional liberty and free government. I think we can discharge our hopes for the world better when following that course than by surrendering our sovereignty, and merging ourselves into a great conglomerate mass of all the peoples of the world. We would not need to have a caucus; we could not do anything after we had it. We would be outvoted the first day in any world legislature which might be established.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. A while ago the Senator complained because he was not interrupted. I have that in mind at the present moment or I would not presume to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Go ahead. The Senator may interrupt me as long as he pleases.

Mr. TAYLOR. I merely wish to raise my voice and say that I at least feel that the time has come to evolve a workable world government. I do not say we should submerge our sovereignty, but we should be willing to yield enough sovereignty to a world government to insure peace in the world, or I firmly believe mankind faces extinction. I believe the people of America are anxious and willing that we should participate in a really workable world government, not merely a league of some kind. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to have the Senator's views; but let me suggest to him that he was not born a United States Senator, he was born a little baby. He first learned to crawl, and then he learned to walk, he learned a little more, and a little more, until he finally got to be a man, and a United States Senator.

Mr. TAYLOR. I still do not know very much, I am frank to admit.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not mean to suggest that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am saying it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator has done exceedingly well. I know many men much older than the Senator who are still justices of the peace, and have not gotten to the United States Senate. I congratulate the Senator. I think he has done well. But the Senator did not let me reach the point. The United States cannot at one leap jump into a world government and then run it. Senators and others who are talking about a world government assume we are going to run it; we would not run it very long. We have to grow into it. We are trying to make an approach here to what the Senator says he wants. We are trying to make an approach through an organization to preserve world peace.

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall give the Senator all the assistance I can.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very much obliged to the Senator. We cannot jump into a world government. I, myself, do not want the United States to jump into a world government. If we were in a foreign government, I would try to get our Government to jump out just as we did in 1781, when we defeated Great Britain.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator to state that he did not want a world government. Is that what he said?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I wanted to be sure about that. From the Senator's remarks during the past 5 minutes my impression was that he was saying this was the first step toward a world government.

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly understood his remarks to be to that effect.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I am sorry the Senator misunderstood. I was answering the Senator from Idaho, who wants a world government. I was explaining that even according to his views we could not jump right into a world government. I do not want a world government ever, but I am saying that if there is to be one, we must approach it gradually. We did not approach the formation of a United States Government in a minute. It took us 150 years, as the original colonies, before we ourselves were able to formulate and generate concepts of independence and freedom. We fought a year as Englishmen against the king without a declaration of independence. Independence did not come until more than a year after Washington assumed command of the Army at Cambridge. In 150 years of colonial history and colonial struggle and colonial legislation we learned how at least to conceive of constitutional government and representative institutions.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I happen to be one of the Senators who, I think, the Senator from Texas was referring to as having indicated a very strong belief that except as we take at least a few steps in the direction of government on the world level we do not stand much chance of controlling the destructive weapons of modern war, and I might say that does not detract at all from my strong support of the pending legislation. I think we want to go ahead with what we have, which is the United Nations Organization. I might say it is not Senators alone who feel that way. I read a speech by Dr. Compton, who was one of the leaders in the atomic bomb project, who predicted flatly that the world would achieve some form of united control; that if we did not work it out peaceably it would be by another war, an atomic war.

I should like to ask the Senator from Texas who is so firmly opposed to any step in that direction, how many more world wars he thinks this earth can stand, particularly now that the atomic bomb has been discovered?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not suppose the Senator intends to propound that question seriously.

Mr. BALL. We have had two world wars in 25 years. I do not think we will have sufficient time to achieve organization on the world level so that we will

not have another world war. I think we will have to move much faster and speed up this evolutionary process.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am trying to speed it up. The Senator wants to know how many more world wars I think we can endure. That is hardly a pointed inquiry or one that would elicit any information. Of course, I am against further wars, and I am doing here what I feebly can to set up an agency which I think will prevent another world war. I recognize, as the Senator from Minnesota must recognize, that there is no absolute guaranty, nor can there ever be an absolute guaranty that men will not fight somewhere and somehow. I am trying to contribute what I can to prevent wars. What I propose is a beginning. Does not the Senator remember that in 1920 we could not get through the Senate any sort of a proposal for an international organization? Now, that we are trying to get through the Senate something which we feel can be gotten through, the Senator from Minnesota wants to abandon that and run after some butterfly of world government away over in India or somewhere else.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Texas is not talking about the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator from Minnesota has never advocated abandoning the United Nations Organization. I made a speech, which I placed in the RECORD, in which I pointed out that, in view of the realities of security and preparations for war and national defense in the light of the atomic bomb, it seemed to me some change was needed in the United Nations Organization if it was to meet realistically the danger of another war and the danger of a secret armament race among the great powers. I am certainly in favor of the pending legislation. I think we must go along and use the UNO as it is, but at the same time I think we must be moving in the direction of strengthening it to meet the realities of the present world in which we are living. I do not think the Senator from Texas is helping his cause by sneering at those of us who believe that the atomic bomb has changed the nature of the world in which we live.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know about the world, but the bomb has changed many people around Washington. I do not mean to be offensive to the Senator. I am very glad to have his support. What I mean to imply is, though, that when we are about to get this beginning established, we find those who say "Oh well, it is not of any account, but I will vote for it. I want something else, however. I want a world government. But I will vote for this legislation."

Mr. President, I can see the proposed world legislature in session now. India has 300,000,000 people, twice as many as the United States. Do Senators think we can govern India? China has 400,000,000 people. She would have more representatives than we would have. Russia has probably 175,000,000 inhabitants, many more than we have. Yet Senators seem to assume that by some sort of legislative legerdemain or constitutional conceptions we can simply create a world government, and we will take charge and we will run it, and everything will be lovely.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I simply want to point out that New York has many millions of population, I do not know exactly how many, but about 11,000,000. Idaho has less than 500,000. We lost some during the war. But I think we receive a pretty square deal here in Congress; indeed I would not wonder if, when everything is weighed, it is found that we are on the long end. In fact, we are treated quite well in Congress. The Members here seem to be fairly honorable, and I believe there would be representatives on the Council from other nations who would also be honorable and deal fairly with us. Personally I would rather be out-voted than have an atomic bomb drop on me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that the world government or the Charter, either one, is going to change the character or the chemical constituents of the atomic bomb. All the argument some Senators seem to be able to advance is, "Well, there is the atomic bomb"! The atomic bomb does not answer everything. I do not think it removes the necessity for a world charter. I think we must have a United Nations Charter.

The Senator from Idaho compared his State with New York. He said New York had 11,000,000, and I believe he said the population of Idaho was 500,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the Senator said he thought Idaho received more consideration than New York. The Constitution provides for equal representation of States in the Senate regardless of their size. The Senator from Idaho ought to venerate the Constitution and our system for guaranteeing that representation, because he will not get the representation he wants in a world government. He will not receive equal rights there.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. What would there be to stop us from having the same sort of a government under a world government and the same kind of representation for our country as my State has in the National Government?

Mr. CONNALLY. If we were to grant that the United States will create the world government all by itself, and by itself run the world government, that would be be fine, but the Senator will find that some other countries will want to have a say about that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I realize that, but I want to see a beginning made in that direction, and I am heartily in favor of the pending legislation as being a step in the right direction.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, if we were to establish a world government we would do away with all our immigration laws; people could move into any locality they pleased; we would do away with the sacred white cow of the tariff, and so forth.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Texas think it would be valuable to have a rule relating only to armaments, which would be enforceable by this Organization?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that if he were present a while ago he heard me say that I did not contend that any sort of an organization can be created which will be an absolute guarantee that there will not be a war. Some one said something about 1861—I think it was the Senator from Minnesota. The Constitution of the United States did not prevent the war in 1861. The British Constitution did not prevent our Revolution, and it does not prevent disturbances in India and elsewhere in the world. Until we get something which absolutely guarantees peace, the prevention of war, I am not in favor of disarming our own country. I believe we have got to maintain a Navy sufficiently strong to command the seas. While we shall not need an Army so large, comparatively, as the Navy, I favor maintaining an adequate military force, because after all we owe ourselves and our children and our native land the duty of protecting it and defending it. This world is in such a state of turmoil and we are wandering about with so many problems and so many difficult situations, that I am not in favor of disarming.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not be in favor of disarming. That is not the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator asked me about disarmament.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What would be the Senator's attitude toward rules which are enforceable, we will say, by the United Nations Organization, relating to armaments, which apply not simply to us but to all the members of the United Nations?

Mr. CONNALLY. Nations can make recommendations under the Charter now. I will say that I am not in favor of another such thing happening as occurred in 1922, if that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not either.

Mr. CONNALLY. At that time many of our warships were deliberately sunk. I am not in favor of repeating what resulted from the Washington Conference of 1922, when many of our naval vessels were sunk, if that is what the Senator means.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I am not in favor of that either.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is talking about disarmament. What does the Senator want to do?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There was discussion a moment ago about the atomic bomb. That is an easy thing to talk about. I assume that what applies to the atomic bomb applies also to the B–29 and to other weapons. Several responsible scientists have stated before one committee which I attended that a system of inspection control could be agreed upon and effectively administered pro-

vided that each member of the United Nations would give representatives of the other members permission and power to make inspections in its country. That is what I mean by rules and regulations which would be enforcible.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is possible that such a plan might be carried out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For example, if such rules were proposed, would the Senator have any objection to this country going along with Russia and all other countries in adopting such a system?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not propose that immediately. First, I think we ought to find out what the atomic bomb is. I think we ought to find out a little more about it than we now know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not mean to restrict it to the atomic bomb.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator favor giving away all our airplanes and saying, "We do not need any more airplanes"?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator favor giving away our Navy?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator favor giving away our bombers?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not as such. If the suggestion on the part of the scientists could be made effective, and the armaments of other countries could be controlled, I certainly would be willing to submit to the same control under which other nations would operate. But that has nothing to do with our giving away our arms unilaterally, which is what we did in sinking our fleet. However, I do not see any real objection to rules which would apply to all alike.

Mr. CONNALLY. If we had such rules, and had a guaranty that every nation would abide by them, we would not need any armies or navies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the plan were successful, that is what would happen, but certainly that would not be the situation in the beginning. I do not mean to discard the United Nations Organization; but to describe my idea in a few words, it is simply to strengthen it a little by delegating to it some further powers than it now has. I think it is admirable machinery to start with. That is far from saying that we should discard it or throw it out the window.

Mr. CONNALLY. We alone cannot modify or change it. Our delegates in the Security Council and the Assembly can make proposals.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree to that. Does not the Senator think that we should make such proposals, and that they would carry weight?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator wishes to offer an amendment to the bill, he is free to offer it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not have in mind offering an amendment to the pending bill. However, the question arose in the debate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I always try to do the job at hand. I am interested in having the pending bill enacted into law and getting the Organization started. I am not looking for additional proposals to confuse the issue. The Senator has already made a speech in which he stated that our foreign affairs are confused and that the President and the Secretary of State are wandering around without any leadership or guidance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I am not mistaken, the Senator said the same thing not more than 5 minutes ago.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was referring to the world. I was covering a little more territory than was the Senator. I am not complaining, but I am suggesting that that is one reason why I do not wish to introduce other questions until we dispose of this one. I do not wish to fall into the confusion about which the Senator is speaking, as applied to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. I like their company, but I do not wish to get in their company in that way. That is my answer to the Senator's question.

Why can we not stay with this Organization until we try it for a while? Why do we have to abandon it, modify it, or change it before it ever comes into being?

Let us see how it works. It may not work. I do not guarantee that it will. I wish I could. If I could, I would. We cannot find out whether it is going to work until we try it. Why do we permit our attention to be diverted? As soon as we propose something, it is said, "Let us do something else." After we pass this bill, we shall be free to do something else, if we wish. We can offer suggestions and our delegates can submit proposals. Resolutions can be offered and Senators can make speeches and get their names in the newspapers. But let us go along with what we have. If we wish to improve on it, we are free to do so, but let us not endanger the whole cause of international peace by denying to other nations the only hope of this world in these dark and troubled times.

I have already stated that I hope for an early peace treaty. I have already commented on the gentlemen who say that we have no foreign policy. In answer to that charge, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from the President's speech in New York, in which he pointed out 12 of his theories.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We seek to use our military strength solely to preserve the peace of the world, for we now know that that is the only sure way to make our own freedom secure.

That is the basis of the foreign policy of the people of the United States.

The foreign policy of the United States is based firmly on fundamental principles of righteousness and justice. In carrying out those principles we shall firmly adhere to what we believe to be right, and we shall not give our approval to any compromise with evil.

But we know that we cannot attain perfection in this world overnight. We shall not let our search for perfection obstruct our steady progress toward international cooperation. We must be prepared to fulfill our responsibilities as best we can, within the framework of our fundamental principles, even though we recognize that we have to operate in an imperfect world.

Let me restate the fundamentals of that foreign policy of the United States:

1. We seek no territorial expansion or selfish advantage. We have no plans for aggression against any other state, large or small. We have no objective which need clash with the peaceful aims of any other nation.

2. We believe in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all peoples who have been deprived of them by force.

3. We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

4. We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western Hemisphere.

5. By the combined and cooperative action of our war allies, we shall help the defeated enemy states establish peaceful democratic governments of their own free choice. And we shall try to attain a world in which nazism, fascism, and military aggression cannot exist.

6. We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power. In some cases it may be impossible to prevent forceful imposition of such a government. But the United States will not recognize any such government.

7. We believe that all nations should have the freedom of the seas and equal rights to the navigation of boundary rivers and waterways and of rivers and waterways which pass through more than one country.

8. We believe that all states which are accepted in the society of nations should have access on equal terms to the trade and the raw materials of the world.

9. We believe that the sovereign states of the Western Hemisphere, without interference from outside the Western Hemisphere, must work together as good neighbors in the solution of their common problems.

10. We believe that full economic collaboration between all nations, great and small is essential to the improvement of living conditions all over the world, and to the establishment of freedom from fear and freedom from want.

11. We shall continue to strive to promote freedom of expression and freedom of religion throughout the peace-loving areas of the world.

12. We are convinced that the preservation of peace between nations requires a United Nations Organization composed of all the peace-loving nations of the world who are willing jointly to use force if necessary to insure peace.

That is the foreign policy which guides the United States now. That is the foreign policy with which it confidently faces the future.

It may not be put into effect tomorrow or the next day. But, nonetheless, it is our policy; and we shall seek to achieve it. It may take a long time, but it is worth waiting for, and it is worth striving to attain.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in closing let me say that we can best meet the world, we can best promote the cause of international peace, we can best forward the interests of constitutional and free government, by remaining Americans in dealing with other nations, supported by the prestige and the historical traditions of the United States. That is why I say that at the moment we are not ready for, nor do I favor, the creation of a world state in which the identity of the United States would be submerged, and in which our institutions would be blotted out and

combined in some sort of conglomerate mass with the institutions of other lands. America must remain American.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wished to get the distinguished Senator's viewpoint relative to a section of the committee's report. At the bottom of page 7 of the committee report I find the following language:

> The bill provides that such approval by Congress shall be expressed by appropriate act or joint resolution.

The subject under discussion was military agreements.

Mr. CONNALLY. The report states that—

> The bill provides that such approval by Congress shall be expressed by appropriate act or joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Continuing with the language of the report—

> During the debate in the Senate on the Charter last July, there was considerable discussion as to whether the military agreements should be considered as treaties or whether they might be approved by the Congress through the joint resolution procedure.

The report continues relative to the viewpoint of the committee and the opinion of Senators as to how the approval should be accomplished. I merely wish to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to an observation, and also to ask him a question.

Is it not still an open question as to how approval is to be accomplished?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. That was one thing which we did not decide when we voted for the machinery of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Those of us who voted for it now agree that military agreements should be made; but the question still remains for determination as to whether they shall be made by treaty or through ratification by Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That question is before us for consideration in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. It is not determined in the bill. The question is still left open, to be decided when such agreements are submitted.

Mr. WHERRY. By further implementing legislation?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. When the agreements are submitted to the Senate, that question will be considered. The President will negotiate them and then submit them to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any provision in the bill to the effect that the agreements should come before us for ratification as treaties, rather than by joint action of the two Houses of Congress?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not believe so, if I correctly understand the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to inquire of the able Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] if he desires the floor at this time? If so, I prefer to yield to him.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I had intended to follow the distinguished Senator from Texas. However, I have a speech which will probably take at least 2 or 2½ hours. Consequently I should prefer not to begin at this time; but I now give notice that at the earliest possible opportunity tomorrow I shall seek recognition.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, under those circumstances, and since my observations are the precise opposite of those of the able Senator from Montana in contemplated length, I shall proceed at this time for a few minutes. I can be brief on the subject because the pending measure speaks for itself. It is the wholly logical supplement to the Senate's action on July 28, 1945, when, by a vote of 89 to 2, we ratified the Charter of the United Nations Organization in behalf of the people of the United States. In my opinion, the American people overwhelmingly wanted that action taken then. In my opinion, they want this action taken now. They want the only available hope for organized peace and security to have its prompt and unfettered chance to serve a seething world. In my view, we are committed to proceed—committed, on the one hand, by our own earlier and eloquent action; committed, on the other hand, by the perilous trend of intervening international events.

In the face of these intervening events, Mr. President, I submit that there is even more need for putting virility into the United Nations Organization in November than there was last July, when we ratified the Charter. The obvious worsening of international relations on many fronts is not a reason for abandoning or for scuttling this great adventure in which 50 nations have agreed to the rules and regulations under which this war-worn earth shall seek international peace and security. On the contrary, it is a multiplying reason for putting these healing processes to work as swiftly as is possible. Meanwhile, the intervening disclosure that man has robbed nature of its terrorizing atomic secrets—as a result of which civilization could easily commit global suicide—is not a reason for dismissing this adventure as inadequate. On the contrary, it is a multiplying reason for earnestly and faithfully pursuing it to whatever subsequent perfections may be dictated by subsequent experience. I shall join in these subsequent progressive evolutions. But if we let loose now of what we have, Mr. President—either because some think international collaboration for peace has become a vanishing mirage or because others think that we need more or different or lustier international engagements—if we let loose of what we have we are well calculated to wind up with no organized international defense at all against a grim, ghastly, climactic war which can be too awful for human minds to contemplate or for human flesh to suffer.

I call the record to witness, Mr. President, that I have never attempted to oversell the United Nations Organization. I have never offered it as a sure cure for war fever. I have never had any illusions—in private or in public—that this noble effort will not stand or fall chiefly as a result of the degree of good faith and good will which the major powers devote to it and to our mutual comity. This good will has sagged since San Francisco, Mr. President. Again I cherish no illusions. But if it has sagged, Mr. President, then there is greater need than ever to try the only available device for renewing and resuming the intimate and constant contacts which brought 50 nations into hopeful concord only four short months ago. The greater the lack of concord today, the greater the need to resume its quest.

I shall never tire of pointing out that when these 50 nations came together at San Francisco last April, they literally represented bedlam. They were separated from each other by race, religion, language, tradition, habit, environment, geography, ideology, and aspiration. They came with a thousand amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. There was no common denominator except a common enemy. Yet, at the end of 11 or 12 weeks of constant and uninterrupted conference, they unanimously signed the San Francisco Charter. These continuous contacts—day in and day out—wore away the points of difference and finally amalgamated a united point of view. That is something that spasmodic Potsdams can never do. Mr. President, I shall always believe—unless and until fair trial of the United Nations Organization proves otherwise—that similar continuity of contact day in and day out, week in and week out, in respect to the labors of the Security Council of the United Nations Organization offers us and the world our greatest hope to liquidate World War II without precipitating World War III. Today there is no such continuity of contact. We are relying now upon intermittent conferences, not attended by all of the allied fraternity of earth, but by merely a few of the big and major powers. They meet for a short time, and then disperse. From that sort of intermittent contact it is utterly impossible to achieve the result which can be obtained from the continuity of contact which demonstrated at San Francisco that it can find a common meeting place and a common measure for common minds. That is why I am saying with all the emphasis at my command that, no matter how difficult the international situation may have become in the last few intervening months, the greater the reason why we need this device for bringing into constant and continuous contact the major nations of this earth in pursuit of a common denominator and an adequate and satisfactory answer for our common problems; and there is no remote invitation to that net result, there is no possible opportunity for its achievement, except as the United Nations Organization is sped upon its way into active action with the least possible delay. That is why I feel that the pending legislation, Mr. President, at the bar of the Senate at this moment, is freighted with desperate importance to the pacific relationships of America and the other major powers of this earth.

Mr. President, no one pretends that the United Nations Charter is perfect. None of us who signed it was wholly satisfied. But it contains within itself the machinery for its own improvement. Perhaps, like our own immortal Constitution, its formula may speedily require amendment. But we must lay the firm foundation before we can improve the roof. The agreement at San Francisco was the greatest single step toward collective security ever taken by multiple sovereigns in the history of humankind. I deeply wish, Mr. President, that we might complete this first step before attempting other steps—lest, in our international confusion, we take no step at all. With greatest respect I shall have to say that premature perfectionists, despite their worthy meditations, might be unwittingly dangerous.

I have said—and I say again—that the success of the United Nations Organization depends essentially upon the good faith and the good will of the major powers. This pending bill, Mr. President, in my view, is the first test of America's good faith and America's good will. It provides for our representation in the various agencies of the United Nations Organization. It implements our Senate vote of 89 to 2 on July 28. It does so with complete fidelity to the letter and the spirit of our previous engagement. It involves no commitment which was not implicit in our previous action. Therefore it seems clear that a "yes" vote then calls for a "yes" vote now. We crossed the Rubicon on July 28.

The issue is very simple, if there be an issue: First, shall our representative on the Security Council be the statutory mouthpiece of the President who has certain well-defined and traditional constitutional prerogatives in our foreign affairs? This bill answers "Yes." When our representative votes it is the President who is voting. Our representative possesses no independent voting powers of his own.

Second, shall this representative be confirmed by the Senate in line with its constitutional prerogatives and its traditional partnership with the Executive in respect to foreign affairs? This bill answers "Yes."

Third, shall the President, through this representative, be entitled to vote for limited military sanctions that seek to prevent aggression and preserve the peace, without further action by the Congress—limited always and specifically to such military force as the Congress, by subsequent action, contractually puts at the disposal of the President and the UNO for these purposes? This bill answers "Yes," and then proceeds categorically to make it plain that this power is strictly limited by the ultimate contract for these purposes which the Congress shall approve. If this was not the purpose of the Charter which the Senate has overwhelmingly approved, if it was not the purpose to discriminate between these contractual peace forces at the disposal of the President and the total war forces of the nation, why was chapter VII of the Charter written at all? Why did not the Senate challenge chapter VII instead of voting for it? The answer is plain. This authority is not in derogation of the constitutional war powers of the Congress. It is in recognition of the traditional constitutional defense powers of the President. To attempt to strip him of these limited powers when he speaks for us in the Security Council would be to silence the effective voice of America in those summary decisions through which the United Nations Organization shall strive to keep peace and prevent war. I submit that any such hobble is not what the Senate voted for on July 28 last. I submit that it would not be in our own intelligent self-interest to do so.

Fourth, if and when the President, through his representative, votes for military sanctions, shall he be required immediately to notify the Congress so that there are no dark corners in this enterprise? This bill answers "Yes."

Fifth, shall our representatives on subordinate councils and commissions be subject to confirmation by the Senate? This bill answers "Yes."

In a word, Mr. President, it is my considered opinion that this bill—upon which the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee closely collaborated and unanimously agreed before it was ever introduced—represents American good faith and good will in implementing our pledges to the United Nations Organization. At the same time it confines itself within our own American constitutional process. It fully protects the prerogatives of the President, Congress, and the Senate. It leaves our destiny within the keeping of our own constitutional authorities. Yet it provides our cooperation with the United Nations Organization in full keeping with the spirit of the San Francisco Charter, and in full keeping with the process which it invites in behalf of international peace and security.

Mr. President, I shall amplify these views in the course of the debate, but I wanted to make the preliminary statement which I have made, so that my colleagues may know why I earnestly support the pending bill as it is written, and why, at this delicate, if not ominous moment in international affairs, I deem it so vital that the clear, strong voice of mighty America shall again be heard around the world in effective and unequivocal support of the United Nations Organization. The conscience of the earth requires this leadership of us. If there is a lapse in these fidelities in any other lands, Mr. President, that is their own tragic responsibility. There must be no lapse in ours. We have won the war. We have yet to win the peace.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat will be yield for a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I assume that the distinguished Senator from Michigan regards this proposed legislation just as he would regard any other legislation passed by Congress in respect of the capacity of Congress at any time in the future, upon changed conditions in the world, to alter the authority, and increase or expand the limitations of the delegates to the Security Council, and the delegates to the General Assembly, is that the view of the Senator with reference to the pending legislation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, the Senator is entirely correct. This Congress may not bind even its next successor in respect to legislation. I would feel that there is a moral obligation involved in our perpetual cooperative effort to make this great enterprise succeed. But I totally agree with the Senator that we maintain unto ourselves complete right of freedom of action in respect to the method by which we undertake to implement our obligations.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator regard the limitation upon our power, as a legislature, to apply only to the extent of the four corners of the treaty which we have made? That is, is it not true that we must keep within the four corners of the agreement which we have entered into, so long as it remains in effect?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I entirely agree with the able Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan be kind enough to enlighten me on one or two points of the bill? I invite his attention to section 2 (a).

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am flattered by the Senator's suggestion that I could enlighten him upon anything.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am sure that the Senator can enlighten me, and I am also sure that he will do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the reference, please?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Section 2 (a) of the bill. I notice there seems to be a mixed function on the part of our representative to the Security Council. He is not only to be our representative to the Security Council, but apparently he will have additional duties. May I ask what are the reasons for this?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am afraid I do not follow the Senator. Will he identify more closely what it is he is reading from?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am referring to section 2 (a) of the bill which reads as follows:

> SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of envoy extraordinary and ambassador plenipotentiary, shall receive annual compensation of $20,000, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct.

I invite the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that the language which I have read apparently is not an inadvertence. The representative is to be given the rank of ambassador, and is to be given a larger salary than is to be paid to the representatives on the assembly, or on the other branches of the Organization. My question is: What are the extra duties of this person beyond those associated with being a representative on the Security Council?

Mr. VANDENBERG. My reply to the Senator is that the answer depends upon events. I can conceive of many functions which the President might want his representative to perform, perhaps in connection with meetings of the Social Security Council, or perhaps in connection with the Trusteeship Council. When the United Nations Organization is in full bloom it will consist of a large number of departmentalized activities. I would say that this is simply a blanket clause for the purpose of giving to the President sufficiently broad authority to use his ambassador, which is to say his representative, in any of these various capacities which might seem desirable or advisable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator say that the language which I have read might have the effect of down-grading our representatives on the Assembly?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Again I am afraid I do not follow the Senator's question. What does the Senator mean by "down-grading our representatives on the Assembly?"

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I interpret the Charter, there is no elevation of the Security Council over the Assembly. According to the Senator's very eloquent description of the powers of the Assembly and its importance, if one ranks above the other perhaps the Assembly might be placed above the Council. We pay a higher salary to the representative on the Security Council. We make an ambassador out of him whereas we give the representative to the Assembly, under the provision which I shall inquire about later on, only a sort of temporary capacity. If the member to the Security Council is to be a sort of coordinating man between all the organs of the Organization, I should like to be informed. In other words, what are his extra duties which the representatives to the Assembly will not have?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not think there is any remote analogy between the membership on the Security Council and the membership on the General Assembly. In the first place, I remind the Senator that the representatives on the General Assembly have no compensation designated at all. In all probability they are annual appointees, meeting for perhaps 4 or 5 or 6 weeks once a year at the central point of the UNO. The Senator is familiar with my belief that, in the ultimate hope of the world, the General Assembly is of far greater potential importance than is the Security Council. I think the General Assembly offers us our real chance to mobilize the conscience of humankind, and to make it articulate effectively. Certainly I would agree to nothing at any time which would subordinate the General Assembly to the Security Council. I do not see how there is anything in the legislation now proposed which would remotely look in the direction of such a subordination.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the representatives to the Assembly have the rank of Ambassador?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would think not.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Why are they subordinated in rank?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I may have too hastily answered the Senator's question, because I do not know what their rank will be. Perhaps they will be designated as Ambassadors. That is purely a matter of protocol with which I am not familiar. I would not consider, certainly, that it is necessary for the prosposed legislation to identify those representatives as Ambassadors.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the Charter does not contemplate the appointment of Ambassadors to this Organization..

Mr. VANDENBERG. Again, I am afraid the Senator will have to be more explicit, if he is asking me for a comment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Why do we appoint an Ambassador to the Council?

Mr. VANDENBERG. So far as I am concerned, solely for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that our representative on the Council is not an independent agent exercising independent power and using an independent voice, but that he is the ambassadorial representative of the President. In my view, that designation carries with it a standardized status which all the world can understand.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is there a possible conflict between the rank and status of an ambassador and the normal functions of a representative to the Council?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would not think so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is nothing in the Charter which requires any rank or status for any of the men appointed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am curious to discover why we start a precedent which will make a sort of diplomatic convention out of the Organization. I suggest to the Senator as a comment after this inquiry that every other nation will be called upon to do the same thing, and pretty soon we will have a flock of diplomats at the seat of the Organization who will be suffocating in their own incense. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I recall a discussion of this matter; I cannot remember between whom it occurred, but I know that it was a discussion which occompanied the use of the phrase "rank and status." We have used it in the case of various organizations now independent, but which are intended ultimately to become affiliated with the United Nations Organization. We have used it, I think, in every case. The purpose of the use of those words is not to grant the authority or the functions of an ambassador or minister plenepotentiary to the particular person, but the purpose of the use of this language is to give him such a status that he will be accorded the immunities, freedoms and privileges which are enjoyed by officers holding the rank and status of ambassador. I think the use of this language does not authorize the person appointed to exercise the functions, but authorizes him only to enjoy a condition.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. With this further observation first, if the Senator will permit me. I am sure that everything the able Senator from Vermont says is so. In addition, however, the discussions clearly involve the fact that from beginning to end we wanted to be sure that we were not creating a representative with independent freedom of function and activity when we sent our representative to the Security Council, but that all times he would be definitely and specifically subordinate to the President of the United States, and the relationship which exists on the ambassadorial level.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the Senator whether the bill is clear that he does act under the instructions of the President?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is by way of surplusage, then?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is very definitely clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has it occurred to the Senator that the Charter itself provides for the immunities and the privileges which it considers shall be necessary for the representatives to the Organization?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So what is the point of bringing it in here?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Again I shall have to ask the Senator to be more specific in his question. I cannot follow him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Charter has a comprehensive provision in which it is declared that the representatives to the Organization shall have diplomatic immunities and privileges. These, I assume, will be defined by the Organization itself. Does the Senator agree with me that far?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That being true, why do we not let the Organization set out the immunities and privileges it thinks the representative to the Organization shall have, and defer our own action until we can fit it into what they propose to do?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is referring again entirely to what he believes to be the inadvisability of identifying this representative as an ambassador.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not making an argument, I am trying to find out the purpose of the appointment of an ambassador to the Security Council, without appointing ambassadors to the Assembly, which the Senator himself has emphasized is a very important organ. I am trying to explore the crannies to find out what the purpose really is. It may develop that it is inconsistent with the Charter. I am not making an argument now, I am trying to obtain some information.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have indicated to the Senator what I considered to be its purpose. What the State Department may have had in mind I am un-

able to tell the Senator at the moment. The Senator from Vermont has given his response to the Senator's question.

I would think that the representative of the United States upon the Security Council is going to exercise an influence, I certainly hope he is, which is of ambassadorial level and ambassadorial authority.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator from Michigan yield again?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The provision of article 105, to which the distinguished Senator from Colorado referred, relates to the Organization itself, and does not comprehend any authority in the Organization to give a status to the nationals of any other country that requires action according to the constitution of such country. No organization could be delegated the authority to give this rank and status to the representative from the United States. If our representative or representatives are to enjoy that rank and status, it has to be given by us. The Organization cannot confer it on them. All I apprehend can be done by the Organization for its members is what is provided in section 2 of article 105, as follows:

> Representatives of the members of the United Nations and officials of the Organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Organization.

Let me say that Great Britain, for example, has accorded to the representatives from the United States by this clause in the Charter only such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions.

We wish to have our representatives exempt from interference as to travel, their baggage admitted free from examination, their persons free from arrest. There are also numerous other privileges which we wish to have them possess. I cannot remember them all. It is that, I believe, which is accomplished by the bill that is not accomplished by the Charter. I myself do not regard the two as in conflict. I think the bill supplements the Charter and does not take away any of the authority of the Organization.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest to the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Colorado that the status of an ambassador is well known in all countries, whether they are members of the United Nations Organization or not, and it carries with it certain immunities and privileges. There is no necessity for defining them. The authority does not come from the Charter, but it comes from each individual nation with which we deal.

When we in the proposed statute make our representative an ambassador, then he is supposed to receive these privileges, no matter what the nation is, whether it is a member of the United Nations Organization or not. He might in traveling have to cross a nation which is not a member of the United Nations, and on presenting his credentials he would be accorded free entry and other privileges. I think that is one reason for the provision.

Another matter is that the proposed statute provides that this representative may be employed by the President to perform other duties besides serving on the Security Council. In the performance of some of those duties he might require ambassadorial status. He might be sent to confer with a foreign government. One of our Ambassadors might be absent from his post because of sickness, and this man, stationed in a foreign country, presumably could be detailed to perform the ambassadorial duties. He derives that power from us, not from the Charter.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Michigan further yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask why it is not of equal importance to give the members of the assembly the same privileges and immunities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I have indicated to the Senator, the membership in the General Assembly is a purely temporary assignment. Our representation in the assembly will probably be a group representation rather than an individual representation, and it does not occur to me that the two categories are at all analogous.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the Senator how much consideration has been given to this point. A representative to the assembly, under this bill, is a sort of temporary officeholder. The Charter does not say anything upon the question. The Charter says the Assembly shall meet annually and on special occasions. The Constitution says the same thing about the Congress. The man who comes to Congress does not lose his congressional status because the Congress is in recess. Why should a man lose his status and rank as a representative to the Assembly because the Assembly does not happen to be in session?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should think that if his duties were concluded he might still consider himself to be a member of the General Assembly if he pleased, but I do not know what good it would do him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But I am driving at the reason for this apparent discontinuity in our representation to the Assembly. There is one group of representatives to start with. The next time the Assembly meets there may be another group. What is there in the Charter that contemplates anything of that kind, and why is that advisable?

Mr. VANDENBERG. So far as the Charter is concerned every member of the United Nations Organization is completely free to name its membership to the General Assembly and to the Security Council, as it sees fit.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree. Now I ask the Senator: Why do we not make it an office of continuity for particular persons rather than sending new representatives to every session of the Assembly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. One answer would be that the meetings of the General Assembly are anticipated by an agenda which might indicate that the major subjects for consideration at some particular meeting of the General Assembly call for one type of representation as perhaps against another type for a different subject if it were the major consideration.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would not that also be true as to the business of the Security Council?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think so. I think the Security Council in the very nature of its continuous operations calls for a continuous representation on the part of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. I was going to suggest that membership on the Security Council requires the presence of the representative regularly at all times at the seat of the Council. In the case of the Assembly does not the Senator think it would be desirable to leave the appointments open, without making them restrictive, so that the President could distribute and scatter the representation from time to time? Would it not contribute to the work of the Organization? Would it not popularize it, and bring more men in contact with it, more Representatives, more Senators, and more outstanding public citizens, than if we were simply to appoint a professional member of the Assembly and a professional member of the Security Council?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator from Texas is quite correct in that respect. The Senator is simply emphasizing again that the character of service to be rendered is totally different in the two instances. I am unable to follow the able Senator from Colorado to any conclusion which is out of harmony with the pending legislation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I notice that advice and consent of the Senate is not required so far as the appointments of representatives to the Assembly is concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Why is that?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Chiefly, I will say to the Senator, because we could not find a formula which seemed to fit the probable circumstances which we shall confront. I will be quite frank with the Senator about it. I think he knows that I was very anxious to have the members of the General Assembly confirmed by the Senate. If I were to be honored with an appointment to the General Assembly, I should very much prefer myself to have my appointment confirmed by the Senate. But if Members of the House of Representatives were to be appointed to the General Assembly there seems to be considerable doubt as to whether the House would be satisfied to pass any legislation which would require the consent of the Senate to the service of Members of the House in one of these functions.

Furthermore, perhaps there is no good reason for confirming Senators as delegates. In any event there can only be

five representatives at any one meeting of the General Assembly representing the United States. In the natural course of events most of those delegates are calculated to be either existing officers of the Government who have been elected to their present positions or who have been confirmed by the Senate in their present positions.

We finally came to the conclusion that about the only persons left for whom it might be logical still to seek confirmation by the Senate, would be perhaps one or two civilians at the end of the list. In the light of the complete complication which I have very frankly explained to the Senator, we left the membership on the General Assembly without confirmation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say that in view of the importance that has been placed upon the Assembly, which is placed there by the Charter as well as by those who have advocated the Charter, it seems very strange to me that such an important office should not in each instance come before the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will say to the Senator that if anyone wants to propose confirmation of nominations to the General Assembly, that is the one amendment to the pending bill for which I might be willing to vote.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator again yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I notice there is a recognition in the bill that Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives or officers of the United States who have already been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate do not have to come before this body for confirmation. I suppose consideration has been given to the fact that that might lead to the appointment of unacceptable individuals. Because the Senate has confirmed a specific man in the light of a specific job it certainly does not indicate that it is the opinion of the Senate that he is competent to hold another job.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator may be able to make an argument of that nature.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Earlier in the day there was some discussion of the significance of the President's instructions to the member of the Council, and I think the bill makes it very clear that he does act under the instructions of the President, and I do not see how it could be otherwise. Does the Senator join in the opinion that insofar as the Congress retains constitutional jurisdiction over a subject, when the Congress acts on that subject in relation to business before the Assembly, that in such case the President would be the vehicle for passing on the instructions of the Congress?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I correctly understand the Senator's question I agree with it; but I reserve the right to pursue it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will give the Senator an example. A matter in this bill which is under the clear domain of Congress under a half a dozen express provisions of the Constitution, is the embargo provision. The legislation, if it passes, renders the question moot, because we surrender our power to the President. Assuming we did not surrender it to the President—and I cite this merely as an example—if we want to put on an embargo, and retain the power to put it on, would not the President be merely a vehicle for passing our instructions on to the member of the Security Council?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I understand the Senator's question, I would say "yes."

Mr. BALL rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator permit me to yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall be glad to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I was going to ask the Senator from Michigan if he does not feel there is quite a difference in the instructions and the source of the authority of the delegation in the Assembly and our representative on the Security Council? The bill makes very clear that the representative on the Security Council is an agent of the President alone, whereas it seems to me our delegation in the Assembly represents the whole United States Government, not merely the President. Congress might very well adopt resolutions instructing our delegates to take certain positions. It seems to me they should be bound in some way by such instructions issued by Congress. I do not know quite how that idea could be incorporated in the pending legislation unless we specifically provide that Congress should elect its own representatives on that delegation. Does the Senator feel there is a difference there?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, I think the Senator has a point. At the same time I would not think it was necessary to provide textually for any process of instructions. I would think that if the Congress of the United States by concurrent resolution expressed its opinion on some new subject in anticipation of a meeting of the General Assembly, it would be quite as effective as if there were a compulsory routine involved in the statute itself.

Mr. BALL. In any event the Senator, I think, will agree that the delegation in the Assembly is not simply the agent of the President bound to do whatever he instructs them to do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. They represent the United States as a whole Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that is true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have asked the Senator to yield for what is perhaps a very technical question in conjunction with what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has said. The Senator from Colorado called attention to the fact that under section 2 (a) the representative on the Security Council "shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct."

Then in section 2 (b) the deputy representative has the functions of the representative on the Security Council, but there is nothing said about other functions. On the other hand, he performs in the absence or disability of the representative. Would it not be well to make a technical addition, to amend section 2 (b) by adding the words at the end "and shall perform such other of his functions as the President may from time to time direct"?

I simply ask the Senator from Michigan if that would not be a helpful suggestion, in view of his answer to the Senator from Colorado that these other functions may become important.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It might be. I suggest that the matter go over for the consideration of the chairman of the committee, so that we can see the proposal in black and white, and fully estimate the context.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest for the consideration of the distinguished Senator and the distinguished chairman of the committee that there is a distinct usefulness in having someone to coordinate the activities of our representatives on the Council, our representatives on the Assembly, and our representatives on the other special bodies. They should not be flying around, each one operating under separate, and possibly uncoordinated, instructions. My suggestion is that instead of giving one member of the Organization a sort of aggrandized position over the others, we should provide for a special ambassador who shall have that special function. That plan would get away from many troublesome questions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean in addition to the representative on the Security Council?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I mean a separate man to do coordinating between the various representatives to that Organization. I suggest that it is something to think on.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I notice the requirement on the President to submit an annual report, and interim reports on decisions of the Council. Would it be impractical for the President to keep the Congress currently advised as to matters which might lead to a decision, so that if we should have to take action, we should be fully informed, and not confronted by a fait accompli?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it would be impracticable to set that down as an indispensable requirement, because I can conceive of discussions and considerations in the Security Council with respect to which it might not be desirable to disclose the full purpose of the Security Council in any such fashion as would be required by a definitive notification to the Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree that it might not be practicable to advise the Congress of the minutiae of everything that went on, but would it not be practicable to keep the Congress currently advised on matters which might lead to a decision of that kind?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I doubt if it could be done in any degree of completeness which would admit of a rule in this statute. That is what I am trying to say to the Senator. I would hope that the President, under the reporting section of the bill, would keep us just as fully advised as is feasible and practicable, not only in respect to what has happened, but in respect to what he contemplates may happen in connection with the functioning of the United Nations Organization.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is exactly the point I am driving at.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that must be left in the discretion of the President, because I do not believe such a rule could be reduced to a formality without perhaps absolutely destroying in some particular instance the very necessities which the Security Council might confront in behalf of world peace and security.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I notice, for example, that the Charter provides that once the Security Council has taken jurisdiction of a matter it shall notify the Assembly, and the Assembly shall lose jurisdiction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In that connection, the Security Council must advise the Assembly exactly what it is considering.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am trying to find out whether there is any objection to informing Congress currently on matters which might lead to a decision, without going into the minutiae.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can only repeat my answer to the Senator. I think he understands my position. I think there is no objection to his suggestion except in those particular instances in which there might be objection; and I do not believe that we can contemplate the total situation with a general rule.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator feels that it would be impossible to include such language in this enabling legislation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is my view.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is that the Senator's sole objection to that sort of a provision?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I notice that there is an amendment on the subject of embargo legislation. I had intended to ask for some information on that, but it is a very large subject, and I shall not bother the Senator with it at this time. In that connection, it is needless to add that it is an enormously important subject. The citations given in the committee's report, for example, not only concern things which led to war, but ultimately almost led to the dissolution of the Union. So I think that question should receive very careful consideration. I make the random suggestion that counsel for the committee might look over the early embargo acts and get some very practical pointers, perhaps, on what should be in this act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his observations.

COMPULSORY JURISDICTION OF THE WORLD COURT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this late hour I shall not introduce a revision of Senate Resolution 160, which I submitted on July 28, 1945, relating to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. I simply wish to serve notice that if I can obtain the floor tomorrow, or at the latest on Wednesday, I hope to submit a revision of Senate Resolution 160, which sets forth only minor changes in that resolution as it now appears in the RECORD. I shall engage in a somewhat lengthy discussion of the problems which I think confront this country in regard to granting compulsory jurisdiction to the World Court.

I hold to the view—upon which I shall expand at some length—that now is the time, prior to the convening of the General Assembly in the first week of January, for the Government of the United States to keep faith with the spirit and intent of the San Francisco Charter by taking this very important first step. I shall reiterate and enlarge upon the reasons which I set forth in my speech on July 28 in support of the proposal that compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court being made applicable to the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I desire to speak on another subject.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF COURT-MARTIAL SYSTEMS, PUNISHMENT, INCARCERATION, AND SO FORTH, IN THE ARMED FORCES.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this occasion I wish to take 2 or 3 minutes of the time of the Senate to submit and comment upon a resolution pertaining to what I consider to be a very vital problem affecting the people of this country, and particularly the members of the armed forces of this country.

I refer to my previously expressed belief that it is incumbent upon the United States Senate to proceed without delay to conduct a Senatorial investigation of the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy, the sentencing practices, and the prisons and places of incarceration of members of our armed forces who have been found guilty of military crimes. I say that, Mr. President, because of complaints I have obtained in talking with a large number of lawyers—and it would be an understatement to point out that I have discussed this question with at least 35 lawyers who went into the Army and Navy and are now out of the service. Without exception—and this is a very significant point to me—those lawyers tell me that they believe it to be of vital importance that the Senate of the United States proceed without delay to investigate the court-martial systems and prisons of the Army and Navy. Those lawyers have told me without exception that in their opinion many of the sentences imposed by the military are unbelievably harsh and unjust and that the prison treatments which men found guilty of military crimes are receiving at the hands of the military and naval officials of this Nation cry out for investigation.

I have mentioned this subject once before. Let me say, by way of advance rebuttal, that it is no answer to me to say that the Army is now undertaking some survey or review of sentences imposed, and has enlisted the aid of a committee composed of very distinguished citizens to assist the Army in conducting such a review. That is no answer to me, Mr. President, because in my judgment it is the duty of the Senate to see to it that a Senate committee reviews any review conducted by the Army; I care not what citizens the Army brings in to help it in that review. I want to see an investigation conducted by the Senate independent of the Army and Navy or of any committee appointed by the Army. I point out that members of the armed forces in both the Army and the Navy are not wards of the Army or Navy. They are American citizens, and they are entitled to the same fundamental guaranties which other Americans have a right to enjoy under our Constitution and its Bill of Rights. The proposal of the Army to investigate itself insofar as this issue is concerned should be supplemented by an independent investigation conducted by the Senate.

On the basis of the complaints which I have investigated and the reports which have been filed with me, and on the basis of my conversation with lawyers who I know are competent to recognize a fair trial when they see it, I here and now allege that injustice is rampant in the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy. I believe that it is incumbent upon this body, which must ever be vigilant in preserving the fundamental liberties of American citizens, to take the type of action which I propose in the resolution, which I now read into the RECORD:

Resolved, That a special committee to be composed of nine Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three from the Committee on Military Affairs, three from the Committee on Naval Affairs, and three from the Senate Judiciary Committee is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the courts-martial systems of the Army and Navy, and of the prisons, jails, and places of incarceration of Army and Navy prisoners with particular emphasis on (1) alleged miscarriages of justice arising out of the operation of such systems and places of incarceration; (2) the question of whether or not punishments meted under such systems are unduly excessive; (3) the alleged lack of uniformity in punishments meted under such systems; (4) the question of whether or not present methods of holding courts martial are desirable and proper; and (5) any desirable improvements in or modifications of courts-martial systems and places of incarceration or the administration thereof. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed

$15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The investigation also would extend to the Marine Corps; would it not?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; that would come under the Navy.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks on this subject, let me say that over the years I have devoted a considerable amount of time to the investigation of State and Federal penal systems and practices, and I wish to say that it is to be expected that when an investigation is first proposed, those who are about to be investigated never relish the idea of being investigated. Various excuses are usually offered in an endeavor to prevent the conducting of such an investigation. A standard cover up is to allege that the public body about to be investigated is itself taking steps to remedy the criticism made against it. Yet, without fear of successful contradiction, I say that I do not think there has been a crime survey or a penal investigation conducted in the United States during the past 20 years that has not resulted in some very much needed correction of abuses. I say that it is now too late for the Army and Navy to prevent a disclosure of some of their practices by saying that they propose to investigate the matter themselves. I have no doubt at all that if the Senate rises in connection with what I consider to be its obligation under my resolution, we shall find that as a result of the investigation both the Army and the Navy will be materially strengthened because of the reforms which I am confident will be brought about as a consequence of the investigation.

But be that as it may, I believe that citizens serving in the armed forces of the United States are entitled to have the procedures in respect to courts martial in the Army and the Navy investigated by people whom they have elected to be their representatives in Congress. They are entitled to the assurance that their Congress will see to it that the principles of justice, fair trial, and reasonable punishment guaranteed by our system of law and the administration of justice are protected and practiced by all agencies of the Government, including the Army and the Navy.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to submit the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 195), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, along the line suggested by the Senator from Oregon, there is an additional point to which I should like to have consideration given. The other day in connection with the discussion of certain measures by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, reference was made to the situation in which we now find ourselves. We are not now at war, but inasmuch as there has not been a declaration of the cessation of war either by the President or by the Congress, persons convicted in courts-martial cases which now are being tried are receiving the wartime penalties, whereas, as a matter of fact, in all justice and fairness any such violations of regulations should call for much lesser penalties. I think that is one matter to which the Senator from Oregon should give consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his comment, and I wish to say that in my judgment the resolution I have submitted is broad enough to encompass exactly the type of investigation he mentions. I most certainly think that type of investigation should be conducted within the framework of my resolution.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maple T. Harl, of Colorado, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 6, 1945, vice Leo T. Crowley, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Arthur J. Mellott, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas, to fill a new position;

Henry L. Hess, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon, vice Carl C. Donaugh, term expired; and

Russell Nichols to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Albert M. Rowe, term expired.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dwight David Eisenhower, to be Chief of Staff in the Regular Army of the United States, with the rank of General of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester W. Nimitz, to be Chief of Naval Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL CONCERNING WHALING

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on November 23, 1945, the President sent to the Senate Executive J, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, a supplementary protocol concerning whaling signed at London on October 5, 1945, for the Governments of the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Republic of Mexico, New Zealand, and Norway. Under the rules of the Senate, there is a ban of secrecy on protocols and treaties until removed by the Senate. On behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the supplementary protocol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol and it will be printed in the RECORD.

The supplementary protocol, with accompanying papers, is as follows:

EXECUTIVE J

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 23, 1945.*

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a supplementary protocol concerning whaling signed at London on October 5, 1945, for the Governments of the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Republic of Mexico, New Zealand, and Norway. The purpose of the present protocol is to bring into force, without awaiting the accession thereto of the Government of Eire, the protocol signed at London on February 7, 1944, amending the international agreement for the regulation of whaling signed at London on June 8, 1937, as amended by the protocol signed at London on June 24, 1938.

With the supplementary protocol of October 5, 1945, I transmit for the information of the Senate the report relating thereto made to me by the Secretary of State.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of whaling protocol signed October 5, 1945.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 20, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of a supplementary

protocol concerning whaling signed at London on October 5, 1945, for the Governments of the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Republic of Mexico, New Zealand, and Norway.

The purpose of the protocol herewith submitted is to bring into force, without awaiting the accession thereto of the Government of Eire, the protocol signed at London on February 7, 1944 (Senate Executive D, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), amending the international agreement for the regulation of whaling signed at London on June 8, 1937 (Treaty Series 933), as amended by the protocol signed at London on June 24, 1938 (Treaty Series 944).

As provided in paragraphs (i) and (ii) of article 7 of the afore-mentioned protocol of February 7, 1944, that protocol could not come into force until instruments of ratification thereof or accession thereto had been deposited on behalf of the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Canada, Eire, Mexico, New Zealand, and Norway. Such instruments have been deposited for each of those governments with the exception of the Government of Eire. The supplementary protocol of October 5, 1945, has therefore been signed with a view to bringing into force the protocol of February 7, 1944, at the earliest practicable date in order that it will be effective during the 1945–46 whaling season.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES F. BYRNES.

[Enclosure: Supplementary protocol concerning whaling, signed October 5, 1945.]

SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Mexico, New Zealand, and Norway:

Having ratified or acceded to the Protocol signed in London on the 7th February, 1944, amending the International Agreement for the Regulation of Whaling, signed in London on the 8th June, 1937, as amended by the Protocol of the 24th June, 1938;

Considering that it is provided under Article 7 that the said Protocol of the 7th February, 1944, shall come into force as soon as ratification or accessions have been deposited on behalf of all the Governments referred to in paragraph (i) of that Article;

Considering further that ratifications or accessions have been deposited on behalf of all the said Governments with the exception of the Government of Eire; and

Desiring that the said Protocol shall be brought into force without awaiting the accession of the Government of Eire;

Have decided to conclude a Supplementary Protocol for this purpose and have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (i) and (ii) of Article 7 of the Protocol on the Regulation of Whaling, signed in London on the 7th February, 1944, the said Protocol shall, on the signature of the present Supplementary Protocol, be deemed to come into force with respect to States signing the present Protocol, except that the said Protocol shall come into force with respect to any State signing the present Protocol subject to ratification upon receipt of notice of ratification by the Government of the United Kingdom.

In witness whereof, the Undersigned, duly authorised by their respective Governments have signed the present Supplementary Protocol.

Done in London this 5th day of October, 1945, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom and of which certified copies shall be transmitted to all the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the United States of America:

JOHN G. WINANT,
Subject to ratification.

For the Government of Canada:

FREDERIC HUDD.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

O. G. SARGENT.

For the Government of the Republic of Mexico:

ALFONSO DE ROSENZWEIG DIAZ.

For the Government of New Zealand:

R. M. CAMPBELL.

For the Government of Norway:

ERIC COLBAN.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 27, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 26 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Maple T. Harl, of Colorado, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 6, 1945, vice Leo T. Crowley.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 26 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

IN THE ARMY

Dwight David Eisenhower for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the Chief of Staff with the rank of General of the Army, for a period of 4 years from November 19, 1945.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Chester W. Nimitz to be Chief of Naval Operations for a term of 2 years.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Mary E. Owen, Higley.
Edward H. Kuhn, Litchfield Park.

INDIANA

Walter Bouse, Claypool.
Idelle M. Gallaher, Mellott.
Lydia A. Mann, Stillwell.

NORTH CAROLINA

A. Eloise Maness, Star.

OKLAHOMA

Milton Pete Toffier, Dewar.
Doris C. Turner, Harden City.
W. Lynn Norman, Mangum.

PUERTO RICO

Silvestre G. Gonzalez, Lares.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ann Brooks, Florence.
Myron J. Cannon, Hermosa.

VERMONT

Rose M. Wright, Colchester.
Edna R. Morris, South Barre.

WASHINGTON

Frank O. Keith, Battle Ground.
John E. Martin, Buckley.
Enis Beasley, Lyman.
Hans Christoffersen, Marlin.
Macil C. Lee, Wilsoncreek.

WISCONSIN

Albert L. Van Alstine, New London.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most Gracious God, we thank Thee for what Thou hast wrought in the past by noble men and women and for what we believe Thou wilt accomplish through them in the future. Thus may the injunctions of our Elder Brother be stamped upon our land, evoking thoughtfulness, patience, and gratitude, the sure pathway into the presence of our Father.

This robe of flesh, with its strange infirmities, was worn as the earthly garment of our Lord; His life was grandly lived; we pray that we may keep the quality of our outlook unwarped and unsullied by girding our faith and our conscience. Be Thou the strength behind our weakness, the wisdom behind our ignorance, and the vision behind our shadows. By Thy mercy help us to present our bodies a living sacrifice, not conformed to this world, but by the renewing of our minds we may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 23, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 744. An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions;

H. R. 801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children;

H. R. 843. An act for the relief of Francis A. Hanley;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend;

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Nannie Bass;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of John August Johnson;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Carl Lewis;

H. R. 1192. An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of O. M. Minatree;

H. R. 1512. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Candler Cobb;

H. R. 1902. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Annie M. Lannon;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others;

H. R. 1961. An act for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler;

H. R. 1978. An act for the relief of Jay H. McCleary;

H. R. 2027. An act for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deecased;

H. R. 2029. An act for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of John J. Gall;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Craig;

H. R. 2191. An act for the relief of Cleo E. Baker;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Florence Zimmerman;

H. R. 2290. An act for the relief of Mary Galipeau;

H. R. 2300. An act for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of James A. Brady;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Arlethia Rosser;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz;

H. R. 2481. An act for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson, deceased;

H. R. 2512. An act for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton;

H. R. 2595. An act for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly;

H. R. 2620. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Allen;

H. R. 2642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson;

H. R. 2686. An act for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley;

H. R. 2836. An act for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti;

H. R. 2874. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to authorize any corporation formed under authority of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of such code to specify in its bylaws that a less number than a majority of its trustees may constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the corporation;

H. R. 2886. An act for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.;

H. R. 3011. An act for the relief of John Hames;

H. R. 3135. An act for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3198. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Rolla Duncan;

H. R. 3249. An act for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly;

H. R. 3302. An act for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler;

H. R. 3636. An act relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish;

H. R. 3660. An act to provide for financial control of Government corporations;

H. R. 3790. An act for the relief of Genevieve Lund;

H. R. 3867. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies;

H. R. 3868. An act to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3873. An act to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md.;

H. R. 3979. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4018. An act for the relief of Robert A. Hudson;

H. R. 4411. An act to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 304. An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations;

H. R. 608. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States;

H. R. 697. An act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes;

H. R. 874. An act for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges;

H. R. 1123. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy;

H. R. 1457. An act for the relief of Josephine Benham;

H. R. 1862. An act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, for other purposes;

H. R. 2335. An act for the relief of Albert E. Severns;

H. R. 2835. An act for the relief of James Lynch;

H. R. 2930. An act for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll; and

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 831. An act for the relief of James Alves Saucier;

S. 845. An act for the relief of Mabel Fowler;

S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder;

S. 896. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Oscar S. Reed;

S. 1152. An act to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1189. An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia;

S. 1212. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940;

S. 1278. An act to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones;

S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park;

S. 1371. An act for the relief of Reginald Mitchell;

S. 1405. An act to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

S. 1448. An act for the relief of William Wilson Wurster;

S. 1466. An act authorizing rehabilitation on the island of Guam;

S. 1467. An act to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations, of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes;

S. 1489. An act to authorize payment for accumulated accrued annual leave to female dietitians and physical-therapy aides whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073);

S. 1492. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945;

S. 1493. An act to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters' and doctors' degrees in engineering and related fields;

S. 1494. An act to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes;

S. 1532. An act to authorize the appointment of certain persons as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army;

S. 1533. An act to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy;

S. 1560. An act to amend the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, to extend reemployment benefits to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who entered the Women's Army Corps;

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to provide for proceeding with certain rivers and harbors projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war; and

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution calling on the Secretary of the Interior for a report upon the minerals situation of the United States.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

NOVEMBER 26, 1945.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of state of the State of Illinois, I have received the certificate of election of Hon. ROY CLIPPINGER, as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-ninth Congress from the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of that State to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. James V. Heidinger.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLIPPINGER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 189]

Andrews, N. Y.	Gamble	Norton
Angell	Gardner	O'Brien, Mich.
Baldwin, Md.	Gavin	Outland
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gearhart	Pace
Barden	Geelan	Patrick
Barrett, Pa.	Gibson	Pfeifer
Barry	Gifford	Philbin
Bates, Ky.	Granahan	Poage
Beall	Granger	Powell
Bender	Gross	Quinn, N. Y.
Bishop	Gwinn, N. Y.	Rabin
Bonner	Hancock	Rains
Bradley, Mich.	Hand	Randolph
Bradley, Pa.	Harless, Ariz.	Rayfiel
Brehm	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Hartley	Reed, Ill.
Buckley	Heffernan	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Herter	Roe, N. Y.
Campbell	Hope	Rogers, N. Y.
Carlson	Jackson	Rowan
Case, N. J.	Kearney	Ryter
Chapman	Keefe	Sadowski
Chenoweth	Kelley, Pa.	Sheridan
Clements	Keogh	Short
Cooley	Kilburn	Sikes
Corbett	King	Smith, Ohio
Crosser	Kunkel	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	LaFollette	Sparkman
Dawson	Landis	Stockman
Delaney, James J.	Lane	Sumner, Ill.
	Latham	Taylor
Delaney, John J.	Lesinski	Thomas, N. J.
	Lewis	Torrens
Dingell	Luce	Vursell
Doughton, N. C.	Lynch	Wadsworth
Drewry	McGlinchey	Weichel
Ellsworth	Mansfield, Mont.	Weiss
Elsaesser		White
Elston	Mansfield, Tex.	Wilson
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	Winter
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Wolverton, N. J.
Fogarty	Mason	Wood
Forand	May	Woodhouse
Fuller	Morgan	
Fulton	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 301 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROTECTION OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 406, Rept. No. 1283), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REPEALING WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 407, Rept. No. 1284), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3937) to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and to abolish the National War Labor Board. All points of order shall be waived against any provisions of the bill or to amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is this winter and not next winter that there is a terrible need for food in many, many parts of the world. I hope that whatever disagreements there may be, that the UNRRA appropriation will be passed, and passed at the earliest hour possible. I also hope that the production of American farmers will not be cut, but that whatever can be spared from full production will be bought at a fair price from our farmers and made available on whatever terms it can most quickly be made available to people who need it throughout the world. It will build more good will than anything I know of. If there ever was a time in the history of the world when good will was needed, it is today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an excerpt.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a radio address delivered by him last night over radio station WITH.

FARM HOMES FOR RETURNING VETERANS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the soldier boys are coming home. Of course, they are not all coming home, and they are not coming home fast enough to suit parents and other loved ones, but I am under the impression that they are coming home faster than the country is prepared to take care of them properly in hospitals and homes.

Some time ago a survey showed that there were 850,000 persons in our armed services who hoped to be able to own a piece of land and live on it after the war. I wonder if one-tenth of that number will be able to get a family-sized farm in private ownership at reasonable cost with any chance of making a living thereon. Where are such farms to be had? While I presume there are farms to be had in every one of the 48 States, I would like to know what definite arrangements have been worked out so that any qualified veteran who would like to own a farm home might have some chance of getting such a home in any State of the Union in which he might choose to reside. What program, with that object in view, does Congress have? What has the Department of Agriculture to offer toward this end?

As one interested in western reclamation I have been advocating an extensive reclamation program that would provide several thousand farms within the 17 Western States on which a veteran could make a living and on such terms as he could make a go of it. The success of this plan involves certain legislation such as H. R. 520 and H. R. 2742, both of which measures have passed the House but have not yet been acted on in the Senate. Of course in addition to the legislative foundation for the benefit of veterans we need proper appropriations to implement the program. Such appropriations are soon to be considered by the House. I do trust that the final result of our action will keep in large measure the promise which we have so lavishly made the veterans.

Although I am interested in all of the 17 reclamation States of the West I am rather provincial and am thinking of the Southwest, with special emphasis upon Arizona. Out of many, many requests from servicemen, a large proportion of my mail pertains to new lands to be irrigated in the southwestern corner of Arizona. After the House passed H. R. 2742 it has come to my attention that the language of that bill probably does not cover lands in Arizona. For that reason I have asked the Senate committee to put in an amendment to H. R. 2742, which will make the terms of its preferential rights to servicemen apply to lands irrigated by the Gila Canal in Yuma County, Ariz., in the same way that those rights apply to California lands watered by the All-American Canal. I trust that the other body will act quickly on this important bill and modify it accordingly to broaden its coverage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a chronological history of

the negotiations between the UAW and General Motors.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include therein an article on Chicago for the world capital, and another on full employment and world peace.

FIRE AND POLICE DEPARTMENTS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'TOOLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Carlisle Bargeron.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New Orleans Item.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the president of the Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by a constituent.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Los Angeles Times.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mark Sullivan.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after the legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, while the House is in general debate, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have the privilege of sitting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REMUNERATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENNINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION IN THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONKMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF BARBITURATES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an article from the Hearst papers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OPA RENT DIVISION UNDER INVESTIGATION IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter and resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today following the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

STARVATION IN CENTRAL EUROPE

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUFFETT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution on the subject of control of atomic energy.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to the President of the United States by one of the small businessmen in his part of the State of Michigan.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Minneapolis Tribune.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and include some testimony by General Robinson given before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House in 1941.

GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this morning's mail brought me an inquiry from a constituent of mine who has heard a good deal about the good-neighbor policy during the past 12 years. These good people have a daughter living in Chile and occasionally they send her small items of clothing.

They advise me that on one item amounting to about $8 the daughter had to pay a duty of $24 and on another item amounting to about $7 the daughter was imposed a duty of $16.

My constituent inquires as to just what is reasonable and what is reciprocal about this sort of good-neighbor policy.

NOVEMBER 19, 1945.

Hon. J. P. O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been hearing a great deal in the last dozen years concerning a so-called good-neighbor policy, particularly with the various South American republics.

In this regard I would like to say that apparently it is not reciprocal and if not, what can we expect to gain from it?

For example, our daughter who is a teacher in Chile occasionally requests us to forward certain articles of apparel, such as stockings or undergarments, which are not available in that location, and we find the Chilean tariff duties are exorbitant and prohibitive from a practical point of view.

We recently mailed a small consignment of rayon underwear costing slightly over $8 here and we are just in receipt of a letter from her stating that the goods have arrived, and that the duty on same is close to $24. In November 1944 stockings were sent her which cost a trifle over $7 here and she paid $16 duty on them.

This is perhaps a trivial matter in itself but it seems to us that such gross inequalities should be properly aired, to the end that some good may accrue.

UNRRA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of this country today would vote overwhelmingly to provide our share of the funds immediately needed for UNRRA. A great majority are emphatically of the opinion that there should be no further delay in the passage of the pending bill appropriating $550,000,000, nor should there be any limitations in the use of the money except as already provided in legislation adopted by both bodies. From reliable information it is clear that right now our failure to provide our share of the funds for this United Nations organization is costing untold human life.

Although I am one of those who voted for the free press amendment and believe in the principles for which it stood, the result has been delay. In the interest of saving human life, the funds appropriated in the pending bill must be made available now. Inasmuch as the amendment adopted by the House has been struck out in the other body, and no amendments are to be insisted upon there as seemed likely until this morning, I feel that, in order to make way for the early passage of the bill, the House ought not to insist upon its own amendment. In this instance urgency is the principal consideration. Since the funds for this United Nations organization are needed for immediate use and since there will be sufficient opportunity to consider the question of the propriety of adopting any future restrictions upon relief appropriations, there seems to be no reasonable excuse for any further delay.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after the legislative program of the day and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON STATE OF THE UNION WITH REFERENCE TO THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain quotations and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to have a good report for the Members this morning. A week ago, on November 19, I reported on the lack of progress being made by the administration in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Forty-eight days had then elapsed and nothing had been done. Today, November 26, is the fifty-fifth day of inactivity. It almost parallels some of the nervous breakdowns that have occurred in the past few weeks from overwork on the part of some of us on the floor of the House on account of an overwhelmingly large legislative program.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know just what we can do to help President Truman in this matter. It has been 54 days now since he sent to this House a magnificent message, every word of which was true, and I am beginning to wonder if he really should not have somebody tell him just what is happening. I do not believe he knows that his message has been ignored and forgotten.

Now if President Truman meant what he said 54 days ago on that bright sunshiny morning, on October 3, 1945, when he sent a message to Congress, then somebody has fallen down on the job. He ought to have one of his secretaries look into the situation.

I want to help the secretary and this is what he will find:

Senate Joint Resolution 104 authorizing construction, introduced by Senator BARKLEY and others, October 2, 1945, and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

October 3, 1945, President Truman sent a message to Congress calling for construction of the St. Lawrence project.

October 4, 1945, I called for immediate action on the Barkley resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 104. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, Appendix, page A4170.

On November 12, 1945, I called attention to delay, and no action on the Barkley resolution. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10601; also Appendix, page A4835.

On November 19, 1945, I called attention to delay. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10811; also Appendix, page A4988; RECORD for November 19.

Well, here we are, and 55 days gone by since October 2, 1945. Nothing doing.

PROPAGANDA ABOUT COST OF PROJECT MAY WORRY THE PRESIDENT

I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the President is worried about the cost of this project and if that is responsible for the delay. There are a lot of wild and woolly fairy tales floating around in thin air, mostly thin. For example, the executive committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce "resoluted" nobly and eloquently some time ago and assuming that they were not trying to be funny—I think they were—this is what the playboys said:

> The total cost of the seaway project will be far beyond Government estimates, which have been around $600,000,000. These figures are based on construction costs in 1926 and 1927; costs are far higher now. Eminent engineers about 20 years ago placed the cost at over $1,000,000,000.

SENATOR FERGUSON'S COMMENT

It is really remarkable, Mr. Speaker, how these mathematical economists can make a lead pencil do the work of a magician. They not only contradict the War Department engineers, but they insult the learned and outstanding contribution on this question of the Honorable HOMER FERGUSON, United States Senator of Michigan, who extended in the United States Senate on Friday, June 23, 1944, his remarks on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway. In the course of his remarks Senator FERGUSON used this language without any equivocation, mental reservation, or self-evasion whatever:

> The entire cost of the project to the United States was estimated in 1941 at about $285,000,000. Of the total cost, some $93,000,000 would be paid by New York State, which would be given control of the generation and distribution of electric power. The Federal Government's share will therefore be, roughly, $195,000,000.

IN CONCLUSION

So there you are. Mr. John Q. Public can take his choice, but nobody has ever accused Senator FERGUSON of making wild statements. He is noted as a man of truth and veracity. So far as I am concerned, I think he knows what he is talking about on this matter of cost, and I think the "glamour boys" in the New York Chamber of Commerce are just handing out what one of our outstanding Members of the House of Representatives calls "globaloney."

With all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, this argument that we cannot afford the cost is no argument at all and no one acquainted with the facts will treat it seriously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a statement by Joseph Leib in support of H. R. 4717, and in the other an editorial from the Chattanooga Times.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and

include a speech he made at the Association of National Advertisers in New York on November 20.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] will not use the time for the special order allotted him today.

THE LATE DR. JACOB THORKELSON

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of this House from Montana has died. Dr. Jacob Thorkelson, widely known Butte physician and surgeon, and a former Republican Congressman from Montana, died on November 20 after a 2-day illness. Dr. Thorkelson was stricken last Saturday night and removed to a hospital and died without regaining consciousness. He was active in Republican political circles and represented the western district of Montana in Congress for one term, 1939 to 1940. He was also a Republican candidate for Congress in the 1940 primary election and sought the Republican nomination for United States senatorship in 1942 and for Governor in 1944.

Born in Egersend, Norway, September 24, 1876, Dr. Thorkelson went to sea at the age of 15. He came to the United States 53 years ago, and from 1897 to 1899 he was a member of the Virginia naval reserve. He served in the Navy during the Spanish-American War in 1898.

From 1899 until 1907 he served as master of seagoing ships, visiting many of the world's countries during that time. He maintained his interest in naval affairs until his death, and at that time held the rank of lieutenant commander in the medical corps of the Naval Reserve.

In 1907 Dr. Thorkelson enrolled at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Baltimore, receiving his medical degrees in 1911. From 1911 until 1913 he was a member of the faculty of the Baltimore school.

He moved to Montana in 1913, settling in Dillon. After a short time he moved to Anaconda, where he practiced until 1920 when he came to Butte. At the time of his death he also was president of the Butte Neon Outdoor Advertising Co.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Charlotte S. Thorkelson, of Butte; two sons, Jacob, of Butte, and John Milton Thorkelson, now serving with the armed forces in the South Pacific; a daughter, Mrs. Frances Clare Wyatt, of Reseda, Calif.

Funeral arrangements were pending.

Dr. Thorkelson was a member of Hope Lodge, No. 4, A. F. & A. M., of Laurel, Del.; the grand chapter, Royal Arch Masons, of Delaware; St. Elmo Commandery, No. 7, Knights Templar, of Dillon; Bagdad Temple of the Shrine in Butte; Anaconda Lodge, No. 239, B. P. O. E., Anaconda; the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States; the Explorers Club of New York; and the Butte Town Club.

We in Montana greatly regret the loss of Dr. Thorkelson.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

NATION'S HOME CRISIS CALLS FOR DRASTIC ACTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in connection with my remarks a copy of the bill H. R. 4761 concerning housing, also items from St. Louis newspapers, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my point of order that caused the roll to be called a moment ago. I think I should call it every day until we get a vote on my bill, or some other bill, to discharge from the service those men who have been in the armed forces continuously for 18 months, or who have dependents at home to look after, or who desire to return to school and complete their education.

I have petition No. 9 in the well of the House. That applause in the galleries is coming from those servicemen you see up there in uniform.

I wish you could hear the applause that would come from the men in the Southwest Pacific, in England, in Europe and everywhere else these boys are stationed. They have done their duty. Now let us do ours. If you want these boys to come home, sign that petition No. 9, and help us to get a vote on this bill.

But remember this, we expect to call the roll every day until something is done.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

COMPLIANCE WITH STATE INSPECTION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3321) to provide that the several States shall continue effective measures of control and protection against the importation, introduction, and spread of noxious weeds, injurious insects, and animal and plant diseases, and to guarantee that purchasers or recipients of seeds, livestock, and poultry feeds, nursery stocks, fertilizers, and other agricultural chemicals shall have the protection guaranteed them under the laws enacted by the several States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. KEFAUVER objected.

INCREASED NUMBER OF CADETS AT THE MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 320) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous censent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE PRIVILEGE OF RETIREMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 565) to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4191) to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the second proviso of section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1168; 8 U. S. C. 801 (a)), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That a person who has acquired foreign nationality through the naturalization of his parent or parents, and who at the same time is a citizen of the United States, shall, if he is abroad and has not theretofore expatriated himself as a citizen of the United States by his own voluntary act, be permitted at any time prior to January 13, 1947, to return to the United States and take up permanent residence therein, and it shall be thereafter deemed

that he has elected to be a citizen of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4162) to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases prior to and including verdict, or finding or plea of guilty.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., "That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the power to prescribe, from time to time, rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to any or all proceedings prior to and including verdict, or finding of guilty or not guilty by the court if a jury has been waived, or plea of guilty, in criminal cases in district courts of the United States, including the district courts of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands, in the Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, in the United States Court for China, and in proceedings before United States commissioners. Such rules shall not take effect until they shall have been reported to Congress by the Attorney General at the beginning of a regular session thereof and until after the close of the Congress to which they have been reported, and thereafter all laws in conflict therewith shall be of no further force and effect."

With the following committee amendment:

After the enacting clause insert the following: "That the act of June 29, 1940 (Public Law No. 675, 54 Stat. 688), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1940 (Public Law No. 675), entitled 'An act to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases prior to and including verdict, or finding or plea of guilty'."

LIMITING THE TIME FOR BRINGING CERTAIN ACTIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2788) to amend title 28 of the United States Code in regard to the limitations of certain actions, and for other purposes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Clerk has just read the title of the bill H. R. 2788, which is shown on the Consent Calendar as a bill to limit the time during which certain actions under the laws of the United States may be brought. That is not the title the Clerk read.

The SPEAKER. The title as shown on the Consent Calendar is not the title that is contained in the bill, the Chair understands.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is this the same bill, H. R. 2788?

The SPEAKER. That is right.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WALTER, Mr. BIEMILLER, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. PATTERSON objected.

ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4386) to facilitate and simplify the administration of Indian affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when this bill was called on the last call of the calendar the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] raised some questions concerning it. Since the gentleman from South Dakota is unable to be in the Chamber, being detained by committee assignments, he has requested me to ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Secretary of the Interior with regard to the questions raised by him. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., November 16, 1945.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Indian Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JACKSON: On November 5, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, in reserving the right to object to the unanimous passage of H. R. 4386, a bill to simplify the administration of Indian affairs, raised some question about the interpretation of the bill. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 5, p. 10374.)

Mr. CASE stated that the purpose of the bill, to expedite action on Indian affairs, was desirable. He thought it necessary to permit persons aggrieved by any decision to appeal to higher authority.

I agree that the right of appeal is necessary and desirable, and in the event that the bill is enacted this Department will, pursuant to its usual practice and in accordance with the authority contained in the bill, promulgate regulations authorizing persons aggrieved by a decision to appeal to higher authority within the Indian Service and the Department within a reasonable time.

That part of the bill authorizing the Secretary or the Commissioner to revoke any part of the delegation relates only to a revocation of the power to act and not the revocation of any decision made by an official. Any person who had what he thought was an unsatisfactory decision would appeal, and the matter would be handled on its merits by the higher officer.

The revocation of the power to make a decision would not affect any decisions theretofore made. The revocation would merely prevent such officer from making a decision in the future on the type of matter involved.

I hope that this explanation will clarify the interpretation of the bill to the satisfaction of Mr. CASE.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of facilitating and simplifying the administration of the laws governing Indian affairs, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to delegate, from time to time, and to the extent and under such regulations as he deems proper, his powers and duties under said laws to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to delegate, in like manner, and powers and duties so delegated to him by the Secretary, or vested in him by law, to the assistant commissioners, or the officer in charge of any branch, division, office, or agency of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Secretary or the Commissioner, as the case may be, may at any time revoke the whole or any part of a delegation made pursuant to this act, but no such revocation shall be given retroactive effect. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to abrogate or curtail any authority to make delegations conferred by any other provision of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSING CERTAIN MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL

The Clerk call the bill (S. 1215) to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when this bill came up on the last call of the calendar I asked certain questions with reference to it, to which I could not get answers. Since then I have received a letter from the Navy Department, which I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT W. KEAN,
House of Representatives.
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KEAN: When the bill S. 1215 to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941, was called on the Consent Calendar of the House of Representatives on Monday, November 5, 1945, it was passed over without prejudice pursuant to your request for information as to the reason for the presence of United States marines on the *Maasdam*, a Dutch ship, at that time (see p. 10376 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 5, 1945, 79th Cong.).

When the *Maasdam* was sunk on June 26, 1941, it carried as passengers a Marine Corps detail consisting of Col. Walter I. Jordan, then a major, and 10 enlisted men. This detail was part of a detachment ordered overseas to guard the American Embassy at London, England. At the time of this disaster, no ships flying the American flag were allowed to go through the war zone. Hence, Marine Corps Headquarters arranged and authorized transportation for this detail by a vessel flying a foreign flag; namely, the steamship *Maasdam*.

Sincerely yours,

IRA H. NUNN,
Captain, United States Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $2,859.35, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost in the sinking of the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4343) to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill, S. 1459, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill undertakes to extend the period of time during which a lessee of an oil or gas lease from the Government must drill on the land in order to preserve and continue the life of the lease. This is perhaps the fourth time that such a bill has been passed extending that period for a term of an additional year. The reason for the extension was predicated upon war conditions. Now, although the war has ended, it is predicated upon the claim that drilling material and equipment is not available. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida if it is his intention a year from now to bring in another bill extending this period by an additional year.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is based on the present facts as they exist. I can see no reason for such an action in the future although it is always hard to anticipate conditions. But the theory upon which they were extended heretofore has been the lack of material and the lack of labor. In some instances, the Department of the Interior was bogged down in the approval of assignments. At the present time, I see no reason for an extension beyond a 1-year period.

Mr. COLE of New York. So that the owners of these leases can take due and proper notice that this is the last extension that they will have or can expect to have?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. As they realize that will be the condition a year from now, they will probably be more diligent.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Will that time start as of the year 1945?

Mr. COLE of New York. It would depend, as I understand it, upon the particular lease. A lease itself is for a period of 5 years. This bill simply extends the term of that lease an additional year.

Mr. RICH. That would be 1 year after the date that it passes Congress at this time?

Mr. COLE of New York. It would be for 1 year beyond the 5-year term enumerated in the particular lease.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence in the first section of the act entitled "An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas leases," approved July 29, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The term of any 5-year lease expiring prior to December 31, 1946, maintained in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements and regulations and for which no preference right to a new lease is granted by this section, is hereby extended to December 31, 1946."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4343) was laid on the table.

AMENDING ARTICLE 6 OF THE ARTICLES FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1308) to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy (Revised Statutes, sec. 1624, art. 6) is amended and reenacted to read as follows:

ART. 6. If any person subject to the Articles for the Government of the Navy commits the crime of murder without the territorial jurisdiction of any particular State, or the District of Columbia, he may be tried by court martial and punished with life imprisonment or death.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "with", strike out the words "life imprisonment or."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENTAL CARE FOR PERSONNEL OF UNITED STATES NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 715) to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1064) authorizing the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs state whether or not the Superintendent of the Academy and the Secretary of the Navy have the power now to do just exactly what is provided in this bill?

Mr. VINSON. They do not. That is the reason the bill is here before the House. It is recommended by the Superintendent of the Naval Academy and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is recommended by both of them?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; it is recommended by both men.

Mr. COCHRAN. And they do not have the right now to discharge a midshipman from the Naval Academy whose conduct is not satisfactory?

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly correct. That is the reason the bill is before the House. Otherwise, we would not have the bill here.

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, I have had some cases myself where they had the power to discharge a man from the Naval Academy.

Mr. VINSON. The President does it under the procedure today, and this permits the Superintendent of the Naval Academy to do it directly without going to the President.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does it have to be approved by the Secretary of the Navy? I do not want a midshipman discharged just because an officer would like him out of the service. He should have his day in court.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes. Of course, it has to be approved by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. COCHRAN. And then he authorizes the Superintendent of the Academy to do it?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. But it does not give the Superintendent of the Academy the power alone?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course, it has to clear through the various agencies at the Naval Academy. Then it must go to the Chief of Naval Personnel. Then it must go to the Secretary. Then it must go back again to the authorities at the Academy and then must go back to the Secretary of the Navy. Then it must finally meet the approval of the President. What we are trying to do is to put the midshipmen on the same basis as the young men who have academic failures, and have that subject to review by the authorities at the Academy, with an opportunity for the boy to have a hearing, and then the information submitted to the Secretary of the Navy, who may then grant a hearing; and if the Secretary of the Navy feels that the authorities at the Academy are justified in the dismissal, then it takes effect.

Mr. COCHRAN. I just wanted to be sure that the midshipman is going to have a little protection and that one officer at the Naval Academy cannot put him out.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. He will have more protection than he has under the present law.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy shall, whenever he determines that the conduct of any midshipman is unsatisfactory or that any midshipman has demonstrated that he possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service, submit to the Secretary of the Navy in writing a full report of such determination and of the facts on which it is based. If, after according such midshipman an opportunity to examine such report and to submit a written statement thereon, the Secretary of the Navy shall deem the Superintendent's determination reasonable and well founded upon the basis of such report and statement, he may, in his discretion, discharge such midshipman from the Naval Academy.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "unsatisfactory", strike out the remainder of line 5, all of line 6 and line 7 down to and including the word "service."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, since the committee amendment has made a specific change in the body of the bill, the title should be modified, and I offer an amendment to amend the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Amend the title by striking out the last two words "or aptitude."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

ESTABLISHING STATUS OF FUNDS AND EMPLOYEES OF MIDSHIPMEN'S STORE AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1097) to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the author of this bill or the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs whether it is at this store that the midshipmen purchase the class rings which they are required to purchase upon graduation.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the question as to whether rings are purchased at this store, but the basic purpose of this bill and of two others that are companion bills further down on the Consent Calendar, is to place the employees, some 40 or 50 of them who work in the midshipmen's tailor shop, carpenter shop, store, and barber shop under retirement, and on the same footing as other employees in the United States Naval Academy.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] advises me that the rings are not purchased at this store. So I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all funds collected from the operations of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy are appropriated for the purpose of providing and maintaining the necessary service and shall hereafter be accounted for as public moneys.

SEC. 2. All employees of such midshipmen's store, whether heretofore paid from appropriated moneys or from receipts of the midshipmen's store, shall hereafter be deemed to be Government employees entitled to all benefits and subject to all restrictions arising under the laws of the United States applicable to civil-service employees of their grade and class. All employees of said midshipmen's store on the effective date of this act shall be entitled to claim credit for prior employment in said store for purposes of any benefits to which they may be entitled under the laws of the United States, and no such employee shall suffer, by virtue of being placed in the status of a civil-service employee by this act, a reduction in total pay below that being received by him on the effective date of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPROMISE AND SETTLEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1364), to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damages to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we might have some explanation of this bill.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the purpose of expediting claims which the Navy Department has in connection with admiralty cases. In other words, it allows the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims, and avoid long litigation.

Mr. RICH. Is sole power lodged in the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims?

Mr. HÉBERT. He is given the sole power to settle claims, such as he has now, although this simply extends his right, and raises the limit and avoids the necessity of going to the Department of Justice and having them prosecute certain claims, or going to other agencies of the Government. It merely raises the limit of what they already have the power to do.

Mr. RICH. Suppose somebody had a claim against the Federal Government arising out of negligence on the part of naval personnel, could the Secretary of the Navy settle such claim without a hearing?

Mr. HÉBERT. No; this relates to admiralty cases only, not to any other claims against the Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, compromise, or settle claims for damage cognizable in admiralty in a district court of the United States and all claims for damage caused by a vessel or floating object, to property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department or property for which the Navy Department may have assumed, by contract or otherwise, any obligation to respond for damage thereto. The Secretary of the Navy is further authorized to receive in payment of any such claim the amount due the United States pursuant to determination, compromise, or settlement as herein authorized and, upon acceptance of such payment but not until then, such determination, settlement, or compromise of such claim shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, any law to the contrary notwithstanding. All such payments shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Navy is further authorized to execute on behalf of the United States and to deliver in exchange for such payment a full release of such claim: *Provided*, That this section, as respects the determination, compromise, settlement, and payment of claims, shall be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, all other provisions of law authorizing the determination, compromise, or settlement of claims for damage to property hereinabove described: *Provided further*, That no settlement or compromise where there is involved a payment in the net amount of over $500,000 shall be authorized by this act.

SEC. 2. Within 20 days after receipt of a payment in a net amount exceeding $3,000 due the United States pursuant to determination, compromise, or settlement of any

claim under section 1 of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall file reports with the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, setting forth the nature of the claim; the vessel or vessels involved; the amount received; the basis of determination, compromise, or settlement; and other pertinent facts: *Provided*, That during any war the reports required under this section may omit any fact or facts, disclosure of which, in the opinion of the Secretary, would be prejudicial to the national security.

SEC. 3. This act shall not apply to any claim for which a suit filed by or against the United States is pending.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 22, strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDUCEMENTS TO MAKE A CAREER OF NAVAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1438) to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States Naval Service a career, and for other purposes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

STATUS OF FUNDS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE MIDSHIPMEN'S TAILOR SHOP, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2553) to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all funds collected from the operation of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy are appropriated for the purpose of providing and maintaining the necessary tailor service and shall hereafter be accounted for as public moneys.

SEC. 2. All employees of such midshipmen's tailor shop whether heretofore paid from appropriated moneys or from receipts of the midshipmen's tailor shop, shall hereafter be deemed to be Government employees entitled to all benefits and subject to all restrictions arising under the laws of the United States applicable to civil-service employees of their grade and class.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 13, after the word "to", add the words "civil service."

Page 1, line 14, after the word "class", add the language: "All employees of said midshipmen's tailor shop on the effective date of this act shall be entitled to claim credit for prior employment in said tailor shop for purposes of any benefits to which they may be entitled under the laws of the United States, and no such employee shall suffer, by virtue of being placed in the status of a civil-service employee by this act, a reduction in total pay below that being received by him on the effective date of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING STATUS OF FUNDS AND EMPLOYEES OF MIDSHIPMEN'S COBBLER AND BARBER SHOPS AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2556) to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, this is companion legislation to the bill passed a few moments ago affecting the tailor shop at the Naval Academy. This bill in no way enlarges the activities of the barber shop or cobbler shop or the midshipmen's store. It merely places the employees of these particular activities under civil service and entitles them to receive benefits under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act. A similar bill for the employees in the laundry was passed several years ago. Most of the employees of the United States Naval Academy are under civil service and come under the Retirement Act but these three or four activities covered by the bills on the calendar today have not been covered under civil service and the employees in these shops do not therefore receive the civil service benefits that the other employees do.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many persons are involved in this and the companion bills about which the gentleman speaks?

Mr. SASSCER. In the midshipmen's store about 30 are affected, in the tailor shop 38, in the cobbler shop 5, and in the barber shop 6.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What effect does it have on the hours and pay of these employees?

Mr. SASSCER. Under the amendment it will have no effect on the pay; they will continue on the same basis of pay. This merely channels them into the retirement provisions and protection of the civil service.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Would they be getting the same pay as persons similarly employed under civil service?

Mr. SASSCER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. So it is in line with the classification of the civil service system?

Mr. SASSCER. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all funds collected from the operations of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy are appropriated for the purpose of providing and maintaining the necessary cobbler and barber service and shall hereafter be accounted for as public moneys.

SEC. 2. All employees of such midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops, whether heretofore paid from appropriated moneys or from receipts of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops, shall hereafter be deemed to be Government employees entitled to all benefits and subject to all restrictions arising under the laws of the United States applicable to employees of their grade and class.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "to", insert the words "civil-service."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "class", add the language: "All employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops on the effective date of this act shall be entitled to claim credit for prior employment in said cobbler and barber shops for purposes of any benefits to which they may be entitled under the laws of the United States, and no such employee shall suffer, by virtue of being placed in the status of a civil-service employee by this act, a reduction in total pay below that being received by him on the effective date of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING HEAD OF POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL OF UNITED STATES NAVY TO CONFER MASTERS AND DOCTORS DEGREES IN ENGINEERING AND RELATED FIELDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4412) to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTING NAVY OR COAST GUARD VESSELS FROM REQUIREMENTS AS TO NUMBER, POSITION, RANGE, OR ARC OF VISIBILITY OF LIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4413) to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill, S. 1494, to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any requirement as to the number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of lights required to be displayed by vessels under the act of Congress approved August 19, 1890 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 61–141), entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at

sea"; or the act of Congress approved June 7, 1897 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 154–231), entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collision upon certain harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States"; or the act of Congress approved February 8, 1895 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 241–294), entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters"; or the act of Congress approved August 19, 1890 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 301–351), entitled "An act to adopt special rules for the navigation of harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States, except the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal, supplementary to the act of August 19, 1890, entitled 'An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea'," and all laws amendatory thereto, shall not apply to any vessel of the Navy or of the Coast Guard, where the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of Coast Guard vessels operating under the Treasury Department, or such official or officials as either may designate, shall find or certify that, by reason of special construction, it is not possible with respect to such vessel or class of vessels to comply with the statutory provisions as to the number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of lights. The lights of any such exempted vessel shall, however, comply as closely to the requirements of the applicable statutes as the Secretary shall find to be feasible.

SEC. 2. When the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Treasury, or such official or officials as either may designate, shall make any finding or certification as prescribed in section 1, notice of such finding or certification and the character and position of the lights to be displayed on such vessel shall be published in "Notice to Mariners."

SEC 3. This act shall expire on June 30, 1948.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4413) was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF TRAVEL ALLOWANCE AND TRANSPORTATION OF MEMBERS OF THE NAVAL FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4450) providing for payment of travel allowance and transportation to their homes, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I was very glad to note the passage of the bill, H. R. 2556, and I was very much interested in the colloquy which took place between the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER]. It was a great pleasure to me to see these few employees covered by the bill bracketed into the civil service law and also that they will receive the benefits of the Retirement Act.

This brought to my mind the recollection of a bill that passed the House not so long ago, within the time of most of the Members of this Congress, in which we did the very same thing for Members of Congress so far as the retirement laws of the United States are concerned. There was then portrayed to the whole country the picture that Members of Congress were making a raid upon the Treasury and receiving pensions when, as a matter of fact, all we were doing was to make Members of Congress subject to the same retirement laws that other Federal employees were subject to. Deductions were to be taken from our salaries the same as from the salaries of other Federal employees and if a Member wanted to receive the benefit of previous years of service he had to pay back with interest, and I think it was compound interest at that, but with interest at any rate, the deductions that would have been taken from his salary during the years served prior to the Member of Congress coming within the retirement provisions of the Federal law.

My only purpose in making these few remarks is to express my pleasure in seeing this small group of employees covered into the retirement provisions, and when a bill comes out from committee to include Members of Congress, I hope it will be debated fully so that the country will know what it is, and that we will pass such a bill because if there ever was a meritorious bill it is a bill of that kind.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and getting back to the bill under consideration, as I understand it, this bill would provide that any sailor being discharged from the service or any officer being discharged from the service may pick his home as anywhere in the United States and get travel pay thereto. I do not know what would happen to those who have already been discharged from the service and who have not had the benefit of this bill. I do not believe the Army does the same thing. In my opinion, both services should act in unison in such practice. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

STUDY OF ADDITIONAL PANAMA CANAL FACILITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4480) to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I remember correctly it was only a year or so ago that we doubled the security of the Panama Canal, and that millions and millions of dollars have been spent down there. What does the gentleman expect that the committee will do in recommending for the future development of the Panama Canal?

Mr. BLAND. The bill that the gentleman refers to, which was passed August 11, 1939, provided for an additional set of locks, what is commonly termed the third set of locks. Construction on these locks commenced July 1, 1940, that is, the preparatory work, and an appropriation, as I recall, of about $277,000,000 was made. I do not recall whether it was an appropriation or authorization but I think it was an appropriation. The work proceeded until May 1942, when modification of the construction program was directed in order to conserve manpower and materials for more immediate war needs. Under the modified program the completion of the project was postponed indefinitely, but a large part of the major excavation work and some pertinent operations previously commenced were carried to substantial completion and detailed plans and specifications for all major features were completed. Approximately $75,000,000 of appropriated funds were expended on the project. In the hearing before the committee it was testified to by General Mehaffey, Governor of the Panama Canal, that that money would not be lost. It is very important to review entirely the plans and purposes of the Panama Canal, the extension of the project, and the security.

Mr. RICH. Then they will make a general recommendation as to whether the proposition that was proposed in 1939 will be carried out in its entirety or whether they will do something else before we spend any money on that?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. RICH. The work, I understand, has all been curtailed at this particular time?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; that is true. There is one thing that has been considered many times before, considered when the Panama Canal was originally constructed and is now being considered, and that is whether it should be a sea-level canal. In view of the development of the last war and various matters in connection therewith that situation will be studied. A report will be made to Congress and we will be in a position to carry the work forward. Of course, if it is made a sea-level canal, we will have to do something with the waters of the Pacific Ocean to see that they do not flow into the Atlantic Ocean. The tidal range at Balboa is normally 15 feet, and at Cristobal 1 foot.

Mr. RICH. If the Pacific Ocean would flow over into the Atlantic, we would drown everybody.

Mr. BLAND. We will have to take care of that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I believe the gentleman said that this was a proposition involving about $250,000,000 or $275,000,000.

Mr. BLAND. That was the original appropriation, $277,000,000, if my recollection is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The work has been stopped?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What has been expended up to this time?

Mr. BLAND. Seventy-five million dollars, and the testimony of the Governor of the Panama Canal is that that was not lost at all. That will be worked in with this program.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much will this bill involve in cost?

Mr. BLAND. Of course, no one can tell.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean in making the survey.

Mr. BLAND. About $1,500,000. I was reading from the report of the Secretary of War.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. I wonder if the gentleman's committee is going to give any consideration to other plans.

Mr. BLAND. I am not surprised the gentleman asked the question. I recall he had a bill before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries that was studied at one time in connection with the Nicaragua canal. Authority is given here not for the final examination, as that would probably go over the $1,500,000, but generally any proposition can be taken up.

Mr. WELCH. If the gentleman will yield, may I add that this proposed legislation, constructive in its character, was carefully considered by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and reported unanimously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Governor of the Panama Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, is hereby authorized and directed to make a comprehensive review and study, with approximate estimates of costs, of the means for increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense, including restudy of the construction of additional facilities for the Panama Canal authorized by the act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409), and such additional investigation as he may deem necessary, and to report thereon to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President, not later than December 31, 1947.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to insure the prompt and efficient completion of the study and report authorized hereunder.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 524) to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the calendar.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman withhold his request?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. For a moment.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that this is a bill which really is badly needed at the present time. It provides for additional cemeteries for the veterans of this and other wars. The record shows that of the 78 national cemeteries available at the present time 62 are associated entirely with the Civil War and most of those are filled up completely. There are 16 available cemeteries in the United States. The evidence shows they are filling up very rapidly with veterans of this war and the last war. It is estimated that by 1955 there will be no national cemeteries available for burying the veterans of our wars, so I submit that this is an important bill and deserves attention.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my request that the bill be stricken from the calendar. I can appreciate the point of view of the gentleman from Louisiana, representing one State. This bill is one of the greatest real estate log-rolling rackets to come before the Congress. The family of the average veteran whose body is overseas want him buried in a cemetery of their own faith. What they really want is a larger appropriation to give them a decent burial in that way. The statistics for the entire country show quite the opposite of what is stated by my good friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will withhold his request for a moment further, I do not believe the gentleman is cognizant of the amendments we placed in the bill, or he would not have made the statement he did.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It makes no difference to me what amendments are in the bill. There is no necessity for this bill now. There is ample ground available. There are not enough bodies to be brought back from overseas to require additional cemeteries. Where they are brought back, 9 out of 10 of the families want to put the body of the veteran in a cemetery of their faith.

Mr. BROOKS. There is no provision in the bill to take care of any definite number of cemeteries, it only authorizes the Secretary of War to provide cemetery space if and when it is needed. How the gentleman can interpret that as a real-estate deal or log rolling I cannot understand.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my request that the bill be stricken from the calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is a very unusual proceeding on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BROOKS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York, Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Mr. SHAFER, Mr. HARNESS of Indiana, and Mr. SPRINGER objected.

REPATRIATION OF PERSONS BURIED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3936) to provide for the evacuation and repatriation of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States and whose remains could not heretofore be returned to their homeland due to wartime shipping restrictions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill in which there is probably genuine interest on the part of every Member of the House. Rather than have the bill passed by unanimous consent, I think it might be well for the gentleman from Louisiana or some other member of the committee to explain its purposes and provisions so that Members may be informed concerning it.

Mr. BROOKS. This bill provides for the repatriation of the bodies of our war dead which lie in foreign countries today. It provides within 5 years after the termination of the war against Japan that at the request of the families of these soldiers or people who were killed or died overseas, their bodies may be brought back for burial in the United States. Of course, it covers the dead of both the Army and Navy, and it is contemplated that these bodies may be brought back to the United States for interment. All expenses will be paid by the United States. The interment is handled in accordance with the request of the nearest surviving relative. The body may be interred either in the National Cemetery or in a private cemetery, according to the wishes of the family of the deceased.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman prepared to say that the 5-year period has already begun to run?

Mr. BROOKS. No, it has not. The 5 years begins to run after the termination of the war by virtue of a proclamation of the President or by resolution passed by the Congress.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is not what the bill says. It says the 5-year period starts at the cessation of hostilities with Japan.

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will read just a little further, he will note that it says "within 5 years after the cessation of hostilities with Japan as proclaimed by the President or such earlier date as may be specified in a proclamation by the President or a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress."

Mr. COLE of New York. It is my recollection that along about VJ-day the Nation heard an expression from the President that the shooting in the Pacific had stopped. Is it the gentleman's view that does not constitute a proclamation by the President of the cessation of hostilities?

Mr. BROOKS. That is my view. May I say further that if it is desirable to fix a date before then, of course, a resolution of Congress can do that. Otherwise, the time would be 5 years from the proclamation officially made by the President or a resolution of the Congress.

Mr. COLE of New York. In view of the fact, whether it is proclaimed or not, that hostilities have actually ceased, I am surprised that the committee does not arbitrarily say within 5 years from the date of the act rather than hinge it on some contingency.

Mr. BROOKS. There was never a thought that it covered anything else. I believe a correct interpretation of what the President said would show that it was not an official proclamation of the end of the war.

Mr. COLE of New York. There is another question that I would like to direct the gentleman's attention to. With reference to section 3, is it to be understood that the remains of the soldiers or persons involved will not be brought back unless upon application

by the next of kin of the deceased person?

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mr. COLE of New York. And only in that event?

Mr. BROOKS. The wishes of the nearest surviving relative will be followed.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is putting words there which are not in the bill. That raises another question. To what extent did the gentleman's committee inquire into the meaning of the expression "next of kin?"

Mr. BROOKS. That has been defined in previous laws repeatedly. The committee felt that the War Department would follow the same procedure which was followed after the first World War in bringing the bodies back to this country where an expressed desire was indicated.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the expression "next of kin" has a statutory meaning with regard to the War Department, then can the gentleman advise me whether the wife of a soldier is a next of kin?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, ordinarily the wife is considered as the next of kin for this purpose.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the expression "next of kin" has been defined, then there is no question about it being ordinarily true. It is either true or not true.

Mr. BROOKS. That is true. It has already been defined by statute.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman identify what statute so defines that expression?

Mr. BROOKS. Not offhand, but I would be glad to give the gentleman further information.

Mr. COLE of New York. I know it does so far as veterans' legislation goes. I am not aware that it does so far as War Department legislation goes, except with particular reference to the provisions in some particular bill or law. I only raise this question to make sure that the committee was on sound ground when it used the expression "next of kin" so that we might avoid some controversy arising in the future as between the relatives of a deceased veteran. The time to make sure of that is now.

Mr. BROOKS. The committee did go into that matter. It was thoroughly satisfied that the wishes of the next of kin, which would include a surviving wife, would be considered. All of us, the gentleman has and I have, received letters from next of kin of these boys who have been killed and who desire that the bodies of these boys be brought back home. I think this is a matter which touches not only the highest sensibilities of every individual, but it is also a matter which is urgent and should be attended to at once.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, further, with reference to section 3, the bill covers persons who have been killed, or who have died during the war period, including the members of the armed services, civilian officers and employees of the United States Government, citizens of the United States who served in the armed forces of some of the Allies of the United States, citizens of the United States whose residence is in the United States but who in fact were in a foreign country and were killed by reason of the war, but it also covers such other citizens of the United States, the repatriation of the remains of whom would, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, serve the public interest. Who could those people possibly be?

Mr. BROOKS. Offhand, I do not know, except it was felt there were a number of people taken overseas for work, perhaps not members of the armed services, but certainly whose work has been directly associated with the armed services, that might not be covered by the preceding paragraphs. Therefore, we wanted to be sure that all Americans whose lives had been lost as a result of the war should come within the act.

Mr. COLE of New York. If that was the purpose of the committee, and I have no doubt it was, and I have no disagreement with it, why did not the committee simply say that the next of kin of any citizen of the United States who was killed abroad might be brought back by the War Department, because the effect of the final subparagraph is just that, is it not?

Mr. BROOKS. We might have worded it better had we had the gentleman's fine ability on the subcommittee, but he was not present. I think this bill covers all groups that should be covered. I certainly think it is a most important piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. I have been on the floor all morning, but I have been advised that earlier in the day unanimous consent was given to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to have until midnight to file a report on the deficiency appropriation bill. I did not hear that request.

The SPEAKER. The request was made and the consent was granted.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, was in the committee room, as I am advised, at the time. Had he been present and known about it, he would have asked permission to reserve all points of order on the bill.

I now ask unanimous consent to reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by Archbishop Cushing, of Boston.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Saturday Evening Post of November 17, 1945, entitled "Where Do Wages Come From?"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RETURN OF UNITED STATES TROOPS FROM CHINA

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, less than a year ago, on January 6, in his annual message to Congress, President Roosevelt clearly stated the kernel of the foreign policy which proved so successful in holding the nations together until victory could be won over their common enemy. It lay, he made it plain, in the right, the inalienable right, of every people to choose and enjoy their own form of government. We must see, he said, that no government or authority should block the exercise of that right.

Yet, in China today, United States marines, United States transports, United States military supplies are being used to suppress the aspirations of millions for a new democracy which they began to build for themselves in the course of heroic, large-scale, and most effective resistance in the very teeth of a ruthless invader.

We have permitted ourselves to become so thoroughly committed to armed intervention against the Chinese people's own struggle for freedom that only last week an officer in the United States Army, Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, authorized air attacks upon a tiny Chinese village.

I have asked the State Department under whose authority and in pursuance of what recognized American policy General Wedemeyer was acting when, in retaliation for a few rifle shots at a train that happened to be carrying a marine officer, he threatened another Lidice, this time in China.

There is no answer. There is neither moral nor political authority for armed attacks or threats of armed attacks by American forces or for the use of American-made equipment against any people anywhere who are seeking to expand their liberties and improve the conditions under which they live and work.

We have all been told, of course, that American troops are in China and that American transports are carrying Chungking's soldiers into north China, not for the purpose of helping the Kuomintang consolidate its pretensions to a one party dictatorship in China, but solely to insure the surrender of Japanese armies.

That explanation blew up when press dispatches began to reveal, first, that in areas where the Communist-led troops were strong, the Japs and the puppet Chinese troops were being quickly disarmed, and second, that in some areas,

where the marines and the central government troops took over, the Japanese and the puppet troops were permitted to keep their arms and ordered to stand guard over strategic railroads.

We were next told that a secret agreement between ourselves and the Japanese militarists committed us to stay in China until all Japanese there were repatriated.

Then why do not we disarm the emperor's troops ourselves and send them home? Why do we make a large scale civil war possible in China by providing equipment and transporting Chiang Kai-shek's troops into an area where he has so little support among the people that he must keep the Japs and their puppet troops armed as part of his war against his own northern countrymen?

We have been hearing, too, Mr. Speaker, that America must uphold Chiang's government and party against the Chinese Communists.

As that great American, Cordell Hull, vigorously reminded the Nation last week, in his testimony to the committee investigating Pearl Harbor, the Japanese militarists invented the Chinese Communist menace to justify their aggressive imperialism. Japan was marching into China, her representatives told our State Department and the American public, only to suppress banditry and communism.

Under the firm leadership of President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, America was not deceived by that transparent fiction. It had been invented, we saw clearly then, by the Mikado's militarists appeasement-minded circles in China and abroad. Surely, after all the blood that has flowed since Pearl Harbor, we will not now be fooled by another effort to dress military conquest in the shop-worn garments of anticommunism.

We have just come out victoriously from a costly war which was inevitable from the day the ink was put on the Axis anti-Comintern pact. From that day, under slogans of a war to the death on communism, Fascists and militarists and reactionaries in all countries began to press democracy back and back to the wall from which there was no escape with life or honor without fighting the war we have just been through.

If America now continues to lend its great power to the establishing of anti-Communist bases in North China, that, too, will have its own logic. And that logic is not of peace and self-government for all peoples. It is the logic of the most reactionary of American big businessmen, wanting unrestricted economic exploitation of Asia. It is the logic of dollar imperialism. It is the logic of a new world war, this time against the Soviet Union, launched from great bases in the Pacific, from a Japan whose militarists we have not yet rooted out, from anti-Communist basis in north China.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think it is wrong for the United States to aid the Chinese now in this war?

Mr. DE LACY. I think we should assist China to become united and democratic and not aid in suppressing the few liberties which have begun to develop over there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. China has a government. It had a representative over here. He was one of the conferees at San Francisco. Should not our aid be extended to him under this United Nations Organization?

Mr. DE LACY. Our aid should go to all the people, and if the gentleman will be patient I will try to cover that shortly.

The newspaper correspondents who know China have been trying to tell us the truth. It is time to listen to them and to the hushed voices of the experts in our own State Department, and among the members of our own military missions.

The facts about the censorship and suppression of news from Chungking are known everywhere. That Chiang Kai-shek and the ruling Kuomintang have held no elections, high or low, in the territories they rule is also well known. They have kept crushing burdens of taxation on the backs of the landless peasantry of their part of China. They have not only permitted graft and large-scale speculation in army supplies and necessities of the people to continue, virtually unchecked, but these intolerable abuses, so substantially contributing to inflation, are carried on by persons and groups close to high Chungking officials.

During the war, only the brief period of General Stilwell's vigorous efforts at elemental reforms in the supply and deployment of all Chinese forces against the Japanese saw even temporary improvement in the general defeatism, inefficiency, downright bad government, and latent civil war with which the Kuomintang's "period of national tutelage" was blessing its country.

Every defeat was met with the explanation that space was being traded for time or that American aid was insufficient. No defeat was ever followed by reform. That alone could mobilize the whole people. But on the contrary, secret Kuomintang police suppressed criticism, and what arms did reach China from this country were chiefly used to blockade the Chinese Communists, who were mobilizing wide popular resistance.

Two recent books by members of the foreign press correspondents' party which finally obtained permission to visit the communist-led areas in North China have powerfully shown the contrast between the generally known picture of decadence and reactionary scheming in Chungking and the vigorous new democracy whose foundations have been laid in the North by the anti-Japanese resistance movement.

In Harrison Forman's report from Red China, in Guenther Stein's Challenge of Red China, in the New York Times dispatches by Brooks Atkinson, in conversations I have held with some of these returned correspondents, the essential facts are being made known to the American public.

The Chinese Communists stand for a simple program which has long ago been achieved in Western Nations, a program of simple land and tax reforms and of free elections. Limiting their own party members to a maximum of one-third of elective governmental posts, high or low, the Communists have succeeded in drawing peasants, old style gentry, landlords, small, middle, and big merchants into every level of the resistance governments. In these councils, in open session, taxes, reclamation of waste land, sanitation, education, problems of production and of defense are freely discussed and decided.

Where else in China has such a broad beginning been made toward democracy? Not in the area where the Kuomintang appoints all officials, from the villages to the Generalissimo. Not in the area where the local tax collector, magistrate, and police officer are more likely than not the largest local landlord, appointed to combine all those vital functions by the Kuomingtang rulers in Chungking.

The best answer to those who think that the skeptical correspondents who saw these conditions with their own eyes might have been mistaken or deceived is that the nearly 100,000,000 Chinese who have been mobilized against the Japanese by the methods and material benefits of the new democracy engaged and pinned down 358,000 of the 562,000 Japanese troops in China, or roughly 64 percent.

And of the 780,000 Chinese puppet troops—480,000 of whom were former Central Government troops who went over with their officers and equipment to the Japanese—nearly 90 percent were pinned to their positions by the communist-led forces.

And yet neither the Eighth Route Army nor the New Fourth Route Army nor the people's militia backing them received the tiniest fraction of aid from America. Yet these armies and people's forces received no guns, no medical supplies, and no money from Chungking. They were, in fact, stringently blockaded by Chiang's best-trained and best-equipped troops.

For daring to insist that these good troops be taken away from their anti-Communist blockade and thrown into the war against Japan, for daring to ask for a united China and for certain simple administrative army reforms, General Stilwell was sent out of China.

If America had held to the policies of Roosevelt, Ambassador Gauss, and General Stilwell, it is quite unlikely that there would be any civil war in China today.

It was General Hurley, sent to China specifically to help heal the rift between Chiang and the Communists, who reversed our policy of bringing about an understanding between them and a coalition for victory over Japan and a stable, democratic, postwar China.

Hurley backed the Generalissimo's demand for the removal of General Stilwell. By giving Chiang blank-check support, he assured the break-down of negotiations between him and the Communists. The continued disunity and the continued use of Chiang's best troops and best American equipment for his anti-Communist blockade enabled the Japanese to launch a new offensive which destroyed several United States air bases and threatened for several months to knock China out of the war.

In protest against Hurley's uncritical support to Chiang, Ambassador Gauss, who had worked ardently to unite the Chinese, resigned his post.

Appointed then to the ambassadorship, Hurley purged able China experts with long records of service who were critical of his policies. In flagrant curtailment of the American free press, he began to screen press correspondents in accordance with his estimate of their "political reliability." The door which the correspondents had laboriously opened so that press representatives could go to see for themselves, Ambassador Hurley closed again.

He dropped Stilwell's insistence that American lend-lease supplies be used against Japan. Instead, he permitted Chiang Kai-shek to keep them for use in the civil war which even then he was planning for the day after the day on which the United States should defeat Japan.

Step by step Ambassador Hurley's reversal of the Roosevelt-Gauss policies in China have made the present civil war unavoidable. He and General Wedemeyer have now committed us to armed intervention.

They excuse and explain and deny, but the brute fact of using our transports to put Chiang's forces in position, the brute fact of permitting American lend-lease munitions to be used against China's heroic anti-Japanese resistance forces in north and central China, the brute fact that scores of thousands of high-point servicemen are held in the Pacific while transports and hundreds of victory ships are tied up in Seattle and San Francisco—all add up to something.

They add up to the very thing it was the object of Roosevelt and Gauss and Stilwell to avert.

They add up to the negation of the lofty principles expressed in the preamble of the world Charter, which we were the first Nation to ratify.

They add up to war in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, the west coast was the first section of the country to demand that we stop sending scrap iron and oil to Japan, stock piling her for war against China and against us. Judging from the hundreds of letters I and other Members are getting, the west coast is once again taking the lead in a demand that has now become Nation-wide—that we reaffirm our desire to see a united, democratic China; that we stop helping one side in the present civil war and call back our troops and military supplies, putting the transports we have in China and the hundreds of ships tied up in west coast harbors into use to bring our men home from the Pacific; that we renew our pressure for a genuine coalition government in China composed of representatives of the Kuomingtang, of the Communists, of the Democratic League, and other groupings; that we express our earnest hope that this coalition at an early date call free elections for every village, provincial, and government post in that great land.

Mr. Speaker, the only side we can afford to take in China is the side of democracy.

In the hopes of gaining early action to this end, various west coast Members—the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. COFFEE and Mr. SAVAGE], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS], the gentlemen from California [Mr. PATTERSON and Mr. HEALY], and I have today introduced the following resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point.

Whereas under the leadership of that great American statesman and world leader, the late President Roosevelt, the American people, side by side with our allies, worked and fought unitedly for military victory over an enemy which nearly succeeded in conquering and enslaving the world; and

Whereas America fought tyranny and underwrote with the blood of her finest youth and with billions from the pockets of her citizens the right of all peoples to go forward freely, under peaceful governments and social forms of their own choosing; and

Whereas American troops and American weapons are being used in China to strengthen one side of an undeclared and growing civil war; and

Whereas our armed intervention can only prolong the civil war in China, help deprive millions of their beginning toward self-government and democratic progress, indefinitely postpone profitable commercial relations between our country and theirs, and create the conditions for another great war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the people of the United States, acting through our elected representatives in the United States House of Representatives in Washington, to help preserve the peace of the world and to assure every people their inalienable right to establish governments and promote internal reforms of their own choice, do call upon the President of the United States to order forthwith the recall of all United States troops, transports, and supplies from China, to express to her America's deep regret that she should be divided into two armed camps, and to offer every peaceful assistance which would help her take her rightful place as a great, united, democratic, and prosperous nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a speech by Hon. John J. McCloy, the retiring Assistant Secretary of War, before the Academy of Political Science, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on the 8th of November last, and in the other a speech made by himself before the National Industrial Conference Board at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York, on November 20, 1945, on the subject of foreign loans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 30 minutes.

NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL REVIVAL OF SPIRITUAL INTERESTS AND VALUES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, a few hours before his death last April, President Roosevelt concluded his last message with these words:

> The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

For several weeks it has seemed to me that there is a growing need nationally for the exercise of strong and active faith, and for the examination of doubts that disturb and distract us to determine if they are well-founded. If they are not, then in the interest of a fuller realization of the possibilities of tomorrow, they should be eliminated.

That there is unrest, uncertainty and dissatisfaction all across the country, no one who reads mail coming to congressional offices, or who otherwise keeps informed on national attitudes will deny.

Moreover, all of us will agree that there are circumstances and conditions that exist in various phases of our national life that are far from ideal and that tend to contribute to dissatisfaction if we allow them to be magnified out of proportion to the complete picture.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to attempt any profound psychological analysis of the national state of mind in this brief discussion. I am convinced, however, that at least a part of the apparent lack of direction, the hesitancy, the skeptical pessimism, the impatience, and the tendency to indulge in self-pity, are in a very large measure psychological, and are to some degree the convalescing symptoms of a world that has been very sick and literally has undergone a major operation. No physician ever expects a patient to recover completely on the day after a major surgery.

To use a different analogy, I believe that some of our national reactions today are in many respects similar to what happens in a terrific traffic jam.

Suppose the automobile traffic that will move away from the Army-Navy football game next Saturday, all in one direction, should be stopped rather suddenly by an unforeseen obstacle blocking the way, and it should become necessary for every driver to turn around and seek another way. If you have ever experienced a traffic jam of such proportions you know full well what the pattern would be. Every driver would begin to blow his horn, after screeching his brakes and sliding his wheels, and to hunt an opening for his own best way out. The sense of direction of the entire throng would be lost, and as patience yielded to personal impulses confusion for a time would increase.

Now, in effect that is what has happened to this country and to most of the world. Up until a few months ago this Nation of 140,000,000 people was organized into a mighty machine for waging total war. We were driving hard and fast in one direction, and suddenly we came to a full stop in that direction and a traffic jam was inevitable. We started then, individually and by groups, to work our way out and drive in a different direction.

Because we could not immediately reverse the national machine and start smoothly in the other direction, there has been some horn blowing and at times a growing impatience. I think it may be helpful to us, Mr. Speaker, to compare our situation with what it was exactly 1 year ago today on November 26, 1944. On that day a year ago a mighty offensive was under way in Europe and in the Pacific. On Sunday, November 26, 1944, Col. Albert Warner, reporting on the situation for the Army Hour, opened his report with these words:

> During the past week Allied troops in western Europe have crumpled the German lines * * * have taken Metz and reached into the edges of the German Saar Valley. Near Achen, amid the heaviest fighting and

the greatest concentration of troops, we have carved out gains.

A little further along in his report he said:

Consequently during the week we have seen the enemy cling to every pillbox. He has drawn up his scanty reserves to hold the line and has thrown in valuable forces of tanks. In the face of this rugged defense American troops of the First Army have pressed slowly into the outskirts of Weisweiller. * * * Our men are also breaking out today from the Hurtgen Forest, whose gaunt shattered pine trees moaned with fire of German bullets and gloomily smothered progress.

Colonel Warner closed that broadcast exactly 1 year ago with these words, and they contain for us a real challenge:

The events of the week are, in fact, written in the lives of individual men and women. Lt. Frances Slanger, of Roxbury, Mass., a nurse on the western front, with her pen and life contributed to those events. After a day of work she wrote about the men. "The wounded do not cry," she said. "Their buddies come first. The patience and determination they show, the courage and fortitude they have, is something always to behold."

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that on that night this nurse was hit by a shell, and conscious a little while before she passed away, she remained a part of the courage of which she wrote.

And what was happening in the Pacific a year ago today.

Secretary Stimson, in his weekly report, said this:

In the Pacific war, Japanese ground forces in the Ormoc corridor of western Leyte have been further compressed. Our veteran Thirty-second Division eliminated enemy resistance at the village of Limon and pushed southward.

In that same report Secretary Stimson listed total casualties through November 15, as follows: 89,840 killed, 258,106 wounded, 57,514 missing, and 55,598 prisoners.

A year ago today the Secretary of War was reporting the saddening news of growing casualties, of new cross-marked graves in foreign lands.

And what types of reports are coming from that office today. Well here is one. Since VE-day in May up to the middle of November, 3,114,000 have been discharged from the Army exclusive of the other services. That is more men than was in the World War I Army.

During the month of October, 1,270,000 men were discharged and at the present rate well over a million will be discharged this month.

One year ago ships were leaving our ports, bound with men and munitions to the fighting fronts.

Today close to 600 ships are bringing men back to these shores for discharge. It may be well, since the matter of shipping has been much under discussion, to list the numbers of various types of ships now being utilized for transporting men back home. Only yesterday a headline in the Washington Post read: "48,000 troops due today in United States ports."

The 253 troop transports that were in use for transporting men to other lands have been augmented by 210 Liberty cargo ships that have been converted; 97 Victory converted ships; 38 hospital ships; 178 Navy assault transports, and 111 Navy combat vessels.

Mr. Speaker, no demobilization program can be 100-percent satisfactory.

I am not here to say that the present program is perfect. But when I consider what happened after World War I when mass demobilization by units resulted in the misplacing of thousands of service records, and in thousands of others being incomplete, and when I recall that the plan then used resulted in many instances in men with overseas service being the last to be discharged, and compare that program with the present program, I am grateful that today we are following a plan that comes much nearer to taking into consideration the individual rights of the individual soldier.

Patience still is a virtue devoutly to be desired and encouraged in all our relations, both national and international.

Today emotional strains and stresses and powerful psychological pressures beat upon us and upon all people in every land around the world.

These influences are apt to move us, to move various groups among us, as well as other nations into channels of thought and action that criss-cross and create confusion in policies and practices, and completely obscure great purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I imagine most Members of this House saw Bill Mauldin's cartoon a few days ago, the one in which the two famous characters face each other in belligerent mood and one says to the other: "What do you mean calling me a Communist, you Fascist?"

Bill Mauldin is a returned veteran of World War II. Now he did not get his idea for that cartoon while facing enemy fire on a flaming foreign front where he shared the common danger of death with his American and Allied comrades.

No, Mr. Speaker, men who 1 year ago were charging courageously into storms of unleashed lightning around the world were not calling each other names or tacking on tags or labels because of a difference in viewpoint, but more than 3,000,000 who have been discharged since VE-day have discovered that in our civilian population there is a growing tendency, impelled in part by those same emotional pressures I mentioned, to indulge in name calling.

Walter Lippmann made what to me seem some very sane observations a few days ago in an address before the Association of National Advertisers in New York.

For one thing, Mr. Lippmann suggested that the American businessman need not be afraid to look under the bed. While conceding that the United States is the only big industrial country now committed to the perpetuation of free enterprise, Mr. Lippmann said he saw "no cause in this for panic, scaremongering, or hysteria."

I said in the beginning of this discussion that we needed to examine the doubts and uncertainties that seem to trouble large segments of the people today to see if they have substance. In line with that same thought as he applied it to the world of business, I quote one more brief passage from Mr. Lippmann's address:

Just because the world is turbulent, difficult, and dangerous, it is particularly necessary that the business community be unfrightened, confident, and set firmly against false alarms and stampedes. In the Army this is called discipline and morale, and it is when things are toughest that discipline and morale are most needed.

Mr. Speaker, I join Walter Lippmann, not only in calling on the business world for greater discipline and morale but in calling on industry and labor, on Congress and the country, for a real and practical demonstration of discipline and morale and in the exercise of such strong and active faith that we shall begin to talk and act more confidently and constructively.

While the traffic jam was inevitable, it need not be permanent, and it seems to me that we have had sufficient time to come out of it.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, and because of my own very deep convictions in this respect, I feel it entirely proper to suggest that the strong and active faith we need today and in the days ahead is a spiritual quality, and I make no apology for standing here in the well of this House, perhaps today the greatest forum in the world, and calling for an international revival of spiritual interests and values.

The whole world listened not so long ago when General MacArthur presided over the surrender ceremonies of Japan aboard the battleship *Missouri*. He said some things on that occasion that might not have been unusual at all for a clergyman to say, but they seemed highly significant in expressing the sentiments of a great military leader at a moment of triumph, and while surrounded by the greatest display of military and naval strength in the history of the world.

I wish to quote a brief portion of what General MacArthur said:

Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Various methods through the ages have attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned, but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliances, balances of power, League of Nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh.

It is that last sentence that I particularly want to underscore:

It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh.

And so, Mr. Speaker, having joined Walter Lippmann in calling for more discipline and morale, and having chuckled with Bill Mauldin over the prospect of two old war buddies calling

each other Communist and Fascist, I now make the plea which General MacArthur suggested and call for a resurgence of spiritual interest, a reemphasis on spiritual values and moral stamina, and a rededication of ourselves to the final achievement of those things that were close to so many hearts as they beat the last beat.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the intelligent presentation of the cause by the gentleman from Tennessee, and I want to congratulate him. I hope to God that not only those who are Members of Congress but the people of this country generally will pay heed to the gentleman's appeal and to his advice, and once more we should be thankful to the gentleman for again appealing for justice, right, and righteous living.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished dean of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE LATE JACK NICHOLS

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that it was impossible for me to be present on November 12, when tribute was paid by Members of the Oklahoma delegation and other Members of the House to the memory of the late Jack Nichols, who for 8 years represented the district I now have the honor to represent. I therefore wish to take this opportunity to add my tribute.

When the news of his death was flashed on Wednesday, November 7, I was en route to Oklahoma and was greatly shocked when my office notified me by wire of his untimely passing.

A memorial service was held for Jack Nichols in the city of Washington at one of the Baptist churches on Sunday, November 18. I wish so much it had been possible for me to have returned from my State in time to have attended that service.

On Monday, November 12, the League of Young Democrats of the Second Congressional District held a district convention at Muskogee, Okla., the largest city in my district, and the morning of that day was especially set aside for memorial exercises for our late President and Jack Nichols.

Hon. Kelly Brown, an outstanding lawyer of my district and a very intimate friend of Jack's, as he was familiarly known by everyone, delivered the principal address. In his masterful way he delivered a most eloquent and beautiful eulogy. It was my pleasure on that occasion to add my own tribute to his memory and the deeds he performed.

Mr. Speaker, Jack Nichols had many friends in the district he so ably represented, as well as in our State and Nation. Throughout the convention many complimentary remarks about our departed friend were heard. The expressions "Isn't it too bad about the untimely and tragic death of Jack" and "We shall certainly miss him" were constantly heard from many lips.

He was known by his multitude of friends for his fearlessness, determination, and courage. That, in my judgment constituted his outstanding traits. He fought indomitably for those things he thought were right and dear to him and would never give in to a foe. The tougher the foe the better he liked it. He thought nothing was impossible. What sterling qualities for any man to possess. As we turn back the pages of time and the record of yesterday, we see him as a World War I veteran, lawyer, legislator, and an air-line executive.

As a World War I veteran he was always sympathetic to the cause of the war's sick and disabled and their dependents. Much of his time was devoted to their cause.

In his capacity as a lawyer he was ever ready to defend the weak and the poor, even though no compensation was forthcoming. It was a matter of principle with him. He seemed to gain a deep sense of personal satisfaction that he could make such a contribution. I happened to be in Oklahoma City at the time he took the examination for admission to the bar. In talking with him about his prospects of passing he manifested the same spirit of confidence about becoming a lawyer as he always did in solving the many problems he approached. His determination to do or die in the attempt was ever present.

As a legislator, he was always progressive and liberal in his thoughts and action. At all times he was ready to lend his talents to legislation that would benefit the many instead of the few. As an air-line executive, he was a pioneer in the field of aviation. The training and experience he received as chairman of the Special House Committee to Investigate Air Accidents gave him added equipment to become the successful executive that he was of Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc. As vice president of that company he gave impetus to the vision of world-wide expansion. It was while performing this important duty that he met his unfortunate death.

In mourning his passing, I am reminded of something that was said on a previous occasion concerning the death of a Member of this House. It so typifies the creed and spirit of Jack Nichols I would like to quote it, as I remember it, at this time:

I am only one,
But I am one;
I can't do everything,
But I can do something;
And what I can do,
And what I ought to do,
By the grace of God, I will do.

Mr. Speaker, the life and deeds of Jack Nichols needs no eulogy from me. Moreover, how weak are words when we try to measure the heights of men. The many good things he did on this earth will be forever embalmed in the hearts of his friends. No one can take that away from his memory. His voice may be stilled by death and his earthly body gone, but his spirit will continue to hover among his many friends and particularly in the aviation world. Those of us who knew him intimately will miss him intensely. In his passing, my district and State lost a valuable citizen. I lost a friend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization that recently met in the city of London, and the final act of the United Nations Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve as a delegate of the United States to the recent United Nations Educational and Cultural Conference held in London November 1–16. This Conference was called to write the constitution for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. I shall subsequently refer to this Organization by its short title, UNESCO. During the time at my disposal, I wish to report to the House on the activities of the Conference, discuss the provisions of the UNESCO constitution written during our deliberations, and explain how this new agency will contribute to the establishment of a just and lasting peace. I shall endeavor to present to the House a detailed and comprehensive summary of what was accomplished in London.

THIS SHRINKING WORLD

I need only to point to my flight from Great Britain to the United States in the very short period of approximately 20 hours to emphasize that this is one world. Unless we recognize this as one world, there may be no world. The instruments of destruction created by human genius are so effective and so powerful that if they are not controlled, humanity will destroy itself. The closeness of countries and continents to one another makes it imperative for those dwelling on this planet to understand each other more fully to the end that an orderly society may be constructed—a society which will result in good will and permanent peace. There is no choice about the problem of world unity. We must resolve this issue or be destroyed. We must either achieve world unity or be faced with universal annihilation. The crucial struggle is to lay a solid foundation for world unity through international good will and mutual understanding. It is here that we must win and hold the peace.

ORGANIZATION FOR PEACE

I have long been an advocate of an international organization to maintain the peace and to make security among the nations as common and as certain in the future as were wars and threats of wars in the past. Long before I became a Member of this House I repeatedly expressed the hope that we would develop

in this troubled world an international organization to prevent war. I have again and again pledged my constituency that whenever the opportunity presented itself I would raise my voice in an effort to help bring into being such a structure. On several occasions I have stated on this floor that world organization is the only alternative to international anarchy. I, therefore, welcomed the opportunity to serve on the American delegation to the United Nations Educational and Cultural Conference in London. To assist in writing the Constitution of UNESCO affords me a deep personal satisfaction.

If the United Nations Charter is to work effectively, the peoples of the world must give it their wholehearted support. The most effective way of assuring this support is to create the greatest possible understanding among the nations. The Conference in London was a historic and successful event in man's march toward peace. The importance of the Organization provided for by the constitution will grow in significance as time passes. I go so far as to predict that it will become one of the great foundation stones in the United Nations' structure. I thoroughly believe that it will aid immeasurably in preventing war. The constitution written by the London Conference is being submitted to the members of the United Nations for their acceptance. This constitution will be effective when it has been adopted by 20 states. I hope that the United States will become one of the first members of UNESCO.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER AND UNESCO

UNESCO is in harmony with and brings to fruition certain provisions of the United Nations Charter. In the Charter, written at San Francisco:

> The peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war—

Provide in article 57 of the Charter for—

> various specialized agencies, established by intergovernmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities, as defined in their basic instruments, in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields.

Article 63 of the United Nations Charter states that—

> The Economic and Social Council may enter into agreements with any of the agencies referred to in article 57, defining the terms on which the agency concerned shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations.

The constitution of UNESCO in article 10 provides "for effective cooperation between the two Organizations in the pursuit of their common purposes," and at the same time recognizes that UNESCO is autonomous within the fields of its competence as defined in its constitution.

Like the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Civil Aviation Organization, the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization will be associated with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, which has a broad concern with the several major divisions of our social life. International organizations, to be effective, must have the support of enlightened world opinion. They will not run themselves. The success of UNO and UNESCO depends on the brains and will of the peoples of the world to make them work.

The United States has demonstrated its generosity and its unequaled military and economic power. It must now demonstrate its statesmanship in achieving international understanding and cooperation. We have made an incalculable contribution to the winning of the war. We now have an opportunity unique in history to help organize this world for peace. With great power comes great responsibility. Our own people and people everywhere look to this Republic to give leadership in building the new world.

BACKGROUND OF THE CONFERENCE

On August 3, 1945, invitations to the London Conference were extended by the United Kingdom in association with the Government of France. Forty-four nations sent their representatives. All of the principal countries of the United Nations took part in this undertaking, with the exception of one great power, the Soviet Union. Throughout the Conference the hope was repeatedly expressed that the Soviet Union, which has contributed so much to winning the war, might find it possible to join UNESCO.

The call to the Conference was issued before hostilities had ended. The constitution of UNESCO was drafted against the somber and realistic background of the most terrible war in history. Like a veteran wearing his battle stars, the great city of London displayed her bomb-scarred buildings alongside vacant sites of houses completely obliterated, showing that she, too, had fought in the front lines. A few steps from the Conference headquarters, I saw a monument to the dead of 1914–18, its marble surface disfigured by enemy bombs in the war of 1939–45. Passing by that monument, as well as everywhere in London, could be seen men and women wearing the uniforms of all the allied forces. In the Conference itself were delegates still in uniform, returned prisoners of war, and former members of the Allied armed forces and underground resistance movements. Shortages of shelter, clothing, fuel, and food in the great capital of the British Commonwealth gave additional evidence of the price that the United Nations paid in men and materials to defeat the totalitarian powers.

IN THE WAKE OF WAR

Further evidence of the destructiveness of war was given to the Conference in vivid reports by the delegates from devastated countries. Representatives from Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, and Yugoslavia graphically described the effects of war on their educational, scientific, and cultural institutions, and urged the planning of reconstruction measures, which could be put into operation with the least possible delay. All of these delegates in statements to the Conference or in private conversations told us of the systematic attempt of the invading or occupying forces to stamp out all patriotic thought and action. They told of teachers who were killed, imprisoned, or deported for anti-Nazi or anti-Japanese activity. Children's textbooks were rigorously censored, destroyed, and in many schools the use of textbooks was discontinued. School buildings were leveled by bombs and shells or were used to quarter troops or store materials of war. The famous Library of Louvain, rebuilt after the last war by international contributions, was burned to the ground in May 1940. The library of the University of the Philippines was totally destroyed by the retreating Japanese. These are only two examples of many libraries which were wiped out by the enemy. Laboratories, universities, museums, opera houses, and institutes were looted and burned.

DELEGATES REALISTIC

The spirit of the delegates to this Conference was determined and realistic. These men and women remembered the forward steps taken at San Francisco in providing a charter for the United Nations while the war was still raging. Although fully aware of the destructive forces of international conflict, they kept in mind the long-term objectives of civilization and energetically devoted themselves to planning for peace. In the Conference all were acutely aware of the power of the forces of war and realized that critics of such an organization as UNESCO might feel that the textbook, the school, the radio, the press, motion pictures, the laboratory, and the teacher, were weak tools in comparison with the V2 and the V1 bombs, the modern battleship, the aircraft carrier, the bomber and fighter planes, and atom weapons. But as Prime Minister Attlee stated during the opening session of the Conference, "Wars begin in the minds of men." The delegates recalled how the basis for the last war was laid in the schools, in the textbooks, in the theater, the newspaper, in the radio broadcasts of Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and jingo-controlled Japan. Keeping all this in mind, they were deeply moved by the urgency and importance of their work.

PREPARATION FOR THE CONFERENCE

The delegates assembled in London had before them plans, carefully prepared in advance, plans which were based on long experience in educational, scientific, and cultural cooperation. I take this opportunity to commend the State Department for its most excellent work in preparing for this Conference.

Ministers of education from the war-torn countries of Europe held a series of meetings during the war, beginning as early as October 1942. Their discussions centered largely on problems of educational reconstruction. Beginning in April 1944, the United States took an active part in these meetings and emphasized the need for long-range planning. The United States Department of State prepared a draft of a constitution for UNESCO which was used by the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in the preparation of the draft put forward as the basic document for the deliberations of the Conference. We profited also by the sound proposals contained in the resolutions of Congressman MUNDT, Senators FULBRIGHT and TAFT which were unanimously approved by the House and the Senate, and by a draft constitution

from the French Government. A working committee, representative of the governments participating in the Conference had prepared materials and made necessary technical arrangements. We had behind us the long experience of governmental and nongovernmental organizations in the field of intellectual cooperation to provide a working basis for our task. Delegates from the Western Hemisphere were particularly fortunate in this respect, since we have had unusual experience with inter-American cooperation in educational, scientific, and cultural affairs.

A RECORD FOR SPEED

The Conference convened on November 1, and the final act, which I will include in the RECORD, was signed on November 16. When we went to London we expected to stay from 3 to 4 weeks. The realization of the pressing need for such an Organization as UNESCO stimulated our energies and gave us an impetus that resulted in early agreement on all major points. We made a record by finishing the job ahead of schedule.

The United States, the United Kingdom, France, and China were represented by large and active delegations. The smaller delegations also worked day and night to complete their work. The conference selected the British Minister of Education, Ellen Wilkinson, as president, and the French statesman, Leon Blum, lately returned from 4 years in a German concentration camp, as associate president. The chairman of the United States delegation, Archibald MacLeish, was elected a vice president. The five main working commissions or committees of the conference were presided over by delegates from smaller nations.

THE TITLE OF THE ORGANIZATION

The original draft constitution before the conference bore the suggested title "United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization," but because of the importance of science, and the many cooperative scientific activities long carried on in the international field, the term "science" was included in the title. The organization will, therefore, marshal the principal forces which play upon the mind of man, forces which make for war if wrongly directed, forces which make for peace if inspired by ideals of understanding and international cooperation.

THE PREAMBLE

The preamble of UNESCO states impressively the purposes of this organization. So well worded is this statement, I am going to quote it in full. That it fits the temper of our people and our times is clear from the fact that some of the language of the recent atomic charter might well have been taken from this preamble. It reflects the high objectives which the delegates to the London conference had in their minds and hearts. Certainly the views of the United States delegation, which had a large part in drafting the preamble, are set forth here decisively and eloquently:

The governments of the states parties to this constitution on behalf of their peoples declare:

That since wars begin in the minds of men it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed;

That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war;

That the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality, and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races;

That the wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern;

That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting, and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

For these reasons, the states parties to this constitution, believing in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge, are agreed and determined to develop and to increase the means of communication between their peoples and to employ these means for the purposes of mutual understanding and a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other's lives;

In consequence whereof they do hereby create the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization for the purpose of advancing, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations Organization was established and which its charter proclaims.

THE PURPOSE AND FUNCTIONS OF UNESCO

In the language of the constitution:

The purpose of the Organization is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion by the charter of the United Nations.

In order to realize this purpose the signers of this constitution pledge themselves to collaborate in "advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples," to "give fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture"; and to suggest "educational methods best suited to prepare the children of the world for the responsibilities of freedom." They furthermore pledge themselves to "maintain, increase, and diffuse knowledge."

I have quoted the general language of the constitution. The purposes of UNESCO will be further defined by the outline of activities presented in a later section of this report.

THE ORGANS OF UNESCO

UNESCO will work through a conference, an executive board, and a secretariat.

CONFERENCE

The legislative body of UNESCO will be a general Conference consisting of five representatives of each of the states members of the Organization who shall be selected after consultation with leaders in educational, scientific, and cultural groups. This general conference shall determine the policies and the main lines of the work of the Organization and is comparable to the General Assembly in the United Nations Organization. Each state shall have one vote in the Conference. The place of meeting of the general Conference shall vary from year to year.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

The constitution also provides for an Executive Board which shall consist of eighteen members elected by the general Conference from among the delegates appointed by the member states. To quote the constitution:

The Executive Board, acting under the authority of the General Conference, shall be responsible for the execution of the program adopted by the Conference and shall prepare its agenda and program of work.

SECRETARIAT

The Secretariat shall consist of a Director General and such staff as may be required.

The Secretariat shall be international in character:

In the discharge of their duties they shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might prejudice their position as international officials. Each state member of the Organization undertakes to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the Director General and the staff, and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their duties.

NATIONAL COOPERATING BODIES

Each member state shall make such arrangements as suit its particular conditions for the purpose of associating its principal bodies interested in educatonal, scientific, and cultural matters with the work of the Organization, preferably by the formation of a National Commission broadly representative of the government and such bodies.

It is not mandatory that member states establish such a Commission, but the constitution reflects the general consensus of the Conference that such National Commissions would constitute an important agency for the advancement of the program of UNESCO. These National Commissions, and, where they are not established, existing organizations "shall act in an advisory capacity to their respective delegations to the General Conference and to their governments in matters relating to the Organization and shall function as agencies of liaison in all matters of interest to it."

FINANCING

The General Conference will approve the budget and apportion financial responsibilities among the states members of the Organization, subject to such arrangements as may be worked out with the United Nations. The request for funds to finance the United States contribution to the Organization would be submitted to Congress for approval along with the budget for the United Nations Organization.

PREPARATORY COMMISSION

Pending the coming into force of the constitution of UNESCO, a preparatory

commission has been provided to make arrangements for the first session of the general conference. This commission, which consists of one representative from each of the governments which attended the conference, selected an executive committee of 15 to exercise the powers of the commission. A special subcommittee has also been appointed to examine the problems relating to the educational, scientific, and cultural needs of countries devastated by the war. When this technical subcommittee has made its study it will report to the commission. The commission in turn may decide to bring the needs of these countries to the attention of governments, organizations, and persons, so that coordinated relief may be given either directly by the donors to the countries requiring aid or indirectly through existing international relief organizations. It is now planned that the preparatory commission will not receive or handle relief funds nor procure and distribute supplies and equipment for educational institutions.

The instrument establishing the preparatory commission provides for the location of the organization of the preparatory commission in London and for the transferral of the commission to Paris when 20 governments have approved the constitution of UNESCO. The seat of UNESCO will be in Paris.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

Delegations to the Conference presented resolutions bearing on the scope of the program of the Organization. The United States delegation presented three resolutions, which were unanimously approved.

The first urges UNESCO to establish close working relationship with various adult education agencies, public and private.

The second requests the Preparatory Commission, through its executive committee, to consult with the International Council of Scientific Unions to strengthen both bodies and plan a suitable working arrangement.

The third recommends that "the Preparatory Commission, in drawing up the agenda for the first conference of UNESCO, provide full opportunity" for the discussion of such means of communication as press, radio, and motion pictures for the ends of peace, and that in working out the internal arrangements of UNESCO special attention be given to the relationships to be established with the various agencies and organizations operating in those fields.

ACTIVITIES

When any new organization is planned, it is inevitable that speculation develops as to its specific activities. The broad general statements in its constitution can take on real meaning for the general public only as the contemplated program is defined. As one who attended delegation, commission, and general-conference meetings and held many private conversations during my 2½ weeks in London, I feel I am familiar with the thinking which lies back of provisions of the constitution of UNESCO. It should be emphasized that there are certain things that UNESCO will not do.

WHAT UNESCO WILL NOT DO

In the first place, I quote article I, paragraph 3, of the constitution:

First:

With a view to preserving the independence, integrity, and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the States Members of this Organization, the Organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction.

Second. UNESCO will not receive and administer funds for material relief and rehabilitation.

Third. It will not take over or control the activities of the press, radio, and motion pictures. We hope, however, that it will facilitate the use of these mass media of communication for international understanding.

Fourth. It will not undertake the construction of school buildings.

Fifth. It will not restrain or interfere in any way with the exchange of ideas, materials, and personnel now being carried on through existing international organizations.

I have purposely presented first the limitations on the activities of this Organization to forestall unjustified criticism. It was the firm conviction of the American delegation, and, in fact, the great majority of the delegations, that this new Organization would be swamped if it undertook responsibility for the collection and disbursement of funds, and the administration of programs to rebuild educational, scientific, and cultural institutions in Europe, and the Far East. It was also clear to all of the delegates that UNESCO could not, and should not, meddle in the domestic educational, scientific, and cultural programs of the countries participating in this Organization. However, the Conference did realize that campaigns of hate and lies in schools, the press, radio, and motion pictures could lay the foundation for aggressive war, in accordance with the now well-known pattern of Nazi Germany. Any such organized program would, of course, be dealt with by the Security Council of the United Nations.

UNESCO will not deal in problems involving the security of military information. These questions will have to be dealt with in the future as they have been in the past, on the political and military levels.

WHAT UNESCO WILL DO

The positive goals and functions of this organization have already been presented to you in an earlier part of this speech. I wish even at the risk of possible repetition to list more specifically what this agency might accomplish.

The Preparatory Commission is beginning its work in London. It is formulating a definite program for consideration at the first meeting of the General Conference of UNESCO. Consequently, it is not possible to tell in detail and finally the nature of the projects and activities which will constitute the program of UNESCO. The functions referred to earlier indicate the general scope of work of this agency. I cite the following as examples of activities which have received general approval in preliminary discussions:

First. Promote a free flow of ideas and information on the popular as well as the scholarly level—through the radio, motion picture, and printed page, and directly between scholars, teachers, librarians, and artists.

Second. Encourage the exchange of students and the reciprocal visits of scientists, and other scholars, teachers, and artists.

Third. Stimulate the circulation of scientific and technological information, now so vital to the well-being of all peoples.

Fourth. Forward the contribution to world understanding by creative writers, artists, and musicians through encouraging their association across national boundaries.

Fifth. Provide liaison arrangements to facilitate the giving of aid to peoples whom the war has stripped of educational and scientific resources, for the reestablishment and restaffing of schools, laboratories and libraries.

Sixth. Provide for studies and reports concerning situations where educational and cultural opportunities are deficient.

Seventh. Cooperate with the Trusteeship Council in assisting non-self-governing peoples in the improvement of their educational opportunities.

Eighth. Assist in cooperative efforts to define the educational goals necessary to the development of free peoples.

Ninth. Foster approved programs of adult education in accordance with the needs and desires of the several nations.

Tenth. Publish factual studies of progress achieved in educational and cultural development.

Eleventh. In general, give all practical assistance to education, research, and scientific advance, as well as the free functioning of the press, radio, and motion picture, while scrupulously refraining from repression, surveillance, or dictation in the educational and cultural affairs of any country.

Twelfth. Encourage the development of education which gives support to world peace and international cooperation through the United Nations and its associated agencies.

These proposed activities have been presented for purposes of illustration only. In no sense do they indicate the full scope of the work of UNESCO.

CONCLUSION

The Conference in London wrote the constitution and prepared the plans for a most significant international organization. The United States, with its power and influence, can and must take a major part in making this new organization effective.

Mr. Speaker, I have presented to the House a report of the London Conference; I have discussed the constitution which I will include in the RECORD. I hope that the Congress will act at once in placing its approval on this constitution. Such action would guarantee to the world that we intend to participate actively in UNESCO. Such action would hasten the approval of this constitution by the requisite number of nations.

We have just won a war against enemies we fought with weapons of steel

and flame. But the most dangerous enemy to us and to all mankind is not an enemy who can be overcome by such weapons. The enemy to whom I refer appears in many disguises and under a variety of names. He is often cloaked in prejudice and bigotry. Sometimes he assumes the shape of lying propaganda. Always he walks in masks of hatred, suspicion, jealousy, and ill-will. Beneath these outward forms he remains forever the same. His name is ignorance. He can be conquered by only one weapon, the weapon of free and unfettered truth.

We must keep faith with the young men who died in the service of our country. They fought with weapons of steel and flame. We must forge and use with all the will and wisdom at our command, the instruments of international cooperation which will win the peace. To achieve that high purpose, we who remain must show the same qualities of daring and devotion to high ideals which our victorious sons have displayed on the land, on the sea, and in the air.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS

The Governments of the States Parties to This Constitution on Behalf of Their Peoples Declare that since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed;

That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war;

That the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races;

That the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern;

That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

For these Reasons, the States parties to this Constitution, believing in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge, are agreed and determined to develop and to increase the means of communication between their peoples and to employ these means for the purposes of mutual understanding and a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other's lives;

In Consequence Whereof they do hereby create the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation for the purpose of advancing, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations Organisation was established and which its Charter proclaims.

ARTICLE I

Purposes and functions

1. The purpose of the Organisation is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations.

2. To realise this purpose the Organisation will:

(a) Collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples, through all means of mass communication and to that end recommend such international agreements as may be necessary to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image;

(b) Give fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture; by collaborating with Members, at their requests, in the development of educational activities; by instituting collaboration among the nations to advance the ideal of equality of educational opportunity without regard to race, sex or any distinctions, economic or social; by suggesting educational methods best suited to prepare the children of the world for the responsibilities of freedom;

(c) Maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge; by assuring the conservation and protection of the world's inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science, and recommending to the nations concerned the necessary international conventions; by encouraging cooperation among the nations in all braches of intellectual activity, including the international exchange of persons active in the fields of education, science and culture and the exchange of publications, objects of artistic and scientific interest and other materials of information; by initiating methods of international cooperation calculated to give the people of all countries access to the printed and published materials produced by any of them.

3. With a view to preserving the independence, integrity and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the States Members of this Organisation, the Organisation is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction.

ARTICLE II

Membership

1. Membership of the United Nations Organisation shall carry with it the right to membership of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.

2. Subject to the conditions of the agreement between this Organisation and the United Nations Organisation, approved pursuant to Article X of this Constitution, States not members of the United Nations Organisation may be admitted to membership of the Organisation, upon recommendation of the Executive Board, by a two-thirds majority vote of the General Conference.

3. Members of the Organisation which are suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership of the United Nations Organisation shall, upon the request of the latter, be suspended from the rights and privileges of this Organisation.

4. Members of the Organisation which are expelled from the United Nations Organisation shall automatically cease to be members of this Organisation.

ARTICLE III

Organs

The Organisation shall include a General Conference, an Executive Board and a Secretariat.

ARTICLE IV

The General Conference

A. Composition

1. The General Conference shall consist of the representatives of the States Members of the Organisation. The Government of each Member State shall appoint not more than five delegates, who shall be selected after consultation with the National Commission, if established, or with educational, scientific and cultural bodies.

B. Functions

2. The General Conference shall determine the policies and the main lines of work of the Organisation. It shall take decisions on programmes drawn up by the Executive Board.

3. The General Conference shall, when it deems it desirable, summon international conferences on education, the sciences and humanities and the dissemination of knowledge.

4. The General Conference shall, in adopting proposals for submission to the Member States, distinguish between recommendations and international conventions submitted for their approval. In the former case a majority vote shall suffice; in the latter case a two-thirds majority shall be required. Each of the Member States shall submit recommendations or conventions to its competent authorities within a period of one year from the close of the session of the General Conference at which they were adopted.

5. The General Conference shall advise the United Nations Organisation on the educational, scientific and cultural aspects of matters of concern to the latter, in accordance with the terms and procedure agreed upon between the appropriate authorities of the two Organisations.

6. The General Conference shall receive and consider the reports submitted periodically by Member States as provided by Article VIII.

7. The General Conference shall elect the members of the Executive Board and, on the recommendation of the Board, shall appoint the Director-General.

C. Voting

8. Each Member State shall have one vote in the General Conference. Decisions shall be made by a simple majority except in cases in which a two-thirds majority is required by the provisions of this Constitution. A majority shall be a majority of the Members present and voting.

D. Procedure

9. The General Conference shall meet annually in ordinary session; it may meet in extraordinary session on the call of the Executive Board. At each session the location of its next session shall be designated by the General Conference and shall vary from year to year.

10. The General Conference shall, at each session, elect a President and other officers and adopt rules of procedure.

11. The General Conference shall set up special and technical committees and such other subordinate bodies as may be necessary for its purposes.

12. The General Conference shall cause arrangements to be made for public access to meetings, subject to such regulations as it shall prescribe.

E. Observers

13. The General Conference, on the recommendation of the Executive Board and by a two-thirds majority may, subject to its rules of procedure, invite as observers at specified sessions of the Conference or of its commissions representatives of international organisations, such as those referred to in Article XI, paragraph 4.

ARTICLE V

Executive Board

A. Composition

1. The Executive Board shall consist of eighteen members elected by the General Conference from among the delegates appointed by the Member States, together with the President of the Conference who shall sit *ex officio* in an advisory capacity.

2. In electing the members of the Executive Board the General Conference shall endeavour to include persons competent in the arts, the humanities, the sciences, education

and the diffusion of ideas, and qualified by their experience and capacity to fulfil the administrative and executive duties of the Board. It shall also have regard to the diversity of cultures and a balanced geographical distribution. Not more than one national of any Member State shall serve on the Board at any one time, the President of the Conference excepted.

3. The elected members of the Executive Board shall serve for a term of three years, and shall be immediately eligible for a second term, but shall not serve consecutively for more than two terms. At the first election eighteen members shall be elected of whom one third shall retire at the end of the first year and one third at the end of the second year, the order of retirement being determined immediately after the election by the drawing of lots. Thereafter six members shall be elected each year.

4. In the event of the death or resignation of one of its members, the Executive Board shall appoint, from among the delegates of the Member State concerned, a substitute, who shall serve until the next session of the General Conference which shall elect a member for the remainder of the term.

B. Functions

5. The Executive Board, acting under the authority of the General Conference, shall be responsible for the execution of the programme adopted by the Conference and shall prepare its agenda and programme of work.

6. The Executive Board shall recommend to the General Conference the admission of new Members of the Organisation.

7. Subject to decisions of the General Conference, the Executive Board shall adopt its own rules of procedure. It shall elect its officers from among its members.

8. The Executive Board shall meet in regular session at least twice a year and may meet in special session if convoked by the Chairman on his own initiative or upon the request of six members of the Board.

9. The Chairman of the Executive Board shall present to the General Conference, with or without comment, the annual report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organisation, which shall have been previously submitted to the Board.

10. The Executive Board shall make all necessary arrangements to consult the representatives of international organisations or qualified persons concerned with questions within its competence.

11. The members of the Executive Board shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the General Conference on behalf of the Conference as a whole and not as representatives of their respective Governments.

ARTICLE VI

Secretariat

1. The Secretariat shall consist of a Director-General and such staff as may be required.

2. The Director-General shall be nominated by the Executive Board and appointed by the General Conference for a period of six years, under such conditions as the Conference may approve, and shall be eligible for re-appointment. He shall be the chief administrative officer of the Organisation.

3. The Director-General, or a deputy designated by him, shall participate, without the right to vote, in all meetings of the General Conference, of the Executive Board, and of the committees of the Organisation. He shall formulate proposals for appropriate action by the Conference and the Board.

4. The Director-General shall appoint the staff of the Secretariat in accordance with staff regulations to be approved by the General Conference. Subject to the paramount consideration of securing the highest standards of integrity, efficiency and technical competence, appointment to the staff shall be on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

5. The responsibilities of the Director-General and of the staff shall be exclusively international in character. In the discharge of their duties they shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any authority external to the Organisation. They shall refrain from any action which might prejudice their position as international officials. Each State Member of the Organisation undertakes to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the Director-General and the staff, and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their duties.

6. Nothing in this Article shall preclude the Organisation from entering into special arrangements within the United Nations Organisation for common services and staff and for the interchange of personnel.

ARTICLE VII

National cooperating bodies

1. Each Member State shall make such arrangements as suit its particular conditions for the purpose of associating its principal bodies interested in educational, scientific and cultural matters with the work of the Organisation, preferably by the formation of a National Commission broadly representative of the Government and such bodies.

2. National Commissions or national cooperating bodies, where they exist, shall act in an advisory capacity to their respective delegations to the General Conference and to their Governments in matters relating to the Organisation and shall function as agencies of liaison in all matters of interest to it.

3. The Organisation may, on the request of a Member State, delegate, either temporarily or permanently, a member of its Secretariat to serve on the National Commission of that State, in order to assist in the development of its work.

ARTICLE VIII

Reports by member States

Each Member State shall report periodically to the Organisation, in a manner to be determined by the General Conference, on its laws, regulations and statistics relating to educational, scientific and cultural life and institutions, and on the action taken upon the recommendations and conventions referred to in Article IV, paragraph 4.

ARTICLE IX

Budget

1. The budget shall be administered by the Organisation.

2. The General Conference shall approve and give final effect to the budget and to the apportionment of financial responsibility among the States Members of the Organisation subject to such arrangement with the United Nations as may be provided in the agreement to be entered into pursuant to Article X.

3. The Director-General, with the approval of the Executive Board, may receive gifts, bequests, and subventions directly from governments, public and private institutions, associations and private persons.

ARTICLE X

Relations with the United Nations Organisation

This Organisation shall be brought into relation with the United Nations Organisation, as soon as practicable, as one of the specialised agencies referred to in Article 57 of the Charter of the United Nations. This relationship shall be effected through an agreement with the United Nations Organisation under Article 63 of the Charter, which agreement shall be subject to the approval of the General Conference of this Organisation. The agreement shall provide for effective co-operation between the two Organisations in the pursuit of their common purposes, and at the same time shall recognise the autonomy of this Organisation, within the fields of its competence as defined in this Constitution. Such agreement may, among other matters, provide for the approval and financing of the budget of the Organisation by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XI

Relations with other specialized international organisations and agencies

1. This Organisation may co-operate with other specialised inter-governmental organisations and agencies whose interests and activities are related to its purposes. To this end the Director-General, acting under the general authority of the Executive Board, may establish effective working relationships with such organisations and agencies and establish such joint committees as may be necessary to assure effective co-operation. Any formal arrangements entered into with such organisations or agencies shall be subject to the approval of the Executive Board.

2. Whenever the General Conference of this Organisation and the competent authorities of any other specialised inter-governmental organisations or agencies whose purposes and functions lie within the competence of this Organisation, deem it desirable to effect a transfer of their resources and activities to this Organisation, the Director-General, subject to the approval of the Conference, may enter into mutually acceptable arrangements for this purpose.

3. This Organisation may make appropriate arrangements with other inter-governmental organisations for reciprocal representation at meetings.

4. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation may make suitable arrangements for consultation and co-operation with nongovernmental international organisations concerned with matters within its competence, and may invite them to undertake specific tasks. Such co-operation may also include appropriate participation by representatives of such organisations on advisory committees set up by the General Conference.

ARTICLE XII

Legal status of the Organisation

The provision of Articles 104 and 105 of the Charter of the United Nations Organisation concerning the legal status of that Organisation, its privileges and immunities shall apply in the same way to this Organisation.

ARTICLE XIII

Amendments

1. Proposals for amendments to this Constitution shall become effective upon receiving the approval of the General Conference by a two-thirds majority; provided, however, that those amendments which involve fundamental alterations in the aims of the Organisation or new obligations for the Member States shall require subsequent acceptance on the part of two-thirds of the Member States before they come into force. The draft texts of proposed amendments shall be communicated by the Director-General to the Member States at least six months in advance of their consideration by the General Conference.

2. The General Conference shall have power to adopt by a two-thirds majority rules of procedure for carrying out the provisions of this Article.

ARTICLE XIV

Interpretation

1. The English and French texts of this Constitution shall be regarded as equally authoritative.

2. Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation of this Constitution shall be referred for determination to the International Court of Justice or to an arbitral tribunal, as the General Conference may determine under its rules of procedure.

ARTICLE XV

Entry into force

1. This Constitution shall be subject to acceptance. The instruments of acceptance shall be deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom.

2. This Constitution shall remain open for signature in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom. Signature may take place either before or after the deposit of the instrument of acceptance. No acceptance shall be valid unless preceded or followed by signature.

3. This Constitution shall come into force when it has been accepted by twenty of its signatories. Subsequent acceptances shall take effect immediately.

4. The Government of the United Kingdom will inform all members of the United Nations of the receipt of all instruments of acceptance and of the date on which the Constitution comes into force in accordance with the preceding paragraph.

In faith whereof, the undersigned, duly authorised to that effect, have signed this Constitution in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic.

Done in London the sixteenth day of November, 1945 in a single copy, in the English and French languages, of which certified copies will be communicated by the Government of the United Kingdom to the Governments of all the Members of the United Nations.

FINAL ACT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

FINAL ACT

The Conference for the Establishment of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation of the United Nations was convened by the Government of the United Kingdom in association with the Government of France. The invitations were sent out in accordance with the recommendation of the Conference of San Francisco and upon the request of the Conference of the Allied Ministers of Education, in order to promote the aims set out in article I, paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations. The Conference met in London from the 1st to the 16th November, 1945.

The Governments of the following countries were represented at the Conference by delegates and advisers: Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Chine, Colombia, Cuba, Czecho-slovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (represented by an observer), Yugoslavia.

The following international organisations were also represented by Observers:

International Labour Organisation.

League of Nations Secretariat.

League of Nations Committee on Intellectual Cooperation.

International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation.

Pan-American Union.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA).

International Bureau of Education.

The Conference had before it, and adopted as its basis of discussion a draft Constitution prepared by the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education. It likewise had before it a draft Constitution prepared by the French Government. A number of proposals put forward by other Governments and by various bodies and organisations were also before the Conference.

After consideration of these drafts and proposals the Conference drew up a Constitution establishing an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation and an Instrument establishing a Preparatory Educational, Scientific and Cultural Commission. The Conference also adopted the following Resolution:

"The seat of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation shall be in Paris.

"This Resolution shall not in any way affect the right of the General Conference to take decisions in regard to this matter by a two-thirds majority."

In faith whereof, the undersigned have signed this Final Act.

Done in London, the sixteenth day of November, 1945 in a single copy in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic. This copy shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom, by whom certified copies will be sent to all the United Nations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made by the national executive secretary of the American Veterans of World War II.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE FARMERS' STAKE IN SUBSTANTIAL WAGE-SALARY INCREASES

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, America's farmers are in the business of feeding and clothing the people. They depend upon city customers to buy their goods. Over three-quarters of these customers are wage and salaried workers and their families. Since the level of wages and salaries determines how much Americans can buy, and at what price, every farmer has a stake in labor's fight for substantial wage-salary increases now.

WHAT VJ-DAY MEANT TO THE FARM ECONOMY

Until 1939, when the war began in Europe, American farmers had suffered 20 years of mostly bad times. Then there was a change. Our growing Army had to be fed and clothed, our allies called on American agriculture for help, and growing domestic needs had to be filled. And our farmers did the impossible. During the war agricultural production increased 30 percent, even while the number of people living on farms dropped 20 percent.

And during those 5 years, from 1939 to 1944, net farm income increased 160 percent to a high of $20,000,000,000. The American farm, like the munitions factory, worked day and night. All that could be raised was sold, and American agriculture prospered.

VJ-day marked the turning point. According to Reconversion Director John W. Snyder, in a report last September 30:

> Since VJ-day military requirements for food have been cut about 40 percent, and gradual additional cuts over the next few months will turn back considerable quantities of various foods to civilian channels.

The loss of the military market is only one of the threats to American farm prosperity. Says the Wall Street Journal, of October 12:

> Wartime export markets for wheat, cotton, and other farm products have dried up with the end of lend-lease.

The backbone of peacetime farm prosperity is the home market. Military and foreign markets always ebb and flow.

BUT WHAT IS HAPPENING TO CIVILIAN DEMAND?

The Wall Street Journal of October 6 told the story in a nutshell. This was the headline "Meat rationing may end November 1 as declining civilian purchasing power results in lower demand."

And here is the heart of the story:

> Agriculture Department surveys indicate that families uncertain over their future earnings already are counting their food pennies. The competition of other civilian goods available with reconversion for the weekly pay check may further cut demand.
>
> Only 2 months ago, these surveys show, the average individual would have bought meat at an annual rate of 170 pounds, had it been available. The surveys indicate that these same individuals now will be willing to buy only 155 to 160 pounds. Some economists consider even this figure high.
>
> The October civilian meat supply would allow an annual consumption of 148 pounds. The November supply will be even larger, because of increased marketings of both beef and pork.

According to Government estimates, unless something is done quickly, $20,000,000,000 per year less will be going into wages and salaries by the end of this year. The loss of that much purchasing power will mean smaller markets for food, clothing, and services. For the farmers it will bring a 25-percent cut in net farm income in 1946. This dangerous trend must be stopped by restoring the shrunken national pay envelope.

WHAT THE WORKERS FACED ON VJ-DAY

Let Reconversion Director Snyder tell you what happened:

> When the surrender of Japan was confirmed, cancellations went out swiftly—more than 100,000 overnight, and brought unnecessary war production to a halt. * * * Orders for $23,000,000,000 in war goods were canceled. Munitions production in September fell to a rate 60 percent below July. In December the drop will amount to 80 percent.
>
> In the first month after Japan's surrender, the jobs of more than 4,100,000 workers were affected by cancellation of war contracts. Of these, 2,600,000 were laid off, while 1,500,000 shifted immediately to peacetime production in the same plants.

This growing unemployment, which Reconversion Director, John W. Snyder, estimates will rise to 8,000,000 by next spring, means that many customers of farm products are going to be forced to cut their purchases of foods and clothing drastically. And more. The elimination of overtime, downgrading, and the several other cuts in weekly earnings being suffered by wage and salaried workers mean lower living standards and shrunken markets for farm products. The United States Commerce Department estimates that wages and salaries will drop $20,000,000,000 by the end of the year. The farmers are bound to feel the effects of this huge shrinkage of the national pay envelope.

As wages and salaries sink, farmer's income shrinks.

This is the warning of the new Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton P. Anderson, when he testified on August 23, 1945, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. He said:

> Farmers cannot be prosperous unless our total economy is prosperous. The interest that farmers have in seeing that all workers are fully employed at adequate wages is direct and specific. When urban people have

jobs and are making good incomes, they buy more clothes which come from wool and cotton; they eat more fruit, meat, and vegetables, drink more milk, and even smoke more cigarettes than when they are unemployed or working only part time. The wartime experience of the past few years has given us abundant and convincing proof of this.

That farm prosperity or depression is closely linked to the condition of the whole economy is demonstrated by the relationship between farmers' income and the level of employment from 1929 to 1944. When unemployment rose to almost 14,000,000 workers in 1932 and 1933, net farm income dropped to less than $3,000,000,000—the lowest level since farm income records were begun in 1910. When unemployment fell to less than a million people in 1943, net farm income climbed to $11,000,000,000—an all-time high.

High wages and salaries are essential for farm prosperity, because if the national pay envelope is not big enough farmers' income is not big enough. The direct relationship between the pay envelope and farm income is demonstrated by studies completed by the United States Agriculture Department. These studies show that with full employment the average person will eat 96 pounds of pork products a year compared to 67 pounds between 1935 and 1939. He will eat 25 pounds of chicken, instead of 18 pounds. Citrus fruits will be eaten at the rate of 75 pounds, instead of 49 pounds a year. And so, too, with most other foods. How much is shown in the following table. In reading this table bear in mind that the wage and salaried earner does not reduce his consumption of these foods because of any shrinking of the appetite. The cause is the shrinking of his pay envelope.

How much food is consumed by each person

	When the pay envelope is as small as it was in the years of 1935–39	When there is full employment and big pay envelopes
Food:	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Beef and veal (dressed weight)	63	71
Lamb and mutton (dressed weight)	7	7
Pork and lard (dressed weight)	67	96
Chickens (dressed weight)	18	25
Turkeys	3	5
Eggs	37	44
Dairy products (fluid milk equivalent)	801	895
Fats and oils (excluding lard and butter)	20	21
Citrus fruit	49	75
Other fresh fruit	89	90
Commercial truck	95	109
Canned vegetables (processed weight)	31	43
Potatoes	131	116
Dry beans (cleaned)	9	9
Sugar (refined)	97	115
Wheat	221	212
Corn (excluding malt liquor)	56	58
Peanuts (shelled)	4	6
Nonfood:		
Wool (mill consumption)	5	6
Cotton	25	30
Tobacco (farm sales weight)	8	10

Source: What Peace Can Mean to American Farmers, Miscellaneous Publication No. 562, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

This same study emphasizes the vital interest that farmers have in seeing wages and salaries at high levels and everybody at work. It comments:

That consumers are disposed to buy larger quantities of agricultural products in general (and substantially larger quantities of particular commodities) when labor is fully employed and business activity and national income are high is a matter of great significance to agriculture. It demonstrates, as nothing else can, the farmer's interest in a high level of industrial activity. For it means not only that he can sell a larger volume of most agricultural products but that he can sell at more favorable prices than when the national income is depressed or is below the full employment level.

But still more. Not only will the shrunken pay envelope reduce the quantity of farm products that the farmers can sell but it will reduce the prices that the farmers will get for their reduced sales. This is emphasized by an official of the United States Agriculture Department, Arthur P. Chew, who reports—the New Republic, September 17, 1945:

Under conditions of serious unemployment, with possibly seven or more million workers out of jobs, farm prices would decline at least 10 percent below parity; cash sales of farm commodities would drop to about $12,000,000,000, as compared with $20,000,000,000 in 1944. * * * With, say, 15,000,000 workers unemployed, agricultural prices might drop to 60 percent of parity and cash sales to possibly $6,500,000,000.

PRICES OF THINGS FARMERS BUY

The necessary increases in wages and salaries will not require any increase in the prices of the things that farmers buy. American corporations can restore, in large part, the $20,000,000,000 cut in the national pay envelope out of accumulated profits and the high level of profits they are due to make in 1946, despite high wartime taxes and the payment of billions in dividends. During six war years, 1940–45, they made $52,000,000,000 in net profits, after taxes, according to the United States Department of Commerce. Of this vast amount they paid out $25,900,000,000 to their stockholders and put $25,100,000,000 into their treasuries.

Yearly wartime profits were $8,700,000,000. Prewar profits, averaged between 1935 and 1939, were $3,300,000,000. Wartime profits, after taxes, increased 160 percent.

What are prospects after the war? A hardheaded business journal, Business Week, estimates that 1946 profits will be $8,000,000,000, and perhaps as high as $10,000,000,000. Industry can afford higher wages without prices going up on the things farmers buy.

Farmers well know how much the processors, distributors, and monoplies that sell farm products to the public take for themselves from the dollar the consumer pays. The same is true in manufacturing.

Take a look at the farm-equipment industry, for example.

According to the United States Federal Trade Commission a three-bottom plow for which farmers paid $153.50 had a least manufacturing labor cost of any agricultural implement, the farmer paid $100.84 and only $14.66 went to the wage earners who produced it. Surely wage rates can be substantially increased here with no increase in price to the farmer.

Look at farm equipment industry profits:

During five war years the Big Six companies earned $227,000,000 after all taxes. Certainly they can afford to increase wage and salary rates substantially.

CONCLUSION

Farmers have a big stake in labor's efforts to see that wages and salaries are raised substantially. There can be no farm prosperity when city dwellers are underconsuming. But in order to buy what they need takes adequate pay envelopes. If only small wage and salary boosts are made, the farmer is going to feel it in lower prices and in unprofitable acreage. There can be no farm prosperity without substantial increases in the pay envelopes of the city wage earners and salaried employees who buy the farmers' products, because farm income is directly related to how much purchasing power is in the hands of urban wage earners and salaried employees.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CONGRESS OF 1945–46 AND THE DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Military Affairs Committee has spent weeks of valuable—yes; precious—time on universal military training and the Atomic Energy Act while our veterans wait in vain for transportation home from Europe and the Pacific. Not a single one of the bills introduced to speed up demobilization has even been considered by the committee. At present we have four discharge petitions on the Clerk's desk because of no action from the committee.

What kind of a program are we operating under here? Is not bringing our men home after the war more important than laying out plans for the next one? If we do not get our men home soon, they may be involved in another war. General Wedemeyer is being blamed right now for using our men and equipment in China. The situation is tense in the Balkans and the Military Affairs Committee sit around talking about a bill for our domestic policy on atomic energy which is not half as important as our international policy on atomic energy and universal military training which portends another war, or at least our defense against another war, leaving our veterans of this war stranded on foreign shores, away from their families, without legislation or any consideration from Congress except what each individual Congressman can get done for them through the War and the Navy Departments.

This session of Congress should be called, and properly so, the psychological session of 1945–46. We are being given psychological legislation to act upon by the majority leadership instead of logical legislation. The Commander in Chief comes at the psychological time to urge universal military training and again at the psychological time to urge atomic-energy legislation, and the Military Affairs Committee are "psychoed" into taking up all of their valuable time

on these two items because they are psychological and must be passed while the public is in the psychological frame of mind to accept them, while our veterans are left to the mercies of foreigners on foreign shores, their families crying for them, their wives and children without proper care and without proper housing. How long is this delay to continue? How long are we going to allow it to continue? The appeals of these veterans' families are pitiful, heartrending. And yet the majority leadership places universal military training and atomic energy legislation ahead of veterans demobilization legislation.

Let us get this program straightened out. Let us get logical and forget this psychological urge that has been forced upon us. Let us get our veterans home before somebody starts a war of convenience so that they can use the excuse that they cannot come home.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield gladly.

Mr. RAMEY. I have received petitions from the mothers of children in the city of Toledo, who are united in a "bring-your-daddy-home" movement, reciting that Congress is doing nothing. Mrs. Eva Skelton Adams says: "We are going to march to Washington because the Congressman is doing nothing about it. He may speak energetically"—like the gentleman is speaking—"he signs these petitions." But as the gentleman says the committees are turning a deaf ear. However, the tragedy of it is that you folks who are working on that matter, Members of Congress, are being blamed when you are doing all you can to get the boys home. It is really a tragedy.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. I definitely think we have gotten into a slump on important veterans legislation that should take precedence over some of these other things that are not so important as getting our veterans home. Please do not misunderstand me. I think universal training is important, to be considered at the proper time. I think atomic-energy legislation is important, to be considered at the proper time. However, I think that the consideration that is being given to atomic energy by the Military Affairs Committee under the May-Johnson bill is not necessarily timely, because the domestic problem of atomic energy is not half so important as our international policy is on that important question. The May-Johnson bill has nothing to do with our international policy or atomic energy at all. However, there is certainly one thing we will have to account for, and that is what are we doing about veterans legislation to bring them home? I want it understood that insofar as I am concerned, I have done everything possible to bring these boys home.

In that connection I would like to say, with pardonable pride, I have had five of my own sons in this war. I am doing nothing to obtain the return of my own sons. I would not do it because I would not play favoritism by giving them preference over everyone else. But I am doing everything possible for the return of relatives of other people who are urging me. I do not have any particular complaint as far as my boys are concerned. I would like to have them home, yes, but we are not suffering by their absence half so much as many mothers, fathers, wives, and children of veterans, who are now on foreign shores and cannot get home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BISHOP (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) on account of illness.

To Mrs. NORTON, until January 3, 1946, on account of illness.

To Mr. JACKSON (at the request of Mr. KEFAUVER), for 30 days, on account of acting as a delegate representing the Congress at an International Maritime Commission meeting at Copenhagen, Denmark.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 831. An act for the relief of James Alves Saucier; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 845. An act for the relief of Mabel Fowler; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the townsite of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 896. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Oscar S. Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1152 An act to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1189. An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1212. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1278. An act to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1323. An act for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1371. An act for the relief of Reginald Mitchell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1405 An act to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1448. An act for the relief of William Wilson Wurster; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1467. An act to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations, of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1489. An act to authorize payment for accumulated accrued annual leave to female dietitians and physical-therapy aides whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 1492. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building numbered 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1532. An act to authorize the appointment of certain persons as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1533. An act to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1545. An act to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1580. An act to amend the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, to extend reemployment benefits to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who entered the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent Resolution calling on the Secretary of the Interior for a report upon the minerals situation of the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 744. An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions;

H. R. 801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children;

H. R. 843. An act for the relief of Francis A. Hanley;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend;

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Nannie Bass;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of John August Johnson;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Carl Lewis;

H. R. 1192. An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of O. M. Minatree;

H. R. 1512. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Candler Cobb;

H. R. 1902. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Annie M. Lannon;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others;

H. R. 1961. An act for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler;

H. R. 1978. An act for the relief of Jay H. McCleary;

H. R. 2027. An act for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased;

H. R. 2029. An act for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of John J. Gall;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Craig;

H. R. 2191. An act for the relief of Cleo E. Baker;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Florence Zimmerman;

H. R. 2290. An act for the relief of Mary Galipeau;

H. R. 2300. An act for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore, and Louise D. Blackmore;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of James A. Brady;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Arlethia Rosser;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz;

H. R. 2481. An act for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson;

H. R. 2512. An act for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton;

H. R. 2595. An act for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly.

H. R. 2620. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Allen;

H. R. 2642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson;

H. R. 2686. An act for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley;

H. R. 2836. An act for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti;

H. R. 2874. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to authorize any corporation formed under authority of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of such code to specify in its bylaws that a less number than a majority of its trustees may constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the corporation;

H. R. 2886. An act for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.;

H. R. 3011. An act for the relief of John Hames;

H. R. 3135. An act for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3198. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Rolla Duncan;

H. R. 3249. An act for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly;

H. R. 3302. An act for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler;

H. R. 3636. An act relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish;

H. R. 3660. An act to provide for financial control of Government corporations;

H. R. 3790. An act for the relief of Genevieve Lund;

H. R. 3867. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies;

H. R. 3868. An act to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3873. An act to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md.;

H. R. 3979. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4018. An act for the relief of Robert A. Hudson;

H. R. 4411. An act to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 27, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 28, 1945, in room 1304, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

838. A letter from the Administrator, Surplus Property Administration, transmitting report on aircraft and aircraft parts; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

839. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

840. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report (list No. 1) reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of six individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by his immediate predecessor, Attorney General Biddle; a report (list No. 2) of the cases of 1,257 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and a report (list No. 3) of the cases of 190 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4780. A bill to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 406. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 32, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 407. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3937, to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and to abolish the National War Labor Board; without amendment (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4683. A bill to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4149. A bill to provide for the establishment of lawful entry into the United States of certain aliens not subject to deportation who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924; with amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 181. A bill to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4805. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2934) granting a pension to Ethel Lynn Ruble, and the same was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severall referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4786. A bill relating to the taxation by State and local taxing units of certain real property sold by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4787. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative

of the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Commodore John Barry, "Father of the American Navy"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 4788. A bill to provide for the establishment of Naval Reserve training fleets for the Atlantic and Pacific coasts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4789. A bill to amend section 702 of title 34 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 4790. A bill to provide for the coinage of 10-cent pieces bearing the likeness of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 4791. A bill to direct and require the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces, and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 4792. A bill relating to the payment for grave markers and headstones which the Secretary of War is authorized to furnish; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4793. A bill to amend sections 13 (f) and 16 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, with respect to the disposition of property to veterans; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 4794. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain enlisted men on the retired list of the Regular Navy and certain enlisted men of the Fleet Reserve who performed active duty during World War II; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4795. A bill to prevent smuggling of opium and other narcotic drugs into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4796. A bill to amend section 905 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. Res. 408. Resolution urging the recall of American troops and munitions from China to encourage the development of a united democratic government that will serve the welfare of all its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 409. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress that United States Marines be withdrawn from China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 410. Resolution providing for an investigation of conditions in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. Res. 411. Resolution expressing the will of Congress that the United States Marines be withdrawn from China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEALY:

H. Res. 412. Resolution requesting recall of United States troops from China to permit and encourage free democratic determination of their form of government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Res. 413. Resolution expressing our foreign policy in China be to permit Chinese self-determination by removal of our troops from China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 414. Resolution creating a select committee to study the feasibility of establishing and operating floating, world-traveling universities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAVAGE:

H. Res. 415. Resolution to remove our troops from China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. Res. 416. Resolution creating a select committee to study and investigate techniques, practices, and methods of legislative counsel, lobbyists, lobbies, and pressure groups; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 417. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 715, to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 418. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4450, a bill to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation to their homes, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 4797. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United State District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to determine the claim of Lewis E. Magwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4799. A bill to restore Lt. Col. Sidney R. Williamson, United States Marine Corps (retired), to the active list of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4800. A bill for the relief of Harry Fleishman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4801. A bill for the relief of Raymond P. Guidoboni; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4802. A bill for the relief of Petrag (or Petraki) Ristani; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4803. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Keizer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4804. A bill for the relief of David E. Goodwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1346. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of the 1945 Armistice Day committee of the city of Detroit, Mich., urging that November 11 be recognized as Armistice Day for and as the official victory day of both World War I and World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1347. By Mr. IZAC: Petition of 350 citizens of San Diego, Calif., urging the speedy passage of the Murray-Patman full employment bill, the Kilgore unemployment insurance bill, and the Pepper amendment for 65 cents hourly minimum wage; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the love that our indifference cannot discourage, for the patience that our folly cannot exhaust. As we turn again unfilled to Thee in the heat and burden of the day, wilt Thou restore our souls. If any of us are faltering under the load of these demanding times, be Thou our reinforcement and comfort as we open our yearning hearts to Thee. Lead us where the quiet waters flow, that our souls may be refreshed ere we enter upon the duties of yet another day. Grant us the enabling grace to follow closely the wounded footprints of that One who wore our flesh as a regal robe and who walked our earthly ways like a conqueror in triumph. In His name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 26, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am advised by the Secretary of the Interior that, beginning next Monday, administrative hearings will be held in the State of Oregon looking toward the establishment of a sustained yield of timber in my State. This is a matter of very great importance to the timber industry, not only in Oregon but elsewhere. I ask that I may be excused from attendance upon sessions of the Senate for the purpose of attending and taking part in the deliberations at the hearings to which I have referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week. I must necessarily return to California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LANGER:

Resolutions adopted by the Farmers Unions of Cass and Grand Forks Counties, N. Dak., protesting against the exportation of automobile tires to foreign countries; to the Committee on Commerce.

A petition of sundry Chinese students in the United States, relating to the civil war in China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Buxton, Reynolds, and Wahpeton, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime universal military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROTESTS AGAINST IMMUNITIES OF CERTAIN COOPERATIVE ORGANIZATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asks unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD for the information of the Senate a resolution of the Memphis (Tenn.) Chamber of Commerce on the subject of subsidies given under the Federal law to cooperatives. The Chair has not gone into this matter fully. The resolution and letter accompanying it should be called to the attention of the proper committee.

There being no objection, the resolution and letters were received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government, in an effort to encourage associated efforts in a cooperative form by small farmers and fruit growers in purchasing products needed for their farms and orchards and in marketing their crops, has granted to them certain advantageous immunities from taxation and from regulation and has provided to them certain subsidies from the public funds in the form of low-cost financing and otherwise, and some States have granted to them certain similar immunities; and

Whereas advantage has been taken of said immunities and subsidies, intended originally for small farmers and fruit growers, by certain large business organizations operating under farm cooperative charters as consumer cooperatives, marketing cooperatives, wholesale cooperatives, and cooperative associations; and these organizations have on a large scale entered into a host of large-scale businesses, which operations are in direct, substantial, and unfair competition with privately owned business organizations that do not have said immunities and subsidies; and

Whereas these cooperative organizations, referred to in the second recital, by being permitted to retain profits that other types of organizations in the same businesses have to pay out in income taxes, by being exempted from additional types of taxes paid by said other types of organization, by getting easy favorable loans in large amounts for capital investments for expansion from the Federal Government, and by being permitted to indulge in associative practices that, if indulged in by other forms of businesses, might be held in violation of the laws concerning monopolies and restraints of trade, have been able to expand greatly and to accumulate large surpluses for future expansion; and

Whereas such cooperative forms of organization have been used to develop many businesses, referred to in the second recital above, that do not in truth and substance resemble the associations of farmers and fruit growers whom the laws were originally framed to favor (whatever their technical legal form or practices may be), and that these are not in justice or fairness entitled to any immunities or subsidies but should be required to pay the same taxes, both State and Federal, and to stand in the same status as noncooperative types of business organizations—without favor, immunity, or subsidy; and

Whereas the Memphis Chamber of Commerce of Memphis, Tenn., deems that the following measures should be taken to correct the injustices, inequalities, and abuses above mentioned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Memphis Chamber of Commerce of Memphis, Tenn., That the Federal Government and those State governments which grant immunities or subsidies to cooperative organizations be urged to amend the presently existing laws and enact all additional laws that are necessary in order to prevent the granting of immunities, subsidies, favors, and unfair advantages to cooperative organizations merely because of their cooperative form and practices, and to place all of said organizations (other than those associations of farmers and fruit growers hereinafter mentioned) on an equal and competitive basis with all other business organizations, and to that end this chamber recommends:

1. That exemptions and immunities be confined to those cooperative organizations that sell, either in original form or after an initial processing operation for market, only the identical products grown on the farms or orchards of their members; or that purchase commodities, for use on the farms or orchards of their members, that are not for resale by them; or that furnish services solely for their members, in connection with their farms or orchards; and that as to said cooperative organizations—

A. That no exemptions or immunities be granted to any such cooperative organization which in the future derives its investment capital from anyone, other than its members, through the sale to them of nondividend-bearing or non-interest-paying certificates of membership or certificates of stock;

B. That all loans from banks for cooperatives or any governmental agency to such cooperatives in the future be confined to the financing of current operations and not to the supplying of capital funds;

C. That no immunities from income taxation be granted on any part of the net income of said cooperative organizations that is not paid out in cash to the members within three (3) months after the close of the calendar year or fiscal year in which the net earnings are realized; and that all said cooperative organizations be required to make regular comprehensive income-tax reports and to show therein all members to whom all dividends or other cash distributions are made, in addition to all other necessary information.

2. That all cooperative organizations be subjected to all of the rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act.

3. That all special advantages given to cooperative organizations, except those mentioned in section 1 above, in preference to noncooperative organizations be eliminated.

Approved and adopted this 24th day of October 1945, by the board of directors of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

EDMUND ORGILL,
President.
CLIFFORD PENLAND,
Secretary.

PROBLEMS OF SOLDIERS RETURNING TO CIVILIAN LIFE—LETTER FROM EDWARD P. DOBYNS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter written me by a veteran, Edward P. Dobyns, discussing conditions faced by service men as they return to civilian life.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE TEST, USNAS,
Patuxent River, Md.,
November 10, 1945.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This letter is being written to you not only from an individual but also on behalf of a very large group of enlisted men who feel that they have certain information which should be brought to the attention of those who represent us in Congress.

We are all in our 30's, are married and have from one to three children, or have dependent fathers and mothers. We have served from 2 to 3 years in the armed forces of our country. At the time of our entrance into the armed forces we were just beginning to get our start in life from an economic standpoint. We had what we considered a fairly good job. We had just begun to purchase our own home or had accumulated some savings for that purpose, and we had a small sum laid aside with which to meet an emergency.

After our entrance into the service we found that the family allowance paid to our dependents was sufficient to meet only the expenses of bare necessities. Consequently, the premiums on our life insurance policies had to be deferred, as did our income and property taxes, and the payments on the homes which we were purchasing. As the months plodded slowly by we were forced to dip deeper and deeper into our savings to meet the rising cost of living as well as unforeseen emergencies that arose. After our savings were depleted we very reluctantly were forced to cash our war bonds; to forego vital repairs on our homes; to rent our homes to more fortunate individuals; and to send our families "home," or if no "home" existed to remove them to squalid surroundings.

We did all this for it was our duty to give our all to the winning of the war. That war has been won. In the not too distant future (we hope) we shall once again take our places in civilian life.

Yes, after having given 2 to 3 years of our lives to the service of our country, not to mention our life savings which we were forced to exhaust, we will take our places in civilian life. We realize that we are extremely fortunate to have come through the war unscathed; that many thousands of our buddies and shipmates made the supreme sacrifice that we might live in a free world. However, we must face the cold, cruel facts.

When we return to civilian life what will we face? The answer is obvious. We will face the prospect of paying the deferred premiums on our life insurance policies, our deferred income and property taxes, the deferred payments on our homes. We will have to make the necessary repairs to our homes, purchase civilian clothing, remove our furniture from storage and establish a home again, and the numerous other unforeseen items which always arise. How shall we meet this mountain of obligations? From our mustering-out pay? Impossible. We shall not be able to meet these obligations without going into debt.

Will we be given any assistance in straightening out our financial affairs and in gaining a firm economic footing? The answer to this and to all our questions rests with our Senators and Representatives. We are depending upon you to help us.

The majority of the civilians who remained on their jobs throughout the war should have no serious economic problems. They have

their war bonds and war-swollen savings as nest eggs. It is our understanding that in most cases this "egg" is quite a large one. From a financial standpoint, the officers of the armed forces have fared very well in this war. Most of them have been able to purchase a sizable amount of war bonds and to accumulate savings from their generous salaries and allowances. They have been given living quarters and subsistence allowances for their families and, besides mustering-out pay (for junior officers), they are given terminal leave, as much as 120 days, with pay, at the time of their discharge. The enlisted man gets nothing.

It is the enlisted men of the armed forces, who have the same problems as ourselves, who have been forgotten and who will suffer. Are you going to help us? We believe you will.

We are not seeking charity, but we are asking that the highly undemocratic way of life which has plagued us since our entrance into the service be not continued into civilian life. Since the officers of the armed forces and the civilians who remained at home during the war do not have the economic problems such as ours, we feel that our Senators and Representatives should take immediate steps to recognize our predicament. We feel that we are a class which has been overlooked.

Some of our suggestions are that relief be granted in the form of increased income-tax exemptions for a period of time equal to that which we spent in military service; that the income-tax payments we had to defer when we entered service be forgiven; that we be granted a sum of money as a differential payment which would enable us to take care of our most pressing obligations, and thus once again make a fresh start on the arduous road to economic security; and, finally, that we be allowed to join our families and take up our civilian jobs as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. DOBYNS, SKV2c.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, appropriately referred, a petition signed by 25 citizens of Warwick, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of the so-called Murray bill, authorizing the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the petition presented by Mr. LANGER was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

WARWICK, N. DAK., *November 12, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned farmers residing in Eddy County, N. Dak., do heartily recommend the passage of the Murray bill, creating a MVA for this area. We believe it will better serve the needs of this territory than any other bill heretofore proposed.

We greatly appreciate your efforts in its support.

PEACETIME UNIVERSAL MILITARY CONSCRIPTION—MEMORIAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, and appropriately referred, a memorial of about 136 citizens of the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime universal military conscription.

There being no objection, the memorial was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD with the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

We, the undersigned, are hereby opposed to universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress.

A. R. Laurence, C. H. Peterson, Paul Peterson, James Kale, Charles M. Archer, Kert H. Good, G. E. Mont, W. E. Busch, F. J. Jordahl, A. L. Loucks, Gilbert Berg, Math Theisen, Mrs. F. Finch, Thomas W. Lawrence, Percy Larson, Elliott Scouten, John Christofferson, Alvin J. Ketterling, Ludwig Larson, Kenneth G. Richards, Harold W. Beeber, Harry R. Hansen, Lee H. Richards, Don Gordon, Leo Froelich, Carl Roberts, Melvin Holt, Wesley Friduburg, Elsie Anderson, Wm. Arndt, Gerahart A. Geaser, J. A. Frank, M. L. Shockman, T. C. Shockman, Chas. A. Long, Mrs. Jesse Johnson, Edwin Johnson, James M. Archer, Oliver Johnson, Milton F. Johnson, Oliver Johnson, Jr., Anna I. Johnson, Mrs. Marville Johnson, James Finch, W. R. Finch, H. J. Finch, Edith Finch, Pius M. Reis, Mrs. Pius M. Reis, Helen Reis, Matt Mitzel, Mrs. Matt Mitzel, Maggie Jacobs, John J. Nentz, Philip Fettig, John A. Schmidt, Wesley Johnson, Wendelin A. Wangler, George Doll, Gabriel Schotz, Orra Schotz, Eva M. Reis, S. Widmann, Rosalia Roehrich, Joe J. Aberle, Mrs. Joe J. Aberle, Wendelin W. Wangler, Paul Rudnick, Karl Zahn, Sylvester Schmuts, Joe A. Rudnick, Wm. Sauter, Edward Sauter, George Grochow, Jr., Gust Delzer, Adam Hager, Felix Schwaze, Wendilen Rudnick, Mrs. Hattie Rudnick, August Selzler, Art Heitman, Alvin Finch, Louis Schilling, Philip Rath, Mrs. Louisa Miller, John P. Miller, Joe Weil, Albert Bauer, David C. Tesky, Raymond Beich, Art Giese, Elmer Meissel, Edward Bauer, John M. Erickson, Dave Raszler, Herman Reb, Jacob Gerving, Mary Neil, Annie Becker, Bill Weil, Martin Becker, Ray Matchke, Otis Olson, Gust Bloom, Mabel Matchke, John Kounovsky, S. B. Wiseth, Casper Hanson, Tonnes Jakabran, M. Dalby, C. H. Arnegard, R. O. Kaufman, Gust Weber, Bernard Ballard, Edwin Mohr, Ole Haugen, Louis Thompson, Hilgen Gilbertson, Gutford Gilbertson, Louis Wavra, George E. Salie, Ludwig Knudswig, Christ N. Smith, Gilbert M. Spillman, Theo. Honet, Chas. Johnson, Arthur Erickson, Sverre J. Houge, Orlian G. Smilsvig, Gerald Honet, Walter Teige, A. M. Cinghann, Johne O. Hunge, John J. Higland, Jack Martino, Amelia Gerving.

SCARCITY OF CLOTHING IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a communication from George Mann, of Glenburn, N. Dak., which is in the nature of a petition to Congress, asking that something be done with reference to clothing. In North Dakota the weather is very cold at this time of the year, and Mr. Mann states that the clothing available is entirely insufficient. I ask unanimous consent to present the communication and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLENBURN, N. DAK., *November 20, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: Gloves, overalls, and underwear are nonavailable here except in a few large sizes of the latter two. With a severe winter in progress here already, something must be done as no one can work in this climate without adequate clothing for winter. Large manufacturers are purported to be on a sit-down strike against OPA ceilings while we freeze. Perhaps some Army stock piles could be released.

Yours truly,

GEORGE MANN.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

H. R. 4350. A bill to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 801).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 802).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. 1627. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabel N. Mifflin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1628. A bill for the prevention of obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in butter and eggs by regulating transactions relating to future sales on commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1629. A bill to permit veterans to change their beneficiary under a policy of national service life insurance and to exercise an option in the method of payment of such insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1630. A bill providing for retirement of certain officers of the Regular Army with the rank and pay of their temporary grades; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1631. A bill to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1632. A bill for the relief of Stephen Hoksina; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill (S. 1633) to provide for hospitalization and treatment of members of the armed forces suffering from transversemyelitis, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

HOSPITALIZATION AND TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES SUFFERING FROM TRANSVERSEMYELITIS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for hospitalization and treatment of members of the armed forces suffering from transversemyelitis.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1633) to provide for hospitalization and

treatment of members of the armed forces suffering from transversemyelitis was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SALE OF TICKETS FOR THE ARMY-NAVY FOOTBALL GAME

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Philadelphia, where the Army-Navy football game is to be played next Saturday. The letter is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you on your stand with regard to the sale and disposition of the tickets for the Army and Navy game.

Within 24 hours after the prices were announced, and the city selected, I sent my check to the West Point Athletic Association. I was informed within 3 days that I was too late and my check returned—that all tickets had been sold.

This is the most clear-cut case of racketeering in the athletic world. Only 105,000 seats and all sold before the public could get their letters into the mails.

I wasn't too disappointed. My years of experience with the brass hats has proved to me that anything can happen.

Sincerely yours,

QUIN GOLDMAN,
Sales Manager.

PROPOSED ADVERTISEMENT REFUSED BY THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement which was refused by the Washington Post. It was offered to the Post by various organizations, among them being the Americans United for World Organization, Friends of Democracy, Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Citizens Political Action Committee, National Council of Negro Women, National Farmers Union, National Lawyers Guild, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and United Christian Council for Democracy.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE ALARMED—A MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President and gentlemen, we are alarmed.

The freedom from fear we pledged to humanity is today neither ours nor the world's. We Americans are proclaiming foreign policies based on a spirit of nationalistic smugness and worse. We are using the same weapon to keep fear alive that we used to end the war against fascism—the atom bomb.

Today the fate of our children rests in your hands.

We implore you to listen to the scientists who built our atom bomb—who unleashed the power of the atom—to listen and listen carefully as they tell us that what we have is no long-term secret; that what we have is either a power for good or for the destruction of all mankind.

We implore you to listen to them and to listen to the people who will not and do not believe that more war is necessary. We implore you to listen to the hearts of men everywhere—quickened with fear where they were once filled with hope.

We implore you to listen and to act.

We urge an end to policies and proclamations which stir international uneasiness and distrust and plunge us into a new and final game of power politics.

We urge that the United States take the initiative through the United Nations Organization to bring about a meeting of the representatives of the nations of the world in order to plan the control of atomic energy as a weapon of war and in order to strengthen the United Nations Organization so that it will be truly effective.

We are alarmed. We want to be free from fear.

Americans United for World Organization; Friends of Democracy; Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Citizens Political Action Committee; National Council of Negro Women; National Farmers Union; National Lawyers Guild; Southern Conference for Human Welfare; United Christian Council for Democracy.

INLAND PLANTS TO AID NATIONAL DEFENSE—STATEMENT BY WEST CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a statement by the West Central Industrial Council, stating reasons why national safety and economy require inland plants to aid the national defense program.

It seems to me that the points made are reasonable and the conclusions reached logical. I hope every Senator will read this statement, and draw his own conclusions as to what should be done in this regard.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MATTER OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO EVERY CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES

Now that World War II has ended in victory, it is the responsibility of the Congress, aided by military and naval officials, to formulate and effectuate an adequate program for our national defense in this atomic age.

This must be done without undue delay.

It must be done so as to assure, to the fullest extent possible, our national safety.

It must be done so as to enable us to cope with any foreseeable method of enemy attack.

It must be done with due regard for the economical expenditure of the taxpayers' money, so as to secure maximum results for the funds expended.

Air power in all of its phases will be a chief factor in our defense program, and our air power production facilities must be in the least vulnerable locations. Also, we must make adequate provision for constant research and experimentation.

Even before the development of the atomic bomb, the strategic military advantages of the west central region of the United States for air-power production had become widely recognized during World War II. Now that we have the atomic bomb, we are absolutely compelled, as a matter of national safety, to both recognize these advantages of this region and to plan our future defense program accordingly.

Air-power production facilities can be operated in the west central region with maximum certainty of successful defense in case of enemy attack. This fact is implicit with inland locations, whereas coastal locations afford the least opportunities for defense. This vast advantage of inland locations for plants can be ignored only at the expense of national safety.

The Nation's newspapers on September 20, 1945, published an item quoting Lt. Gen. Barney Giles, who had just led a one-stop flight of superfortresses from Japan to Washington, D. C., as declaring that the Pacific Northwest would have been bombed by Japanese suicide planes before the end of 1945 if the war had not ended suddenly. He said those same superforts took off from a super airfield on Hokkaido, from which Japan was planning to send four-motored suicide bombers against Seattle and other Pacific coast cities. In his opinion the bombings would have come within 6 months if the war had not ended.

The extravagant claim was made recently in a nationally circulated magazine that, by flying the great circle route, certain nations could attack this inland west central region as easily as the coastal areas. This cannot be successfully argued for the simple reason that inland locations afford time and space within which to apply effective defense measures. All coastal areas are vulnerable to carrier-based aircraft. This was demonstrated by the Japanese in the attack upon Pearl Harbor and by other actions in World War II. In planning a continuation of our air power-production program, these facts must be recognized.

It is worth noting that many millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money were expended during World War II for coastal plant protection. For example, Associated Press news and pictures were published throughout the Nation, July 24, 1945, of Boeing plant camouflage at Seattle, and the Wall Street Journal of August 10, 1945, published a story of similar camouflage, costing $18,000,000, at aircraft plants in Southern California, stating that additional millions will be required for its removal. Douglas, Lockheed, Consolidated Vultee, Northrop, and North American plants were included.

Additional millions were spent for air-raid shelters, black-outs, antiaircraft defense, barrage balloons, revetments on airports, bombproof walls separating important plant areas, and duplicate sets of original drawings of whole plants for safekeeping in the interior.

All of these measures were necessary in World War II because, being on the coast, these plants were wide open to enemy attack. Such expenditures were not made at plants in the West Central region, because such protection was believed unnecessary. The inland plants were considered safe, or at least much less vulnerable than those on the coasts.

By concentrating much of our air power production in dispersed, inland locations, the Government very probably can avoid the necessity for and the tremendous expense of such protective measures in case of another war emergency, as the presently existing production facilities of this region can be preserved and, if war comes again in a few years, they could serve as the nucleus for quick expansion to meet requirements. Even if, as some argue, the atomic bomb and other scientific developments in warfare should require some types of protective measures for inland plants in the event of future conflicts, the inland plants would still afford the tremendous advantage of time and space within which to stop anything directed toward them by the enemy. This might very easily spell the difference between defeat and victory, between safety and disaster.

Prior to World War II, airplane manufacturing was heavily concentrated on the west and east coasts. During the war, these facilities were augmented by Government-built plants, and the Government also established large plant facilities in several dispersed locations in the west central region. These factories still are owned by the Government. The

west central region's aircraft plants, it should be noted here, have made the most outstanding production records in World War II, proving this region's labor is superior—no serious strikes, less absenteeism, more production per worker. Furthermore, the west central region has better transportation to the east coast than exists between east and west coasts, with only seven transcontinental rail lines, as against numerous railroads between the west central region and the east coast. Bombing could far more easily knock out the seven east-west lines, where they cross the Rockies, than the numerous west central-east coast lines. This is a vital advantage which we cannot afford to sacrifice.

Due to the fact that the prewar west and east coast locations usually include the home plants of the parent companies, there is a natural tendency on the part of the companies involved to draw back into these prewar coastal plants, now that war orders have been canceled and their services are no longer required for operation of the inland Government-owned plants.

If this is allowed to happen, leaving all of the inland plants idle or permitting their sale and diversion to other types of manufacturing, our defense program would necessarily depend on the coastal plants for essential production, and they would have to serve as the nucleus for quick expansion of production in the event of a sudden war emergency. Such concentration of production in the coastal areas not only increases vulnerability to attack but reduces the potential expansibility because of the limited reservoir of manpower.

To permit the development of such a condition would be, manifestly, the height of folly and in utter disregard of our national safety, for the reasons already cited.

For these same reasons, it is obvious that our wisest and safest course, and the one least costly to the Nation's already heavily burdened taxpayers, is to prepare for the concentration of a large portion of our production in these inland plants, which already are in dispersed locations. From the cost angle, our expenditure of $300,000,000,000 in World War II, representing unavoidable and tragic waste and destruction, and leaving us with a national debt of astronomical proportions, compels judicious fiscal policies if we are to provide the defense measures required for national safety and simultaneously retire or even carry our existing debt, thereby avoiding national economic ruin.

Some of the companies, therefore, should be induced to move inland. Surplus Government plants at inland locations might be traded for privately owned coastal plants, or they might be leased to the coastal companies on such attractive terms that they could afford to move their operations inland. Expense of such removal to the interior should be borne by the Government, to assure such removal and because this would be less costly in money and far less hazardous to our national safety than to have our production concentrated in the vulnerable coastal areas, with expansibility reduced by inadequate resources of manpower.

It may not be found necessary or desirable to keep all of these inland Government-owned plants to produce for our defense program. Congress, with advice from military and naval officials, should decide how many and which of them are to be retained. Some of the communities where these plants are located may prefer to have them made available to private enterprise for other types of manufacturing. Where this would not conflict with the needs of the Government in developing an adequate defense production program in dispersed inland locations, such uses should be permitted.

It cannot be truthfully said that these arguments are motivated by selfish sectionalism. It just happens that the facts of life force this Nation, as a means of self-preservation, to be realistic in planning its future defense program so as to most effectively meet the new conditions of this atomic age. Such realism will, of necessity, accept the conclusions herein expressed. There is no disposition to injure or take advantage of other sections of the country by developing the proposed program. All sections are equally and vitally concerned. Indeed, the west and east coast sections should, and probably will, recognize the validity of the arguments advanced and therefore, in the interest of the Nation's safety, not to mention economy in the use of public funds, may very well be expected to favor such a program. Opposition would be an untenable attitude on the part of any section because, when national safety is at stake, all other arguments fall.

Of course, if this Nation knows positively that no other nation will suddenly attack us at some future time, these conclusions can be ignored. Manifestly, we possess no such knowledge, but on the contrary it is reasonable to assume that a danger exists and that our safety requires adequate defense plans for possible future emergencies, more especially so since we cannot hope to permanently monopolize the ability to employ atomic energy in warfare.

There is no time to be lost in developing this defense program. Congress should move swiftly, assisted by military and naval officials. The program should be defined and the necessary funds appropriated by Congress, followed by prompt effectuation of the program. Our national safety demands it.

RETURN TO OWNERS OF PETROLEUM REFINERIES SEIZED BY THE NAVY

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have received a great many letters from members of the Oil Workers' International Union protesting the retention by the Navy of the refineries which were seized under the order of the President of the United States. These letters are so numerous as to indicate to me that they represent a concerted effort to have the refineries released to their owners. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. J. D. Ingram, secretary-treasurer of the Oil Workers' International Union at Tulsa, Okla., and also one from R. J. Rose, of Ponca City, Okla., member of the Oil Workers' International Union, as samples of the letters I am receiving on the subject, together with my reply to Mr. Ingram, secretary-treasurer of the Oil Workers' International Union, setting forth my views with reference to the matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TULSA LOCAL, NO. 217,
OIL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, CIO.,
Tulsa, Okla., November 17, 1945.

Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In the President's Executive Order No. 9639 of October 4, 1945, seizing the oil properties which were on strike, it was the understanding of the local unions of the Oil Workers' International Union that machinery would be set up by the Government for the settlement of this dispute. The Government has had control of these properties for considerable time and out of the Government-Labor-Management Committee that has been meeting in Washington recently, no machinery has been set up for the settlement of the dispute between the Oil Workers' International Union and the oil companies.

The membership of local 217, Oil Workers' International Union, CIO, is very much dissatisfied with the Government operating these properties. We think machinery should be set up at once so these difficulties can be settled. We wish you would use your good office and influence in setting up machinery for the settlement of this dispute.

Respectfully yours,

J. D. INGRAM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

PONCA CITY, OKLA.,
November 14, 1945.

Senator ED. MOORE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am writing you in regard to the unsettled strike of the Oil Workers' International Union against the major oil companies. The Oil Workers' Union accepted the intervention of Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach in the oil strike in good faith. When the companies flatly rejected Schwellenbach's arbitration proposal, President Truman seized certain key oil properties, with the understanding on our part that machinery would be set up to adjust the basic wage issue in dispute between the companies and the union. To date no serious effort has been made to set up such machinery.

The strike would by now have been settled on terms mutually agreeable to the union and the employer if the United States Labor Department had not stepped into the situation with an offer of conciliation that proved wholly fruitless.

The Labor Department showed its ineptness in interfering with union-management relations. Unable to get the oil companies to accept an arbitration proposal which the union had reluctantly accepted, President Truman thereupon shackled the hands of the Nation's oil workers by seizing certain key plants.

The Navy now threatens to remain in indefinite possession of these plants because the administration has provided no method of settling the dispute and will not allow the union to settle it through economic action.

Unless arrangements are immediately completed for a bargaining conference between the Oil Workers' Union and the oil companies, I, along with thousands of American workers will be convinced that the seizure of the oil properties is merely a device for defeating the just wage demands of the oil workers and placing their concerted activities under permanent military restraint.

Our armies of occupation in Germany and Japan have set up and encouraged membership in free and independent labor unions for those who were shackled by the chains of fascism. Why do that, and then use our Navy as a strike-breaking agency?

The prospect of such outcome is deeply disturbing. I urge you to do everything humanly possible to avert it. Seizure of the oil industry was wholly unwarranted. Leaders of the oil industry now admit publicly that there was no shortage of fuel oil for the Navy and that adequate stores were available for all military needs.

I have followed recent developments in Washington very closely. The living standards of the workers have been slashed by the weakening of OPA price controls. Generous gifts in the amount of billions of dollars have been offered industry through reduction or complete lifting of excess-profits taxes.

These grave economic errors I have pointed out to you are retarding our reconversion program and are hindering the American way of life. Please use your influence in

effecting a release of the oil properties so we can settle our wage issue.

Yours sincerely,

R. J. ROSE,
Member of Oil Workers' International Union, Local No. 231.

NOVEMBER 26, 1945.

Mr. J. D. INGRAM,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Oil Workers' International Union,
(CIO), Local No. 217, Tulsa, Okla.

DEAR MR. INGRAM: I have yours of November 17 concerning seizure of certain petroleum refineries by the Navy under the President's Executive Order 9639 of October 4, 1945. Numerous letters and cards from members of the Oil Workers' International Union have been received and uniformly they request the plants be returned to their owners and that some governmental machinery be established by Executive order designed to settle labor-management disputes. I, therefore, assume there is an organized campaign of the Oil Workers' Union to seek assistance of the Congress in this connection. On this assumption, I am answering the letters and cards received by mailing to the senders a copy of this letter. The correspondence I have received raises the fundamental issue of the proper place of government in the field of labor-management relations. I am in hearty accord with the view that the seizure was improper, illegal, constitutes a grave error on behalf of the President, and violates the constitutional freedom of both the employees and the employer to settle their controversies by peaceable and lawful methods. It is indeed encouraging to know that the employees of the seized plants who, as well as the management, are victims of this seizure are exercising the freedom guaranteed to them by the Constitution to protest such unlawful action.

The Congress, exclusively as a war measure, enacted the Smith-Connally law delegating authority to the President to seize manufacturing plants and other facilities engaged in the manufacture of war materials and equipment during the period of the war. To some it seemed a war necessity to invest the President with this dictatorial power. Personally, I have never been convinced of the efficacy of such action. The language of the act was debated at length when it was before the Congress. Clearly, it was the intent of the Congress that this power should be limited to the period of the fighting war. From the outset the power was used arbitrarily and unlawfully. Many businesses were seized and operated under Executive order which were not engaged in the manufacture of war materials and equipment or whose activities were remotely and indirectly related to the war effort. The seizure of the Montgomery Ward retail stores was a prime example of the dangers of one-man government. Unfortunately, organized labor failed to stand up and protest this destruction of civil rights guaranteed under the Constitution, but, on the contrary, approved the President's action. Many people did see the danger signal and protested to the limit of their ability, but to no avail. There is little wonder that the present administration now feels that it should and can, by the mere legal fiction of declaring the war not yet ended, continue the exercise of assumed wartime authority which results in the destruction of the constitutional rights and freedom of the people. Certainly, petroleum was a war necessity, but the war has ended and we are now looking at the problem of reconversion and readjustment to a peacetime economy. Now that the war has ended, the seizure of the refineries at this time is as unlawful and arbitrary as was the seizure of the Montgomery Ward retail stores which were never engaged in manufacturing any war equipment. It was as incumbent upon the members of your union and others to resist the Montgomery Ward seizure as it is now to resist the seizure of the oil plants. Had you and others of the country resisted at that time, it is probable that you would not now be in the position in which you find yourselves.

Of course, I shall use every facility I have to restore the refineries to their owners and relieve the employees of every governmental restraint that interferes with their constitutional rights to settle any controversy that exists between them and the management of the plants, including the right to quit work individually or to strike as a union. The right to strike is a lawful right of every employee and every labor organization. The right is many times used unwisely, but it is a right that must be preserved.

The right to strike, however, does not carry with it the right to abandon and ignore contractual obligations. Many of the local oil workers' unions have gone on strike in violation of existing contracts governing wages and hours of work during a definite and fixed period of time. These contracts impose a sacred obligation upon both the employee and employer. They are binding upon each individual member of the union. To ignore these contractual obligations, although their terms may be burdensome, encourages disrespect for law and order and invites the dictatorial action of those authorities who are inclined in that direction.

The present controversy arises over a demand of the CIO master union that all union refinery workers everywhere, regardless of local conditions or contractual obligations, be paid in proportion to 52 hours for 40 hours of work, which amounts to a 30-percent increase over existing wages. Undoubtedly, the cost of living in this period of inflation and scarcity demands higher wages. During the war industry, including the petroleum industry, increased its basic wage scale 15 percent under the Little Steel formula. Under orders of the War Labor Board, I understand the oil industry voluntarily raised wages on an average of approximately 6 percent. Following VJ-day, most of the refineries raised or offered to raise wages another 15 percent, thus making a total increase of about 36 percent in the basic wage scale within 3½ years. This is not a bad wage record. The war has been over 4 months and we have not yet started reconversion. Production of consumer goods throughout the Nation is at a standstill as the result of two factors—first, the action of organized labor in bringing about work stoppages through strikes; and, second, the action of OPA in maintaining price levels that make it impossible for thousands of manufacturing concerns to commence peacetime production. As a result of this shortage of production, prices are being bid up and the cost of living is rising day by day. If the President would face facts and release price controls so that incentive prices might prevail and organized labor would return to work, the result would be great production of consumer goods and almost overnight competitive prices would prevail, the cost of living would decline, profits would accrue to industry, and wages would be increased. If organized labor had understood this simple economic formula and had demanded of the administration that wartime controls be removed so that the Nation could have quickly reverted to the peacetime production of consumer goods, then labor would have been in an economically sound position to have demanded and received a fair share of their productive efforts in the form of increased wages. The demands that are generally being made at the present time, however, are economically premature. The theory that industry can or should pay wages and operating expenses out of surplus is an economic fable. No business can remain economically sound that cannot pay wages and operating expenses out of current production. It is true that industry has been relieved of some tax burdens but these are benefits against future production and mean nothing unless there is future profitable production. We must first have production before we can have reduced cost of living or high employment or high wages.

A continuation of price control by Executive order emanates from the same principle and theory that motivated the President to seize the refineries at this time. One is as illegal and economically unsound as the other and it is your duty, as well as mine, to resist one as strongly as the other.

Your suggestion that the President should set up an Executive agency to settle existing disputes between labor and management simply means a further retreat from constitutional government and a continuation of one-man government by Executive order. Controversies arising between employee and employer are no different from any other controversy. Are we to abandon the Constitution and set up executive agencies invested with supreme authority to settle all disputes? Implicit in such plan is the power to enforce their bureaucratic decrees. Such was the plan of government that existed in Germany and Italy and now exists in Russia. If we are to adopt the principle of setting up executive agencies for the settlement of labor-management disputes, and for this and that, then we have government by bureaucracy instead of constitutional government.

The alternative is a return to the processes for the peaceful settlement of disputes set up by the Congress under the Constitution. Under our form of constitutional government it is the duty of Congress to enact laws prescribing rules of conduct for the citizens. It is the obligation of the executive department to enforce the laws enacted by Congress and of the courts to adjudicate the rights of the parties to any controversy. Such is the constitutional machinery for settlement of management-labor disputes or any other dispute. The quicker the Congress enacts adequate labor-management laws the quicker we will have industrial peace in this country. The executive machinery you propose means more bureaucracy and further regimentation and leads to the very thing of which you now complain. The continuation of such policy will soon destroy the rights of organized labor, including the right to create unions, the right to bargain collectively, and the right to strike. This was the result in Germany and Italy.

What are some of these rules of conduct? It has long been recognized as wrong and adverse to the public interest for management to exercise its economic power to exploit labor by maintaining dangerous or unhealthy working conditions, unduly long workdays, or creating conditions to oppress wages, and such should be prohibited by law. It is wrong for labor to seize and destroy the property of its employer, to resort to violence, to enter into conspiracies to boycott or destroy business, and such should be prohibited by law. It is wrong for corporations, labor unions, or any other organization to use their concerted influence and money to displace the proper functions of government or to control the duly constituted authorities by intimidation and coercion, and such should be prohibited by law. It is wrong for management or labor unions to force men to join or belong to a labor organization as a condition to his right to work and earn a living, and such should be prohibited by law. It is wrong for management at the dictates of union officials to deduct union fees and assessments from the wages of employees unless the employee shall agree, and such should be prohibited by law. It is wrong for unions to break their contracts and not be held accountable under the law as other citizens and corporations. It is wrong for union officials to assume dictatorial powers, make assessments, and spend money at will to advance their own personal and political fortunes, and such should be prohibited by law. It is wrong for a national union to become the

master of its locals; thus, it is essential for the local unions to maintain their own collective-bargaining rights.

It is unconstitutional for the executive department to assume to make the law, enforce the law, and to interpret the law, and Congress should not pass any legislation designed to that end. If it does, the courts should strike it down as unconstitutional. It is wrong for any branch of government to interfere with or control the economic forces that cause prices, wages, working conditions, and the production of consumer goods to be fixed in accordance with the levels that result from the operation of the natural law of supply and demand. It is the constitutional duty of Congress to protect and guarantee the operation of such natural forces which in turn is the only way that all citizens can at all times have an equal opportunity to enjoy the benefits of a free and constitutional government.

I shall do what I can to see that the oil refineries and other properties that have been seized are returned to their owners. I shall do what I can to insure for every employee and every employer freedom to settle their controversies in accordance with constitutional procedure without governmental dictation or coercion. I shall do everything possible to restore constitutional government in this country.

You and other members of your union have raised certain fundamental issues that will determine our economic future. We must meet the issues fairly, squarely, and without prejudice to our own personal positions. Unless we are willing to do that, constitutional freedom for both labor and management will perish.

With kind regards, I beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

E. H. MOORE.

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICA'S VETERANS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge to America's Veterans," prepared by him and broadcast from station WIND in Chicago, November 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

GRANTS, GIFTS, OR LOANS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES—ADDRESS BY COL. ROBERT R. McCORMICK

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of grants, gifts, or loans to foreign countries, delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, before the Foreign Policy Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISCHARGE OF MEN FROM CIVILIAN PUBLIC SERVICE—LETTER FROM PAUL G. HAYES

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the discharge of men in civilian public service, from Rev. Paul G. Hayes, pastor of the McCabe Methodist Church of Bismarck, N. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1097. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 1215. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the S. S. *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941;

S. 1459. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. 1494. An act to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 4162. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1940 (Public Law No. 675), entitled "An act to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases prior to and including verdict or finding or plea of guilty;

H. R. 4191. An act to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 4386. An act to facilitate and simplify the administration of Indian affairs; and

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy; and

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4162. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1940 (Public Law No. 675), entitled "An act to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases prior to and including verdict, or finding or plea of guilty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4191. An act to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 4386. An act to facilitate and simplify the administration of Indian affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

Mr. WHEELER obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Huffman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stanfill
Butler	Knowland	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Carville	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McKellar	Tobey
Cordon	McMahon	Tunnell
Donnell	Magnuson	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wheeler
Fulbright	Moore	Wherry
George	Morse	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries from an accident.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the speech I am about to make is in no way intended as a criticism of President Truman. He has inherited an almost insoluble situation—one which some of us foresaw was the inevitable consequence of the policies pursued before Pearl Harbor. Now there are those who seek to blame him—in order that they may

excuse their own lack of foresight, their own support of some of the things which could only lead to the situation in which we now find ourselves.

I also wish to point out, Mr. President, that all the individuals whom I shall quote in my remarks today are for most part the self-same internationalists and interventionists who were clamoring for war before Pearl Harbor.

I shall not quote from any so-called isolationists or noninterventionists, so far as I know their record. I shall give a picture of Europe and Asia today, not as I see it, but as it is seen by some of the most experienced observers in the United States and in Europe. I shall also refer to criticisms of our policies by those who helped to promote and make them.

Mr. President, I do not see how I can possibly vote for the pending legislation in the form in which it is now written. I am frank to say I do not see how other Senators find it possible to do so, and I speak without rancor or bitterness. The pending bill is hailed as a peace measure. So has every other step that led us down the path to war.

Something terrible is happening to America and to the world. The best-laid plans of vanquished and victor have gone awry. Humanity's men and nations have been torn loose from the mooring of its ancient hope and prayer for peace. The whole world is getting out of hand.

This is no time for hatred, rancor, bitterness, or fear. The world crisis we confront cannot be resolved by mental bigotry or littleness of spirit or a cringing courage. We confront the greatest crisis in human history.

Mr. President, I believe in world cooperation, but a world cooperation based on mutual consultation and consent. I believe in cooperation on the basis of principle. I have always believed in living, working, and cooperating together with all peoples, and with all nations. I have always believed that tyranny in every form is by its very nature established and maintained only by an unscrupulous minority which is compelled to impose its will by force, by a prostitution of the truth, and by a perversion of morality upon the masses. And I have always believed that the noblest alternative to this way of life is found here in America where we have built solidly on the principles of freedom, decency, equality, and justice for all.

In such tragic times as these no man would dare to claim omniscience. The confusion of the war years is fast becoming pandemonium. Old hatreds are now compounded of new bitterness. Old wounds in the body politic of nations have been reopened and now bleed and run anew. All the reasons for America's sacrifices in this war, that a frenzied fear gave as its excuse, have now become a thousandfold more valid and impelling. These times call for the creative and healing power of cultured and civilized humanity, based upon the principles of our Creator. No one man knows the answer to our fears. Yet now, Mr. President—now is the time for men to seek the dictates of their conscience.

Mr. President, I cannot support the pending legislation, for the very simple reason that I believe there is a far wiser and happier alternative. Again I say, no man can see the future with unerring vision, yet, as I see this legislation, it leads us inevitably down the road to the annihilation of an atomic war.

Once before America poured out her treasure and her blood in what history inevitably has proved to have been a vain attempt to satisfy the insatiable cunning and greed of power politicians and world brigands, not one of whom wanted any traffic with the alleged principles, ideals, and moral values for which America was ruthlessly propagandized into believing that struggle was fought.

Once before a strange minority placed its stamp of approval on a war-breeding absurdity called a "peace treaty" in a vain attempt to salvage an illusion of world solidarity, representing this betrayal as the noblest compromise of legitimate interests that could be obtained among honorable victors.

And once before men deliberately attempted to maneuver America into a perpetual guaranty of the brutal injustices of that betrayal, while at the same time distorting, misrepresenting, and suppressing the tragic implications of such a commitment.

Mr. President, I find it terribly significant that our own State Department has not seen fit to publish the violent protest of the following members of the American Peace Commission of 1919 against such a wanton betrayal, until 25 years later.

I call as my first witness former Secretary of State Robert Lansing, who on May 8, 1919, wrote in bitter protest against the so-called peace treaty:

> The terms of peace appear immeasurably harsh and humiliating, while many of them seem to me impossible of performance. * * * Examine the treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others.

What was he writing about? Was he writing about conditions today, or was he writing about the conditions which existed after the last war and after the peace treaty? If what he said was true in 1919, it is far more true of the conditions which exist in the world today. People by the millions are torn from their homes and placed with people they hate. Their resources are taken away from them, whether they be friends or foes.

> Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed peoples are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort. * * * The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests to their own.

Could anything more clearly picture the situation which exists today with respect to the conferences, and the activities of our recently created so-called peace organization?

I call as my next witness Mr. John Storck, a member of the Peace Commission, who forwarded the following protest to the Secretary General of the Peace Commission:

> I find that I shall not retain the least shred of respect for myself if I let the moment pass without protesting most vigorously against the treaty which has been presented to the German plenipotentiaries. * * * It will stand as a monument of shame above the graves of millions who have suffered and died in the greatest of all wars. I may add that I have spoken to many persons about the treaty, and that none express approval, while but few attempt extenuation.

I call as another witness Sgt. Joseph V. Fuller, another member of the Peace Commission, who on May 15, 1919, wrote to Mr. Grew as follows:

> I feel impelled by my conscience to register in some manner a protest against the terms of peace. * * * We have bartered away our principles in a series of compromises with interests of imperialism and revenge, until hardly a shadow of them remains. Such a settlement assures neither permanence nor tranquillity. My earnest conviction is that our country dishonors itself in adding its signature and guaranty.

Let me call another distinguished gentleman as a witness—Adolph A. Berle, formerly of the State Department, and now our Ambassador to Brazil, a former close friend and adviser to the late President of the United States. He said, in protest to Mr. Grew:

> After reading the summary of the terms of the proposed German treaty and examining its text, I feel bound in honor to place on record my protest against American acquiescence in it. The American war was declared, supported, and fought to a victorious conclusion on and for certain fundamental principles, stated by the President, to the attainment of which the United States pledged itself. The treaty as prepared seems in large measure to have abandoned both the letter and the spirit of these pledges.

Have we not now abandoned all our pledges?

> The honorable fulfillment of my oath as a United States officer would constrain me to a statement that conclusion of the proposed treaty will not, in my judgment, serve either the idealistic or material interests of America, or, indeed, of humanity.

Again, on May 15, 1919, Mr. S. E. Morison, to another member of the Peace Commission, communicated the following protest to Mr. Grew:

> I feel it my duty to inform you that, after carefully reading the Conditions of Peace, I am convinced that, taken as a whole, they are in flagrant contradiction both to the interests of the United States and to the ideals and principles for the vindication of which the United States was supposed to be waging war against Germany. That being my opinion, I should prefer to sever my connection with the American Commission to Negotiate Peace.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair.) Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is the Senator speaking about the previous peace treaty or about present conditions?

Mr. WHEELER. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota asks me whether I am speaking about the peace terms of the last war or the peace terms of the present war. I am not surprised that anyone should ask that question, because

of the very things which were charged with respect to the last peace treaty. Then we abandoned every principle for which we went to war. We are abandoning our principles now and forsaking the unfortunate people of the world. We are asked to use American boys to maintain the status quo and to prevent the unfortunate peoples of the world from being liberated from the yoke of tyranny.

On May 15, 1919, Lt. George B. Noble, another member of the Peace Commission, sent the following expression of sentiment to Mr. Grew:

I feel that the peace, as proposed, will be an exceedingly dangerous settlement—if it could be called a settlement—of world affairs. I believe it to be provocative of future wars, rather than a guaranty of world peace. I believe it will stir up strife among the nations, rather than allay it. I feel that the idealism of America has been largely sacrificed on the altar of imperialism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has not yet answered the question of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course I am speaking of conditions after the last war. I am not surprised that the Senator should question me in that connection.

Another distinguished gentleman, Mr. William Bullitt, a close friend of the late President Roosevelt, a close friend of President Wilson, and at times a close adviser to both, wrote on May 17, 1919, to President Wilson, following his resignation in protest:

I was one who trusted implicitly in your leadership and believed that you would take nothing less than "a permanent peace" based upon "unselfish and unbiased justice." But our Government has consented now to deliver the suffering peoples of the world to new oppressions, subjections, and dismemberments—a new century of war.

Mr. President, the second reason why I believe this legislation provides such a threat to our people is that while no one dreamed the inevitable consequences of this war would so swiftly mature, now—strangely enough—the terrifying fact is that the most enthusiastic, optimistic opponents of American neutrality are frightened out of their wits by what they see.

It now turns out that if the consequences of the last war bred disaster, this war has bred monsters of catastrophic proportions which have broken their leash and are now at large.

Listen to what Dorothy Thompson, a leading internationalist, an ardent friend and supporter of the late President, and also sometimes an adviser, wrote on October 19:

At the present, victorious nations are overreaching themselves and are thereby bringing about a condition of appalling chaos in the countries which they occupy. This chaos inevitably richochets upon themselves. * * * If deindustrialization is ruthlessly carried out in the west as well as in the east, homeless, foodless, workless hordes will surround the American, British, and French occupation forces. * * *

What we have to fear, therefore, is not war, but the collapse of large parts of the world into total anarchy, with all its concomitants of lawlessness, banditry, and crime. * * * Needed is a thorough revision of occupation and political policy. It is no less in the Russian interest to revise it than in our own. We cannot get world organization out of anarchy.

That is what we are trying to do today. Then she said:

We must take thought now of the immediate necessities of policy rather than of the ultimate use of the atomic bomb. For there is more than one way in which the world can blow up. * * * The mob is a human variety of nuclear disintegration.

On April 25 Mr. R. H. Markham, for 17 years foreign correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, wrote in Human Events of what America's policies had permitted in the Balkans:

Now that Russia has taken practically the whole of southeast Europe under its direct control, what effect will that have on Balkan democracy?

Sad to say, Balkan democracy has always faced great handicaps and progressed very slowly. But it had significant achievements to its credit. Today they are a thing of the past. The last vestiges of freedom are being wiped out. In every Balkan land there prevails stark autocracy—

Not the four freedoms—

imposed by violence and maintained by force.

Not the four freedoms, not freedom from fear.

In most of the countries Communists have subverted justice, exercise absolute authority, and are exterminating all leading political opponents. They have placed their hands on every vital post and are as determined to hold power as was Nikolai Lenin in Russia 28 years ago.

Behind this cruel absolutism stands the mighty power of triumphant Russia. The Balkans are passing from a brief troubled twilight into another dark night.

Does this aggression by Russia constitute the new foreign policy which our boys are to defend?

Concerning this Government's policy toward Palestine, where riots and sudden death are the disorder of the day, and where mounting hatreds are only intensifying the bitter conflict between Arab and Jew, Sumner Welles wrote, on October 31:

Unfortunately this Government is as yet not giving any sign that it is pursuing any clear and consistent policy which will facilitate the objective to which it is pledged * * * . If the present floundering continues, the hope of a peaceful solution will become increasingly remote. The antagonism of the Arab leaders is daily becoming more envenomed. As the Arab states become increasingly aroused, the position of some Jewish groups is becoming correspondingly extreme.

And on November 15, the Washington Evening Star editorially observed of our own record in the matter:

Confidence is universally lacking because the past record does not inspire anyone's confidence.

What about public confidence in the way our Morgenthau plan for Germany is working out, Mr. President? On October 7, the New York Times foreign correspondent, Raymond Daniell, wrote:

The American economic advisers to the Office of Military Government have made the "surprising" discovery that the Potsdam formula for the collection of German reparations and the industrial disarmament of Germany will be difficult if not impossible of achievement. As the experts see it, it will be necessary to allow the Germans an export trade just about equal in value to what she enjoyed before the war if she is to maintain a "minimum" standard of living and meet the costs of Allied occupation.

Yesterday there appeared on page 3 of the New York Times an article entitled "Army Called Foe of Jackson's Views." The article is by Frank E. Mason, and it reads in part as follows:

Many policies in our occupied area are determined by the State Department or the Treasury Department. When the real position of the State Department as the dictator of Army occupation policies was revealed in the press last September many officers in Berlin and Frankfurt-on-the-Main expressed relief. Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson publicly rebuked Gen. Douglas MacArthur for presuming to determine even such a purely military matter as the number of troops needed to occupy Japan.

An American general expressed the hope to me that the American public would clearly understand that the State Department was admitting that it was the "Edgar Bergen of occupation policies, and that, although Army officers get top billing, they are only playing Charlie McCarthy."

TREASURY ALSO CRITICIZED

The Treasury Department has been no less troublesome from an Army standpoint. Military government officers complained that the financial directives were so involved, ambiguous, and confusing that they could not make head or tail of them.

Col. Bernard Bernstein, who has been closely associated with former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., was chief of the G–5 financial branch of USFET in Frankfort. Colonel Bernstein was relieved of his assignment in the middle of September and placed in charge of the cartel-investigation branch. This occurred after criticism from military government officers that Colonel Bernstein appeared to be embarked on a somewhat individual and independent enterprise that appeared to be quite parallel with Mr. Morgenthau's plan. Colonel Bernstein is generally believed around Frankfort to be a coauthor of this plan.

Typical of the "un-American policies" for which they must assume public responsibility, frequently criticized by our Army officers, are the so-called Gestapo methods used in handling Germans. Much of our police work is done by German refugees who were drafted into the United States Army during the war. Many of them were hurriedly commissioned as officers when interpreters for occupied Germany were needed. Nazi Gestapo practices are the only police methods that they know.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator read a statement that, if Germany is to have a prosperous peacetime economy, it would be necessary to allow her to have aggregate exports in the same amount as those she had before the war.

Mr. WHEELER. That is what Mr. Raymond Daniell, of the New York Times, said in an article from which I read.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the period 1926 through 1930, Germany did not have a prosperous economy, yet during that period her exports aggregated 12,000,000,000 reichsmarks a year. Did the Senator know that our State Department expects to limit the exports of Germany to 2,000,000,000 reichsmarks a year, or

one-sixth of what they were before the war?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I am not familiar with that.

I wish to read next a leading editorial from the Philadelphia Record. I desire to call attention to the fact that the Philadelphia Record was one of the leading interventionist newspapers in the United States, and one which criticized violently everyone who was in favor of keeping the United States out of the war. On November 4 of this year the Philadelphia Record editorialized as follows:

General Eisenhower in a monthly report gives the American people an alarming picture of conditions in the United States occupation zone in Germany. Unrest and some organized resistance exist among the 18,000,000 Germans of the United States zone, Eisenhower reports. Murder and organized looting are part of the picture. Presence of thousands of displaced persons is a serious problem. Lack of fuel and food as winter approaches aggravates the situation.

What does all this mean? Only one thing: After 6 months, we have either failed in establishing order, or failed in de-Nazifying and planting the seeds of democracy, or come perilously close to it. * * * It is a shocking thing to find American soldiers beginning to believe that Hitler wasn't so bad, that maybe the Germans were forced into this war.

That is because of the conditions which we have permitted to exist.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator quoting now, or does what he is reading express his own sentiments?

Mr. WHEELER. I am quoting.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will be careful, because some of us cannot readily distinguish between his own sentiments and his quotations. I do not believe the Senator wants to press the sentiment that Germany was in the right.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly not.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; because the Senator is recorded as having favored the declaration of war. According to the record he was in favor of the war against Germany, and in favor of the war against Japan.

Mr. WHEELER. I voted for both, and I was so recorded although I was not present when the vote was taken.

Mr. CONNALLY. I congratulate the Senator for having done so, because some Senators, because of their absence, were not recorded.

Mr. WHEELER. I want to make this clear: I was one of those who came back from Germany in 1938 and denounced Mr. Hitler from the public platform for the things he was doing in Germany. I did so at a time when certain prominent Britons were shooting birds with Mr. Goering and some of the great international financiers who helped put Mr. Hitler in power because of their fear that Germany was becoming too democratic.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, with regard to the vote which was taken on the declaration of war, I assume that the Senator voted, as did many other Senators, that a state of war then existed.

Mr. WHEELER. Germany declared war upon us. After Japan had attacked us, in my own mind there was no other recourse than to declare war upon her. Right after the attack had taken place I said, "We have got to go and lick hell out of Japan." I think I was the first Member of the Senate who made such a statement, and it was broadcast over the radio.

Mr. President, recently a report signed by all 18 members of the House committee under the chairmanship of Representative COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi, was made public. It reads in part as follows:

If a hard peace requires the elimination of 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 Germans, it would be much more humane to eliminate them at once. The committee cannot refrain from asking the simple question: "What incentive under this plan exists for Germany to turn to democratic ways?"

On November 13 David Lawrence, in commenting on this committee report, warned the American people:

The committee points out that to strip Germany of her transportation equipment and the machinery of her factories beyond the point recommended by General Clay's advisory committee of experts can mean only one of two things:

(a) That a considerable part of the German population must be liquidated through disease, malnutrition, and slow starvation for a period of years to come, with the resultant dangers to the rest of Europe from pestilence and the spread of plague that knows no boundaries; or

(b) The continuation both of large occupying forces to hold down unrest and the affording relief mainly drawn from the United States to prevent actual starvation.

And Mr. Lawrence adds the following observation to complete his article:

Very soon if American news photographers do an honest job, as there is every reason to believe they will, the American people will soon see movies of starving German men, women, and children which will rival in their horror the pictures of Buchenwald concentration camps. But these will be pictures of torture inflicted by reason of an Allied policy of indifference, or misguided revenge, or plain blundering.

Mr. President, what of our policies in the Far East? What of Japan? Surely the American people do not yet realize that our own Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, repudiated specific directives that were drawn up to implement unconditional surrender in May, because he knew the American Army and Navy forces were bitterly resentful that this Government had failed completely to use its psychological warfare to supplement our costly military powers of destruction to defeat the enemy; because he was convinced that such a policy would involve such a frightful cost in casualties that he would not take responsibility for it, and because he was further convinced that we had neither the trained personnel nor the technical machinery with which to carry out the complete demobilization and occupation of Japan. Certainly time is proving the wisdom of Mr. Stimson's stand in this matter.

The New York Times of November 22 quotes Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, General MacArthur's chief intelligence officer since Bataan, as pointing out that the occupation has been carried out without a single shot having been fired, and without a single American death. And General Willoughby, in pointing with pride to MacArthur's achievement, asked his critics:

Just what alternative was expected to this painless occupation without casualties?

On October 30, the New York Times had the following to say of the civil war that has broken out in China:

There is no political rationality in this fighting. There is apparently little military rationality except that the Communists appear to be trying either to hold or to extend the areas they control. * * * For Americans the picture is one of sad confusion and disappointment.

And on October 31, PM—sometimes called the uptown edition of the Daily Worker—openly demanded that the United States get out of China, where at the present moment we are told there are more than 1,000,000 Japanese still under arms.

On November 16, Mr. President, the Washington Daily News, under a featured front-page headline, "U. S. orders air war on Chinese Reds," said:

Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer announced today that he had authorized United States Marine commanders to take appropriate action, including air attacks, to halt attacks on United States marines from a small Communist-held village.

The News goes on to say:

Russo-Chinese relations appeared to be approaching a crisis over growing belief that Russia has deliberately aided the Chinese Communists to establish themselves in Manchuria. There were indications that the Chinese Communists have established themselves so strongly in Manchuria that the Central Government will be unable to dislodge them. Government circles believe tacit Soviet assistance through the Chinese Communists violated at least the spirit of the 3-month-old Sino-Russian treaty of friendship and alliance. * * * Chinese observers pointed out that the Russians first allowed Communist forces to enter southern Manchuria and entrench themselves along the frontier, thus making it impossible for Nationalist troops to come in by land. The Russians then allowed the Communists to occupy the Manchurian seaports, preventing the landing of Central Government troops by ship.

Would that situation come within the definition of aggression?

And on November 17, Hugh Baillie, president of the United Press, stated in an AP dispatch, after returning from a 20,000-mile trip through the Far East:

Here is a situation in which we are arming and backing one Chinese Army against another Chinese Army and the stake appears to be Manchuria, which is right where this was started in 1931 when the Japs occupied it and changed its name to Manchukuo.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek finds his armies confronted by Chinese Communist forces who evidently have no intention of giving up Manchuria and the areas they dominate in north China without a fight.

Extricating ourselves from the military situation in northern China and Manchuria will be one of the neatest tricks of the war if we can do it.

In southeastern Asia America seems also to have become tragically implicated in policies which cannot help but further degrade the ideals for which we stand.

On September 27 the New York Times, in its leading editorial, sadly observed:

> The people of Indochina have revolted several times during three generations of French occupancy but there seems to be a new impetus behind the present troubles. The slogans of freedom used during the war have naturally had an effect upon subject populations in the Orient. Such populations are likely to ask on what grounds Japanese imperialism was condemned if European imperialism is to be continued. * * * It is not quite enough to reply that the Europeans are less cruel than the Japanese. The whole problem is as big as east Asia. Indochina is in the same boat as Malaya, the Netherland Indies, Burma, and India.

And, Mr. President, on October 24, 1945, the Washington Daily News carried the story that the United States Government itself was frightfully embarrassed and shocked at what was going on in Indonesia, where our kindly and peace-loving British allies are massacring civilians with American-owned armaments and guns. The News stated that one Government official remarked:

> We don't see how we can take this equipment away, yet we want to make perfectly clear that the United States is not involved in this trouble.

On November 10, the Nationalist Indonesian leader, Dr. I. R. Soekarno, sent the following bitter protest to the leaders of the world:

> I strongly protest against the use of heavy bombers and heavy weapons against a city population which is unable to defend itself properly against those weapons. I hereby draw the attention of the whole world toward the vast massacre of men, women, and children.

These also were the acts of our peace-loving ally.

Mr. President, the same tragic situation obtains in French Indochina where Annamite natives are in open revolt against the return of French colonial rule by the imposition of force, the instruments of which have come from American lend-lease stock piles.

While the implications of our policy in Korea have been suppressed by Government officials, each one of these implications, as fast as it comes to light, has been and will continue to be bitterly attacked. We have only to remind ourselves of what happened when the American people discovered we had agreed to use the established Japanese authorities as administrators of America's zone of occupation. It is not difficult to predict how violent the uproar will be when the American people, spearheaded by our most ardent interventionists, become aware of the story of where and why a secret agreement was reached with Russia that left Russia in control of the northern half of Korea in repudiation of the Cairo declaration, and which has completely disintegrated the social, economic, and political life of the nation. For the first time in the history of Korea coal must be shipped from Japan to Korea. There are coal mines in northern Korea but Russia will not permit coal to be shipped to the southern part of that country.

On November 20, the Washington Evening Star editorially viewed with alarm the development involving a serious threat to Britain's life line in Iran:

> Whatever the technicalities, the equities of the case seem to fix responsibility on the Soviet authorities. A Russian acquisition of northern Iran, open or disguised, would be a challenge to Britain which might precipitate a major diplomatic crisis throughout the Near and Middle East. So patent a violation of the rights of a charter member of the United Nations would likewise put in question the intrinsic value of that organization.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator might add something more about the presence and actions of the British in Indonesia. I noticed in a newspaper the other day a statement—I forget what the authority was—that the British were acting under the directions of the Supreme Allied Command in the Far East. Was the Senator aware of that?

Mr. WHEELER. I was not aware of that. If, in bombing the people of Indonesia, they were acting under such direction, then I would say they certainly would be subject to condemnation equally with our British ally.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not say that the article said that they had been ordered to bomb the people, but that the British were there and had been ordered to go there to maintain and restore order and to take into their control the Japanese forces. That was their reason for being there.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me again read what the Washington Evening Star says:

> Whatever the technicalities, the equities of the case seem to fix the responsibility on the Soviet authorities.

If the story is correct, there is plainly a case of aggression; and, Mr. President, the moment the Council defines aggression, if it defines aggression, then certainly the British are in honor bound to stop that aggression. Regardless of who does it or what causes it, we are in honor bound to prevent aggression. I continue the quotation from the Star:

> A Russian acquisition of northern Iran, open or disguised, would be a challenge to Britain which might precipitate a major diplomatic crisis throughout the Near and Middle East. So patent a violation of the rights of a charter member of the United Nations would likewise put in question the intrinsic value of that organization. Here is an issue which no peace-loving power can evade or overlook.

Mr. President, my friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan said yesterday that the American people wanted the San Francisco Charter and he said that they wanted to have the pending legislation enacted. Much propaganda was employed in favor of the United Nations Charter, and yet Mr. President, none of the people of the United States knew what was going on in Europe, nor do they now know what is going on in Russia or in other places. Information as to what is actually going on and concerning the aggressions by Russia which are taking place, either directly or indirectly, not only in Europe but also in Asia, is only now beginning to come out.

What is our foreign policy with reference to this aggression by Russia? Are we to send our police force? Oh, no; we are not going to send a police force to stop aggression by Russia. Not only that, but we are not going to send such a force to stop aggressions by any of the satellites of Russia, because Russia is not going to permit it to be done. We are only going to use such powers against the small and the weak nations who have not any friends and who are not satellites of some powerful nation.

Mr. President, the situation in Iran is so similar to the situation in China that it immediately raises the question of what constitutes aggression. When is aggression aggression? And when, Mr. President, are we going to make the distinction between a domestic affair and actual aggressive interference in the internal affairs of a nation by an outside power or powers?

The League of Nations was unable to define aggression. That was one of the things that broke it down. The members of the League never could agree and the leading statesmen of the world of that time could never agree upon a definition of aggression. Yet we talk glibly about stopping aggression and about utilizing a police force to stop aggression. The Congress of the United States cannot define aggression. Aggression may take place in many different ways. Is it aggression when one powerful nation says to another nation "Stop doing thus and so in your internal affairs"? Is it aggression when one government furnishes secret agents to overthrow another government? Is it aggression when Russia backs up the powerful Chinese Communists? Is that an aggression? Certainly it is, just as much so as if they sent their own armies into China and furnished supplies and food to back them up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, do we not have the same difficulty in defining democracy? Yet we can follow it in this country.

Mr. WHEELER. We do not follow democracy in this country. We have a democratic republic. We hear talk about democracy, but we have not democracy in this country. We have what is called democracy, but as the Senator well knows, we have a democratic republic, and we can easily define a democratic republic. When people glibly talked about democracies, they did not mean democracy, and no one talked of democracies who knew what the term meant. They were talking about a democratic republic, where the people would have a voice in their government, where authority did not come down from the top, and the people would be told by an autocratic tyranny what they had to do. They meant a government where the people would select their own representatives, as we do in the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be very difficult to find much agreement in this body as to a democratic republic.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator know many places in the United

States where the ideas of the people as to how we should function differ very greatly?

Mr. WHEELER. I have not found many differences of opinion among intelligent people. Certainly, we find some crackpots in this country—and some of them have been very close to the Government in recent years—who do not know what the first principles of a democratic republic are.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We know that many large cities and some States in this country have been dominated by individuals and organizations, yet we would hardly denominate as crackpots the people of those cities and States.

Mr. WHEELER. After all, the people of our country get the kind of government they deserve, no better and no worse. The people have it within their power to set up the kind of government they want. If they send illiterate or corrupt Senators to the Senate——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not make any such implication as that. I do not think there are any illiterate Senators.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that, and I agree, but I am merely saying that if the people should send that kind it would be their responsibility. If they elect a corrupt mayor in a community it is not because the form of government is wrong, it is because the people themselves, in their own hearts and their own minds, are too lazy to take an interest in their own government and to go out and fight against wrongs, but they want to leave it up to an individual or to a corporation or to a crooked machine to do the work.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with all the Senator says, except that in those instances there is not democratic representation.

Mr. WHEELER. If the people do not have democratic representation it is not the fault of the form of government, it is the fault of the people themselves. All we can do is to set up a form of government under which the people can have democracy or a democratic government if they have the intelligence and the will to demand it. We cannot force the people to have democracy if there is inertia among them or if they have not intelligence.

In order to have a democratic republic, or any form of it, it is necessary to have an informed and intelligent public opinion. Not only is it necessary to have an informed public opinion but the people must be constantly on the alert to see that their democratic republic is not taken away from them. They cannot blindly follow any man. As Thomas Jefferson once said, very tersely, people must put their trust in no man, but must put their trust in the law. When people start to put their trust in individuals as against the law, that is when democracy or a democratic republic begins to fall.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is it not true that democracy is government by majority?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Under a constitutional republic such as ours, the majority is limited in many ways. Its power is limited for the protection of the minority.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is what makes it a constitutional republic.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And not a democracy.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; a democratic republic. It is sometimes loosely said our Government is a democracy. It is nothing of the kind. We have the form of government we have because the fathers saw, in their wisdom, that minorities, as well as majorities, had to have protection

I repeat, Mr. President, when are we going to make a distinction between a domestic affair and actual aggressive interference in the internal affairs of a nation by an outside power or powers, whether it be done secretly, by sending in secret agents, or openly? The greatest statesmen in the world, sitting on the League of Nations, were never able to define what constituted aggression.

If anyone labors under the illusion that I have gone out of my way to track down isolated instances with which to draw this gloomy picture, I want to enter in the RECORD certain verbal "broadsides" now being directed at the over-all foreign policy of this Government.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator mentioned the difficulty at times of defining aggression. At the time Japan went into Manchuria, the United States Government called upon the League of Nations to stop the aggression, but the League of Nations did not find it to be aggression, because those who controlled the League did not find it to their interest to do so. So they did not do anything about it.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course they did not.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. After the Japanese representative had spoken for 3 hours in defense of Japan, the representative of the British Government is reported to have spoken for half an hour, taking the Japanese position, and the Japanese representative afterward rose and thanked him for having made the Japanese question more clear than he himself had done in 3 hours.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. I am quite familiar with that situation, and the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree thoroughly that it is pretty difficult to define aggression. I am reminded of the difficulty we have had in the last 150 years in defining interstate commerce. It is a gradual process, which has been very difficult. It has taken all the efforts of many lawyers, and the courts, to arrive at the present understanding, which is quite different from what it was in the beginning. I think we will find it will be the same with aggression and many of the other concepts which, while not definite, are a part of the everyday affairs in the world. We have to deal with that sort of concept.

Mr. WHEELER. In reference to that matter, when the Constitution was drafted, the fathers of the Constitution had a very definite picture and showed a very definite understanding of what interstate commerce was. But since that time our Supreme Court has taken a very different view of interstate commerce. They felt it necessary to do that. Instead of coming to the Congress and asking Congress to define what was meant by interstate commerce, they did it by judicial interpretation, to meet the changes occurring from time to time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We still have the power to change the definition if we do not agree. Long before the last 15 years there were a great many changes.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And I think the Senator will admit they were necessary; that is, changes came with the times. I do not think that with a concept such as aggression it is possible to lay down a definition in black and white. It depends on the good judgment of the people.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no. If we are to lay down a definition of aggression, we cannot say that what is done by one country today is aggression and that it is something else if done by another country tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The same thing?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; of course, not. That is very different from saying we must lay down a complete and satisfactory definition.

Mr. WHEELER. I think we must definitely lay down a definition. Jefferson said, I repeat, "You cannot place your reliance upon man, but you must place it upon the law." If the Council is going to take steps against aggression, no nation will be safe if there is not established a specific definition of what aggression is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We do not have any law at the present time on the subject. If we can start by establishing a law, I think we can arrive at the solution.

Mr. WHEELER. If a law respecting aggression had been established and were in force today, would there be any question in the mind of the Senator from Arkansas that we would be obliged to say that Russia was the aggressor in Iran? Would we not have to say that Russia was the aggressor in northern China?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know enough about the facts in those two cases, but taking the Senator's assumption——

Mr. WHEELER. I am assuming to be true what has been written in the Washington Star, and that what other responsible reporters and experts are saying in those two cases is true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a conflict with reference to those cases.

Mr. WHEELER. Listen, Senator, there never in the history of the world has been an aggression when conflict did not exist respecting aggression between the aggressor and the country attacked. That conflict has always existed when there has been aggression.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And in time that question is to be decided by reference to

a law, and in referring to a law the human element comes in.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but first we must have a definition of what is aggression. The reason the League of Nations broke down, according to the statement made by the man who for many years was our own adviser at the League of Nations, was that members of the League never could agree on a definition of aggression.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was but one of the many reasons. The Senator from Montana would not say that was the only reason the League broke down. There was no law under the League dealing with the subject of aggression. The League did not pretend to have such a law. I do not see how the Senator could claim there was such a law.

Mr. WHEELER. The League attempted to define aggression.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say the League had no such law.

Mr. WHEELER. The League attempted to define what was aggression. The members of the League never could agree upon a definition of aggression. I gather that from what our own representative at the League of Nations has written in his book. I cannot recall the name of the book at the present moment, but I will get it for the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is it not reasonable to assume that nations have not agreed with respect to what is aggression because it would be more convenient for each nation to determine for itself when it wants to be an aggressor, and does not want its action to be called aggression?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, that is true.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As to international law, it is interesting to observe that international law is being established, or an attempt is being made to establish it, in different parts of the world by individuals. The law that is invoked in the war criminals trials is a new conception of international law, if it is international law at all. If that conception of international law should prevail all over the world, how many generals would the various countries have in their armies in the event there should be another war?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, on the point just raised by the Senator from Minnesota I call attention to an article by Frank E. Mason, which appears on page 3 of the New York Times for Monday, November 26, 1945. I read as follows:

The Nuernberg trial is intensifying the Army's urgent insistence that American civilians speedily take complete responsibility for the government of Germany. For weeks Regular Army officers in Germany have viewed the development of Justice Robert H. Jackson's new theories of international law with distrust.

Collective responsibility or institutional guilt, whereby every person listed on the membership of an organization is an equal partner in crime, is a new principle of international justice, sponsored by the American members of the court. Overcoming the opposition of Britain, Russia, and France, the American representatives finally prevailed on them to agree that all German General Staff and High Command officers "be condemned as a criminal group."

American General Staff officers, needless to say, side with the British, Russians, and French against Justice Jackson and his demand that professional soldiers be convicted as criminals on no more individual evidence than their membership in an army general staff. Our Regular officers in Europe are becoming increasingly vocal in expressing opposition to any such international law.

WANT HELP FROM CONGRESS

Since it now appears to be the law, they want to know what new principles of military organization are being contemplated by the Congress of the United States to safeguard our career Army officers from continuance as whipping boys of politicians and civilian administrators who give the secret orders for which the Army officers take the public blame.

Because Army officers, never free from the menace of discipline, will obey orders and keep their mouths shut, they are frequently forced to assume responsibility publicly for measures taken in occupied Germany that they did not initiate and for which they had authority. These officers often appear to the world as sponsoring or approving policies in Germany that they privately condemn as un-American.

Many policies in our occupied area are determined by the State Department or the Treasury Department. When the real position of the State Department as the dictator of Army occupation policies was revealed in the press last September, many officers in Berlin and Frankfurt-on-the-Main expressed relief. Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson publicly rebuked Gen. Douglas MacArthur for presuming to determine even such a purely military matter as the number of troops needed to occupy Japan.

If such a policy is to be universally adopted, the Army officers cannot be blamed, as someone said recently, for being apprehensive. It would result in obtaining only second-rate men in the Army, because officers will be afraid of what might happen to them if this country were involved in a war and we were to lose the war. I do not know what the policy is to be. I am not prepared to say whether Mr. Justice Jackson is correct or not, but I know that a fear exists in the minds of many of our own Army officers as the result of the policy now being pursued. They want to know whether they would be tried on a similar basis in the event this country were again involved in a war and lost.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If, after the Civil War, the Federal Government had decided to shoot General Lee and all the other surviving generals of the Confederate Army, we would have been accused of instituting lynch law.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What sort of analogy is that? What does that have to do with the present situation?

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Arkansas can ask the Senator from Minnesota that question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Montana seemed to think it had some pertinence.

Mr. WHEELER. If such a law as now contemplated were in effect at that time, I assume we would have tried General Lee and shot him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not thought or considered at that time but that war was a perfectly legitimate and proper way to settle differences.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But have not some changes occurred in the attitude toward war? Have not some slight superficial changes occurred?

Mr. WHEELER. There have been some changes in some individuals. There have not been in the minds of most Army officers, because they are thinking of themselves in the event we should again be engaged in a war and should lose it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But there have been public statements made and agreements to which all nations have adhered that war is not a legitimate way to settle disputes.

Mr. WHEELER. Everyone admits that war is not a legitimate way to settle disputes. It is not a way of settling disputes that should be permitted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It used to be thought that war was perfectly legitimate.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I do not think anyone thought war was legitimate. I cannot conceive of any intelligent man thinking war is legitimate. I cannot believe anyone thinks it legitimate to kill others, at least since people have become civilized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When would the Senator say people have become civilized? Does the Senator mean only a year or two ago?

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. About when did people become civilized?

Mr. WHEELER. It was a long, long time ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very doubtful whether we are civilized now. When would the Senator say it was that people became civilized?

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator doubts we are civilized now?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the same position the Indians take.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean we became civilized a hundred years ago, or 5,000 years ago?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not want to engage in an argument as to when people became civilized because I think we are dealing with more important things. I sometimes question whether we are civilized today when we in the United States of America are permitting the enslavement of millions upon millions of people of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is just what I mean, and it seems to me we ought to make some effort to prevent it. The point on which we differ is as to how to prevent it.

Mr. WHEELER. We agree upon the objective, but upon the method we disagree entirely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree with the Senator from Arkansas upon the method. The Senator agrees with the method which is being pursued now, to

some extent, although I understood the Senator to say yesterday that he, like some others, does not agree with the particular method now in question, in that the Senator thinks it is entirely inadequate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the fundamental difference is that the Senator from Montana feels we should proceed as we have heretofore, and I feel there should be a new and different way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the difference between the Senator from Arkansas and me is that the Senator believes in a great world organization, and I do not. If I misstate the Senator's position I wish he would correct me. I understand that the Senator believes in a great world organization. I know there are many who do not believe in such an organization. I say it is an idealistic conception. If such an organization could work successfully it would be a fine thing; but we must deal with realities. The movement of representatives of a world organization into some troubled district would not result in changing the nature of peoples. Those who are Russians would still be Russians. Those who are Indians would still be Indians. The Japs would still remain Japs and the Chinese would still be Chinese. It seems to me we cannot have a great world organization in which some of our high-minded, idealistic individuals believe, without first completely destroying our own economy in the United States, and bringing our civilization and our standards of life down to the same level as that of others. So far as I am concerned, I do not know any other country than the United States of America, and my first obligation is to it. I am thinking of protecting the people of the United States, and their standards of living, before I am thinking of other peoples of the earth. I want to help them, but I want them to help themselves. In my judgment that is the only way by which to elevate their standards—not by continually giving them something, but by trying to help them to help themselves. That statement applies to Europeans, Asiatics, Africans, and all other peoples, whether they are in the United States or anywhere else.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I tried to make my position clear yesterday in a speech. The Senator refers to a great world organization. I know that there are many difficulties in the use of words in this field. However, my emphasis was on the establishment of some rules of conduct in a restricted field. A moment ago, as I understood, the Senator heartily approved the principle of law.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly the principle which I have in mind to apply in the beginning in the field of armaments. I am not too sure that it is possible; but I think it is worth seriously investigating and trying. Assume that such a plan were tried in that narrow field, in somewhat the same way that narcotics control is applied by the Federal Government. That is a specialized field. Assume that it could be done. If it could be done, it would be of great benefit to the people of the United States, in whom both the Senator and I are interested, for this reason:

Without any control, I do not consider that the system of isolationism has been protective, or effective in preserving our independence and our standard of living. We are now just beginning to reap the fruits of two wars, and I do not believe that the prospects for the next few years in this country are too bright, particularly if we must look forward to a third war in 10 or 15 years. The effects become cumulatively worse.

Mr. WHEELER. I entirely agree with the Senator's view that if we could have some rule of law, and could have a general disarmament, everything would be fine. I would favor calling a disarmament conference tomorrow, and having the nations of the world disarm, and I would favor the establishment of a police force to go into Russia and other countries to see that the plan was carried out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To operate on the individuals within a country, not on the nation itself. That is really what law amounts to in this field.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what we must have ultimately.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But that has never been attempted.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree that it has never been attempted. I have no disagreement with the effort to bring about complete disarmament. As I stated a moment ago, I should like to see a disarmament conference called tomorrow, because I should like to see whether our peace-loving allies would agree to disarm.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator propose that we permit the operation of such a law in our country?

Mr. WHEELER. Absolutely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With the Senator's support, I think we might accomplish it; but I did not know that that was the Senator's position.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the Senator did not know, because he has been reading the kind of propaganda to which I have referred. Because I tried to keep this country out of war, I was called an isolationist. I was called many other things because I wanted to keep out of the war and to prevent conditions which exist in the world today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have tried to follow the Senator's speech, but still I had not gathered from his speech that he would support such a plan.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not finished my speech. When we speak about isolationism, I contend that this country has never been isolationist.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is the same difficulty with words. I agree that words are difficult to define, just as the Senator says aggression is difficult to define.

Mr. WHEELER. I repeat that this country has never been isolationist. We have always traded with other nations. We have had our diplomats in every other country. We have done everything we could in past generations to try to prevent war. We have traded with other peoples, but we have tried to protect the standards of living of the American people, both in our tariff laws and in our immigration laws. Sometimes tariffs have been too high. I opposed the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill because I thought it went too far.

With respect to immigration, we have not allowed immigrants to enter this country freely because we felt that if we did, the standard of living of our workers would be destroyed. We have tried to maintain peace, and to live in peace with our neighbors to the north and to the south. But because of the fact that I have not wanted to become involved in every dog fight in Europe I have been called an isolationist.

Let me call attention to some of the instances in which we have tried to get along with other nations, and what the result of the recent peace conference was. I repeat what I said a moment ago. If any one labors under the illusion that I have gone out of my way to track down isolated instances with which to draw this gloomy picture I want to enter in the RECORD the following verbal "broadsides" now being directed at the over-all foreign policy of this Government.

We might begin with the first tragic attempt at peacemaking, called the Five Power London Conference. On September 21 Mr. Herbert L. Matthews, foreign correspondent, cabled the following report to the New York Times:

> The Council of Foreign Ministers is approaching the close of its first conference amid intense gloom and disappointment. There were probably only 3 or 4 days of discussion after tonight with little hopes of anything being accomplished, although many believed that the foreign ministers will pull something out of their hats at the last minute so as not to have to register virtually complete failure.
>
> The only delegation that shows signs of satisfaction is the Soviet, but in every other case one meets reactions from disappointment to despair. The New York Times has four or five correspondences covering this conference daily and they come in contact with many persons connected with the council. There is not one of the latter who is not deeply worried, disappointed, or pessimistic.
>
> There is no use dodging what is now plain: A serious cleavage has developed between Russia and the western democracies.

On September 24 the Philadelphia Record, another great internationalist newspaper, protested in its leading editorial:

> Isn't it time for Russia to show her good faith? * * * Yes; we think that right now, in view of Molotov's meat-ax diplomatic efforts at London, notably his demand for territory in Africa, this is a time for Russia—not us—to be demonstrating good faith. * * * Meantime, let's have a moratorium that it is only the United States of America whose good faith needs to be demonstrated.

That newspaper is an ardent supporter of all the New Deal policies, an ardent supporter of internationalism, Union Now, World Government, and everything else of that nature.

Frederick Kuh, covering the Conference for the Chicago Sun and the New York PM, Mr. Marshall Field's interventionist newspapers, great liberal newspapers which follow the philosophy of

the Senator from Arkansas, with reference to international affairs, at least, referred to the deliberations as an "epic tragedy," and denounced the "barren and fatuous communiques" issued by "these five men with a mania for secrecy." The conference, he said, "is deadlocked, frustrated, and steeped in conflicts in almost every phase of its drooping efforts."

On October 3, PM carried a leading editorial by Mr. Max Lerner. I have no more violent critic than Max Lerner, in regard to my so-called isolationist policies. I quote from the editorial:

A specter is haunting the world. It is fear.

Mr. President, I thought we had done away with fear; that is what we were told.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who told us?

Mr. WHEELER. Not the Senator from Arkansas. But he will remember the great speeches which were made here, to the effect that we were going to do away with fear in the world. Yet, Mr. President, there is more fear in the world today, there is less freedom of speech, less freedom of press, less freedom of radio, less freedom of religion, more dictatorship, more autocracy, more tyranny, more people in slavery, than ever before in the history of the world since the Dark Ages, and I am even doubtful if there is not more now than there was during the Dark Ages, in view of the fact that in that era the people did not know as much about liberty as they know at the present time.

I continue to read from Mr. Lerner's editorial:

The inglorious ending of the London meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers has left that specter in full possession of the anarchic world arena. It holds the field in solitary splendor, after having done alone what Hitler and Hirohito and all their cohorts together were unable to do—split the unity of the great powers. * * *

In the end Bevin called Molotov's tactics Hitlerian, and Molotov remarked that things were different, and better, in the good old days of Eden and Hull. One began to wonder whether this was a meeting of the foreign-policy chiefs of great nations or a gathering of fishwives.

On the same day, Anne O'Hare McCormick—another great internationalist and a very brilliant woman—wrote in the New York Times:

There could be a worse failure than breakdown of the preliminary peace council, and that would be a failure to recognize, report, and face the differences that exist in minds and methods of powers that have to make peace. * * *

Actually the same conflicts of ideas and interests have run through the Big Three from the beginning. Stalin has never concealed his conviction that peacemaking was the business of the three principal victors in the war and bringing in lesser powers was only a kind of window dressing. This was the crux of the only real dispute over the organization of the United Nations at San Francisco. It is the fundamental cause of the deadlock here.

We use fine phrases about peace, world union, world organization, stopping aggression, and so forth; yet the first peace conference we get into breaks down, and it is said that it is like "a gathering of fishwives."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator take the position that because of the difficulties arising in the conference to which he has just referred, we should do nothing further about the international settlement of problems involved?

Mr. WHEELER. No. I think we should try to. But I say that if the United States is going to live up to the high principles and the high motives for which our forefathers fought, bled, and died, if we are going to live up to the principles which we told our boys they were fighting for, we cannot permit Russia and other nations to rule the world and enslave the peoples of half the world. We must stand on principle. We should not give away every principle we have in order to try to get along with Russia.

I am calling attention to this matter in order to show how ridiculous it is to talk about some of the things we are advocating and to speak of our peace-loving allies, and then to say we must make great sacrifices in order to get along with them. Of course, I wish to get along with them, but I wish to get along with them on the basis of the principles for which our boys died on the battlefields of Europe and in the vast Pacific.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me that very often in our human relationships we find the answer in the effort. I take the position that if we are unwilling to make the effort, then certainly we cannot find the answer to a difficult international situation.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not disputing the Senator on that point. I think we must make an effort to try to get along; but in making the effort I am unalterably opposed to sacrificing every principle for which the Government of the United States has stood and every principle for which we went to war. We should not do that in order to get along with a nation which is seeking to enslave half the people of Europe and a large portion of the people of Asia.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in agreement with the Senator that we should give up just as little as possible. I am always interested in what the distinguished Senator says. Let me say that I must hurry away in a moment; otherwise I would not be interrupting the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate that.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand the Senator now, he takes the position that difficulty in the definition of the term "aggression" and, even after it is defined, difficulty in its application are reasons for doing nothing about the situation.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; the Senator does not understand me. I am saying that the League of Nations was unable to define "aggression"; and before I agree to give the President or a delegate whom he may appoint the right to send a part of our Army to Europe to put down aggression, I wish to know what is meant by "aggression," and I wish to have the Congress of the United States say something about when our boys will be used to put down aggression and the kind of aggression it will be. I am one of those who believe that, instead of having less democracy in the world, we should have more democracy. In the world and in the United States today we should have less secrecy and more honesty and more statements as to what the actual conditions in the world are. That is what I am trying to do. I am attempting to bring out what the conditions are, not what propagandists are saying they are.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with that statement of the Senator. But let us consider for a moment the simple term "reasonable doubt," with which the Senator is so familiar, in the criminal law of this country. Our laws provide that no man shall be convicted unless a jury shall find him guilty beyond all reasonable doubt. The term is a simple one, but I imagine that in defining "reasonable doubt" and in its application in our criminal law there have been at least thousands of definitions as to what it means. However, I say that simply because there has been difficulty in defining and in applying the term, it still remains a very definite part of our criminal law. We have not abandoned it or thrown it out the window because it has been difficult to define and to apply; but we have kept it in our criminal law, and we continue to keep it there.

Mr. WHEELER. I have heard it defined. I do not know that I can give the correct definition offhand.

Mr. MURDOCK. I doubt whether the Senator could do so, and I doubt whether any lawyer in the Senate could define the term "reasonable doubt" and have all the other lawyers in the Senate stand up and applaud his definition.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, well, probably it would be impossible to get any two lawyers in the Senate to agree upon anything.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the very point I am making.

Mr. WHEELER. But that does not mean that the term cannot be defined and that it is not defined. As a matter of fact, "reasonable doubt" means such a doubt as would arise in the mind of an ordinary, reasonable man in the exercise of his ordinary, daily duties in the event that a certain particular situation should arise.

Mr. MURDOCK. I very readily agree with the Senator's definition of "reasonable doubt," but I would wager that when the empty seats in the Senate are filled up, when the lawyers return, 9 out of 10 of them would pick the Senator's definition to pieces.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that when our own Constitution was being written there was just as much pessimism, even in the minds of the men who were writing it, as to its endurance and its satisfactory application to the needs of the people as there is today in the minds of the statesmen of the world with reference to the United Nations Charter. But the pessimism and the conflict of opinion which surrounded the writing of the Constitution did not stop

it. Some of the men who participated in writing the Constitution said that they would be surprised if it lasted more than 40 years. More than 150 years have passed and we still have that Constitution. To my mind that is the greatest example in history of the fact that the United Nations Charter can be made to work, and I predict, not withstanding all the pessimism now associated with the subject, that it will work.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad the Senator is an optimist concerning the matter. But the situation which he has cited with reference to the Constitution does not seem to me to apply to the present situation. In this country, at the time of the writing of the Constitution nearly all the people spoke the same language and had the same common objectives. The situation was entirely different from that which exists now. Mr. President, while Senators may disagree on the floor of the Senate with reference to what is meant by the term "reasonable doubt," it seems to me that the courts have universally adopted a definition of the term. In substance, they use the definition which I have already given. When I was a prosecuting attorney and engaged in the prosecution of cases, I heard the definition given so many times that my recollection is fairly clear with reference to it.

We are now dealing with a different thing. We are dealing with the question of the interpretation of a term which may require sacrificing human beings and perhaps sending American boys to their death. When someone says to me that the American people are in favor of such a course, I say that the American people do not know what the situation in the world is today because so much diplomacy has been carried on behind closed doors and in secret sessions that the people have not been informed. What the American people have been receiving is propaganda which has emanated from New York City and a few other places in this country.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator's statement that the American people do not know what it is all about is a mistake. My experience with the American people is that they do know what it is about. They know so well what it is about that they have little difficulty in pointing out those who are in disagreement with the great majority of the American people.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator's interpretation of the public mind is quite different from mine.

Mr. MURDOCK. I so understand.

Mr. WHEELER. It is quite different when it comes to the particular issue which is now before the Senate. I distinctly remember what took place during and following the First World War. I remember what took place after the war when the people found out some of the things which they had not theretofore known. I also remember that our Secretary of State protested, that Mr. Bullitt protested, that Mr. Adolph Berle protested, and that nine members of the Peace Commission protested against the peace which had been written, saying that it had not been made public until recently, and that it meant another war. We now know that the war to which they referred has taken place.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I recall, President Wilson predicted in a speech delivered in Colorado or in St. Louis that if this country failed to carry out the pledge he had made to the American soldiers of the First World War, we would some day send millions of boys, instead of hundreds of thousands, to their death in order to redeem the pledge he had made before he went to Europe to participate in the writing of the peace. To me, what Mr. Wilson said was one of the most justified predictions ever made. His prediction came true. Now, following the Second World War, we find almost a unanimity in the United States Senate for doing the job which it refused to do following Mr. Wilson's prediction after the First World War.

Mr. WHEELER. I recall very clearly that protests were made to the President of the United States by Mr. Grew, by Mr. Berle, by Mr. Bullitt, and other members of the Peace Commission. They said that they were withdrawing from the Peace Commission because the powers that be at the peace conference had not carried out Mr. Wilson's 14 points and other promises he had made to the American people.

Is there anyone so naive as to say that because we did not become a member of the League of Nations Germany was permitted to go into the Rhine? Is there anyone so naive as to say that because we did not become a member of the League of Nations Hitler was permitted to gain power over Germany? Is there any Member of this body who does not know that it was England who wanted to permit Hitler to go into the Rhine, and that she controlled the League of Nations and could have prevented Hitler from doing what he did? Is there any Senator in this Chamber who does not know that it was the Krupps and other corporations in Germany, aided and abetted by international bankers, who helped put Hitler into power because they wanted to put down what they thought was too radical a democracy developing in Germany at that time?

Mr. MURDOCK. Even at the risk of being characterized as naive, I take the position that there would have been all the difference in the world in the functioning of the League of Nations if this great country had been a member of it. It was because of our failure to become a member of the League of Nations that I am anxious at this time to see my country, which took leadership in the war, retain and pursue its leadership in peace. It cannot do so by backing away at this time from the United Nations Organization.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, no one can say what would have happened had we become a member of the League of Nations. However, regardless of whether we were a member or not, I do not believe the Senator can cite a British statesman who will not admit that the mistake which England made was when she permitted the Germans to go into the Ruhr, permitted Hitler to become powerful in Germany, and permitted him to be financed by large international bankers and "big interests" of that country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That certainly is not equivalent to saying it would not have made any difference if we had been in it. I am assuming that if we had been in the League we would have had some influence, and we must assume that our influence would have been fairly intelligent. I mean, we cannot assume we would have been nitwits.

Mr. WHEELER. How much influence did we have at the Peace Conference? How much influence did we have at Yalta?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To which peace conference does the Senator refer?

Mr. WHEELER. How much influence have we had at any peace conference, wherever we have been? As the late humorist, Will Rogers, said, "We never lost a war and we never won a conference."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At the Peace Conference we certainly induced the other countries to join the League of Nations, from which we withdrew.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; but in order to get them into the League we had to go back on practically every promise Mr. Wilson had made.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not every promise.

Mr. WHEELER. Wait a moment; and he came back from Europe a broken man. He threatened to quit the Peace Conference on several occasions because of the treatment accorded him by Clemenceau and the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There were disagreements, there is no question.

Mr. WHEELER. Disagreements? They laughed at the President, as the Senator knows. I was a great admirer of Woodrow Wilson. As a matter of fact, I spoke in favor of the League of Nations and the World Court until I went to Europe in 1923, and saw what was taking place there—that the League of Nations was simply trying to maintain in status quo an economic situation which could not be maintained in Europe at that time. It was recognized everywhere except by some in two or three countries. It may be there was a possibility we could have changed it, but I am frank to say that I seriously doubt it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. Anyone who stands on the floor of the Senate and says our nonadherence was the reason why the League broke down, and was the reason why this war came on, it seems to me is deprecating the United States of America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not remember exactly what the Senator said, but he made a statement a moment ago regarding the similarity of tastes and of interests, and of course of language, among the Colonists. It seems to me the Senator overdid that a bit. There was great diversity as between Massachusetts, Vermont, Virginia, and Georgia, and even today there is as much diversity in many respects between the people of Maine and

those of New Orleans and Arkansas, and so on.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Except as to language, and even in that, I confess, there is a very great variation.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is entirely wrong.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why was it they were on the verge of fighting all during the period from 1781 to 1787? They were, if the Senator recalls.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not wish to be dragged into that, but there were in the Colonies people who spoke the same language, who came from the same mother country, and who had the same ideals of liberty. For instance, my people were Quakers, and left Europe because they wanted to get away from religious persecution. They had had their ears clipped and their noses cut because of their religious faith, so they came to this country many years ago and settled in Massachusetts because they wanted to get away from that. Others came to Virginia, and others to other places.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Dutch also came.

Mr. WHEELER. They came ostensibly, to a large extent, because they wanted to get away from the tyranny and religious persecutions of the old countries and to establish themselves in a new world. Certainly they had some economic differences. Even Benjamin Franklin, after the Constitution had been drafted, when asked by a lady, "What is it, a democracy or a monarchy?" said "It is a democracy, my lady, providing we can maintain it," or words to that effect.

Now we are dealing, not with people who speak the same language or have the same ideals, we are dealing with people who never knew what liberty was, who never knew what democracy was. They talk about it glibly, but they have not the slightest conception of what liberty is or what it was, because they have never known.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A great many have.

Mr. WHEELER. Where?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In England, in Belgium, in Holland, in France, in Denmark, in Norway, and Sweden.

Mr. WHEELER. How about India? How about China? How about Japan? How about Russia? How about the great bulk of the billions of people of the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I confess there are many such people; but even among them there is a nucleus of those who know what freedom means. We are not the only people who have enjoyed freedom.

Since the Senator is of Quaker stock, I wanted to remind him of William Penn's studies on the question of how to prevent wars. I think the Senator will find he says that there must be this rule of law in order to have peace in the first instance. I am sure the Senator is impressed by William Penn's views on that subject.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course. But we have gotten quite far afield, and I wish to return to what took place at the first peace conference of our peace-loving allies. I quoted Anne O'Hare McCormick, whom we all recognize as one of the outstanding international writers of this country. I now quote Barnet Nover, of the Washington Post. The Post is a great international journal, and Barnet Nover is a great international writer. I read from the Post of October 4:

> The inescapable and tragic fact is that the first peace conference to meet after World War II was a flat failure. It accomplished nothing it was assigned to do. It led to no agreements even with respect to the most innocuous matters. Its net result was not an increase but a sharp and possibly catastrophic decline in Big Five harmony upon which a world's future peace depends.

On October 5 Dorothy Thompson wrote:

> A first-class tragedy has taken place. The peace negotiations have broken down. There is no peace. We have been counting our chickens before they were hatched. The eggs that were to produce the great new age of peace are sterile. The situation is just as bad as it can be.

Mr. President, men rise, as I stated a moment ago, and talk glibly about peace-loving people, and democracy the world over, and about establishing the "four freedoms."

On October 8 the New York Times in its leading editorial said in part:

> The causes of the London disagreement and the issues which must be settled are not planning up. Russia's whole effort in London, as at San Francisco, was to confine all important decisions to the Big Three.
>
> The whole Russian diplomatic and propagandistic pressure is for unity among the Big Three to the subordination of everybody and everything else.

I am sure the Senator from Utah does not agree with that philosophy.

> That unity is predicated on a free hand for the Big Three in their respective spheres of influence, and a veto power which, in view of Anglo-American anxiety to get things done, gives Russia the greater power. All other disputes and maneuvers at London, including the deadlock over procedure, were merely part of the larger issue which overshadowed everything else. Russia made concessions to the views of others, or withdrew them, solely according to whether she thought they would serve or hamper her own purposes.

How can an intelligent public opinion be formed in the United States? How can anyone say that the American public is for this or for that, if they do not know what it is all about—what the terms of the agreements were at Yalta, what they were at Teheran, what they were at Potsdam, what they were in London?

Can anyone say there is an informed public opinion? As I stated a moment ago, in order to preserve democracy in this country, we must have an informed public opinion, and there must be intelligence along with it. No democracy, wherever it is established, can survive under conditions of secrecy.

Mr. President, on October 19, in an editorial entitled "Why All the Hush-Hush on Our Foreign Affairs," PM stated, concerning the secret diplomacy in which America had become involved:

> One of the most vicious hang-overs of the war is the outrageous secrecy that still surrounds much American public business, particularly in the conduct of our foreign affairs.
>
> It is a secrecy that has enabled many of our public officials to surround themselves with all sorts of safeguards against being forced out into the open where their acts can be judged alongside their professed intentions.
>
> And it is a secrecy that means that the American people are now facing a tremendously critical period of our national history with only the meagerest scraps of knowledge—some of it grossly distorted—on which to base their judgment of vital things ahead.

That was from PM—that great liberal paper published in New York—supporter of the pending proposal, supporter of the administration, ardent supporter of the late President Roosevelt.

Mr. President, many people criticize Secretary Byrnes. Many people are criticizing the President of the United States for things for which he is not at all responsible and for conditions which he inherited. The truth about the matter is that we are facing an almost insoluble situation.

On September 26 Sumner Welles wrote the following grim warning:

> The peoples of Europe confront the worst winter in their history. They face hunger, cold, and general unemployment. Widespread social and economic disorders are inevitable. If the European peoples now learn that the governments of the United Nations are unable to cooperate effectively in laying the foundations for a new and better order, the measure of the resulting upheaval staggers the imagination.
>
> This is the moment for responsible American leadership.
>
> We seem to be heading for a catastrophe. If it takes place, it will be our own shortsightedness and our own incapacity to play the cards which we have in our hands that will be largely responsible.

Mr. President, I cannot agree with Mr. Welles that the responsibility shall be upon the President of the United States. Mr. Welles makes it too simple. Everyone seems to want to blame the United States of America. I agree entirely that we did let the power we had slip through our hands when we had it. But that is not the fault of the present President of the United States. We cannot cooperate unless other nations are willing to cooperate. But we find too many Senators and others in this country saying: "It is all the fault of the United States"; and they place no blame upon Russia whatsoever.

On October 26 Dorothy Thompson wrote:

> We are governed everywhere by men who seem incapable of systematic thought, foresight, or imagination. They lead us from hand to mouth—from Yalta to San Francisco, to Potsdam, never giving any reasons for their acts, and never showing any sign of competence to foresee the chain of events logically likely to result from their momentous decisions, which are really snap judgments.

Dorothy Thompson is not an isolationist. As I said a while ago, she was a close friend and adviser of the late President, and at times supported his international policies.

On November 1 Walter Lippmann charged that—

> The men who have the chief responsibility for our foreign relations * * * must be aware of the mounting discouragement and dismay and of the need to search out the causes of what is now prospectively a gigantic historic failure.
>
> Let no one deceive himself, we are drifting toward a catastrophe.

I call attention to the fact that on November 18 the Catholic bishops of the United States challenged the leaders of the victorious nations with their courageous statement entitled "Between War and Peace," from which I quote:

The war is over but there is no peace in the world.

Since the Moscow Conference of 1943 the United States, Great Britain, and Russia have undertaken to shape gradually the peace which they are imposing on the nations. From the Conference to these victorious powers there is emerging slowly their pattern for the peace.

It is disappointing in the extreme. Assurances are given us in the announced peace principles of our country, but so far results do not square with these principles. We are in perhaps the greatest crisis of human history. * * *

Instead of honest promising discussion even on diverging plans we are witnessing a return of the tragedy of power politics and the danger of balance of power arrangements, which, with the substitution of mere expediency for justice, have begotten war after war.

And as recently as November 24, Mr. President, the executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, central organization for over 27,000,000 church members in 25 denominations, adopted a report saying:

Too easily we have condemned whole peoples because of their race and have hardened our hearts to inflict on them wholesale death and destruction (and) have come to tolerate, as aids to victory, qualities, and deeds which, when they appeared in nazi-ism, rightly revolted us.

The report urged application of these principles in the making of any peace treaties:

1. Territorial changes to conform to the natural long-term aspirations of the inhabitants and the subordination to human considerations of strategic and economic considerations.

Have we done that? Have we done that with respect to Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, Rumania, and Bulgaria? Have we done it with respect to any of the countries from the Baltic to the Agean?

2. Colonial peoples should be assured independence or self-government within a fixed term wherever practicable.

Are we doing that? Instead we are furnishing arms to kill off the people of Indonesia and in the neighboring islands.

3. Armaments and military establishments should be limited to the needs of internal order and of international order as planned by the United Nations.

I said a moment ago I favor the calling of a disarmament conference to do exactly that thing.

4. Reparations should be limited to productive capacity over and above that required to maintain average living standards. It should not be an instrument of vengeance.

5. The treaties of peace should make a beginning in realizing the conception of an international bill of rights.

On November 11 the Washington Post editorializing under the caption "A tragic letdown," lamented—

American prestige—

Listen to this, Senators. We talk about the great power we have.

American prestige in the world has never before reached such a peak as was attained at the close of the war * * * Now, less than 4 months after VJ-day, it must be acknowledged that our influence in the shaping of tomorrow is critically sagging.

In our opinion, every citizen ought to be asking himself with the utmost gravity, What is the reason for this tragic let-down? Why have we suddenly relinquished our vigor in pursuit of aims which only a few months ago were deemed worthy of the sacrifice of our sons?

Mr. President, this bitterness and despair, born of a sense of frustration and disillusionment that has been growing with increasing rapidity for many months attached even to the so-called noble recipe for peace, the United Nations Organization.

On October 18 a private conference of some 50 men and women, including Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, former Gov. Robert P. Bass, of New Hampshire, and such an ardent enthusiast for collective security as Granville Clark of New York, attacked the United Nations Organization as inadequate, calling for an organization stronger than that outlined in the San Francisco Charter. Why? Because they realize as most persons who have given any thought to the subject, especially those who are experts respecting the international situation, realize that the United Nations has already, or very nearly already blown up, to say the least, and they are seeking an alibi for themselves by saying that this organization is not strong enough, that it is necessary to have something different. They know what the situation is, but they want to place the blame upon the President of the United States and upon the Congress and others. The great internationalists who predicted all these things want now to place the blame upon the President of the United States, upon the Congress of the United States, upon the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and say, "Well, after all, if we had only gone far enough, if we had only done this, if we had only thought in terms of 'one world,' things would have been all right."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has made reference to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator favors the Charter, does he not?

Mr. WHEELER. I voted for the Charter.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand. But the Senator favors it, does he not? I did not ask whether the Senator voted for it. I want to know if the Senator does not in fact favor it.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I voted for it in the hope that it might work out favorably. I am very frank to say to the Senator that because of the attitude of our peace-loving allies in connection with the recent conference I do not believe it is possible for it to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that the organization has not yet been set up. Why should the Senator despair of something which has not yet been cranked up? We are trying to put a little oil and gas in the tank now, and the Senator is resisting that.

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume the Senator is.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree that we are putting oil or gas in the tank.

Mr. CONNALLY. We are trying to help the Senator, because he voted for it, and I thought he meant it.

Mr. WHEELER. I did mean it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let us go along now and do something for it. The preparatory commission to devise a plan for the convening of the assembly in January met in London yesterday. Before ever we get to the point of the first meeting, Senators who say they are for it begin to dash cold water on it and say that it is not worth anything, and so on and so on. Senators say it cannot succeed, that it is "done ruin't," that it is "done washed out." I cannot understand that sort of attitude at all.

Mr. WHEELER. I will be glad to tell the Senator what my position is. Let me say to the Senator that I was quoting such ardent——

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Senator quotes on the floor of the Senate he smiles and rubs the quotation along with the hair and I assume he is sponsoring the quotation and approving it.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; quite the contrary. I said distinctly that those quoted were saying that they felt that the organization will not work, and, because they were the leading internationalists of this country, I called attention to what they were saying.

Mr. CONNALLY. If they are saying it will not work they are not saying any more than the Senator from Montana says, because he says it will not work.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that he is not putting gas into the tank of the machine simply by saying that a preparatory commission has just met. Let me ask the Senator if, when the organization meets, it is going to carry out the "four freedoms"? Is it going to say to Russia, "You cannot take over Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland"? Is it going to say to Russia, "You cannot commit aggression in Iran. You cannot take over Manchukuo"? The Senator knows and I know that they have already taken over Latvia and Lithuania.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator want an answer?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I would not have asked the question if I did not wish an answer.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said that when the organization began functioning it was expected to stop aggressions in Bulgaria, Indonesia, and in other places. Let me say that when the organization meets and gets under way, it ought to proceed under the terms of the Charter. It ought to call upon all nations to live up to the obligations assumed by them. If I were a delegate, which I am not, and will not be, I should certainly insist that the security council and the assembly measure up to their obligations. But there is nothing in the

Charter which gives the United Nations Organization the power to revise the map of the world. There is no such authority in the Charter. I assume that the matters which the Senator from Montana is now discussing will be the subject of the peace treaty. We must have a peace treaty to settle boundaries and all the other issues. The security council and the assembly do not have widespread and plenary jurisdiction all over the world.

Under the terms of the Charter the power of the United Nations Organization is limited to the questions involved in the Charter. Primarily those questions involve aggression by one nation against another. When the Organization meets and begins to function, I hope that it will live up to its obligations. All we can do is to live up to ours, and express the hope and desire that other nations will live up to theirs. When we do that, we shall have fulfilled our duty to ourselves and our duty to the Organization and to the world.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that the thing which makes people skeptical of the United Nations Organization proving a success is the fact that before we entered the war certain promises were made to the effect that the peoples of the countries of Europe and other peoples in the world would be liberated. But, instead of liberating Estonia, Latvia, and Poland, they have been delivered into the hands of one of the greatest tyrannies in the world. I shall call attention later to the fact that that situation has been pointed out by correspondents and others who are experts in such matters. We have delivered those peoples into the hands of the greatest tyranny that has ever been imposed on any nation in the world.

Mr. President, how can we say that we are going to build a peace organization when we maintain the status quo of slavery for millions of people from the Adriatic to the Aegean, under tyrannical governments which have not only changed the boundaries but have changed their ideas of religion, of political economy, and religious philosophy and idealism?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question or two.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I remember very well the Senator's vote for the United Nations Charter.

Mr. WHEELER. I voted for the United Nations Charter.

Mr. TUNNELL. At that time, therefore, the Senator felt that it was better than nothing, or at least he hoped it might be better than nothing.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, the Senator's objection at this time is that he believes that the "four freedoms" will not be protected by force, and that Latvia, Estonia, and other nations will not be protected by force.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator spoke of their condition. What connection did that have with the question?

Mr. WHEELER. It had all the connection in the world. I never suggested that they should be protected by force, in any sense of the word. What I said was that we should never have agreed at any time to turn Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Rumania, and Bulgaria over to Russia. We promised those people liberation and democracy. We promised them the "four freedoms." We told our boys that that was what we were fighting for, and that that was why we were going to war. Now I say that we have no right to put our stamp of approval on turning those countries over to one of the most tyrannical governments that has ever existed. If the Senator wishes to put his stamp of approval on it, he has that right. But I will never, by my voice or my vote, approve placing hundreds of millions of people in slavery. We fought the Civil War to free the slaves, and now I will not vote or speak in behalf of placing hundreds of millions of white people in slavery.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator answer a question for me?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. TUNNELL. What would have been the Senator's course? Would he have been in favor of going to war with Russia?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not. We did not need to go to war with Russia.

Mr. TUNNELL. What would the Senator have done?

Mr. WHEELER. I would have said to Russia, at the Yalta Conference, "You cannot do it, and we will not put our stamp of approval on it." I knew that that question would arise. I knew I would be asked, "Do you want to go to war with Russia?" If we had stood up to Russia, in my judgment she would never have done what she has done. At that particular time Russia needed us far more than we needed her. In my judgment, all we needed to say to Russia was, "You cannot do it," and Russia would not have had the nerve to do it. Our military authorities tell us, as some of them told me in Europe, that conditions in Russia were such that she could never have stood up if we had said "No." But we have appeased Russia, and turned everything over to her. We have allowed her to take over any countries she desired to take over.

Mr. TUNNELL. Suppose Russia had had the nerve to proceed against our wishes. What would the Senator have done?

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly would not have put my stamp of approval on such action.

Mr. TUNNELL. Would that have saved Latvia?

Mr. WHEELER. I think it would have. I may be mistaken.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator thinks it would have saved Latvia if we had not approved the action of Russia.

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly do, because Russia agreed to the Atlantic Charter. Russia put her stamp of approval on the "four freedoms." Now our great peace-loving ally is violating the Atlantic Charter, and we are standing by and saying to Russia, "Go ahead and do the very thing that we went to war to prevent Hitler from doing."

Mr. TUNNELL. We stand by. I am trying to find out what we should have done.

Mr. WHEELER. I have told the Senator plainly. If I have not made my position clear, I am unable to explain it in the English language.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not think the Senator has made his position clear.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry. It is probably my fault.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may pursue that question a little further?

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says he would have favored telling Russia, "No; you cannot do it." Suppose Russia had said, "We are going to do it anyway." What would the Senator have done?

Mr. WHEELER. I would simply have said, "You are not going to do it with our approval."

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose Russia had said, "Those countries belonged to us before World War I. You took them away from us, and we have now liberated them. We have freed them from German control, and we are going to take them back." What would the Senator have said?

Mr. WHEELER. I would have said, "You freed them from German control and put them under a tyranny which is just as bad as any that has ever existed in the history of the world."

Mr. CONNALLY. My question was, What would the Senator have done if Russia had said, "We are going to take them anyway"? What would the Senator have done? Would he be willing to fight? I would never use fighting words unless I were willing to fight. That is the only kind of talk that counts.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate the fact that the Senator feels that that is the only kind of talk that is effective.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not believe in the Senator's doctrine of saying, "Do not do that. If you do it, we will not like it." I do not believe that that kind of talk would get very far.

Mr. WHEELER. We told the world that we were going to give freedom to the peoples of the world, and then we liberated certain peoples from one tyrant and delivered them into the hands of another. We say, "We are not going to do anything about it. We must put our stamp of approval on it. We must appease Russia in order to have peace in the world."

Mr. CONNALLY. I deny the assumptions of the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. I knew the Senator would.

Mr. CONNALLY. I deny the assumption that we went to war to free Latvia and Estonia, if that is what the Senator is talking about.

Mr. WHEELER. The facts speak for themselves.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator may have voted to do so, but I did not.

Mr. WHEELER. The facts speak for themselves as to what we said were our principles in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." I am sure that every Member of the Senate remembers our declarations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have complete sympathy with what the Senator says about the violation of the Atlantic Charter. So far as I am concerned, I put no stamp of approval upon what has happened in Poland, Latvia, Estonia, or Lithuania. But what puzzles me in respect to the pending issue—and with great respect and sincerity, I ask the Senator to enlighten me—is what has happened since July 28, when the Senator voted for the United Nations Charter, and the present time in respect to Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Poland which would change the Senator's viewpoint toward the Charter?

Mr. WHEELER. I said I voted for the Charter, and at that time I said I was voting for it although I was extremely doubtful whether it would work. I am still hopeful that the Charter will work. I am still hopeful that Russia will see the light, because I think it is not only to Russia's interest but to the interest of all the people of the world that she do so. I think we should take a positive stand. I think we should have stated to her definitely, when we had the power and when she was in desperation, "You cannot take it." Then she would not have dared take it. That was the time to get an agreement.

I am still hopeful; but what I am now trying to point out is that when we are talking about giving the President the power to use a police force, we should consider what we are doing. Are we going to say that American boys will be used in those countries in order to help them free themselves? If Poland wants to free herself from Russia, what are we going to do? Will help to Poland in such a situation be considered aggression? If another country wishes to help Poland free herself, will that be considered aggression, and will our boys be sent over there to fight? If we say it is aggression, then of course, our Army will be used against it and we shall be in a war again. Suppose England says she wishes to help Poland free as many of the Polish statesmen as possible, in view of the fact that she, England, was in duty bound obligated to go to war to defend Poland and to help her have freedom and liberty. What shall we do then?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In dealing with the rights of the smaller countries—rights which I agree with the Senator have not been even remotely adequately recognized in the temporary peace settlements up to date—I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that at San Francisco the delegation of the United States was insistently responsible for writing article 14 into the Charter. With the Senator's permission I shall read it:

> Subject to the provisions of article 12—

That is a pure technicality—

> the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

In those purposes and principles of the United Nations are identified the precise rights of which the Senator has been speaking, and which I agree deserve recognition. That is not any automatic assurance of correction or of improvement in the situation; but I respectfully submit to the Senator that therein is the only organized invitation to hope for a correction of these situations that I see in this troubled world today. So I would expect the able Senator from Montana to be tremendously sympathetic with the purposes, at least, which inspired article 14, and it would seem to me that if there is any hope for Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, and some of the other powers to which the Senator has referred, it probably lies in the ultimate correction which can be achieved through a meeting of minds in the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization. That may be a very tenuous reliance; nevertheless, I respectfully submit that it is infinitely preferable to no reliance at all, and I doubt whether justice can be achieved in any other way, under the circumstances which we confront.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am moved again to ask the Senator what has happened since July 28, when the able Senator, I am happy to say, voted with the rest of us for confirmation of the Charter. I am unable to understand what has happened since that date in respect to these small countries which was not definitely and specifically in contemplation at that time. So I have asked what has happened in the interim to change the Senator's point of view.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I am sure he has misunderstood my statements. I voted for the Charter because I hoped that, under article 14, the small nations would have an opportunity to regain their freedom and their liberty. I admit that it was an extremely faint hope, but I voted for the Charter with that faint hope.

I have not said today that I was opposed to the Charter. What I said was that the very people who were the loudest in shouting for world organization are already beginning to say that it is a failure and that it is not going to do any good, and they are advocating something else because they believe the Charter is not going to work out, and they are seeking an alibi for themselves, since they think it will not work out.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to complete my question?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I yield again to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator is quoting those who are complaining about the Charter because it does not go far enough in the face of developments, I entirely agree that, so far as I am concerned, the obvious necessity is to ratify and implement the thing we already have, and proceed with it and put it in motion, before we undertake to discuss something else. I certainly am not one of those who, having "shouted for the Charter," to quote the Senator—and I did, and I continue to do so—are now deserting the original thesis. I am not deserting the thesis which we presented in the first instance.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I had no illusions then; I have none now. But I know of no hope on earth except to implement this document and to try to see what can be done under it. Therefore, I am not in the classification to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no. At the time I mentioned them, I used their names and I called attention to them. The Senator from Michigan was not in the Chamber when I did that.

But, Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator whether he does not agree that, in view of all the power we had when the war in Europe was at its crisis, we should then have obtained an agreement about these matters. After all, we were the great power in the world. Everyone agrees that if it had not been for American men, American guns, American tanks, and American planes, Russia would have gone down and the world would have gone down. Let us not forget that. Our generals and everyone else who was familiar with the situation will verify that statement. Yet, when we had that power, we gave over a large part of Poland and we gave up Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

When I told a very prominent statesman in this country, a year ago last May, that Russia was going to demand all of the Baltics, all the Balkans, a large part of Poland, the Dardanelles, and probably a sphere of influence over Norway and Sweden, he said he did not think Stalin wanted to take over Europe. When I told another prominent statesman the same thing, last April, he said I was wrong. Of course, it seemed to me that anyone who had watched the maneuvers of Russia and was at all familiar with the situation could not help but admit the truth of my statement. One gentleman to whom I talked said he wanted Russia to have friendly nations around her. I said I, too, wanted her to have friendly nations around her. But, Mr. President, as I said then, it is one thing for a country to have friendly nations around her, and it is another thing for her to take them over, to kill off all her opponents, to change their philosophy of life and their religious and the political concepts, and to put them under an absolute tyranny. I say that I cannot do otherwise than condemn that, and I say we are going backward when we permit it to be done, in view of the promises we made to the men in our Army and Navy and to the people of the United States and the people of the world.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a further comment—and then I shall be through.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator cannot condemn any more strongly than I will the failure of the United States Government at least to assert its objec-

tions to some of the things which happened in direct derogation of the warrants of the Atlantic Charter. I agree completely as to that. But I fail to understand why, in the presence of a record which we cannot overtake, it is not all the more essential and all the more desirable that we should as speedily as possible launch what to my mind is the only possible adventure in collective security which offers the remotest hope either for security or for the ultimate attainment of justice by peaceful means.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not disputing the Senator. I merely wish to say that without the approval of the Congress I am opposed to giving power to any President of the United States to send a police force into some other part of the world. If we should send a police force against a strong power it might mean war. If, today, there was a definition of aggression, according to which we would be compelled to stop aggression if it existed anywhere, we would be at war with Russia tomorrow. Russia has defined what is meant by aggression. She defines it in one way, and others have defined it in other ways.

Mr. President, on September 7, Sumner Welles wrote:

> Public opinion is disheartened and perplexed by the mounting cloud of suspicion and of antagonism between the United States and the Soviet Union. Increasing civil strife throughout the world, the ominous signs that millions of people in Europe may starve or freeze this winter, and the utter failure of the major powers as yet to show that they can agree upon even one of the foundations needed before world reconstruction can be commenced, are rapidly undermining popular faith in the United Nations Organization as a means of obtaining physical and economic security.

The words which I have read are not my words; they are the words of Sumner Welles.

On November 10, even such a passionate advocate of superstatism as my colleague the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] attacked the United Nations Charter as "pitifully inadequate," and called for a new international conference to strengthen it into a superstate. My colleague went so far as to say:

> Perhaps an invitation to Russia's leaders and scientists to observe a demonstration of the atomic bomb dropped in Siberia might help, and, as a last resort there is always the possibility of organizing the rest of the world and leaving Russia in self-imposed isolation.

On the same day the Washington Post and other papers revealed that former Gov. Harold E. Stassen, finding the present United Nations Charter—which he himself helped to create and to which he gave his official blessing—pitifully inadequate, urged steps to outlaw the atomic bomb by the creation of an international air police force empowered to use the atomic bomb to force its outlawry. The tragic contradiction of any thesis that seeks to outlaw the atomic bomb by perpetuating its use—particularly in our kind of a world—is nowhere better described than in Stassen's description of the nature of the peace resulting from this war which he asserted must be atomically controlled by the "peace-loving victors."

Incidentally, Mr. Stassen is the white hope of the internationalists for President of the United States in 1948. Speaking of the war, he said:

> It ended, and left in its wake a billion of the men and women and little children of the world hungry and short of food. It ended, and left a quarter billion of the people of the world without shelter; it ended, and left a half billion of the earth's inhabitants, including many on each hemisphere, seething in the ferment of political and social unrest. It ended, and left fifty millions of mankind wounded or ill, or long, dreary distances from home, at strange locations to which they had been swept by the flood tides of the conflict. It ended, and left little white crosses, row on row, around the globe, as signposts of the youth, virility, and manhood that was no more and as symbols of the sorrows in the hearts of their loved ones.
>
> It ended, as the United Nations were preparing to put into effect their charter for peace. It ended, and left the production and distribution systems in great areas of the world disrupted and destroyed.

Does not that sound like a speech by one of the so-called isolationists before Pearl Harbor? It is exactly what I warned would happen to the world if we followed the policy advocated by Governor Stassen and others who were shouting and agitating for war before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. President, there is a third reason—the most important reason of all—why I am so adamantly opposed to this legislation. Instead of providing for genuine world cooperation it will irrevocably commit America to the continuance of the foregoing policies, the consequences of which are now being so bitterly attacked by our interventionists.

Mr. President, we are urged to take this action in the name of world cooperation, compromise, and a promise to "enforce the peace." Enforce the peace against whom? Certainly not Germany and Japan—they are destroyed. The only aggressors today are our beloved and noble peace-loving allies. We are further urged to this action by a hounding propaganda to the effect that we owe this action to the world, and that we owe a tremendous indebtedness to our allies, and that the inescapable and unalterable claims of the world upon our moral leadership can only thus be faithfully discharged.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has referred to suggestions which have been made by Senators with regard to strengthening the Charter. I do not see that those suggestions are inconsistent with their approval of the Charter. I am reminded that at the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States Mr. Jefferson, who, I believe, was in favor of it, thought that we should first have the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. I think that at the present time we are in a similar position. The Charter, as such, is a perfectly proper machine to start with. At the time the Charter was written I do not believe that anyone, even its most avid supporters, contemplated that it was the last word. Certain very important events have since transpired, which it seems to me afford some reason for saying, in effect, "It would be better if we could make certain changes in the Charter, such as giving it a little greater power with regard to making rules of conduct in certain fields." I do not think such an attitude is inconsistent with support of the Charter.

Mr. WHEELER. When it is said that the Charter is entirely inadequate, it is realized by many that since the San Francisco Conference certain things have happened in different parts of the world. Because of the actions of Russia many persons have become discouraged and feel that the Charter will not work. They are disappointed with Russia's attitude. There is no question about it. Almost every internationalist, almost every newspaper in this country and almost every columnist who is an internationalist, has said that the Charter will break down.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly everyone is disturbed, but that seems to me to be all the more reason why we need the Charter and should not throw it out the window.

Mr. WHEELER. The editor of a very prominent newspaper in the Middle West came to Washington. He told me that he had heard I was opposed to the veto. I said, "That is right." He said, "I understand you are also opposed to giving the President the power to project us into war." That was as he expressed it. I said, "That is right." He said, "Well, Senator, if you do not agree to that and we do not agree to it, Russia will never go into this thing." I said to him, "Russia will never agree to the veto power." Russia did not agree and would not agree. I have been told—my information may be incorrect—that England would not agree to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Senator mean by "agree to it"? Does he mean that the veto power should be removed?

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry; I meant the reverse.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I should like to ask the Senator how he expects any revision of treaties, or any change in the present status of the so-called "four freedoms," so long as we have power in the Council? The Assembly can debate those questions and can make recommendations to the Council, but any of the Big Five countries on the Council which is criticized for doing the things about which there may be complaint has the right of veto. Only the Big Five are now in possession of power, and are writing treaties and taking territory. I understand that at the time of the originally Connally resolution with reference to the agreement of Moscow, it was said that we would have an organization to enforce the treaty of peace. That treaty has not yet been entered into. I said at the time that to establish an organization to enforce a treaty before we knew what the treaty was to be was like signing a blank check.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am not surprised that the Senator is disillusioned. I think he has as much reason for being disillusioned as has Associate Justice Roberts, or some of the distinguished

Members of the Senate who have confessed that they have been disillusioned. I do not see why the Senator from Montana should be questioned for admitting that.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not a prophet, nor am I the son of a prophet, but I am willing to predict that many other people will be disillusioned before many months pass, when they see what is taking place and what the future is going to hold as the result of the actions of our peace-loving allies.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield just once more?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under the Senator's last statement I may become one of those within the next few months who will be disillusioned.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator will be.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But I shall at least have the consolation of knowing——

Mr. WHEELER. That you tried.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That with good faith and with good will and complete cooperation in respect to international security, I have made the supreme effort by collective security to prevent war.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree. That, frankly, was one of the reasons why I voted for the Charter. I felt at the time, and then stated, that I did not think it would work, but that I would vote for it because I did not want the United States to be put in such a position that it could be said, "It is the United States again that is responsible for the break-down of world peace." I want to see what our dearly beloved peace-loving allies are going to do about it. I want to see if Russia will disarm. I want to see if they will give the "four freedoms" to any of the people they take over. I want to see if they will stop aggression.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator one final question?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I to understand from the Senator's observation that the events since July 28, when he voted for the Charter, have been such that if he were voting on the original question today he would vote "No" instead of "Yes"?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know that I would, but I say frankly that I have become extremely discouraged and pessimistic because of the attitude Russia has taken in Manchukuo and China and other places. I cannot conceive how anyone who looks on the true picture that faces the world today can feel otherwise.

As I have said, I have not quoted from any isolationist newspaper, I have not quoted from one single isolationist newspaper or so-called isolationist authority. I have quoted entirely from internationalist and interventionist authorities. If some do not like to hear the voices of their masters, I am sorry.

Mr. President, we are urged to take this action in the name of world cooperation, compromise, and a promise to enforce the peace. Enforce the peace against whom? Certainly not Germany and Japan—they are destroyed. The only aggressors today are our beloved and noble peace-loving allies, both of which are still at war. We are further urged to this action by a hounding propaganda to the effect that we owe this action to the world and that we owe a tremendous indebtedness to our allies, and that the inescapable and unalterable claims of the world upon our moral leadership can thus only be faithfully discharged. Where is our moral leadership today? Where has it been since Yalta or since we entered the war?

Mr. President, I want to be fair to both sides. I want the facts on both sides. I want nothing covered up. I want no one-sided victory by any means, fair or foul.

Indeed, Mr. President, the American people must cooperate and are determined to cooperate with the family of nations. But must we continue to be compelled to cooperate blindly? Must we continue to give up every principle for which we told our boys we were fighting? Must we continue to give up our substance to one of our allies whose price for cooperation is to let her do in Europe, Asia, and Africa whatever she chooses to do?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator believe that we fought for survival?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly not.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator take the position that America was in no danger at any time?

Mr. WHEELER. I did not catch the question.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator take the position that this country was in no danger at any time?

Mr. WHEELER. We were never in any danger until we were attacked.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator believe that that attack was inevitable?

Mr. WHEELER. No, I do not.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator thinks it could have been avoided?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course I do. I have said so repeatedly. I think it could have been. I do not claim to be infallible. My own conviction was then, and my conviction is now that the policies we pursued led us down the road to war. I stated on the floor of the Senate that when we voted for lend-lease we were voting for war. Every other Senator on this side said we were voting for peace, but Herbert Agar, one of the leaders in the fight and a leading propagandist for lend-lease, made a speech at Boston University, and, as recorded in his speech, he said:

> Unfortunately, people who are on our side lied, and the only man who told the truth was our opponent, Senator WHEELER, because he said that when we voted for lend-lease we were voting for war.

And we were voting for war when we voted for lend-lease.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the fact that the atomic bomb has arrived on the scene and the fact that the German scientists were proceeding under direct orders from Hitler, and making all speed in trying to perfect it before we did, in any way change the Senator's mind as to his intention to accomplish world control, including ourselves?

Mr. WHEELER. I have said on the floor of the Senate—and the Senator would have heard if he had been here—that so far as I was concerned, I was in favor of calling a disarmament conference tomorrow, and having every nation agree to disarm.

Mr. McMAHON. That was not quite my question.

Mr. WHEELER. I misunderstood it, then.

Mr. McMAHON. I asked the distinguished Senator if, in view of the facts we now know, namely, that Germany, under Hitler's orders, was hurrying, with all possible speed, toward the invention of the atomic bomb, he did not believe Hitler was intending to use it against the one last democracy that survived?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator does not believe that?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course I do not, and I know of very few people in the United States who believe it.

Mr. McMAHON. I beg to disagree with the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. I expect the Senator to.

Mr. McMAHON. Whether the Senator expects it or not, it is so, and if the people of the United States were to vote on the question, I would take my chances that they would vote that Hitler intended to dominate us.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator has a right to his opinion and I have a right to mine. He is only philosophizing, it is merely a guess, and he does not know any more about it than I do.

Mr. McMAHON. Except that I can use the evidence of my senses, and I watched Hitler roll over Europe and go as far as he could, and try to trick the Japanese into attacking us, and I watched the philosophy he was attempting to make supreme.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate that the Senator has much more sense than I have, and I will not argue that with him.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not accept the Senator's compliment at all.

Mr. WHEELER. Whether the Senator accepts it or not, it is there for him.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator made the statement that he was in favor of a disarmament conference being called sometime in the near future.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wondered if the Senator referred to disarming from a purely military standpoint, as it would affect the Army, the Navy, ships, and the like. What is his idea of world scientific disarmament? How are we practically to accomplish it?

Mr. WHEELER. There would be only one way, I assume.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is, free knowledge of what is going on in the world?

Mr. WHEELER. A free check-up on what is going on.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator would throw that in along with the others?

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly would.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am somewhat inclined to agree with the Senator that probably what is armament today and was armament last week may not be considered armament next week.

Mr. WHEELER. I entirely agree with the Senator. I think when we are talking about large armies and navies today, to a great extent they may become entirely obsolete, because the next war, as I envision it, will be almost entirely a scientific war, and the outcome will depend to a large extent upon which country develops the scientific weapons the quickest. For that reason I am wholeheartedly in favor of the Government of the United States setting up in this country a laboratory, and spending money on it for the purpose of developing the latest scientific methods along the lines of furnishing protection for the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senator will support the legislation I have proposed.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not know the Senator had introduced a measure, but I certainly shall give its support serious consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has several times on the floor of the Senate mentioned specific reasons why he objects to the passage of this implementing legislation. I am asking the distinguished Senator now if he expects to deal further with the question of delegating additional congressional authority to the President. I am very much interested in that phase of the implementing legislation.

I voted for the United Nations Charter, but I certainly felt that when the implementing legislation came along we would have open discussion and debate respecting the delegation of congressional authority to the President of the United States which might involve us in war. Because of the fact that I respect the legal ability of the distinguished Senator from Montana, I should like to have him discuss, if he cares to do so in connection with the pending bill, what legislative authority Congress by the bill is delegating to the President, if in fact it is doing so, and whether or not if there is a delegation of legislative authority it will mean a commitment to the Security Council and might involve us in war without a vote by Congress.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I shall not touch upon that specific point this afternoon. I expect to do so later.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the American people must cooperate and are determined to cooperate with the family of nations. But must we continue to be compelled to cooperate blindly? Must we continue to give up every principle for which we told our boys we were fighting? Must we continue to give up our substance to one of our allies whose price for cooperation is to let her do in Europe, Asia, and Africa whatever she chooses to do? Must we continue down the present road to catastrophe that we have been following merely because the road signs of propaganda that have been wedged in between the cobblestones over which we walk read "This is the only road to world cooperation"?

Mr. President, the truth is, that for the second time in one generation America has been called to pull the chestnuts of an ancient rivalry out of the holocaust of war. Now we are faced with a rivalry between British and Russian imperialism that has its roots deep in the distant past. And for the second time in one generation not one of our allies has wanted any traffic with American principles, ideals, or moral values, either for themselves or for the miserable people who by our stupidity have been herded under their hegemony.

Mr. President, we are asked to cooperate with the world. No more distorted or misleading propaganda is conceivable. This bitter rivalry between Great Britain and Russia has torn the world in two. This rivalry has destroyed all semblance of the old balances of power and leaves the small nations of the world cringing as puppets, satellites, and slaves under the towering shadow of the two mightiest political, economic, ideological, and military powers the world has ever seen.

Mr. President, are the memories of American statesmen so short they cannot remember another time in their generation when America joined three other victorious nations in carving up the world to suit themselves? Have our statesmen forgotten so soon that a cordon sanitaire from the Baltic to the Balkans was carved out of eastern Europe without either the advice or consent of Russia?

On the 1st of July, 1921, the Russian Ambassador, Bakhmeteff, sent a note to our Assistant Secretary of State, Dearing, which contained the following threat:

> The Russians maintain that Russia's rights should be kept in trust by the community of nations and that final settlements should be deferred until a time when decisions can be made with Russia's participation and consent. * * * As a matter of fact, should the status of the small states be established at this time on the basis of unreserved recognition such a solution would possess only a semblance of permanency and would last only while Russia remained inarticulate.

Russia is today, to say the least, not inarticulate as the Members of this body well know, nor are her followers in England, the United States, and all over the world inarticulate. They are the only ones who have their secret agents in every country of the world carrying out their ideas.

Mr. President, have our statesmen completely forgotten not only what Russia thought of the Versailles Treaty but also her bitterness toward the League of Nations which was described in a note sent to the General Secretary of the League of Nations by the Peoples Commissariat of Foreign Affairs on March 15, 1923:

> It regards it as a coalition of certain states endeavoring to usurp the power over other states and masking their attempt on the rights and independence of other nations in a false appearance of groundless legality and in the form of the mandates issued by the Council or Assembly of the League of Nations. The Soviet Government maintains its conviction that this pseudointernational body really serves as a policy of certain great powers or their vassals. The Soviet Government finds confirmation for its conviction every time that a state assuming the leading role in the League of Nations makes a decision on international questions, touching the interest of the Soviet Republic.

That is exactly what they are contending and what they are insisting today.

Mr. President, have our statesmen completely forgotten that the Russians as well as the Germans are ancient students and past masters of the arts of "realpolitik?" Certainly the historical record clearly reveals that up to this very moment Russia has backed and filled, hemmed and hawed, intrigued and threatened, and imposed her will and her way of life where any man or nation has been unable to prevent this sorry sequence of events by force. Russia has let nothing stand in her way where the consolidation or extension of purely Russian interests was at stake. Russia has not changed her practices or policies. She has only, at times, for the sake of expediency, changed her pace. For the illumination of those who now have the effrontery to insist that America's only hope of salvation lies in a world cooperation along the lines of a world union, the success of which is entirely dependent on Russia's keeping of her word, I want to ask my colleagues if they know of any major treaty she has not broken since she joined the League of Nations?

Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a list, as compiled from authoritative sources, of treaties which Russia has broken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

The Soviet-Finnish Nonaggression Treaty, January 21, 1932.

The Latvian Nonaggression Treaty, February 5, 1932.

The Soviet-Estonian Nonaggression Treaty, May 4, 1932.

The Polish-Soviet Nonaggression Pact, July 25, 1932.

The Protocol of May 5, 1934, extending the validity of the above pact to December 1945.

The Protocol for the Definition of Aggression, signed between Soviet Russia, Poland, Rumania, Estonia, Latvia, Afghanistan, Persia, and Turkey, July 3, 1933.

The Treaty of Good Will between the Soviet Union and the three Baltic Republics, September 12, 1934.

The Pact of Mutual Assistance with Estonia, September 28, 1939, valid for 10 years.

The Pact of Mutual Assistance with Latvia, October 5, 1939, valid for 10 years.

The Pact of Mutual Assistance with Lithuania, October 10, 1939, valid for 15 years.

The Atlantic Charter, signed on September 24, 1941.

The United Nations Declaration, January 1, 1942.

The Treaty of Alliance between the United Kingdom, Russia, and Iran of January 29, 1942.

The Treaty of Mutual Assistance between Great Britain and the Soviet Union, May 26, 1942.

The Agreement of Mutual Aid between the United States and U. S. S. R., June 11, 1942.

The Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943.

Mr. WHEELER. To these should be added the treaty of August 26, 1945, with China. I understand the Chinese nationalists are now charging the Russians with having violated it.

Mr. President, Hitler could never have attacked the west except Russia had agreed to stab Poland in the back and protect Germany from the rear. And from the moment Hitler turned on Stalin Russia has continued to play a lone hand in world affairs. The American people have not yet the slightest appreciation of how Russia has threatened and coerced both Great Britain and the United States into serving her interests. Yet the single political economic and military line Russia has followed can be clearly traced from the time Harry Hopkins went to Moscow in July 1941 down through the turn of the tide of battle, the Moscow Conference, Tehran, the second front, Yalta, the San Francisco Conference, Potsdam, and London.

The truth is, America, in cooperating with Russia, has been cooperating on Russia's terms with Russia's interests. From the moment we poured the master lend-lease proposal into Stalin's lap he has called the tune by which the people of every nation around the world have danced to Russian music.

Mr. President, that music has now swelled to a shrieking, anguished chorus of despair in the ears of hundreds of millions of miserable and helpless people, and it is at this moment in history that America can render either a great service or a disservice to the world. No one wants war with Russia, but we cannot and must not put our stamp of approval upon every violation of the pledges made to the people of the world by America, England, and Russia herself. We must not put our stamp of approval upon human slavery of the white races after fighting a war to free the black races.

Strange as it may seem, the great threat and crisis confronting the world and western civilization itself is not yet the bogey of communism. The issue is power—sheer, naked, and unadulterated power.

By way of illustration, Mr. President, the New York Times of November 18 carries the story of the seized areas which have been annexed and which are forcibly to be compelled to vote in the general election of the Soviet Union on February 10, 1946. These districts include portions of East Prussia, taken from Germany; the Kuriles and southern Sakhalin Island, taken from Japan; the former independent Baltic states now forcibly become Soviet republics, namely, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania; Moldavia, taken from Rumania; Karelia, annexed from Finland; large districts of the Ukraine and White Russia, formerly eastern Poland; and the Carpatho-Ukraine, which was part of Czechoslovakia; all of which Pravda said will be conducted under the most democratic election system in the world. Is there any Member of this body who believes there will be democratic elections in those countries?

It is only in these helpless little territories that have been deliberately annexed by Russia that our great and noble associate has been able to use her power to impose her way of life on the tragic peoples involved.

However, in the areas now occupied by Russia, which have not yet been subjected to outright annexation and communization, Russia's primary concern is for sufficient naked and unchallengeable power with which to impose her will and her way of life. Finland, Poland, over half of Germany, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, and half of Austria are at this moment within the orbit of Russia's domination, along with Outer Mongolia, the northern provinces of China, Manchuria, and half of Korea.

The threat of complete communization in these areas is compelled to wait on Russia's absorption of the necessary power with which to impose it, and any man who believes that when the time comes Russia will not exercise that power to impose her will and her way of life is indulging in the sheerest fantasy.

The only reason why, to this moment, Russia has had a free hand to liquidate all potential opposition, both among organized patriotic resistance groups, and among the disorganized helplessly miserable masses, is because we have been willing not only to shield her and keep the facts from the American people but also because, by our abject appeasement for the sake of a specious unity, we have deliberately played her game for her.

What about our British friends? Mr. President, was it not Mr. Churchill himself who blandly informed the world, after he had helped successfully to stage America's participation in the war, that he had not become Prime Minister of His Majesty's Government in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire? But Mr. Churchill, who throughout his life has been one of communism's bitterest antagonists, was confronted, from the moment Russia was attacked, with the deadliest threat to the British Empire in history. The whole course of this war now conclusively proves that when the tide of battle turned Russia and Britain subordinated what had been a primary objective, namely, the defeat of Hitler, and the defeat of Japan, to a bitter rivalry between themselves in a vicious struggle to consolidate and extend their respective spheres of influence in Europe and Asia.

If there is the slightest doubt in the mind of anyone as to what the British really think about this situation, and whether the British are going to surrender their interests to a world that has gotten out of control, the following excerpts might serve to dispel such illusions. On September 18 the British Labor Party's official paper, the Daily Herald, had the following to say in an editorial entitled "1919 and Worse":

Are we reproducing the blunders of the last peace and courting the same consequences? It is a fair question. Indeed, too fair. For the Daily Herald believes that the blunders of the last peace are being exceeded and that the consequences of error, if erroneous methods persist, will be infinitely more terrible.

Read that and then reread the excerpts from the protests of resigning members of the Peace Commission after the last war.

This is what Winston Churchill had to say in the House of Commons of the lamentable European situation:

Almost everywhere in the mountainous, turbulent, ill-organized, war-line Balkans, Communist forces have obtained or are in the process of obtaining dictatorial powers. That does not mean that communism has been established everywhere nor that it will be established. In those countries, torn by war, there must be for some months an authoritarian government. The alternative would be anarchy, and it would be unreasonable to ask or expect that liberal British or American democratic conditions should be instituted immediately.

Nevertheless, we must know where we stand, and we must make clear where we stand.

Democracy is on trial as it never was before, and we must uphold it with all our hearts and all our vigilance and with our untiring and inexhaustible strength. In our foreign policy let us strike a continuous note of freedom and fair play.

In the October issue of the Nineteenth Century and After, Mr. F. A. Voigt, one of England's most brilliant authorities on British foreign policy, hurls the following grim warning at the world:

The "European problem," which is the greatest problem of our day, is inseparable from the problem of British security. It was believed in 1914, and again in 1939, that if the German problem were solved the European problem would be solved. The reverse is true—the German problem can only be solved within the European problem.

Germany must be kept weak for a long time, but she cannot be kept weak forever. If Europe is strong, and if England is strong, then it does not matter if Germany is strong—as long as she is strong as an integral part of Europe. Europe must be built upon weak Germany. If this is not done, then Germany, however weak, will not be a center but a fulcrum—and whoever is at the fulcrum wields great power even if he is weak.

The states of eastern Europe were created or reestablished in 1918, not as a cordon sanitaire against Germany. The mistake made in the later twenties and early thirties was to underrate the German danger, and to overrate the ultimate importance of Germany, to underrate the importance of the countries between the Arctic and the Aegean, and to overrate the danger of occasional friction between them. After the Treaty of Riga in 1921, the peace of Europe was never menaced by one of these countries.

The Second World War could have been averted on three conditions only—that Great Britain and France be strong, that the countries of eastern Europe be strong, collectively, that Germany be weak, relatively. All these conditions were capable of fulfillment through a sound foreign policy.

Not one of them was fulfilled. But they persist and must be fulfilled. To fulfill them will again require a sound foreign policy—an armed strength, without which there can be no foreign policy. Armed strength England has today, and must maintain it. Perhaps Mr. Bevin's words in the House of Commons allow the hope that she has a sound foreign policy at least.

And what did Mr. Bevin have to say? Mr. Bevin warned Russia that England has yielded to every one of Russia's ter-

ritorial demands up to the London Conference, and grimly reminded her of what would happen if she threw herself at the throat of the life line of Britain's empire.

Is there any longer any question in the minds of American statesmen what the British mean by world cooperation?

Mr. President, what has been the nature of America's world cooperation? The truth of what we have done becomes more terrifying by the hour. As the tragic story of the consequences of America's foreign policy unfolds it proves not only that we have tragically blundered but as a result the whole world is plunged into a mad race with disaster.

Mr. President, remember the destroyers-bases deal, lend-lease, the arsenal of democracy, all aid short of war, the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," the great design, the Moscow Conference, Cairo-Teheran-Yalta, Dumbarton Oaks, unconditional surrender, the Morgenthau plan, San Francisco, Potsdam—all of which, we were told, was merely an extension of America's good-neighbor policy.

If the criterion of success of this kind of a good neighbor policy is to be that America's leaders have now attained the distinction of becoming full fledged and permanent members of an iniquitous three-power world conspiracy, then America has achieved an unutterable success.

But Mr. President, if the present world tragedy is not to be the measure of our triumph, the time has come to tell the truth.

Mr. President, time does not permit a detailed presentation of the anguish, misery, and human degradation resulting from this war. Suffice it to say that our appeasement, our betrayal of principles, and our abandonment of human beings to a fate worse than death, have made a Europe and Asia a veritable chamber of horrors.

In the October issue of the Reader's Digest, reprinted from the Saturday Evening Post, Mr. Charles Lanius said in an article titled "I Saw the Russians Take Over Bulgaria":

> At the time of the coup d'état Communists comprise not more than 5 percent of the total population of roughly 6,000,000. When the Communist seized power Anton Yugoff, a smooth-talking factory worker, under death sentence for Communist activities, came out of hiding to take over the Ministry of Interior and turn Bulgaria into a land of terror. In every city and village in Bulgaria the Communists took over the civil administration. Ordinary criminals—murderers and thieves—were released from prison and put into Yugoff's police. Old grudges were settled with bullets. Bulgarians say that in nearly every municipality the chief of police, the mayor, and the tax collector, and sometimes their assistants, were shot or beaten to death. More than a hundred former ministers, deputies, and members of the late King's official household were sentenced to death at a trial in the people's courts, packed with Communist prosecutors, judges, and jurors. The condemned, including Prince Kyril, brother of the King were stripped, machine-gunned, and tossed into bomb craters. * * * Many died only because they might rise as opposition leaders and menace the new regime.

From Yugoslavia comes a similar story. On September 16, John MacCormac wrote in the New York Times:

> Politically central Europe has been troubled by the social and economic revolution which the war brought in its wake, by boundary disputes, and, not least, by the rivalries of the great powers aggravated by that ideological class between east and west. It is obviously Moscow's policy to extend its sphere of influence to the Danube, using strong native leaders, like Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia, Matthew Rakosi in Budapest, and George Dimitroff in Bulgaria, and, where it can find them, local Communist Parties where they exist or can be created and puppet governments when, as in Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, it is expedient and feasible to set them up.

The Yugoslavs will have cause to remember for long years into the future how the British sold them down the river with the betrayal of General Mihailovitch, which amounted to a betrayal into the hands of Russia. On August 9 Miha Krek, leader of the Slovenian People's Party, announced from Rome:

> Tito's Yugoslav Government ordered shooting 20,000 more people in Slovene. The order was executed. People are begging for help against tyranny.

Mrs. Sylvia Sprigge, Balkan correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, one of England's outstanding liberal newspapers, reviewed what had happened in Trieste prior to the Allied agreement of June 13 as nothing less than a revolutionary Communist movement. According to the New York Herald Tribune of October 31:

> She recited Yugoslav decrees taking control of economic, industrial, transport, shipping, fishing, and insurance concerns in Trieste; seizure of all printing presses, newspapers, and the Italian radio; establishment of a new judiciary to judge by evidence and not by law, and handing over of government to the local Slovene Italian Communist Parties, known as councils of liberation, with a promise of autonomy inside Yugoslavia.
>
> All these acts, she said, have been abolished by Anglo-American proclamation west of the Morgan line, meaning, the whole of Istria save for Pola.

On September 21 the bishops of Croatia issued a pastoral letter describing the bitter persecution of the church in Yugoslavia under the Tito regime and requested that representatives of other nations be named on an international commission to conduct trials of persons accused as war criminals. The pastoral goes on to say, of Tito's partisans:

> Judging by their ferocious manner, it is readily apparent why they accuse all bishops, priests, and religious as war criminals; why they wish to foist totally false accusations of crime upon them. In the civilized world, however, not a single person will be found approving such fictitious and arbitrary accusations, or believing that bishops, priests, and religious orders of men and women known the world over are war criminals and worthy of capital punishment; or that they are perpetrators of massacres. Perpetually shall the blood of these heroic martyrs cry out in accusation against those who grasp murder as a means of power. * * *
>
> But now from the depths of our souls we send forth our protesting cry before God and mankind against systematic killings and persecution of innocent priests and Catholic faithful, many of whose lives excelled in sanctity and whom the enemies of the Catholic Church, through diabolical perjury, have brought to death.

On October 25 the New York Times editorially lamented Poland's predicament by saying:

> Because of its suffering, no nation deserves more sympathy and help. Yet the present-day picture of Poland is not a pretty one. A small minority, imposed on the country from outside, holds the Government captive and the people cowed in fear. Man hunts and mass arrests are matched by the retaliatory excesses of the remaining underground, which, after having fought for Poland's freedom, now does not dare show itself. To all this is added the immense destruction of the war, which is further intensified by the presence of Russian armies living on the country, armies whose discipline is beginning to give way in some cases.

Even the Philadelphia Record of October 29 admitted:

> It is becoming clearer that Russia's hold on eastern Europe and in Asia is due not to the convictions of the people there but to the presence of the Soviet Army.

On October 30 Gladwin Hill cabled to the New York Times that the highly touted blessing of Soviet land reform in Poland is no panacea for the desperate agricultural situation. According to Mr. Hill—

> The present circumstances reveal that this process in many cases has fallen far short of solving the problems even of the peasants who have received land. They cannot do much farming if they have no animals, no implements, no seed, no fertilizer, no transportation, and no grubstake provisions. In many cases the newly endowed peasants, over half of them in fact, do not even have houses. According to the Ministry of Agriculture, Poland lost 40 percent of her farm land in the cession of eastern Poland to Russia—29,000,000 of 65,000,000 acres. She recouped about 20,000,000 acres in her newly allotted territory, giving her a total of 56,000,000 acres, although a lot of this new land is not only uncultivated but unsettled.

On September 6 Stephen King-Hall's London News Letter commented on the reforms in East Prussia under Russian-Polish rule:

> The Poles have taken over the ruins of the province, and there are comparatively few Germans left. Immense numbers migrated westward, and indeed some towns—Allenstein, for instance—have no Germans left at all. Those miserable ones who do remain in the area are put to work on the fields—the women to do normal men's jobs, the men to pull the ploughs, carts, etc.—six to a plough or five if they can manage it, for the Russians have driven off with all the horses. Even so, the amount of productive agriculture going on with such absurd resources is negligible. No crops of any importance have been sown or reaped this year, not even potatoes. That alone means present starvation; but it is likely to last.

On October 12 a delayed United Press dispatch carried the following story from Warsaw:

> Disease slowly but surely is accomplishing what the Nazi hordes failed to do—exterminating Poland.
>
> Each month 10,000 Poles die of tuberculosis, a recent survey showed. Whole villages have been wiped out and the disease still is spreading. Out of a total population of 25,000,000, more than 1,200,000 cases were reported between last January and August alone.

Mr. President, one can get a deeper understanding of what our betrayal of Poland means to the tragic Polish people when we realize that after their heroic resistance that has not yet ended we sold them down the river into the hands of as despicable a tyranny as the world has ever seen. A picture of what they have been through since they have been delivered from the tender ministrations of the Nazis to those of the Soviet is found in the following excerpt from the Manchester Guardian of December 23, 1943:

These unfortunate people were transported in cattle trucks hundreds and thousands of miles into the remote and desolate regions of Asiatic and Arctic Russia. Many of them died on the way. The rest were imprisoned or put in labor camps or on collective farms in Kazakstan and elsewhere. Some were forced to work in mines in Karaganda and Kolyma, others along the Trans-Siberian Railway or in brickworks and sawmills in many districts of Central Russia. Thousands died from overwork, illness, and undernourishment, particularly the old people and young children. * * * They were forced to live in overcrowded barracks without light or heating in many cases. Those who were too old or ill to work usually received no food or money and had to be maintained by their families or friends. Quite small children thus often supported their aged or ailing relatives. The mortality of these children was fearful. Precise figures are unobtainable, but it is estimated that between 25 and 30 percent succumbed of about 180,000 children deported from Poland and roughly 30,000 from the Baltic States. Many families were broken up and dispersed to different regions. Wives were separated from husbands and children from their parents.

As for Italy, Dr. G. A. Canaperia, Inspector General of Health for the Italian Government, has just released the following picture:

Twenty-five million out of the Italian population of 44,000,000 are in need of assistance of various kinds. And at least 5,000,000 homeless Italians face the coming winter in desperate need. A severe drought during the last summer caused a failure in the wheat crop in most of Italy and there is an alarming shortage of proteins, fats, and bread.

On September 7, 1945, Roger Treat in writing from Naples said:

Emotionalism and ignorance are in the saddle and the fed natives of good breeding an education are dreading the day when Allied authority leaves Italy to its own destiny. These people are mob fodder. You could start a riot in any place by standing on the street corner, waving your arms and howling gibberish.

The situation in Greece is tragic. Her population of 7,000,000 has been reduced by one-seventh since the Italian attack and now the rest of her population has been reduced to a ration of between 900 and 1,000 calories a day.

On September 29 an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the New York Times stated:

The worst drought in 25 years has cut production of food to less than half, leaving farmers even insufficient feed to maintain livestock. A minimum of 35,000 tons of imported coal is necessary to operate essential industry. Millions of Greeks have received no clothing since the occupation and there appears to be little hope that the textiles from UNRRA can be turned into clothes in time for winter.

Mr. President, hunger, disease, starvation, and death are now stalking hundreds of millions of people in Europe and Asia. Within the Russian zones of occupation between 200,000,000 and 300,000,000 human beings are now caught. The terrible conditions under which these people are now compelled to live a lingering death for want of food and shelter, clothing, and medicine can be partially explained by the fact that Russia herself is unable, with her own people homeless and starving, to relieve the situation. Even Russian armies of occupation are compelled to forage off the land for their own subsistence.

But, Mr. President, this does not in any way excuse Russia for the atrocious and savage way in which she has violated every single principle and precept of civilized law, decency, and justice in her wanton attacks upon the tragic peoples who have come under her control. The time has come for the American people and the whole world to be shocked into an awareness of what the alleged extension of our "good-neighbor policy" into the care and keeping of Russia means to humanity.

The British publication, the Nineteenth Century and After, contains an editorial in its November issue in which the most tragic irony I have ever read in modern times is written. It concerns the free city of Danzig.

The following excerpts define in vivid and awful terms the real nature of the world cooperation which I am now convinced the passage of this legislation before us would permanently sanction and perpetuate. Says Mr. F. A. Voigt:

Our information with regard to this tragedy is based on abundant evidence. We have, in our possession, 17 statements by eyewitnesses of what happened in Danzig after the Russians took the city, first-hand and detailed reports by 2 British officers, 1 of whom is a fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons—a detailed report by a British officer who made a tour of inquiry in the Sudetenland during the month of September, and numerous reports by clergy, doctors, and others who witnessed the flight of men, women, and children from the territories assigned to Poland from the Sudetenland. We have also many photographs showing the condition in which many of the children reached Berlin. * * *

The evidence reveals one of the greatest tragedies of our time. It also shows that the particular agreement, embodied in the Potsdam Declaration, that the "transfers * * * should be carried out in an orderly and humane manner," has not been carried out.

Danzig was taken and sacked by the Russians on March 27. The greater part of the city had been destroyed by bombing and by artillery fire. About a third of the central area was standing. The Germans, on leaving, ordered a general evacuation, but the Danzigers, for the most part, were convinced that the Allies would reestablish the city as a free state. They had been confirmed in this belief by broadcasts from London. That is why so many disobeyed the German orders and awaited the Russians, while taking shelter. Their numbers were greatly increased by refugees from the surrounding countries.

The Russians entered every shelter, cellar, and basement and, under menaces, demanded and took watches, rings, and other valuables. Nearly all the women were raped—amongst the victims were old women of 60 or even 65 and girls of 15 or even 12. Many were raped 10, 20, or 30 times. Most of those that suffered in this way contracted venereal disease. All the houses left standing were ransacked—according to one eyewitness, the Russians gave order that the doors should remain unlocked. Furniture, wireless sets, to protect their mothers against outrage were taken away.

The excesses went on for days. Boys trying to protect their mothers against outrage were shot down. There were many suicides.

Danzig Cathedral was plundered of all movables and left in a condition of indescribable filth. It was reconsecrated by Dr. Behrendt.

There were similar scenes in other towns. At Oliva the Russian officers lost control over their men, all of whom seemed to be drunk. One Russian officer went to several shelters and advised the inmates to take refuge in the church. They did so and remained unmolested for a night and a day. The next night the church was invaded and became the scene of wild outrage while some of the soldiers played, or tried to play, the organ and others tolled the bells. The inmates then took refuge in the vicarage, where they were undiscovered for 2 days. On the third they were again subjected to outrage—amongst the victims were Sisters of Mercy and a girl of 13.

Other Danzigers who were arrested by the Russians were asked if they had been members of the National Socialist Party, the Gestapo, or the Werewolf. Their denials were followed by such terrible beatings that they were ready to admit anything. Many were sent to a concentration camp at Matzkau. The rooms were so crowded that the inmates could not lie down to sleep. Twice daily 800 to 1,000 of the prisoners were sent to Russia. There were refugees from East Prussia in Danzig, but it seems that the greater part of the population of East Prussia was deported to Russia before Danzig was taken.

The Russians set fire to what remained of Danzig, so that the destruction of the city was complete * * * Polish militiamen arrived. * * *

The Russians announced that all Germans must leave Danzig. No distinction was made between Danzigers and Germans proper. In the first half of July, the Polish militiamen cleared Danzig of all its inhabitants, street by street, without any regard for the sick or aged.

This was the end. The Danzigers saw no more of their city, not even the ruins, but took to trains, cattle trucks, carts, barges, or to their feet, to swell the streams of refugees that made for Rostock, Stettin, Hamburg, Berlin.

Now, Mr. President, if there is any sanity left in America we dare not look for one moment longer with the blurred vision of hate, of revenge or of fear, upon an enemy whose predicament now threatens the greatest human catastrophe in history.

First, there is the fact of the dissection into four quarters of the most highly industrialized and organized social structure in Europe, perhaps in the world. On one side, occupying more than half of Germany, is the Soviet Union; on the other side, Britain, France, and the United States. This fact alone has broken down all hope, even from the selfish point of view, of relieving the Allied armies of occupation of tasks that might easily be done with the disintegrated German structure permitted to function as a unit even at the lowest level.

The terrible conditions that exist and that are spreading their infection throughout Europe are the direct result of the bitter fears and conflict of in-

terests that exist between and among the victor powers. At this very moment with Russia in control of the eastern provinces of Germany, in which most of Germany's prewar food stock that supplied only 85 percent of her total needs was raised, the crops are rotting on the ground, the farm equipment and machinery stripped from the land, and the male population almost completely liquidated or deported.

Mr. President, the American people have never agreed to wreak their vengeance on millions of helpless women and children, by condemning them to being driven like vast herds of cattle across the wasteland that now is Europe, to their death or worse.

Listen to a statement from London, England. On September 8, 1945, the New Statesman and Nation, a Socialist publication, said:

For many weeks the facts about the mass expulsions have been withheld or played down. Conscientious journalists have remembered that our friends as well as our enemies are starving. They have been reluctant even to appear as though they were appealing for sympathy toward Germans while Yugoslavia receives virtually none of the UNRRA supplies which she so desperately needs. They have realized, also, that the mere reporting of these facts must imply a criticism of Russian policy which might endanger the plans for central inter-Allied control announced at Potsdam.

* * * It is difficult to blame those who have come to the conclusion that Stalin's plan is to remove everything of material value to Russia out of Germany, to create a Poland, tied to her eastern ally, if by nothing else, by the German desire for vengeance and then to clear out, leaving to the western powers, if they feel so inclined, the task of cleaning up the mess.

To those who fear and who say that Germany may become an aggressor in the near future let me read from an article by Anne O'Hare McCormick, one of the leading international writers for the New York Times. On October 29, writing from Frankfort, she put to an end once and for all, for reasonable men, all talk about a hard or soft peace, by saying:

Actually there is no Germany today. The divided corpse breathes but it has not motion, articulation, or conscious life. The ruin has been vividly described again and again, but the limits of human imagination are such that until you see it for yourself you cannot believe that every industrial city is as dead and buried under its own dust as Frankfort is.

In spite of that and in spite of the conditions which some of us saw when we went over there, a Senate committee gave out a report that 75 percent of the German industries were still intact.

On October 2, while the real truth of the situation was still being suppressed, Donald MacKenzie, an American foreign correspondent, wrote from Berlin:

Children of this city are dying like flies from undernourishment. Typhoid is rampant and the shadow of approaching death is plain on the gaunt faces of adults who are slowly starving. * * * But worse is still to come. Winter, it is universally admitted here, will intensify hardships a hundredfold. There will be no coal or any other heating fuels for city dwellers in Germany this winter (except for the occupational armies). * * * Most of the habitable buildings have been taken over by American, British, or Russian occupation missions. More than 3,000,000 Berlin residents, most of them women, live in the remainder. Only an infinitesimal number of homes in Berlin have any unbroken windows. Fewer still have whole roofs. All let in the wind, rain, and snow. The city was systematically looted in May and blankets, pillows, bed linen, cooking utensils, and all food was carried off. So the Germans will have to go through this winter—and winter in Berlin is intolerably cold even with heat installations—without these essentials. * * * We took the best homes left standing and gave the German occupants a few minutes to pack one suitcase and get out to find what accommodations they could. Evacuees were not permitted to move anything except personal effects. * * * The authorities refuse to issue ration cards to discharged soldiers, so they are compelled to carry their miseries elsewhere. * * * As a final touch to the picture of Berlin's plight, the sewers are seeping into the drinking water supply so that it is dangerous to drink any unchlorinated water. That is well enough for the victors, who have plenty of drugs. The Germans have none and do not even ask for drugs at the hospitals where operations are performed without anesthetics.

On October 3, Ed Johnson, foreign correspondent for PM, sent back the following grim story:

Germans are going to die like flies this winter—so say the United States public health officers here. * * * The infant mortality rate in Berlin is 16 times as high today as it was in 1943. A German Red Cross official predicts an infant mortality rate of 80 to 90 percent during the coming winter.

There is going to be a definite age group elimination of the German population. Most children under 10 and people over 60 cannot survive the coming winter. The inevitable influenza will fill the gutters with German dead—and I am still quoting the public health officers with whom I have had rather close associations during the past few days.

In the October issue of the Review of World Affairs, edited in London by Kenneth DeCourcy, Mr. DeCourcy says:

Three and a half million Sudenten Germans have been ordered out. They were allowed 35 kilograms of luggage, and 250 reichmarks apiece. First they were driven towards the Riesengeierge, only to be stopped by the Poles. Then there was a mass movement toward Silesia, stopped by the Russians. They then switched towards the American zone, to be refused there. In the end vast numbers of them took to the woods and forests, and authoritative observers reckon that at least 60,000 have already committed suicide.

Or if the pictures are not terrifying and degrading enough to please those who seek vengeance, the following excerpt written to the bishop of Chichester, by a German Protestant pastor, formerly a prisoner in a horrible concentration camp and now living in the Russian-occupied zone, certainly ought to be:

The distress that passes everyday through our office, and which we witness on every road and square of Germany, is beyond words. I have known the sufferings of the Jews, and I have borne the tortures of a concentration camp; but what takes place before our eyes at the present moment surpasses everything of the past. I think of those, for instance, who take their lives. Thousands of bodies are dangling from the trees around Berlin and nobody takes even the trouble to cut them off. Thousands of corpses float in the Oder and Elbe Rivers down to the ocean; nobody cares. Thousands and tens of thousands perish of hunger and exhaustion by the roadside; other thousands do not know where in the world they will ever find a home again.

Mr. President, I am glad to see, however, that even some people in our State Department have begun to realize where our policies in Europe are leading us. On November 24, 1945, in a speech at Kansas City, Mr. James W. Riddelberger, chief of the State Department's Division of Central European Affairs, urged that Germany be given a chance at self-maintenance. He asserted that too heavy a hand on German economy will result in a distressed and embittered people, a ready breeding ground for dangerous ideologies, and added that the powers which have conquered Germany should be firm, but should give the country a chance at self-maintenance.

Mr. Riddelberger declared that:

Germany cannot be maintained permanently on a soup-kitchen economy.

He said that the final test of our policy will come with our withdrawal from the conquered country, and he stated:

Germany must be so completely regenerated politically, socially, and spiritually that we can safely withdraw.

With these sentiments I wholeheartedly agree.

Mr. President, I feel it is my duty to read into the record the grim picture of the over-all conditions in Europe which this kind of a good-neighbor policy and world cooperation has reduced the population.

On November 3, Dr. H. C. M. Case, an agricultural economist expert, reported by means of the Associated Press, from London, that 90,000,000 European allies in urban areas may be near starvation this winter. Dr. Case issued the statement after studying food production in Czechoslovakia, Greece, Italy, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Yugoslavia. Dr. Case states that, whereas nutritionists generally consider 2,600 calories as an acceptable minimum, average comestible food production will provide an average of only 1,200 calories daily this winter for 90,000,000 people.

Mr. President, I want this country to understand what this really means. For that purpose, I desire to enter into the record the reply of the National Research Council to a question asked of it by our Foreign Economic Administration. The question was:

Assuming that a man in reasonably good physical condition to start with were placed on a daily diet consisting of 42 grams of fats, 23 grams of animal protein, a reasonable intermediate quantity of vegetables characteristic of Germany, cereals, potatoes, total caloric content 1,200, what would the effect of such food rations distributed in occupied Germany be?

The answer was as follows:

The best evidence available to the Board would indicate that the effects of semistarvation should receive consideration under three headings, namely: Capacity for work, psychological effects, vulnerability to infectious and other nutritional diseases. The judgment of the Board, based on evidence available, is that adult European males reduced to an intake on the average of 1400–1700

calories for a period of 6 months will suffer: (1) Reduction of capacity for work (endurance) to the point where only very light work can be performed effectively, moderate heavy work, and heavy work not at all. (2) Loss of power of mental concentration associated with apathy, depression, and a high level of irritability. (3) Increased susceptibility to infections and contagious diseases. It is appropriate to point out the broader implications of the foregoing conclusions: In the first place, the ability of a population to maintain or increase its own community production of food, not to speak of other goods, would be diminished. In the second place, there would be less hope of establishing acceptable community and political organization. In the third place, a population subjected to such a low level of food supply might be expected to develop epidemics which might spread to other nations and consequently represent a hazard to the entire world. It is reasonable to suppose that if the average food intake per adult male is less than 1,400–1,700 calories, the effects described above would be exaggerated and also that an increasing number of persons would lose ability to support themselves and thereby greatly add to the burden of the occupying authorities

Mr. President, these are the reasons why I believe the passage of this legislation will plunge us directly out of our second venture into international affairs into a third, of only a very brief and tragic duration. Power politics breeds only power politics, whether played by Italy, Japan, Germany, England, Russia, or America.

In terms of geopolitics, America has now helped to tear the world in two. In one half of the world the Russian bear is sprawled out across the Eurasian continent, from Berlin to Port Arthur, digesting its prey and biding its time until it can dig itself in for a long and cruel international winter.

We have completely destroyed any semblance of the old balances of power either in Europe or in Asia. By building up the jaws of two military monsters which have caught and crushed hundreds of millions of helpless human beings, by transplanting power politics from between the great nations to within the borders of every nation, large and small, not only have we torn the world in two geopolitically but we have torn it in two in terms of an ideological civil war as well.

On October 30 Mr. Arthur Krock, brilliant journalist, writing in the New York Times, lamented:

The fear now strongly exists that the United States and other victorious nations in the Second World War will repeat the errors of the interval from 1918 to 1940—sales of arms to governments where they are likely to be used for internal conflicts that breed general wars, and sales to governments which may in time turn them against the seller.

This is the fear, based on experience, and sharpened by the new civil struggle in China and disorders in South America, which has impelled those who feel it to urge that the United States destroy its arms surplus.

Our wartime good-neighbor policies have earned America the distinction of becoming the first nation in history that has fought two wars with tremendous sacrifices only to end up with the necessity of supporting and financing a politically absurd, economically bankrupt, war-breeding imperialism in Europe and Asia. By some awful mistake, Russia is being left in possession of the greater proportion of the agricultural, economic, and industrial resources of both continents.

What we went to war to prevent Germany and Japan from achieving, we are now permitting to become a Russian triumph.

Mr. President, let me read again from an article entitled "Army Called Foe of Jackson's Views," by Frank E. Mason, published in the New York Times of yesterday. In speaking of the Army, Mr. Mason said:

Typical of the "un-American policies," for which they must assume public responsibility, frequently criticized by our Army officers are the so-called Gestapo methods used in handling Germans. Much of our police work is done by German refugees who were drafted into the United States Army during the war. Many of them were hurriedly commissioned as officers when interpreters for occupied Germany were needed. Nazi Gestapo practices are the only police methods that they know.

The feeling of our Regular officers in Europe that a day of reckoning is coming for our stewardship in Germany was summed up for me by one of our outstanding combat generals. He said:

"My friend, we fought the Revolutionary War to establish the rights of man. We fought the Civil War to free the slaves. We fought this war to lose for humanity what we won in the other two wars."

Mr. President, that is not my statement. It is taken from an article by Mr. Frank E. Mason, a correspondent for the North American Newspaper Alliance, and published in yesterday's issue of the New York Times.

By our so-called liberation of the tragic peoples of Europe and Asia we have delivered them from the hands of one cruel and inhuman dictator into the bloody and tyrannical hands of another.

We have so degraded the democracy for which we fought that, when brought to the bar of judgment, it will be found a harlot who has been whistled off the streets of chaos.

We have been maneuvered into a position where we must furnish by replacement the reparations that the scorched-earthly policies of our allies demand, both in cash and in kind.

We have succeeded in padlocking and sealing a "closed door foreign trade policy" that is directed against the western democracies wherever Russian influence is paramount.

In spite of the fact that both of our enemies would turn to us far quicker than to Russia, by our policies of revenge we are bound to the undying hatred of their 160,000,000 people who flank both sides of the Western Hemisphere.

Miss Dorothy Thompson, an ardent internationalist and interventionist, has turned the full fury of an outraged spirit at these consequences of American leadership in the following article:

The President makes another plea for "realism," so, by all means, let us look at the reality.

The reality is that at Teheran, Yalta, San Francisco, and Potsdam our political leaders gave away the power that America had built up for the cause of justice, liberty, and peace. So today they must ask for more power.

The political leaders of the Three Great Powers rejected the Atlantic Charter, first as its provisions applied to the vanquished, then as its provisions applied to any nation weak enough to be bullied.

The political leaders of the Three Great Powers rejected, at San Francisco, the thesis that great powers must be subject to any law governing their sovereign actions, and in the name of law, established lawlessness for the powerful and servitude for the weak.

The political leaders of the Three Great Powers threw into the wastepaper basket at Potsdam every shred of historical and ethnographical principle and human rights. By extending the frontiers of Poland under a thoroughly unrepresentative government to the Oder and the Neisse, and agreeing to the expropriation and deportation of indigenous populations, they compounded the crimes of Hitler himself—the very crimes of which the Nazi leaders stand accused before the world—and condemned millions of absolutely helpless men, women, and children to terror, migration, and starvation.

By agreeing to divide vast parts of Europe into zones within each of which four armies would have, in effect, unrestricted license to do as they pleased, they made inevitable the division of Europe into two blocs, and th break-down of the London Conference.

By agreeing in the name of "reparations" and "industrial disarmament" to a four-way loot in countries already devastated beyond imagination, they initiated in the name of peace a new scorched-earth policy; set adrift the last remnants of order; betrayed the hopes and prayers of all Christendom, and sowed the seeds of anarchy, nihilism, and despair.

Mr. President, those are the words of Dorothy Thompson, who was one of the most ardent interventionists, and one of the greatest of all great haters of Hitler. She propagandized against him from one end of the country to the other. Some persons said that she was carrying on a private war against Hitler, or words to that effect. Much as I disagreed with her before we entered the war, one must admit that at the present time she has a knowledge of Europe, and has spent far more time there perhaps than has any Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have heard a great deal of talk about how frantically the American people have been clamoring for internationalism, for America's world cooperation; yet, I have never before seen such a pathological spectacle so efficiently produced by such a pump-primed propaganda. But, now, is there any Member of this Senate who would dare to tell the American people this is what they have been sold? Is there anyone who would dare to urge them to embrace permanently this kind of internationalism as representing American ideals and principles?

I am speaking of conditions which exist in the world today as contrasted with the conditions which before we got into the war, it was said would exist.

Is this what the American people were led to expect would result from this war? Is this what we are now being called to put our stamp of approval on? Is this what the sacrificing, suffering and death involved in over one million American casualties has purchased with American blood and treasure?

Emphatically not, Mr. President. Instead; the day is coming when the facts will become widely known and the outraged conscience of the American people will become so articulate that they will

repudiate any and every man who votes to commit this country's resources and America's manhood and womanhood to war all over the world to maintain, not peace—for there is no peace—but to attempt to control the state of anarchy in Europe and Asia, to intervene in civil wars, to spread violence and destruction to non-peace-loving neutrals, and to sanction by force the preservation of a status quo which is a cruel war breeding mixture of human misery, human slavery, and human degradation.

Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan said a few minutes ago, under the Charter there is a slight possibility that the provisions about which complaint is made may be changed. It was with that hope in mind that I voted for it, but with serious doubts. I am extremely fearful, and I believe that today every intelligent person who is a student of foreign affairs feels in his heart and soul that the United Nations Organization will not be a success. Because of my attitude toward it I felt that we should stop, wait, look and listen before we took another step. Every step which we have taken has been met by the suggestion, "You voted for this, and because you did so you obligated yourself to the next step." Step by step we have obligated ourselves to take other steps.

Mr. President, before we take another step, should we not ascertain what Russia is going to do with reference to settling certain boundaries, and relieving the people whom today she has under subjugation, slavery, and misery? In good conscience I cannot put my stamp of approval upon any further steps until I know that something will be done about correcting the steps which we have already taken. Every step which Russia has taken since the San Francisco Conference shows conclusively, it seems to me, that with respect to Potsdam, London, Iran, and Manchuria, she does not intend to cooperate with the western democracies, but, instead, intends to go her own way for power, power, and more power. Yet she has her apologists in the United States who say, "Well, the United States is to blame." Mr. President, I assert that the time is not far distant when the American people will repudiate anyone who undertakes to apologize for the enslavement of peoples which is taking place today because of the tyrannical power which Russia is exerting throughout eastern Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world. I say with reference to those who wish to apologize, "Let them apologize if they will, but they will find that, unless Russia changes her course, the honesty and integrity of the American people will repudiate those who apologize for Russia—and let them make no mistake about it."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator mentioned slavery. As a matter of fact, slavery has now been instituted against the white race, not only the colored race.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator mentioned obligations which have been incurred under the Charter. As I understood the debate at the time we ratified the Charter, it was claimed again and again that we would not incur any obligations, that we were only making arrangements for an assembly of representatives who would formulate an implementation program, and that when it came before us, then the question of obligations would arise.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Now we hear that we have already accepted obligations. That kind of talk I do not understand.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, a few days ago, on the floor of the House of Commons, Mr. Eden made a statement. He was speaking of the organization of the United Nations, and he said the idea of sovereignty should be done away with and that nationalism should be done away with, and that the peoples of the world should forget about sovereignty and nationalism.

As I have said, I have never been a high protectionist, but I do say that if we are to have a world government, and are to give that government the power to tear down tariff barriers completely, to abrogate our immigration laws, to divide up the wealth of 130,000,000 people among the 2,000,000,000 throughout the world, we will not be helping the other countries, but we will be tearing down the only great democratic Republic that now exists, and which has existed for more than 150 years.

When the American people come to understand the philosophy that is back of the position taken by some of these idealists, I venture to say public opinion will not follow them. If it does follow them, if that is what the American people want, then the sooner we find it out the better, and the sooner we ascertain whether we are to maintain a democratic Republic in the United States, or are going to be led off to become merely a satellite of some world power, the better off we will be.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator spoke of sovereignty. In this country the sovereignty is in the people. Does the Senator think that, without a constitutional amendment, Congress by any act can destroy the sovereignty of the people, without their consent?

Mr. WHEELER. That depends upon what the Supreme Court might rule on the question.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is a very pertinent remark, in view of some decisions the Supreme Court has made.

Mr. WHEELER. When the great internationalists were talking about what we should do, and criticizing some of us because we wanted to keep out of war and preserve our neutrality, on September 15, 1936——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the subject he has been discussing, may I ask him merely one question for clarification?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has most emphatically discussed what he defines as apologists for Russia.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure the Senator does not mean to indicate any belief that one is an apologist for Russia because he believes in the United Nations Organization.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; not at all. I would not for a minute have such an implication be drawn. Some of the very articles which I have read today criticize us because of the break-down of the London Conference when, as Anne O'Hare McCormick and some of the other writers pointed out, the whole difficulty was that the Russians refused to take any step unless it was to help their particular policy and their particular philosophy.

So far as I was concerned, I was glad to see our Secretary of State, for the first time, have the courage to stand up and not further appease and give in to everything Mr. Molotov wanted at the London Conference. I was particularly glad to see the statement sent by the State Department, or our Government, today with reference to Iran. We have declared again and again that we have to appease. We criticized Chamberlain for appeasing Hitler, and what have we been doing?

In order to have unity must we get down on our knees and crawl before a man who has enjoyed the fruits of our lend-lease? Have the American people become such simple-minded children as to believe such a thing; or is it because over the radio and in the press the propaganda goes out all the time? If the American people do not begin to think for themselves rather than let a few propagandists do their thinking for them, the American form of government as we all know it will soon disappear.

I now wish to quote from Secretary Hull, a statement made on September 15, 1936. This is not an isolationist speaking. On September 15, 1936, Secretary Hull defended American neutrality against our internationalists and interventionists by saying:

> At times there has been criticism because we would not depart from our traditional policy and join with other governments in collective arrangements carrying the obligation of employing force, if necessary, in case disputes between other countries brought them into war. That responsibility, carrying direct participation in the political relations of the whole of the world outside, we cannot accept, eager as we are to support means for the prevention of war. For current experience indicates how uncertain is the possibility that we, by our action, could vitally influence the policies or activities of other countries from which war might come.

Now, let some of the critics of what I am saying answer that. Was Secretary Hull an isolationist?

Mr. President, it was Confucius who said:

> It is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness.

There is a better way for America now to serve humanity than is provided for by this legislation. For years now America has traveled the wretched and twisted road of a foreign policy that has shifted,

without rhyme or reason, from the extreme of a fawning appeasement to the opposite extreme of war. Even now we are caught in such a dilemma that we cannot possibly honorably withdraw into what would be for the first time in our history the isolation with which America so often has been charged. But if this is true, as I believe it to be, what many of our internationalist enthusiasts do not yet seem to understand is that neither can we swing permanently to the opposite extreme of intervention and atomic war. Not only civilization, but also the very future of the human race itself, is now at stake, and is in our hands. America is now burdened with a terrible responsibility which we cannot and will not disown. But the world would earn our undying contempt and hatred if now, with the whole weight and burden of its cries and prayers for peace upon America, we should, in our blundering haste, take one false step that might prove our own undoing from within.

Mr. President, this legislation provides not only another step toward surrender of our form of Government, it is the product of an escapist and defeatist philosophy. Rather than yield to it, now is the time for all men of good heart and creative vision to find a truly American way to meet the obligations that are ours, to find an American way to remove from the earth once and for all, the threat, the fear, and the curse of tyranny and war. We shall not get another chance, we must stand now for a principle. But we are told that to stand for a principle now means war. If we stand for principle it means war, so we must do away with our principles. I cannot believe it means war, as I have already stated this afternoon. I will not believe that Russia wants war or dares to go to war against the United States. We must quit appeasing Russia and let her know once and for all we did not fight this war to let her enslave the people of Europe. She agreed to our high principles in her hour of distress. She must abide by them now.

Mr. President, I strongly urge, with all the seriousness at my command, that rather than lend their support to the measure which is now before the Senate, my colleagues give serious consideration to the following propositions:

First. If we are to play our full part to redeem the present world tragedy we must now take back into our own hands the control of America's destiny.

Second. America must stop her appeasement, and her compromise with principles, both with Great Britain and with Russia.

Third. I submit the following amendments to this legislation now under consideration:

(a) The United States delegate to the Security Council shall present a review of the proceedings of the Security Council every month to a joint session of both Houses of Congress.

(b) Wherever a decision to use United States armed forces arises in the Security Council, such a decision must be made by Congress.

Fourth. Let us grant the full appropriation being asked for UNRRA. There is not a moment to lose, but at the same time let us serve notice on the world that this is to be the last appropriation except where nonpolitical administration of relief is deserving of continued support.

Fifth. Let us set up our own American relief missions and appropriate all the money that is necessary to do more than our share in feeding, clothing, and sheltering the millions who now look to us for help, but let us administer this relief through American channels and on the basis of America's humanitarian principles.

Sixth. If as some say, the Russian people are starving and 25,000,000 of them are without the barest necessities of life, let us set up an American relief mission to Russia, as we did after the last war, appropriating the necessary money adequate to the task and on the same terms as above mentioned. We ourselves should handle it.

Seventh. Let America have the courage to call a real peace conference and let us do it with or without Russia's participation. Let us at least attempt at that conference—

(a) The universal abolition of conscription;

(b) Progressive multilateral disarmament; and

(c) Some measure of international control of the atomic bomb patterned after the Truman-Atlee-King formula.

Admitting the tragic blunders to which we have been a party, and the overwhelming power of destruction in our hands that terrorizes the world, we must find a way to take back into our hands and hearts the moral leadership of humanity. Moral leadership? Have we ever had moral leadership at any conference? And if we fail, liberty and freedom as we have known will perish from the earth. The choice lies with us. It was Edmund Burke who wrote in his Treatise on Conciliation of the Colonies:

> Power and authority may sometimes be bought with kindness, but they can never be begged as alms by an impoverished and defeated violence.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the hour is rather late. I hope Senators who have amendments they propose to offer at a later time will offer them now so the Senate may have the advantage of examining and perusing them in the meantime. If any Senator cares to proceed now with an amendment I have no disposition to object.

May I inquire of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] if he desires the floor at this time?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thought I might offer an amendment so that it might be pending. I do not desire to speak on it at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 21, it is proposed to add the following:

> The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall—
>
> (a) vote to recommend what he may consider appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment under article 36, and preferably recommend reference to the International Court of Justice;
>
> (b) in voting to recommend terms of settlement under article 37 or 38 vote only for terms of settlement which are just to both parties and in accordance with international law so far as it may be applicable;
>
> (c) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 (except by direction of the Congress) for measures against a nation unless he is satisfied that such measures, if taken, will bring about a result in accord with international justice as well as international peace and security;
>
> (d) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 (except by direction of the Congress) for measures against a nation unless such nation has been given an opportunity to be heard before the Security Council, except in cases in which such nation has made an aggressive attack on the territorial integrity of some other nation.

REHABILITATION OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration, with a view to its passage, of Senate bill 1610, for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. I make the request with the definite understanding that if the bill brings on a debate which exceeds more than 30 minutes it will be immediately withdrawn and the unfinished business will automatically come before the Senate again.

Mr. EASTLAND. I object.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not asking the Senator to vote for the bill, nor am I denying him the right to oppose it, but I am simply asking the right to have it considered.

Mr. EASTLAND. I object.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall, if I may, take the liberty of explaining the bill, because I am satisfied that many Members of the Senate who might be fundamentally opposed to it would, if they understood it, take a different view. The bill does not appropriate any money to the Philippine Government. It does not appropriate any money for the restoration of governmental property. It does provide that $30,000,000 worth of surplus war property now in the Philippines shall be made available to the Philippine Government in case the Administrator deems it wise.

We have now in the Philippines about $1,000,000,000 worth of surplus war material. It consists of trucks, bulldozers, and many other articles and commodities which will be useful to the Philippine government. At the present time it is very expensive for us to maintain this material there because the country is tropical and a large force of men is required to keep the machinery oiled and turned over weekly to prevent it from rusting and deteriorating.

The man in charge of this operation in the Philippines, General Browning, has testified before our committee that there is no point in bringing that property home because if it is brought home there will be little sale for it, and, in his opinion, in many cases sufficient money will not be realized from the sale of the property here to justify its transportation.

Furthermore, if the property brought back was in better condition than the average article there, it would only come in conflict with the reproduction activities of many of our large plants. According to the War Damage Corporation, the Philippine Government has suffered about $190,000,000 worth of damage.

The method of helping out the Philippine Government is simply to allow it to use this property, which has no real value to us, to the extent of $30,000,000. After that the property is to be sold, in the Philippines, for cash for all it will bring, and the money is to be turned into the Treasury of the United States. So, any remaining trucks or automobiles or bulldozers, or clothing, or groceries or what not, will all be put up and sold to the highest bidder, and the money will go into the Treasury of the United States.

The bill carries a provision for $330,000,000 in the form of rehabilitation and relief for the devastated private property held by persons in the islands who are either of Filipino or American citizenship. It precludes all nationals except Filipinos and Americans. It is estimated that about two-thirds of the claims will be filed by Filipinos and Americans, and that about one-third of the property lost was owned originally by those who were not American or Filipino nationals. So the committee has restricted this provision so as to exclude everybody from the benefits of this bill except Filipinos and Americans.

In addition to the above the War Damage Corporation collected in premiums during the war a sum in excess of $200,000,000 which it did not have to pay out in war damages. In other words the Government of the United States made a profit of $200,000,000. At the same time Mr. Jesse Jones, who was then the head of the Corporation, with the approval of the President, published an order which provided in effect that Filipinos and Americans in the Philippine Islands who could not obtain insurance because of the Japanese occupation, would be covered into the fund to the extent of $100,000,000 without the payment of premiums. That is in the record. No one denies it. So we have a moral obligation and a legal obligation, in my opinion, to the extent of $100,000,000, whether we pass this bill or not, and cases are already pending in some of the courts to collect under this procedure. So, when we consider that $100,000,000 and the $200,000,000 of the original fund which is available for the payment of war damages, in effect this bill will cost the American taxpayer very little in real outlay.

Moreover, the bill contains a provision that any reparations collected from the Japanese people or Government shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States. Out of that fund the Filipinos will not receive a single penny until any outlay made by Congress under the provisions of this bill is first accounted for from the Japanese reparations received. So the prospects are that the passage of the bill would not cost the American taxpayer a single penny if all its provisions were carried out. I am of the opinion that the Senator from Mississippi, who was not present at the hearing, and who has not, as he says, had an opportunity to read the bill, assumes that this is a gesture of largesse, a pouring out of Federal funds without that degree of husbandry and economy with which the committee has attempted to surround every operation under the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the bill supposed to encompass all classes of claims which are expected to arise in the Philippines against us as the result of the war?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There are no claims for support of the Filipino guerrillas outside this bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. That has been taken care of in a separate measure, and is not encompassed in this bill. It has already been taken care of by a blanket appropriation which is now either pending or has passed the Congress, to deal with all war claims of every kind and description, a part of which we are legally committed to pay.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, that appropriation would merely pay for guerrillas who were officially made a part of the United States Army by General MacArthur, and are entitled to the pay of American soldiers?

Mr. TYDINGS. But that is not in this bill.

Mr. TAFT. That is outside of anything in this bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is not in this bill. That subject has been dealt with separately by the Appropriations Committee, which I believe authorized an appropriation. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] worked diligently on that subject and reduced all the claims to an irreducible minimum. We have worked on the problem with the Veterans' Administration, and we hope and believe that we can dispose of the question once and for all, with the expedition of all claims, and with a great saving to the American taxpayer.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not questioning the Senator's statement. I simply wish to ask him for his judgment as to whether, if the bill were passed, the books would be balanced.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is my understanding and belief.

In addition to the property which was damaged in the Philippines, the committee thought it would be wise to couple with the provisions for rehabilitation provisions for training certain Filipinos to carry on work which heretofore has been carried on for the most part by our own Government. For example, in connection with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, provision is made to train 25 Filipinos in that work for a limited period of time so that thereafter they may do the work themselves. In connection with the United States Maritime Commission, provision is made to train a number of Filipinos at the United States Maritime Commission School in New York so that they may be able to captain the Pacific and interisland shipping in the islands, which to some extent has been depleted of personnel and almost entirely of ships.

In addition, the bill carries a provision for the training of 125 Filipinos in the art and practices of deep-sea fishing. Heretofore all the deep-sea fishing in the Philippines has been done by the Japanese. It was not thought wise to let the Japanese return to this line of activity, both from the standpoint of the Filipinos and from the standpoint of the United States. So we have provided that 125 Filipinos may be trained in the art and craft of deep-sea fishing. That would not entail the expenditure of much money. We are responsible for transporting the Filipinos to the west, Gulf, and Atlantic coasts, but the fishing companies have already agreed, after consultation with certain naval officers who were placed at their disposal and who explored the field, to hire the Filipinos at union wages so that they may learn the business from the ground up. The labor unions have agreed to amend their contracts so that the Filipinos may be trained in this work with little or no cost to our Government.

Furthermore, it has been provided that our Public Roads Administration shall survey and lay out a plan for road construction in the Philippine Islands. It is not proposed that we build the entire road system once it is envisaged and designed. It is not contemplated that we shall carry the program to a state of completion. We are proposing to start it and hand over all the plans for the development of a road system in the Philippines and eventually have the Filipinos take it over, complete the road system, and thereafter maintain it. The bill provides that the Filipinos may obtain certain surplus war materials now in the Philippines so that they may do this work more cheaply.

That, in essence, is an outline of the bill, which has been pictured by those who have not taken the trouble to read it as involving a heavy drain on the Federal Treasury. In my humble judgment, and in the judgment of the members of our committee, so far as I know, in the last analysis it is probable that the bill will cost the American taxpayer very little, if anything, for we would get all the reparations which would come to the Filipinos, and they would get none of the reparations until every cent advanced under the provisions of this bill had been repaid through the medium of reparations.

But even without considering reparations, $200,000,000 in premiums has been collected by this Government for war damages, and is now in the Treasury. Although in a sense it has been earned, in another sense it has not actually been earned, because although damages in Hawaii and Alaska were paid for out of this fund, the Filipinos, who were under our flag, have so far been denied any payments from the fund.

Probably the Senator from Mississippi will not withdraw his objection, but I have assumed that perhaps this little enlightenment as to what the bill contains might soften his heart when he

considers that we are now feeding 600,000 people three meals a day in Manila alone. The city is as flat as a pancake, and will remain in that condition until something is done to rehabilitate it. If the Senator has a better solution than the one which the committee has offered, I should be glad to hear it. I greatly regret that, although the Senator is a member of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, he took so little interest in the bill that, aside from an attendance of 10 minutes, he was not present at any of the committee meetings.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 266, commonly known as the appropriation measure providing $550,000,000 to carry out the provisions of UNRRA.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is the second appropriation of $500,000,000 for UNRRA, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. The first appropriation was $800,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. And this is the second?

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the second part under the authorization. The Senator will recall that last year a bill was passed by the Congress and signed by the President authorizing an appropriation of $1,350,000,000. When the first appropriation measure came before us, it was for $800,000,000. That measure was passed. The proposed appropriation for $550,000,000 is the remainder of the authorization. The joint resolution has passed the House, and the Committee on Appropriations has unanimously reported it to the Senate. I do not believe that consideration of the joint resolution would require much time, and I will say to the Senator from Texas that I hope we can pass it this afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall object unless it be stipulated that if the joint resolution is not passed today it will be laid aside.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that the joint resolution can be passed this afternoon. I certainly hope that it can be. At any rate, no harm would be done if we were to occupy 5 minutes tomorrow in its consideration. The joint resolution must be passed by the Senate before it can go to the President. If the Senator from Texas is not going to speak on his bill this afternoon and if no other Senator desires to speak on it, why cannot we proceed to consider the joint resolution? I appeal to my friend from Texas, whom I have known for a long time, not to ask me to promise that consideration of the joint resolution will be concluded in 25 minutes. I cannot do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not believe consideration of the joint resolution will take 15 minutes, and I appeal to the Senator from Texas to permit its consideration at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. If consideration of the joint resolution will not take 15 minutes, action on it will be completed today. I stipulated that I would not object, provided consideration of the measure would be concluded today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that if the joint resolution referred to or any other measure is taken up at this time, a demand for the resumption of consideration of the unfinished business at any time will immediately bring it before the Senate again.

Mr. CONNALLY. It seems to me that when the Senate has a measure under consideration, its consideration should be concluded before the Senate proceeds to consider other measures.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, of course what I have requested can be done only by unanimous consent. That is the only way it can be done.

I renew my request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I state now that I shall not object——

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Because I realize the importance of the UNRRA measure, and I realize that the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee feels that this appropriation measure should be considered and passed—nevertheless, I suggest to the Senator that I expect to offer an amendment to the joint resolution, and in that connection it might be necessary to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is just what I thought might happen.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to suggest the absence of a quorum if by doing so, passage of the UNRRA measure will be delayed beyond the conclusion of today's session. I do not desire to object to consideration of the joint resolution, but I must say that if the Senate proceeds to consider it at this time, in view of the fact that I intend to offer an amendment, I think it may be necessary to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to reiterate my statement that if consideration of the joint resolution continues beyond today and into tomorrow, I reserve the right to demand the regular order at any moment, and I expect to exercise that right.

A moment ago we were told that the joint resolution would be passed almost as soon as it was presented to the Senate; but, as I anticipated, now we learn that one Member of the Senate is to offer an amendment and that in that connection he will suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, no one can tell how long consideration of the joint resolution will take; and, furthermore, the measure will not become effective until the 1st of January; will it?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will become effective immediately.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator is going to do that, why does he not simply object to consideration of the joint resolution, because everyone knows that it will not be possible to obtain a quorum at this late hour in the afternoon. It is now 20 minutes to 5.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to have my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, feel for a moment that I am attempting to defeat the passage of this appropriation measure by suggesting the absence of a quorum. I do not wish to do that. If the Senator feels that way about it and if he is serious in his view, I shall temporarily withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can demand the regular order at any time, and in that way he can have the Senate proceed with the unfinished business.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate can dispose of noncontroversial items at this time without the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and in that way we can proceed to handle some parts of the measure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I feel very strongly that a quorum should be present for the consideration of the joint resolution or any similar measure. No notice has been given that the joint resolution would be brought forward for consideration this afternoon. There may be Senators on this side of the aisle who did not know that it was coming up, and I think it is important that they be present, so as to be informed that it is about to come up.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my request, but I desire now to give notice that at the first possible opportunity I shall call up House Joint Resolution 266, making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. If the unfinished business remains before the Senate for quite a time, later on I may ask unanimous consent to bring up the joint resolution, and I wish all Senators to know that I desire to have the joint resolution acted upon by the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Brig. Gen. Alden Harry Waitt (lieutenant colonel, Chemical Warfare Service), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. William Nichols Porter, whose term of office expired May 30, 1945;

Sundry officers in the Regular Army of the United States; and

William Green de Rosset, for appointment as records analyst, national headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. Mellott, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Henry L. Hess, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Russell Nichols to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of those nominations.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of all other nominations acted on today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all other confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 28, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 27 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons now foreign-service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

M. Williams Blake, of Ohio.
Overton G. Ellis, Jr., of Washington.
Beppo R. Johansen, of Florida.
Herbert V. Olds, of Massachusetts.
Rolland Welch, of Texas.
Robert E. Wilson, of Arizona.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry A. Zinn, of Denver, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo., to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 27 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Arthur J. Mellott to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas. (A new position.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Henry L. Hess to be United States district attorney for the district of Oregon.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Russell Nichols to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Alice Y. Brown, Hercules.
Mildred H. Moran, Spring Valley.

IOWA

Leadayle I. Brayton, Somers.

LOUISIANA

Kathryne S. Doggett, Blanchard.
Bettye R. Kemp, Ethel.
Audrey N. Evans, Jamestown.
John L. Richard, St. Gabriel.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 27 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Robert Tenbrock Stevens, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Edward Hughes Pruden, pastor, First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Father and our God, we would this day lift up our voices in thanksgiving to Thee for all Thy good gifts and tender mercies. We confess to Thee our transgressions and acknowledge ourselves to be unworthy and unprofitable servants. Wilt Thou cleanse us from all evil and empower us with the strength of Thy holy spirit.

As we now take up the grave responsibilities resting upon this legislative body, make us mindful of Thy promise, that "if any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all freely and upbraideth not." We are grateful that we have experienced sufficient failures to learn that without Thee we can do nothing. Help us to be worthy of the duties entrusted to us, and may we this day make some lasting contribution to a better and a more orderly world. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 905. An act for the relief of Harold E. Bullock;

S. 976. An act for the relief of the estate of Howard Francis Waldron;

S. 1294. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker;

S. 1338. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor; and

S. 1480. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Alien Property Custodian.
6. Interim International Information Service.
7. Petroleum Administration for War.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that the Chair prefers not to recognize Members to proceed for 1 minute this morning, as we desire to get along with the bill that was reported from the Committee on Appropriations on yesterday.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. Are we to be permitted to extend our remarks this morning?

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to announce that he would recognize Members for that purpose.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one to include a magazine article.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include three insertions dealing with the problem of refugees from the Baltic states and Sweden.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a resolution of the Common Council of the city of Cudahy, Wis., with reference to the need of a new post-office building, and in the second to include a biographical sketch of the Hon. August Charles Bachus.

Mr. ROE of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington News written by Thomas L. Stokes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with certain remarks which I hope to make in the Committee of the Whole today on the deficiency appropriation bill I may be allowed to insert certain relevant excerpts and data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other to include a letter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain letters.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include some resolutions from the Marshall County (Iowa) Farm Bureau.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on Russia and Iran, taken from the Washington Post.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "To Make the Charter Work."

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the American Legion convention on the question of immigration, naturalization, and deportation.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a news story from the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Daily Herald of November 22.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an item taken from the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Joseph Leib.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, and also upon Thursday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and to the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NO QUORUM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have a most important bill before us that carries with it what I consider a great departure and, in my opinion, the Members ought to be here to hear the debate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not press that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment? There is a new Member here who desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withhold the point of no quorum?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it for the moment until the Member can be sworn in.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr., of New Jersey, may be allowed to take the oath of office at this time. There is no contest. He has been clearly elected and there is no opposition, although his papers have not yet arrived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect will present himself to the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR., of New Jersey, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. Without objection, a call of the House will be ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 190]

Adams	Drewry	Poage
Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Powell
Andrews, N. Y.	Engle, Calif.	Quinn, N. Y.
Angell	Fernandez	Rayfiel
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fuller	Reed, Ill.
Barden	Gardner	Riley
Barry	Gearhart	Roe, N. Y.
Bolton	Gifford	Rowan
Boren	Hartley	Ryter
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Sadowski
Brehm	Hinshaw	Sheridan
Buckley	Hope	Slaughter
Butler	Jackson	Smith, Ohio
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearney	Somers, N. Y.
Campbell	Keefe	Sparkman
Carlson	King	Stockman
Chapman	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Clements	Lemke	Taylor
Crosser	Lewis	Tolan
Curley	Martin, Iowa	Vursell
Dawson	Mason	Wadsworth
Delaney, John J.	Morgan	Weaver
	Norton	Weiss
Dingell	O'Brien, Mich.	Wilson
Dirksen	Outland	Winter
Doughton, N. C.	Patrick	Wolverton, N. J.
Douglas, Calif.	Pfeifer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the New York Times.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts and communications.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Gen. Philip B. Fleming.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the magazine Tennessee Teachers.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial that appeared in yesterday's Boston Daily Globe.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some questions and answers by the Labor Department.

Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given per-

mission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an invitation.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from an Atlanta, Ga., newspaper on amputees.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain material on the Black Hills as the capital for the United Nations.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject General Motors Makes a Whipping Boy of the OPA.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include portions of an address made by the deputy commander of the Army Air Forces, Gen. Ira C. Eaker.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to file minority views to accompany the record on H. R. 2788.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill continue through the day and that at the close of the debate today the first paragraph of the bill be read, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, a great many Members of the House have indicated to me that they feel that this bill should have 2 days' general debate. As the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations knows, it required more time in committee to consider this bill than any appropriation bill that has been considered by the Appropriations Committee in the last several years. There are many Members of the House who desire to be heard in general debate on the bill.

I have no particular objection to limitation of debate to today if we can be assured that no other business is to intervene. I understand there is a conference report on the land-grants freight-rate bill pending which might be taken up at any time and which might take some of the time that we would otherwise have for general debate. I would like for the gentleman to couple with his request, if he sees proper to do so, a request that general debate shall continue for at least 4 hours.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that I have conferred with the Speaker and no other business will be taken up. The entire time will be devoted to this bill. I will couple with my request that at least 4 hours be devoted to general debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not understand that that request implies that if there is an opportunity to have more debate than 4 hours today, and there is demand for it, that we could not have it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our intention is to run as long as anybody wants to talk. We want the Members to talk themselves out, and anybody who wants time can have it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it may be that under the proposition made by the gentleman from Missouri we would have to run very late this evening. Of course, there are very important projects that have been eliminated from this bill in which a great many Members are interested, and I particularly hope that the gentleman will withdraw his request to read the first paragraph of the bill today because there are many Members who are not members of the Committee on Appropriations who desire time on this measure.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, no requests have been made and we shall deny no requests that are made.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then do I understand the gentleman to say that as long as a gentleman is making a request for time, that he will be recognized, and he will be yielded to?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unless there is interruption from other source than the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if it is the intention of the chairman to go on with the bill tomorrow in the event we conclude general debate today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expect to read the bill tomorrow.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, it is not proposed to take up any amendments today; that we will merely read the first paragraph, which may be subject to amendment, and then take up any amendments tomorrow?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the gentleman's statement about "unless there is interruption from some other source than the committee." I am wondering if we could have the assurance from the Speaker that no other business will be taken up this afternoon except this.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Speaker has given us assurance that there will be no intervention. It is a little out of order, and rather bad taste, to insist on the Speaker's making terms.

Mr. TARVER. Then I think the gentleman might withdraw his reservation about "unless there is interruption from some other source than the committee."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We will continue all night if necessary unless somebody outside the committee objects.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this for the purpose of asking if it is the purpose, when we start to read the bill tomorrow, to go on reading it and come to a conclusion and vote on the bill immediately thereafter?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is our expectation, Mr. Speaker, to devote today to general debate, to begin reading the bill for amendment tomorrow, and to continue through the remainder of the week until the bill is disposed of.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, not to inquire about this bill, where does that leave the conference report on the so-called Boren bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] to call up the conference report after this bill is disposed of.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will not be called up until after this bill is disposed of?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the Chair state the request of the gentleman from Missouri so that the Members may understand it?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that general debate be continued throughout the day, not less than 4 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from New York, and that the first paragraph of the bill be read today. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4805, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we submit today the first deficiency bill for the fiscal year 1946, and the last appropriation bill for the calendar year.

But, Mr. Chairman, before we take up the bill in detail, may I earnestly invite the serious and considered attention of the House to a general phase of the fiscal program, particularly in point at this time. There is no more vital consideration in national economy than the National Budget. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries every administration that came to power or fell from power in the major European nations either rose or was wrecked upon its fiscal

policies. No nation can be indefinitely maintained today on a deficit budget. In the end disaster must overtake any nation which fails to pay its way.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached this year, this month, this hour, a turn in a long road. It is a road that leads from the beginning of our Government down to today and stretches way ahead of us into the far distant future. Upon the nature of the turn we make today depends to a very large degree the destination to which that road leads the Nation, not only next year, but for 100 years to come, and not only for the American people but for the world. Unless we can maintain this Nation on a sound financial basis there is disaster ahead for us and for the world.

The situation is critical not because we are in a stage of transition from one historic era to another, not because we are entering on a period of extraordinary scientific and industrial development. It was critical before we entered the war, before we dreamed that a war was possible. It is critical because a decade before the opening of the war we had developed a spending psychology, had entered upon a period of unrestrained and uninhibited expenditure. We bought what we wanted. Too often we bought what we saw whether we were certain we wanted it or not. We did not stop to count the cost or to consider the source from which the money came to pay for it. The result was a spending spree such as the world had never seen before.

Let us take a few concrete instances. For example, let us check the astounding growth of the agricultural appropriation bill. For the fiscal year 1933 the agricultural appropriation bill totaled $175,000,000, to be exact, $175,671,665. That was a large sum.

Under the chairmanship of Congressman James W. Wadsworth, of New York, the father of our distinguished colleague, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., the agricultural appropriation bill carried a total of $3,232,995. But coming back to modern history. In 1940, the agricultural appropriation bill was $1,194,498,633. In 7 years the bill had jumped 700 percent.

Let us check the Interior Department appropriation bill. In 1933 it was $45,533,672.33. At the beginning of the war it had reached $188,325,923. Likewise, the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor bill for the fiscal year of 1933 was $112,291,970.89. In 1941 the combined bills representing the same departments aggregated $1,130,431,691.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. With reference to the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill, the gentleman must remember that included an appropriation for aviation, which was badly needed for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the expenditure was a purely peacetime expenditure. It was in time of peace, and at that time no one dreamed a war was ahead of us. If you had taken a vote on this floor you could not have gotten one vote for war. There was not a man here who believed we were going into war or would ever go to war. In time of peace, with no prospect of war we ran expenditures from $112,000,000 up to $1,130,000,000; more than a billion dollars' increase in 8 years.

Now, these bills were typical of practically all Government expenditures. In those seven or eight run-away years we increased the supply bills, the annual appropriations by leaps and bounds. There is no parallel in the fiscal annals of any nation. Remember, these are not war expenditures. There is nothing here for war or preparation for war. All the figures cited are peacetime expenditures for the annual housekeeping expenses of the Nation.

It might be added, however, that the civil functions bill, reported out by the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, but which carries only civil appropriations, increased from $106,578,489 in 1933 to $305,188,514 in 1940.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Did that first bill include the Department of Labor, to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; State, Commerce, Justice, and Labor. The four Departments were provided for in one bill at that time.

Mr. RABAUT. If it refers to State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor it probably has taken in Social Security now, has it not? I mean the bill to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; it includes the departments originally provided for in the four-department bill.

Mr. RABAUT. That was because the subject became so large it had to be broken up and be handled by two committees of the House, State, Justice, and Commerce in one, and Labor and Social Security in the other.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The increase was so rapid and so precipitous it became necessary to divide the bill into two bills. But these figures cover the departments handled in the original bill.

Mr. RABAUT. We had social-security legislation that took care of the people. That was the cause for the enormous increase.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is what I am calling attention to—the extraordinary increase of all Federal expenditures in such an incredibly short space of time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman mentioned the increase for the Department of Agriculture. I wish to call his attention to the fact that a large portion of the billion dollars that was appropriated went to pay the farmers to produce less food.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was only one item in the bill and the bill was only one of many passed by the Congress. Regardless of the purpose for which expended, all expenditures of the Government climbed to astronomic proportions in a little more than half a decade.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. But I want to ask the gentleman if it would not be fair, because all this money that the gentleman is talking about comes through the Appropriations Committee, to state that the Appropriations Committee has been forced to take action because of earlier action taken in the legislative committees of the Congress authorizing expenditures, the Committee on Appropriations being finally asked to appropriate the money. That is the cause of the high figure. We must also remember that we had an economy in this Nation of $38,000,000,000 which has risen to a point where the taxes of the Nation a year or so ago were above what the whole economy of the Nation was when we came into power. So in justice to the situation the two things should be mentioned at the same time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has put his finger on the crux of the matter. Expenditures necessarily originate in the legislative committees, which bring in bills authorizing expenditures and then demand that the Appropriations Committee supply the funds. The Appropriations Committee frequently declines to appropriate the amount authorized or in some instances to appropriate anything at all. But in the end all must accept their share of the responsibility. The legislative committees are responsible, the Committee on Appropriations is responsible, and the House itself is responsible for this extraordinary and unprecedented, but perhaps not unwarranted increase in the annual expenses of the Government.

I say "perhaps not unwarranted" because under conditions extant at the time many, if not all of them, might have been fully warranted.

The alarming feature of the situation is not that in this short period of 6 or 8 years appropriations and expenditures mushroomed, and pyramided, and skyrocketed. The alarming feature is that today—under vastly different circumstances, and steadily shrinking revenues, with hugh burdens of new responsibilities—there seems to be a general impression that we can continue the free and untrammeled spending of prewar days.

Conditions have vastly changed since those halcyon days in which if we spent $1,000,000,000 it was all right, there was more where that came from.

But today we find ourselves in a vastly different situation. We have not balanced the budget for 15 years. For 15 years we have been running this Government on I O U's, not merely in time of war, but in time of peace. We owe today, when we have finally settled all of our bills, approximately $300,000,000,000. Such a debt has never burdened any nation in human history. Under the pressure of that colossal debt we cannot continue to spend money at the rate at which we spent before the war. We can no longer spend for any indispensable objective, however desirable and however advantageous the purpose of the expenditure.

Today we have fixed charges that we did not have before the war, fixed charges which must be paid before we spend a dollar for current expenses.

For instance, the interest on the national debt is already between five and six billion dollars annually. That one item alone is larger than the entire expenditures of the Federal Government for all purposes prior to 1934. We have to take that out of our revenues before we start to spend.

Not only that, but the national debt has to be refunded. It is all in short-term issues, comparatively speaking, and the loans, the certificates of indebtedness, have to be renewed. We are paying now the lowest rate of interest ever paid on Government money—about 2 percent.

When business starts again and investors need capital and the banks begin to make loans, and we continue to refund this money, we are going to have to pay more than 2 percent. If we refunded the public debt at the same rate of interest that we paid after the last war, our interest charges today would be twelve billion dollars instead of five. It might be $12,000,000,000 again. Then where would we stand with $12,000,000,000 interest charges to start with? It is my belief that while we may not always be able to refund at 2 percent, we will not have to go as far as we did before, but there is no guaranty of that.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. The gentleman stated that we have not balanced the Budget for 15 years. I remember that the gentleman along with me opposed passing the tax-reduction bill while our Budget was in such bad condition. I believe the gentleman knows that we are not going to balance the Budget for years to come as long as pressure groups can come in here and shove through tax-cutting bills regardless of our responsibility to the Nation. We are not going to balance the Budget under those circumstances.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the astounding feature of the situation which confronts us today. We are being importuned by all sorts of pressure groups, insisting upon increased expenditures and then, on the other side, we are being urged by pressure groups, just as insistent, demanding reduction in taxes. And, mirabile dictu, we have Members of Congress who vote with both crowds. We have Members of Congress who vote for the highest appropriations and vote for the lowest taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. There was made recently a computation of appropriations or requests for appropriations and they aggregated $39,000,000,000. There are eight valley authorities requests in there. In addition, we have this health program that has been sent to us by the President which will cost billions of dollars. There is also the full-employment bill that will run into the hundreds of millions of dollars if not billions of dollars. As the gentleman from Missouri said, there is pressure. Of course, the taxpayer is seeking relief from wartime taxation, which is only natural, but what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has reference to is all the pressure groups asking for anything and everything, going on the theory that every dollar they give me out of the Federal Treasury is that much gravy. They refuse to stop and consider the fact that every dollar spent must be raised by taxation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is absolutely no other source from which the Federal Government can obtain money to pay for all these local expenditures we are asked to vote on this floor. All of it must come direct from the pockets of the taxpayers of the Nation—all the Nation. I am glad to hear the very influential gentleman take that position. I trust he will join this committee in trying to hold down expenditures and, incidentally, will join with the little group of 33 who voted on the last revenue bill against reducing wartime taxes while the taxpayers are still drawing wartime incomes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the interest on the public debt is only the first of the fixed charges, accumulated during the war, which the Government must pay before it can begin paying on current expenses. But before I take up the rest of them, in their order, may I call attention to the fact that we are still running the Government on borrowed money and these extra appropriations for which we are being asked, and on which we will vote tomorrow, would be deficit expenditures. We are still borrowing money. We are now busily engaged in trying to put over the eighth bond drive—the Victory loan. We are trying to sell $11,000,000,000 worth of bonds and having a harder time selling them than we have had on any of the preceding seven campaigns to sell bonds.

But there are men in the House who already want to start spending on that $11,000,000,000 before we borrow it. They come in here for appropriations and they want to appropriate money we do not have and have not yet been able to borrow for things we can get along without.

We must face the fact that from this time on we will have steadily shrinking revenues. That is inevitable. Already the national income is falling. For the current year it reached $46,400,000,000, the largest amount in the history of any nation. The most optimistic estimate for the coming year is ten billion below that figure. But the people who want to spend money, both in this House and out of this House, pay no attention to the fact. They want to increase expenditures while income is declining.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does not the gentleman think that the best time to pay taxes is when people have money to pay them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Beyond a shadow of a doubt. The basic law of scientific taxation is that the burden should be in proportion to ability to pay. Those who have the money to pay should pay, and they should pay when they have the money to pay. That is why I joined with the gentleman in opposing the reduction of taxes in the last tax-reduction bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe that the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman now addressing the House were practically the only two Members of the House who argued against that tax-reduction bill because of the serious effect it might have upon our national income; am I not correct in that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am always glad to find myself in agreement with the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, another fixed charge we have never paid before is the maintenance of a military establishment. For the first time in American history we must maintain a large military establishment in time of peace. We are maintaining today a large standing army and the largest navy that the world has ever seen.

And fully as important as the Army and the Navy, we must spend a vast sum of money in research. Everybody realizes that the last war was won on research. It was radar, the proximity fuze, our antisubmarine devices, the atomic bomb, and innumerable other scientific developments which protected our continent and crushed the enemy. All testimony before the committee was to the effect that but for these developments we would still be fighting on all fronts. The next war—if mankind should ever again be cursed with another war—will be purely a war between scientists. So that a heavy fixed charge, which we have never carried before, must be incurred every year in research to keep ourselves abreast of the time to see that no other nation develops some secret weapon which would destroy us overnight.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of the next war. Is it the gentleman's idea that we must continue to have an arms race and a naval race over the world, and never devote our attention to disarmament and to obtaining peace throughout the human family?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; I have an abiding faith that we will never have another war, but the only way to guard against another war is to trust in God and keep our powder dry. These fixed charges are to keep our powder dry.

Mr. WHITE. When the gentleman says, "Keep our powder dry" he means the biggest navy and the biggest army, and an armament race with all the nations of the world. They will all keep their powder dry, and they will all have tremendous armies and tremendous navies. Is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We must always have a shotgun behind the door.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Another fixed charge, incurred as an aftermath of the war is the expense of vastly enlarged international obligations. The world has shrunk so rapidly that every nation in the world is just across the street from us, just over the fence. We have assumed, beginning with the San Francisco Charter, international obligations, including financial obligations, military obligations, diplomatic obligations, and all of them involving increased expense which must be paid before we start giving away money. They are expenses we have never paid before, and we must pay them before we start distributing money for the things some of our friends here on the floor want spent back home in their congressional districts.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. Has the gentleman any idea how much the United Nations Organization will cost the United States its first year?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The negotiations now under way have not yet reached the stage where we can crystallize either the program or the cost of the program, but we do know that it will be substantial.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. If I understood the gentleman's question correctly, it was how much has the United Nations Organization cost up to this time.

Mr. CLASON. No; it was not. I said during the next year.

Mr. STEFAN. I can tell the gentleman approximately what it has cost up to this time, but I cannot answer as to next year.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Another charge, and this is the greatest debt of honor America owes today, an obligation which must come first, whatever the cost, is our obligation to the veterans. We must pay the allotments, the expense of education, the hospitalization; we must pay for all of these things we have promised and guaranteed the men who saved the Nation in its time of need, in the GI bill, in legislation already passed, and in other legislation which will be passed in the future. And, however much we pay, it will be only a part of what we owe them.

It was testified before the committee that the peak of hospitalization of veterans of the war will not be reached until 1975. We are today paying pensions for every war the United States has fought except the Revolutionary War.

We are still paying pensions for the War of 1812, for the Mexican War, the Indian war, and the Civil War, and we will be paying pensions on this war for 100 years to come. From this time on we must set aside at the beginning, before we pay anything else, billions of dollars to redeem our obligations to the veterans. That is a fixed charge that cannot be avoided and one which no one desires to avoid. And its cost will run into the billions.

Then we must pay—now or eventually—the cost of rehabilitation. It is a part of the cost of the war, and it is a matter of particular interest at this time because a great many people are saying that the money they are asking us to spend ought to be spent in order to make work for the unemployed. We have no unemployment in this country. Neither in the cities nor on the farms are they able to secure the labor they need. They are advertising in the papers for people to work in the factories and they are advertising for people to work on the farms—and getting no applications.

This situation will continue. We need today every manufactured product that is consumed by a civilized people. Our shelves are bare; our warehouses are vacant; our pipe lines are empty. We need in this country 15,000,000 automobiles. We need 5,500,000 radios. We need everything that men consume. We have the money to pay for them. You cannot go downtown in Washington today and buy a shirt. They are not down there. We need men in factories all over the country to produce these goods. Just as soon as we can get those factories going, we will employ all of the labor in the country. And that situation will continue until we reach the saturation point in supplies. There is a difference of opinion among economists as to when that point will be reached, but nobody estimates it will be reached in less than 2 years. Some say 5 years. But at the end of that time, when we reach the saturation point in the production of goods for daily consumption, then the test will come. That is when unemployment will develop if at all—not for the next 2 years and perhaps not for the next 5 years, but when it comes, as inevitably it must come—and as it has come after every war—we must be prepared to meet it. How will you meet it? It will require huge expenditures. We must have money. But if we go out to every Member's congressional district and build everything his constituents want there, and spend all the money that they would like for us to spend there, with this huge unpaid debt still hanging over us, how will we be in a position to finance rehabilitation when the time comes—as come it must.

The alarming thing is that notwithstanding we have all these new expenses and fixed charges to meet now that the war is over, and with the decline in income there is a general expectation not only that we will continue to spend at the old rate of expenditure, but that we will actually increase expenditures. The people at home are demanding it. I have been alarmed at the letters I have received from my congressional district. From one town in my congressional district they wrote that they wanted to build a post office, an airport, a new sewer system, and a hospital; and they expect the Federal Government to pay for a large part of it just as in the old WPA days. All sorts of commercial clubs and business organizations are writing. Not only the people back home expect the Government to pay but the Congressmen expect to continue appropriations at prewar figures. Here in Congress bills are being introduced to authorize heavier expenditures than before the war. I read a bill just yesterday which has been introduced in another body. It is a general health bill. It provides for huge expenditures, never made before. Its aims are very desirable, of course. It provides for these vast appropriations but makes no provisions whatever for any funds to pay the expense except to take them out of the general revenues of the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that the policy of the National Government now is to take care of all flood-control projects, without any hope of recoupment from the localities or cities?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not know what the policy is, but I do know we have not got the money to do it. In view of the fact that the gentleman mentions flood control, let me say we had before our committee yesterday a Member who talked about a project for flood control in his district. He told us that for 50 years that water had been causing them damage. As a matter of fact, it had been causing damage ever since the river had been there. Now, if we could not finance before the war, how can we finance it now, after the war?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We have been led to believe in California, where we have a great many of these multipurpose dams, sometimes as many as five or six purposes, that the only chargeable cost against the consumers of electricity or water will be the costs that are properly allocated to hydroelectric power and irrigation. Is that not the fixed policy of this Government?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I cannot say what the fixed policy is, but regardless of whether it is as the gentleman indicates, or otherwise, we do not have the money with which to do it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I first wish to commend the gentleman for his fearless speech this morning, regardless of partisanship. Recently, in my own district, in making a speech or two along the same line, and the result it might have upon people as far as the bonds held by the people is concerned, I found that I received more applause along that line, from Democrats as well as Republicans. The whole country is thinking along the same line, I believe. But what surprised me was this: I saw in the Washington Post of Sunday a United Press story stating that investigation had disclosed and that the administration would soon submit a budget for it, that our deficit for this year would be somewhere around forty or fifty billion dollars. When we passed the tax bill, it was said the deficit would probably be $30,000,000,000 this year. I took occasion to say on the floor that it was a very illogical bill, with a deficit of $30,000,000,000 facing us this year, that we should reduce taxes. I want to ask the gentleman what is the likelihood as to

what our deficit will be for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The prospect now, as nearly as we can figure it, is that the Budget deficit for the coming year will be, roughly, between fifty and sixty billion dollars. Our income will be less than it was last year, and last year it was only $46,400,000,000.

But I am glad the gentleman mentioned his constituents. You know, we grow worried when we receive a telegram or a letter from back home demanding appropriations. But these demands are not as serious as they sometime seem. When I was home the last time delegates from various parts of my district visited me. All of you had about the same experience. They said they had completed plans for construction and needed Federal contributions, and wanted to know when they could get the money.

I explained there were no funds available from which such expenditure could be met, and that they would not be available until Congress voted them. Then I said, "As much as I regret to have to disappoint you, I must vote against the appropriation of any money for such purposes. The country is too deep in debt and we must begin cutting it down." Under the circumstances, I feel I would have to vote against the appropriation of money to start another WPA."

They were all businessmen. They talked it over for a minute and then said, "You are right about it. We do not want you to vote that money. Of course, if everybody else is going to get it, then we want ours; but if nobody is going to get it that suits us. We would rather pay off the debt and keep the finances of this country intact than to spend the money when we ought to be paying our debts." And they went away satisfied. But let me tell you that the conservative businessmen—the intelligent, average, solid citizen of your district—is going to stand back of you if you stand against reduction of taxes, against increased expenditures, and against appropriations for another WPA.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I asked the gentleman to yield to me in order that I might make an observation. The gentleman from Missouri is making an economic speech which I believe the entire Nation will applaud. He has here today charted the legislative course of the direction we in Congress must take if we are to save our country from financial disaster. He has said many things, in my opinion, which ought to be said for the good of the country; and I know of nobody who could have said the things more effectively or more impressively than the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has performed a great public service in his speech this afternoon.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to say that I am simply following the lead of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana who has always believed in a sane status of expenditure. I have always been glad to follow his lead, and when I did I always found I was in a sound and safe position.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri for the very splendid statement he made just preceding the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana. I should like to ask him if I understood him correctly when a few minutes ago he stated that our deficit next year would be between fifty and sixty billions of dollars?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That, of course, is purely a matter of estimate. No one can say what it will be. I have heard it stated as low as $40,000,000,000, although that was an exception to the rule. The average is about $50,000,000,000 and some go from fifty to fifty-five or fifty-six billions. That, of course, is only an estimate, but in any event we will have a huge deficit.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell me whether or not those figures have been arrived at with due consideration to the amounts of money we will secure from the disposal of surplus war stocks?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The disposal of surplus war stocks, of course, is a matter which will extend over a number of years and no one can make an accurate estimate as to what it will amount to in any particular year. It will be so distributed that the amount will not be very large in any particular year; and for that reason it will not be very appreciable in its effect on the national budget.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I believe the gentleman will agree that the amounts we receive will be very much greater in the immediate future than in the distant future.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If we repeat the experience we had in the last war, the largest amount will be received within the first year.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GILLESPIE. I believe the gentleman misstated himself. He said the deficit would be fifty to sixty billion dollars.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The budget will be fifty to sixty billion dollars. I thank the gentleman. That was a slip of the tongue.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the courageous statement he has made before the House today. I am no different than any other Member of this body. I am receiving telegrams, letters, and petitions urging me to vote very large sums for nearly every conceivable kind of activity, including Federal aid to schools. We have a duty to perform on this floor and that is to preserve a sound economic structure in this country. If we do not do that, what is there left for the hope of the world so far as maintaining world peace is concerned?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Finance, of course, is the cornerstone upon which everything must be based.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I refer to the committee report, page 3, and the title, "Temporary housing for veterans."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit me to take up the bill in detail a little bit later?

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL, 1946

Carries appropriations totaling $1,131,552,312.48.

Reduction under Budget estimates, $576,142,136.

Ninety-eight percent of the amount in the bill is traceable to the 12 items in the first tabulation on page 2 of the report.

As will be seen, the outstanding item in the list is the one of $928,000,000 for national service life insurance. That item alone accounts for 82 percent of the amount carried by the bill.

There is a statement respecting each of the items in the report.

The Employees' Compensation Commission item is for complying with the law providing for the compensation of civilians engaged on Government work who were captured and held prisoners by the Japanese.

For grants to States for unemployment compensation administration, there is a statement in the middle of page 8 of the report. The amount in the bill will increase the total for this year to $57,042,000. This pertains to USES, which is involved in the pending rescission bill. That is a question which the conferees will have to work out, including the proposition of bringing into line with this appropriation the funds available to the War Manpower Commission for the operation of employment offices. The item under consideration deals strictly with unemployment compensation expenses, but the law fixes an over-all ceiling on appropriations for the two.

Advance planning for public works: Appropriated heretofore $17,500,000. We provide an additional $12,500,000. We speak of this matter on pages 8 and 9 of the report. We were asked to provide an additional $107,500,000, of which $57,500,000 was by way of contractual authority.

You will note that we are providing that works readied for construction with this advance planning money are not to be financed by Federal lending agencies. The law says that the Congress shall not be in any way committed to appropriate funds to undertake any projects, plans for which were financed from advance planning funds.

It has been announced that the RFC will make loans or cooperate with private lenders for almost any type of construction work. In other words, we advance the money for the planning and the RFC, whose resources the Government owns, will finance or back the financing of the construction, which is

an indirect way of doing that which Congress has said in the law it would not do. Let us give private capital a chance. Let us make a real effort to regain complete control of the right to appropriate.

The Federal-aid highway item is in response to law. Reference on page 9 of report.

That is true, also, of the item below pertaining to forest roads and trails.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM, $14,000,000

This money is for the period ending December 31, 1946. Item discussed on page 13 of the report. The estimate and bill provide for an additional amount of approximately $4,250,000 to be raised by charging 50 cents a day, wherever practicable, for the number of days a man works. The estimated total availability for 1946 calendar year is $19,564,000, which Secretary Anderson believes will be adequate. This year the availability is about $32,000,000.

As domestic workers return to the farms, as it is hoped they will, the need for bringing in alien labor will diminish. What the situation will be during the next planting and harvesting seasons no one can foretell. This is an insurance appropriation.

As the program nears its end, there arises for consideration the disposition of camps, other facilities, and equipment which have been purchased for use in the housing of agricultural labor. It has been recommended to the committee that authority should be granted to dispose of such property to local public agencies or to nonprofit associations of farmers for continued use in the housing of agricultural labor. We are recommending such authority.

The census item is for enabling the Census Bureau to supply statistics for which there is an urgent demand on account of the switch-over from war to peace. It is a very economical program and should be of genuine value to business and industry in getting squared away for the new economy era. The program is detailed on page 356 of part I of the hearings.

The reclamation items are explained rather fully in the report, commencing on page 15. The projects are listed on pages 211–212 of part II of the hearings. If you wish any further word about them, we can hear later from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

There are many other items in the bill and we have screened them very carefully and very few have escaped without some pruning.

We have omitted from the bill funds under the four heads you will see listed in the lower table on page 2 of the report. They have been omitted without prejudice. All, in our judgment, need to be further studied, and that study can be made and, I am sure, will be made by the regular subcommittees.

The item of temporary housing for veterans could be a boomerang, if approved. I am not so sure that it is not more in the interest of becoming dispossessed of useless temporary housing, owing to its location, than to provide shelter for veterans in areas where a paucity of housing prevails.

The need of colleges for temporary housing for former servicemen has been considerably met by making available trailer-housing which has become idle. This is still going on. That matter is not involved here.

This proposition deals with providing for community shortages. It contemplates sawing up nonportable houses into sections or panels, crating them, and shipping them to new areas where a demand for housing for veterans exists.

Twenty-five thousand units are involved. To dismember, ship, and reerect costs $2,500 per unit average. To dismember and prepare for shipment costs $600 per unit average. The estimate contemplates that 20,000 units will be taken by communities which will pay all costs save the $600, and that 5,000 units will be supplied on requisition to communities, unable to pay, for which the Government will be charged the whole cost.

If the housing has any worth, there is a question as to why communities should not bear the whole expense. If the housing, when reerected, would be crude and uninviting, it is questionable whether or not the Government should be sponsoring that kind of shelter. Other than a small amount to smooth over sites from which housing would be removed, no appropriation is necessary if communities really want and will pay for this type of shelter.

In any event, the Independent Offices Subcommittee begins hearings on the 28th of this month on the 1947 Budget, and the Deficiency Subcommittee feels that that subcommittee should go into the matter at greater length and in greater detail.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES, $158,320,000

The estimate contemplates, first, additional amounts for construction previously appropriated for; second, additional establishments; and, third, extensions to existing accommodations.

We all recognize that additional permanent accommodations will have to be provided way and beyond what is contemplated by this estimate, which looks to adding 29,445 beds. Present number, 85,094; future objectives, 1955, 171,000; 1965, 249,400; 1975, 298,400.

This is a very important matter. It is felt that the Congress should have some voice in the location of hospitals and in the priority of providing for such locations. It is also felt that the Congress should make a study of existing facilities built during the war for the Army and Navy with the idea of later use by the Veterans' Administration, and see what the plan is with respect to such facilities. In other words, that there should be an examination of the Veterans' Administration pattern for future facilities, and that we should not go ahead with expanding programs without some knowledge of the program as a whole to the extent that it can be reasonably projected.

We have passed the item over, therefore, for the fuller consideration of the Independent Offices Subcommittee.

It was represented to the committee that the Veterans' Administration would like some expression of the Congress as to the utilization of war-built facilities, permanently or temporarily. We have included in the bill a paragraph reading as follows:

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, subject to the approval of the Federal Board of Hospitalization, is authorized to utilize such Army and Navy hospitals, temporary or otherwise, not required by the Army or Navy, as such Administrator and the Federal Board of Hospitalization may deem safe and suitable for the hospitalization or domiciliary care of veterans.

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS, $128,475,000

We have omitted the entire estimate. There are a number of projects which the Deficiency Subcommittee feels should be reexamined by the regular subcommittee having jurisdiction. That may mean a delay of possibly 75 days, because the War Department subcommittee may begin its hearings on the 1947 bill on the 7th of January. This bill will not be a law before the latter part of December. The other bill should be a law before the end of February.

We could have selected out for inclusion in this bill a large number of items, but it was considered to be to the best interests of all who are interested in the projects to have them all go over.

The projects which we feel should be further studied are the multi-purpose-dam projects. These are always costly installations and it is felt that it should be well established that the need for the multipurpose features is sufficient or will be sufficient to warrant the cost of dams of that character. Also, whether or not provision is being made for power when simply provision for future power installation would suffice. There is much money involved in this matter and we owe it to the House and to the people to do this sort of work just as economically as possible.

Mr. Chairman, we have grown so inured to the habit of spending that it is difficult to free ourselves of it. It is difficult for the people to get out of the habit and still more difficult for the Congress to get out of the habit.

After the debacle on Wall Street in which so many men went to ruin in 1929 a philanthropic organization investigated the suicides and found that the great majority of those suicides which followed the crash were not due to the loss of property, but due to the fact that their families could not understand their changed financial status and continued, or attempted to continue, to spend at the old rate at which they had spent in the days before the crash.

We have a crash in this country. We have burned up men and money in the crucible of war to an extent beyond all computation. Like those Wall Street families we must readjust ourselves to a changed financial status; we cannot spend after the crash at the rate at which we spent before the crash, and we must make the people at home understand that, and when they do understand they will support your policies of retrenchment and amortization here on the floor.

We face today a situation comparable only to that which faced American statesmen in the foundation of the Re-

public, and for that reason I would like to go back to those constituent assemblies which established the Government.

You men who sit here as Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress are the legislative descendants of great men in the Assembly which promulgated the Declaration of Independence and that which evolved the Constitution were men who sat about as we sit here today. Perhaps in some ways we have the advantage of them. In the first place, of course, we have a much larger number here in the House. We have 435 Members. Only 56 men signed the Declaration of Independence and 39 signed the Constitution. We are a good deal older than they were then. Those who signed the Declaration of Independence were an average of 43 years old. The men who signed the Constitution averaged 44 years. The average age of the membership in this House is a little over 56 years. We have 10 or 12 years the advantage of them in age and experience.

We are more cosmopolitan. They were sort of a provincial set, those fellows. They came from a little string of settlements along the Atlantic coast. We represent here today every section of the heart of the North American continent.

With the exception of Charles Carroll of Carrollton they all belonged to one church. They all worshipped alike. We belong to divers religious faiths. They all belonged to the same political party. They were Federalists. We represent both major political parties and perhaps some others.

They were largely men of one nationality. Practically all were English. We have here on this floor descendants of every nation in Europe. In other words, my colleagues, we today have every advantage of them. We are older, we are more experienced and we are in position to take a broader view. We have a richer background. But we face a problem second only in its serious import and implications to that which they faced when they founded this Government. They established the Government. It is up to us to maintain it.

I do not have to ask my colleagues, in passing on the appropriation bills which will come before the House in the next year, to take into consideration as they took into consideration at that time the welfare of the whole people, the welfare of the whole Nation, and the integrity of the Treasury of the United States. Now is the first criterion. This war is not won until we pay for it. The first interest of the American people is the safety of our Government. With that in view we are thinking of military conscription; of strengthening the Army and maintaining the Navy; of consolidating the various branches of the service. The dominant concern today is safety. But the first line of defense in any nation is a balanced budget. For the next several years that must be our first consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the question of the size of Federal appropriations, especially for nonessentials, is a matter of very grave concern. For this current fiscal year it is apparent that the Federal expenditures are going to run in the neighborhood of $65,000,000,000. It is apparent that the Federal income will not exceed $35,000,000,000. This means a deficit of at least $30,000,000,000. These figures are not exact, I appreciate that, but that is probably as good an estimate as anyone can make with the picture we have in front of us.

In 1947 we have certain things thrown at us as probable expenditures for the period beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1947. This is what they are talking about: Army, peacetime basis, $8,000,000,000. Navy, peacetime basis, $3,500,000,000. Compulsory military training, $2,000,000,000. Interest upon the public debt, $5,000,000,000. Departmental expenditures, $3,000,000,000. Veterans' Administration, $4,000,000,000. This is without any substantial construction program. The total of these items is $25,500,000,000.

There are folks who talk about wanting Federal expenditures of $2,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 for construction projects. There are folks who want spent in 1947 $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA, $3,000,000,000 for loans to Russia, and $5,000,000,000 for loans to Great Britain. Those items added together would involve $10,350,000,000, and the total with the figures that I have given you before would run $35,850,000,000. The largest revenues that anyone with any idea of Government finance can see in sight for the fiscal year 1947 is $25,000,000,000. In the years following that year there will be much smaller tax recoveries on account of previous years' operations because the tax items will be less and our excess-profits taxes will be out. And if it were not out, there would not be much excess-profits tax that they could collect from anybody because there cannot be expected to be any. That presents a picture that absolutely demands an intelligent approach, first on the part of the administration and the Budget; and, second, on the part of Congress.

Let me say to you that we must balance the Federal Budget. If the departments do not take it upon themselves to reorganize their ideas and put them on an intelligent basis instead of on a wildcat basis, it is going to be necessary for the Congress to do an operation on this picture. Frankly, we will have to ask the departments as they come before us to give us the priority in their minds, of every single item on which they come before us, before we make appropriations. If we do not do that, and if we do not trim the sails of governmental expenditures down to the point where there is a chance of balancing the Budget, America is going to take an inflation ride and America is going to get to the point where we will have nothing but paper-money inflation. We are getting there awfully fast right now with upwards of 25 billions of dollars of paper money outstanding, 5 times what it was before the war. What does that mean? That means that the United States of America must begin to wake up. That means that the membership of this Congress must show some sense of the responsibility of citizenship here in America and that we must stop trying to cater to every whim and trying to provide funds for things that we can do without. It means we must give the people in America an opportunity to live. If we do not do that, we will not measure up to the responsibilities that are ours.

This bill has been brought before you with $576,000,000 of cuts on the face of it. On the other hand, much of that is not a saving. For instance, we were confronted with a Budget estimate of $191,000,000 to operate the Surplus Property Administration. There was allowed $170,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

There was allowed $170,000,000, payable out of the receipts of the Surplus Property Administration.

There was a Budget estimate for $158,000,000 for veterans' hospitals. That was cut out because we did not feel that the justifications which were presented were satisfactory, and we felt it would be absolutely impossible for the Veterans' Administration to proceed at once with that construction. We felt that the regular Committee on Independent Offices, which begins hearings very shortly, should go over those items in detail and find out what should be done.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That hearing begins tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. That is what I understand.

It is also true that the supply of building labor available to do building is not sufficient to permit of the construction of any thing in most parts of the country today.

There were other items involved. There were river and harbor and flood-control items. On some of those items there were enormous power projects involved.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The very fact that these items have been omitted does not mean we are all opposed to them. It does mean that they are simply laid aside until a more opportune date, when they may be constructed, and when we are able to do it.

Mr. TABER. They have been laid aside by the committee on this basis: That no satisfactory hearings have been held where the Department has demonstrated that these projects should go ahead. The hearings which have been held were in the main most general and cursory in character. For instance, on one particular project, it is claimed there was $100,000,000 of flood damage, and the report of the Board of Engineers indicates that the annual saving on account of flood damage would be $208,000. That is the involved character of the thing that was presented to the committee. I am not satisfied with that kind of explanation. I could go into other items and call your attention to them and they

would be just as bad. I do not like to appropriate money in large volume on that sort of a picture. I do not see how the House can do it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Would the gentleman care to discuss a provision of the bill at this time?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the farm labor supply program appearing on page 22. I am gratified to know that the committee found it advisable to appropriate $14,000,000 for continuing this program during the next calendar year, but I would like to draw particular attention to the language starting on line 8, page 23, having to do with payments by the users of this labor of certain sums to the Secretary of Agriculture to defray the expenses.

The language is not specific and I wonder if the gentleman can advise the House just what is anticipated in the language between lines 8 and 16 on page 23, reading as follows:

> Whenever labor recruited from outside the State of use is furnished hereunder to any agency, public or private, or individual, the Secretary may make such charges for furnishing such labor as he may determine to be practicable to help defray the cost of recruitment, transportation, housing, medical care, and supervision, and the receipts derived therefrom shall be credited to the funds hereby appropriated and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of said act.

Mr. TABER. It indicates that the committee had in mind that these people who used this labor should pay some of these costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it indicates that the Secretary of Agriculture should fix that item, and I understand he has in mind to fix it at not exceeding 50 cents per day, which would go toward the expense the Government is put to. In other words, we want to get away just as far as possible and practicable from the idea of subsidy in connection with anything in the line of the Government's operation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think the gentleman will agree with me that where this is done the far-sighted farmers who find it necessary to use this imported labor and who sign advance contracts to use Mexican national labor, and leave the home labor supply available for other farmers in that same area, are actually going to be penalized for using the imported labor.

Mr. TABER. If they pay the same price they do for local labor, that may be so; but I would imagine that would be an item to be taken into consideration by the Secretary in fixing what wage the farmer would have to pay.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish in the first place to express my appreciation of the very able presentation the gentleman has made of this important subject. He has always been very careful in spending the people's tax money. What I wish to have clear in my mind is: What is the estimated cost of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946? I believe the gentleman gave it as $65,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. I do not see how the cost can be less than $65,000,000,000. I do not see how the revenues for that same period can exceed $35,000,000,000. This means a deficit of at least $30,000,000,000 and it might be much more, it might be more.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then with the figures the gentleman gave for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, we will still have a deficit for that year of some ten or fifteen billions of dollars.

Mr. TABER. That depends upon how wild we are in making appropriations for the fiscal year 1947. The revenues, in my opinion—and I believe I have a pretty good grasp of that picture—cannot exceed $25,000,000,000. If we give all these people what they are asking for we are going to have a deficit of a very substantial amount. The only way I can see that we can avoid a substantial deficit and a dangerous deficit is by putting on the brakes and keeping these expenditures down.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One other question, if the gentleman will permit. Did the gentleman's estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and June 30, 1947, include these recommendations of the President in his several messages to make large expenditures along various lines?

Mr. TABER. I have included in here UNRRA $1,350,000,000, loan to Russia $3,000,000,000, loan to Great Britain $5,000,000,000, and public works running anywhere from two to three billion dollars, all of which are not a necessity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does that include these prospective loans, gifts, or whatever you may call them, to France and a prospective loan to China which would run into several billion dollars?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I did not have those two in. Maybe I have left out something. I would not be surprised if I did.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. Does it include such items as Federal aid to public instruction, educational training, the food-stamp plan, school lunches, the national health program, and all those things?

Mr. TABER. It includes them in a very moderate degree, but not perhaps to the degree that a lot of these communistic promoters would like to have them.

Mr. SHAFER. I saw an item in the RECORD last week where these socialistic items, as you might call them, totaled somewhere around $40,000,000,000 by themselves.

Mr. TABER. I would not be surprised at that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, it is always a great pleasure to me to listen to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. There is no Member of the House who ranks higher in my estimation. He is honest and he is sincere. I do not always agree with him, however. I find myself in disagreement with him in regard to one very important subject matter with regard to which an amendment will hereafter be offered. But the gentleman from New York fights fair and straight from the shoulder and I am always glad to have an antagonist of that character when I must have an antagonist in the consideration of legislative problems.

I want to talk to you for a few minutes and to insert in the RECORD certain statistical data, permission for the insertion of which I have already procured in the House, with reference to the estimates for rivers and harbors work and flood control which were submitted by the Budget and which have been eliminated from this bill. These estimates total approximately $128,000,000.

You will observe from reading the hearings that these estimates were referred originally to the Civil Functions Subcommittee—that is, the War Department Civil Functions Committee—and that there were extensive hearings which are set out in volume 2 of the hearings before you, aggregating 659 pages with reference to those particular projects.

You will find that the President of the United States in a message he transmitted to the Congress in September of this year urged that these projects should again be undertaken, most of them having been projects of a type for which Congress had made appropriations prior to the war, which appropriations were canceled on account of the war with the understanding that the work which had been undertaken would be completed at the conclusion of hostilities.

Subsequent to the delivery of the message of the President to the Congress urging resumption of this work, budget estimates covering the sundry items to which I have made reference were in due course transmitted to the Congress, and, as I have said, were referred to the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

I understand from sources other than members of the committee itself that the Civil Functions Subcommittee approved all of those projects with the exception of four, totaling $6,200,000, and submitted its report in approval of those projects to the Deficiency Subcommittee which,

without having any hearings that amounted to very much, proceeded to disapprove the work of the Civil Functions Subcommittee which had been done by a practically unanimous vote—I believe it was stated that one member of that committee was in disagreement with the action of the full committee—and has eliminated all of the rivers and harbors and flood-control projects for which estimates were submitted by the Bureau of the Budget from the pending bill.

It is interesting to note in this connection that that course was not followed with reference to reclamation projects but that some $45,000,000 is carried in the bill for the completion of construction or carrying on of construction of various reclamation projects throughout the country. I am not here for the purpose of submitting any argument against reclamation projects but I am here as a representative from a section of the country which is vitally interested in the subject matter of flood control to insist that there ought not to be any discrimination in passing upon Budget estimates by any committees of this Congress as between projects of certain types which have been authorized as reclamation projects by the Congress and those which have been authorized as river and harbor or flood-control projects.

If you will examine the report of the committee on page 5 you will find the reason assigned for the elimination of these projects is that the Deficiency Subcommittee does not believe, apparently, that we ought to appropriate any more money for the development of projects which involve the production of power. By that conclusion, as stated in the report of the committee, they are seeking to embark the Congress upon a policy which is entirely at variance with that which it has pursued for the last several years. I hold no brief either for or against power companies. I believe that power companies, the stockholders of which are citizens of our country, are entitled to the equal protection of the law and fair treatment. Yet I do not think that at the behest of a power company or aggregation of power companies we ought to eliminate from consideration by the Congress flood-control projects which, incidentally, involve the production of power.

If you will examine page 77 of volume II of the hearings you will find a list of certain projects to which the deficiency subcommittee took pointed exception with the statement of the amount of the total construction cost in each case, and in the last column a statement of the estimated cost of power features. The first is the project of my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C., total estimated Federal cost of project, $30,900,000, estimated cost of power features $5,660,000, or approximately one-sixth of the total cost involved for the construction of the power features. It is not necessary at this time to refer to all of the other projects which are here listed, but I shall insert this table in the RECORD in accordance with the permission heretofore granted me in the House, and you will observe from an examination of the table that the cost of the power features of these several flood-control projects is only a minor portion of the total cost of the projects themselves.

The table is as follows:

Data on flood-control reservoirs, including power-generating facilities

The supplemental estimates include 56 reservoir projects, of which the following 13 reservoirs include power-generating facilities:

Project	Total estimated Federal cost of project	Initial power installation (kilowatts)	Estimated cost of power features
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	$30,900,000	85,500	$5,660,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	35,300,000	160,000	11,065,000
Allatoona Reservoir, Ga.	17,400,000	66,000	3,220,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark.	6,470,000	17,000	1,253,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark.	11,080,000	42,000	2,647,000
Norfolk Reservoir, Ark.	27,500,000	70,000	4,676,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark.	47,000,000	126,000	6,171,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla.	59,315,000	70,000	8,094,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla.	21,435,000	45,000	6,914,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.	130,000,000	80,000	5,900,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky.	52,000,000	135,000	9,522,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky.	22,739,000	36,000	5,075,000
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn.	25,400,000	90,000	6,200,000

NOTE.—Based on power market studies made by the Federal Power Commission there is need for power at all of these projects.

I wish to point out for the information of the House that the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative KERR, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, will on tomorrow, upon the reading of the bill, offer an amendment which is intended to carry into effect the conclusions of the Civil Functions Subcommittee which had the hearings on these items and is based upon its report to which I have referred.

I shall at this point in the RECORD insert a copy of Judge KERR's amendment. I also shall insert at this point in the RECORD a list of the projects which are involved, some 119 in number, as they appear on pages 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the hearings of the Civil Functions Subcommittee:

Amendment offered by Mr. KERR: On page 43, after line 2, insert the following:

"RIVERS AND HARBORS

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Rivers and harbors,' including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $25,516,000, to remain available until expended.

"FLOOD CONTROL

"Flood control, general: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Flood control, general,' including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $81,759,000: *Provided*, That any dam constructed at the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir site shall not be operated at a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet above sea level unless operation at a higher pool elevation subsequently is authorized by law, and no part of this appropriation shall be used to design or construct dikes or levees for operating such dam at a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet above sea level.

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries,' including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended."

NOTE.—The foregoing accords in form, text, and amount with the Budget submission, with the exception of the proviso limiting the height of the Garrison Reservoir Dam to 1,830 feet above sea level, and the amount for "Flood control, general," which is $6,200,000 less than the estimate because of the proposal of the War Department subcommittee to eliminate the following projects:

Osceola Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Mo.	$1,000,000
Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga.	200,000
Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa.	3,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif.	2,000,000
Total	6,200,000

TABLE I.—*Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946, new work*

Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.	$75,000
Hudson River, N. Y.	515,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway	2,000,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea	743,700
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal	645,000
Potomac River water front, District of Columbia	413,000
James River, Va.	652,000
Charleston Harbor, S. C.	185,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La.	1,573,500
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.	3,439,500
Missouri River at Fort Peck, Mont.	1,185,000
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.	2,700,000
Keweenaw waterway, Michigan	548,000
Racine Harbor, Wis.	72,300
Lorain Harbor, Ohio	131,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.	967,000
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.	571,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif.	7,100,000
Suisun Canal, Calif.	160,000
Sacramento River, Calif.	390,000
San Joaquin River, Calif.	150,000
Columbia River and tributaries, Celilo Falls to Snake River	100,000
Total new work	24,316,000
MAINTENANCE	
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal	1,200,000
Total	25,516,000

TABLE II.—*Flood control, general—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946*

Franklin Falls Reservoir, N. H.	$60,600
Mountain Brook Reservoir, N. H.	521,500
Nashua, N. H.	195,000
Mansfield Hollow Reservoir, Conn.	1,500,000
Norwich, Conn.	632,000
Union Village Reservoir, Vt.	1,000,000
Surry Mountain Reservoir, N. H.	17,000
Knightville Reservoir, Mass.	14,000
Hartford, Conn.	285,000
Winsted, Conn.	132,500
Springfield, Mass. (Mill River)	42,000
West Springfield, Mass. (Agawam)	338,000
Riverdale, Mass.	403,000
Chicopee, Mass.	170,000
Holycke, Mass.	500,000
Syracuse, N. Y.	500,000
East Sidney Reservoir, N. Y.	700,000

Whitney Point, N. Y	$243,000
Elmira, N. Y	1,000,000
Lisle, N. Y	240,500
Bath, N. Y	295,500
Addison, N. Y	331,100
Almond Reservoir, N. Y	1,000,000
Canisteo, N. Y	250,700
Almond, N. Y	30,500
Sunbury, Pa	500,000
Williamsport, Pa	1,000,000
Wilkes-Barre, Hanover Township, Pa	135,000
Plymouth, Pa	400,000
York, Pa	218,200
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C	1,000,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	1,000,000
Allatoona Reservoir, Ga	3,000,000
Homochitto River, Miss	15,000
Wallace Lake Reservoir, La	193,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Terre Noire Creek, Ark	100,300
Bayou Bodeau, Red Chute and Loggy Bayou, La	65,000
Bayou Bodeau Reservoir, La	1,000,000
Shreveport, La	500,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark	500,000
Memphis, Tenn	1,000,000
Buffalo Bayou, Tex	1,500,000
Columbus, Tex	212,800
John Martin Reservoir, Ark	500,000
Blue Mountain Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Nimrod Reservoir, Ark	198,500
Clearwater Reservoir, Mo	1,000,000
Norfolk Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark	3,000,000
Fort Smith, Ark	853,600
Little Rock, Ark	548,400
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	1,500,000
Canton Reservoir, Okla	2,000,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla	2,000,000
Fall River Reservoir, Kans	1,000,000
Wister Reservoir, Okla	1,000,000
Hutchinson, Kans	500,000
Union Township drainage district levee, Missouri	47,000
Green Bay levee and drainage district No. 2, Iowa	49,300
Dry Run, Iowa	382,500
Lake Traverse and Bois de Sioux River, S. Dak. and Minn	45,800
Lac Qui Parle Reservoir, Minn	30,900
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans	2,000,000
Kanopolis Reservoir, Kans	1,000,000
Osceola Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Mo	1,000,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak	2,000,000
Council Bluffs, Iowa	500,000
Omaha, Nebr	500,000
Hamburg, Iowa	236,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr., and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa	500,000
Schuyler, Nebr	64,000
Hot Springs, S. Dak	154,000
Cotton Wood Springs Reservoir, S. Dak	510,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky	4,000,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	1,500,000
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn	3,000,000
Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga	200,000
Brevoort Levee, Ind	30,000
Muncie, Ind	70,000
Harrisburg, Ill	24,500
Golconda, Ill	29,200
Brookport, Ill	28,500
Mounds and Mound City, Ill	500,000
Newport, Ky	500,000
Delaware Reservoir, Ohio	1,000,000
Muskingum River Reservoirs, Ohio	1,500,000
Bluestone Reservoir, W. Va	3,000,000
Massillon, Ohio	500,000
Parkersburg, W. Va	500,000
Dewey Reservoir, Ky	1,000,000
Dillon Reservoir, Ohio	1,000,000
Tionesta Reservoir, Pa	277,600
Mahoning Creek Reservoir, Pa	360,000
Loyalhanna Reservoir, Pa	$494,000
Youghiogheny River Reservoir, Pa	573,000
Crooked Creek Reservoir, Pa	3,000
Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa	3,000,000
Punxsutawney, Pa	500,000
Elkins, W. Va	500,000
Coal Creek drainage and levee district, Illinois	500,900
Kelly Lake drainage and levee district, Illinois	97,900
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas and Kerton Valley drainage and levee district, Illinois	172,900
Sebewaing, Mich	241,800
Lancaster, N. Y	570,400
Mount Morris Reservoir, N. Y	500,000
Santa Fe Reservoir, Calif	900,500
Los Angeles River, Calif	2,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif	2,000,000
Big Dry Creek Reservoir and diversion, California	435,000
McKensie River, Oreg	62,000
Cottage Grove Reservoir, Oreg	11,500
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg	2,000,000
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg	1,000,000
Mill Creek, Wash	125,600
Mud Mountain Reservoir, Wash	257,000
Tacoma, Wash	700,000
Yakima, Wash	134,000
Snagging	500,000
Round-off	−100
Total	85,159,000

TABLE III.—*Projects requiring additional funds for advance planning in fiscal year 1946*

Bennington Reservoir, N. H	$30,000
Nashua, N. H	7,000
West Peterboro, N. H	8,000
North Andover and Lawrence, Mass	9,000
North Plymouth Reservoir, N. Y	100,000
Genegentalet Reservoir, N. Y	60,000
Philpott Reservoir, Va	150,000
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Ark. and La	150,000
Big and Little Sunflower Rivers, etc	150,000
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff, Mo	15,000
Black River, Poplar Bluff, Mo., to Knobel, Ark	10,000
Creede, Colo	5,000
Louisville, Ky	100,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek levee, Ind	8,000
Indianapolis, Warfleigh section, Ind	8,000
Bald Hill Reservoir, N. Dak	35,000
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers, Minn	30,000
Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin, Ind., Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif Folsom Reservoir, Calif Table Mountain Reservoir, Iron Canyon site, Calif Terminus Reservoir, Calif Isabella Reservoir, Calif	600,000
Harlan County Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Nebr	300,000
Panther Mountain Reservoir, N. Y	50,000
Cahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	200,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak	100,000
Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans	200,000
Success Reservoir, Calif	50,000
New Melones Reservoir, Calif	125,000
Lookout Point Reservoir, Oreg	100,000
Quartz Creek Reservoir, Oreg	150,000
Recreational investigations and plans	50,000
Total	2,800,000

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I think there are 4 less than 119. I think 4 of them were deleted in the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Yes, the gentleman is correct. Four of them have been deleted in the amendment; 119, however, are included in the statistical data I am placing in my remarks at this point, the deletions having been made because of the recommendation submitted by the Subcommittee on Civil Functions which conducted the hearings.

These appropriations, in my judgment, are going to be made. I appreciate the arguments which have been advanced and which I have heard so many times heretofore from the gentleman from Missouri in the interest of economy. I think my record is one of economy. I am willing to compare it with that of any other Member of the House. I believe in economy. But by rejection of these items you will not save the Treasury of the United States one thin dime. The Senate last summer almost decided to place these items in a deficiency bill, but at that time decided that it would defer action until after the conclusion of actual hostilities. At that time there were no Budget estimates for them. I have assurance that there will be little if any question but that if the House does not restore these items to the bill they will be restored by senatorial action in connection with the pending bill.

I understand it is contemplated by the Deficiency Subcommittee that these items should go back to the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the War Department for further study and consideration in connection with the bill which it is to submit during the early part of the coming year. It is not to be anticipated that that subcommittee after further hearings will take any action different from that which it has already taken by practically unanimous vote. The only effect of that would be to attempt to postpone final action in the matter. Further, of course, the regular bill reported next year would not become effective until July 1, 1946, whereas the moneys carried in this bill become immediately available.

So the question is, it seems to me, whether you are going to take care of these flood-control problems with regard to which the President of the United States has recommended immediate action and has transmitted budget estimates to the Congress for consideration, or whether you are going to leave them out of the bill and permit the Senate to make the restoration. I have no question but that if the Senate does make the restoration the vote of this House will probably be overwhelmingly in favor of the approval of the Senate amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I am wondering if the gentleman is for the Kerr amendment which he intends to insert in the RECORD.

Mr. TARVER. My remarks have been absolutely to that point. Unless I have convinced the gentleman that I am very strongly in favor of the Kerr amendment I am afraid the gentleman has not heard

everything I have undertaken to say. I not only think the Kerr amendment should be adopted, but I feel that every consideration of fairness, of equity, and of justice to the sections of the country that are damaged by flood requires that that amendment be approved.

They say the amount involved is tremendous. It is approximately $121,000,000, with the $6,200,000 eliminated to which I made reference a while ago. It is for the reclamation or the protection of certain vast and important areas in the United States.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has just pointed out the fact that we are going to consider lending, it is said, practically giving, $4,000,000,000 to England for reconstruction purposes, and $6,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000, the amount varying in the statements of various gentlemen, for the use of Russia in reconstruction; yet we gag at appropriating $121,000,000 for our own people to solve very important flood problems for them. They talk about how we are going to increase the national debt by doing that. They say, "For heaven's sake, do not do anything for the people of the United States." But, of course, you know whether you and I are for it or not, practically everything that Russia or the British Empire wants will be made available by a generous Congress. I think it is time for us to give a little consideration to our own people and not let these arguments of economy force us into the position of not making provision for our own people at a time when we are making tremendous provisions for people of foreign lands.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Of course, as the gentleman has so ably stated, flood control is almost an age-long program in this country. It is a continuous program. Does not the gentleman look at it in that light? It is a program that you cannot very well break up. It is a well recognized program. I live on the Ohio River. There are about 175 miles of the Ohio River front in my district. We have looked with favor on flood control and water conservation for generations.

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman is undoubtedly correct. With reference to one particular project, and I make no bones of the fact that I am interested in a project in my own district, and I think I have a right to be—I certainly would be recreant to my duty if I were not—in the case of this particular project, it has been three times approved by the Congress in two flood control bills and in one rivers and harbors bill. It has been twice approved by this same deficiency committee that now cuts it out. This deficiency committee appropriated $3,000,000 initially for the beginning of this project a number of years ago; $1,065,000 has been spent on it; thereafter, $10,000,000 were approved as a supplemental appropriation. But those appropriations were canceled on account of the war with the understanding that the work was going to be continued after the war was over. Now they talk about having further hearings and reviewing the power features of these projects and things of that sort. They have had hearings before the Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Committees and before the Deficiency Subcommittee itself, which has approved appropriations for that particular project. They had hearings before the Civil Functions Subcommittee into whose particular jurisdiction this subject matter falls. All of those committees, after complete hearings, have approved this project. Now, why—because somebody is distressed for fear that a little too much power may be produced in this country in competition with the power companies—why should we pick out rivers and harbors and flood control items and slap them down and then put everything else in the bill? Why should we say we are not going to consider those until later? Of course, some of those who do not want to consider them until later do not want to consider them at all, and if they have their way about it they never will be considered.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman referred in the committee and again today to the table on page 77 with reference to the 13 projects which have power in them.

Mr. TARVER. That is the table cited by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes, that is right. The table has three columns—first, the total estimated Federal cost of each project; second, the initial power in kilowatts; and, third, the estimated cost of the power features. The gentleman stated that the third column contained the increased cost of the dam, because of power requirements. The third column contains only the cost of the power features or installations and does not include the increased cost of the dam because of power requirements.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry I cannot yield further to the gentleman because I have so little time. I said exactly what the statement says and I read from the statement. "The estimated cost of the power features" is the exact language which I used and it is the language used in the hearings. I said nothing about the cost of the dam. I said, according to this statement, total estimated cost of the project is carried in the first column. In the third column there is carried the estimated cost of the power feature.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. You would have to add to that the estimated cost of the dam.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman reasons in that way about these matters. I understand the gentleman favors completion of these projects, such as the one in which I am interested in my own State, which was begun prior to the war and for which appropriations were made prior to the war. But I do not want to be selfish about such matters myself. I think some of our colleagues have other projects which are included in this list which are equally deserving of attention, and when they have had approval of these projects by everybody, from the President of the United States on down, except the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which itself has approved most of them on previous occasions, it seems to me there is no reason why this House should not make the appropriation which has been recommended by the Budget.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman wants to be accurate, does he not?

Mr. TARVER. I think I am.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Now, does or does not this third column include the increased cost of the dam because of the installation of power?

Mr. TARVER. As I understand it from the statement submitted to the committee, of which the gentleman is a member, and I am glad the gentleman is interrogating me, because he will know whether or not I state the matter correctly——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman can corroborate the statement which I have made as to my understanding from other sources than members of the committee with reference to what your subcommittee did. I understood the gentleman from Michigan is the only member of the subcommittee who favored eliminating these projects, and he did not favor eliminating those for which appropriations were made before the war. But however that may be, I understand the third column relates to the additional cost of the project on account of the power features. In other words, that the rest of the project would cost, in the case of the proposal of the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, $5,660,000 less than the $30,900,000 if the development of this power were not included. That is what it says.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman is in error. I just talked to the engineering department of the War Department again, and they informed me that this cost that you have in the third column takes in only the power installations, and it does not include the increased cost of the construction of the dam because of the power features.

Mr. TARVER. I prefer to rely upon the testimony in the printed hearings before the subcommittee, of which the gentleman is such an able member. Those hearings convinced all of his colleagues except himself that these Budget estimates should be approved; and, in my judgment, the House of Representatives should approve them, and I hope it may do so by the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] when it is offered tomorrow, either by himself or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Will the gentleman also put in the RECORD the letter which the War Department submitted to me in which they sent me this table, in which they so state?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is a distinguished Member of this body and he can call attention to anything he desires, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a few observations on the bill which we now have under consideration.

The first observation is this: It is apparent from the record that various agencies included in this bill have taken things into their own hands, to the extent of appointing personnel for which there has been no authorization from the Congress.

This appears to be the case with respect to the Federal Communications Commission, the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, and the Bureau of Customs.

In other instances, increases in salaries which are not mandatory have been allowed without even the courtesy of consultation with the committees of Congress in charge of the appropriations for the agency in question.

At times the agency has consulted the Bureau of the Budget. At other times it has acted without that consultation. It appears that in at least one instance the Bureau of the Budget went so far as to advise the agency that it could go ahead and make the increase and that it was unnecessary to contact the appropriate committee before doing so.

It is, of course, perfectly meaningless for the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and the Congress as a whole to determine how much a given agency shall or shall not have if the agency is going to take things into its own hands thereafter and proceed, regardless. The practice must stop.

There is another general observation which I wish to make. The financial course which this country has been following, and the tremendous dangers involved for every man, woman, and child in this country have been emphasized, today. It was my lot in the years after the last war on the other side of the water to come face to face with the suffering resulting from uncontrolled inflation, not only in Germany but in other countries in Europe. In the light of this experience the situation in this country today is not a comforting one. We are confronted by a so-called national debt approaching $300,000,000,000. We are confronted by another contingent national debt which we hear very little about amounting to well over $300,000,000,000. We are confronted by a further deficit, referred to this afternoon in the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] of thirty, thirty-five, or forty billion dollars, whatever it proves to be. We are confronted by the tremendous sums we have been pouring into Europe in one way or another, by the enormous demands upon this country in the postwar period both domestic and foreign, by a currency expanded to some $25,000,000,000. The possibilitiy of savage inflation in this country is enough to keep anyone awake nights. To me it is the most serious danger confronting the Nation at this time.

Now there are members of the committee and of the House who feel that the committee went too far in postponing or excluding items from consideration in this deficiency bill. Personally, I do not agree with them. Personally, I think the committee failed to go far enough in this direction.

There is in contemplation at this time a tremendous expansion in the minds of certain departments and agencies of this Government. Some of that expansion may be justified. I believe, however, that generally speaking, the expansion in any given department or agency should be considered as a whole by the subcommittee charged with responsibility for that agency; and that it should not be considered in a piecemeal manner.

In this bill, although it is a deficiency bill, we have expansion provided for the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, and the Federal Communications Commission. I want to say a word in respect to each expansion.

The Department of Commerce, the record indicates, contemplates an expansion program which will cost $192,000,000 in the coming fiscal year. That compares with an appropriation of $79,000,000 for the present year.

The basis for this enormous expansion may perhaps be found in the thought expressed by one of the representatives of the Department who indicated that in his opinion, during the past 12 years, the Department, under Secretary Jones and other Secretaries, had just failed to do its job.

Or perhaps it may be found in the old-time slogan of "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect" which, judging by the prospective mailing list of 2,750,000 manufacturing concerns and the colorful charts presented to the committee by Secretary Wallace himself, would appear to be still in full force and effect.

Four items aggregating $8,464,000 were presented to your committee by the Department.

Let us take, for instance, the Secretary's office itself. The Congress allowed the office for the current year the sum of $570,000. Shortly after Secretary Wallace came into office we gave him $83,000 more. Now, the Department is back here with a request for an additional $150,000. If that were allowed in full it would mean he would have 50 percent more for his own office than we originally appropriated for this fiscal year.

If this request were allowed in full, the record indicates we would have the following set-up in Mr. Wallace's own office: One Secretary of Commerce, eight assistants to the Secretary of Commerce, eight assistants to the assistants to the Secretary of Commerce, one executive assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, one Under Secretary of Commerce, two assistants to the Under Secretary of Commerce, one Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and two assistants to the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, as well as the Solicitor with his force, a brand new set-up for program coordination and a 300-percent expansion in his office of information—an expanded publicity force—a total of 299 people in this one office as compared with 213 now.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How much of this additional force in the Department of Commerce did the committee allow in this bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. For this particular item the committee allowed $63,400, as compared with the request for $150,000.

Mr. STEFAN. How many additional employees have you allowed the Department of Commerce which are not authorized by law or which has not been before the regular committee making appropriations for the Department of Commerce?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot give the gentleman that over-all figure for the various items at the moment.

Mr. STEFAN. Why did not your committee hold this item up in order that the regular committee which deals with these items for this particular department and which knows practically all about it, having worked on it for years, might go into the matter? Why did you not let the regular committee pass on this?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman and I see eye to eye. I made that suggestion when the bill was being marked up, but got nowhere. This and other items in my opinion should have gone to the proper subcommittee so that the whole expansion program could have been considered together.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that when the Deficiency Committee adds additional employees to the various agencies of the Government that appear before the Committee on Deficiencies, those employees are usually frozen into the service, which makes it very unfair to the committee considering these bills to pass intelligently on the new requests for the next fiscal year.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is the old story of the camel getting his nose under the tent.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Nebraska who has just interrogated the gentleman from Massachusetts finds some fault and makes some complaint about the procedure of the Appropriations Committee of which both gentlemen are members. I want to renew an old complaint which I have made so many times and this bill accentuates the necessity of making the change which I have advocated. I hold in my hand the printed copy of the hearings held by the deficiency subcommittee of which the gentleman is a member. It is in two parts; 892 pages in one part and 665 pages in the other. That subcommittee has devoted a great deal of work to, and should know a great deal about this bill. I also hold in my hand the bill itself, containing 50 pages; then I hold in my hand the report on the bill, the explanation of the committee as to the necessity for the items in the bill, which consists of 43 pages.

The point I want to make is that late yesterday afternoon the Appropriations Committee asked to have until midnight

last night in which to report out this bill. Up to that time the contents of this bill were unknown to all but the Committee on Appropriations.

None of this information to which I have referred was available to Members of the House not members of the Committee on Appropriations until the House convened at 12 o'clock this noon; therefore the House at this good hour is considering appropriating one-billion-one-hundred -and -thirty -one -million-and-some - odd - hundred - thousand dollars without any knowledge at all, other than information obtained from the floor of the House, from the few members of the committee who know something about the bill. That method is wrong. That method is not democratic. That method should be changed, and the Committee on Appropriations is the first committee who should ask that this method be changed.

Oh, yes; I forgot an important part, and that is this, that these hearings to which I have referred, consisting of several hundreds of pages, were conducted in executive session, which means in secret session, by the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I was not present, and I have not been told by a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but I understand, and it is commonly reported in the press gallery, that there was a real dispute in the Committee on Appropriations yesterday based upon the fact that some Member of Congress or some member of the press found out, before this bill came to the floor this morning, something about some of the items contained in the bill. Can we justify a condition like that? Of course, we cannot. No member of the Committee on Appropriations itself will question a single statement of fact I have made. I challenge any member of the committee or anyone else to stand up here now and answer the logic of my few desultory remarks.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the general objectives of the gentleman from Michigan. I may say in this connection, however, that I understand the hearings on this bill were available to Members of the House last Friday, and that the report was available as of 3:30 yesterday afternoon.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. It was only yesterday afternoon that permission was granted by the House to file the report printed before midnight. Certainly it was not printed and it was not available to anybody before it was printed. You could hardly expect Members of Congress to be sitting around here waiting on the committee to get a report at midnight.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I had a copy of the report considerably ahead of that, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. But the gentleman is a member of the committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If I may resume where I left off, in reference to the Department of Commerce I may point out that in addition to the increase referred to there has been $250,000 allowed for a declassification and technical service, a brand new set-up to act as a clearing house for scientific and other data obtained abroad, which is supposed to be helpful to business, which may very well involve considerable duplication and which very well may run into several millions of dollars, when considered in connection with expenditures by other agencies working in this field.

There has also been allowed $3,250,000 for the Bureau of the Census on top of the $5,378,000 already appropriated for 9 census projects, some of them sampling in character, all of them to be conducted under abnormal conditions, all of them to be conducted despite the fact that we have some 65 agencies of Government that are gathering statistics at this time.

Further, there has been allowed an item of $675,000 for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, on top of the $2,000,000 appropriated in the regular bill.

I defy anyone to read the hearings on this item and to form an intelligent opinion as to what the money is to be used for. It was one of the most unsatisfactory hearings I ever recall. About the only thing that is clear is that it is intended, among other things, to lead small business by the hand in every conceivable way, even down to the proper operation of bars and grills.

There is a large increase contemplated in every one of nine divisions in this Bureau, as well as the creation of a new Division on Industrial Relations, because, we were advised, nobody in the Department of Commerce is equipped to talk to a labor-management conference so we have to set up a brand new organization in this Department duplicating that which we already have in the Labor Department.

I think the whole expansion proposed should be set aside and turned over to the regular subcommittee to be considered as a part of the $192,000,000 program which Secretary Wallace has in mind at this time.

Similarly, in the State Department, you will find a request for $1,740,000 for an increase in personnel in the Secretary's office. You will find $5,200,000 asked for an increase in the foreign auxiliary service. You will find a request for $2,000,000 for what is called the Interim Research and Intelligence Service. That is the new name for the OSS, or that part of it which is to be taken over by the State Department.

There is an enormous expansion contemplated by the Department not only in its regular functions but in respect to OSS, OWI, OIAA, FEA, and so on.

I am not opposed to the taking over of essential functions of these agencies; in fact I advocated this action on the floor of the House many months ago. I am opposed, however, to using the deficiency bill as a means of permanent expansion which should be justified in connection with the overall expansion program before the regular subcommittee.

Just take for a minute this OSS expansion. The Department of State wants to take over 853 people from OSS. They have in their European and African Divisions at the moment about 183 people. They intend to add 118 people. In their Latin-American Division they have 110 and they want to add 35. In the Far Eastern Division they have 45, and they want to add 117. They have 98 down for a so-called Central Information Division; 74 for a Presentation Division, to prepare charts and other graphic work; and 38 for a Reproduction Division. The increase calls for detailed justification.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

If there is one department in this Government that needs strengthening, in my judgment, it is the State Department. There never was a time in our history when a strong State Department and a strong foreign policy were more important. I am for abler key men; I am for a firmer foreign policy but I do not believe you are going to get it by a haphazard, piecemeal method of approach. The situation calls for careful and comprehensive consideration, with the complete elimination of politics.

If time permits, I want to say a further word in reference to the Federal Communications Commission.

In 1940 this agency had an over-all appropriation of $1,800,000. This year it had an appropriation of $5,000,000. In the rescission bill the House reduced this appropriation by $930,000; nevertheless, the agency comes before us again with a request for $785,000 more. It requests an increase in personnel from 1,165 to 1,661 as compared with a force of 625 people just prior to the war. It makes this request despite the fact that the Senate has restored the $930,000 eliminated by the House in the rescission bill.

In the engineering department it wants an increase of 182. It has 648 employees now. In the accounting department it has 127; it wants 67 more. In the law department it has 78; it wants 75 more. In the Secretary's office it has 226; it wants 167 more.

It is difficult to understand how any such increase can be justified. It has not been justified to date, and regardless of its merits or demerits should be referred to the regular committee, which is starting hearings tomorrow on a request for the fiscal year 1947 amounting to more than $6,000,000, in order that the entire expansion contemplated may be considered as a whole.

Attention of the Members is particularly directed to a list of personnel and salaries in the Legal Department of the Commission and the enormous salary increases in various instances appearing at page 37 of the hearings.

Attention is also called to the extent to which the agency frowns upon suggestions made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], contemplating a policy of recovery by taxation or otherwise of part of the enormous profits realized by temporary holders of Government franchises obtained without cost.

There are other things to which I would like to refer. In view of the shortness of time, however, I will close by simply calling the attention of the Members to several matters: First, to the testimony of General Bradley in regard to his plans for decentralization of the Veterans' Administration; second, to the testimony of Mr. Symington in reference to the Surplus Property Administration; third, to the provision unanimously inserted by the committee with a view to terminating any further activities under the Smith-Connally Act; and finally, to the road program which we are embarking upon providing for $500,000,000 a year for 3 years. I emphasize that this program, like other road programs, involves the incurring of obligations before any appropriation is made. It is too late to lock the door after the horse is out of the stable. I have always thought this procedure was wrong. I think it is particularly wrong in times like these when retrenchment is vital. I intend to introduce a bill which will apply not only to this program, but to all road programs with a view to changing the procedures.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am among the Members of the House who generally follow the Committee on Appropriations after they have heard the evidence and carefully weighed the matters that have been submitted for their consideration. I, therefore, very deeply regret that I am forced to say in my judgment the committee in reporting the pending bill has made a very great mistake. I think unwittingly they have committed a very grave error. I speak with respect to the Budget recommendations submitted to the Congress and to the committee by the President of the United States for $25,000,000, approximately, for river and harbor work; for $37,000,000 for national flood control; and for $15,000,000 for flood control along the lower Mississippi River. In my judgment, the utter rejection of every one of these items constitutes not only an injustice, but in view of the other provisions of the bill, a discrimination that I do not believe the House of Congress or the country will stand for. Sound public works for the normal needs and functions of the Government are always in order. But sound public works capable of expansion in times of unemployment to stimulate employment in private industry are absolutely essential in our economy.

I have been rather amused at the argument of the distinguished chairman of the committee as to why no provision was made for these important public works. The word "economy" was used by him repeatedly. I answer: "How can you reconcile the use of the word 'economy' in December and emphasize the word 'appropriations' in January following?" That argument simply will not hold water. It is inconsistent. It simply does not make sense to say that we reject the appropriation in December but we will make it in January.

Nor is that all. As I said, I believe in public works—including highway construction and reclamation. Provision has been made for highway construction and reclamation in this bill. Reclamation applies to the great West, and I have stood for sound reclamation projects. I want to emphasize in this bill that it is rank discrimination, nay, more, it is a grave injustice, in my judgment, with all regard to the Committee on Appropriations, when they recommend an appropriation of substantially $77,000,000 for reclamation in the pending deficiency bill and refuse to appropriate one cent for the harbors from Maine to Los Angeles and from Portland to Jacksonville, or one cent to prevent the loss of life and property from overflows, no matter where they may occur in the United States. We believe in economy. We believe in retrenchment where retrenchment should be made, but the American people also believe in fairness and we believe in fairness to all parts of our common country.

Advocating as I do reclamation, advocating as I do flood control, sound projects, I assert, and I challenge anybody to contradict successfully the proposition, that this is the first time, certainly within my recollection, over a long period of years, when there was a Budget recommendation, when the President of the United States recommended projects for reclamation that were approved, and recommended projects for flood control and rivers and harbors that were absolutely rejected.

I should like to say another thing. The RECORD discloses and the hearings disclose that the recommendations for river and harbor improvements, and for flood control took the usual course. They were referred to the War Department Civil Functions Committee, the committee that has reported to Congress the expenditure of multiplied billions of dollars to win the war, and we followed their lead. They have reported the largest appropriations in this or any other country. They recommended, with an amendment reducing national flood control by about $6,000,000, the appropriation as submitted by the Budget, for flood control, and rivers and harbors. The Budget recommended the flood-control and river-and-harbor appropriations. Their recommendations were rejected.

Let me say this: A similar course was pursued, according to the hearings, with respect to reclamation. The reclamation projects were referred to the Subcommittee on the Interior Department Appropriation. There was a Budget recommendation of substantially $99,000,000 for reclamation in the West. This report approved $77,000,000. There was a Budget recommendation for $87,000,000 for national flood control, and the subcommittee recommended, after considering as carefully as they have any previous appropriation, approximately $81,000,000.

I say that the people of the United States, Members of this House, believe in fairness.

While I advocate reclamation for the Western States, I assert that the harbors—and we have more ships than ever before in the history of our country along the Atlantic Seaboard, the Gulf, and the Pacific—are entitled to consideration. I assert the property that has been destroyed, I assert the lives that have been lost, by floods, are monumental witnesses to the fact that we sacrificed much when we in October 1943, under WPB L–41 eliminated all flood control and all reclamation and all river and harbors works for the duration with a few exceptions, to promote the war. We did that and we did not make any complaint, but now we say that flood works should be inaugurated when highway inmprovements are being started; and we say of national flood control that when in 1943 we made an annual appropriation of approximately $130,000,000 for national flood control from New England to Los Angeles and from Portland to Jacksonville, but that money was transferred, that money was impounded, the least that can be done now is for these projects to be taken up where we left off and for us to begin in flood control as we are beginning in highway construction, and as we are beginning in reclamation.

It has been said to me, and the report indicates, that one of the reasons why the Committee rejected, absolutely rejected, no matter how much money the local people put up, no matter how many bonds had been issued, interest being paid on the bonds, people furnishing rights-of-way and easements, no matter how much money had been spent in the emergency—as it was spent in Louisiana by the millions because of the incomplete state of the lower Mississippi River project—was as the committee says, "We should like to postpone this matter from December until January and we want to look into it a little bit further."

I know about comparisons. I just want to say this to reassure the Members of the House. The flood-control recommendations submitted by the Director of the Budget were after the most comprehensive hearings, provided for with respect to any public works in the United States. Let me remind you that which you yourself know, that first of all in flood control—and the same thing applies to rivers and harbors, I am not a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors but the procedure is the same—there is a requirement for a preliminary examination. The district engineer notifies all people interested, not in secret session. He conducts a hearing. The district engineer then submits a report to the division engineer after he has conducted his hearing; and the division engineer reviews it and he submits it to the reviewing Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Board of Engineers goes over the matter and submits their report and review to the Chief of Engineers. The Chief of Engineers, under the Flood Control Act of 1944, communicates with the governors of the States, inviting all views, both for and against projects, before he can submit his report to the Secretary of War. The Secretary of War transmits to Congress, and Congress must authorize.

Now, then, when you tell me that one reason why the flood control and the rivers and harbors projects have been postponed until January was because you

wanted to conduct further hearings, I assert that after the Secretary of War has transmitted the report to the Congress of the United States and before a single project is eligible for submission by the Budget, the Committee on Flood Control and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors conduct hearings. Everybody interested is invited to come and is permitted to testify either for or against the project and the project has got to be approved by the committee, submitted to Congress, and before any of these projects is eligible for construction it has to be approved by the House, by the Senate, and by the President of the United States. I said I was for reclamation. Who approves a reclamation project before it is eligible under the law?

I refer to the statute with respect to the construction of reclamation projects to refute any contention that the flood-control projects recommended by the Budget have not been carefully examined including previous approval by Congress. I point out that no authorization by Congress is necessary for an appropriation for reclamation. I emphasize that a previous authorization by an affirmative act of Congress is necessary for flood control and river and harbor appropriations. A reclamation project is deemed to be authorized when certified by the secretary and approved by the President. No act of Congress is necessary. I therefore insist that the criticism that there should be further study of the flood control projects is without foundation and that this contention made by the same committee that recommends reclamation projects is unsound.

I have before me Public Law 848, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, authorizing the construction of reclamation projects. I refer to section 3. This section provides that no construction of a reclamation project may be undertaken until the secretary makes an investigation and submits his findings to the President, but it provides that when he does make his findings and certify to the President and the President approves, the project is deemed to be authorized. I quote from section 3 of the said act approved October 14, 1940, Public Law 848, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session:

> The project shall be deemed authorized and may be undertaken pursuant to this act if (1) the secretary finds and certifies to the President that the project has engineering feasibility and that the water users probably can repay, in accordance with the requirements of section 4, an amount equal to or in excess of that part of the estimated cost allocated by him to irrigation to be met by expenditure of moneys appropriated pursuant to section 12 (1); and (2) the President has approved said report and findings and has found that services, labor, materials, easements, and other property, including money, for the construction of the project, should be made available to the Department of the Interior by the Work Projects Administration or other Federal agencies, to the extent found necessary by the secretary to make up the difference between the estimated cost of project construction and (i) the part thereof to be met by expenditure of moneys appropriated pursuant to section 12 (1), together with (ii) such services, materials, money, easements, and other property as non-Federal agencies or parties have agreed to contribute and the secretary has found acceptable under section 2.

I therefore assert that while flood-control projects must be authorized by act of Congress, such is not the case with reclamation projects, for the only authorization required for reclamation appropriations is the finding of the Secretary and the approval of the President, as provided by said act.

It is fair to say, too, that a number of the reclamation projects included in the pending bill provide for the development of power. The ultimate cost of some of the projects is far more than the ultimate cost of any of the river and harbor or flood-control projects. It is difficult to tell what the ultimate cost of the Central Valley project is. It will certainly run into the hundreds of millions. It provides for power. There is an appropriation for this project here. If power is to be developed in the West, I know of no reason why power should not be developed as an incident to flood control in the East, as well as elsewhere in the United States. Moreover, the Appropriations Committee reduced the Budget recommendation for reclamation by $22,000,000. The subcommittee handling the flood-control recommended a reduction of $6,000,000. Both subcommittees should be treated alike. There should be no discrimination.

What, say you, about examination, about approval, when river and harbor and flood-control projects have to run the gantlet of the district engineer, the division engineer, the Board of Rivers and Harbors, the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary of War, and the approval by Congress passing authorizations, reclamation projects, $77,000,000 worth of them, are approved in this bill and do not have an act of Congress.

I say, in my humble judgment this committee has done a very grave injustice to the people of New England, to the people of the Atlantic seaboard, to the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Florida, and the other States of the Union interested in rivers and harbors, and in flood-control projects.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said with respect to power projects. It is well known that I supported the Tennessee Valley Authority and that I oppose the Missouri Valley Authority and I oppose similar authorities. In my judgment, for whatever it be worth, those who oppose the projects which provide for the development of incidental power are contributing, whether they know it or not, to the establishment of valley authorities. In my judgment, when we come to provide flood control I have always advocated and I shall continue to advocate that in providing flood control to protect the lives and property of the people of the United States in the development of our national resources, if there can be developed power incident to the protection of the lives and property of the people, I favor such development, and in my judgment, opposing that program is shortsighted. But be that as it may, let me repeat, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, the Subcommittee on the Interior, took out $22,000,000 of the $99,000,000 recommended for reclamation; the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the War Department took out $6,000,000 and they might have taken out other projects in their discretion, although power is provided in a number of the reclamation projects in the bill. The committee should not have rejected all projects because it opposed, perchance, some or did not agree with the subcommittee. But I assert that it is utterly unfair, that it is discriminatory to reject all of the flood control and all of the river and harbor projects perchance because some members of the committee oppose a project here and there, or a type of project here and there.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman mentioned economy a while ago. May I remind the gentleman that in this same bill the Deficiency subcommittee gave the Public Works Administration $12,500,000 for the preparation of programs for public works projects which in itself would bring about much greater expenditures than the question involved here. I am glad to hear the gentleman speak of incidental public power because that question came up before our committee, and it is simply a bugaboo, because out of 119 projects only 37 had anything to do with power. Power was purely incidental, and nobody could say anything else after it was pointed out to him.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. Let me say this, that the alleged contention that river and harbor and flood control projects can wait until January is the same contention and the same argument that can be made not only with respect to public works, not only with respect to reclamation, but with respect to substantially every other item in this bill. In my judgment, if you are going to have a deficiency bill, let us give all of the interests in the country consideration. Let us give them the consideration that they are entitled to. Let us not, under the guise of economy, contradict it by saying that we will make the appropriation 30 days from now when we know the next annual appropriation bill will not be approved for months no matter when hearings begin; that we will eliminate the projects that will protect lives and property and promote the commerce of the Nation. I think the gentleman's view is sound. If we are going to have a deficiency bill, I believe that we should have a deficiency bill for all of the interests, for all sound public works, for all works that have been approved by the Congress of the United States and in the order of priority recommended by the Chief of Engineers. Every one of the items submitted by the Budget, every one of the items recommended to the Budget, have been items that have been approved by Congress and have been reported and approved by committees of Congress or by Congress itself, and they are not in the same category with the items with respect to reclamation or other public works, for that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to have the gentleman comment on whether or not the Subcommittee on Appropriations really should veto the will of Congress as expressed in some of these flood control items after they have been not only investigated but authorized by Congress and submitted to us by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the gentleman will recall that I have been chairman of the Committee on Flood Control for many years, and the subcommittee of which the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas is a member has done me the courtesy to invite me before that committee, and while I am interested in flood control for the protection of the area that I represent and have been for more than 20 years, I might observe that my work in flood control has been devoted to the protection of the lives and property of the people of the United States. It fell to my lot to pilot through the House the first national flood control bill ever enacted. Asking for protection for the people among whom I live and whom I represent, I have accorded that protection, sir, as best I could to the people everywhere in the United States consistent with the national interest and sound public projects, and I have never voted to support a project unless the Corps of Engineers, the agents of the Congress of the United States, recommended that the benefits exceeded the cost. I accord to the members of the Committee on Appropriations on Civil Functions for the War Department the same privileges exercised by the other committees, but I have never advocated elimination of any project approved by Congress.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to say, in view of the implicit confidence that this committee has in the ability and integrity of not only the Flood Control Committee of the House, but of the distinguished chairman of that committee, that we feel absolutely safe when we bring an estimate in here that has cleared through the gentleman's committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am very grateful to the gentleman. Let me say this: I know about highway construction. I know about flood control projects. I have in mind the city of Cairo in southern Illinois, a city that has suffered from floods as but few municipalities of the United States have suffered. They had a project, they had a wall 60 feet high. They had the material on the ground, but that project was discontinued. I could emphasize that other projects, substantially all the projects of the lower Mississippi Valley, aggregating $15,000,000, are to take up the works that were stopped by the order of the War Production Board in 1943. My understanding is that substantially half of the $81,000,000 contained in national flood control are to take up and carry on projects where the works were stopped 2 years ago, and that other projects equally as important are recommended for initiation.

In my judgment, there now is a scarcity of labor. We must have, in order to provide for the expansion of the days to come, the nucleus of well-organized public works agencies. We must provide now that the men have constructed the highways and the bridges to provide for the advance of our armies, the men from the Corps of Engineers, shall be brought back home, and that the organization that was really disrupted by the discontinuance of these public works shall be made to function so that in 1947 and 1948 and 1949, if there should happen to come unemployment, we might have sound public works in order to provide for stable employment throughout our country.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do not know whether the gentleman has told the House that this whole group of projects was submitted to the War Department subcommittee on appropriations and that we held hearings.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, I went over that in detail.

Mr. HENDRICKS. We reported it and reported it almost unanimously. I will not say what the vote was, but we reported it almost unanimously.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have read the hearings, of 210 pages. If anybody says you did not have hearings on these projects, I want to say in praise of the gentleman's committee that if you will take the hearings conducted by the committee and read the Budget recommendations for rivers and harbors and flood control, they are substantially the types of hearings that have been conducted previously and that have been approved by Congress many, many times.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I never saw anyone ask for time that he did not get it, and I never heard a question asked that was not answered in the hearings.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In my judgment, the amendment to restore these projects to this bill ought to be overwhelmingly adopted by the House.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the War Department Civil Functions Subcommittee, or the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, the ranking member of the subcommittee, will introduce an amendment to restore the Budget recommendations for rivers and harbors and flood control as approved by the committee and as recommended by the Civil Functions Subcommittee to the Committee on Deficiency Appropriations.

I trust the House will approve, and thus remove the discrimination against rivers and harbors and flood-control projects. I have quoted the law to show that river and harbor and flood-control projects are thoroughly studied and must be approved by Congress before they are eligible for appropriations. I have shown that such is not the case with respect to reclamation. I insist that if reclamation projects are to be included, rivers and harbors and flood-control projects should be included, as otherwise a discrimination will obtain.

While the costs of power at some of the dams have been emphasized, it will not be overlooked that the Boulder Dam and the Grand Coulee Dam are primarily for power, and it will not be overlooked that an appropriation is being made in the pending bill for the Central Valley project, originally estimated to cost $175,000,000 and now estimated to cost $375,000,000.

I close by emphasizing that under directive of the War Production Board in 1943 flood-control appropriations were discontinued for the duration. In many cases the projects are in the process of construction. They should be completed in order to protect the appropriations already made. In the interest of economy I maintain that these works that have been begun should be promptly reinstated. There has been construction during the war where it was necessary to protect war activities. Inasmuch as substantially all flood-control work was discontinued for the duration, it is important that the works be reinstated as we turn from the destruction of war to the construction of peace.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say that several years ago I had the privilege and pleasure of serving on the Committee on Flood Control with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, who is doing such an excellent job as chairman of that important committee. I know he goes very thoroughly into every matter that comes before his committee and that any legislation emanating from his committee comes to this House only after careful investigation and due deliberation. He and his Committee on Flood Control have rendered yeoman service to the country. Permit me to add that I have followed his leadership on flood control at all times. There is no safer chairman nor a more efficient committee in the Congress. And now I desire to assure the distinguished chairman as well as other Members of this House that an amendment will be offered tomorrow to restore those projects, eliminated by the Committee on Appropriations, which action was taken without my support, and I predict that they will be reinserted in the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I join with him in urging the restoration or inclusion of the appropriations for flood control and rivers and harbors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

GIFT LOANS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, over a century ago, an American naval officer replied to the demands of the Barbary pirates in the immortal words, "Millions for defense; but not a cent for tribute!" In this defiant answer is contained the pattern for meeting a present-day situation which confronts this House because

we are vested with the responsibility under section 7, article I, of the Constitution of the United States, namely: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." The present-day situation which this House must meet is: Foreign nations have demanded that the United States Government loan them or give them billions of American dollars which this House must take from our people through tax legislation.

Let us be fair in this matter. Let us remember that many of these countries demanding gift loans were our allies in the late war. Let us forget, for the moment, that their attitude in this matter is unparalleled in all financial history—that they do not come, hat in hand, begging; that they do not come as equals, asking openly for honest loans to bear honest rates of interest and to be honestly repaid—that, rather, they come in arrogance, demanding outright gifts. Above all, let us not forget that the members of these foreign missions are perfectly aware of the source of these gifts they so avidly seek, the American people.

It is difficult to ignore the barbed criticism directed at this body by a spokesman of the British delegation headed by Lord Keynes seeking an American gift-loan. The spokesman asserted in a statement released to the press on October 25 that American negotiators from the State Department "see our view entirely" about not paying interest, but "have their ears too close to the clamor for commercial rates" on Capitol Hill.

Nor can we fail to recognize the blunt warning of Bernard M. Baruch in his published letter to the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative GORE, in which he said in part:

> We must be careful, when we give aid to other countries, that this aid is not used to nationalize their industries against us, to destroy their own competitive system which, I think, should be preserved.
>
> England, France, and other countries are nationalizing or about to nationalize their industries. Russia has totalized herself—one buyer and one seller—and is totalizing all countries under her aegis.

Over the next 30 years, six of our former Allies have contracted to pay us about one-and-one-half billion dollars for lend-lease material which they have agreed to purchase and they will pay an interest rate of 2⅜ percent. This will bring to our Treasury roughly $750,000,000 over three decades, a puny sum compared to that which we have expended in lend-lease—yet, at least some return on our original investment. Gift-loans present none of the advantages of lend-lease. With gift-loans, it is all "put" and no "take." It is no wonder that President Truman has long delayed his open advocacy of any British loan on this basis.

The Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee of this House has arrived at three major conditions for any proposed British loan. These are:

> 1. A scaling down of the sterling debts owed by Britain to sterling countries, and no restrictions on trade between these countries and the United States.
>
> 2. Removal of discriminatory treatment of quota, exchange controls, and tariff preferences.
>
> 3. The use of as large a portion of any future loan as is possible to liquidate lend-lease settlements and for the purchase of surpluses.

But, even before Chairman COLMER'S committee reported on its findings, a spokesman of the British gift-loan delegation declared:

> We are unwilling to put our names to a loan we cannot repay, and to giving up our system of Empire preference.

And Robert Boothby, Conservative member of the House of Commons, urged the Socialist Government to "suspend the present financial negotiations in Washington if necessary rather than sign an agreement which would hamper the country's economic recovery. If the price demanded by the Americans for a loan to Britain now is abolition of the sterling area then I think the price is definitely too high and we ought not to pay it."

These are not only the words of a proud man, representing a proud people; they are the words of a group that arrogantly expects something for nothing; inflexible in a world of change. The British are speaking of one thing—their country's economic recovery—and they are engaged in something entirely different: The domination of the world's commercial shipping lanes. With the virtual elimination of the prewar ranking maritime nations as competitors, with the exception of the United States—with Japan, Germany, Italy, and Norway off the seas—Britain is prepared to conquer the peacetime battlefields of foreign shipping.

We are not only asked to finance Britain's program of socialized industry, but we are asked to finance Britain's incursions into foreign trade. We are asked to jeopardize the future of our farms, our mines, our factories, and our merchant marine, to mortgage the future of our people, to borrow at 2.5 percent and lend at 2 percent or borrow at 2.5 percent and give away. It is not a reasonable demand.

I say, in answer to it, "millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." I say "charity begins at home." There are deeds we can do to bolster the economy of these United States and—through us—to benefit the world.

Shall we really begin at home? Recently, John Ihlder, executive officer of the National Capital Housing Authority, pictured the dire need for housing in the District of Columbia. He warned that private enterprise had as yet made no start on housing developments for the occupants of over 3,800 temporary homes here to be removed within the next 2 years.

Mr. Ihlder said in part:

> We have 200,000 dwellings here for nearly a million people. Forty thousand slum houses need replacement. Our 3,819 temporary houses must come down or fall down by 1948. And we now have a surplus population of nearly 200,000. Only if we start now could we do something to alleviate the problem in 2 years.

Mr. Ihlder could not start now or ever if the money for his projects was financing the nationalized mines of Britain against the privately owned mines of Pennsylvania or on the seas between Liverpool and South America in nationalized ships competing with privately owned ships from New Orleans and Boston and San Francisco.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has estimated that $100,000,000,000 in new capital will be needed in the next 5 years to provide jobs for nonagricultural workers. In this estimate, based on the investment-per-job survey at Gastonia, N. C., an average investment of $7,000 was found to be necessary for each individual. How is such an investment to be provided if privately owned American industries have to compete with state-owned British industries which will be bought, paid for, and kept in running order by the money of the American taxpayer?

Veterans want to set up shop for themselves. The Gastonia survey acted as a guide to what veterans interested in establishing their own business could expect in the way of needed capital. Filling stations needed upward of $1,500, with restaurants and cleaning establishments around the same figure; $8,000 was required for food processors; insurance offices called for approximately $11,000; and lawyers, doctors, and dentists could get by on $4,984. Even noncompetitive jobs and professions would be taxed to make possible any gift-loan to Britain. Individual initiative would be hamstrung. The men who fought this war to get back into their prewar peacetime jobs would be denied the very fruits of victory. The boys who did not return would be most shamefully betrayed.

This is a free country and we want to keep it free. If individual lenders want to take a chance and buy the bonds of foreign governments, I believe they should have that right. I do not call this a privilege since it is indeed a risk to do business with defaulters. But if Americans want to get rid of their money this way, I believe they should be allowed to do it. In no instance is this a field for the American Government to play international stud poker with the taxpayer's money in a game where we can watch the cards being stacked against us from the start.

Former United States Ambassador to Mexico and chairman of the executive committee of the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, Inc., J. Reuben Clark, Jr., told the National Industrial Conference Board on November 20:

> Governments now debtor to us are not now safe risks for further Treasury loans from us.
>
> If you add to this fact the further ones that we are in no position nationally to make Treasury loans unless we either substantially raise, not lower our taxes, or resume our peacetime deficit spending—that is, float more Government bonds—neither of which alternatives is desirable, as each may be ruinous, we are in no position to make loans to foreign governments from our national funds.
>
> Whatever further financing of foreign governments is to be done by dollar lendings should be done only by lendings in the conventional way of privately purchased foreign bonds by persons willing to take the hazard.

It is high time to let the British and all other peoples know, beyond the possibility of misunderstanding, that we will put no barrier in the way of their recovery,

that we will do all we can—so long as it does not interfere with the welfare of the American people—to help them. This body, elected by the American people, owes no allegiance to any foreign country when the welfare of the electorate is at stake. This is not a sectional matter. This is not a matter peculiar to farm or city. This is not a partisan matter. This is an American matter. In this, I believe my colleagues will act as Americans entrusted with the responsibilities and honors of one of the highest offices within the power of the American people to give, and follow the banner of that early patriot who said: "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to commend the gentleman's position on the proposal to make a huge loan to Britain. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the research and investigations I have been making over the past 2 weeks, and particularly to call attention to one item, that British reserves of unmined gold amount to over 400,000,000 ounces which, valued at $35 an ounce, is over $15,000,000,000.

I wish also to call attention to the article appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of this week showing that we have spent $1,300,000,000 building bases in the British Empire. I wish to call attention to the huge reserve of diamonds and to the capital the British have. I wish also to call attention to the fact that we advanced $23,000,000,000 under lend-lease and received back only $5,000,000,000 at fantastic prices.

The gentleman is doing a wonderful service to the country in calling attention to this discrepancy and to the adverse effect on the national economy of America that the making of the proposed loan would have.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has just finished an amazing series of so-called hearings on a second 1-percent contribution from the United States to UNRRA. Governor Lehman, the head of UNRRA, an international organization, not only testified but interrupted witnesses and even cross-examined witnesses. When asked certain questions about UNRRA, however, he became very international, and no answers were forthcoming.

I asked to see the Army C. 1 D. report of investigation of the UNRRA center at Granville, France. I have not seen it, although UNRRA has it.

I asked why UNRRA had refused to request soybean products made by a special process which I had been informed prevented deterioration, and was approved for our Army and Navy. I have gotten no explanation.

I asked for the names and addresses of United States employees leaving UNRRA in the last 6 months, and whether they resigned or were discharged and their comments, suggestions, or criticisms concerning UNRRA. This information is taken by a personnel officer upon separation. I received a list of 449 names with no addresses, none of their comments on UNRRA, and no information as to whether they were discharged. I find the list is incomplete and inaccurate. UNRRA propaganda has been that all criticisms from ex-employees were from disgruntled or incompetent discharged employees. Of the "reasons" for termination on the list of 449, 30 showed dissatisfaction with UNRRA, 33 showed that UNRRA was dissatisfied, 28 were marked "No reason." I have heard from a number of present and past employees about UNRRA and except for those appearing before the committee their comments were invariably critical. We all know that present employees are in no position to talk, but the comments of these 449 ex-employees, apparently all but 33 leaving voluntarily in a 6-month period, would be helpful in appraising UNRRA administration. This information is apparently not going to be available.

I asked the details of how, when, and where UNRRA intended to spend the second $1,350,000,000 from the United States. I was shown the figures, but they are secret and why they are a secret is also a secret. From public figures it is apparent, however, that no one will starve this winter for lack of their second contribution. President Truman's message says supplies from the first contribution cannot last beyond the early spring. In its first 2 years UNRRA spent $683,000,000 for supplies and services. With the completion of our present 1 percent contribution, by appropriating $550,000,000 the House has already passed, UNRRA will have $1,152,000,000 to spend up to early spring. This will mean doing many times better than they have ever done in any previous period. I hope they can do it, for the need is there. If Congress could see some performance instead of promises, and frankness instead of secrecy, we could act more intelligently. The big reason UNRRA wants the money now is because it takes them so long to do anything with it after they get it. They not only admit this, they urge it. Programing, allocating, committing, obligating—that sort of thing, you know. If they are as pokey this winter as they have been in the past and apparently intend to be next year they will not need so much money, for those they should have saved will have died. On their record UNRRA may be asking "too much, too soon."

Although UNRRA has voted to close up December 31, 1946, in Europe and 3 months later in the Orient, the committee bill, H. R. 4649, provides for UNRRA until June 30, 1947. This bill came out of committee without amendments. It needs amending if it is to pass.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, once again the pinch-penny policy of the House Appropriations Committee promises to create even greater bottlenecks than already exist in one of the Nation's major channels for postwar economic stability.

I refer to the committee's utter disregard for President Truman's recent request, in a special message, for adequate funds for planning postwar public works through the Division of Community Facilities of the Public Works Agency.

The President asked that $50,000,000 be made available for the current fiscal year and that the Public Works Agency be allowed to make contract obligations for an additional $57,500,000. What happens? His request for additional contract authority is tossed out of the window and a paltry 25 percent of his request for $50,000,000 in deficiency funds is included in the pending bill.

The $12,500,000 recommended by the committee is, when viewed in the light of the action taken by this same committee on this same item in the regular 1945 independent offices appropriation bill, just further proof of the plan to sabotage this program, which was provided for under title 5 of the Reconversion Act of the Seventy-eighth Congress passed last December.

Members of the Congress will remember the fight I made to increase this same item in the regular appropriation when it was before the House on February 8, last. You will remember I lost in my attempt to up the committee item of $5,000,000 to $25,000,000. You will also remember that the Senate later amended the item to make it read $30,000,000 and the conference committee reached an agreement on $17,500,000.

Time will not permit me to give you the details of how wholly inadequate this $17,500,000 has been to meet the ever-increasing requests for allocations from this fund to county, school, and municipal governmental units. All but 14 of the States have exceeded their allocations and the requests are still pouring in at the rate of $7,000,000 monthly. At this rate the President's request for $50,000,000 would be insufficient.

I predicated my previous fight on this matter on the ground that we would face serious unemployment problems in the postwar period. That prediction is proven since conservative estimates place unemployment at 8,000,000 men by June 30, 1946. I want to reiterate my statement made then that "America wants no part of another PWA or a WPA." We face just such a situation in the months ahead.

Will the Congress take a businesslike view of this matter or will it again be deluded into a sense of false security by a small group of so-called economists who prefer to use a pair of scissors instead of sense when dealing with appropriation items?

It is my present intention to propose a more equitable and adequate sum for this item when this legislation reaches the amendment stage. At that time I shall go into the matter in greater detail.

I do not want to be too critical of the committee's position on elimination of funds for new construction items in flood control and for funds to carry out the new construction program in the Veterans' Bureau. Their decision means months of delay in getting both these programs under way.

It appears to me the committee is pinning too much faith on what private

business can or will do to meet the postwar employment needs. It is just another instance where the President's requirements are lightly tossed aside. It is just one more step on the road to normalcy. It may be courageous and romantic to "come in on a wing and prayer" but it is not always the safest thing to do.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if my hearing is good and my understanding correct, the gentleman who just left the floor made the statement that there would be some 8,000,000 unemployed shortly; is that right?

Mr. BAILEY. That is what I read in the paper.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what you read in the paper? Well, I, too, read something in the paper. It is in the noon issue of the Washington News. The substance of it is that Mr. Reuther, who overlong has been planning a strike in the motor industry, is afraid he is going to have too many unemployed right now, too many unionmen out of jobs.

Walter and some of his associates, who, long before the war ended, served notice that when it did end, industry would be tied into a knot, are now well on the way to the success of their plan. Neither Walter nor any of his associates ever made an automobile, and perhaps none of them ever operated an industry which made jobs which met a pay roll.

Nevertheless, they assume to tell industry—not only General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford, and the employees of the steel industry—how much those workers should receive in the form of a wage, but they assume they have the authority to determine the price of the manufactured product.

So far as we know, none of them ever built a factory. None of them knows anything about the cost of the equipment of a factory, how much it requires to keep it in operation, how much of a dividend or profit stockholders must receive in order to be induced to invest their money. Nevertheless, Walter and his associates demand a share in management. They act as though they were the only ones who are interested in a factory or an industry. They refuse to assume any part of the responsibility of carrying on industry, but they propose to determine how the dollars which come in from the operation of a successful industry shall be spent.

Walter announced that he would tie up the motor industry with a strike. Having started his strike, he now finds that some of those who are striking, and a few thousand or hundred thousand of those who will be deprived of their paychecks because of the strike which he instigated and is carrying on, are so great in number that people generally are having their attention attracted to some of the results of his work.

Now Walter and his gang called this strike against General Motors, and according to the paper to which the gentleman made reference, and the press generally, the plan was to close down General Motors and keep Ford and Chrysler going, making cars, competing with GM and aided by that competition force GM to face ruin or submission to the UAW-CIO. Then when they had cleaned up on General Motors and got all they wanted there they were going to strike at the other plants. That is the policy and the strategy that they followed in the sit-down strikes back in 1937. It worked then, and they picked off GM, Chrysler, and Ford one by one. That is the typical communistic policy of cleaning up on them one by one, but unfortunately from Reuther's standpoint it is not working out now. Apparently GM has decided that if it must surrender its business to Walter or fold up, it might just as well close its plants. Too many are on strike or out of jobs to suit Walter, who has no job for the unemployed. They have closed down some of these supplier plants and Chrysler and Ford cannot go ahead with their plans. As a result, 40,000 at Ford's are out of work—all due to Reuther and Thomas, and their associates, and neither Reuther nor Thomas has a single job, except on a picket line, and picket lines are cold places to work just now. So it occurs to me that there is one point of agreement between the gentleman who just left the floor and Mr. Reuther, and that is, there are too many out of employment.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. As I understand the unanimous-consent request for time, debate was to be confined to the bill. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not confining his remarks to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is mistaken. Debate is not confined to the bill. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to be in order, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] who, it is said, is a very good lawyer, I hope he will keep me straight on this argument. I understand that the gentleman, when he was not in Congress here, when he had his little vacation given him by his constituents, was working with the FEPC committee down here in Washington, and I am sure he will not discriminate against me just because I am a Republican. I know that he has been said to be familiar with the rules of the House and I repeat, I hope he will aid in keeping me in order.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be glad to. I thank the gentleman for helping me out.

Mr. HOOK. On the question of the suppliers' shut-down, if the gentleman will go into the facts he will find that that is not a strike, but a lock-out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A lock-out? I hope the gentleman will agree with me that Reuther has too many who are out of employment. The gentleman will agree with me that far, will he not?

Mr. HOOK. I certainly do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not think there are too many out of employment? Then I do not see how he can support the so-called full employment bill.

Mr. HOOK. If a man is going to be employed, he should be employed at decent, honest wages.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. I believe the gentleman is right there. He should be. Of course, Reuther's statement is, if I get him correctly, that General Motors now has the profits to pay the 30 percent demanded.

Mr. HOOK. Correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And that they are going to make enough profit hereafter to pay them some more.

Mr. HOOK. Correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the theory of Mr. Reuther and the gentleman who is on his feet is correct, then it is this, if I get it: That the wage earner should be paid, not in accord with what he earns, not a wage to enable him to have what we call a fair standard of living, but his pay should be based upon the profits that the employer makes. Is that the theory?

Mr. HOOK. If the employees work enough to make enormous profits for the employer, then they are entitled to some of the fruits of those profits.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. I agree that where the profits are high the wages should be high—that the employer should not hog it all. But I do not think that there should be a hard and fast sharing of profits with no responsibility for losses. But does the gentleman think the employees' pay should be measured by the profit made by the employer?

Mr. HOOK. I certainly do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does? Now we have it right. That is the theory of the Communists, that is the theory of the Socialists, that is the theory of all those who advocate stateism.

Mr. HOOK. That is the theory of real democracy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, if you want to call it that. It is a funny description of democracy, though, to my mind. I never figured it out that way.

Mr. HOOK Democracy is equality, is it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that when the gentleman wishes to speak he should address the Chair first.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You see where we get. If the theory of the gentleman that we should have equality of opportunity is correct—then why does he follow those who deny a job to Americans who are not members of a union? They are all Americans. Then the gentleman's theory and the theory of Mr. Reuther is this, that the wage is to be fixed not as I had always supposed, upon the degree of productivity, upon the value of the service rendered—and let me digress there to say that Henry Wallace in his book—page 17, Sixty Million Jobs—says this:

No wage is too high if the worker earns it. Five cents an hour is too high if the worker doesn't earn it.

Henry Ford II or III said that $50 an hour was none too high if a man could earn it.

Reuther is frequently caught yelling about the high salaries paid General Motors executives. I never heard him squawking about the salaries of union officials, about the amounts paid Green, Lewis, Phil Murray, or Sidney Hillman. Perhaps each earns all he receives, but each receives far, far more than many a man who toils all day in a factory. Reuther may earn many times what he receives for his services, and at that what he receives may be far more than the actual worth of the service he renders the average man who is an employee, or what Reuther could contribute if he was employed in an industry. My belief always has been that we should be paid whenever it is possible in accordance with the value of the services that we render and—a qualification, of course—that you never should be paid less than enough to sustain you in ordinary decency. If Reuther is right—and by the way, Reuther is by deferment the No. 1 draft evader in this war. He was deferred on the ground of dependency. He did not at the time have a single chick nor child. He had a wife who was employed and earning not less at that time than $1,000 a year working for Reuther, and I think it is something like $3,000 now.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry, I am extremely sorry that I cannot yield just now.

He was deferred because it was said his services were necessary to promote industrial peace. Think of it, not world peace, but industrial peace here at home, Walter Reuther, the fellow who was thrown off that standard down there at Ford's when he was distributing some kind of literature designed to promote civil strife—think of him as a disciple promoting industrial peace.

If it is true, as Walter says it is, that the corporation, in order to fix the wage of the employee, should open its books to him, then it would seem to be also true that the individual employee should open his books to GM to see whether he is getting too much and whether he is spending his money wisely. I would not advocate that. I do not think that should be. But I say, as a reciprocal proposition, if the employer must open his books and tell the employees the percentage of profit and how many dollars of what comes in should be spent for new machinery, should be spent for equipment all the way through, should be used to enlarge the plant so as to provide jobs—and, by the way, they say that it requires $45,000 worth of machinery and equipment to give one man a job—but if Reuther is to take a look at the books of General Motors to see how much it makes in order to determine how much it should pay, then does it not follow that Mr. Wilson, of General Motors, should take a look at Walter's books and see whether Walter on his salary or wage buys two beers, three beers, a case of beer, or no beer at all. If Walter is to supervise the expenditure of the dollars that come into General Motors from the sale of cars, then why should not General Motors have something to say or at least some knowledge of how the employee is spending his money, because certainly if the employee is not getting money enough to keep his children in shoes, clothing, and books, I am sure that General Motors would go to the extreme end—and I hold no brief for them—but I am sure that they would go to the greatest possible lengths, let us put it that way, to give him more. But if the employee is wasting his money betting on football games and the races and going across the lake to Cleveland and patronizing some of their places of amusement for the enrichment of some of the millionaires of Cleveland, then I think General Motors would not be inclined to go along as far as it would if the employee was spending his money in a worth-while way.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield; but the gentleman is not going to advance any leftist views? I do not go along with this move toward the left.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is trying to put words in my mouth. I was just going to ask the gentleman a very simple question which I think he can answer. Does the gentleman think the suggestion made by the automobile companies for a 10-percent raise in wages based on the 40-hour week meets the increased prices and the increased cost of living?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know. I will tell you why.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You do not think it does?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know whether it does or does not.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You will not say it does, will you?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wonder if the gentleman can give us his opinion as to whether or not the 10 percent represents an increase in the cost of living, that is, 10 percent over 1941. Do you believe that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, will the gentleman permit me to answer?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes, surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Unlike some Members of Congress, I do not want to express an opinion on a matter that I do not know anything about. Do you not see why I cannot answer?

Mr. EBERHARTER. If you do not know, then what is the matter with them asking for a 30-percent increase?

Mr. HOFFMAN. So far as I am concerned, they can ask for 40 percent. I do not know what wage they should receive. I know the cost of living in Detroit is high because when I tried to send provisions and fruit into Detroit on my own truck the A. F. of L. insisted that I pay them a $50 membership fee for the driver for bringing them food that I could have sold them cheaper than what they were paying for it had they let me in and they would not stand for it. Then, not only that, but when the condenseries and creameries in my district wanted to send, and did send, butter and milk down to Detroit, not only did they have to pay the $50 tribute, which was added to the cost of the butter, but they had to pay another man to unload it, and we had a man sitting there on the truck ready and willing to unload; but, no, the union insisted one of their members should be paid even though he did not work at unloading. So I assume, and I am sure, that the cost of living is higher in Detroit than it would be if the unions would not attempt to racketeer and seek tribute from every farmer in Michigan who wanted to send something to eat—milk for their families—if food is high in Detroit, the cost has been increased to some extent by the dollars the food producers and processors were forced to pay to unions by way of tribute.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman give us his opinion as to whether or not the cost of living of Members of Congress generally and their expenses have increased 30 percent over what they were in 1941?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, my cost of living has not gone up because I have tried to get along on a different diet—cheaper foods—I met the emergency by eating less and at places where the cost was not so high. I do not know about the others. I do not know what they eat or drink. Each has his own way of living. When I go over here and find an apple for 10 cents or a pear for 15 cents and I know that I have some home and they are rotting and because of the labor shortage I cannot get them harvested, I just do not buy them. They would not taste good if I bought them at that price. So I do not buy them. Therefore, my cost of living has not gone up very much because I have reduced the number of things and the quality of things that I buy. I get along. I find that I am in lot better health than I used to be when I went out to dinner with some other Members. Too often I think the American who stayed at home, who did none of the fighting, who was not called upon to serve with the armed forces and who complained because he had to scrimp a little, because he could not get everything he wanted, who went around squawking because of his own personal discomfort, is a rather poor citizen. Many a stay-at-home made more during the war than he ever did before, and now, if we all have to take less because of the war, of its waste, and of the debt that was piled up, it does not help very much to be kicking about it all the time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, you cannot answer my question. You have no opinion?

Mr. HOFFMAN. As to whether your cost of living has gone up?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; not my cost of living. But I said the cost of living of the Members generally.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know whether the cost of operating your automobile has gone up or down.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I said the cost of living generally.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know whether the cost of living of the Members "generally" has gone up, but I do know that wages have gone up, the cost of services of all kinds, the cost of things and materials, including food and fuel, has gone up, and we may assume that it costs considerably more now for a man or a family to eat or live in the same manner that he did in 1941. It makes no difference whether you call wages or prices the tail or the dog; we are in the same situation as the puppy chasing his tail. He either never catches it, or if he does, he finds he is just biting a part of himself.

Almost everyone knows or should know that when we have a boom or when we have a depression, it is the man on a fixed salary, the man with the lower income who is hit first, who suffers the most. Men and women who toil with their hands, who earn their livelihood by manual labor should and must be protected, but I see little sense in destroying the enterprises which give them employment, in tearing down the system which every witness who appeared before our commitee on the so-called full employment bill said had given us here in America more than any other people anywhere in the world. Our system is the best, and I am not in favor of yielding 1 inch to the advocates of communism or stateism, who have infiltrated themselves into the unions, who would destroy rather than build. Nor is the rank and file of the union in favor of destroying that system.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield further.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would yield. This is very interesting.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, on the advice of the gentleman from Minnesota, I yield once more.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman, of course, takes a lot of time, while we are debating a measure of great importance to the country. Of course, I assume——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman finding fault with that?

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman has made that point, I cannot yield further and permit him to waste more time. I am in favor of economy of time right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The point is this: For weeks, for months, I might say for a year, Reuther and his outfit have been telling the country that just as soon as the war was over they were going to give the country strikes. Now they have called their strike. They find, according to the press today, that they have too many men out of employment; that the reconversion program will not go on. Now, sometime we must have a showdown on whether we can have strikes where hundreds of thousands of men can be called out of their jobs for a good reason or for no reason at all, or whether those who want to work will have the privilege of working. The Nation might just as well learn now whether business shall manage its affairs or whether the union officers shall manage industrial plants.

In Michigan today, according to the paper, they have a picket line which, by force and intimidation, kept the man who wanted to go in and prepare the pay checks out of the factory. Can you tie to that one? The fellow who wants to write the pay checks cannot get in. The manager of General Motors cannot get his automobile in his own garage at the factory. While Reuther has the right to throw a picket line around a factory, he has no right to keep a worker out. We have a statute on the books in Michigan, act No. 176 of the Public Acts of 1939, which makes it a criminal offense for any man on a picket line, or otherwise, to interfere or prevent by force, by threat or show of force, the man who wants to go to his job, going in to his job. There is your lawlessness, and until the law is enforced we will not get our reconversion program started.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Michigan for their aid.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

ARE WE IN A POSITION TO TELL ENGLAND AND RUSSIA WHAT TO DO?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call attention to certain serious implications of current aspects of our foreign policy.

The bill before us has a considerable appropriation for the Department of State, particularly transportation in the Foreign Service.

This morning I was startled to read the headlines and the details of a story about the note that was being sent to Russia on the situation in Iran. I shall read a sentence or two from the text of the United States note to Russia as reported this morning. The proposal, in general, made to the Russian Government is that the Russian troops and British troops should be withdrawn because our troops have been or are being withdrawn.

The note says:

It will be recalled that on December 1, 1943, Marshal Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt signed in Tehran, a declaration in which they stated that their governments were at one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran.

Then the note says:

We have entire confidence in the intentions of the Governments of the Soviet Union and Great Britain, and expect, of course, that they will carry out the agreement.

Then the note goes on to say:

The Government of the United States has already reduced its forces in Iran during the present year from a maximum strength of 28,000 to less than 6,000.

Then, the note states:

There are no American combat troops in Iran.

Then, further, the note says:

While the immediate withdrawal of these troops will cause considerable inconvenience to this Government, nevertheless, instructions are being issued to the American military authorities in Iran to take immediate steps to effect the complete withdrawal of all American forces from Iran by January 1, 1946.

This Government therefore proposes that the British and Soviet Governments issue similar instructions to their commanders that arrangements be made immediately for the complete withdrawal of all foreign troops from Iran by January 1, 1946.

Now, an obvious reply for the Soviet Government to make to the United States would be to say: "Well, who are you to tell us to get out of Iran? What are your troops doing in China?"

Personally, I would like to see both England and Russia remove their troops from Iran. I know they are a source of annoyance and concern to the Government of Iran. I was in Tehran just a little over 2 months ago. Tension was in the air then.

I was in the historic room of the Russian Embassy where a marble plaque with gold letters commemorates the signing of the Tehran agreement by Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt. The last line on the plaque calls attention to the declaration respecting Iran.

And that declaration does call for the removal of the foreign troops within 6 months after the close of the war, as our note to Russia recites. It is a declaration on which the Government of Iran has counted greatly. I know that because we discussed it with the Shah of Iran that same afternoon. And the day following our visit there, the Government of Iran served notice on the other governments that it expected the troops to be removed within the agreed time.

The day we were in Tehran, the British troops were moving out of one of their major camps. Our own soldiers had largely gone. In fact, so far along was the process of troop removal and disposal of surplus goods as reported to us at that time, I am surprised to learn that as many as 6,000 United States troops remain, even of a noncombatant character.

I would like to see all foreign troops out of Iran but I question whether the United States Government is on good grounds in calling upon the Soviet Government and the British to get out of Iran. There is the situation in China where we have troops. Perhaps they should be recalled. I will not get into that question in the limited time available, but certainly we are inviting Russia to tell us what to do in China when we attempt to tell them what to do in Iran.

You see, our position in Iran is somewhat complicated and uncertain. When it was desired to send lend-lease goods to Russia by the southern route, to avoid the heavy toll of German submarines and weather on the route to Murmansk, arrangements were made by the British to take delivery at the head of the Persian gulf, transport the goods across Iran by a railroad recently completed, and deliver them to the Russians.

Russian troops came in from the north and British troops from the south to effect the delivery, and perhaps equally to protect oil supplies. The Shah of

Iran, with very inadequate armies to keep out the foreign troops, felt humiliated and abdicated. His son, the present Shah, took over. An agreement was made to permit the Russian and British troops to enter and remain in Iran during the emergency. No such agreement was made for the occupation by United States troops. We were not then in the shooting war.

Our troops came in later. The British found difficulty in operating the railroad. Problems of manpower and rolling stock were too great for them to solve under conditions then existing. So, when we came into the shooting war, we took over the job of transporting the goods on the Iranian railroad, operating so to speak, under the British permit for occupancy.

Hence, although I am sure the Iranian Government came to regard our presence with even more tolerance than that of the Russians or the British, actually we did not have the specific authority by treaty to be there that either the British or the Russians had.

And that is why the Soviet Government now may well question our assuming to tell them when to get out of Iran and may reply by asking us to get out of China.

Perhaps we are prepared to go around the world telling other nations where to walk, but I should like to see the issue squarely faced, and the implications of that kind of a foreign policy fully explored.

And, in connection with the interests of the United States in China, I wish to call attention to some strong statements which appear in the RECORD of yesterday in the remarks made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY].

He said:

It was General Hurley, sent to China specifically to heal the rift between Chiang and the Communists, who reversed our policy of bringing about an understanding between them and a coalition for victory over Japan and a stable democratic postwar China.

He further said:

By giving Chiang blank-check support, he assured the break-down of negotiations between him and the Communists.

Then he said:

Step by step, Ambassador Hurley's reversal of the Roosevelt-Gauss policies in China has made the present civil war unavoidable. He and General Wedemeyer have now committed us to armed intervention.

In passing I challenge the statement that General Hurley reversed the Roosevelt policy in China. When War Department Appropriations subcommittee was in China we had several conferences with Ambassador Hurley and with General Wedemeyer. On the basis of what was there said I assert that whatever policy Hurley and Wedemeyer have followed, it has been the policy laid down to them by orders from Washington.

I do not deny that Hurley has supported the Central Government of General Chiang Kai-shek, but I do say that if he has it is because he was sent to China by Mr. Roosevelt with instructions to support the Central Government. Furthermore, I assert that Ambassador Hurley has sought to bring the Communists in the north and the Central Government together. In fact he promoted a meeting of the Communist leaders with the Generalissimo at the time we were in Chungking. It was said that Communist leaders showed some hesitation, fearing perhaps a trap or that something might happen to the plane in which it was proposed that he come. Finally the Ambassador was said to have taken his own plane and went up to ride back with the Communist leader himself.

Whether that is true or not I do not know, but I do know that while we were in Chungking in early September the Communist leader came to Chungking to meet the generalissimo and that Ambassador Hurley played a large part in bringing them together.

I call attention to these two incidents today because of a mounting fear in the mind of a great many people that our foreign affairs are drifting dangerously in these days. There seems to be no clear or settled policy. Apparently we assert the right to tell Russia and England when their troops should get out of a foreign country and reserve to ourselves the decision on our own in another quarter of the world.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I was following the remarks of the gentleman very carefully. He said that the Communist leader came for the purpose of conversation with the American Ambassador; is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; at Ambassador Hurley's request and invitation and due to his good offices.

Mr. RABAUT. Did the gentleman make some deductions that from out of that talk the country might become involved? Did the gentleman make any particular deduction from that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. The remarks of the gentleman from Washington yesterday were to the effect that General Hurley reversed the Roosevelt policy and that instead of trying to heal the rift, he, and I quote, "assured the break-down" of negotiations between Chiang and the Communists. As a matter of fact, I am confident that Ambassador Hurley sought to bring the Communists and Gen. Chiang Kai-shek together for the purpose of developing a better understanding.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman think that was a favorable action toward our Government? I was led to believe that your implication is that it was an action unfavorable to our Government.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Oh, no; on the contrary, favorable to peace in China.

Mr. RABAUT. Oh. That is fine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, personally, I have the feeling that it is definitely in the interest of peace and in the interest of the United States to develop friendly relations with China. We cannot, however, expect to tell Russia and England to get out of Iran and not expect them to tell us to get out of China. We are pursuing a double-headed policy and one that will lead to confusion and ultimate trouble unless it is clarified.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this deficiency bill brings us to the point at which we have the decision to make respecting our own financial situation in this country. All know of our tragic financial situation—and this is not for a day, and not for 1 year—but it reaches far into the future. Our boys and girls of today, who will be the fathers and mothers of tomorrow, will have to face that debt—and they will have to pay upon it. Then, as we think through the span of years in the future, as generations come and go, they, too, will feel the terrific impact of this debt. We must curtail in every element of spending, and we must stop the spending of money, or the giving away of our resources to others who are in far better situation, financially, than our own country.

In this measure, there was originally submitted certain items relating to flood control, many of which were needed very badly, and all of which have not been incorporated in this measure. In other words, all of the needed flood-control items have been omitted. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to refer to one item submitted for flood control at and in the city of Muncie, in the State of Indiana, which is located in the district which I have the honor to represent, and which is not included in this deficiency appropriation bill. The river, which passes through the city of Muncie, Ind., carries much water in time of flood. The banks are low, and at high-water periods the water overflows the banks and enters the residence section, and to some extent the same enters the business section of that city. There has been a great need for many years for flood control at and in that city of some 70,000 people, which is located in and which is the county seat of Delaware County, Ind.

It was my wish and hope that the flood-control item of some $70,000 for this relief would be incorporated in this deficiency bill. It was my intention to offer an amendment during the reading of this bill for amendments to include this badly needed item for flood control at the city of Muncie, Ind. However, I have been assured that all items of flood control which have been proposed have been eliminated from this measure and the subcommittee will, immediately after the first of the year 1946, start hearings upon these items, which will include the item for flood control at the city of Muncie, Ind., and by reason of that fact I will not offer an amendment to incorporate it in the pending bill. I do know that this item for flood control is needed very badly at Muncie, Ind., and I hope this committee will include this item in the next measure wherein it may be appropriate so this work may proceed with promptness and this question of flood damage forever eliminated in that city.

Mr. Chairman, during this session of the Congress many very important items are before us. We have the problem of securing the return of our boys who have waged this war to a victorious conclusion, and this is one of our big problems. And we have the problem of keeping our spending of the taxpayers' money for only those things which are entirely essential. We must reach the point at which our Budget will be balanced and then kept in balance for the future years. Too long our Budget has been off of balance. The people are now demanding that the Budget be balanced and then kept in balance. I call upon the President and upon every agency and department of our Government to balance our Budget, and then to keep our Budget balanced in the future. This is merely good business—such as every businessman and home owner respects. Our Government is merely larger than the ordinary business, but the same rule applies—the Budget must be balanced and kept in balance, otherwise disaster will follow.

As we debate this measure today I urge that our Budget be balanced in the future, and that we give some aid to the overburdened taxpayers of this Nation, all of whom are struggling to exist because of the terrific drain of our finances, regardless of the balancing of our Budget. Let us seek to practice some economy as we proceed and let us keep our spending within our receipts as we face the future and the staggering debts we owe.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I shall confine my remarks largely to the proposed amendment submitted earlier in the afternoon by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], who advised the amendment will be introduced on tomorrow by the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule. This amendment, as I understand, proposes to insert into the bill 119 items that were left out by the Deficiency Subcommittee and by the full Committee on Appropriations yesterday. The items are largely for flood control, navigation, and power, all of which were heretofore authorized by the Congress. Under the time allotted I will not be able to discuss any of the many items included in the bill. However, I want to make it clear at the outset that I feel just as the chairman of the committee expressed himself this morning, emphasizing the necessity for exercising economy in making appropriations. I am sure I share his viewpoint and the apprehension that we may be reaching the point when our expenditures will be so far in advance of our revenues that our national economy will be seriously threatened. However, I was not able to follow our able chairman in his reasoning and in his logic with reference to the elimination of the items referred to on the ground of economy. When I examine the bill before us I find it carries an appropriation of $1,131,000,000, and find that $128,000,000 for 119 items could not be added for the reason, as the chairman argued, it would be too expensive and it would add too much to the national debt. I know if he were present at this moment he would reply that approximately $928,000,000 of the $1,131,000,000 referred to is for the purpose of national service life insurance for veterans. There can be no reason why this item should not be included, but that still leaves upward of $400,000,000 carried in this bill, much of which is for salaries, which will in no way decrease our national debt.

Let me read just a few items in order that you might understand just what this $400,000,000 are for. On page 5 of the bill, in the first paragraph, I find an item for "Administrative expense," totaling $150,000. In paragraph 2 I find under the heading of "Salaries and expenses" an item of $392,500. Then on page 6, first paragraph, "Salaries and expenses," $200,000. Then on page 7, paragraph 1, "Salaries," $188,000. On page 8 we again have "Salaries," $1,682,500. In other words, there is an increase over the regular appropriation for 1946 of $1,682,000 for salaries alone.

In the next to the last paragraph on that page we find "Salaries," $16,000. On page 9, paragraph 2, we have "Administrative expenses," $12,500. On page 11, for "Salaries," $2,693,900. On page 12, "General administrative expenses," $206,000. On page 13, "Salaries and expenses," $1,000,000; and so on. This bill has 49 pages. We could go on through the other 36 referring to increases in salaries and expenses. So when it comes to the question of economy, I take the position that this increase of expenditures does not in any way contribute toward paying the interest on our national debt, a matter about which the chairman properly expressed much concern earlier in the day.

It was emphasized in his speech we should make special effort to economize and be able to pay from our national income the interest on the bonds we have sold and pay the principal of the national debt. He is exactly right in his objective, but I take the position he has the cart before the horse, when he undertakes to increase salaries on practically every page of this bill, salaries that will not pay one penny of the interest on the national debt and then thinks he is exercising economy by eliminating appropriations for the 119 projects already referred to.

My thought is that with the expenditure of $128,000,000 for the establishment of 119 projects recommended by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the Flood Control Committee, and then recommended by the House of Representatives to the Senate, the Senate approving, and the President of the United States approving them last year, if these projects were established and put into operation they would increase the wealth of the Nation and thereby add to our Nation's economy, the national income, and which would to some extent enable us to pay some of the interest on the national debt.

In other words, if these projects were installed they would in their operation produce wealth and add to the national income and contribute something toward paying the interest on our national debt, but the money appropriated to pay "salaries" will not add one penny to the Nation's wealth or contribute one dime toward paying our national debt. This illustrates the difference between my idea of economy and that expressed or indicated by the committee when it failed to include these items in the bill in place of the appropriations for "salaries."

I am not familiar with all the projects that are contained or will be contained in this amendment. I am familiar with only one. That one happens to be located in my district. But I assume that the other projects are just as meritorious.

You will find when you get to the real objections to these items that the question of power is going to be the principal objection. That was the principal objection raised in the committee. Only 13 of the projects provide for any power, and there is not a great amount of power to be generated, but I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] when he expresses the opinion it is foolish to construct a dam for the purpose of flood control or navigation and not make provision for power, when it can be done with but little added cost, which may mean so much to the community and add much to the wealth of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, some of these projects, I understand, were eliminated because they were new. I do not know, but I know some of them are new from the standpoint of power. That is, they were originally flood control and navigation projects, the power feature being recently provided. I happen to know that one of them has been receiving aid from the Federal Government for 40 years to assist in controlling the floodwaters of the Savannah River and aiding navigation. If this item is left out of the bill, there will be no fund to continue the flood-control work. I do not believe they should be eliminated simply because they have a little power attached to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by including a statement I made before the Rivers and Harbors Committee on this subject in 1941.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the remarks are as follows:

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think it would be appropriate to supplement the answer to the question just propounded by the chairman relative to the sources of power in the section to be covered in the event the proposed plant is constructed. My information is that the power now used in the State comes from the output of the River Bend plant, and the Furman power plant in North Carolina; the Parr Shoals plant; the Lake Murray plant; the recently constructed Buzzard Roost power plant, and the Santee-Cooper project now under construction in South Carolina. But I would like to call attention at this point to Senate Document No. 66 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which contains practically all the available information pertaining to electric power in the vicinity of the proposed plant where it is stated there is now a deficiency of power

in this particular area to the extent of 267,800 kilowatts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been such an indefinite and uncertain idea on the part of some interested in this particular project as to its location I would first attempt to locate the Clark Hill Dam site on the Savannah River. I am sure members of the committee know or have been advised that the Savannah is one of the largest and longest river of the southeastern part of the United States. Beginning at its mouth on the Atlantic Ocean near Savannah, Ga., it forms the boundary line between South Carolina and Georgia for a distance of about 325 miles, where it is formed by the confluence of the Seneca and Tugaloo Rivers, the Tugaloo forming the remainder of the boundary line between the two States.

Last year when the matter came up for discussion, Clark Hill was referred to as being about 75 miles from the mouth of the Savannah River. Colonel Hall, of the War Department, speaking from memory I am quite sure, a few days ago stated that the Clarks Hill site was about 150 miles from the mouth of the river. As a matter of fact, the Army engineers in their reports state that the site we are now referring to is located about 221 miles from the mouth of the Savannah River.

A century ago or more the Savannah River was navigable from its source to its mouth, a distance of more than 300 miles; cotton and lumber constituting the larger portion of the outgoing freight; brick, imported from England, being the leading incoming tonnage. Navigation by shallow draft boats has continued to date from Augusta, Ga., to the Atlantic Ocean, a distance of approximately 200 miles. In the mouth of the river the United States Government maintains a channel of 30 feet over the ocean bar, and a channel of 26 feet deep is maintained at the principal wharf of Savannah, Ga., a city of about 100,000 people, located on the river about 17 miles from its mouth. Therefore, navigation on the Savannah is not a new problem. The Federal Government has made appropriations for 40 years or more at different times for aiding navigation by the construction of training walls, winged dams, and bank protection, the controlling depths at low water being from 3 to 4½ feet. The engineers say that the construction of the proposed dam would provide for at least a 6-foot channel from Augusta to Savannah for at least 85 percent of the time. The tabulated estimate of over 1,000 prospective shippers and receivers show that over 1,000,000 tons of freight will be available upon the completion of this project.

Augusta has spent upward of $2,000,000 in constructing levees along the Savannah River to prevent floodwater from covering the city. Many plans have been devised to obviate overflow of farm lands on both sides of the river. In recent years engineers have found that it is easier and cheaper to control floodwaters by constructing and maintaining reservoir dams near the source of streams in which floods are certain to occur. Following this plan of storing floodwaters, the question of using them for navigation purposes logically suggested itself. Later it was found that water impounded during floods when loosed for navigation purposes may well be utilized in generating electric power, which has become such an indispensable and daily enlarging factor in our modern life. Hence, navigation, flood control, and power development have in many cases resolved themselves into one problem. I am sure that the members of the committee know about that much better than I.

Mr. RANKIN. With reference to the statements being made to the effect that this power is not needed, I want to call attention to the fact that they told us that in 1932. In 1932 we used only 62,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric current in the whole United States. They told us then that there was a surplus of power, and that we did not need any additional power. Last year we used 118,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and there is a greater shortage of power today than in 1932; so all this talk about surplus power is coming from that element which believes in the philosophy of scarcity in everything.

Mr. HARE. I would like to discuss that question a little further on, but I appreciate the gentleman calling it to my attention.

The construction of the proposed dam is not a new idea. It has been discussed and considered for 15 years or more. The first formal action taken by the Government was by this committee when it authorized a survey and study of these problems as related to rivers in the southeastern part of the United States in 1927. The report was to be prepared and submitted to Congress under the direction of the Secretary of War and the Chief of the Board of Engineers.

The survey and report were not completed and submitted until November 1934. The feasibility of navigation, flood control, and power development by one or more reservoir dams above Augusta, Ga., was recommended in the report, the reasons therefor being set out in considerable length and detail.

In 1935 the President of the United States addressed a communication to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, directing that a three-member board be created, consisting of one representative from the Corps of Engineers, one from the Natural Resources Committee, and one from the Federal Power Commission, to make a further study and prepare a report on the advisability of proceeding the following year with a Savannah River improvement by erecting a dam at a point approximately 21 miles above the city of Augusta, Ga. On February 29, 1936, the committee submitted a report which has been filed, and I assume it is now before this committee for attention. While I am not an expert, I do consider this one of the most complete, detailed, and comprehensive studies of any proposal I have had the pleasure of examining.

I shall not attempt to discuss the details of this report. I think it is sufficient to say that the committee enthusiastically recommended the proposed development referred to as the Clark Hill project, 222.3 miles above the mouth of the Savannah River. The committee found that the construction of this dam would prove to be an insurance against floods on the Savannah River, a distance of 200 miles, and will insure a 6-foot channel for navigation purposes over 80 percent of the time. It was found further that "The Clark Hill site is one of the best undeveloped power sites on any of the streams entering the Atlantic Ocean from the South Atlantic States."

More recently the report referred to was submitted by the President of the United States to the Natural Resources Committee and Federal Power Commission for a further study and report, both of which have approved the recommendation of the special committee in most enthusiastic terms. Mr. Chairman, reverting to the observation made a few minutes ago by Mr. RANKIN calling attention to the lack of electric energy generally, you will observe from their report they find that the industrial possibilities of the Savannah River Valley and adjacent territory are practically in their infancy, although within a radius of 85 miles on each side are the great textile industries in both South Carolina and Georgia. The Federal Power Commission concludes that there is and will be ample and suitable markets for all the power generated at this plant when completed. It is estimated that upward of 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours of primary electric current can be generated annually in addition to 100,000,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary electric power.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, you will find that the proposed navigation and power project, after a study of 6 years, was favorably reported and highly recommended by the Chief of Engineers, November 9, 1935, the same being printed in House Document No. 64, Seventy-fourth Congress.

The special board provided for by the President to make further report and study made a similar recommendation February 29, 1936.

The National Resources Committee, to which the matter was referred, reported in November 1936 and endorsed the proposal equally as strong. The Federal Power Commission gave the report entitled "Power Market for the Output of the Clark Hill project," in April 1937. Another report by the Inland Waterways Corporation, showing the tonnage on the Savannah River, was made December 15, 1937. The last report by the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Resources Commission in April 1939 confirmed reports made by other governmental agencies and enthusiastically recommended the erection of this proposed dam.

Before concluding, I would like to call attention to some of the facts found and reported from the reports above referred to and other official reports.

In the area below Augusta the average annual rainfall reported is 45 inches. The annual precipitation in the vicinity of Augusta and the dam site proposed is 53 inches, whereas the average rainfall at and above the source of the Savannah River is between 70 and 85 inches. The territory below Augusta is largely agricultural. Beginning with Augusta and going north to the Georgia and North Carolina line in the Savannah River Basin agriculture and industrial activities prevail. The heart of the textile or cotton-mill industry in South Carolina is found in this area. On both sides of the river north of Augusta inexhaustible kaolin deposits of very fine character are to be found. In this connection I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that in recent years chemists have found that these kaolin deposits contain as high as 40 percent of alumina in some cases, an indispensable factor in the manufacture of aluminum now so essential in the manufacture of airplanes. Last year I addressed a communication to the Chairman of the National Defense Council suggesting the advisability of constructing a power plant in the neighborhood of these mines for the purpose of testing the possibility of producing aluminum from kaolin, the idea being that if for any reason there should be a shortage in the imports of bauxite from French and British Guiana in South America we might find ourselves badly and sadly in need of aluminum.

I was advised by the Director of the Minerals Division of the Defense Council that he did not consider the construction of such a plant justified for the reason that the supply of aluminum was ample to meet all needs in the defense program. However, in less than 6 months, as a matter of fact, it was not over 3 months later, the National Defense Council admitted there was an actual shortage of aluminum.

Mr. PITTENGER. They have made a lot of mistakes like that.

Mr. HARE. Today we understand that the supply of aluminum in the United States is being distributed by quotas to the various industrial agencies using aluminum; that is, there is a distinct shortage despite the fact that some of us insisted last summer that steps should be taken to supply the needs of aluminum in our national-defense program but were advised there was no apprehension for a shortage of aluminum. An enormous amount of electric current is used in the manufacture of aluminum and power plants of this type are indispensable. A question has been raised by some as to whether or not there is any specific need for additional power in the vicinity of Clark Hill.

In order to dissipate this idea it is only necessary to refer to Senate Document No. 66,

where it is stated that the construction of this project would supply the increased power load during war as well as the expanding of markets in the region of the product. That is, it would make possible the establishment of war industries in that region, or, in the alternative, would provide power for transmission to distant industrial centers. The report shows further that following the completion of the Buzzard Roost project in South Carolina and the Santee-Cooper River project in South Carolina there will still be a deficiency of electric power to supply the needs of this particular part of the country. In reality, following the construction of this dam, according to the Senate document referred to on page 36. there will still be a shortage. I quote: "The maximum possible development at Clark Hill does not meet the estimated requirement of class 1 and 2 loads for South Carolina." There have been frequent demands for the past 6 months on the part of big industry for large amounts of electric current in the neighborhood of Clark Hill.

My information is that the Metals Co., Inc., was prepared last fall to erect a $15,000,000 plant for use in the manufacture of aluminum and planned to locate it somewhere near Augusta, Ga., but since the electric power was not sufficient they decided to locate the plants at some other point. According to press reports in one of the daily papers in South Carolina last Friday, March 15, the du Pont people are now or have been looking for sites to locate large war industries in the western part of South Carolina but are unable to do so for the lack of electric current. It is estimated that the entire output from Clark Hill will be consumed within a 60-mile radius.

Mr. Chairman, General McWhorter, chief engineer of the Federal Power Commission, who is present and familiar with all the facts justifying this proposal, will be able to advise the committee in some detail as to the actual supply of electric current in the territory proposed to be covered, the immediate necessity for additional power, and the expected increased demand following the construction of this dam as a result of increased industrial establishments throughout this section, and I shall be glad, therefore, to yield any further time I may have to General McWhorter, but before doing this I want to state as emphatically as I know how that this proposal has received the approval and enthusiastic endorsement of every governmental agency to which it has been referred up to this date and my purpose in appearing here is to urge upon the committee the necessity for this plant and express the hope that the proposal will receive the enthusiastic and unanimous endorsement of this committee.

I shall be glad now to yield any time I may have remaining to General McWhorter.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear Mr. McWhorter at this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill with amendments. I am in favor of restoring the appropriation taken out of the bill for the Army engineers in connection with the development of the Missouri River project. I am in favor of amending the bill so as to allow the Bureau of Reclamation to build transmission lines, in connection with the power to be developed by this project.

I am in favor of harnessing the water of the Missouri River and making it work for mankind rather than permitting it, in its mad rush to the ocean, to destroy millions of dollars worth of property annually, including human lives.

I know that it is claimed that this is not a deficiency appropriation. That is true, but it is an emergency appropriation. For years Congress has sat by idly and permitted the destruction of property and human lives. It has talked and talked about flood control, but it has never had the vision and the courage to tackle flood control in a serious manner.

For years the inhabitants of the Missouri and Mississippi River Valleys have demanded that Congress act. Now the time has arrived for action. There is no excuse for further delay or quibbling with a regular or a deficiency appropriation.

Public Law No. 534 and Senate Document No. 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, have cleared the way. The Appropriations Committee should not now delay or block the construction and development of the Missouri River Valley Basin. All too long has it been neglected.

The development of this basin will add billions of new wealth to the Nation. It will repay the expenditures many times in years to come. It will not only repay it in giving to the inhabitants of that basin cheaper electrical energy, but it will repay it in creating new wealth, and as a result of the new wealth increase tax returns. It will repay it in furnishing employment when we are discussing unemployment insurance. Here is a case of giving employment assurance rather than unemployment insurance—idleness insurance.

The Army engineers are unwittingly being blamed by many of the inhabitants of the Missouri River Basin for not having provided flood control long ago. The truth is that Congress is to blame. It is responsible because it never provided the Army engineers with legislation or appropriations to do the job. Now we have the legislation and surely the Committee on Appropriations should accept the amendment and restore the Budget's recommendation for the Army engineers.

Again, flood control and irrigation and the development of power go hand in hand. The water stored and used for irrigation will produce crops and wealth rather than destroy crops in its uncontrolled stage. The water used for navigation and irrigation will produce power, and in turn that power will be the cause of the creation of billions of dollars of new wealth to the Missouri River Basin States.

The development of the Missouri River Basin will not only prevent the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of property annually, together with human lives—by uncontrolled waters—but will also prevent drought and will restore water levels in the Dust Bowl. Few Members of Congress perhaps realize that our loss in crops, livestock, and other property caused by drought is many times greater than that occasioned by floods. For every dollar lost by flood, at least $50 have been lost by drought.

In conclusion, permit me to suggest that Congress has now passed the appropriate legislation. It has given the green light—the go-ahead sign—to the Committee on Appropriations. The Bureau of the Budget has approved this appropriation. Colonel Pick, in his report, has informed Congress and the Nation that the Missouri River Basin project had been altogether too long neglected. He pointed out the multiple purposes to which the development of this basin could be put to.

Congress accepted his report and acted. It provided that dams on the main stem of the Missouri should be constructed by the Army engineers; that the Army engineers should have control of floods and navigation. It provided that the Bureau of Reclamation should have control over irrigation, power, and domestic uses.

Let us now appropriate the money necessary to do the job—this without restrictions, without putting hobble skirts on either the Army engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation.

When completed, the entire Missouri River Basin multiple-purpose dams will develop 4,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. They will develop all of the electrical power possible to be developed from the Missouri and its tributaries. The Bureau of Reclamation will distribute this power over a wide area by transmission lines to the REA, to farmers, co-ops, and municipalities. It will do this just as it is doing now on other similar projects—the same as on the Coulee and Boulder Dam projects. Remember that to date this Bureau has distributed more electrical energy for power and light and at a less cost than the TVA.

In North Dakota this project will make possible the irrigation of 1,350,000 acres. This will raise the annual income of the 1,350,000 acres, when irrigated, from $6 to $30 an acre. It will increase the farm population in western North Dakota by cutting down the family-size farm from 600 to 100 irrigated acres. The entire Missouri River Basin irrigated area will cover 4,700,000 acres. This project will reverse the downward trend in population that has taken place in the Missouri River Basin States since 1930.

Since every farm family supports two additional city families, it will greatly increase the city population in the basin. In addition, the electrical power will multiply the activities of the Missouri River Basin States. It will produce new industries and give new life in many diffeernt fields. Again, since every dollar additional aggricultural income adds $7 to the national income, it will increase our national income by several billion each year. In fact, it is impossible for anyone to see how many, and what benefits this long-neglected project will furnish to the future of each of the basin States and the Nation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman agree with me that the money in this bill for the Missouri Valley flood control is a very necessary step to get going to finally bring about the completion of the Pick-Sloan plan which most of the people in that great area favor?

Mr. LEMKE. I agree with the gentleman, and I will add that it is a direction to the Appropriation Committee from a majority of Congress in the acts passed on December 22 last.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment to include those projects recommended by the Director of the Budget will be adopted. The planning of many of these projects is almost completed so they will be ready for construction later on. Why should we wait years to complete the planning when everybody is advocating employment? These projects will give and furnish much employment for our boys for 3 or 4 years in the postwar period. All are worth-while projects and are self-liquidating. In the long run, it is a good investment for the Government.

The project. known as the Clark's Hill Dam, on the Savannah River in my State, can be liquidated in 30 years according to estimates of Army engineers. Then the Government will own and operate it and make money out of it.

We are not asking the Government to give anything. We are only asking the Government to extend credit, which in the last analysis will be a splendid investment.

Why not harness the streams of our country, especially those which will be self-sustaining and at the same time very beneficial to the public? Who can suggest any good reason for not going ahead with these projects, at least have the planning completed, so that construction can be started in the near future? This Congress is committed to develop these projects, and I wonder who is behind all this movement to stop progress of this character when everyone realizes the Government will not lose but will make money out of a great many of them.

Many of these projects, such as the one on the Savannah River, have been recommended unanimously by various boards, by the Army engineers, supported by the people, and not objected to by anyone, not even the power companies in some sections; and this is true of the Clark's Hill project on the Savannah River. All the testimony shows that it will be self-liquidating and profitable to the Government. After it has been authorized, just give me one reason why we should not go forward, especially when the public will be greatly benefitted.

Some, who are opposed to the full-employment bill, give as their reason that we already have authorized many flood-control and river-and-harbor projects and road projects. Certainly those who are against the full-employment bill will not oppose this amendment to include these projects recommended by the Budget Director. And those who are in favor of the full-employment bill would be inconsistent in opposing going ahead with these projects authorized by Congress.

Some of these projects, such as Clark's Hill, can be developed with practically no flowage damage, no flooding of railroads or highways or towns or other valuable property, and that is another reason why everybody in the Clark's Hill area is for this project and many others recommended by the Budget Director are important and desirable.

Approximately 12 years ago the Government was authorized by an act of Congress to improve the navigation of the Savannah River from Augusta to Savannah so as to give a steady flow of water of 6 feet at all times to assure a useful waterway. The Government has spent several million dollars for this purpose. The stream is practically useless for navigation unless we have 6 feet of water the year around.

Army engineers said at that time it would cost nearly $15,000,000 to obtain a channel of 6 feet the year around, and they went up the river and discovered that a dam at Clark's Hill would give them the desired water the year around, and that in developing it the power would pay for the $15,000,000 and for the whole project within 30 years. Now to postpone development of this project or fail to have it ready for construction within a reasonable time is utter foolishness and shortsightedness. What I have said relative to this project is true, in a great measure, of others.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I question the advisability of one decision that has been made by our Committee on Appropriations. Personally I agree with my committee in its action as to the delaying of flood control projects and power projects at this time simply because we do not have an unemployment situation today in America. The action I question very seriously is the decision made to delay for even a few months the granting to the Veterans' Administration the sum of $158,000,000 for veterans' hospitals. I question that action, Mr. Chairman, from the viewpoint of a man who has had a brother in a veterans' hospital for the last 20 years. I feel sincerely that if we make a mistake we should make an error in favor of the veteran. Our committee will eventually give this money for this purpose, so why should we put this over to some future date for action?

I have not as yet heard sufficient testimony which convinces me that we should eliminate this $158,000,000 from the bill. We must have ample hospitalization to give the best of care to our disabled servicemen. You and I and everyone of us know that the duty of providing such care is the number one responsibility of the people of America and primarily our responsibility as Members of the Congress.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree with the position the gentleman takes. To me this program is inevitable and I do not believe the people of the United States want it postponed now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I have been much disturbed by the bill which has been brought to the floor for action at this time. I believe that in its elimination of all appropriations for river and harbor and flood-control projects it has given to the Army engineers the worst slap that they have had during the 9 years I have been in Congress. Every one of the projects coming before the River and Harbor and Flood Control Committees has been approved only after it has been recommended by the Army engineers and after the two committees have had long and extensive hearings.

In many cases the projects are well under way. For instance, on the Connecticut River where part of the funds contained for flood-control projects would be expended, the work on the local flood-protective works at seven cities and towns is so nearly completed that of about $22,000,000 needed for their full completion $18,000,000 have already been expended. It seems to me most unfortunate and unfair that these projects which could be undertaken in early spring, developed and finally carried out to good advantage in 1946 should be set back because someone has decided that they would strike out every river and harbor and flood-control project that came before the Committee on Appropriations at this time. Likewise, of course, I feel the same way about the veterans' hospitals and about housing for veterans. I think for the Congress at this time to delay and say that we will wait 2 months or 3 months or 4 months longer is just to bring into every large community at least in the United States a problem which is already serious and which is becoming dangerous. I know of no place where a returning veteran picking up his wife and his children from the parents of either his wife or himself is able to set up housekeeping in Springfield or in the surrounding community. There is not an available house. It seems to me that inasmuch as the committees of the Congress have been working and have decided on some program which might well be carried out that there should not be any delay which is unnecessary.

I have also been interested in another phase of this bill. It is not fair, perhaps, to speak of the other fellow's project. One's own project must stand on its own merits. Nevertheless I have wondered why it is that the reclamation projects come in here and receive attention and receive consideration while river and harbor and flood-control projects are out. For instance, I kept a copy of a statement which was made by R. S. Calland, acting regional director, region 2, of the Bureau of Reclamation before the conference of the Farmer-Labor-Consumer Association held in San Francisco September 8, 1945. I, of course, am in favor of reclamation projects. To the extent that they will benefit the agricultural producers of this country I think that they ought to be

carried out with Federal aid. But it is my understanding that the Central Valley project was first brought to this Congress or an earlier Congress with the understanding that when completed the project would cost $170,000,000. In his speech Mr. Calland states that already $160,000,000 have been spent. However, the estimates which have come into the Congress of the cost of completion have now risen to $384,314,000. It no longer is a reclamation project. It has become a big power project, a community development project and, as near as I can make out, it almost looks like a communistic project.

Later in his speech Mr. Calland stated:

In addition to these projects—

Which he has already enumerated in an earlier part of his speech—

which we hope will be built as soon as possible, we are engaged in exhaustive studies looking to the ultimate conservation of all the available waters of the Central Valley. In the basin report we have evolved a master plan designed to give the State what is most essential to its wholesome growth and continued prosperity—the full utilization of practically every drop of water available for multiple-purpose use in the Central Valley.

Then comes what to me is a startling statement.

When completed, the total cost will approximate $1,800,000,000.

May I ask some member of the Interior Department subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations what explanation there is for carrying about $20,000,000 in this bill to carry out that scheme, one so tremendous as to involve $1,800,000,000, when less than $103,000,000 is refused for flood control projects? I wonder if anyone can tell me the answer to that.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The Central Valley program has been going on for a number of years. There are a number of projects that are now in process of construction. There are some irrigation, reclamation, and power projects in that program that our committee felt should be completed as quickly as possible. The big over-all program of $1,800,000,000 is one of the many valley-development programs the Interior Department is recommending, similar to the Missouri Valley, the Columbia Valley, the Ohio Valley, and several other such projects. The $1,800,000,000 is supposed to cover the completed job of developing that valley. Most of us are trying to make these projects self-supporting so that they will pay their own way, in order that the folks in Massachusetts will not have to pay for valley development in other sections of the country. We are trying to put them on a good, sound business basis.

Mr. CLASON. Why is it, though, that the Corps of Engineers, carrying out projects where everybody knows we will get 100 cents on the dollar back either in the form of flood protection or harbor development in a particular area, is not given 1 cent to carry on the projects which they have demonstrated they are so capable of carrying on, while the Department of the Interior is given millions with which to carry out this project, which it appears to me, if it has $1,800,000,000 expense attached to it, is a visionary project?

Mr. JENSEN. I think I shall let the members of the Deficiency Committee answer that question. I have my own ideas, but I think they will answer that question in the debate either this afternoon or tomorrow. I may say that there are items for flood control taken out of this bill for projects in my district which I also hope will be put back into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the gentleman has a misunderstanding about the Central Valley water project. The $800,000,000 that you refer to does not include what we ordinarily call the Central Valley water project. That project is a project that includes two main rivers and the tributaries that go into those rivers from the Sierra Nevada Mountains. There is a great misconception about the power provisions that we are developing out in California. They are only a byproduct of water projects. It is only that we allow the water to pass through water wheels on the way to the canals that are going to irrigate the land. In your country you do not put water on the land like we do. We have a dry season from about April until November or December and to irrigate the intensively cultivated land which we have out there, and we are the leading State in agriculture in the United States in dollar value, we have to put water on our lands. Every one of our lay-outs there is a multiple-purpose project. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the development of flood-control dams as a beginning in the ultimate development. Our water development has been going on since 1850. Of course, this is a tremendous development that you refer to of almost a billion or more dollars.

Mr. CLASON. It is $1,800,000,000. So it works up to the point where it is two or three thousand dollars an acre that the Federal Government is going to expend on this land or this project.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. At all events, when you do allow the reclamation projects, and I stand for that, there are power developments in many of these projects aggregating $77,000,000 included in this bill.

Mr. CLASON. That is in this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; in this bill.

Mr. CLASON. This man is talking about 1,000,000 kilowatts.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Inasmuch as that is true, is there any consistency or any good reason why this bill should not include flood-control projects when perchance a little power is being developed as an incident to the flood control?

Mr. CLASON. I certainly think they ought to be allowed to have the flood-control and rivers and harbors projects along with the reclamation projects. I have no fault to find with them if they are properly carried on at a reasonable expenditure.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree with the gentleman that there should not be any discrimination.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Central Valley water project has been estimated by the Department of the Interior to cost about $380,000,000, so all that other stuff is with reference to future developments in the far distant future on other rivers.

Mr. CLASON. No; that is not so.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; it is.

Mr. CLASON. It is all in the Central Valley and this man is talking about the cost as being $1,800,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It has been suggested that one reason the rivers and harbors and flood-control projects were not included is because there is a provision here for the Central Valley Authority and whatever the purpose is, it will cost $375,000,000 ultimately, and that that is the reason for objecting to the others.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. It is a billion dollars.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I said $375,000,000, according to their estimates.

Mr. TABER. It is a billion dollars that they admitted they were going to spend and they would be irrigating not a foot of land, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the proposition of placing back in the first deficiency bill the sum of $128,475,000 for rivers and harbors and flood control projects. The report of the Committee on Appropriations to accompany this bill, H. R. 4805, identifies this total on page 5 of its report.

These projects have already been asked for by our President and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. They have the approval as to need thereof by the Army engineers, and would form a backlog of sound public expenditure in supplemental relationship to the expansion of free enterprise in rebuilding our total national reconversion into a peacetime structure.

Not having time here to discuss every one of the important items as shown in the hearings before the committee and deeming it appropriate to therefore limit my further remarks to those matters affecting the Eighteenth District of California, which I have the honor to represent, I state that in the list is $7,100,000 for the completion of the Federal breakwater extending generally from the San Pedro-Los Angeles Harbor entrance several miles to the south and directly across the front sea door to my home city of Long Beach, where rests the great Pacific Fleet in security and where its personnel find the finest of welcomes and recreation advantages.

This breakwater is not a new project. Already move than $23,000,000 of the total estimate of $31,000,000 has been expended upon it, so this balance of $7,000,000 is merely to complete a project originally started as a necessity well before the war and only discontinued on account of the war. Behind the protection of this breakwater, so necessary for the use of the Navy which comes to home there and also for the benefits of commercial ships, are great naval shore installations extending for several miles, including the Roosevelt drydocks, said to be the largest in existence.

The map I filed with the subcommittee at its hearings on October 25 clearly showed that there were only three short sections now needing completion. One section thereof is now completed to plus 15 feet; one to minus 10 feet; one to minus 26 feet.

It is good business and a necessary protection to the best interests of our Navy and coastwise and foreign commerce that this breakwater be completed.

On October 25 when I testified before the subcommittee, I also supported the engineers request for money to construct the Whittier Narrows Dam. With my argument at that time I filed a resolution by the Board of Water Commissioners of the city of Long Beach, Calif., favoring this construction and also a similar resolution by the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce. I refer you to the text of each on pages 125, 126, 127 of the committee hearings on flood control.

This essential to flood control is no new project for it was proposed as part of a necessary county flood-control district as early as 1932. The Flood Control Acts of June 1936 and May 15, 1937, authorizing construction of not to exceed 70,000,000 in the Los Angeles County drainage area did not include this item but the act of 1936 authorized a survey and examination of the San Gabriel River and its tributaries.

The district engineers for several years have advised that the flood-control dam at Whittier Narrows is the most economically feasible and the plan for Whittier Narrows Dam has been with the full knowledge of Los Angeles County authorities who have approved the same in terms of a strong resolution favoring same.

Not being an engineer, I must needs resolve my opinion as to its needs and economy in favor of the technical knowledge and experience of those upon whom we have learned to rely for such advice on such subjects.

My home city of Long Beach, close by the situs of the proposed dam, urges the construction thereof and both the harbor board, the water board, and the chamber of commerce have urged its construction as being in the best interests of the majority of the people of the whole area involved.

Its construction, too, forms another sensible bulwork for sound employment and expenditure of Federal funds.

The housing problem for veterans and their families is more acute now than before Pearl Harbor, so far as Long Beach and the county of Los Angeles is concerned. I favor the inclusion of the sum of $24,500,000 in the bill for temporary housing for these war veterans.

Granting that these accommodations would only last a few years, that is no argument against these abodes already bought and paid for by taxation, being dismanteled and moved to such areas as most need them for these veterans and their families. Suppose it does cost as much as $600 a unit to dismantle and move them. What is that as a matter of Federal expense when without it we now know that thousands of these distinguished boys and their families will have no chance of any decent home life at all, for they have no abodes now worth calling home.

Granting that Government housing should not compete with private enterprise, it is no answer to the present emergency because there is no low-priced housing immediately available nor any reasonable chance of construction thereof in the next 30 to 60 days. These men who fought our battles for us are entitled to receive our best treatment and neither delay nor hesitation is fair or just to them.

The expressed sympathy of the committee for the distress now being suffered can best be expressed in terms of putting back the $24,500,000. The Nation will applaud this action as sensible and sound.

All or as much as necessary of the $158,320,000 should be available for veterans' hospitals. Now is the acceptable time for our Nation to begin to take such action as is reasonably necessary to have plenty of the best of hospitalization facilities of all sorts for these veterans.

I do not argue for any part of undue haste. But I do insist that there be no delay where there should be action and there be money available when money will buy the needs of these men and that our returning veterans have the very best of facilities and also the best of medical care and hospitalization care and advantages.

I want that no lad who has an iota of chance for rehabilitation mentally be crowded with those who manifestly have no chance of such a mental come-back. I want, too, that those who have no chance of a mental come-back to normalcy have such care and accommodations that they have no occasion to feel they are forgotten men.

Giving credit to every Member of Congress for being just as anxious as I am along this same line, I am also ready to make allowances for any reasonable loss of funds, by so acting in this matter—at every point—that a mistake if made, is made in favor of the veteran getting the better hospitalization; getting the better treatment in the hospitals; getting the best of everything American moneys can buy up to his needs and requirements for the speediest and surest recovery.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON].

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced, on behalf of the veterans of the armed services, an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Public Law 457, Seventy-eighth Congress. Despite the stated intention of that act, our fighting men who are now returning to us will never have a real opportunity to acquire surplus materials they need and can use unless such an amendment is passed.

Much has been said and written about rights and benefits of veterans. Action, not talk, is needed here. There is no way for this Congress or the American people to compensate these men adequately for their discomfort, their wounds, and their heartaches. The services they rendered at Iwo Jima and at Anzio cannot be measured in dollars. However, in the matter of surplus Government property, we can help them a little in beginning life anew by removing some of the handicaps and barriers encountered in finding a place in our economic order. The bill I have introduced is a basic necessity if our veterans are to receive anything but hollow words.

I believe that Congress intended at the time it passed the Surplus Property Act of 1944, and intends today, that veterans should be given a real and not a sham chance to purchase the materials with which they fought when they return to their homes and their jobs as civilians. Many veterans needed automobiles, furniture, and the tools of their trades at the time they entered the service. Although they should have these things now, their right to acquire them is entirely fictional under present legislation.

There are two reasons why the present law does not actually enable the veteran to buy the surplus properties that he needs and can use. First, the act provides, in section 13, that cities, States, and other political subdivisions, and educational and charitable institutions, shall have priority as purchasers over the veteran. It is estimated that the political units and charitable institutions preferred to the veteran by the present statute aggregate 285,000. A water district in South Carolina or a levee improvement district in Texas, commendable institutions as they are, have no right to go before our veterans when it comes to purchasing the very equipment with which those veterans fought. While it seems justifiable to prefer such organizations to those which operate for profit, even they have no claim upon the American people comparable to that of the men who brought the victory that enabled this Congress to meet here today and our citizens to walk with their heads held high in dignity and in freedom.

The present amendment to the Surplus Property Act gives veterans a preference over all purchasers except the Federal Government. In preserving this priority in favor of the Government, it is recognized that it does not make sense

for one arm of the Government to be selling materials while another purchases the same things in the open market.

In actual fact, this is what happens: The Army releases 10,000 surplus jeeps for sale under the terms of the act. Cities, States, schools, and water districts, having been unable to acquire vehicles throughout the war, assert their preference under the present act for more than the available 10,000 jeeps. The veteran is shoved out of the line, and will continue to be until this handicap is removed. As I have stated, the proposed bill would give the veteran priority over all prospective purchasers except the Federal agencies. No hair-splitting interpretation will deprive him of his rights.

The second serious defect in the present law arises from the fact that even the diluted priority awarded the veterans by the act can be asserted only "to establish and maintain their own small business, profession, or agricultural enterprises." Obviously this language does not permit a veteran who has recently returned to purchase materials for building a house or the furnishings for his home. He can obtain furniture for a restaurant or a car for a taxi but not for the use of his wife and children. As we all know, a high percentage of the men overseas were sent out on very short notice and were the first to dispose of their furniture and cars. Is there any conceivable reason why they should not be allowed to be the first to reacquire them now? The proposed bill will give veterans that right and will not require that they establish that the war materials will be used in a commercial enterprise. They will have a real opportunity to buy them.

It is recognized that the Surplus Property Administrator has a very difficult problem in establishing an adequate distribution system which will make it possible for the veteran to inspect available surplus materials. But this legislation will clear the decks for a system whereby a veteran in Keokuk, Iowa, or Johnson City, Tex., can go to any selling agency or wholesaler and buy surplus goods without discovering, as at present, that his priority is strictly third-class. He was I–A in the service of our country. It is up to us to give him an A–1 chance at the surplus war materials.

I say again that until this legislation is passed, the Surplus Property Administrator can say to us: "No regulation of mine can be effective in giving the veteran a genuine priority." Let us pass this bill and say to the Administrator: "We have given you the green light. It is your job now to see that the boys get what they need."

This bill is being introduced with every confidence that the interest of every Member of this House in the welfare of the veteran is such that immediate action will be taken. I appeal to each one of you, and particularly to the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to assist in every way in effecting the enactment of the amendment before the Christmas recess. Our loyalty and devotion to our fighting men must not be put in moth balls now. Surely the victorious parades and celebrations are not so far behind us that we are already unmindful of all they gave so that we could be.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with an acute emergency in the field of housing for veterans. During the past 4 years our boys have been fighting overseas for the homes they left behind them or the homes they hoped to have. They are coming back, thousands of them every day, looking forward to enjoying those homes.

And what do they find? There just is not any place for them. If they find a job they have an income, but they cannot get a roof over their heads. Long years of separation from their loved ones makes them yearn for home more than they ever did before—and there are no homes.

This is more than a community problem. It is a national problem. It is our problem. These boys were not fighting for Brooklyn, or Bridgeport, or Sauk City—they were fighting for America. Because they fought so well, our homes all over America were saved from the bombs which destroyed the cities of Europe and Japan. Yet when they come home, it is as hard for them to get a roof over their heads as it would be in Hiroshima. We reward them with ribbons and pensions, we pass a GI bill of rights, but we have not done anything yet to make good their right to a home.

Many complacent persons, who have comfortable homes of their own, say "The housing situation will take care of itself in time. The builders are busy, and in a few years there will be homes for all." But the crying need exists today, and must be met, insofar as humanly possible, today. We do not expect the veterans to wait for next year's food crop to start eating. They cannot wait till next year's crop of wool is processed to find clothes. They must have homes now.

The veterans' housing need is not the product of anyone's imagination. The National Housing Agency estimated that on October 1 of this year there already was a national deficit of approximately 1,200,000 family housing accommodations, off the farms. Between that date and the end of 1946, approximately 1,600,000 married veterans who have no homes to return to will be discharged from the armed services. And it is estimated, conservatively, that another 1,300,000 single veterans will marry during that period. Against this huge veteran need, less than 1,500,000 dwellings will become available through new construction or through the release from all causes of presently occupied dwellings.

There is just one source of homes readily available today at low cost. That is the surplus temporary war housing located in areas now deserted. For the relatively small cost to the Federal Government of about $600 a house, we can relocate some of that surplus housing in the congested areas which need it. We can move the homes quickly and set them up where needed in a matter of days—if we care enough for our veterans to do so.

An appropriation should now be before us to set aside $24,500,000 to move surplus temporary war housing to the places where it is most desperately needed for the use of veterans and their families. While we all admit that these war housing units are not permanent and satisfactory homes, they offer a degree of comfort, privacy, and family life not available elsewhere at the present time. They can meet a small part of this great need in a very short time, if we give the all-clear signal by voting the money.

There is no question of competing with other private and public enterprises in the housing field. All construction companies are already at work using all the labor and materials they can lay their hands on, and there are not enough of either available for their needs. Most of the enterprises now under way cannot possibly be ready for habitation before next spring, or even later. And the temporary housing cannot possibly last more than a few years, just until it is replaced by better permanent housing facilities.

But these units would help, in a small way, to meet the current emergency. There is no other alternative for making more homes available quickly to veterans. Giving them preference in existing developments is no answer, since there are practically no vacancies in existing developments. Lending them money to buy does not help when there is nothing for sale at their price. The only homes not now occupied are those under discussion in this proposal. We dare not refuse to do this one small thing, to make this one small gesture, toward the veterans who have done so much for all of us.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. RABAUT. Here is a boy who comes back from Iwo Jima. What are you going to say to him? Are you going to say: "Now, you have graduated to a shack"? Or are you going to take these housing units, dismantle them and use what can be salvaged? I say pull them to pieces and use what material may be available from the operation. These boys should go into decent homes. Are we going to take these boys who have laid their life on the line and taken every chance that has been asked of them, bring them home and stick them into one of these shacks?

Mr. BIEMILLER. May I say in answer to the gentleman from Michigan that as he will recall I stated earlier that this was not a satisfactory solution but I know that in my city of Milwaukee—and I presume it is likewise so in Detroit and every other large city—there is literally no place for this boy from Iwo Jima or France to go. My city of Milwaukee is desperately in need of 2,000 of these units. The common council and the county board of supervisors are trying to get them now.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Surely.

Mr. RABAUT. No one is opposed to the veteran, everybody wants to help him; but, after all, he is entitled to some sort of decent consideration. This thing has resolved itself almost to a

perpetual error of the so-called temporary houses. Too many people deserving better housing have lived in them already. Now they want to spend $600 apiece to panel each one of them.

"Panel," that is a new word coined by the agency which wants to tear them down, pack them up and deliver them some place to be reestablished; then some other unit of the Government is going to spend anywhere from $1,800 to $3,000 apiece on them, yet they were not worth that much in the first place. Every time you turn around somebody wants to put more money into them. Always remember that it is the taxpayers' money that is being spent on them some place by some unit of the Government.

I will yield the gentleman more time if I am taking too much of his time, but this matter has been mentioned several times during the course of the debate today and I have not voiced my sentiments on it. I am not belittling the effort of the gentleman from Wisconsin for he is a real progressive Member of the House.

If there are these agencies in different cities in the country who feel their housing is sufficient for the veterans I differ with them, but have no objection to such action. But to ask the Federal Government now to step in again and spend $600 on each of these units to—using their newly coined fancy phrase—"panel" them, which means to take them apart, and prepare them for shipment, I say it is ridiculous. Let the individual cities assume their own responsibilities in this regard. Let them take these units, dismantle them, and make something worth while of them, if possible. The thing we are objecting to in this bill is this positively ridiculous gesture of having the Government spend more money on these shacks and keep moving them continuously at still additional expense and have nothing in the end.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks about myself, but in answer to the gentleman from Michigan I want to point out that what I am arguing for here is not an ideal solution of the problem, and I realize it fully. I am not very happy that we have to rely upon these temporary housing units for our returned veterans; but again I submit to this House that there is no other alternative for immediate housing for veterans. That is the need that faces every large city and many small cities, and particularly university communities, at the present time. There just is no place today for the veterans to go. You cannot rebuild these temporary houses because already there is a terrific shortage of building materials and building labor. The cry goes up from the building-trades councils: "We have no mechanics." Contractors complain to all of us about the shortage of building materials. Materials and labor just are not to be had. I want good homes for veterans, but immediately I want them to have advantage of our temporary war housing, which is now unoccupied.

I believe the Appropriations Committee has erred grievously in not reporting this item and I sincerely hope the House will take immediate steps to make these temporary housing units available to veterans.

Public Law 87 provides for, first, veterans' preference in vacant federally owned war housing; second, moving surplus temporary war housing to congested areas for veterans' use; third, construction of new temporary housing for veterans and their families where the need demonstrably exists. So far, we have appropriated no money and, hence, the law is of little value. Let us remedy that defect forthwith.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, if sufficient time were given me, I could say much in praise of the work of the committee in the preparation of this bill, and I could also find much to criticize. I anticipated two of the matters of praise and criticism, in my 1-minute speech yesterday, at the opening of the day's session, when I referred to this bill as soon to come before the House and its probable attitude concerning hospitals and homes for veterans. I listened attentively, a few minutes ago, to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and found myself agreeing with him in condemning the oversight of this measure in regard to care immediately for returning veterans, although I disagree with him very widely in regard to his statements and views concerning reclamation. I think so highly of the gentleman from Massachusetts and have such great regard for his views generally that it pains me to hear him express a narrow conception of the merits of the reclamation program for the great West. But this is a matter for us to have out at some future time.

In regard to immediate and temporary housing for veterans, I want to present a middle ground which could have great merit and small cost. The gentleman from Michigan decries furnishing what he calls "shacks" to veterans as temporary housing. Now, I am no more in favor of asking the Nation's defenders to live in shacks than he is, or is any other properly appreciative American citizen. Yesterday, I received word from the University of Arizona, from two individuals, indicating the shortage of housing there for veterans who would like to be students at the university. Of course, I want substantial buildings and comfortable homes for these veterans, but I want to point out to my friend from Michigan that in the warm sections of our country temporary housing may be had immediately by a little effort and slight expense and are really usable, whereas with the scarcity of building materials, permanent and heavy construction cannot be had for a long time. I think a middle course between the opposing views we have heard expressed by the gentleman just preceding me would answer an imperative need at once, at a trifling cost, and I think the bill ought to provide for it.

I am not through criticizing the bill, but I would like to say one word in commendation of that part of the bill pertaining to construction costs of reclamation projects. I am pleased to see that the bill contains the full Budget estimates on many of the reclamation projects under construction, to carry on such construction in the best way possible. This is a wise provision of the bill. It will furnish jobs, not of "made" work, but in wealth-producing activity. These jobs will not alone be on the site in the irrigation projects of the Western States, but such construction will call for twice as many jobs in the eastern manufacturing centers to furnish the material necessary to carry on the construction. This fact should never be overlooked and is one of the great advantages of of this type of wealth-producing public building. Nor should it be overlooked that every dollar spent in these reclamation projects is an investment and is reimbursable, coming back to the Public Treasury and bringing with it tax revenues in the taxes on the new wealth which it helped to create.

By way of criticism, I am distressed to see a short paragraph, on page 17 of the report, which indicates a policy on the part of the Appropriations Committee which I think is a short-sighted policy. The closing paragraph on the Department of Interior section indicates that the committee "has taken the position that the Government should not go into the business of constructing transmission lines," but rather that somebody else should build such transmission lines to any dams that may generate hydroelectric power. Now, I am just as much opposed to having the Government go into the distribution and retail sale of electric power as is any Member in this Chamber, but it is my firm belief that if the Government builds no more transmission lines to Government dams, then the cause of reclamation has gone into eclipse and the development of the West has come under a blight.

I could be thinking of the Shasta Dam right this minute, but I am not thinking of Shasta Dam alone. I am thinking of a dozen or a score of dams which ought to be built in the West, many of them bigger than Shasta Dam, bigger than Boulder Dam, possibly even bigger than Grand Coulee. But if the policy indicated by that short, closing paragraph on page 17 becomes an ironclad policy of Congress, it is my firm conviction that the dozen or score of dams referred to above will probably never be built. Certainly then building under that policy will be long delayed.

Let me remind my colleagues that the existing great dams in the West are located in remote sections. They are not right on the edge of a metropolitan area, where the local utilities can hook on to the bus bars at the power plant. Take the Roosevelt Dam in Arizona, named after Theodore Roosevelt. It is about 70 miles from the city of Phoenix, whereas Boulder Dam is about 5 times that distance from Phoenix. I want to remind my Republican friends that the Federal Government furnished the money to build a transmission line from Roosevelt

Dam to Phoenix, and incidentally I may say that the Government has been largely repaid for that investment. The Government did not furnish money to build transmission from Boulder to Phoenix and Arizona accordingly lost her share of that Boulder power benefit. I believe the correct policy in building dams on western rivers is to see to it that such a dam is a multiple-purpose structure, but if no transmission lines are to be built by the Government, such a policy would subtract the multiple from the purpose of such a dam, and would make unfeasible the building of most such dams.

I would like to emphasize to my colleagues that irrigation and reclamation in the great West must depend upon multiple-purpose development, and it takes a coordination of all these to make a given project feasible. Would the Government have spent more than a hundred million dollars to build Boulder Dam for flood protection alone? We know it would not. Many irrigation projects cannot be built if the land must bear all the cost, and it is folly, and certainly unjust, to expect the water users, or the landowners, to stand all the costs and make the repayments. In the building of every dam, power can be produced and much of that same power is needed by the farmers whose association makes the project—but even if the farmers do not need the power for pumping, it is needed to develop cities at some distance, and it helps to produce wealth for the public generally, and this wealth should not consist of profits to some at expense to the pioneer farmers who brought about the development. Gentlemen, it is possible to so allocate costs of a project that hydroelectric power can be a revenue producer, helping to repay the cost of the project and doing it not in competition with local utilities nor destroying any established property rights. A working out of such a mutually helpful policy, in my judgment, is what Congress as a whole should do.

And that brings me to another criticism of this bill, which is that policy determination is not the business of the Appropriations Committee. We have legislative committees in the House whose function it is to give careful study to various policy proposals. To be concrete, it is the function of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to study right national policy in regard to reclamation. Such a committee has more time and can call in experts in the Government, or outside, and should do a better job of determining what is right policy, than is possible for the Appropriations Committee having such a complex of financial matters with a time limit on their action. If legislative policy is to be determined by the Appropriations Committee, the House might just as well abolish its legislative committees. This bill does contain legislation which in my judgment is not of the right kind.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, there are several items in this bill that I do not agree with the committee's recommendations on, especially with regard to flood-control and river and harbor items that were eliminated, and also with regard to the very item that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] just discussed, the housing of veterans.

I appreciate the remarks of a member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], about the temporary condition of this housing, but I would like to know where this housing is now and why is it estimated that each unit is going to cost $600? Much of it may be in the very area that it could be used to the best advantage. I do not want to yield now to the gentleman from Michigan to answer the question, because I would like to complete my statement first.

I call the committee's attention to the condition we are faced with in California. There may be needed 2,000 units in Milwaukee, but we need 50,000 units in Los Angeles County alone, in California. I do not know whether the Members realize it or not, but we have had an increase in population due to the war effort of approximately 1,000,000 in California. Seventy percent of this increase has been in southern California and 90 percent of the increase in southern California is in Los Angeles County. Added to that, we have the temporary residence of the wives of servicemen who are waiting for the men to come back from the South Pacific.

I would like to know if there is any charity or virtue in eliminating an item of this kind from this budget where you have servicemen's wives standing in line with children in their arms looking for a roof over their heads when this kind of housing would serve the purpose at least temporarily. People out there are living in trailers, they are living in abandoned Army barracks, they are living in Quonset huts; the people are living wherever they can find a place to lay their heads. Many of them are living in tents. The situation has become so desperate that the last proposal was that the situation in California and Los Angeles be declared a disaster, that it be treated as a disaster in the eyes of the State, and a special session of the legislature called for the purpose of appropriating money to meet the condition. We are faced with that condition in our section of the country and it is probably nearly as desperate in many other parts of the United States. Yet in view of that situation the committee proposes that because of the temporary condition of this housing it would rather see it on a permanent basis and it would rather withhold putting it into the Budget until some time later. Permanent housing requires priorities for materials, permanent housing requires financing. Where are you going to get the materials to build the houses? If you have capital you cannot set up a subdivision in which to build houses because you cannot get the materials in the market nor can you get an O. K. from the OPA to get much of the materials.

That is a situation that is very, very serious and I want to emphasize it. I would like to interest the members of the committee in the fact that this is an emergency and a critical situation and they are aggravating it by denying this appropriation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan to ask a question or make an explation if he wishes. I was speaking of the temporary condition of these houses when the gentleman arose.

Mr. RABAUT. The houses, of course, are located in many, many areas of the country. But the hearings are filled with testimony to the effect that they do not know exactly how much it will cost to panel these houses and to reestablish the land in the manner in which they found it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. They estimate $600 a unit, according to your report. It is not going to cost $600 a unit to take temporary houses in one part of California and move them to where they are needed.

Mr. RABAUT. This is what they say it is going to cost. It is not our testimony. It is theirs. But they also said it would cost some other division of the Government, or whoever established these houses, somewhere between $1,800 and $2,000, and some Members thought it would cost more than $2,000.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That estimate sounds like a defeatist attitude; that they do not want to do it at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to confirm what the gentleman said about the situation in the Southwest. California, of course, has a pronounced emergency, but the surrounding region also has one. Just yesterday I received a telegram from a married serviceman who cannot even find a place to lay his head in the land of sunshine. These gentlemen who have raised objections are from the North, where the climate is cold. They are talking about permanent construction. We are not advocating permanent shacks for the servicemen. We want temporary housing, usable now in a warm country. It is down there, and it can be furnished them in that southwestern country.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I agree with gentlemen who have preceeded me that the housing situation in this country has become most serious. There ought to be better use of temporary housing than is now being done. It seems to me these houses could be moved and used for veterans especially until the acute shortage has been solved. I shall say more about that problem later. It does not seem right to tear these houses and dispose of the material as second-hand lumber, rather than being retained and used to better advantage, especially for the veterans.

I want to talk at this moment in regard to the item of $23,000 in this

bill, for the State Department, to be used as representation allowance to entertain foreign representatives abroad. I believe they say most of it in the Far East. The funds, I am advised, are mostly used to buy liquor. I realize the amount of money is not so great, but the principle of the thing is extremely distasteful and unjustified. Already during this year $585,000 has been appropriated for entertainment, most of it used for buying whisky and all kinds of liquor. I tried to cut it down when the item was considered early in this year. Now you proceed to charge the taxpayers the additional sum of $23,000 for such purposes.

I call your attention to the fact too that the requested appropriation of funds for flood control is left entirely out of the bill. Can it be possible this administration is more in favor of buying liquor for foreigners than providing funds for flood control for the farmers of the Middle West, especially where it is needed? To me the whole thing does not make good sense. Not only that, but it occurs to me that our methods of dealing with foreign countries is falling to a low ebb when it becomes necessary to increase the so-called "entertainment" fund by $23,000 in order to get along with their representatives. The question is whether one believes in this method of handling situations with foreign representatives. The idea of using this method in order to deal with foreign representatives is a thing that to me is not right. After all, you and I know that the whole $585,000 and the extra $23,000 is charged to the taxpayers of this country, and they are required to foot the bill. The amount contemplated is not comparatively large but the principle, it seems to me, is extremely bad. At the proper time I expect to move to strike this particular item from the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, along with a great many other Members of the House and most of those who are in attendance here this afternoon, I am very much disappointed at the action of the Committee on Appropriations in deleting from the bill as reported all items covering flood control. It seems to me it has made a very grave mistake, particularly during this period which we will in the future know as the reconversion period.

Speaking generally on that subject, Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that Congress itself since VJ-day, and particularly some of the committees of the House, has not shown to the people of this country the leadership for which the people look to the House and the other body. It seems to me the Congress is approaching the very many problems of reconversion in too much a spirit of fear and with too much timidity. The Members seem to be laboring under a psychosis of using extreme caution when it comes to taking any step which would help along in the reconversion period. They exercise a great deal of hesitancy. They seem to go in for retrenchment on every conceivable project that is suggested. I am of the opinion that perhaps the Congress of the United States, both the House and the other body, has become too economy-minded during this period.

If business, which looks to the Congress of the United States, were to develop the same attitude and the same psychology we are evidencing here in this very appropriation bill, of fear to go ahead, of being too fearful of taking steps to continue projects that have been authorized and that have been wisely planned, that have the approval of the proper agencies after a great deal of study, if the businessmen of this country were to hesitate as much as the Congress is hesitating, I think the country would be in for a period of recession and that it would finally develop into a real depression.

It is time for this Congress to move forward with a little bit of boldness, in my opinion. It is time for us to go ahead with a little bit of courage, with a little bit of vigor, and to show the people of the country, the businessmen as well as the workingmen, that we have some confidence that we can come through this reconversion period without going into a terrible depression or even a small recession.

I think this bill from the Committee on Appropriations illustrates my point very well. Here you have the flood-control projects which have been given intensive and extensive study. Extensive surveys have been made. All of these projects have been very wisely planned. They were delayed because we were engaged in war. The planning was done so that they could be taken up immediately when the shooting ceased. Here the Congress through the Appropriations Committee is recommending a delay of at least 8 months, with the consequent danger of heavy damage and loss through a lack of proper flood protection.

For what reason? They say, "So that we can give more study to the projects and so that we can give them further consideration."

Mr. Chairman, I submit that every one of these projects that has been deleted by the Committee on Appropriations has been given all the study necessary. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that no matter how much longer you study them nor how many more surveys you make you will come up with the same recommendation and the same conclusion; because the United States engineers, for whom every Member of Congress has the greatest respect, have approved every one of these flood-control projects. The subcommittee having jurisdiction of flood control, that is, the subcommittee on War Department civil functions, has approved them. They have made the necessary studies. The Bureau of the Budget we all know is not a bureau that recommends the expenditure of money foolishly or profligately. And it has recommended approval. The local agencies in almost every instance have recommended these projects. So that no matter how much more study—the stock phrase which you so often read in these Appropriation Committee reports, "More study and further consideration" is made with reference to these matters—the same conclusions will be reached. We are facing what is merely a delaying action. What good will it do to delay this 8 months? We all know that all of these projects are going to be approved finally, in all probability by next June, so why not go ahead now during this period of reconversion when it is necessary for us to show the people of the country that we have some confidence in the future, and are willing to step out and spend a little money.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call particular attention to a project affecting the city of Pittsburgh, the project known as the Conemaugh River Reservoir project. It is a project which is described by General Robins as the key reservoir in the whole system—the key reservoir! In other words, it is the reservoir that will make operative to a much greater degree the flood control system of protection that has been designed for western Pennsylvania and for the Ohio River, all the way down the Ohio and its tributaries clear down into Mississippi. I want to read to you, Mr. Chairman, if I may, what General Robins said with respect to the general program. He said:

"The authorized river and harbor flood-control projects contained in the present supplemental estimates are widely distributed throughout the United States and are greatly needed by the country from a standpoint of economic returns and social benefits. The program includes authorized improvements having important economic and social benefits for which construction plans have been developed in accordance with the intent of the Congress in providing funds for advanced planning. It is believed that this program will not conflict with the reconversion of industry, but will constitute a step in the rehabilitation of the Nation's heavy construction industries so necessary to normal peacetime operations and full employment."

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you for the record what General Robins said with respect to the Conemaugh River Reservoir in which the people of Pennsylvania, the people of western Pennsylvania particularly, and Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky, are interested. General Robins said, and it appears on page 73 of the hearings:

"The Conemaugh Dam is the key dam in the whole system and will take more off of the flood height at Pittsburgh than any other."

Again, General Robins says on page 32 of the hearings:

"The project is a key reservoir in the plan for flood control for Pittsburgh and a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control and related purposes in the Ohio River Basin."

Now, Mr. Chairman, where is the wisdom in postponing action after testimony of that sort?

Under this plan that has been developed by the United States Army Engineers, there has already been constructed six reservoirs. Those six reservoirs have reduced the flood stage for the Pittsburgh area, based upon the 1936 flood, 5½ feet. That was with six reservoirs. With the construction of this one additional reservoir, the reservoir which will be known as the Conemaugh River Reservoir, and which General Robins calls the key reservoir in the whole program, it will further reduce the flood stage 4.6 feet. That is with one additional reservoir. Imagine how many people that will affect. It will

not only affect industries, it will affect all those who live in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the Congress cannot afford to leave this job of flood protection uncompleted. It cannot afford to do so at this time. It cannot afford to postpone it. The postponement of the completion of this program for 8 months will affect the inhabitants and residents of 11 States of the Union. I am not only speaking for western Pennsylvania or the city from which I come, and a portion of which I represent, but I am speaking in behalf of 11 States which will be affected by this one particular reservoir. The area directly around Pittsburgh and directly affected by these floods includes 1,375,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a sad thing that the Committee on Appropriations would overrule its subcommittee in charge of the special study of this subject, overrule the United States engineers, overrule the Bureau of the Budget, and come in here without an adequate excuse. The construction of these flood-control projects, Mr. Chairman, will help business. It will help the farmers. It will help the workingmen, and in particular it will help the people who live along the banks of these rivers, people who can ill-afford to have their belongings washed away by the spring floods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am very much alarmed at the cut of $158,000,000 for veterans hospital construction. During the war it was a constant battle to secure priorities for the building of veterans hospitals. I think the Appropriations Commitee went along with the recommendation of General Hines, but he always told me he could not get the priorities after he received the authorization and appropriation to build the hospitals. As a result the veterans did not receive proper care during the war.

The excuse always was, when there was overcrowding in the veterans hospitals, when there were not beds for the veterans, when there were not recreation facilities, that priorities could not be obtained.

It mentions the West Roxbury Hospital in Massachusetts, which has never been completed, there are no day rooms for the men. The men have to stand in the corridors waiting to see the doctors. There are no quarters for nurses or attendants or doctors. So the care of the veterans is very much delayed.

Overcrowding at Bedford Hospital, which happens to be in my own district, is very serious. Patients are placed in the day rooms and in the dining rooms because they do not have the buildings. They do not have the wards in which to place these men. As a result of overcrowding in NP hospitals, a great many accidents have happened. The beds are much too close together for the mentally disturbed patients, or for any patients, in many hospitals. At the Bronx Hospital in New York, the spinal cord cases are placed too close together for the well being of the patients. At the NP hospitals where there is not enough space in the day rooms and there is overcrowding there. There are fights among many patients who are not mentally right. Because they do not have quarters for attendants often they cannot secure desirable attendants. Testimony has shown that there were beatings at the Northport Hospital.

Mr. Chairman, it is to my mind an extremely unfortunate and inexcusable matter that today we seem to be having to go through the same battle to get buildings for our disabled men who fought for us, men who should be our very first care and our very first charge, that we had before peace was declared. I am quite sure this committee action was taken through a misunderstanding of the situation. I am sure the committee does not realize what the dire need of the veterans is for hospitals, nor do they realize the difficulty we have had in securing doctors and nurses. I hope that on Friday of this week the medical service bill which was reported out of the World War Veterans' Committee will come up for action. We must have these quarters for hospitals and suitable care for our men.

It was my amendment that included in the GI bill the authorization of $500,000,000 for the building of hospitals. I wanted to make sure, and so did the other members of the committee—and it was approved by all the veterans' organizations—that an authorization of sufficient money would be all ready so that the Appropriations Committee when the Veterans' Administration went to them for an appropriation the Appropriations Committee could grant that appropriation at once because the authorization was there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for one additional minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have been told that one reason this committee did not grant the $158,000,000 that General Bradley and General Hawley, the Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration have asked for was because they thought it would go into the independent offices bill; but every day counts in hospital construction and we need additional hospitals to care for our wounded.

I was overseas at the time General Bradley was in charge of the hospitalization of all our men in the European theater of war, the SHAEF theater of war. I saw every type of hospital or dressing station over there. He did very fine work in caring for our men and women, and I am sure he will provide the very best medical and nursing care it is possible to secure for our discharged veterans. He is a great inspiration to those who work with him, but without the necessary facilities and the necessary personnel he cannot carry on his work properly, and our men will not have hospitals if we do not provide them. Our service men and women will be neglected. Miracles were performed for our service men and women—miracles must be performed for our discharged disabled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HEALY].

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a number of Members this afternoon speaking with regard to the appropriation of $24,500,000 in connection with the moving of demountable housing from areas where they are not now in use to areas where there is an extreme need. I happen to represent a district in the city of Los Angeles, and so that the Members of the House may have some specific information concerning the situation in that city at the present time I desire to bring you the following facts:

It is anticipated that not less than 40,000 veterans who will need housing for their families will return to the city of Los Angeles within the next 6 months. Estimates of the possible or probable construction of new housing which private contractors can complete within the next 9 months is 20,000 units. So in consideration of just those two figures alone we will within the next 6 to 9 months' period accumulate a housing shortage of 20,000 units over and above the situation as it exists right today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give some comparative figures on this present situation as contrasted with the situation that prevailed when the war started. There have been 360,000 new families who have come to the city of Los Angeles during the course of this war. During that same period of time 21,000 units of housing have been constructed through the Los Angeles City Housing Authority and 66,000 units constructed by private contractors. The difference then between the new housing constructed during the war period and the number of new families which have moved into the city of Los Angeles during this approximately 4-year period is 273,000. In other words, the city of Los Angeles now has 273,000 less housing units with which to supply the needs of that city than it had at the beginning of the war.

Insofar as the local city housing authority is concerned, and its condition at the present time, I give you the following figures. The city housing authority now has 7,000 applications unfilled and a point that should be stressed in connection with this is the fact that applications are being accepted only from veterans, servicemen, military contract employees and civil-service employees of the Army and Navy. This means that the great bulk of people who do not fall in these categories directly connected with the Government or war effort are ineligible and in spite of that fact the housing

authority has 7,000 requests which it is unable to fulfill.

Other speakers who preceded me this afternoon have indicated the critical condition of the housing situation in the city of Los Angeles. All agencies which have made a study of this matter recently agree that this is the most critical housing situation which the city of Los Angeles has ever experienced in its entire history.

The appropriation to which I originally referred was for the purpose of taking down and crating vacant demountable homes. The cost of transporting and setting up these temporary homes will be borne by the cities which need them. The director of the Los Angeles City Housing Authority has already requested 5,000 units.

Obviously there is an immediate dire need for housing in Los Angeles. It would be wonderful if the building industry could build several hundred thousand new homes in the next few months. This would provide jobs for many of those now unemployed, there would be new homes for all who need them and rent controls in the Los Angeles area could be safely withdrawn. But we must face the realities of the situation. Mr. M. H. Driggers, Los Angeles Director of the National Housing Authority, estimates that the building industry cannot complete more than 20,000 housing units or homes in the next 9 months.

As has been stated by well-known Los Angeles leaders, this is a disastrous situation. Local and national authorities must take advantage of every possible opportunity to help. Even though this appropriation if made will probably give Los Angeles no more than 5,000 temporary homes, it will be much better than living in a tent or a parked auto and will be a real help to 5,000 veterans now without housing.

This $24,500,000 appropriation which the committee has stricken from the bill was for the purpose of providing temporary housing for veterans. This Congress called upon our boys to fight and even die to protect us from our Fascist and Nazi attackers. Are we now going to deny them housing? I realize full well that we must do much more to get construction of new homes going at a rate higher than ever before but gentlemen, tomorrow the gentleman from Texas, Mr. FRITZ LANHAM, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, is going to offer an amendment to include in the bill $24,500,000 for temporary housing for veterans. I hope that all Members who have any regard for the welfare of our returning veterans will be on hand to support this amendment which will, at least in a small way, show our appreciation of the boys who won the war for us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, as I walk through the streets here in Washington and in the corridors of the House Office Building more and more I spot the gold lapel pin that marks the ex-serviceman. Millions of these little gold pins are being worn on all the streets in America. Since VJ-day something like 4,000,000 men and women have put them on. These pins are the badge of honor of the most important single group of America—the veteran of World War II.

These men and women achieve their importance in the political and social scheme of things by virtue of their service to us. There is no question of the immensity of our debt to them nor of our responsibility to discharge that debt to the best of our national ability.

The GI bill of rights is only a down payment on what we owe.

Too often in our thinking about the veteran we clothe him in an invisible uniform—set him apart from the rest of us. Of course, he is different in many ways. He has problems growing out of his service, he has adjustments to make. Many of them are set apart by the cruel distinction of their wounds, but an important thing we are inclined to overlook about the veteran is that he has not only the peculiar problems of the ex-serviceman but he also has the problems and worries and ambitions of the ordinary citizen. He is a voter, a taxpayer, a wage earner. He has the same fears and hopes for his family as all of us do. His stake in a prosperous, secure democracy is the same as the worker's, the farmer's, the businessman's. He wants to collect the dividends of his fight for democracy—not as an ex-soldier, sailor, or marine, but as a citizen-partner in democracy.

Servicemen and veterans usually express their ambitions and hopes for the future the same way the war worker does. "I want a job," he will tell you. "Not just any old job, but a good steady job at good pay."

A great many of the millions of men who were called into service never had a good job. Millions of them never had a job at all. Actually only something like 20 percent of them left permanent employment to go to war.

An economy of high wages and full employment is the only economy which can satisfy the postwar objectives of the veteran.

No one can claim that servicemen during the war got paid too much, or lived in luxury, or that their families at home were adequately cared for. But, if the veteran is to maintain even that standard—the standard of his wartime employment as a soldier, his wages as a civilian worker must be raised, and raised substantially. The veteran has a right to expect a higher standard of living than he and his family had while he was fighting for democracy.

Based on figures arrived at by Government agencies, we can contrast the wartime living standards of a typical serviceman with the probable postwar standard of the same serviceman—now turned veteran and worker.

Let us take the case of an enlisted man who left behind his wife and two children while he served in the European theater of war. What is the value of the things he and his family were provided by the Government, his wages, goods and services, and the allowance for his dependents?

The serviceman's wife and two children were given $100 monthly, or $1,200 a year.

Assuming that the serviceman received the pay of the average enlisted man in the European theater, he earned $1,033 annually according to War Department estimates. Out of this sum, $264 was deducted for his family allotment, so his net wages equaled $769.

In addition to his wages, the average GI is provided with food amounting to $279.37 a year, clothing at a cost of $212.01 a year, and medical supplies adding up to $20.89 a year.

These figures do not include anything for quarters or equipment. You cannot arrive at the cost value for lodging in a tent or barn or a bombed-out building.

Thus taking into account wages and essential provisions for the soldier, and allotment for his family, the wartime total income of our GI with a wife and two children figures out to be $2,481.27 a year, or $47.71 a week.

This $47.71, even though tax free, was not an adequate family budget. In order to reduce expenses, many servicemen's families were forced to live with relatives in crowded quarters while great numbers of service wives had to go to work to increase the family income.

What does this serviceman—now a veteran and looking for a job in industry—look forward to. He wants a good steady job, at good wages. What are his chances of making things easier for his wife, giving his children better food, more clothing, adequate medical attention?

In April 1945 the gross weekly pay of the average worker in manufacturing industries was $47.12, or slightly less than the cost of goods, essential services, and salaries received by the serviceman and his family.

With the return to the prewar workweek—with overtime and premium pay cut out—the average earnings in manufacture will drop to $33.96.

In other words, the average veteran who goes into industry and the average wage earner who stays at his job can expect to earn, at present wage rates, only $33.96 each week. This will represent a cut of $13.75—or more than 28 percent of the wartime earnings of the veteran, on the basis of cost of Government-provided wages and services for him, his wife, and his 2 children.

For many veterans, as well as for war workers shifting from war to peace production, the cut in income will be as high as 45 percent, at present wage rates.

There is not any question but that there was considerable resentment among servicemen, particularly those with families, against what they thought of as fabulous workers' earnings back home.

Now they are home, and workers themselves. As they join the ranks of civilian workers in industry, they are being quickly disillusioned.

Recently, Col. Arthur V. McDermott, director of the Selective Service System in New York, charged that some employers, apparently imbued with the idea of a surplus of labor, were trying to put

ex-servicemen to work at $24 to $26 a week.

Then he said:

It is a terrible reward to give a man who has served from 2 to 5 years, a job at $25 a week. How can he possibly support himself and his family in New York (or any place else) on that kind of money?

The answer to the colonel's question, of course, is that the veteran cannot support himself and his family on $25 a week, in New York, Detroit, here, or anywhere else.

The American veteran does not want a hand-out from the Government. He wants a job at a living wage. He wants to support himself and his family in decency and security. He cannot do this at present rates of pay. It will take at least a 30-percent increase in wages to maintain even the inadequate standard he knew while he was at war.

A 30-percent increase in wages will mean that average weekly earnings for industrial workers will be $44.14. This is less than what his wages, services, and family allotment cost the Government while he was in uniform overseas.

Out of this $44.14, the veteran will have to pay social security and income taxes which he did not pay as a soldier.

The average veteran will be the sole source of income for his family. Most servicemen's wives will want to stay home with their children.

A 30-percent increase in wages is a moderate demand. I have heard this demand called greedy and absurd. The same people who revile labor for its campaign to raise the level of wages shout to the housetops of the country's responsibility to our returned hero.

We do have a responsibility to our heroes—most of whom want to forget their heroism and get on with life as a civilian worker. We do have an obligation to the veterans—but oratory will not meet it. We cannot meet the obligation we owe to the veterans without bringing the fruits of a prosperous, secure democracy to all the people of that democracy.

The American serviceman was told that this war was a crusade against want. Yet, on his victorious return when he takes up life again as a civilian worker, he will find, like the veteran of World War I, that he has been shamefully deceived. Even though he has a good job, his wages at present rates will not buy the home, the new car, washing machine, radio, or even the food and clothing his family needs.

Low wages and salaries paid to veterans and other workers also dooms the brave hope of veterans who stake their future on the so-called GI bill of rights. If the national paycheck falls, most of the veterans who borrow money to go into business will lose it. Those who borrow to buy farms will lose their farms. Those who use Government funds to pay for their education may find no employment for their skills when they finish school.

The Nation has a moral obligation, on which it cannot welch, to improve and not cut the living standards of her fighting men and their families. The servicemen's sacrifices must be rewarded, and the future of all Americans must be protected, by substantial increases in wages now.

No amount of congressional hysteria against labor; no mischievous legislation against unions will change our responsibility. By taking a stand against labor in its fight for higher wages, Congress will be striking a blow at the earning power of millions of American veterans. It is our responsibility to see to it that the veteran not only gets a job—but gets a good job at wages which will maintain his family in decency and comfort.

Average cost of maintaining a soldier

In the United States:	Per annum
Pay	$816.00
Food	233.82
Clothing	212.01
Individual equipment	63.94
Barrack equipment	31.65
Organizational equipment	27.98
Medical supplies	31.34
Barrack upkeep	98.55
Total	1,515.29
In the army of occupation in Europe:	
Pay	1,033.00
Food	279.37
Clothing	212.01
Individual equipment	63.94
Barrack equipment	31.65
Organizational equipment	27.98
Medical supplies	20.89
Barrack upkeep	60.22
Total	1,729.06
In the Pacific theater of operation:	
Pay	1,080.00
Food	327.33
Clothing	273.29
Individual equipment	81.60
Barrack equipment	29.52
Organizational equipment	43.90
Medical supplies	36.57
Barrack upkeep	65.70
Total	1,937.91

The items of pay do not include the Government contribution to family allowances, to dependents of enlisted personnel, for the reason that such payments are not variable with the area in which the soldier is serving. Statistics on family allowance payments to dependents reflect that of the entire number of enlisted men in the Army, approximately 55 percent have accounts for family allowances. The average Government contribution per soldier's account for the month of May 1945 was $41.18. Thus the average Government cost of family allowance for all soldiers in the Army per annum would be 55 percent of $494.16 ($41.18 by 12) or $271.79.

Source: Gen. Brehon Somervell in a statement to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 12, 1945.

Annual pay of average enlisted man as of June 30, 1945

	United States	European Theater of Operations	Pacific	Percent of total
No dependents	$816	$1,033	$1,080	45
With dependents	1,310	1,527	1,574	55

Enlisted figure includes factor for flight pay, combat infantryman's badge, jump pay, and decoration allowances and longevity.

Annual pay of average officer as of June 30, 1945

	United States		Overseas	
	No flight pay	With flight pay	No flight pay	With flight pay
Major	$5,548	$7,339	$5,848	$7,789
Captain	4,048	5,383	4,288	5,743
First lieutenant	3,301	4,366	3,501	4,666
Second lieutenant	2,765	3,706	2,945	3,976

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there seem to be no further requests for time in general debate on the bill, so I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including page 2, line 4, of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] I ask unanimous consent that his special order be transferred to Wednesday for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] I ask unanimous consent that his special order be transferred to next Monday for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have be transferred to Friday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made this afternoon a schedule.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech he delivered at the Massachusetts State convention of the Federation of Post Office Clerks.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] may address the House for 40 minutes on Thursday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. JENSEN) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. JENSEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 905. An act for the relief of Harold E. Bullock; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 976. An act for the relief of the estate of Howard Francis Waldron; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1294. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1338. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1480. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1097. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 1215. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941;

S. 1459. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. 1494. An act to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to number, position, range, or arc of visability of lights, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 744. An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions;

H. R. 801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children;

H. R. 843. An act for the relief of Francis A. Hanley;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend;

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Nannie Bass;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of John August Johnson;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Carl Lewis;

H. R. 1192. An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of O. M. Minatree;

H. R. 1512. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay;

H. R 1781. An act for the relief of Candler Cobb;

H. R. 1902 An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries and for other purposes", approved May 15, 1928;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Annie M. Lannon;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others;

H. R. 1961. An act for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler;

H. R. 1978. An act for the relief of Jay H. McCleary;

H. R. 2027. An act for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased;

H. R. 2029. An act for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of John J. Gall;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Clifford E Craig;

H. R. 2191. An act for the relief of Cleo E. Baker;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Florence Zimmerman;

H. R. 2290. An act for the relief of Mary Galipeau;

H. R. 2300. An act for the relief of the estate of John R. and Louise D. Blackmore;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of James A. Brady;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Arlethia Rosser;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Capt. Warner Holtz;

H. R. 2481. An act for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson, deceased;

H. R. 2512. An act for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton;

H. R. 2595. An act for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly;

H. R. 2620. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Allen;

H. R. 2642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson;

H. R. 2686. An act for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley;

H. R. 2836. An act for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti;

H. R. 2874. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to authorize any corporation formed under authority of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of such code to specify in its bylaws that a less number than a majority of its trustees may constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the corporation;

H. R. 2886. An act for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.;

H. R. 3011. An act for the relief of John Hames;

H. R. 3135. An act for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3198. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Rolla Duncan;

H. R. 3249. An act for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly;

H. R. 3302. An act for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler;

H. R. 3636. An act relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish;

H. R. 3660. An act to provide for financial control of Government corporations;

H. R. 3790. An act for the relief of Genevieve Lund;

H. R 3867. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies;

H. R. 3868. An act to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3873. An act to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md.;

H. R. 3979. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R 4018. An act for the relief of Robert A. Hudson;

H. R. 4411. An act to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 28, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 28, 1945, in room 1304, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related

bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

841. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the effectiveness of title V of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

842. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

843. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Deputy Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, dated October 25, 1945, forwarding statements of the cost of manufacture at the armory and arsenals named therein, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

844. A letter from the secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians," approved April 10, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Submits additional minority views on H. R. 2788 (Rept. No. 1141, pt. III). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARY: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4652. A bill to provide credit for past service to substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to extend annual and sick leave benefits to war service indefinite substitute employees; to fix the rate of compensation for temporary substitute rural carriers serving in the place of regular carriers in the armed forces; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2647. A bill to restore the 2-cent-per-ounce rate of postage on first-class mail for local delivery; without amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4649. A bill to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Select Committee to Investigate and Study Laws and Problems Relating to Postwar Immigration and Naturalization submits an interim report pursuant to House Resolution 52 (79th Cong., 1st sess.) (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 207. A bill for the relief of Edgar Kaigler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 873. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of B. Pending; with amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on claims. H. R. 1348. A bill for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham, and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1615. A bill for the relief of the legal guardians of John Buchan and Lawrence Gillingham, minors; with amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2251. A bill for the relief of Catherine V. Sweeney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2596. A bill for the relief of M. F. Diller; with amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Charlie Powell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of R. H. Sindle; with amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante; without amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3158. A bill for the relief of Leonard J. Fox and Milford G. Fox, a partnership, doing business as Fox Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Commitee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3229. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry; with amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3285. A bill for the relief of Capt. Wayne E. Meisenheimer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3784. A bill for the relief of C. H. Brumfield; with amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3834. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage; with amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4116. A bill for the relief of M. R. Stone; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4117. A bill for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of Lucy Delgado; with amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1782. A bill for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3698. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Scarlett and Charles Scarlett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4806. A bill to amend the codification of existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States set forth in the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, as amended, so as to include among the special days on which the flag of the United States should be displayed the anniversary of the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. R. 4807. A bill relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4808. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Valley and McCone, Mont., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Frazer, Mont.," approved August 5, 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 4809. A bill relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4810. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 4811. A bill to provide certain benefits under the National Housing Act to veterans and war-service seamen in order to facilitate home ownership by such veterans and seamen; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4812. A bill to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4838. A bill to amend the act of January 22, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 5), to

authorize and direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase aluminum for stock-piling purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAY (by request):

H. R. 4839. A bill to amend Public, No. 779, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, approved December 1, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 419. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a study with respect to the holding and disposition of alien property; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 420. Resolution requesting information from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration about transportation to return troops from overseas points; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. Res. 421. Resolution requesting information from the Secretary of War about transportation to return troops from overseas points; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. Res. 422. Resolution requesting information from the Secretary of the Navy about transportation to return troops from overseas points; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. R. 4813. A bill for the relief of the Bunker Hill Development Corp., to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 4814. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Peter Benezis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH:

H. R. 4815. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 4816. A bill to provide for the advancement on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army of John W. McManigal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 4817. A bill for the relief of A. J. Davis, Mrs. Lorene Griffin, Earle Griffin, and Harry Musgrove; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4818. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Richard K. O'Connor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4819. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John J. Akers; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4820. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Clayton L. Lowe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4821. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Chauncey W. Whitright, Jr.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4822. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Robert J. Leete; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4823. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Robert J. O'Connor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4824. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Charley Roller; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GEELAN:

H. R. 4825. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Geenty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4826. A bill granting a pension to Nellie Knotts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4727. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Pan American Petroleum and Transport Co. against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4828. A bill for the relief of Edwin W. Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4829. A bill for the relief of Commander R. P. Erdman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 4830. A bill for the relief of J. H. Karr and Mrs. J. H. Karr, doing business as Home Plumbing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4831. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances B. Bynum; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 4832. A bill for the relief of Stanley B. Reeves and Mrs. Stanley B. Reeves; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4833. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Lee Blackman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4834. A bill for relief of the estate of Katherine Delores Booth to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4835. A bill for relief of the estate of Agnes Jane True; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4836. A bill for the relief of Louis M. Drolet; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 4837. A bill for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1348. By Mr. EATON: Petition of certain returning GI veterans of Raritan, N. J., regarding leave or furlough credit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1349. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of board of directors of the Texas Federation of Cooperatives, opposing H. R. 4322 in its present form and favoring suggested changes proposed by B. L. Sanders, director of the Navarro National Farm Loan Association of Corsicana, Tex., and others; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1350. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Southwest Shippers Advisory Board, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their approval of H. R. 2536 and with regard to other legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who revealest Thyself in all that is true and pure and lovely, we beseech Thee to help us make our minds the fitting audience chambers for Thy presence. O Thou who art Light, and in whom there is no darkness at all, help us to open wide the windows of our lives that we may be filled with Thy light.

We pause to acknowledge our human frailty and to lean our weakness against the pillars of Thy almightiness. Grant us wisdom, courage, and understanding adequate to meet the demands of each recurring day. Make us worthy ministers of Him whose love alone can conquer hate. Heal our sorely wounded world, and break down the barriers to human brotherhood. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 27, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1097. A act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 1215. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the S. S. *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941;

S. 1459. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. 1494. An act to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTIONS OF TWENTY-NINTH DIVISION ASSOCIATION, INC., BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. TYDINGS presented resolutions adopted by the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., at its annual convention, Baltimore, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime universal military training, protection of reemployment rights of discharged veterans, maintenance of an adequate enlisted personnel in the various States guards, and continuation of the Veterans' Administration as an independent governmental agency, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a petition signed by Mrs. A. Kovarik, of Hebron, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime universal military conscription.

There being no objection, the petition was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I, the undersigned, hereby favor universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress.

Mrs. A. KOVARIK.

HEBRON, N. DAK.

PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION—MEMORIAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a memorial signed by William L. Larsen, of Agate, and 68 other citizens of Agate, Bisbee, Mylo, and Mott, all in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the enactment of peacetime universal military conscription.

There being no objection, the memorial was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

We, the undersigned, are hereby opposed to universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress.

RECONSTRUCTION OF OMAHA AND COUNCIL BLUFFS LEVEES, NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and reference to the Committee on Commerce a resolution adopted by the industrial committee of the Omaha (Nebr.) Chamber of Commerce relating to the reconstruction of the Omaha and Council Bluffs levees in the State of Nebraska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Commerce as requested by the Senator from Nebraska, and printed in the RECORD.

The resolution presented by Mr. BUTLER was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, before the House Committee on Appropriations, a deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, which includes an item covering the reconstruction of the Omaha and Council Bluffs levees; and

Whereas there is also pending in the Congress of the United States House Joint Resolution 265 and Senate Joint Resolution 105, the purpose of which is to eliminate from the act of Congress approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law No. 14, 79th Cong.), the limitation against construction of public improvements until 6 months after the termination of the present war, so that immediate construction may be commenced on such projects; and

Whereas this committee upon full consideration is of the unanimous opinion that it is of paramount importance to the protection of industries in what is known as East Omaha and to the protection of the Omaha Municipal Airport, the general shops of Union Pacific Railroad Co., and the lead refinery of the American Smelting and Refining Co., together with much vacant industrial property behind said levees, that the Omaha levee be reconstructed at the earliest possible date, in accordance with plans developed by the United States engineers and approved by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee urge upon all Senators and Congressmen from the State of Nebraska the necessity for the adoption of the aforesaid appropriation bill and House and Senate resolutions, to the end that reconstruction of said levees may be undertaken at the earliest possible date in accordance with said United States engineers' plan; and further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Nebraska.

Clarence L. Kirkland, chairman, industrial committee; H. R. Freed, G. E. Mullarky, A. W. Roy, A. J. Rhode, Ford Bates, Richard E. Robinson, W. H. Hulsizer, members.

RESOLUTION OF THE NEBRASKA BANKERS ASSOCIATION RELATING TO INFLATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Nebraska Bankers Association at their convention held in the State of Nebraska on November 12, 1945. The resolution, which relates to the threat of inflation, is signed by 18 country bankers and 3 city bankers.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. We recognize that the threat of runaway inflation is present and real and that all banks and bankers must do their part if it is to be successfully controlled. With this thought in mind, we feel that legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by increasing minimum wages from 40 cents to 65 cents and eventually to 75 cents an hour is definitely and dangerously inflationary. Furthermore, the bill is definitely discriminatory to employers paying monthly wages, and gives no consideration to the difference in living costs in different parts of the country. We believe the measure should be defeated.

2. The Treasury Department in prescribing regulations for the operation of the withholding tax law acknowledges that banks are incurring additional costs for their service in acting as collectors and depositaries for such taxes. Reimbursement is limited to the privilege of loaning trifling sums to the Government at 2-percent interest and this interest is subject to all income-tax requirements. Such an arrangement is, in fact, no remuneration at all, and we request that the Treasury Department pay banks for the cost of such services plus a fair profit. We urge the American Bankers Association to join us in this request.

3. We feel righteously proud of the record the banks of Nebraska have made in the part they have taken in the past seven war loan drives. Banks represent only about 400 of the 1,000 issuing agencies in the State, but have been responsible for selling over 70 percent of all E bonds and 85 percent of the total of all bonds in these drives. We know that banks are keeping up their good record in this Victory drive now in progress and will urge their depositors to hold the bonds they buy.

4. Travel restrictions, together with lack of gasoline and tires, have made it impossible to hold many of our regional clearing house, group, and county meetings the past 3 years. We feel that these meetings are important in bringing out a solution to the many problems we are always confronted with, and strongly urge that these meetings be resumed now that we are able to travel again.

5. We commend the executive committee and the committee on group life insurance which is now in operation for those banks which have availed themselves of its privileges. We know that it furnishes protection at a low cost and is responsible for creation of extra good feeling between employer and employees in every bank that has come in on the plan. We urge those banks that have not yet availed themselves of its benefits to do so without delay.

6. The bankers of Nebraska are deeply grateful to all service men and women for the magnificent contribution they have made to the peace of the world. We are desirous of being of the utmost help to them in reestablishing themselves in their communities, but loan provisions of the GI bill of rights consist of such a maze of red tape and delays that it makes it almost impossible for bankers to help veterans through GI loans. We strongly urge the passage of pending legislation which will eliminate most of this red tape and delay.

7. Out of the legislation in the past years adopted for the benefit of agriculture, the one plan that stands out above all others is that of soil conservation. The benefits from conservation of our soil will accrue to our Nation and its citizens for generations to come. We strongly urge the continuance and expansion of the soil-conservation program, with control to be held by a local board of supervisors.

8. In spite of all our efforts and those of the ABA we still have with us the various subsidized Government lending agencies. We believe that where private capital is able and willing to take care of the credit needs, Government lending should be discontinued. We recommend that all subsidies and special privileges be withdrawn from such lending agencies and that no loans be made through them unless the prospective borrower has proof that he has been unable to obtain the credit needed from private lending institutions. We commend the committee on subsidized lending for the good work they have done and urge them to keep up the fight till we have won.

9. During the war it may have been necessary to give consideration to nothing but the winning of the war, and very little criticism has been made of the fiscal policies or any other measures as long as they contributed even in a small degree toward the war effort. Now that the war is over, it is time to view these policies in an entirely different light. We feel that deficit spending should stop and that when existing commitments have been fulfilled, all Government subsidies should be discontinued. Consideration should be given to reduction of taxes, particularly double taxation on dividends. We believe that the many Government corporations that exist only through Executive order should be discontinued unless approved directly by Congress; our National Budget should be brought in balance at the earliest possible date; and all the broad powers granted the executive department, and under which most of these spending agencies exist, should be returned to Congress so that we may have a government by the will of the people through their elected representatives and not by Executive order. We commend Senator HUGH BUTLER and Senator HARRY F. BYRD for the introduction of S. 469 which embodies much of the above, and we urge its passage.

10. In the past few years cooperative organizations have expanded their field of operations from early consumer societies and farm locals to wholesale buying for resale to consumer coops; and even into many lines of manufacturing, all representing huge business totals. We are not opposed to cooperatives as such, but we are opposed to the

special tax consideration and other special privileges granted them, which give them an unfair advantage over their competitors. We believe Congress should take appropriate action to redefine what constitutes a cooperative association; and the special tax considerations and other special privileges should be withdrawn or granted to all other businesses. Favoritism and special privileges have no place in our Government.

11. We commend our president, Edgar McBride, for the campaign he has carried on to induce banks to enter the field of installment lending. Like the "vanishing American," our loans have vanished to a point where there is only a few of them left. Installment buying and borrowing is here to stay, and is growing constantly. We can provide a service that is much in demand by making and keeping these installment loans at home. We urge every banker to give serious thought and consideration to this matter of installment loans in his own community.

12. We congratulate Leo T. Crowley on his excellent administration of the FDIC. The FDIC should maintain its status, independent of other Government agencies. In his final report, Mr. Crowley stated that a reduction in the assessment might now be made, and in line with this we suggest that a bank's cash and Government bonds be deducted from their deposits, both in computing the assessment base and in the 10-to-1 capital-deposit ratio.

13. We do not like to admit that our fellow bankers of the Cotton States are any smarter than we are, but they have succeeded in recapturing their cotton loans from the Commodity Credit Corporation and the full 3 percent interest on these loans now goes to the banks. Possibly, if we bankers of the divided North would emulate our brother bankers of the solid South, we, too, might be getting our full 3 percent interest on loans on grains. We suggest that the proper committee of our association see what can be done about it, by presenting a demand backed by a solid northern front.

14. Our University of Nebraska gives special consideration to agriculture, engineering, music, and law in order that we may have better farmers, engineers, lawyers, and musicians in the future. We believe that our future bankers should also be better bankers, and we commend the committee for the work they have done to provide a chair of banking in our university.

15. It is with the deepest regret that we learn of the retirement of our friend, our good and able secretary, Billy Hughes. During the 40 years he has been our secretary, he has become a personal friend of every banker in Nebraska. He has worked tirelessly all these years for the good of our association, and although he will no longer be our secretary after January 1, we will still claim him as one of us. We heartily endorse and commend the way in which our executive committee has expressed our appreciation for his long years of service. Though we cannot but feel deeply our loss of Billy Hughes, we welcome our new secretary, Carl G. Swanson, and pledge him our full cooperation as he takes over the duties of secretary of our association.

16. In the past year, the legislature passed a law which deprives banks of a source of revenue which many banks sorely need. We regret that the legislature felt it necessary to take legislative action on this matter. We feel it was something which could and should have been handled by the department of banking under the powers granted them under section 8-104 of the banking laws of Nebraska. We feel that in passing this legislation, it may be the opening wedge for further attempts by various pressure groups to take away from banks other legitimate sources of revenue. We urge our legislative committee to keep a watchful eye on all future legislation of this kind that may be proposed.

17. The passing of friends and colleagues is difficult to accept at any time. This past year, the grim reaper has taken quite a number from our ranks, and we who knew them and the work they did, the things for which they stood, and the superb service they rendered, find it difficult to realize that their living careers are ended. We mourn the passing this year of the following friends and colleagues: Norman E. Shaffer, cashier, First National Bank of Hooper; L. J. Kudrna, vice president, First National Bank, Wahoo; Pete Eginton, president, Bank of Paxton; E. C. Yont, president, Bank of Brock; M. V. Nicholson, president, First National Bank of Valentine; C. C. Miller, vice president, Crete State Bank; C. J. Hitchcock, vice president, Havelock National Bank, Lincoln; E. E. Landstrom, assistant cashier, United States National Bank of Omaha; Mrs. Clara W. Phillips, president, Cambridge State Bank; G. A. Matz, president, First National Bank of Cozad; John Link, assistant cashier, Bank of Stapleton; C. E. Samuelson, vice president, State Bank of Hildreth; Mrs. A. H. Banks, president, Commercial State Bank of Wausa; G. C. Benning, cashier, Bank of Madison; Dennis A. Criss, president, First National Bank of Stuart; W. R. Maloney, vice president, First National Bank of North Platte; T. R. Wake, president, Jones National Bank of Seward; Percy Baird, president, Farmers State Bank of Superior; Morris Weil, president, National Bank of Commerce of Lincoln; D. E. Wilkie, Bank of Talmage; H. R. Waite, chairman of board, Beatrice State Bank.

(Signed by 18 country bankers, 3 city bankers.)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1288) to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 803) thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHEELER and Mr. MILLIKIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them respectively, to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS OF VETERANS OF ALL WARS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS (S. DOC. NO. 99)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a revision of Senate Document No. 15 of this session, having to do with compensation of veterans or their dependents under all wars of the United States. The revision brings the document down to date.

It will be recalled that this compilation was printed on March 1, 1945. Since that date the Congress has made many amendments to the existing laws on the subject, and this compilation will be found by the Members of the Senate to be most valuable in that it gives not only all the laws on the subject, but the regulations of the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO PROPERTY UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1364) to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, line 21, to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1308) to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy, which was, in line 10, to strike out "life imprisonment or."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

DISCHARGE OF MIDSHIPMEN BECAUSE OF UNSATISFACTORY CONDUCT OR APTITUDE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, which were, on page 1, line 5, to strike out all after "unsatisfactory" down to and including "service" in line 7, and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENTS TO GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjust-

ment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
ED. C. JOHNSON,
ROBERT LA FOLLETTE,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
JAMES DOMENGEAUX,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments, ask a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. MILLIKIN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

OVERSUBSCRIPTIONS TO E-BOND QUOTAS BY NORTH DAKOTA AND MONTANA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call attention to an article published in today's New York Times headed "Montana second State over E-bond quota." I further call attention to the fact that North Dakota was the first State to exceed its E-bond quota, a fact which is not mentioned in the headline of this article. North Dakota passed its E-bond quota over a week ago, and was the first State in the United States to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the first three paragraphs of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Individual sales of Victory bonds in the Nation, tabulated through yesterday, totaled $3,159,000,000, of which $833,000,000 was in E bonds, according to the Associated Press. The individual goal is $4,000,000,000 of an overall goal of $11,000,000,000 in the Victory loan drive, which is to end December 8.

The Treasury anounced that Montana became the second State in the Union to go over the top on E bonds in the drive. North Dakota surpassed its E-bond quota on sales recorded by November 20.

Montana achieved 101.2 percent of its $9,000,000 E-bond quota, with sales of $9,108,104. At the same time it topped its $15,000,000 individual sales quota with $16,041,847, or 106.9 percent.

ARMY-NAVY FOOTBALL GAME

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I announce to Senators present that if any of them want to attend the Army-Navy football game and have not obtained tickets to the game, that, according to an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post, they can buy tickets at the price of $35 for each $4.80 ticket. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY-NAVY GAME DUCATS AVAILABLE, BUT AT A PRICE

PHILADELPHIA, November 27.—Tickets to the Army-Navy game are rarer than uranium, but a few ducats are available if a person wants to pay as high as $35 for a $4.80 seat behind the goal posts, the Philadelphia Record reported today.

Not many outsiders will attend the service classic at Municipal Stadium here Saturday. That is, the expected 105,000 persons who will jam-pack the giant oval will be members of the Army and Navy athletic associations, high Government officials, Congressmen, Philadelphia city officials, and their friends.

The Record said the ticket situation shaped up this way, quoting West Point and Annapolis sources:

"No tickets have been sold except to members of the Army Athletic Association and a few to Congressmen. We had to cut out the public sale of tickets because graduates returning from overseas who hadn't seen a game in years oversubscribed the tickets."—West Point.

"This isn't like a Penn-Navy game. This is a game between the Military Academy and the Naval Academy—and the services get tickets first."—Annapolis.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF COURT-MARTIAL SYSTEMS, PUNISHMENT, INCARCERATION, ETC., IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, what I am about to say I should like to have considered in connection with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and his colleague the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on November 26, 1945, as set forth beginning on page 10979 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pertaining to the subject of a proposed investigation of court-martial systems, punishment, incarceration, and so forth, in the armed forces.

I have before me a portion of a letter which I have received from a very distinguished member of the bar of the State of Nebraska who has served as an officer in the Marine Corps. His letter contains suggestions which I believe will be pertinent to the subject. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recently the newspapers carried an article stating that congressional committees were to investigate the Navy court-martial system. Since the Marine Corps operates under the Navy in matters of this kind, is governed by the articles for the government of the Navy, and conducts its court-martial cases under the rules and regulations of Navy courts and boards, and since I have made a very definite study of the system and have spent months in that type of work, I thought perhaps you might appreciate some of my comments on the system.

First, it has been my opinion for the duration of my contact with Navy law that it fails to administer justice and also fails as a medium of enforcing discipline.

The only qualifications demanded of the judges in court-martial cases is that they be commissioned officers. In general court-martial cases the senior line officer is president of the court. The same is true in summary court cases. I saw lieutenant colonels, majors, colonels, captains—men who had absolutely no knowledge of law—sit as judges and sentence men to prison terms of 5, 10, 15, or more years in the Navy prisons. These officers were officers because they could fly airplanes, because they were skilled in military pursuits, but they had absolutely no qualifications as judges.

Navy Courts and Boards (the Navy lawbook) provides that a defendant shall be entitled to service of counsel of his own choice, if available, and that if he wants counsel but has no special person in mind that the convening authority (the person ordering him tried) shall appoint an officer to defend him. A recreation officer, mess officer, athletic officer, or any other officer may be appointed. It is not required that the defendant be furnished a lawyer, and as a practical matter it frequently occurred that he was not furnished one.

There is a provision that a defendant (accused) may be held in jail awaiting trial and awaiting results of trial. I saw cases at Cherry Point where men were held for some 80 days awaiting trial, and then were acquitted. Others may be held prisoner at large (restricted to the base and not allowed "liberty") while waiting trial or sentence.

Bread-and-water punishment is still given, with full ration of food every third or fifth day, depending on the sentence.

There is no adequate provision for appeal of cases. As soon as the case is decided, it is executed (except in a very few instances), and the result is that a man may serve his 30 days on bread and water before the record has gone to the Judge Advocate General's office and been passed on there. The only review or procedure in the nature of an appeal is that all case records are forwarded to the JAG's office. No briefs are filed (except in rare cases), no oral argument on appeal is made.

In practice, I observed that when an attorney arrived on a base, he was appointed "legal officer" or "judge advocate (prosecuting attorney)." Attorneys were not assigned to defend cases. There is no "public defender" system set up. But, some enlisted men—privates or privates first class—who were attorneys, have been assigned to defend the men. Naturally, being enlisted men, they work under a distinct disadvantage, and they will leave the service as soon as possible. I have seen cases where both the prosecuting attorney, judges, and defense attorney, all were absolutely ignorant of the law. I personally, sat in on such cases, trying to guide them through the legal technicalities. It was a farce, and a disgrace to the country to permit a man to be tried under such circumstances. * * * Captain Tredup, legal officer for this regiment and the regiment when set up as training-command regiment, had not graduated from law school, much less ever practiced law. He was a pleasant, hard-working young man, but not a lawyer. The present legal officer, who replaced Captain Tredup, is not an attorney.

It is my definite opinion that the entire system should be studied, and that the Articles for the Government of the Navy should be amended so as to provide some safeguards under which the men will be protected from the present abuses. The Navy has accepted a medical department, and it seems to me that the time has come for them to accept a real legal department. Judges deciding cases involving prison terms should be lawyers, or at least should have some lawyers among them. Prosecuting attorneys and defense attorneys should be lawyers—they should be men who had a few years of practice on the outside in the civil courts. Bread and water punishments

should be outlawed—I do not see how it can be justified in these times. Confinement before trial should not be permitted in cases of minor violation of rules, or a limit on the time of confinement should be set. The enlisted men should be acquainted with their rights and should always be given the opportunity of having an attorney defend them.

Actually, the problem would be solved by setting up a real legal department, patterned after the medical set-up, if given the personnel and equipment and books; especially would this be true if the Articles for the Government of the Navy were amended so as to require the Navy to improve the system.

That about covers the court-martial comments.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I offered an amendment which I desire to discuss.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Briggs	Huffman	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stanfill
Butler	Langer	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Taft
Capehart	McCarran	Taylor
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McMahon	Tunnell
Connally	Magnuson	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wheeler
Fulbright	Moore	Wherry
George	Morse	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Green	Myers	Wilson
Guffey	O'Daniel	Young
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has been excused to attend hearings on sustained yield timber units on Oregon and California lands.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is necessarily absent. He has been excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall—
>
> (a) vote to recommend what he may consider appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment under article 36, and preferably recommend reference to the International Court of Justice;
>
> (b) in voting to recommend terms of settlement under article 37 or 38 vote only for terms of settlement which are just to both parties and in accordance with international law so far as it may be applicable;
>
> (c) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 (except by direction of the Congress) for measures against a nation unless he is satisfied that such measures, if taken, will bring about a result in accord with international justice as well as international peace and security;
>
> (d) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 (except by direction of the Congress) for measures against a nation unless such nation has been given an opportunity to be heard before the Security Council, except in cases in which such nation has made an aggressive attack on the territorial integrity of some other nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is, of course, important to provide for the appointment of American representatives on the Assembly and the Security Council of the United States Nations, and it is likewise important that prompt action be taken. Having ratified the United Nations Charter, I fully agree that we must appoint representatives, and we must proceed with a supplement agreement, which I think should be in the form of a treaty, to define the military forces which we have undertaken to provide. But there are several criticisms of the pending bill which I wish to express briefly.

The best analysis of the Charter was presented by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on his return from San Francisco. It consists of three parts. The first is the assembly, which is to be the town meeting of the world, and which in many ways is the most important contribution to world understanding and world peace.

The second is the plan to advance the peaceful settlement of international disputes. And the distinguished Senator stated:

> The use of force is wholly secondary to the use of the pacific tools which this Charter primarily provides.

The third relates to the use of force. Considering the veto power given to five different nations, the value and effectiveness of the use of force against any nation likely to endanger the peace of the world may well be questioned. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan when he said in his speech:

> The great hope which is here held out to humankind stems largely from the solemn formula which the San Francisco Charter creates for the pacific settlement of disputes before they ever reach a fighting stage.

But the pending bill, Mr. President, emphasizes only the force provisions of the Charter—only the third of the three features which I have discussed.

The American representatives to the Assembly, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], are given a temporary and inferior status in the bill. That is true also of the representatives on the Security Council and the representatives on the various branch organizations of the United Nations itself. There is no provision in the bill to implement in any way the pacific settlement provisions of the Charter. We indicate no interest in them whatsoever. If we really believe in the efficacy of such procedures, we should indicate now and in this bill, or in a separate resolution as proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], our intention to submit all of our disputes, at least those which are justiciable, to the International Court or to some other impartial tribunal. If we do not take the lead now and show our good faith and intention to use these procedures no other nation will do so.

Regardless of the form of organization, whether United Nations, or Federated State, or World State, there can be no peace in this world unless peoples come to believe that all international disputes should be settled after negotiation by submission to an impartial tribunal.

I believe therefore that we should adopt the resolution which is to be discussed by the senior Senator from Oregon, providing that we shall adhere to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court, or the alternative, my own amendment, which is not the amendment before the Senate at the moment, proposing that we authorize the President at least to submit any justiciable dispute to the International Court of Justice without further reference to the Congress.

I might say, Mr. President, that I feel that that procedure is the key to peace to a far greater extent than can be the use of force as provided in the United Nations Charter.

I think in the year 1910 my father, when President of the United States, initiated general arbitration treaties with both France and England. Both of those treaties were submitted to the Senate of the United States and both were defeated. It seems to me that now we have followed another line, and that at this time, before we discuss and implement and build up the conception of force which is contained in the Charter and the Security Council, we should indicate our willingness to submit our disputes at least to the decision of an impartial tribunal.

When we come to the provisions for the use of force, Mr. President, they are contained in articles 39, 41, and 42 of the Charter; that is, article 39 is general, article 41 relates to economic sanctions, and article 42 relates to the use of force. These articles contain no reference whatever to international law or justice. Except for the veto power, the fate of the world rests in the hands of five men who, as a practical matter, may do anything they please. The only principle guiding them is that the measures they take shall be calculated to maintain or restore international peace and security. In other words, that is purely an opportunistic approach which contains, I think, no principles by which they can be guided. It is entirely consistent with this goal that some small nation be entirely eliminated from the earth, or that an atomic bomb destroy a city and millions of lives of people in nations which these five men decide should in some way be attacked by the forces of the United Nations. There is no suggestion in those articles that in reaching that decision they shall be guided by the principles of international law and justice. The amendment before the Senate proposes that we indicate to our representative that while he shall, of course, follow the general principle that his action should be directed toward the goal of international peace and security, he should also follow the rules required by international law and justice. It would be entirely possible, so far as I can see, for some small nation to become involved in a quarrel in which we felt it was entirely right, and yet technically it might be an aggressor under the "peace and security definition. The great nations might say, "We want the United Nations to suppress and largely destroy this small nation which has offended the law," and yet we might feel that the principles of international law and justice were on the side of that nation, and that we should refuse to join with others in marching into that nation or destroying its cities from the air by the use of our air power.

It seems to me that this is the great defect of the Charter, because it places the use of force on opportunistic grounds as the keystone of the structure of the Charter. Without the veto power this section would have been intolerable, because that force could have been used against us, even though international law and justice were on our side. When the Charter was before the Senate I pointed out these facts. I refer to the speech which I made at that time, in which I made reference to the different kinds of cases upon which our Security representative would be required to pass.

In the first place, there are the cases in which action is sought against the United States itself. I suppose we can trust the President not to approve the use of force or the use of economic sanctions against the United States, but we are delegating all our power. We are leaving it to one man to decide whether that force shall be used against the United States. I suggest that it not be used if we think that we are pursuing the course of international law and justice, which I presume we shall be doing.

The second class of cases involves those in which we are called upon to apply sanctions or force against nations which the Security Council considers to be aggressors. There may be a number of different situations. I do not think we would agree to permit the use of force in an oppressive way against a nation struggling for freedom, with whose cause our people might sympathize. It is important to determine that our representative shall take a position in which the American people think he should be guided by fundamental principles of law and justice, and not solely by the question whether there has been some form of territorial aggression, which we may consider to be justified under the law.

There may also be cases in which the threat to the peace is so distant from us that other nations should undertake the peace function. That particular problem probably ought to be dealt with in the treaty which is to be negotiated on the use of force, the amount of force, and where it is to be used.

Under section 3 of the bill our representative on the Security Council is instructed to cast any and all votes in accordance with the direction of the President. We delegate to the President of the United States all power which is vested in the Congress with respect to determining national policy. If our delegates were to vote in accordance with international law, if that were the basis of their decision, I should have no objection to giving the delegates or the President the power to determine, in our behalf, what that law might be, and its application to the facts of a dispute. But under the Charter the Security Council knows no law. Whether we vote "Yes" for the use of force or sanctions or whether we veto such action is purely a question of national policy. It relates to legislative matters such as embargoes and other actions leading to war.

This national policy is constitutionally in the hands of Congress. The bill proposes to delegate it completely to the President, without any guide whatever as to the course which he should pursue. We give him the power to destroy our trade or the economic life of any other nation, or destroy its citizens and cities, or even the nation itself, without consulting the Congress. Should we not attempt to lay down some principles upon which our national policy should be determined? What the President does may not be war, but it may involve us in war, and may be likely to involve us in war, at a cost of billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives.

I have submitted this amendment for two reasons: First, to suggest that at least the President must be guided by principles of international law and justice, in addition to the purely opportunistic goals of peace and security. I wish to suggest also that it is very wise for us to indicate that we consider that we have the power at least to lay down the rules for the President to follow in exercising the tremendous powers of a delegate to the Security Council, because if we now delegate power without question, without any attempt to limit it, constitutional law as it develops may gradually build up a condition in which it may be held that the President has the power under the Constitution. It may be contended that he, himself has the power, and that we cannot take it away from him. I think it is wise for us to indicate by some such amendment as I have offered that we consider that we have the power, and that we assert our right—in a very mild way, to think—to indicate the principles upon which the President shall act.

It is quite possible that the Senate would never have ratified the Charter if there had not been a veto power. As the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said on June 29:

> This veto, which we share with others and which we could not enjoy alone, is a protection against American involvements which many millions of our citizens would require as the indispensable price of our adherence to this treaty.

Mr. President, I believe that the veto then envisioned was a veto by the Congress, representing the views and the emotions of the people of the United States. Now it is proposed in this bill that we entirely surrender the power of veto to the President, without indicating in any way how it shall be used. I quite realize that prompt action will be necessary, but I believe that we should prescribe standards to deal with particular varieties of questions which may arise. Our Presidents have sometimes been more inclined than the people themselves to go to war and send American troops abroad. It is quite true that they have been able to involve us in wars without consulting the Congress, but the power of Congress has nearly always been a restraining influence. Now it is to be completely surrendered, unless we choose to pass an act repealing the present act or imposing restrictions on the President in a particular case. I think it is wise to show that we at least retain this power by indicating now—as I say, in a mild way—that our delegate on the Security Council should be guided by the principles of international law and justice. Unless we can gradually build up that concept of justice, unless gradually the action of the Security Council comes to be based upon that concept, I believe that the United Nations Charter will be a complete failure. Every step we can take in that direction, indicating that we will act only in accordance with those principles, is a step toward the ultimate goal of peace, which I believe the people of the United States and the Senate desire to attain.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that Congress seems to be more and more undertaking to delegate its powers to the President of the United States without restraint. In the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act we practically give the President power to make tariffs for the United States. In the Reorganization Act we give him power to a large extent to make over all the departments in the United States Government. Now we propose, without any restraint whatever, without any attempt to lay down

standards, to give the President complete power to involve this country in war, to veto or not to veto action that is imposed by others, to veto economic sanctions or to impose economic sanctions against any nation against which he chooses to use that power. We are passing to a point where Congress becomes merely an advisory body, a body in which men merely stand up and shout, and in which they may or may not obtain results.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is, as I have said, a mild amendment, I think. It is on the desks of all Senators, I believe. It provides, first, that under article 36 of the Charter, which provides that—

1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

Then, in general—

2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.

3. In making recommendations under this article, the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the statute of the Court.

The first part of my amendment subdivision (a), does not depart substantially from the provisions now found in section 3 of the bill. It only calls attention to the fact that our delegate should—

(a) Vote to recommend what he may consider appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment under article 36, and preferably recommend reference to the International Court of Justice.

Subdivision (b) of my amendment refers to the right of the Security Council, under article 37 or article 38, to recommend terms of settlement to various nations. Article 37 provides, in part, that—

2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

Article 38 provides that—

Without prejudice to the provisions of articles 33 to 37, the Security Council may, if all the parties to any dispute so request, make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute.

Mr. President, those recommendations if they are followed, are likely to become the basis of the use of force or of economic sanctions. It is important that in recommending such terms of settlement our delegates shall be guided by the principles of international law and justice, and I so require in my amendment, as follows:

The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall—

(b) In voting to recommend terms of settlement under article 37 or 38 vote only for terms of settlement which are just to both parties and in accordance with international law so far as it may be applicable.

Subdivision (c) of my amendment refers to the key vote under articles 39, 41, or 42 which the Security Council considers necessary under articles 30 to 39 to maintain the system of international peace and security. Subdivision (c) provides that—

The representative, of the United States on the Security Council shall—

(c) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 (except by direction of the Congress) for measures against a nation unless he is satisfied that such measures if taken will bring about a result in accord with international justice as well as international peace and security.

In other words, Mr. President, my amendment provides that we shall not become involved in a dispute merely for the sake of making peace, if we feel that the nation against whom the measures would be recommended has the law on its side.

Subdivision (d) I do not regard as so important; but it provides that—

The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall—

(d) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 (except by direction of the Congress) for measures against a nation unless such nation has been given an opportunity to be heard before the Security Council, except in cases in which such nation has made an aggressive attack on the territorial integrity of some other nation.

I quite agree that in such a case action must be immediate. But as the matter now stands, five large powers are able to go out over this world and direct punitive measures against some small nation which they consider to be an aggressor, regardless of international law and justice, and to do it without any hearing, without any opportunity for that nation to come before them and be heard as to what its case in the matter is. If one nation is actually attacking the territory of another, all right; they can act; but I think there should be some semblance of legal procedure in connection with the action of the Security Council. I say that is perhaps more a matter of procedure, and I do not regard it as so important as subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of the amendment.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the amendment may be adopted. As I have said, I have another amendment which provides for the addition of a new section to read as follows:

SEC. 8. The President is authorized to submit any dispute to which the United States is a party and which is justiciable in nature to the International Court of Justice.

I have still another amendment which provides that under the economic-sanctions provision the President's power to make laws imposing economic sanctions shall expire at the end of 3 months, and Congress shall be given an opportunity to legislate during that period. Mr. President, the powers delegated to the President are most extreme—indeed, they are unlimited. They cover the investigation; they cover the suppression of the press; they cover censorship of all news out of the United States. They are so extremely radical that I believe very strongly that, although the President should have the power temporarily to do it, the Congress should pass on the exact nature of the laws which prohibit intercourse with other nations, as required by the economic sanctions.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. In regard to the amendment which is now under discussion, I should like to ask what is the reason for insertion of the language "except by direction of the Congress." The particular point in my mind is this: Does the Senator mean to indicate that in his judgment there may arise instances in which international justice might be sacrificed by the Congress for the sake of international peace and security? If the Senator does not mean that, what does he mean?

Mr. TAFT. My real desire, if the Senator wishes to know, is to assert the ultimate power of the Congress to do anything it pleases. I do not greatly insist on the inclusion of those words; I should be quite willing to eliminate them, if that would make any difference. But I really wrote them in to indicate that Congress has the power to instruct our delegate or to direct the President to instruct him to do anything the Congress might wish him to do.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the thought in my mind is that obviously the Senator feels that international justice should in every case be taken into consideration. With that thought I am heartily in concurrence with him. But I question whether there might be an instance in which the Congress might sacrifice international justice to considerations of international peace and security.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator's criticism is sound. Mr. President, I modify the amendment by striking out, in line 6, the words "except by direction of the Congress," and also in line 12.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. OVERTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to ask a question. If I understand the Senator's point of view, I hope he will not strike out the language which he just indicated he desires to delete from his amendment, because, as I see the matter, that language reserves to Congress powers which the Congress already possesses, including the final power of this Government to act on any question.

Mr. TAFT. I think the mere fact that we enact a law saying how our delegate shall vote and establishing the rules by which he shall vote indicates sufficiently clearly that we are asserting the right to lay down the rules on the basis of which he shall vote and directing him as to how he shall vote. So I have agreed to eliminate those words. I agree with the Senator from Missouri that I wish to emphasize the feature of international law and justice, and I think the inclusion of the words referred to does detract from that particular point.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We all wish to emphasize international justice and fair-

ness in the settlement of such issues. But I think it should also be accentuated as much as possible in this measure that serious and definite reservations are made as to the power of the President to act on behalf of this country.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that there is a misprint in the printed copy of the amendment. On page 2, in line 1, the word should be "recommend", not "reconsider", so as to read "in voting to recommend", and so forth.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I correctly understand that under subsection (c) of the amendment, which has to do with directing our representative to refuse to vote under articles 39, 41, and 42 in connection with measures calling for the use of force—and when I speak of force I mean armed force—the Congress still reserves the right to say to our representative that the force set aside for the Security Council by this country may not be used if the Congress of the United States says it should not be used in a given instance?

Mr. TAFT. No. I feel that the crucial element in our action is the vote of our representative on the Security Council. Once he has cast that vote I think that the United States has been committed to the use of force. Once he votes for such measures it seems to me that, with the provision in the Charter providing for the use of certain forces, those forces may be used. The key to the question is not the use of those forces. The key is whether we vote or do not vote for the use of force against any particular nation. If a case arises in which we vote for force, I believe we should use armed force. I believe that to be implied in our approval of the Charter. But it seems to me, with regard to the question whether our representative votes or does not vote for the use of armed measures, that it is a question of national policy which must be determined.

Mr. REVERCOMB. By whom? The Congress?

Mr. TAFT. I believe that fundamentally it should be approved by the Congress. In the pending measure it is delegated to the President. He determines that question. I am trying to impose some mild rules on the President in one respect. I believe that difficulty is involved in reserving the entire power to Congress. Such reservation would delay prompt measures in the event of emergencies. I should personally prefer to reserve the power to Congress, but I did not feel that I could go that far and get the majority of the people at the present time to agree with me. However, I believe we could lay down certain rules. If the Senator has any rules in mind which our representative should follow, I think he should also present them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I see it, the effect of the Senator's amendment is simply to say to the representative that he may refuse to vote until he receives certain instructions.

Mr. TAFT. No. To vote or not vote lies within his discretion, but he must be guided by other rules as well as by the rules of international peace and security which might require the wiping out of Poland, we will say. Poland has been a stumbling block to many nations for several centuries. Perhaps the Security Council will decide that the way to bring about peace in Europe is to wipe out Poland or Germany. I do not know what the principles of international security and peace may be. But I want to impose the obligation of considering international law and justice as applying to the subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator strikes from his amendment the words "except by direction of the Congress," to my mind he eliminates the strongest feature of his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. We should not adopt the amendment at all unless we have the right to repeal it. We assert here the right to tell our representative how he shall vote. I do not think the language referred to weakens our assertion of that right.

Mr. REVERCOMB. How binding would an act of Congress be upon our representative on the Security Council?

Mr. TAFT. If this proposal should be adopted, in my opinion it would completely bind him.

AMERICA'S CHALLENGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, 6 months ago I might have faltered, but today, with assurance and confidence, I do not hesitate to vote for Senate bill 1580 just as it comes from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Six months ago I would undoubtedly have supported the position being taken by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who, I think, has stressed some points which are very important. Six months ago I might have gone so far as to support the position which was stated so vigorously and eloquently yesterday on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. But today, Mr. President, I feel that I must support Senate bill 1580 as it has come from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Divine Providence now has placed in the hands of this Nation the weapon to establish lasting peace throughout the world, and the pending bill will make that weapon effective. Within that period of 6 months to which I allude, science has created the atomic bomb, and thereby the art of mass slaughter and wholesale destruction has moved forward a thousand years. The most hideously successful killer of all, history is a reality. I am trying to adjust my political thinking to keep pace with that epochal development. Today I see no hope for humanity except through an organized world effort to stop war, backed by force. That is the approach to the problem of the pending bill.

Unrealistically, much stress in this historic Senate debate is being placed on the percentages of our participation in war. Some seek here a formula whereby the President's power to go to war may be limited by the number of men or the amount of equipment he may send to war. Under some mistaken theory concerning the realities, they are presuming that by limiting the President's authority to send 1 percent or 5 percent or 10 percent of the armed might of this Nation to war, and by reserving to Congress authority over the remaining 99 percent or the 95 percent or the 90 percent, as the case may be, the Congress can retain its constitutional responsibility to declare or to not declare war. That is fantastic nonsense. One does not go 1 foot down Niagara Falls and then make up his mind about the wisdom of going the rest of the way. If he even goes prowling around close to the Falls he will be sucked in. War is exactly like that. There is no halfway measure.

Wars from now on will start suddenly and will be lost quickly. There will be no time for debates, consultations, and declarations. Nations not set to get under way trigger-quick will be whipped before they start. That is the only reason for having the pending bill before us at this time. The primary objective of the bill is to prevent war before it starts. As the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has pointed out, it is "preventive medicine."

However, unless the pending bill is premeditated deception, we must have military weapons worthy of the times before we begin throwing our weight around. The authors of the pending bill assert that we have definite military commitments under the San Francisco Charter and the inescapable responsibility of backing up the Security Council of the United Nations with military power. Unless we meant business we should have kept out of the United Nations Organization. If we do have such responsibilities and commitments—and certainly I believe we do—we should meet them not with the obsolete armaments of yesteryear but with the latest weapons of tomorrow's science. General Eisenhower, ignoring the atomic bomb and the other military technological developments, asserts that American failure to build a conscript army would rekindle Europe's fear that America is returning to isolationism—a feeble argument and a feeble remedy. The threat of obsolete military methods will not prevent war.

We have been fretting and quibbling about sovereignty and we have been scheming secretly to make international policemen out of our young and vigorous manhood—an ambitious manpower program indeed for a Nation having only 7 percent of the world's population! It seemed pretty hopeless.

And then God Almighty in His infinite wisdom dropped the atomic bomb in our lap. The shock of its discovery has thrown us into a blind stupor, but gradually the peace possibilities of this frightful weapon of destruction are dawning upon us. Make no mistake; the atomic bomb is a hideous and monstrous lethal weapon. It has completely modified all military conception of land, air, and sea offensives and defenses.

We have the blueprints for a new plane with a flying range of 10,000 miles. Therefore, with the strategic location of airfields from the Philippines to Alaska,

on the coast of Asia, from Alaska to Iceland in the Arctic Circle, and in Dakar and the Azores in the South Atlantic, we can drop, on a moment's notice, atomic bombs on any spot on the earth's surface and return to our base.

For our own military security we dare not contemplate any defense program of lesser scope. The only defense against the atomic bomb is the atomic bomb. Will the world like our military security plan? Every peace-loving nation that fears aggression and that has faith in our high ideals and our good intentions will like it and we ought not to care whether others, if any there be, like it or not.

Twice in 30 years we have saved the world from slavery and have asked nothing for ourselves. If that has not earned for us the respect and the confidence of mankind we had better be on our guard, for we are among enemies.

With vision and guts and plenty of atomic bombs, ultramodern planes, and strategically located air bases, the United States can outlaw wars of aggression. But do not overlook the cold, bitter fact that the courage to assume such a magnificent, God-inspired responsibility is also the price of our own survival.

Mr. President, I do not want to detract from the great strides of science in developing an atomic bomb. Their monumental and ghastly experiment has proved the long-held theories that matter and energy are one and that vast quantities of energy may be released by splitting an atom of matter. But the time has come for debunking the prevailing notion that the atomic age is here.

The only atoms the scientists have succeeded in splitting are the unstable atoms of one type of uranium and plutonium, and these strange metals have been splitting atoms naturally since creation. Let it be remembered that the scientists have not discovered how to split atoms which do not split naturally. The unstable elements are almost nonexistent. The centuries have taken their toll and only the stable elements remain on the earth. Uranium is a very scarce metal which, strangely enough, houses two kinds of atoms identical in their chemical properties. One kind of uranium atom or seven-tenths of 1 percent of all natural uranium is determined to split; the other kind or 99.3 percent of all natural uranium atoms is as stable as the atoms of lead and cannot be split by any known method. Science has known of that peculiarity of uranium for a long time. Recently American physicists discovered how to separate the splitting type of atom from the stable nonsplitting uranium atom. It is a long, slow, tedious, complicated, and tremendously expensive process. The real discovery which our scientists have recently made has been to cause the splitting type of uranium atom, when segregated, to split by the billions instantaneously instead of one by one as they have been splitting since creation.

These are tremendous scientific strides indeed, but they should not be exaggerated unduly. They have proved correct many long-held theories of atomic construction, and they may point to the atomic age and the release of unlimited energy at the will of man, but for the present that age is remote. The supply of atoms which are willing to split is infinitesimal and their segregation in desirable quantities costs literally billions of man hours.

At present it costs more than $100 to create $1 worth of atomic energy. By improving the methods of converting the infinitesimally small percentage of uranium capable of conversion into the new element, plutonium, the cost of atomic energy in time may be reduced slightly. For instance, it may be feasible to heat an airport in the Arctic Circle thousands of miles beyond a supply of coal and other fuels with the water from the cooling system of a huge plutonium plant, and at a relatively low cost. However, such water will be dangerously radio-active. It is likely also that a formula may be developed to produce steam in a plutonium plant, but, due to the "death rays" which it creates, such a plant would of necessity be exceedingly bulky and not well adapted to transportation other than in very large steamships.

The main difficulty in utilizing this newly discovered energy is that when the atoms of uranium are split, death rays are given off which must be confined within thick, heavy, concrete or lead walls to avoid the destruction of all nearby life. Yet, these radio-active death rays, properly shielded or transmitted to other metals in safe proportions, may prove a boon to the healing arts.

Uranium and plutonium atoms have another serious disadvantage. They either split one by one very slowly or they split all at once in a tremendous explosion. There are no halfway measures with them. It is either all or nothing. For these and many other reasons, it is not likely that atomic energy created from uranium will replace coal, petroleum, electricity, and other sources of energy except to a limited extent.

Therefore, for the present, atomic energy must be classed merely as an explosive and a vigorous competitor of TNT and not as a new source of domestic power. As a weapon of destruction it is God awful. As a servant of mankind it has decided limitations. So let us keep our feet on the ground and not go overboard in an emotional tailspin of Buck Rogers fantasy until atomic energy for multiple purposes becomes a reality. Optimists think the atomic age is just around the corner. They may be correct.

Such scientific facts should be understood to avoid confusion in our international thinking. If we view the atomic energy of today as nothing more than a frightfully destructive lethal weapon of war, with little or no constructive peacetime uses, we will comprehend better the scope of the problem we face in utilizing it.

There have always been men of good will who by law would halt scientific progress. Now, they would destroy the formula for producing the atomic bomb. Others would hand this hot potato to someone else to control, even though they realize that such control might result in slavery for millions of human beings. All such approaches to humanity's greatest challenge must be brushed aside as unworthy by the United States of America.

Whether or not the atomic bomb is our exclusive property is beside the point. Physicists contend that any people with average ingenuity and skill can segregate and harness the uranium atom within a period of 5 to 7 years. That sounds reasonable. Our monopoly at best is only temporary. Soon good nations and bad will possess it. Shortly good men and evil men will be toying with its awful potentialities.

But scientists also must admit that we have the jump on the rest of the world in its development and use. That is the important thing. We should not dissipate and fritter away that significant and tremendous advantage by surrendering its know-how and its formulas to anyone.

We have no monopoly on virtue, but we are singularly free from territorial ambition, and we have successfully fought two World Wars for world freedom without anticipating material reward. We should act with boldness now, and alone.

It is our opportunity right now to compel mankind to adopt the policy of lasting peace on the basis of righteousness, justice, and equality, or be burned to a crisp. The alternative is a Roman peace based on tyranny. This is a terrifying situation, but we ought to assume our full responsibility alone, and at once. To share it means watering it down by compromises with respect to such fundamental principles as imperialism and the subjection of so-called inferior peoples. God forbid that we become the arsenal of imperialism. If the atomic bomb ever becomes the handmaiden of imperialism and power politics, may God have mercy on humanity.

President Truman very properly accepts the atomic bomb as a sacred trust and seems eager to assume the full responsibility for its proper use. Too, the President understands that even a just peace requires brute force to make it endure. The Committee on Foreign Relations, in sending to the Senate without a dissenting vote the pending bill to provide for the quick use of force, proves my point that a peace organization must use force. Man by nature is a cruel, selfish, savage animal, who rose to the pinnacle of eminence in the animal kingdom through the ruthless and merciless destruction of every obstacle he encountered in his upward path. The survival of the fittest is a brutal and inexorable law.

If we keep the atomic bomb free from emotionalism and crackpot thinking it in itself will compel mankind to perfect a workable, worth-while, world organization for permanent peace. It is the persuader that will make this a "One World." The world organization which I have in mind is not to be created to control the atomic bomb, for such control must lead to tyranny. The world organization of which I am thinking is one designed to stop war with the atomic bomb in the hands of the United States as the club behind its door, to be used only when a bandit nation goes berserk. If the

United States is to become an integral part of such an organization, why should she not be made the custodian of this awful weapon which she has created? If we indicate faith in ourselves to assume such a vital responsibility, I have no fear the world will place its faith in us.

But first things must come first. We must show the world that we are able and ready to defend ourselves against anyone and against any kind of warfare, atomic or otherwise. When we do that, other nations will join us in finding the road to peace. So long as we fly the yellow flag of impotence, defeatism, and panic, no worth-while nation is going to seriously consider our views on peace. Bold action and not whimpering is the need of the hour. The questions we are dealing with today are not for quaking weaklings. The road to peace is rough and tough. The road to peace is positive, not negative.

The most fateful indulgence of the present day is the desperation talk about the inevitability of a war with Russia. Such a war would mean suicide for both nations, and no one—individual or nation—in his or her right mind contemplates suicide deliberately. The No. 1 job for America and for Russia today is to avoid at all costs an American-Russian war.

In my election campaign for the United States Senate in 1936 I did not make a speech in which I did not stress my opposition to World War II. Many eyebrows were raised, and my fellow candidates and the startled news reporters asked me what I was driving at.

Immediately after being sworn in as Senator in January 1937, I introduced two bills, one to protect children and the other requiring the construction of 10,000 fighter airplanes and the training of 100,000 pilots annually. Both were humanitarian measures. The bill protecting children passed the Senate, but the bill providing for fighter airplanes and pilot training was referred to the War Department for comment and counsel. The War Department informed Senator Sheppard, then chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee that my proposal was fantastic, and I was not able to get my bill out of committee. Many competent observers say now that had my bill received favorable action in 1937 it might have averted World War II.

If I were a candidate for the Senate today my principal plank would be to stop World War III. I deem this the foremost problem facing America and humanity. We are drifting toward war with Russia with certainty and speed. A combination of suspicion, bluff, and appeasement brought on the war with Japan. Today we are trying to bluff Russia with conscription of teen-age boys, but we are only fooling ourselves. Russia knows that we are waving an empty pistol by our conscription prattle, and their contempt for us must grow with each passing hour. Panic action, appeasement, and defeatism must certainly end in disaster.

Russia is huge and Russia is strong, and she respects these qualities in others. I should like to see hundreds of millions of dollars voted by Congress for the interchange of Russian and American students; and I should like to see the United States stand up to Russia and say in serious dignity, "Brother, you have not a thing on this earth that we covet other than your cooperation, friendship, and good will; but do not make the fatal mistake of pushing us around—we will not take it." Mutual respect must always remain the prime basis for international friendship.

Protocols and international agreements and world conferences have their good points, but without the backing of sheer force, they are a weak reed upon which to lean. They can be only as effective as the strong nations of the earth make them. Almighty God has placed in our hands His mightiest instrument of peace. With His help we can free the world from the nightmare of wars of aggression. Civilization itself hangs on the thread of our decision. Dare we accept this opportunity and the challenge?

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and Mr. COLE of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have eight brief points to make with regard to the pending bill, S. 1580. The nature of the bill has already been ably covered at some length by my brother Senators. My purpose now is merely to synopsize what I believe to be the principal points. They are:

First. Enactment of this bill merely fulfills a commitment we have already made by our signature to the United Nations Charter. It does not make new promises; it backs up old ones.

Second. By enacting this bill America will be demonstrating its traditional good faith. It will attest again to the inviolability of a contract into which we have entered.

Third. Enactment of S. 1580 will not, however, of itself, make for peace any more than the Charter of itself makes for peace. Both the bill and the Charter are merely the mechanism for peace, a mechanism which has no life unless the nations activate it with their will, intent, purpose, and desire for peace.

Fourth. Senate bill 1580 is but the child of the parent document, the Charter. Both are obviously fraught with grave consequences for the expenditure of American blood and treasure in the defense of the peace.

Fifth. The American people have under the impact of vast pressure and propaganda measured the consequences of these documents and accepted them.

Sixth. The postwar world of today is woefully in need of means for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Seventh. The present ravaged world does not, however, provide the best criteria for testing the adequacy of the nations' will to cooperation.

Eighth. Just as the ravaged world may by all signs seem unready today, as it was 20 years ago, for cooperation, so by the same token the world is absolutely unready for what we might call world government.

In the light of these eight points we should keep the blinkers off our eyes and, with mind unclouded, enact this bill. We should do everything thereafter within our power to hold up our end of the bargain and to commend to our reluctant allies that they do the same.

Let us examine each of the above points briefly.

First. The Senate ratified the United Nations Charter by a vote of 89 to 2. Nothing is contained in Senate bill 1580 which was not indicated and necessitated by our agreement to the Charter, in particular section 7 of the Charter, covering action to cope with threats to the peace.

Second. By passing this bill, America will again manifest her leadership. She will again prove the validity of her word. She will again keep the faith. She will show that America does not "crawfish" out of obligations she accepts; in this case the obligations of the United Nations Charter.

Third. Senate bill 1580 is but one more document. Documents do not signify peace. Their contents must be administered in a manner consistent with their letter and with their spirit. I have insisted upon that all along when others were making a fetish of the San Francisco instrument. Let us not make the same fetish mistake with this bill.

Fourth. The use of sanctions and of force reauthorized in this bill against international aggressors and potential aggressors obvicusly portends the possible spending of American blood and treasure. If we intend to dance, we must pay the fiddler.

Those who told us that we could engage in reckless interventionism without paying the price are once more proved wrong and misleading. One-quarter million American boys perished in the war just concluded. Thousands of other boys are in peril today in the chaotic Far East. Anguished parents are pleading for their return home. We have sown and we are now reaping, and by "we" I do not mean simply the United States; I mean all the nations of the earth who have failed to be adequate and failed to see the road toward peace.

Many of us before the war saw the dangers of interventionism. We foresaw the bloody futility of meddling. We pleaded that international law be upheld. Our counsels were overruled. Our country is now up to its neck in obligations and commitments. Having been

precipitated into this course, our country must continue in it consistent with her obligations under the Charter and her sacred word of honor. We who implored America to keep the faith with her living sons before the war cannot but ask that she keep the faith with her dead sons now, and keep faith with the challenge of the present and the future.

Fifth. America overwhelmingly supported our entrance into the United Nations Organization. Our people were beset on every side by propaganda, urging all-out world cooperation. Our people pondered and agreed with the contentions of that propaganda. The die is cast. Our people would, therefore, have us back up our commitments now by passing this bill.

Sixth. A look around the world today shows how desperately international machinery is needed to preserve and make fruitful the peace. Civil war, revolutions, riots, famine, pestilence abound, and over them all hovers the menace of the atomic bomb. The new league must cope with those subjects immediately.

Seventh. Wars do not make for peace. From a good many signs of the times one might almost conclude that the world, with its prejudices, its hatreds, its feuds, is still unready for cooperation, just as it was unready 20 years ago.

But we can appreciate the suffering, the despair, the horror left in the wake of the war. We know that the present sad state of the world does not prove a good index of the world's adequacy for peace.

Eighth. By the same reasoning, just as the world will be hard put to achieve a minimum of international cooperation, so it is inconceivable that "world government" is now either possible or desirable. Let us not reach for the moon before we have solved the problems of the earth.

I have stated that the world is unready for world government. We have yet to demonstrate that the world is ready for an association of nations under the new League.

A high-ranking American, just a few years ago—a Vice President of the United States—stated that the peoples and the nations of earth were not ready for the League of Nations. I repeat the question, and it poses the issue. Are the peoples and the nations now ready for the new League?

The only way we can get the answer is by America living up to her obligations as contemplated in the United Nations Charter—going ahead and providing the leadership and the hope of peaceful-minded people everywhere. Then, and then only, will we know whether the world is now ready for this step forward in international cooperation. If the world is not ready, we will have lost nothing by being loyal to the royal within us. We will have met the challenge of this hour to this Nation and to the world.

If, on the other hand, we should fail to live up to our obligations under the United Nations Charter, then we the American people who have been precipitated into leadership in this world crisis—will always feel that we have not measured up to our responsibility.

Mr. President, the challenging remarks of the Senator from Colorado caused me to turn back and view the condition of the American mind before the atomic bomb was thrown into the world arena. Because of the world confusion which was so aptly pictured yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], together with the apparent failure of the nations to advance forward one step toward peace, I agree with him that the situation looks pretty dark; but with the advent of the atomic bomb nothing should interfere with our taking leadership in this desperate world situation. No matter how desperate the situation, no matter how inadequate the nations appear to be, the atomic bomb, as someone has said, has precipitated the world ahead a thousand years, and has made it imperative that America fail not in the slightest degree in her approach to these international problems.

Today I have joined in support of a measure which the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will undoubtedly discuss after I shall have concluded. It relates to America saying to the world that in all justifiable matters the United States will take leadership and agreed to the functioning of an international court, and abide by the decisions of that court. That is the leadership which the world needs. The world is looking to America for such leadership. We must hold the light high. Peoples who are discouraged, and who are sick both economically and physically, are looking to this land, and we must not fail to meet the challenge in this hour. Therefore I support the pending bill.

COMPULSORY JURISDICTION OF THE WORLD COURT

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. No. I do not care to have a quorum call. I will not yield for that purpose, but I wish to thank the Senator for his consideration in the matter.

Mr. President, if I did not feel so deeply about the vital importance of the issue which I propose to discuss for the RECORD this afternoon, I would not take as much time of the Senate, as I feel it will be necessary for me to consume, in order to place in the RECORD for future reference and debate, the historical background of the World Court jurisdiction issue. However, I am very happy to proceed with this somewhat lengthy discussion during the luncheon hour so as to save as much of the time of my colleagues as I can. I am also aware that at least four very large committees of the Senate are meeting this afternoon. Hence, I think it particularly appropriate for a freshman Senator to take advantage of this particular time to make his record on an issue which he is satisfied must be met in the very near future if we are to fulfill our obligations under the San Francisco Charter and if we are to keep faith with our pledge that in this new one-world era disputes among nations shall be settled by pacific means rather than by resort to war.

On July 28, 1945, I submitted what has become designated as Senate Resolution 160. This resolution seeks to have the President of the United States, upon the recommendation of the Senate, commit this Nation to an acceptance of the so-called compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, in keeping with paragraph 2 of article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice.

At the time the resolution was submitted I set forth my reasons for believing that the adoption of the resolution by the Senate was one of the first steps which should be taken by this Government in demonstrating our good-faith intention so to implement the San Francisco Charter as to attain, if humanly possible, the great objectives of the United Nations Organization.

What are those objectives, Mr. President? I feel that too soon many persons have lost sight of the great principles enunciated in the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations. Not only are the language and the style of that Preamble noteworthy, but I think the great plea for a better world order and civilization, as set forth in that language, is not equalled anywhere in English literature. Hence, I think it quite fitting that as a preface to my remarks this afternoon I should again read that preamble into the RECORD. It reads as follows:

> We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and
>
> To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and
>
> To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and
>
> To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors; and
>
> To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security; and
>
> To insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest; and
>
> To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples; have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.
>
> Accordingly, our respective governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

Mr. President, that is a great emancipation proclamation. It is an emancipation proclamation for the peoples of the world, which will free them from the scourge of future war if the leaders of the peoples of the world today will rise to the sacred obligation and trust which I think the precepts of that preamble place upon their shoulders.

Since this body rose to the great heights which it attained in July 1945 I have felt the pangs of disappointment as I have watched some of the nations of

the world taking a toboggan ride down the slopes of national aggrandizement and into the abyss of blind nationalism. I think we would be less than honest, as we face the great international problems raised not only by the bill under discussion, but by the San Francisco Charter itself, if we did not frankly admit that the people of this country, tired and worn from carrying the great weight of war, and confused because of international trends which they cannot well understand, have in recent weeks tended to return to some of the old shibboleths of nationalism. Many very sincere people among us are raising serious questions as to whether or not the United States should continue to contribute so much of her wealth, manpower, and influence in an endeavor to set up and implement a world organization based upon the principles set forth in the great preamble of the San Francisco Charter. The road to an effective world organization based upon justice is bound to be a rugged one because there are so many barriers of injustice all over the world which must be cut through. However, we must never forget that a return to isolationism as a national policy is the surest way to another war and possible loss of all national security. There are no certain winners in the next war. All nations are sure losers—yes, even the United States.

We cannot afford to continue in the trend toward nationalism because the peoples of the world are certain to organize against us if we violate our covenant and theirs to substitute pacific procedures based upon reason and justice for war. If for no other reason than that of national security, I would raise my voice this afternoon in support of the bill pending before the Senate and I would raise my voice in support of the resolution which shortly I shall introduce, because, Mr. President, in the history of the future there will be no security for America unless America lives up to the principles of the preamble of the San Francisco Charter and every clause contained therein. Further, we must as a national policy continue, even in the face of what at times may seem to be unsurmountable obstacles, maintain our leadership in the world in support of what the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said on so many occasions is the only hope for permanent peace, and that is justice through law.

Mr. President, I say that armament races will not give us security. I say that the rattling of swords, and manufacturing of atomic bombs, implying that we are ready to use force on a nationalistic basis if we cannot have our way in international negotiations will not bring peace to America or to the world. Instead of reverting to isolationism and thereby losing the peace, we must take our place at the conference tables in the world organizations provided for by the San Francisco Charter, and demonstrate the superior strength of pacific procedures for settling disputes when those procedures are backed up by the Security Council. We must proceed without further delay in demonstrating to the people of the world and to every nation of the globe that we are perfectly willing to have a justiciable dispute involving the United States of America placed before a tribunal of international judges in accordance with the principles of international law, and to rest our case on its merits.

We cannot build up confidence among the peoples of the small nations of the world or to the peoples of the large ones either if we continue to reserve unto ourselves the right to determine whether the new International Court of Justice shall exercise judgment over us. Before I finish my remarks this afternoon I hope, Mr. President, to put into the RECORD ample evidence that the policy of the United States in regard to the so-called optional clause for jurisdiction of the World Court has been particularly detrimental to the standing of America in the thinking and confidence of the peoples of the small nations of the world.

There is another section of the San Francisco Charter which I think it is well to put into the RECORD again. In this country too frequently we make the mistake of thinking that because a thing has been said well once, it need not be repeated; that because we take a stand for a certain principle once, it is to be taken for granted that reference to it again is not necessary. Mr. President, if we are going to keep the people of the United States constantly enlightened as to the part we must play in the international relations of the present and of the immediate future, I believe it important that we impress on their thinking, by way of repetition over and over again, the principles set forth in articles 1 and 2 of the San Francisco Charter. So, Mr. President, I repeat them for the RECORD:

ARTICLE 1

The purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means—

Mr. President, one of the elements of greatness of this document is that throughout it there is constant reference to the very important foundation stone "settlement of disputes by peaceful means." To me, it means peace by law; it means peace by reason; it means our willingness to submit our disputes to an international court of justice and to let the merits of the case on the record speak for themselves.

Thus, article 1 continues as follows:

and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

The Senate will recall that when I discussed the Charter on July 28, 1945, I made a plea for recognition of this principle of the self-determination of peoples. In that speech I pointed out that in my judgment it would be difficult for us to justify, on the basis of article 1, section 2 of the San Francisco Charter, the action which has been taken in Korea. Mr. President, today, as we see in many parts of the world the tendency to divide the world by powerful interests and to set back many years, I think, the pursuit of freedom on the part of now subjugated peoples, I repeat that we can well say to the United Nations Organization, when it proceeds to function in the very near future, "Do not forget the recognition under article 1, section 2 of the San Francisco Charter of the principle of self-determination of peoples." I am sure that millions in partitioned Korea await an implementation of the principle by the United Nations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHERRY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the morning newspapers, which undoubtedly he has read very thoroughly. They contain a report of charges made by General Hurley that our country is rapidly being alined—I would not go so far as to say that the references are that we are doing it deliberately—but that we are rapidly being alined with a power bloc of governments in connection with the future control of world territories and peoples. Has the Senator discussed that phase of the subject in his speech? I do not mean General Hurley's charges, but I mean that particular phase of the matter.

I raise this issue at this time, Mr. President, because I shall have to leave within a few minutes in order to attend a committee meeting, and I shall be interested in hearing whatever comment the Senator may wish to make.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his question. I have not discussed the matter of the obligations of the United Nations Organization to protect the rights, and particularly the right to freedom, of subjugated peoples of the world around. However, I think it is clear that the general assembly cannot escape dealing with such questions once the United Nations Organization is implemented. I too have noted the comments which have been printed in the morning newspapers, and I wish to say that I am very much concerned about the reports which the newspapers contain. I think it is incumbent upon the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to proceed without delay to investigate the charges made by our former Ambassador to China. I am sure the committee will do that because the charges are serious and our people are entitled to know to what degree if any they can be sustained.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not raise the question with regard to our obligations as a member of the United Nations, particularly, but as to the trend within our own country and within our own thinking as a strictly national group. I am thinking of the alliances which are apparently being built up on the power-politics theory,

whether they be on our own side of the question or on the other side.

Mr. MORSE. If it be true that our Government, or any branch of our Government, is following a course of power politics, those who are responsible for such a course do violence, in my judgment, to the pledges to which this Government committed itself under the United Nations Charter. If the facts show that we are going outside of the tenets of the Charter and alining ourselves on the basis of power politics in our international relations, then I am satisfied that we are buying a war. International power politics, balance of power diplomacy, world economic exploitation, imperialistic subjugation of weaker peoples, territorial confiscation, cruel and ruthless treatment of defeated enemies and conquered peoples, terms of peace which do violence to the sense of justice and recognized principles of international morality of the generations who come thereafter have been shown by history to be among the chief causes of war. If any of these enemies of peace are stalking the world today I think it doubly important the United Nations Organization be made as strong as possible to meet their threat to peace. That is one reason why I plead for the compulsory jurisdiction of the world court.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It would seem to me that there is a little more involved in the reports in the morning newspapers, if they are true, than merely a question of the violation of the international Charter. It seems to me that the significance of those reports goes to the violations of our individually declared ambitions and intentions regardless of what we mutually agree with other nations.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not think the question begins at the heart of the situation, necessarily, but begins with the violation of every fundamental which must be built up within an individual or individual nation before that individual or that individual nation can sincerely cooperate with other nations.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the charges which have been made are true, they may be significant in showing that we may be violating fundamentals upon which we base our own philosophy.

Mr. MORSE. I trust that the charges cannot be substantiated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before asking my question I wish to congratulate the Senator for having the fortitude to make a speech to the Senate. I have been censured for not having made to the Senate the speech which I made last week over the radio. I wish to invite attention to the fact that there are exactly three Senators on the floor of the Senate listening to the speech which the Senator is now making on one of the most important subjects before the country. There are three Members on the floor, exclusive of the Senator who is addressing the Senate, and the occupant of the chair. In other words, there are only three Senators on the floor of the Senate listening to the address which the Senator from Oregon is making. If that situation is not a perfectly excellent reason why any Senator who wishes to obtain the attention of the people of this country should make a speech on the radio instead of on the floor of the Senate, I do not know what is a good example. I may say that the Senator from Oregon has more patience than do the majority of the Members of the Senate, including myself. I think that the fact that no one finds time to listen to a debate in the United States Senate on a major problem represents one of the great defects of our congressional system. However, all that is beside the point.

Mr. President, I wish to make this point: The amendment of the Senator from Oregon relates to the judicial functioning of international law. To make it really effective we must look forward to some means of establishing international law. Will not the Senator agree that the term "international law" is a misnomer as we understand it?

Mr. MORSE. I am not sure the Senator is correct. However, I do agree that if we are going to settle those international disputes which have in them the basis of war, I think it is important that we broaden the bracket of so-called justiciable disputes, as the definition of justiciable disputes is now applied in the realm of international law. But here again we are dealing with a problem which cannot be solved overnight. As a nation, our first step is, in my opinion, to commit ourselves to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court on the basis of justiciable disputes as now defined and limited. I think that is a minimum which we should do. Then, as the decades unfold, I hope that the type of disputes which will be submitted to the International Court will be enlarged so that 20 years, 30 years, or 50 years from today many international controversies, which we now consider as not being subject to international law determination, will be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court. As the people of the world learn how to live in cooperation with each other, and as they build up greater and greater confidence in the strength of international justice, impartially administered, I believe we will find the nations of the world submitting many issues to a court of international justice which they now, under the so-called justiciable dispute rule, would not submit.

I think that the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization should gradually become to be looked upon as an international legislative body. As the international organization develops I hope that within 20 or 30 years, indeed, in less time than that if the people can adjust themselves to the concept sooner, the General Assembly will, in effect, be proposing international legislation on matters which history has shown to have been the causes of war, and that on the basis of such legislation any disputes which may arise thereafter will be submitted to the International Court of Justice for judicial determination.

I do not think that the exercise of such a legislative function will endanger legitimate nation sovereignty, but rather will protect it. I, of course, think the world no longer can afford to recognize any sovereign right on the part of any nation to wage aggressive war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator does not mean, does he, that we should wait 20 or 30 years before we attempt to make rules concerning the control or elimination of such things, for example, as armaments?

Mr. MORSE. No; not in respect to such specific issues as armaments, or such a specific issue as the atomic bomb.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, that includes armaments. In other words, my point is that in order to be effective we must not only have the system of judicial determination to which the Senator has referred, but we must also have the power to make rules with relation to specific matters such as those related to armaments and atomic bombs. The three elements of law are the judicial, executive, and legislative, are they not?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I agree. I think the General Assembly as the legislative branch should consider at an early date atomic bomb policies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that one comes before the other, for all three are necessary ingredients of a system of law.

Mr. MORSE. I agree; but I urge today that the next step we as a nation should take is to strengthen the World Court as an instrument for adjudicating disputes by accepting its compulsory jurisdiction. I want to see us strengthen the powers and functions of all departments of the United Nations Organization just as rapidly as world thinking will permit, because I am convinced that only by such a strong organization can we prevent another war. All departments of the Organization must, as the Senator suggests, have power to make rules which will prevent war in the making.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, we want them all at once, if we can get them at the same time; I do not mean today, immediately, but all at the same time.

Mr. MORSE. I certainly will join with the Senator from Arkansas in his optimistic desires, but I think he will join with me in recognition of the fact that the whole solution of the question of jurisdiction of the World Court, both as to the scope of justiciable disputes now recognized and as to enlarging the bracket of jurisdiction of the Court to cover disputes not now recognized as justiciable will have to be a matter of historical growth. It will not take place in as short a period of time, perhaps, as we wish the peoples of the world would be ready in their thinking to adjust themselves to accept, but I am confident that the broadening of the Court's jurisdiction is inevitable. I want to do what I can to help that cause.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I desire to say to the Senator that I value his discussion, and probably am in agreement with

many of the things he has said. However, in discussing international law I have always felt we used the term "international law" without the full implications of our use of the term "law" internally, as the Senator pointed out a moment ago.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Reference has been made to three Senators being present listening to the debate. Two of those Senators have been carrying on a dialog with the Senator having the floor, the Senator from Oregon, and as the third Senator present trying to hear the debate, I suggest Senators are not carrying on their dialog in a tone of voice loud enough to be heard by others in the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure we all regret the Senator from Rhode Island has not been able to hear us. There is now pending before a committee of the Senate, of which I believe he is chairman, a resolution proposing to remodel this Chamber so that it can have decent acoustics. At present it is almost impossible for one to be heard even when he shouts.

Mr. GREEN. I agree with the Senator as to the necessity for improvement. I happen to be on the committee to which the Senator has referred, and we hope to have the acoustics of the Chamber improved, but the other Senators who have been participating in the debate are sitting within 6 or 8 feet of the speaker and are carrying on what amounts to a private conversation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I might state that there are a good many seats on this side of the Chamber, in fact, there are two next to the Senator having the floor, and perhaps it would save some voices if we did not have to speak too loud. I say that in all friendliness.

Mr. President, I started to say that in discussing the question of international law too often we think of international law as we regard a law or statute in one of the States, or a Federal statute, when in fact the overwhelming bulk of international law is nothing but international rule or international principle, because it is lacking in one fundamental which is a quality of the law as we understand it, and that is, the power to enforce its mandates. Therefore, when we speak of international law we use the term without too great exactness. I believe that the body of international law which we have is more a body of international rules, perhaps, or of moral suasion of one kind or another.

However, a moment ago the Senator said that he believed we should submit certain matters to an international court, and then in the course of the years additional matters should be submitted, until nations began voluntarily to submit perhaps all such questions to the court.

Heretofore we have tried international courts, specifically called courts, and there were treaty provisions which affected the determination of disputes. I may say that it is my opinion that the experience of such tribunals as have been set up in the past has been that for a time shortly after their establishment there have been submitted a substantial number of restricted issues, but as time has gone on the nations involved which otherwise might have used them gradually drifted away from the use of those tribunals for the settlement of disputes, and instead of the courts strengthening themselves and enlarging their jurisdiction, there has in fact been a lessening of the use by the nations of treaty provisions for mediation and arbitration, and like matters.

One of the reasons, perhaps, is that there is no provision for means of enforcement, no compulsion. There is nothing that binds the nations except their own morality and their own determination. Therefore I am afraid that if we proceed on the philosophy of setting up the court now proposed, and rely upon the nations to participate in it voluntarily, we will have a repetition of the experience with some of our other courts and international forums, namely, we will see it used for a while, and then there will be a gradual diminution of the activities of the court, to the point where it will become nothing but a tribunal considering moot questions, with perhaps a willingness to discuss certain questions in a forum without coming to any binding agreement as to enforcement action.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Even assuming it to be true that so-called international courts have not settled many matters which could and should have been disposed of, I think we often underestimate the number of cases which they really have decided. Of course, the matter of percentages in itself may not be so imposing when we consider the relative importance of the questions determined, but arbitration boards and international courts have disposed of many controversies which might have led to intense friction and at times bloodshed.

I take it that certainly the Senator from Iowa would not feel that, although the results which have been accomplished by international courts and other agencies have not been so satisfactory as we would like to have had them, yet the establishment of such a court is not now a step in the right direction. International law, though it is not real law in one sense of the word as the distinguished Senator from Iowa has just emphasized, may be on the eve of being strengthened and greatly developed. Many people believe, and I am certainly one of them, that this new organization under a new charter for promotion of peace and providing for an international court, will mean a real step forward in the strengthening and development of international law. So why not take the chance and go on with the program in a feeling of hopefulness that good results will follow and a determination on our part to do what we can to help make such a court and its underlying international law really effective as a powerful and possibly indispensable organization for the promotion and preservation of peace?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think perhaps the Senator from Maryland did not understand the point I was trying to make. I very much favor the decision of international questions by an orderly system of law. I was not speaking in disparagement of the international court system. I was trying to make the point, although I did not say it definitely, that we have tried the voluntary court system, and there has been a diminishing of its use from time to time because the courts had no means of compulsion; they could not enforce their decrees.

The point I was trying to bring out was that perhaps on this occasion we should establish a system for the enforcement of the decrees of the court which would bring its decrees under the category of law as we understand it, and not under the category of international rules of morality for the enforcement of which only the individual nations are responsible.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, such a result as that might follow. Certainly everyone is justified in believing that the International Court which is provided for in the Charter offers possibilities for good which probably never before existed. The need for it exists as never before in history. Tremendous problems have arisen such as have been created by the atomic bomb, and we are getting a new concept of the opportunity and need for closer international relations. So it may very well be that from now on there may be a strengthening and development of the theory and practice of international law which will eliminate many grave controversies which in the past would not have been disposed by instrumentalities of peace. Now is our opportunity. If we fail to avail ourselves of it, the consequences to the world may be infinitely more tragic than have ever before harassed and harried mankind.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My point is that I could support a greater strengthening of the arm of the Court, rather than go with a court which is on a purely voluntary basis. I think the history of the past has indicated that that is not always successful, and that the arm of the Court needs to be strengthened.

I apologize to the Senator from Oregon for taking so much of his time.

Mr. MORSE. Not at all; the Senator's contribution makes the discussion more valuable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question on the point he has been discussing, because I think it is exceedingly important. The Senator would be in favor of strengthening the arm of the court; that is, strengthening the power of the court to carry out its decrees. Is that the point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So that if it made a decision there would be some means of enforcing it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly. In the past we have relied upon the moral suasion of nations to do what is morally right and to refrain from doing what is morally wrong, and that has not worked. As a result international banditry and crime of various kinds have ensued.

In the courts of the States, and in the Federal courts, in fact, in the courts of most of the nations of the world, decisions based upon orderly statutes are enforceable by some means. A man can be taken by the arm and put him into jail if he does not obey. We cannot put nations in jail, and there are no means of enforcing the decrees of international courts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator agree the decisions should be made to operate upon the individuals within the nations? Then they could be enforced. There are always individuals involved in all these actions.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Unless the Senator is speaking about statutes having to do with purely international relations on a high scale, I believe we now have laws under which individuals may be punished for their shortcomings in the violation of certain rules.

I again apologize to the Senator from Oregon, but I must leave shortly to attend an important meeting.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the Senator participate in the debate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am greatly interested in the discussion. Today we can, if we desire, punish individuals who have engaged unlawfully in combinations in restraint of trade, in cartel actions, and in various other types of international associations which violate, perhaps, numerous statutes which we have on the books; and we have prosecuted some as individuals. When we go higher than that we go onto international levels to which about the only method of approach is at the governmental level and not at the level of the individual. The World Court, I assume, is not designed to punish an individual citizen of a nation any more than the Federal law, is designed to punish a citizen of a State for violations on his part of purely State laws. A Federal court can punish him if he violates a Federal law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But when a citizen of Iowa, let us say, makes whisky illegally against the Federal law——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Perish the thought!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let us suppose, then, that the citizen in question is a citizen of Nebraska or of Oregon. When he violates the Federal law by making whisky illegally, the Federal official does not protest to the State officials of Iowa or Nebraska or Oregon. The Federal official goes directly and arrests the man guilty of the violation of the Federal law. If a law is made by an international agency, or by the United Nations, does not the Senator think the real way to make it effective would be to have it applicable to the individual, after the court, we will say, had passed upon the subject, if there was a dispute?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not say to the Senator from Arkansas that at some time in the future there may not be an approach to and in fact an exercise of that kind of jurisdiction. I do say to the Senator that it raises a grave question in my mind as to whether it would be remotely possible to enforce a law in such a way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator to say that he was for such procedure because it would be enforceable.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is talking about the enforcement of regulations by an international group upon the individual himself. In other words, the international organization would go into a country and prosecute an individual in the State of Pennsylvania, or something of that sort. I say that at that level I am very doubtful that it would be possible to enforce such a system at this time. I am not saying that eventually that may not be the place at which we will arrive. But I believe it is possible at this time to arrive at an enforceable system of laws among the nations, at least in rather broad categories of international activity, that can be enforced against a nation, either by sanctions or by various other means, that will have a direct effect upon the individual while being enforced against the nation as a whole. I think it is a question of degree. It is like centralized national government. We have been centralizing the National Government in the last few years to a degree that 50 years ago would not have been tolerated for a moment. That may or may not be wrong. I am not discussing that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think there is a question of degree involved at all. There is a very great difference of principle as to whether a regulation laid down by the United Nations would be applicable only through diplomatic means as now employed by governments, or whether it should be enforcable against the individual within a given country. For example, if the du Pont Co., which is one of our great companies, were making atomic bombs, and a rule outlawing it had been adopted and the United Nations Organization found the du Pont Co. doing it, they would go to the du Pont Co. direct, not send a message to the President of the United States. That is a very great difference, not of degree but of fundamental principle. Such an approach would be very effective. I thought that was what the Senator from Iowa was getting at. In that way the law could be enforced against a corporation or legal entity.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not care to become involved in a dispute with the Senator on that subject. I do not say that at some time that may not become the method of international approach.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood that was what the Senator was getting at, that is all.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, no. What I was getting at—and apparently I did not properly express it—was that while we have an international court to decide disputes and policies and interpret the rules or statutes or agreements or treaties which are entered into between nations no means are available to enforce the judgment of that court and make effective its decision. I was merely trying to say that we have tried the method of voluntary adherence, and while that is all right, and a step in the right direction, yet I think we could well devote much of our time to studying how we can strengthen the enforcement of the court's decrees, and if we do not, instead of there being an increased use of international courts, there will be a diminished use of them in the years to come, as a result of indifference and lack of effective means of enforcement of decisions which may be rendered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from Iowa for his contribution to this discussion, and I also thank the Senator from Arkansas. I think, however, there are several things which ought to be pointed out to the Senator from Iowa in regard to the points which he raises. First, I think he should recognize that a great many disputes of an arbitrable nature have been considered by courts which have been set up on an international basis throughout the years. It is true that many of these disputes were voluntarily submitted or submitted under a declaration by the governments concerned that the old Permanent Court of International Justice should exercise its compulsory jurisdiction in accordance with such conditions as the nations might reserve in a declaration granting jurisdiction to the court. However, there have been a great many such cases. There not only have been a great many such cases but the system has produced uniformly successful results. I do not think the public is aware of the large number of adjudications which have been rendered by the Permanent Court of International Justice and other courts which by treaty have been set up between nations during the past 25 years. The remarkable thing about the record is the universal acceptance of the decisions of such courts.

In the second place, however, I think we need to remember that the issues which have been submitted to those courts, have been, as I said earlier in my remarks, very limited in scope, and I think that if international courts are to be as effective, as they should be, in preventing war, then more disputes which spring from the causal roots of war ought to be submitted to them for determination.

Now let us be specific. I do not expect agreement on this point now, and I am certainly no prophet, but I am willing to venture the guess that 25 years from now—I hope sooner—the people of the world will be ready to say that the dispute now affecting Korea ought to go, not to the Security Council of the United Nations Organization, not to the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization, but that it is a type of dispute which ought to go to the World Court for determination as to the respective rights of the governments concerned. However, before it could go there Russia and the United States would have to agree to the court's jurisdiction. Further a body of rules and agreements as to the self-determination rights of subjugated peoples would have to be agreed upon by the General Assembly for application by the court to the facts of the case.

The next point I want to make in regard to the Senator's comment is that I think the United Nations Organization Charter has taken a very definite step toward providing a weapon for the enforcement of the judicial decisions of the International Court by agreement on the part of the signatories thereto, I refer the Senator to article 94 of the Charter dealing with the International Court of Justice. It reads as follows:

1. Each member of the United Nations undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which it is a party.

2. If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment.

I think that article 94 of the Charter is a great step in the direction of the end which the Senator from Iowa seeks to accomplish, and I believe it argues well for my major proposition, which is that the United States ought to be one of the nations to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, without reserving unto itself the right to hold a case back and say, "We will determine for ourselves whether you will sit in judgment on our case." We should be willing to take our chances before world judges on the merits of any dispute which we may have with another nation. If we should ever say—and God forbid that history should ever record such an action on our part—"You have rendered your decision, but we refuse to abide by it," I think we should be subject to the Security Council and such sanctions as that Council might see fit to impose upon us. We should neither seek nor want immunity from international law administered by a court of impartial world judges.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not want the Senator to understand that I am at all discouraged about the United Nations agreement. I agree with a great many persons that it is not a perfect document, but I think tremendous strides have been made in the right direction, and very important formulas have been adopted.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon is in agreement with that statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Perhaps some of them leave much to be desired in the specific nature of their provisions and their effect on implementing the organization, but I do not want the Senator from Oregon to feel we have made no progress. I think we have made tremendous progress, and I hope we shall continue to make progress.

I feel there is open a great field, a great avenue for progress in connection with the compulsory enforcement of decrees which are rendered by a properly constituted court based upon what are properly determined to be international duties. Of course I feel that before a court of international justice can be used there must be a system of international statutes thoroughly defining the basic rights and the basic immunities and privileges and obligations of the nations, and perhaps, as the Senator from Arkansas said, of the individuals within them. Some day I may talk to the Senator from Arkansas about that subject, but I am not prepared to go that far today. But I feel—and this is no criticism of the Senator from Oregon, because I know something about his sentiments on the subject—that sometimes we talk too much of idealisms, without coming down to specific implementation, which is the first necessity before we can obtain satisfactory results.

Mr. MORSE. I do not dispute the premises of the Senator. However, I wish to point out that, inadequate as it may be, we do have a body of international law which is applied in determining rights of nations under treaties and agreements which they have entered into. The documents of reference may be trade agreements, treaty agreements with respect to boundaries, or agreements which encompass a variety of other relationships between the nations which have entered into such agreements. If we are to develop a body of international statutes with a corresponding larger body of international law which is what the Senator has in mind—and I believe that is the road we must follow—the first thing the United States ought to do is to say by declaration to the United Nations Organization and say it now, is to say with authority, "We agree that the World Court shall have jurisdiction over us, to apply its decisions to us on the basis of the rules of law which now exist and which are applicable to other nations." Then perhaps we shall be more ready to enlarge, over the years, the jurisdiction and legislative scope of the General Assembly, and see to it that more problems between nations which give rise to misunderstandings are covered by the type of international statute to which the Senator from Iowa refers. With such a body of international statutes all alleged violations of such statutes would be referred to a World Court for judicial determination and I am convinced that the adoption of such a system of rule by reason would reduce greatly the threat of war.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe that our Nation has a vital and leading responsibility because of our economic and social position in the world. However, I wish to invite the Senator's attention to an idea which I have, but which is not mine exclusively, that while we may, and do, in my opinion, have a tremendous responsibility because of conditions and circumstances, nevertheless our responsibility and our leadership can go only so far. There comes a time when the responsibility and the moral obligation of other nations in the world to meet our leadership and our responsibility for international unity, friendship, and harmony become very controlling factors. Our leadership can extend only to the point where the equitable cooperation of other nations of the world meets it fairly, and in a degree commensurate with our own action. I do not believe that we should slacken in meeting our responsibility or diminish our efforts, but I think we should keep in mind that we alone cannot establish such a system. We can state our ideals and determine our principles. We can do whatever we may be able to do in contribution to world harmony; but there comes a time when it cannot be established beyond a certain point without the fair, honorable, and vigorous cooperation of other nations of the world.

Mr. MORSE. Not only do I not dispute the points which the Senator has just made—I am in agreement with him—but I point out that on this particular issue we are a laggard Nation. On this particular issue we have not gone along with the majority of the nations of the world in granting compulsory jurisdiction to the World Court. In fact, we stand today, in the list of so-called great powers, as one of two nations in the world which have not accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. Those two nations are the United States and Russia. If we look upon our responsibility under the San Francisco Charter to develop pacific means for the settlement of international disputes, we cannot justify an alinement with Russia in refusing to submit justiciable disputes to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. I believe that if we take the lead in this matter now, we cannot only demonstrate to the small nations, but clearly demonstrate to Russia, that we intend to submit all justiciable disputes within the authority of the World Court to adjudicate to the compulsory jurisdiction of that Court. I believe that such a declaration on our part now would have a very salutary effect on Russia and would be heralded throughout the world. It would be evidence that we intended to practice as well as preach international relations based on rules of justice.

To return to the outline of my speech, Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD section 3 of article 1 of the purposes and principles of the San Francisco Charter, because I think it has interesting implications in connection with the problem of enlarging the so-called legislative functions of the General Assembly as I think those functions will and should be enlarged over the years.

3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

I think there is no doubt that as the United Nations Organization grows and develops controversial issues will be raised, particularly in the General Assembly, over the problems encompassed by section 3 of article 1 of the Charter.

Section 4 of article 1 reads as follows:

To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

The job of harmonizing problems arising among nations under this section will call for both agreement within the General Assembly and application of

judicial rules to those agreements by the Court.

Also as I a foundation for this discussion, I think it is important to have in the RECORD a repetition of article 2 of the Charter:

The Organization and its members, in pursuit of the purposes stated in article 1, shall act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members.

That particular pledge gives concern to some of the small nations because they feel that equality of sovereignty also imposes upon equal sovereigns equality of responsibility to implement fully the entire Charter. They feel that equal sovereigns should be willing to accept the principle of equality before the bar of the World Court.

Whether we like it or not the fact is that many small nations feel that we have assumed unto ourselves a superiority of sovereignty when we refuse to accept equally with the great majority of the world's nations the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

The section reads further:

2. All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means—

That is the pledge—

in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

What other procedure is there, Mr. President, for the settlement of an international dispute by peaceful means when nations reach a good-faith deadlock over a given issue, but an appeal to the reason of a judicial tribunal? So I say, as we look forward to the expansion and evolution of the United Nations Organization, that it is to be hoped that more and more disputes will be submitted to the jurisdiction of the World Court, including issues which are not now, under existing international law, considered to be justiciable disputes.

4. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

I feel that even in the functioning of both the General Assembly and the Security Council, many disputes over questions of fact are bound to arise in connection with carrying out the objectives of those two bodies. I hope that in due course of time those questions of fact can be referred to an enlarged jurisdiction of the World Court for determination, and the findings then submitted to the Security Council and to the General Assembly for such action as the powers of those organizations within the Charter permit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the remainder of article 2 of the San Francisco Charter, because I think it is basic to an understanding of my views as to why there should be an enlargement of the jurisdiction of the Court.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

5. All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

6. The Organization shall insure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

7. Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I take it from the Senator's presentation that he is arguing for the enlargement of the field of the rule of law in international affairs, as distinguished from the rule of force.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. That is the goal toward which we are moving through the International Court.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish for anyone to have any illusions as to what it means to go along with a proposal to grant compulsory jurisdiction to the Court. I think it means, if the United Nations Organization is to be really a dynamic force in preserving peace in the world, that over the decades more and more jurisdiction will be given to the judicial department of the United Nations Organization. I think that is essential if we are to have international differences settled in accordance with principles of justice.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. If we are to have rules of reason applied to the settlement of disputes, then I think issues over facts should be submitted to impartial judicial minds for determination. On such questions the Court could and should be of great help to both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

I think it is a very interesting fact that in all the discussion prior to the San Francisco Charter, and in all the conferences, including Dumbarton Oaks and the Washington Conference of Jurists, no question was raised as to the fairness and judicial impartiality of the old Permanent Court of International Justice. Its record is a glorious record of men who sat on an international bench, not as representatives of any particular nation but as world judges. As Senators know, the selection of judges on the old International Court was not made on the basis of representation by nations. The statute of the new Court as set forth in the Charter adopts the same basic procedures for selecting the Court's judges. The World Court judges have been men sitting over the years as representatives, not of any nation, but of the peoples of the world, carrying out what they considered to be a sacred trust in applying judicial principles to the determination of disputes falling within their jurisdiction. They have done great honor to the judicial process.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator know, from his study of the history of the World Court, of any instance where other than judicial principles were applied? Was there any evidence of political decisions which might be open to criticism?

Mr. MORSE. I know of none.

I wish to reiterate the point I made in the beginning, Mr. President, namely, that throughout the Charter there is the oft-repeated reference to peaceful methods of settling disputes on the basis of international justice. It is impossible for me to comprehend any international organization which can be effective in preventing war by means of the peaceful settlement of disputes unless the nations adhering to the Charter establishing that organization are also willing to bind themselves to the jurisdiction of the judicial branch of that organization. Thus, chapter VI of the Charter, dealing with the pacific settlement of the disputes, rings with references to judicial means of settling disputes. Let me read one or two sections of article 6. Take, for example, section 1 of article 33, chapter VI:

The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

There, once again, we find implanted in the Charter a pledge on the part of the nations that they shall use these pacific methods for the settlement of their disputes, including judicial settlement rather than resort to war. Mr. President, it seems to me that if this Nation is going fully to live up to what I consider to be a moral obligation under the San Francisco Charter, then it is morally bound, in keeping faith with article 33, section 1, chapter VI of the Charter, to agree to the compulsory jurisdiction of disputes. If we mean it when we say that we pledge ourselves and agree to the principle that these methods of negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and judicial settlement should be used, then I think we are in a very weak position when we continue to assert our right under the optional clause to determine for ourselves whether a given dispute should go to the World Court for determination.

Likewise, Mr. President, article 36 of chapter VI of the Charter, especially section 3 thereof, contains this language:

In making recommendations under this article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the statute of the court.

I think that section of article 36 also places upon us the moral obligation to

accept the jurisdiction of the World Court as to all justiciable issues.

It is my view that on July 28, 1945, when we voted for the Charter, we voted for approval of that principle. We said, "We agree that we, as a Nation, ought to refer to the International Court of Justice, in accordance with the provisions of the statute of the Court, issues involving disputes with other nations." I am not arguing, Mr. President, that we are legally bound to do it, because there is specifically in the Charter, of course, the so-called optional clause; but I think it is impossible to reconcile our refusal to do so with principles of international morality and fair dealing. I repeat that it is difficult to reconcile our reservation in regard to jurisdiction and our commitment under article 36 of chapter VI of the charter that—

> In making recommendations under this article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the statute of the Court.

I think our position is quite untenable not only on broad moral grounds but also from the standpoint of our own self-interest. We encourage the pacific settlement of disputes; we endorse the language which says that that shall be the general procedure; yet up to this hour we have not been quite willing to go all the way and to say, "Yes, we will submit, on the basis of the compulsory-jurisdiction doctrine, our disputes within the bracket of justiciable disputes." Sooner or later we shall find ourselves in dispute with another nation who refuses to meet us before the bar of the World Court and then we are likely to find that we have created great difficulties for the very organization to which we have entrusted the pacific settlement of disputes. It can best protect our rights if we come before it with clean hands. I repeat that I hope the Security Council will eventually order compulsory adjudication in specific cases, instead of using military sanctions or economic sanctions, as now provided by chapter VII. It is my contention that the Security Council now has the power, once the United Nations Organization goes into effect, to order compulsory judicial determination of a dispute as a form of sanction, irrespective of whether we file a declaration agreeing to such jurisdiction. I recognize that men can differ on that point. But let us take a hypothetical and absurd case to illustrate the point. Let us assume that we found ourselves in a dispute with Mexico; and let us assume that we refused to submit the dispute to the World Court for determination, and that the Security Council was satisfied that we were proceeding with warlike measures toward Mexico. Under the present language of the Charter, I think the Security Council would have the right to say to the United States, "The first sanction we are going to impose on you is that the dispute shall be judicially determined. We are going to have the World Court determine the facts about that dispute, and on the basis of those facts determine what further action we, as a Security Council, may wish to take in protecting Mexico's rights in the premises, if we decide that the United States is in the wrong."

But, Mr. President, be that as it may, regardless of whether as of this moment that power rests in the Security Council, I express the hope that as the United Nations Organization develops its methods and its procedures for the pacific settlement of disputes, nations the world around will agree that certainly that should be a sanction to be used by the Security Council, acting through the World Court, before making use of either economic or military sanctions.

So I say that personally I regret that chapter VII of the Charter does not specifically provide for ordering a nation to submit to court procedure for determination of an issue, whenever such procedure would be feasible in the opinion of the Security Council, prior to the use of other sanctions—economic or military—by the Security Council, as permitted under chapter VII.

In his now historic utterances on the objectives of the San Francisco Conference, both before and after the Charter was penned, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] stirred this Senate and the entire Nation by his eloquent appeals for a system of international cooperation based upon the one, fundamental, and essential principle supporting all our hopes and prayers for permanent peace, namely, international justice. He warned that any plan for international cooperation which does not stem from the roots of international justice is doomed to failure. The result of any such failure, let us never forget, especially in these critical hours of the world's history, means but one thing—another world war. Thus, on June 29, 1945, the senior Senator from Michigan said—as recorded on page 6982 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date—

> Now, Mr. President, I briefly sketch the Charter's working structure. It will function through four major instruments: First, a General Assembly in which each signatory nation has one vote—tomorrow's "town meeting of the world"; second, a Security Council—the executive agency for action—in which Britain, Russia, America, France, and China have permanent seats, together with six other nations chosen periodically by the Assembly; third, an International Court of Justice where all nations will have the option of seeking juridical decisions; fourth, a Social and Economic Council, consisting of 18 nations chosen periodically by the Assembly, which will explore those social and economic dislocations in the family of nations, that too often breed the wars which might otherwise be avoided through voluntary readjustments.
>
> It is my profound belief that the pacific contacts and consultations which will constantly be maintained by the powers—and particularly by the great powers—plus the pacific routines which every dispute must hereafter exhaust before it is subject to any sort of sanctions, can and will resolve most, if not all, of the controversies which otherwise might lead once more to war. Mind you, Mr. President, these routines must be consulted, under the solemn pledge of these nations; and I venture the assertion and the hope and the prophecy that they will be consulted, in view of the nature, character, and extent of this new obligation, which stands in a degree of sacred trust which has never heretofore been approached by an international obligation in the history of humankind. What are these pacific routines to which resort must be made by the large as well as by the small powers before there can be any consideration, thought, or suggestion of resort to force? First, solution by negotiation; second, solution by inquiry; third, solution by mediation; fourth, solution by conciliation; fifth, solution by arbitration; sixth, solution by judicial settlement; seventh, solution by resort to regional arrangements; eighth, other peaceful means chosen by the disputants themselves; ninth, appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment recommended by the Security Council.

In other words, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan urged upon the Senate, and rightly so, the approval of the Charter because it provides for these pacific procedures for the settlement of disputes, including the procedure of judicial settlement.

On page 6983 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the same speech the Senator from Michigan had the following to say with regard to this concept of international justice and pacific settlement of disputes:

> As a result of the San Francisco Conference, Dumbarton Oaks has been given a new soul. As originally drawn, it avoided any reference to justice—without which there can be no stable peace. San Francisco's Charter fills that void. The Charter names justice as the prime criterion of peace. It repeatedly dedicates itself to human rights and fundamental freedoms. It declines to accept a static world in which yesterday's inequities are frozen in a strait-jacket. It tells the General Assembly that it is empowered—and I beg of you, Senators, to listen to these words. Here is the heart and core of humanity's hope for tomorrow. The General Assembly is empowered—to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situations, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, and of situations resulting from a violation of the purposes and principles set forth in this Charter.

Mr. President, what instrument devised by the mind of man is more competent to carry out the great objectives to which the Senator from Michigan alluded than a world court, to the compulsory jurisdiction of which nations in good faith pledge themselves to abide?

In the same great speech the Senator from Michigan had this to say:

> In this and other aspects, I repeat, the San Francisco Charter proposes to avoid a static world. In this and other aspects, the Dumbarton Oaks plan has been greatly liberalized by the progressive labors of this Conference. I submit that justice is thus guaranteed its hearing under the healthiest possible auspices available to this distraught and tangled world. I submit that justice is infinitely better off with such a forum than it would be if such a forum were refused. I suggest that the more one fears the nature of the final peace, speaking not of our enemies but of our friends, the warmer should be one's welcome to an institution which can promise some element of orderly correction. Under such circumstances, the quicker this institution begins to function the quicker justice may hope to find its voice and mobilize its friends.

I assert, Mr. President, that the sooner the World Court begins to function on the basis of compulsory jurisdiction, encompassing the pledge of the United States that we will abide by its decision in accordance with the terms of the resolution which I shall shortly submit, the sooner will another great stride in the direction of permanent peace be

taken by the greatest peace-loving nation on the face of the globe, namely our own.

On January 10, 1945, the Senator from Michigan stated as follows, as recorded on page 166 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date:

If World War III ever unhappily arrives, it will open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate. I propose to do everything within my power to keep those laboratories closed for keeps. I want maximum American cooperation, consistent with legitimate American self-interest, with constitutional process and with collateral events which warrant it, to make the basic idea of Dumbarton Oaks succeed. I want a new dignity and a new authority for international law. I think American self-interest requires it. But, Mr. President, this also requires whole-hearted reciprocity. In honest candor I think we should tell other nations that this glorious thing we contemplate is not and cannot be one-sided. I think we must say again that unshared idealism is a menace which we could not undertake to underwrite in the postwar period.

Mr. President, I underwrite every word and clause of that great speech which was delivered by the Senator from Michigan. But I assert that we stand today in the eyes of the majority of the nations of the world as a nation which apparently believes that the question of the jurisdiction of the World Court can be one sided. We have reserved to ourselves, as we have a right to do under the Charter with its optional clause, the right to exercise our discretion as to whether a particular dispute, justiciable in nature and arising in accordance with existing international law, shall be subjected to the court for final determination. I say that such a position of the United States is not in keeping with the great ideals and principles which were expressed by the Senator from Michigan on January 10, 1945.

Unquestionably the statesmanship of the Senator from Michigan in insisting upon the recognition of the concept of justice as the warp and woof of any determination for world cooperation left a great imprint upon the San Francisco Charter. I make that statement because through practically every chapter of that great document runs the threads of this principle of justice so essential to pacific settlements of disputes.

Finally, when we come to chapter XIV of the Charter we enter the very citadel for administering international justice through pacific means of law based on justice. Here we find the nations binding themselves to the International Court of Justice itself. Thus, Mr. President, in article 92 of chapter XIV we find the nations undertaking this solemn commitment:

The International Court of Justice shall be the principal judicial organ of the United Nations.

There is the judicial department, Mr. President.

It shall function in accordance with the annexed statute, which is based upon the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and forms an integral part of the present Charter.

At some time later I shall have something to say as to how this new statute came into being.

I read from articles 93 and 94:

1. All members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice.

Mr. President, that includes the United States.

2. A state which is not a member of the United Nations may become a party to the statute of the International Court of Justice on conditions to be determined in each case by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

ARTICLE 94

1. Each member of the United Nations undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which it is a party.

Mr. President, that is an interesting commitment, in view of our preference to exercise our rights under the optional clause. We agree that in any case actually submitted to the Court of International Justice, each and every nation should be bound by the decision of that court. But if that principle is sound, Mr. President, I submit that it is reasonable to argue that we should be willing to agree to have it binding upon us in all justiciable disputes which are subject to trial within the jurisdiction of the Court.

The article continues as follows:

2. If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment.

I have already commented on that article, Mr. President, in connection with my remarks in answer to the Senator from Iowa. I repeat that I think the commitment contained in the article is a great commitment. It is a commitment in which we say that the Security Council may, in effect, exercise the powers of force. It may exercise police powers. The Council can be the sheriff and the marshal of the World Court in carrying out the decrees and the judgments of that Court. In my judgment, that section meets the test put by the Senator from Iowa. It does give to the World Court at least a policeman, or a sheriff, or a process officer to enforce its decisions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks articles 95 and 96 of chapter XIV of the World Court.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 95

Nothing in the present Charter shall prevent members of the United Nations from entrusting the solution of their differences to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future.

ARTICLE 96

1. The General Assembly or the Security Council may request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question.

2. Other organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies, which may at any time be so authorized by the General Assembly, may also request advisory opinions of the Court on legal questions arising within the scope of their activities.

Mr. MORSE. The foregoing articles make clear that the very foundation of the United Nations Organization for the pacific settlement of disputes in accordance with rules of justice is the jurisdiction and availability of the new International Court of Justice. How regrettable it is that we do not give it our full and complete confidence. What a sad commentary it is that our Nation holds out in opposition to granting the Court full jurisdiction over justiciable issues involving disputes between America and any other country. What are we afraid of? The merits of a case against us?

Mr. President, in my judgment, in this great chapter of the Charter we find the greatest hope for mankind at last emerging from the jungle law of war to the civilized rules of judicial reason. This chapter offers the peoples of the world not only their greatest hope for a world at peace ruled by reason, law, and justice, but in my opinion it offers mankind its only hope to save civilization from a new "dark ages" resulting from another war.

To talk about international cooperation, based on principles of justice; to endorse the ideal of pacific procedures for the settlement of international disputes without here and now, at the very start of the functioning of the United Nations Organization, fully and completely implementing the International Court of Justice insofar as this Nation's submission to the jurisdiction of the court is concerned, amounts, in my judgment, to a great, colossal mistake. I think granting jurisdiction now is essential if we are to keep faith with the San Francisco Charter. Not doing so is a failure on our part to live up to the spirit and the intent of those sections of the San Francisco Charter which seek to substitute peaceful settlements for force in the determination of international disputes. We must not as a nation continue to hold ourselves aloof in regard to the jurisdiction clause, and thereby serve notice on the world that we will not submit, at least at this time, all justiciable disputes to the World Court. It would be a clear demonstration that we place our hope and trust in pacific procedures for settling disputes beneath our right to determine for ourselves whether we prefer to resort to war rather than use the judgment of a world court to render justice upon ourselves.

I said as much on July 28, 1945, when I presented Senate Resolution 160. I repeat it now. On that occasion I pointed out that—

The issue as between involuntary and compulsory jurisdiction is the difference between shadow and substance. Nothing whatever is gained by merely stating that law must replace force as the governing factor of international relations. So long as states have the option of withholding their legal disputes from adjudication, this remains an empty phrase, of which we have had too many in the past. In spite of the undeveloped body of law capable of playing a great role if regularly called upon and obeyed by states, and capable of much greater development if we will but make use of it. The mechanism for the selection of judges

is such that only those of the highest capacity and integrity have any chance of sitting on its bench.

I know of no criticism in any of the records or writings I have read in regard to the World Court which casts any shadow of doubt over either the impartiality of the judges selected or the procedures for selecting them. I said further that—

As a people we have long placed our faith in the law. As a lawyer and legislator I feel that the best hope of a stable world order lies in the development and strengthening of the rule of law. This means, as a practical matter, the development and strengthening of the jurisdiction of the court.

The adoption of the present article 36 of the statute, containing the so-called optional clause, leaves the way open for the achievement of general compulsory jurisdiction. If all states sign declarations under the optional clause—

As I propose the United States now do—

the same result will be achieved as if general compulsory jurisdiction had been incorporated in the statute from the outset.

It is very much to be hoped that this will be done. It is very important to the United States do its part to bring this to fulfillment, and in order to facilitate this, and in order to dispel any doubts about the attitude of the Senate, I am filing a resolution to be considered when we reconvene, proposing that the United States accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

That is Senate Resolution 160. I continued:

I have spoken on only one of the great forces of the Charter—the World Court. I believe it is such a creative and dynamic power for giving life and strength to a war-sick world that through its jurisdiction and procedures is to be found our best hope for bringing law and order into international relations. In ratifying this Charter we are taking an important step along a long and hopeful road with a goal which has yet to be reached by the human race in its struggle to become civilized. Although we flatter ourselves by referring to our society as civilized, objectivity should force us to admit that resort to war is man's self-indictment of his primitive state. Have not the destruction, misery, blood, tears, and death which man has visited upon himself in the present holocaust of war, unequaled in all of history, finally taught the peoples of the world that if they are to reach the goal of the civilized state they must learn to live in peace?

Law and order, based upon rules of reason, are the instruments of peace. The San Francisco Charter, in the form of the treaty which it is our privilege as the representatives of a free people to ratify today, points the way to civilization. Through the processes of its General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, and World Court, rules of reason and just decision can be made to prevail over the primitive weapons of economic exploitation, suppression of weaker peoples, military might, and periodic resort to war.

I feel that the time has come for the Senate to take final action on this proposal. We now have before us Senate bill 1580, which provides for the appointment of the representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations Organization, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in such an organization. It would seem clear that Senate Resolution 160, with some modifications, calling for adherence of this Nation to the cumpulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, is particularly germane to any discussion of Senate bill 1580. I know that many other Senators share my view of this matter, hence I propose to offer today a revision of Senate Resolution 160. I sincerely hope that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will permit the resolution, in its revised form, to be voted upon in connection with the consideration of Senate bill 1580.

I wish to make perfectly clear, Mr. President, that I do not offer the resolution as an amendment to the bill now pending before the Senate, but I assert that in my judgment we should not pass Senate bill 1580 unless we are now ready to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

This resolution is now a bipartisan sponsored resolution. I am pleased to announce that joining me in sponsoring the resolution are the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. Many other Senators on both sides of the aisle have told me in conversation that they agree with the principles of the resolution, and hope that at an early date it will be definitely submitted to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations for final debate and vote.

On November 23, 1945, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] made what I think is one of the great speeches of this session of the Congress in regard to the international obligations of this country. In the course of his remarks he said this concerning the World Court:

Procedure for the Court is already provided. Nations could speed the day of judicial determination by quickly providing for adherence to the Court and giving it compulsory jurisdiction, which I believe is absolutely required. The machinery for such is already set up. It needs only to be put into motion.

The senior Senator from New Mexico is out of the city, and it was impossible for me to reach him in connection with our new resolution, but I feel that he indicated at least by his speech that he recognizes the importance of an early determination of this issue by the Senate and an early acceptance on the part of the United States of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

The revised resolution (S. 160) is as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the deposit by the President of the United States with the Secretary General of the United Nations, whenever that official shall have been installed in office, of a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice recognizing as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning:

(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

(b) any question of international law;

(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Provided, That such declaration should not apply to—

(a) disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; or

(b) disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Provided further, That such declaration should remain in force for a period of 5 years and thereafter until the expiration of 6 months after notice may be given to terminate the declaration.

Thus in accordance with the provisions of the resolution after such action has been taken by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting, then it will be entirely up to the President to submit to the Secretary of the United Nations Organization a declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. His declaration must contain the terms and conditions as set forth in the resolution passed by the Senate. Thereafter we would be bound by the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in all cases involving justiciable issues following within the terms and conditions of the declaration filed by the President as approved by the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. It relates to a two-thirds vote in the Senate. Is it the opinion of the Senator that this resolution is specially provided for in the Charter somewhere? I do not myself find in it the requirement of a two-thirds vote in any way, or even the requirement which we find elsewhere with respect to conforming to constitutional processes.

Mr. MORSE. It is not specifically required in the Charter, but in my judgment it would be required by the Constitution of the United States, because I think it has treaty status, and I think that the acceptance of the jurisdiction of the World Court would have to comply with the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, although I know that there are international lawyers who certainly do not share that view.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask a further question? Does the Senator expect that if the Senate should, by a two-thirds vote, agree to his resolution that there would have to be something further done in order to conform to section 2 of article 36 of the Charter, which provides "The states parties to the present statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory," and so forth? Could the Senate, by its action alone, conform to that or would it be necessary that in addition to the resolution there

would have to be action by the Chief Executive?

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, the President would have to file with the Secretary of the United Nations Organization a declaration that we accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I should now like for the record to make a very brief statement as to the history of the resolution I have just now offered. Following the submission of Senate Resolution 160 a considerable number of international lawyers in this country became very much interested in the resolution. Among them was one of the great scholars of international law of this country and one of the judges of the Permanent Court of International Justice. I refer to Prof. Manley O. Hudson, of the Harvard Law School. I met with Judge Hudson and we worked over Senate Resolution 160. Senators will note that the changes in the resolution which we have just submitted are minor when compared with Resolution 160 submitted on July 28, but nevertheless, Mr. President, I think I ought to comment on the changes which have been made.

By way of introduction to those comments I should like to repeat that the statute of the International Court of Justice, annexed to the Charter of the United Nations, retains in article 36 referred to by the distinguished Senator from Vermont the optional provision with reference to jurisdiction over legal disputes which was previously contained in old article 36 of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

At one time or another, Mr. President, 45 of the 51 states which became parties to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice made declarations similar to the one I have just submitted, recognizing the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court over legal disputes. Some of the declarations were made for limited periods of time, and some of them excluded various types of disputes. The jurisdiction recognized in certain of these declarations was invoked in 11 cases before the Court, and it was exercised by the Court in two cases, which shows very clearly that the nations did not require any urging on the part of the Court in the great bulk of cases that came before the Court, to live up to jurisdictional obligations under this section.

The declarations made under the old statute by 28 States are still in force. Article 36 of the new statute provides in paragraph 5:

> Declarations made under article 36 of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties the present statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period for which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

In consequence of this provision 21 declarations—those of the Argentine Republic, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Great Britain, Haiti, India, Iran, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, El Salvador, South Africa, and Uruguay.

That is, in consequence of these provisions 21 declarations will be continued in force and will apply to the jurisdiction of the new Court. Without further action, however, the declarations of 7 States, those of Bulgaria, Finland, Ireland, Portugal, Siam, Sweden, and Switzerland will not apply to the jurisdiction of the new Court.

Article 37 of the new statute provides:

> Whenever a treaty or convention in force provides for reference of a matter to a tribunal to have been instituted by the League of Nations, or to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the matter shall, as between the parties to the present statute, be referred to the International Court of Justice.

In consequence of this provision the new Court will have the jurisdiction previously conferred on the old Court by a large number of international instruments.

It is interesting, Mr. President, that the United States is party to only one such instrument, namely, the constitution of the International Labor Organization. The effect of article 37 of that constitution will be to confer on the new Court jurisdiction over "any question or dispute relating to the interpretation" of that ILO constitution or of any labor convention concluded under it. Articles 30 and 32 of that constitution will also confer jurisdiction on the new Court. That is, to that limited degree, Mr. President, we have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court because of the agreement we have entered into in regard to the ILO. If that particular agreement, Mr. President, is sound in principle, then I submit we ought to recognize its soundness in connection with all types of justiciable disputes arising under the San Francisco Charter.

At San Francisco a majority of the delegations wished to require that all parties to the new statute confer on the new Court jurisdiction over legal disputes. The Conference did not take that step, but when it decided to leave the matter to the option of each State, it also adopted a recommendation to the members of the organization that as soon as possible they make declarations recognizing the obligatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice according to the provisions of article 36 of the new statute.

Mr. President, I do not feel that that action on the part of the Conference was just a mere empty gesture. I think that action requires further action on the part of the United States in keeping with the objectives of the recommendation adopted by the San Francisco Conference. What was that recommendation? That as soon as possible all nations make declarations recognizing the obligatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice according to the provisions of article 36 of the new statute. I cannot say, Mr. President, that every delegate there voted for that recommendation, but the record shows that no dissenting vote was filed. That is, those who did vote all voted for the recommendation. Therefore, I feel that we as a nation are bound by that recommendation—not legally, but again morally.

As soon as possible, the recommendation says, we should make declarations recognizing the obligatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Surely it is possible to do so now. Surely, after having had ample time to consider the provisions of the San Francisco Charter, the Senate ought now to be ready to commit itself on the question whether we wish to carry out the recommendation of the Conference. I think now is the time, before the General Assembly meets in London in January. I think we ought to put our American representative in a position where no small nation, or any nation, can embarrass him to any degree by pointing out that we remain one of the very few nations not accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Such action by States would be in line with the announced purpose of the United Nations "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

If a declaration by the United States accepting the Court's jurisdiction can be effected at the first meeting of the General Assembly it may serve to inaugurate a general movement which would greatly enhance the existing jurisdiction of the new Court and thereby increase its importance. The resolution submitted today after a thorough study of the 45 declarations made in the past by other nations, and after extensive consultations with authorities in the field of international law, would authorize the President to proceed in a constitutional manner to make a declaration on behalf of the United States recognizing as compulsory ipso facto the jurisdiction of the Court over legal disputes to which the United States may be a party.

The term "compulsory" does not refer to enforcement of judgment. It merely means that the Court may be seized of a case on the application of one party to the dispute. Even without such a declaration the Government of the United States may conclude special agreements with other States providing that particular disputes shall be submitted to the Court. We have done that in many cases. Many of our arbitration tribunals involve the carrying out of a similar principle. Mr. Green H. Hackworth's memorandum of July 23, 1945—published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27, 1945, volume 91, page 8109—explains the details of such procedure. With such a declaration, however, as those of us associated in this resolution proposes today, the United States will be in a more favorable position, in that it may go to the Court against any other nation which has made a similar declaration without the necessity of negotiating a special agreement for the settlement of a particular dispute. On the other hand, the declaration would permit the United States to be sued in the Court by any other state which had made a similar declaration without a special agreement.

I cannot believe, Mr. President, that any of the hesitancy on the part of this Government to accept the jurisdiction of

the World Court on a compulsory basis grows out of an unwillingness on our part to be sued under the jurisdiction of the Court if some other nation believes that ground for suit exists. If we make such a declaration, it will be in line with the traditional policy of the United States of favoring the settlement of disputes according to international law, as manifested in numerous arbitration treaties.

Now that the United States has ratified the Court statute, this is clearly the next step to be taken "to keep faith with the spirit and intent of the San Francisco Charter." The first paragraph of the proposed declaration follows closely the text of article 36 of the statute. It would limit the acceptance of jurisdiction to justiciable disputes. The characterization of the disputes to which the declaration would apply, in subparagraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) is the classification in article 36, as drafted in 1920. A similar classification was inserted in article 1 of the 1929 Inter-American Arbitration Treaty, to which the United States is a party.

The declaration would limit the jurisdiction recognized to disputes "hereafter arising." I pause to stress the importance of that point. I understand that there are some who are fearful that the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court would result in our being faced with litigation arising years prior to our acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. We have specifically provided in the resolution that the jurisdiction shall be limited to disputes hereafter arising. This would not prevent reference to the Court of a dispute which had already arisen, but such reference would have to be effected by a special agreement. A similar limitation was made by many states in their declarations in the past. Some states have also limited their acceptance of jurisdiction to disputes arising with regard to "situations or facts" of a subsequent date.

This formula would be difficult to apply, and in our judgment should not be encouraged. It is not a formula contained in the majority of the declarations of nations which have already accepted the jurisdiction of the Court.

The first proviso in the declaration would exclude disputes of two classes from the jurisdiction conferred on the Court by the declaration: First, disputes which the parties may refer to other tribundals by virtue of applicable agreements existing or future. In other words, the nations are perfectly free to continue to submit to other tribunals, such as an arbitration tribunal set up under an existing arbitration agreement, any disputes they may wish to submit. Such disputes will not be submitted to the World Court. Likewise, a nation is perfectly free under this proviso in the resolution to enter into any future agreement providing for any other tribunal for the settlement of any specific disputes, and under this declaration such disputes would not go to the World Court. This exclusion is in line with the provision in article 95 of the Charter, that—

> Nothing in the present Charter shall prevent members of the United Nations from entrusting the solution of their differences to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future.

Further, the proviso is made in the resolution that disputes concerning matters within our domestic jurisdiction shall not go to the World Court. This exclusion is in line with the provision of article 2, section 7, of the Charter, that—

> Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter.

In my judgment these exclusions would be operative not only in cases in which the United States might be a respondent, but also in cases in which it might be a complainant. A declaration would have effect only between declarant states "accepting the same obligation." Hence an exclusion in a declaration would inure to the advantage of a respondent in a case brought by the United States. I do not believe that that point can be too strongly stressed. I am aware of the fact that there are some who seem to be fearful about having our disputes brought before a tribunal with so-called compulsory jurisdiction; but let us keep constantly in mind, as the debate on my resolution opens subsequently, that we are not bound in any case to adjudicate with any nation which has not likewise bound itself to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

The second proviso in the proposed declaration would limit its duration to "a period of 5 years, and thereafter until the expiration of 6 months after notice may be given to terminate the declaration." I do not wish anyone to have any misunderstanding about that proviso. It is not a proviso which calls for an automatic ending of the declaration as of a certain date. There are some declarations—a minority of them—which were filed with the old Permanent Court of International Justice which fixed definite dates for expiration after 5 years, 7 years, or 10 years. However, the majority of them carry out the principle of this proviso clause of our declaration, namely, that the duration of jurisdiction shall be for a period of 5 years, and thereafter until the expiration of 6 months after notice may be given to terminate the declaration.

Let us see the practical importance of that provision. Suppose we are about to be sued after the 5 years, and we then and there wish immediately to get out from under the jurisdiction of the court because, let us say, we think we have a pretty weak case and we are rather fearful that a decision may go against us. Under that proviso we would be bound to continue under the jurisdiction of the court for 6 months after giving notice. In other words, the Court would have jurisdiction to proceed with the trial of the case. I think it is perfectly obvious that that is a very fair proviso, which ought to be incorporated within the declaration if we are really to carry out the true spirit and and intent of such a declaration. At any time after 5 years the United States could therefore discontinue its recognition of the Court's jurisdiction over legal disputes by giving 6 months' notice. Declarations made in the past by Great Britain and several other states were "for a period of 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice might be given to terminate the acceptance." Under this formula notice of termination could be given whenever the state thought it likely that its dispute would be taken to the Court by the other party. The formula suggested in our resolution seems, in our judgment, more in consonance with the aims and objectives which are sought.

I believe it is important to consider at least briefly some of the historical background of article 36, but before doing so I invite attention to the fact that the principles of Senate Resolution 160, predecessor to the resolution submitted this afternoon, have received great support, not only from international lawyers in this country, but from lawyers generally throughout the country.

I should like to point out to the Senate that for four issues in a row, beginning with the August issue—in other words, in the issues for August, September, October, and November—the American Bar Association Journal has carried editorials urging the Senate of the United States to adopt Senate Resolution 160 or such modifications of the resolution as we have provided in the resolution submitted today. I do not wish to take time to read all those editorials or to read excerpts from all of them into the RECORD, but I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD certain excerpts from the editorials which I think all Members of the Senate should have before them when they consider the merits of the resolution which we have submitted today.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Bar Association Journal of August 1945]

Friends of international adjudication have abundant reason for satisfaction in the outcome as to the International Court of Justice. The statute annexed to the Charter is expressly stated to be "based upon the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice" (Charter, art. 92). Declarations under the latter statute are to be treated as declarations under the new statute (art. 36, par. 4), and all references to the Permanent Court of International Justice, in treaties, multipartite agreements, etc., are to be deemed to be references to the International Court of Justice. Practically all of the provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, which were criticized by American lawyers as likely to impair the functioning of the Court, are in satisfactory verbiage in the final draft. It would be difficult to point to any provision of the Charter of the statute which is regrettable, so far as the Court is concerned, except the failure to take advanced ground as to universality of jurisdiction.

* * * * *

Ratification of the Charter and the setting up of the structure provided for therein will not accomplish the objectives or end the tasks in which American and Canadian lawyers have worked unceasingly. The authority to be given to the American representative in the Security Council will be an imminent

problem. The territorial coverage of the agreements for the availability and use of American armed forces under the mandate of the Security Council will be another. More particularly within the province of lawyers will be the scope and the promptness of the declaration to be filed by the United States under article 36 of the statute, accepting the jurisdiction of the Court as to enumerated types of legal disputes. Above all, the maintenance of the militancy of American public opinion in support of the Charter, the organization, and its work, and the discussion of desirable amendments and improvements in the light of experience, will be continuing tasks for lawyers.

[From the American Bar Association Journal of September 1945]

THE MORSE RESOLUTION

"The hour is historic, the obligation sacred, the challenge great." In this spirit, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, took a most useful initiative in the Senate on July 28. The resolution which he introduced (S. Res. 160) would recommend that the President proceed to make a declaration under article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice, accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court over legal disputes. The resolution is in line with our professed aims. It is, indeed, a way "to keep faith with the spirit and intent of the San Francisco Charter." It unfurls for us a banner.

Judge Hudson gives the background and the setting of the proposal in this number of the Journal. A few of his points may be underscored.

Twenty years ago, when it was proposed that the United States support the Permanent Court of International Justice by becoming a party to its statute, no one in official position was adventurous enough to suggest that we accept its compulsory jurisdiction. All then contemplated was that we should give our moral support to the court, and undertake to meet a part of its expenses. Even that failed to muster a two-thirds vote in the Senate in 1935.

Today we have moved on. We are no longer imprisoned by fears about a general international organization. The United States will be a charter member of the United Nations. A global war now leads us to put peace first in our foreign policy. Yet we want it to be a peace with justice. We shall have an adequate court. We wish to see it used. We wish to make it a bulwark of peace.

The Senate debate was on a high level. Yet so many questions were involved in the Charter that some of them, including those relating to the Court, were little explored. The mists which excited such fulminations in 1935 had melted away, and the statute of the Court was consented to with hardly more than passing references. Only Senator MORSE spoke on it at any length.

* * * * *

There were doubtless good reasons for the President not suggesting to the Senate at this time that the United States accept the Court's jurisdiction as obligatory. * * *

Faced with our present responsibilities, it is not enough for us to utter platitudes. We have passed beyond the stage of generalities. We cannot be content to point with pride. Let us declare a holiday on inaction. Let us get on with the organization of the world. Peace with justice according to international law is our goal. The Morse resolution is in that direction.

[From the American Bar Association Journal of October 1945]

Ratification of the Charter brings also into effect the Statute of the Court (31 A.B.A.J. 400–406), but the Court does not come into being until its members have been nominated and elected. This will require many months, after the business meeting of the Assembly. Meanwhile, the old Court and its statute remain in existence, until the adherence of the parties to it is in some manner withdrawn. The present Court is not likely to function extensively during the gap.

Perhaps naturally, a good deal of the uncertainty as to the intentions of the United States arises from the failure of the President and the Senate to accomplish an acceptance of the obligatory jurisdiction of the Court, at the time of American ratification of the Charter. The United States and the Soviet Union are still laggard, as to a declaration under article 36 of the statute. Unfortunately, the matter has not been placed high on the program for the action of the Senate or the Congress, which are now reconvened after recess.

Bold leadership by President Truman and prompt action by the Senate, in behalf of the Morse resolution or some similar declaration, would tend to remove grounds for suspicion that this country is content to leave justiciable matters within the domain of diplomatic negotiation and discretion, in the hands of the Council of Ministers and later in the Security Council.

We urge that all members of the American Bar Association, as well as other citizens interested in international justice according to law, should do immediately all they can to support and bring about the earliest possible passage of the Morse resolution, or some like declaration, by the Senate of the United States. The votes and attitude of your Senators may be decisive any day.

[From the American Bar Association Journal of November 1945]

PASS THE MORSE RESOLUTION NOW

Unless the Senate of the United States adopts promptly the Morse resolution (S. Res. 160), or some equivalent, this country will soon be in a position which seems to us anomalous, as to the United Nations and the International Court of Justice.

The Charter of the United Nations has been ratified by more than the required number of States and has become effective through the deposit of sufficient ratifications with the National Archives Commission in Washington. Meanwhile, as a member represented in the Preparatory Commission, the United States is taking part in the steps to bring into effective being the International Court of Justice. Nominations have been called for and are in progress. Early in January the votes of the United States will doubtless be cast in favor of nominees for membership in the Court, the judges of which will be elected jointly by the General Assembly and the Security Council, in each of which the United States will be represented.

Nevertheless, the United States has filed no declaration, under article 36 of the statute of the Court, to submit itself to the obligatory jurisdiction of that tribunal. The United States and the Soviet Union will soon be virtually alone, among the United Nations, in taking part in establishing the Court and electing its judges, without having submitted themselves to the jurisdiction of the Court.

As in 1921 and ever since the United States, whose lawyers have ever been in the forefront in the advocacy of international adjudication, is dilatory and holds aloof from accepting the jurisdiction of the World Court over legal disputes between nations. This country never filed a declaration submitting itself to the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice under its statute. It remains to be seen if a similar course of delay will take place as to the International Court of Justice.

Reports have indicated that the permanent seat of the United Nations may be in the United States, and that the secretary-general of the new organization may be a citizen of the United States. Our ratification of the Charter was prompt and by a decisive vote. American public opinion strongly supports the Charter and the Court.

A bewildered, anxious world needs mightily the earliest possible establishment and functioning of the impartial, law-governed Court, with full authority as to all member nations. As Senator MORSE said: "The hour is historic, the obligation sacred, the challenge great." Americans will have only themselves to blame if the new international organization bogs down because their own country fails to meet the acid test of prompt adherence to one of the basic institutions of the United Nations. It remains to be seen how long this country will continue to take part in the setting up of the Court and the selection of the judges, without itself accepting the basic jurisdiction of the Court.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is a remarkable thing that not only the editors of the American Bar Association Journal but the American Bar Association itself, acting through its appropriate committees, from time to time has manifested its support of the principle of compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. I also should like to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the October issue of the American Journal of International Law, by Dr. Philip C. Jessup, one of our great American authors and scholars on international law. He has this to say about Senate Resolution 160:

During the Senate debates on the Charter, there was notably little discussion of the Court and its statute. This is a happy indication of the progress which the United States has made in the direction of international cooperation. The past debates on the Permanent Court of International Justice were filled with discussions of its relation to the League of Nations and that relationship was largely responsible for the nonparticipation of the United States; with membership in the United Nations, acceptance of the International Court of Justice is properly taken for granted. On July 28 Senator MORSE introduced Senate Resolution 160, whereunder the Senate would recommend to the President that he deposit a declaration under article 36, on behalf of the United States.

* * * * *

The initiative may now be taken by the President or by the Senate acting on Senate Resolution 160, the passage of which would amount to advice and consent given in advance. Action should be taken soon after Congress reconvenes. As the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations noted, ratification of the Charter included acceptance of an obligation to settle our international disputes by peaceful means; for legal disputes, what more appropriate means than submission to the Court? The experience of 51 states, including such great powers as Great Britain and France, which made declarations under article 36 of the old statute, demonstrates that this is no dangerous venture.

Then he goes on, Mr. President, to explain the very successful experience which this country has had in connection with its separate treaties to arbitrate disputes and to submit them, in essence, to judicial determination; and he makes what I consider to be a very well-reasoned plea for Senate approval of Senate Resolution 160. I ask unanimous consent that the entire excerpt may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCEPTANCE BY THE UNITED STATES OF THE OPTIONAL CLAUSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

"Unless we are prepared to take all steps which are necessary to effectuate our membership in the United Nations," the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations declared in its favorable report on the Charter of the United Nations,[1] "we would be merely deceiving the hopes of the United States and of humanity in ratifying the Charter." This sound exhortation concludes the committee's pregnant comment that the establishment of the United Nations is a beginning and not an end and that "to the extent to which we do participate actively in this Organization, we will by that very process be overcoming the imperfections in the Charter." One of the early and vigorous criticisms of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals was their lack of emphasis upon law and justice; Senator VANDENBERG was among the most effective critics of this defect. The Charter as elaborated at San Francisco went far toward meeting these criticisms. One important step which was not taken in drafting the Charter was to confer upon the International Court of Justice what has come to be known as compulsory jurisdiction. The optional clause found in article 36 of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice was retained. The United States, having accepted the statute of the new Court as an integral part of the Charter, has now the opportunity to strengthen the judicial arm of the United Nations by exercising its option in favor of the automatic submission of those types of legal disputes which are listed in article 36.

The history of article 36 of the old statute is generally familiar and may be briefly summarized. The Committee of Jurists which framed the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice in 1920 proposed that the Court should have compulsory jurisdiction in stated categories of legal disputes. Elihu Root, the American member of the Committee, strongly advocated this proposal. The Council and Assembly of the League of Nations, to which the report of the Committee of Jurists was submitted, were not ready to take that step at that time. On the suggestion of a Brazilian jurist, however, the "optional clause" was inserted in article 36 of the statute. This provision left it optional with states to declare at any time their acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction. Before the outbreak of World War II, 51 states had voluntarily made such declarations. It became the established practice for states to include reservations in such declarations, the most usual being those which limited the effect of the declaration to a stated number of years or which limited the applicability of the declaration on the basis of reciprocity.[2] The Court was also given "compulsory jurisdiction" by numerous special treaties, such as those dealing with the mandates and minorities, and, more generally, for the purpose of deciding on the correct interpretation of any disputed provision of a treaty which included a clause to this effect. Only the general jurisdiction under declarations made in accordance with article 36 is considered here.

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals did not contain any direct specification on this point, although paragraph 6 of section A of chapter VIII was interpreted by some to imply that the Court would have compulsory jurisdiction of "justiciable disputes."[3]

The drafting of the statute of the new International Court of Justice was entrusted to a United Nations Committee of Jurists which met in Washington from April 9 through April 20, 1945, 44 states being represented. The Committee of Jurists throughout all its deliberations bore in mind its essential character as a group of experts whose conclusions were to be submitted to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. The point was frequently made that political questions must wait to be settled at that conference. The compulsory jurisdiction of the Court was the subject of intense discussion. In the first debate on this question at the sixth meeting of the committee on April 12, impressive statements in favor of including a provision for the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court were made by representatives from Brazil, China, Turkey, and Czechoslovakia, supported by a majority of the members of the committee, but some of the speakers expressly reserved final decision to their delegations at San Francisco. On the other hand the representative from the United Kingdom, while calling attention to the fact that his country had accepted the optional clause of the old statute, made the important observation that the new statute was to be an integral part of the Charter rather than a separate instrument as was the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice with reference to the covenant of the league. Accordingly he thought it would be appropriate, if the principle of compulsory jurisdiction were acceptable to all the states, to include such a provision in the Charter rather than in the statute. The representative from the Soviet Union noted that the inclusion of a provision for compulsory jurisdiction in the statute might defeat its purpose which was to broaden the competence of the Court, since more states might be induced to accept such jurisdiction on an optional basis than if an attempt were made to compel its acceptance through ratification of the Charter, embodying the statute. Representatives from France, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, and Haiti were among those who favored the retention of the optional clause, at least until the basic political issue was settled at San Francisco. The debate continued at the seventh meeting of the committee on the following day. At this session the representative from the United States strongly urged that the wisest course was to retain the optional clause in the draft statute which the committee was to submit to the Conference.

The outcome of the discussion was that two subcommittees were appointed, one of which prepared a draft based on the optional clause model of article 36 of the old statute, and the other a draft under which the acceptance of the statute would include the automatic acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the court in the familiar categories of legal disputes. In the discussion of the reports of the two subcommittees, at the tenth meeting, on April 16, considerable attention was devoted to the question of including various reservations in declarations made optionally under article 36, but this question was deferred to the San Francisco Conference. The report of Professor Basdevant, rapporteur of the Committee of Jurists, includes this statement of the result of the committee debates:[4]

"It does not seem doubtful that the majority of the committee was in favor of compulsory jurisdiction, but it has been noted that, in spite of this predominant sentiment, it did not seem certain, nor even probable, that all the nations whose participation in the proposed international organization appears to be necessary, were now in a position to accept the rule of compulsory jurisdiction, and that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals did not seem to affirm it; some, while retaining their preference in this respect, thought that the counsel of prudence was not to go beyond the procedure of the optional clause inserted in article 36, which has opened the way to the progressive adoption, in less than 10 years, of compulsory jurisdiction by many states which in 1920 refused to subscribe to it. Placed on this basis, the problem was found to assume a political character, and the committee thought that it should defer it to the San Francisco Conference."

At San Francisco there was no important change in the alinement. The majority of the members of committee I of commission IV, which dealt with the Court, favored the inclusion of compulsory jurisdiction. It was clear that the Soviet Government was not prepared to accept the Court at all if the compulsory feature was included. The position of the United States, while not so flatly stated, was to the effect that the optional clause was strongly preferred.[4a] In the minds of many delegates the issue seemed to resolve itself into this simple question: Is it better to have a Court without compulsory jurisdiction which will be accepted by the Soviet Union and the United States, or a Court with compulsory jurisdiction but without the two principal states of the world? There could be only one answer, no matter how reluctantly given, to the question posed in this form.[4b] This was the more true in view of the fact that the statute is part of the Charter, and the inacceptability of the statute might result in the rejection of the Charter itself, thus preventing the United Nations from coming into existence. Under the circumstances the decision was wise. It does leave an imperfection in the Charter, but, to borrow the words of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, it is an imperfection which can be overcome by a form of active participation in the Organization, namely, a declaration under article 36. Committee IV/1 adopted a resolution urging all states to make such declarations.

The chief debates on article 36 took place in the fourteenth and seventeenth meetings

[1] Ex. Rept. No. 8, 79th Cong., 1st sess.

[2] For an analysis of the forms of declarations see Hudson, ——.

[3] The paragraph reads in part: "Justiciable disputes should normally be referred to the International Court of Justice."

[4] Report on draft of statute of an international court of justice referred to in chapter VII of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals (Prof. Jules Basdevant, rapporteur) submitted by the United Nations Committee of Jurists to the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco (San Francisco, April 25, 1945, Document Jurist 86, G/73, April 25, 1945, being a revision of Doc. 61 issued in Washington on April 20, Conf. Doc. 857 (English) IV/1/70, June 8, 1945, p. 18.

[4a] There is no doubt that the committee in general shared the understanding expressed by the United Kingdom delegate on May 28, when he said: "Two countries, whose cooperation is essential, are not ready to accept compulsory jurisdiction." (Conf. Doc. 661 (English), IV/1/50, May 29, 1945, p. 4.)

[4b] The final vote, on June 1, was 31 to 14 in favor of the text including the optional clause. The following voted in the affirmative: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, France, Honduras, India, Iraq, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Philippine Commonwealth, Saudi Arabia, Syria, South Africa, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, of whom Australia, China, New Zealand, and Turkey stated that they voted in favor "only to prevent a stalemate." The following voted in the negative: Bolivia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Iran, Liberia, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Uruguay. (See Conf. Doc. 759 (English), IV/1/59, June 2, 1945, p. 6, as corrected in Doc. 796 (English), IV/1/59 (1), June 5, 1945.)

of Committee IV/1 and in its Subcommittee D.[5] There is no need to repeat the arguments made, but certain suggestions merit attention. There was further discussion of the question of permissible reservations to declarations made under article 36, and the form used in the general act of 1928 was suggested as a model to be followed.[6] The reservation which many delegates evidently had in mind was one which would limit the obligation of automatic reference to the Court to disputes arising after the declaration was made, thus excluding old controversies which the parties had hitherto been unwilling to submit to arbitration or judicial settlement. The delegates of New Zealand and Canada made the sound point that the word "compulsory" is misleading and should not be continued in use. If declarations are made under the optional clause, and one of the states which has made such a declaration submits a case involving another such state to the Court, the Court has jurisdiction. The word "compulsory" has no more pertinence to the functioning of the international tribunal than it has in the normal judicial processes of national courts. The Canadian delegate also called attention to the inappropriateness of the Latin term "ipso facto" in paragraph 2 of article 36 as an equivalent of the French expression "de plein droit." Unfortunately neither of these suggestions for change in phraseology was adopted.

The text of article 36 as finally adopted in the statute of the International Court of Justice is as follows:

1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

2. The states parties to the present statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

(b) any question of international law;

(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.

4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

5. Declarations made under article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.[7]

6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

During the Senate debates on the Charter, there was notably little discussion of the Court and its statute. This is a happy indication of the progress which the United States as made in the direction of international cooperation. The past debates on the Permanent Court of International Justice were filled with discussions of its relation to the League of Nations and that relationship was largely responsible for the nonparticipation of the United States; with membership in the United Nations, acceptance of the International Court of Justice is properly taken for granted. On July 28 Senator MORSE introduced Senate Resolution 160 whereunder the Senate would recommend to the President that he deposit a declaration under article 36 on behalf of the United States. In the course of the hearings, Senator VANDENBERG had asked Mr. Hackworth, legal adviser of the Department of State, how such a declaration should be made. Mr. Hackworth stated[8]: "If the Executive should initiate action to accept compulsory jurisdiction of the Court under the optional clause contained in article 36 of the statute, such procedure as might be authorized by the Congress would be followed, and if no specific procedure were prescribed by statute, the proposal would be submitted to the Senate with request for its advice and consent to the filing of the necessary declaration with the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

The initiative may now be taken by the President or by the Senate acting on Senate Resolution 160, the passage of which would amount to advice and consent given in advance. Action should be taken soon after Congress reconvenes. As the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations noted, ratification of the Charter included acceptance of an obligation to settle our international disputes by peaceful means; for legal disputes, what more appropriate means than submission to the court? The experience of 51 states including such great powers as Great Britain and France, which made declarations under article 36 of the old Statute, demonstrates that this is no dangerous venture. A joint report of the Canadian and American Bar Associations in April 1945 advocated giving the Court compulsory jurisdiction. It is notable that, throughout the discussions in the Committee of Jurists in Washington and in the committee sessions in San Francisco, no dissatisfaction with the work of the Permanent Court of International Justice was expressed. There is every reason to suppose that the new Court will be equally satisfactory if not superior in view of the more nearly universal auspices under which it will function. The submission of any legal disputes which may hereafter arise between the United States and other nations would be in accord with our traditional advocacy of judicial settlement and the reign of law among nations.[9] A declaration by the United States under article 36 of the Statute would do much to strengthen the new Court at the outset and thereby to strengthen the United Nations organizations as a whole. Like all litigants in court the United States would undoubtedly lose some cases as it would win others. We have not suffered in the past from such adverse decisions as those of the arbitral tribunals which rejected our contentions in the great controversies involving the seals of Behring Sea and the North Atlantic coast fisheries, and the world has gained through the example set by the peaceful adjustments. Scientific ingenuity has reenforced the conclusion that it would be better to strengthen the peaceful processes of the United Nations and lose a lawsuit, than to weaken the organization and win a war.

PHILIP C. JESSUP.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the August 1945 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, at page 387, Judge Manley O. Hudson expresses himself at some length in support of Senate Resolution 160. I can assure the Senate that Judge Hudson is wholeheartedly in support of the resolution introduced this afternoon. I wish to read just an excerpt or two from his article in the August issue of the American Bar Association Journal, because I think it is important for us to have these facts in mind as we consider the resolution. Judge Hudson wrote as follows:

With the new statute before them, North American lawyers will doubtless take satisfaction in the vista which it opens for the international administration of justice in the future. A new stage is now set for the movement which has persisted for more than a century. After the passage of 25 years, the new statute streamlines the old. For the most part, the gains of the past generation have been preserved. The new Court will take up where the old Court leaves off, the continuity being amply safeguarded. Some improvements have been made, some dead limbs have been cut away, some clarification has been attained. What is vastly more important, however, is that the way has been opened for all of the leading states of our time to lend their support to the Court. The hesitance of the United States of America is a thing of the past.

The immediate program before us is clear.

Then referring specifically to what he considers to be our duties as a Senate in connection with the compulsory jurisdiction clause, he said:

We can insist that the compulsory jurisdiction of the new Court be extended. Canada accepted such jurisdiction in 1929, and its acceptance, still in force, will now apply to the new Court. The United States has yet to take a first move in this direction.

Subsequently, he said:

These are the principal tasks before us in the immediate future. After their accomplishment, there will remain the tasks of seeing that the new Court is used when occasion arises, of keeping close watch on its development of the judicial process, and of zealously protecting its authority. In the first instance, these tasks will be for the statesmen who are charged with the conduct of international affairs. Clearly, however, they will also be the responsibility of men at the bar who are devoting their lives to the nurture of justice, and North American lawyers will doubtless continue to insist that peace must be buttressed by the efficient administration of international justice according to international law.

Writing in the September issue of the same journal, this great American World Court judge and international law scholar, stated, on page 443, the following:

What, then, will the new Court have to do? To adjudicate, it must have jurisdiction. Of

---

[5] Conf. Docs. 661 and 759, as cited.

[6] Report of subcommittee D of committee IV/1, Conf. Doc. 702, IV/1/55, May 31, 1945, particularly the important interpretation of the old practice of adding reservations to declarations which the subcommittee considered "as being henceforth established" as the proper interpretation of paragraph 3 of article 36. See also the excellent Report of the Rapporteur (Nasrat Al-Farsy, Iraq) of committee IV/1, Conf. Doc. 913 (English) IV/1/74 (1), June 12, 1945, p. 11.

[7] This important provision was inserted as part of the attempt to avoid breaking the "chain of continuity with the past"; see Charter of the United Nations, Report to the President on the Results of the San Francisco Conference, by the chairman of the United States delegation, the Secretary of State, June 26, 1945, Department of State Publication 2349, page 140. It was estimated at the Conference that about 20 such declarations would become immediately applicable to the new Court, others having lapsed or having been made by states not original parties to the new statute.

[8] 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD p. 8107.

[9] See in general an article by Judge Manley O. Hudson to be published in the American Bar Association Journal for September, 1945.

course, states can agree at the time to carry their disputes before it, yet it is highly important that they should agree in advance.

Fortunately, the new Court will be invested with some of the old Court's jurisdiction in advance. So far as members of the United Nations are concerned, international treaties and conventions expressly conferring jurisdiction on the Permanent Court will in future be deemed to confer the same jurisdiction on the International Court.

* * * * *

In the past many American and Canadian lawyers have advocated the inclusion in the Court's statute of a provision conferring a general obligatory jurisdiction over legal disputes. This course was suggested by the Committee of Jurists which drafted the statute of the permanent Court in 1920, but it was so stoutly opposed by some states that it was necessary to stop short of creating a general obligation for the states parties to submit to the jurisdiction. There was included, however, an optional provision under which states desiring to do so could, as among themselves, invest the Court with jurisdiction over defined classes of legal disputes.

I digress from reading the article by Judge Hudson just long enough to point out, Mr. President, that the optional clause roots from the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice which was agreed upon in 1920. In order to understand the problem which is before us today, we need to know a great deal about the history which produced the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice of 1920. There were various nations, including our own, which were hesitant about giving to the League of Nations all of the powers which its charter sought to grant to it. In those days many nations were hesitant about submitting disputes to a world court. We refused at that time to be a party to the World Court statute; and the debate on whether we would even submit, on an optional basis, American disputes to the World Court, continued to be waged in this great Chamber from 1920 up to the final determination in 1935, when the Senate refused to accept even optional jurisdiction of the Court.

But, Mr. President, times have changed, as Judge Hudson points out in his article; and I think that now we should accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in order to give that Court the type of strength which I think it is going to need when it proceeds to start its functioning under the United Nations Charter some 60 days hence.

Now, returning to Judge Hudson's discussion of the jurisdiction issue, he writes:

This history engendered hopes that after the lapse of 25 years further progress might be achieved. Both in the Committee of Jurists at Washington and in the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, a majority of the delegations insisted that the jurisdiction be made obligatory for all of the parties to the statute. This was not only the position taken by most of the smaller states; it also had the support in principle of some of the great states which have in the past made declarations accepting the Permanent Court's jurisdiction. Yet the step could have been taken only if all states agreed, and some delegations, including that of the United States, foresaw difficulties which led them to hesitate. It was, therefore, impossible to go beyond the existing situation, and the new statute merely continues in article 36, with slight modification, the optional provision in the old statute. The San Francisco Conference expressed the hope, however, that states would proceed promptly to make declarations with reference to the obligatory jurisdiction of the new Court.

Mr. President, I have already expressed myself with reference to our obligations to carry out that recommendation of the Conference now.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks one other excerpt from the Hudson article as published in the September issue of the American Bar Journal.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If our position be compared with that of a number of other states, it hardly entitles us to claim the leadership. We have, in fact, fallen behind. For more than 40 years we have been stymied by the Senate tradition which requires that our obligation with reference to the arbitration of disputes be subject to the requirement for each particular case of a special agreement consented to by the Senate with two-thirds of the Senators present concurring. If that tradition is still to hold sway, the United States cannot confer on the International Court of Justice compulsory jurisdiction, the essence of which is that one state should be able to proceed against another without the latter's consent at the time. Yet the march of events has now brought us face to face with the question of the Court's jurisdiction.

In the Senate debate on the Charter, the statute of the Court was relegated to a minor place. Reading the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, one would hardly suppose that only a few years ago what was in substance this same statute had excited the ire and foreboding of more than one-third of the Senate. Numerous references were made to the fact that the United States is not required to submit to the Court's jurisdiction. The question was raised as to the manner in which a declaration accepting compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of the United States might be made, it being feared, apparently, that the President might make the declaration without seeking in advance the advice and consent of the Senate. "To avoid any possibility of misunderstanding," Senator VANDENBERG addressed to the legal adviser of the Department of State the question: "Who would make this decision and how?" Mr. Hackworth's excellent memorandum in reply stated that "if the Executive should initiate action to accept compulsory jurisdiction of the Court under the optional clause contained in article 36 of the statute, such procedure as might be authorized by the Congress would be followed, and if no specific procedure were prescribed by statute, the proposal would be submitted to the Senate with request for its advice and consent to the filing of the necessary declaration with the Secretary General of the United Nations." Though in submitting the Charter to the Senate the President had made no proposal concerning the Court's compulsory jurisdiction, a few Senators expressed themselves as favoring its acceptance.

On the last day of the debate, it remained for Senator MORSE to make the one speech dealing at length with the Court, and to take the only initiative in the direction of compulsory jurisdiction. He had declared on July 27 that "if we really mean to keep faith with the Charter, if we really mean to carry out what so many have said on the Senate floor during the past few days, we must agree to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court." On July 28 he offered the following resolution "for early consideration and action":

"*Resolved*, That the Senate hereby recommends that the President of the United States deposit with the Secretary General of the United Nations, whenever that official shall have been installed in office, a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice recognizing as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning:

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) Any question of international law;

"(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; and

"(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

"*Provided*, That such declaration should be for a period of not to exceed 5 years, and should exclude from its operation:

"(a) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of pacific settlement; and

"(b) Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United States.

"*Provided further*, That the President be, and hereby is, requested to furnish the Senate for its information a copy of any declaration filed by him pursuant to this resolution."

This resolution, referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, now spearheads the next step for the United States to take. The text might perhaps be improved. Five years are a short period, and uncertainty as to renewal is always disturbing. Can't we go as far as Canada went in its declaration of 1929, still in force, when it accepted the jurisdiction "for a period of 10 years and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance?" Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama, El Salvador, and Uruguay placed no time limit on the duration of their declarations.

There may have been some exaggeration in Senator TAFT's declaration, after expressing the hope that "all the nations ultimately come to be willing to submit all their disputes to arbitration or adjudication by an impartial tribunal," that "America must set the example." The example has already been set by other nations. Yet if the Court is to have adequate jurisdiction, many more nations must still act to confer it, and their course may be influenced by what the United States decides to do. If, since 1920 when other nations adopted the Statute of the Permanent Court, we have not led the movement which previously we had helped to sponsor, we now have an oportunity to push it on. We can offer encouragement to those who would participate in it. We can assure the world that we mean business in our heraldry of justice according to law as a basis of peace.

Of course the conferring of jurisdiction must be distinguished from its exercise. If the new Court should not have much to do in the years immediately before us, this need be no cause for discouragement. Peoples everywhere can take satisfaction in its availability. From the outset it will have the formal support of a large number of States. From the outset it will have an extensive jurisdiction. What remains is for the United States and other nations to give it vitality as a "principal organ" of the United Nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we need to keep in mind the fact that chapter XIV of the Charter, in setting up the new

International Court, incorporates by reference the main provisions of the old statute of 1920. Therefore, when we agreed to incorporate it in the San Francisco Charter, we agreed to all the provisions of the statute of the old Permanent Court of International Justice as modified by the conference save and except that we reserved to ourselves the optional right to agree to the jurisdiction of the Court in specific cases as we best determine.

Article 36 of the statute raises the jurisdictional problem to which our resolution addresses itself. Thus I think it of importance to consider at least briefly some of the historical background of article 36. Without some knowledge of the background of article 36 of the statute it is difficult to understand why the article was incorporated in the San Francisco Charter in its optional form with reference to jurisdiction, rather than in language clothing the Court with compulsory jurisdiction.

Article 36 of the new Court statute is based on the optional jurisdiction article of a corresponding number in the statute of the old Permanent Court of International Justice. However, both at the Washington committee meetings of the International Jurists which was held preceding the San Francisco Conference, and at the San Francisco Conference itself, there was a marked division of opinion and much pointed debate on the issue of optional versus compulsory jurisdiction. Thus Lawrence Preuss, a recognized authority on the World Court, formerly associate chief in charge of the judicial organization and legal branch of the Department of State, in a very excellent article in the September 30, 1945, issue of the Department of State Bulletin, pulls back the curtain of historical recording and gives us an accurate view of the controversy over the jurisdiction issue which took place. Without taking time to read it, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts from the article by Dr. Preuss as published in the bulletin to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JURISDICTION OF THE OLD COURT

Such an effort was made in 1920 by the Committee of Jurists which drafted the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. This committee recommended that a broad compulsory jurisdiction be conferred upon the Court in all or any of the classes of legal disputes declared by article 13 of the Covenant of the League of Nations to be generally suitable for settlement by judicial means.

The Assembly and Council of the League, which reviewed the recommendations of the Committee of Jurists, were not prepared to go so far. As a result of strong opposition by the great powers, a compromise was evolved by which parties to the statute of the Permanant Court of International Justice might accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court with respect to the classes of disputes referred to above. This submission was effected by acceptance of the optional clause, annexed to the protocol of signature, and by making a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the statute whereby the parties recognize the jurisdiction of the Court as "compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement," subject to reciprocity, to conditions as to time, and, by a liberal interpretation subsequently adopted, to reservations which relate either generally to certain aspects of any kind of disputes or specifically to certain classes of disputes.

In default of a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36, parties to the statute are subject only to the voluntary jurisdiction of the Court, which, by paragraph 1, comprises "all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in treaties and conventions in force." Treaties ordinarily provide only for voluntary jurisdiction in that they expressly require a special agreement for reference of disputes which arise thereunder or because they provide alternative procedures of settlement. Many treaties, however, confer a limited compulsory jurisdiction upon the Court by the terms of "compromissory" clauses which permit reference of disputes upon application by any party. The final paragraph of article 36 also creates a limited compulsory jurisdiction in providing that the Court shall decide disputes relating to its own jurisdiction.

JURISDICTION OF THE NEW COURT

The jurisdictional provisions of the old statute were adopted by the United Nations Conference without basic changes in principle. As finally approved, the text of article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice reads as follows (the bracketed words indicating omissions from the former text and the italic words, additions):

1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for *in the Charter of the United Nations or* in treaties or conventions in force.

2. The [members of the League of Nations and the] states [mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant] *parties to the present Statute* may [either when signing or ratifying the Protocol to which the present Statute is adjoined or at a later moment], *at any time* declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other [member or] state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all [or any of the classes of] legal disputes concerning—

(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

(b) any question of international law;

(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain [members or] states, or for a certain time.

4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the Statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

5. Declarations made under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present Statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

This result was reached only after prolonged debate, in which a sharp division of opinion developed on the central issue of general compulsory jurisdiction for all parties to the Statute versus limited compulsory jurisdiction based upon individual and voluntary acceptances of the optional provisions of paragraph 2 of article 36. The optional form was adopted by Committee 1 (the International Court of Justice) of Commission IV by 31 affirmative votes as against 14 negative votes, but, as the rapporteur (Nasrat Al-Farsy, Iraq) stated in his final report:

"At the same time a majority of the members of the first committee favored making the Court's jurisdiction compulsory, and some of these stated that they voted for the text only to achieve agreement. Formal declarations were made by several delegates to the effect that their votes did not indicate their state's views on the question of principle, as to which their states favored compulsory jurisdiction."

Although the Conference failed to adopt the principle of general compulsory jurisdiction, it nevertheless took two steps which show that it regarded such jurisdiction as a desirable, though not immediately realizable, goal: (1) it adopted by unanimous vote a new paragraph under article 36 which provides that declarations made under the old statute, and which are still in force, are to be deemed as among the parties to the new statute to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the new Court for the period which they have to run and in accordance with their terms; and (2) it adopted, also by unanimous vote, a resolution, later approved by the Conference, which recommended that states parties to the statute proceed "as soon as possible" to make declarations according to the provisions of article 36. The fact that the Conference considered that a gradual and evolutionary approach to the admitted goal constitutes the soundest policy under existing circumstances can be explained only in the light of the deliberations of the two bodies which were responsible for the formulation of the jurisdictional provisions of the new statute: the committee of jurists, which met at Washington; and committee IV–1 of the Conference at San Francisco.

THE COMMITTEE OF JURISTS

Substantive aspects of the future statute of the proposed International Court of Justice were not discussed at Dumbarton Oaks, but a number of basic proposals were adopted which were to influence greatly the positions subsequently taken by the various governments of the United Nations with respect to the jurisdiction of the Court. These proposals provided that there should be an International Court of Justice which should constitute the principal judicial organ of the organization; that the Court should be constituted and should function in accordance with a statute which should be a part of the Charter of the Organization; that states not members of the Organization should be permitted to become parties to the statute upon conditions to be laid down by the Security Council; and that the statute should be either the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice with such modifications as might be desirable, or a new statute based upon the old statute.

It was suggested informally during the conversations that prior to the United Nations Conference a preliminary meeting of jurists be held for the purpose of drafting the statute of the proposed Court, and formulating plans for its establishment. Such a meeting, it was believed, would enable the legal experts of the United Nations to give to juridicial problems of the Court a more thorough consideration than would be possible during a general conference, and it would afford an opportunity to secure agreement, subject to approval by the Conference, upon the major issues involved. Accordingly, the Government of the United States, on behalf of itself and the other governments sponsoring the San Francisco Conference, on March 27, 1945 issued invitations to the governments to be represented at San Francisco to send delegates to a preliminary meeting of jurists to be held at Washington on April 9. The representatives of 44 gov-

ernments met on the appointed date, and, as the United Nations Committee of Jurists, continued their deliberations through April 20.

The Committee of Jurists accepted as the basis for its deliberations a draft statute presented by the United States delegate and chairman of the committee, Green H. Hackworth, legal adviser of the Department of State. It was the underlying premise of this draft that the permanent Court of International Justice had, on the whole, functioned satisfactorily, and that changes in its statute should be restricted to those necessary to correct positive defects and to take account of the eventual establishment of the organization. In conformity with these principles, it suggested no change in article 36, except to provide that the jurisdiction of the Court should be extended to include matters specifically provided for in the Charter.

It was apparent in the debates before the Committee that a majority of the delegates considered that the time had arrived for a further advance toward compulsory jurisdiction than the compromise represented in the "optional clause." No less than 20 delegates expressed themselves in favor of the adoption of compulsory jurisdiction, and 4 presented motions to amend article 36 to this effect. Several who opposed such action objected, not to the principle of compulsory jurisdiction, but on the ground that the question involved political issues which fell outside the province of a committee of jurists, and should, therefore, be reserved for decision by the United Nations Conference. Some, including the representative of the United Kingdom, argued that if it were desirable to adopt compulsory jurisdiction, it would be appropriate to make provision therefor in the Charter itself.

An unequivocal position against the inclusion of a provision for compulsory jurisdiction was taken by the Soviet delegate, Minister Novikov, who stated that such action would be unacceptable to his Government, which was dedicated to the establishment of an effective Court. Attainment of this objective would be rendered impossible if an attempt were made to impose its jurisdiction upon states which are reluctant to accept it. On the other hand, the authority of the Court would be enhanced if the enlargement of its jurisdiction were achieved by the voluntary action of states in adhering to the "optional clause." The success of the Permanent Court of International Justice, and the fact that its judgments had been executed without exception, could, to a large extent, be attributed to the voluntary character of the jurisdiction established by article 36 of its statute.

Any attempt to alter it in the sense of making its compulsory might entail refusals to carry out its judgments on the part of states unwilling to submit themselves to its jurisdiction. The result might be to create disputes rather than to settle them. It should be left, therefore, to the volition of parties to the statute to determine whether they wished to be bound by the obligation of compulsory jurisdiction. For these reasons, the Soviet delegate favored the retention of the optional clause, as proposed in the United States draft.

The representative of New Zealand proposed a vote on the question; Mr. Hackworth argued strongly against the adoption of such a course, which, he thought, might lead to so sharp a division of views as to endanger subsequent agreement. He assumed that if signature of the statute should involve ipso facto the compulsory jurisdiction of the court, some states would find it difficult to become parties to the statute. He shared the hope that the jurisdiction of the court might be expanded, and he hoped that his own country might be among those which would adhere to the optional clause if it were adopted. He considered, therefore, that the wisest and most expedient course would be to proceed on the basis of the existing text of article 36.

These arguments proved to be persuasive, since none of the delegates was willing to precipitate a situation in which the court might be deprived of support by states whose membership was essential to its success. This possibility was especially serious, since failure to accept the statute would directly affect the membership of the Organization itself, of whose Charter the statute would form an integral part. A compromise solution was reached through the appointment of a subcommittee which drafted alternative texts—one retaining the optional provisions of the existing text of article 36 and the other providing for compulsory jurisdiction. Placed upon this basis, the question assumed a political character, and, as such, was referred by the committee to the Conference at San Francisco.

COMMITTEE IV/1 OF THE CONFERENCE

Committee IV/1 was faced with the practical necessity of resolving the difference of views which had resulted in the presentation of alternative texts by the committee of jurists. In an endeavor to find an acceptable compromise, the delegate of New Zealand submitted a draft of article 36 which provided for immediate acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction, subject to uniform reservations applicable to all parties. This draft received the support of the delegates of Australia and Canada, but in general the various governments maintained the positions which they had previously taken. The delegate of the United States again set forth the advantages of the optional provision, which would enable states favoring compulsory jurisdiction to remain consistent with their principles while permitting others to maintain their views. The Soviet delegate stated that acceptance by his government of the statute, and perhaps of the Charter itself, might at this time be endangered by insistence upon compulsory jurisdiction, even if provision were made for reservations. He expressed the belief that the position now taken by his government did not preclude its eventual adherence to a general provision for the compulsory judicial settlement of all legal disputes.

The representatives of China and of certain of the lesser powers, while unwilling to assume the risk of jeopardizing the adherence to those states which found it difficult or impossible to accept compulsory jurisdiction at the present stage, were not prepared to forego a statement of their views for the sake of the record. The delegate of Mexico expressed a view shared by several when he observed that the smaller nations, in accepting the extensive powers of the Security Council with regard to the settlement of political disputes, had shown their confidence and their trust in the greater nations; it seemed, however, that the latter, in declining to accept the compulsory settlement of legal disputes by a tribunal which had proved its impartiality, had failed to demonstrate a reciprocal trust.

The point of view which finally prevailed was that stated by the delegate of the United Kingdom, who pointed out that his Government, as a signatory of the optional clause, was not opposed to compulsory jurisdiction. He observed, however, that two states which had not been members of the old Court and whose cooperation was essential to the new Court were not prepared to go beyond the provisions of article 36. The wisest course, therefore, would be to retain the optional form, and to leave to these states time in which to consider their future positions.

Mr. MORSE. The subcommittee to which the subject had been referred recommended acceptance of the optional jurisdiction as the one most likely to secure general agreement. When a vote was taken by Committee IV/1 on the question of principle, there were 26 votes in favor of the optional system and 16 votes opposed. Since the majority fell short of the requisite two-thirds, it appeared then an impasse had been reached. It was then suggested that a roll call on the actual text of article 36 submitted by the subcommittee might avoid this result. The voting on this second question produced the necessary majority in favor of the present text of article 36.

Eventual acceptance of the principle of compulsory jurisdiction was in no way precluded by the position taken by the United States delegation during the United Nations Conference, and the support which it then gave to the optional system cannot be construed to imply any decision as to future policy. The principal task at San Francisco was to draft a charter and statute which would be promptly ratified by the signatory states, thus making possible the early establishment of the United Nations Organization. One of the factors which influenced the action taken has been described by Senator VANDENBERG:

"It was the attitude of the American delegation that inasmuch as each time this question has heretofore been submitted to the United States Senate the question of compulsory jurisdiction has always been a stumbling block, and there has always been a lack of willingness on the part of the Senate to go that far as yet, it would be unfortunate to write the court statute itself on a compulsory basis at the present time, but that rather we should leave its development to evolution, inasmuch as the whole process of world peace itself is finally dependent upon evolution in the spirit and attitude of the peoples of the earth. So we joined at San Francisco in maintaining the optional clause in order to be perfectly sure that at least this one needless hurdle would be removed from Senate consideration of the Charter."

There was little discussion of the International Court of Justice and of its jurisdiction during the consideration of the Charter by the Senate. It appeared, however, that the principal objections which in the past have prevented the adherence of the United States to the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice had disappeared with the decision to accept membership in the Organization of which the International Court of Justice is to be a principal organ. It was without objection that the junior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, introduced a resolution recommending that the President take appropriate action leading to early acceptance by the United States of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the statute. This step, Senator MORSE said, should be regarded "as the first in a series which must be taken if the United Nations Organization is to cope with the complex conditions of present-day international society."

Mr. President, by way of summary with regard to the historical points which Mr. Preuss brings out in his article, it is sufficient to say that the chief difficulty at the Washington committee meeting of jurists appeared to be the adamant position taken by the Russian representative that the issue was political in nature, that it should go to the San Francisco Conference for determination, and that the Russian Government could not accept the statute of the Court if it included a compulsory jurisdiction provision. Thus, under the very able leadership of Mr. Green Hackworth, who later was chairman of the

American committee operating under commission 4 of the San Francisco Charter, the Washington committee agreed to have subcommittees prepare and submit to the San Francisco Conference two proposed drafts of article 36, one calling for optional jurisdiction and the other calling for compulsory jurisdiction. The records are very clear on the point that at the San Francisco Conference, within the sessions of commission 4, committee 1, which dealt with the World Court issue, there occurred the same general division of opinion.

There again, the great majority of the small nations favored compulsory jurisdiction, and the great powers who had previously accepted the compulsory jurisdiction principle expressed their intention and willingness to continue with compulsory jurisdiction. However, the Russian representatives at the San Francisco Conference made it very clear that the adoption of the Charter itself might be placed in jeopardy if the statute of the World Court included the compulsory jurisdiction provision.

The very able and distinguished senior Senator from Michigan last July, on the floor of the Senate when the issue of jurisdiction was briefly discussed, pointed out that it was the opinion of the delegation at the San Francisco Conference—I am sure I quote him correctly, at least in effect—that the question of jurisdiction should not be involved with the question of whether or not the Charter itself should be approved by the Senate of the United States. I think the Senator made it very clear in his remarks that there was some question in the minds of the members of the American delegation—and I think rightly so—that an attempt to agree at San Francisco upon a compulsory jurisdiction provision in the new statute of the new World Court might lead to divergence of opinion in the Senate on the issue of approving the Charter itself. And so the American delegation agreed to the optional clause provision.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has recited the narrative with complete accuracy. The viewpoint of the American delegation at San Francisco, and particularly that of the commission, was that we did not want to jeopardize the acceptance of the basic Charter by any needless controversy which could be either avoided or postponed. I personally had a very deep feeling about the compulsory jurisdiction issue, because I so well remembered the contest which took place here in 1935 when even on an optional jurisdiction basis I was one of only six Republicans who were willing to vote to adhere to it. So I felt, of course, that it was prudent to avoid that issue in connection with the inauguration of the United Nations Organization. That is still my point of view. The chief difference which I have with my able friend from Oregon at the moment is that I do not think we have yet reached the point where it is prudent to raise that issue, because I still think that we need to get this organization under way effectively, and to demonstrate to the American people that it can dependably function before we undertake to expand its functions.

I merely want to say to the Senator that his narrative is correct, and I shall take advantage of the opportunity while I am on my feet to thank him for the very gracious references he has made to me. I cherish them very deeply.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that the references were highly deserved. I understand the views of the Senator from Michigan, both in regard to the position which he took at the San Francisco Conference and is taking at the present time on this question of compulsory jurisdiction. To the extent that I disagree with the Senator from Michigan I may say that I disagree only to this degree, namely, that I believe now is the time for us to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court so as to get the United Nations Organization started effectively. I certainly agree with the Senator from Michigan that we must do everything we can do in order to get the United Nations Organization started effectively, and I think this is one step which we should take for the effective implementation of the United Nations Organization.

The excerpts which I have asked to have inserted in the RECORD from the article by Mr. Preuss point out in some detail the major views which were presented at the San Francisco Conference within commission 4, committee 1. He points out that the representatives of some of the small nations, such as the representative from Mexico, were highly critical of the position taken by the nations which were not willing to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. I am inclined to believe, as a result of my study of the records in connection with this issue, that there are representatives of many small nations who are highly critical of the United States because of its refusal to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

I think I should add that I do not see how the United Nations Organization can make effective demonstration of its force for the pacific settlement of international disputes unless all the members of that organization have expressed a willingness to abide by the decisions of the judicial department of the United Nations Organization. I find it difficult to reconcile myself to the view that the United Nations Organization can be an effective and efficient organization with some nations standing on the sidelines, including two great and powerful nations, Russia and the United States, and saying, "Well, we will consider accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the judicial branch of this Organization, after the Organization demonstrates to us that it is an effective organization."

Mr. President, I think that is an argument whereby we seek to lift ourselves by our bootstraps, because I think giving jurisdiction to the World Court is essential to any effective operation of the United Nations Organization. I think that each and every time the United States withholds agreeing to the jurisdiction of the World Court it raises suspicion and distrust among many nations of the world. Further, I think it is important that we demonstrate our complete willingness to abide by the recommendation which the plenary session of the San Francisco Conference itself passed without a dissenting vote being recorded, to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, or to take the necessary steps to file declarations accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. I think it is essential that we take that step now as a demonstration to Russia that we intend to live up to the maximum of our obligations, so far as the peaceful procedures for settling international disputes under the San Francisco Charter are concerned.

I think it is most unfortunate, Mr. President, for us to classify ourselves in the same category with Russia as being one of the two great nations not willing to accept the jurisdiction of the World Court in all cases which are justiciable under international law. That does not promote international justice nor the cause of peace.

I happen to share the view that a manifestation of intention on our part to accept the jurisdiction of the Court would have not only a salutary effect upon all the small nations of the world—and I am inclined to believe that we can afford to improve our relations with those nations at the present time—but I think it would be bound to have a tremendous favorable effect upon Russia. Further I think such action on our part would put her representatives in the position where they, too, would have to give a clear demonstration as to whether they intend to live up to and abide by pacific procedures for the settlement of international disputes under the Charter to which they are a signatory. It is a test of good faith which both Russia and the United States should measure up to. So long as we refrain from making that commitment, we keep ourselves in the position where Russian representatives can say, "Well, there is another great power which is unwilling to submit disputes to the World Court. We are suspicious of her intentions and until she accepts the Court's jurisdiction we cannot consider it."

Mr. President, I do not think it requires any stretch of the imagination to point out to the Senate of the United States that in all probability issues will arise in the near future between Russia and the United States which might very well be and should be submitted to the World Court for determination on the basis of judicial processes for proper settlement. The peace of the world cannot allow them to be settled on the basis of power politics or regional isolationism.

I think the failure of this Government here and now to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court jeopardizes the effective functioning of that court in connection with issues which may arise between this Government and Russia. I think the sooner we draw the issue as to whether or not Russia will join with the United States in submitting disputes between the United States and Russia to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, the better it will be, in the interest of permanent world peace.

However, I should be less than honest if I did not recognize that there is force in the argument that until there is a clear demonstration on the part of all nations to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, we perhaps should bide our time. The difficulty with the argument is, however, that we have nothing to lose by accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, and we have much to gain in international good will. If Russia does not accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, then we cannot be sued by her, because, as I pointed out earlier in my remarks, jurisdiction exists, of course, upon the mutual acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction by both nations concerned in a given dispute.

In reading the history of article 36 of the Permanent Court of International Justice, and the debates which took place back in 1920, I noticed that the argument was made at that time by some powerful nations that "now is not the time to accept compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court." It was argued that first the League of Nations and the Court, which was an agency thereof, should function for a while, and then the nations which were somewhat hesitant about accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court should decide for themselves, upon the basis of the operation of the Court, whether they wished to be bound by its jurisdiction.

I think one of the most effective pleas made for compulsory jurisdiction was made by Mr. Loder, the representative of the Netherlands, who was subsequently the first president of the Permanent Court of International Justice. I shall not read all his statement, but I should like to read a paragraph or two, because it at least expresses very clearly my view as to why I think now is the time, in 1945, to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the new World Court, just as Mr. Loder believed that in 1920 it was time for all nations to accept a similar jurisdiction of the old Court. He said, in what is recognized as a famous speech:

> We, younger and more impetuous, have found ourselves at issue with the great states in the Council, older and perhaps wiser than we. They have deleted our articles 33 and 34 and replaced them by the articles that are before you; they have eliminated compulsory jurisdiction, even in the form we suggested, restricted and surrounded as it was by special safeguards. What have we done in the committee? What are we about to do? We have yielded to your desires. * * * The real argument is the political one. "The time is not yet ripe." We replied by yielding our position. We said: "You think we are going too fast, and you have laid your hand on the reins to restrain us and to make us go more slowly. Well, we will go more slowly if you desire, even to the point of almost losing an opportunity of going forward. You desire that today shall be yours; today therefore shall be yours; but tomorrow will be ours."
>
> You are fighting against time; you will do so in vain. Time that lives and moves eternally, directs our steps through life, continuing its inexorable march step by step. We cannot hasten it, we cannot delay it, and it merely disregards any effort to do so. Ensure the present for yourselves; the future will be ours. We do not desire that in the future the working of justice should be dependent on the good pleasure of the defendant who is cited before the Court. We recognize no greatness which is raised above justice, even when it wears the mantle of sovereignty. We no longer regard might as the lord of the world. * * * Time moves more speedily than you think. This scheme already shows you that those who follow us, will, when ratifying it, be able to accept compulsory jurisdiction by mutual agreement and dispense with arbitration. * * * The slip that we are planting in the ground today will develop, will increase and become a lofty tree with great branches and thick foliage under the shadow of which the peoples will rest.

I do not propose to argue, Mr. President, that if all the nations in 1920 who declined to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court had accepted it that some of the horrible events of history which have taken place since would not have taken place, but I cannot escape the conclusion that Mr. Loder of the Netherlands in that great speech was on much sounder ground when viewed now in the perspective of history than were those who in that great conference of 1920 argued that "now is not the time to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court." I venture the thought, Mr. President, that when we look back 20 years from now on the historical record that will be written in the immediate future in connection with the relations between the nations of the world we will find that the historians will have recorded, if the Senate of the United States adopts and accepts the argument that "now is not the time to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court," that we were parties to making it difficult, if not impossible, for the United Nations Organization to set up an effective judicial branch of the Organization to the ideal and charged with the responsibility of settling all justiciable disputes by rules of international justice.

I think the argument that "now is not the time," Mr. President, must be recognized as an argument urging that we should keep in our fist the power to determine what the relationships between the governments of the world shall be in connection with us rather than agree to have those relationships, so far as the merits of a specific dispute are concerned, determined by an impartial court, or, to put it this way, Mr. President, I feel that the argument that "now is not the time to accept compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court" is a confession on our part that we do not believe that pacific procedures for the settlement of world disputes, if participated in wholeheartedly and in good faith by all nations, can prevent war.

Mr. President, I am such a believer in the ideals and in the objectives of the San Francisco Charter that I want to, as a Member of this body, do everything I can within my power and by my vote to have the Senate now—I hope within the next few days—register an overwhelming vote in favor of our accepting on a compulsory basis the jurisdiction of the new World Court over all justiciable disputes within the terms and conditions of the resolution which we have offered this afternoon.

I am about through, Mr. President, but there is one other historical reference which I think ought to be referred to in connection with the origin of section 36 of the Statute of the first World Court, and it is to be found in that great speech which was made by the representative of Belgium at the 1920 conference, M. Lafontaine. He said:

> The nations had another hope, namely, that recourse to international justice would be compulsory for all disputes. In this case also a minority of delegations has once more paralyzed the will of the majority. * * * I was astonished to hear those who once defended the principle of compulsory arbitration utter the words "vital interests." I heard proclaimed the absolute sovereignty of states. We were told that only the nations themselves were judges of their vital interests and that to recognize the right of a state to arraign another was a grave encroachment upon the sovereignty of states. This is not the moment to discuss these principles again. They are condemned by the general opinion of the world and of jurists. * * *
>
> Is it forgotten that the refusal to accept the obligation to appeal to the Court means that states have the power to appeal to war?

Mr. President, since we discussed the United Nations Charter in this Chamber in July, and voted our approval of its ratification, two noteworthy events have occurred which help very much in bringing into focus the role of the United Nations Organization in maintaining peace. The first of these was the unveiling of the atom bomb, within a month of the advice and consent of this body to the ratification of the Charter. The second event was the recent meeting of the Foreign Ministers in London to work out the European settlement, a meeting which admittedly ended in failure, albeit, we are confident, temporary failure.

Neither of these two events can be said to have changed the essential character of world politics. The threat of destruction exemplified by the atomic bomb has been with us throughout the present century. This weapon, of course, immeasurably increases the threat of physical destruction, but it hardly increases the danger of moral and spiritual destruction which is wrapped up in modern warfare, and which we have only just now narrowly escaped.

The meeting of foreign ministers demonstrates that now—even now—in the face of this new weapon, and just after the close of the greatest war of history, international politics continue to be governed by the same general considerations that always have governed them. We are perhaps fortunate that these things happened when they did, to demonstrate to us so vividly the nature of the task which confronts us in the field of international relations.

A Member of this body was reported in the press to have said that this meeting showed some of the difficulties of "super-internationalists who have been advocating a one-world government." This is no doubt true, but it hardly suggests a solution to the problem. In fact it does not even state the problem. It would be more in point, in my opinion, to say that the meeting showed very clearly the difficulties which face all of us in an anarchaic world—that is, a world without government and without law. It is time, it appears to me, to define some of the terms which are applied to these situations. The term "government," as applied to international relations, has been taboo, except

that it is used as an epithet to be thrown at those who advocate an effective world organization. On the other hand, in the literature of government, the absence of government is anarchy. The popular understanding of this term, however, is also incorrect. The theory of anarchism is the attainment of peace and order by cooperation, and without law and government. In fact, it corresponds to the method by which the nations of the world seek to achieve peace—by cooperation and not by government.

Everyone realizes, of course, that the success of the San Francisco Charter depends upon the cooperation of the great powers. Maybe our goal can be achieved, in this way. It never has in the past, and the London meeting is very useful in showing us that the obstacles which hindered this achievement in the past are still very much in the picture. The popular mind, of course, is not so much concerned with political theory as with actual realities, and it is interesting to note that in the popular mind anarchy, or the absence of government, does not mean peace and order through cooperation, but it means only disorder and chaos. Therefore, Mr. President, I think it would be a good thing if we ceased to shy away from the term "government," and rather make it one of our tools in dealing with these questions.

The new perspective which is given to the situation by recent events only gives rise to increasing doubts as to the effectiveness of taking this step alone. Of what use will it be to be able to define the law, but to be unable to enforce it? May not a legal regime become a hindrance if we lack the means to change it rapidly to meet the needs of changing conditions?

These are questions that are thrown at us by the course of events, and we should not be afraid to discuss them. The President, in his recent message on atomic energy said:

> In international relations, as in domestic affairs, the release of atomic energy constitutes a new force too revolutionary to consider in the framework of old ideas.

He went on to say that:

> We can no longer rely on the slow progress of time to develop a program of control among nations.

He then said:

> Civilization demands that we shall reach at the earliest possible date a satisfactory arrangement for the control of this discovery.

There we have a statement of the problem, Mr. President. There is a key word in this statement, the word "control." There is also a key phrase: "A force too revolutionary to consider in the framework of old ideas." Behind the easy-sounding word "control" there lies indeed a vast framework of old ideas, and it will require a great exertion to break out of this framework. The search for "controls" is but one route into the labyrinth in which statesmen found themselves after the last war in the effort to achieve the goal of international stability—an effort from which this country held aloof. They took the slightly different pathway of seeking arms reduction or limitation. Then they encountered the problem of security. If the most peace-loving nation is asked to reduce its arms, it is only logical for it to ask: "What guaranties am I offered that my neighbors will do the same?" "What guaranties of security are offered me in return for limiting my own means of defense?" The question of guaranties led to a demand on the part of the states asked to furnish the guaranties that there be better procedures for pacific settlement of disputes.

Then they turned to the question of pacific settlement. Finally, when they thought they had solved the problems of security and pacific settlement in the pacts of Locarno they went back to the problem of disarmament. Everyone recalls the slow and laborious efforts of the Disarmament Conferences, how all the old issues were raised again—problems of inspection, problems of control, problems of enforcement. Finally, after more than 10 years of constant and laborious effort, the whole thing came to nothing. It will be difficult indeed, Mr. President, for us to break out of the framework of old ideas. We can consider ourselves fortunate to have so recently and vividly brought to our attention how great is the tendency of states to continue to be governed in their policy by the forces which have governed them in the past. It is none too soon—in fact, it is later than it should be—for the people of this country and the people of the world to begin to face frankly the real nature of the problem. The term "world government" has been taboo, except as used disparagingly by enemies of international action. Let us adopt the phrase as one of our tools for dealing with this question.

But let us not confine ourselves to the level of generalities. It is necessary to see and to understand the multitude of considerations and problems involved in the solution of the big problem. One of the integral parts seems clearly to be the establishment of an international judiciary with jurisdiction to enable it to lay down the law on questions which are properly justiciable.

All that we can say at this time is that we are seeking security, and that we realize that we will have to take some positive steps if we are to succeed, steps which we have never found it possible to take in the past. There are certainly strong reasons for thinking that we must take at least some steps in the direction of actual controls—some such measure at least as international agreement to cease work on atomic weapons, and an international inspection to see that the agreement is observed, under the jurisdiction of the Security Council. I do not wish to anticipate the work that is doubtless being done on this subject in the executive branch, but an answer can be given to those who would say that such minimum measures are impossible. The answer is that the atomic bomb is not impossible. It is a proven reality.

By ratifying the United Nations Charter, we have already dedicated ourselves to the approach of international cooperation. This would seem to be essential to success, whatever other measures might be agreed on. Our proposal to accept the jurisdiction of the Court is in such absolute accord with the aims and purposes of the Organization that the San Francisco Conference itself, without dissent, approved a recommendation that all the members of the United Nations should adopt such a declaration as we are proposing here today. And if we should go further, and give the Organization more positive powers of international control, then it is equally important that the Court should have adequate jurisdiction. Because whatever is done, Mr. President, will be done under the authority of law—but it is impossible to say that we are acting in accordance with the law if we have no way of finding out what the law is in case a question should arise.

I have said, Mr. President, that this proposal is not extreme. It is just the opposite. It seeks to make an important step in the direction of placing international relations on the basis of law and order. It is those who object to the rule of law who are radical, according to present-day standards of thinking. We might be able to get along without government, Mr. President, but it is really impossible to imagine a society that can get along except on the basis of law. We do have, in fact, a body of law in international society, chaotic though that society has been. This is a very substantial body of law, capable of answering questions as to the legal rights or duties of states in a given situation. And there are a considerable number of rights and corresponding duties of states. This law has been developed by judges, lawyers, legislators, and scholars of the highest eminence. Our own Supreme Court and other high courts have contributed to its development, as have the courts of other countries and arbitral tribunals. This body has participated. The network of treaties constitutes in effect a body of international legislation. It would be impossible for the ordinary relations of states to go on unless we knew what our respective rights and duties were in a given situation. For instance, how could we carry on commercial intercourse unless we had an understanding as to the legal position of a merchant vessel in a foreign port?

Now, international law, of course, tends to fall into disrepute during war, because a certain part of it, largely treaty law, is concerned with the conduct of war, and this body of law emerges in a badly battered state from such a war as we have just been through. This is simply because war is, by definition, a yielding to force of all those elements of law and order which make for peaceful relationships. But the break-down of law comes even before actual war, and arises from the same causes. It yields to force. Not actual physical force, but to the power of each State, in the final analysis, to decide for itself what the law is. When this point is reached, the law is worthless. We might as well not have any law. It is not necessary to be a lawyer to know that an argument is possible on almost any point. States may be insincere in their positions, or they may be perfectly sincere. The result is the same. The state simply stands on its position, and no agreement is possible.

In undertaking to change this situation—in saying that the Court shall always be able to hand down a definite rul-

ing on a request by a party to a case—we are taking perhaps the easiest hurdle of any of those which we must face in our search for international security. We simply say that we will abide by the law. If there is any question as to what the law is, we will let the Court decide. This merely conforms to our general practice as a Nation. We have demonstrated a very general willingness to submit our legal problems to adjudication, and there is no question as to our willingness to do so in the future. But if we can give this as an assurance, undertaking in advance, we will have done a very great deal in the direction of establishing the rule of law as the governing rule of international relations. And we will also have kept faith with ourselves as a Nation and a people which recognizes the supremacy of law over force.

The magnitude of this hurdle has no doubt been greatly lessened as the result of the war, and the demonstrations we have had of the results of lawlessness in international relations. Jurists and students of international relations have long given the idea of general compulsory jurisdiction of legal questions very wide support. When I originally introduced this resolution I referred to the remarks of Elihu Root made 25 years ago in support of this concept. He was then a member of the advisory committee of jurists which drafted the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, and that committee proposed general compulsory jurisdiction of the carefully defined categories of cases involving legal questions. The proposal was vetoed by the League organs, but only after a very interesting debate, especially in the Assembly, in which reference was made to the fact that the struggle to endow the Court with jurisdiction actually went clear back to the Hague Conference of 1907. Of course, in 1907 they did not even succeed in establishing a permanent court. Since that time we have made some progress, we have at least accepted the idea of the Court, but the Court is only of value to the extent that it has jurisdiction to deal with the problems that require attention. Also in these 38 years other events have taken place, which seem to throw some doubt on the reality of the progress we can claim.

These events would seem to indicate, Mr. President, that the time has come to assume the small risk which is involved in saying that, so far as we are concerned, and as among other states assuming the same obligation, we will abide by the law, and we agree that in case of question, the International Court of Justice may decide what the law is.

Rightly or wrongly, Mr. President, may I digress for a moment to say there will be those among the peoples of other nations of the world who will say that our refusal now to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court means that we will reserve, because of our position of great military power unequaled by any nation in the world, the right finally to determine any issue that we do not want to submit to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court by resort to might or at least a take-it-or-leave-it dictate.

I know that such an accusation will never have any foundation in fact, but why, I ask, Mr. President, should we follow a course of action in connection with this issue which even gives any basis for a suspicion that the United States is not ready and willing now to carry out to every letter and phrase of the San Francisco Charter, all of the peaceful procedures for the settlement of international disputes? Oh, I think, Mr. President, that there is a very great obligation on our part here and now as the Senate of the United States, in the next few days so to strengthen the arm of our American representative in the General Assembly when that Assembly meets in the first week in January, so that he can say to all the nations of the world, "The Government of the United States has pledged itself to carry out the peaceful procedures for the settlement of all justiciable disputes in accordance with the letter of the San Francisco Charter," and to that end we have carried out the recommendation of the Conference that as soon as possible nations of the world should make a declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

I close, Mr. President, by asking this question: What is it that makes it impossible for us now to live up to the recommendation of the San Francisco Conference?

My answer to the question, if there is an answer, is fear. Fear of what? Apparently fear that within the United Nations Organization we may be faced with a combination of nations who may play power politics against us and not act in good faith in relation to their pledges under the San Francisco Charter. I have no such fear. I am not afraid, Mr. President, that the other nations who have accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court will not live up to their obligations, but I am fearful that other nations will fear that any nation which has pledged itself, as I think we have pledged ourselves, to follow a course of pacific settlement of international disputes, and then refuses at the very time the United Nations Organization starts to function in the first instance—I say I am fearful that other nations will fear that any nation which refuses to submit all of its justiciable disputes to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court is a nation that wishes to keep a ghost in its diplomatic closet.

I am convinced that once the people of this country fully understand that we have everything to gain and nothing to lose by accepting the jurisdiction of the Court, their mandate to us will be clear and certain.

Hence, I close, Mr. President, with the expression of the hope that the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate will proceed within the next few days to hold hearings, if necessary, on the resolution which we have submitted this afternoon as a substitute for Senate Resolution 160. I hope that in the course of the next 2 weeks the Senate may start an historic debate on whether we are ready now to reverse a position of some 25 years' standing, and hold ourselves out to the nations of the world as a nation now ready to submit all justiciable disputes to the compulsory jurisdiction of the judicial branch of the United Nations Organization set up by the San Francisco Charter.

Mr. President, I repeat, the hour is historic, the obligation sacred, the challenge great. We have a great opportunity to forge a mighty pattern of international controls based upon justice by accepting the jurisdiction of the World Court now.

The resolution (S. Res. 196) submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SMITH, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. WILEY, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. MCMAHON), was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the deposit by the President of the United States with the Secretary General of the United Nations, whenever that official shall have been installed in office, of a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice recognizing as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning:

(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

(b) any question of international law;

(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Provided, That such declaration should not apply to—

(a) disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; or

(b) disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Provided further, That such declaration should remain in force for a period of 5 years and thereafter until the expiration of 6 months after notice may be given to terminate the declaration.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR AUSTIN

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement in order that those who are interested in the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], may be present if they choose. I should like to announce that if I can obtain the floor tomorrow I shall discuss that amendment.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD CHINA—AMBASSADOR HURLEY'S RESIGNATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that I also voted to support the United Nations Charter, when by overwhelming vote last July the Senate accepted it. I felt, after due deliberation, that it provided the machinery by which the nations of the world might come together and, through the General Assembly, iron out many problems which, if unsolved, might lead to war. I cherish the hope that the United Nations will be successful in settling disputes between nations, and thus prevent wars.

In connection with the discussion of the pending implementing legislation,

which has taken place today and yesterday, I think we should not overlook the actions of members of the Department of State. I believe it is essential that we clean up our own backyard in connection with acts which we have already committed and are committing each and every day against the very spirit and the Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations Organization.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate, of whatever party, was shocked yesterday when he read the statement of Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley in connection with his resignation as Ambassador to China. General Hurley made specific and grave charges against the State Department, which this body with its special interest in our foreign affairs, cannot afford to ignore. If General Hurley had charged mere incompetence or mere inaptitude in conducting the foreign relations of this Government in the Orient, I would not treat the matter as I now propose to treat it. But General Hurley has made charges against at least one section of the State Department personnel which seem to me to involve accusations which fall very little short of treason.

General Hurley stated that he was sent by the President of the United States to prevent collapse of the Government of China; to keep the Chinese Army in the war, and to harmonize the relations between the Chinese and the American Military Establishments, and between the American Embassy in Chungking and the Chinese Government. Those were his orders. This was the decision of the President of the United States who is charged with conducting our foreign policy, and whose decision is law upon every branch of the State Department wherever it may be located. Yet General Hurley tells us—and these are his own words:

> The professional foreign-service men in the State Department sided with the Chinese Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against itself.

In doing this they sided against the commands of the President of the United States whose agents they were.

If that is not a violation of the very spirit of the Charter, if that is not a violation of every spiritual, moral, and legal commitment we made when we voted for the Charter, then I do not understand the English language. We are playing power politics. We are on three sides of a revolution. We are giving aid and comfort to the enemy in China in order to keep the central government of China weak so that we may govern China. That is what General Hurley said.

General Hurley further stated:

> Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. The same professionals openly advised the Communist armed party to decline unification of the Chinese Communist army with the National Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

Control of the government, control of the people of China. The Senate of the United States is engaged in implementing the United Nations Charter, and it permits such conditions to exist in China.

This is not the complaint of a carping critic of the administration. It is a cool and deliberate charge by the Ambassador of the President of the United States against a section of the State Department working in China in a movement of the gravest peril to undermine his efforts to carry out the orders of the President. If that were all, it could be called insubordination, and we could let it pass. As was stated not long ago on the floor of the Senate, the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries do not formulate the policies anyway. If that were the only question involved, we could call it insubordination, which is bad enough in itself. but it is far more than that, for they have put themselves on the side of the Communist Party and regime which is backed by the Soviet Government of Russia. If General Hurley's accusation is true, these State Department career men in China are supporting the objectives of a foreign group, hostile to our objectives; and that is why I say, that what they are doing is not mere insubordination but skirts the very edge of treason itself. This body cannot afford to pass this situation by without examining it to the fullest possible extent.

The American people have a right to know who is controlling the foreign affairs of the United States—the President of the United States, with the advice of the Senate, or a group of American Communist partisans who have penetrated our State Department and are in China fighting for a policy in direct conflict with the policy of the President and in the interest of a foreign government.

All this occurs at a moment when China itself, where great numbers of American troops are stationed, is threatened with civil war. There are still a million Japanese troops in China. Many of them in northern China where these policies are most dangerous. Those Japanese troops are still armed, and no man can tell what a cataclysm, in which we would be engulfed, might result from this situation.

If I did not add another word, I think I would be stating a situation of the utmost gravity, but this is not new. I keep asking myself, how in the name of reason such men, either outright Communists or friendly to the Communists of Russia, manage to get into our State Department, and find themselves in the most powerful positions in moments of crises?

Only the other day, Secretary Hull, in testifying before the Pearl Harbor Joint Investigating Committee, said that as late as November 22, 1941, he had sought to fashion some kind of reasonable proposal to the Japanese which, if it would not bring peace, would at least avert an attack which at that moment seemed imminent. He did draw up a plan which he proposed to submit to the Japanese, and which is known as the "modus vivendi" plan.

He promised the Japanese that he would attempt to get the consent of the British and the Chinese to this plan. The plan was sent to General Chiang Kai-shek, who turned it down. Secretary Hull felt that without the consent of the British and Chinese he could not submit it, and the plan was torn up. But when that plan reached Chiang Kai-shek, in that momentous hour when the fate of America was hanging between peace and war, there stood at Chiang Kai-shek's elbow another one of the Communist fellow travelers, Owen Lattimore, a notorious champion of Communist revolutionary tactics and philosophy. There he stood in that critical moment, as the agent of the United States Government, the State Department, not only did Chiang Kai-shek turn this plan down, but Owen Lattimore wrote to the President's representative—and the document is now in evidence before the Senate committee—a passionate appeal against the sending of that note to the Japanese. How does it come about that Communists or Communist sympathizers in this country and worshipers of Soviet Russia managed to find themselves so often at the very point where the switch must be turned one way or the other to determine the course of our Government?

Mr. President, I want my colleagues on the other side to understand that I am not criticizing them. I do not believe that the Democrats want this kind of thing any more than do the Republicans; and I will not conclude that they want it until they approve it by a refusal to do something about it. I am sure the American people do not want such a condition to exist. I do not question the right of the Communist or the lover of Russia to air his views under our principles of freedom of speech in this country, but the people of the United States did not elect the Communist part to office. They did not elect a Communist President, and I do not believe that President Truman wants to place Communists at points of power anywhere in the policy-making departments of our Government, particularly in the field of foreign affairs. We are at a spot in the world today where our foreign policy is clashing with the policy of Russia. It just does not make sense. I do not know how it comes about, but I believe it ought to end. I believe it is the duty of the Senate, in its constitutional role in the field of foreign affairs to inquire into the truth of General Hurley's charges and discover the extent to which the foreign policy of this country is being frustrated by sympathizers with other countries.

As a matter of fact, the Senate is being appealed to by men interested in our foreign affairs who feel themselves utterly helpless to do anything about this serious problem which now reaches crises proportions.

In today's issue of the Washington Post Mr. Sumner Welles, who upheld the arm of the late President Roosevelt and in my opinion did all he could to aid his administration in its foreign policy, directly appeals to the United States Senate to take immediate action to avert the wrecking of our good-neighbor policy in

South America by the Department of State.

Mr. Welles states in his article:

A prominent statesman from one of the great Spanish-American Republics, who is highly regarded throughout the hemisphere, said to me recently that he was disheartened by the apparent failure of the American people to recognize the extent to which public opinion in Latin America had turned against the United States during the last 2 years.

He believed that the following factors were primarily responsible for this change of feeling:

First of all, the unilateral policy which the State Department has followed in its dealings with Argentina, the elements of coercion which that policy contained, and the belief of almost all Latin Americans that this policy not only constituted interference in the domestic affairs of Argentina but that it also foreshadowed a return to the days of the "big stick."

Second, the refusal of the United States Government to consult with the other American Republics before the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for world organization were formulated, and the increasing fear that the United States might use its power in the Security Council of the UNO as a means of dominating the smaller countries of the New World.

Third, the dictatorial action of the State Department in postponing the all-important Inter-American Conference of Rio de Janeiro before consulting with the other American Republics.

Finally, the recent interference of the American Embassy in Rio de Janeiro in the internal political affairs of the Brazilian people, which was regarded throughout the hemisphere as having contributed to the downfall of the Vargas government.

There is a second article which I should like to read. It has to do with the same subject, and it is taken from the same newspaper. It was written by the same man, Sumner Welles. It reads as follows:

On November 15 Assistant Secretary Braden delivered an address in New York in which he declared that the Government of the United States would answer "the cry of the Argentine people" for a democratic government "with every means at its disposal."

In the language of diplomacy, when a government uses the phrase "with every means at its disposal," it means just one thing. It means that that government intends to use all of it resources and power in order to accomplish its announced objectives.

The impact which such a declaration has had upon peoples so jealous of their national sovereignty and so fully determined to preserve their untrammeled independence as are the Latin-American peoples may well be imagined. Such a declaration as this has still further weakened confidence among our neighbors to the south in the intention of the United States to live up to its treaty obligations to abstain from interference in the domestic concerns of the American Republics and scrupulously to respect their sovereign rights.

The reference is to an address by Mr. Braden, but the article is by Sumner Welles. I continue to read it:

The world situation is from day to day becoming darker. Anarchy is quickly spreading over the earth. As a result of the trend of our inter-American policy during the last 2 years, that hemispheric solidarity which by the joint efforts of all of the American nations had been painstakingly built up during earlier years is in danger of disappearing.

That solidarity was the greatest insurance which the United States possessed during the earlier stages of the war. What would the position of the United States have been when it was plunged into war in the Atlantic as well as in the Pacific had it also been compelled to guard against the danger of an attack from within the Americas and had it not received the wholehearted cooperation of its American neighbors? In the increasingly critical situation of the world today, that solidarity and that support are quite as indispensable to the safety of the United States as they were 4 years ago.

In our Government apparently only the Senate of the United States recognizes the gravity of the situation and the disastrous damage which the present policy of the Department of State is doing to the inter-American system.

It is for that reason that today those leaders of opinion in the Latin-American republics who have worked to build up the regional system of the New World, and who regard its preservation as essential to the security of all of the Americas, are looking to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate for remedial action before it is too late.

What is happening, Mr. President? Even in South America the vital interests of the American people are being undermined by policies in the State Department which are destroying the good will, the sympathy, and the support of the South American republics, and those are things which are derived directly from the good-neighbor policy inaugurated in 1933. It cannot be that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle welcome such a prospect as that America should find 21 republics to the south joined with the rest of the world in wreaking their hatred and their suspicion upon the United States.

Mr. President, as though this were not a grave enough crisis, we now discover, to our dismay, that the United States Army itself is now appealing to the United States Senate against practices and policies of career men and diplomats in our Foreign Service in control of our foreign affairs who have destroyed the protection afforded them as defenders of this country by provisions which have been contained in the Hague Convention of 1907 and the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention of 1929.

In the New York Times of November 26, Frank E. Mason, correspondent for the North American Newspaper Alliance, wrote the following story which ought to strike terror in the heart of every patriotic and freedom-loving American:

ARMY CALLED FOE OF JACKSON VIEWS—OFFICERS IN GERMANY SAID TO OPPOSE WAR-CRIME IDEAS, OCCUPATION PRACTICE

(By Frank E. Mason)

WASHINGTON, November 25.—The Nuremberg trial is intensifying the Army's urgent insistence that American civilians speedily take complete responsibilty for the government of Germany. For weeks Regular Army officers in Germany have viewed the development of Justice Robert H. Jackson's new theories of international law with distrust.

Collective responsibility or institutional guilt, whereby every person listed on the membership of an organization is an equal partner in crime, is a new principle of international justice, sponsored by the American members of the court. Overcoming the opposition of Britain, Russia, and France, the American representatives finally prevailed on them to agree that all German General Staff and high command officers "be condemned as a criminal group."

American General Staff officers, needless to say, side with the British, Russians, and French against Justice Jackson and his demand that professional soldiers be convicted as criminals on no more individual evidence than their membership in an army general staff. Our Regular officers in Europe are becoming increasingly vocal in expressing opposition to any such international law.

WANT HELP FROM CONGRESS

Since it now appears to be the law, they want to know what new principles of military organization are being contemplated by the Congress of the United States to safeguard our career Army officers from continuance as whipping boys of politicians and civilian administrators who give the secret orders for which the Army officers take the public blame.

Because Army officers, never free from the menace of discipline, will obey orders and keep their mouths shut, they are frequently forced to assume responsibility publicly for measures taken in occupied Germany that they did not initiate and for which they had authority. These officers often appear to the world as sponsoring or approving policies in Germany that they privately condemn as un-American.

Mr. President, I listened yesterday afternoon to the terrifying picture of the predicament America finds herself in abroad, drawn by the distinguished and able Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I listened to his entire address. Grim as that picture was I confess that the picture drawn here today is even more grim, for it amplifies in specific detail the very mistrust which I voiced on the Senate floor of what was happening to America from within, when I opposed Mr. Acheson's attack upon General MacArthur and when I opposed the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Acheson to be Under Secretary of State.

Mr. President, is it possible that we have fought this most tragic of all wars in history only to discover that the gravest danger and threat to America was not and is not derived from any foreign power or combinations of power, but from an insidious conspiratorial minority of foreign agents and their dupes who have used the glorious freedoms of this land to work destruction from within?

Mr. President, again I say that the charges which are now being leveled at policy-making officers of our State Department border on treason. I ask how we are going to assure security to the other 70 nations of the earth which are now tossing on the floodtides of chaos unless we act to retain control of our own Government and our own policies before it is too late.

I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution, for the consideration of my colleagues, to implement that request. I send the resolution to the desk, and ask that it be read and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 197) was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and read, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee to be composed of five Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate is authorized and

directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the policies, operations, administration, and personnel of the Department of State, with particular emphasis on (1) any variance between the policies now being pursued and those expressed in the Atlantic Charter, the Potsdam Agreement, and the various agreements entered into in recent years by the American Republics, (2) any intervention by personnel of the Department of State in the domestic policies or affairs of the Latin-American Republics or other action by such personnel tending to destroy or militate against the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere, (3) whether any of the personnel of the Department of State have shaped or influenced or have attempted to shape or influence our foreign policies or our operations in any foreign nations with a view toward the establishment of a Communist form of government in such nations, (4) any actions taken in any foreign nation by any personnel of the Department of State which were known by them to be contrary to the foreign policy of the United States or the instructions of our ambassadors or ministers to such nations, (5) the extent to which personnel of the Department of State are in sympathy with Communist ideology, and (6) any conflict between the policies being pursued by the Department of State and those being pursued by our Army or Navy in any territory now occupied by our military or naval forces. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for having the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations without any objection on his part.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is a mania for the appointment of special committees. We have a number of them working now. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that so far as I am concerned I feel that the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has been quite nonpartisan in its consideration of all these matters, is entirely competent to conduct any investigation which may be made necessary or which the facts call for.

I am somewhat amazed that the Senator from Nebraska so hurriedly swallowed the entire statement of former Ambassador Hurley. I assume from his copious reading of the statement that he means to approve it and adopt it as his own. He quotes the general, and seemingly accepts his statement. As a matter of fact, General Hurley, in his dramatic resignation, gave out a press release which bore evidences of rather mature preparation. Today, however, a press conference was held by the Secretary of State in which the Secretary of State pointed out that on the day previous the Ambassador had indicated to him that he had expected to leave for China yesterday. Then, greatly to the surprise of the Secretary of State, in a conversation over the telephone, Mr. Hurley told the Secretary of State that he was going to resign.

Mr. President, in his statement Mr. Hurley points out that he is entirely in agreement with the policies of the President and the Secretary of State. He said that not once, but I think twice, and possibly three times. He said that he was entirely in agreement with the foreign policy of the President and the Secretary of State. But, he says, there is a clerk or two somewhere in the service who does not agree with him, and that he will resign because of that fact. That is the essence of his statement. I have before me a quotation from the New York Times. The New York Times is a thoroughly authentic newspaper. The quotation consists of General Hurley's statement, which reads in part as follows:

Inasmuch as I am in agreement with the President and the Secretary of State on our foreign policy, I think I owe it to them as well as to the country—

The word "country" should be underscored, emphasized, and put in italics—

to point out the reasons for the failure of the American foreign policy in reaching the objectives for which we said we were fighting the war.

Previously he had said:

It is a source of gratification to me that in all my missions I had the support of President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stettinius, President Truman, and Secretary Byrnes.

He had the support of all those gentlemen up to the time he resigned.

Mr. President, what are his complaints? He does not indicate in his statement the names of the two subordinates who, he says, have done so much to wreck his policies. In his news release today the Secretary of State said that if those men were identified and their misdoings pointed out, he would dismiss them immediately. If General Hurley is in complete agreement with the foreign policy of the President and the Secretary of State, what kind of complaint does he make? He says that a couple of Assistant Secretaries, or clerks, or other subordinates, one of whom is a man named Atcheson and the other a man named Service, have done something that he does not like, but he does not point out anything which enables me to find out what they have done. He says that they were not in sympathy with his policy. Mr. President, it is amazing that an Ambassador who has been supported by so many men of high public office as those whom Mr. Hurley states have supported him, should make such a dramatic resignation and hurl these violent charges, which the Senator from Nebraska has said are tantamount to an accusation of treason.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Those charges have been hurled into the faces of the President and the Secretary of State.

The Committee on Foreign Relations is in session quite frequently, and we are in touch with the Secretary of State quite often. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I expect to go into this matter. I have been considering calling some of the parties involved before the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, the Senator from Nebraska does not seem to be satisfied with that committee and wants a special committee appointed. We agree, however, that in the Foreign Relations Committee we will give consideration to his desire for the appointment of a special committee.

Former Ambassador Hurley absolves a great many of the career men, and says that they are fine men. I do not know any of the career men to whom he refers. I hold no brief for them. But it seems to me to be a most extraordinary situation that an Ambassador, who says that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State have unanimously supported him and that he agrees completely with the foreign policy of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, should break forth and condemn and denounce all the foreign policy of the United States merely because a clerk or a subordinate did not agree with him.

Quite frequently I find it necessary to go to the State Department and when I arrive a man who is standing there opens the door for me. I would not become angry about our foreign policy if he did not open the door in the way I think he should open it. A person visits the State Department, sees a great many clerks, subordinates, and functionaries standing around. I would not become angry with the Secretary of State merely because some one of those subordinates had a moustache that I did not admire, or wore a type of striped trousers which I did not like. But, Mr. President, I would welcome an investigation into this matter. I should like General Hurley to come before the committee, take the stand, look some of us in the eye and tell us what are these terrible acts of treachery, and things of that kind.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I invite attention to an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. I read it with considerable interest. It carried a compliment which was paid to our high officials by General Hurley. The editorial states in part:

In his statement General Hurley points the finger of blame for what he calls "the hydra-headed direction and confusion of our foreign policy" in another direction. He exonerates the "higher echelons of our policy-making officials." The fault lies, he says, with the professional diplomats. Many of them, instead of carrying out policies already laid down, tried to set up policies of their own.

Mr. President, in calling the editorial to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Texas, I agree thoroughly with what he has said with reference to the editorial in the Washington Post, as well as the article by Sumner Welles to which reference was made. If I understand English, General Hurley believes that the Secretary of State and our great President are doing everything which they can possibly do. As the distinguished Senator from Texas has suggested, and as is suggested by the editorial from which I have read, it might be that some person far down the line has perhaps aggravated someone above.

I thank the Senator for allowing me to interrupt him.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I do not care to consume more time of the Senate. General Hurley, without immodesty, recites a long list of missions on which he served during the war and since. I read from his statement:

During the war I have served in Java, Australia, New Zealand, and generally in the Southwest Pacific, in Egypt, Palestine—

They should have him in Palestine now. He would settle the dispute there—

Lebanon, Syria, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, Afghanistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and China.

Mr. President, the clear implication is that in his service to the United States he has settled all intricate questions in all these countries except China.

That, however, is not the point I make. The point I make is that when he was serving in these various countries he was there by the grace of the President of the United States, and he was there with the confidence and the backing of the President of the United States, because he says in his statement that at all times he had the support of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, it looks to me as if it is a little ungracious for an Ambassador to a great country, having enjoyed these periods of service all over the world by appointment of the President of the United States, now, because of his disagreement with some subordinate somewhere—what it was about I do not know, it never having been made clear as to what he says they did—to resign his great station in a moment of anger, or pique, and undertake to cover the foreign policy of the United States all over with obloquy and diplomatic slime, and say that the foreign policy of the United States is almost approaching treason, as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, today the Secretary of State held a press conference. I shall read what he said, in part. The answers I shall read were made to very insistent inquiries by the representatives of the press. This was a question:

Mr. Secretary, Ambassador Hurley made some very serious charges about the foreign service in China. Is there any comment you can make on that?

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Nebraska. I listened with great interest and regard to what he said, and undertook to follow his statement with an analytical mind, which I do not claim to possess, but I was straining in that direction during the Senator's remarks. I should be very glad if the Senator would now give heed to some of my comments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Nebraska was commenting to me on the Senator's remarks. He was listening, and he and I were speaking with favor of the Senator's current remarks. We were not disregarding the Senator's remarks at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish the Senator would not be so quiet about it if he favors the remarks of the Senator from Texas, but would say something about them out loud on the floor. [Laughter.] That is a very good alibi for a conversation which was really very irritating and embarrassing to the Senator from Texas. I always crave the attention of the Senator from Ohio, but rarely ever get it. [Laughter.]

The question was:

Is there any comment you can make on that?

The Secretary's response to the question was:

No. I would only say this: The Ambassador is one of my very good friends.

That is, I assume, was a good friend. I do not know whether he is still a good friend or not. I quote further:

I greatly regret that he could not see his way clear to return to China. I had talked with him the day before and expected that he would return to China.

The day before General Hurley handed in his resignation he led the Secretary of State at least to believe that he was going back to China as Ambassador. What happened to him? To whom did he talk? What kind of a conference did he have between the time he talked to Secretary Byrnes and the time he gave out this great press release to the newspapers for publication throughout the whole United States?

I now repeat a little in order to preserve the context. The Secretary said:

I had talked with him the day before and expected that he would return to China this afternoon—

That was today, this afternoon, as the Secretary's statement was made this morning—

after he had filled an engagement at the Press Club.

The Ambassador had an engagement to make an address at the Press Club, and I am informed by reading other portions of this statement that the reason he gave the President and Secretary of State why he could not return to China so soon was that he had this engagement to make a speech. They said, "Fine; that is all right. Wait until your speech is made." So the Secretary of State expected him to stay over today and make his speech at the Press Club. And I suppose he did make it. I suppose he made the speech today at the Press Club, after this statement; that he had a good attendance, plenty of attention, plenty of ink to write what he said, and I doubt not that the Ambassador was there on time, and that there was plenty of curiosity and plenty of interest throughout the country. I imagine the Senator from Nebraska was there in order to get the details of these acts of treachery.

The China mission is important. He admits that. A great work is going on. Our interest is being neglected, our interest there is being sabotaged, but he could not go until he made the speech at the Press Club. He had to stay for a speech. That is all right. I am glad he stayed.

The Secretary of State further said:

He later advised me that he could not.

That is, that he could not go back to China.

I talked to him over the telephone Tuesday afternoon—

That was yesterday afternoon—

and he said that he had determined, after reading some speeches of Congressmen and believing that the speeches they made possibly had been based upon information from the State Department, that he could not return.

Mr. President, that is the greatest achievement any Member of the House of Representatives has attained in my time in the Congress. One little speech drives a great Ambassador from his post in China—just one little speech by a Member of the House of Representatives! I do not know who the Member was. A man who can do that is right on the road to the Presidency now.

This is Secretary Byrnes speaking:

The Ambassador, during the war, has served in some important missions with efficiency and I greatly regret that he could not return as I had urged him to do.

Mr. President, I would have the Senate note the difference between the attitude of the Secretary of State in his references to General Hurley, all of which were in the finest spirit, filled with praise, stating he was a friend of his, and so on, and the statements of the Ambassador, while pretending to be supporting the policies of the Secretary of State and the President, yet damning the whole organization of the State Department, damning the whole conduct of our foreign relations.

Then this question was asked:

Mr. Secretary, have you investigated the charges made by the former Ambassador?

I want the Senator from Nebraska to at least note this. The Secretary replied:

No. Well, I don't know what charges you have reference to.

Why did not the Ambassador tell the Secretary of State what his charges were? Why did he not list them? Why did not the indictment he drew find its way to the written page, and point out the acts of treason of which the Senator makes mention?

This is what the Secretary said:

But the Ambassador did tell me when I asked him a month ago when he was here—

he mentioned two employees of the Department, one in 1941 and one in 1944—

How the one incident in 1941 could affect the present policy in China I do not know. Perhaps General Hurley knows. One was in 1944. The war was still on in 1944. We had not then fixed any peacetime policy toward China that I know of, and how an incident in 1944 could destroy our policy in China at the present moment I do not know—

and in February 1945—

He gives one incident in this year, but still before the war was concluded, either in Germany or Japan.

had taken positions—

I want to find out the heart of this indictment, this arraignment of these men—

had taken positions or held views that differed from his views in the accomplishment of the mission there.

They did not agree with him wholly, and therefore, according to the Senator from Nebraska, appeared approaching treason.

Secretary Byrnes continued:

I did read a report as a result of it. When the statement was repeated the day before yesterday, I did send for a report and it impressed me that there was evidently a difference of opinion and the gentleman who was in charge of the embassy while the Ambassador was away—the difference of opinion was as to the peacemaking that had been attempted in order to restore unity and to bring the two factions together.

That was back, I assume, I am bringing it down to the most recent date, in February 1945.

The two gentlemen referred to—one was Mr. Atcheson—

I want to make it clear that it is not Mr. Dean Acheson, who is Under Secretary of State, but it is another Atcheson, George Atcheson—

The two gentlemen referred to, one was Mr. Atcheson, and the other Mr. Service. Neither Mr. Atcheson nor Mr. Service is now in China.

Neither one of these culprits is now in China.

Mr. BRIDGES. He did not point out, however, that they had been sent to Japan and are there with the advisers to General MacArthur.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will do that, if the Senator wants me to. The Secretary is not talking about conditions in Japan, but in China. Evidently because of the complaint of the Ambassador these men were taken away from China. They have got to be sent somewhere. I do not see why they ought to be executed because they do not agree with the Ambassador.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator wish to say something?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will wait until the Senator has concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; but the Senator is trying to make jest of a very serious matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator from Texas is not trying to make jest. He is trying to show the ridiculous attitude of the former Ambassador to China.

Mr. BRIDGES. Pat Hurley is a great American and what he says justifies a serious inquiry.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know many great Americans, however, who are not worthy to be ambassadors. I am not attacking Pat Hurley. I know Pat Hurley. I presume I have known him longer than the Senator from New Hampshire has. I knew him when he was Secretary of War.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not think the Senator should reflect upon his character.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not reflected on his character. If I have, I withdraw it. I have made no reflection on his character. The Senator cannot point out where I have made any reflection on his character. I know him very well.

Mr. BRIDGES. Instead of handling the matter in a manner of jest, why does not the Foreign Relations Committee get General Hurley up here and question him?

Mr. CONNALLY. We will get him up here in plenty of time. This just happened this morning. I suppose the committee ought to have assembled at 7:30 this morning and had him up here at 8.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator treats everything with jest. This is a serious matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know it is serious. It is not serious, however, when an ambassador resigns and assails his chieftain. It is not serious when a man assassinates the reputation of the whole State Department because some of the subordinates do not suit him. If the Senator from New Hampshire will contain himself a little while I shall yield the floor to him and he can speak until 9 o'clock if he desires.

Mr. President, I desire to be courteous to the Senator from New Hampshire. I am not attacking General Hurley. I am, though, attacking his judgment. I am attacking his resignation under these circumstances. I know General Hurley and esteem him personally very much, just as the Secretary of State esteems him, but I do not imagine the Secretary of State appreciates his action and his conduct when he led him to believe on Tuesday that he was going back to China, and then told him over the telephone "I have already resigned, and I have handed out a statement to the press." I do not think that is quite in keeping with the relationship between a chieftain and his subordinate, a chieftain who has placed confidence in his subordinate, and honored him and bestowed upon him every confidence and consideration and trust.

I continue to read:

Neither Mr. Atcheson nor Mr. Service is now in China, and I so advised the Ambassador, and advised him that as long as I was Secretary of State, when he had been appointed Ambassador, that I would hold him responsible, and if there was anybody in the Embassy who interfered with him, I wanted to know it and that man would be removed.

The Ambassador had the solemn assurance of the Secretary of State that if he should go back to China, he, the Secretary of State, would support him, and that any man who interfered with policies out there would be removed. And yet in the face of a statement on Tuesday that he expected to return to China, and with that sort of an assurance from the Secretary of State, General Hurley hands out this long letter of resignation addressed to the people of the United States.

The man who was in charge of the Embassy for me was going to be held responsible—

That is the Secretary speaking—

and therefore could not be interfered with. He expressed his great pleasure to me as he has to me publicly at that backing and said that no man could ask for more.

The Ambassador told the Secretary of State that no man could ask for more than the assurances that the Secretary of State had given him as to his backing and support if he should return to China.

Mr. President, it seems to me that a man who is capable, who is informed of conditions in China, with the assurances of the Secretary of State that he would have his support, and who has stated that he was in entire harmony with the policies of the President and of the Secretary of State, could render a more useful public service by returning to China than surrendering his commission and provoking bitter issues here at home.

Question. Are you going to make public his reports and those of other officers in Chungking as he has suggested?

Answer. I really don't know. I have not read them. I would have to read them to determine that because I must reply on an ambassador having the right to express to me, not only factual statements but speculation and everything else about the area in which he serves. I don't know what reports are referred to—what is in them. I would have to read them before answering.

Question. Mr. Secretary, do you have any evidence for or against General Hurley's charges that some of the foreign service people were favoring communism and imperialistic blocs as against American policy, particularly with reference to Mr. Atcheson and Mr. Service.

Answer (by Secretary Byrnes). No; I have none. I say to you that statement was made—not that statement exactly but substantially the statement that the Ambassador had made in his release about these two gentlemen—was made to me. I did investigate it to see whether they were returned to the Department and placed in supervisory capacities. They were not, according to the record in the Department. Of course, I am talking about things that happened before I was in charge of the Department and I rely on the records. Neither one of them was placed in a supervisory position but they did return and Mr. Atcheson, after spending a few months here was sent to Tokyo—

I hope the Senator from New Hampshire is convinced now that the Senator from Texas is not trying to conceal something from him or holding something back in the dark—

was sent to Tokyo and Mr. Service is one of his assistants.

I know neither one of them. I do not know Mr. Atcheson and I do not know Mr. Service. I have no interest in them personally.

He occupied an administrative position here in the Department, I am informed, and

those gentlemen are in Japan with the advisers to General MacArthur.

I shall not read the remainder of this statement. I want to read what occurred further on. The Secretary was asked another question which I shall not read at length.

Question. Mr. Secretary, when was that telephone call made by Mr. Hurley to you?

Answer. No. I telephoned him to ask him whether he had authorized that release.

It sounds very much as if the Secretary had seen the release in the newspaper before he had the information from General Hurley, because he said:

I telephoned him to ask him whether he had authorized that release.

Question. That was after the release?

Answer. Yes; when he left me the day before, it was my understanding he would leave this afternoon for China.

Question. Have you any comment on two statements made by Mr. Hurley in his resignation. He said, "Instead of putting our weight behind the Charter of the United Nations, we have been definitely supporting the imperialistic bloc. At the same time a considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support communism generally as well as specifically in China." That is in reference to China in general. That is one, sir.

Answer. That is enough. I read the newspapers, and in the newspapers I read that I ought to investigate the Department that was turned over to me; that there is a definite anti-Russian bloc here, and if I do not watch my step, they will influence my decision. They say there is a definite pro-Russian bloc and that I have to watch that crowd. There is also in there the statement that you read to me, that they are pro-imperialistic at the same time.

Mr. President, I have just had handed to me by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune. I will not weary the Senate by reading it all, but I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 28, 1945]

MR. HURLEY EXPLODES

After months of controversy in the State Department over America's policy in China, Patrick J. Hurley has resigned as Ambassador to Chungking. He announced his resignation, prior to its submission to President Truman, in a statement which showed little courtesy to the President and little consideration for the difficulties this country faces in its relations with Great Britain and Russia. In it he vehemently criticized minor officeholders in the State Department, denouncing them for everything that has gone wrong.

Mr. Hurley has served his country well in many capacities, but his resignation from his post in China is to be welcomed. He is entirely mistaken in attributing American errors in China to the career men in the diplomatic service. Much of the responsibility is Mr. Hurley's own. Much of it belongs to the Presidents and Secretaries of State who kept him in China, despite his lack of success. The rest of it can be attributed to America's complete lack of an integrated foreign policy, which made it possible for Mr. Hurley to follow his own ideas in the Orient.

It was pointed out on this page as long ago as last June that Mr. Hurley's policies were tending to produce a civil war in China in which America would be involved. The same viewpoint was held by most of the China experts in the State Department. It was because they held this opinion, which proved to be correct, that they did their utmost to change the policies devised by the Ambassador. Aside from his criticism of these experts Mr. Hurley's statement is a strange mixture of confusion, sound observation, and nonsense. The confusion appears in his assertion at one point that America is bolstering both imperialism and communism in the Orient and at another that "we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism."

Despite its confusing qualities, however, the general implication of Mr. Hurley's statement is strongly anti-Russian. It is a dangerous statement, just as Mr. Hurley's policies in China were dangerous, for it is likely to increase Russian suspicions of America's actions in the Orient. The character of the statement, of course, will make more difficult the task of Mr. Hurley's successor. President Truman obviously had this in mind when he called upon General Marshall, one of the most talented of Americans and a man of world prestige, to go to China as a special envoy with the rank of Ambassador. No better choice could have been made. But General Marshall faces a task of extreme difficulty. He will need all his exceptional talents if he is to repair the damage that has been done in the last year. The obstacles he faces will be almost insurmountable unless the administration develops an integrated foreign policy providing for actions in China directly related to American policies in other parts of the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. The headline of the editorial is "Mr. Hurley explodes." It read in part as follows:

After months of controversy in the State Department over America's policy in China Patrick J. Hurley has resigned as Ambassador to Chungking. He announced his resignation, prior to its submission to President Truman, in a statement which showed little courtesy to the President and little consideration for the difficulties this country faces in its relations with Great Britain and Russia. In it he vehemently criticized minor officeholders in the State Department, denouncing them for everything that has gone wrong.

At another point the editorial states:

It was pointed out on this page as long ago as last June that Mr. Hurley's policies were tending to produce a civil war in China in which America would be involved.

This is the New York Herald Tribune speaking. This is serious, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire. This is not the frivolous language of the Senator from Texas. This is the New York Herald Tribune. I doubt not that the Senator has worshipped at that shrine for many years in the past.

The editorial continues:

The same viewpoint was held by most of the China experts in the State Department. It was because they held this opinion, which proved to be correct, that they did their utmost to change the policies devised by the Ambassador. Aside from his criticism of these experts Mr. Hurley's statement is a strange mixture of confusion, sound observation, and nonsense. The confusion appears in his assertion at one point that America is bolstering both imperialism and communism in the Orient and at another that "we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against communistic imperialism."

Mr. President, I shall not take more of the time of the Senate, except to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations is not indifferent to occurrences of this nature. Immediately upon reading of the resignation of General Hurley it occurred to me that it might be appropriate for the Committee on Foreign Relations to call him before the committee and have a fuller and more complete exposition of his reasons and views. I would not do such a thing without consulting other members of the committee, particularly representatives of the minority. I always try to confer with representatives of the minority on that committee and agree on a policy.

But, Mr. President, this is no time for partisan politics. This is no time to interject into our foreign relations matters of political expediency. God knows, the world is faced with troubles enough. All over the globe there are dark spots; all over the earth there are lowering clouds; all over the earth there are threats of conflict, confusion, and war. If we in the United States are to contribute to the solution of any of these international problems, we must be united. We must act as Americans—not as Republicans and not as Democrats.

I greatly regret that General Hurley should have resigned in this melodramatic fashion at a very critical juncture in our foreign relations. His resignation cannot contribute to the solution of this question. It will go out to the world that there is a battle in progress here at home between General Hurley and the State Department, and perhaps the President, over the foreign policy of the United States, notwithstanding the statement of General Hurley that he is now, and has been at all times, in complete agreement with the foreign policy of the President and the Secretary of State.

So, Mr. President, I plead with Senators and with the country to treat questions involving our foreign relations not as partisans but as Americans. Let us approach them in a spirit of unity and concord. If there is anyone in the Foreign Service who is disloyal to the President's ideas as to foreign policy, he should be discharged tomorrow, and I am sure that the Secretary of State will discharge him tomorrow if charges are brought in any detail.

Mr. President, I have read everything I can find on the subject, and I have discovered no concrete or detailed charges made by General Hurley against these men. He made some general statement to the effect that they did not agree with his views. That is not sufficient.

I will say to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that I have no disposition to impede, hinder, or delay a thorough investigation. It is true that the basis for an investigation is rather meager because no specific charges are made, but I am perfectly willing to have General Hurley appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any other committee, and invite him to set forth in detail the charges and indictments which he wishes to bring, not only against the two gentlemen about whom

he is talking but anyone else in the service. The same loyalty which he owed to the President and the Secretary of State ought to have been owed by his subordinates to him, and if they could not operate in harmony with him they ought to be removed. I stand for that policy.

While General Hurley is preaching the doctrine of loyalty of his subordinates to himself he ought to remember that there is a lofty obligation on an Ambassador who goes forth with the commission of the President of the United States under present world conditions, when peace is so much to be desired and when war is so threatening on all fronts. He ought to remember that he himself has a great obligation of loyalty. My own view is that he should have frankly told the Secretary of State and the President that he wanted to resign, and he should have resigned, giving his reasons and filing charges, if any. But in doing so he should not have assailed the whole foreign policy of the United States, and sought to cover it with shame and obloquy, bringing upon it the contempt and opprobrium of the people of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in all my experience as a practicing attorney I cannot recall a case in which opposing counsel made a better plea for my position than has been made by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I did not intend by my remarks to provoke a political discussion, or any opposition whatever from the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He has in his jocular and sort of hula-dance fashion come to my defense in such an eloquent discourse that I wish to thank him for bringing to the attention of the Senate the fact that we do need an investigation of the Department which is conducting our foreign relations. In order to prove his point, he read from the New York Herald Tribune an editorial stating that Hurley exploded and after months of controversy he resigned. What more than that could one ask as a basis for an investigation?

Mr. President, the only thing at all in the statement of the Senator from Texas which needs an answer is his oft-repeated reference to certain persons as just a couple of chore boys.

Mr. President, General Hurley was the Ambassador of the President of the United States. Do not ever forget that. He spoke for the President; he spoke for the Department of State. His word was final. He had all the authority he needed. Does anyone think a couple of little chore boys would cause him to resign, if the subject matter were not so highly controversial that the only thing left for him to do was to resign? I do not know General Hurley; I have never met him. But I say that when he makes a statement of this kind an investigation is certainly called for. I will read his statement again:

> The professional foreign-service men sided with the Chinese Communist Armed Party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself.

I say that such action is just short of treason, and it violates the very thing we have been working for in the United Nations Charter. It violates the very thing I voted for, under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Yet he attempts to laugh it off and to say that the person referred to is only a chore boy.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not yield at this time. The Senator from Texas had the floor for almost an hour, and I did not bother him while he was making his melodramatic plea; I let him conclude his remarks.

I wish to quote something else that General Hurley said:

> Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States.

Mr. President, General Hurley was the representative of the President; he was the man who was carrying out the President's policies. I am not criticising the President's policies; I do not know what they were. But there was a representative of the President of the United States who was being thwarted by Soviet sympathizers in the State Department. General Hurley said they did not represent the President of the United States. He said that—

> The professional foreign-service men sided with the Chinese Communist Armed Party and the imperialistic bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself.

In other words, to prevent the unification of the Chinese Communist Army with the National Army. The National Army is the army of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek. It is the army which is fighting for a central government in China. It is the army which is trying to give the people of China liberation. It is the army which is trying to bring about in China what we are trying to bring about by the United Nations Organization. Yet we are financing three ends of a revolution and General Hurley has resigned, but the distinguished Senator from Texas tries to laugh it off by saying that the persons referred to are only chore boys.

Mr. President, the people of America want to know about this matter. They wish to have an investigation made. I think the time has come when the Senate of the United States should have an investigation not only of General Hurley but of every representative of our foreign department in Japan and in China, and also of this man George Atcheson, this man Service, and some of the others. Not a word has been said about what is happening in South America and Europe.

Mr. President, I say that we need a house cleaning in the State Department and we need unification of the so-called groups in the State Department that are attempting to control the foreign policies of the United States despite the policies of the President of the United States.

Why shculd there be any charge of politics about such a request? The Senator from Texas should be the first one who would wish to have light shed in the dark corners of secrecy as to the policies of the United States regarding the whole world. That is what I am requesting. I believe we need such an inquiry, and I think my belief is the belief of the people of America.

Mr. President, I shall not let anyone intimidate me. When seriously I submit a resolution, it is not the work of a chore boy. The resolution I have submitted calls for recognition of the policies of the President of the United States which have been thwarted by chore boys in the State Department and in China and in Europe.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial appearing in the Washington Post printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL HURLEY'S CHARGES

In resigning his post as American Ambassador to China, Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley has made charges against our foreign service so serious as to render a congressional investigation inevitable If his charges are backed up by concrete evidence, a drastic shake-up in the State Department and its foreign service is clearly called for. The Nation cannot tolerate having foreign-service officers act, as the Ambassador accuses some of them of having acted, in a manner that constitutes sabotage of policies laid down by the President and the Secretary of State.

During recent years there has been widespread criticism of the men at the top of the State Department hierarchy. In his statement General Hurley points the finger of blame for what he calls the hydra-headed direction and confusion of our foreign policy in another direction. He exonerates the "higher echelons of our policy-making officials." The fault lies, he says, with the professional diplomats. Many of them, instead of carrying out policies already laid down, tried to set up policies of their own. Consequently, General Hurley alleges, our China policy today is one of confusion. Certainly, as he says, "no international policy can succeed without loyal and effective implementation." All this a congressional committee might well look into. In the meantime General Hurley has made a proposal which ought to be acted on at once.

Pointing out that during the war we had to maintain secrecy to prevent giving aid to the enemy, he argues that the time has come to lift the veil of secrecy that has hidden so much of our foreign-policy activities with the result that, as he rightly says, "the American people have too little basic information to judge the extent to which their State Department correctly interprets and administers the foreign policies of the Nation." To that end General Hurley has declared his willingness to have all his reports made public together with the reports "by those officials in the foreign service who have differed with the promulgated American policy." The State Department cannot afford to ignore this challenge.

With the situation in China in a highly critical state, it is fortunate that there is to be no hiatus in our representation at Chungking. General Marshall's appointment to succeed Ambassador Hurley reflects the great importance that the President attaches to this assignment.

Mr. WHERRY. At this point, Mr. President, I read the first sentence of the editorial:

> In resigning his post as American Ambassador to China, Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley has made charges against our foreign service so serious as to render a congressional investigation inevitable.

Mr. President, why should not we have such an investigation? Why should not we look into the matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska address his remarks to me?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, why should not we examine the foreign-relations service of our Government and remove from it men who have policies which are contradictory to the policies of the United States. Believe me, if we examine into our foreign-relations service we will find in it plenty of such persons.

Mr. President, I did not intend to have an altercation with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Texas. As I said yesterday on the floor of the Senate, many times in the Committee on the Judiciary I sided with the Senator from Texas. I thank him for his leadership and I wish to doff my hat to him now. I think he is a very able man.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly thank the able Senator from Michigan, also, for so ably leading me. In following his leadership I have followed the leadership of a man whom I believe to be one of our greatest American statesmen—the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Today I have submitted a resolution calling for an investigation of those in the State Department who have attempted to advance policies which violate the very preamble of the Charter of the United Nations. Mr. President, if we wish to have peace given to the people of the world, we cannot have a three-sided policy in China. Yet, that is the sort of policy which certain persons in our foreign service have attempted to establish in China, according to the charges of General Hurley.

So, Mr. President, not only do I say that I think the Senate should unanimously adopt the resolution, for the benefit of the Senate, but I say the Senate should adopt it for the benefit of the people of America and the people of the world, so as to clarify what our policies are, not only in China, but in South America and in Europe.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for yielding to me.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks of various Members of this body. I listened over the radio to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and I listened to his remarks in this Chamber. I listened to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]; I listened to the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. Yesterday I listened to the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Today I listened to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. It is clear to me, and it should be clear to every other American, that there is trouble in the hearts and minds of sincere men, men who represent their constituents in the Senate and work for the best interests of America. I have no quarrel with the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], except on one point. I do not disagree with him in regard to raising some question as to the manner in which the resignation of General Hurley was given and whether it was properly given. The only thing I criticize is the fact that the Senator from Texas, in speaking in the Senate, attempted, in the humorous way in which he is so adept, to pass off with a jest the statement of General Hurley. I rise to comment on that because I think it is serious. Regardless of whether General Hurley is right or wrong, I think he is a great American, and I believe he thinks he is doing what is for the best interests of the United States of America.

I feel that with indecision and question in the hearts and minds of so many Senators, so many Members of the House of Representatives, and so many millions of the American people, when an Ambassador of the United States Government makes definite charges, as General Hurley did, they should be accorded serious and careful consideration and thorough investigation should be made before prejudging them and passing them off humorously, as the Senator from Texas has attempted to do.

I agree with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in his statement that we are going to have General Hurley come before us and request him to be definite and specific with regard to the charges which he has made. I should like to have General Hurley called before the Foreign Relations Committee at its regular meeting a week from today, be put on the carpet, and given an opportunity to go into detail with regard to the charges he has made in a general way through the newspapers. I should like to have the Department of State put on the carpet. I should like to see action taken by the President and the State Department in regard to the charges which have been made by General Hurley, and ascertain whether they can be proved to be correct. There cannot be a great deal of smoke without there being some fire. All kinds of rumors have sifted around this country as to the conduct of affairs in China by our State Department. I think it is very wise at the present time, before the fire breaks out in any great volume, to have a thorough investigation made. I think we should go into the subject painstakingly and completely. I think we owe that much to the country and to the Senate. I think the men who have raised in the Senate and on the radio question with regard to our foreign policy are sincere Americans. They are entitled to have the matter investigated, and have their thoughts and views taken seriously.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is greatly in error if he thinks that I regard the circumstances surrounding the resignation of General Hurley as being a matter of small moment. I did make a remark rather lightly with reference to employees of the State Department, but I did not mean to offend the gloomy dignity of the Senator from New Hampshire. I knew that he spent most of his time meditating over matters, and that he did not care to be interrupted. However, I repeat that I assure the Senator that if in the future I see him present I shall withhold any comments of a like nature until sometime when he is absent.

But seriously, Mr. President, I do not mean to treat the matter lightly. Of course, it is serious for an ambassador, who has the intimate relationship which an ambassador should have with his chief, and, as a matter of fact, who carries around within his bosom secrets of state which have been imparted to him by his chieftain and Secretary of State, to make the charges which General Hurley has made. Of course, it is a serious matter when he resigns in the public press without first submitting his resignation to the Secretary of State or to the President of the United States until after he has announced it to the public through the public press, and when only the day before he left the impression with his chief that he would not resign but would return to his post, and had been given the assurance that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State would stand by him, support him, and would discharge any subordinate who was not loyal to his cause and his policies. No, Mr. President; it is not a frivolous matter. It is a very serious matter when we contemplate the world situation, the difficulties which beset us, the dangers which are upon us, and the disasters which may threaten us. We must solve these problems and face them.

The Foreign Relations Committee will not shirk its duties. I repeat what I said yesterday. I thank God that representing the minority on the Foreign Relations Committee there are Senators who approach these matters without partisanship and without any character of political consideration. I think that some of them will bear witness that I undertake to do the same on my side of the aisle. I hope that as Americans we may meet these questions with a solid front. I do not care anything about General Hurley's politics. If he were a Democrat instead of a Republican, and did what he has done, I would entertain the same sentiments with reference to him that I do now. I do not let my politics go to any further extent. I do not agree that because a man is a Republican he is not sincere and capable. Some of the best friends I have are Republicans. I think that many splendid and noble public servants are Republicans. They are just as loyal to their country as are the worthy Democrats. So, Mr. President, in solving these problems we must all cooperate together as Americans and not as Republicans or Democrats.

I am willing to hear General Hurley. I shall be glad to hear the Senator from Nebraska, if he desires to be heard, and the Senator from Maine, who is a member of the committee. I am sorry; I referred to the Senator from New Hampshire as being the Senator from Maine,

but, of course, I meant the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that I was born in the State of Maine, so I have no objection to be referred to as being from Maine.

Mr. CONNALLY. I had received a sort of a radar suggestion that there was something about Maine in the Senator from New Hampshire, and I unconsciously touched the point. I had no intention of offending or complimenting him upon his removal to New Hampshire. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nebraska did not yield to me when I asked him to yield, but I gladly yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. I always yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska does not always yield to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall always yield to the Senator from Texas. There is no Senator with whom I would rather debate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. A moment ago the Senator from Nebraska pointed his finger at me and said so and so.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and I am pointing at the Senator again and asking him if he will let us have this investigation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to the investigation. When I read in the newspapers this morning the articles with reference to Ambassador Hurley, I thought it would be well to bring him before the Foreign Relations Committee. However, I do not act without consulting the members of the committee. I have consulted only one or two of them with regard to the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Texas stated that he would call the Senator from Nebraska before the committee. To make an investigation is not my job. What the American people expect of the Senator from Texas is to make an investigation in order to ascertain the facts surrounding the group which it is said is within the State Department. If the Senator wants me to sit on the committee, there is nothing I would rather do. But I promise the Senator that I will work in the night hours in order to investigate the Department of State. It is not KENNETH WHERRY who should be called upon to make an investigation. The responsibility is on the shoulders of the Senate of the United States and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to uncover anything that can be uncovered with regard to the special group in the State Department that is thwarting the policies of this country. It is not for me to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee. It is not for the Senator from New Hampshire to do so. The responsibility for the investigation is on the Foreign Relations Committee. It should bring the policies of the State Department out into the open, and let the people of the United States know what is going on.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I am not trying to avoid any responsibility which I should assume. The Senator has said that it is not his responsibility. But if he knows anything, he should come before the committee. If he does not know anything, he should not talk so much about it.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that I do not know anything? He is the judge of that, is he?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. The Senator is the judge.

Mr. WHERRY. That is beside the question, and is just a part of the character of defense the Senator is making when he should not be thinking of such small things about anyone, but should be talking about the big thing we have before us; that is, an investigation of the State Department. So far as I am concerned, if by my resolution I have merely raised the question, then I have played a small part in it, and whether the Senator thinks I do or do not know anything makes not a bit of difference about what the resolution provides.

I want the Senator to know that I believe the American people, the fathers and mothers who have lost their boys, the people who are suffering the hardships and the hazards of war, want to know where our foreign policy is taking us. They are the ones who are expecting the Senator, as the chairman of the committee, to find out these things.

I have respect for the Senator. I always have had, and he knows that more than once I have helped him in committees and on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. But I want to tell him that the time has come when we cannot treat this thing lightly. We want to discover what the trouble is, and I think the Senator will find out if he makes an investigation. I think that is his responsibility.

Mr. CONNALLY. I regret the Senator from Nebraska seems to take offense. I was trying to be courteous.

Mr. WHERRY. Then do not tell me I do not know anything.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not tell the Senator that. I did not say anything about that. If the Senator will be patient for a moment, I assure him I was trying to be courteous to him. I said that we hoped to have General Hurley before us, and that we would be glad to hear the Senator from Nebraska if he desired to come. That was what I said. How that can offend him I do not know. Then I turned and said that the Senator from New Hampshire was a member of the committee, and I supposed he would be present. I do not see why Senators should be so sensitive. I was not implying that it was their duty to come. Of course it is not their duty to come.

Then the Senator from Nebraska said it was not his duty to come, and I said, "Well, if the Senator knows anything about it, it is his duty to come, and of course if he does not know anything about it, I do not see much cause for making so many speeches about it."

I withdraw the latter remark. I have no disposition to offend the Senator. I have a very high regard for him; in fact, I have a very tender personal regard for him, and I like him very much. But he is wearing a senatorial coat, or robe, or something, that is so sensitive and so delicate, so tender, that the slightest zephyr that blows, if it is not attuned exactly to his own feelings, irritates him. He is almost as sensitive as General Hurley.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the floor.

Mr. HILL. I merely wish to say that while we are considering this matter it should be noted that the men in the State Department against whom these criticisms are lodged, practically all the men in the State Department except a few at the very top, some 4 or 5, are what we refer to as "career men." That grows out of the fact that under a law passed by Congress some 20 years ago these men became connected with the State Department in what is called the Foreign Service, and Congress gave them certain rights and benefits in connection with their positions in the State Department.

Most of the men who today are among those being criticized and complained about were not brought into the State Department by the present administration, and were not selected or appointed by the present administration. The present administration got them by inheritance. Most of them were inherited from previous administrations. As I have said, these men have certain rights in their positions, given them under a law passed by the Congress. Most of them are in the positions in which they now serve by virtue of that law, by virtue of being in the, what is called the career service.

Mr. President, I am certain that we may be sure, just as the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has assured us, that his committee will go into this matter thoroughly, and that the present Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, will look into it. Knowing how able, how conscientious, how careful, and how devoted the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, is, we may be sure that he will thoroughly and painstakingly go into this matter and make certain that, insofar as he is able to do so, the men serving in the State Department are loyal, are fit, and are true.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. The President shall, in order to strengthen the rule of law and to reduce the crushing burden of armaments upon the peoples of the world (and to give greater

relative strength to the military forces under the jurisdiction of the Security Council for the enforcement of peace), instruct the representative of the United States in the Security Council to seek immediate action by the Security Council and by the General Assembly for an international agreement whereby compulsory military training and service shall be completely eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations.

On page 6, line 3, strike out "7" and insert in lieu thereof "8."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

REPLACEMENT OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CHECKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar which should be passed not later than Saturday, December 1. The bill was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Expenditures ir the Executive Departments and it passed the House unanimously. It was reported by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and I may say it has the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget. The Treasury Department is most anxious to have the bill passed. I have consulted the distinguished acting minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] about the bill. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is also familiar with it. I think there is no opposition to it.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4350.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4350) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr WHERRY. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that the minority membership of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments have no objection to the immediate consideration of the bill; therefore I shall not make objection, and we shall be glad to have the bill considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4350) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Finance:

George T. Cromwell, of Annapolis, Md., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., in place of Gilbert A. Dailey.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Green de Rosset to be records analyst, national headquarters, Selective Service Sytem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 28 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

The following-named persons to be foreign-service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Francis H. Colombat, of California.

Herbert D. Spivack, of New York.

(These nominations are hereby resubmitted in order to correct the spelling of the names as they appeared in the nominations submitted to the Senate on October 3, 1945.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Kenneth Ross Hagen, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 20, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Robert Weston Boal, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 20, 1945.

Capt. Lewis William Kirkman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 23, 1945.

Capt. Dean Schamber, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 30, 1945.

To be captain

First Lt. Daniel Hedgcoxe Cahoon, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 24, 1945.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Douglas Hall, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 5, 1945.

To be first lieutenant

Second Lt. Maurice William Hylden, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from December 19, 1945.

CHAPLAIN

To be major

Chaplain (Capt.) Luther Weltmer Evans, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 16, 1945.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Donald McKechnie Ashton, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from November 1, 1944.

Lt. Col. Stewart Darden Hervey, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

Capt. Daniel Russell Taylor, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. George Cornell Abert, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. Ralph Arthur Koch, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1941.

Maj. Roy Silverman, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

Capt. Meyer Abraham Braude, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

First Lt. Charles Allen Carroll, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 5, 1945.

First Lt. Aleck Francis MacDonald, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 1, 1942.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Second Lt. Philip Barrett Toon, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a fleet admiral of the United States Navy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 28 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

William Green de Rosset, to be records analyst, national headquarters, Selective

Service System, with compensation at the rate of $5,180 per annum.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Alden Harry Waitt, to be Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels

Harry Langdon Reeder, Infantry.
Jay Edward Gillfillan, Infantry.
Richard Jaquelin Marshall, Quartermaster Corps.
Leon Edward Ryder, Signal Corps.
Jay Drake Billings Lattin, Signal Corps.
James Donald MacMullen, Coast Artillery Corps.
Ralph Townsend Heard, Field Artillery.
Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Coast Artillery Corps.
Turner Mason Chambliss, Infantry.
John Frederick Ehlert, Infantry.
Theron Gray Methven, Infantry.
Robert Whiting Daniels, Ordnance Department.
Francis Arnold Hause, Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Paul Lewis Ransom, Infantry.
Roderick Random Allen, Cavalry.
Edward Elliott MacMorland, Ordnance Department.
Adolphus Worrell Roffe, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.
Manton Sprague Eddy, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
Henry Benjamin Holmes, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Gabriel Thornton Mackenzie, Infantry.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Page D. Guptill, Essex.

NEW JERSEY

Josephine Agnes Washkewicz, Hainesport.

NORTH DAKOTA

William A. Gamble, Edgeley.
Josephine McLauchlin, Sanish.
John Wiedmann, Venturia.

OREGON

Weldon C. Keller, Vida.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ethel E. Morris, Modena.

TENNESSEE

Walter M. Craig, Andersonville.
Eugene F. Roberts, Decatur.

TEXAS

Walter L. Wiseman, La Vernia.
James B. Pitman, Muldoon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most loving and patient Father, breathe upon our labors that we may come within the compass of sound reason and wise judgment. We dare not pray for ourselves only, but for all who are in the perplexity of division, who are plagued by suspicion and beset by a mistrust that is sweeping round our country. O God, we beseech Thee to bring them into the embrace of understanding and mutual respect, opening up before them new phases of human rights, new and just regions of Christian duty and opportunity.

While the night is threatening with its shadows overshaping the glorious Advent season of our blessed Lord, grant us Thy wisdom; make us willing to be what we are called to be, bending our time and energies toward the goal of peace and good will for all men. Hasten the day when Thy word of promise shall be fulfilled:

I will bring the blind by a way that they knew not; I will lead them in paths that they have not known; I will make darkness light before them and crooked things straight. These things will I do unto them and not forsake them.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RANK OF CHIEFS OF BUREAU, NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Naval Affairs Committee, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1862, an act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1862, an act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a request for a conference?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and COLE of New York.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he intends to make on the bill today by including therein a telegram received from a city manager.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a resolution adopted by the Textile Workers' Union of America and in the other to include a letter by John J. Riley.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Star Times.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow following the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ROBERT RAMSPECK

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I know I voice the sentiment of every Member of this House in saying that we regret that our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK, is leaving us.

We congratulate the Air Transport Association of America in securing the services as executive vice president of one of our most outstanding Members.

I have known BOB RAMSPECK practically all of his life. He is honest and honorable and has the respect of everyone. No one in Congress, since I have been a Member, has rendered greater service or contributed more to the welfare and interest of the American people than Mr. RAMSPECK. He is very capable, thoroughly sincere, and you always know how BOB stands on all public questions. No Member of this House doubts his sincerity or stability. I have not always agreed with Congressman RAMSPECK on all issues, but at the same time I knew he was absolutely sincere in the position he took on all questions. Regardless of public opinion, BOB RAMSPECK fought for those things he considered to be in the best interest of his district, his State, and the Nation.

I have never known a public servant whom I have admired and loved more than I do ROBERT RAMSPECK, and I wish for him much happiness in his new field of service.

DISCHARGE OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MONRONEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY TO VETERANS

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest needs in connection with the Government's disposal of surplus property is an arrangement whereby

our veterans will have an opportunity to secure boats which they wish to use for business and other purposes. At the present time great numbers of ex-servicemen are finding that when they wish to purchase these utility boats they are unable to do so or they are being forced to buy them from brokers at higher prices than they would have to pay under the preference rights to which they are entitled.

I am today introducing a bill to correct this situation. This measure would amend the Merchant Marine Act in such a way as to enable veterans and also Government agencies to acquire these boats without recourse to public bidding. They would have the opportunity to inspect the vessels before they are advertised for sale and to purchase them at a negotiated price.

This legislation is designed particularly to enable the veterans to secure boats larger than the 30-foot class, but which do not fall within the category of the Ship Disposal Act now before Congress. The majority of veterans, and especially those needing boats to initiate their own small-cargo business or for other commercial enterprises wish to purchase 30- to 70-foot vessels, and it is that class of boats that they are experiencing the greatest difficulty in acquiring.

While the Surplus Property Act gives veterans preference over private buyers, the law under which the War Shipping Administration is disposing of its property calls for sealed bids on all WSA boats over 30 feet. This makes it mandatory that the WSA accept the highest bid, whether it comes from a veteran or from someone else.

This situation should be corrected as quickly as possible in order that the veterans can have real preference in the matter, which is the intent of Congress in this connection as well as in all other phases of the surplus property program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address by Robert St. John.

Mr. RIZLEY (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter and in the other to include a newspaper article.

THE LATE EDWARD E. BROWNE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I announce the passing of one of the former Members of this House, the Honorable E. E. Browne, of Waupaca, Wis., who represented the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin from 1913 to 1931.

The standing of Mr. Browne and the high esteem in which he was held in Washington has been evidenced by the many, many inquiries of his friends and former colleagues during the years I have been here.

He was a most excellent public servant and a true American. The confidence, faith, and loyalty shown him by his constituents has always been an inspiration to me.

Waupaca County has lost one of its most outstanding civic leaders; the University of Wisconsin has lost one of its great sons; and the State of Wisconsin and the Nation loses one of its greatest political leaders.

I have known Mr. Browne all of my life. The memories of his many kindnesses and his genuine friendliness to me in early life have been ever before me.

His counsel, which so many of us sought and which he so kindly bestowed upon us will not only be missed by his friends but by his family to whom he was deeply devoted.

I am sure that the membership of this House and the entire Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin join me in extending sincere and heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved family. He leaves his devoted wife, two splendid sons, Edward, Jr., and Thomas, and two daughters, Helen and Katherine.

Mr. Browne's kindly and Christian-like approach to life's problems will ever remain as an inspiration to all of us who now mourn his passing.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I desire to say that the Members on this side of the aisle who served with Mr. Browne, join the Wisconsin delegation in mourning his untimely passing. I served with him for many, many years, and I do not hesitate to say that he was one of the finest characters I ever met.

He was a true patriotic American in whom "the elements were so mixed that Nature might stand up and say to all the world: 'This was a man.'"

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not want this moment to pass without saying that I knew Mr. Browne intimately and well. There was never a gentler man served in this House, or a more patriotic one, or one who more desired to be of service to his country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the Speaker and I may say to him that Mr. Browne on many, many occasions has expressed his admiration for the Speaker of this House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I join with the distinguished Member from Wisconsin in paying tribute to Mr. Browne. It was my privilege to serve with him on committees and I know what a splendid gentleman he was. I know the fine and patriotic purpose that actuated his services here. The country has lost a great friend in the passing of Mr. Browne.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the minority leader.

THE FOREIGN SITUATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when one reads the headlines of the Washington Post of this morning he does so with some trepidation. These headlines make the people of the whole country cry out for leadership.

We see a Member of another body stating that Russia and Britain are the only aggressors and are being appeased by the State Department, thus building a military monster. We read another headline, "Hull blasts Army report as infamous," another headline, "Hurley blasts United States policy in Asia," another, "Labor regime censor asked by Churchill," another, "Teheran defense is ordered as rebels advance," another, "Ten diplomats brought back from China," and still another, "Career diplomats took sides with Reds," and so on.

It seems that if this country ever comes out of the mess it is in now it will be out of resentfulness on the part of the people against the Government and the leaders of the poltical party now in power.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to read an extract from a letter received from some members of the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division, now located on Luzon, in the Philippines. They have just had their sailing date deferred twice and have now been given No. 3 priority in place of a No. 2. They feel discouraged, to put it mildly. They say:

> We know that there are plenty of ships if they were made available to us. We also know that there are ships leaving Manila capable of carrying troops home, but they are leaving with only a ballast load. We also know that United States shipping is being used now to transport Japanese prisoners of war back to Japan. It seems that you politicians are interested in them first. We hear that the reason they are not sending men home on cargo ships is that health and sanitary conditions couldn't be made well enough aboard to permit letting troops make that long a trip. Still they let us sit down here in these rice paddies that are malaria mosquito infested and we are exposed to all tropical diseases. Living conditions aboard ships were not considered during the war.

All these men have enough points for discharge now. Congress has provided everything needed. It is high time for

the President, still Commander in Chief, and the Army and Navy to carry out the will of Congress. These men should have been home long ago.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Unsung Hero.

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention at this time to the Treasury statement of the United States, issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, showing that on November 23 we were in the red $264,924,219,853.85. Where are you going to get the money? You are going to be asked today to pass an appropriation bill. You are going to have a lot of amendments to increase that appropriation bill. Just remember that you cannot have a balanced budget and pass everything that everybody wants, especially when they can get along without those funds, and we have to be mighty careful what we do, or you, the Congress, along with the administration, will bankrupt America and the American people.

Another thing. You have been requested by the administration to pass the full employment bill. That is going to require a lot of money. The jobless pay bill of $25 a week for rocking chair money is going to cost a lot of money, as well as the socialized medicine bill that was proposed the other day. Remember, those things all cost great sums of money. You cannot get them for nothing. You have also been told that the Members of Congress ought to get $20,000 instead of $10,000 a year, a 100-percent increase. That is going to cost a lot of money. Congress raised the salaries of the Government employees a month or two ago, and now you are proposing to increase those wages. That is going to cost a lot of money. What are the people back home going to say when they know they have got to pay the bill that you Members in Congress are requesting for increased expenditures? Just remember, you cannot pay the fiddler without taxing the people back home. You cannot offer the people everything they want without paying for it. Who pays for this spending? The people back home. The people back home should remember if taxes are too high, it is the fault of these spenders in Congress. Watch your voting record.

FOREIGN SERVICE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Patrick Hurley yesterday, in resigning as Ambassador to China, made very serious accusations against our foreign service. I have always had a particular interest in our foreign service. Mr. Speaker, the members of the foreign service should be given a chance to clear themselves. If the accusations be true, they should be tried, in my opinion. Mr. Speaker, my request is that Gen. Patrick Hurley, a man who has been honored by both the Republicans and the Democrats for years, should come before us and give us all the facts. That is the only right thing to do. The country is entitled to know the facts. Several times General Marshall and Admiral King brought us information regarding the war. I believe the accusations of General Hurley are so far reaching that the entire Congress and the country should be told the truth. We have been kept in the dark for too long regarding what is going on in our foreign affairs. The security of our country demands full information.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALBOT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Frank Kent.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by former President Hoover in regard to Palestine.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include several tables and a letter from the War Department.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CURTIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ACCUMULATED FURLOUGH PAY FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, as shown by the report of Mr. Bernard Baruch on comparative benefits to veterans of various nations, ours is shown to be, as it should, the most liberal.

There is, however, one injustice, one inequity, which should be immediately corrected.

Although officers in our services, before being discharged, are relieved from duty and granted terminal leave, for which they receive pay, equal to the accumulated leaves they had not been able to take, there is no such allowance for enlisted personnel.

Due to the demands of service, hundreds of thousands of enlisted men got little or no time for furloughs, even though they have served 3, 4 or more years.

These men, upon or after being discharged, should be entitled to equal consideration with the officers and to receive an allowance for the normal furlough periods they were unable to enjoy—a cash allowance to cover this time in lieu of the retention in service on terminal leave.

If this be done an injustice will be eliminated and there will then be no phase of veterans' benefits where we fall behind any other nation.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the Military and Naval Affairs Committees will immediately report out a measure giving the enlisted personnel what they justly deserve—accumulated furlough pay.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the genleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will compare the purchasing power of the compensation paid to veterans in foreign countries with the purchasing power of compensation paid to veterans in this country, he will find where the Baruch "error" comes in.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

THE ARMY AND NAVY SHOULD CLARIFY AND EQUALIZE THEIR DEMOBILIZATION PROGRAMS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial and an excerpt from a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MUNDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and also to insert certain remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, no one who has had the experience of seeing the ravages of war as I have seen them could fail to be torn by the need that exists for relief—immediate and basic. Nor could one fail to wish that the machinery for which we supply 72 percent of the fuel were less ponderous, more efficient, and more effective.

In addition, no one could fail to wish to pay tribute to so many of the consecrated people who are working for UNRRA both in Washington and throughout the world. So many of them went into the work starry-eyed, longing to be of service.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has held hearings for several weeks. With one exception the witnesses were administration witnesses and had only praise to give.

I should like to be able to tell this House that after the hearings were closed the committee had met and made a careful study of the evidence and of the information requested by members of the minority. Unfortunately I cannot do so. I can say only that the committee met on November 26 and voted the bill out. We could not study the evidence because we did not have it before us.

The bill, H. R. 4649, will come to the House without amendments, even the five which I understand the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, has agreed would not be inimicable to the continuance of the international procedures.

But we are faced with the fact that the administration has not had imagination enough either to provide a better machinery by which we can give of the much that is ours to the starving of the war-torn areas of the world. We are faced with a need so great that even an inefficient method is better that none at all.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution submitted by the physics department of Dartmouth College on the use of atomic energy.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, one regarding the death of an ex-Representative from Montana, Dr. Jacob Thorkelson, and in the other to include a resolution of the United Mine Workers of America.

FAVORITISM

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by including a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I noticed with interest the statement attributed to General Hurley in the newspapers of last night and this morning criticizing the underlings and the professionals in the State Department Foreign Service. I think those are alarming charges and they are the background for some observations of end results which were made personally by me in Europe during a recent tour investigating State Department installations of the foreign service this summer. I think that the Congress should invite General Hurley to address us in recess so that the Members of Congress who are called upon to vote for larger and larger appropriations in the international field could have the benefit of his views first-hand. Tomorrow I intend to introduce a resolution to investigate the State Department by a special select committee of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a letter proposing a children's crusade.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article of great importance about the Philippines by a distinguished lawyer, Mr. Vicete Villamin, who is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities on the Philippines, having been born there. He is a distinguished resident of the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ALUMINUM PLANT DISPOSAL

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a manuscript on UNRRA, the cost of which will be $117.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the additional cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF AMERICAN TROOPS FROM INDIA—BRITISH MURDER, INC.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, our troops should be taken out of India forthwith. They have no business there now save to pull British chestnuts out of the fire. The British apparently want them there as lightning rods to draw off Indian resentment against Britain's use of Indian and Japanese troops, American lend-lease tanks and Thunderbolts machine-gunning innocent civilian Indonesians on Dutch territory. That British cruelty is on a par with their use of tear gas and V-bombs in shooting their way into Jewish villages in Palestine and strafing innocent people.

The battle of Palestine has begun but the battle is only on one side. We, the Members of Congress, should not be silent. Lucifer in hell has invited Attlee to visit him and has bestowed the Order of Atilla the Hun on Bevin.

Remember, these are the same British that are begging us for a loan, the same British that have so much of socialism at home and too much imperialism abroad. It is high time that we Americans withhold aid from them until they know the meaning of honor, decency, and humanity.

The Jewish Agency for Palestine has cabled Secretary of State Byrnes to the effect that Britain has introduced a regime of terror in Palestine in order to intimidate the Jews into submission. In Palestine on Monday there were 9 dead and 80 wounded.

A report comes through that leaders of the Central Jewish Committee at Bergen-Belsen, the former Nazi concentration camp now in the British zone, have been arrested for protesting against the new British policy in Palestine. The Zionist flag was thrown onto a heap of garbage and several thousand Jews in the camp, including women, were beaten by the police with rubber truncheons. It was stated that during the questioning at headquarters of the military police, one was struck twice by a German policeman in the presence of a British officer.

These facts speak for themselves. It is British imperialism above British conscience.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN, MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I do so for the purpose of thanking you and also our majority leader for your gracious kindness in appointing the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN, as majority whip.

And speaking for the Alabama delegation, may I say to the House that we are exceedingly grateful for this mark of appreciation of the high qualities of our distinguished Member from Alabama, which are known to every Member of the House on each side of the aisle. We regret, as much as any group in this body, the retirement to private life of our fellow Member from Georgia, the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK, than whom there has been no more worthy servant of the people, nor of this body. We believe and predict that his successor in the office of majority whip will live up to the confidence which the Speaker and our majority leader have reposed in him, and that he also may win the tribute "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," from every one of us, when he may see fit to shuffle off the mortal coil of service in this body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief newspaper article.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain communications.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick.

OUR POLICY IN CHINA

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I likewise noticed General Hurley's statement in the press with as much interest as our Republican associates on the other side of the aisle.

I was particularly pleased to see that he confirmed in his own words the substance of my charge, namely, that he had taken a partisan attitude in China, had reversed the President's policy there for unity and for democracy in that country. By giving Chiang pledges of unconditional American support he strengthened Chiang's determination not to come to agreement with the Communists and the Democratic League. That broke down negotiations and made civil war unavoidable. I am happy to see that there is now a chance, through a new man, to try to reestablish the former policy of promoting unity and a representative coalition government in a free China.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he intends to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain excerpts from the RECORD and certain tables of statistics.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on two subjects and include certain newspaper articles.

SEPARATIONS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are indeed in a confusion of tongues.

The front page of the morning paper this morning carries three "blasts" by three distinguished Americans on questions vitally affecting our national welfare.

We just now heard a discussion on UNRRA, and the statement by Barney Baruch to the effect that our soldiers are better cared for than those of any foreign country. But I remember Mr. Baruch's opposition to veterans' legislation before, and at the proper time I shall analyze the statement and show the falsity of his conclusions.

As "UNRA," let me say that I am interested in "INRA." I want to do something for our own people—and especially our own servicemen.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] complains that certain servicemen were flown to this country, and thereby given preferences. We have any number of complaints of officers' terminal leave being a preference to officers that is denied to enlisted men.

On that count I call attention to the fact that if you want to do justice to the rank and file of servicemen you will walk up to the desk and sign petition No. 9 to bring to the floor of the House my bill to discharge those men on their own application who have served for 18 months, or who have dependents at home to look after, or who desire to return to school.

Let us do justice to all of them, and do it now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-five Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 191]

Andrews, N. Y.	Engle, Calif.	Patrick
Barden	Gardner	Pfeifer
Barry	Gearhart	Phillips
Bell	Gifford	Poage
Brehm	Harless, Ariz.	Powell
Buckley	Hart	Price, Ill.
Bunker	Hartley	Quinn, N. Y.
Butler	Heffernan	Randolph
Byrne, N. Y.	Hook	Reed, Ill.
Campbell	Hope	Rizley
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Robsion, Ky.
Carlson	Jenkins	Roe, N. Y.
Chapman	Jennings	Rowan
Clark	Judd	Sadowski
Clements	Kearney	Sharp
Courtney	Keefe	Sheridan
Crawford	King	Short
Crosser	LaFollette	Slaughter
Curley	Lewis	Somers, N. Y.
Dawson	McGlinchey	Sparkman
Delaney, John J.	Mansfield, Mont.	Taylor
		Voorhis, Calif.
Dickstein	Martin, Iowa	Weiss
Dingell	Morgan	West
Dirksen	Neely	Wilson
Doughton, N. C.	Norton	Winter
Douglas, Calif.	Outland	Wolverton, N. J.
Drewry	Pace	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 348 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4805, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fees of commissioners: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for "Fees of commissioners," including the objects specified under this head in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1945, $34,000.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 3, after line 15, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Salaries of criers: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946 for 'Salaries of criers,' $20,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the minor amendments. I wonder if we could agree on time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I hope no one will listen to me who has made up his mind to follow the committee in its recommendation that 14 judges should be denied their right under the law—the same right the Appropriations Committee appropriated the money to give 111 other judges under the same law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to say to the gentleman that I reserved on this item; the committee is not unanimous on this item.

Mr. HOBBS. I know that. I do not think there are more than three or four members of the committee who are really in favor of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should not make such a statement. In the first place, it is against the rules of the House to state how anybody voted in the committee. Certainly by a gentleman who was not present.

The fact remains that it was reported out certainly by a majority of the committee or it would not be here—by a majority both of the subcommittee and of the full committee. So the gentleman's statement lacks foundation.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I never said how any man voted. I said I did not believe there were more than three or four Members who really favor this item.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would not be here, of course, if no more than three or four Members really favor it, because both the subcommittee and the full committee voted to bring it to the floor. There are 11 members of the subcommittee and 43 members of the full committee. So I do not see where the gentleman gets his three or four Members.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the action of the committee grew out of at least three mistakes.

MISTAKES

First. "Criers."

No. The law says:

Each district judge may appoint a crier for the court in which he presides, who shall perform also the duties of bailiff and messenger.

Second. "New."

No. Prior to the Economy Act of 1932 each district judge was fully provided with all necessary assistance of the kind now provided by the act of December 7, 1944. In 1932 we killed the court criers and in 1933 the messengers. The bailiffs remained, so they and deputy marshals did the work formerly done by them and the criers and messengers. Of course, the marshals had to hire many more bailiffs, and an appropriation of $130,000 for "salaries of bailiffs" was carried in the appropriation acts until that item was eliminated because of the new law.

Third. Estimate for fiscal year 1946: Three hundred and fifty-four thousand six hundred dollars by administrative office of United States courts—the lawfully designated Budget agency. Two hundred thousand dollars appropriated. One hundred and thirty thousand dollars cut out by changing names.

So increase was only $70,000.

The $200,000 was sufficient to pay for only 111 criers-bailiffs-messengers, when the statute authorized the appointment of 210.

The Budget agency had to request of the Appropriations Committee a supplemental $45,000.

This request has been refused—not 1 cent can be had from our Appropriations Committee.

It was based on an estimate that 39 additional judges would appoint criers who would serve for an average period of 8 months during the present fiscal year. However, only 14 judges have had to be denied their rights under the law.

The Appropriations Committee has furnished the money for 111 courts to be served. Fourteen courts are on the committee's blacklist:

The judges of these 14 courts are:

Judges Forman and Smith, of New Jersey.
Judge Burke, of western New York.
Judge Chesnut, of Maryland.
Judge Connor, of New Hampshire.
Judge Timmerman, of South Carolina.
Judge Kennedy, of Wyoming.
Judge Hartigan, of Rhode Island.
Judge Boyd, of western Tennessee.
Judge McDuffie, of southern Alabama.
Judge Briggle, of southern Illinois.
Judge Clark, of Idaho.
Judge Brown, of Montana.
Judge Mathes, of southern California.

ECONOMY

First. The total budget of the United States courts is one and one-half tenths of 1 percent of the regular National Budget, excluding war items.

Second. This bill carries $1,131,552,-312.48.

Third. My amendment would add to that total $20,000, or seventeen ten-thousandths of 1 percent.

CONCLUSION

But if it would double the total, it should be passed, for it is right. The law we passed gives the 14 judges the same rights as the 111.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if no one desires to be heard further I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an explanation from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on this item.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What would the gentleman like to know?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many offices are involved?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are 110 criers on the rolls. There was so little demand for these criers that many of the judges, although they had authority to reward some good friend with a sinecure at $2,100 a year, did not even appoint them. There are only 110 on the roll, and if the full number eligible were appointed, there would be 39 more, and if there were 39 more and they get $2,100 a year, the amount which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] asks would not be sufficient to pay them. They originally asked for $43,000. They say now they want $20,000. If they provide for the 39, they would need $40,000. They do not know a thing about it. They evidently have not stopped to figure it out at all, yet they come on the floor and ask to spend money for snap jobs which we have never spent before.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For 150 years these courts got along without criers. The only duty of these criers is to open court with "Oyez, oyez, the court is now in session," and you pay a man $2,100 a year for that, $1,800 basic salary and the additional $300 under the Ramspeck Act. We have been getting along without these men for 150 years. Before the war when we had plenty of money they did not ask for these men. Now, after the war is over they want to saddle us with these fellows who do nothing more than open court. And they do not know how much money they want.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman from Missouri has abundantly explained his position but not the case. There is no salary above $1,800. The budgeting authority of the court is the one who gave these figures. It is because you have preferred 111 judges to the 14 whose requests you have denied that we are here, and it is because more than 8 months have elapsed of the fiscal year that we can cut it down to $20,000. The gentleman says we do not know anything about it. His own statement shows he does not know anything about it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This $20,000 will cover the districts of the judges who have not availed themselves of this service and it includes a crier, bailiff, and a messenger for these districts.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And they get how much a year? It seems to me that the clerk, marshal, or bailiff could announce opening and closing of the court.

Mr. HOBBS. One thousand eight hundred dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

My position here, Mr. Chairman, is in support of the amendment. The statement has been made here that "they know so little about it." Well, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for this particular agency I know plenty about it, and I am ready to tell why I know about it to the membership of the House. It is high time that some of the chairmen and some of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations were given some attention when they come face to face with the Deficiency Subcommittee of which I, too, happen to be a member. In the first place, this matter came before our subcommittee, and the amount requested was $354,000. In order to try and safeguard the pocketbook of America we said, "This is the first time that they are having this office under the law which was passed by the Congress, and we will allow $200,000 for the purpose, and that we would recognize them if more judges asked for criers during the

year when they come before the Deficiency Subcommittee." I felt that I was a member of the Deficiency Subcommittee and, accordingly, my views on the subject would be somewhat respected. So, we allowed $200,000. Now they have used the $200,000, and they come in with the request for an additional $20,000 to finish the present fiscal year. That is denied them at this time, and it puts the particular subcommittee having charge of it in a very odd position toward an agency that is functioning quite well. You hear it said, "We got along without them for 150 years." Well, we got along without a lot of things for 150 years, including official stenographers in the Federal courts of this country.

Of all the horse-and-buggy rigs that are still in America, it is the activities and the processes of the Congress of the United States and the Federal courts of this Nation. The only part of this Government that has had any advancement and has gone along is the executive branch. And, in my opinion, part of it has gone too far, compared with the other two branches of the Federal Government. There are 110 of these criers on duty today. Are we going to distinguish and discriminate against the other members of the courts? I, for my part, think that every judge should have a crier. We have some members of the courts, so-called prima donnas, who will not even tolerate a probation officer. Some of them are away beyond the years when they ought to be on the bench; and, in spite of the fact that we have set up retirement, they refuse to leave. They are in their dotage. If you want a functioning court, for heaven's sake at least supply them with the means for running a court, and that seems, to my mind, the proper thing for the Congress of the United States to do.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I was not in the Chamber at the moment the gentleman offered his amendment. As I understand, it is to pay some salaries of court employees.

Mr. RABAUT. This is to pay the salaries of additional criers of the court, $20,000.

Mr. PITTENGER. Have they already earned this money?

Mr. RABAUT. No; they have not earned it, but the judges, in view of the statement of the subcommittee at the time of our hearings, rightfully expected to appoint them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I fear there has been a misunderstanding as to this amendment. It has been said that only three or four are interested on this side. It would be a tragedy if only three or four are interested in saving money, because that is our only interest here. What can it mean personally to the members of this committee if this money is spent or is not spent? All we are trying to do is to retrench unnecessary expenditure. I trust that is not a serious offense, and in that I hope the House will support the committee.

The subcommittee consists of 11 members. Every one of them favored this report except one. It was reported in that way by the subcommittee and supported by the full committee. The committee did not see any reason for spending this money.

There are three men in each court who have been doing this work for the 150 years I have been talking about, that is, the clerk, the marshal, and the bailiff. All in the world this man does is open the court in the morning. He merely rises and mumbles "Oyez, oyez, the honorable court is now in session," and for that he gets $2,100 a year, a basic salary of $1,800 and an additional $300 under the Ramspeck Act.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will yield when I conclude this statement. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman then.

This thing was so outrageous, it was so obviously unnecessary, it was so plainly a gratuity, that many of the judges refused to accept it. Here is a judge who wanted to appoint somebody who would have nothing to do, and have $2,100 a year to pay him for doing nothing. All the judges could appoint someone to do a job like that, but some of them considered it so absurd that they refused to appoint a man. You know how this thing came about. They were like the fox that had its tail cut off and wanted all the other foxes to have their tails cut off. Because they took it, they want to compel every other judge to take it whether needed or not.

I plead with the Members to stand with the committee when all it is trying to do is save a little money.

For all the years before the war we never had these criers. If we did not need them then, we do not need them now. Here, after the war, when we are over our heads in debt, when we ought to exercise somewhere a little economy, shall we give these boys $2,100 to come in and open court?

This amendment is in itself insignificant. The important thing is, whether you stay with the committee in an effort to be reasonable about the expense of the Government? I hope the Committee will vote down this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It occurs to me that what this Committee would like to know is whether any injustice would be done to the Federal courts, if funds are not allowed for so-called court criers, as provided in the pending amendment or whether the courts have others available to open courts.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will tell him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No. I regret that I cannot yield now. I think I know the answer. Let me say that I yield to no one in my esteem for the Federal courts. But I have received some communications from Federal judges concerning this matter. Only one judge states there is any need or excuse for this proposed item. Others tell me there is no urgent need for court criers. One judge goes so far as to say that he does not need a court crier any more than a dog needs an extra tail. He says, "My clerk can open and close court, my bailiff performs that duty, or my marshal can do so without any overexertion." On the other hand, two important Federal courts must write their opinions in longhand because Congress has not given them a personal stenographer. I have repeatedly called this fact to the attention of members of the committee. With this in view, it is difficult for me to believe that there is any real emergency demand for court criers. The only question for us to decide now is, are these criers actually needed and is that need so urgent that it must go into this pending deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Oklahoma has given you the situation exactly as it is. I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 22, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Salaries and expenses," including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, $392,500, and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased from $1,585,650 to $1,903,400.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 5, line 7, after the word "bank" strike out the paragraph in lines 7 to 14, inclusive.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the reasons which I stated in the course of my remarks on the floor yesterday. I offer it as a member of the subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the independent agencies of the Government, in which this agency is included. I offer it because I think it is a mistake to use this deficiency bill as a means for substantial expansion of any department or agency of the Government in respect to which there is no real urgency. I offer it because the increase requested here by the Federal Communications Commission appears to be a part of a very large

expansion which the agency now has in contemplation.

Back in 1940, just before the war, the Federal Communications Commission had an over-all appropriation of $1,800,000. It had a personnel of 625. In the current year, including appropriations for wartime activities, the agency had $5,000,000 and a personnel of 1,165.

The war being over, the House in the recent rescission bill reduced that figure of $5,000,000 by $930,000. Nevertheless, the Federal Communications Commission comes before us again with a request for $785,000, representing an increase in personnel of 501. It comes before us with that request despite the fact that the Senate has restored in the rescission bill the $930,000 that the House took out.

There is now pending before the Independent Offices Appropriation Committee, in a bill in respect to which hearings were started this morning, a request by this agency for over $6,000,000; or about 100-percent increase in the appropriation which it had for its normal activities this year.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of the expansion which the agency has in mind, Mr. Chairman, the whole program ought to be considered by the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee. It ought to be considered as a whole and not in a piecemeal manner, such as is suggested here.

The tremendous expansion in contemplation requires comprehensive and detailed justification. That type of justification has not been made to date. The regular committee has already started hearings on the appropriation for the next fiscal year. The whole matter can be considered in an orderly fashion in connection with those hearings. I hope, therefore, that the House will support this amendment and eliminate this item from the bill, allowing it to go to the regular subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the interest in this matter of my distinguished colleague, both in the House and on the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] whose remarks are always well considered, is fully justified, because this is a very vital activity. It is one of the few activities which touches every man, woman, and child in the Nation practically every day.

When this estimate came in, there were several phases which had to be taken into consideration. Of course, the most obvious thing is that there has been a tremendous development in electronics. There have been greater changes, perhaps, in the field of radio than in any other of our modern developments. For example, the new frequency modulation systen. is destined to supplant completely the standard system now in use. It is only a question of time before it renders obsolete every broadcasting station and receiving set in the United States. It dispenses with interference. It eliminates all static. It provides an indefinite number of direct channels. It will supplant modern radio equipment and procedure in its entirety.

The Commission must meet this and other changing situations. In addition, there are many lines of manufacture which are affected, and which cannot begin production until the Commission passes upon them and gives them the green light and makes it possible for them to start expansion. For us to interfere at this time defers action not only on the many questions which come regularly before the Commission, but defers materially a vast industrial and commercial activity which is of the highest importance at this critical time.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], has well said, we should go slowly, and the commitee is proposing to do just that. We have cut the estimate in half. This is only one-half the estimate that came up to us.

There is another phase to be considered. In the rescission bill we cut $930,000 from the Commission's appropriation. These two figures require readjustment. We should not attempt a readjustment in this bill. We should wait and effect a readjustment in the conference report on the recission bill, upon which we expect to have a conference this week.

We have put this small amount in this bill with that thought in mind. For that reason I trust that for the present the gentleman's amendment will be rejected and we be given an opportunity to perfect the matter in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 45, noes 65.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 87, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administrative expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Administrative expenses," $5,500,000, payable from the funds of the Corporation: *Provided*, That none of the funds available under this head for administrative expenses shall be used in paying the salary of any person engaged in making or processing loans to any State, any subdivision thereof, any municipality therein, or any public authority, for construction purposes, unless in pursuance of a specific authorization.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the Committee's attention to the apparent limitation in the section relative to the Reconstruction Finance Corporaion. This limitation prohibits the paying of salaries or the granting of money to political subdivisions. This would include the REA and irrigation districts. I am not sure but what this should be considered as legislation upon an appropriation bill. The bill would prohibit the Federal Works Agency from making loans under that section to cities or political subdivisions.

I hope the committee did not have in mind preventing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from making loans to irrigation districts. There is in my State the Mid-State Irrigation District that is now in the process of getting a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. They are getting the green light for this loan This limitation will probably prevent this district from getting the loan, which loan is reimbursable. The loan is on a solid basis. The money will be paid back with interest to the Federal Government. It will bring several thousand acres of land under irrigation. There would be a power project to bring electricity to the farmers in this area. It would bring new wealth to the country, millions of dollars' worth of new wealth, which, in turn, helps carry some of the tremendous Federal debt.

Mr. Chairman, this House has appropriated billions of dollars, forty-two or forty-three billion dollars, for lend-lease. We are about to make loans to other countries of money that probably will not be returned. It does seem to me that we ought to look very carefully at this provision of the bill which might cramp or even prohibit the RFC from making loans to irrigation districts.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think I can say without violating any rule of secrecy as to action in the Appropriation Committee that such discussion of this item as occurred indicated it was desired to avoid permitting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to circumvent the intention of the Congress when funds were made available for planning by the Federal Works Agency. Reports had come before some Members of the Committee on Appropriations that the works that were being planned by the Federal Works Agency would be financed by subdivisions of government borrowing money from the RFC, thereby circumventing the announced statements at the time the planning money was voted. At that time it was stated that the money was merely for planning and making loans for planning and that the Federal Government would not be called upon to finance the actual construction.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the gentleman's opinion does this limitation upon the bill prohibit the RFC from extending loans to irrigation districts that are legally organized within the State?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would not want to answer that question categorically. It is my impression that in the original RFC Act, or in some of the amendments thereto, there is specific authority for the RFC to make the type of loan the gentleman is referring to.

However, I do not state that authoritatively, and the gentleman better consult the act.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Otherwise it is dangerous for the committee to place a limitation in this bill which would prohibit the RFC from making loans to irrigation groups, or for the further extension of REA.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course there is specific authority for RFC loans to the REA. That was carried in the agricultural appropriation bill.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Public works advance planning: For an additional amount for "Public works advance planning," fiscal year 1946, $12,500,000, of which not to exceed $375,000 shall be available for administrative expenses in the manner specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, except that the limitation on travel expenses is increased by $40,000: *Provided*, That no loans shall be made or participated in by any Federal agency for the construction of any public works, plans for which have been wholly or partly financed out of this appropriation, except in pursuance of a specific authorization.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 9, line 18, after the words "fiscal year 1946", strike out the sum "$12,500,000" and insert "$32,500,000"; and on line 12, strike out "$375,000" and insert, after the word "exceed", "3½ percent."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a point of order against the last part of the paragraph.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's point of order comes too late.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I asked for recognition on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has already been recognized, and the gentleman from Nebraska made no remarks prior to that time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I asked for recognition, and I was standing here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not know for what purpose the gentleman had risen. The point of order comes too late.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, once more it is apparent that the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee are not infallible. I attribute their action on the matter of postwar planning in the regular appropriation bill for 1946 as an error of judgment. Now it has happened again, and I fear, in view of all the facts available to the committee, it is now deliberate action on their part.

Let me briefly give you some pertinent facts to support my position that this item should be increased. It will be remembered that this postwar planning activity is provided for in the Reconversion Act passed by the Seventy-eighth Congress in December 1944. It will also be remembered that the now inadequate funds for the current year were provided only after the Senate had forced a concession in conference raising the House item from $5,000,000 to $17,500,000 as a compromise.

Now for a brief analysis of what has happened in the Division of Community Facilities of the Public Works Agency in the 5 months of the present fiscal year since July 1. In these 5 months a total of 3,402 requests for grants have been received. These requests involve a total dollar basis of $36,312,862. This, my friends, is more than double the $17,500,000 available in the appropriation for the entire year.

I have been advised, as late as yesterday, by the Federal Works Agency that requests for grants from this fund are pouring into the Bureau of Community Facilities at the rate of $7,000,000 monthly. All of the States, except 14, have already exhausted and exceeded their allocations out of the $17,500,000 available for the full year and there are still 7 months to go.

It might be well at this time to remind members of the committee of the situation existing in their home States. Let us take Missouri, home of the distinguished chairman, Mr. CANNON. Here the State's allocation for the year was $531,437 and requests already pending amount to $1,191,000. Missouri's share of the $12,500,000 fixed by the committee will not provide funds for pending requests to say nothing of other applications for grants that are sure to come in between now and June 30, 1946.

Virginia, home of another distinguished member of the committee, Mr. WOODRUM, is in even more serious condition in this respect. Virginia's allocation for the year is $355,245. Requests filed to date are more than $1,700,000 or are more than a million and a quarter in excess of funds available. The new allocation from what the committee is making available would take care of only 60 percent of the requests now pending. This means some of the county courts, school boards, or municipalities will be discriminated against for lack of funds.

Other States whose requests far exceed their allocations are:

	Funds available	*Requests*
Florida	$316,229	$1,396,585
New Jersey	474,214	2,403,698
Ohio	787,402	2,418,884
Michigan	659,031	1,413,090
Georgia	456,119	1,075,420
Illinois	900,150	4,917,609

The last named State is the home of another distinguished member of the committee. I remember his eloquent plea on the floor of the House, some weeks ago, for added millions for United Nations Relief. I seem to recall having heard something about charity beginning at home.

There is much merit in this program from the standpoint of postwar economic security. Think of the unemployment slack that can be taken up by a program that involves $1,146,680,000 in construction alone. They may well be doubled by June 30 if funds are made available for this planning.

Permit me to summarize briefly:

There is a widespread deficiency in the plan preparation for State and local public works. For the purpose of stimulating and encouraging such State and local planning, a program of Federal planning advances has been authorized by the Congress, but has thus far been provided with funds inadequate for the accomplishment of this purpose.

State and local governments are now deeply interested in going ahead with the preparation of drawings and specifications for public works, but local governments are still widely hampered by lack of funds for this purpose. Their response to the present program within the last few months has shown that they will enlarge and accelerate their planning if they receive adequate assistance through Federal advances, to be repaid when the works so planned are undertaken and local funds became available.

The additional appropriation now requested by this amendment will enable this program to continue, and will speed up State and local planning of public works in accordance with the purpose of the Congress as declared in title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. I trust it will be not only the pleasure but the duty of the Members to make these funds available.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. This provision is simply for loans that are to be repaid in order that plans may be made so that construction may be carried on to give employment.

Mr. BAILEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if this Congress has any idea of ever balancing the budget, it is about time to begin to think when amendments increasing appropriations are offered. As a matter of fact, we ought not carry a dollar of this item under the Federal Works Agency for advanced planning. It is only reimbursable in the event that these projects are carried out. None of them so far have been carried out. We are in a situation where it is absolutely impossible to get any help upon construction work. We are in a situation where construction work is not proceeding. This idea of making allotments to all sorts of communities with the idea that they are go-

ing to go ahead with those works is just ridiculous. Why, the situation now is that they are promoting agitation for the purpose of getting the people interested in this planning by telling them that they are going to get loans and that they will not have to pay back to the Federal Government. They are planning to get some of those loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is about time that kind of business was stopped.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. No; I do not yield because I do not believe the gentleman wants to hear the facts.

Mr. BAILEY. You do not want to hear some of the facts.

Mr. TABER. I want the House of Representatives to stop appropriating money for this kind of wild proposition. It was put through the Congress with the understanding that the Federal Government would not put up this money. Now they go around and promote the thing with the idea that they are going to get it. I had telephone calls galore from New York City the other day telling me that it was understood that for the operation represented by this they were going to get $218,000,000 in that one town for this coming calendar year. That is the kind of situation which prevails. We must not go ahead and increase this item. We must have some regard for our responsibilities and not run wild and appropriate funds which will not be repaid to the Treasury of the United States. They will not be repaid to the Treasury of the United States because the provision is contingent. You will find that every one of them have been persuaded to get into this thing with the idea that this money would be provided for the construction job by the Federal Government. We must not do that sort of thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, when this section was read I attempted to get recognition to make a point of order against the last three lines, which I think are clearly legislation against an appropriation bill. It says:

Provided, That no loan shall be made or participated in by Federal agencies for the construction of any public works—

And so forth. That clearly is legislation on an appropriation bill. I doubt if it should be here. I want to bring out again that I hope this type of limitation on legislation is not prohibiting Federal agencies from making loans to irrigation districts which want to develop large sections of land for irrigation purposes or for extension of rural electrification. If that is the situation, then it should not be in this bill. I can agree with the gentleman from New York that it is time for the Federal Government to stop making loans for which the Federal Government gets nothing. We are making a great many foreign loans of doubtful character. We have spent a great deal of money through lend-lease and a dozen other agencies that will be a complete loss. Loans for developing irrigation and REA are paid back with interest. They should not be made difficult to get. Generally speaking, the States, cities, and political subdivisions are in much better financial condition than our Federal Government. However, I am firmly of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that there are certain types of loans which the Federal Government must have a hand in. One of those is the development of the natural resources of this country, including the irrigation projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for the remaining time, 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this proposition is really a question of mathematics. All you have to do is put a lead pencil on this amendment and you will see at once the justice of the position of the committee.

They reported to us, on November 2, that out of the $17,500,000 which was originally granted to them they still had $7,332,796 they had not used.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. They have $24,000,000 of requests that they have not processed right now.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That may be true, but the fact remains that out of $17,500,000 they had for this work, as of November 2, they had obligated only $10,167,204. They had left over at that time $7,332,796 which they had not allotted.

Now, we have given them $12,500,000 new money, which, with the money they had not obligated, gives them, in round figures, $20,000,000 from November 1. They will have $20,000,000 from November 1, whereas they had only $17,500,000 at the start of the fiscal year. To be exact, they will have $19,832,796.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. BAILEY. What money is the gentleman talking about being carried over? They had only $17,500,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of that $17,500,000 they had obligated only $10,167,240, which left $7,332,796 of their original $17,500,000. Now, when you add the amount which is given in this bill, that gives a total of $19,832,796.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish the gentleman would clear that up. They never had any previous appropriation and they could not possibly have on hand the $7,000,000 the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, carried an initial appropriation of $17,500,000.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I believe the gentleman will recall we gave them $17,500,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. And this $12,500,000 more, which makes a total of $30,000,000 for the year, we felt was sufficient.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct.

Now, since they had been obligating at the rate of two and one-half million dollars a month, we have given them enough to provide $2,470,000 each month, for the remainder of the year. In other words, we have given them enough to maintain this obligation rate up through October.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my good friend from West Virginia?

Mr. BAILEY. Is it not true that President Truman asked a $50,000,000 appropriation for this in a special message?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Any amount of money could be spent on this but the Department is using only two and a half million per month, and I am certain the President would not favor giving them more than they can administer, or have been administering.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 26, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Housing Agency——

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: On page 12 after line 18, insert the following:

"Office of the Administrator, veterans' housing: To enable the National Housing Administrator to carry out the purposes of title 5 of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, $24,500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would yield in order to see if we can save a little time by reaching an understanding as to how much debate there shall be on this amendment.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that I should like 5 minutes additional with reference to this item.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, 16 Members have indicated a desire to be heard on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 1 hour, the

gentleman from Texas to have 10 minutes of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas already has his 10 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I shall reserve the right to object until we get a clarification. I wish to know how many Members are asking for time and how much time each Member will receive?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen Members have arisen. The gentleman from Missouri asked unanimous consent that debate be limited to 1 hour. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], has already been allotted 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, does that mean there will be 50 minutes among 16 Members?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixty minutes among sixteen. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 10 minutes, 10 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is the same request that was made before. The gentleman from Texas was already allowed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] previously asked unanimous consent. Now he is making a motion. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to an item which was recommended by the President in a communication he sent to the Committee on Appropriations on the 23d day of October of this year and it applies entirely to housing for distressed cases of veterans and servicemen and their families. From the number of Members who have spoken to me with reference to the housing situation in their respective districts as it relates to living quarters for these returning veterans and servicemen, this must be a very serious problem all over the United States.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, anticipating that this very serious problem would arise, reported a bill which I had introduced to be helpful in this regard insofar as it is possible under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and without in any way interfering with private enterprise, which bill was enacted into law, approved on the 23d of June of this year, and is known as title V of the so-called Lanham Act.

That law provides that vacant war housing constructed under that act, housing that has been vacated by inmigrant war workers who have been operating at the various defense plants, may be occupied by these distressed veterans, servicemen and their families, at such rentals as they can afford to pay, which rentals have been at least the cost of the operation of the housing. Under that title today 20,000 distressed families of veterans and servicemen are living in such housing that became vacant and in all of the housing constructed under that act, today there are 75,000 veterans and servicemen and their families living. However, much of this housing that has become vacant is in isolated areas and in many instances in rural sections where it is not available for occupancy by these veterans, servicemen and their families. So the President made the recommendation that under title V this sum of $24,500,000 be appropriated to make some of the vacant housing that is not now being used available to these veterans and servicemen in locations where it could be used.

The adoption of this amendment is but the first step in making such housing so available. I realize that its provisions are inadequate and somewhat burdensome, but it will start us on the legislative path of proper solution.

Let me call your attention to the fact that the National Housing Agency which operates under title V of this act is rescinding to the Federal Government more than $127,000,000. Consequently, this is but a very small portion of the money that is being rescinded. This amount stated in the amendment suggested by the President is not sufficient because it will still leave upon localities and cities and political subdivisions and colleges and universities the obligation of moving this building material from the sites after it has been put into panels, to be taken and reerected at the sites where it can be used. I hope that the amount will be eventually increased, but we want to make a start to solve this serious problem.

May I call attention to the fact that this in no way interferes with private enterprise. It does not take from private enterprise one foot of material that they can use in the building of houses. This has to do with the temporary war houses which were constructed originally for these in-migrant workers and which now can be used temporarily by the servicemen and veterans and their families in this time of distress. The Committee on Appropriations, judging from its report, recognized that this effort is probably very worthy and everything of that kind, but stated we ought to defer it for consideration until the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations takes it into consideration and puts it in their annual appropriation bill, which would mean that it would become effective perhaps about the latter part of next June. This is a pressing emergency problem. It does not brook delay. In my own city alone, judging by the reports of 2 or 3 weeks ago, there are 462 applications from veterans and servicemen who would qualify for housing under this act, and no housing is available. The veterans and servicemen of this country who have returned from these various fronts are looking to us to do what we can to relieve this terrible situation. As I say, this does not involve in any way any interference with private capital in looking after our housing situation, and it restores to the National Housing Agency but a very small part of the money which is being rescinded in the legislation which is now pending.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman is offering a very fine amendment. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he believes, under the terminology of his amendment, any of these funds would be available in the alteration of such things as surplus Army barracks which can likewise be used for the same purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. No. That, I think, would require additional legislation because the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has no jurisdiction over Army barracks. But I do think that there is much that could be done in that regard, and I understand the military authorities are very much interested in that very problem. I hope that that will follow in the wake of this legislation, and that we will do what we properly may to relieve this situation that exists in this country. As I say, this will get a start toward doing it, and with a small part of the money that is being rescinded, and without in any way interfering with private enterprise.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that these surplus barracks probably can be transferred to the Federal Public Housing Agency for that purpose, so that it would not be Army property at that point.

Mr. LANHAM. That is all very true, but the National Housing Agency looks after housing legislation emanating from several committees, the Committee on Banking and Currency, for instance, and that would not be included within title V which deals only with this vacant war housing constructed under this act.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for unqualified priorities for veterans seeking housing?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. Title V does. Under title V it applies only to veterans and servicemen and their families.

Mrs. LUCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. Private enterprise is left without any interference from this act because these materials are already available under law for the purpose stated. It will take not one foot of material from private capital and it will be at least a start in relieving this situation that must obtain in the districts represented by practically every man and woman in this Congress.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. How many units is it expected $24,500,000 would provide?

Mr. LANHAM. It would provide for the housing of 20,000 of these families, provided the expense of moving these panels and reerecting them is paid by the cities or the colleges or those who might wish them. In addition, it would provide for at least 5,000 where they would be moved at Federal expense and reerected at Federal expense. There are today between 45,000 and 50,000 of these vacant houses available to be moved, in addition to those being occupied today by 20,000 of these veterans and servicemen. The amendment by no means wholly solves the problem, but let us make a start and continue our efforts toward its satisfactory solution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

There is not a man in the Chamber who does not want to provide adequate housing promptly for the veterans, of course, but this is not a practical plan. If you vote the money for this plan you will accomplish nothing by it. What they propose, as briefly as I can state it, is to take houses of a temporary type, saw them in half at a cost of $600 per house, and then send word to the cities, "Come and get them, and you can use them for veterans' housing."

The truth of the matter is, if you spend $600 per unit on these houses you will have wasted your money. It will do little good. There is a meeting now of the housing officials and I believe from conversations I have had that they will abandon the idea even if you provide the money to panelize these houses in the hope that some city will pay to go bring them back to another city for use. If they do not come and get them, then, the Housing Authority says, it will cost $2,500 to take and deliver those sawed-in-half temporary homes.

What is needed is something that will do some good for the veterans. For instance, in my home city we have temporary housing that with very little money can be made into useful housing for the veterans who are returning to my city. But my city and your city would not consider going up into Michigan or into any other State and getting one of these sawed-up temporary affairs. They must pay for bringing it down to your town, and then provide the land and the facilities for making it habitable. It just is not common sense and will do the veteran no good.

There is a better way to do it. The Independent Offices Appropriation Committee can take this proposition and not appropriate money just to seem to be doing something for the veteran, but really to do him a service. The way to do it is to take the houses in the communities and remodel them so that they can be used, or provide some other means for using them. But it certainly is not common sense to knock down these old houses and saw them in half and say, "Come and get them, boys," because they will not come and get them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, all of us have a high regard for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] who just left the well of the House, and for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who has served us for so many years as the outstanding housing authority in Washington. When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] appears in the well of the House and offers testimony that these houses can be transported and that they are needed, I will take his word for it. I believe it can be done and it should be done. We are talking about a very practical thing. I have just signed three petitions on the desk here to help get the boys out of the service. Many of us are signing these petitions. Why bring these boys home unless we have a place for them to live? In Cleveland, in Marietta, in Columbus, in fact, in so many towns in Ohio, these boys have no place to live. I am appealing to your good judgment. We have at least 1,500 of these units near Cleveland which can be moved. When you speak of private enterprise, may I offer the testimony of President Hugh Selby, of the Home Builders' Association. He says:

> This is not a question of public versus private housing. Private builders are working furiously to produce homes at top speed, in the face of exasperating material shortages. Public housing has the temporary war housing units, already built, that can tide some veterans over the winter. These temporary houses should and must be made available.

That is the testimony of an important representative of private enterprise in my own community.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman if we give back to the National Housing Agency one-half of what is being rescinded, then these houses can be moved without any obligation on any city or on any serviceman.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. LANHAM. I hope that when this bill gets to the Senate they will put that in.

Mr. BENDER. You have had these bonus marches on the Capitol. I tell you that this situation is so desperate that if we fail in this I predict there will be marches on the Capitol by veterans from all over the country demanding shelter.

One of the accusations most frequently leveled against Congress is the charge that we are unrealistic. The action of the House Appropriations Committee rejecting the Budget Bureau request for $24,500,000 to provide temporary veterans housing furnishes a perfect corroboration of this charge.

It is absolutely certain from the experience of such large cities as Cleveland, whose problems I know most intimately, that veterans are facing extremely serious problems in connection with housing. Cleveland is already talking in terms of making available public buildings for housing veterans. The city of New York seriously considered the advisability of pitching tents in the public parks last summer.

Certainly this is not a problem which can be postponed. If it can be solved through the allocation of Federal funds there can be no reason whatever for hesitation by Congress in providing those funds.

Veterans have good cause for resentment in the callous indifference to their problems which is already manifesting itself. Congress cannot by any action sanction such indifference.

I trust that the vote for the Lanham amendment will be unanimous.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, Congress decided in the act of June 23 of this year in title 5 of the Lanham Act that in communities where temporary war housing is no longer needed for war workers, such temporary war housing could be utilized for veterans and their families. Also it provided that temporary war housing in communities where there is no need for veterans could be moved to places where there is a need for veterans. For example, in the city of Berea, a suburb of Cleveland, a bomber plant was shut down and in place of war workers, veterans and their families were housed. At Windham, Ohio, 44 miles southeast of Cleveland, near the Ravenna arsenal, where an ammunition loading plant was closed down, temporary war housing is available, but there are no war workers and there are no veterans in this small community. In Berea there are 378 family units not completed which require only a small expenditure for completion. At Windham, Ohio, there are approximately 500 completed housing units unoccupied. Similar situations obtain in many communities throughout the country.

Under the present law, Congress has provided that in communities where there are no veterans, these housing units can be moved to supply the requirements for veterans, yet we have not appropriated money for the purpose of moving these units. This is inconsistent. The Appropriations Committee has expressed doubt whether the appropriation of $24,500,000 is the proper approach. In the act of June 23 the Congress approved what was then considered to be the proper solution. The need now for housing has increased.

The committee also posed the question as to why communities should not bear the whole expense. Well, the answer to that question is that the solution of this problem is a joint responsibility. It is a Federal responsibility because of the veterans, and it is a local responsibility because the need for housing is present in communities. The solution of this problem should be worked out by an equitable program between the Federal and local governments—the Federal

Government by making the buildings available, and the communities by providing the land.

The committee states that the housing would be crude and uninviting and questions whether or not the Government should be sponsoring that kind of shelter. The answer to that is that the present situation creates an emergency, and this emergency can be met only by a stop-gap measure. Everyone admits that the temporary housing, when reerected, would not be good. In the first place, this housing, mostly, was constructed with cheap substitute material—the only material that was available because the good material was used in war production. Secondly, the specifications were skimpy because of its temporary character.

Moreover, there is definitely still a scarcity of materials and private building will not be able to supply the need in time to relieve the distress of the homeless veterans and their families. Since there is a scarcity of materials, it certainly is sound judgment to utilize what materials we have available because these units will have to be torn down anyway 2 years after the war emergency has been declared ended.

The suggestion that this material be used by private enterprise for new buildings is fallacious because, as just indicated, the materials were of necessity of inferior quality, therefore, cannot now be used for permanent construction.

In Cleveland alone the veterans are returning at the rate of approximately 12,000 a month, and there is not adéquate housing available to them in spite of the fact that all public housing units are accepting only veterans. There were 2,500,000 veterans returned up to October 1 and it is estimated there will be 10,000,000 veterans returning from October 1 to the end of 1946.

The completion of these temporary homes is not a substitute for permanent homes. They are built only to be temporary structures. They are meant to be just a temporary stop-gap until private housing is able to supply the need. No one desires this temporary housing except to fulfill the need in the present emergency.

We Members of Congress must face this situation realistically. This is not a question of private housing against public housing—private builders, apartment-house and real-estate owners have enthusiastically endorsed this program.

As previously pointed out, materials of inferior quality cannot now be used for permanent construction.

The committee stated that postponement of action upon the estimate would mean the delay of possibly only 8 weeks if, in the end, a program should be adopted.

In considering a permanent program, we must realize that we now face an emergency and the veterans should be assisted in their readjustment to civilian life, at least temporarily, until a long-range program could be considered with which this temporary assistance would not be in conflict. This amendment should be adopted in order to complete necessary housing units and to make them available to the veterans. Our Government loaned the money and supplied technicians to build 17,500 dwelling units for bombed-out families in England and France—a laudable undertaking. We can do no less for those veterans who have given so much to us. We give platitudes and testimonials to our veterans. We honor our dead with memorials. Surely we must not fail our living.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield gladly to my able colleague from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. I wonder if, under the municipal law of Ohio, communities would have the right to appropriate any money to set up this housing, make plumbing connections, and so forth. In my judgment, they would not.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Of course, this situation affects practically every State and Commonwealth in the Union. I am satisfied that all States and municipalities will enact legislation, if necessary, to assist veterans and their families to enjoy, at least, temporary housing, until permanent housing may become available.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in suport of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

I want to read two telegrams I received this morning from Los Angeles:

> The American Veterans Committee, composed of World War II veterans, believes that the housing crisis in this area has already reached disaster proportions and is nearing the explosive stage. We feel that even the fastest moving program for new housing cannot be completed in time to relieve some of the mounting and dangerous tensions in the community. We are therefore starting a comprehensive drive through press, radio, screen, and billboard appealing to the citizenry of Los Angeles to make room in their homes for veterans and their families—as they would for the victims of any other great disaster such as fire, flood, or earthquake—for the duration of the crisis. We ask you as a public-spirited citizen to join with other leaders in this community and with us in sponsoring this activity. We are not appealing for funds nor is this drive political in any sense whatsoever—merely an intense effort to open up housing for returning veterans and their families.

This wire is signed by Maj. Ted Lawson and Capt. Ronald Reagan, cochairman of the executive committee, AVC.

Let me read another wire from another source which I received today from my district:

> Five hundred families in the Temple and Sunset districts face eviction due to the development of a freeway. They have searched diligently elsewhere for months for homes. No housing available in any section of Los Angeles County. Situation critical. Urging you to secure assistance of Federal Government in this crisis. The families include veterans, discharged wounded veterans, families, children, and parents.

This indicates the urgent necessity that we are facing in Los Angeles County alone. This kind of temporary housing which the amendment will provide, as temporary as it may be, is better than nothing at all, where people are living in tents, in abandoned gasoline stations, abandoned Army barracks, in anything that will put a roof over the heads of the wives of servicemen who are waiting for return of the men from the Pacific.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Not only are they sleeping under whatever roof can be found, including chicken coops, but they are sleeping under trees and in their own automobiles, if they have one. It is a dangerous situation and one that must be alleviated immediately.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

I just want to call attention further to the fact that an appeal has been made to the Governor of the State of California to call a special session of the State legislature for no other purpose than to provide temporary housing for the veterans who are returning to that area.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Does the gentleman know any more economical way than to have this temporary housing so used?

Mr. McDONOUGH. No; I certainly do not. Furthermore, I think the committee has been given an improper estimate of the cost of $600 for the handling of each of these units. The question is, Where do these units exist now? Could they not be moved to where some concentrated critical situation exists, at less than $600?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The State of Oregon Board of Higher Education is not only endeavoring to get housing of this kind to put on the campuses of our colleges and universities, but we are having trouble in getting them even if we pay for them. We are anxious to get more right now and do not know where we are going to get them.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Added to the situation in Los Angeles is this, 500 families in the Temple-Sunset district are being evicted in order to provide a new traffic artery through the city, as stated in the wire I just read, and many of those people who will be evicted are wounded veterans of this war. This situation is more critical and serious than I believe the Appropriations Committee realize. I urge all Members of the House to support the Lanham amendment for the benefit of the veterans returning home from this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PATTERSON] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH]. As the House knows, he is a former supervisor of the County of Los Angeles and he is very close to the facts. Now, I want to give you a few facts about our particular district in Los Angeles, of things that come under my personal knowledge. I realize, of course, that similar conditions exist in many other cities of the Nation. Right at the present time we are 273,000 housing units short in the Los Angeles area alone. We actually need, according to an estimate by the City Housing Authority, 40,000 additional housing units for veterans, for returned veterans. There are 7,000 applications now on file from veterans and from civilian employees of the Army and Navy Department out there in that area.

Now, there has been an application filed, a certification of the need and of the willingness to procure 5,000 units of these demountable houses, to be used by the Los Angeles City Housing Authority. My good friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] said that when you sawed these crackerboxes in two he did not think anybody would use them. I know of some situations on the Pacific coast where they have already used some of them. I also know that it does not take $600 a house to transport these houses. To transport them to some locations, possibly, yes, but that is not generally the case. Many of these demountable houses have been built close to cities, within 10, 15, or 25 miles, and can be brought into those cities at much less expense than $600.

Let me ask why these houses were made demountable in the first place? They were made in sections and in partitions; they were made so they could be put together quickly. They can easily be taken down and transported to other places to use. So it is not as though you were sawing a permanent structure in two, it is merely a matter of taking these demountable panel houses apart, putting them on trucks and setting them up again in another place.

My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] told you about people living in gasoline stations. That is true, they are living in gasoline stations, they are living in auto parks, they are living in tents, they are living in small family garages. It is a pitiful condition. Many of these people are veterans and not people who have enjoyed the prosperity of high war wages.

You ask, What about the private builders? The private builders in our territory are using all the material that is available and all they can procure. Letters from private builders in my district complain because of the shortage of material. There are many structures already partly constructed which cannot be finished.

As a matter of fact this will not interfere with private builders at all, because this is only a temporary arrangement to meet an emergency, and it will not require the use of new materials which should be available for permanent structures. This demountable house material is already owned by the Government and is paid for and is available.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Even this effort to do something in the emergency does not by any manner of means meet the situation adequately. We have already had testimony from a number of other Ohioans setting out what our situation is. The situation in and around Cleveland is exceedingly bad. Let me tell you just one of several hundred cases that have come to my personal attention: A man who has spent 5 years in the service, 3 of them overseas, comes home to a house of four rooms in which live his mother-in-law, her new husband, two step-sisters-in-law, and the man's own wife and baby. What kind of a home is that to come to? What kind of a life does that mean?

A great deal has been said about private enterprise and veterans' housing. I am more than anxious to have private builders given not only a green light but the priorities on material for homes rather than to see the scarce material being put into new motion-picture houses and new shops, as well as additions to shops. Is it not far better to build houses for veterans? Is it not far better to do something for a man to enable him to have a place in which to live than to permit that? But this takes time and this is an emergency. Cleveland needs help. We know the type house involved. We know its discomforts and its temporary quality. We know also that our discharged soldiers will be better off in these "card houses" than on the streets, in automobiles, and in overcrowded homes. I do not feel that the veteran is going to come back in a year or two and blame us for putting him into a Rickety-Rackety Ann house, because I feel that by that time he will have had a chance to get on his feet and get himself a decent place and permanent place in which to live. We in Cleveland know how unsatisfactory these houses are, but at least they will serve as a roof over his head.

I want to say what my colleague from Canton said in reference to the matter of municipal difficulties. There are certain municipal limitations in the State of Ohio which seem to make it impossible for us to go out and get these units and put them up for ourselves. We do need Federal help to do it.

Let me make my position clear:

The last thing I want to do is to put people in houses which are going to fall down on their heads. I know these movable houses will not be luxurious; they will answer only the barest necessities; they may even leak; but I would rather have that for the veterans of my district than to have him live in four rooms with an enormous family not his own, or have to sleep, himself and his wife and children, in an automobile.

I believe we do have a responsibility to our returning soldiers in the matter of temporary housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, this is a reasonable request that is made for the housing of returning veterans. There is not any doubt that we are bringing them back to places where there are no houses available. Certainly we can take the demountable houses, as was said by previous speakers, and take them to places where the veterans can use them.

The amendment, I understand, provides for $24,500,000. If $24,500,000 will house some 20,000 veterans and their families I believe it should be spent because they can be placed at spots where they will do the most good.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman is familiar with the fact we spent $2,000,000,000 in developing the Manhattan project, a large part of which was spent to build a whole city for 75,000 war workers. Does not the gentleman agree that if we can spend that much money for a development of that kind that we can spend this comparatively small sum to provide housing for our returning servicemen?

Mr. HOOK. I think the gentlewoman from Connecticut is quite correct. We should not be niggardly in this respect.

I agree with the gentleman from Texas that this is just the first step. It is only a temporary thing and I hope that as we go along we will prepare a housing program that will adequately take care of the returning veterans, that we will bring to him a standard of living under which in the postwar world he will be able to get the home to which he is entitled and not have to live in any cracker box. It is up to us to provide a better standard of living to these returning veterans than they had during and prior to the World War and it is up to us as representatives of the people to look at this program from a broad point of view. We must see to it that he is not put in a cracker box when he returns. We must see to it that his standard of living is increased to the point where he can have decent housing and a decent home in which to place his family.

I hope that when we consider this temporary thing that we will not stop there; that we will take a look at the fact that unless we increase the wage scale of the returning veteran we will not give him the standard of living that he is entitled to. The United Automobile Workers are asking for a 30-percent increase in wages without any increase in prices. Even with this increase the standard of living of the returning veteran will be less than he had during his service in the armed forces as an overseas veteran with a wife and two children. A 30-percent increase is a reasonable request. The veteran is now becoming a worker and his standard of living must be such that will enable him to raise his family in decency.

I plead with you for not only decent housing but decent wages. Make him a partner in democracy. His welfare is tied up with all workers. The UAW-CIO is fighting his battle for him. They are demanding that the returning veteran and all others share in the fruits of democracy. They are fighting against inflation because inflation would ruin not only the returning veteran's chance to a decent living but all others who live in this Nation. If General Motors have their way the veterans and all others will be saddled with inflation because General Motors insists on an increase in prices if there is an increase in wages. That will mean inflation. The strikers through their president, R. J. Thomas, says that the union will fight to the limit against inflation and that they want an increase in wages only if it will not mean an increase in prices. The facts submitted by the union show conclusively that the union's position is sound. The veteran should, and I know will, go along with the union's position because it is his only hope for a better standard of living which he so justly deserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, early this year I introduced a resolution, which I tried to get the House to pass, calling for a continuous investigation of how the administrative agencies of the Government were carrying out the GI bill of rights. Since then I have sought, in vain, to vote upon more than one or two items of veterans' legislation. I have attempted to bring measures before the House from time to time which would benefit the veteran, but all in vain. Today I am grasping at a straw. I should like to register my support for any and all amendments which are brought up today on the floor of the House for the support of the veteran. I expect to do everything I can to see that proper housing facilities, proper hospitalization, medical care, and every other opportunity which you and I guaranteed the veteran in the GI bill of rights last year, are afforded them. I expect to follow up every opportunity I can get to vote for legislation for the benefit of the veteran. I wish to say here and now that if the mail which other Members of the House are receiving is similar to mine you will find that the veterans of the country are getting mighty sick and tired of the way things are going. Congress is falling down on the job of passing legislation which will benefit millions of returning servicemen and veterans in this country today. So I say, Mr. Chairman, at this time there is no better opportunity in the consideration of this deficiency appropriation bill than for the House to put various items in the bill for the proper hospitalization, proper medical facilities, housing, and all other things that we can give the veteran. I, for one, believe that we will be going back upon the promises that we made in the GI bill of rights if we fail in doing this.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the use of providing all these benefits if we do not get them home?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman has something there. Of course, he knows as well as I do that a tremendous number of men have already come home. But I, for one, am ready and willing to vote for these benefits, and I am going to do it every chance I get on the floor of the House. I just hope that from now on there will be more and more measures offered, whether they come up in the form of deficiency appropriation bills or other items, to give us all a chance to show the veteran that we are behind him and give the Congress of the United States the chance of seeing that the GI bill of rights is carried out. It is not being followed through today as it should be. All I have to do is to call your attention to the various letters that you and I are getting from the servicemen. I hope that this amendment and the other amendments for the benefit of the veterans will be passed here today.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of putting back into this first deficiency appropriation bill the $24,500,000 for temporary housing for veterans. I have read the report and arguments of the committee on page 3 of the report and as the testimony appears on the record of the hearings. I emphatically feel that now is the acceptable time to demonstrate to these boys, who fought for us, that we have something besides lip service in mind in the interests of themselves and their loved ones.

Distinguished gentlemen who have already spoken for this provision have all emphasized that his Nation should provide housing for the veterans. As I recall it none of them have happened to mention that whatever hardship or privation or risk or detriment these veterans were suffering as a result of there being no housing accommodations for them as they return home, but I desire to emphasize that hundreds of thousands of these veterans are married, and not only have wives, but they have children. These children, gentlemen, and these wives of these veterans are not a minor consideration of this Nation by any means. I desire to quote from a letter received by me from a distinguished junior grade lieutenant of the Eighteenth District of California, which I have the honor to represent. It is as follows:

COMPTON, CALIF., *October 20, 1945.*

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in behalf of myself and all other returning servicemen who might find themselves in a similar predicament.

The housing situation in this area is deplorable. To one who has suddenly appeared on the scene, it appears that a lack of proper coordinated planning between local, State, and Federal agencies for the proper housing of returning servicemen is very evident.

These men, through no fault of their own, were removed from communities which they had called home for a good number of years, only to return and find a housing situation they are unable to cope with. This local situation is unquestionably duplicated in innumerable towns and cities, not only in your own congressional district, but in others located similarly, close to former war production centers.

There appears to have been a large influx of the so-called out-of-State migrant who now, that the war plants have ceased to operate as such, are finding the communities of their temporary abode to their liking and are not readily set to move themselves to their former places of residence. This is a condition that has unquestionably been brought about locally due to the pleasant climatic conditions for which we are noted, but it is extremely difficult for a person similar to myself who is a native to this State to find himself unable to locate a place to reside as a result of this condition. My suggestion would be that some temporary measure be enacted in order to prevent a still larger influx of temporary citizens to this community until they are able to accommodate those who are forced to reside here. This will present problems, but should be given as deep consideration as was the former war effort as it is unquestionably an emergency of a very acute nature.

Very truly yours,

M. E. MANNING,
Lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserves.

Also, I quote from a recent letter to me from Mr. Rollin L. McNitt, distinguished attorney of the State of California, and chairman of the Democratic County Central Committee of Los Angeles County, Calif., in which he says:

This housing must be so programed as to be available to all in need, regardless of race. I cannot overstress the urgency of the situation, especially as related to Los Angeles' ability to carry its part in the continuation of the war effort and in the reconstruction period.

Very sincerely yours,

ROLLIN L. MCNITT,
Chairman, Democratic County Central Committee.

And quoting from volume II, No. 4, of the Housing News, issued November 1, 1945, by the Los Angeles Housing Authority, I read:

It is becoming increasingly evident, even to those who do not care to look, that the Los Angeles housing shortage is no transitory problem that will quietly and conveniently erase itself, at the end of the war, through the simple process of having no attention paid to it. The end of the war has come and the simple facts are that temporary war workers have decided to stay and seek permanent employment; that more and more demobilized soldiers, bringing their families with them, are arriving every day; that easterners and middle-westerners who have perforce postponed their coming to California for the past several years are either on the way or getting ready to start. The only real answer is, as it has been all along, more housing, quick.

You will of course understand that it is appropriate for me to read and quote the facts relating to housing by the City of Los Angeles Housing Authority, because the metropolitan city of Long Beach, where my home is, is no different in this matter than the larger city of Los Angeles, only 18 miles distant.

And for accuracy of information and down-to-date statement of facts as to housing in Long Beach and the Eighteenth Congressional District of Cali-

fornia, especially, I give you the substance of a report by George Toll, the able USES manager at Long Beach, Calif., under date to me of November 15, 1945. In substance, he says:

Since VJ-day over 100,000 men have been discharged from the service through Fort MacArthur and Terminal Island separation stations. A large number of these men were inducted from southern California.

Toll said that there is every indication that not only those inducted from southern California but many of those being released here who formerly lived in other States have expressed a desire to locate in the southern California area.

"Eight percent of the Nation's armed forces were recruited in California; 10 to 12 percent of the Nation's armed forces are being discharged here with the intention of making California their permanent home. There is every indication that the ratio in Long Beach is even larger."

According to Toll, the following factors further complicate the problem: (1) Before they entered the service, a large percentage of the veterans were single and living at home. Thousands of these have married and are looking for homes of their own; (2) housing has had to be made available to the families of men in the local United States Navy hospital. It is only natural that families from every corner of the Nation flock to the bedsides of these men who were wounded in combat and who, in many cases, are back in the United States for the first time in many months; (3) while the population of the Long Beach area has grown by leaps and bounds during the war years, housing facilities have increased by only a small percentage; (4) war-industry workers formerly housed in barracks or West Side housing projects now are seeking other types of work and moving into homes away from the aircraft and shipbuilding districts; (5) over-1,200 in-migrants are settling in the Long Beach area each month.

"Long Beach has an unparalleled industrial growth ahead; it would indeed be unfortunate if the housing shortage were responsible for these veterans, whose skills will be so urgently needed, having to make their homes elsewhere."

Reminding you that the home-port base of the great Pacific Fleet is in the front waterway of my home city of Long Beach, it is no less than tragic that these thousands of men of the fleet arrive at that home port only to find that there is nowhere into which they can go with their wives and children. So I am advised that literally hundreds of the fleet have to stay aboard the ships while the wives and children seek day and night for places to stay to which they can invite their husbands and fathers to come. A nice picture, is it not? I do not think so. I think it is a shame and a disgrace and must be forthwith corrected.

One gentleman, in opposing this provision, emphasizes that it would cost as much as $600 a unit and that then the localities and communities burdened with this problem would still have to spend money on these movable units. As far as I am concerned, if it costs six times $600 to provide ample temporary housing for their loved ones, I would be in favor of doing just that. Put your own son or own daughter or your own grandchildren in the position in which these fathers and mothers and children are forced to live in California, and all over the Nation, and see what your decision is. Do dollars count very much if it happens to be your own flesh and blood? Let us do more and talk less. Let us do it now. This is the first chance we have had to make this provision for these men and their families. Let us not procrastinate nor postpone.

Whatever the cost, I believe the people of the Nation want it expended so that these veterans and families will have a place to lay their heads in decency and dignity and safety, and with fair living standards about them. I can see from the response to me that hundreds and hundreds of veterans with hundreds also of their loved ones are sleeping in unfit, unsanitary conditions surrounding them. This is bad. It should not be tolerated, and when this Congress, charged with such responsibility, long delays this necessary temporary provision, I consider it a direct neglect to perform our official duty in the premises.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I want to add my words of support to what the gentleman from California is arguing for. Only yesterday I returned from my State and I saw acute conditions there. I talked to returned veterans who have spent 4½ years in the service. They have come back and found that they are not able to find a place to live.

May I say also that something should be done to force the War Department to release surplus supplies, because I was told that there is enough lumber in the San Francisco Supply Depot to build 100,000 homes.

Mr. DOYLE. We are definitely contributing to substandards of living and subnormal conditions by neglecting longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this story has been pretty well told, but I would feel negligent in my duty if I did not say one or two things about it.

I have before me a letter from the commander of the American Legion in one of the towns in my district. This is a medium-sized city in Los Angeles County, Calif. This is what he says:

Many of the returned veterans are married and are now having to live with their in-laws or in garages or makeshift shacks. Our local city jail is crowded each night with returned veterans looking for a place to rest. Many jobs are available but cannot be taken because of no housing. Many of the veterans' inquiries are for lawyers due to domestic troubles, most of which are due to housing conditions.

In other words, we have a situation here which has to do not only with physical comfort, but with the all-important matter of knitting up the ties of the family when the man comes home from war. Everything that we owe to him is involved in this problem.

It has been suggested that perhaps this is not the most practical way to do the job. Certainly it is not the best way, certainly it is not the most desirable way, but equally certainly if we cannot get construction of enough good homes quickly there should be some of the emergency type of construction that we did when we were trying to house war workers during the war. The situation is that serious in some of these crowded areas.

Now here we have a sort of third or fourth best measure. But at least it will help some to get a roof over the veterans' heads.

I talked to the National Housing Agency people about this. I talked to the highest officials in that Agency about it. They tell me it is altogether practical, that if we will only give them the money to take some of this temporary housing from some sections where it is not needed at all, where it is only standing idle, vacant, and deteriorating, and move it into these areas where the veterans are going without homes, the job can be done. That is all in the world we are trying to do here.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman from California recognizes that it is estimated that in Los Angeles there are 40,000 returned veterans, while at the same time the housing authorities have estimated there is a possibility of building during the next 9 months only 20,000 units of housing. Therefore, there is a tremendous shortage in that regard. We cannot possibly meet the need even if the contractors build all they can in the next 9 months.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true. What the gentleman has stated is an accurate description of the situation.

I want to add one word about the Army and Navy surpluses because I have been trying to find out all I could, from both the Army and Navy and the Surplus Property Administration and to get surpluses released. I expect some of the reports about these surpluses have been exaggerated. But I do think that a whole lot of red tape could stand to be cut and I believe that a great deal more speed could be used in releasing some of these building materials which actually are surplus. I think when they are released it should be done with the specification that the material should be used only for the construction of homes for veterans until this problem is met.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am at a loss to understand how this amendment is going to correct the situation as it exists today. The Federal Housing Authority has the right at the present time to lease these properties, but a veteran cannot today buy one of the houses and put it on his own land.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The purpose of this is to enable the National Housing Authority to have some money with which to do this job and make this housing available where it is needed. That is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I regret I must differ with my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, who told us a little while ago that cities would not want Lanham Act houses. I know that the city of Milwaukee does want these houses. The aldermen of that city and the county board of supervisors are anxious to acquire 2,000 of these units as quickly as they possibly can.

This housing is feasible. It is now vacant. It is a crime that we permit houses to be vacant in the United States when returning veterans cannot find places to sleep. When I was in Milwaukee about 3 weeks ago, I spent nearly one solid afternoon doing nothing but attempting to find places for veterans to live. They cannot buy anything because there is nothing for sale at a price that they can afford to pay. There is nothing to rent. They are doubling up and living under all kinds of makeshift conditions as has been suggested. They would welcome these homes.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, the gentleman knows as I do that there have been many marriages of these veterans and many new families created. They will need living quarters. As I said in my original statement, I realize that this is not adequate, but this is what the President recommended in order to bring this matter to legislative attention. We are hopeful that it will be increased and approved. But under a deficiency bill where points of order can be made against anything that is legislative, this is the best that we can do as a start.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I agree entirely with the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

I want to answer in part the question raised earlier by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. Individuals cannot buy these homes because under the terms of the Lanham Act they are earmarked for destruction 2 years after the end of the war. That is why no individual would possibly want them. They are going to be torn down. They are not going to be permanent. I think that point ought to be driven home.

One more point that I want to make is this. I think the gentleman from Texas suggested a few moments ago that we have to recognize in addition to meeting this temporary situation through makeshift measures, such as we are about to do, I trust, this afternoon, Congress does have to get down to brass tacks on a permanent long-range housing program, particularly for our veterans. We are told that there will be 1,600,000 married men now in the service returning who will have no homes in which to live, and that in addition it is estimated that 1,300,000 single veterans will be married during the next 12 months and will be without homes to live in. We are, in the next 12 months, faced with a shortage of nearly 2,000,000 homes, allowing for those that will be vacated for one reason or another. I think it is high time that Congress got down to work on the Wagner-Ellender bill. We should have a housing program which can stimulate both private and public housing at the same time. Otherwise, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] said earlier on this floor, we will have a real eruption from our veterans that will make the bonus marches look very tame in comparison.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why do they not change the Lanham Act so that individual cities and States which have a lot of money can buy these houses, if they have the money?

Mr. BIEMILLER. May I inform the lady that some of them are already being bought. The city of Milwaukee did buy 200 of them, and it wants to lease an additional larger number.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak to those Members of the House who have been complaining about lack of housing facilities for their educational institutions in this crisis.

There is one of these plants in the district in which I live, the Gulf Ordnance Plant. I believe we worked out the best program that has as yet been proposed. That is for the State College to take over the machine shop and the housing, and remove the engineering and mechanical classes to that place and house them in the houses already built. Many of these houses are concrete and cannot be moved. State College is only 30 miles away. We are going to get this program worked out, and in my opinion, it is the most sensible solution that has as yet been proposed. That is what the RFC has said about it. That is what the Governor of my State has said about it. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], who has worked with me on it, agrees with that settlement.

I know that when you go to tear down these houses and move them you virtually destroy them. I realize that under the operation of the OPA you cannot get materials with which to build houses. I am not going to oppose this amendment, but I want to say to you gentlemen who have colleges in your States that need housing for your students, a program could be worked out to utilize these houses where they now stand.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I call to the attention of the gentleman the fact that in the handling of these houses it is contemplated that in their removal they will not be torn down.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not opposing the gentleman's amendment, but I repeat that if you will have the State institutions take over the machine shops and the houses and move a portion of the student body there, you can utilize them as they now stand, and relieve the overcrowded condition.

In addition, we are bringing back untold thousands of servicemen who want this mechanical training. The majority of them could not go to college if they had the money, because they cannot meet the educational requirements, but by relaxing those requirements for students who are taking mechanical or industrial training it will enable us to train untold thousands of those servicemen at a minimum of expense.

You are not going to get anywhere—and you might as well quit tugging at your bootstraps—you are not going to get anywhere until we get the OPA off the necks of the American people. The little sawmills cannot operate. The big ones cannot operate. You have a wave of strikes all over the country. Many servicemen cannot get work after they get home.

The OPA reminds me of what happened in Siam about 100 years ago. It is said that the British minister gave the Emperor of Siam a library of classical English literature. He had his carpenter, his OPA man, go out and make him some bookshelves; but when he got the shelves made he said to him, "Take those books and put them in there." When he tried it, he found he had made the shelves too short for the books. So that wise old bureaucrat, that ancient OPA artisan, simply took the books out and sawed them off to fit the shelves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is a case where somebody may fool the veteran if this amendment does not succeed; that is, the advocates of this amendment may fool the veterans into believing that they were trying to do something for them when they proposed and voted for it. If the amendment is adopted and the veterans move into one of these rookeries, and that is what they will be, the fellow who promoted it is going to have the wrath of the veterans descend upon him.

I am not opposed to any of these shacks being given to veterans or veterans being allowed to use them where they are, but you cannot with any satisfaction take these buildings down and move them somewhere at a total cost of $2,500, which the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, Mr. Blandford, testified would be the cost, and have anything left that is satisfactory as a house. Move a veteran into it and he will realize what he has had put over on him. There are cases where a veteran himself if he were given one of these houses might move it somewhere as it stood and receive some benefit from it; and he ought to be given that opportunity. But when they come before us with a crazy scheme to spend $600 panelizing a house when anybody who has had any experience in building—and, frankly, I have had considerable in my day—realizes that it could not possibly cost $200 to do it and do a decent job, we have to oppose it. Lots of people say it could be done for $50. Then they talk about its costing $600 more to put them

together again if you get it moved. I was down at Oak Ridge and went through some of these buildings. They told the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself that they could put those things together in a day. I understood it would take four men but the gentleman from Missouri understood it would take two. The way I figure it would cost $100 to put it together and the way the gentleman from Missouri figured it would take $50.

Why should we fall for this kind of a wild scheme that does not go together and does not make sense and which will disappoint and disillusion the veteran and everybody who has gotten behind this kind of scheme? Help the veteran, but do not hurt him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, there are several omissions from this appropriation measure which seem to me particularly unfortunate, among them the elimination of the items for flood control and rivers and harbors.

However, at this time I wish to emphasize the desperate need for restoring the all-too meager sum of $24,500,000 to provide housing for returning servicemen. This money was requested to move demountable housing for localities where it is no longer needed to those sections of the Nation, like by own Pacific Northwest, where servicemen are returning to find that they have no homes.

Actually the request for $24,500,000 was in itself a most meager one. The truth is that we need between $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 to actually provide temporary homes for our veterans. If we are to do justice to those who wrested victory from the hands of Nazi tyranny and Japanese military imperialism, we must pass additional legislation to authorize the appropriation of this additional amount, and we must appropriate that money. The present small request is but a beginning.

However, we must make that beginning.

In my own district, embracing the busy war centers of Seattle and Bremerton, Wash., there are no homes available.

Mr. Chairman, we spent billions of dollars to carry forward our war to its victorious conclusion. Millions upon millions was spent uprooting men from their homes and sending them across the seas to bring us victory. The least we can do here today is to give the promise of a roof over their heads to these men who are now returning to us.

Private builders in my own district have told me that they cannot possibly cope with the housing shortage immediately. As I have previously informed this House, I am now preparing legislation to provide home ownership to low-income families by eliminating the present down-payment requirements under FHA loans. It is my hope, and the hope of the private builders and prospective home owners in my own district, that this legislation will aid materially in providing low-cost homes to the average family. But even with such a program, large-scale home building in the low-cost field is months away.

Yet the problem is with us today. The veterans are coming back into our communities this very hour, not months away. They are seeking today for a place to live, Mr. Chairman.

And all that is asked of us here and now is that we provide them with temporary quarters—to be torn down when permanent private housing is available.

We are not asked to legislate for the ill-housed. This is legislation for the unhoused veteran. On such a matter there is no alternative.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I assure you I will not take the full 3½ minutes. I desire to support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] largely because of one or two situations existing in my congressional district. We have in the city of Montgomery the West Virginia Institute of Technology. The returning GI boys claiming their rights under the GI bill have swamped this institution. It is the only one for many miles around. There are no housing facilities available for those boys so they may attend this institution. We have searched the country over and we have succeeded in locating some demountable buildings and we have partially solved that difficulty. I think there is considerable merit in the proposition the gentleman is offering and I want to assure him it will receive my support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on behalf of the Lanham amendment. The only particular in which I disagree with the amendment is that it is not 10 times as much as now provided in the amendment. Even then it would be less than a minimum that is required to put our housing situation in order for the veterans who are returning.

In my own city I know there are six and seven veterans sleeping in one room in the Salvation Army almost every night in order to have a roof over their heads. I know they are sleeping in flophouses at 15 cents a night on a cot.

Mr. Chairman, this is what America is giving the men who have spent 2 and 3 years overseas in fox holes while they dreamed of the home they left. Then we hear this amendment called a wild-eyed visionary idea by its opponents because we propose to spend five or six hundred dollars each to panelize these houses in order to make them available where they can be used by these veterans.

Bear in mind that if we could go ahead and get all the lumber out of the forests we need to erect these houses tomorrow, if our stock piles of materials were such that we could build decent houses tomorrow, I would not be pleading for panelizing these houses.

But we are in exactly the same situation that we were in during the war. We have got to make the best of what we have to work with. The available supply of lumber and building materials that we have in our stock piles today is desperately short and our best immediate supply is in these demountable and portable houses. This Congress will make the greatest mistake it has made in years if it fails to recognize this situation and do something now about providing temporary houses to shelter our returning servicemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we do not have more time in which to go into this matter. I always hesitate to try to put an item in an appropriation bill when the full committee has acted upon it, but in this particular case I do not think that the committee gave this item proper consideration. I have talked with my chairman and he said, of course, that this matter would be referred back to the committee which had jurisdiction. That is my committee. We are now holding hearings on the matter. I want to say that I do not want this item returned to my committee. I want it in this bill.

I have reasons for making that statement. If we are going to put the item in the bill it ought to be put in today because this is an emergency. Of course, you can send it back to my committee if you want to, but when it becomes available it will be June 30, 1946, and at that time it will serve no purpose so far as these veterans who have returned and need housing are concerned.

I was in my State a few days ago and these young men who have returned, who are wearing their honorable discharge buttons, many of them wounded, came to me en masse and told me they were not able to get housing at all. The only possible thing they could get in Orlando and other places in my State was a small room that they could rig up as best they could. At the same time we have many housing units available throughout the State of Florida but they are in inacessible places. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has said, what we need is an emergency fund so the housing authority can provide the houses for these young men at the present time and I make this statement in spite of the fact this is supposed to be returned to my committee. We will study the matter if it is returned to our committee, but we ought to have this now, we should not wait until next spring to bring it up and study it. We should put it in this bill and give them something for housing which they so badly need.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman believe that the emergency at the present time is as great as when the war was on and we had to move these houses from some other place?

Mr. HENDRICKS. It is worse now than it was during the war because the

veterans are returning and in certain places we have overcrowded conditions. The veterans are returning and cannot find a place to stay. In certain places in this country the condition is worse than it was during the war.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that in many places in the gentleman's State these houses can be brought to the cities where they are needed for much less than $600?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Certainly that is true. There are 200 trailers frozen in Fort Myers, Fla., where they do not need them. They could be moved for much less but they cannot be moved to Orlando where there is a need for them because the housing authority has not the funds to do this. Those soldiers need them. They say that they will take trailers if they cannot get anything else. I do not want these veterans to have to use trailers, I want them to have houses.

If this were a permanent housing project I would not be in favor of it because private capital ought to build our permanent housing program. This is an emergency, and these veterans absolutely need this housing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will adopt the pending amendment. I have not been able to poll my committee, but, as far as I am concerned, I do not want it returned to our committee, I want it put in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee yields the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, for about the first time in nearly 14 years I find myself in disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], and it embarrasses me because there is no Member of the House that I hold in higher esteem for ability, or for whom I have any warmer affection. But I am against this amendment, and I can say to the gentleman from Texas I will take the same position on every other amendment that is offered to increase this bill, and I hope this House is going to be opposed to every other amendment for increased spending. I shall go into that in 1 minute.

First, on this amendment, I understand that, even if adopted, a community would have to pay for moving the houses anyway. I understand that they can be made available to the communities when declared surplus. Not long ago Washington and Lee University in my home town said, "We need houses for married veterans coming back to school. How can we get them?" I told them how to get them. The Government had 65 houses at Dublin near Radford, where there is located the first big powder plant built in the United States, a little community of 2,500 or 3,000, and they housed and took care of 6,500 workers. Then the plant was closed down. There is nobody but watchmen there. The portable houses were declared surplus. I said to Washington and Lee, "You will have to pay for them." Washington and Lee said, "We will gladly pay for them if you tell us how to get them." So the real essence of this argument, except as to municipalities—they can get them free when declared surplus—is who is going to pay for them. I say that the Federal Government is no longer in a position to be generous, to be giving money away or to be giving property away.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I agree with what the gentleman is saying, and I want to know if the gentleman can tell me how this amendment would give a veteran a house. How could he get it even if you adopt the amendment?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. He could not get it to save his life.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course he could not.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the implication of the question and the answer defeats the purpose of those who are in favor of this, because we are not asking that veterans be given houses. We are asking that they be given homes to live in.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. As all Members know, a veteran cannot buy any surplus war property for private use. He cannot even buy a fountain pen for that purpose. A veteran cannot buy a jeep for private use. He cannot buy anything for private use. It must be for business purposes. But to get back. I had not intended to speak on this bill. I voiced my sentiments in behalf of economy more than 10 years ago when I spoke against the relief and recovery bill, the $4,800,000,000 bill. Few Members of the House have since voted more consistently for economy. I was shocked today when I saw that the press virtually ignored a statement made by the chairman of the committee that we faced not a $30,000,000,000 deficit this year, but a forty or fifty billion deficit; that we are not going to have just a twenty billion Budget for fiscal 1947, but a forty or fifty billion dollar Budget. I want to tell you, especially those who criticized yesterday the members of the Committee on Ways and Means for bringing in a tax-reduction bill in face of those serious financial difficulties, that we acted under a serious misapprehension of the facts. Look at the statement that I put into the RECORD in September before the bill was even introduced before our committee. I went to all sources I could to get the facts. I went to the Committee on Appropriations and I was told, "We cannot tell what the next Budget will be," because the Budget requests had not come in yet. I said, "What is the estimated deficit for the current fiscal year?" As far as they could tell the Treasury was right in estimating that it would be $30,000,000,000 for this year and not fifty. I then asked the best estimates of economists in three different departments about the national income for next year. They thought it would not fall below $130,000,000,000. Then I prefaced my recommendation of a tax cut not exceeding $4,000,000,000 by saying, "We will have a $30,000,000,000 deficit this year, we will have an appropriation of about $20,000,000,000 or $22,000,000,000 for next year, we will be within sight of a balanced Budget for next year, and we can depend upon a balanced Budget in fiscal 1948." It was on those premises that I recommended to the Congress and to our committee that we cut not exceeding $4,000,000,000. The Treasury recommended $5,000,000,000, and we wound up with $5,800,000,000 or $5,900,000,000 by the time we had accepted the compromises proposed by the Senate. Now we are told that spending will far exceed those estimates. Action on this bill will indicate to the country our future fiscal policy.

On January 24, 1935, in opposing an appropriation of $4,800,000,000, I stated my position, as follows:

My observation of private financial transactions has been that when an individual, firm, or corporation continues to spend more than he or it earns bankruptcy is the probable end. For 6 years I was legal adviser to the board of supervisors of my home county—the agency that prepares county budgets and levies county taxes. That experience convinced me that a big bonded debt was a great handicap to any county, and that after it reached a certain proportion of taxable assets repudiation would be the result. For 6 years I served in our State senate and for 7 years as the head of a State department. My experience with State financial affairs convinced me that a large bonded indebtedness was a dangerous thing. Following the World War motor transport developed by leaps and bounds in the United States, and with the widespread use of motorcars and trucks came a widespread demand for improved highways on which they might operate. In Virginia there was a bitter and long drawn out fight over whether these improved highways should be built with the proceeds of a $50,000,000 bond issue or from current revenue. When that issue was ultimately submitted to the Virginia electorate it voted overwhelmingly for a pay-as-you-go policy in road construction. While sister States and political subdivisions thereof were freely spending the proceeds of tremendous bond issues, Virginia and the political subdivisions thereof kept relatively free from bonded debt. As a result, when the depression came Virginia was better able to weather the storm than many States, and ultimate recovery in Virginia, if the taxpayers of that State are not bowed down by an overwhelming national debt, will be more rapid than in some States And the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia was preserved not only by refusing to expend the proceeds of bond issues, but by making personal sacrifices during the depression. The appropriations for all State activities were drastically reduced, and the salaries of all State employees were cut not 5, 10, or 15 percent, but 30 percent.

It is with this background, and representing in the House a section of Virginia that was settled and developed by industrious and thrifty Scotch-Irish and Dutch, that I approached the pending proposal to add to the present appropriated and unexpended

sum of $5,000,000,000 an additional appropriation of $4,800,000,000. * * *

I would not undertake to speak dogmatically as to what is wise and what is unwise, what is safe and what unsafe with respect to a national spending program and a tremendous national debt, but will content myself with the mere expression of the personal opinion that the present spending tendency is neither wise nor safe. I roughly estimate that Virginia's share, as the seventh largest taxpayer in the Nation, of the proposed appropriation will be about $250,000,000, or equal to the entire cost of operating our State government for half a decade. I do not feel that any benefit that Virginia will receive, directly or indirectly, from the total expenditure will be commensurate with the burden of the repayment of Virginia's share of the debt.

When I was a boy an old farmer used to tell me, "The tendency of everything is to be more so." The tendency of a Federal spending program is undoubtedly to be more so. Close on the heels of this bill will come the demand for the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates. I, for one, do not feel that I could consistently vote for the current appropriation and then deny my comrades of the World War the payment of a debt already contracted on the ground that the national credit and the public welfare could not stand the payment. I will not undertake to enumerate the other demands of group benefit payments and social reform measures nor the socialistic proposals that have been made that will involve a continuing operating expense as well as direct injury to private business through Government competition. But I do not feel that I am extravagant when I estimate that the demands for the coming fiscal year could easily run our national debt to $40,000,000,000, and since it is so easy to spend when we abandon a tax-levying pay-as-you-go program our commitments for the 1937 Budget could easily reach $50,000,000,000.

The distinguished chairman of our Appropriations Committee, on February 5, 1934 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1940), said:

"Direct relief or the dole for the able-bodied produces moral disintegration, destroys industry, self-reliance, and initiative. It dims ambition, converts energy and industry into indolence and idleness. If permanently continued, its recipients become as satisfied with their existence as a miserable worm that ekes out its miserable existence in the dust of the earth."

And again on page 1941 he warned us against an unlimited spending program, when he said:

"Mr. Speaker, to those who advocate increased appropriations over this $950,000,000, let me say that relief in a Nation the size of ours is like a rapacious maw. It would absorb every dollar you appropriated, whether it was one billion or five billion dollars. We must conduct this relief project with a discriminating judgment, so we will have just enough money to relieve the actual necessities and the real suffering of our people."

Those storm warnings were ignored. We continued to spend borrowed money in times of peace, and then were forced to spend borrowed money for war purposes on an unprecedented scale. Fifteen continuous years of deficit financing have dulled our sensibilities as to what is involved.

When I was a boy I heard a minister tell the story of how an eagle, confident of its strength and power, met its fate. He said it was a period of spring thaws and flood waters in the Niagara River. A lamb, unconscious of its danger, fell into the stream and was swept down the rapid current. A baldhead eagle, king of the birds of prey and symbolic to us of our national power, circling above the stream in search of food, saw the helpless lamb. Diving upon the lamb, the eagle drove its talons deep into its carcass and commenced to feed. The current of the stream became swifter and swifter, but the eagle knew the power of its broad wings. Soon it could hear the roar of Horseshoe Falls, and still it continued to feed. Just as the carcass of the lamb was caught in that terrific current that races for the death-dealing drop over those falls, the eagle decided to leave its prey and soar again in the safe heights above. But when he spread those strong wings he failed to rise. His talons had become frozen to the carcass of the lamb, and he could not disengage himself nor lift his heavy burden from the water. And so the two were swept together over the falls.

Chairman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee was indulging in no hyperbole of speech when he told the House on yesterday: "We have reached this year, this month, this hour, a turn in a long road. It is a road that leads from the beginning of our Government down to today and stretches away ahead of us into the far-distant future. Upon the nature of the turn we make today depends to a very large degree the destination to which that road leads the Nation, not only next year, but for 100 years to come, and not only for the American people but for the world. Unless we can maintain this Nation on a sound financial basis there is disaster ahead for us and for the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANHAM) there were—ayes 76, noes 70.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. LANHAM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 115, noes 89.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospital and domiciliary facilities: The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, subject to the approval of the Federal Board of Hospitalization, is authorized to utilize such Army and Navy hospitals, temporary or otherwise, not required by the Army or Navy, as such Administrator and the Federal Board of Hospitalization may deem safe and suitable for the hospitalization or domiciliary care of veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 17, line 19, after the colon, strike out the remainder of line 19 and all of lines 20 to 23, inclusive, and on page 18, strike lines 1 and 2, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "or an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'hospital and domiciliary facilities', including the 3-percent limitation specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, $158,320,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is the amount requested by the Veterans' Administration and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It is absolutely necessary that we make arrangements to take care of our veterans who are so badly disabled as to require hospitalization.

I know it is being said that they are going to take over some Army and Navy hospitals. That is true, but there will not be enough of them at proper places to meet the requirements. I have just talked with General Bradley about this proposition, and he points out the fact, which is well known to every member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, that we are having a great deal of trouble getting sufficient doctors of the right kind to service the veterans' hospitals that we now have. There will be a bill come before the House this week to liberalize the provisions of the present law, in order to enable General Bradley to get sufficient physicians of the right kind to meet this emergency. He very much fears, and I very much fear, that if this amendment is voted down it will have the effect of further discouraging those doctors who are coming home from the service, or those doctors who may be available, from going into the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Did not General Bradley also testify before the subcommittee that many of these temporary Army facilities are not fireproof, and are dangerous?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. Many of these Army and Navy hospitals are not suitable for veterans' hospitals. Some of them are too badly scattered. Some of them are built on scales that do not conform to the requirements of the Veterans' Administration. Remember, our first duty is to the servicemen of this country who were injured in this war. That is our first duty. That is the duty we are trying to meet with this amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has no objection to the use of the Army and Navy hospitals which are suitable for the hospitalization of veterans?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I am not only not opposed to it, but I am very much in favor of it.

Mr. TARVER. Then why does the gentleman wish to strike out this language? Why would his objective not be reached if the appropriation of $158,320,000, as recommended by the Budget, is made, and the present language left in the bill? That language only permits the Veterans' Administration to use suitable facilities.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. I will change my amendment and submit an amendment that will meet the criticism offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 17, after line 8, add a new paragraph to read as follows:

"For construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities for fiscal year 1946, $158,320,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand it the gentleman has withdrawn his other amendment so the language giving permission will be left in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that I have no desire whatsoever to prevent the use of any of these facilities constructed by the Army and Navy that can be used for this purpose. We want to use them all, but at the very best it is absolutely necessary we have this amendment in order that the Veterans' Administration may go forward with its present program. As General Bradley pointed out, if we are not going to discourage the physicians of the country from going into the Veterans' Administration this amendment is vitally necessary and should be adopted without opposition. Those Members who are opposing the amendment ask us to wait and bring it out next year. If we were to defeat this amendment now the chances are the Veterans' Administration would lose a great many of the finest physicians and finest surgeons now coming out of the Army. If this amendment is passed, together with the bill which we hope will be taken up in a day or two, it will make the conditions more attractive to these fine doctors who are so badly needed. I trust this amendment will be adopted by a unanimous vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes. I see there are 11 Members who wish to be heard on it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I neglected to say that this appropriation has already been authorized by law. I have no objection to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is understood, of course, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will have the last 5 minutes in which to close the debate.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that was not in the original request and if the gentleman is asking for only 45 minutes, there being 11 Members who have indicated they desire to be heard, they would have but 4 minutes apiece. Unless they are given 5 minutes apiece I shall object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I counted 11. That will give them 4 minutes each with 5 minutes left to the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I ask the gentleman to make it 55 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair he has only eight Members listed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That would allow more than 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I object, unless he will amend his request to make it 50 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 45 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse this amendment. I planned to introduce one myself. I am glad the chairman of our World War Veterans' Committee has introduced one. It is a national scandal that we have not enough beds for our disabled veterans. My belief is that this $158,000,000 was taken out of this deficiency bill through a misunderstanding. General Hawley, the Surgeon General of the Veterans' Administration, who is doing such splendid work at the present time in the care of veterans, did not appear before the committee. He is the doctor who had charge of all the very fine first care that was given to our soldiers in the European theater of war. The care the soldiers received over there was miraculous. It does not seem possible that some of those men could have been saved, but they were. Many are very seriously injured and require the most skilled care that this country can secure for them. Highly trained specialists must be made available. They have had the finest medical service in the world while in the armed service. When the soldiers were overseas, and I inspected both Army and Navy medical facilities, both in Europe and Italy, they were taken care of with fine and competent medical attention until they were brought back to this country. I saw that care, from the first-line doctors, nurses, and medics, back to this country, with my own eyes. They have had very good care in the Army and Navy hospitals. We must see that they receive the same fine care in the Veterans' Administration.

The Veterans' Administration hospitals are lacking in space for operating rooms, physiotherapy, and for reconditioning, and in beds and also in quarters for personnel. I know the House is not going to say to the wounded and disabled men who have come back: "We took wonderful care of you overseas when you were in the service but now that you have been discharged we have no bed for you. We have not enough doctors or nurses or medical personnel."

It has been said that there is some question why the Navy and Army hospitals are not going to be used. I would like to read a part of General Hawley's letter to me, and in this letter he also said that if he could not provide the proper quality of medical care that the veteran deserves he would quit and quit at once. I consider that would be a great tragedy because I know of no one who has a wider friendship of doctors all over the country or who is more respected by the medical profession. They heartily endorse this program.

I read the part in which he speaks of the use of the Army and Navy hospitals:

I think some Members have hesitated to vote for this or that hospital because they had Army and Navy installations in their own districts. They thought if they voted for the building program that these Army and Navy installations would not be used.

General Hawley further states:

It may be asked why existing Army and Navy hospitals are not used to make up this deficit. We are requesting every surplus Army and Navy hospital which can be staffed with doctors, nurses, and attendants.

There are certain types of Army and Navy hospitals which are not suitable for the care of veterans. They are not fireproof and they should not house disabled veterans, or the critical cases until they are fully fireproofed and of proper construction.

I started inspecting hospitals way back in 1922 and I remember there were some fires in the Army barracks where our disabled men were hospitalized at that time. There was quite a bad fire in one of the mental wards of the Walter Reed Hospital. I cannot forget those experiences.

The Veterans' Administration itself plans to use those hospitals and doctors near the medical centers where the men may get the finest type of medical care. Where civilian specialists who can go to the veterans' hospitals to treat the veterans. The Veterans' Administration has promised to build additional small hospitals besides the list already designated as the House will see by the following letter from General Hawley:

NOVEMBER 28, 1945.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In reply to your query concerning the hospital-bed situation for veterans, I am submitting a rather detailed statement in order to give you a complete picture.

As you know, the number of beds required are estimated actuarily from past experience, modified as indicated by current experience, This is to say that the basis for the initial calculations is the experience with veterans in the years following World War I. But corrective factors are applied to this experience where indicated, as, for example, the screening of tuberculosis in the Selective Service was so much more efficient in World War II than in World War I that our expectancy of the need for beds for tuberculosis now is much less than that indicated by the experience following World War I.

Our actuarial calculations may be summarized as follows:

Hospital bed program of Veterans' Administration

Geographical area	Estimated requirement of beds by 1950	Existing beds	Beds requested in 1946 regular and 1946 deficiency appropriations [1]	Beds to be requested in 1947 appropriation [1]	Surplus or deficit remaining
No. 1 (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island)	9,980	4,832	2,599	400	−2,149
No. 2 (New York)	16,640	7,294	5,001	2,492	−1,853
No. 3 (New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware)	17,920	4,232	8,134	1,250	−4,304
No. 4 (Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina)	12,140	5,777	4,313	750	−1,300
No. 5 (South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Alabama)	13,110	7,506	4,144	1,700	+240
No. 6 (Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky)	17,470	5,943	4,597	2,201	−4,729
No. 7 (Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois)	16,810	9,995	3,526	450	−2,839
No. 8 (Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska)	7,860	5,508	2,282	0	−70
No. 9 (Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Oklahoma)	10,410	5,223	2,890	1,700	−597
No. 10 (Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas)	12,290	4,171	4,106	1,128	−2,885
No. 11 (Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon)	4,390	2,630	1,034	614	−112
No. 12 (Nevada, Arizona, California)	9,760	5,827	1,138	1,000	−1,795
No. 13 (Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico)	2,720	2,346	526	[2] 590	+652
Total (all United States)	151,500	71,284	44,190	14,185	−21,741

[1] Due to the fact that both the Federal Board of Hospitalization and the Bureau of the Budget review and modify the recommendations of the Veterans' Administration, the finally approved programs may show some changes from the 1946 to the 1947 columns, or vice versa; but the total of these 2 columns will not be changed.

[2] This surplus is due to the urgent need for neuropsychiatric beds in Utah. The distances are great, and the surplus in Wyoming is in another type of beds.

These figures show that, even if every bed on present programs were built, there will be a deficit of 21,741 beds by 1950; and it is planned to request these additional beds in the 1948 and 1949 appropriations.

It may be asked why existing Army and Navy hospitals are not used to make up this deficit. We are requesting every surplus Army and Navy hospital which can be staffed with doctors, nurses, and attendants.

Let me show you the present personnel situation for doctors alone, and it is almost as critical for all other classes of personnel.

At the present time we need 3,456 doctors to operate the 71,284 beds now in existence and to staff the regional offices. We have only 2,327, a deficit of one-third.

Of the 2,327 doctors now on duty with the Veterans' Administration, 1,714 (or 74 percent), are medical officers of the Army or Navy (largely Army) lent temporarily for duty with the Veterans' Administration.

We have canvassed these 1,714 doctors from the Army and Navy, and only 35 percent intend to remain with the Veterans' Administration after they are separated from the service. From our experience, I think it is fair to state that a certain proportion of those who desire to remain with the Veterans' Administration are not of the quality we want to care for veterans. Without definite knowledge, I would estimate that, of those who would elect to remain, we would want not over 350. So, unless we obtain new doctors from the outside, after the separation of these medical officers from the service, we shall have only about 960 doctors left in the Veterans' Administration, to fill 3,456 vacancies as of today, and probably 4,000 vacancies as of June 30, 1946.

Besides other personnel, it would require a minimum of 35 full-time doctors properly to staff 1,000 beds. If we were to attempt to staff these 58,375 beds in Army general hospitals we would have to have more than 2,000 additional doctors. Faced with a possible shortage of 2,500 doctors already by June 30, 1946, we should have to recruit 4,500 doctors in the next 6 months to staff our hospitals.

But a shortage of 4,500 doctors is misleading. If our veterans are to get anything but a poor quality of care at least 2,000 of these 4,500 must be trained and qualified specialists.

Anyone is merely deluding himself and misleading the veteran who thinks that it is possible to gather a full-time staff of this size and the necessary quality within 6 months, or within 3 years, even at the rate of pay offered in H. R. 4717. Every medical man in the United States of any experience knows that such a program would be doomed to abject failure. And I, for one, will not experiment with the medical care of the veteran. Either he gets the quality of medical care that he deserves, or I quit—and quit at once.

But he can be given the proper quality of medical care if only we exploit on a part-time basis the huge reservoirs of medical talent in the United States. These fine specialists will not even consider coming into the Veterans' Administration on a full-time basis; and it is folly even to consider such a solution. But they will give liberally of part-time service—if only we take the veteran to them.

Where are these reservoirs of great medical talent to be found? You know, as well as I. They are not to be found in small communities, but only in the larger medical centers.

The great proportion of Army and Navy hospitals were built out in the country where it is impossible to obtain any high-standard part-time assistance. Any attempt to use such can result only in a poor standard of care for the veteran. Such as are convenient to medical centers can be used and will be used.

There is another misconception that should be dispelled. This is that we plan to build only around medical centers. This is not true. Our program includes a generous proportion of smaller hospitals to be built in smaller communities to be of greater convenience to the veteran. We think we can staff these smaller hospitals with full-time doctors, because they will not require the large number of specialists of all kinds that are required for the larger hospitals. Perhaps 80 percent of all cases can be handled well in these smaller hospitals; but the 20 percent that require highly specialized treatment will have to be transferred to a hospital in a medical center. This is exactly what happens in every small community in the United States—the local profession is competent to treat the majority of cases, but the serious cases are referred to a medical center.

I apologize for the length of this letter; but I want to give you a picture of the problems that confront me and my reasons for the program I hope to be able to follow. Not only I, but the best medical brains in the United States also, are confident that no other type of medical care will give the veteran what he deserves and what the people of this country expect him to get.

I am most grateful for your continued understanding and encouragement.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL R. HAWLEY,
Major General, A. U. S.,
Acting Surgeon General.

Gen. Omar Bradley told me this morning he needed this appropriation now. The $158,000,000 has the approval of the Board of Hospitalization, the Bureau of the Budget, and also the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment for some very good reasons. After World War I we learned it was the veterans of Germany, Russia, and Italy who, after returning home from that war, were told that the Government owed them nothing. That is about what they were told, and that is about what they got. They set out to change their form of government, and they got the job done, but they went too far.

There is one thing that a veteran always insists on, and that is that his disabled buddies and the widows and orphans are properly taken care of. An able-bodied veteran is not so concerned about himself. He says, "I will get along, but I am going to insist that my disabled buddies and the widows and orphans are taken care of." We must take care of them, because we certainly have enough people in this country today who are trying to change our form of government, and I do not want any veteran who has done such a wonderful job in the winning of this war to join forces with that radical element. Certainly, unless we prove to them that their buddies, and widows and orphans of their buddies who paid the supreme sacrifice, are well taken care of that is exactly what we can expect.

I talked to General Hawley and he assured me that every dime spent for these hospitals would be spent judiciously and that they would give every consideration for the benefit and the comfort of the boys who are going to be in these hopitals. He also said that these Army and Navy hospitals are not in any shape to take care of these disabled veterans; that they were scattered all over, some of them over 50, and 75, and 100 acres—some of them covering 160 acres. Furthermore, you cannot expect the doctors in the Veterans' Administration to take care of these disabled veterans properly with that kind of facility. It takes a good many doctors, and we do not have them, and good doctors will not go into places like that. So I hope that we will pass this amendment. I do not think anybody in the House can accuse me of being liberal with the taxpayers' money. My record proves that I am not liberal. But certainly this is one place where we cannot be too conservative, and we must do justice to the men and women that have fought and bled in this terrible war.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey

Mr. CANFIELD. Is not the question today one of timing, whether we do it now or do it next year?

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly it is. We are going to spend this money. These facilities must be built and we might just as well give them the green light now and let them go ahead and do a good job. I am sure the Veterans' Administration can do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, again this committee comes before the House of Representatives asking you to proceed in what seems to the committee to be a sound businesslike way which will take care of the interests of everybody concerned. It so happens that I was not present when this bill was written, but I concur in the findings of the committee. The Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee is holding meetings at the present time. They are just as patriotic as any other set of men in this House. The men who are on this subcommittee are just as much interested in the veteran. I might say to you, if you examine the record, in the $158,000,000 you will find a hospital with 750 beds for the city of Louisville, Ky. I happen to be just a little bit interested in that proposition. The people back home are interested in it. Yet my people are not going to object to this House acting with consideration although they, of course, are interested in speed just as I am. All we are asking you to do is to let this committee, which is now meeting and which will have a bill out here within 30 days, go into the question. Why is that inadvisable?

Some of us may differ from the Veterans' Administration as to what should be built and what should not be built, or whether some existing facility you have in your district might not be used, but if this money is used for just the purposes here, without your knowing the relative merits, or if something else is done, the one in which you are interested might not receive quite the favorable consideration for which you are hoping.

There are plenty of buildings that some of you may not think can be used for the veterans. There are magnificent hospitals. Possibly the Veterans' Administration may think they are not exactly what they ought to be, and maybe you differ with them in that opinion. The sensible thing to do is to give every Member of Congress a chance to represent his community properly and to say, "We want this thing gone into before you build that hospital over there."

We are, of course, as eager as you are to see that every veteran is taken care of, and every veteran will be taken care of, but let us see if we cannot develop a better hospital program by giving it to the committee downstairs to go into it. It would be pleasant for me to vote for this amendment, because immediately I would get this magnificent building in my home city, but do not forget that in the long run we are trying to do something for the veteran that he will appreciate. Take time and think in terms of economy and better service, not just because a sentimental appeal is made to you to do it now. In the long run you will be benefiting the veteran if you put sound business behind it and more thorough consideration of every proposal that comes before the House. We are almost being stampeded—I am not speaking of this amendment—on everything coming before the Congress today, because we can attach the word "veteran" to it. You will be kind to the veteran if you get this country so it will balance the Budget, and he will not have to carry the tax load he has been carrying. If you have a project in which you are interested in the way of a veterans' hospital, I think you should have your day in court and the Independent Offices Committee is down there now considering the proposition. I am willing in the interest of proper economy and a better program to ask my people to wait another month, until the proper committee can decide it. I hope you will defeat the amendment.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and I am sure the House will show its interest in the veterans by giving favorable support to this amendment. The amendment will restore to this first deficiency appropriations bill, 1946, an item of $158,320,000 for construction of hospitals for veterans, recommended by Gen. Omar Bradley, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. The Appropriations Committee left this item out of the bill, now before the House of Representatives.

During my service in this House I have always supported legislation that would be for the welfare of the veterans of this country. I intend to continue that record. When patriotic impulses run strong, as war impends, no one has any difficulty in placing the highest value on the services of our soldiers, sailors, and marines, and others in our armed forces. We pledge them the gratitude of a grateful nation, translated in terms of benefits and rewards that they have more than earned. When peace comes memory sometimes grows dim and fades and tributes and promises are apt to be forgotten. I know that sort of an attitude does not prevail here today. We should, and we will, appropriate money for the construction of these hospitals as soon as possible. There is no reason that I can see for any delay. If we postpone this work, it puts off without any valid excuse the commencement of a construction program that should be undertaken immediately.

I am not influenced in my attitude by the fact that additional beds are provided for Minnesota. I would support this program anyhow. But I know the conditions in Minnesota. There has been a shortage of veterans' hospital facilities in that State for a long time. That need has not been met. We have been slow to recognize it, and slower still to take action. This new program has been carefully worked out by Veterans' Administration officials. They have kept in mind the care and needs and welfare of the veterans and their families in determining where additional hospital facilities should be located. Veterans' Administration officials have made careful surveys, and have established their plans for expansion of the hospital program, with the single aim of contributing to the welfare of veterans needing hospital attention. In Minnesota, plans call for a new unit in the southern part of the State, additional beds at the present hospital in Minneapolis, and a new hospital to serve the needs of northern Minnesota and vicinity. This new hospital has long been needed in my section of the State. Under Veterans' Administration plans it will be located at Duluth, Minn., on the shores of Lake Superior, where the unusual advantages for a new veterans' hospital have been properly recognized.

I feel certain that this program of General Bradley is going to be carried out by Congress. Now is the time to make a start. We can best keep the faith with World War veterans by making the lofty sentiments in their favor, so often uttered on the floor of this House, mean something. The way to do that is to support the hospital program, now, so that this service will be available when needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMBAUGH].

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rankin amendment.

It would be very unfair to the veterans of this Nation to deprive them of the benefit of adequate medical and hospital care. I am advised by the Veterans' Administration that the elimination of this appropriation will seriously interfere with the entire hospital program.

The argument that only inferior material is available for construction at this time is without convincing proof because by granting priorities for the proposed hospitals I am certain they can be built of the best material and become permanent hospitals which we will need for many years to come.

It is recognized that there are many Army and Navy hospitals constructed to serve the war needs of those in our armed forces. However, to convert these hospitals to the care of veterans reveals that patients will not have the services of physicians and surgeons to a degree comparable to the facilities to be offered in this respect by the proposed hospitals under the medical and hospital program of the Veterans' Administration. The hospital program of the Veterans' Administration is designed to give

veterans the benefits of an aggressive and modern program to improve and expand the medical care and hospitalization facilities that will be available to the veterans of this Nation.

We can appropriate billions of dollars to be expended abroad but when it comes to taking care of those who made it possible for us to enjoy comfort and security here at home we find that there are those among us who are willing to preach economy at the expense of the crippled and sick of our veteran population, thousands of whom are destined to spend the balance of their lives in hospital beds.

This amendment will at least permit the Veterans' Administration to make the lives of disabled veterans brighter and more useful and by hospitalizing patients nearer their home communities their loved ones may assist in their recovery by visiting them and encouraging them in their efforts to regain their health.

The hospital program of the Veterans' Administration resulted from a careful survey conducted after close study of the hospital needs of the veteran population of the United States. As a result each of the proposed sites was selected after careful deliberation and with only one paramount thought—to provide proper and adequate medical and hospital care to eligible veterans.

I respectfully urge unanimous support of the proposed amendment in order that the Veterans' Administration may proceed without further delay to begin construction of these badly needed hospitals.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. On the 3d of May the law was passed making immediately available to the Veterans' Administration $84,500,000, of which not one cent has been spent up to the present time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. But plans are being made for that money. If you kill this amendment now, it will merely postpone the day when these funds may be spent for that purpose. If we dilly-dally along as some of our opponents would have us do, we never will take care of the veterans.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I understand the President of the United States recommended this program.

Mr. RANKIN. He did.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. He made the very convincing argument in favor of his amendment that the Veterans' Administration was having a hard time to get the doctors it needs to properly care for our disabled veterans, and that the appropriation of this money now would show that the Administration was going to have proper facilities to handle these men, thereby assuring these doctors that if they entered the service they would have proper facilities and up-to-date hospitals in which to work.

However, I would like to add one other point to this debate. From actual experience I have found that two large Army hospitals in my area have already been examined by the Veterans' Administration and have found them unsuitable for use by the Administration. These hospitals are located in Auburn and Modesto, Calif., and are known as the De-Witt General and the Hammond General Hospitals. The result is that the Army has declared these hospitals surplus as of December 30, 1945, and from then on they will be no longer of service for veterans, whether they are wards of the Army or wards of the Veterans' Administration.

The area contiguous to Sacramento has a population of about three-fourths of a million people. In this area are thousands of disabled veterans. There should be a veterans' hospital in this area. It would serve such a great number of disabled veterans that it is a necessity. Furthermore, this hospital would be at or near Sacramento, the State capital of California, where its officers and doctors have access to the State department of health.

We cannot wait for this money till the appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1946–47 is prepared and passed. That will be over 8 months from now. We know we are going to need this money eventually, so why not have it now? I am not urging any particular place for any hospital. That is for the hospital board, in whose judgment I have confidence and whose choice I will gladly accept. But I do know from conversations with the medical men of the Veterans' Administration that they are going to try to disperse these hospitals around the country so as to make them as close to the homes of the disabled veterans as possible. It is fair, I think, that I point out that the abandonment of the two big hospitals mentioned above by both the Army and the veterans will leave a big gap of hospital facilities and service that the veterans of this great area are entitled to.

For this and other reasons, which I have not the time to enumerate, I sincerely hope that the amendment under consideration will receive the approval of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rankin amendment. I think the argument that there is money which has already been made available that has not been used is untenable because the Veterans' Administration cannot go forward and plan these hospital facilities until appropriations are made for them. The money heretofore appropriated has already been committed. If we delay now to provide money for this building program for hospitalization, it will mean a delay of perhaps 6 or 8 months. These veterans who were ill or injured overseas have all been returned to the United States. They need hospitalization right now. I just returned from my district. The only hospital that we have in my district for veterans and the contiguous area is a hospital that was built for veterans of World War I. It is completely full at the present time. There is a large temporary Army hospital called the Barnes Hospital just over the Columbia River in the adjoining State of Washington. I pleaded with the veterans' authorities to use that temporarily for the veterans. They have decided to make that surplus and not use it. It is to be closed, I believe, the first of next month. There are many veterans or servicemen in this and other temporary Navy and Army hospitals which are being closed. It is absolutely essential if we are going to provide for veterans' hospitalization to provide for them now. I, too, am for economy as most of you gentlemen are, but I am not going to economize on cutting down on facilities for taking care of the veterans who fought our war and now need medical or hospital care. They are the ones we must provide for, and whether we provide for anything else, we must first provide for the sick, the ill, and the maimed who have been fighting for us overseas. I know of my own personal knowledge from having crossed the continent this month, not only on the west coast, but throughout the entire United States, hospitalization for veterans is going to be at a premium in a very, very few months. It will take many months to construct these facilities. It is urgent to begin now. Without this appropriation the whole program will be stymied. At the present time, many of these veterans are in these temporary hospitals of the Navy and of the Army. They are rapidly being closed. They are temporary in nature and are not suitable for taking care of our veterans the way they should be taken care of. They are wooden structures, many of them firetraps and situated in remote Army camps away from the centers of population.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] spoke about the $84,000,000 provided last year. That has already been allocated and the expansion will go forward rapidly.

Mr. ANGELL. That is absolutely true.

Mr. RANKIN. But if we kill this appropriation now, there is no telling when we will provide additional funds to continue this expansion.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is correct. It will just delay the program another 6 or 8 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that the Veterans' Administration has looked over the temporary Army hospitals and most of them have been declared surplus already. Two of such hospitals in central California, De-Witt General at Auburn, and Hammond General at Modesto, were inspected by the Veterans' Administration and found unsuitable for Veterans' Administration

hospital purpose. Thereupon, the Army declared them surplus as of December 31, 1945. This leaves the Sacramento area containing thousands of disabled veterans without hospital facilities to care for these unfortunate men.

Mr. ANGELL. That is right. They are not suitable for this purpose. They are temporary in nature, many of them are firetraps. They are not the type of hospitals we should provide for our veterans. The permanent veterans' hospitals should be located in the large centers of population where the veterans may be near their homes. They should also be near medical schools and clinics where medical experts and experienced physicians and surgeons are available.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Certainly, these Army hospitals cannot be changed and made suitable if there is not the the money with which to do it. So the money is needed for that purpose if Members have those installation in their districts. Additional hospitals will also be built in other areas of the country.

Mr. ANGELL. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The conditions in the Southwest are as the gentleman has described the conditions in the Northwest. We find we do not have the facilities to take care of the returning veterans.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and will say the same conditions exist throughout the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. The veterans needing hospitalization are coming in faster than we can take care of them.

Mr. ANGELL. I agree with the gentleman. Every veterans' organization in the Northwest has appealed to the Northwest delegation to provide these hospital facilities. They were shocked to learn that the appropriation had been omitted from the bill after it had the approval of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Veterans' Administration. In fact General Hawley, of the Veterans' Administration, advises us the failure to provide this appropriation will slow up and delay the whole program for veteran hospitalization. Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to vote for the Rankin amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, when there were but a few Members present in the House, I opened up a little discussion which is the forerunner of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. That was to the effect that perhaps our Appropriations Committee is making a mistake in leaving out this money for hospital construction. I have discussed my amendment and urged its adoption in private conversations with many of you gentlemen. In deference to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, however, I have not offered my amendment, as many of you know, although I have the prior right to do as a member of the Appropriations Committee, but am affording to the gentleman from Mississippi the opportunity to offer his amendment instead. May I urge upon all of you, ladies and gentlemen, as I stated yesterday, that if we do make a mistake, let us err in favor of the veterans. If there is one place that I personally feel that we cannot in justice exercise economy, that one place is when it comes to treating with the disabled veterans of this Nation. I do not think anybody can accuse me of being extravagant in matters affecting the taxpayers of America, and I am sure those same taxpayers place the welfare of the disabled veteran above their desire for economy.

May I quote just a few remarks that I made yesterday as to why I consider that perhaps our great Appropriations Committee has erred in leaving out this item. I do that with no reflection whatsoever on that committee.

I stated yesterday, "I have not as yet heard sufficient testimony which convinces me that we should eliminate this $158,000,000 from this bill." No argument here today has changed my mind. Fifty thousand Federal employees in 1 year will earn this amount. Let us cut them off the rolls.

We have today heard here a few remarks about how desirable some may think it to be to have a veterans' hospital allocated to his district. These hospitals are the last thing in the world which should have attached to them the label of political plums. There is not a single hospital or addition to a hospital in this particular $158,000,000 appropriation that is in my congressional district. Veterans' hospital locations must be determined by only one factor, and that is, the welfare of the men it is destined to care for.

I close my remarks today by repeating that if there is one place where I personally do not intend to economize, it is when it comes to treating with the disabled veterans of America. Let us give them more than what is absolutely needed for hospitalization, rather than cut the cloth too close.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman certainly I am not objecting to the appropriation of sufficient money to provide all the facilities necessary to take care of our disabled veterans, but for the life of me I cannot understand why the Veterans' Administration will not utilize those facilities that are now available. For example, in my Congressional District there is the Bunker Hill Naval Air Station that will be declared surplus the first day of December. The State Department of the American Legion in the State of Indiana unanimously adopted a resolution calling upon the Veterans' Administration to take over this training station as a rehabilitation center for veterans. It is peculiarly adapted to that purpose. It has a fine, modern, 150-bed hospital which is today idle, while the two veterans' hospitals in the State of Indiana are today overcrowded; yet with all of our appeals we have so far been unable to interest the Veterans' Administration in even investigating the possibilities in this idle Navy property. I should like to ask the chairman of the Veterans' Committee if he has attempted to prevail upon the Veterans' Administration to use these facilities which are now idle.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that I have discussed that question with General Hawley and with General Bradley both, and with General Hines before he went out, and they are attempting, and will continue to attempt, to utilize every one of these facilities that is available and suitable for veterans' facilities.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But they are doing nothing today about this facility in Indiana. This training station represents an investment by the Government of $20,000,000. It is today idle with only a few guards around it. For 3 months the American Legion of Indiana and the Members of Congress from that State have been trying to get some action out of the Veterans' Administration, but to date it has done nothing. Unless it exercises the priority right to take over this property between now and the 1st day of January, it will be declared surplus and they will start tearing the buildings down.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana that a 150-bed hospital is a mighty small hospital for the expensive veterans' facility that has to be placed around one. I do not know what the Veterans' Administration has decided or will decide.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I realize that a 150-bed hospital alone would be nothing more than a nucleus for a Veterans' Administration facility. But the hospital is only one of the many available assets at the Bunker Hill station. There are machine shops, hangars, and all the other facilities necessary for a vocational training program. There are drill halls, complete gymnasium, and one of the finest enclosed swimming pools in the United States, all immediately available for a large-scale program of physical rehabilitation. There is a fine, large recreation center. The station would provide barracks and mess halls all ready for immediate occupancy and use. Heat, light, water, telephones, and a complete system of paved roads are all ready for use.

All this is located upon an unbroken tract of more than 2,000 acres of fine, level, beautifully fenced and drained land. In short, right here in one complete parcel is practically everything the Veterans' Administration might ask for if it expects to provide the type of rehabilitation program our veterans have a right to expect.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to call to the gentleman's attention the fact that it is

the Federal Board of Hospitals which determines which of these hospitals are to be taken over by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But General Bradley is a member of the Hospital Board.

Mr. RANKIN. He is Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. We have asked him several times to do something about it.

Mr. RANKIN. General Hawley is a member of the Board of Hospitalization. I am sure the Veterans' Administration will take over this facility if it is available and suitable.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It certainly is available. It should be more than suitable; it should be ideal as a rehabilitation and vocational training center with comparatively minor alterations and additions.

Mr. RANKIN. If it is a proper facility, I am sure General Hawley will not overlook it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman use his influence as chairman of the Veterans' Committee to prevail upon these men on the board to utilize these available facilities?

Mr. RANKIN. As I said, I have already done that, and so has General Bradley.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE] is recognized.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have a concrete example of the need for the adoption of this proposed amendment. Recently, about a month ago, Albany, N. Y., was designated for a 1,000-bed veterans' hospital; Buffalo was also designated; some other places in New York State likewise have been designated. We have already had the so-called site viewers come to Albany.

Unquestionably, they have determined upon the site for the hospital. I do not know just what site they have accepted out of the great number offered, but I know the engineers have been there looking into the conditions of the soil. We know that we have the Albany hospital in Albany with 400 beds which has a contract with the Veterans' Administration, yet not a single bed in the hospital that can be used by the veterans, and literally hundreds of veterans are begging to get into the hospital—not only the Albany hospital but the hospitals all around that part of the country.

There is an absolute need and necessity for the building of a veterans' hospital at Albany, and I presume at Buffalo and these other places, under the conditions that prevail. The report in connection with the striking out of this proposed appropriation indicates that perhaps they cannot get the materials with which to build these hospitals. Mr. Chairman, that seems to be a rather ridiculous reason because, frankly, in my opinion, if the United States Government cannot secure the materials and the men with which to build these hospitals, then, indeed, we are in a very dire situation. There is no question about that.

We in Albany are interested because we have been designated as one of the places. We know very well that everyone expected that appropriations would be made quite immediately after the site was selected for the building of this particular hospital and we cannot see any reason why it should be delayed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the areas that has been badly in need of hospital facilities is western and up-State New York. The Board of Hospitalization has looked over these sites and I understand it has approved one or both of them. But what we want to do is to make it possible to build these hospitals where they are necessary and not where somebody wants one built merely for political purposes.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have been told by representatives of the Veterans' Administration that they cannot get the doctors to go to some of these hospitals. Perhaps the place mentioned by the gentleman from Indiana is one of these places. They cannot get the doctors to go to those particular places. Of course, the Army could get them to go because it could compel the doctors to go; but they will not go to the places where they have 75, 150, or 200 beds, because that particular spot does not have perhaps sufficient doctors to supply the needs of the particular hospital.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to point out to the gentleman that the place to which I referred is within 20 miles of a veterans' facility where they are overcrowded. They have sufficient doctors at the place, I think, but they could at least utilize the 150 beds that are now idle without any inconvenience to the doctors.

Mr. RANKIN. Then that facility could be taken over and made a part of the existing hospital.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It is only 25 miles distant.

Mr. RANKIN. That could be done and should be done, and, in my opinion, it will be done.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will use his influence to have it done.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me it is scandalous that we have this shortage of beds today. We spent billions of dollars on the atomic bomb to destroy life, and it is little enough to spend money to try to get ready for our veterans.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for her observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rankin amendment. Less than an hour ago I spoke with General Hawley, Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration. He is very apprehensive that if the pending amendment is not passed, the whole program that they have in mind will be disrupted, and possibly when we do take it up it will become, as has been suggested here today, just a political football in the various congressional districts.

A month and a half ago I had the pleasure of accompanying the Surgeon General on an inspection tour of a certain service command in this country. We visited various general hospitals of the Army, the kind of hospitals that have been spoken of today, that, it has been said, ought to be taken over, but with very few exceptions I can say those hospitals are not suitable for the Veterans' Administration.

In the first place they are isolated from the various communities having the greatest population. As I understand, the present Veterans' Administration wants their hospitals located close to the medical centers in which they can secure the various specialists, because the Veterans' Administration facilities are peculiar in that they do require specialists of my profession. Therefore I do think, and I know now, that the Veterans' Administration and the Surgeon General are both besieged with requests from communities having present Army hospitals to keep and take over for the veterans these various hospitals.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does the gentleman think that the facilities already in existence at Tobyhanna are adequate for the treatment of tuberculosis?

Mr. FENTON. No; but I understand that as far as Pennsylvania is concerned, I will say to my colleague, that the Veterans' Administration — and General Hawley is my authority for this—is going to take over Valley Forge General Hospital as a tuberculosis hospital.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Within the limits of the city of New York is a 3,000-bed Army hospital, modern in every respect, built in the last 5 or 6 years. I hope the Veterans' Administration, in order to meet the bed shortage, will give consideration to taking over that hospital.

Mr. FENTON. I think I know the hospital the gentleman refers to, and I agree with him in every respect.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This amendment has not only been approved by the Administration but this provision has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and

the head of the Bureau of the Budget is Chairman of the Board of Hospitalization.

Mr. FENTON. I might give you a few statistics that I think are very interesting. As of October 9 there were 571,442 cases of men wounded in action. As of September 30 the Veterans' Administration tells me that they were giving pensions to 698,807 veterans of World War II. There are now in the Veterans' Administration hospitals 3,558 tubercular boys of World War II. There are 11,793 NP—neuropsychiatric—cases of World War II and 7,605 general medical and surgical cases. There are now in Veterans' Administration hospitals 22,986 boys of World War II. As of September 30 there were 12,605 Reserve officers who have been retired for disability and are receiving pensions. I suppose most of you know that there are 14,000 amputees from this war and I am informed there are about 1,200 whose vision is so impaired they are considered blind. There are about 1,500 paraplegics, boys whose spinal columns have been severed, and who are totally disabled and who must have absolute care. I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted the privilege of quoting holy writ on this floor, I would like to call attention to an ancient warning which I think this House ought to take very much to heart here this afternoon:

> Many shall rise in My name. But be not deceived. Go ye not therefore after them.

Many are rising everywhere in the name of the veteran. It is the vogue. It is the order of the day to be for the veteran. And like those who are for virtue and against sin, they too often seek to leave the impression that everybody else is against the veteran. But everyone who rushes in at every opportunity crying in stentorian tones that he is for the veteran and all others are ingrates is not necessarily doing the veteran a service. On the contrary, he may be doing the veteran a very material disservice. And that is the situation here today. I want to say most emphatically that I believe a vote for this amendment is a vote against the real interest of the veteran and against the great hospitalization program which must be developed in the next few years.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have just a minute. Most of this time has been used by the other side. Let me have just a word.

The proposition here is not whether there shall be beds for veterans. There are beds for veterans.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would like to be heard. Everybody else has been heard. I trust you will permit the committee to be heard for 1 minute, just once for 1 minute.

The absurd statement has been made on this floor that there were veterans who needed hospitalization and there were no beds for them. This committee has held hearings and the committee of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has made exhaustive investigations. I want to say that there it today no veteran who needs hospitalization for whom there is not a facility right now, and I make that statement on the responsibility and the authority of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JENSEN. They are kept in old fire traps, remember that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Gentlemen, please, may we have just one word against all this unfair and unparliamentary hullabaloo? There has not been a single fire; there has not been a single accident from fire to any veteran in all the history of all our hospitals. Let us confine ourselves to the facts. You would think to listen to some who have spoken here this afternoon that this committee was made up of a bunch of monsters of ingratitude who wish to deliberately deny the veterans the barest humanities. This is the committee which through 4 years of desperate warfare has reported out the appropriations for every comfort and necessity which could be provided for these veterans in barracks, en route, and on the front. It is the committee which has reported out the money which made our servicemen the best fed, best clothed, best housed, best equipped, best armed, best paid, the best hospitalized servicemen in any war, in any country in the history of the world. Does anyone here challenge that statement?

Then why would this committee, or any member of this committee, at this late day seek to deny any member of the armed forces, whether he fought on the sea or beneath the sea, on the land or above the land, the common decency of a bed in an efficient hospital. Provision has been made, not only for hospitals but for the most adept and expert surgeons and physicians and nurses who have ever served in public or private hospitals anywhere.

The statements which have been made in this debate to the effect that ill and wounded and suffering veterans have been denied hospitalization is a reflection on the Nation and the American people that they should be guilty of such inhuman ingratitude. And those are an indictment of those who now make the statements of dereliction of duty. If such a condition existed anywhere why did they not come here on this floor, or appear before a committee of this House and demand prompt and adequate redress of such conditions? If an instance of a veteran, a suffering veteran, being denied hospitalization had come within my observation I could not have rested until I found who was responsible and remedied the situation. Statements that suffering veterans have been denied needed hospitalization are absurd. There is not a word of truth in them. I ask anyone who questions that to read the hearings. They show beyond the peradventure of a doubt that any veteran who needs hospitalization can get is.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that nobody in this House has made any such intimation against the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a point of order. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let us be at least fair about this. You have but to mention the veteran here and everybody stampedes; everybody is ready to chime in; a veteran is being mistreated, he is being imposed upon, he is being outrageously denied facilities. And there is not one word of truth in it.

Read the testimony of General Somervell at page 617 of the hearings on the rescission bill. He testifies that 20 Army hospitals with 40,000 beds will be declared surplus in December. That would leave 65 operating Army hospitals, all but 14 of which would be turned back not later than June 30, 1946.

Admiral McIntyre testified, and you will find his testimony on page 364 of the same hearings, that the Navy now has 12,000 permanent beds and 98,000 temporary beds, and ample provision for everybody. You will also note that the Veterans' Administration is not limited to hospitals under its immediate control but has access at will to facilities in these other hospitals. It now has 5,341 patients in hospitals other than its own.

So, it is not a question of immediate facilities here. It is a question of the determination of permanent hospitalization policies—a question which has been completely ignored in this entire debate.

The permanent hospitalization of veterans is a proposition of such dimensions that it is difficult to reach any final determination of it at this early stage. The testimony before the committee is that the hospitalization of veterans of the war which closed in 1945 will not reach its peak until 1975. The demand for beds in veterans' hospitals will be greater in 1975 than it has ever been in any year between 1945 and 1975. And yet the proponents of this amendment want to decide offhand here on the floor this afternoon, on 45 minutes' debate—and in contravention of the considered judgment of the committee which has been studying it for months—an important feature of permanent veterans' hospitalization which may run steadily upward for the next 30 years—and then down from the peak for how many years nobody now living can estimate. We are still paying veterans' benefits on the War of 1812. In effect it amounts to mob rule.

We have a new Administrator and there are naturally many changes in the administration of the Veterans' Administration—some of them still impending. The foundation must be laid for a facility which will last at least 100 years and will involve the expenditure of billions of dollars and the treatment of millions of veterans. It ought not to be decided on a political stampede here this

afternoon. The amendment involves the question of enlargement of present hospitals as compared with construction of new hospitals. It affects the salvaging of Army and Navy hospitals which may affect a savings of millions of dollars. It involves the formulation of policies which will be in operation beyond the lifetime of any man on this floor. These questions deserve more than 45 minutes' consideration. They should not be determined at a drum-head court martial here this afternoon. The amendment is a disservice to the veteran. The committee asks that it be rejected and the whole matter be referred to Judge WOODRUM's committee, the Independent Offices Subcommittee, which is now in session and ready to take up the question immediately and give it orderly consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 78, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK, having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today have 5 days within which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 427, Rept. No. 1316), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 426, Rept. No. 1315), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered or ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING THE FIRST WAR POWERS ACT OF 1941

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 428, Rept. No. 1317), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4571) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 429) on the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2536, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to certain agreements between carriers, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. McGEHEE, from the Committee on Claims, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 693) for the relief of Saunders Memorial Hospital, for printing in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks upon the appropriation for the veterans' hospitals, known as the Rankin amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks by including a statement by Mr. E. F. Scattergood of the department of water and power of Los Angeles.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Leib, and a newspaper article.

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ALBANIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of those who have special orders, to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is appropriate to call to the attention of the House the fact that today, Wednesday, November 28, 1945, marks the thiry-third anniversary of Albania's independence.

As we know, Albania was the first nation to openly resist fascism and was suddenly attacked by Italy on Good Friday, April 1939. From that time until the time of their complete liberation

1 year ago, the Albanian people continued active resistance against the Axis. This struggle against overwhelming odds gave them new leaders to unify their struggle for freedom. The army of liberation and the present Government of the Albanian people, organized and led by Gen. Emer Hosxha, has the unqualified support of the Albanian people and of Albanian Americans. Albania is a country that has fought fascism, nazism, and totalitarianism in any form. Its people believe in the dignity and the personality of the individual. Its people are freedom-loving people. The people of Albania, a very individualistic people, have deeply rooted in their hearts and in their minds and traditions a strong desire to possess freedom and liberty, and, under the law, to possess the rights of the individual.

I think it is appropriate on this occasion that in the Congress of the United States reference be made to the great struggle of the people of Albania. I know I express the sentiments of my colleagues when I express the strong hope that an independent government be established, and that the people of Albania, for countless of generations, for evermore in the future, will enjoy independence of government, and liberty of the individual for which they have so strongly fought, and to which they are so rightly entitled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR RELATIONS, COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Committee on Military Affairs usurped the power of the Committee on Labor of the House and reported out the bill, H. R. 3937, dealing with labor and negotiations. The committee took this action on the premise that the war was still going on and that they were trying to help the war effort by crushing labor and preventing any strike action in industrial relations. It is pretty far fetched to usurp that kind of power now because the war is actually over and we are trying to get back to normal conditions.

The bill comprises two sections and I shall deal with each. The first section of the bill is important in that it prevents collective political action; for instance, prevents workers through their unions from making any contributions to any kind of political campaign, either primary or general. However, H. R. 3937, which repeals the old Smith-Connally bill as far as the taking of strike votes is concerned also carries a much more vicious provision.

The second section of the bill takes away from a union for a period of 1 year the right of collective bargaining if the union violates a contract in any respect. Offhand, it might sound as though this would be a good provision. I have had a great deal of experience in writing contracts and in collective bargaining, experience on both sides of the table. I know that this provision will cause a great deal of disruption in industrial relations, and it is my purpose to tell you just why it will. In the first place, right now we are trying to establish better industrial relations between employees and employers; we are attempting to get them together. A working agreement between labor and management is a voluntary proposition, a sitting down of two parties and talking across the table, coming to an agreement and saying that hereafter they will work according to it. Quite often one side or the other will violate minor sections of the agreement. Under this bill if the workers do not follow the leadership on some occasion, and the leaders of a union cannot always keep the men on the job while they are settling things that require negotiations extending over months and months and months, if a small part of the crew in disgust disregard the recommendations of the union leaders and walk off it would make the leaders subject to fine and make the unions responsible for any loss suffered by the employer. The employer could sue the union. Many of the unions do not have money except from month to month as they collect small dues. Some large unions do have a lot of money, it is true, but the vast majority of our unions have very little money. It would be decidedly unfair to place a fine upon leaders who were attempting to smooth out industrial difficulties, to make those leaders subject to punishment for something they could not control.

Collective bargaining is the crux of the relationship between employers and employees. If this bargaining right is taken away from a union for 1 year the employer and the union would not be able to sit down and discuss their troubles, it would prevent collective bargaining, the union could not send an officer or business agent to talk about any of the problems of the worker, and relations would be disrupted for an entire year. Right there is where great strife would be created, because as soon as the union failed to have the right to bargain for its employees some rival union would spring up and say: "You join our union because your old union has no right to bargain for you, therefore it is no good to you. We can help smooth things out if you will just join our union."

As soon as the new union got 50 percent of the employees in the new union then it would have the right to bargain for the employees, and for 1 year the old union could say nothing. But the real strikes and jurisdictional strife would be created just 1 year later, when the old union would be legally able to bargain for the employees again. At that time we would see tremendous strife in industry.

Now, a word in regard to the no-strike clause. The bill says that if the workers violate the no-strike clause they will lose their bargaining rights. It is an attempt to make the workers and employers mutually responsible for living up to every detail in a contract. That would be desirable, though we cannot do it through this type of legislation. For instance, we cannot force something that is supposed to be voluntary. If Congress steps into the picture on the matter of responsibility, we will have to start controlling labor relations all the way along the line. It is either going to be voluntary or it is going to be controlled. This bill would be the first step toward getting away from voluntary relations and starting control.

Mr. Speaker, right now the latest statistics show that 98 percent of the working agreements having no-strike clauses in them are being lived up to. In order to provide a penalty on the 2 percent that might break the no-strike clause we are going to cause all the unions the next time their agreements are opened, which will be next March or April, to refuse to renew the no-strike clause. When the new contracts are written they will be written without the no-strike clause in them. Thus we are going to chase out of existence 98 percent of the contracts that have no-strike clauses in them, that are now being lived up to. This will be a distinct loss to the Nation, because those clauses have helped to bring about friendly relations. But to get at the 2 percent we are going to destroy all the good that has been done by the no-strike clause.

The no-strike clause provides that workers and employers will do certain things, go through a certain procedure before they strike. They usually provide that the agreements have to be in writing. Then the committee will meet the employer's committee. They will bargain. Some of them require 30 days, some 60 days. Often the contracts say that when all these procedures have been gone through the employer is at liberty to shut down and the workers are at liberty to stop work and to go on strike because, according to the agreement, they have gone through the procedure and have been unable to reach an agreement. So those clauses would be stricken out because the workers will not agree to write a clause in there that would make them liable to this law, subject to fine and loss of their bargaining rights for a year.

Since this bill has been introduced one convention on the west coast meeting in Eugene, Oreg., adopted a resolution recommending, from fear of this bill, that no more contracts be written with the no-strike clause in them and recommending that when their contracts come up next spring the no-strike clause be taken out. I am sure that is the effect the bill will have all over the Nation. Unions will take all the no-strike clauses out so that we will not be able to touch them any more than we can right now, and we will have lost 98 percent of the contracts that have no-strike clauses in them. The no-strike pledge during the war has been lived up to more than 99

percent. That was a voluntary pledge; it was not a contract. We could not change that by law anyway, because it was not in black and white. It was a pledge by the workers that for the interest of the war effort they would not strike, and they lived up to that pledge more than 99 percent.

I appeared before the Committee on Rules to give them the benefit of what experience I had along this line, and opposed H. R. 3937. One member of the Committee on Rules said that he was glad that the Committee on Military Affairs passed this out because he did not believe the Committee on Labor would pass it out, and he said that therefore, if it was coming to the floor, it would have to come through some other committee. I think he was right. I do not think the Committee on Labor, which is familiar with industrial relations, would pass out such a bill; in fact, I know they would not. I am not on the committee, but I am sure that they know more about collective bargaining than to pass such a bill.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. May I ask if this measure was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs instead of the Committee on Labor by stealth? Who is responsible for the modus operandi that puts these measures in the wrong committee?

Mr. SAVAGE The Committee on Military Affairs wrote the bill, but that does not mean that they would still have jurisdiction, except that it amends the Selective Service Act.

Mr. RAMEY. Could this mistake at this time be corrected? I understand it is now in the Committee on Rules. The House could direct the Committee on Rules to return it or place it in the proper committee, could it not?

Mr. SAVAGE. I believe that is right. The Committee on Rules has already approved a rule on the bill, and it is somewhere between the Committee on Rules and the House floor now.

Mr. RAMEY. It is in transit somewhere.

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right.

Mr. RAMEY. I was wondering how the mistake could be corrected and that it now be placed in the proper committee for consideration?

Mr. SAVAGE. When it comes to the House floor it is within our jurisdiction to send it back to the Committee on Labor or any other committee for hearing. I understand there were no hearings at all.

Mr. RAMEY. It rightly belongs to the Committee on Labor as a strictly labor matter.

Mr. SAVAGE. Yes. They understand these problems. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman feel that any legislation is needed or would be in order now to help work out some of the difficulties between industry and labor? What suggestion would the gentleman have?

Mr. SAVAGE. I think we all agree that there is too much strife in industrial relations right now. We cannot approve that. I actually do not think that we are quite ready to go in and outlaw strikes or do anything that would prevent harmonious relations between employer and employee. We are hopeful that in a free economy they can work it out themselves. We hope that out of the labor-management conference will come some recommendations that will do us some good. Until that conference is completed and we get the value of their experience, I am hardly able to make any recommendations for specific legislation, but I want to assure the gentleman I am giving the matter a great deal of thought because I am interested in it. I have studied it a great deal, and I feel that the minute Congress starts to control labor-management relations we either have to squelch workers down and make virtual slaves of them, or else we have to control prices and we have to take the responsibility of seeing that they have enough wages to live on. If the employer says that he cannot pay the wages, then the Congress would have to take the responsibility of saying, "We will see to it that you get better prices," and then we will be in a controlled economy, and we are not yet ready to go into that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, the no-strike pledge during wartime, I think, was lived up to pretty well by labor. In fact, that directive is still in effect, because the Government just recently seized the transportation system in Washington, D. C. Technically, the war is still on and the Government has the power to seize industry, at least where there are difficulties that cannot be resolved between labor and industry.

Mr. SAVAGE. The gentleman from Nebraska is correct, for we are still in the war. If we were not, the Committee on Military Affairs would have absolutely no right in any way. It is a very slim threat that I think they are using in this respect.

Speaking frankly, I feel that this bill was not reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs by members who were sincerely interested in improving industrial relations. I feel that it was passed out of there by people who are inclined to hate labor and would like to see them lose their organizations, and would like to see the unions crushed. We are not ready to do that, I am sure. I feel also that the rule from the Committee on Rules was brought to this floor by those who hate labor rather than want to build up the standards of living of the people. I am sure a further hearing would be a valuable thing on this type of legislation.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I am sure the gentleman would not want to say that those on the Committee on Military Affairs hate labor because they were for that. I happen to be one who voted against it, understand, but, in justice to my colleagues on that committee, I do not believe the gentleman would want to imply that they hate labor.

Mr. SAVAGE. I might just say that there are labor haters but I do not know where they all are. I feel that some of the people who do not particularly care, who are interested on the other side of the question, have no reluctance to see labor driven back to virtual slavery. They have had quite a struggle to get up and raise the standard of living. They have had a difficult struggle. They are not interested just in labor, they are interested in their families.

The income of the Nation depends on how much workers make. I am sure they have to confine themselves to what industry can charge. Industry sometimes has to regulate its prices according to what its labor costs are.

I feel that this legislation is hasty. It has not had proper consideration, and it certainly is not being handled by the proper committees.

I draw the attention of the House to the fact that in 1937 Japan outlawed unions, strikes, and everything like that, and in 1937 in Germany Hitler's S. S. troops right out in the public squares and in the streets were beating to insensibility the union workers and their leaders, just to make a public example of them so that they would not have any desire to organize into unions. I am sure we must recognize that we are getting onto dangerous ground when we start to crush the workers because they are the backbone of our Nation. Farmers depend on selling commodities to the workers, and businessmen depend on selling their wares to the workers. We are all interested in how much income the Nation has through the channels of labor. We all depend on labor for everything we do. Everything we eat and wear and all the luxuries of American life are produced by labor, and we are all interested in it and should give these things careful thought.

The Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Rules, I think, lose prestige throughout the Nation by reporting this kind of legislation to the floor with the recommendation that it pass. If Congress should follow their lead, certainly the Congress would also lose prestige. Congress is responsible to the Nation. I think we should pretty well follow the desires of the people throughout the country and not oppose the people's wishes in general. I saw that going on in England in April. Those in power were opposing the desires of the English people, and in the following election we saw what happened. The voters just dumped the old party out and put in a new one, and they would do that in America. We have to fulfill our responsibilities.

I say Congress would do a great disservice to the Nation by passing H. R. 3937. Let us not carry on the job that Hitler started.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

COMMUNISM IN OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I addressed the House, calling attention to the case of six persons arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for stealing secret and highly confidential documents and files from the State Department and other agencies of our Government. Both Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew and J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, believed the stolen documents were of great importance to the welfare and security of the Nation. The papers, documents, and files stolen were found in New York in the possession of some of the persons arrested.

Three of the persons have been released, two paid small fines. I do not have reliable information as to the status of the remaining defendant. None has received a jail sentence because it is alleged that the secret files stolen by the defendants had not been used by them to the injury of the United States.

Let us look at the record. Since addressing the House I have made further inquiry and investigation as to the exact nature of the stolen papers. Predicated on information recently obtained, I wonder if the court before whom these people were brought or pleaded guilty was fully informed of all the facts and of the vital and important nature of the documents in question. Having learned of the character of the papers stolen, I am forced to the conclusion that the court was not fully informed of the facts and that some influence, either within or without the Department of Justice, was exercised to prevent the full and complete administration of justice.

Within 2 or 3 days after the arrest of the persons involved the Communist and radical press, also a small part of the conservative press of the country, attacked Secretary Grew and the arrests made as an invasion of freedom of speech and the press. The simple fact is that the crime committted, stealing secret files from departments of our Government, had nothing to do with either freedom of speech or press.

What were some of the files or documents stolen from our Government? I am reliably informed that the Government records in this case show that there were scores of records stolen not only from the State Department but also from the very top office of Naval Intelligence, Office of Strategic Services, Postal and Telegraph Censorship, and others. They were primarily of a secret military nature, the contents of which could not be made public. Some of the information contained therein was of a delicate international kind, which in the hands of those who have no respect nor sympathy for our form of government and way of life could cause irreparable damage to the national interest and security.

Let me give some examples. One document marked "Secret" and obviously originating in the Navy Department dealt with the schedule and targets for the bombing of Japan. This particular document was known to be in the possession of Philip Jaffe, one of the defendants, who pleaded guilty and was released on payment of a $2,500 fine, and his associates, during the early spring of this year, and before the program had been effected.

Another document, also marked "Top secret" and likewise originating in the Navy Department, dealt with the disposition of the Japanese fleet subsequent to the major naval battle of October 1944, and gave the location and class of each Japanese warship. What conceivable reason or excuse can there be for these people, or anyone else without authority, to have that information in their possession and at the same time claim freedom of the press. They stole those documents for no good purpose. That information in the hands of our enemies could have cost us many precious American lives. A concentration of antiaircraft defense by the Japanese against our bombing plan of Japanese military targets would have meant the death of many American airmen and the beheading of American fliers shot down over enemy territory, together with the loss of costly war material.

I wonder if the court were duly and fully apprised of the serious consequences involved in the theft of these documents.

Another document, stolen from the office of Postal and Telegraph Censorship, was a secret report on the Far East and so stamped as to leave no doubt in anybody's mind that the mere possession of it by an unauthorized person was a clear violation of the Espionage Act. This was not an antiquated paper but of current and vital interest to our Government and the Nation's welfare.

Another document stolen was from the office of Military Intelligence and consisted of 22 pages containing information obtained from Japanese prisoners of war. When our military officials question prisoners of war, it is for the purpose of getting secret military information of the enemy's plans. What business is it of these people to have information of that nature in their possession? Can it be claimed that the theft and possession of such documents is the act of innocent persons loyal to the United States? What was the purpose or hidden intent of these defendants in stealing those records?

Let me give one more example which is particularly illuminating and of present great importance to our policy in China. This stolen document was a lengthy, detailed report showing complete disposition of the units in the army of Chiang Kai-shek, where located, how placed, under whose command, naming the units division by division, and showing their military strength. It is easy to visualize the consequences of this information in the hands of the Communist forces in China, then and now. Is it possible that this information reached the headquarters of the Communist forces in China, enabling them to arrive at strategic places at the opportune time to accept the surrender of Japanese arms to serve their own purposes?

The six defendants in the case were arrested on or about June 7 of this year, but for a considerable time prior thereto these conspirators were under constant surveillance by agents of our Government and particularly by the FBI.

During this time, the San Francisco Conference was called and was in session to establish World Peace. In the delegation from China to that Conference was one duly accredited Communist officially representing the Communist regime in north China. His name was Tung Pi Wu and, until recently, he was here in Washington. It is not improbably that he may have alienated from Chiang's government the friendship and assistance promised by the United States at Cairo. He has been dividing his time between Washington and New York, working in the cause of communism.

Our Government records will show that one of his first acts upon arrival in San Francisco was to take a plane for New York City. The records will also show that Tung Pi Wu conferred with Philip Jaffe, one of the convicted conspirators, in New York, and a third person participating in the conference was Earl Browder, then head of the Communist Party in the United States and now planning a trip to Russia. He is the same man who served a term in a Federal penitentiary for passport fraud committed when he masqueraded in China under a false identity while engaged in organizing the Communist Party in China.

The conference between Jaffe, Tung Pi Wu, and Browder lasted approximately 5 hours. At the conclusion of that meeting, Mr. Tung Pi Wu hastened back to the San Francisco Conference for World Peace. Is there any doubt in anybody's mind what became of the military secrets which Jaffe then possessed as stolen property of our Government?

In addition to the military information, Jaffe had secret reports intended only for the Secretary of State, which had a direct bearing on our relationship with China. Does anyone doubt what became of that information?

We can be fairly certain that such information which Jaffe had was disclosed by him to the Communist delegate from China and used by him to his advantage at San Francisco and transmitted to the Communist leaders in China.

Was the court fully informed of all these circumstances before the final disposition of the cases against these conspirators? I have grave doubts regarding it. Was there some sinister influence exercised in relation to these six defendants of which the court was not aware? I believe the American people would be interested to know the inside of this unusual case because it involves the national interest and security.

While Jaffe was under surveillance by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, he was in contact not only with Earl Browder but he was also in contact, directly and indirectly, with known foreign Communist agents.

All these circumstances must lead any reasonable person to believe that all the

evidence in the case of these six individuals has not been made known and that some hidden influence has been at work to obstruct the wheels of justice.

Are there other cases in which undisputed evidence has been obtained by the FBI but no action taken to bring such cases before the bar of justice? The country is entitled to know. Congress has authority in the public interest, safety, and security to probe these questions and ascertain the truth. Accordingly, I have introduced a resolution in the House today to authorize the Judiciary Committee, acting as a whole, or by subcommittee, to make a thorough investigation of all the circumstances with respect to the disposition of the charges of espionage and the possession of documents stolen from secret Government files made by the FBI against Philip J. Jaffe, Kate L. Mitchell, John Stewart Service, Emmanuel Sigurd Larson, Andrew Roth, and Mark Gayn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PROBLEMS OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, the labor-industry strike of today overshadows all other domestic problems.

I want it distinctly understood that my remarks today about labor unions and their leaders apply only to that group of leaders and unions who seem to lack responsibility and are committing certain acts not in the interest of the public. We do have some excellent labor unions in the country, such as the railroad brotherhoods and certain groups of the A. F. of L., who are rendering a distinct service not only to their union members but to industry and to the public. Those labor leaders and unions who are doing their best to serve the public and produce the things needed deserve our thanks. My remarks today will be directed against the irresponsible labor leaders who, in a sense, are racketeers and are using their unions to promote their own lust for power and money and using their position as one of special privilege to advance their own personal power.

The Wagner Labor Act, passed in 1935, has been interpreted by the Supreme Court in such a fashion as to grant sweeping immunities to labor organizations. It makes it perfectly legal for union officials to commit antisocial acts and hinder our economic well-being without penalty. If these acts were committed by anyone else, or by industry, they would be illegal and subject to penalties.

Under present laws, unfair labor practices may be charged only against management—not against unions. The law does not make labor leaders equally responsible with management for keeping contracts. Labor unions cannot be sued. They pay no taxes. They make assessments and levy a head tax, or dues, on their members for the right to work. Some do not make financial statements such as are required for corporations. All this is done without even an attempt to learn the will of the majority. Many working men pay initiation fees and dues to their unions which far exceed what many of the better country clubs would dare ask of their members. When strikes are called, willing workers are prevented from earning their livelihood and the burden of relief is increased. In most meetings, no member would dare raise his voice in criticism of those in power.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater right than the right to work, for the right to work is the right to live, but for countless numbers of our people today, that right is being abridged because certain selfish labor politicians have a yen for personal power and they have usurped powers unparalleled in the history of our country. In many labor unions today, the individual member is a slave and even if well paid, still a slave insofar as his personal decisions are concerned. He works when he is told to work. He is idle when he is told to be idle. He pays when he is told to pay. He has little to say about how his organization shall run. He knows little of where the bulk of his union money goes or who gets it. This type of action by these labor unions is far removed from what we know as democracy. This type of labor union is dominated by a leader whose lust for power and money far outweighs his interest in the welfare of the members or the public. I am sure that there are many honest, willing, labor men who would oppose these self-appointed leaders in labor if they dared to do so.

Labor now has power. It has big power, but not enough responsibility. In terms of power labor is bigger than business or even the United States Government, for it has in its hands the power and ability to paralyze Government and business through strikes. Labor uses the resources of the Government and the immunities granted thereunder to tie up essential public services and hinder reconversion. The rules applying to industry should apply to labor.

There are certain collective bargaining laws that set up standards and provide penalties upon industry, but these laws do not touch the labor unions. Labor unions need not bargain and no penalties are provided for them. They may mock and jeer at reasonable collective bargaining attempts or break their contracts without fear of penalty. The Congress, under the Wagner Act, set up certain restrictions on business and large corporations, for they must be regulated. Now that unions have grown large they need regulation. The Government should not permit industry and labor to get into an economic impasse through disagreements and bring profound injury upon the public through strikes, work stoppages, and lock-outs.

Mr. Speaker, the action of these outlaw unions and their leaders bring discredit upon other good patriotic union leaders and their membership. I am sure that the good unions do not oppose revision of labor laws which might be of benefit to the general public.

Labor and industry must work together in this country if we are to produce the goods so badly needed. Labor leaders should not consider their position one of special privilege. Leadership is not built upon arrogant supermen drunk with power. The labor leaders should be servants and not masters of one of the finest American groups—the American working men and women of our country. Union members ought to watch carefully lest they permit leaders to arise who assume that the union is merely a vehicle to advance them to personal power. If the union does not serve the average member, what good is it? Is it the purpose of the union to furnish subservient backs upon which ambitious men may climb to power over their fellow workers?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the present method of collective bargaining between unions and employers is in about the same state of chaos that would exist if we had no courts to settle all other differences that exist between our people. It corresponds to the individual who assumes a legal right to use strong-arm methods of taking or getting what he wants. The American people have a right to expect that capital and labor shall iron out their differences without paralyzing production. There must be some means by which the employer and the workingman can settle their troubles without strikes, slow-downs, work stoppages, and lock-outs.

Mr. Speaker, it now appears that the Labor-Management Conference will end in failure. I should like to make the following suggestions which might be used as a basis for settling labor-management disputes.

I believe it is the duty of this Congress to have a revision of labor laws requiring labor to have the same responsibility under the law as industry now has. They should be required to incorporate. They should be financially responsible for their contracts. They should be subject to damages, as is business now, for failure to perform and keep their contracts. They should pay taxes just as business. They should be made accountable for their incomes and expenditures, and these figures should be made available to all its members. They should not be permitted to violate the constitutional rights of their members by coercive action. They should have responsibility commensurate with their power.

In doing this, I believe that where there is a dispute between labor and industry, a conciliator should first try to iron out the difficulties through conferences. Labor and industry should be willing to sit down around the same table and look their troubles in the face. If the conciliator fails to bring about a solution of the problem, then it should be referred to a commission or a court who would hear all of the testimony in connection with the differences. This court, like our Supreme Court, should be the final judge. When the decision is rendered, both the labor and industry should abide by that decision. This court or commission must have authority and must be backed up by proper authority and laws to enforce their decision. During the time that the

case is under consideration by the conciliator or the court, no strikes or lockouts should be permitted. I believe that such a measure, particularly as it relates to public utilities, such as transportation and communication, would be an effective way of serving the public interest.

In the past, the employers have exploited labor. This condition must never happen again. We now find labor so strong that it is not only attempting to exploit the employer but the public. It is an extremely dangerous condition. The employer has all of the investments subject to all of the penalties under the law. He is responsibile for his every act. The union has no investment, is quite free from all laws governing other citizens and industry. It has little responsibility for its acts or the acts of its members. I do not believe that we can expect industrial peace and harmony to last when we permit a group of labor racketeers so much liberty under the law.

If labor and industry will settle their differences and production can get into high gear, there is no question but what our country can go into a long period of prosperity. Wages will be increased, and as the efficiency of the worker improves, more goods will come to the consumer. John Q. Public has billions of dollars in his pocket and he wants to spend it for many things. If, through strikes, there is no production, then this country will face inflation through a scarcity of goods. Inflation hurts everyone. Ample production is the answer to black markets and inflation. The people of this country look to this Congress and the Government for sufficient strength to settle the differences between labor and industry which now hinders production.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. I would like to ask the gentleman some questions. One of them is this: Should not the worker have the right to set the price on his labor as a businessman has the right to set the price on the commodity that he has to sell, or else refuse to sell his labor for a price?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think he should have the right to say what he thinks he is worth, and if industry does not want to hire the man he should not be forced to hire him if he does not want him.

Mr. SAVAGE. I agree with the gentleman. But I want to say that leaders cannot get very far, as a rule, from what the members of the union want them to carry out. If they do that they do not pay dues, and they just elect someone else to carry out the bidding. There may be a situation or two like that in the country, but there are very few. Does not the gentleman believe that if he were a member of a union and a labor leader was not carrying out his desires, that he would go to the union and see that they brought the man in line?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. I will say to the gentleman that if I was a laboring man I would belong to the union. I have worked many long hours at 50 and 75 cents a day when there were no unions. Industry was exploiting labor, and that is wrong. But I have a definite feeling that members dare not speak up in labor-union meetings. Some men tell me that when they attend union meetings they are not allowed to speak up, and if they do they are subject to penalties; that many fine members in the union would object to what is carried out by the union leadership, but would be penalized if they dared to object. I wonder if that is not true in many labor unions?

Mr. SAVAGE. I have been in attendance at a great many union meetings. I belong to several different unions, and I have been an officer of unions, and I do not think that there is any place that a man is at more liberty to get up and speak than at a union meeting. They seldom invoke parliamentary rules that give a man a chance to speak only once or twice on a subject. I have seen union men get up and speak a dozen times. The same man would get up whenever he had a different idea on the subject that was being discussed at length. I have seen him get up time after time, and they have never invoked any limitation except along way late at midnight and then it was to shut off debate. I have often seen them postpone meetings in order to give members an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am glad to know that.

Mr. SAVAGE. It is their free place in the union, because they have no desire to shut off debate. I think most of the criticism from members could often be pointed back to themselves. Unions have a difficult time getting their membership to attend. Sometimes the members that do attend meetings almost beg and coax the remaining members of the union to come and help them carry on their responsibility, and often these kicks come from the members who stay away from the union meeting until after the action is taken, and then they will get up and say, "Well, I have nothing to say in this whatsoever; I have no voice in it." Actually he did not, but he stayed away, while those members who were doing the work were wishing that he would come and assist them.

There was one more point I wanted to bring up. Financial reports of the unions are pretty generally monthly reports to the membership. They are not required to make them public. I see no real public benefit to come out of saying that a labor union should have to make public their financial reports. It would have this effect. Some employers are very cooperative with their workers. They like their workers. They hire them, and they are glad to deal with them in the union, and if they knew that that union did not have any money in their fund—I am not talking about all of the employers; I mean those employers who want to fight the workers—if they knew they did not have any finances on hand, they would know that it would be easy to destroy them. I have seen that happen. Therefore the union is reluctant to make public its financial reports merely for the safety of its position in relation to its own employer. But the membership can always come into their union meetings. The treasurer stays there, and they can inquire of their financial status. Any time the member wants to know, he can find out. Most of the time they require the financial secretary to put out a financial report monthly, that is, on file or on the bulletin board for the members to see.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am glad to hear that.

The thing I am getting at here is this. It seems to me there ought to be some method whereby labor and industry can sit down across the table and face each other and work out their common problems, so that it is not necessary to go into a strike or lockout that ties up production at this critical time of reconversion. I think the gentleman would agree with me that that is a very necessary step.

Mr. SAVAGE. I think so.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It seems to me that that part of the machinery is breaking down, it is not functioning.

Mr. SAVAGE. Let me say that I have watched very closely. Many things we were restricted on during the war left pent-up feelings for buying and for recreation and for many other things. One of the things is industrial relations. They are out of practice, in a way, because they were not free to function during the war. It was just very recently, a few days ago, that the first wage raise was agreed on voluntarily without Government control in any manner, since 1942, so the workers and the employers are getting together.

It is only in the last few years that the employers and workers have made up their minds that they should sit down and talk across the table. They are getting good experience and it is getting smoother. They know more about it and they are getting proficient at it. I hope that voluntarily we can see that they do get together. Certainly I think once in a while workers walk out even against the advice of their leaders, and they do not do themselves any good and they hurt other people. I should like to see it smoothed out.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman. I also feel that the public utilities, such as transportation and communications, the vital things affecting thousands of people in a community, should not be tied up by strikes of any kind.

Mr. SAVAGE. I think that is right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE COOLIDGE ERA TO THE PRESIDENCY OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the end of this session of Congress will ring the curtain on my service in this body, to which I was first elected in 1922. By the vote of the people of the city of New York I was elected a justice of the supreme court of my State and my services here must now necessarily cease. When I returned here after the campaign it was hail and farewell, greeting my associates of many years and obliged to bid them good-by, and so this is the occasion of my formal leave taking and the time to review the legislative history of the United States, from the beginning of the Coolidge era to the Presidency of Harry S. Truman.

This unusual historical period has no parallel anywhere in the past. When I first came to this House the Republican Party was in full control of affairs in the United States and this House had a Republican majority. I was, therefore, in a position of a minority Member who could criticize things without having the power to redress any situation which called for legislative action. All committees were controlled by the Republican Party and the voice of a newly elected Democrat from New York could not carry very far. I was made a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, little realizing that I was destined to become chairman of that committee in a few years. The Republican Party seemed to be in for a long lease of life, and the whole country was sold on the idea of Coolidge prosperity which would put an end to all poverty and make this country rich and prosperous forever.

But while the political exigencies of the time made it impossible to do any effective legislative work, the situation was conducive to the making of many friends and laying the foundation for close association with the other Members of this body. A young Congressman is obliged to grope around before he can really master the intricacies of congressional procedure and practice, and it is along these lines that older Members can be most helpful. I am grateful to the many men, some of whom have gone to the Great Beyond, who came to my assistance in those trying days when their help was needed. Circumstances made it possible for me to repay this debt of gratitude when I myself have reached the stage of a veteran and when I was called upon to act as a guide and mentor to younger men who came to the House of Representatives in later years.

The Coolidge regime was succeeded by Hoover, and in 1930 the Democratic Party assumed control of this House. From a minority we became a majority, and from being ineffectual in the process of lawmaking we became responsible for the successful operation of the legislative branch of the Government. I became the chairman of the committee of which I was the junior member but 7 years before, and similarly many of my Democratic colleagues were suddenly given the responsibility of managing legislation desired by a Republican President. There was never any partisanship in this legislative body where the interests of the United States were involved. In the matters that come before us as Members of Congress, we usually discard all partisanship where the real interests of the country require a cooperative effort, and so, in spite of the fact that the President was of one political party and the majority of the House was of another, we worked together for one common goal and every bit of legislation necessary for the well-being of the masses which was proposed by the administration was energetically pushed through the House.

As chairman of the Committee on Immigration I then saw the opportunity of sponsoring legislation to bring about some measure of alleviation to those provisions of the immigration laws which were unnecessarily cruel and not in the best interests of the United States. I refer particularly to those situations which kept husbands and wives of American citizens separated from each other because of the quota situation of the particular country to which the husband or wife might have been chargeable. The same thing was true in the case of many minor children of American citizens. I made it a point to make a thorough study of the situation and am glad to be able to report that my endeavors were crowned with success.

The real test of survival of American institutions came during the depression period which began at that time and which continued for many years. We all remember those dreadful days when veterans of World War I came to Washington to plead for their rights and when our streets and the streets of all large cities were full of able-bodied men and women who were selling apples as a means of keeping from starvation. President Roosevelt had just taken over the helm of the state and Congress set itself to the task of implementing the work of the President with far-reaching historical acts of legislation, the effects of which will always be remembered by a grateful Nation and generations still unborn.

It was in that great period of our national history that legislation was enacted putting an end to stock swindles by the creation of the Federal Securities Exchange Act, to bank failures by the enactment of a law insuring bank deposits, to the exploitation of labor by the Wagner Act, to unscrupulous foreclosures by the creation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Housing Authority, and to many other abuses by other legislative measures, too numerous to mention, each of which stands as a lasting monument to the sagacity and love of people which President Roosevelt exhibited in his entire public career. I am proud to have been a Member of Congress in those days and will always look back with real satisfaction at those years when my colleagues and myself steered through the House these salutary laws which by their far-reaching implications saved this country from destruction and preserved our American system for generations to come.

Another danger, however, threatened the security and well-being of our being in a more insidious manner than the economic well-being of the people of the United States. Hitler became the ruler of Germany and sought to conquer the world and make all of us slaves to the German war lords. The trial of Nazi criminals now going on before an Allied court shows the extent of Hitler's conspiracy and how it was necessary for all freedom-loving nations to watch for the preservation of their liberties. We in America felt ourselves immune from that danger and lived in a sort of a fool's paradise, thinking that lightning would never strike us. We paid no attention to Hitler's growls and considered him a sort of a harmless madman.

I was not taken in by that view, and felt that something must be done to stem this German propaganda from becoming really dangerous and from overwhelming us as it did the other nations of Europe. As early as the summer of 1933 I called together the members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization for the purpose of studying ways and means how to prevent the infiltration of alien propaganda to the detriment of the United States. It was as a result of the study undertaken by me that the House passed a resolution organizing the first committee to investigate nazism and other un-American activities, and which committee unearthed a veritable mountain of evidence showing the necessity of legislation to prevent foreign spies and saboteurs to spread the poison of their vicious propaganda, by dividing our people and arraying class against class and faith against faith, brother against brother, and creating racial intolerance. It was then shown for the first time how the insidious poison of racialism becomes the foundation for destruction of our body politic, and how by using this poison the whole world will be enslaved for the benefit of Hitler and his cohorts. This was in 1934. My voice was that of a man crying in the wilderness. The newspapers and other groups of public opinion were poohpoohing my fears. Needless to say now, in 1945, how, much to my regret, my fears were justified.

The years from 1934 to 1939 were years of fear, of war, preparation for war, and steps taken to avoid war. It was not a happy time in the history of the world. Hitler was bestriding Europe like a colossus and the leaders of the democracies were hopelessly divided. When Japan invaded Manchuria and the British Government was asked to protest and join with us to stop Japanese aggression, nothing was done—the world was heading toward appeasement, and the democracies felt that they could avert danger if they could but offer concessions and "lie low." Hitler was moving on, Mussolini was moving on, the Japanese

war lords were moving on; the democracies were standing still, afraid to provoke the beast.

The Ethiopian affair was allowed to pass on unredressed, then Hitler attacked Poland and launched World War II.

It will be to the eternal credit of President Roosevelt that he was able to push through a reluctant Congress the peacetime draft bill, otherwise who knows how we could have emerged from this conflict victoriously. When the draft bill had to be extended it passed this House by a majority of one vote, and if I were unableto be present on that day I would have reproached myself forever that my vote could not be cast for the measure. Fortunately, I was here then and there were others who saw the necessity of voting for this bill, but many other Members did not vote for it, just as many Members of the House did not take seriously my warning in 1934 that intolerance is a Hitler scheme to destroy the United States.

And so, as I am saying good-by to the membership of the House I am repeating to you the warning of 1934: Do not allow intolerance to gain control. America is a country of many nationalities, many racial stocks, many civilizations. It is the glory of America that no matter whence its citizens have come, no matter what their racial background, they must always stand together to work toward the well-being of the Nation, for only in unity lies our strength. Many years ago Benjamin Franklin proclaimed the theory that in order to succeed we must "hang" together if we do not wish to hang separately. This theory is true today, and will always be true.

I am proud of the patriotism of the membership of the House and of the fact that while we were at war partisanship was at its lowest ebb and many a measure passed this House unanimously even if recommended by a Democratic President. May it ever be thus. Let us forget that we are Democrats or Republicans and let us vote for or against any measure as individuals and not as partisans.

In the many years of my service in this House I have made friends on both sides of the aisle. I expect to cherish these friendships for the rest of my life. I have served under many Speakers, I have met many of the clerks of the House. I was the recipient of many acts of kindness. I thank you one and all.

If my official duties will make it possible for me to come to Washington, I pledge myself to look up as many of you as I can to shake your hands and reminisce a while. With the termination of my service in this House go many regrets and many tears. I recall the many faces that have passed on during my term of office.

I shall continue to pray for the well-being of all of you.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I have been here but a short time, but may I say that I look at the gentleman's departure with a great deal of regret. The gentleman has been a real fighter in behalf of the people of his district, but still very fair to the rest of the country and very fair to those on the other side of the House, the other party. I know that in his judgship he will be a jurist who will always exercise a well-balanced and unbiased judgment. I congratulate the people of the State of New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. I have appreciated working with the gentleman in Congress. The country is going to lose a valuable Congressman. His work as I have noted it has been for the real welfare of the Nation and not only for the benefit of his own district. I am very sorry that the gentleman is leaving the Congress, although I am glad to see him go to a better position.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MEMORIAL FOR UNKNOWN SOLDIER OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the war is over. The victory is won. We pause to count the cost.

Not in dollars, or material things, for they can be replaced. We count 1,000,000 casualties and the vast areas of pain and suffering which these figures open up. We try to count the hours of worry, the sleepless nights, and the profound desolation in the hearts of so many homes, but the breadth and depth of this agony is beyond all human reckoning.

We count 250,000 dead.

Say it again. Two hundred and fifty thousand dead.

These stark figures we can understand. They are final and complete. This is the last full measure of devotion which others paid to win for us our present peace and security. This is the debt incurred by us, the living, which can never be repaid.

Before this appalling toll we are shamed and humbled. By our individual, thoughtless living, putting "me first" before "humanity first," we invited the assault which has claimed our best.

We fumble for excuses to mitigate our fault. We grope for words. But the young dead are dead. Nothing can alter that fact. They are dead, and all we can now do is to remember their sacrifices.

How?

It is not easy to comprehend their sacrifices which so far exceed those which the living have made to win the war. We approach this with a reverence born of our own shortcomings. No shrine is too great to honor their giving.

Two of my esteemed colleagues from Massachusetts have taken commendable steps in this direction. They have introduced identical bills, calling upon the Congress to appropriate a substantial sum to provide for a suitable memorial. It will be dedicated to all of our dead in World War II.

The Congress will unanimously support such legislation, but we must do so now, while all of us know and feel the debt we owe to each one of the 250,000 who laid down their lives for us.

It is impossible to honor each one of this army of heroes by individual name. The Kellehers, the Cohens, the Stopyras, the Compagnones, the Bernards, the list of martyrs for America is too long to single out each for the respect which is his due.

We wish to honor them by a symbol which will stand for all of them; a symbol which will bring into focus the undying courage and selflessness and faith in America that was theirs. We wish to bring to it all the reverence and beauty and spirit of a great Nation.

We wish to dedicate ourselves to them and to the cause for which they gave all that life can possibly give by erecting a pure and enduring temple to the unknown soldier of World War II.

The war just ended has been our sternest test, our deepest sacrifice. We have emerged from it a different people, purged by pity and fear, strengthened in our democratic faith by the willingness of humble men and women to die for it, committed by their example to live for it, to work with truth and constancy, building and developing our way of life so that its freedoms and its responsibilities will grace every nook and corner of our land and inspire the minds and hearts of all Americans.

The men and women who have aroused the United States to faith and unity rest in the land of nearly every nation, a reminder to all peoples of our belief in the equality of man, and of our preparedness to live, or die if need be, for a world of peace and justice for all.

At the bottom of the oceans they lie. In Alaska, Canada, and South America. On the island stepping stones across the Pacific. In Australia, India, China, the Soviet Union, the Near East, the Balkans, Africa, Italy, France, England, Ireland, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Norway, Sweden, Ireland, these are the cemeteries of American dead. Most of the dead are known and their graves are marked. But some lie covered by mountain snows or are mercifully hidden by the teeming vegetation of the jungles. Many, though found, can never be identified. No longer John Jones or Steve Szostak but Americans, who died not as brothers, husbands, fathers, or sons of one family in Missoula, Mont., or Claymore, Ga., but as relatives of the family of 140,000,000 citizens which we call the United States. They did not die for a few; they died for all.

Out of this, the costliest war in our history, we shall build a memorial to the unknown soldier of World War II, so that generations to come, bowing their heads before this memorial, may be stirred from their complacency and be inspired to create a citizenship for peace, working day in and day out, with good-will and

intelligence, to build a finer nation in a better world.

If, in the years to come, some evil men may try to set us against one another, by fanning the dying embers of racial and religious hate, we can point to this temple and say: "This was an American who died to save you. Was he a Negro, a Catholic, or a Jew? No one will know and no one will care, because he was an American, which you should try to be. In laying down his life for you, he did not fight for any one race or creed. He fought for the freedom of all to live in fellowship under the all-embracing humanity of our way of life. Whenever you are tempted to divide your brother Americans by falsehoods and by passions, bow your head before this temple, think of this unknown American who might be a Negro, a Catholic, or a Jew, and do not dishonor yourself or your country by betraying him."

During this war we have given billions of dollars to our allies; we are giving billions to feed and clothe the victims of aggression and we may be called upon to give much more in the name of world reconstruction. All this is a part of the inevitable tribute exacted by war. But our dead constitute our greatest loss and it is only fitting and proper that we should spend with our purse and our hearts to erect a splendid memorial to commemorate their giving, beyond which there is none greater.

Here, near Washington, shall be the altar of their sacrifice, containing the broken remains of the Unknown Soldier of World War II. It shall be a thing of beauty carved from imperishable stone by the most gifted of sculptors. Its whiteness, symbolizing purity of heart, shall stand out against the rolling green lawns of our hopeful countryside.

To this shrine, millions of Americans will come. They will bow their heads in silent prayer. Away from the distracting noise and speed, they will come close to the soul of America. And from this tomb containing the hopes and dreams of 250,000 young men, they will seem to hear them whisper: "Forward, the command is ever forward to a brighter, better day. We, the dead, are trusting in you."

They will leave, reminded of their debt to the dead of World War II, and reminded of the unfinished job which the living must complete. From the monument to the dead, Americans will go forward, with renewed faith and will to work for the greatest of all monuments, a just and enduring peace.

And so, we shall build this temple to the unknown hero of World War II.

We shall build it soon and we shall build it great, as the beacon to light our way.

Lest we forget. Lest we forget.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 29, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Thursday, November 29, 1945, in room 1304, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

845. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 426. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4780 a bill to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 427. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4717, a bill to establish a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 428. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4571, a bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 429. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2536, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2688. A bill to provide compensation to Honolulu Plantation Co., a California corporation, as compensation for damages sustained; with amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4826) granting a pension to Nellie Knotts; and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4840. A bill to amend the act of January 22, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 5), to authorize and direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase aluminum for stock-piling purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 4841. A bill to amend the act of January 22, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 5), to authorize and direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase aluminum for stock-piling purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 4842. A bill to allow the disposal of surplus vessels without necessity for public bidding, with prior inspection rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4843. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States foreign service academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4844. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of the alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4845. A bill to permit postal employees to retire after 25 years of service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4846. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians", approved April 10, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4847. A bill providing for domiciliary and hospital care for veterans who have reached the age of 65 years, with non-service-connected injuries or diseases; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4848. A bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4849. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4850. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans," approved May 24, 1944, to provide for the extension of the benefits of such act to certain members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4851. A bill to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 4852. A bill to provide for a reexamination and resurvey of the Mississippi River at and in the vicinity of the East Cape Girardeau and Clear Creek, North Alexander, Clear Creek, Preston, and Miller Pond drainage and levee districts, Illinois, for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to select and procure a design for a medal representative of service in the armed forces in both world wars; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution creating a joint standing committee on scientific research; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GORE:

H. Res. 423. Resolution to create a select committee to make a study of government of occupied enemy territory and of administration of United States foreign policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Res. 424. Resolution to create a select committee to make a study of government of occupied enemy territory and of the administration of United States foreign policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 425. Resolution to recall American troops from China and promote unity and democracy in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 430. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation of the disposition of the case against certain individuals charged by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with espionage and possession of confidential Government documents; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4853. A bill granting a pension to Henry Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4854. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4855. A bill for the relief of Henry P. Garrett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 4856. A bill for the relief of William Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1351. By Mr. LANE: Resolution of New England District Council No. 2, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America with reference to the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1352. Also, resolution of the New England District Council No. 2, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, with reference to S. 380; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1353. Also, resolution of District Council No. 2, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, with reference to status for merchant marine radio operators; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1354. Also, resolution of District Council No. 2, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, with reference to our foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1355. Also, resolution of District Council No. 2, United Electrical Workers, with reference to transportation for our troops; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1356. Also, resolution of New England District Council No. 2, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, with reference to S. 1274; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1357. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution unanimously adopted by the directors of the New England Council at their eighty-first quarterly meeting, Hotel Statler, Boston, November 15, 1945, extending heartiest congratulations to Governor Tobin for his constructive action in extending to the United Nations Organization an invitation to establish its permanent seat in Massachusetts and pledging cordial support of his efforts to bring to that historic region the headquarters of this new world organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1358. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of registering members of American Legion Post, No. 27, Middlebury, Vt., as being against the legislation now before Congress restricting the dissemination of practices and techniques involved in the use of atomic power, urging defeat of this measure; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1359. Also, resolution of registering members of American Legion Post, No. 27, Middlebury, Vt., as being in favor of the universal military training program outlined before Congress by President Truman on October 23, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1360. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Matt W. Becker, commandant, Navy Club, Ship No. 40, 615 Fifty-seventh Street, Kenosha, Wis., organization's views as to consolidation of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.